

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 1996

SESSION OF 1996

180TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 18

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 11:05 a.m., e.s.t.

**THE SPEAKER (MATTHEW J. RYAN)
PRESIDING**

PRAYER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the prayer from today's special session will be printed in today's regular session Journal.

REV. JAMES J. FERGUSON, Chaplain of the House of Representatives and pastor of Second Presbyterian Church, Carlisle, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

Our Gracious God and Heavenly Father, it is a day for hard work, for coming together with ideas, needs, and resources, and we pray, our Lord, that in the midst of this work, Your spirit will prevail to guide each of these who make these decisions, that they may be sensitive to the needs of those in the Commonwealth and in the Nation.

We ask Your blessing upon us in that end and upon the Governor. We ask it in the name of Him who is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE DISPENSED WITH

The SPEAKER. The Pledge of Allegiance will be dispensed with.

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Tuesday, March 19, 1996, will be postponed until printed. The Chair hears no objection.

JOURNAL APPROVED

The SPEAKER. The Journal of Tuesday, June 20, 1995, is in print and will be accepted, without objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Does the majority leader or minority leader have any further business at this time in the regular session?

Hearing none, the regular session will stand in recess until 1 p.m.

All members are advised that their respective caucuses are now meeting.

Recess shall now begin.

RECESS EXTENDED

The time of recess was extended until 1:30 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (JOE CONTI) PRESIDING

REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE PRESENTED

Mr. GANNON presented the Report of the Committee of Conference on **SB 432, PN 1843**.

SENATE MESSAGE

HOUSE BILLS CONCURRED IN BY SENATE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 270, PN 1951**; and **HB 2033, PN 2752**, with information that the Senate has passed the same without amendment.

SENATE MESSAGE

AMENDED HOUSE BILL RETURNED FOR CONCURRENCE AND REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 294, PN 3290**, with information that the Senate has passed the same with amendment in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives is requested.

SENATE MESSAGE**HOUSE AMENDMENTS
CONCURRED IN BY SENATE**

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, informed that the Senate has concurred in the amendments made by the House of Representatives to **SB 708, PN 1824**.

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Perzel.

Mr. **PERZEL**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the following bills be removed from the table:

HB 1952;
HB 1962; and
HB 2261.

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

BILLS RECOMMENDED

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Perzel.

Mr. **PERZEL**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the following bills be recommended to the Appropriations Committee:

HB 1952;
HB 1962; and
HB 2261.

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

**HOUSE BILLS
INTRODUCED AND REFERRED**

No. 2495 By Representatives **NICKOL, MASLAND, FARGO, WOGAN, LYNCH, MAITLAND, FAIRCHILD, GRUPPO, STERN, STETLER, ROONEY, STEELMAN, SAYLOR, HALUSKA, READSHAW, TRELLO, MERRY, HENNESSEY, CLARK, DeLUCA and MILLER**

An Act amending Title 66 (Public Utilities) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for the duty of owners of rental property.

Referred to Committee on **CONSUMER AFFAIRS**, March 20, 1996.

No. 2496 By Representatives **LEH, MELIO, FARGO, PHILLIPS, E. Z. TAYLOR, McCALL, MARSICO, HENNESSEY, GEIST, DEMPSEY, SHEEHAN, STISH, WAUGH, ARMSTRONG, STABACK, FEESE, HALUSKA, ARGALL, JAROLIN, FICHTER, SATHER, TRUE, CLARK, GODSHALL, EGOLF, TANGRETTI, STERN, RAYMOND, ROHRER, DeLUCA, FAJT, L. I. COHEN, SAYLOR, HASTE, YOUNGBLOOD, FARMER and MERRY**

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, providing that mandatory educational programs need not be implemented until funding for the cost of the program is provided for by the General Assembly.

Referred to Committee on **EDUCATION**, March 20, 1996.

**HOUSE RESOLUTIONS
INTRODUCED AND REFERRED**

No. 311 By Representatives **STETLER, SAYLOR, WAUGH, MASLAND, NICKOL, PLATTS and B. SMITH**

A Concurrent Resolution honoring Loretta Claiborne on her induction into the Pennsylvania Special Olympics Hall of Fame on March 21, 1996.

Referred to Committee on **RULES**, March 20, 1996.

No. 314 By Representatives **DeLUCA, CIVERA, GIGLIOTTI, RAYMOND, TRELLO, E. Z. TAYLOR, MELIO, SAYLOR, PESCI, KING, BELARDI, SHANER, OLASZ, WALKO, COLAFELLA, MARKOSEK, ROBERTS, READSHAW, ITKIN, STABACK, PISTELLA, BOSCOLA, DERMODY, CAPPABIANCA, TRICH and McGEEHAN**

A Resolution directing the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee to conduct a comprehensive study evaluating existing health care regulation within this Commonwealth and to make recommendations to the House of Representatives.

Referred to Committee on **RULES**, March 20, 1996.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Itkin, who requests the following leaves of absence: the gentleman from Bucks County, Mr. **CORRIGAN**; the gentleman from Washington County, Mr. **DALEY**; the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. **GIGLIOTTI**; and the gentleman from Westmoreland County, Mr. **MIHALICH**. Without objection, these leaves are granted.

It is the Chair's understanding that there are no leaves of absence for the Republican Party.

MASTER ROLL CALL

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

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT-198

Adolph	Evans	Lynch	Saylor
Allen	Fairchild	Maitland	Schroder
Argall	Fajt	Major	Schuler
Armstrong	Fargo	Manderino	Scrimenti
Baker	Feese	Markosek	Semmel
Bard	Fichter	Marsico	Serafini
Barley	Fleagle	Masland	Shaner
Battisto	Flick	Mayernik	Sheehan
Bebko-Jones	Gamble	McCall	Smith, B.
Belardi	Gannon	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Geist	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	George	Melio	Staback
Bishop	Gladeck	Merry	Stairs
Blaum	Godshall	Michlovic	Steelman
Boscola	Gordner	Micozzie	Steil
Boyes	Gruitza	Miller	Stern
Brown	Gruppo	Mundy	Stetler
Browne	Habay	Myers	Stish
Bunt	Haluska	Nailor	Strittmatter
Butkovitz	Hanna	Nickol	Surla
Buxton	Harhart	Nyce	Surra
Caltagirone	Hasay	O'Brien	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Haste	Olasz	Taylor, E. Z.
Carn	Hennessey	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Carone	Herman	Perez	Thomas
Cawley	Hershey	Pesci	Tigue
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	Travaglio
Civera	Horsey	Petrone	Trello
Clark	Hutchinson	Pettit	Trich
Clymer	Itkin	Phillips	True
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Tulli
Cohen, M.	James	Pitts	Vance
Colafiglia	Jarolin	Platts	Van Horne
Colaizzo	Josephs	Preston	Veon
Conti	Kaiser	Ramos	Vitali
Cornell	Keller	Raymond	Walko
Corpora	Kenney	Readshaw	Washington
Cowell	King	Reber	Waugh
Coy	Kirkland	Reinard	Williams
Curry	Krebs	Rieger	Wogan
DeLuca	Kukovich	Roberts	Wozniak
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wright, D. R.
Dent	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Dermody	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
DeWeese	Lederer	Rooney	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Leh	Rublely	Zimmerman
Donatucci	Lescovitz	Rudy	Zug
Druce	Levdansky	Sainato	
Durham	Lloyd	Santoni	Ryan,
Egolf	Lucyk	Sather	Speaker

ADDITIONS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-5

Corrigan	Farmer	Gigliotti	Mihalich
Daley			

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. At this time the Chair wishes to recognize the Daniel Boone Optimist Club and 11th grade students of Daniel Boone High School. They are here as part of the club's Youth Appreciation Day, and they are the guests of

Representative Leh. They are located in the back of the House. Would we please give these guests the usual warm House reception.

CALENDAR

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2393, PN 3224**, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 18 (Crimes and Offenses) and 54 (Names) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, requiring the Pennsylvania State Police to receive notification when the court orders a change of name for a person with a criminal record; and regulating change of name after conviction of a felony.

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?

The Chair recognizes the lady, Mrs. Rudy.
Mrs. RUDY. I would like to speak on final passage of the measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. You may proceed.
Mrs. RUDY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this measure because I had introduced a very similar bill in 1995, in January of 1995. The measure came out of the Judiciary Committee, and it is now languishing in the Appropriations Committee. I am honored that my Republican colleagues and the leadership side over there thought my bill worthy enough to have it recopied and give it to another member to introduce. But I truly am supportive of the measure because it involves a very strong loophole that needs to be closed in the Megan's Law. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady.

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-197

Adolph	Evans	Lynch	Schroder
Allen	Fairchild	Maitland	Schuler
Argall	Fajt	Major	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Fargo	Manderino	Semmel
Baker	Feese	Markosek	Serafini
Bard	Fichter	Marsico	Shaner
Barley	Fleagle	Masland	Sheehan
Battisto	Flick	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Bebko-Jones	Gamble	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Belardi	Gannon	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Belfanti	Geist	McGill	Staback
Birmelin	George	Melio	Stairs
Bishop	Gladeck	Merry	Steelman
Blaum	Godshall	Michlovic	Steil
Boscola	Gordner	Micozzie	Stern
Boyes	Gruitza	Miller	Stetler

Brown	Gruppo	Mundy	Stish
Browne	Habay	Myers	Strittmatter
Bunt	Haluska	Nailor	Sturla
Butkovitz	Hanna	Nickol	Surra
Buxton	Harhart	Nyce	Tangretti
Caltagirone	Hasay	O'Brien	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Haste	Olasz	Taylor, J.
Carn	Hennessey	Oliver	Thomas
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Tigue
Cawley	Hershey	Pesci	Travaglio
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	Trello
Civera	Horsey	Petrone	Trich
Clark	Hutchinson	Pettit	True
Clymer	Itkin	Phillips	Tulli
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Vance
Cohen, M.	James	Pitts	Van Horne
Colafiglia	Jarolin	Platts	Veon
Colaizzo	Josephs	Preston	Vitali
Conti	Kaiser	Ramos	Walko
Cornell	Keller	Raymond	Washington
Corpora	Kenney	Readshaw	Waugh
Cowell	King	Reber	Williams
Coy	Kirkland	Reinard	Wogan
Curry	Krebs	Rieger	Wozniak
DeLuca	Kukovich	Robinson	Wright, D. R.
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Dent	Laughlin	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dermody	Lawless	Rooney	Youngblood
DeWeese	Lederer	Rubley	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	Leh	Rudy	Zug
Donatucci	Lescovitz	Sainato	
Druce	Levdansky	Santoni	Ryan,
Durham	Lloyd	Sather	Speaker
Egolf	Lucyk	Saylor	

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-1

Roberts

EXCUSED-5

Corrigan	Farmer	Gigliotti	Mihalich
Daley			

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 2402, PN 3126**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for scope of chapter relating to limitation of time.

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?

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

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the prime sponsor would consent to interrogation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In this case, the gentleman will stand for interrogation.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I am having a hard time understanding what this bill does, because it brackets out a paragraph on equitable matters and the principles of waiver, laches, and estoppel. What is the purpose of this legislation?

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

Mr. HENNESSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is a response to the Supreme Court's request in United National Insurance Co. v. J. H. France Refractories Co., a 1995 decision of our Supreme Court, which looked at the language that was passed and which we have now bracketed out and said that it was confusing, that it led to contradictory results. The Superior Court said, because the language exists as written, that it could not apply to doctrines of laches or estoppel in an equitable action brought before the court. The Supreme Court said, no, you are wrong, and reversed the Superior Court and said that laches and estoppel still can be applied, and it recognized that the language itself, in paragraph (c), is confusing. The intent of the bill is to remove that paragraph which the Supreme Court has identified as contradictory so that the doctrines of laches and estoppel will continue to survive in equitable actions.

Mr. LLOYD. Will continue to survive?

Mr. HENNESSEY. Yes.

Mr. LLOYD. So no one is losing any procedural rights that they have at the present time?

Mr. HENNESSEY. No.

Mr. LLOYD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HENNESSEY. The doctrines of laches and estoppel will survive.

Mr. LLOYD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks both gentlemen.

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-197

Adolph	Evans	Lynch	Schroder
Allen	Fairchild	Maitland	Schuler
Argall	Fajt	Major	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Fargo	Manderino	Semmel
Baker	Feese	Markosek	Serafini
Bard	Fichter	Marsico	Shaner
Barley	Fleagle	Masland	Sheehan
Battisto	Flick	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Bebko-Jones	Gamble	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Belardi	Gannon	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Belfanti	Geist	McGill	Staback
Birmelin	George	Melio	Stairs
Bishop	Gladeck	Merry	Steelman

Blaum	Godshall	Michlovic	Steil
Boscola	Gordner	Micozzie	Stern
Boyes	Gruitza	Miller	Stetler
Brown	Gruppo	Mundy	Stish
Browne	Habay	Myers	Strittmatter
Bunt	Haluska	Nailor	Sturla
Butkovitz	Hanna	Nickol	Surra
Buxton	Harhart	Nyce	Tangretti
Caltagirone	Hasay	O'Brien	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Haste	Olasz	Taylor, J.
Carn	Hennessey	Oliver	Thomas
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Tigue
Cawley	Hershey	Pesci	Travaglio
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	Trello
Civera	Horsey	Petrone	Trich
Clark	Hutchinson	Pettit	True
Clymer	Itkin	Phillips	Tulli
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Vance
Cohen, M.	James	Pitts	Van Horne
Colaifella	Jarolin	Platts	Veon
Colaizzo	Josephs	Preston	Vitali
Conti	Kaiser	Ramos	Walko
Cornell	Keller	Raymond	Washington
Corpora	Kenney	Readshaw	Waugh
Cowell	King	Reber	Williams
Coy	Kirkland	Reinard	Wogan
Curry	Krebs	Rieger	Wozniak
DeLuca	Kukovich	Roberts	Wright, D. R.
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Dent	Laughlin	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dermody	Lawless	Rooney	Youngblood
DeWeese	Lederer	Rubley	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	Leh	Rudy	Zug
Donatucci	Lescovitz	Sainato	
Druce	Levdansky	Santoni	Ryan,
Durham	Lloyd	Sather	Speaker
Egolf	Lucyk	Saylor	

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-1

Robinson

EXCUSED-5

Corrigan	Farmer	Gigliotti	Mihalich
Dalcy			

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 2102, PN 3269**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 26, 1931 (P.L.1379, No.348), referred to as the Third Class County Assessment Board Law, further providing for assessment appeals; and providing for changes in assessment.

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	Fairchild	Maitland	Schroder
Allen	Fajt	Major	Schuler
Argall	Fargo	Manderino	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Feese	Markosek	Semmel
Baker	Fichter	Marsico	Serafini
Bard	Fleagle	Masland	Shaner
Barley	Flick	Mayernik	Sheehan
Battisto	Gamble	McCall	Smith, B.
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belardi	Geist	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Belfanti	George	Melio	Staback
Birmelin	Gladeck	Merry	Stairs
Bishop	Godshall	Michlovic	Steelman
Blaum	Gordner	Micozzie	Steil
Boscola	Gruitza	Miller	Stern
Boyes	Gruppo	Mundy	Stetler
Brown	Habay	Myers	Stish
Browne	Haluska	Nailor	Strittmatter
Bunt	Hanna	Nickol	Sturla
Butkovitz	Harhart	Nyce	Surra
Buxton	Hasay	O'Brien	Tangretti
Caltagirone	Haste	Olasz	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Hennessey	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Thomas
Cawley	Hershey	Pesci	Tigue
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	Travaglio
Civera	Horsey	Petrone	Trello
Clark	Hutchinson	Pettit	Trich
Clymer	Itkin	Phillips	True
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Tulli
Cohen, M.	James	Pitts	Vance
Colaifella	Jarolin	Platts	Van Horne
Colaizzo	Josephs	Preston	Veon
Conti	Kaiser	Ramos	Vitali
Cornell	Keller	Raymond	Walko
Corpora	Kenney	Readshaw	Washington
Cowell	King	Reber	Waugh
Coy	Kirkland	Reinard	Williams
Curry	Krebs	Rieger	Wogan
DeLuca	Kukovich	Roberts	Wozniak
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wright, D. R.
Dent	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Dermody	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
DeWeese	Lederer	Rooney	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Leh	Rubley	Zimmerman
Donatucci	Lescovitz	Rudy	Zug
Druce	Levdansky	Sainato	
Durham	Lloyd	Santoni	Ryan,
Egolf	Lucyk	Sather	Speaker
Evans	Lynch	Saylor	

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-1

Carn

EXCUSED-5

Corrigan Farmer Gigliotti Mihalich
Daley

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 1855, PN 3268**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 1, 1933 (P.L.216, No.76), known as The Dental Law, further providing for the general powers of the State Board of Dentistry.

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	Fairchild	Maitland	Schroder
Allen	Fajt	Major	Schuler
Argall	Fargo	Manderino	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Feese	Markosek	Semmel
Baker	Fichter	Marsico	Serafini
Bard	Fleagle	Masland	Shaner
Barley	Flick	Mayernik	Sheehan
Battisto	Gamble	McCall	Smith, B.
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belardi	Geist	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Belfanti	George	Melio	Staback
Birmelin	Gladeck	Merry	Stairs
Bishop	Godshall	Michlovic	Steelman
Blaum	Gordner	Micozzie	Steil
Boscola	Gruitza	Miller	Stern
Boyes	Gruppo	Mundy	Stetler
Brown	Habay	Myers	Stish
Browne	Haluska	Nailor	Strittmatter
Bunt	Hanna	Nickol	Sturla
Butkovitz	Harhart	Nyce	Surra
Buxton	Hasay	O'Brien	Tangretti
Caltagirone	Haste	Olasz	Taylor, F. Z.
Cappabianca	Hennessey	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Thomas
Cawley	Hershey	Pesci	Tigue
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	Travaglio
Civera	Horsey	Petrone	Trello
Clark	Hutchinson	Pettit	Trich
Clymer	Itkin	Phillips	True
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Tulli
Cohen, M.	James	Pitts	Vance
Colafiglia	Jarolin	Platts	Van Horne
Colaizzo	Josephs	Preston	Veon
Conti	Kaiser	Ramos	Vitali
Cornell	Keller	Raymond	Walko

Corpora	Kenney	Readshaw	Washington
Cowell	King	Reber	Waugh
Coy	Kirkland	Reinard	Williams
Curry	Krebs	Rieger	Wogan
DeLuca	Kukovich	Roberts	Wozniak
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wright, D. R.
Dent	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Dermody	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
DeWeese	Lederer	Rooney	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Leh	Rubley	Zimmerman
Donatucci	Lescovitz	Rudy	Zug
Druce	Levdansky	Sainato	
Durham	Lloyd	Santoni	Ryan,
Egolf	Lucyk	Sather	Speaker
Evans	Lynch	Saylor	

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-1

Carn

EXCUSED-5

Corrigan Farmer Gigliotti Mihalich
Daley

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 2412, PN 3147**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, authorizing school districts of the first class to impose dress codes and require students to wear standard dress or uniforms.

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

Mr. **BROWNE** offered the following amendment No. **A0954**:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1317.3), page 1, lines 13 and 14, by striking out "school districts of the first class" and inserting
any school entity

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

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

Mr. **BROWNE**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As you may know, the legislation before us provides the School District of Philadelphia the option of adopting a school uniform/dress code policy. The amendment which I offer, amendment A0954, simply expands the option of adopting a school uniform/dress code policy to every school entity in the Commonwealth.

The reason why I am offering this amendment is because I believe that the option of allowing public school entities the power to adopt a uniform/dress code policy would not only be a benefit to the city of the first class but a positive tool to improve the learning environment in all Pennsylvania schools, and the reasons are many.

First, school uniforms have been credited to increase student performance. In school districts that have implemented the policy — including Long Beach, California; Miami; Baltimore; and others — the increased discipline and decreased distraction caused by clothing choices and competition have led to a greater emphasis on achievement. A good example of this is National City's Granger Middle School outside of San Diego. Ever since a new principal instilled a uniform policy on campus in 1986, test scores have been on the upswing. Of 268 parents responding to a survey of parents' views of uniform policies or practices within the District of Columbia, 196 cited their children's concern with designer clothes over obtaining good grades as a reason for preferring uniforms. Educators say that if students were simply encouraged to not be so busy scanning classmates' wardrobes, they would be more likely to pay attention to the discussion in class.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman yield.

Excuse me, Mr. Browne. The Chair has an announcement he would like to make.

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to advise members that he has given permission to Jim Sinkovitz of WPHL to videotape with audio the House floor proceedings on the school uniforms debate that is occurring.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2412 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Browne, you may continue. Mr. BROWNE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A standard dress code or uniform policy would accomplish this. Students notice this as well. An eighth grader at Drew Middle School in Miami said he disliked the uniform idea at first but stated it is better because I do not have to think about clothes, what style is hitting this year; I do not waste time on that; I have noticed that my grades have improved a lot; I am making A's and B's.

Second, school uniforms or a dress code policy eliminates label competition. Even from the earliest grades, students feel pressure from peers to conform to the standards of dress that are largely dictated by television, radio, and the clothing industry. Often, this pressure to conform places unwarranted personal and financial burdens on families. Counselors have warned that to keep up with the Joneses, secondary school students are taking up jobs to get money for clothes, often to the detriment of their studies. And they say, occasionally students have turned to crime — dealing drugs, for example — to pay for clothes. Students who cannot keep up often have increased low self-esteem. Without the money to maintain the fashion set, they are in fact wearing a de facto uniform — the same worn-out and sometimes ragged clothes, placing them in a class of lower self-worth and status. Uniforms and dress codes will eliminate the destructive effect of clothing competition. As an eighth grader in Rodger Middle School in Long Beach, California, states, students judge you based on who you are and what you do,

not what you wear. For him and others, the clothes do not make the person.

Third, school uniforms or dress codes save money. Comparisons show that the average clothing costs per child in schools that have adopted a school uniform/dress code policy is less than schools without such a policy. Uniforms used in the Cherry Hill Elementary School in South Baltimore cost \$30 apiece, which is a lot less than the average wardrobe that sports popular labels. Surveys of parents have also shown that a uniform policy will produce financial savings for the household. A mother of a high school student in Miami stated that she spent at least \$600 at the beginning of a school year to clothe her daughter, and this did not include Christmas or her birthday. Challenges to the needs of very low income people in their ability to afford conformance with a uniform policy have been met by private donation and uniform purchase programs. Parents in some Baltimore schools with many low-income students have formed their own companies to make and sell moderately priced uniforms. Moreover, with more students wearing uniforms, large discount retailers like Wal-Mart and JCPenney have responded by stocking more uniforms and selling them for less than what they cost at other stores. To the expense of buying uniforms, a Baltimore teacher commented, it must be remembered that children have to wear something to school and uniforms are considerably cheaper than other kinds of clothing.

Fourth and most importantly, school uniforms and dress codes improve behavior, and along with other education initiatives that we have worked with in this General Assembly, such as alternative schools, the Office of Safe Schools, and increased penalties for bringing weapons on school property, it will decrease the destructive, disruptive element in our schools. Teachers, parents, and principals report that discipline problems are reduced greatly in schools where children wear uniforms, thereby improving their own job environment. In Long Beach, California, the results are almost too drastic to believe. In just 1 year, overall school crime dropped 36 percent, fighting down 51 percent, weapons down 50 percent, assault and battery down 34 percent, vandalism down 18 percent, and the list goes on. Student suspensions fell by about a third during the same period, and absenteeism is down. The reason? School uniforms set the tone for a proper working attitude in the classroom, reduce behavioral problems, and improve performance and safety. Parents will send their children an important message when they dress them in uniforms — it is not goof-off time, so they do not go to school dressed for play. Uniforms are a way of communicating expectations of order and purpose and showing students what is appropriate in terms of dress and behavior and what is not. Along with a rigorous emphasis on academics, no-nonsense discipline rules, and parental involvement, school uniforms/dress codes will transform our schools to a showcase of better learning, not a showcase for designer fashion.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, President Clinton, our Governor, the mayor of Philadelphia, many school superintendents, and 70 percent of the National Association of Secondary School Principals believe that uniforms and dress codes can reduce violence and disruption in our schools.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is important for me to remind the members that this amendment provides a clear option, whether exercised or not, to public school entities who believe uniforms/dress codes are a constructive device for their schools. It will allow for the release of a State mandate so that school boards, teachers, administrators, and parents can develop a plan that will meet their needs and their goals.

Through this legislation, as amended, Mr. Speaker, this body will be increasing the tools available to our school entities in the effort to provide a productive, quality learning environment for our Commonwealth students. I urge the members to support this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. MCGEEHAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend and thank Representative Browne for his fine works in not only working hard for the passage of this bill and lobbying for support around the Commonwealth but for really opening this body's eyes about the need for this type of legislation around the State. You know, when we originally introduced this bill, we believed that it was a particular problem in Philadelphia, but thanks to the work of Representative Browne and others from not only other urban areas but from suburban communities and rural communities throughout the State, we realized that the problems that are besetting large districts throughout Pennsylvania are also increasingly becoming a problem in all of our districts.

As Representative Browne has stated very clearly and very well, the problems that are existing around the competition, not about academics but the competition increasingly surrounding fashion and the conflicts and the fights and the violence that are stemming from that competition, are a very real danger and are distracting from the mission of schools — that is, to teach our children.

Mr. Speaker, for those reasons and others, I ask that colleagues on both sides of the aisle give the freedom not only to Philadelphia but give the freedom back to your local superintendents and administrators to make the decision whether they believe— It is their decision whether to implement a mandatory dress code and not the Department of Education's. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair wishes to remind the members that the comments should be directed to the amendment before us. Any comments should be related to this amendment by Mr. Browne.

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

Mr. COWELL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join Representative McGeehan and Representative Browne in supporting this amendment.

The amendment extends to all school districts the authority to impose a dress code or to have uniform requirements. I think that is appropriate. We should give that authority to each school board to make decisions that best reflect the needs and the wants in their particular community.

I urge that we adopt the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the lady from Crawford County, Mrs. Brown, wish to be recognized? The Chair notes that she does. The Chair recognizes Mrs. Brown.

Mrs. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to share with the members of this fine hall a letter I received from one of my students, and it is a rural perspective. And I do rise in support of this amendment. However, I think it is important that we all hear from a young lady from my district. She says: "I have some questions and some comments about students being required to have a dress code. I must admit I hate the idea. As I'm sure many students will.

"My name is Fawn Scovil. I'm eleven years old and I attend Maplewood Elementary School. I love many sports such as

Basketball and Volleyball. By the way I am female. Now that you know a little about me I need to get back to the point.

"I truly don't see how this dress code is going to help PA families. It will actually cause more financial problems. I mean are you going to pay for every child in the state of PA to have at least two uniforms when it costs less for parents to shop at secondhand stores and go to garage sales.

"If I may also bring to your attention that no one asked how I or my parent felt about this. Nobody ever thinks of the children.

"You may also think this is going to discipline students, but HOW! Is this punishment to the children of PA. I have a whole list of things that this dress code is not going to solve. It won't solve crime, it won't solve teen pregnancy, and it will not improve the way a child behaves or help them get better grades.

"Why aren't the state legislators doing a little more with their time? I mean something that's going to help the U.S.A. and not make it worse. I know you think it will make it better, but it won't. Please before you make up your mind look into the eyes of a child. Ask them what they want. I thank you for reading my letter and I would like a response immediately."

I think she makes some good points. I think that it is important that it is not the Department of Education that makes the decision, that the decision is local, and I support that issue. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady.

Does the lady from Philadelphia, Mrs. Lederer, wish to be recognized? On the question of the amendment, the Chair recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Mrs. Lederer.

Mrs. LEDERER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to speak to the cost that Representative Browne mentioned. I wore a school uniform for 12 years. I owned two of them at a time with five blouses, and it was much more cost effective to wear those school uniforms than it is to buy separate outfits of street clothes. Those uniforms also were and still are handed down to underclassmen at no cost to the underclassmen. I believe it does not create a class distinction; it creates a level playing field.

I ask everyone here for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westmoreland County, Mr. Stairs.

Mr. STAIRS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to support the legislator from Lehigh County, Representative Browne, in support of this very important amendment.

The bill as it stands addresses the city of Philadelphia, and his amendment gives the option to other school districts across the Commonwealth to take part in this program. I think the important thing here is that they have an option. They are not required to do this and not dictated by Harrisburg, but each school district can make its decision. As was stated in a letter by a student, local people have the input and will be able to decide this.

I think the outcome of this amendment and this legislation will be to certainly ensure that our children will have a safer school, and it will not encumber the learning environment in the Commonwealth.

So I would hope that we would support this amendment and we give our districts the option across Pennsylvania to have a dress code or uniforms. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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—196

Adolph	Fairchild	Maitland	Saylor
Allen	Fajt	Major	Schroder
Argall	Fargo	Manderino	Schuler
Armstrong	Feese	Markosek	Scrimenti
Baker	Fichter	Marsico	Semmel
Bard	Fleagle	Masland	Serafini
Barley	Flick	Mayernik	Shaner
Battisto	Gamble	McCall	Sheehan
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	McGeehan	Smith, B.
Belardi	Geist	McGill	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	George	Melio	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Gladeck	Merry	Staback
Bishop	Godshall	Michlovic	Stairs
Blaum	Gordner	Micozzie	Steelman
Boscola	Gruitza	Miller	Steil
Boyes	Gruppo	Mundy	Stern
Brown	Habay	Myers	Stetler
Browne	Haluska	Nailor	Stish
Bunt	Hanna	Nickol	Stritmatter
Butkovitz	Harhart	Nyce	Sturla
Buxton	Hasay	O'Brien	Surra
Caltagirone	Haste	Olasz	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Hennessey	Oliver	Taylor, E. Z.
Carane	Herman	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Hershey	Pesci	Thomas
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	Tigue
Civera	Horsey	Petrone	Travaglio
Clark	Hutchinson	Pettit	Trello
Clymer	Itkin	Phillips	Trich
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pistella	True
Cohen, M.	James	Pitts	Tulli
Colaella	Jarolin	Platts	Vance
Colaizzo	Josephs	Preston	Van Horne
Conti	Kaiser	Ramos	Veon
Cornell	Keller	Raymond	Vitali
Corpora	Kenney	Readshaw	Walko
Cowell	King	Reber	Washington
Coy	Kirkland	Reinard	Waugh
Curry	Krebs	Rieger	Wogan
DeLuca	Kukovich	Roberts	Wozniak
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wright, D. R.
Dent	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Dermody	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
DeWeese	Lederer	Rooney	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Leh	Rubley	Zimmerman
Donatucci	Lescovitz	Rudy	Zug
Druce	Levdansky	Sainato	
Durham	Lloyd	Santoni	Ryan,
Egolf	Lucyk	Sather	Speaker
Evans	Lynch		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—2

Carn	Williams
------	----------

EXCUSED—5

Corrigan	Farmer	Gigliotti	Mihalich
Daley			

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

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

Mr. STURLA offered the following amendment No. A1016:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1317.3), page 1, lines 13 and 14, by striking out "School officials in school districts of the first class" and inserting
(a) The board of directors of any school entity or the governing board of any school located within this Commonwealth where a Commonwealth resident may legally fulfill the compulsory attendance requirement of this act may adopt policies that

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1317.3), page 1, by inserting between lines 15 and 16

(b) The Commonwealth shall reimburse those districts or the governing board of any school located within this Commonwealth where a Commonwealth resident may legally fulfill the compulsory attendance requirement of this act and who have provided free or otherwise subsidized the cost of uniforms for those students who are eligible for either aid to families with dependent children or the free and reduced price lunch program. Reimbursement limitations and reimbursement application procedures shall be established by the Secretary of Education.

(c) Payments to school districts shall be calculated by multiplying the district aid ratio by the amount of reimbursement sought by the district. Payments to the governing board of any school located within this Commonwealth where a Commonwealth resident may legally fulfill the compulsory attendance requirement of this act shall be calculated by multiplying the aid ratio of the district in which the school is physically located by the amount of reimbursement sought by the school.

(d) The provisions of this section shall not apply to home education programs established under section 1327.1 of this act.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what this amendment does is allow for the Secretary of Education to provide for some financial relief in terms of helping school districts pay for uniforms for their students if they have a program that would either provide free or subsidized uniforms for those students who are eligible for either aid to families with dependent children or the free and reduced lunch programs in their schools.

Mr. Speaker, what is going on right now— I mean, I applaud these efforts for uniforms, because it will start to level the playing field. However, one of the things that we need to understand is that there are children going to school today and the reason they need the playing field leveled is because they are going to school in a \$3 outfit, a pair of pants that they got down at the local clothing bank, a shirt that was bought on sale for \$1, and a pair of ragtag sneakers. And in some of those school districts where it is needed the most, those school districts will say, you know, we think it is a good idea to have uniforms, and they will pass a program to have uniforms, and that child whose parents can at this point in time only afford a \$3 outfit for him are going to be faced with trying to afford a \$30 or \$40 uniform for those students.

In most cases where schools do currently have uniforms, they have built up a program over the years, and as students outgrow

their uniforms, they turn them in to the uniform bank at the school and some of these parents have access to uniforms either free or at a much-reduced rate. But until such time as that gets into place, the cost is enormous, and what this amendment will do is allow the Secretary of Education to help offset some of those costs at least in the interim.

I would appreciate a positive vote on this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. Browne.

Mr. BROWNE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the option to interrogate the prime sponsor of the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman agrees.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to inquire if you had gotten a fiscal note on your amendment?

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, I had requested a fiscal note, although I have not received it yet.

Mr. BROWNE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the members to oppose the amendment due to the fact that there is no fiscal note currently provided on the amendment.

THE SPEAKER (MATTHEW J. RYAN) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a moment.

The gentleman, Mr. McGeehan, on the question of a fiscal note. Do you have a response to that?

Mr. MCGEEHAN. No, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has been advised that the fiscal note was requested and is just now being duplicated.

Would the gentleman, Mr. Sturla, have any objection to putting this amendment over for the time being?

Mr. STURLA. Temporarily; that would be fine with me, Mr. Speaker.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn temporarily.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. COWELL offered the following amendment No. A1020:

Amend Title, page 1, lines 5 and 6, by striking out "of the first class"

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1317.3), page 1, lines 13 and 14, by striking out "School officials in school districts of the first class" and inserting

The board of directors of any school entity may adopt policies that

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1317.3), page 1, line 15, by inserting after "uniforms."

Such policies may be districtwide or may be on a school building basis.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

AMENDMENT DIVIDED

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Cowell.

Mr. COWELL. Mr. Speaker, first a parliamentary inquiry.

Would it be possible to divide the amendment? I believe that the language in the first half of the amendment has been taken care of by Representative Browne's language that we just adopted. And so, if possible, I would like to divide the amendment, and I would propose to divide it between lines 7 and 8.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion that it is divisible. The Chair gives no opinion as to whether or not the first part is taken care of by the earlier amendment.

The gentleman wishes the amendment divided?

Mr. COWELL. I would like to divide the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and then I would ask a question about part 1.

The SPEAKER. All right.

Under the rules of the House, the amendment is divided.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman state his point of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COWELL. The general issue of extending to all school districts the opportunity to have dress codes has been addressed by Representative Browne's amendment. The language in my part 1 is a bit different though in that it would direct those policies to be adopted by the board of directors rather than the general language currently found in the bill.

Is it, in the opinion of the Parliamentarian, permissible for me to offer part 1 of this amendment given the action we have recently taken with Representative Browne's amendment?

The SPEAKER. Either way, either offering your amendment in its entirety or divided, the effect would be the same. It would supersede the earlier amendment.

Mr. COWELL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Then I would continue to divide the amendment. I would first offer the amendment and that portion of the amendment that appears on lines 1 through 7. The effect of this portion of amendment 1020 would be to clarify that it must be the board of directors of the school entity in Philadelphia or any other school district of the State that may adopt these policies pertaining to uniforms. I think that that is more clear than the language currently found in the bill that speaks generally about school officials.

I do support the bill. I do support the extension to all school entities, but I think we should require that the board of directors be responsible for adopting a policy if they choose to pursue this issue.

I would urge the adoption of lines 1 through 7 of amendment 1020.

The SPEAKER. The question before the House is the question of adoption of amendment A1020-1, which refers to the first seven lines of amendment A1020 offered by the gentleman, Mr. Cowell.

On the question,

Will the House agree to part 1 of the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On that question, does the gentleman, Mr. McGeehan, desire recognition? The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. McGEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that in the School Code, the phrase "school officials" is used. I am wondering if we are just playing a game of semantics with "the board of directors of any school entity."

I am wondering if the gentleman may explain that to me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Cowell, was just in effect subjected to interrogation, if he cares to respond.

Mr. COWELL. Mr. Speaker, staff of the Education Committee has suggested to me that the language currently in the bill pertaining to school officials is too vague and that it is not specific enough so that we could be certain that, one, it would be the school board that was acting, and secondly, the language in the amendment that I am offering speaks specifically to particular policies that must be approved by that school board.

I believe that the amendment is necessary so that all of us are sure that whatever requirements that are imposed on students and their families will be a function of policy and will be a function of policy approved by the local school board, and I think that that is the most appropriate policy that we can establish here.

The SPEAKER. On the question of the first half of the amendment, the gentleman, Mr. McGeehan, for the second time.

Mr. McGEEHAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask just for a moment to consult with my colleague?

The SPEAKER. The House will stand at ease momentarily.

Will the gentleman, Mr. McGeehan, advise the Chair how much more time is needed? Perhaps this bill should go over.

Mr. McGEEHAN. It is hard to predict, Mr. Speaker, with the minority chair of the Education Committee.

The SPEAKER. Should this bill go over?

Mr. McGEEHAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We are prepared to address the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. McGEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, we believe that the language in this amendment has been taken care of in the earlier Browne amendment. We are getting into a game of semantics with school officials, school boards.

Mr. Speaker, we are informed that the phrase "school officials" is used in the School Code, and we are asking that this be defeated. This is simply repeating earlier language that Representative Browne passed in his amendment, and we are asking everyone to vote "no" on the amendment. It is simply a rehash of what we just passed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Cowell, for the second time on the question.

Mr. COWELL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will disagree with Representative McGeehan's interpretation of the School Code. The language about school officials is language that is found in different places in the School Code. but "school officials" can mean lots of different individuals or lots of different positions other—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman, Mr. Cowell, please yield. Conferences on the floor, please break up.

Mr. Cowell.

Mr. COWELL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree with Representative McGeehan's interpretation of the School Code and his suggestion that this is just a matter of semantics or nomenclature. The term "school official,"

which is in the bill now and is found elsewhere in the code, refers to lots of different positions in addition to the school board.

The amendment that I am offering is intended to require that if there is going to be a uniform requirement or a dress code in a district, that it be a matter of policy that is adopted by the school board in that entity rather than risk or authorize a dress code to be imposed by some other official other than the school board. The other officials could include a superintendent or any number of other positions. My intent is to make this language clear and to restrict the authority to impose this dress code to the school board through its authority of adopting policy.

So therefore, I would urge that we approve the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. McGeehan, has spoken twice on the amendment.

Those who are in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman, Mr. Cowell, as divided will vote "aye"; opposed, "no."

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to part 1 of the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—88

Baker	Dermody	Manderino	Rudy
Battisto	DeWeese	Markosek	Sainato
Bebko-Jones	Evans	Masland	Santoni
Belardi	Feese	Mayernik	Scrimenti
Belfanti	George	McCall	Shaner
Bishop	Gladeck	Melto	Smith, B.
Boscola	Gordner	Merry	Staback
Buxton	Gruitza	Michlovic	Steelman
Caltagirone	Haluska	Mundy	Sturla
Cappabianca	Itkin	Olasz	Surra
Carn	Jadlowiec	Oliver	Tangretti
Carone	Jarolin	Pesci	Thomas
Cawley	Josephs	Petrarca	Travaglio
Cohen, M.	Kirkland	Petrone	Trello
Colafella	Krebs	Pistella	Trich
Colaizzo	Kukovich	Preston	Tulli
Corpora	Laughlin	Ramos	Van Horne
Cowell	Leh	Readshaw	Veon
Coy	Lescovitz	Roberts	Vitali
Curry	Levdansky	Robinson	Wozniak
DeLuca	Lloyd	Roebuck	Wright, D. R.
Dempsey	Lucyk	Rooney	Yewic

NAYS—108

Adolph	Fargo	Major	Serafini
Allen	Fichter	Marsico	Sheehan
Argall	Fleagle	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Armstrong	Flick	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Bard	Gamble	Micozzie	Stairs
Barley	Gannon	Miller	Steil
Birmelin	Geist	Myers	Stern
Blaum	Godshall	Nailor	Stetler
Boyes	Gruppo	Nickol	Stish
Brown	Habay	Nyce	Strittmatter
Browne	Hanna	O'Brien	Taylor, E. Z.
Bunt	Harhart	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Butkovitz	Hasay	Pettit	Tigue
Chadwick	Haste	Phillips	True
Civera	Hennessey	Pitts	Vance
Clark	Herman	Platts	Walko
Clymer	Hershey	Raymond	Washington
Cohen, L. I.	Hess	Reber	Waugh
Conti	Horsey	Reinard	Williams
Cornell	Hutchinson	Rieger	Wogan

Dent	Kaiser	Rohrer	Wright, M. N.
DiGirolamo	Keller	Rubley	Youngblood
Donatucci	Kenney	Sather	Zimmerman
Druce	King	Saylor	Zug
Durham	Lawless	Schroder	
Egolf	Lederer	Schuler	Ryan,
Fairchild	Lynch	Semmel	Speaker
Fajt	Maitland		

NOT VOTING-2

James	LaGrotta
-------	----------

EXCUSED-5

Corrigan	Farmer	Gigliotti	Mihalich
Daley			

Less than the majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and part 1 of the amendment was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Cowell, who offers the second portion of the divided amendment, which has been read by the clerk.

On the question,
Will the House agree to part 2 of the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Cowell.

We are referring now to lines 8, 9, 10, and 11 of amendment A1020.

Mr. COWELL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is the second part of amendment 1020.

The purpose of the language on lines 8 through 11 is to make it clear that these policies requiring uniforms or requiring a dress code may apply to the entire district or may apply only to buildings, certain buildings in the district. I think this is particularly important in light of the charter school legislation that we just approved last week where a school board may well want to authorize the use of a dress code in that charter school, which I remind you last week we said is a public school accountable to that school board. The school board may want to give authority for that charter school building or some other building but stopping short of a districtwide policy.

So I again would urge adoption of the second half of amendment 1020.

The SPEAKER. On the question, the gentleman, Mr. McGeehan.

Mr. MCGEEHAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I agree with the gentleman, and I urge an affirmative vote.

On the question recurring,
Will the House agree to part 2 of the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-198

Adolph	Evans	Lynch	Saylor
Allen	Fairchild	Maitland	Schroder
Argall	Fajt	Major	Schuler
Armstrong	Fargo	Manderino	Scrimenti
Baker	Feese	Markosek	Semmel
Bard	Fichter	Marsico	Serafini
Barley	Fleagle	Masland	Shaner
Battisto	Flick	Mayernik	Sheehan
Bebko-Jones	Gamble	McCall	Smith, B.
Belardi	Gannon	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Geist	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	George	Melio	Staback
Bishop	Gladeck	Merry	Stairs
Blaum	Godshall	Michlovic	Steelman
Boscola	Gordner	Micozzie	Steil
Boyes	Gruitza	Miller	Stern
Brown	Gruppo	Mundy	Stetler
Browne	Habay	Myers	Stish
Bunt	Haluska	Nailor	Strittmatter
Butkovitz	Hanna	Nickol	Sturla
Buxton	Harhart	Nyce	Surra
Caltagirone	Hasay	O'Brien	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Haste	Olasz	Taylor, E. Z.
Carn	Hennessey	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Thomas
Cawley	Hershey	Pesci	Tigue
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	Travaglio
Civera	Horsey	Petrone	Trello
Clark	Hutchinson	Pettit	Trich
Clymer	Itkin	Phillips	True
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Tulli
Cohen, M.	James	Pitts	Vance
Colafella	Jarolin	Platts	Van Horne
Colaizzo	Josephs	Preston	Veon
Conti	Kaiser	Ramos	Vitali
Cornell	Keller	Raymond	Walko
Corpora	Kenney	Readshaw	Washington
Cowell	King	Reber	Waugh
Coy	Kirkland	Reinard	Williams
Curry	Krebs	Rieger	Wogan
DeLuca	Kukovich	Roberts	Wozniak
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wright, D. R.
Dent	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Dermody	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
DeWeese	Lederer	Rooney	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Leh	Rubley	Zimmerman
Donatucci	Lescovitz	Rudy	Zug
Druce	Levdansky	Sainato	
Durham	Lloyd	Santoni	Ryan,
Egolf	Lucyk	Sather	Speaker

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-5

Corrigan	Farmer	Gigliotti	Mihalich
Daley			

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and part 2 of the amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. COWELL offered the following amendment No. A1065:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1317.3), page 1, line 13, by striking out "School" and inserting

(a) School

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1317.3), page 1, by inserting between lines 15 and 16

(b) Any school entity which adopts a policy which requires pupils to wear standard dress or uniforms shall not be implemented with less than three months' notice to parents and such notice shall contain information regarding the availability of community resources to assist economically disadvantaged pupils. For the purposes of this section, "economically disadvantaged pupils" shall mean those pupils whose families receive aid to families with dependent children payments or who are eligible for the free and reduced lunch program.

(c) The board of directors of any such entity shall provide a method whereby parents may choose not to have their children comply with an adopted school standard dress or uniform policy.

(d) The adopted policy shall include provisions that no pupil shall be penalized academically or otherwise discriminated against nor denied attendance to school if the pupil's parents chose not to have the pupil comply with the school uniform policy. The board of directors shall continue to have the responsibility for the education of those pupils.

(e) A policy adopted pursuant to this section shall not preclude pupils that participate in a nationally recognized youth organization from wearing organization uniforms on days that the organization has a scheduled meeting.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Cowell.

Mr. COWELL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let me note that I will not be offering amendment 1066. I am offering only 1065.

This amendment would establish some rules if a school district is going to exercise the authority we will give the district to impose a dress code or uniform requirement. The language that I am offering is modeled after the California statute which also gave to school boards in the State of California the authority to use dress codes, and in the opinion of many, these kinds of protections are necessary if a school district is going to either avoid a challenge in court to its imposition of a dress code or at least be successful in dealing with a court challenge if one comes up.

There are four or five major things that this amendment will do, all intended to preserve the rights of parents and students.

The first part of the amendment would require that a school district, upon adopting a policy pertaining to the dress code or uniform requirement, must give at least 3 months' notice to parents.

Secondly, it requires that a school district that will have the dress code or uniform requirement will also make available to parents information about community resources that exist to assist economically disadvantaged pupils in purchasing uniforms. Now, I would emphasize the school district is not required to help them purchase but is required to provide information about any available resources that might be available.

Thirdly, the amendment gives to parents the right to opt out of the uniform requirement.

Fourthly, it provides that if there is an adopted policy with respect to uniforms, that policy will include provisions that no pupil will be penalized academically or otherwise discriminated

against if their parent chooses to have the child opt out of the uniform requirement.

And finally, it also requires that the uniform requirement shall not preclude pupils who participate in a nationally recognized youth organization from wearing organization uniforms on days that the organization has a meeting. That is intended to make sure that young people who may belong to the Boy Scouts or the Girl Scouts are still going to be able to wear their uniform to school and will not be penalized for doing so or prohibited from doing so.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge that we approve amendment 1065.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Mr. McGeehan.

Mr. MCGEEHAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do not want to see Girl and Boy Scouts eliminated from the classrooms either or students who cannot afford uniforms to be punished academically or any other way. My problem with this amendment is, here we go again. We need to limit this. We need to allow school districts to make their own regulations, their own rules that fit their own localities and their own students.

The problem is and the reason we have not been able to exercise some discipline and order in our schools across the Commonwealth is because of the Department of Education's regulations, and here we go. We are going to place more regulations, more restrictions, on schools.

The whole emphasis of this bill and this movement is to empower local school districts to make their own decisions about what is best for their own local students. This amendment simply, again, puts regulation upon regulation upon regulation.

Mr. Speaker, vote "no" on this amendment. Let your school board members, let your school district decide what is best for you, not the Department of Education.

The SPEAKER. On the question, the gentleman, Mr. Browne.

Mr. BROWNE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I concur with Representative McGeehan and request the members for a negative vote on the amendment. We have to continue to look to release mandates from our school districts, and the main purpose behind the bill is to release a mandate and regulation upon our school districts to provide for uniforms.

One of the major problems of the amendment is an opt-out provision. The purpose behind the bill is to allow school districts to impose a mandatory policy when they see it is beneficial to alleviate some of the disruption in our schools, to provide some positive improvement in the environment for learning in our schools. With that provision, it will effectively strip the bill of its substance, and I think for that reason we have to keep it free from any restrictions. Our school districts could have the power to deal with it as they please, and I ask for a negative vote on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question, the gentleman, Mr. Cowell.

Mr. COWELL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, just a quick response to a couple of points that were made.

This is not giving to the Department of Education the authority to set rules. We would set the rules here.

Secondly, very often there is a tension between the local-control issue and protections that we provide in statute for either taxpayers or parents or students. This is such an example. We are giving greater authority to local school boards, but we are saying that in giving them that greater authority, we still want to provide protections to parents and students. That is an appropriate

issue for us to address, and the protections that I am suggesting we provide are reasonable. They deal with notice. They deal with the right of parent to opt out. They deal with respecting student involvement in other organizations, or perhaps respecting student wishes and family wishes that the student wear certain religious garb. This is an example where we have to, through our statute — not through department regulation, but through our statute — provide an appropriate balance for local control versus the right of parent and student, particularly the parents.

I think the amendment that I am offering is a very reasonable approach to that balancing act, and it provides necessary and very appropriate protection for parents. In the end, it will help our school districts stay out of court, and in the end, it will make this authority that we are giving to them more meaningful.

I would urge, again, the approval of the amendment.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—45

Baker	Kirkland	Ramos	Steelman
Battisto	Kukovich	Reber	Sturla
Caltagirone	LaGrotta	Rieger	Thomas
Carone	Levdansky	Roberts	Travaglio
Cohen, M.	Manderino	Robinson	Trello
Cowell	Michlovic	Roebuck	Tulli
Curry	Pesci	Rooney	Vance
Dermody	Petrarca	Sainato	Van Horne
DeWeese	Petrone	Sather	Veon
Evans	Pistella	Shaner	Vitali
Itkin	Preston	Snyder, D. W.	Yewcic
Josephs			

NAYS—151

Adolph	Durham	Lawless	Santoni
Allen	Egolf	Leh	Saylor
Argall	Fairchild	Lescovitz	Schroder
Armstrong	Fajt	Lloyd	Schuler
Bard	Fargo	Lucyk	Scriminti
Barley	Feese	Lynch	Semmel
Bebko-Jones	Fichter	Maitland	Serafini
Belardi	Fleagle	Major	Sheehan
Belfanti	Flick	Markosek	Smith, B.
Birmelin	Gannon	Marsico	Smith, S. H.
Bishop	Geist	Masland	Staback
Blaum	George	Mayernik	Stairs
Boscola	Gladeck	McCall	Steil
Boyes	Godshall	McGeehan	Stern
Brown	Gordner	McGill	Stetler
Browne	Gruitza	Melio	Stish
Bunt	Gruppo	Merry	Strittmatter
Butkovitz	Habay	Micozzie	Surra
Buxton	Haluska	Miller	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Hanna	Mundy	Taylor, E. Z.
Carn	Harhart	Myers	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Hasay	Nailor	Tigue
Chadwick	Haste	Nickol	Trich
Civera	Hennessey	Nyce	True
Clark	Herman	O'Brien	Walko
Clymer	Hershey	Olasz	Washington
Cohen, L. I.	Hess	Oliver	Waugh
Colaella	Horsey	Perzel	Williams
Colaizzo	Hutchinson	Pettit	Wogan
Conti	Jadlowicz	Phillips	Wozniak
Cornell	James	Pitts	Wright, D. R.

Corpora	Jarolin	Platts	Wright, M. N.
Coy	Kaiser	Raymond	Youngblood
DeLuca	Keller	Readshaw	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Kenney	Reinard	Zug
Dent	King	Rohrer	
DiGirolamo	Krebs	Rubley	Ryan,
Donatucci	Laughlin	Rudy	Speaker
Druce			

NOT VOTING—2

Gamble	Lederer
--------	---------

EXCUSED—5

Corrigan	Farmer	Gigliotti	Mihalich
Daley			

Less than the majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. STURLA reoffered the following amendment No. A1016:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1317.3), page 1, lines 13 and 14, by striking out “School officials in school districts of the first class” and inserting (a) The board of directors of any school entity or the governing board of any school located within this Commonwealth where a Commonwealth resident may legally fulfill the compulsory attendance requirement of this act may adopt policies that

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1317.3), page 1, by inserting between lines 15 and 16

(b) The Commonwealth shall reimburse those districts or the governing board of any school located within this Commonwealth where a Commonwealth resident may legally fulfill the compulsory attendance requirement of this act and who have provided free or otherwise subsidized the cost of uniforms for those students who are eligible for either aid to families with dependent children or the free and reduced price lunch program. Reimbursement limitations and reimbursement application procedures shall be established by the Secretary of Education.

(c) Payments to school districts shall be calculated by multiplying the district aid ratio by the amount of reimbursement sought by the district. Payments to the governing board of any school located within this Commonwealth where a Commonwealth resident may legally fulfill the compulsory attendance requirement of this act shall be calculated by multiplying the aid ratio of the district in which the school is physically located by the amount of reimbursement sought by the school.

(d) The provisions of this section shall not apply to home education programs established under section 1327.1 of this act.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. It is the understanding of the Chair that a fiscal note has been distributed or is available, as the case may be, in connection with this amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe I was responding to a question from Representative Browne, who asked whether there was a fiscal note, and in

response I will reply that, yes, in fact I have now since received that fiscal note, and the fiscal note assumes that all students eligible would actually take advantage of this, and that there would be two uniforms purchased per person at a cost of \$50 per uniform, and that the cost would be a little over \$34 million.

I would, however, point out that earlier in his testimony, Representative Browne pointed out that the school uniforms that he was talking about cost \$30 apiece, and if we go with a \$30 figure with two uniforms, the cost is around \$20 million, and that is assuming that everyone who is eligible takes advantage of that program and gets two uniforms.

I will also point out that it would be up to the Secretary of Education to determine whether in fact he was going to allow \$50, \$30, \$20, one uniform, two uniforms, eight uniforms, and so I believe that given the current Secretary of Education, we could be assured that he would not be overextravagant with this item.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. McGeehan.

Mr. MCGEEHAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to oppose this amendment. Once again, we are attempting to free up our local school boards and school districts to make their own decisions.

Mr. Speaker, you know, we have heard from parents in the last several months since this issue has been on the table saying that they believe that school uniforms will not cost them money, will save them money, and we have seen unique experiments around this State between private and public partnerships, between corporations and between philanthropic organizations, and we have heard stories related to parents of school children who wore uniforms and how they were handed down.

Mr. Speaker, to pass on this cost to the Commonwealth is absolutely ridiculous. We believe and experience has shown, not only in this State where uniforms are being used in the schools but around this country where this uniform policy has existed, parents are saving money. It is no secret that when you compare the cost of a uniform to the cost of the latest in designer fashions, whether it is sneakers or the latest celebrity-endorsed jacket or the latest in jeans, it is clear to see, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is not putting an onerous burden on parents. It is freeing parents from the competition of keeping up with the Joneses. When your kid comes home from school and says, Johnny has this type of sneakers or Susie has this latest fashion on, the incredible pressure on parents.

And, Mr. Speaker, let us talk about fairness in the public schools. We had an argument with opponents of this bill in leveling the playing field in the schools. And yes, there is competition in the schools, but it does not center around academics; it centers around that very fashion competition. And when we have the very rich, the parents who can afford to dress their child in the latest fashion, and we have parents, as Representative Sturla said, who have to buy at the thrift, imagine how that makes a student feel. Imagine the enormous pressure placed on not only that student but on the parents who are forced to forego the necessities to keep up with the fashion competition in schools.

Imagine what would happen if all those students all wore the same uniform and eliminated that type of competition in schools. Mr. Speaker, not only would parents be freed from the additional burden of the guilt and the financial expense, but also I believe it contributes, as Representative Browne said in his opening statement, contributes to the orderliness, the discipline, and it focuses attention again, Mr. Speaker, on what counts in schools — that is, students who learn and teachers who teach.

Mr. Speaker, a \$34-million price tag is too much, it is ridiculous, and let us get about the business of empowering our local school districts to make the best decision for their students.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Browne.

Mr. BROWNE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, oppose the Sturla amendment, one reason being, of course, the significant fiscal impact of the amendment, but also some of the benefits behind programs in other schools that have administered this. As Representative McGeehan has stated, it gets parents and teachers and communities together to help people who cannot afford the uniforms.

I mentioned teachers and administrators in the school district in Baltimore setting up their own stores to sell the uniforms at a lower price. Also, donations — a tremendous amount of donations from communities toward individuals who cannot afford the uniforms in order to allow them to participate in the program. These benefits will not be provided if we were funding this from the State, never mind the significant fiscal cost.

For these reasons I think we owe it upon ourselves to oppose this amendment, and I ask the members to do that. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On the question, the gentleman, Mr. Stairs.

Mr. STAIRS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the gentleman who offered the amendment consent to interrogation, please?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates he will. You may begin.

Mr. STAIRS. I have a question that I would hope you could answer for me. In reading over the amendment, does this amendment apply to nonpublic school students?

Mr. STURLA. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it would.

Mr. STAIRS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STURLA. In addition to public school students.

Mr. STAIRS. If I may, I would like to make some remarks.

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

Mr. STAIRS. I oppose this amendment, really on two grounds, the first being the exorbitant cost to the Commonwealth that the fiscal note relates that it would cost to us, over \$34 million. And the second, I refer to Article III, section 30, of our Constitution regarding direct aid to our nonpublic schools. I think we have a conflict here in our Constitution.

So I ask that the members oppose this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in opposition to this amendment, and very briefly, really to sum it up — I think the previous speakers did that pretty well — but it would seem to me that we are actually saving low-income people money by having uniforms, so there really is not any need to subsidize it.

You know, for all the reasons that Mr. McGeehan and Mr. Browne and Mr. Stairs had mentioned previously to me, I also rise in opposition to this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question of the adoption of the Sturla amendment, Mr. Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I found this debate rather amazing. We just got done defeating an amendment that Representative Cowell had that said there would be the option to opt out of this if in fact you had various reasons to opt out of it, and we heard people say it is absolutely imperative that everyone comply with this if in fact you

adopt school uniforms. It did not matter your wealth, it did not matter what your circumstances were; it was absolutely important that everybody comply with this.

And then we heard people say that it actually saves money if you are buying a \$100 jacket for your kids or \$80 jeans or those types of things. Well, I will agree. If you are outfitting your kids at \$600 a child in \$80 jeans and \$100 jackets and \$30 designer outfits, yes, it is going to save you money. Those are not the people that I am talking about here. I am talking about the kids who get sent to school in 3 dollars' worth of clothes a day. I am talking about the kids who come in torn clothing because they cannot afford even low-cost clothing, let alone designer outfits.

Representative Teresa Brown earlier had said, she got up and read a letter from a student who said they were concerned about the cost to her family in a rural area, and we have heard various people stand up and say, this will be a local decision, and basically what we are saying here is, if you have got the money, you can decide you want to do it, and if you do not have the money, tough luck.

So whether you think this is a good idea or not, it really depends on whether your local school district has the money to implement it. And once again, as we have done so many times in this House of Representatives, poor school districts in the State of Pennsylvania will not be able to take advantage of what I believe are the benefits of a school uniform in their schools because they will not have the money to implement the program, and wealthy school districts that do not need the money anyway and would not qualify for the money anyway in my amendment will be the ones that will be implementing this.

We have heard people stand up and say they are opposed to the exorbitant amount of money that it would cost this State to provide uniforms, and yet we are willing to say to the local school districts, we are willing to pass what is in fact a mandate to the local school districts to say, if you want to go along with this program, you pay for the \$34 million; we are not going to do it. We are going to say it is a great idea. We are going to stand at home and beat our chests and say to our local school districts, why do you not impose uniforms in your schools, and we are not going to send them \$1 to do it.

Once again we are passing the buck on a program that is an extremely good program. I support uniforms in schools, and we are saying, but you pay for it; we do not want to pay for it; we believe in it so much, we are going to say you got to foot the bill. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-18

Bishop	Josephs	Ramos	Thomas
Cohen, M.	Kirkland	Robinson	Trello
Curry	Manderino	Roebuck	Washington
DeWeese	Myers	Sturla	Youngblood
James	Petrone		

NAYS-178

Adolph	Egolf	Lloyd	Saylor
Allen	Fairchild	Lucyk	Schroder
Argall	Fajt	Lynch	Schuler
Armstrong	Fargo	Maitland	Scrimenti
Baker	Feese	Major	Semmel
Bard	Fichter	Markosek	Serafini
Barley	Fleagle	Marsico	Shaner
Battisto	Flick	Masland	Sheehan
Bebko-Jones	Gamble	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Belardi	Gannon	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Geist	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	George	McGill	Staback
Blaum	Gladeck	Melio	Stairs
Boscola	Godshall	Merry	Steelman
Boyes	Gordner	Michlovic	Steil
Brown	Gruitza	Micozzie	Stern
Browne	Gruppo	Miller	Stetler
Bunt	Habay	Mundy	Stish
Butkovitz	Haluska	Nailor	Strittmatter
Buxton	Hanna	Nickol	Surra
Caltagirone	Harhart	Nyce	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Hasay	O'Brien	Taylor, E. Z.
Carn	Haste	Olasz	Taylor, J.
Carone	Hennessey	Oliver	Tigue
Cawley	Herman	Perzel	Travaglio
Chadwick	Hershey	Pesci	Trich
Civera	Hess	Petrarca	True
Clark	Horsey	Pettit	Tulli
Clymer	Hutchinson	Phillips	Vance
Cohen, L. I.	Itkin	Pistella	Van Horne
Colafella	Jadlowiec	Pitts	Veon
Colaizzo	Jarolin	Platts	Vitali
Conti	Kaiser	Preston	Walko
Cornell	Keller	Raymond	Waugh
Corpora	Kenney	Readshaw	Williams
Cowell	King	Reber	Wogan
Coy	Krebs	Reinard	Wozniak
DeLuca	Kukovich	Roberts	Wright, D. R.
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Rohrer	Wright, M. N.
Dent	Laughlin	Rooney	Yewcic
Dermody	Lawless	Rubley	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	Lederer	Rudy	Zug
Donatucci	Leh	Sainato	
Druce	Lescovitz	Santoni	Ryan,
Durham	Levdansky	Sather	Speaker

NOT VOTING-2

Evans	Rieger
-------	--------

EXCUSED-5

Corrigan	Farmer	Gigliotti	Mihalich
Daley			

Less than the majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

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

Mr. STURLA offered the following amendment No. A1064:

Amend Title, page 1, lines 5 and 6, by striking out "of the first class"

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1317.3), page 1, lines 13 and 14, by striking out "School officials in school districts of the first class" and inserting

(a) The board of directors of any school entity may adopt policies that

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1317.3), page 1, by inserting between lines 15 and 16

(b) The Commonwealth shall reimburse those districts who have provided free or otherwise subsidized the cost of uniforms for those students who are eligible for either aid to families with dependent children or the free and reduced price lunch program.

(c) Reimbursement limitations and reimbursement application procedures shall be established by the Secretary of Education.

(d) Payments to school districts shall be calculated by multiplying the district aid ratio by the amount of reimbursement sought by the district.

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

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

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I imagine this amendment will not fare much better than the last one, but this one does not include private and parochial schools for those who may have had a concern about funding private and parochial schools, as Representative Stairs did.

Once again, I would just like to reiterate the fact that I would hope that members would put their money where their mouth is. If you believe that school uniforms are a good idea, then I would believe that you should be willing to help pay for that. The idea that we will simply pass all sorts of ideas where we can go back and beat our chest and say we did something with no funding to have it happen does not make any sense.

I would encourage an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. McGeehan, on the Sturla amendment.

Mr. McGEEHAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think this argument has been summed up already.

Mr. Speaker, there are those that take a cynical view and say locals cannot solve this problem, that local charities, local private-public partnerships cannot solve the problems of the cost of school uniforms for poorer school districts. I do not believe that, Mr. Speaker. There have been experiments in Philadelphia that have proven that cynicism wrong, and for those reasons and a host of others, I would ask for a negative vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Browne.

Mr. BROWNE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will not prolong the discussion on this amendment. For the same reason as previously as far as the costs and the ability of school districts to decide if they may participate, that is the purpose of the bill. It is not a mandate. If a school district wants to participate, they can, and for that reason I ask the members to oppose the amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—20

Bishop	Josephs	Petrone	Sturla
Cohen, M.	Kirkland	Ramos	Thomas
Curry	Manderino	Robinson	Trello
DeWeese	Michlovic	Roebuck	Washington
James	Myers	Steelman	Youngblood

NAYS—178

Adolph	Egolf	Levdansky	Sather
Allen	Evans	Lloyd	Saylor
Argall	Fairchild	Lucyk	Schroder
Armstrong	Fajt	Lynch	Schuler
Baker	Fargo	Maitland	Scrimenti
Bard	Feese	Major	Semmel
Barley	Fichter	Markosek	Serafini
Battisto	Fleagle	Marsico	Shaner
Bebko-Jones	Flick	Masland	Sheehan
Belardi	Gamble	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Belfanti	Gannon	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Birmelin	Geist	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Blaum	George	McGill	Staback
Boscola	Gladeck	Melio	Stairs
Boyes	Godshall	Merry	Steil
Brown	Gordner	Micozzie	Stern
Browne	Gruitza	Miller	Stetler
Bunt	Gruppo	Mundy	Stish
Butkovitz	Habay	Nailor	Strittmatter
Buxton	Haluska	Nickol	Surra
Caltagirone	Hanna	Nyce	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Harhart	O'Brien	Taylor, E. Z.
Carn	Hasay	Olasz	Taylor, J.
Carone	Haste	Oliver	Tigue
Cawley	Hennessey	Perzel	Travaglio
Chadwick	Herman	Pesci	Trich
Civera	Hershey	Petrarca	True
Clark	Hess	Pettit	Tulli
Clymer	Horsey	Phillips	Vance
Cohen, L. I.	Hutchinson	Pistella	Van Horne
Colaella	Itkin	Pitts	Veon
Colaizzo	Jadlowiec	Platts	Vitali
Conti	Jarolin	Preston	Walko
Cornell	Kaiser	Raymond	Waugh
Corpora	Keller	Readshaw	Williams
Cowell	Kenney	Reber	Wogan
Coy	King	Reinard	Wozniak
DeLuca	Krebs	Rieger	Wright, D. R.
Dempsey	Kukovich	Roberts	Wright, M. N.
Dent	LaGrotta	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dermody	Laughlin	Rooney	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	Lawless	Rubley	Zug
Donatucci	Lederer	Rudy	
Druce	Leh	Sainato	Ryan,
Durham	Lescovitz	Santoni	Speaker

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Corrigan	Farmer	Gigliotti	Mihalich
Daley			

Less than the majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

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

Mr. **PETRONE** offered the following amendment No. **A0753**:

Amend Bill, page 1, by inserting between lines 15 and 16

Section 2. The Department of Education shall adopt rules and regulations offering guidelines to school districts implementing the provisions of section 1317.3 within 60 days after enactment of this act.

Amend Sec. 2, page 1, line 16, by striking out "2" and inserting
3

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

The **SPEAKER**. On the question of the adoption of the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. **PETRONE**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment requires the Department of Education to adopt rules and regulations offering guidelines to school districts who opt to require standard dress or uniforms in their schools.

I would appreciate an affirmative vote.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman, Mr. McGeehan, on the Petrone amendment.

Mr. **McGEEHAN**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With all due respect to my esteemed colleague, I am going to oppose this amendment.

Again, these are the same folks who denied us all these years, our school districts, from imposing a mandatory dress code when we believe, many of us believe in our districts, that it is the right thing to do. We do not need the Department of Education telling our local school districts how to administer a school dress program. I think we can trust our local school boards and districts and local school administrators to make those decisions on their own, and for those reasons I ask for a negative vote.

The **SPEAKER**. On the question of the adoption of the Petrone amendment, the gentleman, Mr. Browne.

Mr. **BROWNE**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As we had stated before, we want to keep this bill as a release of a mandate from our school districts so they can decide whether and how to implement it that is best for their school district.

In addition, there is a possibility that the amendment will delay implementation of a mandatory uniform policy for those school districts. We want them to be able to use it to their advantage immediately to stem some of the problems of disruption and also promote a better learning environment in the schools, and for that reason I oppose the amendment and ask members to do the same.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—29

Bishop	Itkin	McCall	Shaner
Caltagirone	James	Michlovic	Thomas
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Petrone	Trello
Colafella	Kirkland	Preston	Van Horne
Colaizzo	Lescovitz	Ramos	Vitali
Cowell	Levdansky	Roberts	Washington
DeWeese	Manderino	Robinson	Youngblood
Haluska			

NAYS—168

Adolph	Evans	Lynch	Schroder
Allen	Fairchild	Maitland	Schuler
Argall	Fajt	Major	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Fargo	Markosek	Semmel
Baker	Feese	Marsico	Serafini
Bard	Fichter	Masland	Sheehan
Barley	Fleagle	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Battisto	Flick	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Bebko-Jones	Gamble	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Belardi	Gannon	Melio	Staback
Belfanti	Geist	Merry	Stairs
Birmelin	George	Micozzie	Steelman
Blaum	Gladock	Miller	Steil
Boscola	Godshall	Mundy	Stern
Boyes	Gordner	Nailor	Stetler
Brown	Gruitza	Nickol	Stish
Browne	Gruppo	Nyce	Strittmatter
Bunt	Habay	O'Brien	Sturla
Butkovitz	Hanna	Olasz	Surra
Buxton	Harhart	Oliver	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Hasay	Perzel	Taylor, E. Z.
Carn	Haste	Pesci	Taylor, J.
Carone	Hennessey	Petrarca	Tigue
Cawley	Herman	Pettit	Travaglio
Chadwick	Hershey	Phillips	Trich
Civera	Hess	Pistella	True
Clark	Horsey	Pitts	Tulli
Clymer	Hutchinson	Platts	Vance
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Raymond	Veon
Conti	Jarolin	Readshaw	Walko
Cornell	Kaiser	Reber	Waugh
Corpora	Keller	Reinard	Williams
Coy	Kenney	Rieger	Wogan
Curry	King	Roebuck	Wozniak
DeLuca	Krebs	Rohrer	Wright, D. R.
Dempsey	Kukovich	Rooney	Wright, M. N.
Dent	LaGrotta	Rubley	Yewcic
Dermody	Laughlin	Rudy	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	Lawless	Sainato	Zug
Donatucci	Lederer	Santoni	
Druce	Leh	Sather	Ryan,
Durham	Lloyd	Saylor	Speaker
Egolf	Lucyk		

NOT VOTING—1

Myers

EXCUSED—5

Corrigan	Farmer	Gigliotti	Mihalich
Daley			

Less than the majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage.
 The question is, shall the bill pass finally?
 Agreeable to the provisions of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS-197

- | | | | |
|--------------|------------|-----------|---------------|
| Adolph | Fairchild | Maitland | Schroder |
| Allen | Fajt | Major | Schuler |
| Argall | Fargo | Manderino | Scrimenti |
| Armstrong | Feeze | Markosek | Semmel |
| Baker | Fichter | Marsico | Serafini |
| Bard | Fleagle | Masland | Shaner |
| Barley | Flick | Mayernik | Sheehan |
| Battisto | Gamble | McCall | Smith, B. |
| Bebko-Jones | Gannon | McGeehan | Smith, S. H. |
| Belardi | Geist | McGill | Snyder, D. W. |
| Belfanti | George | Melio | Staback |
| Birmelin | Gladeck | Merry | Stairs |
| Bishop | Godshall | Michlovic | Steelman |
| Blaum | Gordner | Micozzie | Steil |
| Boscola | Gruitza | Miller | Stern |
| Boyes | Gruppo | Mundy | Stetler |
| Brown | Habay | Myers | Stish |
| Browne | Haluska | Nailor | Strittmatter |
| Bunt | Hanna | Nickol | Sturla |
| Butkovitz | Harhart | Nyce | Surra |
| Buxton | Hasay | O'Brien | Tangretti |
| Caltagirone | Haste | Olasz | Taylor, E. Z. |
| Cappabianca | Hennessey | Oliver | Taylor, J. |
| Carn | Herman | Perzel | Thomas |
| Carone | Hershey | Pesci | Tigue |
| Cawley | Hess | Petrarca | Travaglio |
| Chadwick | Horsey | Petrone | Trelle |
| Civera | Hutchinson | Pettit | Trich |
| Clark | Itkin | Phillips | True |
| Clymer | Jadlowiec | Pistella | Tulli |
| Cohen, L. I. | James | Pitts | Vance |
| Colafrèlla | Jarolin | Platts | Van Horne |
| Colaizzo | Josephs | Preston | Veon |
| Conti | Kaiser | Ramos | Vitali |
| Cornell | Keller | Raymond | Walko |
| Corpora | Kenney | Readshaw | Washington |
| Cowell | King | Reber | Waugh |
| Coy | Kirkland | Reinard | Williams |
| Curry | Krebs | Rieger | Wogan |
| DeLuca | Kukovich | Roberts | Wozniak |
| Dempsey | LaGrotta | Robinson | Wright, D. R. |
| Dent | Laughlin | Roebuck | Wright, M. N. |
| Dermody | Lawless | Rohrer | Yewcic |
| DeWeese | Lederer | Rooney | Youngblood |
| DiGirolamo | Leh | Rublely | Zimmerman |
| Donatucci | Lescovitz | Rudy | Zug |
| Druce | Levdansky | Sainato | |
| Durham | Lloyd | Santoni | Ryan, |
| Egolf | Lucyk | Sather | Speaker |
| Evans | Lynch | Saylor | |

NAYS-1

Cohen, M.

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-5

- | | | | |
|----------|--------|-----------|----------|
| Corrigan | Farmer | Gigliotti | Mihalich |
| Daley | | | |

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. The Chair apologizes to the lady from Chester County, Mrs. Taylor, for failing to recognize her prior to taking that vote.

Mrs. TAYLOR. It was, Mr. Speaker, only to point out to those that spoke for and against this issue that many years ago there was a legislator from Philadelphia, Representative Ruth Harper, who put this same issue before the House, and at that time there was, I think, a little bit of titter, of laughing, on the Dems' side and on our side perhaps, and this is a woman who probably foresaw long before some of you ever entered this House of Representatives that this was an issue that would one day be addressed.

So I could not let the moment pass but that we did not remember that Ruth Harper was probably the one that first offered this idea to the General Assembly. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. For the information of the lady, Mrs. Taylor, I asked one of the staff members of the Democrat leader's office to contact Mrs. Harper yesterday to tell her that this bill was going to be run today in hopes that she might be here, and, well, she was here earlier this week and I did talk to her, but she did not come up today because of scheduling problems. So she at least knows what is going on, and we owe her some thanks for this. I guess we also owe her an apology because we are about 10 years late on it.

Thank you, Mrs. Taylor.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

HB 2446, PN 3297 (Amended) By Rep. DURHAM

An Act amending Title 66 (Public Utilities) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing incentives for an electric public utility to restructure, buy down or buy out a nonutility generation contract from which such utility has an obligation to purchase electricity; and providing for rate recovery of certain electric utility payments for such purposes.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS.

SB 1441, PN 1832 By Rep. CORNELL

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P. L. 31, No. 21), entitled "Public Welfare Code," further providing for legislative intent, for definitions, for uniform administration of assistance, for community work and training regulations, for work registration and for administrative duties and personal obligations; providing for grant diversion; further providing for special needs and self-sufficiency, for eligibility, for voluntary termination of employment, for identification and proof of residence, for limits on property holdings, for support from legally responsible relatives, for paternity determinations and support enforcement, for protective payments, for determination of need, for eligibility verification, for medical eligibility, for additional medical

services and for penalties; providing for prescription drug benefits; and imposing duties upon the Department of Public Welfare.

HEALTH AND HUMAN RELATIONS.

RESOLUTION

Mr. PERZEL called up **SR 81, PN 1830**, entitled:

A Concurrent Resolution directing a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives to study the implementation of the Pennsylvania Farmland and Forest Land Assessment Act of 1974.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-198

Adolph	Evans	Lynch	Saylor
Allen	Fairchild	Maitland	Schroder
Argall	Fajt	Major	Schuler
Armstrong	Fargo	Manderino	Scrimenti
Baker	Feese	Markosek	Semmel
Bard	Fichter	Marsico	Serafini
Barley	Fleagle	Masland	Shaner
Battisto	Flick	Mayernik	Sheehan
Bebko-Jones	Gamble	McCall	Smith, B.
Belardi	Gannon	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Geist	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	George	Melio	Staback
Bishop	Gladeck	Merry	Stairs
Blaum	Godshall	Michlovic	Steelman
Boscola	Gordner	Micozzie	Steil
Boyes	Gruitza	Miller	Stern
Brown	Gruppo	Mundy	Stetler
Browne	Habay	Myers	Stish
Bunt	Haluska	Nailor	Strittmatter
Butkovitz	Hanna	Nickol	Sturla
Buxton	Harhart	Nyce	Surra
Caltagirone	Hasay	O'Brien	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Haste	Olasz	Taylor, E. Z.
Carn	Hennessey	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Thomas
Cawley	Hershey	Pesci	Tigue
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	Travaglio
Civera	Horsey	Petrone	Trello
Clark	Hutchinson	Pettit	Trich
Clymer	Itkin	Phillips	True
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Tulli
Cohen, M.	James	Pitts	Vance
Colafella	Jarolin	Platts	Van Horne
Colaizzo	Josephs	Preston	Veon
Conti	Kaiser	Ramos	Vitali
Cornell	Keller	Raymond	Walko
Corpora	Kenney	Readshaw	Washington
Cowell	King	Reber	Waugh
Coy	Kirkland	Reinard	Williams
Curry	Krebs	Rieger	Wogan
DeLuca	Kukovich	Roberts	Wozniak
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wright, D. R.
Dent	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Dermody	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
DeWeese	Lederer	Rooney	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Leh	Rubley	Zimmerman
Donatucci	Lescovitz	Rudy	Zug
Druce	Levdansky	Sainato	
Durham	Lloyd	Santoni	
Egolf	Lucyk	Sather	
			Ryan, Speaker

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-5

Corrigan Farmer Gigliotti Mihalich
Daley

The majority required having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the resolution was concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1441 be removed from the table.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1441 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Chester County, Mrs. Taylor.
Mrs. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I was just waiting for you to call up HB 216.
The SPEAKER. It is on the schedule.

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

BILLS PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. On page 1 of today's calendar, HB 837, PN 1044, is over.
On page 2 of today's calendar, SB 633 is over.

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2186, PN 2760**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 30 (Fish) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, relating to Class A regulated fishing lakes.

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

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

YEAS-197

Adolph	Fairchild	Maitland	Schroder
Allen	Fajt	Major	Schuler
Argall	Fargo	Manderino	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Feese	Markosek	Semmel
Baker	Fichter	Marsico	Serafini
Bard	Fleagle	Masland	Shaner
Barley	Flick	Mayernik	Sheehan
Battisto	Gamble	McCall	Smith, B.
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belardi	Geist	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Belfanti	George	Melio	Staback
Birmelin	Gladeck	Merry	Stairs
Bishop	Godshall	Michlovic	Steelman
Blaum	Gordner	Micozzie	Steil
Boscola	Gruitza	Miller	Stern
Boyes	Gruppo	Mundy	Stetler
Brown	Habay	Myers	Stish
Browne	Haluska	Nailor	Strittmatter
Bunt	Hanna	Nickol	Sturla
Butkovitz	Harhart	Nyce	Surra
Buxton	Hasay	O'Brien	Tangretti
Caltagirone	Haste	Olasz	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Hennessey	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Carn	Herman	Perzel	Thomas
Carone	Hershey	Pesci	Tigue
Cawley	Hess	Petrarca	Travaglio
Chadwick	Horsey	Petrone	Trelfo
Civera	Hutchinson	Pettit	Trich
Clark	Itkin	Phillips	True
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Tulli
Cohen, L. I.	James	Pitts	Vance
Colafranca	Jarolin	Platts	Van Horne
Colaizzo	Josephs	Preston	Veon
Conti	Kaiser	Ramos	Vitali
Cornell	Keller	Raymond	Walko
Corpora	Kenney	Readshaw	Washington
Cowell	King	Reber	Waugh
Coy	Kirkland	Reinard	Williams
Curry	Krebs	Rieger	Wogan
DeLuca	Kukovich	Roberts	Wozniak
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wright, D. R.
Dent	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Dermody	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
DeWeese	Lederer	Rooney	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Leh	Rublely	Zimmerman
Donatucci	Lescovitz	Rudy	Zug
Druce	Levdansky	Sainato	
Durham	Lloyd	Santoni	Ryan,
Egolf	Lucyk	Sather	Speaker
Evans	Lynch	Saylor	

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-1

Cohen, M.

EXCUSED-5

Corrigan Farmer Gigliotti Mihalich Daley

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 216, PN 3223**, entitled:

An Act establishing the Office of Physician General; providing for the appointment, term of office and powers and duties of the Physician General and for the Secretary of Health; making an appropriation; and making repeals.

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

Mr. HASAY offered the following amendment No. **A1069**:

Amend Title, page 1, line 7, by inserting after "Health;" providing for continued operation of State Health Care Centers and for a State Public Health Laboratory;

Amend Bill, page 5, by inserting between lines 15 and 16 Section 6. State Health Care Centers.

The Department of Health shall operate a system of State Health Care Centers which shall provide, at the minimum, those public health services in effect as of July 1, 1995. The department shall not enter into contracts with private providers that would result in the elimination of these centers, nor reduce the scope of services currently provided, nor reduce the number of centers unless specifically authorized and approved by the General Assembly.

Section 7. Public Health Laboratories.

The Department of Health shall maintain and operate a State Public Health Laboratory that shall assure the availability of reliable, clinical laboratory services and laboratory-based information that are needed by clinicians and other health providers for proper diagnosis and treatment, the prevention of disease, and promotion of the health of the citizens of this Commonwealth. The State Public Health Laboratory shall arrange for and perform clinical tests to identify diseases and provide epidemiological and surveillance support. However, it shall not contract with outside laboratories to perform testing in rabies, measles, rubella, Lyme disease, influenza and tuberculosis identification. In addition, the public health laboratory shall be administered and maintained in a manner in effect as of July 1, 1995.

Amend Sec. 6, page 5, line 16, by striking out "6" and inserting 8

Amend Sec. 7, page 5, line 23, by striking out "7" and inserting 9

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

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Hasay.

Mr. HASAY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is the Hasay-Blaum amendment, and it is amendment A1069.

This is an important amendment. This would put in statute the 60 public health centers in the counties where they are presently, and it would also maintain the State laboratory in the Commonwealth.

Public health care is an important issue and a major issue and has a responsibility from the Commonwealth to the citizens of the Commonwealth to that responsibility. I feel that we should not experiment in privatization of these health centers and experiment where these health centers control and contain contagious diseases, such as all kinds of AIDS (acquired immune deficiency syndrome), typhus, TB (tuberculosis), which are on the rise in certain counties, where they control it and they also control and monitor those clients and patients with the medicine that is required. They go the extra distance.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, those community nurses make much less in the public health centers than they do in the private hospital sector; much, much less. The average nurse in a community health center makes around \$27,000, and a nurse in a private hospital makes around \$45,000.

So I am asking you, on both sides of the aisle, Representative Blaum and I have worked on this amendment, and if this amendment passes, Representative Blaum and I will withdraw all of the other amendments, so I would appreciate your support, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The lady from Chester, Mrs. Taylor.

Mrs. TAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise as the prime sponsor of this bill to say that I think this is a fine amendment. I am pleased that Representative Blaum and Representative Hasay have put this before the House. We all know how important the State health-care centers are. We know, some of us, firsthand because we know the work of our public health labs. I think whether or not these labs and the laboratories and the health centers are to stay in existence should be something that is decided by the legislative body. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

The Chair recognizes Dr. King.

Mr. KING. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Even though you see on your sheet for today that I have an amendment also, it alludes to the same subject, and I want you to know, I support the Hasay-Blaum amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Chester, Mr. Schroder.

Mr. SCHRODER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I also rise in support of the Hasay-Blaum amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the public health lab which exists in Lionville, Pennsylvania, in my district, provides a valuable and very important service to the citizens of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that we should never consider the issue of privatization of this lab. I commend the administration for bringing the issue up in the first place, but I think we should heed the advice of the report of the impact commission, which does suggest that we get a thorough cost-benefit analysis before moving ahead with that proposal. To my knowledge, that has not been done.

Therefore, in order to see that this does not happen prematurely, in order to have time to adequately study the costs and benefits as well as to have adequate quality assurances, I urge

my colleagues today to vote for the Hasay-Blaum amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Blaum.

Mr. BLAUM. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Not to belabor the point any further, I think the members know the issue before us, and that is that these health centers are currently in danger and that this is a policy decision which we make here today, saying that they are a valuable asset throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, when all kinds of serious and infectious diseases strike, to advise the public and to take care of our people. They are necessary not only in metropolitan areas but also especially in rural areas, and I would ask the members for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Jarolin.

Mr. JAROLIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Going back quite a few years, I believe it was in 1993, David Richardson — passed — had conducted an investigation into the privatization of some of the institutions where they had the nurses down there. It proved the fact that the quality of care by privatization does not surpass the people that are working at the health-care centers now.

I do not want to make the same mistake twice. Mr. Speaker, I urge you people to vote in favor of the Hasay and Blaum amendment. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—198

Adolph	Evans	Lynch	Saylor
Allen	Fairchild	Maitland	Schroder
Argall	Fajt	Major	Schuler
Armstrong	Fargo	Manderino	Skrimenti
Baker	Feese	Markosek	Semmel
Bard	Fichter	Marsico	Serafini
Barley	Fleagle	Masland	Shaner
Battisto	Flick	Mayernik	Sheehan
Bebko-Jones	Gamble	McCall	Smith, B.
Belardi	Gannon	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Geist	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	George	Melio	Staback
Bishop	Gladeck	Merry	Stairs
Blaum	Godshall	Michlovic	Steelman
Boscola	Gordner	Micozzie	Steil
Boyes	Gruitza	Miller	Stern
Brown	Gruppo	Mundy	Stetler
Browne	Habay	Myers	Stish
Bunt	Haluska	Nailor	Strittmatter
Butkovitz	Hanna	Nickol	Sturla
Buxton	Harhart	Nyce	Surra
Caltagirone	Hasay	O'Brien	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Haste	Olasz	Taylor, E. Z.
Carn	Hennessey	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Thomas
Cawley	Hershey	Pesci	Tigue
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	Travaglio
Civera	Horsey	Petrone	Trello
Clark	Hutchinson	Pettit	Trich
Clymer	Itkin	Phillips	True
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Tulli
Cohen, M.	James	Pitts	Vance
Colafiglia	Jarolin	Platts	Van Horne
Colaizzo	Josephs	Preston	Veon
Conti	Kaiser	Ramos	Vitali

Cornell	Keller	Raymond	Walko
Corpora	Kenney	Readshaw	Washington
Cowell	King	Reber	Waugh
Coy	Kirkland	Reinard	Williams
Curry	Krebs	Rieger	Wogan
DeLuca	Kukovich	Roberts	Wozniak
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wright, D. R.
Dent	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Dermody	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
DeWeese	Lederer	Rooney	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Leh	Rubley	Zimmerman
Donatucci	Lescovitz	Rudy	Zug
Druce	Levdansky	Sainato	
Durham	Lloyd	Santoni	Ryan,
Egolf	Lucyk	Sather	Speaker

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-5

Corrigan	Farmer	Gigliotti	Mihalich
Daley			

The majority having voted in the affirmative, 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?

The SPEAKER. It is my understanding the gentleman, Mr. Hasay, is withdrawing the other three amendments. Is that correct?

Mr. HASAY. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Dr. King, are you withdrawing your amendments? Thank you.

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Dr. King.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I was not withdrawing all my amendments. I have some other amendments to this bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair apologizes to the gentleman. I was under the impression that all of your amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. KING. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. Would you advise the Chair what amendments you seek to have considered at this time.

Mr. KING. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to have considered amendment 1006.

DECISION OF CHAIR RESCINDED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair rescinds its statement that HB 216 was agreed to on third consideration as amended.

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

Mr. KING offered the following amendment No. A1006:

Amend Title, page 1, line 7, by striking out "AND" and inserting a comma

Amend Title, page 1, line 7, by inserting after "HEALTH" and for a public health dentist within the Department of Health

Amend Bill, page 5, by inserting between lines 15 and 16 Section 6. Dental health districts and officers.

The Department of Health shall apportion the Commonwealth into dental health districts, administered by a public health dentist within the Department of Health, who shall implement dental health policies and programs for the various counties and political subdivisions within this Commonwealth.

Sec. 6, page 5, line 16, by striking out "6" and inserting 7

Amend Sec. 7, page 5, line 23, by striking out "7" and inserting 8

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. KING. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I ask the consideration of the Assembly in this matter in statutorily placing a public health dentist into the Department of Health. We have currently a public health dentist. It is a very important role. We have many issues on health-care reform in front of this body today and in the future. This has been a very valuable office. In the past we have had this office summarily dismissed by a Secretary of Health, and because of the importance of this particular position and what they do for our constituents' public health, as it relates to dentistry and other public health matters, I ask that this be statutorily placed within the Department of Health, and I ask for your vote on this.

The SPEAKER. Does the lady, Mrs. Taylor, desire recognition?

Mrs. TAYLOR. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Only to say that, again, I think that this is a good amendment, and I would urge your acceptance.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-198

Adolph	Evans	Lynch	Saylor
Allen	Fairchild	Maitland	Schroder
Argall	Fajt	Major	Schuler
Armstrong	Fargo	Manderino	Scrimenti
Baker	Feese	Markosek	Semmel
Bard	Fichter	Marsico	Serafini
Barley	Fleagle	Masland	Shaner
Battisto	Flick	Mayernik	Sheehan
Bebko-Jones	Gamble	McCall	Smith, B.
Belardi	Gannon	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Geist	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	George	Melio	Staback
Bishop	Gladeck	Merry	Stairs
Blaum	Godshall	Michlovic	Steelman
Boscola	Gordner	Micozzie	Steil
Boyes	Gruitza	Miller	Stern
Brown	Gruppo	Mundy	Stetler
Browne	Habay	Myers	Stish
Bunt	Haluska	Nailor	Strittmatter
Butkovitz	Hanna	Nickol	Sturla
Buxton	Harhart	Nyce	Surra
Caltagirone	Hasay	O'Brien	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Haste	Olasz	Taylor, E. Z.
Carn	Hennessey	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Thomas
Cawley	Hershey	Pesci	Tigue
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	Travaglio
Civera	Horsey	Petrone	Trello
Clark	Hutchinson	Pettit	Trich
Clymer	Itkin	Phillips	True
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Tulli
Cohen, M.	James	Pitts	Vance
Colaella	Jarolin	Platts	Van Horne
Colaizzo	Josephs	Preston	Veon
Conti	Kaiser	Ramos	Vitali
Cornell	Keller	Raymond	Walko
Corpora	Kenney	Readshaw	Washington
Cowell	King	Reber	Waugh
Coy	Kirkland	Reinard	Williams
Curry	Krebs	Rieger	Wogan
DeLuca	Kukovich	Roberts	Wozniak
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wright, D. R.
Dent	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Dermody	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
DeWeese	Lederer	Rooney	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Leh	Rublely	Zimmerman
Donatucci	Lescovitz	Rudy	Zug
Druce	Levdansky	Sainato	
Durham	Lloyd	Santoni	Ryan,
Egolf	Lucyk	Sather	Speaker

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-5

Corrigan	Farmer	Gigliotti	Mihalich
Daley			

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. KING offered the following amendment No. A1032:

Amend Sec. 5, page 5, lines 14 and 15, by striking out "BUT MUST HOLD AT LEAST A GRADUATE DEGREE IN PUBLIC HEALTH"

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment ?

The SPEAKER. On the question of the adoption of that amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. King.

Mr. KING. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is a very important issue in front of us, eliciting qualifications for the Secretary of Health, and in the language it calls that the Secretary must hold at least a graduate degree in public health. While I am foremost to realize the benefits of that particular degree, I want to give the Governor a wide leeway in selecting this particular designee, and I know that there are people involved in the health-care industry, hospital administrators and others, who do not hold a graduate degree in public health, and especially, I would like to see that if ever we needed, Sister Teresa could be a designated Secretary of Health.

I ask for your support.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment ?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-183

Adolph	Fairchild	Lucyk	Santoni
Allen	Fajt	Lynch	Sather
Argall	Fargo	Maitland	Saylor
Armstrong	Feese	Major	Schroder
Baker	Fichter	Manderino	Schuler
Bard	Fleagle	Markosek	Scrimenti
Barley	Flick	Marsico	Semmel
Battisto	Gamble	Masland	Serafini
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	Mayernik	Shaner
Belardi	Geist	McCall	Sheehan
Belfanti	George	McGeehan	Smith, B.
Birmelin	Gladeck	McGill	Smith, S. H.
Bishop	Godshall	Merry	Snyder, D. W.
Blaum	Gordner	Michlovic	Staback
Brown	Gruitza	Micozzie	Stairs
Browne	Gruppo	Miller	Steil
Bunt	Habay	Mundy	Stern
Butkovitz	Haluska	Myers	Stish
Buxton	Hanna	Nickol	Strittmatter
Caltagirone	Harhart	Nyce	Surra
Cappabianca	Hasay	O'Brien	Tangretti
Carn	Hennessey	Olasz	Taylor, E. Z.
Cawley	Herman	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Chadwick	Hershey	Perzel	Thomas
Civera	Hess	Pesci	Tigue
Clark	Horsey	Petrone	Travaglio
Clymer	Hutchinson	Pettit	Trello
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Phillips	Trich
Cohen, M.	James	Pistella	True
Colaella	Jarolin	Pitts	Tulli
Colaizzo	Josephs	Platts	Van Horne
Conti	Kaiser	Preston	Veon
Cornell	Keller	Ramos	Walko
Corpora	Kenney	Raymond	Washington
Cowell	King	Readshaw	Williams
Curry	Kirkland	Reber	Wogan
DeLuca	Krebs	Reinard	Wozniak
Dempsey	Kukovich	Rieger	Wright, D. R.

Dent	LaGrotta	Roberts	Wright, M. N.
Dermody	Laughlin	Robinson	Yewcic
DeWeese	Lawless	Roebuck	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Lederer	Rohrer	Zimmerman
Donatucci	Leh	Rooney	Zug
Druce	Lescovitz	Rubley	
Durham	Levdansky	Rudy	Ryan,
Egolf	Lloyd	Sainato	Speaker
Evans			

NAYS-14

Boscola	Haste	Steelman	Vance
Boyes	Melio	Stetler	Vitali
Carone	Nailor	Sturla	Waugh
Coy	Petrarca		

NOT VOTING-1

Itkin

EXCUSED-5

Corrigan	Farmer	Gigliotti	Mihalich
Daley			

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

On the question recurring,

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

YEAS-197

Adolph	Evans	Lynch	Schroder
Allen	Fairchild	Maitland	Schuler
Argall	Fajt	Major	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Fargo	Manderino	Semmel
Baker	Feese	Markosek	Serafini
Bard	Fichter	Marsico	Shaner
Barley	Fleagle	Masland	Sheehan
Battisto	Flick	Mayernik	Smith, R.
Bebko-Jones	Gamble	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Belardi	Gannon	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Belfanti	Geist	McGill	Staback
Birmelin	George	Melio	Stairs
Bishop	Gladeck	Merry	Steelman
Blaum	Godshall	Michlovic	Steil
Boscola	Gordner	Micozzie	Stern
Boyes	Gruitza	Miller	Stetler
Brown	Gruppo	Mundy	Stish
Browne	Habay	Myers	Strittmatter
Bunt	Haluska	Nickol	Sturla
Butkovitz	Hanna	Nyce	Surra
Buxton	Harhart	O'Brien	Tangretti
Caltagirone	Hasay	Olasz	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Haste	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Carn	Hennessey	Perzel	Thomas
Carone	Herman	Pesci	Tigue
Cawley	Hershey	Petrarca	Travaglio

Chadwick	Hess	Petrone	Trello
Civera	Horsey	Pettit	Trich
Clark	Hutchinson	Phillips	True
Clymer	Itkin	Pistella	Tulli
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pitts	Vance
Cohen, M.	James	Platts	Van Horne
Colafella	Jarolin	Preston	Veon
Colaizzo	Josephs	Ramos	Vitali
Conti	Kaiser	Raymond	Walko
Cornell	Keller	Readshaw	Washington
Corpora	Kenney	Reber	Waugh
Cowell	King	Reinard	Williams
Coy	Kirkland	Rieger	Wogan
Curry	Krebs	Roberts	Wozniak
DeLuca	Kukovich	Robinson	Wright, D. R.
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Dent	Laughlin	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dermody	Lawless	Rooney	Youngblood
DeWeese	Lederer	Rubley	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	Leh	Rudy	Zug
Donatucci	Lescovitz	Sainato	
Druce	Levdansky	Santoni	Ryan,
Durham	Lloyd	Sather	Speaker
Egolf	Lucyk	Saylor	

NAYS-1

Nailor

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-5

Corrigan	Farmer	Gigliotti	Mihalich
Daley			

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.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Gannon, for the purpose of making an announcement.

Mr. GANNON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to immediately reconvene the Judiciary Committee to the back of the House, on the meeting recessed on Tuesday of this week, to consider a bill and an amendment.

The SPEAKER. That is immediately?

Mr. GANNON. At the pleasure of the Speaker, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. That is indefinite then.

Mr. GANNON. Immediately.

The SPEAKER. Immediately; very good; immediately.

Mr. GANNON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Judiciary Committee can retire to the rear of the hall of the House as soon as the last announcement is made.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Pitts.

Mr. PITTS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to call a meeting of the House Appropriations Committee immediately in room 243, in the Appropriations area. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. There are two immediate meetings; one of Judiciary, the other of Appropriations. Members should retire to the two meeting areas.

GUEST INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pleased to welcome to the hall of the House, as the guest of Representative Harhart, Chelsea Severson, here today as a guest page. She is seated here to the front of the Speaker on the bench with the other pages.

STATE GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Clymer.

Mr. CLYMER. Mr. Speaker, there will be a meeting of the State Government Committee immediately in the hall of the House; immediately, State Government Committee. Thank you.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Pistella, from Allegheny County, who asks that the record reflect that during the regular session of Tuesday, March 19, 1996, he was not recorded as voting on HR 302 and that he wishes to be recorded in the affirmative. The remarks of the gentleman will be spread upon the record.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MAJORITY LEADER

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

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

If I could have the attention of the members just for one moment.

It is our intention, Mr. Speaker, on Monday to run SB 1441, PN 1832. That is the welfare reform bill, and we would like to have the members have their amendments ready by tomorrow at 2 o'clock, which would be the deadline. That bill will be out of Appropriations in a few minutes, Mr. Speaker.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. The lady, Mrs. Taylor.

Mrs. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I do have some remarks I would like to submit for the record in reference to the passage of HB 216.

The SPEAKER. The remarks of the lady should be submitted. Turn the remarks over to one of the pages, please.

Mrs. TAYLOR submitted the following remarks for the Legislative Journal:

I am here to explain why I believe the change embodied in HB 216 is necessary. At present the Governor is mandated to choose a medical doctor for the position of Secretary of Health. Nearly a decade ago, well over 60 percent of the States had a similar mandate. However, in less than 10 years, the number of States has dwindled to nearly 40 percent. Why this change? I cannot speak specifically to the changes in other States, but we need look no further than our own Department of Health and its current and past Secretaries. The recent history of the Pennsylvania Department of Health is one of ineffective performance and inefficient operation. Questions and concerns regarding the Emergency Medical Services System and Operating Fund, the certificate-of-need process, the certification of managed-care providers, and the overall inspection and certification duties of the department have all gone unanswered and unaddressed for years. At the beginning of the Ridge administration, the Governor's appointee, Dr. Peter Jannetta, admitted that the Department of Health has serious problems and required a serious change of course, but that he would be only a "part-time" Secretary, spending the rest of his time practicing his profession — his resignation is effective March 1, 1996. The previous Secretary, Dr. Allan Noonan, was allowed to be on two payrolls, both Federal and State, at the end of his tenure as Secretary. For what reason did we have such "unique" employment arrangements with our past two Secretaries? The answer is money. Within the mandate on the Governor to supply a medical doctor appointee, the Governor must also find an individual willing to take, in most cases, a significant pay cut. It is clear that Dr. Jannetta and his predecessors have had extreme difficulty accomplishing any of the goals they set out to achieve as Secretary of Health; the reason could be that many doctors are not appropriately equipped to deal with the everyday administrative duties that the department and the position of Secretary require. I do not mean to place undue blame upon the Secretary for the failures of the department, but where I come from, the captain of the ship is ultimately responsible for the actions, or inactions, of the entire crew. This begs the question, "Why hamstringing the Governor with an unnecessary mandate that the Secretary be a medical doctor when the Governor is trying to find the best captain for the Department of Health ship?" If medical expertise or knowledge is needed in various situations, the advice of a medical doctor could be solicited by a non-M.D. Secretary.

There seems to be little argument from all concerned that the mandate is an ineffectual requirement. Taken with the performance of the Department of Health over the last decade, I believe the time has come to eliminate this mandate and give the Governor the chance to find the best person to take the helm of the Department of Health and attempt to steer it onto a more effective course.

INTERROGATION

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to interrogate the majority leader.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Perzel, Mr. Lloyd would like to have a brief discussion with you by way of interrogation.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the welfare bill, are we in a position to rely on the fact that the bill is not going to be amended in the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. PERZEL. Yes.

Mr. LLOYD. And you indicated that we needed to have our amendments prepared for tomorrow. My assumption is that we have satisfied the requirement if we have posted a certificate by 2 p.m. tomorrow. Is that correct?

Mr. PERZEL. Yes.

Mr. LLOYD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Mr. Perzel.

Mr. PERZEL. Judging from past history, Mr. Speaker, they will probably be able to draft up amendments until 2 o'clock Monday and maybe 2 o'clock Tuesday, depending upon how long it takes to get the bill passed.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Trich.

Mr. TRICH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would I be in order also to submit remarks for the record at this time concerning HB 216?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may submit his remarks.

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

Mr. Speaker, re HB 216, amendment A1069, I strongly support this amendment and the concept of protecting the State's health center system. There is no question that these centers are very necessary to the well-being of public health. The centers provide extraordinary services, important to all Pennsylvanians.

We cannot afford to experiment with a system that has proven itself effective over the course of many years. In fact, we have a duty to put into law a prohibition, by this Governor or any other Governor, to close or privatize our health centers without legislative action.

I urge all members to vote "yes" on the Hasay-Blaum amendment.

* * *

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Roberts.

Mr. ROBERTS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would also like to submit some comments for the record on HB 216.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may submit his remarks.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Blaum amendment.

I have received numerous letters and phone calls from people in all walks of life. My constituents vehemently oppose the Governor's plan to privatize State health centers. In Fayette County, the health centers provide a level of service that will surely deteriorate if contracted out, and I am not convinced that we will save any money.

Privatizing the centers can only mean increased costs and increased health problems.

State health centers have spent decades establishing our trust and support by effectively and professionally providing everything from immunizations to specialized health care and infection control.

I agree that we must tighten our belt and cost-savings must be an issue during budget negotiations, but this is going too far.

The well-being of Pennsylvanians must be paramount, and closing State health centers flies in the face of that principle. I, for one, cannot and will not support such a proposal.

I urge my colleagues to support the Blaum amendment and save the State health centers.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

BILLS SIGNED BY SPEAKER

Bills numbered and entitled as follows having been prepared for presentation to the Governor, and the same being correct, the titles were publicly read as follows:

HB 270, PN 1951

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for the Department of Health and for counties to furnish certified copies of documents without charge.

HB 2033, PN 2752

An Act authorizing the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission to convey a Project 70 tract of land in Porter Township, Clinton County, under certain conditions.

SB 708, PN 1824

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P. L. 30, No. 14), entitled "Public School Code of 1949," further providing for granting of tenure to professional employees, for causes for termination of professional contracts and for rating of professional employees.

Whereupon, the Speaker, in the presence of the House, signed the same.

INTERROGATION

Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. I would like to interrogate the majority leader.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Perzel?

You may begin.

Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker, the pronouncements of the majority floor leader from Philadelphia were devoid of any mention of the token session that will probably be foisted upon us. Would the gentleman react to an inquiry as to what plans the majority has for a token session on Thursday?

Mr. PERZEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for not bringing that up earlier, Mr. Speaker.

We did tell the members to have their amendments done by 2 o'clock tomorrow, and I left out the fact that there is a token session tomorrow. There are already 72 amendments filed. I figure there will be 72 to 100 more. Everybody is going to be given an opportunity to put whatever amendment they want on this bill, Mr. Speaker, and we are not trying to hide anything. I wanted to make sure the members knew the bill and the printer's number. That is why I stood up.

Tomorrow there is a token session, and I apologize for not mentioning that.

Mr. DeWEESE. I thank the gentleman.

If I might make a few observations, Mr. Speaker, on the matter at hand.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. First of all, Mr. Speaker, this is not welfare reform that we are going to be talking about next week. This is medical benefits that we are going to be cutting — medical benefits — and I think that has to be a preeminent concern of the men and women in this chamber as we go home for the weekend. This is a hospital bankruptcy bill. This is a medical services purging

operation on our part. And quite frankly, again, the metroliner, the Republican metroliner that my worthy colleague from Philadelphia has waxed on about over the span, has disallowed the dynamics of our committee chairmanships and our committee system from working in their full opportunity, in their full capability.

... In the United States Congress, which should not necessarily always be a paragon for us to emulate, work is done at the subcommittee level. Bills are crafted and recrafted again and again at the subcommittee level. They are honed and refined at the committee level, and when measures reach the floor, final votes are taken. Quite frankly, I would have to laud our congressional counterparts, because here in this chamber, it seems like we are trying to do too much on the floor at the last minute.

It cannot be stressed enough that this weekend, hospital workers, health-related workers — in Altoona, Blair County, 14.7 percent of all the people in that county are involved in health care; Philadelphia County, 14.4 percent; in Lackawanna County, 14 percent — thousands of health-care jobs are in jeopardy. Several hundred thousand Pennsylvanians are potentially going to be without health care in a matter of weeks, and I think that for us to have another rush to judgment in a similar venue as we did vouchers and as we have done other things in the last 14 months should at least be brought to the microphone and should be brought to the attention of the membership.

So I would deplore the idea of using a token session as a parliamentary venue to advance this legislation. It should be done slowly, methodically, specifically, amendment after amendment after amendment in a committee.

If we are going to take hundreds of thousands of Pennsylvanians off welfare last year and now we are going to take hundreds of thousands of Pennsylvanians off health care, health care, health care — this is not a welfare bill; this is a health-care bill; this is a hospital bankruptcy bill — we at least should have the opportunity to have long, lengthy, substantive committee meetings, and I just wanted to make that point clear, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Perzel.

Mr. PERZEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just a few points.

First off, this was in the Governor's budget message 6 weeks ago. The Appropriations Committee has completed its meetings. They discussed this. Feather Houstoun discussed it at length. There was a committee meeting here this morning where amendments were offered by both sides, Republicans and Democrats; they were defeated. There is no rush to judgment. Everybody knew this was coming. This was no secret. Did anybody doubt that we could not afford to do what we are doing in Pennsylvania without these cuts? The Governor said we needed to do it; stood right up there and said it. It was in his speech.

So we are not rushing to any judgment. We are approximately \$250 million shy in our budget, Mr. Speaker, and this is one of the ways we have chosen to fill that hole, Mr. Speaker.

Next week every member of this General Assembly will be able to bring up amendment after amendment after amendment. We will hear everyone, we will listen to everyone, and a decision will be made by this body collectively, and it will take 102 votes to pass that, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. I cannot help but be inspired by the gentleman's fealty to His Excellency, the Governor. He gestured

to the podium and recollected momentarily, the Governor was up there; he said we needed the money; we are going to be out here next week, and we are going to do it.

Well, I am anxious to see, Mr. Speaker, whether my worthy colleague will have the same kind of reaction with a gasoline tax since the Governor also admonished his Republican colleagues for the dire need for that kind of effort to be started. So we will see if Mr. Perzel has the same kind of unabated enthusiasm for that kind of effort and we will see if we do it without any public hearings, because no matter what he says, when you are cutting medical benefits, medical benefits to hundreds of thousands of Pennsylvanians, you need some public hearings, and that is all I wanted to share with the members of the Assembly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BELFANTI. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Belfanti.

Mr. BELFANTI. Mr. Speaker, point of parliamentary inquiry, if I may.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BELFANTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As one of the Democrats who has consistently voted with the other side of the aisle on previous welfare reform measures and who has really gone through the paperwork on what we are talking about doing on Monday, I am wondering if a motion to adjourn this House until Monday would preclude the majority leader from scheduling tomorrow as a token session day so that we could at least put this matter off for another day — Tuesday or Wednesday or weeks from now — so that we might hear from our constituents, our senior citizens who will be thrown out of nursing homes and others who will be directly affected by this very callous measure that we are about to be forced to vote on on Monday.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. BELFANTI. So I would like to make a motion that we adjourn this House until Monday without the opportunity of allowing the majority leader a parliamentary process of a token session day tomorrow.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Perzel.

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I notice the absence of a quorum in the House. So I would think—

The SPEAKER. The Sergeant at Arms will close the doors of the House. Members in the building should return to the floor of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will admit people to the House. The gentleman, Mr. DeWeese; the gentleman, Mr. Perzel.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

The SPEAKER. At this time I am about to read the rule that we will be guided by if this persists. "If a question of the absence of a quorum is raised...the Speaker shall order the Sergeant-at-Arms to close the doors of the House. No member shall be permitted to leave the House, except by permission of the House. The names of

the members present shall be recorded and absentees noted. Those for whom no leave of absence has been granted or no sufficient excuse is made may, by order of a majority of the members present, be sent for and taken into custody by the Sergeant-at-Arms and his assistants appointed for that purpose, and brought before the bar of the House where, unless excused by a majority of the members present, they shall be censured” – this is considered by the Speaker to be a serious matter – “where...they shall be censured or punished for neglect of duty as the House may direct.

“Further proceedings under a call of the House may be dispensed with at any time after the completion of the roll call and the announcement of the result.

“These proceedings shall be without debate, and no motion, except to adjourn, shall be in order.”

Mr. PISTELLA. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not recognizing the gentleman at this time.

The Chair is about to take a roll-call vote. Members will take their seats. It is the intention of the Chair to call as absent anyone— Any seat that the Chair sees absent and being voted, I will announce. So I am suggesting, do not vote your neighbor if he is not in his seat. Not on the floor of the House; only those in their seat are permitted to vote. Members will take their seats.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Pistella. For what reason—

Mr. PISTELLA. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

Some of the members may never have, as myself, in the course of their service participated in a quorum call and a quorum vote. I was asking, with your permission, prior to the actual taking of the vote, if you could walk us through what is to be expected through this process.

The SPEAKER. Well, you are going to be here or not and that is going to be recorded. And—

Mr. PISTELLA. But— I am sorry.

The SPEAKER. —and it appears there is a quorum, but because a quorum call has been suggested, we are going to have an actual recording of it, and we will see what happens from there when we get a count. What can happen, I have been a member of this House; I have been a member of this House when the State Police have been sent out to bring members back by the Speaker. Now, that has been done in my time; that is, members who were not on official leave.

Members will proceed to vote.

Mr. DeWEESE. Point of order, Mr. Speaker; point of order.

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

Mr. DeWEESE. Or maybe properly it would be a parliamentary inquiry.

The gentleman, Mr. Belfanti, asked for an adjournment motion, and the gentleman, Mr. Perzel, I believe, asked for the quorum or at least broached the subject of a quorum, and I think the record should reflect that, sir. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. I think the record does reflect that.

Members will proceed to vote.

(Members proceeded to vote.)

Mr. BELFANTI. Mr. Speaker, which motion are we voting on?

The SPEAKER. We are taking a roll-call vote right now.

Mr. BELFANTI. On the adjournment, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. No, no.

Mr. BELFANTI. Does that not take precedence?

The SPEAKER. This is not on the question of adjournment. We are first determining if there is a quorum.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BELFANTI. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it. The gentleman will state his point of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BELFANTI. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was under the impression that an adjournment motion takes precedence over other motions, all other motions, and I made that motion prior to the majority leader asking for a quorum.

Mr. Speaker, the last sentence of rule 57—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

The gentleman is correct in his statement to a great extent. However, you cannot take the official action without a quorum being present on the floor of the House, and that is what has been questioned – the presence of a quorum – and that has to first be determined.

Mr. BELFANTI. Mr. Speaker, nonetheless, I did make a motion to adjourn, and—

The SPEAKER. That will be handled next.

Mr. BELFANTI. —we have previously taken the master roll today and many other votes, which indicate a quorum has in fact been present all day.

The SPEAKER. Everybody— Not everybody. Many people left the floor, Mr. Belfanti, as you well know. This hall was, at a glance, half full when you made your motion, and it was, I suspect, at that point that the quorum call was requested.

Have all the members voted?

The roll was recorded, and the following members were present:

PRESENT—183

Adolph	Egolf	Lucyk	Scrimenti
Allen	Evans	Lynch	Semmel
Armstrong	Fairchild	Maitland	Serafini
Baker	Fajt	Manderino	Shaner
Bard	Fargo	Markosek	Sheehan
Barley	Feese	Marsico	Smith, B.
Battisto	Fichter	Masland	Smith, S. H.
Bebko-Jones	Fleagle	Mayernik	Snyder, D. W.
Belardi	Flick	McCall	Staback
Belfanti	Gamble	McGeehan	Stairs
Birmelin	Gannon	McGill	Steelman
Bishop	Geist	Melio	Steil
Blaum	Godshall	Merry	Stern
Boscola	Gordner	Michlovic	Stetler
Boyes	Gruitza	Miller	Stish
Brown	Gruppo	Mundy	Strittmatter
Browne	Habay	Myers	Sturla
Bunt	Haluska	Nailor	Surra
Butkovitz	Hanna	Nickol	Tangretti
Buxton	Harhart	Nyce	Taylor, E. Z.
Caltagirone	Hasay	Oliver	Taylor, J.

Cappabianca	Haste	Perzel	Thomas
Carn	Hennessey	Petrarca	Tigue
Carone	Herman	Petrone	Travaglio
Cawley	Hershey	Pettit	Trello
Chadwick	Hess	Phillips	Trich
Civera	Horsey	Pistella	True
Clark	Hutchinson	Pitts	Tulli
Clymer	Itkin	Platts	Vance
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Ramos	Van Horne
Cohen, M.	James	Raymond	Veon
Colafiglia	Jarolin	Readshaw	Vitali
Colaizzo	Josephs	Reber	Walko
Conti	Kaiser	Reinard	Washington
Cornell	Keller	Roberts	Waugh
Corpora	Kenney	Roebuck	Williams
Cowell	King	Rohrer	Wogan
Curry	Kirkland	Rooney	Wozniak
DeLuca	Krebs	Rublely	Wright, M. N.
Dempsey	Kukovich	Rudy	Yewcic
Dent	Lawless	Sainato	Youngblood
Dermody	Lederer	Santoni	Zimmerman
DeWeese	Leh	Sather	Zug
DiGirolamo	Lescovitz	Saylor	
Donatucci	Levdansky	Schroder	Ryan,
Druce	Lloyd	Schuler	Speaker
Durham			

NOT VOTING—15

Argall	LaGrotta	O'Brien	Rieger
Coy	Laughlin	Olasz	Robinson
George	Major	Pesci	Wright, D. R.
Gladeck	Micozzie	Preston	

EXCUSED—5

Corrigan	Farmer	Gigliotti	Mihalich
Daley			

The SPEAKER. The Chair observes and notes the presence of a quorum.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

The SPEAKER. The question now reverts back to the motion of the gentleman, Mr. Belfanti, and I would ask at this time that the gentleman restate his motion.

Mr. BELFANTI. Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until 1 p.m., Monday, March 25, 1996.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Perzel. There is a motion to adjourn until Monday at 1 p.m.

Mr. Perzel.

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, as I stated previously, there are 72 amendments already for the welfare reform bill, and I expect that by tomorrow at 2 o'clock or Monday at 2 o'clock, whatever ends up being the final time before we are done with amendments, it will probably be 100 to 150 amendments that will be put on the bill.

Nobody is being denied an opportunity to put their amendments on, Mr. Speaker; nobody is being denied that.

So I would move that we defeat this motion to adjourn and we have the token session tomorrow so we can move the bill forward. That is all, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. I would politely request that we accept the gentleman, Mr. Belfanti's motion to adjourn. That would only give us an additional 24 hours when we are contemplating the excision of several hundred thousand Pennsylvanians from the medical rolls of our State. I think it would be advantageous for many of us to prepare more specific, more cogent amendments.

For us to be the beneficiary of input from our hospital boards and from our community service advocates back home, I think 1 extra day is what we are essentially asking for, and the parliamentary maneuver that Belfanti has deployed seems very appropriate. It does not seem egregious; it does not seem onerous. It seems like something that poor people would want us to do, our constituents would want us to do — to take 1 extra day. We are not postponing this indefinitely. We are just putting the brakes on the proverbial metroliner, and sometimes speed and haste are not necessarily to be favored, and this is an example of a time when we should be a General Assembly, when we should be a little bit more tentative.

There is no reason for a great locomotion. There is no reason for pell-mell speed. We will realize the end of our deliberation sometime next week. It might take an additional day or so, but when you think about what is going to happen in our emergency rooms, when you think about what is going to happen to tens and tens of thousands of health-care workers and patients, when you think about all the hospitals that may be jeopardized, I think 1 extra day is what we are asking for. And this stratagem is in our rules; it is an appropriate mechanism that we should utilize.

Therefore, I would ask that Mr. Belfanti's appropriate motion be supported by not only Democrats but by all of us who would like an extra day to be involved in this debate. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—88

Battisto	DeWeese	Markosek	Scrimanti
Bebko-Jones	Donatucci	Mayernik	Shaner
Belardi	Evans	McCall	Staback
Belfanti	Fajt	McGeehan	Steelman
Bishop	Gordner	Melio	Stetler
Blaum	Gruitza	Michlovic	Sturla
Boscola	Haluska	Mundy	Surra
Butkovitz	Hanna	Myers	Tangretti
Buxton	Horsey	Olasz	Thomas
Caltagirone	Itkin	Oliver	Tigue
Cappabianca	James	Pesci	Travaglio
Carn	Jarolin	Petrarca	Trello
Carone	Josephs	Petrone	Trich
Cawley	Kaiser	Pistella	Van Horne
Cohen, M.	Keller	Readshaw	Veon
Colafiglia	Kirkland	Readshaw	Vitali
Colaizzo	Kukovich	Rieger	Walko
Corpora	Lederer	Roebuck	Washington
Cowell	Levdansky	Rooney	Williams
Curry	Lloyd	Rudy	Wozniak
DeLuca	Lucyk	Sainato	Yewcic
Dermody	Manderino	Santoni	Youngblood

NAYS-95

Adolph	Fargo	Lynch	Semmel
Allen	Feese	Maitland	Serafini
Argall	Fichter	Marsico	Sheehan
Armstrong	Fleagle	Masland	Smith, B.
Baker	Flick	McGill	Smith, S. H.
Bard	Gannon	Merry	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Geist	Miller	Stairs
Boyes	Godshall	Nailor	Steil
Brown	Gruppo	Nickol	Stern
Browne	Habay	Nyce	Stish
Bunt	Harhart	Perzel	Strittmatter
Chadwick	Hasay	Pettit	Taylor, E. Z.
Civera	Haste	Phillips	Taylor, J.
Clark	Hennessey	Pitts	True
Clymer	Herman	Platts	Tulli
Cohen, L. I.	Hershey	Raymond	Vance
Conti	Hess	Reber	Waugh
Cornell	Hutchinson	Reinard	Wogan
Dempsey	Jadlowiec	Rohrer	Wright, M. N.
Dent	Kenney	Rubley	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	King	Sather	Zug
Druce	Krebs	Saylor	
Durham	Lawless	Schroder	Ryan,
Egolf	Leh	Schuler	Speaker
Fairchild			

NOT VOTING-15

Barley	Gladeck	Major	Ramos
Coy	LaGrotta	Micozzie	Robinson
Gamble	Laughlin	O'Brien	Wright, D. R.
George	Lescovitz	Preston	

EXCUSED-5

Corrigan	Farmer	Gigliotti	Mihalich
Daley			

Less than the majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the motion was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. To the best of the Speaker's knowledge, there are no further votes today.

The Chair will now ask though, for the benefit of the members, the majority leader and the gentleman, Mr. DeWeese, if he is accurate in that remark or does anyone else have any motions that will require votes?

Hearing none, other than homework-type votes, the Chair advises the members of the House that no further votes will be taken at this time except the ordinary votes that the Chair handles in the course of closing down for the day.

There will be a token session tomorrow. I say again, there will be a token session tomorrow. You heard the debate on that subject.

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HB 2312, PN 3000 By Rep. PITTS

An Act amending the act of June 24, 1931 (P.L.1206, No.331), known as The First Class Township Code, further providing for contracts.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2313, PN 3001

By Rep. PITTS

An Act amending the act of February 1, 1966 (1965 P.L.1656, No.581), known as The Borough Code, further providing for contracts.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2314, PN 3002

By Rep. PITTS

An Act amending the act of May 1, 1933 (P.L.103, No.69), known as The Second Class Township Code, further providing for letting contracts.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2403, PN 3300 (Amended)

By Rep. PITTS

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for police animals; and providing penalties.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2494, PN 3301 (Amended)

By Rep. PITTS

An Act amending the act of October 27, 1955 (P.L.744, No.222), known as the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, defining "advertisement" and "advertiser"; and providing for certain forms of advertisement and for limitations.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 1441, PN 1832

By Rep. PITTS

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P. L. 31, No. 21), entitled "Public Welfare Code," further providing for legislative intent, for definitions, for uniform administration of assistance, for community work and training regulations, for work registration and for administrative duties and personal obligations; providing for grant diversion; further providing for special needs and self-sufficiency, for eligibility, for voluntary termination of employment, for identification and proof of residence, for limits on property holdings, for support from legally responsible relatives, for paternity determinations and support enforcement, for protective payments, for determination of need, for eligibility verification, for medical eligibility, for additional medical services and for penalties; providing for prescription drug benefits; and imposing duties upon the Department of Public Welfare.

APPROPRIATIONS.

BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

SB 790, PN 1856 (Amended) By Rep. GANNON

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for collection and payment of court costs and fines.

JUDICIARY.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Wogan.

Mr. WOGAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just to correct the record.

Yesterday on HB 2204, my switch did not engage. Had it engaged, I would have liked it to have engaged in an affirmative fashion.

The SPEAKER. On what bill?

Mr. WOGAN. HB 2204, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

**BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE,
CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED****HB 2439, PN 3197**

By Rep. CLYMER

An Act authorizing and directing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Governor and the Secretary of the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, to sell and convey to Mr. David B. and Mrs. Delphia Lohr, certain land situated in the Township of Lewis, Union County.

STATE GOVERNMENT.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. Does the Republican floor leader or the Democratic floor leader have any further business? Any announcements? Any corrections of the record?

Hearing none, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Horsey.

Mr. HORSEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, March 21, 1996, at 11:05 a.m., e.s.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to, and at 4:01 p.m., e.s.t., the House adjourned.