

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23, 1994

SESSION OF 1994

178TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 21

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

**THE SPEAKER (H. WILLIAM DeWEESE)
PRESIDING**

PRAYER

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

Let us pray:

O God our Father, who art the way, the truth, and the life, who alone can quiet our restless hearts and minds and can lead us to that peace and joy that only You can give, be with us as we stumble and struggle here below.

May we always be true to ourselves, for we know if we are, we cannot then be false to any man.

Be with Your servants in this House in all things great and small so that the small might become great and the great possible. Make their homes sanctuaries of love and joy that they might draw spiritual resources to keep them both day and night. Remind them of the pleasures of family life and how it can bring them a peace that passes all understanding.

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. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Tuesday, March 22, 1994, will be postponed until printed. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. Trello, would you please approach the podium.

**THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
(FRED A. TRELLO) PRESIDING**

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Steighner, for leaves of absence.

Mr. STEIGHNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask for leave for today only for the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. BUTKOVITZ; the gentleman from Mercer, Mr. GRUITZA; and the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. ACOSTA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Perzel, for leaves of absence.

The Chair thanks the gentleman. No leaves requested.

MASTER ROLL CALL

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

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—197

Adolph	Farmer	Lynch	Saurman
Allen	Fee	Maitland	Saylor
Argall	Fichter	Manderino	Scheetz
Armstrong	Fleagle	Markosek	Schuler
Baker	Flick	Marsico	Scrimenti
Barley	Freeman	Masland	Semmel
Battisto	Gamble	Mayernik	Serafini
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	McCall	Smith, B.
Belardi	Geist	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belfauti	George	McNally	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Gerlach	Melio	Staback
Bishop	Gigliotti	Merry	Stairs
Blaum	Gladeck	Michlovic	Steelman
Brown	Godshall	Micozvie	Steighner
Bunt	Gordner	Mihalich	Steil
Burns	Gruppo	Miller	Stern
Buxton	Haluska	Mundy	Stetler
Callagirono	Hanna	Nailor	Stish
Cappabianca	Harley	Nickol	Strittmatter
Carn	Hasay	Nyce	Sturla
Carone	Hennessey	O'Brien	Surra
Cawley	Herman	Olasz	Tangretti
Cessar	Hershey	Oliver	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Hess	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Civera	Hughes	Perzi	Thomas
Clark	Hutchinson	Petrarca	Tigue
Clymer	Itkin	Petrone	Tomlinson
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Petit	Trello
Cohen, M.	James	Phillips	Trich
Colafigella	Jarolin	Piccola	True
Colaizzo	Josephs	Pistella	Tulli
Conti	Kaiser	Pitts	Uliana
Cornell	Kasunic	Platts	Vance
Corrigan	Keller	Preston	Van Horne
Cowell	Kenney	Raymond	Veon
Coy	King	Reber	Vitali

Curry	Kirkland	Reinard	Washington
Daley	Krebs	Richardson	Waugh
DeLuca	Kukovich	Rieger	Williams
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Ritter	Wogan
Dent	Laub	Roberts	Wozniak
Dermody	Laughlin	Robinson	Wright, D. R.
Donatucci	Lawless	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Druce	Lederer	Rohrer	Yandriacvits
Durham	Lee	Rooney	Yewcic
Egolf	Leh	Rubley	Zug
Evans	Lescovitz	Rudy	
Fairchild	Levdansky	Ryan	DeWeese,
Fajt	Lloyd	Santoni	Speaker
Fargo	Lucyk	Sather	

Burns	Gruppo	Mihalich	Steil
Buxton	Haluska	Miller	Stern
Caltagirone	Hanna	Mundy	Stetler
Cappabianca	Harley	Nailor	Stiah
Carn	Hasay	Nickol	Strittmatter
Carone	Heaneasey	Nyce	Surra
Cawley	Herman	O'Brien	Tangretti
Cessar	Hershey	Olasz	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Hess	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Civera	Hughes	Perzel	Thomas
Clark	Hutchinson	Pesci	Tigue
Clymer	Itkin	Petrarca	Tomlinson
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Petrone	Trello
Cohen, M.	James	Pettit	Trich
Colafella	Jarolin	Phillips	True
Colaizzo	Josephs	Piccola	Tulli
Conti	Kaiser	Pistella	Uliana
Cornell	Kasunic	Pitts	Vance
Corrigan	Keller	Platts	Van Horne
Cowell	Kenney	Preston	Veon
Coy	King	Raymond	Washington
Curry	Kirkland	Reber	Waugh
Daley	Krebs	Reinard	Williams
DeLuca	Kukovich	Richardson	Wogan
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Rieger	Wozniak
Dent	Laub	Ritter	Wright, D. R.
Dermody	Laughlin	Roberts	Wright, M. N.
Donatucci	Lawless	Robinson	Yandriacvits
Druce	Lederer	Roebuck	Yewcic
Durham	Lee	Rohrer	Zug
Egolf	Leh	Rooney	
Evans	Lescovitz	Rubley	DeWeese,
Fairchild	Levdansky	Ryan	Speaker
Fajt	Lloyd	Santoni	

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Acosta	Bush	Butkovitz	Gruitza
Boyes			

CALENDAR

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1075, PN 3285**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of September 24, 1968 (P.L.1040, No.318), known as the Coal Refuse Disposal Control Act, providing for selection of sites for coal refuse disposal; further providing for areas unsuitable for coal refuse disposal; providing for coal refuse disposal activities on areas on which there are preexisting pollutional discharges; providing for experimental practices and demonstration projects involving coal refuse disposal; and providing for retention of jurisdiction over surface coal mining.

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—193

Adolph	Fargo	Lucyk	Sather
Allen	Farmer	Lynch	Saurman
Argall	Fee	Maitland	Saylor
Armstrong	Fichter	Manderino	Scheetz
Baker	Fleagle	Markosek	Schuler
Barley	Flick	Marsico	Scrimenti
Battisto	Gamble	Masland	Sennel
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	Mayernik	Serafini
Belardi	Geist	McCall	Smith, B.
Belfanti	George	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Birmelin	Gerlach	McNally	Snyder, D. W.
Bishop	Gigliotti	Melio	Staback
Blaum	Gladeck	Merry	Stairs
Brown	Godshall	Michlovic	Steelman
Bunt	Gordner	Micozzie	Steighner

NAYS—4

Freeman	Rudy	Sturla	Vitali
---------	------	--------	--------

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Acosta	Bush	Butkovitz	Gruitza
Boyes			

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.

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1996, PN 2447**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, further providing for definition of "professional employe" to include school social workers.

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

BILL TABLED

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

Mr. CESSAR. Mr. Speaker, I move that HB 1996 be placed on the table.

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

BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

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

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that HB 1996 be taken off the table.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 515, PN 1331**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 40 (Insurance) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, adding provisions relating to speech-language pathologists, audiologists and teachers of persons who are hearing impaired.

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—195

Adolph	Fee	Lynch	Saurman
Allen	Fichter	Maitland	Saylor
Argall	Fleagle	Manderino	Scheetz
Armstrong	Flick	Markosek	Schuler
Baker	Freeman	Marsico	Scrimenti
Barley	Gamble	Masland	Semmel
Battisto	Gannon	Mayernik	Serafini
Bebko-Jones	Geist	McCall	Smith, B.
Belardi	George	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Gerlach	McNally	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Gigliotti	Melio	Staback
Bishop	Gladeck	Michlovic	Stairs
Blaum	Godshall	Micozzie	Steelman
Brown	Gordner	Mihalich	Steighner
Bunt	Gruppo	Miller	Steil
Burns	Haluska	Mundy	Stern
Buxton	Hanna	Nailor	Stetler
Caltagirone	Harley	Nickol	Stish
Cappabianca	Hasay	Nyce	Strittmatter
Cam	Hennessey	O'Brien	Sturla
Carone	Herman	Olasz	Surra

Cawley	Hershey	Oliver	Tangretti
Cessar	Hess	Perzel	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Hughes	Pesci	Taylor, J.
Civera	Hutchinson	Petrarca	Thomas
Clark	Itkin	Petrone	Tigue
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pettit	Tomlinson
Cohen, L. I.	James	Phillips	Trello
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Piccola	Trich
Colafiglia	Josephs	Pistella	True
Colaizzo	Kaiser	Pitts	Tulli
Conti	Kasunic	Platts	Uliana
Cornell	Keller	Preston	Vance
Corrigan	Kenney	Raymond	Van Horne
Cowell	King	Reber	Veon
Coy	Kirkland	Reinard	Vitali
Curry	Krebs	Richardson	Washington
Daley	Kukovich	Rieger	Waugh
DeLuca	LaGrotta	Ritter	Williams
Dempsey	Laub	Roberts	Wogan
Dent	Laughlin	Robinson	Wozniak
Dermody	Lawless	Roebuck	Wright, D. R.
Donatucci	Lederer	Rohrer	Wright, M. N.
Druce	Lee	Rooney	Yandrisevits
Durham	Leh	Rubley	Yewcic
Egolf	Lescovitz	Rudy	Zug
Evans	Levdansky	Ryan	
Fairchild	Lloyd	Santoni	DeWeese,
Fajt	Lucyk	Sather	Speaker
Farmer			

NAYS—2

Fargo	Mery
-------	------

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Acosta	Bush	Butkovitz	Gruitza
Boyes			

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 return the same to the Senate with the information that the House has passed the same without amendment.

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2624, PN 3369**, entitled:

An Act making appropriations from a restricted revenue account within the General Fund and from Federal augmentation funds to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?
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—197

Adolph	Farmer	Lynch	Saurman
Allen	Fee	Maitland	Saylor
Argall	Fichter	Manderino	Schoetz
Armstrong	Fleagle	Markosek	Schuler
Baker	Flick	Marsico	Scrimenti
Barley	Freeman	Masland	Semmel
Battisto	Gamble	Mayernik	Serafini
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	McCall	Smith, B.
Belardi	Geist	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	George	McNally	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Gerlach	Melio	Staback
Bishop	Gigliotti	Merry	Stairs
Blaum	Gladeck	Michlovic	Steelman
Brown	Godshall	Micozzie	Steighner
Bunt	Gordner	Mihalich	Steil
Burns	Gruppo	Miller	Stern
Buxton	Haluska	Mundy	Stetler
Caltagirone	Hanna	Nailor	Stish
Cappabianca	Harley	Nickol	Strittmatter
Carn	Hasay	Nyce	Sturla
Carone	Hennessey	O'Brien	Surra
Cawley	Herman	Olasz	Tangretti
Cessar	Hershey	Oliver	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Hess	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Civera	Hughes	Pesci	Thomas
Clark	Hutchinson	Petrarca	Tigue
Clymer	Itkin	Petrone	Tomlinson
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pettit	Trello
Cohen, M.	James	Phillips	Trich
Colaella	Jarolin	Piccola	True
Colaizzo	Josephs	Pistella	Tulli
Conti	Kaiser	Pitts	Uliana
Cornell	Kasunic	Platts	Vance
Corrigan	Keller	Preston	Van Horne
Cowell	Kenney	Raymond	Veon
Coy	King	Reber	Vitali
Curry	Kirkland	Reinard	Washington
Daley	Krebs	Richardson	Waugh
DeLuca	Kukovich	Rieger	Williams
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Ritter	Wogan
Dent	Laub	Roberts	Wozniak
Dermody	Laughlin	Robinson	Wright, D. R.
Donatucci	Lawless	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Druce	Lederer	Rohrer	Yandrisevits
Durham	Lee	Rooney	Yewcic
Egolf	Leh	Rublely	Zug
Evans	Lescovitz	Rudy	
Fairchild	Levdansky	Ryan	DeWeese,
Fajt	Lloyd	Santoni	Speaker
Fargo	Lucyk	Sather	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Acosta	Bush	Butkovitz	Gruitza
Boyes			

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.

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2625, PN 3370**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation from a restricted revenue account within the General Fund to the Office of Consumer Advocate in the Office of the Attorney General.

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—197

Adolph	Farmer	Lynch	Saurman
Allen	Fee	Maitland	Saylor
Argall	Fichter	Manderino	Schoetz
Armstrong	Fleagle	Markosek	Schuler
Baker	Flick	Marsico	Scrimenti
Barley	Freeman	Masland	Semmel
Battisto	Gamble	Mayernik	Serafini
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	McCall	Smith, B.
Belardi	Geist	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	George	McNally	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Gerlach	Melio	Staback
Bishop	Gigliotti	Merry	Stairs
Blaum	Gladeck	Michlovic	Steelman
Brown	Godshall	Micozzie	Steighner
Bunt	Gordner	Mihalich	Steil
Burns	Gruppo	Miller	Stern
Buxton	Haluska	Mundy	Stetler
Caltagirone	Hanna	Nailor	Stish
Cappabianca	Harley	Nickol	Strittmatter
Carn	Hasay	Nyce	Sturla
Carone	Hennessey	O'Brien	Surra
Cawley	Herman	Olasz	Tangretti
Cessar	Hershey	Oliver	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Hess	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Civera	Hughes	Pesci	Thomas
Clark	Hutchinson	Petrarca	Tigue
Clymer	Itkin	Petrone	Tomlinson
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pettit	Trello
Cohen, M.	James	Phillips	Trich
Colaella	Jarolin	Piccola	True
Colaizzo	Josephs	Pistella	Tulli
Conti	Kaiser	Pitts	Uliana
Cornell	Kasunic	Platts	Vance
Corrigan	Keller	Preston	Van Horne
Cowell	Kenney	Raymond	Veon
Coy	King	Reber	Vitali
Curry	Kirkland	Reinard	Washington
Daley	Krebs	Richardson	Waugh
DeLuca	Kukovich	Rieger	Williams
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Ritter	Wogan
Dent	Laub	Roberts	Wozniak
Dermody	Laughlin	Robinson	Wright, D. R.
Donatucci	Lawless	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Druce	Lederer	Rohrer	Yandrisevits
Durham	Lee	Rooney	Yewcic
Egolf	Leh	Rublely	Zug
Evans	Lescovitz	Rudy	
Fairchild	Levdansky	Ryan	DeWeese,
Fajt	Lloyd	Santoni	Speaker
Fargo	Lucyk	Sather	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Acosta	Bush	Butkovitz	Gruitza
Boyes			

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.

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2626, PN 3371**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation from a restricted revenue account within the General Fund to the Office of Small Business Advocate in the Department of Commerce.

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—197

Adolph	Farmer	Lynch	Saurman
Allen	Fee	Maitland	Saylor
Argall	Fichter	Manderino	Scheetz
Armstrong	Fleagle	Markosek	Schuler
Baker	Flick	Marsico	Scrimenti
Barley	Freeman	Masland	Semmel
Battisto	Gamble	Mayernik	Serafini
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	McCall	Smith, B.
Belardi	Geist	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	George	McNally	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Gerlach	Melio	Staback
Bishop	Gigliotti	Merry	Stairs
Blaum	Gladeck	Michlovic	Steelman
Brown	Godshall	Micozzie	Steighner
Bunt	Gordner	Mihalich	Steil
Burns	Gruppo	Miller	Stern
Buxton	Haluska	Mundy	Stetler
Caltagirone	Hanna	Nailor	Stish
Cappabianca	Harley	Nickol	Strittmatter
Carn	Hasay	Nyce	Sturla
Carone	Hennessey	O'Brien	Surra
Cawley	Herman	Olasz	Tangretti
Cessar	Hershey	Oliver	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Hess	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Civera	Hughes	Pesci	Thomas
Clark	Hutchinson	Petrarca	Tigue
Clymer	Itkin	Petrone	Tomlinson
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pettit	Trello
Cohen, M.	James	Phillips	Trich
Colafiglia	Jarolin	Piccola	True
Colaizzo	Josephs	Pistella	Tulli

Conti	Kaiser	Pitts	Uliana
Cornell	Kasunic	Platts	Vance
Corrigan	Keller	Preston	Van Horne
Cowell	Kenney	Raymond	Veon
Coy	King	Reber	Vitali
Curry	Kirkland	Reinard	Washington
Daley	Krebs	Richardson	Wauugh
DeLuca	Kukovich	Rieger	Williams
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Ritter	Wogan
Dent	Laub	Roberts	Wozniak
Dermody	Laughlin	Robinson	Wright, D. R.
Donatucci	Lawless	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Druce	Lederer	Rohrer	Yandrievits
Durham	Lee	Rooney	Yewcic
Egolf	Leh	Rubley	Zug
Evans	Lescovitz	Rudy	
Fairchild	Levdansky	Ryan	DeWeese,
Fajt	Lloyd	Santoni	Speaker
Fargo	Lucyk	Sather	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Acosta	Bush	Butkovitz	Gruitza
Boyes			

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.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. Will the gentleman, Representative Fajt, come to the podium, please.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (GREGORY C. FAJT) PRESIDING

HB 1075 RECONSIDERED

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. The Chair is in receipt of a reconsideration motion for HB 1075, PN 3285, which passed on the 23d day of March, and the request is to have that vote reconsidered.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—197

Adolph	Farmer	Lynch	Saurman
Allen	Fee	Maitland	Saylor
Argall	Fichter	Manderino	Scheetz
Armstrong	Fleagle	Markosek	Schuler
Baker	Flick	Marsico	Scrimenti
Barley	Freeman	Masland	Semmel
Battisto	Gamble	Mayernik	Serafini
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	McCall	Smith, B.
Belardi	Geist	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	George	McNally	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Gerlach	Melio	Staback
Bishop	Gigliotti	Merry	Stairs

Blaum	Gladeck	Michlovic	Steelman
Brown	Godshall	Micozzie	Steighner
Bunt	Gordner	Mihalich	Steil
Burns	Gruppo	Miller	Stern
Burton	Haluska	Mundy	Stetler
Caltagirone	Hanna	Nailor	Stish
Cappabianca	Harley	Nickol	Strittmatter
Carn	Hasay	Nyce	Sturla
Carone	Hennessey	O'Brien	Surra
Cawley	Herman	Olasz	Tangretti
Cessar	Hershey	Oliver	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Hess	Petzel	Taylor, J.
Civera	Hughes	Pesci	Thomas
Clark	Hutchinson	Petrarca	Tigue
Clymer	Itkin	Petrone	Tomlinson
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Petit	Trello
Cohen, M.	James	Phillips	Trich
Colaella	Jarolin	Piccola	True
Colaizzo	Josephs	Pistella	Tulli
Conti	Kaiser	Pitts	Uliana
Cornell	Kasunic	Platts	Vance
Corrigan	Keller	Preston	Van Horne
Cowell	Kenney	Raymond	Veon
Coy	King	Reber	Vitali
Curry	Kirkland	Reinard	Washington
Daley	Krebs	Richardson	Waugh
DeLuca	Kukovich	Rieger	Williams
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Ritter	Wogan
Dent	Laub	Roberts	Wozniak
Dermody	Laughlin	Robinson	Wright, D. R.
Donatucci	Lawless	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Druce	Lederer	Rohrer	Yandrisevits
Durham	Lee	Rooney	Yewcic
Egolf	Leh	Rublely	Zug
Evans	Lescovitz	Rudy	
Fairchild	Levdansky	Ryan	DeWeese,
Fajt	Lloyd	Santoni	Speaker
Fargo	Lucyk	Sather	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Acosta	Bush	Butkovitz	Gruitza
Boyes			

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

On the question recurring,

Shall the bill pass finally?

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

YEAS—194

Adolph	Farmer	Lucyk	Sather
Allen	Fee	Lynch	Saurman
Argall	Fichter	Maitland	Saylor
Armstrong	Fleagle	Manderino	Scheetz
Baker	Flick	Markosek	Schuler
Barley	Freeman	Marsico	Scrimenti
Battisto	Gamble	Masland	Semmel
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	Mayernik	Serafini
Belardi	Geist	McCall	Smith, B.
Belfanti	George	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Birmelin	Gerlach	McNally	Snyder, D. W.
Bishop	Gigliotti	Melio	Staback

Blaum	Gladeck	Merry	Stairs
Brown	Godshall	Michlovic	Steelman
Bunt	Gordner	Micozzie	Steighner
Burns	Gruppo	Mihalich	Steil
Burton	Haluska	Miller	Stern
Caltagirone	Hanna	Mundy	Stetler
Cappabianca	Harley	Nailor	Stish
Carn	Hasay	Nickol	Strittmatter
Carone	Hennessey	Nyce	Sturla
Cessar	Herman	O'Brien	Surra
Chadwick	Hershey	Olasz	Tangretti
Civera	Hess	Oliver	Taylor, E. Z.
Clark	Hughes	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Clymer	Hutchinson	Pesci	Thomas
Cohen, L. I.	Itkin	Petrarca	Tigue
Cohen, M.	Jadlowiec	Petrone	Tomlinson
Colaella	James	Petit	Trello
Colaizzo	Jarolin	Phillips	Trich
Conti	Josephs	Piccola	True
Cornell	Kaiser	Pistella	Tulli
Corrigan	Kasunic	Pitts	Uliana
Cowell	Keller	Platts	Vance
Coy	Kenney	Preston	Van Horne
Curry	King	Raymond	Veon
Daley	Kirkland	Reber	Washington
DeLuca	Krebs	Reinard	Waugh
Dempsey	Kukovich	Richardson	Williams
Dent	LaGrotta	Rieger	Wogan
Dermody	Laub	Ritter	Wozniak
Donatucci	Laughlin	Roberts	Wright, D. R.
Druce	Lawless	Robinson	Wright, M. N.
Durham	Lederer	Roebuck	Yandrisevits
Egolf	Lee	Rohrer	Yewcic
Evans	Leh	Rooney	Zug
Fairchild	Lescovitz	Rublely	
Fajt	Levdansky	Ryan	DeWeese,
Fargo	Lloyd	Santoni	Speaker

NAYS—3

Cawley	Rudy	Vitali
--------	------	--------

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Acosta	Bush	Butkovitz	Gruitza
Boyes			

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.

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION CONTINUED

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1006, PN 1088**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of July 28, 1953 (P.L. 723, No. 230), known as the Second Class County Code, providing for a supplemental retirement benefit for certain persons.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. TRELLO offered the following amendment No. A1045:

Amend Title, page 1, line 5, by removing the period after "persons" and inserting under certain conditions.

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1712), page 2, by inserting between lines 2 and 3

(2) The county shall not be responsible for continuing any payments made under clause (1) in the event that funding for such payments is no longer available under the act of December 18, 1984 (P.L.1005, No.205), known as the "Municipal Pension Plan Funding Standard and Recovery Act."

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1712), page 2, line 3, by striking out "(2)" and inserting

(3)

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the Chair recognizes the chairman of the Finance Committee, Representative Trello.

Mr. TRELLO. Mr. Speaker, this amendment guarantees that Allegheny County will not have to continue payments in the unlikely event that Act 205 money would no longer be available.

I ask for support of the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the Republican chairman of the Transportation Committee, Representative Cessar.

Mr. CESSAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I support the amendment and ask everybody to vote for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

Adolph	Farmer	Lucyk	Sather
Allen	Fee	Lynch	Saurman
Argall	Fichter	Maitland	Saylor
Armstrong	Fleagle	Manderino	Scheetz
Baker	Flick	Markosek	Schuler
Barley	Freeman	Marsico	Scrimenti
Battisto	Gamble	Masland	Semmel
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	Mayernik	Serafini
Belardi	Geist	McCall	Smith, B.
Belfanti	George	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Birmelin	Gerlach	McNally	Staback
Bishop	Gigliotti	Melio	Stairs
Blaum	Gladeck	Merry	Steelman
Brown	Godshall	Michlovic	Steighner
Bunt	Gordner	Micozzie	Steil
Burns	Gruppo	Mihalich	Stern
Buxton	Haluska	Miller	Stetler
Caltagirone	Hanna	Mundy	Stish
Cappabianca	Harley	Nailor	Strittmatter
Carn	Hasay	Nickol	Sturla
Carone	Hennessey	Nyce	Surra

Cawley	Herman	O'Brien	Tangretti
Cessar	Hershey	Olazz	Taylor, B. Z.
Chadwick	Hess	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Civera	Hughes	Perzel	Thomas
Clark	Hutchinson	Pesci	Tigoe
Clymer	Itkin	Petrarca	Tomlinson
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Petrone	Trello
Cohen, M.	James	Pettit	Trich
Colafralla	Jarolin	Phillips	True
Colaizzo	Josephs	Piccola	Tulli
Cornell	Kaiser	Pistella	Uhiana
Corrigan	Kaunic	Pitta	Vance
Cowell	Keller	Platts	Van Home
Coy	Kenney	Preston	Veon
Curry	King	Raymond	Vitali
Daley	Kirkland	Reber	Washington
DeLuca	Krebs	Reinard	Waugh
Dempsey	Kukovich	Richardson	Williams
Dent	LaGrotta	Rieger	Wogan
Dermody	Laub	Ritter	Wozniak
Donatucci	Laughlin	Roberts	Wright, D. R.
Druce	Lawless	Robinson	Wright, M. N.
Durham	Lederer	Roebuck	Yandrisevits
Egolf	Lee	Rooney	Yewcic
Evans	Leh	Rublely	Zug
Fairchild	Lescovitz	Rudy	
Fajt	Levdansky	Ryan	DeWeese,
Fargo	Lloyd	Santoni	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—3

Conti	Rohrer	Snyder, D. W.
-------	--------	---------------

EXCUSED—5

Acosta	Bush	Butkovitz	Gruitza
Boyes			

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

On the question,

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER 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?

The Chair recognizes Representative Nyce on the bill.

Mr. NYCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the maker of the bill would stand for a brief interrogation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Trello, indicates that he will stand for interrogation. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. NYCE. Mr. Speaker, I am interested in exactly what we are providing by way of additional benefits for these retirees. Could you please explain to me the criteria and the additional benefits that would be provided and whether or not that is on top of the pension already received?

Mr. TRELLO. Mr. Speaker, in 1984 the Allegheny County Police were included as eligible recipients of the State aid and the county firefighters were not. Allegheny County firefighters, paid firefighters, are the only firemen in Pennsylvania that do not receive this municipal pension State aid. It amounts to \$28 for each paid fireman.

Mr. NYCE. Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding that the benefit is \$28 times the number of full years of service on a monthly basis, so that if a retiree had 10 years of service, he got 10 times \$28, or \$280. Am I incorrect?

Mr. TRELLO. You are absolutely correct. Their pension is the same as ours. They add it by the amount of 2 percent times whatever.

Mr. NYCE. Could you give me some idea of the average pension already received by a firefighter; the amount per month, for example? What I am trying to get to is what kind of an increase this represents in the amount of monthly pension that a firefighter is already receiving. Two hundred and eighty dollars for 10 years or \$560 per month for 20 years is a very substantial amount.

Mr. TRELLO. Well, I am not sure what they already get. The only thing that I am sure of is, they do not participate in Act 205 money at all. They are the only paid firefighters in the State that do not participate, and in the interests of fairness and equity, I believe that since they are not paid, the only firefighters not paid, I think in fairness they should be involved in this Act 205 money.

Mr. NYCE. Mr. Speaker, one other question.

It is my understanding that there is a guaranteed 10 years of benefits regardless of when the retiree should pass. Does that correspond with the benefit already received under the pension plan? In other words, if I am drawing a regular pension and I pass away, is my beneficiary guaranteed 10 years of additional benefits, as this bill would do on the supplemental payment?

Mr. TRELLO. The language in this legislation was drafted by the Retirement Study Commission to conform with Act 205.

I might add also that Mr. Buskey, the president of the Firefighters of Pennsylvania, strongly approves of this measure.

In the interest of fairness, they are the only firefighters that do not participate in this program.

Mr. NYCE. Mr. Speaker, one final question.

Could you please tell me where the funding for this benefit is derived?

Mr. TRELLO. I am sorry. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. NYCE. Could you please explain to the body where the funding would come from to pay for these benefits?

Mr. TRELLO. Out of Act 205 moneys, and there are only 55 firefighters that we are talking about.

Mr. NYCE. Is it fair to assume then that you are talking about the State portion which is normally distributed back to all the municipalities across the Commonwealth?

Mr. TRELLO. Repeat that.

Mr. NYCE. Is that coming from the funds that are normally distributed back to each of the municipalities?

Mr. TRELLO. That is correct; yes.

Mr. NYCE. And is there an estimated amount to pay for this?

Mr. TRELLO. Well, out of the estimated \$127 million that is absorbed under Act 205, this would amount to about \$204,000.

Mr. NYCE. And that \$100-and-some million is the total for the entire Commonwealth?

Mr. TRELLO. Well, that fluctuates every year, depending on the number of police and the number of firemen.

Mr. NYCE. I understand.

Mr. TRELLO. It is \$127 million this year, which they will not participate in. It might be \$150 million next year or it could be \$120 million. I understand that the city of Scranton just laid off 20 policemen, so there will be less involved and there will be more money for the other members to participate in.

Mr. NYCE. I understand. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have ended my interrogation. I would like to speak on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. NYCE. Mr. Speaker, the intention of the maker of the bill is certainly a good one. Fairness in providing benefits to employees and retirees is something that most of us in this House support. But I believe that when we talk about a supplemental benefit, at 10 years of service even, of \$280 per month, or for 20 years, \$560 per month, and guarantee it, regardless of when the retiree should pass, for 120 payments, we are talking, even though it is a small number of recipients, about a substantial amount of money and a tremendous obligation. In addition to that, the funding for this program would be taken from the money that is distributed to all of our municipalities and shared by those firefighters back in our home districts. So I would encourage the members, even though it is a fairness issue, to look at the size of the payments that are going to be made.

Now, I did not get a response with regard to what retirees currently receive. It must be very substantial if in fact we are going to provide \$280, \$560, or even more for retirees with more years of service.

This is a very, very lucrative supplemental payment, and I encourage everyone to pay attention to this bill. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the bill, the Chair recognizes Representative Armstrong.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to interrogate the maker of the bill, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman indicates he is willing to stand for interrogation, and the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, you noted that the paid firefighters that have retired in Allegheny County are not participating in the present pension fund that the other firefighters are receiving. Correct?

Mr. TRELLO. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Are they receiving pension funds from some other avenue at this point?

Mr. TRELLO. The county firemen are not.

Mr. CESSAR. Oh, yes they are.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. So there is no other pension that they are receiving, you are saying, at this point, that they are receiving?

Mr. TRELLO. Well, I would imagine they are receiving some kind of money for a pension. They are not receiving any of this money.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do you know how much they are receiving per month?

Mr. TRELLO. I have no idea what the pensions are for firefighters in your area or my area or any other area.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Well, I think we are looking at the paid county firefighters from Allegheny County at this point, who, I believe, are under their own pension plan, and I would like to be able to compare that to what we have offered statewide to other firefighters.

Mr. TRELLO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer the rest of this interrogation to Representative Cessar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and notes that he yields the interrogation to Representative Cessar. Representative Cessar may proceed.

Mr. CESSAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To respond to the gentleman, the Allegheny County firemen, who do only one thing, fight fires at the Allegheny County Airport and at the new International Airport—that is 55 firemen—they are incorporated in the Allegheny County pension system, and their pension system is the same as third-class cities, first-class cities, second-class cities, which says in effect that they can collect a pension after 20 years of service or 50 years of age.

Does that answer your question?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Well, that is a part of the question.

How much are they receiving as a part of that pension?

Mr. CESSAR. Fifty percent of their pension. That is in the law, the same as your policemen. If your policeman is paid \$30,000 a year and he retires after the prescribed number of years, he gets a half-paid pension. That would be \$15,000. I have no idea what their pay is presently.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Okay. Fifty percent of what they were earning when they were working full time.

Mr. CESSAR. That is correct.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. All right. Do you know what the other firefighters across Pennsylvania are making in pensions at this point?

Mr. CESSAR. I have no idea, but as I stated before, Mr. Speaker, under the law, especially in the third-class cities, second-class and first-class cities, I am almost positive that it is a 20-and-50-out, same as police and firemen.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Okay. I would like to raise the issue—and I ask for you to respond; I do not know if I can put this in a question—but in relation to these county firefighters that are receiving a pension, even though they are not receiving it out of the funds that our other firefighters are receiving it,

they are receiving a pension; it has been set up for them. Why do they have to dip into this fund at this point and risk some of the pension-sharing with the rest of the firefighters?

Mr. CESSAR. First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me say this to you: Ever since the Allegheny Fire Department was in place, they have never received any of this money, which they should be entitled to, just like every other paid fire department in this Commonwealth, just like every volunteer fire department is paid from this fund.

Right now, as was mentioned by the previous speaker, there is \$127 million in the fund. Eleven million dollars is dedicated strictly to paid firemen in the Commonwealth. The other \$116 million is dedicated to local fire departments.

Now, what I am saying to you is, in all fairness, I think Allegheny County firemen should be getting this money. As a matter of fact, they should have been incorporated into this years ago, the same way as the Allegheny County police were incorporated into it, by legislation, and I believe that occurred in 1938. So what we are looking at is fairness and parity on this issue, and the issue is, if you are going to say that firemen should all participate in getting this money from this fund, then I think the firemen from Allegheny County should be included, in all fairness.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Okay. You are saying that \$11 million of the State funds that are available are supposed to go to third-class cities or paid firefighters?

Mr. CESSAR. I am saying to you, all paid firefighters participate in the \$11 million. The other \$116 million, from the information I have received, Mr. Speaker, is dedicated to our volunteer fire departments for their funds.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Okay. How many other paid firefighters are there that are retired in the State?

Mr. CESSAR. I cannot answer that question, but I can tell you, if you take all the third-class cities, first-class cities, and second-class cities, that is where it is. They have been getting this casualty money for years, and the only one that has never received it was the paid volunteer fire department which services the Allegheny County airports, 55 men.

What we have been doing, basically, is contributing over the last 30 years, when this program was put into place, to make sure that they got our money. Right now what I am saying to you is, in fairness, in fairness, the Allegheny County firemen, the paid firemen, at the airport, should be participating in this. How they use the money, that is up to them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. By allowing them to participate in this program, is it going to cause our other firefighters across the State to realize a reduction in their pensions?

Mr. CESSAR. If you are talking about \$240,000 out of \$127 million, I cannot answer that. I think what it really depends on is, if the insurance premiums go up, the money in the whole fund will go up; if it goes down, it goes down.

What we are saying to you is, \$240,000 out of \$11 million, which is part of that bank for the paid fire departments, would be the ones that would be affected.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have ended my interrogation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On final passage, the Chair recognizes Representative McNally.

Mr. McNALLY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to support HB 1006.

This is a matter of parity with Allegheny County police officers. I would point out that this legislation affects only Allegheny County, only firefighters in Allegheny County, and it would involve no fiscal impact to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I think that given the nature of the work involved with these public safety employees, it would behoove us to support this legislation, to show our support for those individuals who work hard, who put their lives on the line to protect the lives and safety of the people of Allegheny County. I urge your support. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Gamble.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to support HB 1006.

Representative Trello worked long and hard on this legislation, and he did it in cooperation with the Retirement Study Commission, who had a lot to do with the wording of this bill and, as a result of that, is not in opposition to this bill. Two hundred and forty thousand dollars a year out of \$127 million is insignificant. It will create no fiscal hardship and will bring parity and fairness between the police department and the Allegheny County Fire Department in Allegheny County.

I respectfully request your support for this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On final passage for the second time, Representative Nyce.

Mr. NYCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on the bill. I am not going to interrogate anyone. I would just like to speak on the bill.

It has been brought to our attention here by a number of speakers that this is not going to cost anything to the State, that it does not affect anyone else. The reality is, this money comes from the money that is distributed to all of the rest of the counties.

The issue is not one, really, of parity, because I believe we just keep expanding programs on the basis of parity without any fiscal responsibility and we are going to end up in dire straits with regard to the financial end of this fund. As a matter of fact, the unit value of the general municipal pension system State aid allocation has been decreasing for the last 4 years. In addition, an additional 75 municipalities in just the last year have not qualified to be fully funded under this program.

Now, it is easy to say this should be fairly done, but when you look at the amount of money that is going to be paid as a supplemental pension payment, not a pension, a supplement, an additional bonus to a pension plan, you must compare this to

what we are going to act on later with regard to a COLA (cost-of-living adjustment) for teachers or any other supplemental payments. This is a lot of money on a monthly basis, and it sets the standard to open the door for future increases in this kind of pension program.

Now, I agree with fairness; all of us would, and if we do it just on the basis of fairness, go right ahead, but I am telling you that the funding of these programs is in jeopardy. Certainly the bureaucrats will agree with that. There is no question about it. Any expansion of a program is okay with them. I am seriously concerned about the fiscal responsibility. When you go home and you tell your constituents that you just increased pensions for I do not care how many employees by \$560 a month, then you go home and explain how you can justify that from funds that should come back to your county.

Thank you very much. I urge a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative Van Horne on final passage.

Mr. VAN HORNE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am speaking today as the House Democrats' appointee to the Retirement Commission. The commission studied this issue and worked on this for about 5 or 6 years now. I want to tell you that the staff has worked hard to come up with something that has been acceptable to the commission and I think to the General Assembly today.

I think the key word that everybody focused on is "supplemental." I think that was the staff's language, and I do not think that is what it is today. This is not a supplemental benefit, a windfall.

Also, we have to remember, Allegheny County is the only county in the Commonwealth that has the county fire department and the county police as such, and these 55 members have worked long and hard to get this. The Retirement Commission has found no problem with the policy considerations of this and a very minor fiscal impact on the county system. There are no State dollars involved. It is in fact a question of fairness and equity. It is not a supplement. It is something that should have been done years ago. From the commission's standpoint, we find it to be good public policy.

I would urge all my members on this side of the aisle to vote "yes" and the others to also support this. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative Trello.

Mr. TRELLO. Mr. Speaker, I am not here today to ask you to include the Boys and Girls Club of Pennsylvania in this Act 205 money. I am asking you to include the firefighters from Allegheny County, 55 members.

Put yourself in my place. If you had a paid fire department in your county that was not involved in the distribution of that \$127 million under Act 205 that was designated specifically for firemen, I guarantee you, you would be pleading the same way that I am for fairness and equity. I am not talking about people that are sitting around doing nothing. I am talking about firefighters that sit at that airport 24 hours a day taking care of plane crashes, chemical fires, risking their lives every single

day. All I am asking for is equity and fairness to my firemen, and I would give you the same courtesy for your firemen.

I urge a positive vote, and I thank you for your consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative McNally for the second time.

Mr. McNALLY. Mr. Speaker, I just cannot allow the charge of fiscal irresponsibility to go unanswered.

I think that it has to be made clear for the record that the fiscal impact to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and to the other municipalities, the other 66 counties in the State, is zero. There is no fiscal impact. This is a matter that only affects Allegheny County.

I cannot believe that I am hearing people complaining about bonuses or supplements to pensions. A few months ago I did not hear those same people complaining about supplements to pensions for teachers. They did not have any qualms about spending money then.

I think that we have to bear in mind the motivation, and I will remind the members of this House who are concerned about spending money, when they come back later on and they want to spend money for their pensions, we will remind them about their concerns today.

I urge the House to support HB 1006. It is a matter of equality and fairness and parity within Allegheny County. It has no impact on the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to comment briefly on this bill, and I want you, if anybody is listening to me, to pay very close attention to what I am going to say here.

If anybody's municipality out there has a State pension, if this bill is passed, their State pension is going to be "in effect"—and I will use those words lightly, very lightly—in effect decreased. If the pensions are going to remain intact for any municipality outside Allegheny County, it is going to have to be made up at the local level. That is going to have the effect of decreasing the pensions on any municipality that has a paid pension plan outside the Allegheny County district. I want to make sure everybody understands that, because that is the effect of this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative Cessar for the second time.

Mr. CESSAR. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman who made the last statement please stand for a brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman indicates that he will stand for a brief interrogation, and the gentleman, Mr. Cessar, may proceed.

Mr. CESSAR. I am not quite sure you are correct on that. Would you tell me how this can affect your pensions?

Mr. LYNCH. The unit value is going to continue to decrease as the amount of the pension unit value for Allegheny County increases.

My municipality back home, the city of Warren, the unit value per employed person is going to decrease. That is a fact.

Mr. CESSAR. Okay.

Let me ask the question, you are a third-class city. Is that correct; Warren? What are their pension benefits?

Mr. LYNCH. I am not really sure there, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CESSAR. Okay. Third-class cities, as I mentioned before, would be under the 20-and-50. At 20 years of service and 50 years of age, they would be eligible for a pension. Is that correct?

Mr. LYNCH. I cannot hear. Say it again, Mr. Speaker, would you, please?

Mr. CESSAR. Your pension is valued at 20 years of service and 50 years of age, third-class city, Warren. Is that correct?

Mr. LYNCH. I believe so.

Mr. CESSAR. Okay. The question I am saying to you is, if Warren did not get the money from this casualty insurance, you know, they would be in the same position as the Allegheny County firemen. Why do you say that the Allegheny firemen ought not to be included in part of that money? I do not understand that.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I guess the—and I recognize where you are coming from with the parity and so forth—but the problem I have is, I do not want it to negatively affect me, and it will do that.

Mr. CESSAR. Well, I do not think you will ever see the effect of that as long as you live, because it will not be that much, if there is any effect.

What I am saying to you is, you are talking about your paid firemen in Warren being eligible to get this money from the Commonwealth, from the insurance that is written. Why should not—and I ask you this question—why should not the Allegheny County Fire Department—which has been in place for the last 40 years at the airport—why should they not be getting this money?

Mr. LYNCH. The question I have back to you is, why should my municipality help pay for it?

Mr. CESSAR. Your municipality is not paying for it.

Mr. LYNCH. It ultimately will.

Mr. CESSAR. Well, I disagree. But, Mr. Speaker, I do support the bill and hopefully everybody else will. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER (H. WILLIAM DeWEESE) PRESIDING

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

Mr. TRELLO. Mr. Speaker, if a paid firefighter in Warren, Pennsylvania, is making \$28,000 a year and retires with 20 years of service, he is going to get 50 percent of that, which is \$14,000, and this will not affect that in any way.

I can appreciate the gentleman being concerned about his firefighters the same way that I am concerned about my firefighters. I respect firefighters, whether they are from Warren, Allegheny, Delaware County, Montgomery County, Chester County, wherever they might be. I respect all

firefighters, and this bill just gives us equity with all firefighters.

If you believe that all firefighters should be treated equally, you will vote "yes" for this bill, and I would appreciate it if you do. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Gamble, for the second time.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I just rise again to support this bill, and I want to bury the seed of doubt that was just planted a few moments ago that this is going to adversely affect the other counties. It is not.

Representative McNally made the point, it is zero, zero effect, and one need to only look at the numbers to reach that conclusion.

I think we have really taken a minor, fair attempt to bring parity to Allegheny County and just blown it totally out of proportion.

I would ask you that you seriously consider supporting HB 1006. It is fair. It is not a grab. It is fair. We have paid our way in Allegheny County, and we just wanted to be treated fairly. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Ryan, on final passage.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to make a suggestion. What I am hearing as I sit here—and I have no preconceived notion, frankly, as to what to do with this bill—what I am listening to is I am listening to Allegheny County pretty much fighting the rest of the world here today, and it is a shame. I say to you, I do not know what is right or wrong on this, and I do not believe the others in this House really know, and I am questioning whether in caucus we did right by the bill.

I have heard the debate on this floor, and I walked in here with the preconceived notion that to vote in favor of this bill was to vote against the firefighters or the money that is in the fund for the other firefighters in Pennsylvania. I do not know that that is the truth today. But I am reluctant, and I will error on the side of conservatism and vote against the bill the way it presently is, and I suspect that most of the people in this House will error on the side of conservatism in favor of their own firefighters because that is the safe bet.

Now, I am going to suggest to whoever the moving party is on this bill that it probably would be very prudent to let this go over and let everyone get a look and talk to people at home over the next week to see whether or not it in fact does hurt our local firefighters, because I think we are all big enough that if it hurts us, we are going to come back and tell you, but if we do not know, we are going to assume it does hurt us, and we are big enough that if it does not hurt us, we are going to come back and be fair and treat it in a fair fashion.

That is my suggestion. If the suggestion is no good, I am voting "no."

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

YEAS—80

Bebko-Jones	Evans	Laughlin	Preston
Belardi	Fajt	Lederer	Richardson
Bishop	Farmer	Lescovitz	Rieger
Blaum	Fee	Levdanaky	Ritter
Burns	Fichter	Manderino	Roberts
Buxton	Gamble	Markosek	Robinson
Caltagirone	George	Mayernik	Roebuck
Cappabianca	Gigliotti	McGeehan	Saurman
Carn	Godshall	McNally	Steelman
Cawley	Haluska	Melio	Steighner
Cessar	Hughes	Michlovic	Sturla
Cohen, M.	Itkin	Mihalich	Tangretti
Colaella	James	Naior	Thomas
Colaizzo	Josephs	Olasz	Trello
Corrigan	Kaiser	Oliver	Trich
Cowell	Kasunic	Peaci	Van Horne
Curry	Keller	Petrarca	Veon
Daley	Kirkland	Petrone	Washington
DeLuca	Kukovich	Pettit	Williams
Dermody	LaGrotta	Pistella	Wozniak

NAYS—116

Adolph	Freeman	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Allen	Gannon	Merry	Snyder, D. W.
Argall	Geist	Micozzie	Staback
Armstrong	Gerlach	Miller	Stairs
Baker	Gladeck	Mundy	Steil
Barley	Gordner	Nickol	Stern
Battisto	Gruppo	Nyce	Stetler
Belfanti	Hanna	O'Brien	Stish
Birmelin	Harley	Perzel	Strittmatter
Brown	Hasay	Phillips	Surra
Bunt	Hennessey	Piccola	Taylor, E. Z.
Carone	Herman	Pitts	Taylor, J.
Chadwick	Hershey	Platts	Tigue
Civera	Hess	Raymond	Tomlinson
Clark	Hutchinson	Reber	True
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Reinard	Tulli
Cohen, L. I.	Jarolin	Rohrer	Uliana
Conti	Kenney	Rooney	Vance
Cornell	King	Rudy	Vitali
Coy	Krebs	Ryan	Waugh
Dempsey	Laub	Santoni	Wogan
Dent	Lawless	Sather	Wright, D. R.
Donatucci	Lee	Saylor	Wright, M. N.
Druce	Leh	Scheetz	Yandrisevits
Durham	Lloyd	Schuler	Yewcic
Egolf	Lucyk	Scrimenti	Zug
Fairchild	Lynch	Semmel	
Fargo	Maitland	Serafini	DeWeese,
Fleagle	Marsico	Smith, B.	Speaker
Flick	Masland		

NOT VOTING—1

Rubley

EXCUSED—5

Acosta	Bush	Butkovitz	Gruitza
Boyes			

Less than the majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the bill fell.

SB 515 RECONSIDERED

The SPEAKER. The Chair has in its possession a reconsideration motion filed by Representative Lynch, moving that the vote by which SB 515, PN 1331, was passed on the 23d day of March be reconsidered.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—191

Adolph	Fichter	Manderino	Saylor
Allen	Fleagle	Markosek	Scheetz
Argall	Flick	Marsico	Schuler
Armstrong	Freeman	Masland	Scrimenti
Baker	Gamble	Mayernik	Semmel
Barley	Gannon	McCall	Serafini
Battisto	Geist	McGeehan	Smith, B.
Belardi	Gerlach	McNally	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Gigliotti	Melio	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Gladeck	Merry	Staback
Bishop	Godshall	Michlovic	Stairs
Blaum	Gordner	Micozzie	Steelman
Brown	Gruppo	Mihalich	Steighner
Bunt	Haluska	Miller	Steil
Burns	Hanna	Mundy	Stern
Buxton	Harley	Nailor	Stetler
Caltagirone	Hasay	Nickol	Stish
Carn	Hennessey	Nyce	Strittmatter
Carone	Herman	O'Brien	Sturla
Cawley	Hershey	Olasz	Surra
Cessar	Hess	Oliver	Tangretti
Chadwick	Hughes	Perzel	Taylor, E. Z.
Civera	Hutchinson	Pesci	Taylor, J.
Clark	Jadlowiec	Petrarca	Thomas
Clymer	James	Petrone	Tigue
Cohen, L. I.	Jarolin	Pettit	Tomlinson
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Phillips	Trello
Colafella	Kaiser	Piccola	Trich
Colaizzo	Kasunic	Pistella	True
Conti	Keller	Pitts	Tulli
Cornell	Kenney	Platts	Uliana
Corrigan	King	Preston	Vance
Cowell	Kirkland	Raymond	Van Horne
Coy	Krebs	Reber	Veon
Curry	Kukovich	Reinard	Vitali
Daley	LaGrotta	Richardson	Washington
DeLuca	Laub	Rieger	Waugh
Dempsey	Laughlin	Ritter	Williams
Dent	Lawless	Roberts	Wogan
Dermody	Lederer	Robinson	Wozniak
Donatucci	Lee	Roebuck	Wright, D. R.
Druce	Leh	Rohrer	Wright, M. N.
Durham	Lescovitz	Rooney	Yandrisevits
Egolf	Levdansky	Rudy	Yewwic
Evans	Lloyd	Ryan	Zug
Fairchild	Lucyk	Santoni	
Fajt	Lynch	Sather	DeWeese,
Fargo	Maitland	Saurman	Speaker
Farmer			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—6

Bebko-Jones	Fee	Itkin	Rubley
Cappabianca	George		

EXCUSED—5

Acosta	Bush	Butkovitz	Gruitza
Boyes			

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

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Gannon, from Delaware is recognized on final passage of SB 515.

Mr. GANNON. Mr. Speaker, there is a fiscal note supposedly attached to this bill, and I have not seen the fiscal note. I do not want to delay voting on it, but I would like to know if the chairman of the Appropriations Committee could tell us what the fiscal impact will be on the Commonwealth of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Gannon will be at ease momentarily along with the House.

Mr. Evans is recognized in response to the gentleman from Delaware's interrogatory.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, my understanding, based on a fiscal note provided by the Senate Democratic Committee, is that it has no fiscal impact on the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GANNON. I am sorry; there will be no fiscal impact?

Mr. EVANS. It says SB 515 has no fiscal impact on the Commonwealth.

Mr. GANNON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

YEAS—176

Adolph	Fee	Lucyk	Saylor
Allen	Fichter	Maitland	Scheetz
Argall	Fleagle	Manderino	Schuler
Armstrong	Flick	Markosek	Scrimenti
Baker	Freeman	Mayernik	Semmel
Barley	Gamble	McCall	Serafini
Battisto	Gannon	McGeehan	Smith, B.
Bebko-Jones	Geist	McNally	Smith, S. H.
Belardi	George	Melio	Snyder, D. W.
Belfanti	Gerlach	Michlovic	Staback
Birmelin	Gigliotti	Micozzie	Stairs
Bishop	Gladeck	Mihalich	Steelman
Blaum	Godshall	Miller	Steighner
Brown	Gordner	Mundy	Stern
Bunt	Gruppo	Nyce	Stetler
Burns	Haluska	O'Brien	Stish
Caltagirone	Hanna	Olasz	Strittmatter
Cappabianca	Hasay	Oliver	Sturla
Carn	Hennessey	Perzel	Surra
Carone	Herman	Pesci	Tangretti
Cawley	Hershey	Petrarca	Taylor, E. Z.
Cessar	Hess	Petrone	Taylor, J.
Chadwick	Hughes	Pettit	Thomas
Civera	Hutchinson	Phillips	Tigue
Clark	Itkin	Pistella	Trello

Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pitts	Trich
Cohen, M.	James	Platts	True
Colafiglia	Jarolin	Preston	Uliana
Colaizzo	Josephs	Raymond	Van Horne
Cornell	Kaiser	Reber	Veon
Corrigan	Kasunic	Richardson	Vitali
Cowell	Keller	Rieger	Washington
Coy	Kenney	Ritter	Waugh
Curry	King	Roberts	Williams
Daley	Kirkland	Robinson	Wogan
DeLuca	Krebs	Roebuck	Wozniak
Dempsey	Kukovich	Rohrer	Wright, D. R.
Dent	LaGrotta	Rooney	Wright, M. N.
Dermody	Laub	Rubley	Yandrisevits
Donatucci	Laughlin	Rudy	Yewcic
Durham	Lederer	Ryan	Zug
Evans	Leh	Santoni	
Fairchild	Lescovitz	Sather	DeWeese,
Fajt	Levdansky	Saurman	Speaker
Farmer	Lloyd		

NAYS—20

Buxton	Fargo	Marsico	Reinard
Cohen, L. I.	Harley	Masland	Steil
Conti	Lawless	Merry	Tomlinson
Druce	Lee	Nailor	Tulli
Egolf	Lynch	Piccola	Vance

NOT VOTING—1

Nickol

EXCUSED—5

Acosta	Bush	Butkovitz	Gruitza
Boyes			

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 return the same to the Senate with the information that the House has passed the same without amendment.

HB 1006 RECONSIDERED

The SPEAKER. The Chair has in its possession another reconsideration motion filed by the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Trello, who moves that the vote by which HB 1006, PN 1088, was defeated on the 23d day of March be reconsidered.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—196

Adolph	Fee	Maitland	Saurman
Allen	Fichter	Manderino	Saylor
Argall	Fleagle	Markosek	Scheetz
Armstrong	Flick	Marsico	Schuler
Baker	Freeman	Masland	Scrimenti
Barley	Gamble	Mayermik	Semmel
Battisto	Gannon	McCall	Serafini
Bebko-Jones	Geist	McGeehan	Smith, B.
Belardi	George	McNally	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Gerlach	Melio	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Gigliotti	Merry	Staback

Bishop	Gladeck	Michlovic	Stairs
Blaum	Godshall	Micozzie	Steelman
Brown	Gordner	Mihalich	Steighner
Bunt	Gruppo	Miller	Steil
Burns	Haluska	Mundy	Stern
Buxton	Hanna	Nailor	Stetler
Caltagirone	Harley	Nickol	Stish
Cappabianca	Hasay	Nyce	Strittmatter
Carn	Hennessey	O'Brien	Sturla
Carone	Herman	Olasz	Surra
Cawley	Hershey	Oliver	Tangretti
Cessar	Hess	Perzel	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Hughes	Pesci	Taylor, J.
Civera	Hutchinson	Petrarca	Thomas
Clark	Itkin	Petrone	Tigue
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Petit	Tomlinson
Cohen, L. I.	James	Phillips	Trello
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Piccola	Trich
Colaizzo	Josephs	Pistella	True
Conti	Kaiser	Pitts	Tulli
Cornell	Kasunic	Platts	Uliana
Corrigan	Keller	Preston	Vance
Cowell	Kenney	Raymond	Van Horne
Coy	King	Reber	Veon
Curry	Kirkland	Reinard	Vitali
Daley	Krebs	Richardson	Washington
DeLuca	Kukovich	Rieger	Waugh
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Ritter	Williams
Dent	Laub	Roberts	Wogan
Dermody	Laughlin	Robinson	Wozniak
Donatucci	Lawless	Roebuck	Wright, D. R.
Druce	Lederer	Rohrer	Wright, M. N.
Durham	Lee	Rooney	Yandrisevits
Egolf	Leh	Rubley	Yewcic
Evans	Lescovitz	Rudy	Zug
Fairchild	Levdansky	Ryan	
Fajt	Lloyd	Santoni	DeWeese,
Fargo	Lucyk	Sather	Speaker
Farmer	Lynch		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—1

Colafiglia

EXCUSED—5

Acosta	Bush	Butkovitz	Gruitza
Boyes			

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

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

**BILL PLACED ON FINAL PASSAGE
POSTPONED CALENDAR**

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

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that HB 1006 be placed upon the final passage postponed calendar.

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

CONDOLENCE RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER. The Sergeant at Arms will please close the doors of the House. We have a condolence resolution. Members will please be seated. Staff will please be seated.

The following resolution was read by the Speaker:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Russell J. Blair of Perryopolis, former Pennsylvania Legislator who served from 1967-1971, passed away March 12, 1994 at the age of eighty-six; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Blair was a funeral director in Perryopolis for the past fifty-seven years, a member of First Christian Church, and the first mayor of the Borough of Perryopolis, where he served for twenty years. He was also a member of the Southwestern Funeral Directors Association; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Blair was the last of the charter members of the Perry Township Volunteer Fire Department, Past Master and member of Gummert Lodge F&AM No. 252 of Fayette City, Uniontown Lodge of Perfection, and Consistory and Syria Shrine of Pittsburgh. He dedicated his time and energies as membership chairman of the Western Pennsylvania Federated Sportsmen's Club for fifty years, and as a member of the Fayette County Sportsmen's League; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania note with great sadness the passing of Russell J. Blair, beloved family member, dedicated professional and community leader; extend heartfelt condolences to his sons, James D. and Richard B.; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to The Family of Russell J. Blair.

We hereby certify that the foregoing is an exact copy of a resolution introduced in the House of Representatives by the Honorable Richard A. Kasunic and unanimously adopted by the House of Representatives.

H. William DeWeese
Speaker of the
House of Representatives
ATTEST:
John J. Zubeck
Chief Clerk of the
House of Representatives

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. Members and guests please rise.

(Whereupon, the members of the House and all visitors stood in a moment of silence in solemn respect to the memory of the Honorable Russell J. Blair.)

The SPEAKER. The resolution has been unanimously adopted.

The Sergeant at Arms will open the doors of the House.

GUEST INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to welcome to the hall of the House Shirley Glass, the treasurer of York County. Ms. Glass is a guest of the delegation from York County.

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS
TO HOUSE AMENDMENTS AS AMENDED**

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to House amendments to the following SB 974, PN 2017, as further amended by the House Rules Committee:

An Act amending Titles 24 (Education) and 71 (State Government) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for the Public School Employees' Retirement System and the State Employees' Retirement System; adding and amending certain definitions; further providing for older workers, for nonintervening military service, for eligibility for and the computation of annuities and other retirement benefits, for contributions and other payments made by employers, for certain credited service, for the powers and duties of the Public School Employees' Retirement Board and the State Employees' Retirement Board, for the rights and duties of members, for the management of funds and accounts, for taxation, attachment and assignment of funds and for certain domestic relations matters.

On the question,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments to House amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Geist, is recognized. Mr. GEIST. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Because of what was out, what was in, and what is back in this bill now, we had caucused on it previously, but for those members who need refreshed, I would ask that the chairman of the Republican Education Committee, Representative Stairs, give an explanation to our members so that it will not be necessary to caucus. Thank you.

I yield the floor, at your pleasure, to Representative Stairs.

The SPEAKER. At my pleasure?

The gentleman, Mr. Stairs, is recognized.

Mr. STAIRS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to make a few remarks regarding the concurrence on this legislation.

If our members will recall, last year we took this legislation up and we offered amendments to the legislation to change the retirement pension percentages for retired teachers. Even though this amendment that many of my colleagues had supported failed, I am happy to report that the Senate has picked up in this concept that we had and put this into the bill, which I certainly concur with and I would ask our members to concur with.

I particularly like the way the Senate handled the percentages giving the older teachers a higher percentage, because we all realize that many of our older teachers who have been retired for many years, their pension is very meek and certainly this increased percentage was beneficial, and on the other hand, the more recent retirees, you know, with a larger pension got a much lower percentage that I think was more fair and certainly something that we can support very strongly.

But another section to the bill that is somewhat more controversial and certainly maybe I would ask the members to vote their conscience with, whether they want to concur or not,

would be the aid ratio. Certainly school districts with a very low aid ratio are going to find out that their amounts of money that they have to pay locally are going to be greatly increased in the coming years because of the change in the aid ratio while some of the schools that have a high aid ratio would certainly receive a benefit in the coming years.

So I would just caution our members that they might want to look at this more closely, and if there is any doubt on this bill, they might want to consider that in their vote. So that is something they have to decide individually what they want to do, but certainly as far as the percentage for the retirement, I certainly support that very strongly. You know, we are kind of caught between a rock and a hard spot on this. It has a very good section that you might like, but on the other hand, there may be a section that you do not like. So I would say, you use your discretion and see what your school district would be to see how it benefits the taxpayers whom you are representing. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Nyce, is recognized on concurrence.

Mr. NYCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wonder if Representative Stairs would answer a few questions.

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

Mr. NYCE. Mr. Speaker, could you explain to us—you may have touched on this—the 50-50 share that currently exists for sharing pensions, Social Security costs. Is that going to remain now that the Senate has amended the bill? Will that remain?

Mr. STAIRS. In answering your question, to be more specific, at the present time the State has a 50-50 split with the school districts on these two issues of the retirement and the Social Security. So whatever the State pays, the local effort is 50-50. This will change, so the school districts that have a smaller or less than 50 percent aid ratio—say, for example, it would be 20, the aid ratio would be .20—they would pick up 80 percent and the State would pick up 20 percent. So it would be a shift. So the districts that have a low aid ratio would be picking up a much greater percentage than they are now doing.

Mr. Speaker, in a further clarification, after all is said and done, I do not know if the State is going to be spending more money or less money, because there are districts above 50 percent and there are districts below 50 percent, so I do not have in my presence right now an answer for you to say what the State's— If it is going to be a windfall for the State or not, I do not know that.

Mr. NYCE. Mr. Speaker, my question was simply whether or not the 50-50 remained in the version of the bill that we just got back from the Senate. I thought I had information that said the Senate changed the bill to retain the 50-50 split. Am I incorrect?

Mr. STAIRS. Well, the Senate did change that. The Senate made that correction, but when it came back to the House, it went to the Rules Committee and the Rules Committee in the House just yesterday changed it again from what the Senate had done.

Mr. NYCE. Thank you.

That ends my interrogation. I would like to comment on the bill, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. NYCE. Mr. Speaker, those of us who support a COLA— And obviously the retirees that have been out for a longer period of time deserve some help. They have been receiving very small pensions without any adjustment. But I wonder why we would fund a COLA, which we will probably revisit in the next 3, 4, or 5 years, over a 20-year period. How in the world can this body justify paying for something that might only be beneficial for the next 3 or 4 years over a 20-year period? This does not make sense. Four or five years from now when we come back to address COLA's, are we going to merely stack up the costs of all these COLA's on top of one another? We should be funding this now with an appropriate adjustment, if necessary, to the employee, the employer, and the Commonwealth portion of the contributions to fund this pension plan.

If you look at the plan, you will find that over the last year or two we have offered significant improvements to pension benefits, yet we have consistently reduced the contributions. This is ridiculous. We must fund these things in an appropriate fashion.

Secondly, this bill provides for an extension of the Mellow bill back to May 15, 1993, for retirees who are already retired, and for those of you who were opposed to that element when the Mellow bill was first introduced and passed, I urge you to be aware of that fact.

There are also changes in the bill which address the amount of retirement that a retiree gets when he returns to work and subsequently requalifies for a new pension. So I urge you to be aware of that as well.

And finally, with regard to what Representative Stairs was addressing, I had addressed an amendment which would require the State to maintain its 50-percent funding of the pension and Social Security costs. I was unable to get that amendment into the bill, and for that reason I am going to be very careful about this vote and I urge the members to be very careful as well. Even if you support a COLA, there are elements of this bill, which have been comingled into the bill, which are not fiscally responsible.

I am sorry I had to get up twice in one day; I thank the body for its indulgence, but these bills must be reviewed more carefully, and I urge a "no" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Adolph, from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to at the present time yield to the minority leader, Mr. Ryan.

The SPEAKER. The Republican floor leader, Mr. Ryan, is recognized.

Mr. RYAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, one of the few things I have picked up over the years is how to count. I do not always count before I talk,

however, and sometimes it is close enough that I can change some votes, but I do not think that is the case here.

I think my members—I do not really care about yours on this one; you should listen to this—I think we are in this situation with this bill: We have a bill before us that has gone through the House before, and it has a much-needed cost-of-living increase for the retired teachers of Pennsylvania. After it passed this body, and this body had in it this amendment, which was again put in by the Rules Committee yesterday, which, in my judgment, treats unfairly certain of the school districts in Pennsylvania by messing around, if you will, with the Social Security repayment by repaying it under a formula rather than just as a cost factor at 50 percent, but what they did they did. In any event, we lost that battle here the first time out; it went over to the Senate; the Senate sent it back to us with a better cost-of-living-increase proposal for our retired teachers. The Senate sent the bill back with a provision that was better suited to the needs of at least the so-called wealthier districts of Pennsylvania, continuing to treat them the same way other districts were being treated. Mr. Trello—I do not see him on the floor at the moment—but he is asking for equality of treatment with his fire company, but yet some of the other school districts you would ask not be treated fairly with the distribution of Social Security moneys. So a lot of our districts in the suburbs, Republican and Democrat districts in the suburbs of our bigger, larger cities, are being treated unfairly, in our opinion, because of an amendment that was placed into this bill, after it came back from the Senate, by the Rules Committee yesterday.

Now, the dilemma that we are faced with as we stand on the floor today is (a) do I realistically think I can suspend the rules right now to permit me to put in an amendment to bring this back to the shape it was in when it came from the Senate? The answer is no. I am not going to take the House's time trying it. I think it is an exercise in futility. (B), do we try and encourage people to vote against concurrence? If you vote against concurrence, what you are really doing is you are doing two things. First, you are registering a protest about the unfairness—at least I would be registering; Bill Adolph, John Lawless, Larry Curry, Mr. Corrigan, Mr. Melio—they would be registering a protest about what is happening in their school districts by reason of the amendment put in in the Rules Committee yesterday by the gentleman, Mr. Evans, but it would not carry. You would get 34 votes to change it—37 votes perhaps; that is what it got the last time.

So we could go up and put our chins out and say, this is what we want to do; we are going to vote “no” on concurrence, but by voting “no” on concurrence we are telling a lot of people that we have a lot of respect for, a lot of people who are our friends, the retired teachers of Pennsylvania who educated many of us, that we do not care enough about them to give them a long overdue cost-of-living increase, and I am not going to ask any member of my side of the aisle to vote against that long overdue cost-of-living increase and vote “no” on the question of concurrence.

It is my hope, it is my hope that given an opportunity at some later date, that the provision of this bill that unfairly, grossly unfairly changes the system of reimbursement to some of the school districts in Pennsylvania on the cost of Social Security contribution is rechanged to the existing law. It is my sincere hope that all of you will join in rectifying that wrong and correcting what is obviously a tampering with a formula that, though not perfect, has been fair at least, and if that cannot be done, then I do not see why anyone should be fair—if that is the argument. Right, Mr. Trello?

Now, under the circumstances, I am going to encourage a concurrence vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Coy, on concurrence.

Mr. COY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I guess the bottom line is we get paid to make difficult decisions, and while we would like to avoid this one, or separate the issues even, while we would like to provide the cost-of-living adjustment for retirees and vote “yes” on that part of the issue and not vote on the funding part of the issue, or vote the other way, we cannot do that this time.

Last year, last year, and I prefer not to say we monkeyed with the formula; I prefer to say that we started down the road toward equity with education funding last year, something that many of us felt we should have done for years. What did we do before that? We just kept throwing more money at the problem. We kept saying in the area of education equity, we will solve it by providing more, and that is what we did.

Now, this year we hear that we need to cut taxes, and I think most of us will be here in a couple months voting to cut taxes, and while we want to do that, we also want to provide more money to school districts. They are both very admirable things to do. The bottom line is, it is time to make some decisions with regard to the way the formula has been structured for many years, which many of us happen to believe needs restructuring.

We started down that road last year, and we said to school districts whose aid-rate ratio is higher that they should get more help from the State, and the districts that can afford to go it on their own more and have the tax base to sustain it on their own should not benefit as greatly. That is what we did last year with equity funding, and it had a good vote in this House of Representatives, and it passed the Senate and the Governor signed it. This is an extension of that thought. This is an extension of that premise, and it is not that bad of an extension. It does not talk about current employees and current reimbursement rates; it talks about reimbursement for new employees only. We are asking the House to take one more logical step in the direction of equity funding, which I think makes sense.

Now, should members look at the printout with the names of school districts and see where the aid ratios lie and should you realize where you are at? Yeah, you should. And make no mistake about it, there will be people inside and outside this room and people within earshot of the microphone who will be making very quick notes about votes and making very quick

notes about how people voted so that they can call to the attention of people in various districts how people voted.

The bottom line is, if you are interested in equity in education funding and if you are willing to say that students, no matter where they come from in Pennsylvania, should receive at least the bottom-line reimbursement of some even level throughout the State and if you believe that that naturally extends to benefits for employees, then you have to vote for it. And the other good thing about voting for it is you provide a much-needed cost-of-living adjustment to retired employees.

I applaud the Senate. The Senate did even better than we did, I think, in providing a larger cost-of-living increase, especially to those retirees who have been retired for a longer period of time. Those teachers that retired years and years ago at smaller pensions benefit greatly by this, and I applaud the Senate for making that change.

The change in the funding formula, however, needs to return to the sensible change we made last year in equity funding, and for that reason, while we might like to vote one or two different ways, there is only one logical vote, and that is "yes" to equity funding, that is "yes" to a cost-of-living adjustment, that is "yes" to 30-and-out and the other good things in this legislation. While it may not be popular and while it may be tough and even tough on districts where Representatives have more than one school district and one may benefit greater than the other, the logical vote, the vote on behalf of equity, is "yes" — "yes" to concurrence on this vote as amended in the Rules Committee to get it back to the Senate and to the Governor's desk. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Adolph, for the first time.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question regarding where this SB 974 is going to go here on concurrence.

Mr. Speaker, if we concur with SB 974, does this bill go back to the Senate?

The SPEAKER. The answer is yes.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Can I also ask the Speaker the question, what purpose does it go back to the Senate for?

The SPEAKER. For concurrence?

Mr. ADOLPH. Yes. And if the Senate does not concur, what is the procedure?

The SPEAKER. Then it would proceed to conference committee.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have just a couple comments on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My first comment regarding the COLA for the retired teachers—

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. COY. The Speaker's response to the gentleman.

His question was, if the Senate does not concur in these amendments, does it go to conference committee? I think for that to happen, the House would have to vote to insist on its amendments. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. That is correct. However, the House would have the option to recede from its amendments.

Mr. COY. So it would require another vote in the House?

The SPEAKER. No vote would be taken, according to the Parliamentarian, not unless the House wished to recede.

Mr. COY. So the assumption would be that we have insisted on our amendments unless we took a positive vote to recede. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. Adolph may proceed.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Commenting on the COLA, I agree with the previous speakers that the COLA that is being presented to us today is a much fairer COLA for the retired teachers of Pennsylvania. The retired teachers that have been retired prior to June 30, 1989, will receive a higher increase in their monthly pensions.

I also happen to agree with the bill regarding the Mellow service credit. When the Mellow bill was being voted, there was a lot of confusion within each school district regarding retirement date. I see that SB 974 takes out that confusion which disallowed certain teachers who thought they were retiring under the Mellow bill, but because of the July 1, 1992, due date—we are moving it back to May 15, 1992—they will now qualify for the Mellow bill, and I agree with that because of the confusion that was involved.

My last comment, Mr. Speaker, however, is not a positive comment, and that is regarding the aid ratio for the funding to the school districts on Social Security and pensions for new teachers. For those legislators that represent those districts, roughly, on a new teacher, the State will contribute about \$2,000 towards their Social Security plus the pension contribution. As a result of this Rules Committee change last night, the State will only contribute about \$300, leaving the local school districts a liability of \$1,800 for every new teacher that they hire starting in July of 1995. As the teachers retire and your school districts hire new teachers, each and every teacher hired will cost your school districts an extra \$1,800 plus the pension contribution. Social Security is over 7 percent of their gross wages. A majority of the schoolteachers' starting salaries, especially in these school districts, are over \$30,000 a year. So we are really putting a mandate on our school districts.

And I happen to agree with equity, but how come every time we talk about equity, our school districts in suburban Philadelphia and Pittsburgh and other areas are on the short end? The people that are in court right now looking for equity, I have never heard them once say, we want more money, but

let us take it away from Marple Newtown; let us take it away from Springfield School District; let us take it away from Rose Tree Media. I never heard those people say that they want to take from those school districts. They would like to receive more on their school districts because of their per capita, et cetera, but never once did those groups say, take it away from those other people.

I have just got to remind those people that we have tuitions. The average cost of educating a public school student in our districts is getting close to \$10,000 a year. We are receiving a whopping \$500 from the State of Pennsylvania to educate those children.

I hope, I hope our Senate will not concur with this bill, and obviously, the Rules Committee has put many members of this House between a rock and a hard place, because we want to help our retired teachers, especially the ones that have been retired 10, 15, 20 years; they need that COLA, but the method and the final bill of 974 leaves something to be desired. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Nickol on concurrence.

Mr. NICKOL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SB 974 is a significant piece of legislation containing more than 25 changes to our laws governing the pensions of State and public school employees. As a member of the Public School Employees' Retirement Board, let me emphasize how critical it is we pass this legislation and pass it quickly.

Prompt action on some of the provisions in this bill is critical. Let us look at the COLA for retired State and public school employees.

Older retirees have suffered the greatest reduction in the purchasing power of their pensions due to the longer number of years since retirement. We must also remember their pension checks started much smaller because they worked for lower wages than our present State and public school employees. A flat COLA would have given a recent retiree with a \$3,000-a-month benefit check a \$237 increase, but an older retiree with the same years of service and a \$1,000 monthly check would have only received \$79, yet the need of the older retiree is greatest. The structured COLA in SB 974 today is a definite improvement in reflecting the relative needs of our retirees.

Delaying SB 974 will not kill the COLA since it is not due until July 1, although we do take a risk in losing the bill in the shuffle on other issues. Also remember, the pension systems need some lead time in order to calculate and incorporate any COLA's into pension checks.

Another benefit provision is the 30-and-out retirement window. Delay in final action on SB 974 will not kill 30-and-out, but I am sure public school employees now considering retirement would like to know if it is going to be law before school ends in June.

The timing of final action on SB 974 is of critical importance. The pension systems urgently need passage of the sections of this bill granting them prudent-person investment

authority. The issue of prudent-person investment authority overshadows everything else in the bill.

The total first-year cost of all the benefit provisions in SB 974 — the COLA, 30-and-out, the health insurance premium assistance, all the rest, the whole works — totals \$95.6 million for both systems. Stack this against the approximately \$660 million the two pension systems estimate they could have earned with prudent-person investment authority in 1993 — \$660 million they could have earned given the chance. Prudent person could have paid for the first-year cost of this bill more than six times over.

Senate Democratic whip Bill Lincoln very ably presented the issue of the cost in delaying the bill's passage in remarks last week on the Senate floor. He took the \$660 million in lost-opportunity costs for 1993 and divided it by 12 months in a year to produce a dollar value for each month's delay. Senator Lincoln—and this is his calculation, not mine—puts the cost of delay in passing SB 974 at \$55 million a month.

Let me take the cost of delay a step further than Senator Lincoln. The total cost of all benefit provisions contained in SB 974 funded over the entire 20-year period is estimated at \$1,075,200,000. Sounds like a huge amount of money. It is. Well, we risk losing more than the entire 20-year cost of SB 974, more than \$1 billion, in a matter of days if long-term interest rates climb by more than 1 percentage point.

This is the most serious risk we take in delaying final passage of SB 974 as we argue over peripheral issues.

Things were great for our pension systems in recent years as interest rates plummeted, but what goes up must come down, or vice versa in this case: What came down must go up. Interest rates are not only expected to rise, they have already started to rise.

The investment office at the Public School Employees' Retirement System tells me a rule of thumb is that for every 20-percent increase in interest rates, there is a corresponding 20-percent reduction in the principal value of domestic fixed income investments. The Public School Employees' Retirement Fund is locked into \$10 billion in investments of this nature by our antiquated pension law. They need prudent person to better position the pension funds' assets and cut losses in value as interest rates rise.

I will repeat: A 1-percentage-point rise in interest rates could cost our pension funds more than the entire 20-year cost of all the benefit provisions in SB 974 — more than \$1 billion.

Do we really want to play political games and take the risk that interest rates will wait for us? Any economic shock could cost us enormously. OPEC, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, is meeting Friday. Do we want to gamble that they will not agree on lower production ceilings and send interest rates soaring? Do we want to roll the dice as to the mood of Alan Greenspan, head of the Federal Reserve Board, with regard to interest rates? It is our gamble. I feel we need to pass SB 974 today and send it quickly on its way to the Governor's desk.

Yes, the issue of the State's share of the cost of pensions and Social Security contributions for public school employees

has raised its head again. I have never been sure why this subsidy issue has been enmeshed in this pension bill, but it has.

I happen to support moving from a 50-50 matching contribution to one based on a school's aid ratio. After all, I represent five districts which would win and only one which would lose, but I do not see this issue as important enough to jeopardize prompt passage of SB 974.

This change would be phased in over many years with only the contributions for new hires affected in the first year. We are only talking about plus or minus a few thousand dollars for many of our districts in the initial year.

Maybe this issue should be postponed to another date and another bill. Senate majority leader Joe Loeper publicly pledged to Senator Bill Lincoln and other members of the Senate that he will allow the issue of pension and Social Security contributions to be brought before the Senate as a separate matter.

The financial health of our State pension systems is at stake. Let us not play Ping-Pong with the Senate on this pension bill — it is too important.

Remember Senate Democratic whip Bill Lincoln's calculation of the cost of delay — \$55 million a month. And, yes, remember the huge risk we take that interest rates will not rise as we continue to argue over details.

I ask for your support of SB 974. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. John Lawless.

Mr. LAWLESS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I urge members to vote against concurrence. Although I believe teachers who have been retired for a number of years deserve an increase in retirement, I believe an extension of the Mellow bill back to include those employees who retired almost 2 years ago is fiscally irresponsible.

Keep in mind, if you vote for this concurrence, you are saying that those people who willingly and knowingly made a decision to retire deserve a 10-percent incentive now to something they did 2 years ago. I do not understand this thought process and I do not believe the taxpayers will support this fiscally irresponsible decision. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Ken Lee on concurrence.

Mr. LEE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will not take very much time here because I think this whole exercise is a waste of time. There is no parliamentary significance to our actions today. If we vote for concurrence, this bill does not go to the Governor; it goes back to the Senate. If we vote not to concur, the same thing happens. It goes into a conference committee, I guess.

I just think this whole rule 30 is not a good parliamentary rule. It is contrary to the whole idea that we should have some closure. If we do not agree with what the Senate did, the bill should go to a conference committee, and we should have a conference committee work out our differences and then go from there.

So I am just going to vote for concurrence but realize that it has no significance. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Gannon, on concurrence.

Mr. GANNON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we spent a great deal of debate on some amendments, and the thrust of the debate was that if we sent this bill back to the Senate for concurrence on some amendments, the bill would never see the light of day.

Now, what is before us today is almost analogous to what was happening yesterday. We have a bill that the Senate has sent to us that will give our retired schoolteachers a much-needed increase in their retirement benefit—a very modest increase, I may add—and that bill was sent over to this House, and it was in a position to go to the Governor for his signature so that we could get that pension to these retired teachers. However, the Rules Committee, in its wisdom, decided to throw in an amendment, and now we are here considering, as part of this package, that amendment. The net effect of that is that this bill will now have to go back to the Senate, where it may very well never see the light of day, particularly with an amendment that has already been rejected by the Senate prior to today.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. GANNON. So I am going to make a suggestion, Mr. Speaker, to get around this dilemma, and I would like to make a motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his motion.

Mr. GANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a motion to refer this bill back to the Rules Committee with instructions, two specific instructions. The first is to remove the language put in by the Rules Committee dealing with this aid ratio question, and then once that is accomplished by the Rules Committee, to return the bill to the House so that we can vote on it, get it to the Governor, and get that much-needed pension to our retired teachers.

I think we have delayed long enough on this issue. Amending this bill simply sends it to the Senate, where it may never see the light of day. I think we have a better obligation than that. That was the argument presented by the other side yesterday on some amendments. I think the same thing applies here, if it applies at all.

Therefore, I would make a motion to refer this bill to the Rules Committee with instructions that it remove those amendments and then immediately refer it to the House for concurrence on Senate amendments. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order, and his motion is to recommit to the Rules Committee with instructions to remove the amendments inserted by the Rules Committee and then to be sent back to the floor.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Coy, is recognized on the motion.

Mr. COY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask for a "no" vote on the motion and that we proceed to vote on concurrence with the amendments placed in by the Rules Committee and get the bill back to the Senate.

I simply ask for a "no" vote on the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Vitali, on the motion to recommit to Rules.

Mr. VITALI. I rise in support of that motion, Mr. Speaker.

I decry the maneuvering of the House which forces members to vote the good with the bad. What we want to do is help retired teachers, and that is what the prior printer's number did. Now what has been added to the mix is something different that is going to hurt our school districts. I do not think that members should be placed in that position.

I think if we are really interested in doing what is right and really interested in helping our retired teachers, let us give members a clear shot at this, let us take away the confusion, and let us vote to help retired teachers and allow members who want to do the right thing to take a "yes" vote. So I would urge members on both sides of the aisle to vote "yes" to the Gannon motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman, Mr. Vitali, and recognizes Representative Cowell on the motion to recommit to Rules.

Mr. COWELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge that we defeat the motion to recommit this bill to Rules.

Back in December of 1993, we had a similar issue before us. The attack on the language in the legislation to promote school finance equity took the form of an amendment rather than a recommittal motion, but the effect would be the same. On that day in December, 137 members of this House said we wanted to preserve the language that promotes school finance equity.

This is not a partisan issue. In fact, there are more than 25 members on the Republican side who have an interest in preserving the language currently in the bill with respect to retirement and Social Security contributions. More than 25 members on the Republican side and many, many on the Democratic side are in a position where every one of your school districts benefits from this current language, and it is to their detriment to remove it. There are additional members who have all of their districts, with the exception of one, who benefit from this current language.

The last time we were asked to deal with this issue, 137 of us saw that it was in our interests to promote the school finance equity effort and to promote the best interests of those districts we represent, and I would urge that the same two-thirds of the members, Republican and Democrat, will join together and defeat this motion to recommit this bill to Rules. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Stairs, is recognized on the motion to recommit.

Mr. STAIRS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I certainly support the motion to recommit this concurrence bill to the Rules Committee. I do so for the reason that I think we at this time, without delay, must address the very serious concerns that this legislation has in it: namely, an equitable

retirement for our teachers; two, to correct the problems of the Mellow bill; three, resolve the problems of the frozen annuities; and four would be the teachers who want to take advantage of the 30-year early retirement window.

Now, I realize that the aid ratio will not be addressed, but I certainly feel that that should be discussed on its merit in another bill and that should not be attached to this legislation. The aid ratio matter, which is very controversial and is very divisive among the members of the House, certainly needs to be addressed, and I hope that we could do that on another day, but to tie up this important legislation with that idea in it is certainly a disservice to our retired teachers and to our active teachers and to the taxpayers of Pennsylvania.

I would feel that if we do not send this back to Rules and Rules rescind their views, this issue that should be addressed very expediently will be delayed further in the Senate and in conference committee, and it probably would be part of the budget process, and I do not think we owe this to our teachers to delay this any further. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman, Mr. Stairs, and recognizes Lita Cohen.

Mrs. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the recommittal of this bill.

I am very supportive of our teachers. In fact, my mother was a schoolteacher. I think that our teachers do deserve this COLA. It is important that we provide it to them. However, Mr. Speaker, the way the bill is written now, it would be a terribly costly measure to my school districts and therefore an unfair burden on my taxpayers. Therefore, the decision concerning the bill as it stands right now is very, very difficult, because on the one hand, we are very supportive of the needs of our retired teachers who well deserve this cost-of-living adjustment. However, there is an undue burden placed upon our school districts. We cannot come to a resolution between the two conflicting needs. Therefore, the bill must go back and be recommitted so that we can adjust these two conflicts.

I urge a "yes" vote on this. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Coy, from Franklin on the motion to recommit to Rules.

Mr. COY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to point out that the vote in the Rules Committee yesterday was substantial. It was not certainly a close vote, and so a rereferral of the bill to the committee for action today, I think, would simply move to procrastinate even more.

For that reason, once again we would ask for a "no" vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—51

Adolph
Allen

Flick
Gannon

Miller
Nailor

Snyder, D. W.
Steil

Argall	Gerlach	Nyce	Strittmatter
Civera	Gladeck	Perzel	Taylor, E. Z.
Clymer	Godshall	Pettit	Tomlinson
Cohen, L. I.	Harley	Pitts	True
Conti	Hennessey	Reinard	Tulli
Cornell	Hershey	Rublely	Uliana
Curry	Laub	Ryan	Vance
Druce	Lawless	Saurman	Vitali
Durbam	Marsico	Schuler	Wright, M. N.
Farmer	Masland	Semmel	Zug
Fichter	Micozzie	Smith, B.	

NAYS—146

Armstrong	Fajt	Levdansky	Rooney
Baker	Fargo	Lloyd	Rudy
Barley	Fee	Lucyk	Santoni
Battisto	Fleagle	Lynch	Sather
Bebko-Jones	Freeman	Maitland	Saylor
Belardi	Gamble	Manderino	Scheetz
Belfanti	Geist	Markosek	Scrimenti
Birmelin	George	Mayernik	Serafini
Bishop	Gigliotti	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Blaum	Gordner	McGeehan	Staback
Brown	Gruppo	McNally	Stairs
Bunt	Haluska	Melio	Steelman
Burns	Hanna	Merry	Steighner
Buxton	Hasay	Michlovic	Stern
Caltagirone	Herman	Mihalich	Stetler
Cappabianca	Hess	Mundy	Stish
Carn	Hughes	Nickol	Sturla
Carone	Hutchinson	O'Brien	Surra
Cawley	Itkin	Olasz	Tangretti
Cessar	Jadlowiec	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Chadwick	James	Pesci	Thomas
Clark	Jarolin	Petrarca	Tigue
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Petrone	Trello
Colaella	Kaiser	Phillips	Trich
Colaizzo	Kasunic	Piccola	Van Horne
Corrigan	Keller	Pistella	Veon
Cowell	Kenney	Platts	Washington
Coy	King	Preston	Waugh
Daley	Kirkland	Raymond	Williams
DeLuca	Krebs	Reber	Wogan
Dempsey	Kukovich	Richardson	Wozniak
Dent	LaGrotta	Rieger	Wright, D. R.
Dermody	Laughlin	Ritter	Yandrisevits
Donatucci	Lederer	Roberts	Yewcic
Egolf	Lee	Robinson	
Evans	Leh	Roebuck	DeWeese,
Fairchild	Lescovitz	Rohrer	Speaker

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Acosta	Bush	Butkovitz	Gruitza
Boyes			

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

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments to House amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

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

YEAS—180

Allen	Fee	Markosek	Saurman
Argall	Fichter	Marsico	Saylor
Armstrong	Fleagle	Masland	Scheetz
Baker	Flick	Mayernik	Schuler
Barley	Freeman	McCall	Scrimenti
Battisto	Gamble	McGeehan	Semmel
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	McNally	Serafini
Belardi	Geist	Melio	Smith, B.
Belfanti	George	Merry	Smith, S. H.
Birmelin	Gerlach	Michlovic	Snyder, D. W.
Bishop	Gigliotti	Micozzie	Staback
Blaum	Gordner	Mihalich	Stairs
Brown	Gruppo	Miller	Steelman
Bunt	Haluska	Mundy	Steighner
Burns	Hanna	Nailor	Stern
Buxton	Hasay	Nickol	Stetler
Caltagirone	Hennessey	O'Brien	Stish
Cappabianca	Herman	Olasz	Strittmatter
Carn	Hershey	Oliver	Sturla
Carone	Hess	Perzel	Surra
Cawley	Hughes	Pesci	Tangretti
Cessar	Hutchinson	Petrarca	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Itkin	Petrone	Taylor, J.
Civera	Jadlowiec	Pettit	Thomas
Clark	James	Phillips	Tigue
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Piccola	Trello
Colaella	Josephs	Pistella	Trich
Colaizzo	Kaiser	Pitts	True
Corrigan	Kasunic	Platts	Tulli
Corrigan	Keller	Preston	Uliana
Cowell	Kenney	Raymond	Vance
Coy	King	Reber	Van Horne
Curry	Kirkland	Richardson	Veon
Daley	Krebs	Rieger	Washington
DeLuca	Kukovich	Ritter	Waugh
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Roberts	Williams
Dent	Laughlin	Robinson	Wogan
Dermody	Lederer	Roebuck	Wozniak
Donatucci	Lee	Rohrer	Wright, D. R.
Durham	Leh	Rooney	Yandrisevits
Egolf	Lescovitz	Rublely	Yewcic
Evans	Levdansky	Rudy	Zug
Fairchild	Lloyd	Ryan	
Fajt	Lynch	Santoni	DeWeese,
Fargo	Maitland	Sather	Speaker
Farmer	Manderino		

NAYS—16

Adolph	Druce	Laub	Steil
Clymer	Gladeck	Lawless	Tomlinson
Cohen, L. I.	Godshall	Nyce	Vitali
Conti	Harley	Reinard	Wright, M. N.

NOT VOTING—1

Lucyk

EXCUSED—5

Acosta	Bush	Butkovitz	Gruitza
Boyes			

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments to the House amendments as amended by the Rules Committee were concurred in.

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

HB 1510 RECONSIDERED

The SPEAKER. The Chair has in its possession another reconsideration motion. Mr. Lloyd of Somerset moves that the vote by which HB 1510 was passed on the 22d day of March be reconsidered.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—189

Adolph	Fee	Manderino	Saurman
Allen	Fichter	Markosek	Saylor
Argall	Fleagle	Marsico	Scheetz
Armstrong	Flick	Masland	Schuler
Baker	Freeman	Mayernik	Scrimenti
Barley	Gamble	McCall	Semmel
Battisto	Gannon	McGeehan	Serafini
Bebko-Jones	Geist	McNally	Smith, B.
Belardi	George	Melio	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Gerlach	Merry	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Staback
Blaum	Gladeck	Micozzie	Stairs
Brown	Godshall	Mihalich	Steighner
Bunt	Gordner	Miller	Steil
Burns	Gruppo	Mundy	Stern
Buxton	Haluska	Nailor	Stetler
Caltagirone	Hanna	Nickol	Stish
Cappabianca	Harley	Nyce	Strittmatter
Carn	Hasay	O'Brien	Sturla
Carone	Hennessey	Olasz	Surra
Cawley	Herman	Oliver	Tangretti
Cessar	Hershey	Perzel	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Hess	Pesci	Taylor, J.
Civera	Hutchinson	Petrarca	Thomas
Clark	Itkin	Petrone	Tigue
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pettit	Tomlinson
Cohen, L. I.	James	Phillips	Trello
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Piccola	Trich
Colaizzo	Josephs	Pistella	True
Conti	Kasunic	Pitts	Tulli
Cornell	Keller	Platts	Uliana
Corrigan	Kenney	Preston	Vance
Cowell	King	Raymond	Van Horne
Coy	Kirkland	Reber	Veon
Daley	Krebs	Reinard	Vitali
DeLuca	Kukovich	Richardson	Waugh
Dempsey	Laub	Rieger	Williams
Dent	Laughlin	Ritter	Wogan
Dermody	Lawless	Roberts	Wozniak
Donatucci	Lederer	Robinson	Wright, D. R.
Druce	Lee	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Durham	Leh	Rohrer	Yandrisevits
Egolf	Lescovitz	Rooney	Yewcic
Evans	Levdansky	Rubley	Zug
Fairchild	Lloyd	Rudy	
Fajt	Lucyk	Ryan	DeWeese,
Fargo	Lynch	Santoni	Speaker
Farmer	Maitland	Sather	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—8

Bishop	Curry	Kaiser	Steelman
Colafella	Hughes	LaGrotta	Washington

EXCUSED—5

Acosta	Bush	Butkovitz	Gruitza
Boyes			

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

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

**BILL PLACED ON FINAL PASSAGE
POSTPONED CALENDAR**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, Mr. Itkin, of Allegheny County.

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that HB 1510 be placed upon the final passage postponed calendar.

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

**BILLS ON THIRD
CONSIDERATION CONTINUED**

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1635, PN 1861**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 21, 1939 (P.L.626, No.294), referred to as the Second Class County Assessment Law, providing for reduction of tax rates in certain cases.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

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

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that HB 1635, PN 1861, be recommitted to the Rules Committee.

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

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Trello, is recognized. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. TRELLO. To make an announcement, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. TRELLO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the members of the Finance Committee that there will be a meeting at the call of the adjournment in room 40E. I would appreciate all members being in attendance.

The SPEAKER. Finance Committee, 40E, at the adjournment.

We still have an additional vote to take, as paperwork is being prepared for a resolution for one of our colleagues.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MR. FREEMAN

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Freeman, is recognized. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise for two announcements, if I may.

The SPEAKER. You are in order.

Mr. FREEMAN. The first announcement is that the legislation which was drafted by the ad hoc land use group to reflect the recommendations of the House select committee on land use and growth management from last session is at the bill clerk's desk for those who would care to cosponsor who have not. It is HB 2662, and I would urge the cosponsorship of those members who are interested in putting good land use legislation into place here in Pennsylvania.

The second message pertains to the meeting of the ad hoc land use group. We are scheduled to meet at the break. We will meet at 1:30 in room 302, South Office Building. So for those who belong to the land use group, it is 1:30 in room 302, South Office Building. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

LABOR RELATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Belfanti, is recognized. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BELFANTI. To make an announcement, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. BELFANTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to inform the members of the Labor Relations Committee, both the Democrat and Republican, that we will be having a Labor Relations Committee meeting next Tuesday at 11 o'clock. You will get a flier in the mail today both at your district office and your home also, but I would like to advise you, since this is our last session day, that we will be having a meeting of Labor Relations next Tuesday at 11 o'clock. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Mr. Battisto for the purpose of an announcement.

Mr. BATTISTO. To make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BATTISTO. There will be a meeting of the House Appropriations Committee immediately upon adjournment in the majority caucus room. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Pistella, for the purpose of an announcement.

Mr. PISTELLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wanted to announce for the benefit of the members of the Local Government Committee that the meeting that was recessed this morning will be reconvened tomorrow morning at 9:30, prior to our scheduled public hearing at 10. Again, the meeting will be reconvened tomorrow morning at 9:30. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks Mr. Pistella.

VOTE CORRECTION

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

Mr. LUCYK. Mr. Speaker, on concurrence in Senate amendments on SB 974, I was in my seat and I did vote. My vote did not record. Would it be better to reconsider that vote or just have the vote recorded in the affirmative?

The SPEAKER. The House will be at ease momentarily.

RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Itkin, for the purpose of an announcement concerning a Rules Committee meeting.

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce a Rules Committee meeting while the House is at ease.

The SPEAKER. Rules Committee meeting while the House is at ease at the majority leader's podium.

VOTE CORRECTION

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

Mr. LAWLESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. LAWLESS. On SB 515 I believe I was recorded in the negative, and I would like to be recorded in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman, and his remarks will be spread across the record.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 2635 By Representatives KELLER, MIHALICH, M. COHEN, COWELL, ROONEY, BAKER, TIGUE, VEON, TRELLO, DERMODY, RAYMOND, PISTELLA,

WILLIAMS, BELFANTI, ACOSTA, MCGEEHAN,
YANDRISEVITS, RICHARDSON and SURRA

An Act providing for the Workforce Antiretaliation Act.

Referred to Committee on LABOR RELATIONS,
March 23, 1994.

No. 2636 By Representatives YANDRISEVITS,
MARKOSEK, ROONEY, LAUB, PESCI, KELLER,
MIHALICH, NYCE, CARONE, BATTISTO, KAISER,
GODSHALL, PETRARCA, DeLUCA, MUNDY,
BELFANTI, MELIO, PISTELLA, WILLIAMS,
TANGRETTI, B. SMITH, L. I. COHEN, VEON, KENNEY,
J. TAYLOR, STEELMAN and WASHINGTON

An Act amending Title 20 (Decedents, Estates and Fiduciaries)
of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for
shares of other than surviving spouse.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, March 23, 1994.

No. 2637 By Representatives CAPPABIANCA,
M. COHEN, PISTELLA, TRELLO, GORDNER, ROONEY,
KUKOVICH, SAURMAN, D. W. SNYDER, TULLI, LEE,
THOMAS, GEIST, TRICH, GANNON and COLAFELLA

An Act amending the act of June 5, 1937 (P.L.1688, No.352),
entitled "An act relating to the dissemination of information
pertaining to affairs of the Commonwealth, including information
pertaining to civil rights and constitutional guarantees; and
conferring powers and duties with respect thereto upon the
Department of State," establishing the Office of Information
Technology in the Governor's Office and providing for its powers
and duties; and providing for information accessibility.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT,
March 23, 1994.

No. 2638 By Representatives GODSHALL, FEE,
SURRA, STABACK, LEVDANSKY, BROWN, TIGUE,
MERRY, DERMODY, SCHULER, GORDNER, ZUG,
GANNON, CAWLEY, WOZNIAK, PLATTS,
HUTCHINSON, TRELLO, KASUNIC and HANNA

An Act amending Title 34 (Game) of the Pennsylvania
Consolidated Statutes, permitting Sunday hunting for coyotes and
Sunday hunting on noncommercial regulated hunting grounds.

Referred to Committee on GAME AND FISHERIES,
March 23, 1994.

No. 2639 By Representative GERLACH

An Act authorizing the Department of General Services, with
the approval of the Governor, to grant and convey tracts of land
situate in East Vincent Township, Chester County, Pennsylvania;
and making a repeal.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT,
March 23, 1994.

No. 2640 By Representatives COLAFELLA,
DeWEESE, TANGRETTI, KUKOVICH, DEMPSEY,
BELFANTI, STABACK, YEWIC, GORDNER,
HENNESSEY, D. W. SNYDER, VAN HORNE,
GODSHALL, MICHLOVIC, TOMLINSON, DERMODY,
MICOZZIE, DeLUCA, GIGLIOTTI, DURHAM,
LaGROTTA and LAUGHLIN

An Act regulating the sale of life insurance and annuities;
providing for additional powers and duties of the Insurance
Department; defining certain unfair financial planning practices;
and providing for compensation limits, for procedural matters, for
policy copies, for records retention, for the use of illustrations and
for enforcement.

Referred to Committee on INSURANCE, March 23, 1994.

No. 2641 By Representatives SAURMAN, BUXTON,
CESSAR, LAUB, MARKOSEK, PETTTT, REBER,
TRELLO, JOSEPHS, CAPPABIANCA, MELIO,
HENNESSEY, J. TAYLOR, FICHTER, CARN, FLICK,
KENNEY, FAJT, L. I. COHEN, STURLA and RUBLEY

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

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, March 23, 1994.

No. 2642 By Representatives PITTS, E. Z. TAYLOR,
HERSHEY, HENNESSEY, GERLACH, RUBLEY,
FICHTER, B. SMITH, FLICK and TRUE

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania
Consolidated Statutes, further providing for traffic and engineering
investigations and for specific powers of the Department of
Transportation and local authorities.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION,
March 23, 1994.

No. 2643 By Representatives WAUGH, COY,
CIVERA, CESSAR, NICKOL, SAYLOR, DEMPSEY,
FARGO, FLEAGLE, LAUB, ZUG, STETLER, FLICK,
MASLAND, BROWN, PETTTT, BAKER, CLARK, LEH,
EGOLF, PLATTS, B. SMITH, TRELLO, GEIST,
FICHTER, TRUE, YANDRISEVITS, MAITLAND and
ROBERTS

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania
Consolidated Statutes, providing for the designation of an
emergency vehicle as a command post with appropriate green
lights.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION,
March 23, 1994.

No. 2644 By Representatives LAWLESS, PITTS,
MAITLAND, BELFANTI, PETTTT, SATHER, FAJT and
MERRY

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for the fine for vehicle inspection violation.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, March 23, 1994.

No. 2645 By Representatives LYNCH, BARLEY, CESSAR, MERRY, LAUB, FAIRCHILD, BAKER, MAITLAND, ARMSTRONG, FARMER, ZUG, HASAY, RAYMOND, ADOLPH, HUTCHINSON and LEH

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.177, No.175), known as The Administrative Code of 1929, further providing for budget procedures.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, March 23, 1994.

No. 2648 By Representatives CALTAGIRONE, RYAN, PICCOLA, STETLER, SAYLOR, TRELLO, JAMES, HUGHES, CARN, O'BRIEN, HENNESSEY, YANDRISEVITS and LINTON

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for the number of judges of the courts of common pleas.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, March 23, 1994.

No. 2650 By Representatives LESCOVITZ, CESSAR, COY, WOZNAK, OLASZ, GODSHALL, McCALL and M. N. WRIGHT

An Act amending the act of November 30, 1965 (P.L.847, No.356), known as the Banking Code of 1965, further providing for mergers, consolidations and conversions of savings banks.

Referred to Committee on BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, March 23, 1994.

No. 2651 By Representatives KASUNIC, GORDNER, B. SMITH, HERSHEY, ROBERTS, KAISER, STISH, COLAIZZO, COLAFELLA and JAROLIN

An Act providing for authority to exercise police powers in the enforcement of the cruelty to animals law; and conferring powers and imposing duties on the Department of Agriculture.

Referred to Committee on AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS, March 23, 1994.

HOUSE RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 282 By Representatives SAURMAN, FARGO, CESSAR, CAWLEY, M. COHEN, NAILOR, CURRY, MICOZZIE, L. I. COHEN, PETTT, MELIO, BUNT, MAITLAND, ROONEY, STABACK, GEORGE, FICHTER, SCHULER, MILLER, HENNESSEY, TIGUE, MERRY, LYNCH, LAUGHLIN, KENNEY, O'BRIEN, KASUNIC, J. TAYLOR, TOMLINSON, SATHER, MICHLOVIC, CLARK, STEELMAN and KING

A Resolution memorializing Congress to consider individual retirement accounts as monthly income for purposes of determining eligibility for welfare.

Referred to Committee on RULES, March 23, 1994.

No. 283 By Representatives KASUNIC, LUCYK, DeWEESE, CORRIGAN, DeLUCA, DALEY, GIGLIOTTI, OLASZ, STISH, HANNA, ROBERTS, MELIO, HALUSKA, CURRY, M. N. WRIGHT, BAKER, MILLER, EGOLF, ALLEN, SCHULER, FLEAGLE, ZUG, STABACK, LEDERER, GORDNER, ADOLPH, LAWLESS, LYNCH, HASAY, KENNEY, CLYMER, TIGUE, CAPPABIANCA, MAYERNIK, FARGO, CIVERA, RAYMOND, GEIST, SATHER, CLARK, SAYLOR, FLICK, MERRY, SAURMAN, J. TAYLOR, B. SMITH, VANCE, NAILOR and MARSICO

A Resolution congratulating the American Legion on the momentous occasion of its 75th Anniversary.

Referred to Committee on RULES, March 23, 1994.

VOTE CORRECTIONS

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentlelady, Mrs. HARLEY, rise?

Mrs. HARLEY. I would like to correct my vote, please.

The SPEAKER. The lady is in order.

Mrs. HARLEY. Yesterday on HB 1510, I was recorded as "yes." I would like that changed to a "no" vote.

Today on SB 515, I would like to change that vote to a "yes." My switch malfunctioned. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady, and her remarks will be spread across the record.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (FRED A. TRELLO) PRESIDING

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MAJORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, Mr. Itkin.

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I would like to make it clear that this House will be in active working session on Tuesday, April 5, and Wednesday, April 6. There were some rumors going around the floor that they may be token or nonvoting sessions. That is not correct. We will have active session on Tuesday, April 5, and on Wednesday, April 6. We will not be in session next week.

SB 974 RECONSIDERED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is in possession of a reconsideration motion from the gentleman, Mr. Lucyk, who moves that the vote by which SB 974, PN 2017, was passed on the 23d day of March be reconsidered.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—196

Adolph	Fee	Maitland	Saurman
Allen	Fichter	Manderino	Saylor
Argall	Fleagle	Markosek	Scheetz
Armstrong	Flick	Marsico	Schuler
Baker	Freeman	Masland	Scrimenti
Barley	Gamble	Mayernik	Semmel
Battisto	Gannon	McCall	Serafini
Bebko-Jones	Geist	McGeehan	Smith, B.
Belardi	George	McNally	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Gerlach	Melio	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Gigliotti	Merry	Staback
Bishop	Gladeck	Michlovic	Stairs
Blaum	Godshall	Micozzie	Steelman
Brown	Gordner	Mihalich	Steighner
Bunt	Gruppo	Miller	Steil
Burns	Haluska	Mundy	Stern
Buxton	Hanna	Nailor	Stetler
Caltagirone	Harley	Nickol	Stish
Cappabianca	Hasay	Nyce	Strittmatter
Carone	Hennessey	O'Brien	Sturla
Cawley	Herman	Olasz	Surra
Cessar	Hershey	Oliver	Tangretti
Chadwick	Hess	Perzel	Taylor, E. Z.
Civera	Hughes	Pesci	Taylor, J.
Clark	Hutchinson	Petrarca	Thomas
Clymer	Itkin	Petrone	Tigue
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pettit	Tomlinson
Cohen, M.	James	Phillips	Trello
Colaifella	Jarolin	Piccola	Trich
Colaizzo	Josephs	Pistella	True
Conti	Kaiser	Pitts	Tulli
Cornell	Kasunic	Platts	Uliana
Corrigan	Keller	Preston	Vance
Cowell	Kenney	Raymond	Van Horne
Coy	King	Reber	Veon
Curry	Kirkland	Reinard	Vitali
Daley	Krebs	Richardson	Washington
DeLuca	Kukovich	Rieger	Waugh
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Ritter	Williams
Dent	Laub	Roberts	Wogan
Dermody	Laughlin	Robinson	Wozniak
Donatucci	Lawless	Roebuck	Wright, D. R.
Druce	Lederer	Rohrer	Wright, M. N.
Durham	Lee	Rooney	Yandrisevits
Egolf	Leh	Rubley	Yewcic
Evans	Lescovitz	Rudy	Zug
Fairchild	Levdansky	Ryan	
Fajt	Lloyd	Santoni	DeWeese,
Fargo	Lucyk	Sather	Speaker
Farmer	Lynch		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—1

Carn

EXCUSED—5

Acosta	Bush	Butkovitz	Gruitza
Boyes			

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

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments to House amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

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

YEAS—181

Allen	Fee	Manderino	Saurman
Argall	Fichter	Markosek	Saylor
Armstrong	Fleagle	Marsico	Scheetz
Baker	Flick	Masland	Schuler
Barley	Freeman	Mayernik	Scrimenti
Battisto	Gamble	McCall	Semmel
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	McGeehan	Serafini
Belardi	Geist	McNally	Smith, B.
Belfanti	George	Melio	Smith, S. H.
Birmelin	Gerlach	Merry	Snyder, D. W.
Bishop	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Staback
Blaum	Gordner	Micozzie	Stairs
Brown	Gruppo	Mihalich	Steelman
Bunt	Haluska	Mittler	Steighner
Burns	Hanna	Mundy	Stern
Buxton	Hasay	Nailor	Stetler
Caltagirone	Hennessey	Nickol	Stish
Cappabianca	Herman	O'Brien	Strittmatter
Carn	Hershey	Olasz	Sturla
Carone	Hess	Oliver	Surra
Cawley	Hughes	Perzel	Tangretti
Cessar	Hutchinson	Pesci	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Itkin	Petrarca	Taylor, J.
Civera	Jadlowiec	Petrone	Thomas
Clark	James	Pettit	Tigue
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Phillips	Trello
Colaifella	Josephs	Piccola	Trich
Colaizzo	Kaiser	Pistella	True
Cornell	Kasunic	Pitts	Tulli
Corrigan	Keller	Platts	Uliana
Cowell	Kenney	Preston	Vance
Coy	King	Raymond	Van Horne
Curry	Kirkland	Reber	Veon
Daley	Krebs	Richardson	Washington
DeLuca	Kukovich	Rieger	Waugh
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Ritter	Williams
Dent	Laughlin	Roberts	Wogan
Dermody	Lederer	Robinson	Wozniak
Donatucci	Lee	Roebuck	Wright, D. R.
Durham	Leh	Rohrer	Wright, M. N.
Egolf	Lescovitz	Rooney	Yandrisevits
Evans	Levdansky	Rubley	Yewcic
Fairchild	Lloyd	Rudy	Zug
Fajt	Lucyk	Ryan	
Fargo	Lynch	Santoni	DeWeese,
Farmer	Maitland	Sather	Speaker

NAYS—16

Adolph	Druce	Laub	Steil
Clymer	Gladeck	Lawless	Tomlinson
Cohen, L. I.	Godshall	Nyce	Vitali
Conti	Harley	Reinard	Wright, M. N.

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Acosta	Bush	Butkovitz	Gruitza
Boyes			

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments to the House amendments as amended by the Rules Committee were concurred in.

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

RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HR 213, PN 3404 (Amended) By Rep. ITKIN
A Resolution directing the Consumer Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives to consider cable television regulation.

RULES.

HR 228, PN 3082 By Rep. ITKIN
A Resolution designating the week of May 1 through 7, 1994, as "Correctional Officers Week" in Pennsylvania.

RULES.

HR 268, PN 3320 By Rep. ITKIN
A Resolution designating the month of May 1994 as "Physical Fitness and Sports Month."

RULES.

HR 269, PN 3321 By Rep. ITKIN
A Resolution recognizing the month of May 1994 as "Healthy Babies Month" in Pennsylvania.

RULES.

HR 270, PN 3322 By Rep. ITKIN
A Resolution designating April 1994 as "Pennsylvania Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Month."

RULES.

HR 277, PN 3386 By Rep. ITKIN
A Resolution recognizing April 10, 1994, as "Marlborough Township, Montgomery County, Environmental Awareness Day."

RULES.

RULES SUSPENDED

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

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House immediately suspend the rules to consider HR 281.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—197

Adolph	Farmer	Lynch	Saurman
Allen	Fee	Maitland	Saylor
Argall	Fichter	Manderino	Scheetz
Armstrong	Fleagle	Markosek	Schuler
Baker	Flick	Marsico	Scrimenti
Barley	Freeman	Masland	Semmel
Battisto	Gamble	Mayermik	Serafini
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	McCall	Smith, B.
Belardi	Geist	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	George	McNally	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Gerlach	Melio	Staback
Bishop	Gigliotti	Merry	Stairs

Blum	Gladeck	Michlovic	Steelman
Brown	Godshall	Micozzie	Steighner
Bunt	Gordner	Mihalich	Steil
Burns	Gruppo	Miller	Stern
Buxton	Haluska	Mundy	Stetler
Caltagirone	Hanna	Nailor	Stish
Cappabianca	Harley	Nickol	Strittmatter
Carn	Hasay	Nyce	Sturla
Carone	Hennessey	O'Brien	Surra
Cawley	Herman	Olasz	Tangretti
Cesar	Hershey	Oliver	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Hess	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Civara	Hughes	Pesci	Thomas
Clark	Hutchinson	Petrarca	Tigue
Clymer	Itkin	Petrone	Tomlinson
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pettit	Trello
Cohen, M.	James	Phillips	Trich
Colaella	Jarolin	Piccola	True
Colaizzo	Josephs	Pistella	Tulli
Conti	Kaiser	Pitts	Uliana
Cornell	Kasunic	Platts	Vance
Corrigan	Keller	Preston	Van Horne
Cowell	Kenney	Raymond	Veon
Coy	King	Reber	Vitali
Curry	Kirkland	Reinard	Washington
Daley	Krebs	Richardson	Wagh
DeLuca	Kukovich	Rieger	Williams
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Ritter	Wogan
Dent	Laub	Roberts	Wozniak
Dermody	Laughlin	Robinson	Wright, D. R.
Donatucci	Lawless	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Druce	Lederer	Rohrer	Yandrisevits
Durham	Lee	Rooney	Yewcic
Egolf	Leh	Rublely	Zug
Evans	Lescovitz	Rudy	
Fairchild	Levdansky	Ryan	DeWeese,
Fajt	Lloyd	Santoni	Speaker
Fargo	Lucyk	Sather	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Acosta	Bush	Butkovitz	Gruitza
Boyes			

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Pettit, who offers the following resolution, which the clerk will read.

The following resolution was read:

House Resolution No. 281

A RESOLUTION

Memorializing the Librarian of Congress to make a handwritten copy of the Gettysburg Address available for public display at Gettysburg.

WHEREAS, There are five copies of President Lincoln's Gettysburg Address handwritten by President Lincoln; and

WHEREAS, None of these copies are at the town of Gettysburg, the place where this address was delivered; and

WHEREAS, It would be most appropriate for the National Park Service to display a copy of this address for public view; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Librarian of Congress to make one of the handwritten copies of the Gettysburg Address available to the National Park Service for public display at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Librarian of Congress and to the head of the National Park Service.

Albert W. Pettit
 Stephen R. Maitland
 Patricia H. Vance
 Albert H. Masland
 Michael L. Waugh
 Robert E. Nyce
 John M. Perzel
 Kathy M. Manderino
 Dennis E. Leh
 Richard J. Cessar
 Peter J. Zug
 Lita Indzel Cohen
 Howard L. Fargo
 Scott E. Hutchinson
 Lawrence Roberts
 Arthur D. Hershey
 Larry O. Sather
 Charles W. Dent
 Mark B. Cohen
 Edward H. Krebs
 Anthony J. Melio
 T. J. Rooney
 Edward G. Staback
 John W. Fichter
 Katie True
 Samuel H. Smith
 Elaine F. Farmer
 Gregory C. Fajt
 Sheila M. Miller
 Robert L. Freeman
 Timothy F. Hennessey
 Susan Laughlin
 Matthew E. Baker
 Thomas M. Tigues
 Paul I. Clymer
 James R. Merry
 Fred A. Trello
 Jim Lynch
 Ellen A. Harley
 Jerry A. Stern
 Todd R. Platts
 Elinor Z. Taylor
 Robert M. Tomlinson
 Ron Raymond
 Frank J. Gigliotti
 Jerry Birmelin
 Robert E. Belfanti, Jr.
 Richard A. Geist
 George T. Kenney, Jr.
 Jim Gerlach
 Thomas W. Druce
 Frank J. Pistella
 Barbara A. Burns
 Merle H. Phillips
 Dennis M. O'Brien
 Edward J. Lucyk
 Richard A. Kasunic
 Daniel F. Clark
 Dick L. Hess

Stanley E. Saylor
 Patrick E. Fleagle
 Raymond Bunt, Jr.
 Steven R. Nickol

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

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

Mr. PETTIT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

During the first 3 days of July 1863, one of the most famous battles in history was fought at Gettysburg, certainly the most famous battle ever fought in Pennsylvania. Then on November 19, Edward Everett gave a 2-hour speech commemorating the new military cemetery at Gettysburg. He was followed by President Lincoln, who spoke for 2 minutes, 266 words that have gone down in history, and yet of the five handwritten speeches or copies of that speech, none, none is at Gettysburg. As a result, Representative Maitland and I want to see one of the five handwritten copies displayed at Gettysburg and are so memorializing the Library of Congress.

I would appreciate your vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—197

Adolph	Farmer	Lynch	Saurman
Allen	Fee	Maitland	Saylor
Argall	Fichter	Manderino	Scheetz
Armstrong	Fleagle	Markosek	Schuler
Baker	Flick	Marsico	Scrimenti
Barley	Freeman	Masland	Semmel
Battisto	Gamble	Mayermik	Serafini
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	McCall	Smith, B.
Belardi	Geist	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	George	McNally	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Gerlach	Melio	Staback
Bishop	Gigliotti	Merry	Stairs
Blaum	Gladeck	Michlovic	Steelman
Brown	Godshall	Micozzie	Steighner
Bunt	Gordner	Mihalich	Steil
Burns	Gruppo	Miller	Stern
Buxton	Haluska	Mundy	Stetler
Caltagirone	Hanna	Nailor	Stish
Cappabianca	Harley	Nickol	Strittmatter
Carn	Hasay	Nyce	Sturla
Carone	Hennessey	O'Brien	Surra
Cawley	Herman	Olasz	Tangretti
Cessar	Hershey	Oliver	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Hess	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Civera	Hughes	Pesci	Thomas
Clark	Hutchinson	Petrarca	Tigues
Clymer	Itkin	Petrone	Tomlinson
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pettit	Trello
Cohen, M.	James	Phillips	Trich
Colafella	Jarolin	Piccola	True
Colaizzo	Josephs	Pistella	Tulli
Conti	Kaiser	Pitta	Uliana
Cornell	Kasunic	Platts	Vance
Corrigan	Keller	Preston	Van Horne

Cowell	Kenney	Raymond	Veon
Coy	King	Reber	Vitali
Curry	Kirkland	Reinard	Washington
Daley	Krebs	Richardson	Waugh
DeLuca	Kukovich	Rieger	Williams
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Ritter	Wogan
Dent	Laub	Roberts	Wozniak
Dermody	Laughlin	Robinson	Wright, D. R.
Donatucci	Lawless	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Druce	Lederer	Rohrer	Yandrisevits
Durham	Lee	Rooney	Yewcic
Egolf	Leh	Ruble	Zug
Evans	Leacovitz	Rudy	
Fairchild	Levdansky	Ryan	DeWeese,
Fajt	Lloyd	Santoni	Speaker
Fargo	Lucyk	Sather	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Acosta	Bush	Butkovitz	Gruitza
Boyes			

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to congratulate the gentleman from Allegheny County for his fine choice of words.

There will be no further votes for the day.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This House will recess to the call of the Chair, and the desk will be left open for committee reports.

AFTER RECESS

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

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (GREGORY C. FAJT) PRESIDING

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

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

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the following bills be taken off the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar:

HB 1174;
HB 1805;
HB 1905;
HB 1945;
HB 2032;
HB 2033;
HB 2267;
HB 2329;
HB 2348;

HB 2415; and
HB 2308.

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

BILLS RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair next recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the following bills be recommitted to the Appropriations Committee:

HB 1174;
HB 1805;
HB 1905;
HB 1945;
HB 2267;
HB 2415; and
HB 2308.

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

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 2032, PN 3374; HB 2033, PN 2503; HB 2329, PN 3327; and HB 2348, PN 2940.

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HB 4, PN 3423 (Amended) By Rep. EVANS
An Act amending Title 66 (Public Utilities) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for watershed land.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 358, PN 3424 (Amended) By Rep. EVANS
An Act amending the act of August 31, 1971 (P.L.398, No.96), known as the County Pension Law, providing for special early retirement incentives for county employees.

APPROPRIATIONS.

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

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

HB 358, PN 3424.

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

HB 1915, PN 3425 (Amended) By Rep. TRELLO

An Act authorizing interexchange telecommunications carriers to itemize State gross receipts taxes; and making a repeal.

FINANCE.

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 next recognizes Representative Al Pettit from Allegheny County.

Mr. PETTIT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, April 5, 1994, 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 10:59 p.m., e.s.t., the House adjourned.