

# COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

## LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 1992

SESSION OF 1992 176TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 32

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

#### THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (JEFFREY W. COY) PRESIDING

#### PRAYER

REV. CLYDE W. ROACH, Chaplain of the House of Representatives, from Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Lord, give unto us the bread of life. We are hungry for Your companionship. We have overeaten of the things of the world and yet are not filled. We yearn for something more.

Save us from believing that we can feed our souls on the riches of the world. Save us from believing that the accumulation of wealth will satisfy the deep hunger of the soul. Save us from the delusion that happiness consists in things.

O God, we hunger and thirst after righteousness. Our souls are restless until they rest in You. Teach us to love You with all our heart and with all our soul and all our mind and to love our neighbors as ourselves, and we shall not hunger again.

In Your dear name we pray. Amen.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by members and visitors.)

#### JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Tuesday, May 12, 1992, will be postponed until it is in print. The Chair hears no objection.

#### JOURNAL APPROVED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. However, the Journal for Tuesday, March 10, 1992, is in print and will be accepted as printed, without objection. The Chair hears no objection.

### SENATE MESSAGE

#### HOUSE BILLS CONCURRED IN BY SENATE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 686, PN 751; HB 788, PN 865; HB 1263, PN 1450; and HB 1484, PN 3192**, with information that the Senate has passed the same without amendment.

#### BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, the gentleman from Greene County, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the following bills be removed from the table and placed on the active calendar:

HB 389;  
HB 2003;  
HB 2405;  
HB 2449;  
HB 2509;  
HB 2595; and  
HB 2652.

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

#### HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

**No. 2717** By Representative ADOLPH

An Act making an appropriation to the Burn Foundation of Greater Delaware Valley.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, May 13, 1992.

**No. 2718** By Representatives GAMBLE, DeLUCA, PETRARCA, MRKONIC, LEH, F. TAYLOR, THOMAS, KING, ARMSTRONG, STABACK, HAYES, JOHNSON, BILLOW, NOYE, REBER, TANGRETTI, KRUSZEWSKI, STEIGHNER, McHUGH, JAROLIN, E. Z. TAYLOR, FAJT, LAUGHLIN, KOSINSKI, TOMLINSON, GERLACH,

COY, HARPER, GEIST, TRELLO,  
PHILLIPS, GIGLIOTTI, DURHAM,  
McCALL and PISTELLA

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P. L. 6, No. 2), known as the "Tax Reform Code of 1971," further providing for classes of income.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, May 13, 1992.

**No. 2719** By Representative PITTS

An Act making appropriations to the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, May 13, 1992.

**No. 2720** By Representatives WAMBACH, PICCOLA,  
MARSICO and TULLI

An Act authorizing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Governor, to sell and convey to Dayton Parts, Inc., a tract of land located on Verbeke Street in the City of Harrisburg, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania; and authorizing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Governor, to convey to the City of Harrisburg a certain tract of land situate in the City of Harrisburg, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, May 13, 1992.

**No. 2721** By Representative SEMMEL

An Act making an appropriation to the Delaware Valley College of Science and Agriculture at Doylestown.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, May 13, 1992.

**No. 2722** By Representatives THOMAS and  
RICHARDSON

An Act providing for the promulgation of guidelines governing requests by municipal law enforcement agencies for assistance from the Pennsylvania State Police and the Pennsylvania National Guard.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, May 13, 1992.

**LEAVES OF ABSENCE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Are there requests for leaves of absence?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Butler County, Mr. Steighner.

Mr. STEIGHNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for leave for today only for the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. GIGLIOTTI; the gentleman from Westmoreland, Mr. PETRARCA; the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. McNALLY; and the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. OLASZ.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, leaves will be granted. The Chair hears no objection.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Hayes.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I want to be sure that my request of yesterday concerning the gentleman from Perry, Mr. Noye, was accepted. Very good. Thank you. Mr. NOYE will be on leave again today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, leave will be granted. The Chair hears no objection. Leave is granted.

**MASTER ROLL CALL**

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

The following roll call was recorded:

**PRESENT—195**

Acosta	Donatucci	LaGrotta	Rudy
Adolph	Evans	Langtry	Ryan
Allen	Fairchild	Laughlin	Saloom
Anderson	Fajt	Lawless	Saurman
Angstadt	Fargo	Lee	Schectz
Argall	Farmer	Leh	Schuler
Armstrong	Fee	Lescovitz	Scrimenti
Arnold	Fleagle	Levdansky	Semmel
Barley	Flick	Linton	Serafini
Battisto	Foster	Lloyd	Smith, B.
Belardi	Freeman	Lucyk	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Freind	McCall	Snyder, D. W.
Billow	Gallen	McGeehan	Snyder, G.
Birmelin	Gamble	McHale	Staback
Bishop	Gannon	McHugh	Stairs
Black	Geist	Maiale	Steelman
Blaum	George	Markosek	Steighner
Bowley	Gerlach	Marsico	Stetler
Boyes	Gladeck	Mayernik	Stish
Broujos	Godshall	Melio	Strittmatter
Brown	Gruitza	Merry	Stuban
Bunt	Gruppo	Michlovic	Sturla
Bush	Hagarty	Micozzie	Surra
Butkovitz	Haluska	Mihalich	Tangretti
Caltagirone	Hanna	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Harley	Mundy	Taylor, F.
Carlson	Harper	Murphy	Taylor, J.
Carn	Hasay	Nahill	Telek
Carone	Hayden	Nailor	Thomas
Cawley	Hayes	Nickol	Tigue
Cessar	Heckler	Nyce	Tomlinson
Chadwick	Herman	O'Brien	Trello
Civera	Hershey	Oliver	Trich
Clark	Hess	Perzel	Tulli
Clymer	Hughes	Pesci	Uliana
Cohen	Itkin	Petrone	Van Horne
Colafrilla	Jadlowiec	Phillips	Vance
Colaizzo	James	Piccola	Veon
Cole	Jarolin	Pistella	Vroon
Cornell	Johnson	Pitts	Wambach
Corrigan	Josephs	Preston	Williams
Cowell	Kaiser	Raymond	Wilson
Coy	Kasunic	Reber	Wogan
DeLuca	Kenney	Reinard	Wozniak
DeWeese	King	Richardson	Wright, D. R.
Daley	Kosinski	Rieger	Wright, M. N.
Davies	Krebs	Ritter	
Dempsey	Kruszewski	Robinson	O'Donnell,
Dent	Kukovich	Roebuck	Speaker
Dermody			

**ADDITIONS—0**

**NOT VOTING—0**

EXCUSED—6

Durham            McNally            Olasz            Petrarca  
Gigliotti            Noye

**RULES SUSPENDED**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, the gentleman from Greene County, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker, I move that rule 30 of the House be suspended so that when the extract from the Journal of the Senate concerning HB 1721 is returned from the Senate, the bill appears immediately on the calendar rather than going to the Committee on Rules.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—195

Acosta	Donatucci	LaGrotta	Rudy
Adolph	Evans	Langtry	Ryan
Allen	Fairchild	Laughlin	Saloom
Anderson	Fajt	Lawless	Saurman
Angstadt	Fargo	Lcc	Scheetz
Argall	Farmer	Leh	Schuler
Armstrong	Fee	Lescovitz	Serimonti
Arnold	Fieagle	Levdansky	Semmel
Barley	Flick	Linton	Serafini
Battisto	Foster	Lloyd	Smith, B.
Belardi	Freeman	Lucyk	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Freind	McCall	Snyder, D. W.
Billow	Gallen	McGeehan	Snyder, G.
Birmelin	Gamble	McHale	Staback
Bishop	Gannon	McHugh	Stairs
Black	Geist	Maiale	Steelman
Blaum	George	Markosek	Steighner
Bowley	Gerlach	Marsico	Stetler
Boyce	Gladeck	Mayernik	Stish
Broujos	Godshall	Melio	Strittmatter
Brown	Gruitza	Merry	Stuban
Bunt	Gruppo	Michlovic	Sturla
Bush	Hagarty	Micozzie	Surra
Butkovitz	Haluska	Mihalich	Tangretti
Caltagirone	Hanna	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Harley	Mundy	Taylor, F.
Carlson	Harper	Murphy	Taylor, J.
Carn	Hasay	Nahill	Telek
Carone	Hayden	Nailor	Thomas
Cawley	Hayes	Nickol	Tigue
Cessar	Heckler	Nyce	Tomlinson
Chadwick	Herman	O'Brien	Trello
Civera	Hershey	Oliver	Trich
Clark	Hess	Perzel	Tulli
Clymer	Hughes	Pesci	Uliana
Cohen	Itkin	Petrone	Van Horne
Colaella	Jadlowiec	Phillips	Vance
Colaizzo	James	Piccola	Veon
Cole	Jarolin	Pistella	Vroon
Cornell	Johnson	Pitts	Wambach
Corrigan	Josephs	Preston	Williams
Cowell	Kaiser	Raymond	Wilson
Coy	Kasunic	Reber	Wogan
DeLuca	Kenney	Reinard	Wozniak
DeWeese	King	Richardson	Wright, D. R.
Daley	Kosinski	Rieger	Wright, M. N.
Davies	Krebs	Ritter	
Dempsey	Kruszewski	Robinson	
Dent	Kukovich	Roebuck	O'Donnell, Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—6

Durham            McNally            Olasz            Petrarca  
Gigliotti            Noye

A majority of the members elected to the House having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the motion was agreed to.

**SENATE MESSAGE**

AMENDED HOUSE BILL  
RETURNED FOR CONCURRENCE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 1721, PN 3495**, with information that the Senate has passed the same with amendment in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives is requested.

**CALENDAR**

**BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION**

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

**HB 2603, PN 3584; HB 2696, PN 3585; HB 2701, PN 3552; HB 2702, PN 3553; HB 2668, PN 3515; HB 2669, PN 3516; HB 2670, PN 3517; HB 2671, PN 3518; HB 2672, PN 3519; HB 2673, PN 3520; HB 2674, PN 3521; HB 2675, PN 3522; HB 2676, PN 3523; HB 2677, PN 3524; HB 2678, PN 3525; HB 2680, PN 3527; HB 2681, PN 3528; HB 2682, PN 3529; HB 2683, PN 3530; HB 2685, PN 3532; HB 2686, PN 3533; HB 2687, PN 3534; HB 2688, PN 3535; HB 2689, PN 3536; HB 2690, PN 3537; HB 2691, PN 3538; HB 2693, PN 3540; HB 2694, PN 3541; and HB 2695, PN 3542.**

**RESOLUTIONS**

Mr. DALEY called up **HR 306, PN 3490**, entitled:

A Resolution opposing the proposed concept of the housing and location of a drug and alcohol rehabilitation facility at a site off Route 88, Union Township, Washington County, Pennsylvania.

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the resolution, for what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Murphy, rise?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to ask the prime sponsor of the resolution a few questions, if he is available.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Corrigan, rise?

Mr. CORRIGAN. Mr. Speaker, in this area we do not have the resolution; we do not have it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the clerks kindly see that the members in the immediate area surrounding Representative Corrigan are delivered copies of the resolution.

The matter before the House is HR 306.

Is the gentleman, Mr. Daley, in the hall of the House?

Mr. Murphy, the Chair will go over this resolution temporarily until Mr. Daley is available for interrogation.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you.

**RESOLUTION PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, HR 306, over temporarily.

**FORMER MEMBER WELCOMED**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is pleased to recognize a former member of the House, former Representative Ray Book.

**RESOLUTIONS CONTINUED**

Mr. JAROLIN called up **HR 310, PN 3544**, entitled:

A Resolution designating July 1992 as Korean War Veteran Month.

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

**YEAS—194**

Acosta	Dermody	Kukovich	Roebuck
Adolph	Donatucci	LaGrotta	Rudy
Allen	Evans	Langtry	Ryan
Anderson	Fairchild	Laughlin	Saloom
Angstadt	Fajt	Lawless	Saurman
Argall	Fargo	Lee	Scheetz
Armstrong	Farmer	Leh	Schuler
Arnold	Fee	Lescovitz	Scrimenti
Barley	Fleagle	Levdansky	Semmel
Battisto	Flick	Linton	Serafini
Belardi	Foster	Lloyd	Smith, B.
Belfanti	Freeman	Lucyk	Smith, S. H.
Billow	Freind	McCall	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Gallen	McGeehan	Snyder, G.
Bishop	Gamble	McHale	Staback
Black	Gannon	McHugh	Stairs
Blaum	Geist	Maiale	Steelman
Bowley	George	Markosek	Steighner
Boyes	Gerlach	Marsico	Stetler
Broujos	Gladeck	Mayernik	Stish
Brown	Godshall	Melio	Strittmatter
Bunt	Gruitza	Merry	Stuban
Bush	Gruppo	Michlovic	Sturla
Butkovitz	Hagarty	Micozzie	Surra
Caltagirone	Haluska	Mihalich	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Hanna	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Carlson	Harley	Mundy	Taylor, J.
Carn	Harper	Murphy	Telek
Carone	Hasay	Nahill	Thomas
Cawley	Hayden	Nailor	Tigue
Cessar	Hayes	Nickol	Tomlinson
Chadwick	Heckler	Nyce	Trello
Civera	Herman	O'Brien	Trich
Clark	Hershey	Oliver	Tulli
Clymer	Hess	Perzel	Uliana
Cohen	Hughes	Pesci	Van Horne
Colafiglia	Itkin	Petrone	Vance
Colaizzo	Jadlowiec	Phillips	Veon

Cole	James	Piccola	Vroon
Cornell	Jarolin	Pistella	Wambach
Corrigan	Johnson	Pitts	Williams
Cowell	Josephs	Preston	Wilson
Coy	Kaiser	Raymond	Wogan
DeLuca	Kasunic	Reber	Wozniak
DeWeese	Kenney	Reinard	Wright, D. R.
Daley	King	Richardson	Wright, M. N.
Davies	Kosinski	Rieger	
Dempsey	Krebs	Ritter	O'Donnell,
Dent	Kruszewski	Robinson	Speaker

**NAYS—0**

**NOT VOTING—1**

Taylor, F.

**EXCUSED—6**

Durham	McNally	Olasz	Petrarca
Gigliotti	Noye		

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

\* \* \*

Mr. GODSHALL called up **HR 313, PN 3561**, entitled:

A Resolution designating June 7, 1992, as "Cancer Survivor's Day" throughout this Commonwealth.

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

**YEAS—195**

Acosta	Donatucci	LaGrotta	Rudy
Adolph	Evans	Langtry	Ryan
Allen	Fairchild	Laughlin	Saloom
Anderson	Fajt	Lawless	Saurman
Angstadt	Fargo	Lee	Scheetz
Argall	Farmer	Leh	Schuler
Armstrong	Fee	Lescovitz	Scrimenti
Arnold	Fleagle	Levdansky	Semmel
Barley	Flick	Linton	Serafini
Battisto	Foster	Lloyd	Smith, B.
Belardi	Freeman	Lucyk	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Freind	McCall	Snyder, D. W.
Billow	Gallen	McGeehan	Snyder, G.
Birmelin	Gamble	McHale	Staback
Bishop	Gannon	McHugh	Stairs
Black	Geist	Maiale	Steelman
Blaum	George	Markosek	Steighner
Bowley	Gerlach	Marsico	Stetler
Boyes	Gladeck	Mayernik	Stish
Broujos	Godshall	Melio	Strittmatter
Brown	Gruitza	Merry	Stuban
Bunt	Gruppo	Michlovic	Sturla
Bush	Hagarty	Micozzie	Surra
Butkovitz	Haluska	Mihalich	Tangretti
Caltagirone	Hanna	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Harley	Mundy	Taylor, F.
Carlson	Harper	Murphy	Taylor, J.
Carn	Hasay	Nahill	Telek
Carone	Hayden	Nailor	Thomas
Cawley	Hayes	Nickol	Tigue
Cessar	Heckler	Nyce	Tomlinson
Chadwick	Heckler	O'Brien	Trello
Civera	Hershey	Oliver	Trich
Clark	Hess	Perzel	Tulli
Clymer	Hughes	Pesci	Uliana
Cohen	Itkin	Petrone	Van Horne
Colafiglia	Jadlowiec	Phillips	Vance
Colaizzo	James	Piccola	Veon
Cole	Jarolin	Pistella	Vroon

Cornell	Johnson	Pitts	Wambach
Corrigan	Josephs	Preston	Williams
Cowell	Kaiser	Raymond	Wilson
Coy	Kasunic	Reber	Wogan
DeLuca	Kenney	Reinard	Wozniak
DeWeese	King	Richardson	Wright, D. R.
Daley	Kosinski	Rieger	Wright, M. N.
Davies	Krebs	Ritter	
Dempsey	Kruszewski	Robinson	O'Donnell,
Dent	Kukovich	Roebuck	Speaker
Dermody			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—6

Durham	McNally	Olasz	Petrarca
Gigliotti	Noye		

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

\* \* \*

Mr. COHEN called up **HR 318, PN 3563**, entitled:

A Resolution designating May 14, 1992, as "Israel Independence Day" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—192

Acosta	Donatucci	LaGrotta	Ryan
Adolph	Evans	Langtry	Saloom
Allen	Fairchild	Laughlin	Saurman
Anderson	Fajt	Lawless	Scheetz
Angstadt	Fargo	Lee	Schuler
Argall	Farmer	Leh	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Fee	Lescovitz	Semmel
Barley	Fleagle	Levdansky	Serafini
Battisto	Flick	Linton	Smith, B.
Belardi	Foster	Lloyd	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Freeman	Lucyk	Snyder, D. W.
Billow	Freind	McCall	Snyder, G.
Birmelin	Gallen	McGeehan	Staback
Bishop	Gamble	McHale	Stairs
Black	Gannon	McHugh	Steelman
Blaum	Geist	Maiale	Steighner
Bowley	George	Markosek	Stetler
Boyes	Gerlach	Marsico	Stish
Broujos	Gladeck	Mayernik	Strittmatter
Brown	Godshall	Melio	Suban
Bunt	Gruitza	Merry	Sturla
Bush	Gruppo	Michlovic	Surra
Butkovitz	Hagarty	Micozzie	Tangretti
Caltagirone	Haluska	Mrkonjic	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Hanna	Mundy	Taylor, F.
Carlson	Harley	Murphy	Taylor, J.
Carn	Harper	Nahill	Telek
Carone	Hasay	Nailor	Thomas
Cawley	Hayden	Nickol	Tigue
Cessar	Hayes	Nyce	Tomlinson
Chadwick	Heckler	O'Brien	Trello
Civera	Herman	Oliver	Trich
Clark	Hershey	Pesci	Tulli
Clymer	Hess	Petrone	Uliana
Cohen	Hughes	Phillips	Van Horne
Colafella	Itkin	Piccola	Vance
Colaizzo	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Veon
Cole	James	Pitts	Vroon
Cornell	Jarolin	Preston	Wambach
Corrigan	Johnson	Raymond	Williams

Cowell	Josephs	Reber	Wilson
Coy	Kaiser	Reinard	Wogan
DeLuca	Kasunic	Richardson	Wozniak
DeWeese	Kenney	Rieger	Wright, D. R.
Daley	King	Ritter	Wright, M. N.
Davies	Kosinski	Robinson	
Dempsey	Krebs	Roebuck	O'Donnell,
Dent	Kruszewski	Rudy	Speaker
Dermody	Kukovich		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—3

Arnold	Mihalich	Perzel

EXCUSED—6

Durham	McNally	Olasz	Petrarca
Gigliotti	Noye		

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

**CONSIDERATION OF HR 306 CONTINUED**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair returns to page 11 of today's calendar, HR 306.

For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Wambach, rise?  
Mr. WAMBACH. Mr. Speaker, may we go over HR 306 temporarily? I am attempting to get a clarification, Mr. Speaker.

**RESOLUTION PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will go over temporarily.

**BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2503, PN 3250**, entitled:

A Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, providing for reapportionment of districts for the United States House of Representatives.

On the question,  
Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?  
Mr. RYAN offered the following amendments No. A1716:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 17), page 3, line 18, by inserting brackets before and after "and the districts therein provided shall be used"

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 17), page 3, line 20, by inserting after "17."

Except for the filling of vacancies through special elections, the new districts provided for in the State reapportionment plan shall not have the force of law for representational purposes until the first day of December following the next general election.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question, the gentleman, Mr. Ryan.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, this amendment will clear up something that is at the moment, I believe, somewhat unclear,

and that is, when do newly reapportioned districts actually take effect?

Going back some years, if I may, 10 years, I was Speaker of the House at the time, and then Representative Bill Hutchinson became Justice Bill Hutchinson. He vacated his House seat in order to go on the Supreme Court. At that time his particular seat had changed by reason of reapportionment. The question was, if I made a call for a special election, would we be calling it for the geography of the seat he was vacating or the geography of the new seat as reapportioned?

If you look at the law as we have it today before us, it seems to say that the new districts take effect when the plan has been finally approved. That being the case, it seems to say that in the instance that I just gave you, the Speaker would call an election for a district that would end up having a duplication.

May I come down to the present moment. Should the Speaker of the House today call a special election for the seats vacated by former Representatives Bob Wright and Jon Fox, the question comes up, what district would those new candidates be running in? Would they be running in the seat that Jon Fox vacated as we knew it and as he knew it serving, or would he or she be running for a seat that was the new district?

This amendment simply says, the new district will take effect on the first day of December following the next general election, which I believe is what we all intend by the new districts, and I think it will clear up this present controversy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the amendment, the gentleman from Westmoreland, Mr. Kukovich.

Mr. KUKOVICH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let us try to clear up what the amendment does.

I think Mr. Ryan may have an argument that he is trying to clarify a certain arcane point, but the real impact of this will be that it will prevent any individuals from servicing their new districts until after the election. I do not think we necessarily need any certainty in light of the fact that a Supreme Court decision has just come down that clarifies this, and I think what Mr. Ryan is trying to do with this amendment is not just deal with clarity but perhaps give his side a bit of an advantage.

I think what we need to do is make sure that once a State plan is devised and we all know what the districts will be 10 years hence, that we will be able to act accordingly and service the constituents in that area. My reading of this, my interpretation of this, is that you would be precluded from doing so, and for that reason, among a few others, I would ask for a negative vote.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, may I interrogate the gentleman?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman, Mr. Kukovich, stand for interrogation? The gentleman indicates that he will. The gentleman, Mr. Ryan, is in order and may proceed.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, if you were Speaker of the House—that is, the gentleman, Mr. Kukovich—if you were

Speaker of the House and you called a special election today for the seats formerly occupied by Mr. Fox and Mr. Wright—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Ryan, will you suspend for a moment.

Will the House be in order.

The gentleman, Mr. Ryan.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman were Speaker of the House and were to call an election today for the seats that are presently vacated, I am curious as to what he believes the law is. Would the new election take place under the newly reapportioned seats, or would it take place under the seats as they were when they were vacated?

Mr. KUKOVICH. Without studying that specific question, it seems that the Supreme Court decision has clarified that, and from the issuing of the time of the order, they would be able to service that area. But even if you were unhappy—

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, what does that mean? Are you saying that it would be under the new seat, the newly reapportioned geography, or the old geography?

Mr. KUKOVICH. My conjecture would be—and I have not studied the court decision so I cannot be definitive—I would say it probably would be the new seat, but my response also is that no matter which point it is—and there is some efficacy to trying to clarify the vacancy situation—what I want the members to know is that this is much more far reaching than that and would affect all seats after reapportionment and affect them in a way that I think most members do not want to see occur. If you want to amend the Constitution in a more precise way to deal with that, that may be appropriate, but I do not think this language does that. It does much more than that.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, continuing my interrogation.

Assume for a minute that the lady, Mrs. Harper, or the gentleman, Mr. Maiale, resigned today, for whatever reason, and a new election were called for their two seats. Their two seat numbers are now in Republican areas. Would you agree that these elections would be in York or Lancaster County or wherever those numbers are, and would you further agree that by doing that, if Mrs. Harper's successor were elected, you all of a sudden would have two Representatives in—I am saying York County; I am not sure of the number that is attached to that—you would have two Representatives at that time in that particular geographic area and none in Mrs. Harper's area?

Mr. KUKOVICH. No; I do not necessarily agree that that would be the case or that that is a logical interpretation of the case law, but again, even assuming that it would be and you would want to address that with this kind of language, I might go along with that, but I believe it is overly broad. Are you not affecting much more than just special election areas? You are affecting everything after a reapportionment.

Mr. RYAN. What I am attempting to do and what my attorneys have attempted to do is keep everything consistent. I am really upset that you think I have some ulterior motive. For a change, I do not.

I think there is a real problem. It is a problem that faced me when I was Speaker of the House. There is a problem that

faces the present Speaker of the House and every Speaker of the House who is presiding during this term of office, every 10 years, when a vacancy occurs.

If you think that I am doing this to try and get around mailings into new districts, you are wrong. We can do that by agreement. I have got a question before the Ethics Committee now that is unanswered. I am going to get a further legal opinion on that very question in light of this most recent Supreme Court case.

But all I am trying to do is address a simple question, without ulterior motive, that what we all think should be; that Mrs. Harper, if she resigns and she is replaced, her district will continue until next January 1, when a new person is sworn in, and her people are then represented by whoever is in that geographic area, and to do anything different is just crazy. You are going to have places where there are two Representatives; other places where there are none.

That was the problem that faced me as Speaker, and that is the problem that faces the present Speaker and probably the reason why he has not called a special election. At least that is the excuse I used.

Mr. KUKOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like the record to be clear that I would never impugn the minority leader's motives, and I know about his great concern for Representative Harper's district. I assume you are trying to clarify this. I am just saying that my interpretation is that the practical effect would be to have that adverse impact on people servicing their district until too much of a later date, and I would be more than happy to try to address this with another vehicle. My concern is trying to amend the Constitution at the last minute with something which would have a pragmatic effect, which I do not think we want, and I think we need further study of that language.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has concluded his interrogation and is in order to speak on the question.

Mr. RYAN. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the comments of the gentleman, the only way to clean up the Constitution is by changing the Constitution. The only way to address this question is by addressing it in these amendments. You cannot do it statutorily at a later date. If you think I am kidding and I have an ulterior motive, let us put this baby aside and take a good look at it, because there is a problem here. Let us not just run this bill through for the sake of running it through. Let us look at the constitutional question.

I am not trying to pull one over on you. I have three other amendments. Look them over; see if you can agree with them, and let us look at them and come back on Monday and try and attack this thing in a way that is not a D-R situation on a question this serious.

Maybe these words can be changed a little bit to satisfy your concern; I do not know.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman from Somerset County, Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to interrogate the gentleman, Mr. Ryan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Ryan, indicates he will stand for interrogation. The gentleman, Mr. Lloyd, is in order and may proceed.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, if I understood your explanation, if Mrs. Harper were to resign today, it is your intention that the special election would be held in the district which she currently represents and the replacement would serve until the end of November of this year. Is that correct?

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to put the bunny in the hat. I think you have pointed out the error of my amendment now.

I am not doing in the first line what I said I was doing, and you are absolutely right. I want everything to take place December 1, not just special elections, but the old district would stay in effect until December 1, and if Mrs. Harper or somebody else resigned, their successor would serve in that old district. But that is not what would happen under the court interpretation, as I understand it, or under straining of some logic that we have had before us over the years.

#### AMENDMENTS WITHDRAWN

Mr. RYAN. You are right, and on that basis, I would withdraw the amendment and ask leave to have it redrafted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman withdraws amendment 1716.

The question recurs, will the House agree to the bill?

#### BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, HB 2503 will go over temporarily.

#### CONSIDERATION OF HR 306 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Page 11 of today's calendar, HR 306.

Does the gentleman, Mr. Wambach, have his question answered on the resolution?

The question is, will the House adopt the resolution?

On that question, is the gentleman, Mr. Wambach, seeking recognition?

Mr. WAMBACH. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to interrogate the maker of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Daley, indicates he will stand for interrogation. The gentleman, Mr. Wambach, is in order and may proceed.

Mr. WAMBACH. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to hear from you. Do you feel that drug and alcohol facilities are needed in this State?

Mr. DALEY. I think that that question is not directed towards the resolution, Mr. Speaker. If you want to direct your question towards the resolution, I will be glad to answer your question.

Mr. WAMBACH. I think the resolution calls for— The whole problem exists about the establishment of a drug and

alcohol rehabilitation facility in a township in Washington County. Is that not correct?

Mr. DALEY. That is absolutely right, sir.

Mr. WAMBACH. All right.

Do you object then to the establishment of— I just want as far as your personal feelings, not necessarily to this case, because I will speak to this case. I think it is important that you are raising the issue of the resolution here, but I want to establish for the record, of course, the fact, do you feel that drug and alcohol facilities are needed in this State to combat the drug and alcohol addiction that is occurring throughout the State?

Mr. DALEY. Once again, I think my personal feelings on the issue is not what the resolution is addressing. What the resolution is addressing is the feelings of the constituency in Union Township who have approached me concerning this issue. So I answer your question with that statement.

Mr. WAMBACH. Well, I think you are successfully evading the question, and that is probably what you want to do. Knowing your track record on this issue, however, I think you can—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman suspend.

For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Strittmatter, rise?

Mr. STRITTMATTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to object to this questioning and ask the Speaker to remind the members that you should not be impugning the motives of any member with proposing resolutions, amendments, or bills. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman, Mr. Wambach, have further interrogation?

Mr. WAMBACH. Of course I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed, and the Chair cautions the gentleman to limit his questions to the subject before the House, which is HR 306.

Mr. WAMBACH. Do you agree that HR 306 will in fact forestall the installation of a drug and alcohol rehabilitation facility in Union Township until questions that are currently being asked and concerns are fully laid to rest, as you express in your first "resolve" clause in your resolution?

Mr. DALEY. No; I cannot draw those conclusions. Maybe you can.

Mr. WAMBACH. Is that not one of the conclusions of the "resolve" clause? I assume you had written this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DALEY. Absolutely.

Mr. WAMBACH. Do you then agree that the "resolve" clause speaks to the fact that you want the House of Representatives to support the township supervisors and residents in their efforts to forestall the installation until those concerns are in fact addressed?

Mr. DALEY. I think, if you are reading right—and I think you can do that very well—that that is exactly what the resolution says, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WAMBACH. Now, I do not understand why the gentleman has his back up on my questioning here. I just want to answer some questions.

Is this site not in fact part and parcel of the Nike Site in the township?

Mr. DALEY. That is right, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WAMBACH. The Nike Site is a former military site run by the U.S. Department of Defense?

Mr. DALEY. I would assume that is true; yes.

Mr. WAMBACH. And it consists of about 14 1/2 acres?

Mr. DALEY. I think that is right.

Mr. WAMBACH. Okay. I just want to know that— You know, obviously, in my discussions with the Department of Health—and that is why I asked the House to pass this over temporarily—the Department of Health agrees there is a lot of misinformation out there in the township regarding this project, and because of that uproar, you know, I think they are pledging in fact to sit down and to address all the questions that are in fact being raised by the citizens and the supervisors of the township. Obviously, you know as well as I do that—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman, Mr. Wambach, suspend.

Have you concluded your interrogation, sir?

Mr. WAMBACH. No, I have not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would you please frame a question.

Mr. WAMBACH. I am getting to that point, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would appreciate if you would get to it.

Mr. WAMBACH. The point that I am making here is the fact that the Department of Health has told me as recently as 10 minutes ago on the phone that their intent is to sit down with hopefully a committee of citizens that is being formed to collect those concerns of the citizens and to address those problems. I do not see your resolution going beyond that concern of the Department of Health, or does it, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. DALEY. I do not understand your question, Mr. Speaker. I hear your comment, Mr. Speaker, and it is a great bit of rhetoric wrapped around a little question. If you could please be more succinct with your question, ask me the question regarding the resolution, direct your questions regarding the resolution, or I will not stand for interrogation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WAMBACH. I am simply asking you and I have tried to ask you, sir, number one, do you feel that there is a need; number two, do you feel in fact that the concern of the citizens here must be addressed by the Department of Health? That is your bottom line, that your citizens want their concerns addressed by the Department of Health in regards to this facility. Is that correct or not correct?

Mr. DALEY. That is absolutely right, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WAMBACH. And that is as far as your resolution goes, to have those citizens' concerns being addressed by the Department of Health. Is that correct or not correct?

Mr. DALEY. That is absolutely right, Mr. Speaker, except the caveat, Mr. Speaker, is that we are asking the House to support the local concerns of the local taxpayers who have to



have this facility located in their backyard, not in Harrisburg, not in the Department of Health, but in their backyard, in Union Township; that 250 residents have signed a petition that said they are opposed and the supervisors have adopted a resolution that said they are opposed. That is what we are asking, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WAMBACH. So then it is your opinion that in fact there is a need for the rehabilitation center in Pennsylvania. It is a NIMBY problem - not in my backyard. Is that correct?

Mr. DALEY. No. Mr. Speaker, the issue here is a resolution supporting those local residents, those constituents, those citizens who have an issue that they are concerned about. That is the issue, not my opinion, not your opinion, not Tom Stish's opinion or anyone else's opinion; the opinion collectively of this body regarding this resolution.

Mr. WAMBACH. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the gentleman has that attitude about his own resolution, because the resolution does not encourage the House of Representatives to support the residents' position, and I think that is what the gentleman is saying here. The resolution addresses that, number one, there is a concern of the residents that should be addressed and, number two, the Department of Health should get together with the residents to discuss those concerns and address the concerns, not to support the residents about their concerns because there can be a lot of misinformation regarding this project. That is what I want to make clear in front of the House of Representatives today, that we are not encouraging one legislative body over another or one citizens group over another.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Wambach, have you concluded your interrogation or is there another question?

Mr. WAMBACH. I would like to make a final statement on this if I am going to be rudely cut off, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there further interrogation?

Mr. WAMBACH. I would like to make a final statement on this matter upon my conclusion of the interrogation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman have further interrogation?

Mr. WAMBACH. I do not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is in order to speak on the resolution.

Mr. WAMBACH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my attempt here is not simply to raise an issue here that obviously what I feel is basically a not-in-my-own-backyard issue, and I think the concerns of the residents should absolutely be addressed here.

What we have here is a project that was encouraged by the Department of Health and Human Services on the Federal level for the Department of Health, and at the encouragement of Mr. Martinez, the drug czar in Washington, to look at this site for use as a rehabilitation center by the Department of Health. Obviously, after that negotiation takes place, then there is an agreement with the single county authority and a provider is provided to run a facility in this particular location. That is all we are talking about here.

Obviously, there are concerns, however—and that is why I am supporting the resolution—of the citizens regarding exactly what is going to transpire there, and I think it is important to address the concerns. However, the resolution does not say that the House of Representatives supports the concern of the residents. I think the concern of the residents must be expressed. I think the Department of Health must sit down and address the concerns that the residents have. I think that is what I want to make sure that each and every one of you understands, that you are not supporting a resolution here today that says that we support the citizens in their position or the supervisors in their position but we support a fact of open dialogue between the Department of Health and the citizens; that, number one, we agree that treatment facilities are necessary in this State, and number two, addresses and concerns of residents should be taken into consideration by the Department of Health when doing this.

Obviously, the site is a large site. It is a 14-acre site that has been abandoned by the Department of Defense, the former Nike Site, and then obviously, part and parcel of that whole decisionmaking process was on the higher levels in Washington with Mr. Martinez, the drug czar, and the Department of Health, through the Department of Human Services.

But I agree with the resolution, that the concerns of the citizens should be addressed. I do not feel, as Mr. Daley feels, that this basically says that the House of Representatives supports those concerns as gospel without obviously sitting down and working them through and working them out and shedding light on the situation, as expressed in the resolution, so we can come out with a final determination.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, members of the House, and I wish for a positive vote on the resolution, providing the fact that we are talking about an opening up of a process here between a State agency and a residents group back in Mr. Daley's home district. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few questions for the prime sponsor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Daley, indicates that he will stand for interrogation. The gentleman, Mr. Murphy, is in order and may proceed.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be helpful for all of us to know how many families we are talking about will be residents of this facility.

Mr. DALEY. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that we are talking about 10 families that are going to be residents of that facility.

Mr. MURPHY. 10 families?

Mr. DALEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MURPHY. And, Mr. Speaker, in your resolution you indicate that the site is being developed by the Department of Health, and then in your "resolved" part of the resolution further on you encourage the Department of Health to

actively investigate and probe the questions of the residents. If the Department of Health is in charge of it, why are we asking the Department of Health to investigate it?

Mr. DALEY. Because the residents heretofore feel that the Department of Health has tried to ram this project down the local residents', our constituents', throat, the local supervisors' throat, and we are asking someone to put the brakes on, and if it is this legislature to ask them to do that, so be it.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will end my interrogation, and I would like to make a few remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman is in order to make a statement on the resolution. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, there is no one in this House of Representatives who has not been touched by alcoholism or drug addiction. Each one of you know people in your own families or friends who have been touched with this, and for us today to stand here and suggest that the House of Representatives will oppose a facility for 10 families seems to me to be extreme. We should not be in this position to oppose a facility for 10 families for rehabilitation. This facility is a long-term facility. It is a facility that is going to house 10 families for up to 2 years to help them become productive citizens of this Commonwealth.

Personally, I have been involved on the board of directors of a number of alcohol and drug rehabilitation facilities and have been involved in locating these facilities in communities, both in my own legislative district and others, and I certainly understand that people always have concerns about alcoholics and drug addicts living next door to them, but I also understand that these facilities are critical to the success of our society. It is not that drug addicts and alcoholics live only in one particular community; they live everywhere, but the fact of the matter is that most of the facilities that serve people who are drug addicts and alcoholics are located just in a few communities. It is the rare community I know that can sit down and rationally deal with the issue of accepting a drug and alcohol rehabilitation center in their facility. I have seen it happen in only a few cases. I do not think this resolution encourages that kind of dialogue.

While the sponsor of the resolution indicates that his intent is to encourage that dialogue, when I read the language of this, let me remind you what the language says. The concerns of the Union Township residents regarding the drug and alcohol rehabilitation facility include: that existing property values will be adversely affected; that the implementation of this program would in all likelihood curtail further residential and business expansion in the township; that this facility would create a potential threat to the safety of the residents.

We are talking about 10 families, 10 families that have made a decision to change their lives. These families are not being told to locate there; they are not being incarcerated there. These are families that have made a decision to change

their lives, and we are going to say as a House of Representatives that they represent a potential threat to the safety of those residents, that they are going to cost residential and business expansion, that they are going to adversely affect the property values of the people who live there? Come off it.

What are we doing here? We are pandering to the worst instincts of the people in Union Township. We should be standing here and being leaders and talking about what the best instincts are, that we ought to be responsible for each other, and we ought to give people their opportunity to be responsible for themselves by entering into a program that can change their lives.

I urge you vehemently to oppose this resolution. I think it is a terrible statement for this General Assembly to make in light of what is going on in the world today, and for that reason, I ask your opposition. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Preston.

Mr. PRESTON. I have a few questions concerning the resolution for Mr. Daley.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Daley, indicates that he will stand for interrogation. The gentleman, Mr. Preston, is in order and may proceed.

Mr. PRESTON. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, the site, I guess, is known as the Nike Site. How large a site is it now?

Mr. DALEY. It is 14 acres.

Mr. PRESTON. It is 14 acres. Is this going to be a State-owned and State-operated facility?

Mr. DALEY. I think not. I think it is still owned by the Federal Government, but the State is going to have a lease, in my understanding, through the Department of Health.

Mr. PRESTON. Who will be running the facility?

Mr. DALEY. My understanding is the Department of Health.

Mr. PRESTON. The State Department of Health. They will be taking over the whole 14 acres. Correct?

Mr. DALEY. It is my understanding. Yes, sir.

Mr. PRESTON. Okay. Your next statement—and these were my questions that I had before Mr. Murphy made his statement—you said, the reasons why you are opposing this—Well, first help me out. With the population—What is the population currently of Union Township?

Mr. DALEY. Approximately 6,700 or so.

Mr. PRESTON. 6,700.

Mr. DALEY. That is right.

Mr. PRESTON. How many people signed the petition?

Mr. DALEY. The residents around the—250 residents who live around the Nike Site.

Mr. PRESTON. So less than 10 percent of a—Is it a township?

Mr. DALEY. 250 people that live adjacent to the Nike Site.

Mr. PRESTON. Okay. Since you have it here in writing that the existing property values would be adversely affected

by the program, obviously I take it that you mean "adversely" means in the negative. Can you explain to me very clearly how they would be adversely affected and how their property values would be able to go down?

Mr. DALEY. Well, I think what you need to do—and I think Mr. Murphy is raising some red flags or the panic buttons that really drive a lot of our souls.

If you read this resolution, Mr. Speaker, it answers the question. It says, these are questions and concerns that the residents have. These are not assertions; these are not conclusions; these are their questions that they are setting forth that need to be resolved. I cannot answer the question. All we are saying is the residents want these questions answered. They want them answered by the Department of Health. The Department of Health has refused to this point to have any public hearings in this district, in this township, to talk about this issue.

All we are saying by this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is these are truly the concerns. We do not know how valid those concerns are. We do not know what the priority of those concerns is, but we are saying these residents have these concerns that are articulated through this resolution, and they want these answered. I cannot answer them. That can be done by the Department of Health and by the people who are planning to put this facility in.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I am only going by your statement, and I read the top caption: "A RESOLUTION Opposing the proposed concept"—opposing the proposed concept—"of the housing and location of a drug and alcohol rehabilitation facility at a site off Route 88, Union Township, Washington County...."

Mr. DALEY. That is right.

Mr. PRESTON. The resolution is to oppose it, not to slow it down, not to prohibit it. The resolution directly states to oppose it. And then you have several contradictory remarks in relationship to opposing. I am trying to figure out—and a lot of people have gone through this, and we have heard it over again—that you want us to oppose it, and then you say, because of residents' concerns about how it is effectively going to adversely affect their property. They have those concerns. How? What concerns? Obviously if they have signed a petition, you have talked to them. You should be able to have this information to be able to give the body here on what their concerns are on how 10 families are going to adversely affect the property values of the houses surrounding them.

Mr. DALEY. Mr. Speaker—and I know you have been in the legislature for 10 years—you know that the first line of any piece of legislative material does not necessarily identify the language that is within the four-corners doctrine of legislative drafting. If you read the opening paragraph, it says one thing, but if you read also the "whereases" and the "resolveds," it also draws the conclusion of the resolution. I think that speaks quite well to what the resolution is trying to do, Mr. Speaker, and if you are trying to confuse the issue, I do not think you are doing a very good job of it.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to confuse the issue. I am trying to get a clear-cut answer of which I have not gotten one yet.

Mr. DALEY. Ask the question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PRESTON. The next step. I have not gotten an answer, how does a house being built adversely affect or someone else going into this property, how does it adversely affect the property values in that vicinity of the people of the petition?

Mr. DALEY. Mr. Speaker, all I am saying by this resolution, these are concerns that the residents have, and they have the questions. They would like the Department of Health to answer those questions. The resolution does not draw conclusions. It sets forth speculation and questions.

Mr. PRESTON. Well, since you have not answered that question, let me continue to ask my next question then.

Mr. DALEY. Well, ask one that can be answered, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PRESTON. I am trying to. You do not seem to be— It is your resolution, sir. You should be able to answer the questions. You are the representative of those people.

Mr. DALEY. That is absolutely right.

Mr. PRESTON. You are supposed to be concerned about those concerns, and I am just trying to get an answer.

Mr. DALEY. Okay.

Mr. PRESTON. And if you want to go into it further, I have quite a few more questions now from your previous statement that I am going to ask.

Mr. DALEY. Well, ask what you are going to ask, and that is fine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order.

The gentleman, Mr. Preston, is interrogating the gentleman, Mr. Daley, on the issue of the resolution. The Chair cautions him to ask questions on the subject of the resolution.

Mr. PRESTON. I am only asking questions on the resolution.

My next question is stated again from the concerns of the residents of Union Township of 285 people, from a township of 6,700 people. It states "That the implementation of the program"—it is supposed to be a program—"would, in all likelihood"—in all likelihood—"curtail further residential and business expansion in surrounding areas and adversely affect the tax base of the township."

I am asking the gentleman again, since you represent those constituents—they have signed a petition; obviously you have been directly involved with them and they have stated some of their concerns—how does taking a vacant site that is not being used now, obviously that is not even paying any form of taxes now, how is it going to adversely affect the tax base of the surrounding communities when in essence they are even going to be paying taxes?

Mr. DALEY. Mr. Speaker, I think I adequately answered your question the first time you asked that.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask my question again, since the gentleman has said he has answered it, but I do not remember him giving any comment concerning my question. Because of this question—

**PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY**

Mr. MERRY. Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Merry, rise?

Mr. MERRY. A point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MERRY. Mr. Speaker, we seem to have a very argumentative situation. I think the resolution is inappropriate and should not be addressed by legislative intent.

I would like to have the Chair instruct me what motion I could make to refer this back to the Rules Committee so that it could be handled in a legislative manner instead of us having to be voting on every drug and alcohol abuse center and every landfill that might be created in Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman may not interrupt the debate to make such a motion, but at the appropriate time, when this member has concluded his debate, the Chair will recognize him.

For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Preston, rise?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield the floor temporarily for the gentleman to be able to make a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Preston, has concluded his interrogation. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

**RESOLUTION RECOMMITTED**

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

Mr. MERRY. Mr. Speaker, I make a motion that HR 306 be returned to the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Merry, has moved to recommit the resolution to the Committee on Rules. Is that correct?

Mr. MERRY. Yes, that is correct.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the motion to recommit, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Daley.

Mr. DALEY. If the maker of the motion could consider withdrawing his motion, I would be glad to place this on the tabled calendar or whatever the Speaker may suggest so Mr. Wambach and I and a few other members can discuss the issue, and I think that that may alleviate the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman, Mr. Merry, will withdraw his motion, the Chair will move the resolution over for today's session.

Mr. MERRY. I would rather not withdraw it. I would rather leave it up to the membership to make a vote on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The motion before the House is, shall the resolution be recommitted to the Committee on Rules?

On the motion, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Wambach.

Mr. WAMBACH. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion to return HR 306 to Rules, and I will work with Mr. Daley and the Rules Committee on language that would be appropriate to the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the motion, the gentleman, Mr. Daley.

Mr. DALEY. I also agree with the motion then, and what we could do is work out the difference. I know a number of members do have concerns, and I think possibly some minor changes to the resolution could be addressed. The point here is to open up that dialogue with the local municipalities, and I truly appreciate the dialogue this afternoon. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to.

**STATEMENT BY MR. DAVIES**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Davies, rise?

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

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

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. Speaker, the gavel of the Speaker pro tem does not infer rudeness in any manner, shape, or form. It is a matter of an act of maintaining order. That matter of conduct is a judgment call by the Speaker pro tem.

I want to support and confirm the action of the Speaker pro tem. The gentleman in making his statement, instead of a matter of being out of order, was, of course, not interrogating the gentleman but was making a statement. So therefore, I want to confirm the action of the Speaker pro tem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and appreciates the comments.

**RESOLUTIONS CONTINUED**

Mr. LEH called up **HR 302, PN 3478**, entitled:

A Resolution proclaiming the week of May 10 through 16, 1992, as "Traditional Family Appreciation Week" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

Ms. RITTER offered the following amendments No. A1741:

Amend Title, page 1, lines 1 and 2, by striking out "Traditional Family" and inserting "Family

Amend Third Whereas Clause, page 1, line 7, by striking out “the young” and inserting  
our young people

Amend Third Whereas Clause, page 1, line 8, by striking out “place” and inserting  
places

Amend Third Whereas Clause, page 1, line 9, by striking out “traditional” and inserting  
wholesome

Amend First Resolve Clause, page 2, line 1, by striking out ““Traditional Family” and inserting  
“Family

Amend First Resolve Clause, page 2, lines 2 and 3, by striking out “husbands and wives and caring fathers and mothers” and inserting  
family members

Amend First Resolve Clause, page 2, line 3, by striking out “the young” and inserting  
our young people

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the amendment, the gentlelady, Ms. Ritter.

Ms. RITTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think it is very appropriate for this House to honor families. There is a National Family Week, which is in November, and I think that we should also have a Pennsylvania Family Week.

However, the use in this resolution of the word “traditional” to describe the families we want to honor seems to be much too limiting. While there is no definition of “traditional” in this resolution, most people think of a traditional family as mom staying home to take care of the kids and dad going to the office, and I certainly recognize and appreciate the sacrifices that a lot of these families are making, particularly given this recession, to raise their families on one income. However, families where both mom and dad go to the office, families where there is either a mother or a father, not both, foster families, grandparents raising grandchildren - those folks would consider themselves families, obviously, but most of them would probably not consider themselves to be traditional families, and they also make great sacrifices to raise their children.

While I know it was not the intention of the sponsors of this resolution to exclude those families, I think that some of those families would feel that by honoring traditional families, we are somehow saying that we do not appreciate the job that single parents and working mothers are doing. Considering that, according to Paul Gehris of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches, less than 10 percent of our families would meet the definition of “traditional” that most people think of, we are excluding more people from this resolution than we are including.

Again, while I know it was not intentional, the implication is that we appreciate the job that traditional families do, but we do not appreciate the job that single parents are doing or that foster families or grandparents raising their grandkids are doing.

I discussed this resolution with David Lamb of the Pennsylvania Council of Family Agencies, Paul Gehris of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches, and Ron Sell of Pennsylvania Partnerships for Children. Now, while there was not time for their agencies to officially review this resolution, they reviewed it as individuals, and so they are speaking for themselves when they each said that they felt that honoring Family Appreciation Week would be more appropriate than limiting it to traditional families.

In addition, Dave Lamb pointed out that National Family Week will be November 22 to November 28 this year. Mr. Lamb said that some school districts have programs for their students where the students write prose or poetry about their families and have other events to celebrate this week. Now, while I have not included a change of date in this amendment, Mr. Lamb suggested that in the future it might be a good idea to coordinate a Pennsylvania Family Week with the National Family Week and encourage our communities and schools to plan similar events to honor Pennsylvania families.

So I would ask the support of the House for this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentlelady.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. MICHLOVIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair interrupts the debate briefly and recognizes, under unanimous consent, the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Michlovic.

Mr. MICHLOVIC. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to you the Pennsylvania class A championship basketball team, the Duquesne Dukes from Allegheny County, and I would like you to give them a round of applause for their great championship this year.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the courtesy and appreciate the efforts of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

#### CONSIDERATION OF HR 302 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair returns to HR 302, amendment 1741, sponsored by the gentlelady, Ms. Ritter, and on the question, recognizes the gentleman from Berks County, Mr. Leh.

Mr. LEH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am rising to ask the members of this body to oppose the Ritter amendment. I believe, along with the cosponsors of HR 302, that the present language is broad enough. “Traditional” as a term has come to mean many things probably to many people. However, I think it is defined in this resolution as a loving husband, loving wives, and caring parents, so therefore, it is not defined as to the working status or the marital status necessarily of the family unit.

However, I think we have to realize and I think we need to acknowledge the fact publicly that the traditional family has done an excellent job. The traditional family as we know it - husband and wife, mom and dad, grandparents - we found out, I think, and we are seeing more and more today that no other social institution can compare or compete with that institution, the traditional family.

Although, yes, we have problems out there today where we have single-parent families trying to raise children and we do need to encourage and help them, however, we do not need to lift those situations up as the ideal. The ideal still needs to be kept. We still need to raise a high standard of a monogamous family - husband and wife, father and mother. I believe that the Ritter amendment was simply drafted to pander to the problem and totally ignore the cause. In fact, what it does, it seeks to define the family today in politically correct terms rather than ideal terms.

I would, however, like to commend the lady from Lehigh County on one of the changes where she deletes the word "traditional" and inserts "wholesome." "Wholesome" may be a better adjective. I looked up "wholesome" in the Webster's New World Dictionary this morning. The definition is, "tending to improve the mind or character," and as an adjective before the word "virtue," which is defined by Webster as "moral excellence, goodness or morality" - as an example, "chastity" - I think that is an excellent change. I would be willing to make that next year.

I am also concerned about one of the changes on page 2, line 3, where the prime sponsor of the amendment strikes out the word "the" referring to young people and replaces it with "our." That is o-u-r; forgive my Dutch. I am just concerned that by "our"—"our" is a term of possession—that it is referring to the children of this Commonwealth are owned by the State. Although I see that I have received maybe some comical remarks from that, nevertheless, I can draw no other conclusion.

Let me say this: As this amendment made its way through or as this resolution made its way through— And by the way— Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to speak on the resolution. I will speak on the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the amendment.

Mr. LEH. Let me just say one more time that I do not believe the Ritter amendment is necessary. I think we were very sensitive to the way we drafted this legislation. This same resolution was passed in the city of Philadelphia last year, and the word "traditional" was mentioned far more times than we have chosen to mention it.

So I would just simply ask that the members of this House oppose the Ritter amendment and then vote for the resolution in its original form, and we can get on with the business of this House, because we have many important things coming up facing this Commonwealth. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question, the gentleman, Mr. Geist.

Mr. GEIST. I have a question for the Chair. Would it be appropriate in a resolution like this with an amendment like this, so that we do not debate this and make it antichild or antifamily or antianthing, since the intent I think of both the resolution and the amendment is the same, would it be too much to ask the Chair to ask both the maker of the resolution and the maker of the amendment if they could possibly sit down, work out a compromise language, and bring a resolution back to us?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair certainly cannot force such a position, but did the Chair hear the gentleman making a motion to recommit the resolution?

Mr. GEIST. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make a motion to recommit. I think that the maker of the resolution and I think the maker of the amendment are both very rational people, people that can get along with this. I think they both come from traditional families, and I think that they both could agree on language that would be agreeable to all of us. That is all I am saying. I think it should be voluntary and not the will of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question, the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand in support of the Karen Ritter amendment.

I do not think that the amendment in any shape, way, or form should be castigated or interpreted as having anything to do as in opposition to what anybody might interpret to be traditional.

Yes, I come from Philadelphia County where that resolution and all that stuff about tradition was spoken, and we are great believers of tradition in Philadelphia County, the land of the Liberty Bell, et cetera, so I am in understanding of all of that. But this comment and social comment with regard to ideal and we invoke our own ethics, our own morals, our own values upon Pennsylvanians, is scary to me and has been scary to me ever since I have served here.

For us to even engage in a debate about what Ms. Ritter's amendment means is the values, the intent behind the original resolution, and I believe that we should stand and not be scared and intimidated by the fact that in this society—you know, we like to talk about ideal—but in this society, is anybody willing to face the fact that in over 50 percent of the families in this country women will be divorced? The majority of them will be divorced not of their own free will, because a man does no longer want to live with that particular female. So it is not because they are immoral women or even immoral men. The fact is that for some reason in this society things are breaking down, but that should not impugn that we can have families.

Certainly, those of us that get married in churches would like to do it with God's grace and benefit and we would like to be guided through life with the benefit of that, but let us not

be ridiculous and talk about what is ideal. Let us talk about what is real, what faces our society, and build together, not separate. Nobody can live, you know, within a wall and contain within themselves; nobody.

So all this discussion and debate, quite honestly, is redundant; it is old; it is archaic; and it is mean spirited. Let us get on and support the amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question, the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Gamble.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly oppose the Ritter amendment.

HR 302, Traditional Family Appreciation Week. What a threat that is to the people of Pennsylvania that we must liberalize even a simple resolution that appreciates the traditional family. Let us forget all this other stuff, and if they want to put all this other stuff into a resolution, let them do it. But let us pass this resolution in recognizing Traditional Family Appreciation Week and get on with some more important business. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from York County, Mr. Foster.

Mr. FOSTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I agree totally with the gentleman, Mr. Gamble. Let us get on with passing the resolution. Is there something opprobrious about the term "traditional family"? Is there anything wrong with it?

Let us pass the resolution, and if Ms. Ritter wants to offer a resolution next week on some other subject, we will entertain it at that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentelady from Lehigh, Mrs. McHale.

Mrs. McHALE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Representative Gamble suggested that we forget all this other stuff, and I would have to object to that. I think what he is saying is let us forget the majority of families in Pennsylvania.

I think that what Representative Ritter's amendment attempts to do is to broaden our appreciation of families in Pennsylvania to include all of the families of Pennsylvania, and I applaud her in that effort and would hope that we would support it. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady.

The question recurs, will the House agree to the amendment?

The gentelady, Ms. Ritter.

Ms. RITTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think the remarks of the gentleman, Mr. Leh, show very clearly I was misconstruing his—I thought it was inadvertent, but apparently he intended to exclude single parents from this resolution. All we are saying is that if it is good enough for President Bush, it should be good enough for us here in Pennsylvania to honor families. President Bush did not seem to

have a problem with the definition of what makes up a family, and I think we should do the same in Pennsylvania.

We should recognize and show our appreciation for the job that working mothers and single parents and grandparents and foster parents are doing as well as the job that traditional families are doing to raise children in wholesome environments, to instill in them moral and ethical values, and to preserve the future of our society, and I do not think we should leave out any of the families who are doing those jobs.

I would ask again for a positive vote on this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentelady.

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

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, let me throw in my 2 cents' worth. It will only be 2 cents.

I think that this resolution is lacking. I think it is exclusive. I think we should be bringing together all elements that provide in nuturing and caring for young people.

The points raised by prior speakers about the single family mother and the grandmother, those that provide the care should not be ignored in this resolution, and I wholeheartedly endorse the Ritter amendment, and I think it should be approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Richardson.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Karen Ritter amendment.

I think that what we need to do is to start thinking about what we are talking about when we talk about "traditional." It seems to me that we are talking about old, antiquated ideas and times and not dealing with modern times. We are not talking about "Leave It to Beaver" or we are not talking about "Ozzie and Harriet" families. We are talking about what makes up the real world today. If we are sincere about what makes the real world today, we will recognize and understand that now we have all different types of families all over this Commonwealth and all over this country, and if we are sincere about that, then we will not see this as a liberalized way of trying to change some format about which has been introduced, but saying that we need to expand our horizon and our thought and realize that we are dealing with families that invariably out there in this country today are a part of this American dream no matter what you may think, and to begin to separate those two based on some separatism does not seem to be the way to go, and I strongly support her amendment.

In my conclusion, it just seems to me that we always want to try to use exclusionary words and exclusionary phrases and exclusionary code words and phrases to exclude people who should be a part of what we are all about - to begin to segregate them out of that process by not including single family parents, by not including the foster parents, by not including those parents who may have had to take on loved ones whose family person may have died but they are also a part of the

family. We have to realize that families are families and all families should be one no matter what that family represents. Even this House of Representatives should be a family, even though there may be some great differences, but we cannot separate the haves versus the have-nots and allow ourselves to be called something other than what we are, and that is a family.

I am hoping that the members of this House of Representatives will support the Ritter amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Columbia County, Mr. Stuban.

Mr. STUBAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment. There are many reasons I do.

We talk about traditional families. I was born in a traditional family in a little borough up in Columbia County where my parents had a cow and a few chickens in the backyard. My mother stayed home and milked the cow and provided the food for us while my dad went out and made a few dollars. That has changed entirely. We now have laws in my community. We cannot keep chickens in the backyard; we cannot keep the cow. It took the mother now to go out and it took two family people to earn money and be responsible for the things that happen.

Also, I would like to take exception to Mr. Leh, who said down in the change where they inserted "our young people," that it showed as if it was ownership and they were our children. In a sense they are our children. If you look at our budget and see all the money we have in there for child protective services and other measures to take care of the children of our State, I think that is our responsibility, whether it comes from a single family or it comes from that traditional family that we are trying to oppose here. They still are our responsibility.

I ask for an affirmative on the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlelady from Indiana County, Representative Steelman.

Ms. STEELMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was raised in a nontraditional family. When I was 2 1/2 years old, my mother went back to school teaching and my grandmother lived with us. My mother was the only mother I knew who worked full time and ours was the only family that had three generations in it, all up and down our block. But it was a sound family; it was a wholesome family, and it was not unlike many families that exist in this Commonwealth today.

Because she went back to work at a time when it was not at all considered typical for a mother to work full time, I know that my mother suffered a great deal. She worried about whether she was doing the right thing, but as much as she wanted to have a child and participate in a family, she also felt compelled to use her training and her skills to try and help many other children besides the ones in her family.

In memory of my mother and of the feelings that she experienced because we were defined as nontraditional and she

was defined as nontraditional, I appreciate the Ritter amendment that tries to make this resolution more inclusive rather than exclusive. And in the memory of my mother, I do not think that I can do anything other than vote for this resolution, and I hope you will also.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentlelady.

On the amendment, the gentlelady from Centre County, Mrs. Rudy.

Mrs. RUDY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to support Representative Ritter's amendment, even though I am a cosponsor of Representative Leh's resolution.

Families come in all sizes and all shapes, and although a traditional family is ideal, I myself was not raised in a traditional family due to the fact that my mother died when I was very young and I was raised by my father. And after reading over Representative Leh's resolution, I thoroughly believe that the type of family in which I was raised would be excluded from recognition.

So therefore, I urge the support of Representative Ritter's amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—118

Acosta	Evans	Lescovitz	Rieger
Adolph	Fajt	Levdansky	Ritter
Arnold	Farmer	Linton	Roebuck
Battisto	Fee	Lloyd	Rudy
Belardi	Freeman	McCall	Saloom
Belfanti	Geist	McHale	Scrimenti
Billow	George	Maiale	Smith, B.
Bishop	Gruitza	Markosek	Staback
Blaum	Hagarty	Marsico	Steelman
Broujos	Haluska	Mayernik	Steighner
Butkovitz	Hanna	Melio	Stetler
Caltagirone	Harley	Michlovic	Stuban
Cappabianca	Harper	Micozzie	Sturla
Carlson	Hayden	Mihalich	Surra
Carn	Heckler	Mrkonic	Tangretti
Carone	Herman	Mundy	Taylor, F.
Chadwick	Hughes	Murphy	Thomas
Civera	Itkin	Nahill	Tomlinson
Cohen	James	Nailor	Trello
Colafella	Jarolin	Nickol	Trich
Colaizzo	Josephs	Oliver	Van Horne
Cornell	Kaiser	Pesci	Vance
Cowell	Kasunic	Petrone	Veon
Coy	Krebs	Piccola	Wambach
DeWeese	Kruszewski	Pistella	Williams
Daley	Kukovich	Preston	Wilson
Davies	LaGrotta	Raymond	Wozniak
Dent	Langtry	Reinard	Wright, D. R.
Dermody	Laughlin	Richardson	Wright, M. N.
Donatucci	Lee		

NAYS—69

Allen	Fairchild	Jadlowiec	Scheetz
Anderson	Fargo	Johnson	Schuler
Angstadt	Fleagle	King	Semmel
Argall	Flick	Kosinski	Serafini
Armstrong	Foster	Lawless	Smith, S. H.
Barley	Freind	Leh	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Gallen	Lucyk	Snyder, G.
Black	Gamble	McHugh	Stairs



Boyes	Gannon	Merry	Stish
Brown	Gerlach	Nyce	Strittmatter
Bunt	Gladeck	Perzel	Taylor, E. Z.
Bush	Godshall	Phillips	Telek
Cawley	Gruppo	Pitts	Tigue
Cessar	Hasay	Reber	Tulli
Clark	Hayes	Robinson	Uliana
Clymer	Hershey	Ryan	Vroon
DeLuca	Hess	Saurman	Wogan
Dempsey			

NOT VOTING—8

Bowley	Kenney	Taylor, J.
Cole	McGeehan	
Corrigan	O'Brien	O'Donnell, Speaker

EXCUSED—6

Durham	McNally	Olasz	Petrarca
Gigliotti	Noye		

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

*On the question,*

Will the House adopt the resolution as amended?

**PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Leh.

Mr. LEH. Mr. Speaker, may I recommit the resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may move to recommit if he so chooses. The motion is always in order.

**MOTION TO RECOMMIT**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. LEH. Okay. I would like to move to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. To the Committee on Rules?

Mr. LEH. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Leh, makes a motion that HR 302 as amended be recommitted to the Committee on Rules.

*On the question,*

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—87

Adolph	Dempsey	Kosinski	Reber
Allen	Fairchild	Langtry	Ryan
Anderson	Fargo	Laughlin	Saurman
Angstadt	Farmer	Lawless	Scheetz
Argall	Fleagle	Lee	Schuler
Armstrong	Flick	Leh	Semmel
Barley	Foster	Lescovitz	Serafini
Birmelin	Freind	Lucyk	Smith, S. H.
Black	Gallen	McHugh	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Gamble	Melio	Snyder, G.
Brown	Gannon	Merry	Stairs
Bunt	Geist	Micozzie	Stish
Bush	Gladeck	Nahill	Strittmatter
Cawley	Godshall	Nailor	Taylor, E. Z.
Cessar	Gruppo	Nickol	Telek
Chadwick	Hasay	Nyce	Tomlinson
Civera	Hayes	Perzel	Tulli

Clark	Hershey	Petrone	Uliana
Clymer	Hess	Phillips	Vroon
Colafella	Jadlowiec	Piccola	Wogan
Corrigan	Johnson	Pitts	Wright, M. N.
DeLuca	King	Raymond	

NAYS—100

Acosta	Donatucci	Kukovich	Rudy
Arnold	Evans	LaGrotta	Saloom
Battisto	Faji	Levdansky	Scrimenti
Belardi	Fee	Linton	Smith, B.
Belfanti	Freeman	Lloyd	Staback
Billow	George	McCall	Steelman
Bishop	Gerlach	McHale	Steighner
Blaum	Gruitza	Maiale	Stetler
Bowley	Hagarty	Markosek	Stuban
Broujos	Haluska	Marsico	Sturla
Butkovitz	Hanna	Mayernik	Surra
Caltagirone	Harley	Michlovic	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Harper	Mihalich	Taylor, F.
Carn	Hayden	Mrkonic	Thomas
Carone	Heckler	Mundy	Tigue
Cohen	Herman	Murphy	Trello
Colaizzo	Hughes	Oliver	Trich
Cornell	Itkin	Pistella	Van Horne
Cowell	James	Preston	Vance
Coy	Jarolin	Reinard	Veon
DeWeese	Josephs	Richardson	Wambach
Daley	Kaiser	Rieger	Williams
Davies	Kasunic	Ritter	Wilson
Dent	Krebs	Robinson	Wozniak
Dermody	Kruszewski	Roebuck	Wright, D. R.

NOT VOTING—8

Carlson	McGeehan	Taylor, J.
Cole	O'Brien	
Kenney	Pesci	O'Donnell, Speaker

EXCUSED—6

Durham	McNally	Olasz	Petrarca
Gigliotti	Noye		

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

*On the question recurring,*

Will the House adopt the resolution as amended?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the gentleman, Mr. Leh.

Mr. LEH. Mr. Speaker, I realize that this is the procedure, and I would just like to say that I think we are making a mistake today by passing this resolution as is with the amendment in it. It seems that continually, when you talk about standards and ethics today, whether it is in this House or any chamber in this country, we always seem to adopt, because of our so-called diversity, we seem to adopt the lowest common denominator, and that is what we have done here. We have removed language, we have removed language from this resolution that simply recognized and gave and paid a little praise to a traditional family, but because that is too offensive, we decided to lower our standards and include everyone.

*Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, I have the floor.*

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

Mr. LEH. Now, it is a shame. When this resolution was introduced and was sent to the Rules Committee, I started to

hear remarks from people who opposed my resolution. To show you how far left we have gone, those remarks ranged from "it is a dumb resolution" to "it is a rightwing piece of feces."

Now, I think, you know, by understanding that, you are understanding where we are headed by just adopting the amendment to this resolution. We have said that the traditional family really does not mean anything, and when we do that, we discourage - we discourage parents from staying together; we discourage single parents from trying to get back together, from trying to find other spouses, because what is the use? What is the use? A family is a family.

I do not think anybody out there, anybody that voted against or anybody that voted for the Ritter amendment, can tell me that the ideal family is a single family and that that is the best. Nobody, nobody, is condemning a single-parent family. This resolution never sought to do that. It just sought to honor the family in its traditional form.

As you go around—and many of you will be campaigning in your areas—just remember that when you go around campaigning on those traditional family values. Remember that maybe you do not want to use that word. Maybe you will want to substitute it with something else because you voted for the Ritter amendment removing that word.

But I just think it is a shame that it has come to this, that the traditional family means nothing more in this House than just something to be trod upon, and that is what you are doing. You are saying the traditional family really does not mean anything.

Are you willing to acknowledge, is anybody willing to acknowledge, that there is a benefit to the traditional family? I think there is.

I would conclude by just remarking or adding some remarks to Representative Stuban's statement that children are in a sense a ward of the Commonwealth. I do not believe— Maybe his children, maybe he feels that is all right for his children. My children are mine. They belong to me. This Commonwealth has no handle on them.

Anyway, we belabored this issue long enough, and we spent a lot of time on resolutions today, and it was not my intent to get any more involved in this than what we did. So I thank this chamber for just hearing me out, and I would ask that we would vote against the resolution as it now stands with the Ritter amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

**MOTION TO TABLE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Cessar.

Mr. CESSAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In view of all the debate we have had here today, I would like to make the motion, if it is proper, to lay this on the table for another vote at another time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Cessar, moves that the resolution, together with the amendment, be tabled.

The motion is not debatable. The question is before the House.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

**YEAS—88**

Adolph	Davies	Johnson	Robinson
Allen	Dempsey	King	Ryan
Anderson	Fairchild	Kosinski	Saurman
Angstadt	Fargo	Langtry	Scheetz
Argall	Farmer	Lawless	Schuler
Armstrong	Fleagle	Lee	Semmel
Barley	Flick	Leh	Serafini
Birmelin	Foster	Lucyk	Smith, S. H.
Black	Freind	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Gallen	McHugh	Snyder, G.
Brown	Gamble	Melio	Stairs
Bunt	Gannon	Merry	Stish
Bush	Geist	Micozzie	Strittmatter
Carlson	Gerlach	Nailor	Taylor, E. Z.
Cessar	Gladeck	Nickol	Telek
Chadwick	Godshall	Nyce	Tomlinson
Civera	Gruppo	Perzel	Tulli
Clark	Hasay	Phillips	Uliana
Clymer	Hayes	Piccola	Vroon
Colaizzo	Hershey	Pitts	Wogan
Cornell	Hess	Raymond	Wozniak
Coy	Jadlowiec	Reber	Wright, M. N.

**NAYS—102**

Acosta	Evans	Lescovitz	Roebuck
Arnold	Fajt	Levdansky	Rudy
Battisto	Fee	Linton	Saloom
Belardi	Freeman	Lloyd	Scrimenti
Belfanti	George	McCall	Smith, B.
Billow	Gruitza	McHale	Staback
Bishop	Hagarty	Maiale	Steelman
Blaum	Haluska	Markosek	Steighner
Bowley	Hanna	Marsico	Stetler
Broujos	Harley	Mayernik	Stuban
Butkovitz	Harper	Michlovic	Sturla
Caltagirone	Hayden	Mihalich	Surra
Cappabianca	Heckler	Mrkonic	Tangretti
Carn	Herman	Mundy	Taylor, F.
Carone	Hughes	Murphy	Thomas
Cawley	Itkin	Nahill	Tigue
Cohen	James	Oliver	Trello
Colafella	Jarolin	Pesci	Trich
Corrigan	Josephs	Petrone	Van Horne
Cowell	Kaiser	Pistella	Vance
DeLuca	Kasunic	Preston	Veon
DeWeese	Krebs	Reinard	Wambach
Daley	Kruszewski	Richardson	Williams
Dent	Kukovich	Rieger	Wilson
Dermody	LaGrotta	Ritter	Wright, D. R.
Donatucci	Laughlin		

**NOT VOTING—5**

Cole	O'Brien	O'Donnell,
Kenney	Taylor, J.	Speaker

**EXCUSED—6**

Durham	McNally	Olasz	Petrarca
Gigliotti	Noye		

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Gamble.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to vehemently oppose this resolution as it stands now.

We started out with a good, clean, traditional-family resolution, and the good, clean family, traditional family, is a moral fiber that holds this country together, and we liberalized that to include gay and lesbian families that raise children. I have in my hands here an article from the local school district library that says, "My Daddy's Roommate," and it is for elementary school kids, and it tells how these two gay homosexuals who were married raised this little family.

Now, if you want to honor them with the traditional family, you go ahead and vote "yes." If you want to honor the traditional family, you vote "no" and we will do this again on another day. This is absolutely ludicrous where we have taken a traditional-family simple resolution to include anything and everything, and those of you who have always voted and supported the theory that anything and everything goes, I am sure you will also support this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Hughes.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure that we acknowledge the statement that was made earlier by the gentleman, I think who is from Berks County, who considered that we have lowered our standards in adopting the Ritter amendment, and specifically understand what he said to the people of this Commonwealth and especially those people in Berks County.

What he said when he said that we have lowered our standards is he said that a single mother who is trying to raise a family, she is lesser than a traditional family. What he said is when a grandparent is trying to assist their children and trying to move them up and be the head of that household, it is of a lesser standard than the traditional family. What he said, what he said was that a father, a male, a father whose wife may have passed for some reason or another and who is trying to keep the children together and everyone together in that family, in that neighborhood, in that community, keep them strong, he said that they are a lower standard than the traditional family.

It needs to be stated for the record, it needs to be stated clearly for the record, what that statement meant - that all of those who are not as fortunate, if you will, to have the benefits of a two-parent household but who are struggling just the same to keep the safety and security of the children and the rest of that family environment on a single positive course are of a lesser standard than a traditional family. It needs to be stated for the record, Mr. Speaker, what was coming out of that individual's mouth, and it needs to be denounced for what it is.

I support the resolution as it stands, and I ask that we vote in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Luzerne County, Mr. Blaum.

Mr. BLAUM. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by a little bit of what I heard here today. This is an innocuous amendment which seems to include, which desires to include, families in Pennsylvania, many families in Pennsylvania, headed by a single person. I daresay that there are many families headed by people in this room which are single-parent families, and to those families, that family headed by the single people in this room is the ideal.

We can remember the events of last January, the events in the Persian Gulf where Pennsylvanians suffered the greatest number of fatalities. That created an awful lot of single-parent families in Pennsylvania. Those families are the ideal, and that is what this amendment seeks to do. This House stood tall by putting this amendment in the resolution. Let us not belabor the point.

There are many families headed by single people that are deserving of the honor that this resolution seeks to extend, and let us stop the bickering, let us stop the nonsense, and honor families in Pennsylvania headed by husband and wife or headed just by a father or headed just by a mother, and let us vote this resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the resolution, the gentleman, Mr. Fargo.

Mr. FARGO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do not believe that there is anyone here who would not want to honor families. As was already stated, we have a week to honor families later on in the year.

The maker of that amendment that was passed had the opportunity to pass an amendment, to bring an amendment in here. No one is going to argue with that. We would honor families. There is no one here who does not honor families, whether they are single parents or whatever they might be.

All this original resolution attempted to do was to acknowledge the fact that we honor and we want to honor a family that has a husband and a wife and children. That is all it is asking for. What you have done now, what you have done now is to completely limit that and say, in a sense—and you are turning it around over there in some of the arguments we have heard—in a sense, you are saying that we do not honor those people. Instead, we are going to honor all families; we cannot give a separate honor. You can do that at any time.

All we were asking in the original resolution was that we do honor families that have husbands and wives and children. What you are doing to this resolution is just plain ridiculous. I do not even know what you are trying to do. We all honor families. There is no one in this place who does not believe that families are great. If you did not, you would not deserve to be here. But I cannot believe, I cannot believe that we cannot in this House set a separate resolution that says, we honor traditional families. I cannot believe that, but I am seeing it happen. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the resolution, the gentleman from Delaware County, Mr. Gannon.

Mr. GANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to interrogate the gentledady, Mrs. Ritter, if she will stand for interrogation.

Ms. RITTER. Did you want to interrogate my mother or me?

Mr. GANNON. No; no. Excuse me. The gentledady, Ms. Ritter, and I would like the record to be corrected, Mr. Speaker. I would not want to make a mistitle here.

Simple question. I think it will clarify a lot of what is on everybody's mind here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman seeks to interrogate the gentledady, Ms. Ritter, on the question. Does she stand for interrogation?

Ms. RITTER. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. She does. The gentleman, Mr. Gannon, is in order and may proceed.

Mr. GANNON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Very simple question. I think it will clarify what is on a lot of minds in this General Assembly.

The resolution with your amendment, as it now stands, does it include in the definition of families lesbian and homosexual couples living together? Simple yes or no.

Ms. RITTER. There is no definition in the resolution for families, and I would suggest you might want to ask President Bush what his definition is of families, considering there is a National Family Week.

Mr. GANNON. Simple question; no answer. Thank you.

On the question recurring,

Will the House adopt the resolution as amended?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—174

Acosta	Dermody	Laughlin	Roebuck
Adolph	Donatucci	Lawless	Rudy
Allen	Evans	Lee	Ryan
Anderson	Fairchild	Lescovitz	Saloom
Angstadt	Fajt	Levdansky	Saurman
Argall	Farmer	Linton	Scrimenti
Arnold	Fee	Lloyd	Semmel
Battisto	Fleagle	Lucyk	Serafini
Belardi	Flick	McCall	Smith, B.
Belfanti	Freeman	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Billow	Gallen	McHale	Snyder, G.
Bishop	Geist	McHugh	Staback
Blaum	George	Maiale	Stairs
Bowley	Gerlach	Markosek	Steelman
Boyes	Gladeck	Marsico	Steighner
Broujos	Godshall	Mayernik	Stetler
Brown	Gruitza	Melio	Stish
Bunt	Gruppo	Merry	Stuban
Bush	Hagarty	Michlovic	Sturla
Butkovitz	Haluska	Micozzie	Surra
Caltagirone	Hanna	Mihalich	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Harley	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Carlson	Harper	Mundy	Taylor, F.
Carn	Hasay	Murphy	Telek
Carone	Hayden	Nahill	Thomas
Cawley	Hayes	Nailor	Tigue
Cessar	Heckler	Nickol	Tomlinson
Chadwick	Herman	Nyce	Trello
Civera	Hess	Oliver	Trich

Clark	Hughes	Perzel	Tulli
Cohen	Itkin	Pesci	Uliana
Colafiglia	Jadlowiec	Petrone	Van Horne
Colaizzo	James	Phillips	Vance
Cole	Jarolin	Piccola	Veon
Cornell	Josephs	Pistella	Wambach
Corrigan	Kaiser	Pitts	Williams
Cowell	Kasunic	Preston	Wilson
Coy	King	Raymond	Wogan
DeLuca	Kosinski	Reber	Wozniak
DeWeese	Krebs	Reinard	Wright, D. R.
Daley	Kruszewski	Richardson	Wright, M. N.
Davies	Kukovich	Rieger	
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Ritter	O'Donnell,
Dent	Langtry	Robinson	Speaker

NAYS—17

Armstrong	Fargo	Gannon	Scheetz
Barley	Foster	Hershey	Schuler
Birmelin	Freind	Johnson	Strittmatter
Black	Gamble	Leh	Vroon
Clymer			

NOT VOTING—4

Kenney	O'Brien	Snyder, D. W.	Taylor, J.
--------	---------	---------------	------------

EXCUSED—6

Durham	McNally	Olasz	Petrarca
Gigliotti	Noye		

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

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION CONTINUED

The House proceeded to third consideration of HB 1102, PN 1252, entitled:

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for persons qualified to solemnize marriages.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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	Dermody	LaGrotta	Rudy
Adolph	Donatucci	Langtry	Ryan
Allen	Evans	Laughlin	Saloom
Anderson	Fairchild	Lawless	Saurman
Angstadt	Fajt	Lee	Scheetz
Argall	Fargo	Leh	Schuler
Armstrong	Farmer	Lescovitz	Scrimenti
Arnold	Fee	Levdansky	Semmel
Barley	Fleagle	Linton	Serafini
Battisto	Flick	Lloyd	Smith, B.
Belardi	Foster	Lucyk	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Freeman	McCall	Snyder, D. W.
Billow	Freind	McGeehan	Snyder, G.
Birmelin	Gallen	McHale	Staback
Bishop	Gamble	McHugh	Stairs
Black	Gannon	Maiale	Steelman

Blaum	Geist	Markosek	Steighner
Bowley	George	Marsico	Stetler
Boyes	Gerlach	Mayernik	Stish
Broujos	Gladeck	Melio	Strittmatter
Brown	Godshall	Merry	Stuban
Bunt	Gruitza	Michlovic	Sturla
Bush	Gruppo	Micozzie	Surra
Butkovitz	Hagarty	Mihalich	Tangretti
Caltagirone	Haluska	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Hanna	Mundy	Taylor, F.
Carlson	Harley	Murphy	Telek
Carn	Harper	Nahill	Thomas
Carone	Hasay	Nailor	Tigue
Cawley	Hayden	Nickol	Tomlinson
Cessar	Hayes	Nyce	Trello
Chadwick	Heckler	Oliver	Trich
Civera	Herman	Perzel	Tulli
Clark	Hershey	Pesci	Uliana
Clymer	Hess	Petrone	Van Horne
Cohen	Hughes	Phillips	Vance
Colaifella	Itkin	Piccola	Veon
Colaizzo	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Vroon
Cole	James	Pitts	Wambach
Cornell	Jarolin	Preston	Williams
Corrigan	Johnson	Raymond	Wilson
Cowell	Josephs	Reber	Wogan
Coy	Kaiser	Reinard	Wozniak
DeLuca	Kasunic	Richardson	Wright, D. R.
DeWeese	King	Rieger	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Kosinski	Ritter	
Davies	Krebs	Robinson	O'Donnell,
Dempsey	Kruszewski	Roebuck	Speaker
Dent	Kukovich		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—3

Kennedy	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
---------	---------	------------

EXCUSED—6

Durham	McNally	Olasz	Petrarca
Gigliotti	Noye		

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

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

**RULES SUSPENDED**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Greene County, the majority leader, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the rules of the House be suspended for the immediate consideration of HR 323.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—184

Acosta	Dermody	LaGrotta	Ryan
Adolph	Donatucci	Langtry	Saloom
Allen	Evans	Laughlin	Saurman
Anderson	Fairchild	Lawless	Scheetz
Angstadt	Fajt	Lee	Schuler
Armstrong	Fargo	Leh	Scrimanti
Arnold	Farmer	Lescovitz	Semmel
Barley	Fee	Levdansky	Serafini

Battisto	Fleagle	Lloyd	Smith, B.
Belardi	Flick	Lucyk	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Foster	McCall	Snyder, D. W.
Billow	Freeman	McGeehan	Snyder, G.
Birmelin	Gallen	McHale	Staback
Bishop	Gamble	McHugh	Stairs
Black	Gannon	Markosek	Steelman
Blaum	Geist	Marsico	Steighner
Bowley	George	Mayernik	Stetler
Boyes	Gerlach	Melio	Stish
Brown	Gladeck	Merry	Strittmatter
Bunt	Godshall	Michlovic	Stuban
Bush	Gruitza	Micozzie	Sturla
Butkovitz	Gruppo	Mihalich	Surra
Caltagirone	Hagarty	Mundy	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Haluska	Murphy	Taylor, E. Z.
Carlson	Hanna	Nahill	Taylor, F.
Carn	Harley	Nailor	Telek
Carone	Harper	Nickol	Thomas
Cawley	Hasay	Nyce	Tigue
Cessar	Hayden	Oliver	Tomlinson
Chadwick	Hayes	Perzel	Trello
Civera	Herman	Pesci	Trich
Clark	Hershey	Petrone	Tulli
Clymer	Hess	Phillips	Uliana
Cohen	Hughes	Piccola	Van Horne
Colaifella	Itkin	Pistella	Vance
Colaizzo	Jadlowiec	Pitts	Veon
Cole	James	Preston	Vroon
Cornell	Jarolin	Raymond	Wambach
Corrigan	Johnson	Reber	Williams
Cowell	Josephs	Reinard	Wogan
Coy	Kaiser	Richardson	Wozniak
DeLuca	Kasunic	Rieger	Wright, D. R.
DeWeese	King	Ritter	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Kosinski	Robinson	
Davies	Krebs	Roebuck	O'Donnell,
Dempsey	Kruszewski	Rudy	Speaker
Dent	Kukovich		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—11

Argall	Heckler	Maiale	Taylor, J.
Broujos	Kennedy	Mrkonic	Wilson
Freind	Linton	O'Brien	

EXCUSED—6

Durham	McNally	Olasz	Petrarca
Gigliotti	Noye		

A majority of the members elected to the House having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the motion was agreed to.

**RESOLUTION ADOPTED**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House has immediately before it HR 323. The gentleman from Chester County, Mr. Pitts, calls up HR 323, which will be read by the clerk.

The following resolution was read:

**House Resolution No. 323**

A RESOLUTION

Urging the Department of Education, local school districts and intermediate units to participate in the first annual Statewide Pennsylvania Academic Competition on May 29, 1992.

WHEREAS, The education of all Pennsylvania children is a major concern to the citizens of this Commonwealth and requires the use of creative and innovative means to focus attention upon this concern; and

WHEREAS, Academic competition is an innovative and creative attempt to involve children, parents, educators and community members in an educational forum for excellence; and

WHEREAS, Athletic excellence has long been recognized by societal and community rewards provided for that type of competition; and

WHEREAS, Academic competition helps to hone the abilities and intellectual skills of students, as well as providing opportunities for incentives to continue the pursuit of excellence in education; and

WHEREAS, A coordinated program of academic competition has not existed in this Commonwealth, except in isolated school district programs; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the House of Representatives declare the week of May 26, 1992, as "Pennsylvania Academic Competition Week"; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Department of Education, local school districts and intermediate units are urged to actively participate in the finals of the first annual Statewide Academic Competition to be held in the House of Representatives Chambers on May 29, 1992.

Joseph R. Pitts  
 Richard D. Olasz  
 Joseph M. Uliana  
 Timothy L. Pesci  
 Russ Fairchild  
 Robert E. Nyce  
 Anthony L. Colaizzo  
 Anthony J. Melio  
 Gerard A. Kosinski  
 P. Michael Sturla  
 Thomas E. Armstrong  
 Jim Gerlach  
 Elaine F. Farmer  
 Kenneth J. Cole  
 Matthew N. Wright  
 Lois Sherman Hagarty  
 Thomas C. Petrone  
 Charles F. Nahill, Jr.  
 Dick L. Hess  
 Edgar A. Carlson  
 Leona G. Telek  
 Jerry Birmelin  
 Fred Belardi  
 Richard J. Cessar  
 Edward G. Staback  
 Arthur D. Hershey  
 Alice S. Langtry  
 Jeffrey W. Coy  
 H. William DeWeese  
 Connie McHugh  
 Fred C. Noye  
 Patricia Carone  
 Robert M. Tomlinson  
 Richard A. Kasunic  
 Bruce Smith  
 James R. Roebuck, Jr.  
 Thomas W. Dempsey  
 Edwin G. Johnson  
 Richard A. Geist  
 Ronald S. Marsico  
 Babette Josephs  
 Robert W. Godshall  
 Elinor Z. Taylor  
 Patricia H. Vance  
 John A. Lawless  
 Paul W. Semmel  
 Howard L. Fargo  
 Joseph W. Battisto

Ruth B. Harper  
 Thomas M. Tighe  
 David O. King  
 Ron Raymond  
 George E. Saurman  
 Ed Arnold  
 Ivan Itkin  
 Teresa E. Brown  
 Fred A. Trello  
 Italo S. Cappabianca

On the question,  
 Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—192

Acosta	Dermody	LaGrotta	Rudy
Adolph	Donatucci	Langtry	Ryan
Allen	Evans	Laughlin	Saloom
Anderson	Fairchild	Lawless	Saurman
Angstadt	Fajt	Lee	Scheetz
Argall	Fargo	Leh	Schuler
Armstrong	Farmer	Lescovitz	Scrimenti
Arnold	Fee	Levdansky	Semmel
Barley	Fleagle	Linton	Serafini
Battisto	Flick	Lloyd	Smith, B.
Belardi	Foster	Lucyk	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Freeman	McCall	Snyder, D. W.
Billow	Freind	McGeehan	Snyder, G.
Birmelin	Gallen	McHale	Staback
Bishop	Gamble	McHugh	Stairs
Black	Gannon	Maiale	Steelman
Blaum	Geist	Markosek	Steighner
Bowley	George	Marsico	Stetler
Boyes	Gerlach	Mayernik	Stish
Broujos	Gladeck	Melio	Strittmatter
Brown	Godshall	Merry	Stuban
Bunt	Gruitza	Michlovic	Sturla
Bush	Gruppo	Micozzie	Surra
Butkovitz	Hagarty	Mihalich	Tangretti
Caltagirone	Haluska	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Hanna	Mundy	Taylor, F.
Carlson	Harley	Murphy	Telek
Carn	Harper	Nahill	Thomas
Carone	Hasay	Nailor	Tigue
Cawley	Hayden	Nickol	Tomlinson
Cessar	Hayes	Nyce	Trello
Chadwick	Heckler	Oliver	Trich
Civera	Herman	Perzel	Tulli
Clark	Hershey	Pesci	Uliana
Clymer	Hess	Petrone	Van Horne
Cohen	Hughes	Phillips	Vance
Colafella	Itkin	Piccola	Veon
Colaizzo	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Vroon
Cole	James	Pitts	Wambach
Cornell	Jarolin	Preston	Williams
Corrigan	Johnson	Raymond	Wilson
Cowell	Josephs	Reber	Wogan
Coy	Kaiser	Reinard	Wozniak
DeLuca	Kasunic	Richardson	Wright, D. R.
DeWeese	King	Rieger	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Kosinski	Ritter	
Davies	Krebs	Robinson	O'Donnell,
Dempsey	Kruszewski	Roebuck	Speaker
Dent	Kukovich		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—3

Kenney                      O'Brien                      Taylor, J.

## EXCUSED—6

Durham            McNally            Olasz            Petrarca  
Gigliotti        Noye

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There will be no further votes taken on the floor of the House of Representatives today.

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

**HB 1701, PN 2025**                      By Rep. CALTAGIRONE

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, imposing criminal responsibility on landlords for certain activities.

JUDICIARY.

**HB 2004, PN 2495**                      By Rep. CALTAGIRONE

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, prohibiting certain entertainment in specified establishments.

JUDICIARY.

### VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Bowley, rise?

Mr. BOWLEY. To correct the record, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. BOWLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Regretfully, my switch malfunctioned on amendment 1741 to HR 302. If I had been in my seat, I would have voted in the affirmative. Thank you.

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

### STATEMENT BY MINORITY WHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Hayes, rise?

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, it was necessary for the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Taylor; the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. O'Brien; and the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Kenney, to leave the House of Representatives during consideration of HB 1102 and HR 302. They were not voted, but I would like to have the record show that when they left, they did request a leave of absence during consideration of those matters.

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

### SENATE MESSAGE

#### HOUSE AMENDMENTS CONCURRED IN BY SENATE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, informed that the Senate has concurred in the amendments made by the House of Representatives to the Senate amendments to **HB 2529, PN 3565**.

#### BILLS SIGNED BY SPEAKER

The Chair gave notice that the Speaker had signed the following bills:

**HB 686, PN 751**

An Act prohibiting persons who accept credit cards for the transaction of business from requiring certain additional information from the credit cardholder; providing for enforcement of the act; and imposing civil penalties.

**HB 788, PN 865**

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for application for certificate of title by agent.

**HB 1263, PN 1450**

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for adult accompaniment of persons holding learners' permits.

**HB 1484, PN 3192**

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for operations of rescue and emergency squad vehicles and for commercial driver's license.

**HB 2529, PN 3565**

An Act amending the act of August 4, 1991 (P. L. 484, No. 7A), known as the "General Appropriation Act of 1991," providing additional appropriations from the General Fund; and increasing and adding certain Federal appropriations for Executive Departments funded through the General Fund and the Lottery Fund.

#### HOUSE BILL INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

**No. 2751**                      By Representatives McCALL, HESS,  
CESSAR, MARKOSEK and BATTISTO

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the implementation and administration of an enhanced vehicle emission inspection program.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, May 13, 1992.

#### ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS OF SPONSORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair acknowledges receipt of additions and deletions of sponsorships of bills, which will be filed by the clerk.

(Copy of list is on file with the Journal clerk.)

### **BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER**

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

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Elk County, Mr. Surra.

Mr. SURRA. Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until Monday, May 18, 1992, at 1 p.m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to, and at 12:53 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.