

# COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

## LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1986

SESSION OF 1986 170TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 15

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

#### THE SPEAKER (K. LEROY IRVIS) IN THE CHAIR

#### PRAYER

REV. DR. DAVID R. HOOVER, chaplain of the House of Representatives, from McConnellsburg, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

Most Loving Father, we are grateful for the providential care Thou hast shown to all Thine own, and we thank Thee that Thou dost keep us in the hollow of Thy hand. Reach out to the members of this legislature with Thy loving and protective care, enable them to avoid the pitfalls and temptations which confront them in life itself, and inspire and direct them in the accomplishment of greater good for the people of this Commonwealth. This we ask that Thy will may be done and Thy kingdom may come in the hearts and minds of each one of us. Amen.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(The Pledge of Allegiance was enunciated by members.)

#### JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that the Journal for Tuesday, February 18, 1986, is not yet in print. The approval of that Journal will be postponed, without objection, until the Journal is in print, and the Chair hears no objection.

#### HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

**No. 2167** By Representatives FOX, MAYERNIK and NAHILL

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further establishing a duty to stop vehicles at accident scenes; and providing an exception from the duty for emergency vehicles.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2168** By Representatives FOX, NAHILL, VEON, RAYMOND and GODSHALL

An Act amending the act of May 1, 1933 (P. L. 103, No. 69), known as "The Second Class Township Code," authorizing taxation for solid waste removal.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2169** By Representatives FOX, NAHILL, VEON, RAYMOND and GODSHALL

An Act amending the act of June 24, 1931 (P. L. 1206, No. 331), known as "The First Class Township Code," authorizing taxation for solid waste removal.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2170** By Representatives FOX, NAHILL, VEON, RAYMOND and GODSHALL

An Act amending the act of February 1, 1966 (1965 P. L. 1656, No. 581), known as "The Borough Code," authorizing taxation for solid waste removal.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2171** By Representatives GRUITZA, KUKOVICH, OLIVER and GALLAGHER

An Act amending Title 24 (Education) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, including service in the Merchant Marines as credited nonschool service.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2172** By Representatives HUTCHINSON, PETRARCA, TRELLO, DININNI, GEIST, STEIGHNER, STUBAN, PHILLIPS, DAVIES, JOHNSON, LEVDANSKY, MARKOSEK, MURPHY, WOZNIAK and VEON

An Act amending the act of March 27, 1980 (P. L. 60, No. 24), entitled "An act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P. L. 6, No. 2), entitled 'An act relating to tax reform and State taxation by codifying and enumerating certain subjects of taxation and imposing taxes thereon; providing procedures for the payment, collection, administration and enforcement thereof; providing for tax credits in certain cases; conferring powers and imposing duties upon the Department of Revenue, certain employers, fiduciaries, individuals, persons, corporations and other entities; prescribing crimes, offenses and penalties,' establishing a credit against gross receipts tax for railroad expenditures on mainte-

nance or right-of-way improvements and imposing restrictions on such credit," extending the period of expiration of the act.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2173** By Representatives HERMAN, STABACK, TRELLO, JOHNSON, JAROLIN, CIVERA, PETRARCA, PHILLIPS, McHALE, FISCHER, KENNEY and E. Z. TAYLOR

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P. L. 177, No. 175), known as "The Administrative Code of 1929," further providing for the services to be provided by area agencies for aging.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH AND WELFARE, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2174** By Representatives DOMBROWSKI, BOWSER, GALLAGHER, BURNS, CAPPABIANCA, MERRY, BOYES, SWIFT, BOWLEY and ROBBINS

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P. L. 30, No. 14), known as the "Public School Code of 1949," providing for the ownership of land and buildings by intermediate units.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, February 19, 1986.

**SENATE BILL FOR CONCURRENCE**

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, presented the following bill for concurrence:

**SB 1342, PN 1844**

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, February 19, 1986.

**BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, I move that HB 2095 be lifted from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

On the question,  
Will the House agree to the motion?  
Motion was agreed to.

**LEAVES OF ABSENCE**

The SPEAKER. The Chair now turns to leaves of absence.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. PIEVSKY. Do you have any requests for leaves?

Mr. PIEVSKY. Not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the minority whip on leaves of absence.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I request a leave for the gentleman from Luzerne, Mr. STEVENS, for the day, and the lady from Delaware, Mrs. DURHAM, for the day.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection to the granting of the leaves, and the leaves are therefore granted.

**MASTER ROLL CALL**

The SPEAKER. The Chair is about to take the master roll call for today. Members will proceed to vote.

The following roll call was recorded:

**PRESENT—197**

Acosta	Dietz	Lashinger	Rieger
Afflerbach	Dininni	Laughlin	Robbins
Angstadt	Distler	Lescovitz	Roebuck
Argall	Dombrowski	Letterman	Rudy
Arty	Donatucci	Lcvdanskyy	Ryan
Baldwin	Dorr	Linton	Rybak
Barber	Duffy	Livengood	Saloom
Barley	Evans	Lloyd	Saurman
Battisto	Fargo	Lucy	Scheetz
Belardi	Fattah	McCall	Schuler
Belfanti	Fee	McClatchy	Semmel
Birmelin	Fischer	McHale	Serafini
Black	Flick	McVerry	Seventy
Blaum	Foster, Jr., A.	Mackowski	Showers
Book	Fox	Maiale	Sirianni
Bortner	Freeman	Manderino	Smith, B.
Bowley	Freind	Manmiller	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Fryer	Markosek	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Gallagher	Mayernik	Snyder, G. M.
Brandt	Gallen	Merry	Staback
Broujos	Gamble	Michlovic	Stairs
Bunt	Gannon	Micozzie	Steighner
Burd	Geist	Miller	Stewart
Burns	George	Moehlmann	Stuban
Bush	Gladeck	Morris	Sweet
Caltagirone	Godshall	Mowery	Swift
Cappabianca	Greenwood	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Carlson	Gruitza	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Carn	Gruppo	Nahill	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Hagarty	Noye	Telek
Cessar	Haluska	O'Brien	Trello
Chadwick	Harper	O'Donnell	Truman
Civera	Hayas	Olasz	Van Horne
Clark	Hayes	Oliver	Veon
Clymer	Herman	Perzel	Vroon
Cohen	Hershey	Petrarca	Wambach
Colafella	Honaman	Petrone	Wass
Cole	Howlett	Phillips	Weston
Cordisco	Hutchinson	Piccola	Wiggins
Cornell	Itkin	Pievsky	Wilson
Coslett	Jackson	Pistella	Wogan
Cowell	Jarolin	Pitts	Wozniak
Coy	Johnson	Pott	Wright, D. R.
Deluca	Josephs	Pressmann	Wright, J. L.
DeVerter	Kasunic	Preston	Wright, R. C.
DeWeese	Kennedy	Punt	Yandrisevits
Daley	Kenney	Raymond	
Davies	Kosinski	Reber	Irvis,
Dawida	Kukovich	Reinard	Speaker
Deal	Langtry	Richardson	

**ADDITIONS—0**

**NOT VOTING—0**

**EXCUSED—4**

Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue
--------	--------	---------	-------

## ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS OF SPONSORS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who files with the Speaker and the Chief Clerk the additions and deletions for sponsorships of bills.

The following list was submitted:

### ADDITIONS:

HB 408, Broujos; HB 740, Broujos; HB 784, Fox; HB 1127, Itkin; HB 1625, Robbins; HB 1639, Fox; HB 1695, Cimino, Belardi; HB 1791, Nahill; HB 1927, Scheetz; HB 1986, Langtry; HB 2024, Fox; HB 2040, Lescovitz; HB 2051, Kasunic, Veon; HB 2053, Howlett; HB 2056, Burd; HB 2078, Wogan; HB 2085, Laughlin; HB 2086, Laughlin; HB 2107, Flick; HB 2108, Flick; HB 2109, Flick; HB 2111, Freeman, Colafella; HB 2153, Black, Wozniak, Merry, Richardson, O'Brien, J. J. Taylor, Kenney; HB 2154, Tigie; HB 2163, D. W. Snyder, Black, Deal; HR 228, Schuler, Acosta, Trello; HR 237, Fischer, Richardson.

## WELCOME

The SPEAKER. Representative Foster has as his guests Miss Nancy Townsend and her mother, Julia Townsend. Miss Townsend will be a participant in the Model Legislature. We are happy to have you here. Welcome to the hall of the House.

Please, Nancy, when you participate, do not act exactly the way you see some of us acting. We expect higher things of you.

## CALENDAR

### BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 943, PN 1780**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of July 7, 1947 (P. L. 1368, No. 542), known as the "Real Estate Tax Sale Law," adding and amending definitions; further providing for the creation of bureaus in counties, for appointment and compensation of personnel, for the bonding of certain personnel and for accounting and distribution; increasing certain costs and fees; further providing for tax liens, filings, adjudications and collection; providing for discharge of tax claims; further providing for sale and purchase of property; and making editorial changes.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. LAUGHLIN offered the following amendments No. A0620:

Amend Sec. 13, page 20, lines 19 and 20, by striking out "July 28, 1983 (P.L.134, No.36) (expired January 1, 1985)" and inserting

reenacted November 6, 1985 (P.L.305, No.76)

Amend Sec. 13 (Sec. 308), page 22, line 8, by inserting after "sale"

and [(4)] (5) state that the owner of any owner-occupied real estate can apply for an extension of the [redemption] period for discharge of tax claim for up to twelve (12) additional months under and subject to the provisions of sections 502 and 503 of this act

Amend Bill, page 32, by inserting between lines 9 and 10

Section 21.1. Sections 502 and 503 of the act, reenacted and amended November 6, 1985 (P.L.305, No.76), are amended to read:

Section 502. Option of County to Extend [Redemption] Period for Discharge of Tax Claim.—A county may at the option of its commissioners enact legislation extending the [real estate tax redemption] period for discharge of tax claim for real estate taxes for taxpayers for up to twelve (12) additional months.

Section 503. Extension of [Redemption] Period for Discharge of Tax Claim.—(a) If the county commissioners of the county enact legislation pursuant to section 502, then the county commissioners, acting through the county tax claim bureau determine that a tax claim or tax claims constitute severe hardship to the taxpayer and that extenuating circumstances beyond the taxpayer's control have caused the tax claim or claims to be filed or remain unpaid and there is a reasonable probability that the taxpayer will be able to meet the indebtedness if granted an extension of the [redemption] period for discharge of tax claim for up to twelve (12) additional months, they shall have the authority in the event of an application for extension submitted by the taxpayer to:

(1) Extend the [redemption] period for discharge of tax claim for owner-occupied real estate for up to twelve (12) additional months: Provided, That the taxpayer enters into an equitable apportioned payment schedule consistent therewith.

(2) Abate, suspend, continue or stay the tax sale proceedings pending with respect to such owner-occupied residential real estate.

(b) The payment schedule authorized under subsection (a) shall permit the taxpayer to make payment of the amount due in at least four (4) separate payments, spaced at least thirty (30) days apart, and shall require the initial payment to be not more than twenty-five per centum (25%) of the total indebtedness calculated to be due under such schedule. However, the provisions of this subsection and of section 603 notwithstanding, the county commissioners may, in their discretion, in special hardship cases, establish payment schedules specifically suited to the capabilities of the particular affected taxpayer.

(c) The application for extension authorized in clause (1) of subsection (a) shall be made in such form as shall be provided by the bureau. Within thirty (30) days of receipt of such an application, the director of the bureau shall either allow or disallow such an extension. If such an extension is allowed, the bureau shall set the length of such extension. Any taxpayer aggrieved by the decision of the bureau may, within fifteen (15) days after notice thereof, appeal to the county court of common pleas for de novo review of the application.

(d) For the purpose of this section the phrase "extenuating circumstances" means:

(1) Serious physical illness or injury or a combination of such illness or injury with a state of prolonged unemployment if: (i) the taxpayer is a permanent resident of the Commonwealth, (ii) the illness or injury, or combination thereof, occurred or persisted during any of the tax years for which the delinquent taxes were assessed or during the year immediately preceding any such delinquency, and (iii) the illness or injury, or combination thereof, has been a substantial cause of the taxpayer's failure to pay any such delinquent tax or taxes to the date of application for relief under this section.

(2) Unemployment if: (i) the taxpayer is a permanent resident of the Commonwealth, (ii) the unemployment occurred or persisted during any of the tax years for which the delinquent taxes were assessed or during the year immediately preceding any such delinquency, and (iii) the unemployment has been a substantial cause of the taxpayer's failure to pay any such delinquent tax or taxes to the date of application for relief under this section.

(e) For the purpose of this section an extension of the [redemption] period for discharge of tax claim shall only apply to one (1) owner-occupied property per taxpayer.

Amend Bill, page 60, by inserting between lines 15 and 16 Section 45. The portion of the last sentence of section 308(a) which refers to sections 502 and 503, and sections 502 and 503, amended by this amendatory act, shall expire January 1, 1988.

Amend Sec. 45, page 60, line 16, by striking out "45" and inserting

46

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, very briefly.

When HB 943 was originally drafted earlier this year, there was not in position legislation that the House of Representatives passed covering those people who were in very grave difficulty regarding the payment of delinquent taxes and the extension of time that was offered as well as the entire coverage of those people with regard to the unemployment level in their districts. You may recall that Representative Punt had amended the bill, and this legislation today covers that issue.

The amendment, Mr. Speaker, speaks to the fact that we are giving those people the consideration that had been earlier given in the law. If we were to pass HB 943 without this particular amendment, HB 943 would take precedence over the earlier passed legislation and we would lose that protection for the people.

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

Mr. FRYER. Mr. Speaker, I would urge the members of the House to vote "yes" on the Laughlin amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

Acosta	Dietz	Langtry	Rieger
Afflerbach	Diminni	Lashingier	Robbins
Angstadt	Distler	Laughlin	Roebuck
Argall	Dombrowski	Lescovitz	Rudy
Arty	Donatucci	Letterman	Ryan
Baldwin	Dorr	Levdansky	Rybak
Barber	Duffy	Linton	Saloom
Barley	Evans	Livengood	Saurman
Battisto	Fargo	Lloyd	Scheetz
Belardi	Fattah	Lucyk	Schuler
Belfanti	Fee	McCall	Semmel
Birmelin	Fischer	McClatchy	Serafini
Black	Flick	McHale	Seventy
Blaum	Foster, Jr., A.	McVerry	Showers
Book	Fox	Mackowski	Sirianni
Bortner	Freeman	Manderino	Smith, B.
Bowley	Freind	Manmiller	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Fryer	Markosek	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Gallagher	Mayernik	Snyder, G. M.
Brandt	Gallen	Merry	Staback
Broujos	Gamble	Michlovic	Stairs
Bunt	Gannon	Micozzie	Steighner
Burd	Geist	Miller	Stewart
Burns	George	Moehlmann	Stuban
Bush	Gladeck	Morris	Sweet
Caltagirone	Godshall	Mowery	Swift
Carlson	Greenwood	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Carn	Gruitza	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.

Cawley	Gruppo	Nahill	Taylor, J.
Cessar	Hagarty	Noye	Telek
Chadwick	Haluska	O'Brien	Trello
Civera	Harper	O'Donnell	Truman
Clark	Hasay	Olasz	Van Horne
Clymer	Hayes	Oliver	Veon
Cohen	Herman	Perzel	Vroon
Colafella	Hershey	Petrarca	Wambach
Cole	Honaman	Petrone	Wass
Cordisco	Howlett	Phillips	Weston
Cornell	Hutchinson	Piccola	Wiggins
Coslett	Itkin	Pievsky	Wilson
Cowell	Jackson	Pistella	Wogan
Coy	Jarolin	Pitts	Wozniak
Deluca	Johnson	Pott	Wright, D. R.
DeVerter	Josephs	Pressmann	Wright, J. L.
DeWeese	Kasunic	Preston	Wright, R. C.
Daley	Kennedy	Punt	Yandrisevits
Davies	Kenney	Raymond	
Dawida	Kosinski	Reber	Irvis,
Deal	Kukovich	Reinard	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—3

Cappabianca	Maiale	Richardson	
Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue

EXCUSED—4

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

On the question,

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

Mr. LAUGHLIN offered the following amendments No. A0551:

Amend Title, page 2, line 2, by inserting after "claims;" imposing additional notification requirements

Amend Bill, page 46, by inserting between lines 10 and 11

Section 29. The act is amended by adding a section to read:

Section 607.1. Additional Notification Efforts.—

(a) When any notification of a pending tax sale or a tax sale subject to court confirmation is required to be mailed to any owner, mortgagee, lienholder or other person or entity whose property interests are likely to be significantly affected by such tax sale, and such mailed notification is either returned without the required receipted personal signature of the addressee or under other circumstances raising a significant doubt as to the actual receipt of such notification by the named addressee, or is not returned or acknowledged at all, then, before the tax sale can be conducted or confirmed, the bureau must exercise reasonable efforts to discover the whereabouts of such person or entity and notify him. The bureau's efforts shall include, but not necessarily be restricted to, a search of current telephone directories for the county, and of the dockets and indices of the county tax assessment offices, recorder of deeds office, and prothonotary's office, as well as contacts made to any apparent alternate address or telephone number which may have been written on or in the file pertinent to such property. When such reasonable efforts have been exhausted, regardless of whether or not the notification efforts have been successful, a notation shall be placed in the property file describing the efforts made and the results thereof, and the property may be rescheduled for sale or the sale may be confirmed as provided in this act.

(b) The notification efforts required by subsection (a) shall be in addition to any other notice requirements imposed by this act.

Amend Sec. 29, page 46, line 11, by striking out "29" and inserting

30

Amend Sec. 30, page 46, line 23, by striking out "30" and inserting

31

Amend Sec. 31, page 47, line 1, by striking out "31" and inserting

32

Amend Sec. 32, page 47, line 4, by striking out "32" and inserting

33

Amend Sec. 33, page 48, line 9, by striking out "33" and inserting

34

Amend Sec. 34, page 49, line 24, by striking out "34" and inserting

35

Amend Sec. 35, page 51, line 20, by striking out "35" and inserting

36

Amend Sec. 36, page 51, line 23, by striking out "36" and inserting

37

Amend Sec. 37, page 53, line 19, by striking out "37" and inserting

38

Amend Sec. 38, page 53, line 22, by striking out "38" and inserting

39

Amend Sec. 39, page 54, line 15, by striking out "39" and inserting

40

Amend Sec. 40, page 54, line 18, by striking out "40" and inserting

41

Amend Sec. 41, page 54, line 30, by striking out "41" and inserting

42

Amend Sec. 42, page 56, line 22, by striking out "42" and inserting

43

Amend Sec. 43, page 57, line 30, by striking out "43" and inserting

44

Amend Sec. 44, page 59, line 12, by striking out "44" and inserting

45

Amend Sec. 45, page 60, line 16, by striking out "45" and inserting

46

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the reason for the offering of this amendment is the legislation, once again, was drafted in such a fashion to not include the decisions of the Supreme Court in Tracy vs. Chester County Tax Claim Bureau. Mr. Speaker, what happened in that situation, there was not sufficient notice to the owner of the home, and in that circumstance the sale of the home was rolled back and the original owner was given an opportunity to take advantage of that period of time and reclaim his home.

What this legislation does is include the requirements for notice under those specific situations to protect the homeowner's interests.

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

Mr. FRYER. Mr. Speaker, I would urge that the members vote "yes" on the second Laughlin amendment.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—196

Acosta	Dietz	Lashing	Rieger
Afflerbach	Dininni	Laughlin	Robbins
Angstadt	Distler	Lescovitz	Roebuck
Argall	Dombrowski	Letterman	Rudy
Arty	Donatucci	Levdansky	Ryan
Baldwin	Dorr	Linton	Rybak
Barber	Duffy	Livengood	Saloom
Barley	Evans	Lloyd	Saurman
Battisto	Fargo	Lucy	Scheetz
Belardi	Fattah	McCall	Schuler
Belfanti	Fee	McClatchy	Semmel
Birmelin	Fischer	McHale	Serafini
Black	Flick	McVerry	Seventy
Blaum	Foster, Jr., A.	Mackowski	Showers
Book	Fox	Maiale	Sirianni
Bortner	Freeman	Manderino	Smith, B.
Bowley	Freind	Manmiller	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Fryer	Markosek	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Gallagher	Mayernik	Snyder, G. M.
Brandt	Gallen	Merry	Staback
Broujos	Gamble	Michlovic	Stairs
Bunt	Gannon	Micozzie	Steighner
Burd	Geist	Miller	Stewart
Burns	George	Moehlmann	Stuban
Bush	Gladeck	Morris	Sweet
Caltagirone	Godshall	Mowery	Swift
Cappabianca	Greenwood	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Carlson	Gruitza	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Carn	Gruppo	Nahill	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Hagarty	Noye	Telek
Cessar	Haluska	O'Brien	Trello
Chadwick	Harper	O'Donnell	Truman
Civera	Hasay	Olasz	Van Horne
Clark	Hayes	Oliver	Veon
Clymer	Herman	Perzel	Vroon
Cohen	Hershey	Petrarca	Wambach
Colafella	Honaman	Petrone	Wass
Cole	Howlett	Phillips	Weston
Cordisco	Hutchinson	Piccola	Wiggins
Cornell	Irkin	Pievsky	Wilson
Coslett	Jackson	Pistella	Wogan
Cowell	Jarolin	Pitts	Wozniak
Coy	Johnson	Pott	Wright, D. R.
Deluca	Josephs	Pressmann	Wright, J. L.
DeVerter	Kasunic	Preston	Wright, R. C.
DeWeese	Kennedy	Punt	Yandrisevits
Daley	Kenney	Raymond	
Davies	Kosinski	Reber	Irvis,
Dawida	Kukovich	Reinard	Speaker
Deal	Langtry		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—1

Richardson

EXCUSED—4

Cimini Durham Stevens Tigie  
 The question was determined in the affirmative, and the amendments were 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?  
 Agreeable to the provisions of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS—195

- |             |                 |           |               |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------|---------------|
| Acosta      | Dietz           | Langtry   | Rieger        |
| Afflerbach  | Dininni         | Lashinger | Robbins       |
| Angstadt    | Distler         | Laughlin  | Roebuck       |
| Argall      | Dombrowski      | Lescovitz | Rudy          |
| Arty        | Donatucci       | Letterman | Ryan          |
| Baldwin     | Dorr            | Levdansky | Rybak         |
| Barber      | Duffy           | Linton    | Saloom        |
| Barley      | Evans           | Livengood | Saurman       |
| Battisto    | Fargo           | Lloyd     | Scheetz       |
| Belardi     | Fattah          | Lucyk     | Schuler       |
| Belfanti    | Fee             | McCall    | Semmel        |
| Birmelin    | Fischer         | McClatchy | Serafini      |
| Black       | Flick           | McHale    | Seventy       |
| Blaum       | Foster, Jr., A. | McVerry   | Showers       |
| Book        | Fox             | Mackowski | Sirianni      |
| Bortner     | Freeman         | Manderino | Smith, B.     |
| Bowley      | Freind          | Manmiller | Smith, L. E.  |
| Bowser      | Fryer           | Markosek  | Snyder, D. W. |
| Boyes       | Gallagher       | Mayernik  | Snyder, G. M. |
| Brandt      | Gallen          | Merry     | Staback       |
| Broujos     | Gamble          | Michlovic | Stairs        |
| Bunt        | Gannon          | Micozzie  | Steighner     |
| Burd        | Geist           | Miller    | Stewart       |
| Burns       | George          | Moehlmann | Stuban        |
| Bush        | Gladeck         | Morris    | Sweet         |
| Caltagirone | Godshall        | Mowery    | Swift         |
| Cappabianca | Greenwood       | Mrkonic   | Taylor, E. Z. |
| Carlson     | Gruitza         | Murphy    | Taylor, F. E. |
| Carn        | Gruppo          | Nahill    | Taylor, J.    |
| Cawley      | Hagarty         | Noye      | Telek         |
| Cessar      | Haluska         | O'Brien   | Trello        |
| Chadwick    | Harper          | O'Donnell | Truman        |
| Civera      | Hasay           | Olasz     | Van Horne     |
| Clark       | Hayes           | Oliver    | Veon          |
| Clymer      | Herman          | Perzel    | Vroon         |
| Cohen       | Hershey         | Petrarca  | Wambach       |
| Colafella   | Honaman         | Petrone   | Wass          |
| Cole        | Howlett         | Phillips  | Weston        |
| Cordisco    | Hutchinson      | Piccola   | Wiggins       |
| Cornell     | Itkin           | Pievsky   | Wilson        |
| Coslett     | Jackson         | Pistella  | Wogan         |
| Cowell      | Jarolin         | Pitts     | Wozniak       |
| Coy         | Johnson         | Pott      | Wright, D. R. |
| Deluca      | Josephs         | Pressmann | Wright, J. L. |
| DeVerter    | Kasunic         | Preston   | Wright, R. C. |
| DeWeese     | Kennedy         | Punt      | Yandrisevits  |
| Daley       | Kenney          | Raymond   |               |
| Davies      | Kosinski        | Reber     | Irvis,        |
| Dawida      | Kukovich        | Reinard   | Speaker       |
| Deal        |                 |           |               |

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—2

Maiale Richardson

EXCUSED—4

Cimini Durham Stevens Tigie

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the bill passes finally.

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

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE  
 IN SENATE AMENDMENTS**

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned the following **HB 1401, PN 2929**, with information that the Senate has passed the same with amendment in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives is requested:

An Act amending the act of April 6, 1876 (P. L. 18, No. 17), entitled "An act to provide additional security to holders and assignees of mortgages in this commonwealth," eliminating marginal notations of mortgage assignments in certain cases.

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

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

Mr. FRYER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate made only a minor change - allowing the recorder of deeds to collect the fee provided by law for making marginal notations of mortgage assignments. The old fee was 10 cents. I would urge the members to vote "yes" for concurrence, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

YEAS—190

- |            |                 |           |               |
|------------|-----------------|-----------|---------------|
| Acosta     | Deal            | Kosinski  | Reber         |
| Afflerbach | Dietz           | Kukovich  | Reinard       |
| Angstadt   | Dininni         | Langtry   | Richardson    |
| Argall     | Distler         | Lashinger | Rieger        |
| Arty       | Dombrowski      | Laughlin  | Robbins       |
| Baldwin    | Donatucci       | Lescovitz | Roebuck       |
| Barber     | Dorr            | Letterman | Rudy          |
| Barley     | Duffy           | Levdansky | Ryan          |
| Battisto   | Evans           | Linton    | Rybak         |
| Belardi    | Fargo           | Livengood | Saloom        |
| Belfanti   | Fattah          | Lloyd     | Saurman       |
| Birmelin   | Fee             | Lucyk     | Scheetz       |
| Black      | Fischer         | McCall    | Schuler       |
| Blaum      | Flick           | McClatchy | Semmel        |
| Book       | Foster, Jr., A. | McHale    | Serafini      |
| Bortner    | Fox             | McVerry   | Seventy       |
| Bowley     | Freeman         | Mackowski | Showers       |
| Bowser     | Freind          | Manderino | Sirianni      |
| Boyes      | Fryer           | Manmiller | Snyder, D. W. |
| Brandt     | Gallagher       | Markosek  | Snyder, G. M. |
| Broujos    | Gallen          | Mayernik  | Staback       |
| Bunt       | Gamble          | Merry     | Stairs        |
| Burd       | Gannon          | Michlovic | Steighner     |
| Burns      | Geist           | Micozzie  | Stewart       |

Bush	George	Miller	Stuban
Caltagirone	Gladeck	Moehlmann	Sweet
Cappabianca	Godshall	Morris	Swift
Carlson	Greenwood	Mowery	Taylor, E. Z.
Carn	Gruitza	Mrkonic	Taylor, F. E.
Cawley	Gruppo	Murphy	Taylor, J.
Cessar	Hagarty	Nahill	Telek
Chadwick	Haluska	Noye	Truman
Civera	Harper	O'Donnell	Van Horne
Clark	Hasay	Olasz	Veon
Clymer	Hayes	Oliver	Vroon
Colafella	Herman	Perzel	Wambach
Cole	Hershey	Petrarca	Wass
Cordisco	Honaman	Petrone	Weston
Cornell	Howlett	Phillips	Wiggins
Coslett	Hutchinson	Piccola	Wilson
Cowell	Itkin	Pievsky	Wozniak
Coy	Jackson	Pistella	Wright, D. R.
Deluca	Jarolin	Pitts	Wright, J. L.
DeVerter	Johnson	Pott	Wright, R. C.
DeWeese	Josephs	Pressmann	Yandrisevits
Daley	Kasunic	Preston	
Davies	Kennedy	Punt	Irvis,
Dawida	Kenney	Raymond	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—7

Cohen	O'Brien	Smith, L. E.	Wogan
Maiale	Smith, B.	Trello	

EXCUSED—4

Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue
--------	--------	---------	-------

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

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

**RESOLUTIONS**

Mr. WOGAN called up **HR 202, PN 2538**, entitled:

Encouraging school systems of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to use the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery.

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. On the resolution, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Wogan.

Mr. WOGAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution would just give some recognition to the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery, which has been found to be a useful tool in predicting vocational aptitudes by over 1.3 million students in the United States of America since its inception back in 1968. Very frankly, it would be useful both to our school districts which choose to employ it as a tool and, potentially at least, to our military.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

Acosta	Dietz	Lashinger	Rieger
Afflerbach	Dininni	Laughlin	Robbins
Angstadt	Distler	Lescovitz	Roebuck
Argall	Dombrowski	Letterman	Rudy
Arty	Donatucci	Levdansky	Ryan
Baldwin	Dorr	Linton	Rybak
Barber	Duffy	Livengood	Saloom
Barley	Evans	Lloyd	Saurman
Battisto	Fargo	Lucyk	Scheetz
Belardi	Fattah	McCall	Schuler
Belfanti	Fee	McClatchy	Semmel
Birmelin	Fischer	McHale	Serafini
Black	Flick	McVerry	Seventy
Blaum	Foster, Jr., A.	Mackowski	Showers
Book	Fox	Manderino	Sirianni
Bortner	Freeman	Manmiller	Smith, B.
Bowley	Freind	Markosek	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Fryer	Mayernik	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Gallagher	Merry	Snyder, G. M.
Brandt	Gallen	Michlovic	Staback
Broujos	Gamble	Micozzie	Stairs
Bunt	Gannon	Miller	Steighner
Burd	Geist	Moehlmann	Stewart
Bush	George	Morris	Stuban
Caltagirone	Gladeck	Mowery	Sweet
Cappabianca	Godshall	Mrkonic	Swift
Carlson	Greenwood	Murphy	Taylor, E. Z.
Carn	Gruitza	Nahill	Taylor, F. E.
Cawley	Gruppo	Noye	Taylor, J.
Cessar	Hagarty	O'Brien	Telek
Chadwick	Haluska	O'Donnell	Trello
Civera	Harper	Olasz	Truman
Clark	Hasay	Oliver	Van Horne
Clymer	Hayes	Perzel	Veon
Cohen	Herman	Petrarca	Vroon
Colafella	Hershey	Petrone	Wambach
Cole	Honaman	Phillips	Wass
Cordisco	Howlett	Piccola	Weston
Cornell	Hutchinson	Pievsky	Wiggins
Coslett	Jackson	Pistella	Wilson
Cowell	Jarolin	Pitts	Wogan
Coy	Johnson	Pott	Wozniak
Deluca	Josephs	Pressmann	Wright, D. R.
DeVerter	Kasunic	Preston	Wright, J. L.
DeWeese	Kennedy	Punt	Wright, R. C.
Daley	Kenney	Raymond	Yandrisevits
Davies	Kosinski	Reber	
Dawida	Kukovich	Reinard	Irvis,
Deal	Langtry	Richardson	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—3

Burns	Itkin	Maiale	
Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue

EXCUSED—4

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

\* \* \*

Mr. MANDERINO called up **SR 117, PN 1734**, entitled:

A Concurrent Resolution urging the Citizen Stamp Advisory Committee of the United States Postal Service to issue a stamp honoring American horology.

On the question,  
Will the House concur in the resolution of the Senate?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

Acosta	Deal	Kukovich	Richardson
Afflerbach	Dietz	Langtry	Rieger
Angstadt	Dininni	Lashinger	Robbins
Argall	Distler	Laughlin	Roebuck
Arty	Dombrowski	Lescovitz	Rudy
Baldwin	Donatucci	Letterman	Ryan
Barber	Dorr	Levdansky	Rybak
Barley	Duffy	Linton	Saloom
Battisto	Evans	Livengood	Saurman
Belardi	Fargo	Lloyd	Scheetz
Belfanti	Fattah	Lucyk	Schuler
Birmelin	Fee	McCall	Semmel
Black	Fischer	McClatchy	Serafini
Blaum	Flick	McHale	Seventy
Book	Foster, Jr., A.	McVerry	Showers
Bortner	Fox	Mackowski	Sirianni
Bowley	Freeman	Manderino	Smith, B.
Bowser	Freind	Manmiller	Smith, L. E.
Boyes	Fryer	Markosek	Snyder, D. W.
Brandt	Gallagher	Mayernik	Snyder, G. M.
Broujos	Gallen	Merry	Staback
Bunt	Gamble	Michlovic	Stairs
Burd	Gannon	Micozzie	Steighner
Burns	Geist	Miller	Stewart
Bush	George	Moehlmann	Stuban
Caltagirone	Gladeck	Morris	Sweet
Cappabianca	Godshall	Mowery	Swift
Carlson	Greenwood	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Carn	Gruitza	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Cawley	Gruppo	Nahill	Taylor, J.
Cessar	Hagarty	Noye	Telek
Chadwick	Haluska	O'Brien	Truman
Civera	Harper	O'Donnell	Van Horne
Clark	Hasay	Oliver	Veon
Clymer	Hayes	Perzel	Vroon
Cohen	Herman	Petrarca	Wambach
Colafella	Hershey	Petrone	Wass
Cole	Honaman	Phillips	Weston
Cordisco	Howlett	Piccola	Wiggins
Cornell	Hutchinson	Pievsky	Wilson
Coslett	Itkin	Pistella	Wogan
Cowell	Jackson	Pitts	Wozniak
Coy	Jarolin	Pott	Wright, D. R.
Deluca	Johnson	Pressmann	Wright, J. L.
DeVerter	Josephs	Preston	Wright, R. C.
DeWeese	Kasunic	Punt	Yandrisevits
Daley	Kennedy	Raymond	
Davies	Kenney	Reber	Irvis,
Dawida	Kosinski	Reinard	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—3

Maiale	Olasz	Trello	
Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue

EXCUSED—4

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

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

\* \* \*

Mr. MANDERINO called up SR 119, PN 1737, entitled:

A Concurrent Resolution declaring 1986 as "The Year of the Forest."

On the question,

Will the House concur in the resolution of the Senate?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

Acosta	Dietz	Langtry	Rieger
Afflerbach	Dininni	Lashinger	Robbins
Angstadt	Distler	Laughlin	Roebuck
Argall	Dombrowski	Lescovitz	Rudy
Arty	Donatucci	Letterman	Ryan
Baldwin	Dorr	Levdansky	Rybak
Barber	Duffy	Linton	Saloom
Barley	Evans	Livengood	Saurman
Battisto	Fargo	Lloyd	Scheetz
Belardi	Fattah	Lucyk	Schuler
Belfanti	Fee	McCall	Semmel
Birmelin	Fischer	McClatchy	Serafini
Black	Flick	McHale	Seventy
Blaum	Foster, Jr., A.	McVerry	Showers
Book	Fox	Mackowski	Sirianni
Bortner	Freeman	Manderino	Smith, B.
Bowley	Freind	Manmiller	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Fryer	Markosek	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Gallagher	Mayernik	Snyder, G. M.
Brandt	Gallen	Merry	Staback
Broujos	Gamble	Michlovic	Stairs
Bunt	Gannon	Micozzie	Steighner
Burd	Geist	Miller	Stewart
Burns	George	Moehlmann	Stuban
Bush	Gladeck	Morris	Sweet
Caltagirone	Godshall	Mowery	Swift
Cappabianca	Greenwood	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Carlson	Gruitza	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Carn	Gruppo	Nahill	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Hagarty	Noye	Telek
Cessar	Haluska	O'Brien	Trello
Chadwick	Harper	O'Donnell	Van Horne
Civera	Hasay	Oliver	Veon
Clark	Hayes	Perzel	Vroon
Clymer	Herman	Petrarca	Wambach
Cohen	Hershey	Petrone	Wass
Colafella	Honaman	Phillips	Weston
Cordisco	Howlett	Piccola	Wiggins
Cornell	Hutchinson	Pievsky	Wilson
Coslett	Itkin	Pistella	Wogan
Cowell	Jackson	Pitts	Wozniak
Coy	Jarolin	Pott	Wright, D. R.
Deluca	Johnson	Pressmann	Wright, J. L.
DeVerter	Josephs	Preston	Wright, R. C.
DeWeese	Kasunic	Punt	Yandrisevits
Daley	Kennedy	Raymond	
Davies	Kenney	Reber	Irvis,
Dawida	Kosinski	Reinard	Speaker
Deal	Kukovich	Richardson	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—4

Cole	Maiale	Olasz	Truman
Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue

EXCUSED—4

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

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

WELCOMES

The SPEAKER. We have with us the mayor of the city of Nanticoke, Mr. John Haydock. He is the guest of Stanley Jarolin. Also with him - Mr. Joseph Zak and Mr. Richard Buttrick. Welcome to the hall of the House.



Representative Greenwood has John and Norma Bensen here. They are the parents of John Bensen, an Eagle Scout who was a guest page here yesterday. Welcome to the hall of the House.

In the gallery we have a group of gifted students from the Mifflin County School. They are here as the guests of Representative Rudy and Representative DeVerter. Welcome to the hall of the House, children.

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

#### HB 1777, PN 2956 (Amended)

By Rep. F. TAYLOR

An Act amending Titles 1 (General Provisions) and 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for sovereign immunity as it relates to the Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency and for defenses.

#### BUSINESS AND COMMERCE.

#### HB 1784, PN 2293

By Rep. F. TAYLOR

An Act amending the act of November 30, 1965 (P. L. 847, No. 356), known as the "Banking Code of 1965," further providing for investments by savings banks.

#### BUSINESS AND COMMERCE.

#### HB 1882, PN 2957 (Amended)

By Rep. BARBER

An Act establishing a program of dentistry for the home-bound; imposing powers and duties on the Department of Health; and making an appropriation.

#### HEALTH AND WELFARE.

#### HB 2023, PN 2758

By Rep. RYBAK

An Act amending the act of June 18, 1984 (P. L. 384, No. 81), known as the "Amusement Ride Inspection Act," further providing for the minimum amount of insurance.

#### INSURANCE.

#### HB 2079, PN 2958 (Amended)

By Rep. LETTERMAN

An Act amending Title 34 (Game) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, adding revised, compiled and codified provisions relating to game and wildlife; and making conforming amendments to Titles 18, 42 and 75.

#### GAME AND FISHERIES.

### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Ms. Josephs. Why does the lady rise?

Ms. JOSEPHS. I just have a question of parliamentary inquiry, I guess.

The SPEAKER. The lady will state it.

Ms. JOSEPHS. My name was on the resolution for "The Year of the Forest" when it was on the House side, and I would like to know if it is proper or allowable to have my name put on the Senate version of that resolution.

The SPEAKER. No, we are sorry to inform you. We have no power to affix the names of House members to anything which carries Senate signatures.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION CONTINUED

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2036, PN 2771**, entitled:

An Act promoting the hiring of welfare recipients for entry-level positions in State government; providing for the establishment of a public service training program and a State-related employment training fund for welfare recipients; providing for grants to State contractors and providers of services; and making appropriations.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

Mr. DORR. Mr. Speaker, I think all of us are interested in job training programs as a method of removing people from the welfare rolls and entering them into industry and into productive jobs. I am questioning, however, the effect of this particular bill in that, in my judgment, private-sector jobs should be the priority.

The bill requires notification, on the part of all departments, to the Department of Public Welfare with regard to entry-level positions. I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, why we should be targeting necessarily only the entry-level positions even if we should do this kind of thing. Mr. Speaker, I think the actual effect of this bill will be to simply create additional government jobs in the performance of the requirement that is contained in the bill. I think it is duplicative of existing programs being handled administratively today.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, the bill should be defeated, for it simply creates confusion and creates make-work jobs, at best, in all sectors of the departments of government. I do not think it serves a useful purpose, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

The SPEAKER. On final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Haluska.

Mr. HALUSKA. Mr. Speaker, in response to Mr. Dorr's statements, I would like to say that HB 2036 is very much needed.

Under our present job training programs, the Commonwealth exercises the training programs in the various institutions, and I have had some experience where the people have been trained for 6 months. One individual had gone through five different training programs. He was certified at the State school in Ebensburg and he was trained in dietetics. He was discharged after his training program, and soon after that the

State hired somebody just from the outside to fulfill that job. He had no opportunity as a trainee to fulfill that application.

So I think this is a step that will help solve that particular problem. I ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. On final passage, the Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am bothered by this bill, and it may very well be that I do not fully understand it. As I look at the bill quickly, as I understand the bill the way it has been explained to me, it seems to me that we are not being fair to our unemployed whom we are so concerned with, usually, here in Pennsylvania.

It appears to me that what we are doing is we are putting government into a position that when there are government positions available, in effect the government would have to give preference to a welfare recipient. Now, I believe that we have to do whatever we can do, of course, to get people off welfare. I also believe, however, that the person who has worked for the bulk of his life or a good deal of his life, who for one reason or another, usually without their own fault, are unemployed, should have at least an equal crack at new government positions. Here I believe the preference and the priority is being given to welfare recipients over our unemployed or any other person, but people with job records, and for that reason I am against the bill.

The SPEAKER. On final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Pistella.

Mr. PISTELLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I hope that I can try to clear up a little bit of the confusion surrounding this particular bill.

I realize that Mr. Ryan has spoken about people who have worked long and hard to acquire State positions and I am sure are in every intention trying to do the very best they can. But I think what we have here in the Department of Welfare is a failing on the part of the system to move individuals from cash-grant assistance into the public sector or the private sector.

There are three provisions contained in this bill. The first provision is that all departments and agencies will notify the Department of Welfare of the availability of entry-level positions for State Government, to be posted, as one method of displaying these particular listings, across the State. Now, what that in fact will do is make those individuals who through no fault of their own are on public assistance, who wish to get gainful employment, be aware of and conscious of the fact that there are State entry-level jobs that they in fact may qualify for, that they may apply for, that they may wish to take a test for; for example, under the Civil Service Commission.

In addition, what this bill also does is it requires the Governor to establish a public service training program to prepare cash assistance recipients for these entry-level jobs for all State facilities, including but not limited to mental health, mental retardation, et cetera. These, I guess you could say, would be the State provider positions that are across the State in mental health/mental retardation in State hospitals.

Thirdly, it provides for a pilot program of \$1 million to allow private contractors, third-party providers who may in fact provide the same service, a mental health or mental retardation unit or organization in Allegheny County or another county, or another private contractor, to receive a grant for a pilot program to train these individuals who were cash-grant recipients so that they may become gainfully employed and part of the mainstream of the Commonwealth's employment field. It also requires that there be an annual report of those contractors who are participating in the program and a list of those individual locations of those contractors so that we may somehow follow the progress of this pilot program.

Now, remember there are two things: On the one level you have the notification by all State agencies and bureaus to the Department of Welfare of the availability of State entry jobs; and second, a \$1-million pilot program for State mental health, State hospital, and other health care facilities around the State and third-party service providers under the pilot program.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to clear up a matter. One of the individuals on the other side indicated that there was a preference being given in the employment of welfare recipients. This is not so. It is not provided for in this legislation. The only thing that is provided for in main in this legislation is that when State positions are available, that that information be disseminated to the Department of Welfare, which then can distribute that to the local public assistance boards in the various counties. That is as simple as this bill is, except for the pilot program that the gentleman, Mr. Pistella, adequately spoke to. So there is no preference being given, and I urge an affirmative vote on HB 2036.

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

Mr. WASS. Mr. Speaker, thank you, but the gentleman has just answered my question. I was really concerned about preference being given, especially over the veterans and others, and he has satisfied my concern.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Crawford, Mr. Merry.

Mr. MERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill. One of the biggest criticisms that I receive—and I am sure that the rest of the members of the legislature receive—is the duplication of government services. Why do we continue to put level after level of additional bureaucracy and programs duplicating supposedly good services?

This bill has a terrific fiscal impact. I read directly here where it calls for over \$1 million of additional State expenditures, and for what? For the same programs that we are already providing for in many other State and Federal programs. And that only addresses part of the paper shuffle that this bill here calls for. We already provide for job training, for job identification, for job placement services, and here we are going to create additional bureaucracy to provide the additional paperwork to be sure that all these agencies get notified of the available jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we already have these programs covered and we do not need to spend millions of additional State dollars after additional programs. Please, let us not vote for this bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York, Mr. Dorr, for the second time on final passage.

Mr. DORR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple of additional points.

I would caution the members that in the process of setting up this notification procedure, we may very well be creating a liability on the part of State Government to fund positions that do not exist. For example, if the system fails and breaks down at some point and some cash grant recipient's name is not forwarded to a department in time and a job is granted, does he then have the right to go to that department and force the department to give him a job since the law required that notification to take place? I think that is a serious concern here.

I would point out to the members that while we apparently make this requirement on the executive branch, we do not seem to include the legislative branch, and if the proponents of the bill are that interested in bringing persons off the welfare rolls into positions of State Government, they could very well create their own pilot program and do that very thing.

Mr. Speaker, I would reiterate the gentleman, Mr. Merry's comment that these programs are in fact provided already. They are not necessary to put into the law, and I again urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Preston, on final passage.

Mr. PRESTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the gentleman, Mr. Dorr, stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Mr. Dorr indicates he will so stand for interrogation. You are in order, and you may proceed, Mr. Preston.

Mr. PRESTON. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, you mentioned something about a certain liability that we may have as far as guaranteeing a person some form of employment and then he may get there and the position no longer exists. Are you saying that under this current legislation a person would be promised a job before he was even interviewed for the job?

Mr. DORR. What I was indicating, Mr. Speaker, is that I think a clever lawyer could make the argument that if in fact the requirements of this bill were not met - that is, if a recipient who was trained for a position, if his name was not forwarded to the department as is required under this bill, and the department which is in a hiring mode did not in fact have that person's name in front of them for consideration - I can see a clever lawyer making an argument before a court that that department was therefore required to furnish this person with a job, regardless of its present availability, because of the provisions of this act. That was what I was attempting to say, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, are you saying that many of these entry-level jobs would have special requirements, in your opinion?

Mr. DORR. No. I did not make any reference, I do not think, to the requirements of the position. What I was indicating was that under the bill—

Mr. PRESTON. You did say "skills." Am I correct, sir? You did say "skills"?

Mr. DORR. No. I had no reference to the appropriateness of the person. The point is that the bill, regardless of their appropriateness to the job, requires that their name be forwarded to the department. If that system breaks down, it seems to me it creates some liability on the part of the government.

Mr. PRESTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

May I address the bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may speak on final passage.

Mr. PRESTON. I just heard several inconsistencies from the previous speaker. All we are saying here is entry-level jobs, entry-level employment. I am sure that many of you right now know that many of the entry-level positions are currently hard to fill, especially for those people who are in the unemployment ranks, because many of them are looking for higher up and higher paying jobs. But what we are talking about here is working with entry-level positions - positions that do not require basically primary skills; they do not require any good or advanced forms of knowledge. They require basic want as far as being able to go to work. I think that is what we are hearing about, and I would ask you to support HB 2036.

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

Mr. DUFFY. I would like to ask Representative Pistella a question.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Pistella indicates he will stand for interrogation. You may proceed, Mr. Duffy.

Mr. DUFFY. I had a constituent a few days ago call me. He makes approximately \$11,000 a year, he has a wife and three children, and he would like to change jobs and maybe go into these entry-level positions that possibly pay \$12,000 or \$13,000 a year. How would he be considered in this program?

Mr. PISTELLA. Is he a welfare recipient, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. DUFFY. No; he is working.

Mr. PISTELLA. All he would do would be either contact the Civil Service Commission or the appropriate State agency or his State Representative and ask for an application, either noncivil service or civil service, and submit a letter of recommendation from appropriate people. He would not be affected at all by this.

Mr. DUFFY. All right. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader on final passage.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, Mr. Dorr, persists in attempting to characterize this bill as something that the bill is not. He is now concerned about the liabil-

ity of the Commonwealth in the event that a welfare recipient's name is not forwarded to the proper department as the bill requires. Well, the bill requires no such thing. There is no requirement of that. I am sure Mr. Dorr has not seen any requirement, but if you cannot argue the facts, then argue what you think may get some support. That must be what he is doing. There is no requirement that anybody's name be submitted to any department.

The bill is simple in its requirement. It says that where there are entry-level positions in State Government, the Department of Welfare is to be informed of those so that the Department of Welfare may inform the local county boards of assistance, where every welfare recipient in this Commonwealth, under the rules and regulations of eligibility, must visit periodically. That is as simple as this bill is. Do not try to make more out of it in your attempt to knock it down than is there. Do not throw up red herrings. You know, if you can attack the bill on the way the bill is written, that is one thing, but to make up statements that the bill does not provide for in order to knock it down is grossly unfair to the proponents of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask again for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. On final passage, the Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman, Mr. Pistella, stand for a brief period of interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Pistella, indicates he will stand for further interrogation. You may proceed, Mr. Ryan.

Mr. RYAN. Assume for a minute, Mr. Pistella, that your caucus has a self-imposed rule such as you would impose on the executive; assume for a moment that your caucus has adopted this policy on its own rather than having had it imposed on it the way we would do it with the executive. Assume further that there are 1, 2, 3, 5, 10— I do not know how many entry-level jobs your caucus has open each year, and without looking into it, I really could not tell you how many we have. But I know one thing: I know we have many, many, many applications for jobs, and I know I speak with some confidence that you probably have many, many, many applications for jobs with your caucus. I have to suspect the executive department also has any number of applications outstanding for any job that comes up.

Why would we want to go to this trouble, why would we want to go to this expense, to notify all the various agencies in Pennsylvania that there is a job opening when we have 50 applications before us and we know we already have to turn down 49 of these people? How do you justify it?

Mr. PISTELLA. I think what the problem is, Mr. Speaker, is you are missing the point. The point is not a preferential treatment of one individual over another. It is not the preferential treatment in the hiring of a former welfare recipient for an entry-level position. It is merely the procedure by which those agencies, whether it is my caucus—and I do not know if my caucus has any procedure above and beyond what your caucus currently enjoys or employs—but in fact what you are saying with this legislation is that those agencies—

The SPEAKER. Just a moment.

Mr. Ryan cannot hear the answer to the question he posed because there is entirely too much noise.

Will you repeat the answer, Mr. Pistella?

Mr. PISTELLA. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The point that I was making, Mr. Speaker, is that I think there is a misconception as to what is actually occurring with this. It is not a preferential treatment that is given a former welfare recipient by the respective agencies that would be notifying the Department of Welfare of the existence of these positions. What this bill is in fact saying is that there will be a review process by which those State departments and agencies will notify the Department of Welfare of existing vacancies of entry-level positions. The Department of Welfare will then be charged with the job of notifying the county assistance offices so that they may post those existing entry-level positions.

As to why this should be done? My personal feeling, Mr. Speaker, is that I think that with the proposal that has been made in the past for job training, whether it is with the Department of Welfare under its current system or whether it is with JTPA (Job Training Partnership Act), oftentimes what we have is a failure to move people from the program into a position of employment. I am not saying that those programs have failed, that they have not actually trained people; it is just that we in the State have been negligent in moving those people, once they have completed that training, into viable job options. That is what I am viewing this particular piece of legislation as being - a vehicle for placement.

Mr. RYAN. All right.

Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, frankly, I am not satisfied that the gentleman answered my question. Let me make a few observations.

Number one, under the legislative intent that is set forth in this bill on page 2, under the declaration section, it says—these are his words, not mine—“Wherever possible,” wherever possible, make these jobs “available to recipients of cash welfare assistance....” So it is, in a sense, a preferential treatment. When possible, you make it available to the welfare recipient. When is it possible? If I have an unemployed man here, I have a welfare recipient there, I have a job to be given out, that job, under this language - whenever possible, make it available to the welfare recipient - says to me, this language says to me, if you have two people both equally qualified, you give a preference to the one who is on welfare. That is what that language says. Whenever possible, you make it available.

Now, the other parts of the bill that I think are a waste of our money, you require— Let us assume for a minute you have an \$8,000 entry-level job available here in the State Capitol. That notice goes throughout the entire Commonwealth. You impose on the executive—and I do not know why you did not impose it on your caucus and my caucus while you were doing it; we have State jobs—you impose on the executive the obligation for them to send notices to Erie, notices to Philadelphia, Delaware County, Westmoreland County,

wherever there is an office, for an \$8,000-a-year job where there are probably, if I had to make a guess, 500 applications sitting here in the Capitol today for any entry-level job.

I just think it is an extension of the red tape of bureaucracy. I think it is showing a preference—now, it is not written into the law, but they are your words - when available, you shall give it to a welfare recipient. I say to you that those words mean if there are two people equally qualified, one through no fault of his own on unemployment because he was laid off for whatever reason, having worked for many years, and he is there wanting a job, and a welfare recipient who maybe has not worked in 10 years is there wanting a job—and I congratulate them for it—you give that welfare recipient the break because your words say, whenever possible, you give it to the welfare recipient, and I think that is wrong.

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

Mr. FARGO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I certainly agree with Representative Ryan in that there definitely is a preference or priority being indicated here in this bill. I have sat here and listened to Representative Pistella and our majority leader say that there is no priority or preference written into this bill, and yet as I read, I see that there is a million dollars that is going to be provided to third-party contractors, to State contractors, to assist in training those people whom they hire when they are taken from the welfare rolls.

Now, if I happen to be a person who has been out of a job for 15 or 18 months and I am very interested in an entry-level job and I try to compete in getting a job with someone who is going to get money to train me or money to provide for support services in my job, I am afraid I am not going to get that job. I can see no better way of determining a priority or a preference than to provide money to that third party, to that contractor, to provide money for helping in the training of that particular employee. I do not think that I, in the position I just described, could compete with the welfare recipient who is applying for that job. Certainly there is a preference being provided here by the very nature of the bill itself, and by the money that we are providing in the bill.

I would certainly hope that we would not vote against that person who has been unemployed for a long period of time, is hunting for a job, and is more than happy to find an entry-level job. We are now going to make it more difficult for him. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery, Mr. McClatchy, on final passage.

Mr. McCLATCHY. Mr. Speaker, just one point. I think that the Governor in his budget message this year has told us about the State salaried workforce, and I think this piece of legislation flies in the face of what is happening out there. We have reduced our State workforce by over 13,000 people. We are not hiring people the way we think we are hiring them. We are reducing that bureaucracy. I think it is a false hope to hold out to welfare recipients that they are going to get jobs.

Frankly, I agree with what the minority leader said. I do not like the preference that is indicated in this bill. I have people

that if there is a job available, for instance, down in our area, at Haverford State Hospital, that indeed why should a welfare recipient get it over someone else who is trying to get it? Those jobs, because of the State complement being reduced by this amount, over 13,000 people, are very, very difficult to come by.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this bill holds out false promises. I think it is the wrong way to go. I think it should be defeated. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, it must be a contagious disease on the other side to misinterpret the English language. The bill says it will be the policy wherever possible, not wherever available, as Mr. Ryan uses. It says "Wherever possible, make appropriate entry-level jobs in State government available...." That is where the "available" is. It does not say we give it to them. It does not say we prefer it. It just says we make them available. We let them know that there are entry-level positions in State Government that are available. That is all this bill is saying. You have twisted it into anything that you want to twist it into.

As far as the dislocated worker is concerned, there are a package of 9 or 10 bills here, and several of those bills deal specifically with the unemployed and the dislocated persons. We are trying to do a job in job training for all of the people who are entitled to employment if such be available. We ought to make it equally available to everyone, and that is all we are trying to do here.

Go ahead and vote against these if you want to. Demonstrate your hardheadedness; demonstrate your lack of compassion, because that is what you will be doing if you vote against this type of legislation. I expect that many of you will. You follow leaders who have that contagious disease that I spoke about, to misinterpret, to throw red herrings up, to be negative all the time instead of being positive.

Mr. Speaker, I ask again for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. RYAN. Boy, it is a good thing he did not mention my name. I would have thought he was talking about me.

Now, my mother was never accused of raising a dumb kid; she was accused of raising a fat kid, and as I read these words, the word "available" is there, and it says, whenever possible, you make these jobs available and you train them to take the job. I say to you that there is confusion between the preamble or the declaration of intent and the words of the bill, and if I were a judge looking at the declaration of intent, I would say that a State agency faced with a choice between two equally trained people—either trained because of this bill or walking into the entry-level job already trained—the State would have an obligation, under the language of this declaration of intent, to hire and favor and give preference to the welfare recipient.

Now, rather than you and I arguing about this, Mr. Manderino, I am suggesting that the members think for themselves. I am satisfied that my caucus read the bill and think for themselves. Do not listen to me; do not believe me. Look for your-

self and then you decide whether or not you like the bill based on my argument, and I challenge you, Mr. Manderino, to suggest that your caucus not listen to you but rather read the bill themselves.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, we have a country and a Constitution, Federal legislation dedicated to equal opportunity, and I suppose that in a twisted manner you could reason that the equal opportunity that we espouse in some cases necessitates a little more effort on the part of government to make sure that that opportunity is equal to all the citizens of the Commonwealth. And you can twist that, if you want, in an attempt to provide that equality of opportunity; you can twist that into a preference if you want, Mr. Ryan, but it does not exist there in the law, it will not exist there practically, and I think that, again, it is just a red herring. I ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. On final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Pistella.

Mr. PISTELLA. I am somewhat disappointed in the interpretation that the minority leader has taken of this legislation.

Just a few thoughts I would like to share with the members before they vote. You could read the bill if you want to. You do not have to read it. You can believe whom you want to believe.

What this piece of legislation says, Mr. Speaker, is that wherever possible, the State will make available notification of entry-level positions and, in some cases, training. Now, what does that mean? What that means is this: Every month our welfare machine cranks out checks for 140,000 people on general assistance. It cranks out checks for 560,000 people who receive AFDC (aid to families with dependent children). Like a machine, it never stops. Even if we do not pass the budget, it just cranks out those checks. But what we want to tell those people out there is there is something more than just getting a check every month from the State; there is the opportunity to get a job. But what kind of a job, Mr. Speaker? We are not going to let them work at the State in a State hospital; we are not going to let them work for some organization, a third-party payer that is going to provide services for mental health or mental retardation. What we are going to tell them is, you go out and you take a job at a McDonald's or Burger King, and you slap hamburgers for a minimum wage. That is what you are going to tell them if you do not vote for this bill. What you are going to tell them is, we are too good for you here at the State of Pennsylvania - whether it is the General Assembly; whether it is in the Department of Welfare; whether it is in Labor and Industry. We would rather sit back and we would rather give another \$40,000 or \$50,000 to some fat-cat attorney in a pin-striped suit to sit on his hands and do nothing than to let you take a \$12,000-a-year job and become meaningfully employed, to have dignity in your home and dignity in your community.

All this bill does is take \$1 million for a pilot program and say there is still hope for some portion of the 140,000 people on general assistance and the 560,000 people on AFDC. I ask

you to think for a moment. Vote for this bill and just give them a chance. Thank you.

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

Mr. WASS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have some confusion about the "wherever possible" situation, and I would like to interrogate Representative Pistella, please.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Pistella indicates he will stand for interrogation. You may proceed.

Mr. WASS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure in your offices and mine we have many inquiries from people looking for work.

Mr. PISTELLA. Oftentimes.

Mr. WASS. And we do know of our welfare cases, which are many, and we certainly want to help those people. But I am really concerned with this particular part of the legislation. Can you give me an example whenever it would not be possible for the department to give a welfare recipient consideration? Under what conditions would they not give them consideration?

Mr. PISTELLA. If it were an entry-level position that they were, A, not qualified for; and B, there was no training program available. The training program that is provided for in this particular bill is a pilot program of \$1 million for third-party providers or programs with the State. If there is no program in the State, then there is no obligation to set up a program and train them. But the qualification would be one, Mr. Speaker, and the unavailability of a training program.

Mr. WASS. Your legislation, Mr. Speaker, says, whenever possible—

Mr. PISTELLA. Wherever possible, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WASS. "Wherever possible, make appropriate entry-level jobs in State government available to recipients..." and then train them. Can you give me an example when it would not be possible to make the job available and not train them? Can you give me some idea under what conditions it would not be possible to award the job to a recipient and then not train them?

Mr. PISTELLA. Well, you are suggesting, if I understand correctly, please, that they would make the job available and not have a program available to train a welfare recipient for that job.

Mr. WASS. Your legislation calls for both, and I am trying to recognize that with this legislation it is mandatory that a job that is available be given to a welfare recipient and then train him, and I am trying to find out under what conditions would the bill forgive that authority that is given in the bill?

Mr. PISTELLA. If I think I understand your question, Mr. Speaker, what you are suggesting is that if I am with, say, the Department of Commerce, for example, and there is an entry-level position for a clerk, and that is sent to the Department of Welfare, sent to the Indiana County, I believe—

Mr. WASS. Right.

Mr. PISTELLA. —office of general assistance for notification, if the Department of Commerce would then entertain a welfare recipient, a general assistance recipient in Indiana

County for that position of clerk and they would not be able to provide the training program, in my opinion it would be under the conditions that there were not funds available in that department's budget for that particular program.

Mr. WASS. But that would be one of the exemptions whereby they would not have to hire that particular welfare recipient over a regular unemployed or a veteran.

Mr. PISTELLA. If there were an equally qualified clerk who was unemployed in your district, I would think that under the provisions explained they would be able to hire that clerk who was unemployed as opposed to hiring and establishing a training program they have no funds for, sir.

Mr. WASS. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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—102

Acosta	Deal	Linton	Rybak
Afflerbach	Dombrowski	Livengood	Saloom
Angstadt	Donatucci	Lloyd	Semmel
Baldwin	Evans	Lucyk	Seventy
Barber	Fattah	McCall	Showers
Battisto	Fee	McHale	Snyder, D. W.
Belardi	Freeman	Maiale	Staback
Belfanti	Fryer	Manderino	Steighner
Blaum	Gallagher	Markosek	Stewart
Bortner	Gamble	Mayernik	Stuban
Broujos	George	Michlovic	Sweet
Caltagirone	Gruitza	Morris	Taylor, F. E.
Cappabianca	Haluska	Murphy	Telek
Carn	Harper	O'Donnell	Trello
Cawley	Howlett	Olasz	Truman
Clark	Hutchinson	Oliver	Van Horne
Cohen	Itkin	Petrarca	Veon
Colafella	Jarolin	Petrone	Wambach
Cole	Josephs	Pievsky	Wiggins
Cordisco	Kasunic	Pistella	Wozniak
Cowell	Kosinski	Pressmann	Wright, D. R.
Coy	Kukovich	Preston	Wright, R. C.
DeLuca	Laughlin	Raymond	Yandrisevits
DeWeese	Lescovitz	Richardson	
Daley	Letterman	Rieger	Irvis,
Dawida	Levdansky	Roebuck	Speaker

NAYS—95

Argall	Dininni	Johnson	Reber
Arty	Distler	Kennedy	Reinard
Barley	Dorr	Kenney	Robbins
Birmelin	Duffy	Langtry	Rudy
Black	Fargo	Lashinger	Ryan
Book	Fischer	McClatchy	Saurman
Bowley	Flick	McVerry	Scheetz
Bowser	Foster, Jr., A.	Mackowski	Schuler
Boyes	Fox	Manmiller	Serafini
Brandt	Freind	Merry	Sirianni
Bunt	Gallen	Micozzie	Smith, B.
Burd	Gannon	Miller	Smith, L. E.
Burns	Geist	Moehlmann	Snyder, G. M.
Bush	Gladeck	Mowery	Stairs
Carlson	Godshall	Mrkonic	Swift
Cessar	Greenwood	Nahill	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Gruppo	Noye	Taylor, J.
Civera	Hagarty	O'Brien	Vroon
Clymer	Hasay	Perzel	Wass
Cornell	Hayes	Phillips	Weston
Coslett	Herman	Piccola	Wilson
DeVerter	Hershey	Pitts	Wogan
Davies	Honaman	Pott	Wright, J. L.

Dietz Jackson Punt  
NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Cimini Durham Stevens Tigie

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the bill passes finally.

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

PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE  
COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Are there any announcements before we break for lunch?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Somerset, Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, just a reminder to members of the Professional Licensure Committee. We will have an immediate meeting in the rear of the House—it should not take very long—immediately upon the call of the recess.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES,  
CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

HB 1813, PN 2968 (Amended)

By Rep. OLIVER

An Act authorizing and directing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Governor and the Department of Public Welfare, to convey to the City of Philadelphia a tract of land situate in the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

STATE GOVERNMENT.

HB 1885, PN 2484

By Rep. MORRIS

An Act amending the act of March 1, 1974 (P. L. 90, No. 24), known as the "Pennsylvania Pesticide Control Act of 1973," preempting the field of pesticide regulation.

AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. MICHLOVIC

The SPEAKER. Why does the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Michlovic, rise?

Mr. MICHLOVIC. Mr. Speaker, just an announcement.

This morning Representatives Levdansky, Freeman, and I had a press conference on a group of bills we are introducing that would stiffen up the environmental laws and set up a new office of protector general. We are going to lay it on the table this afternoon for members to sign if they wish to. We will introduce it this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

WELCOME

The SPEAKER. We have with us Miss Mary Locke, who is a student at Sacred Heart back in Representative McClatchy's

district. She is here to do a paper on what the job of a legislator is and what the responsibilities of the legislature may be. Let us hope that she does not orient her paper solely on her observations here this morning.

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

**HB 1946, PN 2969** (Amended)

By Rep. LAUGHLIN

An Act requiring retail gasoline dealers to post gasoline additive information; and imposing penalties.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS.

**HB 2154, PN 2937**

By Rep. LAUGHLIN

An Act requiring persons engaged in the rental of motor vehicles who arrange liability coverage for the lessee to ensure that certain coverage is included; and imposing liability for failure to do so.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS.

**RECESS**

The SPEAKER. This House will stand in recess until 1:30.

**RECESS EXTENDED**

The time of recess was extended until 1:50 p.m.; further extended until 2 p.m.

**AFTER RECESS**

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

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

**SB 776, PN 1875** (Amended)

By Rep. LLOYD

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P. L. 177, No. 175), entitled "The Administrative Code of 1929," further providing for examinations.

PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE.

**CALENDAR CONTINUED**

**BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1246, PN 2654**, entitled:

An Act providing for a Statewide emergency telephone number "911" system; establishing a telecommunications unit within the Department of General Services; providing for funding of the system, for a referendum, for contributions from telephone subscribers; providing a penalty; making appropriations; and making a repeal.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. STEWART offered the following amendments No. A0575:

Amend Bill, page 9, by inserting between lines 19 and 20 Section 10. Telephone records.

(a) Access.—Each telephone service supplier shall provide customer telephone numbers, names and service addresses to 911 systems when required. The total cost of the system shall include expenses to provide such information.

(b) Privacy waived.—Private listing service customers in a 911 service district shall waive the privacy afforded by nonlisted and nonpublished numbers only to the extent necessary to provide 911 emergency service.

Amend Sec. 10, page 9, line 20, by striking out "10" and inserting

11

Amend Sec. 11, page 9, line 24, by striking out "11" and inserting

12

Amend Sec. 12, page 10, line 3, by striking out "12" and inserting

13

Amend Sec. 13, page 10, line 6, by striking out "13" and inserting

14

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Stewart.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment adds a section 10 to the bill pertaining to telephone records. The first part provides access to information in situations where there are two or more phone companies in a particular county. The second provision protects the privacy waiver for unlisted numbers by limiting the publishing of unlisted numbers only to the extent necessary to provide "911" service.

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. McHale.

Mr. McHALE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Representative Stewart and I have conferred on this amendment. It is a good one; it is agreed to. I seek an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

**YEAS—191**

Acosta	Dininni	Lashinger	Reinard
Afflerbach	Dombrowski	Laughlin	Richardson
Angstadt	Donatucci	Lescovitz	Rieger
Argall	Dorr	Letterman	Robbins
Arty	Duffy	Levdansky	Roebuck
Baldwin	Evans	Linton	Rudy
Barber	Fargo	Livengood	Ryan
Barley	Fattah	Lloyd	Rybak
Battisto	Fee	Lucy	Saloom
Belardi	Fischer	McCall	Saurman
Belfanti	Flick	McClatchy	Scheetz
Black	Foster, Jr., A.	McHale	Schuler
Blaum	Fox	McVerry	Semmel



Book	Freeman	Mackowski	Serafini
Bortner	Freind	Maiale	Seventy
Bowley	Fryer	Manderino	Showers
Bowser	Gallagher	Manmiller	Smith, B.
Boyes	Gallen	Markosek	Smith, L. E.
Brandt	Gamble	Mayernik	Snyder, G. M.
Broujos	Gannon	Merry	Staback
Bunt	Geist	Michlovic	Stairs
Burd	George	Micozzie	Steighner
Burns	Gladeck	Miller	Stewart
Bush	Godshall	Moehlmann	Stuban
Caltagirone	Greenwood	Morris	Sweet
Cappabianca	Gruitza	Mowery	Swift
Carlson	Gruppo	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Carn	Hagarty	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Cawley	Haluska	Nahill	Taylor, J.
Cessar	Harper	Noye	Telek
Chadwick	Hasay	O'Brien	Trello
Civera	Hayes	O'Donnell	Truman
Clark	Herman	Olasz	Van Horne
Clymer	Hershey	Oliver	Veon
Cohen	Honaman	Perzel	Vroon
Colafella	Howlett	Petrarca	Wambach
Cole	Hutchinson	Petrone	Wass
Cordisco	Itkin	Phillips	Weston
Cornell	Jackson	Piccola	Wiggins
Cowell	Jarolin	Pievsky	Wilson
Coy	Johnson	Pistella	Wogan
Deluca	Josephs	Pitts	Wozniak
DeVerter	Kasunic	Pott	Wright, D. R.
DeWeese	Kennedy	Pressmann	Wright, J. L.
Daley	Kenney	Preston	Yandrisevits
Davies	Kosinski	Punt	
Dawida	Kukovich	Raymond	Irvis,
Deal	Langtry	Reber	Speaker
Dietz			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—6

Birmelin	Distler	Snyder, D. W.	Wright, R. C.
Coslett	Sirianni		

EXCUSED—4

Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue
--------	--------	---------	-------

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

On the question,

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

Mr. STEWART offered the following amendments No. A0549:

Amend Sec. 2, page 3, lines 20 through 22, by striking out "The term shall" in line 20, all of lines 21 and 22, and inserting For purposes of the contribution rate, the term shall not include pay stations owned or operated by a regulated public utility.

Amend Sec. 5, page 6, line 23, by striking out "30" and inserting

60

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Stewart.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment covers the public pay telephones operated by utility companies by exempting them from the contribution

rate. The reason they need to be exempt is that they are already included in the PUC (Public Utility Commission) tariffs, and PUC regulations require any public pay station to participate in any sort of emergency service number.

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. McHale.

Mr. McHALE. Mr. Speaker, this, too, is agreed to. I seek an affirmative vote.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—191

Acosta	Dininni	Lashing	Richardson
Afflerbach	Distler	Laughlin	Rieger
Angstadt	Dombrowski	Lescovitz	Robbins
Angall	Donatucci	Letterman	Roebuck
Arty	Dorr	Levdansky	Rudy
Baldwin	Duffy	Linton	Ryan
Barber	Evans	Livengood	Rybak
Barley	Fargo	Lloyd	Saloom
Battisto	Fattah	Lucyk	Scheetz
Belardi	Fee	McCall	Schuler
Belfanti	Fischer	McClatchy	Semmel
Black	Flick	McHale	Serafini
Blaum	Foster, Jr., A.	McVerry	Seventy
Book	Fox	Mackowski	Showers
Bortner	Freeman	Maiale	Smith, B.
Bowley	Freind	Manderino	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Fryer	Manmiller	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Gallagher	Markosek	Snyder, G. M.
Brandt	Gallen	Mayernik	Staback
Broujos	Gamble	Merry	Stairs
Bunt	Gannon	Michlovic	Steighner
Burd	Geist	Miller	Stewart
Burns	George	Moehlmann	Stuban
Bush	Gladeck	Morris	Sweet
Caltagirone	Godshall	Mowery	Swift
Cappabianca	Greenwood	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Carlson	Gruitza	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Carn	Gruppo	Nahill	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Hagarty	Noye	Telek
Cessar	Haluska	O'Brien	Trello
Chadwick	Harper	O'Donnell	Truman
Civera	Hasay	Olasz	Van Horne
Clark	Hayes	Oliver	Veon
Clymer	Herman	Perzel	Vroon
Cohen	Hershey	Petrarca	Wambach
Colafella	Honaman	Petrone	Wass
Cole	Howlett	Phillips	Weston
Cordisco	Itkin	Piccola	Wiggins
Cornell	Jackson	Pievsky	Wilson
Cowell	Jarolin	Pistella	Wogan
Coy	Johnson	Pitts	Wozniak
Deluca	Josephs	Pott	Wright, D. R.
DeVerter	Kasunic	Pressmann	Wright, J. L.
DeWeese	Kennedy	Preston	Wright, R. C.
Daley	Kenney	Punt	Yandrisevits
Davies	Kosinski	Raymond	
Dawida	Kukovich	Reber	Irvis,
Deal	Langtry	Reinard	Speaker
Dietz			

NAYS—1

Saurman

NOT VOTING—5

Birmelin	Hutchinson	Micozzie	Sirianni
Coslett			

EXCUSED—4

Cimini Durham Stevens Tigue

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. STEWART offered the following amendments No. A0543:

Amend Sec. 4, page 5, line 5, by striking out "The" and inserting

Where technologically feasible, the

Amend Sec. 5, page 6, line 5, by inserting after "meeting" at least

Amend Sec. 5, page 6, line 16, by striking out "county" and inserting

proposed 911 system

Amend Sec. 5, page 7, line 11, by striking out "has" and inserting

and contribution rate have

Amend Sec. 7, page 9, line 4, by striking out "The" and inserting

Upon request by the county, the

Amend Sec. 7, page 9, line 6, by inserting after "the" where it appears the second time

911

Amend Sec. 13, page 10, line 7, by striking out "1985" and inserting

1986

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Stewart.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment has a series of language changes to conform various sections to match other sections. The only major change in this amendment is about three-fourths of the way down where it says, "Upon request by the county..." That refers to delinquent phone bills. The way the bill is written now, the phone company would have to provide the list of delinquent phone bills automatically. I am changing it to they would provide them when the county requests it.

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. McHale.

Mr. McHALE. Mr. Speaker, this is a reasonable amendment. I support it and also seek an affirmative vote.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—192

Acosta	Deal	Lashingier	Richardson
Afflerbach	Dininni	Laughlin	Rieger
Angstadt	Distler	Lescovitz	Robbins
Argall	Dombrowski	Letterman	Roebuck
Arty	Donatucci	Levdansky	Rudy
Baldwin	Dorr	Linton	Ryan
Barber	Duffy	Livengood	Rybak
Barley	Evans	Lloyd	Saloom
Battisto	Fargo	Lucyk	Scheetz

Belardi	Fattah	McCall	Schuler
Belfanti	Fee	McClatchy	Semmel
Birmelin	Fischer	McHale	Serafini
Black	Flick	McVerry	Seventy
Blaum	Foster, Jr., A.	Mackowski	Showers
Book	Fox	Manderino	Smith, B.
Bortner	Freeman	Manmiller	Smith, L. E.
Bowley	Freind	Markosek	Snyder, D. W.
Bowser	Fryer	Mayernik	Snyder, G. M.
Boyes	Gallagher	Merry	Staback
Brandt	Gallen	Michlovic	Stairs
Broujos	Gamble	Micozzie	Steighner
Bunt	Gannon	Miller	Stewart
Burd	Geist	Moehlmann	Stuban
Burns	George	Morris	Sweet
Bush	Gladeck	Mowery	Swift
Caltagirone	Godshall	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Greenwood	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Carlson	Gruitza	Nahill	Taylor, J.
Carn	Gruppo	Noye	Telek
Cawley	Hagarty	O'Brien	Trello
Cessar	Haluska	O'Donnell	Truman
Chadwick	Harper	Olasz	Van Horne
Civera	Hasay	Oliver	Veon
Clark	Hayes	Perzel	Vroon
Clymer	Herman	Petrarca	Wambach
Cohen	Hershey	Petrone	Wass
Colafella	Honaman	Phillips	Weston
Cole	Howlett	Piccola	Wiggins
Cordisco	Itkin	Pievsky	Wilson
Cornell	Jackson	Pistella	Wogan
Coslett	Jarolin	Pitts	Wozniak
Cowell	Johnson	Pott	Wright, D. R.
Coy	Josephs	Pressmann	Wright, J. L.
Deluca	Kasunic	Preston	Wright, R. C.
DeVerter	Kennedy	Punt	Yandrisevits
DeWeese	Kenney	Raymond	
Daley	Kosinski	Reber	Irvis,
Davies	Kukovich	Reinard	Speaker
Dawida	Langtry		

NAYS—1

Saurman

NOT VOTING—4

Dietz Hutchinson Maiale Sirianni

EXCUSED—4

Cimini Durham Stevens Tigue

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. STEWART offered the following amendments No. A0517:

Amend Sec. 6, page 8, line 3, by striking out "contribution upon individuals" and inserting current contribution rate of .... each month upon all telephone subscribers

Amend Sec. 7, page 8, line 17, by striking out "telephone company" and inserting service supplier

Amend Sec. 7, page 8, line 22, by striking out "telephone company" and inserting service supplier

Amend Sec. 7, page 8, line 22, by striking out "1%" and inserting

1.5%

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

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Stewart.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment changes the wording of the referendum question that is currently in the bill, making it very clear on the ballot question how much the service will cost each month on the phone bill. I urge its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. McHale, on the amendment.

Mr. McHALE. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is in the nature of full disclosure to the telephone consumer who will be affected by this legislation. Under the current language of the referendum the actual amount of the monthly billing does not appear. With the Stewart amendment, which I support, the consumer who will vote in the referendum will know exactly what this is going to cost on a monthly basis. For that reason I support the amendment and seek an affirmative vote.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—195

Acosta	Dietz	Lashinger	Richardson
Afflerbach	Dininni	Laughlin	Rieger
Angstadt	Distler	Lescovitz	Robbins
Argall	Dombrowski	Letterman	Rudy
Arty	Donatucci	Levdansky	Ryan
Baldwin	Dorr	Linton	Rybak
Barber	Duffy	Livengood	Saloom
Barley	Evans	Lloyd	Saurman
Battisto	Fargo	Lucyk	Scheetz
Belardi	Fattah	McCall	Schuler
Belfanti	Fee	McClatchy	Semmel
Birmelin	Fischer	McHale	Serafini
Black	Flick	McVerry	Seventy
Blaum	Foster, Jr., A.	Mackowski	Showers
Book	Fox	Maiale	Sirianni
Bortner	Freeman	Manderino	Smith, B.
Bowley	Freind	Manmiller	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Fryer	Markosek	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Gallagher	Mayernik	Snyder, G. M.
Brandt	Gallen	Merry	Staback
Broujos	Gamble	Michlovic	Stairs
Bunt	Gannon	Micozzie	Steighner
Burd	Geist	Miller	Stewart
Burns	George	Moehlmann	Stuban
Bush	Gladeck	Morris	Sweet
Caltagirone	Godshall	Mowery	Swift
Cappabianca	Greenwood	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Carlson	Gruitza	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Carn	Gruppo	Nahill	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Hagarty	Noye	Telek
Cessar	Haluska	O'Brien	Trello
Chadwick	Harper	O'Donnell	Truman
Civera	Hasay	Olasz	Van Horne
Clark	Hayes	Oliver	Veon
Clymer	Herman	Perzel	Vroon
Cohen	Hershey	Petrarca	Wambach
Colafella	Honaman	Petrone	Wass
Cole	Howlett	Phillips	Weston
Cordisco	Itkin	Piccola	Wiggins
Cornell	Jackson	Pievsky	Wilson
Coslett	Jarolin	Pistella	Wogan
Cowell	Johnson	Pitts	Wozniak
Coy	Josephs	Pott	Wright, D. R.

Deluca	Kasunic	Pressmann	Wright, J. L.
DeVerter	Kennedy	Preston	Wright, R. C.
DeWeese	Kenney	Punt	Yandrisevits
Daley	Kosinski	Raymond	
Davies	Kukovich	Reber	Irvis,
Dawida	Langtry	Reinard	Speaker
Deal			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—2

Hutchinson	Roebuck
------------	---------

EXCUSED—4

Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue
--------	--------	---------	-------

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

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

Mr. STEWART offered the following amendment No. A0516:

Amend Sec. 3, page 3, lines 25 and 26, by striking out "There is hereby established a telecommunications unit within the department." and inserting

The department shall establish an operational telecommunications unit within 120 days of the effective date of this act.

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

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Stewart.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the final amendment of mine.

The bill sets up a telecommunications unit within the Department of General Services. This amendment sets a timetable by which that department shall be set up, setting the maximum time for the unit to be up and operational to 120 days from the effective date of the act.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. McHale, on the amendment.

Mr. McHALE. Mr. Speaker, this amendment simply guarantees that what we pass here in the legislature will be swiftly carried into policy by the executive branch. I support the amendment and seek an affirmative vote.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—192

Acosta	Dietz	Lashinger	Rieger
Afflerbach	Dininni	Laughlin	Robbins
Angstadt	Distler	Lescovitz	Rudy
Argall	Dombrowski	Letterman	Ryan
Arty	Donatucci	Levdansky	Rybak
Baldwin	Dorr	Linton	Saloom
Barber	Duffy	Livengood	Saurman
Barley	Evans	Lloyd	Scheetz
Battisto	Fargo	Lucyk	Schuler
Belardi	Fattah	McCall	Semmel
Belfanti	Fee	McClatchy	Serafini
Birmelin	Fischer	McHale	Seventy

Black	Flick	McVerry	Showers
Blaum	Foster, Jr., A.	Mackowski	Sirianni
Book	Fox	Maiale	Smith, B.
Bortner	Freeman	Manderino	Smith, L. E.
Bowley	Freind	Manmiller	Snyder, D. W.
Bowser	Fryer	Markosek	Snyder, G. M.
Boyes	Gallagher	Mayernik	Staback
Brandt	Gallen	Merry	Stairs
Broujos	Gamble	Michlovic	Steighner
Bunt	Gannon	Micozzie	Stewart
Burd	Geist	Miller	Stuban
Burns	George	Moehlmann	Sweet
Bush	Gladeck	Morris	Swift
Caltagirone	Godshall	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Greenwood	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Carlson	Gruitza	Noye	Taylor, J.
Carn	Gruppo	O'Brien	Telek
Cawley	Hagarty	O'Donnell	Trello
Cessar	Haluska	Olasz	Truman
Chadwick	Harper	Oliver	Van Horne
Civera	Hasay	Perzel	Veon
Clark	Hayes	Petrarca	Vroon
Clymer	Herman	Petrone	Wambach
Cohen	Hershey	Phillips	Wass
Colafella	Honaman	Piccola	Weston
Cole	Howlett	Pievsky	Wiggins
Cordisco	Itkin	Pistella	Wilson
Coslett	Jackson	Pitts	Wogan
Cowell	Jarolin	Pott	Wozniak
Coy	Johnson	Pressmann	Wright, D. R.
Deluca	Josephs	Preston	Wright, J. L.
DeVerter	Kasunic	Punt	Wright, R. C.
DeWeese	Kennedy	Raymond	Yandrisevits
Daley	Kenney	Reber	
Davies	Kosinski	Reinard	Irvis,
Dawida	Kukovich	Richardson	Speaker
Deal	Langtry		

NAYS—1

Nahill

NOT VOTING—4

Cornell Hutchinson Mowery Roebuck

EXCUSED—4

Cimini Durham Stevens 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. McHALE offered the following amendments No. A0550:

Amend Sec. 8, page 9, line 8, by inserting before "Funds"

(a) General rule.—

Amend Sec. 8, page 9, line 9, by striking out "If, in any fiscal year, appropriations are" and inserting

(b) Deficiency appropriation.—If, in any fiscal year, appropriations are

Amend Sec. 8, page 9, by inserting between lines 16 and 17

(c) Limit on funding.—No county shall, in any year, be granted more than 20% of the total annual appropriation made for installation grants, unless there are insufficient applicants to consume the entire amount of the appropriation.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. McHale.

Mr. McHALE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is in the nature of guaranteeing fair distribution of the money that we appropriate during the upcoming fiscal year. The total amount of money that we appropriate for installation grants comes to \$1.25 million. There was some legitimate concern expressed that one or two particular municipalities might consume the entire amount. Therefore, we have placed an upper cap on the total amount of money that any one county could obtain during a fiscal year. That cap is one-fifth or 20 percent. I believe it is reasonable, and I seek an affirmative vote on the amendment.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—195

Acosta	Dietz	Lashing	Rieger
Afflerbach	Dininni	Laughlin	Robbins
Angstadt	Distler	Lescovitz	Roebuck
Argall	Dombrowski	Letterman	Rudy
Arty	Donatucci	Levdansky	Ryan
Baldwin	Dorr	Linton	Rybak
Barber	Duffy	Livengood	Saloom
Barley	Evans	Lloyd	Saurman
Battisto	Fargo	Lucyk	Scheetz
Belardi	Fattah	McCall	Schuler
Belfanti	Fee	McClatchy	Semmel
Birmelin	Fischer	McHale	Serafini
Black	Flick	McVerry	Seventy
Blaum	Foster, Jr., A.	Mackowski	Showers
Book	Fox	Maiale	Sirianni
Bortner	Freeman	Manderino	Smith, B.
Bowley	Freind	Manmiller	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Fryer	Markosek	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Gallagher	Mayernik	Snyder, G. M.
Brandt	Gallen	Merry	Staback
Broujos	Gamble	Michlovic	Stairs
Bunt	Gannon	Micozzie	Steighner
Burd	Geist	Miller	Stewart
Burns	George	Moehlmann	Stuban
Bush	Gladeck	Morris	Sweet
Caltagirone	Godshall	Mowery	Swift
Cappabianca	Greenwood	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Carlson	Gruitza	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Carn	Gruppo	Nahill	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Hagarty	Noye	Telek
Cessar	Haluska	O'Brien	Trello
Chadwick	Harper	O'Donnell	Truman
Civera	Hasay	Olasz	Van Horne
Clark	Hayes	Oliver	Veon
Clymer	Herman	Petrarca	Vroon
Cohen	Hershey	Petrone	Wambach
Colafella	Honaman	Phillips	Wass
Cole	Howlett	Piccola	Weston
Cordisco	Itkin	Pievsky	Wiggins
Cornell	Jackson	Pistella	Wilson
Coslett	Jarolin	Pitts	Wogan
Cowell	Johnson	Pott	Wozniak
Coy	Josephs	Pressmann	Wright, D. R.
Deluca	Kasunic	Preston	Wright, J. L.
DeVerter	Kennedy	Punt	Wright, R. C.
DeWeese	Kenney	Raymond	Yandrisevits
Daley	Kosinski	Reber	
Davies	Kukovich	Reinard	Irvis,
Dawida	Langtry	Richardson	Speaker
Deal			

NAYS—0  
NOT VOTING—2

Hutchinson Perzel

EXCUSED—4

Cimini Durham Stevens Tigue

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. McHALE offered the following amendments No. A0646:

Amend Sec. 2, page 3, by inserting between lines 5 and 6 "Local exchange telephone service." The provision of telephonic message transmission within an exchange, as such is defined and described in tariffs filed with and approved by the commission.

Amend Sec. 2, page 3, line 16, by inserting after "for" local exchange

Amend Sec. 4, page 5, line 9, by striking out "operating" and inserting

providing local exchange telephone service

Amend Sec. 4, page 5, line 27, by inserting after "receives" local exchange

Amend Sec. 7, page 8, line 18, by striking out "operating" and inserting

providing local exchange telephone service

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. McHale.

Mr. McHALE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment really spells out in specific terms what was intended to be included in the general language of the bill originally. Frankly, I think this really is somewhat of a surplusage, but I have no objection to it. I have introduced it at the request of a number of interested parties.

What it does is this: It is our intention that the telephone contribution rate only apply to local telephone service providers. It was not our intention to involve long-distance carriers, such as Sprint, AT&T, MCI. Those systems really are not relevant to the bill that is in front of the House. This language simply spells out that long-distance carriers will not be captured by the provisions of the telephone contribution rate in that what we are doing is aiming this legislation appropriately at the local service providers. I had intended that originally; this clears up the language a little bit. I seek an affirmative vote.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—195

Acosta	Dininni	Lashinger	Rieger
Afflerbach	Distler	Laughlin	Robbins
Angstadt	Dombrowski	Lescovitz	Roebuck
Argall	Donatucci	Letterman	Rudy
Arty	Dorr	Levdansky	Ryan
Baldwin	Duffy	Linton	Rybak
Barber	Evans	Livengood	Saloom
Barley	Fargo	Lloyd	Saurman
Battisto	Fattah	Lucyk	Scheetz
Belardi	Fee	McCall	Schuler
Belfanti	Fischer	McClatchy	Semmel
Birmelin	Flick	McHale	Serafini
Black	Foster, Jr., A.	McVerry	Seventy
Blaum	Fox	Mackowski	Showers
Book	Freeman	Maiale	Sirianni
Bortner	Freind	Manderino	Smith, B.
Bowley	Fryer	Manmiller	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Gallagher	Markosek	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Gallen	Mayernik	Snyder, G. M.
Brandt	Gamble	Merry	Staback
Broujos	Gannon	Michlovic	Stairs
Bunt	Geist	Micozzie	Steighner
Burns	George	Miller	Stewart
Bush	Gladeck	Moehlmann	Stuban
Caltagirone	Godshall	Morris	Sweet
Cappabianca	Greenwood	Mowery	Swift
Carlson	Gruitza	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Carn	Gruppo	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Cawley	Hagarty	Nahill	Taylor, J.
Cessar	Haluska	Noye	Telek
Chadwick	Harper	O'Brien	Trello
Civera	Hasay	Olasz	Truman
Clark	Hayes	Oliver	Van Horne
Clymer	Herman	Perzel	Veon
Cohen	Hershey	Petrarca	Vroon
Colafella	Honaman	Petrone	Wambach
Cole	Howlett	Phillips	Wass
Cordisco	Hutchinson	Piccola	Weston
Cornell	Itkin	Pievsky	Wiggins
Coslett	Jackson	Pistella	Wilson
Cowell	Jarolin	Pitts	Wogan
Coy	Johnson	Pott	Wozniak
DeLuca	Josephs	Pressmann	Wright, D. R.
DeVerter	Kasunic	Preston	Wright, J. L.
DeWeese	Kennedy	Punt	Wright, R. C.
Daley	Kenney	Raymond	Yandrisevits
Davies	Kosinski	Reber	
Dawida	Kukovich	Reinard	Irvis,
Deal	Langtry	Richardson	Speaker
Dietz			

NAYS—0  
NOT VOTING—2

Burd O'Donnell

EXCUSED—4

Cimini Durham Stevens Tigue

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. AFFLERBACH offered the following amendments No. A0634:

Amend Sec. 7, page 8, line 16, by inserting after "Collection" and disbursement

Amend Sec. 7, page 8, line 25, by striking out "sole"

Amend Sec. 7, page 8, line 27, by removing the period after "system" and inserting

and for the purpose of making payments under subsection (c).

Amend Sec. 7, page 8, line 28, by inserting after "system", subject to the provisions of subsection (c),

Amend Sec. 7, page 8, by inserting after line 30

(c) Disbursement to municipalities.—The county treasurer shall, on a quarterly basis, pay from funds of the restricted account to a municipality which operates a 911 system established prior to the effective date of this act, a sum of money not less than that contributed by the telephone subscribers of that municipality to the county 911 system through the telephone contribution rate.

Amend Sec. 7, page 9, line 1, by striking out "(c)" and inserting

(d)

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. Afflerbach.

Mr. AFFLERBACH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment provides assurances to the residents of those municipalities which already have in operation a "911" system the fact that they will not be charged twice for the same system. Under the provisions of the bill, if a county establishes a system, it is allowed to establish a surcharge to all telephone subscribers to pay for that system. Without this amendment, individuals who are residing in a municipality which presently operates a system would also have to pay that surcharge. In essence, they would be paying twice for the same system. This amendment guarantees that if that surcharge is collected, that amount of money will be returned to the municipality of those residents so that in the end they end up paying only for the system they presently have in effect.

I would ask support for the amendment.

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. McHale.

Mr. McHALE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I assisted Representative Afflerbach in drafting this amendment. It is a good amendment. It guarantees equity in the distribution of the telephone contribution rate. I seek an affirmative vote.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—197

Acosta	Dietz	Lashinger	Rieger
Afflerbach	Dininni	Laughlin	Robbins
Angstadt	Distler	Lescovitz	Roebuck
Argall	Dombrowski	Letterman	Rudy
Arty	Donatucci	Levdansky	Ryan
Baldwin	Dorr	Linton	Rybak
Barber	Duffy	Livengood	Saloom
Barley	Evans	Lloyd	Saurman
Battisto	Fargo	Lucyk	Scheetz
Belardi	Fattah	McCall	Schuler
Belfanti	Fee	McClatchy	Semmel
Birmelin	Fischer	McHale	Serafini
Black	Flick	McVerry	Seventy
Blaum	Foster, Jr., A.	Mackowski	Showers
Book	Fox	Maiale	Sirianni
Bortner	Freeman	Manderino	Smith, B.
Bowley	Freind	Manmiller	Smith, L. E.

Bowser	Fryer	Markosek	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Gallagher	Mayernik	Snyder, G. M.
Brandt	Gallen	Merry	Staback
Broujos	Gamble	Michlovic	Stairs
Bunt	Gannon	Micozzie	Steighner
Burd	Geist	Miller	Stewart
Burns	George	Moehlmann	Stuban
Bush	Gladeck	Morris	Sweet
Caltagirone	Godshall	Mowery	Swift
Cappabianca	Greenwood	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Carlson	Gruitza	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Carn	Gruppo	Nahill	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Hagarty	Noye	Telek
Cessar	Haluska	O'Brien	Trello
Chadwick	Harper	O'Donnell	Truman
Civera	Hasay	Olasz	Van Horne
Clark	Hayes	Oliver	Veon
Clymer	Herman	Perzel	Vroon
Cohen	Hershey	Petrarca	Wambach
Colafella	Honaman	Petrone	Wass
Cole	Howlett	Phillips	Weston
Cordisco	Hutchinson	Piccola	Wiggins
Cornell	Itkin	Pievsky	Wilson
Coslett	Jackson	Pistella	Wogan
Cowell	Jarolin	Pitts	Wozniak
Coy	Johnson	Pott	Wright, D. R.
Deluca	Josephs	Pressmann	Wright, J. L.
DeVerter	Kasunic	Preston	Wright, R. C.
DeWeese	Kennedy	Punt	Yandrisevits
Daley	Kenney	Raymond	
Davies	Kosinski	Reber	Irvis,
Dawida	Kukovich	Reinard	Speaker
Deal	Langtry	Richardson	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue
--------	--------	---------	-------

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. BURNS offered the following amendments No. A0656:

Amend Sec. 3, page 4, by inserting between lines 27 and 28

(9) To audit annually county expenditures for the operation and maintenance of 911 systems.

(10) To submit an annual report, not later than January 1 of each year, to the Governor, the secretary of the department and the General Assembly and include at least the following:

(i) The extent to which 911 systems currently exist in Pennsylvania.

(ii) Those counties which completed installation, and costs and expenses for installation.

(iii) An anticipated schedule for installing a 911 system on a county basis for that year.

(iv) The estimated cost of installing the 911 system.

(v) Any suggested changes to this act.

Amend Sec. 5, page 7, lines 13 and 14, by striking out "Substantial expansion or change of the" and inserting

Updating and expanding the present

Amend Bill, page 9, by inserting between lines 16 and 17 Section 9. Expenditures for maintenance and operation of 911 systems.

(a) Expenditures authorized.—During each county’s fiscal year, the county may expend the amounts distributed to it from the 911 telephone contribution rate for the maintenance and operation of a county 911 system.

(b) Items included in maintenance and operation costs.—Maintenance and operation costs may include telephone company charges, equipment costs or equipment lease charges, repairs, utilities, personnel costs and appropriate carryover costs from previous years.

(c) Limitations on expenditures.—The unit shall adopt procedures to assure that the total amount collected from the 911 contribution shall be expended only for the maintenance and operation of a county 911 system.

(d) Annual audit.—The unit shall provide for an audit of each county’s expenditures for the maintenance and operation of 911 systems.

Amend Sec. 9, page 9, line 17, by striking out “9” and inserting

10

Amend Sec. 10, page 9, line 20, by striking out “10” and inserting

11

Amend Sec. 11, page 9, line 24, by striking out “11” and inserting

12

Amend Sec. 12, page 10, line 3, by striking out “12” and inserting

13

Amend Sec. 13, page 10, line 6, by striking out “13” and inserting

14

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, this is an agreed-to amendment.

The SPEAKER. Would you explain the amendment briefly?

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, it would require an annual audit and an annual report to be submitted to the department. Currently in the bill there is no oversight provision for any of this, and we decided to go this way, with Mr. McHale’s approval.

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. McHale.

Mr. McHALE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment has gone through several revisions. The revision that is currently being distributed to the House is agreed to. It does provide, I think, for some very important oversight functions with regard to the future operation of the system. The changes that I had requested earlier in the amendment have now been made. It is agreed to. I seek an affirmative vote.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—197

Acosta	Dietz	Lashinger	Rieger
Afflerbach	Dininni	Laughlin	Robbins
Angstadt	Distler	Lescovitz	Roebuck
Argall	Dombrowski	Letterman	Rudy
Arty	Donatucci	Levdansky	Ryan
Baldwin	Dorr	Linton	Rybak

Barber	Duffy	Livengood	Saloom
Barley	Evans	Lloyd	Saurman
Battisto	Fargo	Lucyk	Scheetz
Belardi	Fattah	McCall	Schuler
Belfanti	Fee	McClatchy	Semmel
Birmelin	Fischer	McHale	Serafini
Black	Flick	McVerry	Seventy
Blaum	Foster, Jr., A.	Mackowski	Showers
Book	Fox	Maiale	Sirianni
Bortner	Freeman	Manderino	Smith, B.
Bowley	Freind	Manmiller	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Fryer	Markosek	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Gallagher	Mayernik	Snyder, G. M.
Brandt	Gallen	Merry	Staback
Broujos	Gamble	Michlovic	Stairs
Bunt	Gannon	Micozzie	Steighner
Burd	Geist	Miller	Stewart
Burns	George	Moehlmann	Stuban
Bush	Gladeck	Morris	Sweet
Caltagirone	Godshall	Mowery	Swift
Cappabianca	Greenwood	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Carlson	Gruitza	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Carn	Gruppo	Nahill	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Hagarty	Noye	Telek
Cessar	Haluska	O’Brien	Trello
Chadwick	Harper	O’Donnell	Truman
Civera	Hasay	Olasz	Van Horne
Clark	Hayes	Oliver	Veon
Clymer	Herman	Petzel	Vroon
Cohen	Hershey	Petrarca	Wambach
Colafella	Honaman	Petrone	Wass
Cole	Howlett	Phillips	Weston
Cordisco	Hutchinson	Piccola	Wiggins
Cornell	Itkin	Pievsky	Wilson
Coslett	Jackson	Pistella	Wogan
Cowell	Jarolin	Pitts	Wozniak
Coy	Johnson	Pott	Wright, D. R.
Deluca	Josephs	Pressmann	Wright, J. L.
DeVerter	Kasunic	Preston	Wright, R. C.
DeWeese	Kennedy	Punt	Yandrisevits
Daley	Kenney	Raymond	
Davies	Kosinski	Reber	Irvis,
Dawida	Kukovich	Reinard	Speaker
Deal	Langtry	Richardson	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue
--------	--------	---------	-------

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. BURNS offered the following amendment No. A0644:

Amend Sec. 2, page 3, line 20, by striking out “listing” and inserting  
telephone billable account

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. BURNS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment is not agreed to. We have some concern, however, because of the way the bill is now written. The way the bill presently reads is that if you had an unlisted telephone

number, you could not be charged for that unlisted telephone. In other words, whatever cost this "911" service would be to the customer, you would not be charged if you had an unlisted telephone number.

Just one minute, if I could, Mr. Speaker, to confer with the maker of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Surely. The House will wait.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Burns.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I can continue now if it is all right with the Chair.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman is ready, the House will listen.

Mr. Burns is about to debate a controversial amendment. The others have been noncontroversial; he warns that this one is.

Mr. BURNS. I must apologize to the House, Mr. Speaker, because when I started my remarks, I gave you some false information. That was the reason for the conference.

The Stewart amendment did take care of one part of the bill that I had concerns with; however, I still have a concern with that part of the bill, and let me explain to you why.

Prior to the Stewart amendment, unlisted telephone numbers were not charged in this particular piece of legislation. The Stewart amendment took care of that, and now the unlisted numbers will be charged. My problem comes with the fact that every number will be charged. Let us, for example, say that Saint Mary Hospital in Bucks County has maybe 45 phone lines into Saint Mary Hospital for the ordinary operation of that hospital. Under this piece of legislation, the way it now stands with the Stewart amendment, each one of those 45 numbers—

The SPEAKER. Yield, Mr. Burns.

### POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. Why does the lady from Lancaster, Mrs. Honaman, rise?

Mrs. HONAMAN. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I do not think we have a copy of this amendment. None of us over here do.

The SPEAKER. Has the amendment not been distributed?

The Chair apologizes to Mr. Burns and the members.

Mr. Burns, you are not permitted to argue an amendment which has not yet been distributed. Do you have another amendment which is ready?

Mr. BURNS. We only had the two. One has been put in and this is the second.

The SPEAKER. Where is that amendment now?

Mr. BURNS. The amendment clerk has it.

### BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. The amendment is in the duplicating room now. We will postpone any further action on the amendment until the amendment is on the floor. Advise the Chair when the amendment is ready to be distributed.

We will pass over the bill temporarily.

### RESOLUTIONS CONTINUED

Mr. KUKOVICH called up **HR 238, PN 2933**, entitled:

Establishing a select committee to investigate the incidents of, and the Commonwealth's response to, Medicaid fraud.

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader, who offers the following amendment to the resolution, which the clerk will read.

You better pay attention. The Chair is hopping around on these resolutions and bills.

Why does the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Murphy, rise?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, we have gone from page 6 to page 10. I have an interest in calling up a bill on page 9.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Murphy, we have settled that question. The Chair knows that.

Mr. MURPHY. We will go back? Thank you.

The SPEAKER. You have the Chair's personal word that we shall do it, yes.

On the question recurring,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

Mr. RYAN offered the following amendment No. A0652:

Amend resolution, page 2, lines 18 through 26, by striking out all of said lines

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader on the amendment.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, over this term this House has on a number of occasions changed its practice from every prior year that I can remember and has included specific amounts of money for special committees to do what standing committees always were able to do in the past. My amendment deletes from this bill the \$50,000 that Mr. Kukovich is asking for to fund his special committee. To date, we have authorized up to \$290,000 to fund special committees which to my knowledge have yet to file a single report, with the possible exception of a subcommittee headed by Mr. Daley.

I question, Mr. Speaker, the need at this time for an appropriation of \$50,000. I know of no justification. I have heard of nothing that is needed that requires this House, this Commonwealth, our taxpayers, to put another \$50,000 into special committees. I do not know if Mr. Barber, the chairman of Health and Welfare, is prepared to say that their committee is unable to make the investigation that this resolution calls for. I happen to believe, Mr. Speaker, that there has been abuse of the moneys that have been appropriated to date in some cases to these special committees, and for those reasons I would ask that the \$50,000 be removed from the bill, which is exactly what my amendments do. Let the standing committees do the job that they were formed to do.



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

Mr. KUKOVICH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

*I am not sure what the other committees have to do with the merits of what we are doing with HR 238, but I think we have to take a look at each resolution, each investigatory committee on its merits.*

The Health and Welfare Committee is extremely burdened right now, and they have been all session, with a host of legislation. The staff is probably overworked at this point. But apart from that, what is obviously necessary to deal with the medicaid fraud problem is one or two individuals who have an expertise in this type of investigation and who understand this particular type of law and the fraud that surrounds it.

The money that is asked for is a rather nominal amount compared to the alleged amount of fraud that is being perpetrated upon the State of Pennsylvania. According to a Federal study done regarding the amount of fraud nationally, if you take those numbers—which are anywhere from 5 to 10 percent—and relate them to the amount of money being spent in Pennsylvania on medicaid, then the correlation is something like a minimum of \$115 million of wasted money in Medicaid in this State and may be as high as \$230 million. I think considering that and also considering some of the revelations that we have seen in newspaper articles and some of the information that has been brought to myself and various colleagues of ours here in Harrisburg, it is clear that there is a major problem; it is clear that the House has an obligation to do something about it. By adopting this amendment and stripping out the funding, then we are making a statement that we are not concerned about medicaid fraud and that we do not want to do anything about it. I say the proper thing to do, the fiscally cost-conscious thing to do, is to vote “no” on the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. On the Ryan amendment, the Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not for a minute suggest that there is not fraud and abuse in connection with the medical assistance program. My quarrel, Mr. Speaker, is the track record of the majority party's special committees which are having \$50,000 appropriated every now and again to this time amounting to some \$300,000, \$290,000, without one shred of evidence that the money is being well spent. There are reports upon reports due in from these committees that have never been received.

For 24 years I have been here and have no recollection—I am not saying that it has not happened—of ever funding special subcommittees until this year, this term. I start to wonder, why do we do this? Is the committee system that bad? Are the majority and minority caucuses that understaffed? Are they that understaffed? I think, as I recall, that each of us has \$5 million or \$6 million to staff committees.

Mr. KUKOVICH. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Will the minority leader yield?

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

Mr. KUKOVICH. A point of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the relevance of this line of debate is. We are not debating what money has been spent and with what efficacy by past investigative committees. The point is whether medicaid fraud needs to be investigated in the State.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Kukovich, the Chair has heard your objection, and in the opinion of the Chair, Mr. Ryan is arguing, as is his right, that the money that you would have appropriated would not be useful because it has not been useful in similar investigations in the past.

You may continue, Mr. Ryan.

Mr. RYAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make is both of our caucuses, Mr. Speaker, have millions of dollars that are line itemed - millions of dollars, your caucus and mine - and the number slips my mind, but Mr. Pievsky or Mr. McClatchy, I am sure, could quickly find out, but I am going to guess that it is \$5 million or \$6 million we each have - your caucus, my caucus - for staffing committees. Why do we now have to go to the Chief Clerk's fund to get \$50,000 when for the years that most of us have been here in the leadership, this was never done before? Is it a failure, is my question. Is it a failure of the standing committees that they are unable to do the job for which they have been created? I suggest—and I am looking at a report from the Department of Welfare on fraud and abuse—that maybe there is some fraud and abuse within this subcommittee system that is using up all this money instead of using up the moneys that have already been appropriated to us.

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

Mr. KUKOVICH. Mr. Speaker, the committee system is working well and to the point where I think it is maybe overworked, especially in a few committees that handle the bulk of legislation in this Commonwealth and in this General Assembly. The committee system was not set up to do indepth investigatory work, especially in an area that demands high expertise.

*I would suggest that the minority leader is nit-picking over a relatively small amount compared to the billions of dollars, the 2.3 billions of dollars, that are spent in this Commonwealth on medicaid and the alleged amount of hundreds of millions of potential dollars that are being wasted. I think that is a rather small commitment to this purpose, and again I would ask for a negative vote on the amendment.*

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

VOTES CHALLENGED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.  
 Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, may we have only those in their seats voting on this?  
 The SPEAKER. The rules of the House are clear. Only those members in their seats are permitted to be registered on the vote. If the gentleman, Mr. Manderino, will indicate to the Chair who is voting incorrectly, the Chair will have that vote removed. We are running a stopwatch on this time.  
 Does either leader wish to strike a vote?  
 Mr. RYAN. Yes, Mr. Speaker.  
 The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.  
 Mr. RYAN. The gentleman, Mr. Fee.  
 The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman, Mr. Fee, on the floor of the House? If he is not, strike the vote.  
 Mr. RYAN. The gentleman, Mr. Petrone.  
 The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman, Mr. Petrone, on the floor of the House? He is on the floor of the House.  
 Mr. RYAN. He is here. I am sorry.  
 The gentleman, Mr. Fred Taylor.  
 The SPEAKER. Mr. Taylor is on the floor of the House.  
 Mr. RYAN. The gentleman, Mr. Barber.  
 The SPEAKER. The Chair saw Mr. Barber only about 3 minutes ago.  
 Mr. RYAN. I will accept that, Mr. Speaker.  
 The SPEAKER. He was here talking to the majority leader.  
 Mr. RYAN. The gentleman, Mr. Daley.  
 The SPEAKER. Is Mr. Daley on the floor of the House? Strike the vote. Strike the vote.  
 Mr. RYAN. The gentleman, Mr. Carn.  
 The SPEAKER. The Chair saw Mr. Carn only a few moments ago. Yes.  
 Mr. RYAN. He came over to our side, Mr. Speaker. He is one of ours.  
 Is the gentleman, Mr. Rieger, here?  
 The SPEAKER. Mr. Rieger? The gentleman is present.  
 Are there any further challenges?  
 Mr. RYAN. The gentleman, Mr. Olasz.  
 The SPEAKER. Is Mr. Olasz on the floor of the House? Strike the vote.  
 Mr. RYAN. The gentleman, Mr. Clark.  
 The SPEAKER. Mr. Clark is in his seat.  
 Mr. RYAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
 The SPEAKER. Mr. Manderino, do you have any votes you wish stricken? Any votes to be stricken on the Democratic side?  
 Four minutes and sixteen seconds have elapsed. We will not allow the clock to run beyond 10 minutes. No "times out."  
 On the question recurring,  
 Will the House agree to the amendment?  
 The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—97

Afflerbach	Distler	Kenney	Robbins
Angstadt	Dorr	Langtry	Ryan
Argall	Fargo	Lashingier	Saurman
Arty	Fischer	McClatchy	Scheetz
Barley	Flick	McVerry	Schuler

Birmelin	Foster, Jr., A.	Mackowski	Semmel
Black	Fox	Manmiller	Seraffini
Book	Freind	Merry	Sirianni
Bowser	Gallen	Micozzie	Smith, B.
Boyes	Gannon	Miller	Smith, L. E.
Brandt	Geist	Moehlmann	Snyder, D. W.
Bunt	Gladeck	Mowery	Snyder, G. M.
Burd	Godshall	Nahill	Stairs
Burns	Greenwood	Noye	Swift
Bush	Gruppo	O'Brien	Taylor, E. Z.
Carlson	Hagarty	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Cessar	Hasay	Phillips	Telek
Chadwick	Hayes	Piccola	Vroon
Civera	Herman	Pitts	Wass
Clymer	Hershey	Pott	Weston
Cornell	Honaman	Punt	Wilson
Coslett	Jackson	Raymond	Wogan
DeVerter	Johnson	Reber	Wright, J. L.
Davies	Kennedy	Reinard	Wright, R. C.
Dietz			

NAYS—95

Acosta	Deal	Levdansky	Roebuck
Baldwin	Dombrowski	Linton	Rudy
Barber	Donatucci	Livengood	Rybak
Battisto	Duffy	Lloyd	Saloom
Belardi	Evans	Lucyk	Seventy
Belfanti	Fattah	McCall	Showers
Blaum	Freeman	McHale	Staback
Bortner	Fryer	Manderino	Steighner
Bowley	Gallagher	Markosek	Stewart
Broujos	Gamble	Mayernik	Stuban
Caltagirone	George	Michlovic	Sweet
Cappabianca	Gruitza	Morris	Taylor, F. E.
Carn	Haluska	Mrkonic	Trello
Cawley	Harper	Murphy	Truman
Clark	Howlett	O'Donnell	Van Horne
Cohen	Itkin	Oliver	Veon
Colafella	Jarolin	Petrarca	Wambach
Cole	Josephs	Petrone	Wiggins
Cordisco	Kasunic	Pievsky	Wozniak
Cowell	Kosinski	Pistella	Wright, D. R.
Coy	Kukovich	Pressmann	Yandrisevits
Deluca	Laughlin	Preston	
DeWeese	Lescovitz	Richardson	Irvis,
Daley	Letterman	Rieger	Speaker
Dawida			

NOT VOTING—5

Dininni	Hutchinson	Maiale	Olasz
Fee			

EXCUSED—4

Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue
--------	--------	---------	-------

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

On the question,  
 Will the House adopt the resolution as amended?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.  
 Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, on the resolution.  
 The SPEAKER. On the resolution.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, the funding for the Medicaid fraud investigation has now been removed from the bill, thanks to the Republican Party. I guess the investigations are beginning to hurt; the shoe is beginning to pinch. I think the gentleman, Mr. George, with the investigation of toxic waste sites in the Commonwealth, and the gentleman, Mr. Colafella, and his committee, with the investigation of the

building being erected in the back of the Capitol, and several other of the investigations, Mr. Speaker, are beginning to show results that are at least uncomfortable to the Republican Party. But, Mr. Speaker, I ask nonetheless that the money has been released from this resolution that we vote in favor of the resolution, and I ask Mr. Kukovich, if he should be appointed chairman of that committee, to do the best job he can without funds that we should have provided, and then he can come back to us when he shows that there is good reason for this Assembly to put money into the investigation. He can ask a second time that we put money into the investigation.

I think Mr. Ryan's position is quite clear here today. He talks about some \$290,000 that we have already spent, which is really not very much money. That is about six investigations funded at \$50,000, and I think we should have funded this one, too, because it will take some expertise. But I will try to stir from the majority caucus funds whatever I can to make sure that this investigation is a viable investigation. Mr. Ryan, I invite you to contribute funds from your caucus to see that this is a viable investigation.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. RYAN. I would be happy to do my share, Mr. Manderino, from the \$5 million we each have to staff our committees.

I noticed as you went through your litany of special committees that we neglected to talk about some of the abuses, such as sending the chairman of a subcommittee to Italy, Spain, and Germany to investigate landfills.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, Mr. Ryan, the minority leader, has already launched his investigation into that matter that he just raised. He found out, with egg all over his face, that the gentleman he referred to paid for his own trip across the waters and back, and he did not come out smelling so nicely, and he ought to tell you about that part of it, too.

Mr. RYAN. Ah, Mr. Speaker, we have opened the door.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. RYAN. I have been told that the gentleman in question paid for his plane. I have seen some 2,200 dollars' worth of vouchers for visits in Europe. I have yet to see a report from that committee, although I have asked for it on the floor twice that I can remember. I do not believe a report has ever been filed by that committee. I am looking to some of our members, who indicate they have never received one. I have been told that after my last complaint about a \$500-a-week staff man who is working in Bucks County in the office of the subcommittee chairman, he has since been released and has been replaced by a part-time Harrisburg man. So maybe the shoe was squeezing a little bit there.

Despite the fact that we had a \$500 staff man working in Bucks County, we have yet to see a report. So I think I have some reason to—

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KUKOVICH. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Kukovich, why do you interrupt?

Mr. KUKOVICH. Mr. Speaker, again, as a point of parliamentary inquiry, this has nothing to do with this resolution or the merits of it.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Kukovich, you have been here long enough to know that the majority and minority leaders may speak at length as they will.

Mr. KUKOVICH. Mr. Speaker, if I could ask a question.

If Mr. Manderino had not spoken to this, you mean Mr. Ryan would still be able to elaborate on this subject and I would not?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

## POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER. Mr. Cordisco, you are not—

Mr. CORDISCO. A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Cordisco, why do you rise to a point of personal privilege, and are you absolutely sure you want to so rise?

Mr. CORDISCO. Absolutely.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not heard your name called.

Mr. CORDISCO. Mr. Speaker, I think even the Speaker can comprehend the fact that it was indeed a reference made to me, and that being the case, I think this should be aired out. Obviously Mr. Ryan needs an education, and I think one who is knowledgeable should give him one.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman, Mr. Cordisco, insist on rising to a point of personal privilege? Does the gentleman insist on his point of personal privilege?

Mr. CORDISCO. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. CORDISCO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as had been stated by the minority leader, and I had explained this to Mr. Ryan on more than one occasion, and I do not think it is necessary to belabor the House in reviewing or rehashing an issue that has been dead and long gone, but since he wants to tie it to an unrelated issue, I will then address it.

First of all, a report was filed. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the individual whom he had mentioned is Mr. Christine, who was indeed—as I told Mr. Ryan previously—was in fact in session in Harrisburg every day that we were here and was accessible to the Republican side of the aisle. Mr. Christine is no longer under the employment of the House. I am surprised that Mr. Ryan is not aware of that, but had he contacted his minority chairman, he would have been made aware of that fact, and that has been for at least 2 weeks now, in that the research end of this particular committee has ceased and now we are moving forward with a comprehensive piece of legislation, some 63 pages in all, that we can share with Mr. Ryan, as well

as the members are about to receive a 77-page report which will give an analysis of where every county in the Commonwealth is on this particular issue - the same work that was done by that particular staff member, Mr. Speaker. And as I said before, I think the committee has done a diligent job in moving forward on this particular issue, as we will see in the upcoming months as we compare this particular piece to the poor excuse for legislation that has been introduced by the Governor at this point in time, but that is a discussion for a later date.

As far as expenses are concerned on that particular issue, Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a fact that I have spent more than I have been reimbursed for on this particular legislative tour, whatever the case may be, or factfinding tour, and I think the positive results that have come forward from that particular factfinding tour are a result that is shown in the legislation that has been offered.

I am sorry that this is being brought up at this point in time, but should the minority leader have any further questions, I would hope that he would at least extend the courtesy of asking this particular member, or at least speaking to his members, prior to making statements on the floor, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I did speak to my members. I speak to them now; I look at them now. I say, do you have a copy of a report? They tell me, no.

Mr. CORDISCO. Go to the Chief Clerk's Office.

Mr. RYAN. I have the floor, Mr. Cordisco.

I asked my members, did they know about a trip to Europe by the committee chairman to investigate or to look at landfills in three different countries? No, not prior to the fact. Were any of you invited to attend, as minority members of a subcommittee? Were you asked to go to Europe? No. The man who works in Bucks County—and I will give it to you; I do not even know whether it is true or not; you say it is, so I will believe it—that a man was up here on session days. Fine. Is he down in my office? Is he in your office? No. I think I said that he had since left the employment—if not, I am sorry—and has been replaced by what I am told is a part-time person here on the Hill. All right; that is inaccurate. I stand corrected on that.

I have no report; none of us has a report. We have seen a bill introduced. Out of curiosity, I would love to know the contribution of the landfills in Spain, Italy, France, wherever it was, to the pending legislation. I daresay we have plenty of landfills in this country, probably more than enough in this State, in order to investigate them. But that is neither here nor there. The purpose of it was abuse of subcommittee funds. Maybe they were not abused by you, Mr. Cordisco. I do not know that. The reason I do not know that is because I never got the vouchers that I have several times on the floor asked for. Now, I am asking for them again - the backup data that we were not permitted to get under rule 14. I still do not have them, and this is not new.

Mr. CORDISCO. If you are addressing me, I would gladly give them to you. I gave them to the press; why would I not give them to you?

Mr. RYAN. Well, I would like to have them. Thank you. And then privately—I do not like to do this; I really do not.

Mr. CORDISCO. I have a hanky if you need it.

Mr. RYAN. All right, nonbeliever, then we will do it publicly.

I was going to say I would like privately to look at the vouchers and have an explanation for them. But we can do that publicly. When you give them to me someday under unanimous consent, we can go over them. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CORDISCO. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. This is the second time you are speaking.

Mr. CORDISCO. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

I would gladly share that information with Mr. Ryan, as I shared it with the press when he tried to find that information with a backdoor approach. But I would gladly share that with him and I think they are self-explanatory, even to the point where Mr. Ryan can understand the contents thereof. But obviously from this conversation, he has a lot more to do in the way of factfinding, because obviously he is not aware of the fact that we do not have anyone on staff as of this point in time and have asked his own members for recommendations for somebody to possibly work with the staff.

Furthermore, I also saved money, Mr. Speaker, by having him work out of the same office that I happen to possess in that he was able to use the equipment that was there, and he was available to any member on either side of the aisle if they so pursued.

And, Mr. Speaker, I am going to let you know something. From here on in that policy will stay in place. If any one of your members want to work in a bipartisan fashion to solve the solid waste crisis in Pennsylvania, I share that opportunity with them.

The SPEAKER. Now may we get back to the resolution? Any more invective to be spread upon the floor?

Mr. RYAN. I urge a "yes" vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Mr. Ryan.

On the question recurring,

Will the House adopt the resolution as amended?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

Acosta	Dietz	Lashingier	Rieger
Afflerbach	Dininni	Laughlin	Robbins
Angstadt	Distler	Lescovitz	Roebuck
Argall	Dombrowski	Letterman	Rudy
Arty	Donatucci	Levdansky	Ryan
Baldwin	Dorr	Linton	Rybak
Barber	Duffy	Livengood	Saloom
Barley	Evans	Lloyd	Saurman
Battisto	Fargo	Lucyk	Scheetz
Belardi	Fattah	McCall	Schuler
Belfanti	Fee	McClatchy	Semmel
Birmelin	Fischer	McHale	Serafini
Black	Flick	McVerry	Seventy
Blaum	Foster, Jr., A.	Mackowski	Showers
Book	Fox	Manderino	Sirianni
Bortner	Freeman	Manmiller	Smith, B.

Bowley	Freind	Markosek	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Fryer	Mayernik	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Gallagher	Merry	Snyder, G. M.
Brandt	Gallen	Michlovic	Staback
Broujos	Gamble	Micozzie	Stairs
Bunt	Gannon	Miller	Steighner
Burd	Geist	Moehlmann	Stewart
Burns	George	Morris	Stuban
Bush	Gladeck	Mowery	Sweet
Caltagirone	Godshall	Mrkonic	Swift
Cappabianca	Greenwood	Murphy	Taylor, E. Z.
Carlson	Gruitza	Nahill	Taylor, F. E.
Cawley	Gruppo	Noye	Taylor, J.
Cessar	Hagarty	O'Brien	Telek
Chadwick	Haluska	O'Donnell	Trello
Civera	Harper	Olasz	Van Horne
Clark	Hasay	Oliver	Veon
Clymer	Hayes	Perzel	Vroon
Cohen	Herman	Petrarca	Wambach
Colafrella	Hershey	Petrone	Wass
Cole	Honaman	Phillips	Weston
Cordisco	Howlett	Piccola	Wiggins
Cornell	Itkin	Pievsky	Wilson
Coslett	Jackson	Pistella	Wogan
Cowell	Jarolin	Pitts	Wozniak
Coy	Johnson	Pott	Wright, D. R.
Deluca	Josephs	Pressmann	Wright, J. L.
DeVerter	Kasunic	Preston	Wright, R. C.
DeWeese	Kennedy	Punt	Yandrisevits
Daley	Kenney	Raymond	
Davies	Kosinski	Reber	Irvis,
Dawida	Kukovich	Reinard	Speaker
Deal	Langtry	Richardson	

NAYS—2

Carn Truman

NOT VOTING—2

Hutchinson Maiale

EXCUSED—4

Cimini Durham Stevens Tigie

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

**CONSIDERATION OF HB 1246 CONTINUED**

On the question recurring,

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

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

Mr. McHALE. Mr. Speaker, if I may make a suggestion. There are in fact now two amendments that will be considered remaining on HB 1246 - Mr. Burns' and one of my own that is now being distributed. I would recommend that since the two amendments are interrelated, that we consider them at the same time and that for a few brief moments we continue to pass over the Burns amendment until mine has also been distributed.

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to go along with Mr. McHale on that. I think these two amendments are so—

The SPEAKER. We cannot consider two amendments at the same time, Mr. Burns.

Mr. BURNS. I really did not think so, but I thought maybe we could make some history.

The SPEAKER. The House does many weird things, but not that weird, no. If you will tell the Chair which one of the amendments you wish to take first, we will do that.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. McHale.

Mr. McHALE. Mr. Speaker, what I was suggesting was this: We certainly ought to take the Burns amendment first. But once we consider the Burns amendment, we will immediately then consider the McHale amendment. Since my amendment has not yet been distributed, I was concerned that once again we would break away from this bill waiting for distribution of my amendment.

The SPEAKER. I understood that your amendment had been distributed.

Mr. McHALE. No, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. It has been distributed, Mr. McHale. We are ready to take both amendments.

Mr. McHALE. We are all set to go, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Fine.

Well, I thought this morning that today was going to be interesting, but I did not think it was going to be quite this interesting. And it is going to get better, I warn you.

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

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reconsider HR 238.

The SPEAKER. In order to do that, Mr. Barber, you have to file the proper papers.

Mr. BARBER. Well, I am going to do that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. All right. The Chair thanks the gentleman. We will consider your motion when the papers are filed.

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

The clerk read the following amendment No. A0644:

Amend Sec. 2, page 3, line 20, by striking out "listing" and inserting

telephone billable account

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

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

Mr. BURNS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, you are going to hear an argument from Mr. McHale and me - both are on opposite sides of the fence; both think we are correct - and if you reject my amendment, then you automatically have to go along with Mr. McHale's, or vice versa.

The problem is, the way the bill reads now—and I think I am correct—it is only the listed service that could be charged. Now what, in effect, that means is that a person who has an unlisted telephone number could get away scot-free while you

who have a listed telephone number would be charged. That has to be corrected in this bill, and Mr. McHale agrees to it and I agree to it, and our only problem is how we do it.

My amendment would have every telephone billable account charged. The McHale amendment, which we will see in a few minutes if mine goes down, would have every number charged. That is the key difference. It is a philosophical difference between Mr. McHale and myself. If we charge every number, it would mean that every little "mom and pop" grocery store that might have two or three or four lines in just for convenience' sake—maybe mom and maybe pop are the only two ever working in the store, but they have four lines in—they would be charged four separate times.

If you look at county government, the county courthouse might have 400 lines in. The county courthouse would be charged 400 times. If you look at bigger businesses, of course, if you took Arco (Atlantic Richfield Company) or one of those in the Philadelphia area, and I suspect in the Pittsburgh area, they might be charged 5,000 times. If you look at just the House of Representatives, we are talking about 7,000 times you would be charged for this one type of service.

Now philosophically, I do not think that is right. In my own home, I have five people residing. Those five people residing in my home use one phone. We would be charged one time. All of a sudden, because I have five people working in let us say the "mom and pop" grocery store, beer distributor, travel agency—whatever you have—that group would be charged five times, because you have five lines. Even though there are the same number of people in my home - five - same number of people in the "mom and pop" grocery store - five - the "mom and pop" business would be charged five times what I am charged in my home.

I do not think that is fair, Mr. Speaker, and for that reason, my amendment would say "telephone billable account." So if you had a number here in Harrisburg, let us say 787-2500, and there were 50 numbers that went from that - 2501, 2502, et cetera - that would only be billed one time. On the other hand, in my small travel agency or in a "mom and pop" beer distributor that has four lines only to keep getting the customers so they do not miss a call, never use the service anymore, they would be billed four times, but under my amendment they would only be billed once.

You know, I do not believe the House of Representatives, the State of Pennsylvania, should be billed 7,000 times for the same service, but that is what you have unless you adopt the amendment that I have in front of you, "telephone billable account." I ask for an affirmative vote, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. McHALE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I very strongly oppose the Burns amendment. This amendment has very little to do with mom and pop and a great deal to do with the major corporations of Pennsylvania.

This is a cost-shifting mechanism. The cost of "911" is going to have to be paid by somebody. If you believe, as I do, that telephone subscribers should pay per line, you will

support my amendment in a few minutes. But if you believe that a major corporation with a single billable account should pay the same amount of money for its thousands of lines that your next-door neighbor pays for her or his one line, then you should support the Burns amendment. This has nothing to do with mom and pop. The cost is going to have to be paid.

If in fact the Burns amendment passes, the direct burden for the cost of "911" will be shifted from business enterprises, which now share in that cost equitably, onto the back of your next-door neighbor, who will have to take up the slack. The bottom-line dollar figure will remain the same. The question is how we apportion the cost of "911."

Now, I happen to believe that the number of lines into your business reflects the volume of your business, the number of your employees, and your ability to contribute to "911." A gentleman came up to me yesterday and said, I have a law office; I have four lines. Are you telling me that I would have to pay this telephone contribution rate on each one of my lines? And I said, yes. But how many law firms with four lines cannot afford to pay \$1.50 a month to have "911" emergency telephone service? We are talking about a nominal amount of money, which even when multiplied by the total number of lines for most businesses will not be a significant contribution.

Now, I want to emphasize, we are not talking about extensions here. If in your home you have one line but three extensions, you pay only once. But if you have a business with 10 lines and employees who are in that business who service those lines and a volume of business that justifies the 10 lines, you will have many more people potentially in that commercial enterprise benefiting from the availability of "911," and therefore, in my opinion, you ought to pay proportionately.

If we go with the Burns amendment, major corporations with single billable accounts will pay the same 35 cents per month that your next-door neighbor pays. I think that is obviously unfair. When you have a major business operation, a major commercial operation, with 10 lines, 15 lines, 20 lines, that reflects the volume of traffic in that building and reflects the potential service to all of the people who are employed at that particular operation. So the bottom line is not how much is going to be paid but who is going to pay it.

The language that I will propose in my amendment is absolutely fair to business. There is no unfair burden being placed on our commercial enterprises. But if you adopt the Burns amendment, you will be shifting that cost away from businesses that have multiline operations and can afford to pay more onto the back of the individual telephone consumer. And if you want to go back to your district and explain to your next-door neighbor why he or she has to pay more so that some business down the street can pay less, I suggest you support the Burns amendment. Otherwise, I urge you to come with me and oppose it.

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

Mr. BURNS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, Mr. McHale is exactly right. Who is going to pay? And it is very difficult for me to stand up here and try to

convince you that Bethlehem Steel should get away with a very low amount and have that cost shifted over to the individual phone ratepayer, the phone subscriber. On the other hand, however, I think those who use the service, for whom the service is available and who benefit, should pay on a billable account basis.

For example, take your local hospital. Your local hospital has absolutely no need for the service, but if your local hospital has 50 telephone lines in it, your local hospital will pay for each one of those lines. That local hospital is never going to use those lines. Just like the House of Representatives has 7,000 lines in it - 3 numbers in each one of our offices, et cetera. It comes out to about 7,000 lines. That is our information. We are not going to use 7,000 percent of the service, and it should be those who are going to use the service should pay.

Most of the businesses in this Commonwealth are not the Bethlehem Steels or the U.S. Steels or whatever. Most of the businesses are the small operations - the everyday grocery store, the milliner's - all of the different little businesses that operate in this Commonwealth that might have two or three lines in with one person, one person operating those lines, and they are going to be charged three or four or five hundred times what the ordinary person who may have five people in their home, as I do, would be paying. I do not think it is fair. I think they are going to get socked. I do not know for how much money—it may be a little; it may be a lot—but it is the principle of the thing, and I think it should be on a telephone billable account, not an individual number.

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Stewart.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The whole question here is spreading the cost, and it is no different than the situation that exists right now with telephone systems in this State. The sophisticated and very, very expensive computer switching equipment that the companies are installing now, the very sophisticated and very expensive fiber optic systems that the phone companies are installing now are not being installed and put into place so that the black phone on Mrs. Smith's bedstand works any better; they are being installed so that business computers can talk to each other better. But that cost is spread out to Mrs. Smith on her black phone, and it is not borne completely by the industry or by business.

So what we are talking about here is a similar situation - spreading the cost of an emergency "911" system. And I will just repeat what Representative McHale said: If you want to tell your constituents that they have to pay more because Arco can pay less, then you go right ahead. I urge the defeat of the Burns amendment.

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

Mr. YANDRISEVITS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the maker of the amendment stand for interrogation?

Mr. BURNS. I will, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Burns will stand for interrogation. You may proceed.

Mr. YANDRISEVITS. Mr. Speaker, did I understand you to say earlier that a hospital has no use for a "911" number?

Mr. BURNS. I would not think it would have. I think a hospital would not have to call an emergency service. Maybe a fire company; I will grant you a fire company, but in most cases I would not think they would have to, you know. Maybe you can inform me of that. I do not know.

Mr. YANDRISEVITS. That was the line I was getting at, Mr. Speaker. You apparently have in mind that this is just to be used for injury. Fire and police would also respond to "911," would they not?

Mr. BURNS. That is true, but my question is, would a hospital that has 400 telephone lines in it, should they be charged 400 times what I am charged as a private household with five people in it? Should they be charged 400 times? In the end, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be you and I and all of the people we represent paying for it, whether we pay for it here or whether we pay— You know, it is the old saying, pay me now or pay me later. You are going to pay; it is the question of how, and I think it should be related to the user more, the people who are actually benefiting from it, rather than just socking no matter who it would be. Eventually if it is on the "mom and pop" grocery store, you know, the price is going to go up a penny on this, 10 cents on that. You can pay me now or you can pay me later; you can pay me the easy way or the hard way; we are not going to get a free lunch. I just say it is more equitable for the user to pay.

Mr. YANDRISEVITS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER, may I speak on the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may so speak.

Mr. YANDRISEVITS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In answer to my question it was stated that the user should pay for this service, and I think that hit the nail right on the head. In a hospital which might have 400 phones, we have 400 more places where fire can break out. We have 400 more people, at least, operating where in a residential system you might have 1, 2, or 3 people living. So I think it is clear that the larger the building, the more opportunity to use the "911" service, and therefore, the more phone lines representing the larger building should bear the cost of the "911" service. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. McHale, for the second time on the amendment.

Mr. McHALE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, Mr. Burns' amendment is attempting to paint a portrait with a very wide brush. This bill has been under consideration for at least the last 6 or 7 months and was in fact introduced last May.

If there is some concern as to whether or not a particular enterprise - for instance, a hospital - should be charged for "911" service, there has been ample opportunity to introduce an amendment to the bill or to at least discuss the matter with me in order to provide a specific exclusion for that kind of enterprise. We are not talking about hospitals today; we are not talking about other institutions that may or may not need

“911” service. What we are talking about here is a fundamental change in the method of billing that will benefit primarily major corporations that can afford to pay to the detriment of individual telephone consumers who may or may not be able to pay.

The bottom line for the cost of the “911” system will not change. The only issue is whether it is fair, and I believe it is, to charge an operation in proportion to the number of lines servicing that particular business. There is a reason why a business enterprise might have 4 lines or 10 lines or 100 lines. That reason is related to the number of employees and the volume of business.

I believe that my amendment is eminently fair. I believe that the Burns amendment places an undue burden on the backs of our individual telephone consumers. I want to encourage economic development in Pennsylvania. I want to assist our businesses in any reasonable way that I can, but this amendment is not reasonable. It provides a benefit to business at the expense of the individual telephone consumer. For that reason I urge a negative vote on the Burns amendment.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—89

Argall	Fargo	Lashinger	Saurman
Arty	Flick	McClatchy	Scheetz
Barley	Foster, Jr., A.	McVerry	Schuler
Birmelin	Fox	Mackowski	Semmel
Blaum	Freind	Manmiller	Serafini
Book	Gallen	Merry	Sirianni
Bowser	Gannon	Micozzie	Smith, B.
Boyes	Geist	Miller	Smith, L. E.
Bunt	Gladeck	Mowery	Snyder, D. W.
Burd	Godshall	Nahill	Snyder, G. M.
Burns	Greenwood	Noye	Stairs
Carlson	Gruppo	O'Brien	Swift
Cawley	Hagarty	Perzel	Taylor, E. Z.
Cessar	Hasay	Phillips	Taylor, J.
Chadwick	Hayes	Piccola	Telek
Civera	Herman	Pitts	Truman
Clymer	Hershey	Pott	Vroon
Cornell	Jarolin	Raymond	Wass
Coslett	Johnson	Reber	Weston
DeVerter	Kennedy	Reinard	Wilson
Dininni	Kenney	Robbins	Wogan
Distler	Langtry	Ryan	Wright, J. L.
Dorr			

NAYS—106

Acosta	Davies	Lescovitz	Punt
Afflerbach	Dawida	Letterman	Richardson
Angstadt	Deal	Levdansky	Rieger
Baldwin	Dombrowski	Linton	Roebuck
Barber	Donatucci	Livengood	Rudy
Battisto	Duffy	Lloyd	Rybak
Belardi	Evans	Lucyk	Saloom
Belfanti	Fattah	McCall	Seventy
Black	Fee	McHale	Showers
Bortner	Fischer	Maiale	Staback
Bowley	Freeman	Manderino	Steighner
Brandt	Fryer	Markosek	Stewart
Broujos	Gallagher	Mayernik	Stuban
Bush	Gamble	Michlovic	Sweet
Caltagirone	George	Moehlmann	Taylor, F. E.
Cappabianca	Gruitz	Morris	Trello
Carn	Haluska	Mrkonic	Van Horne

Clark	Harper	Murphy	Veon
Cohen	Honaman	O'Donnell	Wambach
Colafella	Howlett	Olasz	Wiggins
Cole	Itkin	Oliver	Wozniak
Cordisco	Jackson	Petrarca	Wright, D. R.
Cowell	Josephs	Petrone	Wright, R. C.
Coy	Kasunic	Pievsky	Yandrisevits
Deluca	Kosinski	Pistella	
DeWeese	Kukovich	Pressmann	Irvis,
Daley	Laughlin	Preston	Speaker

NOT VOTING—2

Dietz Hutchinson

EXCUSED—4

Cimini Durham Stevens Tighe

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. McHALE offered the following amendment No. A0627:

Amend Sec. 2, page 3, line 20, by striking out “listing” and inserting  
number

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. McHale.

Mr. McHALE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the substance of my amendment was in effect debated during consideration of the Burns amendment. My amendment proposes what I articulated a few moments ago, and that is that a particular telephone subscriber ought to pay the monthly telephone contribution rate based on the total number of lines servicing that particular residence, commercial operation, or industry. Once again I stress, we are not talking about extensions on the same line, so for the overwhelming majority of residences in this Commonwealth we are talking about one billing, one telephone contribution rate regardless of the number of extensions that may exist in a particular home. We are talking about a billable telephone line as expressed in the billable telephone number.

I believe, as I argued a few moments ago, that if you have multiline service, if you have more than one number, you ought to pay this very nominal rate for each one of those lines. I believe that equitably distributes the cost of “911” throughout the service population. Businesses benefit from “911”; residents benefit from “911,” and I believe this fairly shares the cost. I seek an affirmative vote.

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

Mr. BURNS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I said in my opening remarks a few minutes ago, if you did not vote for my amendment—and you did not—you have to vote for this amendment because it makes it a great deal better than the way the bill is now. The way the bill is now,



there is a whole group of subscribers who do not have to pay. I do not agree with that. Even though I oppose this way of doing it, it is much better than the bill in its present form, and being the good loser that I am, I will have to say vote for Mr. McHale's amendment.

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

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—187

Acosta	Dietz	Lashinger	Robbins
Afflerbach	Dininni	Laughlin	Roebuck
Angstadt	Distler	Lescovitz	Rudy
Argall	Dombrowski	Letterman	Ryan
Arty	Donatucci	Levdansky	Rybak
Baldwin	Dorr	Linton	Saloom
Barber	Duffy	Livengood	Saurman
Barley	Evans	Lloyd	Scheetz
Battisto	Fargo	Lucyk	Semmel
Belardi	Fattah	McCall	Serafini
Belfanti	Fee	McClatchy	Seventy
Birmelin	Fischer	McHale	Showers
Black	Flick	McVerry	Sirianni
Blaum	Foster, Jr., A.	Mackowski	Smith, B.
Book	Fox	Majale	Smith, L. E.
Bortner	Freeman	Manderino	Snyder, D. W.
Bowley	Freind	Manmiller	Snyder, G. M.
Bowser	Fryer	Markosek	Staback
Boyes	Gallagher	Mayernik	Stairs
Brandt	Gallen	Merry	Steighner
Broujos	Gamble	Michlovic	Stewart
Bunt	Gannon	Micozzie	Stuban
Burd	Geist	Miller	Sweet
Burns	George	Morris	Swift
Bush	Gladeck	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Caltagirone	Godshall	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Cappabianca	Gruitza	Nahill	Taylor, J.
Carlson	Gruppo	Noye	Telek
Carn	Hagarty	O'Brien	Trello
Cawley	Haluska	O'Donnell	Truman
Cessar	Harper	Olasz	Van Horne
Chadwick	Hasay	Oliver	Veon
Civera	Hayes	Perzel	Vroon
Clark	Herman	Petrarca	Wambach
Clymer	Hershey	Petrone	Wass
Cohen	Honaman	Phillips	Weston
Colafella	Howlett	Piccola	Wiggins
Cole	Itkin	Pievsky	Wilson
Cordisco	Jackson	Pistella	Wogan
Coslett	Jarolin	Pitts	Wozniak
Cowell	Johnson	Pressmann	Wright, D. R.
Coy	Josephs	Preston	Wright, J. L.
Deluca	Kasunic	Punt	Wright, R. C.
DeWeese	Kennedy	Raymond	Yandrisevits
Daley	Kenney	Reber	
Davies	Kukovich	Richardson	Irvis,
Dawida	Langtry	Rieger	Speaker
Deal			

NAYS—7

Cornell	Moehlmann	Pott	Schuler
DeVerter	Mowery	Reinard	

NOT VOTING—3

Greenwood	Hutchinson	Kosinski	
-----------	------------	----------	--

EXCUSED—4

Cimini	Durham	Stevens	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?

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?

On final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. McHale.

Mr. McHALE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I sense the supportive mood of the House and I do not intend to belabor my comments on final passage.

We are today taking a major step forward in enhancing the emergency telephone communications system here in Pennsylvania. Without exaggeration, if the other body agrees with what we have done today, or what I believe we are about to do, lives will be saved. That is by no means an exaggeration.

Last April in my legislative district a woman perished in a fire when a neighbor, mistakenly believing that Bethlehem had "911," dialed that number to notify the local fire department of the existing emergency. We in Bethlehem are typical of most of the State. Only approximately one-third of the citizens of Pennsylvania are now covered by "911." When that call was made, it was routed from the Lehigh Valley to Philadelphia and back to a fire station approximately 2 blocks from the location of the fire. No one can state with a certainty whether or not my constituent would have survived if we had "911." We do not know the answer to that question. What we do know is that the relay of that call to Philadelphia and back to the Lehigh Valley, 2 blocks from the fire, delayed our emergency vehicles and particularly our fire trucks approximately 10 or 15 minutes in their trip - that 2-block trip - to the location of the fire. That kind of tragedy is occurring regularly throughout Pennsylvania. This bill provides a major financial incentive to counties to adopt a technology that has been in existence for 10 years.

I seek an affirmative vote on the bill. I believe that by casting an affirmative vote you will truly be casting a vote for the public health and safety of each one of your constituents. It is a crucial vote; I feel confident you will come with me. I sincerely hope the other body acts as responsibly as we have in this chamber. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. NAHILL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Can I interrogate the prime sponsor, please?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. McHale, indicates he will stand for interrogation. You may proceed, Mr. Nahill.

Mr. NAHILL. Mr. Speaker, there has been quite a bit of conflicting information that I have been receiving, and I wonder whether you could fill me in. Do you know what the position of the Consumer Advocate is on the contribution charge that we are talking about in this bill?

Mr. McHALE. Thus far the position of the Consumer Advocate has been one of silence. The bill has been pending since last May and I have received no communication from the Consumer Advocate. I understand, from speaking with the gentleman, Mr. Burns, there has been some informal communication with the office of the Consumer Advocate, although I understand that communication did not directly involve the Consumer Advocate. So if there is a position being taken by that agency, no such position has been communicated to me.

Mr. NAHILL. It had been indicated to me that there were some conflicts on it. Do you think there has been no position taken at all? I have heard "yes" and I have heard "no," so I guess I have to go with "I am not sure."

Mr. McHALE. I did have a conversation with the minority staff members from the committee and they did advise me about an hour ago that there had been some informal communication but that in fact the Office of Consumer Advocate had taken no position on the bill at all, and at that point it was fairly clear that the Consumer Advocate himself was not even aware of the specific provisions of the bill and had not articulated a position.

Mr. NAHILL. I have also been told—and again this is a conflict and I am not sure where it stands—that there are several consumer groups that are against this contribution rate. Can you elucidate on that or do you not know anything about that?

Mr. McHALE. This bill has been considered now before the Public Utilities Subcommittee, the Consumer Affairs Committee, the Appropriations Committee. In each case the bill has been passed by overwhelming margins. We have had public hearings, both in Harrisburg and elsewhere around the State, and I have never yet heard any consumer group speak in opposition. Now, obviously we would all like to have the system at no cost; realistically, that is impossible. So the question becomes, how do we equitably raise the money that is necessary for the operation of this system, and we—as has been done in our sister State of Maryland—made the decision that the fairest way to do it was through a nominal telephone contribution rate. If there are any consumer groups opposed to that, they have not spoken to me.

Mr. NAHILL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, may I speak on the bill?

The SPEAKER. On final passage, the gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. NAHILL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the basic intent of this bill I think is good. I think we all agree with it. My only problem seems to be the conflicts that I was talking to the prime sponsor about and the contribution rate. I do have a problem with that. I do not know that anybody can really tell me definitively what this is going to cost in the southeast and the more populous areas, and I am quite concerned about what this surcharge will be in the southeast - Bucks, Montgomery, Chester, and Delaware.

So it is with some trepidation that I will vote "yes." I do believe in the intent; I am just very concerned about the con-

tribution rate, and I would hope that maybe the Senate would address this matter in a little bit more concerted fashion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that if I had my way, every county in this State would have the "911" emergency system, and if I had my way, I guess we would pay for it here at the State level, however that would be worked out. If I were the king of this Commonwealth instead of just one of the Representatives or one of the princes, that is the way we would do it.

I think that Mr. McHale is exactly right, that it really is needed. My concern with this bill has to do with some of the provisions that we do not have the answers for. We do not really know—for example, in the southeast—we do not know whether the cost is going to be 35 cents per line or 50 cents per line, which is nothing. I mean, for that kind of protection, for 50 cents or even \$1 a line, it is so well worth it that we cannot even argue the point.

On the other hand, we do not know what the real estate tax bill will be. For example, in Delaware County it is my understanding that it is \$2 million you are looking at as a county real estate tax bill, along with the surcharge. There are a lot of unanswered questions. There are a lot of questions I think in this legislation that will have to be worked out in the Senate. I think—and I am not going to belabor—the whole question of the referendum has some problems, and Mr. McHale and I spoke about these. I just think that the Consumer Advocate ought to take a position on it. We have not heard from him on it; we have heard informally from his staff but not from him. I think the senior citizens, if they are complaining now that they cannot afford telephone service, will they be able to afford it - even at 35 cents or 50 cents or \$1.50? Even though it is extremely worthwhile, will they be able to afford it or should they be taken care of in some way? I do not know how you do it.

I think Mr. McHale has done a commendable job on this legislation, has done the best he could do on it under the circumstances and the set of facts that are given. I have some concerns about counties that have already begun this that really will not get anything out of it. They just have to eat their expenses, and maybe that is the way it should be. I mean, they took the first step and God bless them, and, you know, those of us who did not maybe need some help. But I have some real concerns about it. I think it is going to have to be worked out in the Senate. I totally agree with the concept but I just have some gut-wrenching concerns. I would have to say that Mr. McHale has done an outstanding job on this and probably the best he could do at this point.

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

Mr. WASS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the prior speaker has partially answered my inquiry, but I would like to interrogate the maker of the bill, please.

The SPEAKER. Mr. McHale indicates he will stand for further interrogation. You may proceed, Mr. Wass.

Mr. WASS. Mr. Speaker, several years ago Indiana County did initiate the "911," and I can remember the controversy about the expense and the cost to the taxpayers through the General Fund. What does this legislation mean to our county now and to its people who have been funding a "911" system for many years?

Mr. McHALE. Mr. Speaker, what it means is the potential for a very sizable grant to your county to upgrade your existing system to the most modern "911" technology available. If you have an opportunity, I would recommend that you scan through the bill. There is a specific provision in the bill that says for those counties that already have "911," the money that is available for installation grants shall also be made available in the same manner to those counties that have "911" to upgrade their current systems to more modern, more efficient, more technologically current systems that are in fact available now. I mention that because there is now on the market a brand-new "911" system called "E-911," "Enhanced 911." To the best of my knowledge, that system is not in place anywhere in Pennsylvania, including Indiana. That is a very expensive system. It is also an excellent system. If Indiana County were to make the decision, or Philadelphia County or Allegheny County, to upgrade the existing system to "Enhanced 911," this would at least be a partial payment by the State to assist in that improvement of the existing technology. I want to emphasize, "E-911" is considerably more expensive than "911." The money that we have would not pay the total bill but it certainly would be a major step in that direction.

Mr. WASS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may pursue the inquiry.

In the event that we would participate in these dollars, what mandates befall the county? What mandates would we be required to follow?

Mr. McHALE. The application procedure is the same for that county which wishes to upgrade as it is for that county which wishes to establish a "911" system. And, directly related to your question, no one can really say what the cost of that will be, because that decision is not made here nor is it made in the State Senate; it will be made back home. The more comprehensive a system your county commissioners decide to implement, the more expensive the system is going to be. If they go with a basic "911" system, the technology for that type of system has now become relatively inexpensive. If they make the decision to go to "E-911," which Indiana County may choose to do, that is very, very expensive, and the cost of that system would be considerably greater than that which might be applied in the situation of a county that decides it wants to make do with a less technologically oriented procedure.

Mr. WASS. And finally, sir, the county, if it wished to, could continue to fund it through their general fund; they would not have to assess the people.

Mr. McHALE. This system is absolutely voluntary. If your county is satisfied with its existing "911" system or if in fact your county is satisfied to have no "911" system, there is nothing in this bill which is compulsory. But if your county makes a wise decision, from my perspective, to adopt at least a basic "911" emergency communications system, then this bill holds out the potential for a major financial incentive to implement "911." But if you do not want it in your county, you do not have to have it in your county. I believe that would be a tragic mistake, but it would be a mistake you would be entitled to choose.

Mr. WASS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. FOX. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to make a brief comment in support of the bill. I believe it is a very important measure. I know law enforcement personnel, emergency personnel, and town-watch volunteers in my area, in Montgomery County, we could not have a "911" system without this legislation. Therefore, I ask for its immediate passage. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. Snyder.

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

I just rise in support of the legislation. I can relate to the comments that Representative McHale mentioned earlier. About 2 months ago I was in need of ambulance service myself. I became stricken and had to go to a neighbor to get them to call for an ambulance. Because in Lehigh County we have a dual system, a "911" system and also a county system which is not "911," the neighbor called "911," and during those few minutes of confusion I would have been willing to pay almost any price to have a "911" system in place. I therefore feel that most of the problems on which the questions have arisen can be addressed in further amendments to the legislation if it is so necessary, but I ask for support of this bill.

The SPEAKER. On final passage, the Chair recognizes the lady from Lancaster, Mrs. Honaman.

Mrs. HONAMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a sense of *deja vu* today. Five years ago, I believe it was, I stood at this microphone and pleaded for your votes for "911." I would like to thank Representative McHale for the fine job that he has done on this. I am completely sold on the system. I am from one of those counties that already have "911." We will not benefit from it directly but our people, as they travel across Pennsylvania, will, and we will feel that we have done something good for those areas that have not been able to go it on their own.

I urge that you all vote for this bill. Thank you.

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—182

Acosta	Deal	Lashinger	Rieger
Afflerbach	Dietz	Laughlin	Robbins
Angstadt	Djininni	Lescovitz	Roebuck
Argall	Distler	Letterman	Rudy
Arty	Dombrowski	Levdansky	Rybak
Baldwin	Donatucci	Linton	Saloom
Barber	Dorr	Livengood	Saurman
Barley	Duffy	Lloyd	Scheetz
Battisto	Evans	Lucyk	Sentmel
Belardi	Fargo	McCall	Serafini
Belfanti	Fattah	McClatchy	Seventy
Birmelin	Fee	McHale	Showers
Black	Fischer	McVerry	Sirjanni
Blaum	Flick	Mackowski	Smith, B.
Book	Foster, Jr., A.	Manderino	Smith, L. E.
Bortner	Fox	Manmiller	Snyder, D. W.
Bowley	Freeman	Markosek	Staback
Boyes	Fryer	Mayernik	Stairs
Brandt	Gallagher	Michlovic	Steighner
Broujos	Gallen	Miller	Stewart
Bunt	Gamble	Moehlmann	Stuban
Burd	Gannon	Morris	Sweet
Bush	Geist	Mowery	Swift
Caltagirone	George	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Gladeck	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Carlson	Godshall	Nahill	Taylor, J.
Carn	Greenwood	O'Brien	Telek
Cawley	Gruitza	O'Donnell	Trello
Cessar	Gruppo	Olasz	Truman
Chadwick	Hagarty	Oliver	Van Horne
Clark	Haluska	Perzel	Veon
Clymer	Harper	Petrarca	Vroon
Cohen	Hayes	Petrone	Wambach
Colafella	Herman	Phillips	Wass
Cole	Hershey	Piccola	Weston
Cordisco	Honaman	Pievsky	Wiggins
Cornell	Hutchinson	Pistella	Wilson
Coslett	Itkin	Pitts	Wogan
Cowell	Jackson	Pott	Wozniak
Coy	Jarolin	Pressmann	Wright, D. R.
Deluca	Johnson	Preston	Wright, J. L.
DeVerter	Josephs	Punt	Wright, R. C.
DeWeese	Kasunic	Raymond	Yandrisevits
Daley	Kosinski	Reber	
Davies	Kukovich	Reinard	Irvis,
Dawida	Langtry	Richardson	Speaker

NAYS—12

Bowser	Freind	Merry	Ryan
Burns	Hasay	Micozzie	Schuler
Civera	Kenney	Noye	Snyder, G. M.

NOT VOTING—3

Howlett	Kennedy	Maiale
---------	---------	--------

EXCUSED—4

Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue
--------	--------	---------	-------

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the bill passes finally.

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

REMARKS ON VOTE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Kosinski. Why do you rise?

Mr. KOSINSKI. Correction of the record, Mr. Speaker. On the McHale amendment to HB 1246, amendment No. 0627, I was not recorded. I would like to be recorded in the affirmative.

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

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION CONTINUED

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 9, PN 13**, entitled:

An Act providing priorities for the investment of public moneys.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. RICHARDSON offered the following amendments No. A0651:

Amend Title, page 1, line 1, by removing the period after "moneys" and inserting

; and prohibiting investments in the Republic of South Africa and Namibia.

Amend Bill, page 1, by inserting between lines 13 and 14 Section 2. Prohibited investments.

No public moneys shall be invested in the Government of South Africa or Namibia, or any agency thereof.

Amend Sec. 2, page 1, line 14, by striking out "2" and inserting

3

Amend Sec. 3, page 1, line 17, by striking out "3" and inserting

4

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The SPEAKER. On the question of the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Richardson.

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

Today we are here to debate, Mr. Speaker, the investment priorities of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania regarding moneys that have been invested in South Africa and in Namibia. HB 9, in my estimation, clearly sets forth what the reinvestment priorities should be within this Commonwealth. If we are to consider for a moment the opportunities that could be created in this Commonwealth with moneys withdrawn from the Republic of South Africa and Namibia, I have no doubt that we could support this bill.

The need for additional moneys for job training, economic development, infrastructure repair in this Commonwealth clearly show that with the priorities outlined in HB 9, we will be serving the communities of this Commonwealth and Pennsylvania in a better way if we support HB 9.

We have seen evidence from Connecticut—

The SPEAKER. Mr. Richardson, we are on the amendment to HB 9, not on HB 9 itself.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Right. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry.

The SPEAKER. Speak to the amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. HB 9 in relationship to amendment A0651.

The SPEAKER. That is correct; on the amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am clarifying this in a statement only because the amendment which speaks directly to the prohibiting of investments—

The SPEAKER. I can barely hear you. Just a moment.

Would you repeat your statement, Mr. Richardson?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that this is just a technical amendment to clarify the use of priorities for this particular bill, and I will stop at that point.

The SPEAKER. All right.

On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish the members would listen to me for a moment. Some of you may have noticed, I just had a discussion with Mr. Richardson, and the problem I have goes something like this: Trying to understand the amendment and the bill together is far more difficult than trying to understand the amendment by itself and the bill by itself. So I am going to ask for the license of sort of discussing both of them.

The amendment as I understand it—let us just assume it was a separate bill—the amendment as I understand it says we cannot take Commonwealth pension funds and invest it in the Government of South Africa. My understanding of that—and I believe this is also Mr. Richardson's understanding, based on my short conversation—is that with the Pennsylvania State Employees' Retirement Fund, you could not take that money and buy South African treasury bonds or bills. I have no problem with that. I do not think we should take our State dollars and put it into the Government of South Africa. Now, some of these other bills that Mr. Richardson has, I will have more to say on as far as divestiture and the like, and investment, if that were the case, but I have no personal problem—I do not know how everybody else feels—with a prohibition about buying South African treasury bills, government investments in the Government of South Africa.

So the amendment really does not offend me in any way as I quickly look at it, but then I take a look at the bill to which this amendment would be added. My understanding of the bill is—and I realize that I am off the subject a little; I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, to be able to tie this together at the end—my understanding of the bill is, let us assume for a minute that the Retirement Fund had \$100 million—which is a tremendous amount of money, but these are the numbers these people work in with the multibillion-dollar funds that we have in our retirement system—if they had \$100 million to invest in the month of March under this bill, they would have to first put that money into Pennsylvania business, which has a good ring to it. But in the example I was using with Mr. Richardson, if Richardson and Ryan had their company together and we had a credit rating of Z, would the Commonwealth have to put their \$100 million into this Z-rated Pennsylvania corporation and not into IBM or Xerox or General Motors or one of the

highly accredited blue-chip companies? As I read it, it sounds like the pension board is pretty much directed to give this type priority.

I think the bill is deficient. If the bill said the pension board has to take its \$100 million and if there is an A-rated Pennsylvania company and an A-rated company from somewhere else and the investors believe that the prospects of gain for the pension system are the same in both events, then maybe you would go into that parochialism of buy America, buy Pennsylvania. I can understand that. The way it is now though, I think we put the investors of our pension system into a very tight spot.

### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RYAN. What I am going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that the members take a look at that wording and ask yourselves, ask yourselves whether it makes sense to put the fiduciaries who are handling your money, my money, the State employees' money, the educators' money, and a lot of our retired people, their money, do we want to put them at that investment opportunity disadvantage? I rather think that the way I would recommend we go is recommit this particular bill with the amendment, perhaps in the committee strip the language of HB 9 and insert into HB 9 the simple prohibition, thou shalt not invest retirement dollars in the Government of South Africa or Namibia.

To that end, Mr. Speaker, I would move that the bill, together with the amendment, be recommitted for the purpose which I have just explained.

The SPEAKER. To which committee, Mr. Ryan?

Mr. RYAN. The committee from—

The SPEAKER. The Finance Committee had it originally.

Moved by the gentleman, Mr. Ryan, that HB 9, together with the proffered amendment thereto, A0651, be recommitted to the Committee on Finance.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the motion, and I oppose it for several reasons. Number one, in that same discussion with Mr. Ryan, I tried to clearly indicate that there is a matter of misinformation.

Number one, originally when HB 9 was drawn, it was drawn on the purpose of trying to show that in a package of bills introduced for the sole purpose of trying to deal with divestment in Pennsylvania, that we were going after those companies and businesses, firms, subsidiaries that were doing business in South Africa in the State of Pennsylvania. The purpose of the amendment is to clarify very specifically so there will not be any misunderstanding on behalf of other members that we do not want to include all other businesses, companies, et cetera, that are doing business other than only those that are doing business in South Africa. The question is, what are our investment priorities? We are about the business of—

The SPEAKER. Mr. Richardson, you must limit yourself to the motion, not the debate of either the bill or the amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understand that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the bill together with the amendment be recommitted? You must limit your arguments to that question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Okay.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose then that motion to recommit the bill back to Finance. There was considerable debate on this issue, considerable debate and lengthy discussion on how this should take place, as well as public hearings. It is my feeling that for the purpose of being able to direct this conversation, that we should be able to air this discussion fully on the floor of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Birmelin, on the motion.

Mr. BIRMELIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would rise in support of Mr. Ryan's motion, and I do that for two reasons. Number one, I have the same questions that he does concerning this amendment, and I do not think they are clear. As a matter of fact, I think if we pass this bill with this amendment, we would not know what we did, and we would not know who it would affect, and there would be a misunderstanding as to whether or not it is businesses or government securities we are talking about or whatever.

I will differ a little bit from my leader in this respect, that I think it is a poor amendment no matter how it is drafted and whether it is government securities or what.

But I would ask for the members' support to recommit this bill so that at least we have a clear understanding when it comes back as to what the sponsor is trying to do. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Fattah, on the motion.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to the motion. There are people who are dying each day in South Africa fighting for the freedom that we supposedly represent in this world. Many governments, like our neighboring State of New Jersey, have acted; many local governments, like the city of Philadelphia and their pension fund, have disinvested. Many of our colleges and universities have taken action. The Commonwealth universities at Temple and at Lincoln have divested, and it is time for us here in the General Assembly to make a stand and to take a stand.

Those who purport to suggest that we can have a better bill and we can put it back in the Finance Committee are not those members of this House who truly are interested in divestment of our funds, and they are just trying to stand in the way of this General Assembly taking some action. The time is now that we should act. In other situations we have taken quick action. Last year the President of the United States issued sanctions against the Republic of South Africa. It is time for the State of Pennsylvania, the Keystone State, supposedly the State that cares and is willing to fight for freedom, to stand for freedom in South Africa, to stand for the ideals that we hold dear and to take some action. I oppose—

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker? Excuse me.

The SPEAKER. Why do you rise, Mr. Ryan?

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill itself does not say one word about South Africa or divestiture.

The SPEAKER. All right. We are going to limit ourselves, Mr. Fattah, to debate on the motion, not on the question of the bill but on the motion, whether the bill together with the amendment shall be recommitted.

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the minority leader for raising that concern.

I would ask that we oppose the motion of Mr. Ryan so that we can move to the bill and hopefully have a vote today. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader on the motion.

Mr. RYAN. Briefly, Mr. Speaker.

To give some assurance to the members who perhaps have not read the bill, it is a very short bill. Take a look at it. It is a very confusing short bill, but the bill has nothing to do with divestiture; not one thing does it have to do with divestiture. It is an issue of investment by the pension boards, and the amendment, even if it were attached to it, the only thing that amendment does is say you cannot invest in the Government of South Africa, which I approve of. Together they still say the same thing. You first put your money in a Pennsylvania corporation. It does not matter whether it is A rated or Z rated, you put it first in Pennsylvania, then you put it in New Jersey, New York, contiguous States, then you put it somewhere else in the United States. It has nothing to do with divestiture. It has nothing to do with companies that are doing business in South Africa. None of that is in this bill, as I read it. No one has yet to point out that I am wrong on it.

Please, again, I urge you, take a look at it yourself. I am not trying to whitewash something.

The SPEAKER. On the motion, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Chester, Mr. Vroon.

Mr. VROON. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to discuss it at this point.

I urge a "yes" vote for recommitment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dauphin, Mr. Wambach, on the motion.

Mr. WAMBACH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, may I interrogate the maker of the bill and the amendment, please?

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

Mr. WAMBACH. Mr. Speaker, based on the reasons why Mr. Ryan moved to recommit this bill and the amendment to the Committee on Finance, I would like to get some clarification for the record as to legislative intent of the amendment. If I can interrogate in that vein, I would like to proceed.

The SPEAKER. You may proceed but very carefully because your questions must relate to whether or not we recommit the bill.

Mr. WAMBACH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the questions of the minority leader, based on the wording of the amendment, which basically, I think, said restricted to the Government or Republic of South Africa and Namibia, is that the intent of the amendment, or is the intent of the amendment to follow the bill to prohibit investments in companies, governments, et cetera, that exist in the countries of South Africa and Namibia?

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is correct, Mr. Speaker. We tried very hard to indicate that, and I think that at this point the Reference Bureau has drawn incorrectly to HB 9 the amendment that in fact the intent was supposed to include.

What I would like to do, if it is possible with the indulgence of the maker of this motion, is to ask for withdrawal of this amendment with the opportunity of going back to the Reference Bureau and drawing it correctly.

Mr. WAMBACH. Mr. Speaker, is that a motion?

The SPEAKER. No. Mr. Ryan has been asked— Did you follow the debate?

Mr. RYAN. Not really. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman say that the bill would lay over and Reference Bureau would draw an amendment that would do what?

The SPEAKER. He said if you would withdraw your motion, he would go back to the Reference Bureau and ask them to draw an amendment which, in his opinion, would definitely state the real reasons for the amendment. The Chair looks at it and then follows the questioning by Mr. Wambach. The problem apparently is just what you picked up, Mr. Ryan. The words of the amendment talk about investment in the Government of South Africa or Namibia. Now, the sponsor of the amendment says in reply to interrogation that is not his intention at all, but he says he cannot move on it to correct it unless you withdraw your motion to recommit.

Mr. RYAN. Well, when he gets it redrafted, then I will be against that one. It is a shame I did not get a chance to vote for one of these amendments.

What is he asking to do, Mr. Speaker - let it lay over until we come back March 10?

Mr. RICHARDSON. That will be fine, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. I assume that is correct.

#### MOTION WITHDRAWN

Mr. RYAN. I withdraw my motion.

The SPEAKER. The motion to recommit is withdrawn.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

#### AMENDMENTS WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Richardson, withdraws the amendment A0651; withdrawn.

Now, Mr. Richardson, what you have is HB 9 with no amendment attached thereto, and you are free now to ask for any amendment that you wish to be drawn to the bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON. May I just ask the House to be at ease for one second?

The SPEAKER. The House will remain at ease.

#### REMARKS ON VOTES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York, Mr. Snyder. Why do you rise?

Mr. G. M. SNYDER. Is it appropriate to correct the record at this time?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. G. M. SNYDER. It is, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Yes, it is.

Mr. G. M. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on the vote by which HB 1246 was passed today, I was voted in the affirmative. I inadvertently bumped my switch just before you closed the vote. I would like to be recorded in the affirmative.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. Snyder.

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

On HB 1246, amendment 575, introduced by Representative Stewart, my vote was not recorded. I would like to be recorded in the affirmative. Thank you.

#### REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery, Mr. Fox. Why do you rise, sir?

Mr. FOX. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit comments for the record. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman will send the comments to the clerk, they will be filed.

Mr. FOX submitted the following remarks for the Legislative Journal:

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to bring to the attention of the Speaker and the Members of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives the name of Alexander Henderson, who has recently been awarded Scouting's highest honor - Eagle Scout.

Mr. Speaker, on February 27, 1986, Alexander Henderson will be officially recognized in an induction ceremony as an Eagle Scout.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to the Members of the House of Representatives the following Citation of Merit honoring Alexander Henderson:

WHEREAS, Alexander Henderson has earned the Eagle Award in Scouting. This is the highest award that Boy Scouts can bestow and as such represents great sacrifice and tremendous effort on the part of this young man. He is a member of Troop 7, Elkins Park Presbyterian Church.

NOW THEREFORE, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Alexander Henderson on the occasion of his being honored with the Eagle Scout Award, commends him on the outstanding work he has done to earn this coveted honor, and wishes him continued success in the future.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure that I place in the Legislative Journal the name of Alexander Henderson.

## CONSIDERATION OF HB 9 CONTINUED

### BILL PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Richardson. Are you ready now?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

I ask that HB 9 be passed over in its order for today.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be passed over, without objection, for the day. The Chair hears no objection.

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2035, PN 2770**, entitled:

An Act providing for an employment and training opportunities program for public assistance recipients; providing for the powers and duties of the Department of Public Welfare in administering the program; and making repeals.

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?

On final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Carn.

Mr. CARN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HB 2035 is a bill to assist those on welfare to get off the welfare rolls by providing them with job training and employment opportunities. This bill repeals a section of the Public Welfare Code that established the Pennsylvania Employment Program and replaces it with a requirement that the Department of Public Welfare establish a statewide program directed at obtaining employment for all cash assistance recipients required to register for work.

This bill provides five specific mandated programs: One, job training programs; two, adult basic education programs; three, community work experience projects; four, supported work programs; and five, job development, job search, and job placement.

I ask for an affirmative vote on HB 2035. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. DORR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I indicated this morning, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there are many of us in the General Assembly who do not believe in the concept of job training. I think all of us espouse the action by government to put people who do not now have the opportunity for work because of lack of training to provide them with that opportunity. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania does that now in a fine fashion.

This bill has two basic problems: it duplicates existing programs, and it substantially increases the bureaucracy in a department which does not have the training and expertise to handle the situation.

Current programs operated by the Department of Labor and Industry and the Department of Education do the very things that are talked about in this particular proposal. As a matter of fact, there is nothing in current law to prevent us from increasing those programs, if that is the desire of the General Assembly, by simply appropriating additional funds to those existing experience programs. This bill, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, would ask the Department of Welfare, which has no expertise in this field, to take on the responsibility of the same programs that are now operated in Labor and Industry and Education while we would leave those others in place. It is duplicative, Mr. Speaker, and the Department of Welfare has no ability currently, with its complement of State workers, to handle the program. It would therefore be required to hire additional State workers to handle the programs that are already being handled somewhere else.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago many of us in this General Assembly got on our figurative horses, let loose the hounds, and set about chasing a creature that we came to know as the wily welfare careerist. We thought we bagged him. But, Mr. Speaker, when I took a look at this bill, I knew finally that the first name of that creature was apt. He is indeed wily. And, Mr. Speaker, I think "Wily" has found his friend in Pennsylvania. I think that friend is the drafter of this bill.

I have a lot of respect for the proponents of the legislation for the attempt to enhance job training in Pennsylvania. As I indicated, we are all for that. But, Mr. Speaker, the drafter of this bill could well be named "Bobby Bureaucracy Builder," because that is what this bill is all about. It simply builds more State jobs to handle existing programs that are being done adequately and fairly in other departments of government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. PUNT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the gentleman, Mr. Carn, stand for some interrogation, please?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates he will so stand. You may proceed, Mr. Punt.

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, the bill as it is currently drafted, as Representative Dorr stated, is an enormous duplicate of the bureaucracy. Several questions I have on the bill: First of all, on page 2 you are saying that under the job training program DPW will identify training programs which are already available in the community, outlining five specific programs. Now, that would also include through our vocational education programs, our public secondary schools, community colleges, proprietary schools, and so forth. Also, you say that DPW shall negotiate cooperative arrangements to guarantee access to these programs. What does that mean?

Mr. CARN. What that means, Mr. Speaker, is that the Department of Public Welfare will buy training slots for persons on cash assistance so that they can be trained for employment after they have finished their training. So we are asking the Department of Public Welfare to define where



those training opportunities are, to acquire those slots either through purchase or whichever way to make them accessible for cash recipients to be trained with.

Mr. PUNT. What do you mean by buying training slots?

Mr. CARN. You purchase through contract. Again, if you wanted training in tractor-trailer, you would pay a cost to go to a training school in tractor-trailer - a similar arrangement.

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, on page 4 regarding the community work experience projects: On line 2 you say the participation in this program shall be limited to 4 months. Why are you limiting it only to a 4-month period?

Mr. CARN. The reason that is there is because that is the present operation of the community work experience program now that is presently operating throughout the Commonwealth.

Mr. PUNT. For individuals who are classified as "chronically needy," who are indeed able to register for work and currently are receiving assistance, are they in fact limited to 4 months also?

Mr. CARN. Yes.

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, on line 6 you have "participants may work voluntarily for more hours." Do you really feel that individuals should work for their welfare check more so than what it currently is structured for in the work experience program - the minimum wage to offset the cash assistance allowance?

Mr. CARN. Well, if you look at the supported work programs, what we are basically suggesting is that we utilize the cash payment as a supplement to their employer's pay if employers would hire them.

Mr. PUNT. No, Mr. Speaker. This section I am referring to applies specifically to the community work experience projects.

Mr. CARN. Okay.

Mr. PUNT. We will get to the supported work programs shortly.

Mr. CARN. Fine.

What was your question again?

Mr. PUNT. Do you really feel that assistance recipients currently involved with that program should work more for their welfare check than currently allowed under the law, which would be based upon minimum wage to offset the cash assistance grant?

Mr. CARN. No; we are not saying that at all.

Mr. PUNT. Well, according to line 6, participants may work voluntarily for more hours.

Mr. CARN. What we are saying is that they "may" work voluntarily for more hours. That is not a mandate; that is an option.

Mr. PUNT. All right. On the supported work program itself, DPW "shall contract with business entities or nonprofit organizations to establish supported work positions for cash assistance participants." Now, as I read that, DPW would contract with any business in the private sector. Is that correct?

Mr. CARN. That is possible.

Mr. PUNT. That is correct?

Mr. CARN. That is correct.

Mr. PUNT. That being the case, and as I am reading your work program, the cash assistance amount that individual would be receiving for that month would be transferred to that employer, which would be used to offset the wages paid that individual. Is that correct?

Mr. CARN. To offset the wages and the training costs.

Mr. PUNT. What will be the status of that cash assistance recipient while he is enrolled or employed by that company in the private sector?

Mr. CARN. What do you mean by "status"?

Mr. PUNT. Will he be a full-time employee of that company?

Mr. CARN. He could be full time and he could be part time; it depends on the particular employment situation that exists.

Mr. PUNT. All right. That individual will be paid wages from the payrolls of that company. Is that correct?

Mr. CARN. They will be paid from the payroll of the company.

Mr. PUNT. That being the case, will the employer deduct Federal withholding tax?

Mr. CARN. Yes; he will.

Mr. PUNT. Will the employer deduct Social Security tax?

Mr. CARN. Yes; he will.

Mr. PUNT. State income tax?

Mr. CARN. Yes.

Mr. PUNT. What about workmen's compensation?

Mr. CARN. Yes.

Mr. PUNT. Would they fall under the company's workmen's compensation program?

Mr. CARN. They could.

Mr. PUNT. Potential abuse could or could not occur. Let me ask you this: If a company had laid off X number of people 10 months ago, could a company supplement its workforce by becoming a participant in the supported work program, which the State would assist in subsidizing? The employer would benefit by utilizing those persons, at the same time not calling back individuals who have already been laid off.

Mr. CARN. Well, that is not the intent of this legislation.

Mr. PUNT. That may not be the intent, Mr. Speaker, but can that not in fact happen?

Mr. CARN. Well, anything is possible, but that is not the intent of this legislation. Our goal is to provide employment for persons who are receiving cash assistance from the Department of Public Welfare.

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, that may not be the intent, but there is no safeguard or nothing to prohibit such in this proposal. It can indeed happen.

Mr. CARN. Regulations can be established to protect for that kind of abuse.

Mr. PUNT. We will get into that, too, shortly.

Regarding on down on page 4, line 28: Only the public assistance funds which are attributable to the grant each recipient would have received in this program would be transferred, and in no event shall the amount transferred exceed the amount the individual would receive for their cash assistance grant. Now, that is one method that you are proposing to fund. The second method is "Additional funds appropriated specifically for the purpose of subsidizing wages or otherwise paying for the costs of supported work may also be transferred to contractors under this section." Now, as I read this, you are proposing to finance this in two ways - one, through the cash assistance allowance they would receive, which would be transferred to the employer, plus a direct State appropriation, which would be awarded to that employer?

Mr. CARN. Well, what we are saying is that if the General Assembly so feels that that would be necessary, we could mandate that, but there is nothing that specifically states that they would receive any other additional funds.

Mr. PUNT. All right.

Then continuing on we have limitations: Subsidies for wages or training costs would be provided for a maximum of a 6-month period, and the subsidy will be a maximum of 75 percent of their wage. Is that correct?

Mr. CARN. That is correct.

Mr. PUNT. So we in fact will subsidize that employer up to 75 percent of the wages for that individual. Is that correct?

Mr. CARN. That is correct.

Mr. PUNT. At the same time that employer can be contracting with DPW, hiring these people, and not calling back individuals they had laid off previously. Is that correct?

Mr. CARN. Again, that is not the intent of the bill, but again, that issue will and can be addressed by regulations.

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, several years ago when I argued on the welfare reform issue, many people on your side of the aisle argued bitterly in relying upon the bureaucracy in promulgating proper regulations to administer the program. I would only echo those same remarks to you as were said to us.

In the category of job development, job search and placement, DPW will contract for job development and job search activities specifically designed for public assistance recipients to the extent possible. Who are they going to go to in contracting these services?

Mr. CARN. Well, there are job employment agencies and job development agencies that presently exist.

Mr. PUNT. Do we not do that already?

Mr. CARN. Well, what we are doing is combining all of the existing efforts on this and bringing it under one. Presently under the Pennsylvania Employables Program, that is part of the goals and objectives, but they have been very ineffective in implementing it at this time.

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, based on the information I have received, I would say that the Pennsylvania Employables Program has been quite successful since the inception of this program, since we expanded it statewide. I would take issue with that statement which you just made.

In conducting employment interviews, following up on job leads, conducting effective searches, individual job search assistance, that, too, I take, would be the responsibility of the agency or whomever that would be contracted to perform this service. Is that correct?

Mr. CARN. That is correct.

Mr. PUNT. What do you mean when you continue on three words later when you say, "...who cannot work effectively in a group"? What does that mean?

Mr. CARN. What we are doing, Mr. Speaker, is allowing for those persons who need individual attention in their training. There are those in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania who need individual training, so we are allowing for that as well as group training.

Mr. PUNT. You are telling me that an individual, for whatever reasons, who cannot work within a group of people—And you do not have defined what a "group" is. What is a group - 2 people, 3 people, 13 people?

Mr. CARN. A dozen.

Mr. PUNT. A dozen? First of all, I do not see that defined in here. But you mean to tell me an individual cannot sit down with your definition of 12 people and effectively work towards obtaining employment in counseling, in job services, and so forth?

Mr. CARN. Well, there are individuals who cannot. They all are not as fortunate as we are, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, on page 6, "Disqualification for violation"; that section, paragraph (c). You have on the first offense the individual receiving assistance would be disqualified from receiving assistance for 60 days and thereafter until such time as he is willing to participate. For the second violation the disqualification period shall be 120 days. On the first offense - on the 60-day offense - an individual refuses to participate in the program or he does not work satisfactorily in the program and is dismissed. How long will that individual be dropped from the assistance rolls, on the first offense?

Mr. CARN. For a minimum of 60 days.

Mr. PUNT. What if on the 35th day that individual would say, hey, I will participate in the program. What happens then?

Mr. CARN. Well, then he will have the opportunity to participate at that time.

Mr. PUNT. That is not the way it is worded, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CARN. Well, how do you interpret it, sir?

Mr. PUNT. You have, sir, "...60 days for the first violation and, thereafter, until such time as he is willing to participate." Now, I read that as an automatic suspension for 60 days. That individual cannot change his mind until after the 60-day period to become a participant in the program.

Mr. CARN. I agree with you, Mr. Speaker. I was in error in my statement.

Mr. PUNT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On section 5, "Assessment and counseling to be made available," who will provide for all these programs? Will it be DPW?

Mr. CARN. The question was, who will do the assessment and counseling? That will be contracted out also.

Mr. PUNT. Do you have any cost figures on that?

Mr. CARN. Cost? Well, we are talking about \$2 1/2 million a year, which is money that presently exists for this service.

Mr. PUNT. All right.

Mr. Speaker, on page 7 where you have your order of priority, you say if in the event a priority must be established, you would utilize the following order: First would be single parents who have been receiving assistance for more than 3 years; the second priority would be single parents whose children are between 14 and 18 years of age. My question, sir, is, why do you have them listed in that priority?

Mr. CARN. Well, again we are trying to create some work experience for those who have been unemployed the longest. So that is why we felt the need to find employment for those single parents who have been receiving assistance for more than 3 years first.

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, could not an individual who falls into your first-priority category be a single parent with a child 4 years of age or 6 years of age?

Mr. CARN. Yes.

Mr. PUNT. Now you are telling me that based on your priority, we are going to tell that single parent with a child 4 or 6 years of age they would have to participate in this program first before your second priority, which would be a single parent with children between the ages of 14 and 18. That is correct?

Mr. CARN. True.

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, do you not think it would be better for the parent whose child is in school to be required to participate first rather than the single parent with a child who is at home?

Mr. CARN. Our priorities are for those who have been unemployed and on public assistance the longest. That would not have anything to do with the age of the children but the fact that these persons in priority (1) category were on public assistance for more than 3 years.

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, for the single parent with a child who is not in school, you have further outlined that DPW shall assess the need and arrange support services prior to placement. Now, among those services that DPW will be required to address and resolve would be, (1), child care.

Mr. CARN. Yes.

Mr. PUNT. Okay.

Now, on page 8, the work pilot project features, line 18, paragraph (b), "Participants selected"—in all of this that you have outlined in all these programs—"shall begin work in the supported work pilot project no later than 15 days after establishing eligibility for cash assistance." Is that correct?

Mr. CARN. Yes.

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, you mean to tell me that we have the resources that we can contract out, that we can do everything that you propose here - find a babysitting service or a day-care center; make arrangements for transportation; find

employment, a place of employment; contract with that potential employer; reimburse that potential employer those wages of that recipient - do all of this and the many, many more things that you have outlined here within 15 days?

Mr. CARN. What we will be doing during the 15 days is assessing where the person might be placed, whether it is in a training program or whether it is in an employment program.

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, you are going to have to be counseling these individuals. You are going to be taking aptitudes on these individuals.

Mr. CARN. That is true.

Mr. PUNT. This can all be done within 15 days?

Mr. CARN. If we are committed to finding jobs for our cash assistance recipients, we can do it.

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, do you feel, in your opinion, is DPW properly staffed now to handle the enormous increase and duplication that you have outlined here?

Mr. CARN. If this is a priority of the Governor and the legislature, they will be mandated to do the job.

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, that was not my question.

Presently, if this becomes law, is DPW properly staffed that they can administer this effectively and efficiently?

Mr. CARN. It is a possibility. I feel that they are.

Mr. PUNT. Have you contacted DPW and asked them specifically, can they handle this?

Mr. CARN. This bill has been available and we have not heard a word from DPW on it.

Mr. PUNT. Have you specifically asked them that question, sir?

Mr. CARN. No; we have not.

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, nowhere do I see in HB 2035 any type of definition as to who would be involved in this. Question, example: If an individual from Franklin County who is presently receiving assistance would be assigned to one of these programs, could that individual be assigned to a program in Dauphin County?

Mr. CARN. No. They will be assigned to a program in their particular county.

Mr. PUNT. Where, anywhere in HB 2035, does it say that, sir?

Mr. CARN. It does not have to say that; that is only logical, and regulations can address that concern.

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, that is the same question your side used to argue against the Community Work Experience Program several years ago. We in fact defined it to a specific radius; you have not. Is that correct?

Mr. CARN. Again, the Department of Public Welfare has the administration to decide where these jobs should be to best suit the needs of the individuals on cash assistance. So we feel that they would be prudent enough to create these training and employment opportunities in the areas where the persons reside.

Mr. PUNT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am done with inter-rogation with you. Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman wish to speak on the bill?

Mr. PUNT. No. Mr. Speaker, would Representative Dorr submit to brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Mr. Dorr indicates he will stand for interrogation. You may proceed, Mr. Punt.

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, in reading this bill—and you touched upon it at the beginning of your comments—this in fact is an enormous duplication of existing programs and services already available, plus, in fact, it will increase the bureaucracy I do not know how many times. Now, my concern is that this in fact would replace the PEP Program and incorporate all these other ideas. Do you have—and you said earlier the PEP Program was effective, and from all accounts that I have read over the last 18 months since welfare reform was signed into law and implemented, the PEP Program has been effective—do you have any statistics, any figures which would speak as to the effectiveness of the PEP Program regarding cash assistance recipients?

Mr. DORR. Yes, Mr. Speaker. My information is that in the PEP Program alone, 25,494 recipients were placed in employment, and the total over all of the programs runs to 213,000 welfare recipients in Pennsylvania, over the period of the legislation that you mentioned, who have either found employment or entered job training programs.

Mr. PUNT. Did you say that was over the last 18 months or the last year?

Mr. DORR. No; since the welfare reform act took effect.

Mr. PUNT. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, may I make a statement?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may make the statement on final passage.

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, I believe Representative Carn really, truly means well, and I believe he is sincere in what he is proposing. However, I believe HB 2035 has been drafted very carefully but totally unrealistically and, as has been said previously, is an enormous duplication of existing programs which in fact have already proven successful.

There are many areas in HB 2035 which Representative Carn could not answer. Some of those areas which he could answer consisted of answers such as, well, the department will regulate such; we will come up with the regulations to deal with this. Mr. Speaker, opponents of welfare reform used that same argument for years when we attempted to bring welfare reform about. As the prime sponsor of that proposal, I did address many of their concerns. I and many other members of this House offered amendments to address and define those specific issues, those areas of question, so that abuse in fact does not occur.

HB 2035 is a total nightmare and it is unrealistic. To think that all of what is proposed here can be done in 15 days is ludicrous.

Now, nowhere have I heard anything said about our unemployed workers as well. Are we again, as previously discussed in another bill, giving that priority over those persons who have worked for 10 years, 20 years, or whatever? Should we not feel that those individuals should be just as eligible as these individuals outlined in HB 2035?

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House to think very carefully about HB 2035, and I would further ask that we reject HB 2035. Although Representative Carn means well, they should go back to the drawing board, at least contact the appropriate agency that he is proposing to give this to and determine if in fact they can do it or not, and if they cannot, then propose through legislation the necessary tools needed to do that job.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a negative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery, Mr. Saurman.

Mr. SAURMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, would the prime sponsor of the bill stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Carn, indicates he will so stand. You are in order, and you may proceed, Mr. Saurman.

Mr. SAURMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there is no indication of how much money this proposed legislation will cost. However, in the bill it says that the Federal Work Incentive Program funds available to the department should be used to carry out the programs established by this act. I assume that you are referring to title 4 funds of the Social Security Act. Is that correct, sir?

Mr. CARN. Yes; I am, sir.

Mr. SAURMAN. Could you tell us what that money is currently being used for?

Mr. CARN. Currently that money is being used to fund the PEP Program, and what we are proposing to do is to combine the PEP Program with the other five or so job development programs into one and to use the existing dollars already allocated for these purposes to fund this coordinated effort.

Mr. SAURMAN. Could you tell me why title 4 funds are being used for PEP then, rather than the Job Training Partnership Act?

Mr. CARN. We are going to use those funds also since those funds are available to do a similar job. All we are proposing to do here is to coordinate all of those efforts out of one agency.

Mr. SAURMAN. It is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, that you should coordinate or speak about coordinating programs. Is that coordination a part of this bill, or is that to come in some other piece of legislation that will be—

Mr. CARN. The bill itself is coordination.

Mr. SAURMAN. It in itself is coordination?

Mr. CARN. What we are doing is coordinating efforts to find training and employment for cash recipients of the Department of Public Welfare.

Mr. SAURMAN. Mr. Speaker, referring to the language in your bill on page 2, you say, "The Department of Public Welfare shall establish a Statewide program which will have as its primary purpose the obtaining of bona fide employment for cash assistance recipients...." Is that the intent of this legislation?

Mr. CARN. Yes; it is.

Mr. SAURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read from the Job Training Partnership Act of 1982, which established a

program of job training to prepare youth and unskilled adults for entry into the labor market and to afford job training to those economically disadvantaged individuals and other individuals facing serious barriers to employment. What is the difference between those two, or would you say that they are for all practical purposes identical?

Mr. CARN. Again, what we are doing is coordinating that effort with the effort of the job placement programs and job training programs of DPW so that those efforts will be coordinated together.

Mr. SAURMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am finished with my interrogation. I would like to make a statement, if I may?

The SPEAKER. On final passage, the gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. SAURMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are no new ideas or initiatives in this piece of legislation that is being suggested. As a matter of fact, it follows very carefully a program that has been put into Massachusetts. The difference perhaps is that Pennsylvania's current program for welfare recipients is far more successful and far less costly. During a recent 18-month period, Massachusetts placed 13,200 welfare recipients while Pennsylvania placed 52,000 recipients in job positions. During that same 18-month period, over 107,000 Pennsylvania welfare recipients were placed in employment, a training program, or found a job on their own.

Mr. Speaker, what is being presented here is a duplicate of a system that is already in place, already working well, and takes away from the title 4 funding moneys that could be used for other programs. We have very specific entitlement in the Job Training Partnership Act authorization by the Federal Government. We have a program that is working, and it is working well.

I urge that we stay with that program and defeat HB 2035. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On final passage, the Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, very briefly. HB 2035 and the entire package of job training bills that are before us is an attempt to look at what Pennsylvania is presently doing in the area of job training and offer some constructive changes. We are spending \$22 million in this bill. That is about the same amount of money that is being spent in the programs that we are trying to coordinate.

Now, do you think that the people who are sponsoring these bills, the people who are closest to the problem of welfare recipients - an inability to get work, an inability to be placed into jobs - are going to want something worse for their people in the area of job placement and job training? There are new ideas. There are five specific choices a welfare recipient can make in this particular bill. One of them for the first time is adult education, getting that basic high school diploma to try to assist in the job market. Another is the program on supported work; that is a brand-new idea.

What we are trying to do is take the same moneys that we are using now in the PEP Program and some other programs that are not working so well and coordinate those with moneys that are working well, and the Community Work Experience Program, which is presently on the books, is being coordinated into this. That is one of the choices. The money will still be spent in that area, but there are areas of job training and significant amounts of money that are being spent to attempt to do a job that just is not being done.

The Department of Public Welfare's own figures showing program performance for work registration programs from the inception of the program through June of 1985 show the total PEP job placements were only 78,000. That data, however, in itself shows that at least half of those 78,000 placements were self-obtained, that the program did not do a doggone thing for the people who were placed, and of the remaining 45,000, over half or somewhere around 23,000 were placed into job training slots and not into jobs. Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the programs are not working, and those that are not working we ought to change.

I am appalled at the negative attitude of the Republican Party this afternoon. You want to close your eyes; you want to go back and tell your people that everything is working well; everything is going fine; those job placement programs that we have in effect are working. Well, you are lying to them if you tell them that, and if you do not like what we are proposing as a change, have the gumption to try to propose what might be working or what might work. But for you to say that the programs that we have today are working and doing our people any good, you just do not have the facts; you are not looking for the facts; they are not there.

The PEP Program has helped less than 3 percent of the people who have gone through that program. It is not a very good record. You can use the statistics any way you want, Mr. Speaker. The program simply is not working, and the attempt this afternoon is to get programs that will work, using the same dollars that are out there being spent ineffectively.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for an affirmative vote on HB 2035.

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

Mr. DORR. Mr. Speaker, the present bill before us is apparently an attempt to utilize a program which has been highly touted in Massachusetts. It has been well publicized and gotten a lot of favorable publicity, but if you take the figures and compare them, you find out that Pennsylvania's programs are working better.

During a recent 18-month period, the Massachusetts program placed 13,200 AFDC and GA recipients, while almost 52,000 AFDC and GA recipients were placed in employment through Pennsylvania's Work Registration Program in the same time period.

Mr. Speaker, the facts indicate that 213,000 welfare recipients have found employment through the existing programs of this Commonwealth since welfare reform took effect. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that an argument can be made that we can do better, and I do not disagree with that. But, Mr. Speaker,

to take a program which is operating, which has been successful to some degree, whatever that degree might be, and to dismantle it, or rather not to dismantle it but to take a whole new program and install it on top of the existing program, I do not call coordination of effort. I think that is rather a proliferation of effort and will in fact do the recipients of welfare a disservice rather than a service.

This legislation has the potential to increase medical assistance costs by 50 percent in certain cases. Currently, recipients receive 4 months of medical assistance coverage after leaving welfare for unsubsidized employment. Under this proposal, 2 additional months would be provided.

Mr. Speaker, under the supported work project mentioned in this bill, if you extrapolate and put all of the people who are eligible for that program into it, increasing their benefits by 3 months, from 3 to 6 months, the cost could run as much as \$34 million.

Mr. Speaker, the other bills in this package that Mr. Manderino mentioned provide additional State dollars, so we are not talking about the same dollars. We are talking about additional State dollars in a new department which is not used to handling this kind of program, has no expertise in that regard, and would have to build up a substantial new State bureaucracy to handle the programs. We are not talking about coordination because that is simply an addition on top of existing programs.

Mr. Speaker, I still think that the recipients of general assistance and welfare under existing programs are better served, and I recommend a negative vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, let us look at the argument Mr. Dorr is making. He says that we are going to increase costs, because if everybody eligible for the five categories and especially the work-supported category were placed, we would have to increase costs. We have no doubt that that would be true. We have limited the program to \$22 million.

About the money that is being spent now, we have limited the slots that would be available in those programs, so what he is saying again is something that is a figment of his imagination. He says that we are putting new programs on top of the old programs. Mr. Speaker, we are not doing that. We have eliminated the PEP Program. Read the bill. We have eliminated it completely. We have kept the program of community work experience because we think that that is working best, and we have left that as one of the five options. So it is coordination. We have taken the best of what exists.

You say that we have patterned this after a Massachusetts statute that is being touted as being very favorable and working very well. We have done just that. That particular program in Massachusetts has an 80-percent success record. You are talking about 52,000 placements in a pilot program. We have a success ratio with what we are doing with the same money in Pennsylvania, or less percentagewise, of 3 percent. Let us try for God's sakes to do something new; to be innovative; to find better solutions to problems we all know exist.

I ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. On final passage, the Chair recognizes the minority whip.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I was trying to listen to the gentleman, Mr. Manderino, and maybe I misheard him, but I believe he just turned the figures around. He said that Massachusetts had a success rate of 52,000 and Pennsylvania 13,000. Actually, the reverse is true. Maybe I misheard him, but certainly a case cannot be made to favor Massachusetts as compared to Pennsylvania. Our track record has been better than has been the case in Massachusetts.

As far as money to be spent—I believe the gentleman, Mr. Manderino, was talking about money—actually, the bill does not talk about an appropriation; it talks about what might be done in the budget. The only thing that this bill promises for sure, the only thing this bill promises for sure is an expanded administrative overburden in the Department of Welfare doing things in duplicate of what is already being done in the Department of Labor and Industry and the Department of Education. That is the one thing that this bill will do for sure.

I urge a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. On final passage, the Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, I indeed misspoke. The 52,000 claim is for Pennsylvania, and I demonstrated to you how even that figure is erroneous. The 80-percent figure is not erroneous. The 80-percent success rate is the Massachusetts program; the 3-percent success rate is the Pennsylvania program presently in place. Now, there is no question that the Massachusetts program is working better than what we have in place. The only part of our PEP Program that seemed to be working and seemed to be making the figures look better was a program that by vouchers we were placing, through private employment agencies, job placements. But that was so abused that the Secretary of Welfare himself has suspended completely that part of the program. It was distorting the figures, and not only distorting the figures, distorting the intent of the legislature.

Mr. Speaker, we are simply, again, trying to do a better job with the resources we have. We think that this program of coordinating, of giving the recipient a choice of several options, is better and will work better, as demonstrated in Massachusetts, and we ask that it be given a chance. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority whip.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman, Mr. Manderino, only tells part of the story. He talks about the success rate of Massachusetts in terms of percentage figures. I think that that is the wrong way to look at the problem. How many actual people have been helped in Massachusetts versus how many actual people were helped in Pennsylvania with the programs we have in place? The absolute numbers are much, much greater in Pennsylvania than they are in Massachusetts.

Let us look a little deeper at the Massachusetts program, and we debated this when we debated welfare reform that Mr.

Manderino opposed. In Massachusetts they are selective as to clients. They do not even have a general assistance program. Can the gentleman, Mr. Carn, tell us differently? Does Massachusetts have a general assistance program? Of course they do not. Pennsylvania is already more generous. We already allow more clients into the programs. Massachusetts is very selective as compared to Pennsylvania. If Mr. Carn, Mr. Manderino, or whoever can stand up and tell us today that Massachusetts has a general assistance program, they are making history, but they are certainly misreading it.

I oppose the 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—102

Acosta	Dombrowski	Livengood	Rudy
Afflerbach	Donatucci	Lloyd	Rybak
Baldwin	Duffy	Lucyk	Saloom
Barber	Evans	McCall	Seventy
Battisto	Fattah	McHale	Showers
Belardi	Fee	Majale	Snyder, D. W.
Belfanti	Freeman	Manderino	Staback
Blaum	Fryer	Markosek	Steighner
Bortner	Gallagher	Mayernik	Stewart
Broujos	Gamble	Michlovic	Stuban
Caltagirone	George	Morris	Sweet
Cappabianca	Gruitza	Mrkonic	Taylor, F. E.
Carn	Haluska	Murphy	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Harper	O'Donnell	Trello
Clark	Howlett	Olasz	Truman
Cohen	Itkin	Oliver	Van Horne
Colafella	Jarolin	Petrarca	Veon
Cole	Josephs	Petrone	Wambach
Cordisco	Kasunic	Pievsky	Wiggins
Cowell	Kosinski	Pistella	Wozniak
Coy	Kukovich	Pressmann	Wright, D. R.
Deluca	Laughlin	Preston	Wright, R. C.
DeWeese	Lescovitz	Raymond	Yandrisevits
Daley	Letterman	Richardson	
Dawida	Levdansky	Rieger	Irvis,
Deal	Linton	Roebuck	Speaker

NAYS—93

Angstadt	Dietz	Johnson	Reber
Argall	Distler	Kennedy	Reinard
Arty	Dorr	Kenney	Robbins
Barley	Fargo	Langtry	Ryan
Birmelin	Fischer	Lashinger	Saurman
Black	Flick	McClatchy	Scheetz
Book	Foster, Jr., A.	McVerry	Schuler
Bowley	Fox	Mackowski	Semmel
Bowser	Freind	Manmiller	Serafini
Boyes	Gallen	Merry	Sirianni
Brandt	Gannon	Micozzie	Smith, B.
Bunt	Geist	Miller	Smith, L. E.
Burd	Gladeck	Moehlmann	Snyder, G. M.
Burns	Godshall	Mowery	Stairs
Bush	Greenwood	Nahill	Swift
Carlson	Gruppo	Noye	Taylor, E. Z.
Cessar	Hagarty	O'Brien	Telek
Chadwick	Hasay	Perzel	Vroon
Civera	Hayes	Phillips	Wass
Clymer	Herman	Piccola	Weston
Cornell	Hershey	Pitts	Wilson
Coslett	Honaman	Pott	Wogan
DeVerter	Jackson	Punt	Wright, J. L.
Davies			

NOT VOTING—2

Dininni Hutchinson

EXCUSED—4

Cimini Durham Stevens Tigie

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the bill passes finally.

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

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2037, PN 2772**, entitled:

An Act providing for the administration and use of funds available to the Commonwealth through the Federal Job Training Partnership Act.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. KOSINSKI offered the following amendment No. A0643:

Amend Sec. 4, page 3, by inserting between lines 24 and 25

(5) Maintain proper fiscal accounting, records and information as required by law.

(6) Oversee the efficient disbursal of money to the proper parties.

(7) Appeal to the Secretary of Labor a decision by the Department of Labor that results in a disallowed cost or return of money.

(8) Conduct regular audits. At least once every two years, the Governor shall provide for an independent audit of each recipient of funds.

(i) If a fiscal or record discrepancy is discovered, the council shall act immediately to determine errors and seek rectification. The council shall work with appropriate Federal authorities in correcting any errors.

(ii) If the council determines that funds have been improperly administered within a service delivery area, the council may recommend that all or a portion of the funds may be withheld from the subject service delivery area. Notice of this recommendation shall be sent to the chief elected officials and PIC within the subject service delivery area as well as to the Governor. The council shall hold a hearing within 30 days after the notice of the recommendation. At the conclusion of the hearing, the council shall transmit a recommendation of action to the Governor, who shall make a decision of action within 15 days of the conclusion of the hearing. If the Governor fails to make a decision of action within 15 days, the recommendation of the council shall stand as the final decision of action.

(iii) If the council recommends that funds be withheld from a service delivery area, it shall also recommend temporary alternative service within the subject service delivery area. The temporary alternative service shall continue until appropriate service is offered by the PIC and approved by the council.

(iv) If the council determines that fraud or misrepresentation of funds occurred, the council may withhold funds from the subject service delivery area. The funds may remain withheld pending the hearing of the council and the final decision of action.

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

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Kosinski.

Mr. KOSINSKI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What this would do is basically just tighten up some of the regulations for the Job Training Partnership Act Council that my bill hopes to establish.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—165

Acosta	Daley	Lescovitz	Rudy
Afflerbach	Dawida	Letterman	Rybak
Angstadt	Deal	Levdansky	Saloom
Argall	Dininni	Linton	Saurman
Arty	Distler	Livengood	Scheetz
Baldwin	Dombrowski	Lloyd	Schuler
Barber	Donatucci	Lucyk	Semmel
Barley	Dorr	McCall	Serafini
Battisto	Duffy	McClatchy	Seventy
Belardi	Evans	McHale	Showers
Belfanti	Fattah	McVerry	Sirianni
Birmelin	Fee	Maiale	Smith, L. E.
Blaum	Fischer	Manderino	Snyder, D. W.
Book	Fox	Manmiller	Staback
Bortner	Freeman	Markosek	Stairs
Bowley	Freind	Mayernik	Steighner
Boyes	Fryer	Michlovic	Stewart
Broujos	Gallagher	Micozzie	Stuban
Bunt	Gallen	Miller	Sweet
Burd	Gamble	Morris	Taylor, F. E.
Burns	Gannon	Murphy	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	George	Nahill	Telek
Cappabianca	Gladeck	Noye	Trello
Carlson	Godshall	O'Brien	Truman
Carn	Greenwood	O'Donnell	Van Horne
Cawley	Gruitza	Olasz	Veon
Cessar	Gruppo	Oliver	Vroon
Chadwick	Hagarty	Perzel	Wambach
Civera	Haluska	Petrarca	Wass
Clark	Harper	Petrone	Weston
Clymer	Hasay	Piccola	Wiggins
Cohen	Herman	Pievsky	Wilson
Colafella	Howlett	Pistella	Wogan
Cole	Itkin	Pott	Wozniak
Cordisco	Jarolin	Pressmann	Wright, D. R.
Cornell	Josephs	Preston	Wright, J. L.
Coslett	Kasunic	Punt	Wright, R. C.
Cowell	Kenney	Raymond	Yandrisevits
Coy	Kosinski	Reinard	
Deluca	Kukovich	Richardson	Irvis,
DeVerter	Langtry	Rieger	Speaker
DeWeese	Laughlin	Roebuck	

NAYS—26

Black	Foster, Jr., A.	Kennedy	Pitts
Bowser	Geist	Mackowski	Robbins
Brandt	Hayes	Merry	Ryan
Davies	Hershey	Moehlmann	Snyder, G. M.
Dietz	Honaman	Mowery	Swift
Fargo	Jackson	Phillips	Taylor, E. Z.
Flick	Johnson		

NOT VOTING—6

Bush	Lashingner	Reber	Smith, B.
Hutchinson	Mrkonic		

EXCUSED—4

Cimini                      Durham                      Stevens                      Tighe

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. KOSINSKI offered the following amendment No. A0641:

Amend Sec. 4, page 3, by inserting between lines 24 and 25  
(e) Conflict of interest.—No member of a PIC shall cast a vote which would produce financial benefit to that member, spouse of that member or an employer of that member, or a business concern where that member has either principal ownership or a financial interest greater than \$10,000. The council may investigate alleged violations of this subsection and act by majority vote to rescind an action affected by a conflict of interest.

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

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Kosinski.

Mr. KOSINSKI. This would put a conflict of interest statement in there so that members of private industry councils would be guided by what they could do or what they could not do under the bill.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—195

Acosta	Dietz	Lashingner	Richardson
Afflerbach	Dininni	Laughlin	Rieger
Angstadt	Distler	Lescovitz	Robbins
Argall	Dombrowski	Letterman	Roebuck
Arty	Donatucci	Levdansky	Rudy
Baldwin	Dorr	Linton	Ryan
Barber	Duffy	Livengood	Rybak
Barley	Evans	Lloyd	Saloom
Battisto	Fargo	Lucyk	Saurman
Belardi	Fattah	McCall	Scheetz
Belfanti	Fee	McClatchy	Schuler
Birmelin	Fischer	McHale	Semmel
Black	Flick	McVerry	Serafini
Blaum	Foster, Jr., A.	Mackowski	Seventy
Book	Fox	Maiale	Showers
Bortner	Freeman	Manderino	Sirianni
Bowley	Freind	Manmiller	Smith, B.
Bowser	Fryer	Markosek	Smith, L. E.
Boyes	Gallagher	Mayernik	Snyder, G. M.
Brandt	Gallen	Merry	Staback
Broujos	Gamble	Michlovic	Stairs
Bunt	Gannon	Micozzie	Steighner
Burd	Geist	Miller	Stewart
Burns	George	Moehlmann	Stuban
Bush	Gladeck	Morris	Sweet
Caltagirone	Godshall	Mowery	Swift
Cappabianca	Greenwood	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Carlson	Gruitza	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Carn	Gruppo	Nahill	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Hagarty	Noye	Telek
Cessar	Haluska	O'Brien	Trello
Chadwick	Harper	O'Donnell	Truman
Civera	Hasay	Olasz	Van Horne
Clark	Hayes	Oliver	Veon
Clymer	Herman	Perzel	Vroon



Cohen	Hershey	Petrarca	Wambach
Colafella	Honaman	Petrone	Wass
Cole	Howlett	Phillips	Weston
Cordisco	Itkin	Piccola	Wiggins
Cornell	Jackson	Pievsky	Wilson
Coslett	Jarolin	Pistella	Wogan
Cowell	Johnson	Pitts	Wozniak
Coy	Josephs	Pott	Wright, D. R.
Deluca	Kasunic	Pressmann	Wright, J. L.
DeVerter	Kennedy	Preston	Wright, R. C.
DeWeese	Kenney	Punt	Yandrisevits
Daley	Kosinski	Raymond	
Davies	Kukovich	Reber	Irvis,
Dawida	Langtry	Reinard	Speaker
Deal			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—2

Hutchinson Snyder, D. W.

EXCUSED—4

Cimini Durham Stevens Tighe

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?

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?

On final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Kosinski.

Mr. KOSINSKI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What I would like to do is just briefly and very briefly explain what this bill would do. It would enact into State law a program for taking advantage of the Federal Job Training Partnership Act. This program is currently being run with a mixture of success and failure by the Departments of Labor and Industry, Aging, and also Education. The bill attempts to solidify the existing structure and change some of the emphasis of the State program.

There is also an attempt to deal with some of the coordination problems which the House Subcommittee on Higher Education found in meeting in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh on the JTPA program. The best part of this is there is no cost to this particular bill.

The SPEAKER. On final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery, Mr. Saurman.

Mr. SAURMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Job Training Partnership Act shifted the fundamental decisionmaking previously performed at the Federal level to the State Government. The implicit intent is to establish employment and training policy at the State level for the purpose of coordinating all of the employment, training, and human resource capacities and programs existing at the State and local levels.

Lacking legislative initiative, subsequent to 1982 the administration set in place several programs designed to meet the

basic criteria set forth in that legislative bill. In January of this year the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee submitted a comprehensive report on those activities. I am holding a copy. I do not know how many have seen it. I do not know how many have taken the opportunity to look at it and to take under advisement its recommendations. I do not know how many have had a chance to look at this piece of legislation, which was introduced on the 27th of January into the Appropriations Committee and sent back out the next day with supposed total consideration. Regardless of that, the committee generally made comments that were quite positive. There were some suggestions such as better coordination from agency to agency. That institution located 25 public job training related programs already in existence.

Under the Job Training Partnership Act, the Federal Government provides employment and training resources to Governors in the form of a block grant. The Governor appoints a State Job Training Coordinating Council, which recommends policy goals, service delivery area designs, and reviews local service delivery area plans. It is intended to be an advisory group or advisory council. This piece of legislation to the contrary becomes an administrative body and is located somewhere between the Cabinet and the Governor. In effect, it makes the Governor advisory to the council itself, although it does give him 10 days, 10 whole days, not describing whether they are working days or just 10 days as such, to overturn anything that this council might do.

The reason for the council is to better serve and to serve as a link between the private sector and to make decisions and recommendations regarding the composition of the programs that are located within the various service delivery areas.

HB 2037 places a priority on adult literacy and entry-level training. Going back to what I read under the Job Training Partnership Act, it talks about training people for work. Literacy, while it is a serious, serious problem in this State and is dealt with under another piece of legislation, is pretraining, because unless a person is literate, job training can obviously not take place, and therefore, it should be in the education program.

HB 2037 violates a Federal law in its provisions relating to incentive grants by directing moneys to private industry councils that do not necessarily meet performance criteria and other program standards. Federal law requires that incentive grants be used for programs which exceed performance standards.

In summary, let me just take a note from the Governor's "happy pill" budget message and repeat that for the 16th straight month, employment in the State exceeded 5 million, and Pennsylvania began 1986 with an all-time record of persons employed, 5,162,000. Now, I have seen a map showing pockets of unemployment as high as 18 percent in some counties and other rates that are below the national average in others. I have heard testimony from two programs which have posted impressive employment records. These programs— And I would like to quote from one of them at this moment, because I think it is important that we talk

about employment. We are talking about job training programs; we are talking about putting people to work. We are not talking about in a job training program making people's lives better, making them better educated; we are talking about getting them into a job. So I would like to quote from a program that is looking at that aspect, and they say: "We choose instead to focus inside the institution (that is, toward our own needs) to convince people to buy what is on the shelf....we too must meet our responsibilities. We must turn our focus outward...." The objective of our job training program should be not what people want for themselves but what the employer wants so that we can meet that need and our job training programs are matched then to his needs so that when we are finished with the job training program, that individual will be employed.

I think that it is important that we keep this in mind as we look toward this legislative intent, which, in my opinion, unfortunately, is flawed; it is incomplete as it stands. We are talking about other bills perhaps that will fill it in, but at this point it does not really tell us what the council is, what its composition is. I think it is a very dangerous situation, and I would request that we defeat this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On final passage, the Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, HB 2037 really is a result of Senator Bell's program auditing through the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee. They did a program audit on Pennsylvania's Job Training Partnership Act moneys and the use of those moneys. Mr. Speaker, the comment that the study made was simply that the larger States - New York, California, Texas, Iowa - have enacted a comprehensive program in the area of job training under the Job Training Partnership Act, and States such as Illinois, New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina in one aspect or another enacted parts of programs for the Job Training Partnership Act. The comment for recommending that Pennsylvania do the same I would like to read into the record. The report said: "It appears that without JTPA authorizing legislation in Pennsylvania, program policy and operational guidelines...are generally being developed outside of the legislative decision-making process....State enabling legislation for JTPA would give to the General Assembly the opportunity to define legislative expectations of the program" and establish State legislative intent for broad policies and restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, what we attempt to do in this legislation is just that. We have followed in large part the manner in which the program has been operating in Pennsylvania as a starting point. We think enactment of the statute will give us not only legislative oversight through all the statutes of oversight that are already in place but will give us input through the amendment process.

Mr. Speaker, just recently—in fact, I read it in the Post Gazette this morning—Senator Heinz of Pennsylvania deplored the manner in which Job Training Partnership moneys are being utilized, not only in Pennsylvania but across the United States. I am sure Senator Heinz was looking criti-

cally in his own State in the manner in which the job does not seem to be being done with the Job Training Partnership Act, and I think that that responsibility lies with the General Assembly to put a program into effect and to work on the program to make sure the Federal dollars coming into Pennsylvania are programmed in a manner in which our decisionmaking process in the General Assembly is put in place upon the programs and the manner in which they work.

I would ask for an affirmative vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. On final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Preston.

Mr. PRESTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the gentleman, Mr. Saurman, stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Mr. Saurman will stand for interrogation.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I listened to your words very diligently concerning this piece of legislation, and I am still in a slight quandary as far as your statements are concerned - in particular, exactly why you are against a bill that only rearranges something administratively, that adds to accountability, and does not cost the State taxpayers a dime. In effect, it may make things more efficient. Now, I am not sure exactly what you were saying; I do not know if it was the private industry council or the advisory council, and you also mentioned something about the legislation being incomplete. Could you be a little bit more emphatic to me exactly what you are talking about?

Mr. SAURMAN. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to.

First of all, to your comment about it not costing a cent, this is a shell bill, and when the contents are placed therein, you will get a big bill, and then it will not be any longer a bill that costs nothing.

Secondly, when I mentioned that it was incomplete, that is what I was talking about. What Mr. Manderino has suggested in terms of responding to the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee's report indicated that it is attempting to coordinate, and that is a desperate need in our job training program, admittedly. The problem is that instead of putting all of this into a comprehensive piece of legislation which coordinates and makes sense, we have 10 bills that go in different directions - this bill, for instance, which only has a portion of what it intends to be. It makes it even more difficult and will indeed make it more difficult to provide the kind of responsibility that we need in order to see that this job training program actually continues to work, because I have some information that I would like to share with you at the appropriate time with regard to how it is functioning.

Mr. PRESTON. I listened to those words again and I did not get an answer to my question as far as "incomplete." What it seems to me that you said is that this bill is even a start. Maybe it is not exactly enough but it is a start, so obviously there is something there. Are you saying that this bill does absolutely nothing?

Mr. SAURMAN. All right. Let me again say that there is right now in existence a council such as is being proposed here. It is a 30-member council. So what we are doing is cutting that council in half. What we are doing exactly as far

as legislation is concerned is throwing out what already is in place and replacing it with something else. Now, if there are flaws in the existing programs, then why are we not addressing those flaws instead of throwing out a whole program and starting with a whole new program going in different directions?

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, are you saying that this piece of legislation abolishes the private industry council?

Mr. SAURMAN. No; that is not what I am saying.

Mr. PRESTON. What does it get rid of? You made a statement that this piece of legislation gets rid of a council. Now, I do not—

Mr. SAURMAN. All right. The Job Training Partnership Council, which is already in existence, and that is what this bill is all about, except that there is no definition in HB 2035 of what that council is, what its makeup is. You have to go back to a piece of legislation which will come up later in order to know what that council is.

Mr. PRESTON. Are you saying that this would abolish it but does not in any way adhere or help and increase the amount of participation amongst those groups that have not been included in the past?

Mr. SAURMAN. Well, what it does is to create a parallel council, and therefore, whether it abolishes it by— It does not in its language abolish it. But what would be the sense of two councils functioning identically? As a matter of fact, once this is legislatively adopted, this is the one that the Governor must use and the procedures must be followed. Therefore, the council that currently exists is of no value and, therefore, in all essence and for all practical purposes is in fact being abolished.

Mr. PRESTON. Can you show me exactly in this legislation where it creates another council, please?

Mr. SAURMAN. I am sorry?

Mr. PRESTON. Can you show me where it creates another council, as you just finished saying, in this piece of legislation, sir?

Mr. SAURMAN. On page 2, line 7, it defines "council" as "The entity designated as the State Job Training Coordinating Council...."

Mr. PRESTON. Are you saying that that does not already exist?

Mr. SAURMAN. It does already exist except that although this bill does not specify it, there is another bill that does, and the makeup of that council in the second bill, which is exactly the same and referred to, does in fact change the composition and therefore will abolish that.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, just a few moments ago you said that this creates a council; now you are simply saying that it already exists. Which one is it?

Mr. SAURMAN. I do not know how I can put it more clearly. What you are doing with this legislation is to establish a council, and there is a council already in existence.

The SPEAKER. Just a moment, Mr. Saurman.

Mr. SAURMAN. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. How can you expect Mr. Preston to hear the answers with that noise around him?

Now, Mr. Saurman.

Mr. SAURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think it would probably be more apparent if we were to just look ahead at HB 2043 and determine what the composition of the council that is referred to in HB 2035 is.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I asked a simple question. First I asked, does the council exist?

Mr. SAURMAN. The answer to that is, there is a council that the Governor has appointed.

Mr. PRESTON. Before that, I asked, does this create a council, and you also said "yes."

Mr. SAURMAN. That is correct.

Mr. PRESTON. My question simply is, which of your answers is true? Are you saying that we created something that already exists?

Mr. SAURMAN. It creates a council which in fact already exists. The difference is in the membership and the composition.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to belabor my point.

May I speak on this piece of legislation, please?

The SPEAKER. On final passage, the gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. PRESTON. I could go into this in great depth and probably tear the answers that the previous speaker has made in his statements as being inaccurate, cloudy, without any form of evidence and any support references clearly defined in any kind of way. What we heard was rhetoric. This piece of legislation just simply tightens up something, in my way, speaking from a business standpoint, as far as making clear who is responsible exactly to what. Not only that, it makes the administration much more responsible than what it already presently is.

In the past, I am sure many members know some of the problems we have had with private industry councils. Also what we are saying is the lack of relationship that we have had with some of the unemployment agencies that we have had within our own legislative districts. It is perfectly clear within this piece of legislation that this does something to help each and every one of us. It does not go as far as what maybe we might like it to, but I just finished sitting down and hearing one member say one thing and then he says another, and it was not exactly clear, and that was the total content of his previous speech. I do not think that we can hold much validity in what was said just awhile ago, and I think that we should support HB 2037 like our constituents would want. So I ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. Are you finished, Mr. Preston?

Mr. PRESTON. Yes, sir, at this time, unless there is further dialogue.

The SPEAKER. For the second time on final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery, Mr. Saurman.

Mr. SAURMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to note that in the report of the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee there is a letter addressed to Mr. Dario from James Knepper and from Margaret Smith, which admits and agrees that the Budget and Finance Committee recommendations are valid, and it states what they are already and have already set in place to address those recommendations. Once again, the problem is not with the concept of what this HB 2035 is trying to do but the fact that we already have a program that is in effect. If it is flawed, then we should be addressing the flaws rather than creating an entirely new program. I would ask for a "no" vote on that basis.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Kosinski, on final passage.

Mr. KOSINSKI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very short and sweet.

I feel that HB 2037 is a reasonable legislative solution to the problem. We had seen the problem when we went across the State, and I ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

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—110

Acosta	Donatucci	Lloyd	Rybak
Afflerbach	Duffy	Lucy	Saloom
Baldwin	Evans	McCall	Serafini
Barber	Fattah	McHale	Seventy
Battisto	Fee	Maiiale	Showers
Belardi	Fischer	Manderino	Staback
Belfanti	Freeman	Markosek	Steighner
Blaum	Fryer	Mayernik	Stewart
Bortner	Gallagher	Michlovic	Stuban
Bowley	Gamble	Morris	Sweet
Broujos	George	Mrkonic	Taylor, F. E.
Caltagirone	Gruitza	Murphy	Taylor, J.
Cappabianca	Haluska	O'Brien	Telek
Carn	Harper	O'Donnell	Trello
Cawley	Howlett	Olasz	Truman
Clark	Itkin	Oliver	Van Horne
Cohen	Jarolin	Petrarca	Veon
Colafella	Josephs	Petrone	Wambach
Cole	Kasunic	Pievsy	Wass
Cordisco	Kenney	Pistella	Wiggins
Cowell	Kosinski	Pitts	Wogan
Coy	Kukovich	Pressmann	Wozniak
Deluca	Laughlin	Preston	Wright, D. R.
DeWeese	Lescovitz	Raymond	Wright, R. C.
Daley	Letterman	Richardson	Yandrisevits
Dawida	Levdansky	Rieger	
Deal	Linton	Roebuck	Irvis,
Dombrowski	Livengood	Rudy	Speaker

NAYS—83

Angstadt	Davies	Honaman	Punt
Argall	Dietz	Jackson	Reber
Arty	Distler	Johnson	Robbins
Barley	Dorr	Kennedy	Ryan
Birmelin	Fargo	Langtry	Saurman
Black	Flick	Lashinger	Scheetz
Book	Foster, Jr., A.	McClatchy	Schuler
Bowser	Fox	McVerry	Semmel
Boyes	Freind	Mackowski	Sirianni
Brandt	Gallen	Manmiller	Smith, B.
Bunt	Gannon	Merry	Smith, L. E.
Burd	Geist	Micozzie	Snyder, D. W.

Burns	Gladeck	Miller	Snyder, G. M.
Bush	Godshall	Moehlmann	Stairs
Carlson	Greenwood	Mowery	Swift
Chadwick	Gruppo	Nahill	Taylor, E. Z.
Civera	Hagarty	Noye	Vroon
Clymer	Hasay	Perzel	Weston
Cornell	Hayes	Phillips	Wilson
Coslett	Herman	Piccola	Wright, J. L.
DeVerter	Hershey	Pott	

NOT VOTING—4

Cessar	Dininni	Hutchinson	Reinard
--------	---------	------------	---------

EXCUSED—4

Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue
--------	--------	---------	-------

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the bill passes finally.

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

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2038, PN 2773**, entitled:

An Act expanding the available adult basic education programs and the duties of the Department of Education; and making an appropriation.

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?

On final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Acosta.

Mr. ACOSTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This bill will expand the available adult basic education programs administered by the Department of Education by supplementing the Federal funds with State dollars.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority whip on final passage.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to call to the attention of the members that HB 2038 does not do some of those things that we have debated on previous bills with regard to changing the way we train people, changing guidelines through the enactment of new law, what have you. Actually, HB 2038 does as the gentleman from Philadelphia indicates. It is an appropriation bill. It is an appropriation bill that will extend the current level of appropriations that come to this Commonwealth from the Federal Government. Actually, the Governor has recommended to this General Assembly in 2 previous fiscal years - 1984-85 and the current one, 1985-86 - that the State do contribute as does the Federal Government to these programs. The last 2 years he has recommended \$1 million of State funds. Just a couple of weeks ago he came to us and again recommended the expenditure of \$1 million.

The only difference between what the Governor is suggesting in his budget as compared to HB 2038 is that this bill would dedicate \$5 million rather than the \$1 million of State funds as recommended by Governor Thornburgh. But I would ask all members to not be concerned about whether we are rewriting law, because in this particular bill we are not. This is an appropriation bill. If you favor dedicating more moneys, the sum of \$5 million, than has been recommended by the Governor, you would vote "yes." If you are opposed, you would vote "no." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mrs. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to support this bill. It was my bill that passed this House for \$1 million for adult literacy, and I would like to see \$5 million go to adult literacy and adult education. I held public hearings in October in Philadelphia at St. Joseph's University. I held public hearings here in Harrisburg and Monroeville, Allegheny County. I talked to the people. We need the funds for this bill, and I ask for an affirmative vote for HB 2038. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Preston, on final passage.

Mr. PRESTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, we have a chance here to, I guess, step up and be counted, and I do not know how we even really have a right to say what the amount is for one's education. It is obvious that I do not think that any of us could rightly put a price on what an education should be worth. Unfortunately, in this case two people did - one, the Governor proposed \$1 million; two, Mr. Acosta is proposing \$5 million. That is the choice we have to make, whether to give a little or a little bit more. I would think that we would like to be able to give a little bit more, so I would ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority whip.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I do not stand at this microphone very often and blindly defend the chief executive or attack him, but when Mr. Preston kind of indicates that Governor Thornburgh came here the other day and was just a little bit Scotch in what he recommended, I would just suggest to the gentleman that Governor Thornburgh 2 previous fiscal years before that recommended the expenditure of \$1 million of State funds in each of those years and this General Assembly chose not to do it. The Governor has already recommended, therefore, \$3 million. If we say \$5 million, I presume he will sign it. But the chief executive of this Commonwealth has already suggested that we dedicate State dollars to this program. If we care to appropriate more, so be it, but the Governor has not been deficient.

The SPEAKER. On final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Acosta.

Mr. ACOSTA. I need to say that this \$5 million will provide for 23,000 new people to go to school and learn some more. Thank you all. I need your affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, very briefly. The gentleman, Mr. Hayes, is right that the Governor has come to us two different years and recommended \$1 million. Pennsylvania presently has no adult education statute. We are putting one on the books for the first time. It will, for the first time, put in statute law who is to administer the money, what the program will be, and the guidelines for the program. Administratively, this was done before all through executive order. We think it is better put in law that again the General Assembly can deal with. I would ask for an affirmative vote.

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—194

Acosta	Dietz	Laughlin	Rieger
Afflerbach	Dininni	Lescovitz	Robbins
Angstadt	Distler	Letterman	Roebuck
Argall	Dombrowski	Levdansky	Rudy
Arty	Donatucci	Linton	Ryan
Baldwin	Dorr	Livengood	Rybak
Barber	Duffy	Lloyd	Saloom
Barley	Evans	Lucyk	Saurman
Battisto	Fargo	McCall	Scheetz
Belardi	Fattah	McClatchy	Schuler
Belfanti	Fee	McHale	Semmel
Birmelin	Fischer	McVerry	Serafini
Black	Flick	Mackowski	Seventy
Blaum	Foster, Jr., A.	Maiale	Showers
Book	Fox	Manderino	Sirianni
Bortner	Freeman	Manmiller	Smith, B.
Bowley	Fryer	Markosek	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Gallagher	Mayernik	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Gallen	Merry	Snyder, G. M.
Brandt	Gamble	Michlovic	Staback
Bunt	Gannon	Micozzie	Stairs
Burd	Geist	Miller	Steighner
Burns	George	Moehlmann	Stewart
Bush	Gladeck	Morris	Stuban
Caltagirone	Godshall	Mowery	Sweet
Cappabianca	Greenwood	Mrkoncic	Swift
Carlson	Gruitza	Murphy	Taylor, E. Z.
Carn	Hripp	Nahill	Taylor, F. E.
Cawley	Hagarty	Noye	Taylor, J.
Cessar	Haluska	O'Brien	Telek
Chadwick	Harper	O'Donnell	Trello
Civera	Hasay	Olasz	Truman
Clark	Hayes	Oliver	Van Horne
Clymer	Herman	Perzel	Veon
Cohen	Hershey	Petrarca	Vroon
Colafella	Honaman	Petrone	Wambach
Cole	Howlett	Phillips	Wass
Cordisco	Itkin	Piccola	Weston
Cornell	Jackson	Pievsky	Wiggins
Coslett	Jarolin	Pistella	Wilson
Cowell	Johnson	Pitts	Wogan
Coy	Josephs	Pott	Wozniak
Deluca	Kasunic	Pressmann	Wright, D. R.
DeVerter	Kennedy	Preston	Wright, J. L.
DeWeese	Kenney	Punt	Wright, R. C.
Daley	Kosinski	Raymond	Yandrisevits
Davies	Kukovich	Reber	
Dawida	Langtry	Reinard	Irvis,
Deal	Lashinger	Richardson	Speaker

NAYS—1

Broujos

NOT VOTING—2

Freind Hutchinson

EXCUSED—4

Cimini Durham Stevens Tigie

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the bill passes finally.

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

REMARKS ON VOTE

The SPEAKER. Why does the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Freind, rise?

Mr. FREIND. I was attending to some other things on that last vote and forgot to hit my switch. Had I hit it, I would have voted "yes" on HB 2038, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

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

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION CONTINUED

The House proceeded to third consideration of HB 2039, PN 2774, entitled:

An Act providing for a grant program for innovative job training projects; establishing requirements and criteria for such projects; and making an appropriation.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. MICHLOVIC offered the following amendments No. A0638:

Amend Sec. 5, page 4, by inserting between lines 2 and 3 (3) Job retention and promotion rates after six months, one year and two years of each participant in training projects.

Amend Sec. 5, page 4, line 3, by striking out "(3)" and inserting (4)

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. MICHLOVIC. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment was brought to my attention by Representative Cohen. Essentially, under the data collection part of HB 2039, it would add another category and require the department to keep figures on job retention and promotion rates after a 6-month period, a 1-year period, and a 2-year period for all participants in the training program.

I ask that the amendment be adopted. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—192

Table listing names of members who voted 'YEAS' (192 total). Includes names like Acosta, Deal, Lashinger, Rieger, etc.

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—5

Table listing names of members who did not vote (5 total). Includes names like Fattah, Hutchinson, Pitts, Reber, Yandrisevits.

EXCUSED—4

Table listing names of members who were excused (4 total). Includes names like Cimini, Durham, Stevens, Tigie.

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

On the question,

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?

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

YEAS—195

Acosta	Dietz	Lashinger	Richardson
Afflerbach	Dininni	Laughlin	Rieger
Angstadt	Distler	Lescovitz	Robbins
Argall	Dombrowski	Letterman	Roebuck
Arty	Donatucci	Levdansky	Rudy
Baldwin	Dorr	Linton	Ryan
Barber	Duffy	Livengood	Rybak
Barley	Evans	Lloyd	Saloom
Battisto	Fargo	Lucyk	Saurman
Belardi	Fattah	McCall	Scheetz
Belfanti	Fee	McClatchy	Schuler
Birmelin	Fischer	McHale	Semmel
Black	Flick	McVerry	Serafini
Blaum	Foster, Jr., A.	Mackowski	Seventy
Book	Fox	Maiale	Showers
Bortner	Freeman	Manderino	Smith, B.
Bowley	Freind	Manmiller	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Fryer	Markosek	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Gallagher	Mayernik	Snyder, G. M.
Brandt	Gallen	Merry	Staback
Broujos	Gamble	Michlovic	Stairs
Bunt	Gannon	Micozzie	Steighner
Burd	Geist	Miller	Stewart
Burns	George	Moehlmann	Stuban
Bush	Gladeck	Morris	Sweet
Caltagirone	Godshall	Mowery	Swift
Cappabianca	Greenwood	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Carlson	Gruitza	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Carn	Gruppo	Nahill	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Hagarty	Noye	Telek
Cessar	Haluska	O'Brien	Trello
Chadwick	Harper	O'Donnell	Truman
Civera	Hasay	Olasz	Van Horne
Clark	Hayes	Oliver	Veon
Clymer	Herman	Perzel	Vroon
Cohen	Hershey	Petrarca	Wambach
Colafella	Honaman	Petrone	Wass
Cole	Howlett	Phillips	Weston
Cordisco	Itkin	Piccola	Wiggins
Cornell	Jackson	Pievsky	Wilson
Coslett	Jarolin	Pistella	Wogan
Cowell	Johnson	Pitts	Wozniak
Coy	Josephs	Pott	Wright, D. R.
Deluca	Kasunic	Pressmann	Wright, J. L.
DeVerter	Kennedy	Preston	Wright, R. C.
DeWeese	Kenney	Punt	Yandrisevits
Daley	Kosinski	Raymond	
Davies	Kukovich	Reber	Irvis,
Dawida	Langtry	Reinard	Speaker
Deal			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—2

Hutchinson Sirianni

EXCUSED—4

Cimini Durham Stevens Tighe

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the bill passes finally.

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

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2040, PN 2775**, entitled:

An Act authorizing the Department of Labor and Industry to make grants for projects which provide employment opportunities for certain individuals; and making appropriations.

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?

On final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from York, Mr. Dorr.

Mr. DORR. Mr. Speaker, I will try to be brief.

The problem with this bill is basically it adopts—  
Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker?

BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, the prime sponsor of the bill is not on the floor.

The SPEAKER. Is Mr. Fattah on the floor?

Mr. MANDERINO. No. I ask that it be passed over temporarily.

The SPEAKER. Very well. We will pass it over temporarily, Mr. Dorr. We will call you back when he comes on the floor.

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2041, PN 2776**, entitled:

An Act providing for temporary programs to provide dislocated workers with vocational training, job search assistance and other supportive services, and for the use of certain State and Federal funds for such purposes; creating the Pennsylvania Economic Crisis Intervention Task Force; authorizing the payment of tuition costs for occupational training; and making an appropriation.

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

Mr. RYBAK offered the following amendments No. A0603:

Amend Sec. 4, page 4, line 29, by striking out "Ninety" and inserting

Sixty-five

Amend Sec. 4, page 5, line 12, by inserting after "council." Twenty-five percent of Federal funds available to the Commonwealth under Title III of the Federal Job Training Partnership Act and the necessary State matching funds appropriated by the General Assembly shall be allocated to service delivery areas for projects whose participants are primarily from a plant site which has lost more than 1,500 workers in the current and prior State fiscal year.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Northampton, Mr. Rybak, on the amendment.

Mr. RYBAK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, this amendment in no way will affect the philosophy in HB 2041 but will open eligibility to those workers whose plant site is located in a geographical area not included in a high percentage area. In other words, my amendment will provide benefits for those displaced workers who fall in a crack because their local service delivery area does not qualify under the formula - the high percentage that is required and defined in the legislative proposal that we are about to consider.

The amendment will provide for 25 percent of available funds to be made available for workers from plant sites which lost more than 1,500 jobs in the current and prior fiscal years. Specifically in the Lehigh Valley area, which is one of the delivery service areas, or I assume it will be, we have had an experience consistently over the past 2 years where the New Jersey Zinc Company plotted their plant closeup; 800 went down the drain. Black and Decker; over 800 last year; they closed shop and walked away. They conceivably will not qualify under this amendment. But we also have very serious plants which have dislocated and displaced workers - Bethlehem Steel, which over the prior year and this current fiscal year has lost 3,000 employees, and just recently the experience we had in Allentown, in the neighboring county, where they lost 1,800 displaced workers - and the idea is that they would qualify for funding under this.

Now, although my primary concern is that I am looking in my own district, I want to remind each of you that you may down the line, with the economy what it is, be facing that very serious situation. Therefore, I ask for affirmative support for this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Levdansky.

Mr. LEVDANSKY. I urge an affirmative vote on the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery, Mr. Saurman.

Mr. SAURMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

May I interrogate the maker of the amendment?

The SPEAKER. Mr. Rybak indicates he will stand for interrogation. You may proceed, Mr. Saurman.

Mr. SAURMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the word "primarily." What specifically does that mean?

Mr. RYBAK. The word what?

Mr. SAURMAN. "Primarily." You refer to "...whose participants are primarily from a plant site which has lost more than 1,500...." That language seems to me to be very vague, and I do not know what "primarily from a plant"—Either they are from a plant or they are not. Or does that mean if they worked longer there than somewhere else?

Mr. RYBAK. That is correct. They would have to be from the plant site that meets that level of 1,500 displaced workers.

Mr. SAURMAN. All right, then "primarily" is not of any essence to the meaning of the amendment.

The 25-percent share, will that be distributed all to one site? Suppose there were several sites. Would this money be split between them or would it all go to one place?

Mr. RYBAK. It will go to the area.

Mr. SAURMAN. Well, it would go to the area, but suppose there are three areas, let us say. Would it be divided equally in thirds?

Mr. RYBAK. Yes.

Mr. SAURMAN. Or if there were 10, would it be divided one-tenth each?

Mr. RYBAK. It would be up to the Department of Education to see whether they meet the criteria as displaced or dislocated workers.

Mr. SAURMAN. I am assuming that they meet that criteria. Let us say that there are three areas in the State and they meet the requirements of plant closings of more than 1,500. What is the plan for the allocation of the dollars, is what I am asking, to a given plant in that area? Will all 25 percent of this money go to one, or how will it be distributed?

Mr. RYBAK. Let me clarify your facts. Are you saying the combined displaced workers of the three plants total or exceed 1,500? Or are you saying that each plant has 1,500 dislocated workers?

Mr. SAURMAN. Mr. Speaker, let me reword the question. Perhaps I can clarify it.

Suppose that only one service delivery area has a plant layoff of 1,500. Does the entire 25 percent that is set aside for that purpose go to that one location?

Mr. RYBAK. So much as is needed, as is needed to do the job, goes to that location, yes, in that area.

Mr. SAURMAN. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker; I did not hear.

Mr. RYBAK. So much of the 25-percent funding that is needed will go to that area. It does not necessarily mean that it will take it all.

Mr. SAURMAN. Well, you are saying then that if there were 3,000 people there, the amount of money that is needed would go to that. And who determines how much money is needed for each of those 1,500 under the—

Mr. RYBAK. The Department of Education determines whether or not they meet the definition of displaced or dislocated worker.

Mr. SAURMAN. Would they be then able to determine how much each person would get and how it would be distributed?

Mr. RYBAK. They provide for the tuition payments, yes, for retraining.

Mr. SAURMAN. Suppose this takes place in the area, the 65-percent area which is already previously established. Are they also eligible for the 25-percent set-aside, or are they excluded since they have already been taken care of?

Mr. RYBAK. I would assume that so much as is unused—okay?—in the discretion.

Mr. SAURMAN. Mr. Speaker?



The SPEAKER. You could not hear him?

Mr. SAURMAN. No; I heard. I would like to make a statement, I think, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You may make a statement on the amendment.

Mr. SAURMAN. I am concerned by the answer that I heard, which is, I suppose or assume. I would think that we need to put that into the language, and I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment does not clarify, at least to my satisfaction, the questions that were asked. Thank you.

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

Mr. LETTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the maker of this amendment a question, please.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Rybak indicates he will stand for further interrogation. You may proceed, Mr. Letterman. You are in order.

Mr. LETTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, under this piece of junk that we call a bill, HB 2041, I want to ask you a question. Since I get zero from it now, would your amendment give me 25 percent less of zero? I already get zero from it, so I want to know, does your amendment even put me further in the hole so that I do not get anything for a long, long time. Right? In other words, some of us boys from out in the little old country had better start watching what you big boys from the city are doing to us, huh?

Mr. RYBAK. On the basis of your question, I would believe that you would get zero plus 25 percent.

Mr. LETTERMAN. Is that not great?

Mr. RYBAK. So that you are ahead of the game.

Mr. LETTERMAN. Yes; that is what I thought.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement.

The SPEAKER. You may speak on the amendment.

Mr. LETTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, you know, I am not too smart, and all of you know that, but I want to tell all of you, you had better get the chart out and you had better start to look to see what you are going to get before you vote for this bill or vote for any amendments to it, because when you go home, you may never come back here again when your people find out what you have done to them.

I suggest that you take the time to really look at your figures. I am voting "no," and if you live in a district like I live in, I suggest you vote "no" also. I would just say that if you have not had time, you had better make the time to look at this, because you could really be hurting yourself. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—87

Acosta	Fox	Markosek	Snyder, D. W.
Afflerbach	Freeman	Mayernik	Staback
Baldwin	Gallagher	Michlovic	Steighner
Barber	Gamble	Morris	Stewart
Battisto	Gruppo	Mrkonic	Sweet
Belardi	Harper	Murphy	Taylor, E. Z.
Belfanti	Howlett	O'Donnell	Taylor, J.
Blaum	Itkin	Olasz	Telek

Caltagirone	Jarolin	Oliver	Trello
Cappabianca	Josephs	Perzel	Truman
Carn	Kosinski	Petrarca	Van Horne
Cohen	Kukovich	Petrone	Veon
Colafella	Laughlin	Pievsky	Wambach
Cole	Lescovitz	Pistella	Wass
Cordisco	Levdansky	Pressmann	Weston
Cowell	Linton	Richardson	Wiggins
Deluca	Livengood	Rieger	Wozniak
Dawida	Lucyk	Roebuck	Wright, D. R.
Deal	McCall	Rybak	Yandrisevits
Donatucci	McHale	Saloom	
Duffy	Maiale	Semmel	Irvis,
Evans	Manderino	Seventy	Speaker
Fattah			

NAYS—107

Angstadt	DeVerter	Hayes	Pitts
Argall	DeWeese	Herman	Punt
Arty	Daley	Hershey	Raymond
Barley	Davies	Honaman	Reber
Birmelin	Dietz	Jackson	Reinard
Black	Dininni	Johnson	Robbins
Book	Distler	Kasunic	Rudy
Bortner	Dombrowski	Kennedy	Ryan
Bowley	Dorr	Kenney	Saurman
Bowser	Fargo	Langtry	Scheetz
Boyes	Fee	Lashingier	Schuler
Brandt	Fischer	Letterman	Serafini
Broujos	Flick	Lloyd	Showers
Bunt	Foster, Jr., A.	McClatchy	Sirianni
Burd	Freind	McVerry	Smith, B.
Burns	Fryer	Mackowski	Smith, L. E.
Bush	Gallen	Manmiller	Snyder, G. M.
Carlson	Gannon	Merry	Stairs
Cawley	Geist	Micozzie	Stuban
Cessar	George	Miller	Swift
Chadwick	Gladeck	Moehlmann	Taylor, F. E.
Civera	Godshall	Mowery	Vroon
Clark	Greenwood	Nahill	Wilson
Clymer	Gruitza	Noye	Wogan
Cornell	Hagarty	O'Brien	Wright, J. L.
Coslett	Haluska	Phillips	Wright, R. C.
Coy	Hasay	Piccola	

NOT VOTING—3

Hutchinson	Pott	Preston
------------	------	---------

EXCUSED—4

Cimini	Durham	Stevens	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?

On final passage, the Chair recognizes the minority whip.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the warning issued by Mr. Letterman should be heeded by everyone in this House of Representatives. Not that you will conclude necessarily the same way that Mr. Letterman concludes as to whether or not this particular bill is worthy of passage or not, but the gentleman is right in that the distribution formula contained in HB 2041, if I understand it at all, does do some things that could cause many of you to be criticized back home once it is

learned how this formula is to work. And I do not say that to be terribly critical of HB 2041, because no matter when you write a formula, you have got some winners and you have got some losers. I can stand here and indicate to you, for instance, that maybe the area I represent would be a winner under HB 2041, but it would not be fair for me to stand here and tell the rest of you to vote for it just because of that.

As a leader in this House of Representatives, I think you had better take a look as to how this particular formula will affect your individual areas back home; for after all, if we are going to have a distribution formula that is to be well targeted in terms of economic development, there should be fairness in that formula. Maybe the proponents of HB 2041 will tell us that there is fairness in the formula, but as you cast your vote here this evening, please take heed to the warning of Mr. Letterman. You may not want to vote for this bill.

I would ask the sponsor of this legislation to just maybe walk through with us one service delivery area. Would that be possible, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Do you wish to question Mr. Levdansky?

Mr. HAYES. If he would stand for interrogation.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Levdansky indicates he will so stand. You may proceed, Mr. Hayes.

Mr. HAYES. And I want the gentleman to understand, Mr. Speaker, that I am not coming out to be sharply critical of the formula. I just want, if we can, for the members to understand how it may come to bear on their individual area.

Let us take the area, the service delivery area, that is comprised of the following counties: Clarion, Crawford, Forest, Venango, and Warren. I do not pick those out for any reason other than the fact that they happen to come up first on the formula interpolation that I am working from.

Would the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, indicate to all other Representatives, if he were representing one of those counties, would he vote for or against HB 2041, and why? If he represented one of those counties.

Mr. LEVDANSKY. Mr. Speaker, I do not represent one of those counties; however, if I did, I would vote for this bill because you would be allocated more money under the formula which I propose than what you received last year.

Mr. HAYES. Let us work through how you got to that answer. This formula deals with dislocated workers as compared to the total civilian labor force. Is that correct?

Mr. LEVDANSKY. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

DECISION OF CHAIR RESCINDED

The SPEAKER. Mr. Hayes, Mr. Levdansky, excuse the Speaker, but we must interrupt your debate.

We have being handed to us a reconsideration motion on the Rybak amendment. In order to be fair to those people who wish to reconsider, we will have to slow down the debate on final passage, and the Chair, without objection, rescinds its decision that this bill has been agreed to on three different days and that it is now on final passage. The Chair hears no objection.

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

AMENDMENT A0603 RECONSIDERED

The SPEAKER. It is moved by the gentleman, Mr. Freeman, that the vote by which the Rybak amendment to HB 2041 was defeated on this the 19th day of February 1986 be reconsidered.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—189

Acosta	Deal	Lashinger	Rieger
Afflerbach	Dietz	Laughlin	Robbins
Angstadt	Dininni	Lescovitz	Roebuck
Argall	Distler	Levdansky	Rudy
Arty	Dombrowski	Linton	Ryan
Baldwin	Donatucci	Livengood	Rybak
Barber	Dorr	Lloyd	Saloom
Barley	Duffy	Lucyk	Saurman
Battisto	Evans	McCall	Scheetz
Belardi	Fargo	McClatchy	Schuler
Belfanti	Fee	McHale	Semmel
Birmelin	Fischer	McVerry	Serafini
Black	Flick	Mackowski	Seventy
Blaum	Foster, Jr., A.	Maiale	Showers
Book	Fox	Manderino	Smith, B.
Bortner	Freeman	Manmiller	Smith, L. E.
Bowley	Freind	Markosek	Snyder, D. W.
Bowser	Fryer	Mayernik	Snyder, G. M.
Boyes	Gallen	Merry	Stairs
Brandt	Gamble	Michlovic	Steighner
Broujos	Gannon	Micozzie	Stewart
Bunt	Geist	Miller	Stuban
Burd	George	Moehlmann	Sweet
Burns	Gladeck	Morris	Swift
Bush	Godshall	Mowery	Taylor, E. Z.
Caltagirone	Greenwood	Mrkonic	Taylor, F. E.
Cappabianca	Gruitza	Murphy	Taylor, J.
Carlson	Gruppo	Nahill	Telek
Carn	Hagarty	Noye	Trello
Cawley	Haluska	O'Brien	Truman
Cessar	Harper	Olasz	Van Horne
Chadwick	Hasay	Oliver	Veon
Civera	Hayes	Perzel	Vroon
Clark	Herman	Petrarca	Wambach
Clymer	Hershey	Petrone	Wass
Cohen	Honaman	Phillips	Weston
Colafella	Howlett	Piccola	Wiggins
Cole	Itkin	Pievsky	Wilson
Cornell	Jackson	Pistella	Wogan
Coslett	Jarolin	Pitts	Wozniak
Cowell	Johnson	Pott	Wright, D. R.
Coy	Josephs	Pressmann	Wright, J. L.
Deluca	Kasunic	Preston	Wright, R. C.
DeVerter	Kennedy	Punt	Yandrisevits
DeWeese	Kenney	Raymond	
Daley	Kosinski	Reber	Irvis,
Davies	Kukovich	Reinard	Speaker
Dawida	Langtry	Richardson	

NAYS—1

Letterman

NOT VOTING—7

Cordisco	Gallagher	O'Donnell	Staback
Fattah	Hutchinson	Sirianni	

EXCUSED—4

Cimini Durham Stevens Tigue

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

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

The clerk read the following amendments No. A0603:

Amend Sec. 4, page 4, line 29, by striking out "Ninety" and inserting

Sixty-five

Amend Sec. 4, page 5, line 12, by inserting after "council." Twenty-five percent of Federal funds available to the Commonwealth under Title III of the Federal Job Training Partnership Act and the necessary State matching funds appropriated by the General Assembly shall be allocated to service delivery areas for projects whose participants are primarily from a plant site which has lost more than 1,500 workers in the current and prior State fiscal year.

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

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Northampton, Mr. Freeman.

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to clear up what exactly the intent behind the Rybak amendment is. I think there is a misconception in the chamber that it will not do what its intent really is.

Briefly, what the Rybak amendment attempts to do is to make it possible for more service areas to be available for funding so that when there are plant dislocations, when workers are thrown out of work, more individuals will be able to take advantage of the moneys that are available for job training. A vote in favor of the Rybak amendment is a vote to provide funding for more areas where dislocation has occurred - in essence, to vote for more districts - and I would urge you to keep in mind that the Rybak amendment will benefit more districts than if we have a bill without the Rybak amendment. I would urge a "yes" vote.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

Mr. LETTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am not just on the amendment, but I do have a question that might pertain to the amendment and the bill.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman state the question?

Mr. LETTERMAN. I would like to know why there was not a printout shown to everybody on this House floor of what this formula is. Where is the formula? Why was it not handed out to every member on this floor?

The SPEAKER. Mr. Letterman, there is no requirement that a printout be given out under this circumstance or indeed in any. When printouts are given out, they are given out as a courtesy to the members. The Chair cannot answer you why it was not done.

Mr. Rybak, do you wish to try to answer the question?

BILL TABLED

Mr. LETTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the bill laid on the table until there is a printout for every member of this House.

The SPEAKER. Would you give Mr. Rybak an opportunity to— I think your question is on the amendment, the printout for the amendment.

Mr. Rybak, do you wish to answer him?

Mr. LETTERMAN. Mine is the total printout of the whole bill, what the bill does, because his amendment speaks to that printout.

Mr. RYBAK. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Mr. Letterman insists on his motion, so we will have to take his motion. You may speak against the motion after the Chair places it.

Moved by the gentleman, Mr. Letterman, that HB 2041, together with the Rybak amendment, be placed upon the table.

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

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

Mr. RYBAK. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the members of the House to vote "no" on the motion.

The SPEAKER. That is as far as you can go. It is not debatable.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—118

Afflerbach	Daley	Johnson	Reinard
Angstadt	Davies	Kasunic	Robbins
Argall	Dietz	Kennedy	Rudy
Arty	Dininni	Kenney	Ryan
Baldwin	Distler	Langtry	Saurman
Barley	Dombrowski	Lashingier	Scheetz
Belfanti	Dorr	Lucyk	Schuler
Birmelin	Fargo	McClatchy	Seventy
Black	Fee	McVerry	Showers
Book	Fischer	Mackowski	Sirianni
Bortner	Flick	Manmiller	Smith, B.
Bowley	Foster, Jr., A.	Mayernik	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Fox	Merry	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Freind	Micozzie	Snyder, G. M.
Brandt	Fryer	Miller	Staback
Bunt	Gallen	Moehlmann	Stairs
Burd	Gannon	Morris	Steighner
Burns	Geist	Mowery	Stuban
Bush	Gladeck	Nahill	Swift
Cappabianca	Godshall	Noye	Taylor, E. Z.
Carlson	Greenwood	O'Brien	Taylor, F. E.
Cessar	Hagarty	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Chadwick	Haluska	Phillips	Vroon
Civera	Harper	Piccola	Wass
Clark	Hasay	Pitts	Weston
Clymer	Hayes	Pott	Wilson
Cornell	Herman	Punt	Wogan
Coslett	Hershey	Raymond	Wright, J. L.
Coy	Honaman	Reber	Wright, R. C.
DeVerter	Jackson		

NAYS—77

Acosta	Fattah	McCall	Rybak
Barber	Freeman	McHale	Saloom
Battisto	Gallagher	Maiale	Semmel
Belardi	Gamble	Manderino	Serafini
Blaum	George	Markosek	Stewart
Broujos	Gruitza	Michlovic	Sweet
Caltagirone	Gruppo	Mrkonic	Telek
Carn	Howlett	Murphy	Trello
Cawley	Itkin	O'Donnell	Truman
Cohen	Jarolin	Olasz	Van Horne
Colafella	Josephs	Oliver	Veon
Cole	Kosinski	Petrarca	Wambach
Cowell	Kukovich	Petrone	Wiggins
Deluca	Laughlin	Pievsky	Wozniak
DeWeese	Lescovitz	Pistella	Wright, D. R.
Dawida	Letterman	Pressmann	Yandrisevits
Deal	Levdansky	Preston	
Donatucci	Linton	Richardson	Irvis,
Duffy	Livengood	Rieger	Speaker
Evans	Lloyd	Roebuck	

NOT VOTING—2

Cordisico	Hutchinson
-----------	------------

EXCUSED—4

Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue
--------	--------	---------	-------

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

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2042, PN 2777**, entitled:

An Act promoting the development of programs to prevent students from dropping out of school and to assist persons who have dropped out; and making an appropriation.

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?

On final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Preston.

Mr. PRESTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Basically what we are doing in HB 2042 is addressing an area that affects all of us. It really does not even reach the socioeconomic group. It goes into every community, within every school district that we have, and that pertains to the problem as far as dropouts are concerned.

There could be many different reasons why a person may drop out, not just from lack of the educational ability to totally comprehend. It could even go all the way from whether it is the lights, whether they are having problems at home, whether it is a disciplinary problem, or even whether or not there is a conflict between the student and the teacher himself. I think we are looking here at something that is national in basis. In here we are committing \$2 million, but yet alone we are also looking at other teachers unions who are willing to match grants. The Federal Government is also looking at this situation, and I think that anything we can do to work, to help

those people to further along, to make them a viable person within our communities, is important.

Also, I think something— There is another instance. I also serve on a committee appointed by the Speaker that deals with those people and teenage suicide. If this bill would help one person who was having problems in school not to commit suicide, I think it would be well worth the money. I would ask for an affirmative vote on HB 2042.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority whip, on final passage.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman has essentially framed the question for us. This legislation touches upon two programs which are currently programs of the Commonwealth - that being dropout prevention and reentry. In the current fiscal year, we are spending a total of \$3 million, which is a combination of State and Federal money. Our current State appropriation is approximately \$1.3 million, as I understand it. The Governor, in his executive budget presented to us a couple of weeks ago, recommended an increase of another one-half million dollars. HB 2042 would accelerate that amount up to a \$2-million increase.

Again, we are not rewriting State law, as was the effort in some of the other bills. This is an appropriation bill that targets money towards programs that we are already sponsoring in Pennsylvania.

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—193

Acosta	Dietz	Lashinger	Rieger
Afflerbach	Dininni	Laughlin	Robbins
Angstadt	Distler	Lescovitz	Roebuck
Argall	Dombrowski	Letterman	Rudy
Arty	Donatucci	Levdansky	Ryan
Baldwin	Dorr	Linton	Rybak
Barber	Duffy	Livengood	Saloom
Barley	Evans	Lloyd	Saurman
Battisto	Fargo	Lucyk	Scheetz
Belardi	Fattah	McCall	Schuler
Belfanti	Fee	McClatchy	Semmel
Birmelin	Fischer	McHale	Serafini
Black	Flick	McVerry	Seventy
Blaum	Foster, Jr., A.	Mackowski	Showers
Book	Fox	Manderino	Sirianni
Bortner	Freeman	Manmiller	Smith, B.
Bowley	Freind	Markosek	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Fryer	Mayernik	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Gallagher	Merry	Snyder, G. M.
Brandt	Gallen	Michlovic	Staback
Broujos	Gamble	Micozzie	Stairs
Bunt	Gannon	Miller	Steighner
Burd	Geist	Moehlmann	Stewart
Burns	George	Morris	Stuban
Bush	Gladeck	Mowery	Sweet
Caltagirone	Godshall	Mrkonic	Swift
Cappabianca	Greenwood	Murphy	Taylor, E. Z.
Carlson	Gruitza	Nahill	Taylor, F. E.
Carn	Gruppo	Noye	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Hagarty	O'Brien	Telek
Cessar	Haluska	O'Donnell	Trello
Chadwick	Harper	Olasz	Truman
Civera	Hasay	Oliver	Van Horne
Clark	Hayes	Perzel	Vroon

Clymer	Herman	Petrarca	Wambach
Cohen	Hershey	Petrone	Wass
Colafella	Honaman	Phillips	Weston
Cole	Howlett	Piccola	Wiggins
Cornell	Itkin	Pievsky	Wilson
Coslett	Jackson	Pistella	Wogan
Cowell	Jarolin	Pitts	Wozniak
Coy	Johnson	Pott	Wright, D. R.
Deluca	Josephs	Pressmann	Wright, J. L.
DeVerter	Kasunic	Preston	Wright, R. C.
DeWeese	Kennedy	Punt	Yandrisevits
Daley	Kenney	Raymond	
Davies	Kosinski	Reber	Irvis,
Dawida	Kukovich	Reinard	Speaker
Deal	Langtry	Richardson	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—4

Cordisco	Hutchinson	Maiale	Veon
----------	------------	--------	------

EXCUSED—4

Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue
--------	--------	---------	-------

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the bill passes finally.

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

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2043, PN 2778**, entitled:

An Act establishing the Pennsylvania Job Training Council and providing for its membership, powers and duties; providing priorities and guidelines for Statewide and other job training plans and programs and for coordination of such programs; and making an appropriation.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. PIEVSKY offered the following amendment No. A0604:

Amend Sec. 7, page 8, by inserting between lines 20 and 21

(7) Reject any plan which does not contain assurances that no participant in any program funded within the plan shall be assigned to work opportunities available due to a labor dispute, strike or lockout or be assigned to perform work so as to cause the layoff, downgrading or prevention of return to work of available competent employees, and, where applicable, that workmen's compensation insurance coverage for participants will be provided by the entity sponsoring the employment opportunity.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. PIEVSKY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this council is created to approve or disapprove job training plans from applicants across the State. My amendment was requested by the Pennsylvania labor movement, and it says that no plan may be approved which is intended to violate existing labor-management agreements, to participate in a lockout, or to prevent laid-off employees from returning to a job they are entitled to.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that we put similar language in the Customized Job Training Act in December that this General Assembly passed. I think it would be appropriate to do it here as well. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority whip.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman, Mr. Pievsky, is right. We do have it in the Customized Job Training Program, and it is currently in rule and regulation form. On the basis of that, I would have no objection.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—195

Acosta	Dininni	Laughlin	Rieger
Afflerbach	Distler	Lescovitz	Robbins
Angstadt	Dombrowski	Letterman	Roebuck
Argall	Donatucci	Levdansky	Rudy
Arty	Dorr	Linton	Ryan
Baldwin	Duffy	Livengood	Rybak
Barber	Evans	Lloyd	Saloom
Barley	Fargo	Lucyk	Saurman
Battisto	Fattah	McCall	Scheetz
Belardi	Fee	McClatchy	Schuler
Belfanti	Fischer	McHale	Semmel
Birmelin	Flick	McVerry	Serafini
Black	Foster, Jr., A.	Mackowski	Seventy
Blaum	Fox	Maiale	Showers
Book	Freeman	Manderino	Sirianni
Bortner	Freind	Manmiller	Smith, B.
Bowley	Fryer	Markosek	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Gallagher	Mayernik	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Gallen	Merry	Snyder, G. M.
Brandt	Gamble	Michlovic	Staback
Broujos	Gannon	Micozzie	Stairs
Bunt	Geist	Miller	Steighner
Burd	George	Moehlmann	Stewart
Burns	Gladeck	Morris	Stuban
Bush	Godshall	Mowery	Sweet
Caltagirone	Greenwood	Mrkonic	Swift
Cappabianca	Gruitza	Murphy	Taylor, E. Z.
Carlson	Gruppo	Nahill	Taylor, F. E.
Carn	Hagarty	Noye	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Haluska	O'Brien	Telek
Cessar	Harper	O'Donnell	Trello
Chadwick	Hasay	Olasz	Truman
Civera	Hayes	Oliver	Van Horne
Clark	Herman	Perzel	Veon
Clymer	Hershey	Petrarca	Vroon
Cohen	Honaman	Petrone	Wambach
Colafella	Howlett	Phillips	Wass
Cole	Itkin	Piccola	Weston
Cornell	Jackson	Pievsky	Wiggins
Coslett	Jarolin	Pistella	Wilson
Cowell	Johnson	Pitts	Wogan
Coy	Josephs	Pott	Wozniak
Deluca	Kasunic	Pressmann	Wright, D. R.
DeVerter	Kennedy	Preston	Wright, J. L.
DeWeese	Kenney	Punt	Wright, R. C.
Daley	Kosinski	Raymond	Yandrisevits
Davies	Kukovich	Reber	
Dawida	Langtry	Reinard	Irvis,
Deal	Lashingier	Richardson	Speaker
Dietz			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—2

Cordisco Hutchinson

EXCUSED—4

Cimini Durham Stevens 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. KOSINSKI offered the following amendments No. A0637:

Amend Sec. 7, page 7, by inserting between lines 29 and 30

(2) Encourage the coordination and cooperation among various job training services in order to rapidly and efficiently evaluate the demands for various job skill levels, skill levels of job training recipients, and available or possible training programs for an effective job training system.

Amend Sec. 7, page 7, line 30, by striking out "(2)" and inserting

(3)

Amend Sec. 7, page 8, line 3, by striking out "(3)" and inserting

(4)

Amend Sec. 7, page 8, line 6, by striking out "(4)" and inserting

(5)

Amend Sec. 7, page 8, line 10, by striking out "(5)" and inserting

(6)

Amend Sec. 7, page 8, line 18, by striking out "(6)" and inserting

(7)

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. KOSINSKI. It is a simple amendment establishing legislative intent as far as the coordination and cooperation segments of the program.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

Acosta	Dietz	Lashingner	Rieger
Afflerbach	Dininni	Laughlin	Robbins
Angstadt	Distler	Lescovitz	Roebuck
Argall	Dombrowski	Letterman	Rudy
Arty	Donatucci	Levdansky	Ryan
Baldwin	Dorr	Linton	Rybak
Barber	Duffy	Livengood	Saloom
Barley	Evans	Lloyd	Saurman
Battisto	Fargo	Lucyk	Scheetz
Belardi	Fattah	McCall	Schuler
Belfanti	Fee	McClatchy	Semmel
Birmelin	Fischer	McHale	Serafini
Black	Flick	McVerry	Seventy
Blaum	Foster, Jr., A.	Mackowski	Showers
Book	Fox	Manderino	Sirianni
Bortner	Freeman	Manmiller	Smith, B.
Bowley	Freind	Markosek	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Fryer	Mayernik	Snyder, D. W.

Boyes	Gallagher	Merry	Snyder, G. M.
Brandt	Gallen	Michlovic	Staback
Broujos	Gamble	Micozzie	Stairs
Bunt	Gannon	Miller	Steighner
Burd	Geist	Moehlmann	Stewart
Burns	George	Morris	Stuban
Bush	Gladeck	Mowery	Sweet
Caltagirone	Godshall	Mrkonic	Swift
Cappabianca	Greenwood	Murphy	Taylor, E. Z.
Carlson	Gruitza	Nahill	Taylor, F. E.
Carn	Gruppo	Noye	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Hagarty	O'Brien	Telek
Cessar	Haluska	O'Donnell	Trello
Chadwick	Harper	Olasz	Truman
Civera	Hasay	Oliver	Van Horne
Clark	Hayes	Perzel	Veon
Clymer	Herman	Petrarca	Vroon
Cohen	Hershey	Petrone	Wambach
Colafella	Honaman	Phillips	Wass
Cole	Howlett	Piccola	Weston
Cornell	Itkin	Pievsky	Wiggins
Coslett	Jackson	Pistella	Wilson
Cowell	Jarolin	Pitts	Wogan
Coy	Johnson	Pott	Wozniak
Deluca	Josephs	Pressmann	Wright, D. R.
DeVerter	Kasunic	Preston	Wright, J. L.
DeWeese	Kennedy	Punt	Wright, R. C.
Daley	Kenney	Raymond	Yandrisevits
Davies	Kosinski	Reber	
Dawida	Kukovich	Reinard	Irvis,
Deal	Langtry	Richardson	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—3

Cordisco Hutchinson Maiale  
EXCUSED—4  
Cimini Durham Stevens Tigue

The question was determined in the affirmative, and the amendments were 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?

On final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Kosinski.

Mr. KOSINSKI. HB 2043 is a companion to HB 2037. This actually sets up the Pennsylvania Job Training Council. Again, it is a reasonable bill, and I ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority whip, on final passage.

Mr. HAYES. I wonder if the gentleman, Mr. Pievsky, would stand for brief interrogation, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Pievsky indicates he will so stand. You may proceed, Mr. Hayes.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for you to respond, if you would, please, to language found on page 8 of the bill. On page 8 of the bill, specifically lines 8 and 9, Mr. Speaker, it

states that one of the duties of the advisory council is to approve the budget request for the Office of Employment Security. As Appropriations chairman, how do you read that? What do you think that means? What if the council does not approve the budget request of the Office of Employment Security? What are the results of such a disapproval?

Mr. PIEVSKY. As far as I know, Mr. Speaker, I think the Governor can veto that decision if he wants.

Mr. HAYES. Veto it?

Mr. PIEVSKY. Right. He has 10 days.

Mr. HAYES. What was that?

Mr. PIEVSKY. He has 10 days to veto it if he wants to do that.

Mr. HAYES. Veto what, the bill? The language?

Mr. PIEVSKY. The decision.

Mr. HAYES. Would you go through the complete budgetary process and indicate where this particular provision comes to bear and how it could affect appropriations for the Office of Employment Security?

Mr. PIEVSKY. Well, Mr. Speaker, we do not appropriate to the Office of Employment Security.

Mr. HAYES. Keep going.

Mr. PIEVSKY. So right now, they are not involved in this bill.

Mr. HAYES. That is not an explanation. I am concerned about what happens in the 67 counties if somehow there is a question as to whether or not appropriations are to flow to them through the Office of Employment Security. My question is a serious one, not one to find fault with the bill. I am just concerned about the budgetary process as it affects those 67 county offices.

Mr. PIEVSKY. It must be serious, Mr. Speaker, because I do not understand it.

Mr. HAYES. You do not see that as a problem? Would you put on the record exactly what you think the Governor's prerogatives are to make sure that the moneys flow, just perchance this advisory council decides to disapprove it?

Mr. PIEVSKY. Well, I told you what the Governor's prerogatives are. He has 10 days to veto the decision.

Mr. HAYES. And the moneys could therefore flow?

Mr. PIEVSKY. There is no question about it.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery, Mr. Saurman, on final passage.

Mr. SAURMAN. Just a couple of observations, Mr. Speaker. I did speak, in a sense, to HB 2043 when I was talking of HB 2037. This now is the council. It should have probably been in HB 2037 and there would not have been the confusion.

Let me just make two observations. One is that, first of all, there is a conspicuous absence of any representation from the Department of Welfare or the Department of Education on this council. I suppose they could be brought in in an advisory fashion, but they are lacking.

The other thing that really disturbs me is that we are doing something, I think, entirely new. On page 8, line 14, it says,

“The executive director” of this council, “or his designee, shall attend, and be a voting member of, the Board of Vocational Education and the Human Resources Committee of the Cabinet.” Mr. Speaker, it seems to me to be quite a shocking and alarming development that this House now feels that it can designate someone to serve as a voting member of the Cabinet of the executive branch. I do not think the Constitution ever intended that. I raise that as a very serious objection and would ask that you defeat this bill for that reason.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery, Mr. McClatchy, on final passage.

Mr. McCLATCHY. Mr. Speaker, I again raise the question on page 8 of the bill where we transfer the budget approval for the Bureau of Employment Security to this council. We are transferring this ability to a private group. I think there is a strong legal problem. I do not think legally we could do that, and for that reason alone, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we defeat the 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—110

Acosta	Dombrowski	Linton	Roebuck
Afflerbach	Donatucci	Livengood	Rudy
Arty	Duffy	Lloyd	Rybak
Baldwin	Evans	Lucyk	Saloom
Barber	Fattah	McCall	Seventy
Battisto	Fee	McHale	Showers
Belardi	Fischer	Manderino	Staback
Belfanti	Freeman	Markosek	Stairs
Blaum	Fryer	Mayernik	Steighner
Bortner	Gallagher	Michlovic	Stewart
Bowley	Gamble	Micozzie	Stuban
Broujos	Gannon	Miller	Sweet
Burns	George	Morris	Taylor, F. E.
Caltagirone	Gruitza	Mrkonc	Taylor, J.
Cappabianca	Haluska	Murphy	Telek
Carn	Harper	O'Brien	Trello
Cawley	Howlett	O'Donnell	Truman
Clark	Itkin	Olasz	Van Horne
Cohen	Jarolin	Oliver	Veon
Colafella	Josephs	Petrarca	Wambach
Cole	Kasunic	Petrone	Wiggins
Cowell	Kenney	Phillips	Wogan
Coy	Kosinski	Pievsy	Wozniak
Deluca	Kukovich	Pistella	Wright, D. R.
DeWeese	Laughlin	Pressmann	Yandrisevits
Daley	Lescovitz	Preston	
Dawida	Letterman	Richardson	Irvis,
Deal	Levdansky	Rieger	Speaker

NAYS—84

Angstadt	Dietz	Jackson	Reinard
Argall	Dininni	Johnson	Robbins
Barley	Distler	Kennedy	Ryan
Birmelin	Dorr	Langtry	Saurman
Black	Fargo	Lashingner	Scheetz
Book	Flick	McClatchy	Schuler
Bowser	Foster, Jr., A.	McVerry	Semmel
Boyes	Fox	Mackowski	Serafini
Brandt	Freind	Manmiller	Sirianni
Bunt	Gallen	Merry	Smith, B.
Burd	Geist	Moehlmann	Smith, L. E.
Bush	Gladeck	Mowery	Snyder, D. W.
Carlson	Godshall	Nahill	Snyder, G. M.
Cessar	Greenwood	Noye	Swift

Chadwick	Gruppo	Perzel	Taylor, E. Z.
Civera	Hagarty	Piccola	Vroon
Clymer	Hasay	Pitts	Wass
Cornell	Hayes	Pott	Weston
Coslett	Herman	Punt	Wilson
DeVerter	Hershey	Raymond	Wright, J. L.
Davies	Honaman	Reber	Wright, R. C.

## NOT VOTING—3

Cordisco	Hutchinson	Maiale
----------	------------	--------

## EXCUSED—4

Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue
--------	--------	---------	-------

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the bill passes finally.

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

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2044, PN 2779**, entitled:

An Act providing that certain funds received under the Federal Job Training Partnership Act shall be used to provide support services related to job training; providing for eligibility for such services; and making an appropriation.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Beaver, Mr. Veon.

Mr. VEON. Mr. Speaker, HB 2044 does several things. Briefly, number one, it requires that the local service delivery areas and the local PIC's (private industry councils) set aside a minimum of 5 percent of the funds received under title 2 for needs-based payments. Secondly, it expands the availability of those needs-based payments if the PIC so desired, based on a one-State-dollar-for-every-two-Federal-dollars set-aside basis. Thirdly, it would provide a needs-based payment to the folks who are going through a training program. First of all, if they have no income whatsoever, they would be eligible for an \$8-a-day payment from the local PIC. If they do have an income, they would be eligible for a \$5-a-day payment.

And lastly, and perhaps most importantly in this bill, it responds to a criticism that many of us have had of people who have been going through training programs and have expired their unemployment benefits while in that program. This particular bill would call for a payment of \$177 a month for 3 months, to hopefully allow those people to complete that training program.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a fair bill. I urge its passage. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery, Mr. Saurman.

Mr. SAURMAN. Thank you.

Would the gentleman, Mr. Veon, submit to brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Veon, indicates he will stand for interrogation. You may proceed.

Mr. SAURMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On page 3 of the bill, line 10 begins, "...individuals participating in training who exhaust unemployment compensation payments during a training course and are not eligible for cash assistance payments pursuant to the act of June 13, 1967...known as the Public Welfare Code, in an amount not exceeding \$177 a month." Now, if it says that they are not eligible and the amount is not exceeding \$177 a month, I am confused. It seems to me that there is a double negative. Would you explain that language to me, please?

Mr. VEON. Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure of the question.

Mr. SAURMAN. Well, if in fact you are not eligible for cash assistance payments, then what does the criteria "not eligible for cash assistance...in an amount not exceeding \$177 a month"— In other words, you are using "not" twice there, which is a double negative. Does that mean that they are eligible for assistance at an amount greater than \$177, less than \$177, or does it mean that they are not eligible, or they are eligible for less than \$177? It leaves, I think, something to be desired in terms of clarity, and while I think today we have passed several bills that have demonstrated some lack of clarity—and for that reason I am concerned—I think that this should be clarified before we vote on it.

Mr. VEON. Mr. Speaker, to answer your question, I believe this would answer your question. If the recipient or the person who has expired their unemployment benefits and is in a qualified training program, if he is eligible for more than \$177 a month in public assistance, then he is not eligible for the \$177 a month under this bill.

Mr. SAURMAN. Then you are saying that if in fact from his cash assistance he is getting less than \$177, he is eligible? Is that correct?

Mr. VEON. Could you repeat that question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SAURMAN. If in fact from his cash assistance he is now currently receiving less than \$177, he is eligible? Is that what I understand your answer to have been?

Mr. VEON. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most important eligibility requirement for this \$177 a month is the fact that the recipient is in a training program and while in that training program his unemployment compensation has expired. If he meets those requirements, he is then eligible for the \$177 a month for 90 days.

Mr. SAURMAN. But I think you just said that if he is still getting some benefits that are less than \$177 in his welfare, that he can get the difference, is that right, up to \$177 under this?

Mr. VEON. Mr. Speaker, again, the eligibility requirement is that the person is on unemployment compensation and has expired unemployment compensation. It does not deal with the fact that he is on public assistance. This is if he is on



unemployment compensation in the program and expires his unemployment compensation while in the program, he will be eligible, not if he is on public assistance and expires his public assistance. Just unemployment compensation.

Mr. SAURMAN. Apart from the unemployment benefits which you have described as having expired, what about needs-based assistance other than this? How does that impact upon the \$177 a month that you are setting up here?

Mr. VEON. No, sir, Mr. Speaker. If he receives the \$177 a month, then he is not eligible for the needs-based assistance.

Mr. SAURMAN. Well, which comes first? The language is talking about the amount of money that he is getting. You are saying if he is getting some funds from needs-based programs, from welfare, that he will not be eligible for this unless, or are you saying that if it is less than \$177, he makes up the difference with this? And if so, where is that language in the bill, which I think is most necessary?

Mr. VEON. Mr. Speaker, let me back up a step and say that this bill was in response to the concern expressed by many constituents that they had to drop out of training programs because while in that training program their unemployment compensation expired. So this simply states that this bill does not deal with those who are on public assistance and in a training program, only with those who are receiving unemployment compensation and in a training program and their unemployment compensation expires while in that training program. That is all that section deals with, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SAURMAN. Mr. Speaker, then why would those people not qualify under subparagraph (a) on page 2, and why are you setting this up? What is the difference between those two programs? You have set it up in two different places. Now you are saying that you are not going to utilize it in one; you are going to put it in another. Who decides which?

Once again, I certainly sympathize with what you are trying to do, but I do not think your language does it, and I do not think we should pass a bill that is that unclear.

Mr. VEON. Mr. Speaker, the needs-based payments - the \$5 and the \$8 previously referred to - are not available for the person receiving the \$177 in this bill.

Mr. SAURMAN. It is kind of which comes first, the chicken or the egg, I presume, but I think that the point has been made.

Mr. Speaker, if I might make a statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may make a statement on final passage.

Mr. SAURMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think the point has been made that there is a great deal of inconsistency and unclarity in this bill, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a negative vote.

The SPEAKER. On final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Beaver, Mr. Veon.

Mr. VEON. Mr. Speaker, finally, again, this is in response to those people who are in training programs currently and their unemployment expires while in those training programs. I think all of us have met some of them who, because their unemployment compensation expired, could no longer com-

plete that training program. It is not a lot of money, but it is an attempt to at least allow them to have the amount of money necessary for gasoline and other needed expenses to complete the training program.

I urge its passage. Thank you.

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—141

Acosta	Dininni	Lescovitz	Rieger
Afflerbach	Distler	Letterman	Roebuck
Angstadt	Dombrowski	Levdansky	Rudy
Argall	Donatucci	Linton	Rybak
Arty	Duffy	Livengood	Saloom
Baldwin	Fattah	Lloyd	Semmel
Battisto	Fee	Lucyk	Serafini
Belardi	Fischer	McCall	Seventy
Belfanti	Foster, Jr., A.	McClatchy	Showers
Blaum	Freeman	McHale	Sirianni
Bortner	Freind	Mackowski	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Fryer	Maiale	Staback
Brandt	Gallagher	Manderino	Stairs
Broujos	Gamble	Manmiller	Steighner
Burns	Gannon	Markosek	Stewart
Bush	Geist	Mayernik	Stuban
Caltagirone	George	Michlovic	Sweet
Cappabianca	Gruitza	Micozzie	Taylor, F. E.
Carlson	Gruppo	Miller	Taylor, J.
Carn	Haluska	Morris	Telek
Cawley	Harper	Mrkonic	Trello
Cessar	Hasay	Murphy	Truman
Civera	Hayes	O'Brien	Van Horne
Clark	Herman	O'Donnell	Veon
Cohen	Honaman	Olasz	Wambach
Colafella	Howlett	Oliver	Wass
Cole	Itkin	Perzel	Weston
Coslett	Jarolin	Petrarca	Wogan
Cowell	Johnson	Petrone	Wozniak
Coy	Josephs	Phillips	Wright, D. R.
Deluca	Kasunic	Piccola	Wright, R. C.
DeVerter	Kenny	Pievsky	Yandrisevits
DeWeese	Kosinski	Pistella	
Daley	Kukovich	Pressmann	Irvis,
Dawida	Lashinger	Preston	Speaker
Deal	Laughlin	Richardson	

NAYS—51

Barley	Dorr	McVerry	Ryan
Birmelin	Fargo	Merry	Saurman
Black	Flick	Moehlmann	Scheetz
Book	Fox	Mowery	Schuler
Bowley	Gallen	Nahill	Smith, B.
Bowser	Gladeck	Noye	Smith, L. E.
Bunt	Godshall	Pitts	Snyder, G. M.
Burd	Greenwood	Pott	Swift
Chadwick	Hagarty	Punt	Taylor, E. Z.
Clymer	Hershey	Raymond	Vroon
Cornell	Jackson	Reber	Wilson
Davies	Kennedy	Reinard	Wright, J. L.
Dietz	Langtry	Robbins	

NOT VOTING—5

Barber	Evans	Hutchinson	Wiggins
Cordisco			

EXCUSED—4

Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue
--------	--------	---------	-------

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the bill passes finally.

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

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2089, PN 2856**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation from a restricted revenue account within the General Fund to the Office of Consumer Advocate.

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—187

- |             |                 |            |               |
|-------------|-----------------|------------|---------------|
| Acosta      | Distler         | Lescovitz  | Robbins       |
| Afflerbach  | Dombrowski      | Letterman  | Roebuck       |
| Angstadt    | Donatucci       | Levdansky  | Rudy          |
| Argall      | Dorr            | Linton     | Ryan          |
| Arty        | Duffy           | Livengood  | Rybak         |
| Baldwin     | Fargo           | Lloyd      | Saloom        |
| Barley      | Fattah          | Lucyk      | Saurman       |
| Battisto    | Fee             | McCall     | Scheetz       |
| Belardi     | Fischer         | McClatchy  | Schuler       |
| Belfanti    | Flick           | McHale     | Semmel        |
| Birmelin    | Foster, Jr., A. | McVerry    | Serafini      |
| Black       | Fox             | Mackowski  | Seventy       |
| Blaum       | Freeman         | Manderino  | Showers       |
| Book        | Freind          | Manmiller  | Sirianni      |
| Bortner     | Fryer           | Markosek   | Smith, B.     |
| Bowley      | Gallagher       | Mayernik   | Smith, L. E.  |
| Bowser      | Gallen          | Merry      | Snyder, D. W. |
| Boyes       | Gannon          | Michlovic  | Snyder, G. M. |
| Brandt      | Geist           | Micozzie   | Staback       |
| Broujos     | George          | Miller     | Stairs        |
| Bunt        | Gladeck         | Moehlmann  | Steighner     |
| Burd        | Godshall        | Morris     | Stewart       |
| Burns       | Greenwood       | Mowery     | Stuban        |
| Bush        | Gruitza         | Mrkonic    | Sweet         |
| Caltagirone | Gruppo          | Murphy     | Swift         |
| Cappabianca | Hagarty         | Nahill     | Taylor, E. Z. |
| Carlson     | Haluska         | Noye       | Taylor, F. E. |
| Carn        | Harper          | O'Brien    | Taylor, J.    |
| Cawley      | Hasay           | O'Donnell  | Telek         |
| Chadwick    | Hayes           | Olasz      | Trello        |
| Civera      | Herman          | Oliver     | Truman        |
| Clark       | Hershey         | Perzel     | Van Horne     |
| Clymer      | Honaman         | Petrone    | Veon          |
| Cohen       | Howlett         | Phillips   | Vroom         |
| Colafella   | Itkin           | Piccola    | Wambach       |
| Cole        | Jackson         | Pievsky    | Wass          |
| Cornell     | Jarolin         | Pistella   | Weston        |
| Coslett     | Johnson         | Pitts      | Wilson        |
| Cowell      | Josephs         | Pott       | Wogan         |
| Coy         | Kasunic         | Pressmann  | Wozniak       |
| Deluca      | Kennedy         | Preston    | Wright, D. R. |
| DeVerter    | Kenney          | Punt       | Wright, J. L. |
| DeWeese     | Kosinski        | Raymond    | Wright, R. C. |
| Daley       | Kukovich        | Reber      | Yandrisevits  |
| Davies      | Langtry         | Reinard    |               |
| Dawida      | Lashingner      | Richardson | Irvis,        |
| Dietz       | Laughlin        | Rieger     | Speaker       |

Dininni

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—10

- |          |        |            |          |
|----------|--------|------------|----------|
| Barber   | Deal   | Hutchinson | Petrarca |
| Cessar   | Evans  | Maiale     | Wiggins  |
| Cordisco | Gamble |            |          |

EXCUSED—4

- |        |        |         |       |
|--------|--------|---------|-------|
| Cimini | Durham | Stevens | Tigue |
|--------|--------|---------|-------|

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the bill passes finally.

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

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2090, PN 2857**, entitled:

An Act making appropriations from a restricted revenue account within the General Fund and from Federal augmentation funds to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission.

On the question,  
Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?  
Mr. **PIEVSKY** offered the following amendment No. A0636:

Amend Sec. 1, page 2, lines 23 through 28, by striking out all of said lines

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

The **SPEAKER**. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Pievsky.

Mr. **PIEVSKY**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is a technical amendment. It strikes out a Federal appropriation included in the bill that is actually a subgrant handled through the executive authorization process.

I urge an affirmative vote, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

- |            |                 |           |               |
|------------|-----------------|-----------|---------------|
| Acosta     | Dietz           | Laughlin  | Robbins       |
| Afflerbach | Dininni         | Lescovitz | Roebuck       |
| Angstadt   | Distler         | Letterman | Rudy          |
| Argall     | Dombrowski      | Levdansky | Ryan          |
| Arty       | Donatucci       | Linton    | Rybak         |
| Baldwin    | Dorr            | Livengood | Saloom        |
| Barber     | Duffy           | Lloyd     | Saurman       |
| Barley     | Fargo           | Lucyk     | Scheetz       |
| Battisto   | Fattah          | McCall    | Schuler       |
| Belardi    | Fee             | McClatchy | Semmel        |
| Belfanti   | Fischer         | McHale    | Serafini      |
| Birmelin   | Flick           | McVerry   | Seventy       |
| Black      | Foster, Jr., A. | Mackowski | Showers       |
| Blaum      | Fox             | Manderino | Sirianni      |
| Book       | Freeman         | Manmiller | Smith, B.     |
| Bortner    | Freind          | Markosek  | Smith, L. E.  |
| Bowley     | Fryer           | Mayernik  | Snyder, D. W. |
| Bowser     | Gallagher       | Merry     | Snyder, G. M. |

Boyes	Gallen	Michlovic	Staback
Brandt	Gamble	Micozzie	Stairs
Broujos	Gannon	Miller	Steighner
Bunt	Geist	Moehlmann	Stewart
Burd	George	Morris	Stuban
Burns	Gladeck	Mowery	Sweet
Bush	Godshall	Mrkonic	Swift
Caltagirone	Greenwood	Murphy	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Gruitza	Nahill	Taylor, F. E.
Carlson	Gruppo	Noye	Taylor, J.
Carn	Hagarty	O'Brien	Telek
Cawley	Haluska	O'Donnell	Trello
Cessar	Harper	Olasz	Truman
Chadwick	Hasay	Oliver	Van Horne
Civera	Hayes	Perzel	Veon
Clark	Herman	Petrarca	Vroon
Clymer	Hershey	Petrone	Wambach
Cohen	Honaman	Phillips	Wass
Colafella	Howlett	Piccola	Weston
Cole	Itkin	Pievsky	Wiggins
Cornell	Jackson	Pistella	Wilson
Coslett	Jarolin	Pitts	Wogan
Cowell	Johnson	Pott	Wozniak
Coy	Josephs	Pressmann	Wright, D. R.
Deluca	Kasunic	Preston	Wright, J. L.
DeVerter	Kennedy	Punt	Wright, R. C.
DeWeese	Kenney	Raymond	Yandrisevits
Daley	Kosinski	Reber	
Davies	Kukovich	Reinard	Irvis,
Dawida	Langtry	Richardson	Speaker
Deal	Lashinger	Rieger	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—4

Cordisco	Evans	Hutchinson	Maiale
----------	-------	------------	--------

EXCUSED—4

Cimini	Durham	Stevens	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?  
Bill as amended was agreed to.

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

YEAS—192

Acosta	Dietz	Laughlin	Robbins
Afflerbach	Dininni	Lescovitz	Roebuck
Angstadt	Distler	Letterman	Rudy
Argall	Dombrowski	Levdansky	Ryan
Arty	Donatucci	Linton	Rybak
Baldwin	Dorr	Livengood	Saloom
Barber	Duffy	Lloyd	Saurman
Barley	Fargo	Lucyk	Scheetz
Battisto	Fattah	McCall	Schuler
Belardi	Fee	McClatchy	Semmel
Belfanti	Fischer	McHale	Serafini
Birmelin	Flick	McVerry	Seventy
Black	Foster, Jr., A.	Mackowski	Showers
Blaum	Fox	Manderino	Sirianni
Book	Freeman	Manmiller	Smith, B.
Bortner	Freind	Markosek	Smith, L. E.
Bowley	Fryer	Mayernik	Snyder, D. W.
Bowser	Gallagher	Merry	Snyder, G. M.
Boyes	Gallen	Michlovic	Staback

Brandt	Gamble	Micozzie	Stairs
Broujos	Gannon	Miller	Steighner
Bunt	Geist	Moehlmann	Stewart
Burd	George	Morris	Stuban
Burns	Gladeck	Mowery	Sweet
Bush	Godshall	Murphy	Swift
Caltagirone	Greenwood	Nahill	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Gruitza	Noye	Taylor, F. E.
Carlson	Gruppo	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Carn	Hagarty	O'Donnell	Telek
Cawley	Haluska	Olasz	Trello
Cessar	Harper	Oliver	Truman
Chadwick	Hasay	Perzel	Van Horne
Civera	Hayes	Petrarca	Veon
Clark	Herman	Petrone	Vroon
Clymer	Hershey	Phillips	Wambach
Cohen	Honaman	Piccola	Wass
Colafella	Howlett	Pievsky	Weston
Cole	Itkin	Pistella	Wiggins
Cornell	Jackson	Pitts	Wilson
Coslett	Jarolin	Pott	Wogan
Cowell	Johnson	Pressmann	Wozniak
Coy	Josephs	Preston	Wright, D. R.
Deluca	Kasunic	Punt	Wright, J. L.
DeVerter	Kennedy	Raymond	Wright, R. C.
DeWeese	Kenney	Reber	Yandrisevits
Daley	Kosinski	Reinard	
Davies	Kukovich	Richardson	Irvis,
Dawida	Langtry	Rieger	Speaker
Deal	Lashinger		

NAYS—1

Mrkonic

NOT VOTING—4

Cordisco	Evans	Hutchinson	Maiale
----------	-------	------------	--------

EXCUSED—4

Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue
--------	--------	---------	-------

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the bill passes finally.

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

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2040 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,  
Shall the bill pass finally?

BILL PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. On page 2, I believe it was, we passed over temporarily HB 2040. Without objection, that bill will go over. The Chair hears no objection.

\* \* \*

The SPEAKER. On page 9 we passed over temporarily HB 1876. Without objection, that bill will be passed over.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the bill up today.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Murphy, offers objection to passing over HB 1876.

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1876, PN 2475**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 6, 1956 (1955 P. L. 1414, No. 465), known as the "Second Class County Port Authority Act," further providing for the board of the authority; and providing for a transit council, audits, service standards and the operation budget.

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

### **MOTION TO PLACE BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION POSTPONED CALENDAR**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MANDERINO. I move that HB 1876 be placed on the third consideration postponed calendar.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Pott. Why do you rise?

Mr. POTT. Is the motion debatable, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The motion is debatable; yes.

Mr. Manderino wishes to enter the debate.

The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, HB 1876 was marked by the majority leader this morning to be over. The majority leader was aware that there were amendments from the Allegheny County delegation to attempt to amend the bill to settle what is basically, in my opinion, a labor dispute between labor and management at the port authority entity in Allegheny County. There is very little direction that I think members will be able to get from the manner in which the votes are split within Allegheny County itself on the position.

I indicated to the Allegheny County Representatives in my caucus that if there were a clear consensus from that delegation on what should be done in that matter, I would be happy to run the bill today. I see no clear consensus. I think that that delegation is as fractured as it has always been on the subject, and I would ask that this bill be passed over at this time, because I think nothing is going to be gained by taking the time of the House to debate the issues of that subject matter.

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

Mr. POTT. I would ask that the House of Representatives permit those of us from Allegheny County to bring this dispute to the floor. It is obvious that it has not been able to be settled behind closed doors. Maybe airing some of the debate that has gone on will help settle this labor dispute. It is obvious also that State funds are involved. I would like to ask every member on this side of the aisle to support those Republicans from Allegheny County - Representative Langtry, Representative Book, Representative McVerry, and I - who would like to see this bill brought up today for consideration by this House.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we vote this bill today. Many of you are unaware of the amount of time and effort that has gone into this issue. Understand, this issue was started a year and a half ago for all of us and over the last few weeks has culminated in almost 15-hour daily discussions between union and management in attempting to reach a solution to what is a problem that threatens the very existence of our port authority. While people want to delay this, I think we all understand the timing of a difficult vote. If we delay it 2 more weeks and further weeks, we get into an election, and then afterwards we get into the budget, and then we are into another election. So it becomes very difficult to face this issue this year if we do not begin to deal with the issue.

Many of us spoke publicly in Allegheny County that the issue would be addressed this week. There are many quotes about that in the paper from many legislators. I understand that you want to go home and it is quarter after 6 on a Wednesday evening, but this is an important issue for our transit authority because we face the possibility of 300,000 people facing no transportation in the future if we do not begin to address the basic inequities that are costing our authority money to the point where they cannot continue to operate. So I ask that you give us the opportunity to bring this issue before you, that you show us that patience and let us debate it. Thank you.

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

Mr. COWELL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Manderino is correct when he suggests that there is a significant difference of opinion among members of the Allegheny County delegation about how to address this problem. There certainly is not a consensus among management and labor. We have tried to bring them together for a long period of time. We have also tried to reach a consensus among members of our delegation about how to best address this problem, and if we were to count heads, we would probably be split pretty closely right down the middle.

Nonetheless, I would urge that we take up this bill today. I think that there is a consensus among members of the delegation that we ought to address the bill. I think that you will find that there will be two amendments offered today from members of the Allegheny County delegation - one by Representative Murphy and one that I intend to offer if his should fail. Representative Murphy and I have been of a different mind in terms of the best approach to solve this problem. I think we in that sense represent the difference of opinion among the delegation. But I think we are of one mind, as we are with most members of the delegation, that this is a problem that is serious; it is a problem that demands attention; one that is not going to go away, and one that can best be addressed by taking up this bill today. I would urge that we defeat the motion to postpone consideration of this bill.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to oppose the motion to pass over HB 1876. If anyone wonders, my interest in the matter is one from the hinterlands. I happen to serve on the subcommittee of the Local Government Committee from which the two bills, HB 1876 and HB 1505, emerged.

From the start I worked with the gentlemen, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Gamble, and others with HB 1505 with the idea that HB 1505 and HB 1876 would run as companion bills. In the last couple of days the decision has been made to offer amendments to my bill, HB 1876. I fully support amendments that will be offered by Mr. Murphy, and I think the time has come to address the problem.

For those who wish to delay I would say this: Nothing, no delay, no other amendments will be acceptable to the union. I would say this: Those who are attempting to achieve unanimity, that is as futile as trying to square the circle. What we have to be content with today is consensus. We can get consensus. I doubt we would ever get unanimity and there is no sense in postponing the issue to chase that will-o'-the-wisp. I applaud the efforts being made today, and I would urge that we on the Republican side reject the motion to postpone the bill.

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

Mr. BOOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the postponement of this bill, and I urge the members of the House to bring this bill up for a vote. It is really critical, I think, in Allegheny County, and I think this is the time we have to bring it up. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Dawida, on the motion.

Mr. DAWIDA. Mr. Speaker, I urge the members to reject the motion to postpone. It has been a difficult issue, particularly for those of us on this side of the aisle, but we have to face it. We hope to very concisely and quickly explain our situation, plead our case, and ask for your support on the following amendment. So please do not postpone, and we will deal with it in the following amendment.

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

Mr. LETTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think that all of us ought to take a very good look at this and understand one thing, that the union and the workers are talking. I do not think we should have anything to say about it while they are doing that, and as long as they continue to try to negotiate, I do not think we should do anything in this House of Representatives about it. I think that we should not vote this bill today or any amendments that go with it. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. McVERRY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I urge a negative vote on the motion to postpone, and I would like to make it very clear from this member's perspective that we are not dabbling in a labor dispute. The fact of

the matter is that under the Second Class Port Authority Act the union invoked mandatory arbitration as of December of 1985, and the arbitration proceeding is proceeding in its normal course. What we are dealing with is having observed one study of the Local Government Committee of the House of Representatives and two other independent studies - one by the Auditor General and one by the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce Loaned Executive Committee - all of which concluded that the Second Class County Port Authority Act must be amended so that labor and management deal on more of a par with one another in the collective-bargaining process. The amendments that we wish to discuss this evening—

The SPEAKER. Mr. McVerry, you are now straying way beyond the argument on the motion.

Mr. McVERRY. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

What I would like to point out is that whatever we deal with in HB 1876 this evening in no way affects the labor negotiations, which are at an impasse. It in no way affects the arbitration proceeding that the port authority and the Amalgamated Transit workers are going through. It will in no way affect the contract that comes out of that arbitration proceeding. So we are not really dabbling in a labor dispute. The negotiations that are being discussed are, can the port authority and the union decide on what is fair legislation under which they should be governed? I do not think we should listen to them anymore as to what they think is fair, because neither of them think what is fair is fair. We are the ones who are to decide what is fair legislation, and we want to debate that issue tonight.

I urge a negative vote on the motion.

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

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, urge a negative vote. We have a very pressing problem in Allegheny County. I come to you very seldom, and I know that we have had philosophical differences over my 9 years here, but we have a real problem in Allegheny County and I ask your help today. Our transit system is going broke; it is out of control. Four investigations were held this year, and they all point out what a serious problem we have with the port authority, and we will make these points later. But I ask your indulgence and I ask that you vote "no."

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Allegheny, Mrs. Langtry, on the motion.

Mrs. LANGTRY. Mr. Speaker, Representative McVerry stole my thunder, if you will, and said the words, and I urge a "no" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Moved by the majority leader that HB 1876 be placed on the third consideration postponed calendar.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—97

Acosta	Distler	Lloyd	Rudy
Angstadt	Dombrowski	Lucyk	Ryan
Argall	Donatucci	McCall	Rybak
Arty	Evans	McHale	Saloom

Baldwin	Fattah	Mackowski	Seventy
Barber	Fee	Maiale	Snyder, G. M.
Belardi	Freeman	Manderino	Staback
Belfanti	Gallagher	Mayernik	Steighner
Birmelin	Gannon	Micozzie	Stewart
Blaum	Geist	Miller	Stuban
Boyes	George	Morris	Taylor, F. E.
Broujos	Gruitza	Mowery	Taylor, J.
Burns	Haluska	Noye	Telek
Caltagirone	Harper	O'Donnell	Trello
Cappabianca	Herman	Olasz	Veon
Cawley	Howlett	Oliver	Wambach
Cessar	Jarolin	Petrarca	Wass
Clark	Josephs	Petrone	Weston
Cohen	Kasunic	Pievsky	Wiggins
Colafella	Kosinski	Pistella	Wozniak
Coy	Kukovich	Pressmann	Wright, D. R.
Deluca	Laughlin	Preston	
DeWeese	Lescovitz	Richardson	Irvis,
Daley	Letterman	Rieger	Speaker
Deal	Livengood	Roebuck	

NAYS—97

Afflerbach	Dininni	Kennedy	Reber
Barley	Dorr	Kenney	Reinard
Battisto	Duffy	Langtry	Robbins
Black	Fargo	Lashingner	Saurman
Book	Fischer	Levdansky	Scheetz
Bortner	Flick	Linton	Schuler
Bowley	Foster, Jr., A.	McClatchy	Semmel
Bowser	Fox	McVerry	Serafini
Brandt	Freind	Manmiller	Showers
Bunt	Fryer	Markosek	Sirianni
Burd	Gallen	Merry	Smith, B.
Bush	Gamble	Michlovic	Smith, L. E.
Carlson	Gladeck	Moehlmann	Snyder, D. W.
Carn	Godshall	Mrkonic	Stairs
Chadwick	Greenwood	Murphy	Swift
Civera	Gruppo	Nahill	Taylor, E. Z.
Clymer	Hagarty	O'Brien	Truman
Cole	Hasay	Perzel	Van Horne
Cornell	Hayes	Phillips	Vroon
Coslett	Hershey	Piccola	Wilson
Cowell	Honaman	Pitts	Wogan
DeVerter	Itkin	Pott	Wright, J. L.
Davies	Jackson	Punt	Wright, R. C.
Dawida	Johnson	Raymond	Yandrisevits
Dietz			

NOT VOTING—3

Cordisco Hutchinson Sweet

EXCUSED—4

Cimini Durham Stevens Tigie

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

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

**BILL TABLED**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill be placed upon the table.

The SPEAKER. Moved by the majority leader that the bill be placed upon the table. Those in favor of tabling the bill will vote "aye"; those opposed, "no."

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—109

Acosta	Daley	Lescovitz	Roebuck
Afflerbach	Davies	Letterman	Rudy
Angstadt	Deal	Livengood	Ryan
Argall	Dietz	Lloyd	Rybak
Arty	Distler	Lucyk	Saloom
Baldwin	Dombrowski	McCall	Seventy
Barber	Donatucci	McHale	Sirianni
Battisto	Dorr	Mackowski	Snyder, G. M.
Belardi	Evans	Maiale	Staback
Belfanti	Fattah	Manderino	Steighner
Birmelin	Fee	Micozzie	Stewart
Blaum	Freeman	Miller	Stuban
Boyes	Gallagher	Morris	Swift
Broujos	Gannon	Mowery	Taylor, J.
Burns	George	Noye	Telek
Caltagirone	Gruitza	O'Donnell	Trello
Cappabianca	Haluska	Olasz	Truman
Carn	Harper	Oliver	Veon
Cawley	Hasay	Petrarca	Wambach
Cessar	Herman	Petrone	Wass
Clark	Howlett	Pievsky	Weston
Cohen	Jarolin	Pistella	Wiggins
Colafella	Josephs	Pressmann	Wozniak
Cole	Kasunic	Preston	Wright, D. R.
Coslett	Kenney	Punt	
Coy	Kosinski	Reber	Irvis,
Deluca	Kukovich	Richardson	Speaker
DeWeese	Laughlin	Rieger	

NAYS—83

Barley	Flick	Lashingner	Reinard
Black	Foster, Jr., A.	Levdansky	Robbins
Book	Fox	Linton	Saurman
Bortner	Freind	McClatchy	Scheetz
Bowley	Fryer	McVerry	Schuler
Bowser	Gallen	Manmiller	Semmel
Brandt	Gamble	Markosek	Serafini
Bunt	Geist	Mayernik	Showers
Burd	Gladeck	Merry	Smith, B.
Bush	Godshall	Michlovic	Smith, L. E.
Carlson	Greenwood	Moehlmann	Snyder, D. W.
Chadwick	Gruppo	Mrkonic	Stairs
Civera	Hagarty	Murphy	Taylor, E. Z.
Clymer	Hayes	Nahill	Van Horne
Cornell	Hershey	O'Brien	Vroon
Cowell	Honaman	Perzel	Wilson
DeVerter	Itkin	Phillips	Wogan
Dawida	Jackson	Piccola	Wright, J. L.
Duffy	Johnson	Pitts	Wright, R. C.
Fargo	Kennedy	Pott	Yandrisevits
Fischer	Langtry	Raymond	

NOT VOTING—5

Cordisco Hutchinson Sweet Taylor, F. E.  
Dininni

EXCUSED—4

Cimini Durham Stevens Tigie

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

**REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Kennedy, who asks for unanimous consent to make a statement.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent has not been granted to Mr. Kennedy.

**MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. KENNEDY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I guess the first piece of our strategy was denied. Thank you, Mr. Cohen.

I would like to ask to suspend the rules, Mr. Speaker, if you will.

The SPEAKER. Moved by the gentleman, Mr. Kennedy, that the rules be temporarily suspended so that the House may take up immediately a resolution.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. On the motion, the Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, the leaders have been generous with the members in granting a suspension of the rules and bypassing the Rules Committee when there is a time element involved in the contents of the resolution. We have examined this resolution; there is no time element. Mr. Kennedy had a similar resolution 3 or 4 weeks ago and he chose on his own not to introduce that resolution. He comes before us now, several weeks later, and again wants to suspend the rules. I suggest that we use the committee process, we do not allow suspension of the rules, and we send the resolution to the Rules Committee.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Mr. Kennedy, the Chair regrets to inform you, only the leaders on the floor of the House may debate the suspension of the rules. It is not debatable otherwise.

Those in favor of suspension of the rules will vote "aye"; those opposed, "no."

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

**YEAS—59**

Argall	Fargo	Lashinger	Saloom
Barley	Fischer	Lloyd	Saurman
Birmelin	Foster, Jr., A.	McVerry	Scheetz
Book	Freeman	Manmiller	Schuler
Bowser	Fryer	Mayernik	Serafini
Brandt	Gladeck	Miller	Sirianni
Broujos	Greenwood	Moehlmann	Smith, B.
Burd	Harper	Mowery	Smith, L. E.
Bush	Herman	O'Brien	Snyder, G. M.
Cornell	Honaman	Perzel	Stairs
Deluca	Jackson	Phillips	Wambach
Dawida	Kennedy	Piccola	Wass
Deal	Kenney	Pistella	Wilson
Distler	Kukovich	Pott	Wright, J. L.
Dorr	Langtry	Reber	

**NAYS—128**

Acosta	Dietz	Levdansky	Robbins
Afflerbach	Dombrowski	Linton	Roebuck
Angstadt	Donatucci	Livengood	Rudy
Arty	Duffy	Lucyk	Ryan
Baldwin	Fattah	McCall	Rybak
Battisto	Fee	McClatchy	Semmel
Belardi	Flick	McHale	Seventy
Black	Fox	Maiale	Showers
Blaum	Freind	Manderino	Snyder, D. W.
Bortner	Gallagher	Markosek	Staback
Bowley	Gallen	Merry	Steighner
Boyes	Gamble	Michlovic	Stewart
Bunt	Gannon	Micozzie	Stuban
Burns	Geist	Morris	Swift
Caltagirone	George	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Carlson	Godshall	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Carn	Gruitza	Nahill	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Gruppo	Noye	Telek
Cessar	Hagarty	O'Donnell	Trello
Chadwick	Haluska	Olasz	Truman
Civera	Hasay	Oliver	Van Horne
Clark	Hayes	Petrarca	Veon
Clymer	Hershey	Petrone	Vroon
Cohen	Howlett	Pievsky	Weston
Colafella	Irkin	Pitts	Wogan
Cole	Jarolin	Pressmann	Wozniak
Coslett	Johnson	Preston	Wright, D. R.
Cowell	Josephs	Punt	Wright, R. C.
Coy	Kasunic	Raymond	Yandrisevits
DeVerter	Kosinski	Reinard	
DeWeese	Laughlin	Richardson	Irvis,
Daley	Lescovitz	Rieger	Speaker
Davies	Letterman		

**NOT VOTING—10**

Barber	Cordisco	Hutchinson	Sweet
Belfanti	Dininni	Mackowski	Wiggins
Cappabianca	Evans		

**EXCUSED—4**

Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue
--------	--------	---------	-------

Less than a majority of the members elected to the House having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the motion was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, may I withdraw that motion?

The SPEAKER. I am sorry, Mr. Kennedy. It has already been acted upon by the House.

**MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES**

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, may I make a motion to suspend the rules on another resolution that I have prepared?

The SPEAKER. Yes; that would be in order.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, may I have 2 or 3 minutes to distribute that resolution?

The SPEAKER. That will not be necessary, Mr. Kennedy, because the motion simply states that you wish to suspend the rules for the purpose of introducing a resolution. You do not have to identify it.

It has been moved by the gentleman, Mr. Kennedy, that the rules be suspended so that a different resolution—a different

resolution—may be immediately taken up by the House of Representatives.

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

The SPEAKER. On the motion, the Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, very briefly, this leader has absolutely no idea what Mr. Kennedy wants to suspend the rules to consider. We did know what the last resolution was, and I spoke to that. Simply because of the lack of knowledge, Mr. Speaker, I suggest again that we use the committee process.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of suspension of the rules will vote "aye"; those opposed, "no."

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—55

Argall	Fischer	McVerry	Saurman
Barley	Foster, Jr., A.	Manmiller	Scheetz
Birmelin	Freeman	Miller	Serafini
Book	Fryer	Moehlmann	Sirianni
Bowser	Greenwood	Mowery	Smith, B.
Brandt	Herman	Murphy	Smith, L. E.
Broujos	Honaman	Nahill	Snyder, G. M.
Burd	Jackson	O'Brien	Stairs
Cornell	Kennedy	Perzel	Wambach
Deluca	Kenney	Phillips	Wass
Dawida	Langtry	Piccola	Wilson
Dininni	Lashingier	Pistella	Wogan
Distler	Levdansky	Pott	Wright, J. L.
Fargo	Lloyd	Saloom	

NAYS—138

Acosta	Daley	Kasunic	Richardson
Afflerbach	Davies	Kosinski	Rieger
Angstadt	Deal	Kukovich	Robbins
Arty	Dietz	Laughlin	Roebuck
Baldwin	Dombrowski	Lescovitz	Rudy
Barber	Donatucci	Letterman	Ryan
Battisto	Dorr	Linton	Rybak
Belardi	Duffy	Livengood	Schuler
Belfanti	Evans	Lucyk	Semmel
Black	Fattah	McCall	Seventy
Blaum	Fee	McClatchy	Showers
Bortner	Flick	McHale	Snyder, D. W.
Bowley	Fox	Maiale	Staback
Boyes	Freind	Manderino	Steighner
Bunt	Gallagher	Markosek	Stewart
Burns	Gallen	Mayernik	Stuban
Bush	Gamble	Merry	Swift
Caltagirone	Gannon	Michlovic	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Geist	Micozzie	Taylor, F. E.
Carlson	George	Morris	Taylor, J.
Carn	Gladeck	Mrkonic	Telek
Cawley	Godshall	Noye	Trello
Cessar	Gruitza	O'Donnell	Truman
Chadwick	Gruppo	Olasz	Van Horne
Civera	Hagarty	Oliver	Veon
Clark	Haluska	Petrarca	Vroon
Clymer	Harper	Petrone	Weston
Cohen	Hasay	Pievsyky	Wiggins
Colafella	Hayes	Pitts	Wozniak
Cole	Hershey	Pressmann	Wright, D. R.
Coslett	Howlett	Preston	Wright, R. C.
Cowell	Itkin	Punt	Yandrisevits
Coy	Jarolin	Raymond	

DeVerter	Johnson	Reber	Irvis,
DeWeese	Josephs	Reinard	Speaker

NOT VOTING—4

Cordisco	Hutchinson	Mackowski	Sweet
----------	------------	-----------	-------

EXCUSED—4

Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue
--------	--------	---------	-------

Less than a majority of the members elected to the House having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the motion was not agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. KENNEDY. May I ask for unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. That has already been rejected. I am sorry, Mr. Kennedy. I am afraid you are out. I am sorry, Mr. Kennedy, but your options have now gone up.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Yes?

Mr. KENNEDY. May I request that some of the other members on the floor ask for unanimous consent to speak on this issue?

The SPEAKER. If there is any other one who wishes to rise for unanimous consent, the Chair will recognize him or her.

Mr. KENNEDY. Are there any among you who would like to stand and speak on the issue? I feel that there are a lot of philosophical political friends in this House, and I know that you know what I am talking about, and I know that you know the majority leader knew what he was talking—

The SPEAKER. Mr. Kennedy, do not lose your temper. No one has risen; therefore, you may not speak and no one asked for unanimous consent. The Chair regrets your defeat, but you may not press it any further, Mr. Kennedy. Take the Chair's word for it, Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. KENNEDY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MOTION TO REMOVE BILL FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. McVerry. Why are you rising?

Mr. McVERRY. To ask if it is appropriate to make a motion at this time to remove HB 1876 from the table.

The SPEAKER. Wait just a moment. You may or may not be able to do that depending upon whether there was any intervening business. That is right; there was a motion to suspend the rules. There has been intervening business. Your motion is well taken.

Moved by the gentleman, Mr. McVerry, that HB 1876 be lifted from the table.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.



Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, are you interpreting intervening business as procedural business?

The SPEAKER. We believe that that is true. Let us check it with Mason's and make sure. We think that is true. Hold on. The House will stand at ease.

Just be patient; we want to be very careful with this because this comes up every few months and we do not want to rule incorrectly on it.

For the information of the members, under Mason's Legislative Manual the only thing that the Chair can find is that a motion to take from the table may not be reconsidered as it can be renewed after intervening business, and it does not define "intervening business." So that would apparently, to the Chair's knowledge, be any business on the part of the House. So any vote would be intervening business.

Therefore, the gentleman, Mr. McVerry's motion is well taken, and the Chair again places before the House the motion by Mr. McVerry to lift HB 1876 from the table.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, for all of the reasons that were expressed in tabling the bill, I would ask that the bill remain on the table at this time and that the members vote in the negative on removal from the table.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of lifting from the table will vote "aye"; those in favor of letting the bill remain on the table will vote "no."

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—88

Barley	Fargo	Johnson	Punt
Battisto	Fischer	Kennedy	Raymond
Birmelin	Flick	Kenney	Reinard
Black	Foster, Jr., A.	Langtry	Robbins
Book	Fox	Lashinger	Saurman
Bortner	Freind	Levdansky	Scheetz
Bowley	Fryer	McVerry	Schuler
Bowser	Gallen	Mackowski	Semmel
Brandt	Gamble	Markosek	Serafini
Bunt	Geist	Merry	Sirianni
Burd	Gladeck	Michlovic	Smith, B.
Chadwick	Godshall	Moehlmann	Smith, L. E.
Civera	Greenwood	Mowery	Snyder, D. W.
Clymer	Gruppo	Mrkonic	Stairs
Cole	Hagarty	Murphy	Telek
Cornell	Hasay	Noye	Van Horne
Cowell	Hayes	O'Brien	Vroon
DeVerter	Herman	Perzel	Wilson
Dawida	Hershey	Phillips	Wogan
Distler	Honaman	Piccola	Wright, J. L.
Dorr	Itkin	Pitts	Wright, R. C.
Duffy	Jackson	Pott	Yandrisevits

NAYS—103

Acosta	DeWeese	Livengood	Ryan
Afflerbach	Daley	Lloyd	Rybak
Angstadt	Davies	Lucyk	Saloom
Argall	Deal	McCall	Seventy
Arty	Dietz	McClatchy	Showers
Baldwin	Dininni	McHale	Snyder, G. M.
Barber	Dombrowski	Maiale	Staback

Belardi	Donatucci	Manderino	Steighner
Belfanti	Evans	Manmiller	Stewart
Blaum	Fattah	Mayernik	Suban
Boyes	Fee	Micozzie	Swift
Broujos	Freeman	Miller	Taylor, E. Z.
Burns	Gallagher	Morris	Taylor, F. E.
Bush	Gannon	O'Donnell	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	George	Olasz	Trello
Cappabianca	Gruitza	Oliver	Truman
Carlson	Harper	Petrarca	Veon
Carn	Howlett	Petrone	Wambach
Cawley	Jarolin	Pievsky	Wass
Cessar	Josephs	Pistella	Weston
Clark	Kasunic	Pressmann	Wiggins
Cohen	Kosinski	Reber	Wozniak
Colafella	Kukovich	Richardson	Wright, D. R.
Cordisco	Laughlin	Rieger	
Coslett	Lescovitz	Roebuck	Irvis,
Coy	Letterman	Rudy	Speaker
Deluca			

NOT VOTING—6

Haluska	Linton	Preston	Sweet
Hutchinson	Nahill		

EXCUSED—4

Cimini	Durham	Stevens	Tigue
--------	--------	---------	-------

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

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER. The Chair wants to have read into the record the appointment of certain members to committees.

The following report was read:

Supplemental Report of  
Committee on Committees

In the House of Representatives  
February 19, 1986

Resolved, that Representative Steve Seventy of Allegheny County is elected a member of the Game and Fisheries Committee vice Representative William DeWeese resigned.

Representative Allen Kukovich of Westmoreland County is elected a member of the Judiciary Committee vice Representative Stephen Levin resigned.

Representative James Roebuck of Philadelphia County is elected a member of the Finance Committee vice Representative Stephen Levin resigned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Amos Hutchinson  
Chairman  
Committee on Committees

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolution?  
Resolution was adopted.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair has named, pursuant to the rules of the House, Gerard Kosinski, Subcommittee Chairman on Courts; and Dave Mayernik, Secretary to the Judiciary Committee.

**INSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Northampton, Mr. Rybak. Why do you rise?

Mr. RYBAK. Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the members of the House Insurance Committee that we scheduled a meeting tomorrow in room 418 at 9 o'clock. That time has been changed to 10 o'clock. The meeting will take place but at 10 o'clock—to all members of the House Insurance Committee.

**REMARKS ON VOTES**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Beaver, Mr. Veon. Why do you rise, sir?

Mr. VEON. To correct a vote.

On HB 2042 my switch did not function properly, so I was not recorded. I wish to be recorded in the affirmative. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Cessar. Why do you rise, sir?

Mr. CESSAR. I would like to have a vote recorded, Mr. Speaker.

On HB 2037, PN 2772, I would like to be recorded in the negative.

The SPEAKER. Why does the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Preston, rise?

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, on the motion by Mr. McVerry to remove HB 1876 from the table, I was out of my seat at the time. Had I been in my seat, I would have voted in the negative.

The SPEAKER. Why does the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Truman, rise?

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. Speaker, on HB 1876, the motion to postpone, I accidentally voted in the negative. I wish to be recorded in the affirmative.

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

Why does the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Reinard, rise?

Mr. REINARD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on HB 2037 my vote was not recorded. I would like the record to show that I would have voted in the negative.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Wright. Why do you rise?

Mr. R. C. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on final passage of HB 2043 I was voted in the negative. I would like to correct that vote to be shown in the affirmative.

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

When we adjourn, we will adjourn until 1 p.m. on March 10, 1986, unless sooner recalled by the Speaker. There are no further votes. The members are free to leave.

**HOUSE BILLS  
INTRODUCED AND REFERRED**

**No. 2175** By Representatives DORR and SALOOM

An Act declaring and adopting the song "Pennsylvania Is My Home," by Renie DeMaria, as the State song of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2176** By Representatives KOSINSKI, WOGAN, O'BRIEN, J. TAYLOR and KENNEY

An Act amending the act of August 7, 1963 (P. L. 549, No. 290), referred to as the "Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency Act," further providing for approved institutions of higher learning.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2177** By Representatives PETRARCA, KOSINSKI, PERZEL, STUBAN, OLASZ, SIRIANNI, STABACK, TIGUE, TRELLO, BELARDI, CALTAGIRONE, SAURMAN, MACKOWSKI, DEAL, WOGAN, SEMMEL, FOX, LINTON, McCALL, MARKOSEK, STAIRS and TELEK

An Act requiring specific patient authorization of medical care in order for medical insurance to reimburse for medical care provided.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH AND WELFARE, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2178** By Representatives FREEMAN, DeWEESE, PETRARCA, ACOSTA, TRELLO, JAROLIN, BELARDI, KUKOVICH, OLASZ, RICHARDSON, RYBAK, STEWART, WOZNIAC and McHALE

An Act requiring that certain employers call back laid-off employees before imposing mandatory overtime on fully employed workers.

Referred to Committee on LABOR RELATIONS, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2179** By Representatives OLIVER, TRUMAN, PIEVSKY, JOSEPHS, EVANS, BARBER, CESSAR, DONATUCCI, WOGAN, ACOSTA, RIEGER, DEAL, ROEBUCK and O'BRIEN

An Act amending the act of February 9, 1984 (P. L. 3, No. 2), known as the "Deputy Sheriffs' Education and Training Act," further providing for training requirements.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2180** By Representatives F. E. TAYLOR, L. E. SMITH, LESCOVITZ, GEIST, LINTON, BURD, PRESTON and McVERRY

An Act amending the act of November 30, 1965 (P. L. 847, No. 356), known as the "Banking Code of 1965," providing for the conversion of associations into savings banks.

Referred to Committee on BUSINESS AND COMMERCE, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2181** By Representatives ACOSTA, TRUMAN, STABACK, LINTON, HARPER, KOSINSKI, JOHNSON, DeWEESE, KUKOVICH, MORRIS, NAHILL, O'DONNELL, D. R. WRIGHT, WOGAN, ITKIN, PRESSMANN, YANDRISEVITS, OLASZ, McHALE, CARN, HERSHEY, FISCHER, RICHARDSON, RIEGER, DEAL, BARBER, OLIVER, KENNEY, J. TAYLOR, JOSEPHS, EVANS, ROEBUCK and DONATUCCI

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, increasing the penalty for scattering rubbish.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2182** By Representatives LETTERMAN, PETRONE, STABACK and MARKOSEK

An Act requiring retail gasoline dealers to post prices and gasoline additive information; requiring that grades of gasoline sold be correctly represented as to octane ratings; and imposing penalties.

Referred to Committee on BUSINESS AND COMMERCE, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2183** By Representatives E. Z. TAYLOR, COWELL, FREIND, NAHILL, B. SMITH, STUBAN, STABACK, RAYMOND, ANGSTADT, FATTAH, MORRIS, GEIST, HERMAN, TRELLO, CIVERA, SAURMAN, HARPER, DeLUCA, FISCHER, BURD, LINTON, DISTLER, CARLSON, TELEK, J. TAYLOR, ARTY, D. R. WRIGHT, PETRONE, MERRY, D. W. SNYDER, COLAFELLA, VEON, FOX, HALUSKA, MICOZZIE, DEAL and WASS

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P. L. 30, No. 14), known as the "Public School Code of 1949," providing for individual educational and career counseling in grades eight and ten; and making an appropriation.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2184** By Representatives REBER, HAGARTY, TIGUE, VROON, KOSINSKI, CAWLEY, NOYE, HAYES, POTT, SAURMAN, MAIALE, MACKOWSKI, SERAFINI, AFFLERBACH, MILLER, SIRIANNI, HERMAN, NAHILL, SHOWERS, MORRIS, PETRONE, BUNT,

GODSHALL, KUKOVICH, PHILLIPS, G. M. SNYDER, WOGAN, ROBBINS, ITKIN, LASHINGER, GLADECK, PITTS, MERRY, D. W. SNYDER, DAWIDA, E. Z. TAYLOR, FOX and DEAL

An Act amending Title 1 (General Provisions) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for rules of construction.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2185** By Representatives HOWLETT, MAIALE, ROBBINS, KOSINSKI, CIVERA, SHOWERS, PISTELLA, BELFANTI, KASUNIC, JOHNSON, TIGUE, FISCHER, GLADECK, CARLSON, WESTON, COHEN, WOZNIAK, KENNEY, DONATUCCI, DORR, E. Z. TAYLOR, SIRIANNI, VEON, J. TAYLOR, FLICK, DEAL and FOX

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for manager, coach, umpire or referee and nonprofit association good Samaritan civil immunity in the conduct of certain sports programs.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH AND WELFARE, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2186** By Representatives WOZNIAK, GODSHALL, LETTERMAN, VROON, DEAL, POTT, HERSHEY, TRUMAN, WOGAN, GEIST, HOWLETT, FLICK, RICHARDSON, DeLUCA, STEWART, VAN HORNE, DUFFY, SEVENTY, CLARK, MOEHLMANN, MACKOWSKI and DeWEESE

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for a maximum speed limit of 65 miles per hour on the Pennsylvania Turnpike.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2187** By Representative VAN HORNE

An Act amending the act of June 23, 1931 (P. L. 932, No. 317), known as "The Third Class City Code," providing for civil service for police.

Referred to Committee on URBAN AFFAIRS, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2188** By Representatives SAURMAN, HAGARTY, FOX, LASHINGER, NAHILL, GLADECK, McCLATCHY, CORNELL and BUNT

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, repealing provisions relating to suspension for refusal to submit to chemical testing.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2189** By Representatives GODSHALL, TRELLO, KUKOVICH, NOYE, G. M. SNYDER, YANDRISEVITS, MORRIS, BROUJOS, SAURMAN, MOEHLMANN, STABACK, SHOWERS, HERMAN, CARLSON, GLADECK, AFFLERBACH, SEMMEL, BALDWIN, HALUSKA and HERSHEY

An Act amending the act of August 9, 1955 (P. L. 323, No. 130), known as "The County Code," restricting certain persons from bidding on contracts.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2190** By Representatives GODSHALL, TRELLO, KUKOVICH, NOYE, G. M. SNYDER, YANDRISEVITS, MORRIS, BROUJOS, SAURMAN, MOEHLMANN, STABACK, SHOWERS, HERMAN, CARLSON, GLADECK, AFFLERBACH, SEMMEL, BALDWIN, HALUSKA and HERSHEY

An Act amending the act of July 28, 1953 (P. L. 723, No. 230), known as the "Second Class County Code," restricting certain persons from bidding on contracts.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2191** By Representatives GODSHALL, TRELLO, KUKOVICH, NOYE, G. M. SNYDER, YANDRISEVITS, MORRIS, BROUJOS, SAURMAN, MOEHLMANN, STABACK, SHOWERS, HERMAN, CARLSON, GLADECK, AFFLERBACH, SEMMEL, BALDWIN, HALUSKA and HERSHEY

An Act amending the act of March 7, 1901 (P. L. 20, No. 14), referred to as the "Second Class City Law," restricting certain persons from bidding on contracts.

Referred to Committee on URBAN AFFAIRS, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2192** By Representatives GODSHALL, TRELLO, KUKOVICH, NOYE, G. M. SNYDER, YANDRISEVITS, MORRIS, BROUJOS, SAURMAN, MOEHLMANN, STABACK, SHOWERS, HERMAN, CARLSON, GLADECK, AFFLERBACH, SEMMEL, BALDWIN, HALUSKA and HERSHEY

An Act amending the act of June 23, 1931 (P. L. 932, No. 317), known as "The Third Class City Code," restricting certain persons from bidding on contracts.

Referred to Committee on URBAN AFFAIRS, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2193** By Representatives GODSHALL, TRELLO, KUKOVICH, NOYE, G. M. SNYDER, YANDRISEVITS, MORRIS, BROUJOS,

SAURMAN, MOEHLMANN, STABACK, SHOWERS, HERMAN, CARLSON, GLADECK, AFFLERBACH, SEMMEL, BALDWIN, HALUSKA and HERSHEY

An Act amending the act of June 25, 1919 (P. L. 581, No. 274), referred to as the "First Class City Government Law," restricting certain persons from bidding on contracts.

Referred to Committee on URBAN AFFAIRS, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2194** By Representatives GODSHALL, TRELLO, KUKOVICH, NOYE, G. M. SNYDER, YANDRISEVITS, MORRIS, BROUJOS, SAURMAN, MOEHLMANN, STABACK, SHOWERS, HERMAN, CARLSON, GLADECK, AFFLERBACH, SEMMEL, BALDWIN, HALUSKA and HERSHEY

An Act amending the act of May 1, 1933 (P. L. 103, No. 69), known as "The Second Class Township Code," restricting certain persons from bidding on contracts.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2195** By Representatives GODSHALL, TRELLO, KUKOVICH, NOYE, G. M. SNYDER, YANDRISEVITS, MORRIS, BROUJOS, SAURMAN, MOEHLMANN, STABACK, SHOWERS, HERMAN, CARLSON, GLADECK, AFFLERBACH, SEMMEL, BALDWIN, HALUSKA and HERSHEY

An Act amending the act of February 1, 1966 (1965 P. L. 1656, No. 581), known as "The Borough Code," restricting certain persons from bidding on contracts.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2196** By Representatives GODSHALL, TRELLO, KUKOVICH, NOYE, G. M. SNYDER, YANDRISEVITS, MORRIS, BROUJOS, SAURMAN, MOEHLMANN, STABACK, SHOWERS, HERMAN, CARLSON, GLADECK, AFFLERBACH, SEMMEL, BALDWIN, HALUSKA and HERSHEY

An Act amending the act of May 27, 1953 (P. L. 244, No. 34), entitled "An act relating to and regulating the contracts of incorporated towns and providing penalties," restricting certain persons from bidding on contracts.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2197** By Representatives GODSHALL, TRELLO, KUKOVICH, NOYE, G. M. SNYDER, YANDRISEVITS, MORRIS, BROUJOS, SAURMAN, MOEHLMANN, STABACK, SHOWERS, HERMAN, CARLSON, GLADECK, AFFLERBACH, SEMMEL, BALDWIN, HALUSKA and HERSHEY

An Act amending the act of June 24, 1931 (P. L. 1206, No. 331), known as "The First Class Township Code," restricting certain persons from bidding on contracts.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2198** By Representatives FOX, EVANS, NAHILL and TRUMAN

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for the administration of the examination for a driver's license.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2199** By Representative MAYERNIK

An Act authorizing and directing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Governor, to convey to Emsworth Borough and Kilbuck Township, as tenants in common, 7.5 acres of land, more or less, situate in Kilbuck Township, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2200** By Representatives DeWEESE, MOEHLMANN, McVERRY, KOSINSKI, CORDISCO, HAGARTY, PRESSMANN, BORTNER, GRUITZA and KUKOVICH

An Act amending the act of November 22, 1978 (P. L. 1166, No. 274), referred to as the "Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency Law," adding a definition; further providing for the membership, powers and duties of the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency; and reestablishing the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2201** By Representatives PITTS, VROON, E. Z. TAYLOR, MORRIS and HERSHEY

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further defining the term "delinquent act."

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2202** By Representatives PITTS, VROON, E. Z. TAYLOR, MORRIS and HERSHEY

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for the rights and liabilities of minors.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2203** By Representatives VEON, PRESSMANN, DeLUCA, MARKOSEK, FOX, YANDRISEVITS, LESCOVITZ, COLAFELLA, LAUGHLIN, CLARK, LINTON, FATTAH, LEVDANSKY and TRELLO

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for qualified person or persons.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2204** By Representatives LEVDANSKY, GEORGE, MANDERINO, MICHLOVIC, FREEMAN, LASHINGER, MORRIS, RYBAK, FEE, LUCYK, JOSEPHS, KOSINSKI, SERAFINI, ARGALL, TIGUE, KUKOVICH, VEON and J. TAYLOR

An Act amending the act of July 7, 1980 (P. L. 380, No. 97), known as the "Solid Waste Management Act," further providing for powers and duties of the department, the Environmental Quality Board and the Environmental Hearing Board, for the management of hazardous waste, for permits and licenses and for enforcement.

Referred to Committee on CONSERVATION, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2205** By Representatives MICHLOVIC, GEORGE, MANDERINO, FREEMAN, LEVDANSKY, LASHINGER, McCALL, MORRIS, RYBAK, FEE, LUCYK, JOSEPHS, KOSINSKI, SERAFINI, ARGALL, TIGUE, MURPHY, SHOWERS, LINTON, KUKOVICH, D. W. SNYDER and J. TAYLOR

An Act amending the act of October 15, 1980 (P. L. 950, No. 164), known as the "Commonwealth Attorneys Act," providing for a Protector General to enforce the environmental laws of this Commonwealth; providing for his powers and duties; and making an appropriation.

Referred to Committee on CONSERVATION, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2206** By Representatives FREEMAN, GEORGE, MANDERINO, LEVDANSKY, MICHLOVIC, SCHULER, MORRIS, RYBAK, FEE, LUCYK, JOSEPHS, KOSINSKI, SERAFINI, ARGALL, TIGUE, McHALE, KUKOVICH, D. W. SNYDER and J. TAYLOR

An Act amending the act of July 7, 1980 (P. L. 380, No. 97), known as the "Solid Waste Management Act," providing for the cleanup of hazardous waste sites and for compensation therefor; establishing the Hazardous Waste Abandoned Site Cleanup and Compensation Fund; providing for a surcharge on hazardous waste and for claims and awards; and providing penalties.

Referred to Committee on CONSERVATION, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2207** By Representatives PITTS, LETTERMAN, RYAN, MORRIS, JACKSON, GLADECK, SCHEETZ, BIRMELIN, DISTLER, MACKOWSKI, MERRY, NOYE, JOHNSON, FLICK, BLACK, E. Z. TAYLOR, GODSHALL, COSLETT,

CLYMER, SIRIANNI, HERSHEY,  
FREIND, FARGO, VROON and  
A. C. FOSTER, JR.

An Act amending the act of October 5, 1984 (P. L. 734, No. 159), known as the "Worker and Community Right-to-Know Act," suspending the enforcement of the act.

Referred to Committee on LABOR RELATIONS, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2208** By Representatives CLYMER, BATTISTO, HAYES, HERMAN, ARGALL, BIRMELIN, LUCYK, CALTAGIRONE, COLE, WOGAN, GRUPPO, LANGTRY, KENNEY and ANGSTADT

An Act amending the act of November 26, 1975 (P. L. 438, No. 124), known as the "Child Protective Services Law," further providing for the temporary hiring of certain applicants prior to background checks.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH AND WELFARE, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2209** By Representatives CLYMER, BATTISTO, HAYES, HERMAN, ARGALL, BIRMELIN, PHILLIPS, NOYE, LUCYK, COLE, CALTAGIRONE, WOGAN, GRUPPO, LANGTRY, KENNEY and ANGSTADT

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P. L. 30, No. 14), known as the "Public School Code of 1949," further providing for temporary hiring of certain applicants prior to background checks.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2210** By Representatives D. R. WRIGHT, COY, VEON, RICHARDSON, SWEET, BLAUM, TRELLO, WOZNIAK, AFFLERBACH, STABACK, BATTISTO, PETRONE, CORDISCO, KASUNIC, PISTELLA, CALTAGIRONE, HALUSKA, GEIST, FISCHER, FLICK, J. L. WRIGHT, CHADWICK, GRUPPO, MICOZZIE, WOGAN, VROON, ARTY, MILLER, J. TAYLOR, LANGTRY, SAURMAN, A. C. FOSTER, JR., BOOK, KENNEY, FREIND, BUNT, HERMAN, REBER, FOX, JOHNSON and WESTON

An Act amending Title 66 (Public Utilities) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the regulation of telephone companies that provide recorded message calls.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, February 19, 1986.

**No. 2211** By Representative RUDY

An Act amending the act of October 18, 1972 (P. L. 951, No. 232), entitled "An act amending the act of June 22, 1931 (P. L. 594, No. 203), entitled 'An act establishing certain township roads as State highways; authorizing their construction, mainte-

nance, and improvement under certain conditions and restrictions; limiting the obligation of the Commonwealth in the construction of certain structures located on such highways; conferring certain powers upon the Department of Highways and local authorities, persons, associations and corporations for sharing the cost of the maintenance and construction of such highways; and making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of said act,' changing routes in Centre County," further providing for the effective date.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, February 19, 1986.

### HOUSE RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

**No. 242** By Representatives SCHEETZ, MORRIS, CALTAGIRONE, HERSHEY, BRANDT, ANGSTADT, SCHULER, HERMAN, FARGO, DISTLER, CARLSON, BATTISTO, CLYMER, WOGAN, SEMMEL, DeLUCA, BARLEY, J. L. WRIGHT, SIRIANNI, COHEN, JACKSON, ROBBINS, BLACK and PITTS

Supporting United States House of Representatives Bill 839 to require that all containers of imported preserved mushrooms contain conspicuous labeling stating in English the country of origin.

Referred to Committee on RULES, February 19, 1986.

**No. 243** By Representatives ROEBUCK, IRVIS, COWELL, TRUMAN, R. C. WRIGHT, OLIVER, EVANS, BARBER, JOSEPHS, ACOSTA, RIEGER, DEAL, RICHARDSON, HARPER, LINTON, DONATUCCI, CARN, FATTAH, PRESTON, O'DONNELL, WESTON, FOX, WIGGINS, COHEN, PRESSMANN, McHALE, WAMBACH, KENNEY and J. TAYLOR

Directing the Subcommittee on Higher Education to investigate racial segregation and unlawful discrimination within colleges and universities which receive direct institutional appropriations from the General Assembly.

Referred to Committee on RULES, February 19, 1986.

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

**HB 1160, PN 2976** (Amended)

By Rep. DeWEESE

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) for the disposition of dependent children.

JUDICIARY.

### BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 776 be lifted from the table and placed on the active calendar.

On the question,  
Will the House agree to the motion?  
Motion was agreed to.

#### **BILL RECOMMITTED**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.  
Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 776 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

On the question,  
Will the House agree to the motion?  
Motion was agreed to.

#### **BILL SIGNED BY SPEAKER**

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

##### **HB 1401, PN 2929**

An Act amending the act of April 6, 1876 (P. L. 18, No. 17), entitled "An act to provide additional security to holders and assignees of mortgages in this commonwealth," eliminating marginal notations of mortgage assignments in certain cases.

#### **BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER**

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

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

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

Mr. BORTNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until Monday, March 10, 1986, at 1 p.m., e.s.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,  
Will the House agree to the motion?  
Motion was agreed to, and at 6:44 p.m., e.s.t., the House adjourned.