

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1997

SESSION OF 1997

181ST OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 51

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 10 a.m., e.d.t.

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

PRAYER

REV. LOUISE WILLIAMS BISHOP, member of the House of Representatives and guest Chaplain, offered the following prayer:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today we offer a very special prayer, and as we offer it, we offer it in memory of our fallen comrade, Herman Mihalich.

Dear God, Father of all mankind, creator of every living thing, and the sustainer of all life, how sweet and how wonderful it is for men and women to dwell together in Your presence. Thank You for Your presence. I express gratitude here in Your presence on behalf of all of my fellow comrades and colleagues who are saddened this morning by the passing of our comrade, Herman Mihalich, but we thank You for the gifts that You imparted with him and those that he has been able to share with us.

We take this opportunity, Father God, to thank You for some of the gifts that we sometimes take for granted – the gift of life, the gift of love, the gift of family, the gift of friends, and the gift of the constituency of this entire Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. You have allowed us to serve here. Thank You for that gift.

Some of us finish the work we come to do and some, like Herman, are called off the battlefield and out of the line of duty before the work is complete. But we thank You that even though he has been called out of the line of duty, You have allowed us always to be mindful of the fact that death is not the period that ends this great sentence of life, but rather, it is an exclamation point that punctuates it to a more lofty significance.

Thank You now as we draw to a close remembering that Herman really was a good soldier; he fought a good fight. Help us that our candles might be lit as we rededicate ourselves to the work that he left undone, the work that we, as fellow comrades, must finish. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Tuesday, September 30, 1997, will be postponed until printed. The Chair hears no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. For the information of the House, I have been asked several questions with respect to Mr. Mihalich's memorial service. We will have a memorial service of a sort that we ordinarily have one day next week here during session.

**THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
(J. SCOT CHADWICK) PRESIDING**

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 1826 By Representatives McILHATTAN, HERSHEY, FARGO, NICKOL, FICHTER, BARRAR, DEMPSEY, McNAUGHTON, PESCI, BROWN, GEIST, BELARDI, FLICK, RUBLEY, B. SMITH, ARGALL, FAIRCHILD, HESS, M. N. WRIGHT, BOSCOLA, SCHRODER, ROBERTS, ARMSTRONG, KENNEY, HUTCHINSON, SEMMEL, BENNINGHOFF, MAITLAND, C. WILLIAMS, PISTELLA, SEYFERT, SATHER, YOUNGBLOOD, SAYLOR, ROHRER, ROSS, CORRIGAN, STERN, EGOLF and RAMOS

An Act repealing the act of June 4, 1945 (P.L. 1191, No. 413), entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Post-War Planning Commission under certain conditions to enter into agreements with political subdivisions of this Commonwealth for the financing of plans and specifications for public works; and making an appropriation."

Referred to Committee on INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, October 1, 1997.

No. 1827 By Representatives McILHATTAN, HERSHEY, FARGO, NICKOL, FICHTER, BARRAR, DEMPSEY, McNAUGHTON, PESCI, BROWN, GEIST, BELARDI, FLICK, RUBLEY, B. SMITH, ARGALL, FAIRCHILD, HESS, M. N. WRIGHT, BOSCOLA, SCHRODER, ROBERTS, ARMSTRONG, KENNEY, HUTCHINSON, SEMMEL, BENNINGHOFF, MAITLAND, C. WILLIAMS, PISTELLA, SEYFERT, SATHER, YOUNGBLOOD, SAYLOR, ROHRER, ROSS, CORRIGAN, STERN and EGOLF

An Act repealing the act of May 14, 1874 (P.L.175, No.105), entitled "An act relating to accounts of the several county officers of this commonwealth."

Referred to Committee on INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, October 1, 1997.

No. 1828 By Representatives McILHATTAN, HERSHEY, FARGO, NICKOL, FICHTER, BARRAR, DEMPSEY, McNAUGHTON, PESCI, BROWN, GEIST, BELARDI, FLICK, RUBLEY, B. SMITH, ARGALL, FAIRCHILD, HESS, M. N. WRIGHT, BOSCOLA, SCHRODER, ROBERTS, ARMSTRONG, KENNEY, HUTCHINSON, SEMMEL, BENNINGHOFF, MAITLAND, C. WILLIAMS, PISTELLA, SEYFERT, SATHER, YOUNGBLOOD, SAYLOR, ROHRER, ROSS, CORRIGAN, STERN and EGOLF

An Act repealing the act of April 8, 1851 (P.L.353, No.227), entitled "An act relating to County Prisons, to the Foster Home Association, and Cawanesque Plank Road Company, to apportion the rent of wharves and docks in the port of Philadelphia, and relative to the service of process on foreign insurance companies and other corporations."

Referred to Committee on INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, October 1, 1997.

No. 1829 By Representatives McILHATTAN, HERSHEY, FARGO, NICKOL, FICHTER, BARRAR, DEMPSEY, McNAUGHTON, PESCI, BROWN, GEIST, BELARDI, FLICK, RUBLEY, B. SMITH, ARGALL, FAIRCHILD, HESS, M. N. WRIGHT, BOSCOLA, SCHRODER, ROBERTS, ARMSTRONG, KENNEY, HUTCHINSON, SEMMEL, BENNINGHOFF, MAITLAND, C. WILLIAMS, PISTELLA, SEYFERT, SATHER, YOUNGBLOOD, SAYLOR, ROHRER, ROSS, CORRIGAN, STERN, EGOLF and RAMOS

An Act repealing the act of June 19, 1941 (P.L.142, No.77), entitled "An act authorizing political subdivisions to appropriate money for participation in Federal Surplus Commodities Stamp plans; to borrow money and issue bonds for said purpose; providing for payment of such appropriations into a special fund in the State Treasury; appropriating the money in such fund, and authorizing the purchase of necessary insurance."

Referred to Committee on INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, October 1, 1997.

No. 1830 By Representatives SEYFERT, HERSHEY, FARGO, DEMPSEY, PESCI, PHILLIPS, McNAUGHTON, FICHTER, BROWN, NICKOL, GEIST, STERN, FLICK, BELARDI, CURRY, BARRAR, RUBLEY, ARGALL, HARHART, SCHRODER, B. SMITH, ROBERTS, M. N. WRIGHT, ARMSTRONG, BOSCOLA, E. Z. TAYLOR, HERMAN, FAIRCHILD, KENNEY, HUTCHINSON, SAYLOR, BELFANTI, BENNINGHOFF, SEMMEL, MAITLAND, C. WILLIAMS, PISTELLA, ROSS, STEELMAN, YOUNGBLOOD and EGOLF

An Act repealing the act of April 16, 1845 (P.L.532, No.348), entitled "An act to increase the revenues and diminish the legislative expenses of the commonwealth."

Referred to Committee on INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, October 1, 1997.

No. 1831 By Representatives SEYFERT, HERSHEY, FARGO, DEMPSEY, PESCI, PHILLIPS, McNAUGHTON, FICHTER, BROWN, NICKOL, GEIST, STERN, FLICK, BELARDI, CURRY, BARRAR, RUBLEY, ARGALL, HARHART, SCHRODER, B. SMITH, ROBERTS, M. N. WRIGHT, ARMSTRONG, BOSCOLA, E. Z. TAYLOR, HERMAN, FAIRCHILD, KENNEY, HUTCHINSON, SAYLOR, BELFANTI, BENNINGHOFF, SEMMEL, MAITLAND, C. WILLIAMS, PISTELLA, ROSS, STEELMAN, YOUNGBLOOD and EGOLF

An Act amending the act of October 11, 1984 (P.L.906, No.179), known as the Community Development Block Grant Entitlement Program for Nonurban Counties and Certain Other Municipalities, repealing the allocation mechanism.

Referred to Committee on INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, October 1, 1997.

No. 1832 By Representatives SEYFERT, HERSHEY, FARGO, DEMPSEY, PESCI, PHILLIPS, McNAUGHTON, FICHTER, BROWN, NICKOL, GEIST, STERN, FLICK, BELARDI, CURRY, BARRAR, RUBLEY, ARGALL, HARHART, SCHRODER, B. SMITH, ROBERTS, M. N. WRIGHT, ARMSTRONG, BOSCOLA, E. Z. TAYLOR, HERMAN, FAIRCHILD, KENNEY, HUTCHINSON, SAYLOR, BELFANTI, BENNINGHOFF, SEMMEL, MAITLAND, C. WILLIAMS, PISTELLA, ROSS, STEELMAN, YOUNGBLOOD and EGOLF

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, repealing certain agency duties of local officials.

Referred to Committee on INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, October 1, 1997.

No. 1833 By Representatives COLAFELLA, NAILOR, TRELLO, HALUSKA, BATTISTO, CASORIO, LEDERER, BELFANTI, ITKIN, C. WILLIAMS, STABACK, TRUE, READSHAW, TIGUE, SHANER, WALKO, MUNDY, MILLER, YOUNGBLOOD, SCHRODER, BOSCOLA, HENNESSEY, EGOLF, EACHUS, WOJNAROSKI, BENNINGHOFF, FEESE, McGEEHAN, B. SMITH, SATHER, ROONEY, McCALL, PRESTON, BELARDI, LUCYK, STEELMAN and KIRKLAND

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further limiting visitation rights of parents convicted of certain criminal activity.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, October 1, 1997.

No. 1834 By Representatives LAUGHLIN, SERAFINI, C. WILLIAMS, CIVERA, McCALL, BELARDI, ROONEY, BELFANTI, JADLOWIEC, SURRA, TRELLO, CORRIGAN, SAINATO, YOUNGBLOOD and SEYFERT

An Act amending the act of April 12, 1951 (P.L.90, No.21), known as the Liquor Code, further defining "restaurant."

Referred to Committee on LIQUOR CONTROL, October 1, 1997.

No. 1835 By Representatives SATHER, PHILLIPS, BLAUM, E. Z. TAYLOR, PISTELLA, HESS, BENNINGHOFF, HALUSKA, STERN, GEIST, TRELLO, ROSS, SAYLOR, BOSCOLA, BAKER, SEMMEL, HENNESSEY, YOUNGBLOOD and TIGUE

An Act amending Title 20 (Decedents, Estates and Fiduciaries) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for durable powers of attorney.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, October 1, 1997.

No. 1836 By Representatives STEVENSON, WAUGH, BELARDI, GRUPPO, MARSICO, STABACK, READSHAW, BAKER, C. WILLIAMS, ALLEN, McNAUGHTON, BARRAR, MELIO, HERSHEY, E. Z. TAYLOR, HORSEY, BROWN, BOSCOLA, DEMPSEY, ROSS, WALKO, B. SMITH, EGOLF, D. W. SNYDER, DALLY, GIGLIOTTI, THOMAS, YOUNGBLOOD and TRELLO

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for the offense of impersonating a law enforcement officer; and providing for suspension of operating privileges.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, October 1, 1997.

No. 1837 By Representatives LLOYD, NAILOR, GORDNER, SURRA, SANTONI, WAUGH, DeLUCA, LEDERER, READSHAW, MELIO, PESCI, MANDERINO, CURRY, LUCYK, BOSCOLA, JOSEPHS, WALKO, THOMAS, WOJNAROSKI, McCALL, CORPORA, BELFANTI, PISTELLA, YOUNGBLOOD, STEELMAN, RAMOS, CORRIGAN, MUNDY, SCRIMENTI, BELARDI, CAWLEY and ROONEY

An Act amending Title 66 (Public Utilities) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for the appointment of members to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission.

Referred to Committee on CONSUMER AFFAIRS, October 1, 1997.

No. 1838 By Representatives LLOYD, WAUGH, DeLUCA, SURRA, SANTONI, LEDERER, READSHAW, MELIO, PESCI, BARRAR, CURRY, VAN HORNE, LUCYK, BOSCOLA, JOSEPHS, WALKO, E. Z. TAYLOR, HERMAN, THOMAS, RAYMOND, McCALL, BENNINGHOFF, CORPORA, BELFANTI, PISTELLA, YOUNGBLOOD, STEELMAN, CORRIGAN, MUNDY, ORIE, BELARDI, CAWLEY, ROONEY and RAMOS

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for accident reports.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, October 1, 1997.

No. 1839 By Representatives LLOYD, RAYMOND, PESCI, PISTELLA, LEDERER, READSHAW, MELIO, DeLUCA, CASORIO, MANDERINO, CURRY, VAN HORNE, JOSEPHS, WALKO, THOMAS, MASLAND, BELFANTI, LEVDANSKY, KREBS, STEELMAN, ALLEN, CORRIGAN, MUNDY, ORIE, BELARDI, CAWLEY, ROONEY, WOJNAROSKI, RAMOS and BATTISTO

An Act amending the act of September 30, 1985 (P.L.240, No.61), known as the Turnpike Organization, Extension and Toll Road Conversion Act, further providing for legislative reports and performance audits.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, October 1, 1997.

No. 1840 By Representatives LLOYD, DeLUCA, STURLA, LEDERER, PESCI, CURRY, BOSCOLA, JOSEPHS, WALKO, BELFANTI, YOUNGBLOOD, STEELMAN, ALLEN, BELARDI, CAWLEY and RAMOS

An Act providing for drinking water fountains or other drinking water-dispensing apparatus in places or facilities where the public gathers.

Referred to Committee on LABOR RELATIONS, October 1, 1997.

No. 1841 By Representatives LLOYD, DeLUCA, SURRA, STURLA, SCHULER, LEDERER, READSHAW, MELIO, PESCI, BARRAR, CASORIO, CURRY, VAN HORNE, JOSEPHS, WALKO, HERMAN, THOMAS, RAYMOND, McCALL, PISTELLA, YOUNGBLOOD, STEELMAN, ALLEN, CORRIGAN, RAMOS, MUNDY, ORIE, BELARDI, CAWLEY, ROONEY, WOJNAROSKI and BATTISTO

An Act amending the act of March 11, 1971 (P.L.104, No.3), known as the Senior Citizens Rebate and Assistance Act, further providing for property tax assistance.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, October 1, 1997.

No. 1842 By Representatives LLOYD, ARGALL, McNAUGHTON, STURLA, SCHULER, GORDNER, SANTONI, LEDERER, READSHAW, PESCI, CURRY, VAN HORNE, WALKO, THOMAS, RAYMOND, McCALL, BELFANTI, LEVDANSKY, PISTELLA, YOUNGBLOOD, STEELMAN, BELARDI, CAWLEY, ROONEY, WOJNAROSKI, RAMOS and BATTISTO

An Act amending the act of July 2, 1993 (P.L.359, No.50), known as the Keystone Recreation, Park and Conservation Fund Act, further providing for allocation of State Realty Transfer Tax revenues.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, October 1, 1997.

No. 1843 By Representatives LLOYD, WAUGH, DeLUCA, McNAUGHTON, SURRA, SANTONI, LEDERER, MELIO, PESCI, BARRAR, MANDERINO, VAN HORNE, LUCYK, BOSCOLA, JOSEPHS, WALKO, THOMAS, RAYMOND, McCALL, CORPORA, BELFANTI, PISTELLA, YOUNGBLOOD, STEELMAN, CORRIGAN, ORIE, BELARDI, CAWLEY, ROONEY, RAMOS and BATTISTO

An Act providing for the cancellation of medicare supplement insurance policies.

Referred to Committee on INSURANCE, October 1, 1997.

No. 1844 By Representatives LLOYD, CLARK, MAITLAND, EACHUS, MELIO, PESCI, COLAIZZO, SHANER, ITKIN, LAUGHLIN, WALKO, DeLUCA, TRAVAGLIO, MILLER, BAKER, COY, MARKOSEK, BELFANTI, SEMMEL, LEVDANSKY, C. WILLIAMS, HENNESSEY, YOUNGBLOOD, OLASZ, CORRIGAN, MUNDY, SCRIMENTI, SATHER, SEYFERT, BUNT and RAMOS

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

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, October 1, 1997.

No. 1845 By Representative LLOYD

A Supplement to the act of (P.L. , No.), entitled "An act providing for the capital budget for the fiscal year 1997-1998," itemizing transportation assistance projects to be constructed or acquired or assisted by the Department of Transportation, together with their estimated financial costs; authorizing the incurring of debt without the approval of the electors for the purpose of financing the projects to be constructed or acquired or assisted by the Department of Transportation; stating the estimated useful life of the projects; authorizing certain waivers; and making an appropriation.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, October 1, 1997.

No. 1846 By Representatives McNAUGHTON, BELARDI, BELFANTI, HENNESSEY, ROBINSON, RUBLEY, E. Z. TAYLOR, MELIO, C. WILLIAMS, ROONEY, MCGILL and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, requiring dealers of firearms to install and operate burglar alarms.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, October 1, 1997.

No. 1847 By Representatives TRICH, NICKOL, HENNESSEY, SANTONI, VAN HORNE, VEON, WOGAN, MELIO, LAUGHLIN, HORSEY, READSHAW, SCRIMENTI, DALLY, BELARDI, WILT, STABACK, PISTELLA, ITKIN, RAMOS, BOSCOLA, GIGLIOTTI, SHANER, ROBERTS, YOUNGBLOOD, STEELMAN and TRELLO

An Act amending the act of April 12, 1951 (P.L.90, No.21), known as the Liquor Code, increasing the number of days in a calendar year for special wine permits.

Referred to Committee on LIQUOR CONTROL, October 1, 1997.

No. 1848 By Representatives STERN, HENNESSEY, ROONEY, PESCI, SAYLOR, TRELLO, DEMPSEY, HESS and VAN HORNE

An Act amending the act of November 26, 1982 (P.L.744, No.203), referred to as the Prothonotary Fee Law, increasing fees.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, October 1, 1997.

No. 1849 By Representatives WALKO, PETRONE, FEESE, CALTAGIRONE, WOJNAROSKI, M. COHEN, GODSHALL, ROBINSON, NAILOR, BUXTON, ARGALL, STABACK, CURRY, HERMAN, LESCOVITZ, MUNDY, C. WILLIAMS, READSHAW, BELARDI, RAMOS, MELIO, WAUGH, ADOLPH, SAYLOR, McNAUGHTON, GIGLIOTTI, WOGAN, EACHUS, CASORIO, BELFANTI, DONATUCCI, LEVDANSKY, J. TAYLOR, MCGEEHAN, TANGRETTI, YOUNGBLOOD, STEELMAN, TRELLO, FAIRCHILD and KIRKLAND

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further authorizing operating privilege suspension for certain offenses of scattering rubbish.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, October 1, 1997.

No. 1850 By Representatives WALKO, PETRONE, FEESE, CALTAGIRONE, WOJNAROSKI, M. COHEN, GODSHALL, ROBINSON, NAILOR, BUXTON, ARGALL, STABACK, CURRY, HERMAN, LESCOVITZ, MUNDY, C. WILLIAMS, READSHAW, BELARDI, RAMOS, MELIO, WAUGH, ADOLPH, SAYLOR, McNAUGHTON, GIGLIOTTI, WOGAN, EACHUS, CASORIO, BELFANTI, DONATUCCI, LEVDANSKY, J. TAYLOR, MCGEEHAN, TANGRETTI, YOUNGBLOOD, STEELMAN, TRELLO and KIRKLAND

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for offense of scattering rubbish.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, October 1, 1997.

No. 1851 By Representatives TRICH, ZUG, LaGROTTA, CIVERA, TANGRETTI, PRESTON, SEMMEL, MELIO, BELFANTI, OLASZ, BOSCOLA, EACHUS and TRELLO

An Act providing for responsibility for the payment of unpaid rent and other charges in manufactured housing communities; providing for notices; and further providing for repossession.

Referred to Committee on COMMERCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, October 1, 1997.

No. 1852 By Representatives LLOYD, DENT, SURRA, LEDERER, PESCI, WALKO, THOMAS, RAYMOND, BELFANTI, STEELMAN, BELARDI, CAWLEY and BATTISTO

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

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, October 1, 1997.

No. 1853 By Representatives READSHAW, TIGUE, HUTCHINSON, CAPPABIANCA, KAISER, MASLAND, SHANER, MARKOSEK, MAYERNIK, STEELMAN, CHADWICK, BENNINGHOFF, B. SMITH, BEBKO-JONES, HORSEY, PISTELLA, BELARDI, HERMAN, ROEBUCK, BAKER, BLAUM, CALTAGIRONE, STRITTMATTER, ITKIN, VAN HORNE, LAUGHLIN, COLAFELLA, OLASZ, C. WILLIAMS, WOJNAROSKI, SEYFERT, HALUSKA, BOSCOLA, PESCI, ORIE, JAMES and PIPPY

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for a Gettysburg Civil War memorial registration plate; and establishing the Pennsylvania Monuments at Gettysburg National Military Park Fund.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, October 1, 1997.

No. 1854 By Representatives McGEEHAN, CASORIO, COLAIZZO, KAISER, SANTONI, TIGUE, PESCI, BATTISTO, ROBERTS, STABACK, MANDERINO, LAUGHLIN, GEORGE, STEELMAN, WALKO, GEIST, KENNEY, DALEY, ITKIN, MASLAND, BARRAR, BARD, ARGALL, MUNDY, TANGRETTI, DeLUCA, HENNESSEY, ROONEY, BELARDI, WOJNAROSKI, TRELLO, BELFANTI, SCRIMENTI, DONATUCCI, RAMOS, YOUNGBLOOD, CIVERA, L. I. COHEN, STERN and LEDERER

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, further providing for investment of money.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, October 1, 1997.

No. 1855 By Representatives McGEEHAN, CASORIO, COLAIZZO, KAISER, SANTONI, TIGUE, PESCI, BATTISTO, ROBERTS, STABACK, MANDERINO, LAUGHLIN, GEORGE, STEELMAN, WALKO, GEIST, KENNEY, DALEY, ITKIN, MASLAND, BARRAR, BARD, ARGALL, MUNDY, TANGRETTI, DeLUCA, ROONEY, BELARDI, WOJNAROSKI, TRELLO, BELFANTI, SCRIMENTI, DONATUCCI, RAMOS, YOUNGBLOOD, CIVERA, L. I. COHEN, STERN and LEDERER

An Act amending the act of November 30, 1965 (P.L.847, No.356), known as the Banking Code of 1965, further providing for authorization to engage in banking.

Referred to Committee on COMMERCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, October 1, 1997.

No. 1856 By Representatives PRESTON, ORIE, MELIO, ROBINSON, C. WILLIAMS, ITKIN, BELARDI, LAUGHLIN, TRELLO, MAHER, BELFANTI, WALKO, YOUNGBLOOD, MANDERINO, PISTELLA, DeLUCA, VAN HORNE, KIRKLAND and THOMAS

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Public Welfare Code, further providing for eligibility.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, October 1, 1997.

No. 1857 By Representatives PRESTON, PISTELLA, BENNINGHOFF, E. Z. TAYLOR, KELLER, READSHAW, STABACK, DALEY, TRUE, STERN, PLATTS, EACHUS, MELIO, McGILL, SEYFERT and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for statutory sexual assault.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, October 1, 1997.

No. 1858 By Representatives PRESTON, LAUGHLIN, FAIRCHILD, DeWEESE, READSHAW, YOUNGBLOOD, OLASZ, M. N. WRIGHT, VAN HORNE, COLAFELLA, DALEY, TRELLO, ITKIN, JAMES, WALKO, WASHINGTON, KAISER, LEVDANSKY, PISTELLA, M. COHEN, CORRIGAN, MELIO, JOSEPHS and KIRKLAND

An Act amending Title 74 (Transportation) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, authorizing the incurring of indebtedness, with the approval of the electorate, for loans for port and waterways development; and creating the Pennsylvania Port Capital Loan Fund.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, October 1, 1997.

No. 1863 By Representatives READSHAW, MARKOSEK, COY, ARMSTRONG, SANTONI, LAUGHLIN, B. SMITH, MASLAND, BELARDI, MELIO, MAYERNIK, VAN HORNE, BOSCOLA, PESCI, ITKIN, DALEY, LUCYK, DeLUCA, FICHTER, YOUNGBLOOD, ROBINSON, L. I. COHEN, O'BRIEN, BARD, HABAY, GEORGE, GEIST, BAKER, HERMAN, ROONEY, McCALL, GODSHALL, TIGUE, BATTISTO, SHANER, KAISER, E. Z. TAYLOR, CORRIGAN, STABACK, DENT, TRELLO, SAINATO, ORIE, ROSS, BUNT, LEH, MICHLOVIC, ROEBUCK, STEVENSON, WALKO, FAIRCHILD, RUBLEY, GIGLIOTTI, CALTAGIRONE, ALLEN, OLASZ, NICKOL, LEDERER, WOJNAROSKI, PHILLIPS, PISTELLA, TULLI, HALUSKA, TRAVAGLIO, C. WILLIAMS, CIVERA, BELFANTI, CLYMER, PETRONE, MILLER, COLAFELLA, McGEEHAN and PIPPY

An Act amending Title 37 (Historical and Museums) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, establishing the Pennsylvania Military Monument Board within the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission; and making an appropriation.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, October 1, 1997.

HOUSE RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 253 By Representatives STAIRS, COWELL, DRUCE, FLEAGLE, HERMAN, STEVENSON, FLICK, SCHULER, SANTONI, BATTISTO, STEELMAN, STURLA, C. WILLIAMS,

ROBINSON, PLATTS, LESCOVITZ, COY, McNAUGHTON, BARRAR, DENT, GIGLIOTTI, WASHINGTON, PESCI, BELARDI, TIGUE, PRESTON, ROBERTS, WILT, MAITLAND, MAHER, MANDERINO, DEMPSEY, STABACK, BAKER, LAUGHLIN, PETRONE, PIPPY, WALKO, GEIST, ROSS, KENNEY, RUBLEY, B. SMITH, ITKIN, BARD, ARGALL, FICHTER, CALTAGIRONE, PISTELLA, VAN HORNE, MELIO, ORIE, DeLUCA, CAPPABIANCA, GODSHALL, ROONEY, RAYMOND, SATHER, L. I. COHEN, BEBKO-JONES, WOJNAROSKI, TRELLO, BELFANTI, HALUSKA, HERSHEY, DONATUCCI, YOUNGBLOOD, RAMOS, SHANER, M. COHEN, ALLEN, CIVERA, E. Z. TAYLOR, HORSEY, BROWNE, BENNINGHOFF and THOMAS

A Resolution directing the Department of Education to establish an "Adopt a Classroom Program."

Referred to Committee on RULES, October 1, 1997.

No. 254 By Representatives McGEEHAN, CAPPABIANCA, WOGAN, DALEY, BARRAR, J. TAYLOR, TRELLO and GIGLIOTTI

A Concurrent Resolution memorializing Congress to eliminate "Section 8 Housing" in the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Referred to Committee on INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, October 1, 1997.

No. 255 By Representatives ZUG, LYNCH, EGOLF, BARD, JAROLIN, E. Z. TAYLOR, JAMES, FARGO, HERMAN, STERN, L. I. COHEN, SEMMEL, BARRAR, PESCI, ROHRER, HERSHEY, MARSICO, READSHAW, KREBS, SAYLOR, FICHTER, C. WILLIAMS and HENNESSEY

A Concurrent Resolution to re-create a commission of public and private cost-minded leaders of this Commonwealth to study the management of current government operations and make recommendations of cost-cutting measures.

Referred to Committee on RULES, October 1, 1997.

BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

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

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that HB 1809 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

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

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that HB 1809 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

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

The Chair recognizes the majority whip, who indicates there are no requests for leaves of absence from the Republican side of the aisle.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Itkin, who requests a leave for today's session for the gentleman from Franklin County, Mr. COY, and the gentleman from Westmoreland County, Mr. VAN HORNE. Without objection, the leaves of absence will be granted. The Chair hears no objection, and the leaves are granted.

BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

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

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that HB 954 be removed from the table and placed on the active calendar.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

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

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that HB 954 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

MASTER ROLL CALL

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

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—200

Adolph	Donatucci	Maher	Saylor
Allen	Druce	Maitland	Schroder
Argall	Eachus	Major	Schuler
Armstrong	Egolf	Manderino	Scrimenti
Baker	Evans	Markosek	Semmel
Bard	Fairchild	Marsico	Serafini
Barley	Fargo	Masland	Seyfert
Barrar	Feese	Mayernik	Shaner
Battisto	Fichter	McCall	Smith, B.
Bebko-Jones	Fleagle	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belardi	Flick	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Belfanti	Gannon	McIlhattan	Staback
Benninghoff	Geist	McNaughton	Stairs

Birmelin	George	Melio	Steelman
Bishop	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Steil
Blaum	Gladeck	Micozzie	Stern
Boscola	Godshall	Miller	Stetler
Boyes	Gordner	Mundy	Stevenson
Brown	Gruitza	Myers	Strittmatter
Browne	Gruppo	Nailor	Sturla
Bunt	Habay	Nickol	Surra
Butkovitz	Haluska	O'Brien	Tangretti
Buxton	Hanna	Olasz	Taylor, E. Z.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Cappabianca	Hasay	Orie	Thomas
Carn	Hennessey	Perzel	Tigue
Carone	Herman	Pesci	Travaglio
Casorio	Hershey	Petrarca	Trello
Cawley	Hess	Petrone	Trich
Chadwick	Horsy	Phillips	True
Civera	Hutchinson	Pippy	Tulli
Clark	Itkin	Pistella	Vance
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Platts	Veon
Cohen, L. I.	James	Preston	Vitali
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Ramos	Waiko
Colafella	Josephs	Raymond	Washington
Colaizzo	Kaiser	Readshaw	Waugh
Conti	Keller	Reber	Williams, A. H.
Cornell	Kenney	Reinard	Williams, C.
Corpora	Kirkland	Rieger	Wilt
Corrigan	Krebs	Roberts	Wogan
Cowell	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wojnaroski
Curry	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dally	Lederer	Rooney	Youngblood
DeLuca	Leh	Ross	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Lescovitz	Rubley	Zug
Dent	Levdansky	Sainato	
Dermody	Lloyd	Santoni	Ryan,
DeWeese	Lucyk	Sather	Speaker
DiGirolamo	Lynch		

ADDITIONS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-2

Coy Van Horne

LEAVES ADDED-3

Olasz Petrarca Washington

CALENDAR

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mrs. COHEN called up HR 237, PN 2230, entitled:

A Resolution joining in the observance of the Great American Smokeout on November 20, 1997.

On the question, Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-200

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

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-2

Coy Van Horne

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

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. HR 238 will be over temporarily.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. HR 243 is over for the day.

Mr. DeLUCA called up HR 250, PN 2267, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing October 9, 1997, as National Depression Screening Day in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution ?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-199

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

NAYS-1

Levdansky

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-2

Coy

Van Horne

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

Mr. SCRIMENTI called up HR 251, PN 2268, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing October 7 as "Dairy Farmers Appreciation Day" in this Commonwealth.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution ?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-200

- | | | | |
|--------------|------------|------------|-----------------|
| Adolph | Donatucci | Maher | Saylor |
| Allen | Druce | Maitland | Schroder |
| Argall | Eachus | Major | Schuler |
| Armstrong | Egolf | Manderino | Scrimenti |
| Baker | Evans | Markosek | Semmel |
| Bard | Fairchild | Marsico | Serafini |
| Barley | Fargo | Masland | Seyfert |
| Barrar | Feese | Mayernik | Shaner |
| Battisto | Fichter | McCall | Smith, B. |
| Bebko-Jones | Fleagle | McGeehan | Smith, S. H. |
| Belardi | Flick | McGill | Snyder, D. W. |
| Belfanti | Gannon | McIlhattan | Staback |
| Benninghoff | Geist | McNaughton | Stairs |
| Birmelin | George | Melio | Steelman |
| Bishop | Gigliotti | Michlovic | Steil |
| Blaum | Gladeck | Micozzie | Stern |
| Boscola | Godshall | Miller | Stetler |
| Boyes | Gordner | Mundy | Stevenson |
| Brown | Gruitza | Myers | Strittmatter |
| Browne | Gruppo | Nailor | Sturla |
| Bunt | Habay | Nickol | Surra |
| Butkovitz | Haluska | O'Brien | Tangretti |
| Buxton | Hanna | Olasz | Taylor, E. Z. |
| Caltagirone | Harhart | Oliver | Taylor, J. |
| Cappabianca | Hasay | Orie | Thomas |
| Carn | Hennessey | Perzel | Tigue |
| Carone | Herman | Pesci | Travaglio |
| Casorio | Hershey | Petrarca | Trello |
| Cawley | Hess | Petrone | Trich |
| Chadwick | Horsey | Phillips | True |
| Civera | Hutchinson | Pippy | Tulli |
| Clark | Itkin | Pistella | Vance |
| Clymer | Jadlowiec | Platts | Veon |
| Cohen, L. I. | James | Preston | Vitali |
| Cohen, M. | Jarolin | Ramos | Walko |
| Colafrilla | Josephs | Raymond | Washington |
| Colaizzo | Kaiser | Readshaw | Waugh |
| Conti | Keller | Reber | Williams, A. H. |
| Cornell | Kenney | Reinard | Williams, C. |
| Corpora | Kirkland | Rieger | Wilt |
| Corrigan | Krebs | Roberts | Wogan |
| Cowell | LaGrotta | Robinson | Wojnaroski |
| Curry | Laughlin | Roebuck | Wright, M. N. |

Daley	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dally	Lederer	Rooney	Youngblood
DeLuca	Leh	Ross	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Lescovitz	Rublely	Zug
Dent	Levdansky	Sainato	
Dermody	Lloyd	Santoni	Ryan,
DeWeese	Lucyk	Sather	Speaker
DiGirolamo	Lynch		

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-2

Coy	Van Horne
-----	-----------

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

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Levdansky, who indicates that on HR 250 he was recorded in the negative and intended to be recorded in the positive. The Chair thanks the gentleman, and the gentleman's remarks will be spread upon the record.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair returns to leaves of absence and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Itkin, who requests a leave for the balance of the day's session for the gentleman from Westmoreland County, Mr. PETRARCA. The Chair hears no objection, and the leave is granted.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to take this opportunity to welcome a group of students from Messiah College who are visiting with us today. They are here as guests of Representative Jerry Nailor, and they are located in the balcony. Would they please rise. Welcome to the hall of the House.

RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mrs. COHEN called up HR 238, PN 2231, entitled:

A Resolution commending the Governor for proclaiming the month of October 1997 as "Breast Cancer Awareness Month" and October 17, 1997, as "National Mammography Day" in this Commonwealth and urging all citizens of this Commonwealth to join in its observance by renewing their awareness of breast cancer and by becoming knowledgeable about the most current medical developments regarding this tragic disease.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution ?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the Chair recognizes the lady from Montgomery County, Representative Cohen.

Mrs. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I do not usually speak on resolutions, and as you know, every year during the month of October, I present this resolution to the House to be adopted. This year I am obviously presenting this resolution again because I believe that every year we must remind ourselves and our constituents of the importance of mammography and the importance of doing everything we can to prevent and to treat breast cancer and to cure this terrible disease, because it does affect all of us.

This year, however, Mr. Speaker, I am dedicating the resolution to my friend, Elaine Ominsky, who died recently. She was a 10-year survivor of breast cancer, but more importantly, she was a leader in the fight to cure this disease and to make people aware of how important it is to have mammograms and to prevent this disease. She was an incredibly brave woman who struggled not only with her own illness and that of her mother's but, indeed, raised the awareness of people when she wrote the book dedicated to her son, Jon, who has Down's syndrome. She was a model for all of us to emulate, and I am dedicating this year's resolution to Elaine Ominsky. I believe that everyone has a copy of the obituary that appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer acknowledging her bravery and her courage.

I urge everyone to please support this resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-199

Adolph	Donatucci	Lynch	Saylor
Allen	Druce	Maher	Schroder
Argall	Eachus	Maitland	Schuler
Armstrong	Egolf	Major	Scrimenti
Baker	Evans	Manderino	Semmel
Bard	Fairchild	Markosek	Serafini
Barley	Fargo	Marsico	Seyfert
Barrar	Feese	Masland	Shaner
Battisto	Fichter	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Bebko-Jones	Fleagle	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Belardi	Flick	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Belfanti	Gannon	McGill	Staback
Benninghoff	Geist	McIlhattan	Stairs
Birmelin	George	McNaughton	Steelman
Bishop	Gigliotti	Melio	Steil
Blaum	Gladeck	Michlovic	Stern
Boscota	Godshall	Micozzie	Stetler
Boyes	Gordner	Miller	Stevenson
Brown	Gruitza	Mundy	Strittmatter
Browne	Gruppo	Myers	Sturla
Bunt	Habay	Nailor	Surra
Butkovitz	Haluska	Nickol	Tangretti
Buxton	Hanna	O'Brien	Taylor, E. Z.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Olasz	Taylor, J.
Cappabianca	Hasay	Oliver	Thomas
Carn	Hennessey	Orie	Tigue
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Travaglio
Casorio	Hershey	Pesci	Trello
Cawley	Hess	Petrone	Trich
Chadwick	Horsey	Phillips	True
Civera	Hutchinson	Pippy	Tulli

Clark	Itkin	Pistella	Vance
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Platts	Veon
Cohen, L. I.	James	Preston	Vitali
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Ramos	Walko
Colafrilla	Josephs	Raymond	Washington
Colaizzo	Kaiser	Readshaw	Waugh
Conti	Keller	Reber	Williams, A. H.
Cornell	Kenney	Reinard	Williams, C.
Corpora	Kirkland	Rieger	Wilt
Corrigan	Krebs	Roberts	Wogan
Cowell	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wojnaroski
Curry	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dally	Lederer	Rooney	Youngblood
DeLuca	Leh	Ross	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Lescovitz	Rubley	Zug
Dent	Levdansky	Sainato	
Dermody	Lloyd	Santoni	Ryan,
DeWeese	Lucyk	Sather	Speaker
DiGirolamo			

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-3

Coy Petrarca Van Horne

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

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

STATEMENT BY MR. OLASZ

The SPEAKER. Mr. Olasz.

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

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

Mr. OLASZ. A clarification on the problems with the auto emissions inspection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

Will the House please come to order; will the House please come to order.

Mr. Olasz.

Mr. OLASZ. For a clarification of a problem that has arisen from the emissions testing, Mr. Speaker, and make the members aware of it.

Mr. Speaker, it was approximately 2½ weeks ago that the State finally approved the software for the machines. The software has been slow in coming in, and as a result of this, my district and I am certain that many other district offices are going to be deluged with telephone calls, and they have not had time to set up the software for approximately 480 machines.

What I am concerned about, that hot line, the consumer hot line that they have given out, when people are calling them, they are telling them, call your legislators. That statement should be corrected, Mr. Speaker, because as you know and everyone here

knows, we had no control over that software. So if you can get in touch with—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

I think that the gentleman, Mr. Olasz, is offering the membership some good advice and we should listen.

Mr. Olasz.

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

That hot-line number that they are giving out is 1-800-265-0921, and you should contact your district office and tell them, hey, the legislature has no control over it. It is the fact that the State did not approve that software until about 2½ weeks ago, and it takes time to set those up.

So that is the purpose of my inquiry, special privilege, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that someone can get ahold of PennDOT to correct that erroneous message. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 188, PN 1348**, entitled:

A Supplement to the act of July 11, 1996 (P.L.595, No.101), entitled Capital Budget Project Itemization Act for 1996-1997, itemizing public improvement projects, furniture and equipment projects, transportation assistance projects, redevelopment assistance and redevelopment assistance capital projects, flood control projects, Keystone Recreation, Park and Conservation projects and forestry bridge projects to be constructed or acquired or assisted by the Department of General Services, the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, the Department of Environmental Protection, the Department of Community and Economic Development, the Department of Transportation, the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission or the Pennsylvania Game Commission, together with their estimated financial costs; authorizing the incurring of debt without the approval of the electors for the purpose of financing the projects to be constructed or acquired or assisted by the Department of General Services, the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, the Department of Environmental Protection, the Department of Community and Economic Development or the Department of Transportation; stating the estimated useful life of the projects; authorizing certain waivers; making appropriations; and making repeals.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration ?

RULES SUSPENDED

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Barley. The Chair has listed certain amendments that require a suspension of the rules. It is my understanding that you wish to be recognized in connection with this ?

Mr. BARLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, that is correct.

I would like to move that we suspend the rules for the consideration of actually five amendments, and I will list them by number. It is necessary for a variety of reasons. Initially, amendment 3829 is a technical amendment that changes some language only; absolutely no fiscal impact. It is a technical language change. There are four additional amendments that I am suggesting that we suspend the rules for: 3837, 3836, 3826, and 3827.

Again, by way of brief explanation, they are amendments that various members submitted after the deadline for printing. We are simply accommodating – and they are from members on both sides of the aisle – we are simply accommodating the members who for various reasons missed the cutoff for the original printing of the bill.

So I move that we suspend the rules for consideration of these five amendments only.

The SPEAKER. It is my understanding that the gentleman, Mr. Barley, moves to suspend the rules to consider SB 188, PN 1348, together with the Veon amendment, 3829; the Daley amendment, 3836; the Cowell amendment, 3837; the Lynch amendment, 3826; and the Youngblood amendment, 3827. Is that accurate?

Mr. BARLEY. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. And only those amendments?

Mr. BARLEY. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. On the question of suspension of the rules, the gentleman, Mr. Evans.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to support what the chairman of Appropriations said relating to those five amendments. I would ask that the members would support his recommendation. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-194

Adolph	Donatucci	Lynch	Saylor
Allen	Druce	Maher	Schroder
Argall	Eachus	Maitland	Schuler
Armstrong	Egolf	Major	Scrimenti
Baker	Evans	Manderino	Semmel
Bard	Fairchild	Markosek	Serafini
Barley	Fargo	Marsico	Seyfert
Barrar	Feese	Masland	Shaner
Battisto	Fichter	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Bebko-Jones	Fleagle	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Belardi	Flick	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Belfanti	Gannon	McGill	Staback
Benninghoff	Geist	McIlhattan	Stairs
Birmelin	George	McNaughton	Steil
Bishop	Gigliotti	Melio	Stern
Blaum	Gladeck	Michlovic	Stetler
Boscola	Godshall	Micozzie	Stevenson
Boyes	Gordner	Miller	Strittmatter
Brown	Gruitza	Mundy	Sturla
Browne	Gruppo	Myers	Surra
Bunt	Habay	Nailor	Tangretti
Butkovitz	Haluska	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Hanna	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Olasz	Thomas
Cappabianca	Hasay	Oliver	Tigue
Carn	Hennessey	Orie	Travaglio
Cawley	Herman	Perzel	Trello
Chadwick	Hershey	Pesci	Trich
Civera	Hess	Petrone	True

Clark	Horsey	Phillips	Tulli
Clymer	Hutchinson	Pippy	Vance
Cohen, L. I.	Itkin	Pistella	Veon
Cohen, M.	Jadlowiec	Platts	Vitali
Colafilella	James	Preston	Walko
Colaizzo	Jarolin	Ramos	Washington
Conti	Josephs	Raymond	Waugh
Cornell	Kaiser	Readshaw	Williams, A. H.
Corpora	Keller	Reber	Williams, C.
Corrigan	Kenney	Reinard	Wilt
Cowell	Kirkland	Rieger	Wogan
Curry	LaGrotta	Roberts	Wojnaroski
Daley	Laughlin	Robinson	Wright, M. N.
Dally	Lawless	Roebuck	Yewcic
DeLuca	Lederer	Rohrer	Youngblood
Dempsey	Leh	Rooney	Zimmerman
Dent	Lescovitz	Ross	Zug
Dermody	Levdansky	Rublely	
DeWeese	Lloyd	Sainato	Ryan,
DiGirolamo	Lucyk	Santoni	Speaker

NAYS-5

Carone	Krebs	Sather	Steelman
Casorio			

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-3

Coy	Petrarca	Van Horne
-----	----------	-----------

A majority of the members required by the rules having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the motion was agreed to.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. VEON offered the following amendment No. A3829:

Amend Sec. 3, page 14, line 14, by striking out all of said line and inserting

Western Pennsylvania

Amend Sec. 3, page 14, lines 16 and 17, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

institution within a 50-mile radius of the existing institution with capacity of

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. VEON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, amendment 3829 would change the capital budget in this way: The original capital budget bill allocated money for the construction of a new State prison in western Pennsylvania. In fact, the original language in the capital budget bill said that the facility could be located anywhere within 50 miles of the existing State correctional facility.

The bill was amended in the Appropriations Committee to restrict the location of that State prison to the county of Allegheny only. My amendment would restore the original language, which

states that the new State prison would be able to be located within 50 miles of the existing State correctional facility.

I would ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Mr. Walko.

Mr. WALKO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to the Veon amendment.

It is clear that we need more prison space in Pennsylvania. We are 54 percent over capacity right now. Even at Western Penitentiary in Pittsburgh, we are 600 inmates over capacity.

I do support the capital budget line item which would provide for an additional maximum security facility to be built in western Pennsylvania, specifically in Allegheny County. However, there are a couple of points: First of all, I do not support it in lieu of Western Penitentiary. We must keep that facility.

Secondly, this amendment would remove Western Penitentiary from Allegheny County, and that could have devastating impact on the already tenuous economy of the city of Pittsburgh.

There are many good, solid family-sustaining jobs at Western Penitentiary, and to take those out into the hinterlands somewhere to some rural setting would make it extremely difficult for the guards and the other workers at the facility to get to their places of employment. It would take it out of the realm of public transportation. I do therefore oppose this amendment.

I would also add that for the sake of the families of prisoners, many of whom themselves are innocent victims of crime, to move it out from the center, out from Allegheny County, would make it extremely difficult for them to visit the inmates.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for a negative vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Barley.

Mr. BARLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand to support the amendment. I think this amendment is about fairness, and I would urge all members to vote in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Colafella.

Mr. COLAFELLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Veon amendment.

I think that the State should locate a prison where it is best suited, where it makes most sense, and where it is best for the taxpayers of Pennsylvania, and to limit it to just one area is unfair and it makes no sense.

Therefore, I request your support for the Veon amendment.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Veon.

Mr. VEON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my good friend, the gentleman from the North Side of Pittsburgh, this amendment does not restrict the potential location of this prison from where it stands right now today. It does not restrict it from being placed 100 yards from where it is today. All it does is give the decisionmaking authority to the Governor to locate it somewhere within the 50 miles. That was in the original bill. I think that that makes sense for the location. Everybody can make their case about where the prison ought to go within that 50-mile radius, including the gentleman from the North Side.

So I think this amendment makes sense, and again I would ask for an affirmative vote.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—172

Adolph	Dent	Levdansky	Schuler
Allen	DeWeese	Lucyk	Scrimenti
Argall	DiGirolamo	Lynch	Semmel
Armstrong	Donatucci	Maitland	Serafini
Baker	Druce	Major	Seyfert
Bard	Egolf	Manderino	Shaner
Barley	Evans	Marsico	Smith, B.
Barrar	Fairchild	Masland	Smith, S. H.
Battisto	Fargo	McCall	Snyder, D. W.
Bebko-Jones	Feese	McGeehan	Staback
Belardi	Fichter	McGill	Stairs
Belfanti	Fleagle	McIlhattan	Steelman
Benninghoff	Flick	McNaughton	Steil
Birmelin	Gannon	Melio	Stern
Bishop	Geist	Micozzie	Stetler
Blaum	George	Miller	Strittmatter
Boscola	Gladeck	Mundy	Surra
Boyes	Godshall	Myers	Tangretti
Brown	Gordner	Nailor	Taylor, E. Z.
Browne	Gruitza	Nickol	Taylor, J.
Bunt	Gruppo	O'Brien	Thomas
Butkovitz	Haluska	Oliver	Tiguc
Buxton	Harhart	Perzel	Travaglio
Caltagirone	Hasay	Pesci	Trich
Cappabianca	Hennessey	Phillips	True
Cam	Herman	Platts	Tulli
Carone	Hershey	Preston	Vance
Casorio	Hess	Ramos	Veon
Cawley	Hutchinson	Raymond	Vitali
Chadwick	Itkin	Reber	Washington
Civera	Jadlowiec	Reinard	Waugh
Clark	James	Rieger	Williams, A. H.
Clymer	Jarolin	Roberts	Williams, C.
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Roebuck	Wilt
Colafella	Keller	Rohrer	Wogan
Colaizzo	Kenney	Rooney	Wright, M. N.
Conti	Kirkland	Ross	Yewcic
Cornell	Krebs	Rubley	Youngblood
Corpora	LaGrotta	Sainato	Zimmerman
Corrigan	Laughlin	Santoni	Zug
Curry	Lawless	Sather	
Daley	Lederer	Saylor	Ryan, Speaker
Dally	Leh	Schroder	
Dempsey	Lescovitz		

NAYS—27

Cohen, L. I.	Hanna	Michlovic	Robinson
Cowell	Horse	Olasz	Stevenson
DeLuca	Kaiser	Orie	Sturla
Dermody	Lloyd	Petrone	Trello
Eachus	Maher	Pippy	Walko
Gigliotti	Markosek	Pistella	Wojnaroski
Habay	Mayernik	Readshaw	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Coy	Petrarca	Van Horne
-----	----------	-----------

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. DALEY offered the following amendment No. A3836:

Amend Sec. 3, page 45, by inserting between lines 9 and 10
(H) Construction of a new dormitory 10,000,000

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

The SPEAKER. On the question of the adoption of the Daley amendment, the gentleman, Mr. Daley, is recognized.

Mr. DALEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment amends SB 188, PN 1348, by including the construction of a new dormitory on the campus of California University in the amount of \$10 million.

I ask for an affirmative vote, Mr. Speaker. 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-199

Adolph	Donatucci	Lynch	Saylor
Allen	Druce	Maher	Schroder
Argall	Eachus	Maitland	Schuler
Armstrong	Egolf	Major	Scrimenti
Baker	Evans	Manderino	Semmel
Bard	Fairchild	Markosek	Serafini
Barley	Fargo	Marsico	Seyfert
Barrar	Feese	Masland	Shaner
Battisto	Fichter	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Bebko-Jones	Fleagle	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Belardi	Flick	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Belfanti	Gannon	McGill	Staback
Benninghoff	Geist	McIlhattan	Stairs
Birmelin	George	McNaughton	Steelman
Bishop	Gigliotti	Melio	Steil
Blaum	Gladeck	Michlovic	Stern
Boscola	Godshall	Micozzie	Stetler
Boyes	Gordner	Miller	Stevenson
Brown	Gruitza	Mundy	Strittmatter
Browne	Gruppo	Myers	Sturla
Bunt	Habay	Nailor	Surra
Butkovitz	Haluska	Nickol	Tangretti
Buxton	Hanna	O'Brien	Taylor, E. Z.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Olasz	Taylor, J.
Cappabianca	Hasay	Oliver	Thomas
Carn	Hennessey	Orie	Tigue
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Travaglio
Casorio	Hershey	Pesci	Trello
Cawley	Hess	Petrone	Trich
Chadwick	Horsey	Phillips	True
Civera	Hutchinson	Pippy	Tulli
Clark	Itkin	Pistella	Vance
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Platts	Veon
Cohen, L. I.	James	Preston	Vitali
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Ramos	Walko
Colaifella	Josephs	Raymond	Washington
Colaizzo	Kaiser	Readshaw	Waugh
Conti	Keller	Reber	Williams, A. H.
Cornell	Kenney	Reinard	Williams, C.
Corpora	Kirkland	Rieger	Wilt
Corrigan	Krebs	Roberts	Wogan
Cowell	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wojnaroski
Curry	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dally	Lederer	Rooney	Youngblood
DeLuca	Leh	Ross	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Lescovitz	Rubley	Zug

Dent	Levdansky	Sainato	
Dermody	Lloyd	Santoni	Ryan,
DeWeese	Lucyk	Sather	Speaker
DiGirolamo			

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-3

Coy	Petrarca	Van Horne
-----	----------	-----------

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. COWELL offered the following amendment No. A3837:

Amend Sec. 5, page 71, by inserting between lines 23 and 24
(xxv) East Busway Extension Liner Park 6,000,000
Amend Sec. 6, page 106, by inserting between lines 25 and 26
(Z) Acquisition of property and
development costs for Museum
of Broadcasting 1,000,000

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

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

Mr. COWELL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, amendment 3837 reflects two line items that would be added to the capital budget. The first is a \$6-million item for the East Busway Extension Linear Park, and it should read "Linear" rather than "Liner." That is a park proposed to be developed in conjunction with the expansion of the East Busway in Allegheny County.

The second is \$1 million for acquisition of property and development costs for a proposed Museum of Broadcasting that would be located in the home of radio in this world, and that is Allegheny County.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask for agreement to the amendment.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-199

Adolph	Donatucci	Lynch	Saylor
Allen	Druce	Maher	Schroder
Argall	Eachus	Maitland	Schuler
Armstrong	Egolf	Major	Scrimenti
Baker	Evans	Manderino	Semmel
Bard	Fairchild	Markosek	Serafini

Barley	Fargo	Marsico	Seyfert
Barrar	Feese	Masland	Shaner
Battisto	Fichter	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Bebko-Jones	Fleagle	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Belardi	Flick	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Belfanti	Gannon	McGill	Staback
Benninghoff	Geist	McIlhattan	Stairs
Birmelin	George	McNaughton	Steelman
Bishop	Gigliotti	Melio	Steil
Blaum	Gladeck	Michlovic	Stern
Boscola	Godshall	Micozzie	Stetler
Boyes	Gordner	Miller	Stevenson
Brown	Gruitza	Mundy	Strittmatter
Browne	Gruppo	Myers	Sturla
Bunt	Habay	Nailor	Surra
Butkovitz	Hafuska	Nickol	Tangretti
Buxton	Hanna	O'Brien	Taylor, E. Z.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Olasz	Taylor, J.
Cappabianca	Hasay	Oliver	Thomas
Cam	Hennessey	Orie	Tigue
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Travaglio
Casorio	Hershey	Pesci	Trello
Cawley	Hess	Petrone	Trich
Chadwick	Horsey	Phillips	True
Civera	Hutchinson	Pippy	Tulli
Clark	Itkin	Pistella	Vance
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Platts	Veon
Cohen, L. I.	James	Preston	Vitali
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Ramos	Walko
Colafella	Josephs	Raymond	Washington
Colaizzo	Kaiser	Readshaw	Waugh
Conti	Keller	Reber	Williams, A. H.
Cornell	Kenney	Reinard	Williams, C.
Corpora	Kirkland	Rieger	Wilt
Corrigan	Krebs	Roberts	Wogan
Cowell	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wojnaroski
Curry	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dally	Lederer	Rooney	Youngblood
DeLuca	Leh	Ross	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Lescovitz	Rubley	Zug
Dent	Levdansky	Sainato	
Dermody	Lloyd	Santoni	Ryan,
DeWeese	Lucyk	Sather	Speaker
DiGirolamo			

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-3

Coy	Petrarca	Van Home
-----	----------	----------

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. LYNCH offered the following amendment No. A3826:

Amend Sec. 8, page 149, by inserting between lines 25 and 26
(xxvi) Warren County
(A) Development of the riverfront in
Warren County 500,000

Amend Sec. 8, page 149, line 26, by striking out "(XXVI)" and inserting
(xxvii)
Amend Sec. 8, page 149, line 30, by striking out "(XXVII)" and inserting
(xxviii)
Amend Sec. 8, page 150, line 6, by striking out "(XXVIII)" and inserting
(xxix)

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

VOTE STRICKEN

The SPEAKER. Mr. Gigliotti, do you desire recognition on the question of the amendment?

Mr. GIGLIOTTI. Yes. I would like to have an explanation of the amendment, please, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Strike the board.

Mr. Lynch, the gentleman, Mr. Gigliotti, would like you to briefly explain the amendment.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the reason this is in here is because when I provided my wish list, as everybody else had the opportunity to do, the Legislative Reference Bureau omitted this one. Okay?

Mr. GIGLIOTTI. What does it do?

Mr. LYNCH. The Allegheny River runs through — it has nothing to do with gambling — the Allegheny River runs through downtown Warren, the city of Warren in the county of Warren, and—

Mr. GIGLIOTTI. I just have one question: This does not eliminate the \$75 million in for Three Rivers Stadium?

Mr. LYNCH. Pardon me?

Mr. GIGLIOTTI. This amendment does not remove the \$75 million in for Three Rivers Stadium?

Mr. LYNCH. No, Mr. Speaker; no. It is \$500,000—

Mr. GIGLIOTTI. That is all I care about. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-199

Adolph	Donatucci	Lynch	Saylor
Allen	Druce	Maher	Schroder
Argall	Eachus	Maitland	Schuler
Armstrong	Egolf	Major	Scrimenti
Baker	Evans	Manderino	Semmel
Bard	Fairchild	Markosek	Serafini
Barley	Fargo	Marsico	Seyfert
Barrar	Feese	Masland	Shaner
Battisto	Fichter	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Bebko-Jones	Fleagle	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Belardi	Flick	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Belfanti	Gannon	McGill	Staback
Benninghoff	Geist	McIlhattan	Stairs
Birmelin	George	McNaughton	Steelman

Bishop	Gigliotti	Melio	Steil
Blaum	Gladeck	Michlovic	Stern
Boscola	Godshall	Micozzie	Stetler
Boyes	Gordner	Miller	Stevenson
Brown	Gruitza	Mundy	Stritmatter
Browne	Gruppo	Myers	Sturla
Bunt	Habay	Nailor	Surra
Butkovitz	Haluska	Nickol	Tangretti
Buxton	Hanna	O'Brien	Taylor, E. Z.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Olasz	Taylor, J.
Cappabianca	Hasay	Oliver	Thomas
Carn	Hennessey	Orie	Tigue
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Travaglio
Casorio	Hershey	Pesci	Trello
Cawley	Hess	Petrone	Trich
Chadwick	Horsey	Phillips	True
Civera	Hutchinson	Pippy	Tulli
Clark	Itkin	Pistella	Vance
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Platts	Veon
Cohen, L. I.	James	Preston	Vitali
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Ramos	Walko
Colaifella	Josephs	Raymond	Washington
Colaizzo	Kaiser	Readshaw	Waugh
Conti	Keller	Reber	Williams, A. H.
Cornell	Kenney	Reinard	Williams, C.
Corpora	Kirkland	Rieger	Wilt
Corrigan	Krebs	Roberts	Wogan
Cowell	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wojnaroski
Curry	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dally	Lederer	Rooney	Youngblood
DeLuca	Leh	Ross	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Lescovitz	Rubley	Zug
Dent	Levdansky	Sainato	
Dermody	Lloyd	Santoni	Ryan,
DeWeese	Lucyk	Sather	Speaker
DiGiroIamo			

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-3

Coy	Petrarca	Van Horne
-----	----------	-----------

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?

Ms. **YOUNGBLOOD** offered the following amendment No. **A3827**:

- Amend Sec. 3, page 44, by inserting between lines 10 and 11
- (xi) Eastern Pennsylvania Psychiatric Institute
 - (A) Upgrade of patient units to come into code compliance and general improvements 5,500,000
 - (B) Renovations and improvements to heating, ventilation and air conditioning system 2,500,000
 - (C) Building envelope repairs and window replacement 2,000,000

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 lady from Philadelphia.

Ms. **YOUNGBLOOD**. Mr. Speaker, amendment A3827 amends SB 188, PN 1348.

The amendment is for the Eastern Pennsylvania Psychiatric Institute: upgrade of patient units to come into code compliance and general improvements, \$5,500,000; renovations and improvements to the heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning system, \$2,500,000; building repairs and window replacements for \$2 million.

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-199

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

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Coy Petrarca Van Horne

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?

The SPEAKER. Are there any further amendments?
The Speaker has no further amendments.

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Fairchild.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have an amendment that I would like to introduce, and I realize that I would need to suspend the rules. The amendment that I would like to suspend the rules for is to eliminate the items in the capital budget which fund professional sports stadiums.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman, Mr. Fairchild, come to the desk. Will the gentleman, Mr. Evans, come to the desk.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

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

Will the gentleman yield for a moment.

Conversations on the floor, particularly in the vicinity of the gentleman, Mr. Fairchild, please cease.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

Conferences on the floor, please cease. Thank you.

Mr. Fairchild.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to request the suspension of the rules to introduce an amendment, No. 3855, to eliminate from the capital budget the authorization to spend approximately \$373 million of our taxpayers' dollars for the construction of sports stadiums in the Commonwealth. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Now, this is a question of suspension. It is debatable only by the floor leaders.

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. I would ask that the floor leader on the Republican side respond to interrogation on this.

The SPEAKER. You do not desire to be recognized?

Mr. DeWEESE. Yes, sir, I do.

The SPEAKER. I have recognized you.

Mr. DeWEESE. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Philadelphia, the majority leader, respond to interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Mr. Perzel?

Mr. DeWEESE. My interrogatory would simply be, does the gentleman from Philadelphia support the concept averred by Mr. Fairchild?

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, the simple answer would be no.
Mr. DeWEESE. I would concur and ask for a negative vote.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—81

Armstrong	Eachus	Lynch	Schuler
Baker	Egolf	Maher	Semmel
Barrar	Fairchild	Marsico	Shaner
Belardi	Fichter	Masland	Steelman
Belfanti	George	McCall	Steil
Birmelin	Gordner	McGeehan	Stetler
Boscola	Habay	McNaughton	Stevenson
Boyes	Hanna	Melio	Sturla
Browne	Harhart	Mundy	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Hasay	Nailor	Travaglio
Cappabianca	Hennessey	Orie	True
Carone	Kirkland	Pippy	Tulli
Clark	Krebs	Platts	Vance
Clymer	LaGrotta	Reber	Vitali
Cohen, L. I.	Lawless	Reinard	Waugh
Conti	Leh	Robinson	Wilt
Corpora	Lescovitz	Rohrer	Wogan
Corrigan	Levdansky	Ross	Wright, M. N.
Curry	Lloyd	Rubley	Yewcic
Dally	Lucyk	Sainato	Zimmerman
Dent			

NAYS—117

Adolph	Druce	Major	Schroder
Allen	Evans	Manderino	Scrimenti
Argall	Fargo	Markosek	Serafini
Bard	Feese	Mayernik	Seyfert
Barley	Fleagle	McGill	Smith, B.
Battisto	Flick	Mcllhattan	Smith, S. H.
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	Michlovic	Snyder, D. W.
Benninghoff	Geist	Micozzie	Staback
Bishop	Gigliotti	Miller	Stairs
Blaum	Gladeck	Myers	Stern
Brown	Godshall	Nickol	Strittmatter
Bunt	Gruitza	O'Brien	Surra
Butkovitz	Gruppo	Olasz	Tangretti
Carn	Haluska	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Casorio	Herman	Perzel	Thomas
Cawley	Hershey	Pesci	Tigue
Chadwick	Hess	Petrone	Trello
Civera	Horsey	Phillips	Trich
Cohen, M.	Hutchinson	Pistella	Veon
Colafiglia	Itkin	Preston	Walko
Colaizzo	Jadlowiec	Ramos	Washington
Cornell	James	Raymond	Williams, A. H.
Cowell	Jarolin	Readshaw	Williams, C.
Daley	Josephs	Rieger	Wojnaroski
DeLuca	Kaiser	Roberts	Youngblood
Dempsey	Keller	Roebuck	Zug
Dermody	Kenney	Rooney	
DeWeese	Laughlin	Santoni	Ryan,
DiGirolamo	Lederer	Sather	Speaker
Donatucci	Maitland	Saylor	

NOT VOTING—1

Caltagirone

EXCUSED—3

Coy

Petrarca

Van Horne

Less than a majority of the members required by the rules having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the motion was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Vitali.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise for the purpose of offering amendment 3825.

The SPEAKER. The clerk will read the amendment.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. VITALI offered the following amendment No. A3825:

Amend Bill, page 158, by inserting between lines 28 and 29 Section 15.1. Bond services.

(a) Lowest responsible bid.—Any and all bond services performed pursuant to the provisions of this act which cannot be performed by employees of the Commonwealth shall be contracted with and performed by the bond service provider submitting the lowest responsible bid.

(b) Request for proposal.—For each bond service required to be performed pursuant to the provisions of this act, the issuing authority shall distribute a request for proposal requiring a written response.

(c) Selection report.—After each bond service provider is selected, the issuing authority shall issue a written report of the selection of the service provider and the basis therefor. A copy of the request for proposal and the responses thereto shall be made a part of the report. This report shall be made available to the public.

(d) Definitions.—As used in this section, the following words and phrases shall have the meanings given to them in this subsection:

“Bond services.” Legal, financial and other services by a bond service provider rendered in conjunction with any bonds issued.

“Bond service provider.” Any bond counsel, financial adviser, underwriter, loan and transfer agent, verification agent or printer who provides bond services.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On the question of the adoption of the Vitali amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Vitali.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SB 188 authorizes \$6 billion in indebtedness. Section 15 of this bill discusses and authorizes bonding for this work. Now, that is an enormous amount of bonds, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment I am offering requires competitive bidding for bonds issued in conjunction with this capital budget.

It requires that for each bond issue, that a request for proposal be put out and that the lowest responsible bidder be selected, not the lowest bidder but the lowest responsible bidder. This bidding applies to six different categories of bond services — financial adviser, underwriter, bond counsel, loan and verification agent, and printer.

Mr. Speaker, the reason for this amendment and the reason we want to bid these out is to eliminate the practice of pay-to-play. Now, the practice of pay-to-play, which this amendment seeks to eliminate, in my view, has both corrupted the electoral system by giving an unfair advantage to those who are authorized to issue this bond work as well as cause the Commonwealth to spend more money than necessary for these bond services.

Make no mistake about it that pay-to-play, which this amendment seeks to eliminate, is alive and well in Harrisburg. I have provided the members with some information, but essentially, the 1997 data we have recently released on this subject indicates that in every bond issue by the Commonwealth and the three other major issuing agencies, in every bond issue, the bond counsel selection had close ties to the Ridge administration. In fact, every law firm this year from those bond-issuing agencies had a member of that law firm on Governor Ridge's Governor's Club. The Governor's Club, as this House may be aware, requires \$50,000 in political contributions pledged over a 4-year period. And I repeat, every firm who got bond counsel work had a member on the Ridge Governor's Club.

The most egregious example involved the firm of Blank Rome. Over the past 3 years, they got over \$800,000 in no-bid legal fees from— And that work was determined by the Governor's General Counsel, Paul Tufano, who gave this work to his former firm. Tufano's appointment was influential because of David Girard-diCarlo, also a partner in that firm, and that person was also chairman of the Ridge transition team and also Ridge's campaign treasurer.

The problem with pay-to-play, because of the hundreds of thousands of dollars in political contributions that the Governor and other people authorized to issue these bonds, makes the election process less fair. We see that this year in trying to attract candidates for the gubernatorial slot. The Governor is sitting on such a large war chest because of the money he can get from the issuance of bonds that it really becomes difficult to attract candidates.

But in addition to making the election process less fair, it is also costing taxpayers money. We have compared other States who do these issues — Florida, New Jersey, and in particular, Maryland — and they pay significantly less for quality firms. Maryland is paying about a quarter of what we are paying for law firms who do the bond work, and I want to underscore this: They have a triple-A bond rating — a triple-A bond rating — so there is not a problem with the quality of the work that Maryland is getting because of competitive bidding.

Mr. Speaker, the American Bar Association in August has condemned the practice of pay-to-play, which this amendment seeks to eliminate, and in June of this year, Arthur Levitt, chairman of the SEC (Securities and Exchange Commission), has called the practice of pay-to-play commercial bribery.

You will also recall that our own Legislative Budget and Finance Committee with regard to this in a related context — that is, the performance audit of the Turnpike Commission — also

strongly suggested that at least the bond counsel work be competitively bid.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the capital budget has an enormous amount of potential bond issues here. We should do what is best for our taxpayers by approving this amendment so the work can be bid out, and I ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Mr. Snyder.

Mr. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this issue has come before this House on several occasions in the past, and we seem to continue to raise this issue.

I think it is time, first of all, before we take any other action on this amendment, to get on the record some facts other than the allegations that have been raised by the sponsor of this amendment and continuously in this chamber that this is the only way to go for issuing bonds in Pennsylvania and that other States have taken similar action and that, basically, we are out of line with other States that have been more enlightened in trying to, as he tries to allege, take the political process out of bond counsel issuance.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear, based on a study that was done by the Office of General Counsel of Pennsylvania, it is called the 1997 Nationwide Bond Counsel Survey in which our chief counsel's office made contact with every State. Mr. Speaker, there is not one State in this country that has the process that is being advocated on this floor today. Not one State provides bond counsel by issuing it to the lowest bid for that service.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the amendment being offered by—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

The noise level is entirely too high. If conferences are necessary, please go to the conference rooms off the floor of the House, please.

Mr. Snyder.

Mr. SNYDER. It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that within the amendment proposed, amendment 3825, the sponsor seems to confuse two different processes for issuing bond counsel services and contracts. In his first section, he says that it should be provided to the lowest responsible bid, and then in section (b) he talks about an RFP process in which the agency that is issuing the bonds would distribute a request for proposal requiring a written response.

Mr. Speaker, the latter portion requesting a proposal from various bond counsel for review is a common method used by many States, but there is a confusion here between going with the lowest bid. This is not sending out a contract to lay brick or to put in plumbing or something like that where you can measure quality and just go by whoever submits the lowest bid, they would automatically get it. The RFP process would require every firm who is interested in issuing bonds to submit information defining their experience and their expertise in handling complex public financial transactions. So first of all, this amendment seems to be faulty in that it sets forth two different processes.

Second of all, Mr. Speaker, it is irresponsible to go this way. We are in court right now because of questionable bond counsel advice that was given under the Casey administration, and due to the complexities, you need firms that have the type of expertise that is necessary. When we issue these bonds, these bonds are tax exempt, and because of that, we are able to finance capital projects; we are able to get notes based on our future tax revenues

to provide for the expenses of operating State government at a very low cost because of our tax-exempt status. We need bond counsel that has the expertise in tax law, in defining how to package these to make sure that we conform with all the regulations — the Securities Exchange Commission regulations, the Tax Code regulations, the State — and the fact that these are being sold out of State, you need a certain level of expertise, and you can only get that expertise, Mr. Speaker, by determining the qualifications of the firm that is being offered those services. If you go to the lowest responsible bidder, the issuing agency has to disregard most of those criteria and just look at price.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it makes it sound, by the way the sponsor of this amendment has been talking about this issue for the last several months, that only a handful of firms get bond counsel work. Mr. Speaker, in 1996, 33 different law firms were issued contracts for providing bond services.

Mr. Speaker, too, let us just look at the cost to the State of bond counsel work. We make it sound, again, like we are dealing with significant amounts of dollars that are being paid for by the taxpayers. Mr. Speaker, in 1996 there were \$485 million of general obligation bonds issued, \$550 million of tax anticipation notes. While there were \$2½ million in fees for outside bond counsel for those bonds, the actual cost to the Commonwealth was \$79,305. Let me repeat that: \$79,305 was how much it cost the State taxpayers for issuing those bonds. Most of the fees are paid by the issuing authority and the people who are borrowing the money. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if you look at this amendment, we are asking the taxpayers to issue it just to whatever law firm comes in at the lowest price. Let us disregard the hundreds and millions of dollars of potential liability we would have for these bonds if we fail to have good bond service. The impact on the taxpayers of \$79,000 compared to our potential liability, Mr. Speaker, needs us to be responsible.

We have in place fee schedules that have been in place since 1977, and those fee schedules are still applicable to many of our bond issues that we do. It is not like these are coming out escalating at significant amounts if there is a problem.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, there is no problem in our current system; number two, this is not the way to go; and finally, Mr. Speaker, this amendment is not germane to this bill anyway. The fact that the amendment in substance is not valid, it is also not applicable to this legislation.

GERMANENESS QUESTIONED

Mr. SNYDER. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move that this amendment is not germane to SB 188, which is a capital budget bill for appropriations, and is not germane for substantive changes in the way we issue bonds.

Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Mr. Snyder, raises the question of the germaneness of the amendment, and that question is a question that is determined by the House.

On the question,

Will the House sustain the germaneness of the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On the question of germaneness, the gentleman, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. I do not believe what I just heard. We have got a guy who thinks it is germane to put a helmet law into a freestanding bill that deals with the naming of a bridge, and he says, 72 hours later — yes, if we can determine what day it is — that on a capital budget bill, which essentially deals with bonds, that the gentleman's amendment is not germane. Now, we have already evinced from our process the utmost flexibility. This week has been a travesty vis-a-vis our parliamentary procedures; it really has been.

We have bent, massaged, mutilated, and transformed our legislative procedures in such a way that almost anything is germane, and now, the gentleman from Lehigh County comes to the microphone and asks that on a capital budget bill dealing with tens and tens and tens and tens and tens and tens and tens of millions of dollars that will essentially be funded through bond issues, that a measure asking for bidding on these bond issues is nongermane. I think that is downright dishonest. This is germane, and I would ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Perzel.

Mr. PERZEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to see if I could remember this correctly. I believe that Representative Chadwick was in the Chair on the day that the helmet law was passed, and he specifically asked the minority leader if he was going to raise the question of germaneness and he did not. Now, if you were asked and you did not, do not stand up 2 days later and complain about what you were asked to do.

I think it is a little bit of a contradiction, Mr. Speaker. He had every chance to say that the helmet law was not germane and chose not to do it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will yield.

The debate on the helmet law is not germane — by either side.

Mr. Perzel.

Mr. PERZEL. Well then, Mr. Speaker, just let me say that no other State does what Representative Vitali is talking about. I would therefore urge the members to vote that it is not germane to this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Petrone.

Mr. PETRONE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of germaneness for this bill. It is not only germane, it is good government. Its time has come. Regardless of the attempts by anybody to sabotage the intent of this legislation, the day is going to come when it is going to win. There is more chicanery in bond issues today than any other problem in Allegheny County, and our Urban Affairs Committee is investigating it.

It is germane, it is good government, and do it; vote for it.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Vitali.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is disappointing to hear the arguments just made by Representative Snyder with regard to germaneness, clearly disingenuous arguments.

I direct the members' attention to section 15 of this bill on page 158. It talks about — I will just quote its title — "Issue of bonds." There you go; issuance of bonds. There is the subject matter. Generally with germaneness, we only have to have the same title.

This is right on point — issuance of bonds. What this amendment does is just set out some framework for the issuance of bonds.

This amendment is clearly germane. If this amendment is not germane, as the gentleman clearly knows it is, there would be very few amendments this House could possibly offer that were germane. This is right on point. A "no" vote on germaneness is clearly an effort to dodge an important, important issue.

Mr. Speaker, this is germane because it sets out a framework for the issuance of bonds, and it does not, as was previously incorrectly stated, require it go to the lowest bidder. That is just a false argument. It requires the lowest responsible bidder, and I would like the opportunity to respond to some of the false arguments that were made, but to do that I think we need a little bit of integrity in the way we rule on some of these motions. We just need a little bit of integrity with regard to the way we deal with germaneness and the way we play the game, because in this marketplace of ideas, we all have a right to throw them out, or at least we should with a well-run House, and if you are going to kill an issue like this with that false argument, shame on us all.

I ask that this amendment be held to be germane. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On the question for the second time, the gentleman, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. Low-bid bond work. We are talking about a capital budget; we are talking about a capital budget that is sustained with bonds, and for a change, at least ostensibly from a political perspective, the Democrats are asking for responsibility. We are asking for fiscal responsibility.

The gentleman from Lehigh talked about expertise. Well, no one can tell me that there are only three or four or five firms in our State that have this expertise. There have to be 10 or 15 or 20 or 30 or 40 firms that have this kind of expertise. We are asking for "no bid" to be eliminated. We are asking for bids from these monolithic law firms that are participating in tens of millions of dollars of bond work under our common-wealth apparatus.

The issue of germaneness is obvious. If you gainsay the gentleman from Delaware with a negative vote, then it reeks with politics. It certainly does not reek with the enthusiasm that I have heard about before. Where is that Grange Hall populism? Where is the Chautauqua Tent? What is wrong with you Republican members?

The gentleman's argument is empirically accurate, precise, to the point, wholesome, idealistic, and uplifting. What is wrong with you? He wants the big law firms in those bespangled buildings in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh to bid. Fiscal responsibility has been essentially your *raison d'être* over the years, your reason for being.

The Grand Old Party — conservatism and fiscal responsibility. What in the world is wrong? The gentleman is asking for big law firms to bid on bond work in a capital budget bill that is undergirded with bonds.

The SPEAKER. Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. Germaneness is obvious.

The SPEAKER. That is it.

Mr. DeWEESE. The Chair thanks the, or excuse that parapraxis. The gentleman from Greene thanks the Chair for his flexibility.

I would ask that the gentleman, Mr. Vitali's perspective be sustained, and I would also like to say that having spoken twice, I would be allowed to have the flexibility that all floor leaders have. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Micozzie.

Mr. MICOZZIE. Mr. Speaker, may I have permission to interrogate the honorable minority leader?

The SPEAKER. Mr. DeWeese will stand for interrogation. You may begin, at your own peril.

Mr. MICOZZIE. Mr. Speaker, evidently you feel very strong about this issue, and you probably have not felt strong about this issue for a long time. Am I correct in saying that?

Mr. DeWEESE. I am like Paul on the road to Damascus: I have seen the light.

Mr. MICOZZIE. Oh. The reason why I asked that question, Mr. Speaker, is that I have been up in this House of Representatives for 20 years; it is going on 20 years. I had been in the minority for 12 years, and during that 12 years we had Democratic Governors, and you had the good fortune, you and your colleagues had the good fortune, of being in the majority, and I have never once — once — heard you bring this subject up, both in your position as minority leader, majority leader, or Speaker. Evidently you saw the light inasmuch as there is a Governor who is Republican and we have a majority now, Republicans. Could it be that it is politics that you are playing, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. DeWEESE. To the gentleman from Delaware County, I would respond that the great French writer, Victor Hugo, once observed—

Mr. MICOZZIE. Who is that? Say that again, will you? I missed that.

Mr. DeWEESE. To the gentleman from Delaware County I would respond that the great French writer, Victor Hugo, once observed—

Mr. MICOZZIE. Oh, Victor. Yeah; I know him well.

Mr. DeWEESE. I am sure you are well acquainted with the inspirational assertion that he made that nothing is so powerful as an idea whose time has come. Nothing is so powerful as an idea whose time has come, and the crux, to answer your question, sir, of my inspiration and motivation is that trailblazing, fire-breathing Delaware County colleague of yours, Mr. Vitali, who has brought this issue to the fore.

And one more point, Mr. Speaker. When my Governor, the hard-charging middle-class representative, Bob Casey, was running for Governor, we were spending — and his predecessor, Dick Thornburgh — we were spending \$3 million to \$5 million for gubernatorial races. Now we are at \$15 million, and where—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman—

Mr. DeWEESE. —does much of this money come from?

Mr. MICOZZIE. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Both gentlemen yield.

Mr. MICOZZIE. Oh; okay.

The SPEAKER. The question before the House is the question of germaneness. Now, this is interesting and in fact somewhat amusing, but there are some in the House who have tight time constraints that I think we should respect, and I would like the members to generally move along with this program—

Mr. MICOZZIE. Mr. Speaker, I hope you are talking about the minority leader and not me as far as the time that is being taken up.

The SPEAKER. Well, I am just going to hold you to the question of germaneness then.

Mr. MICOZZIE. Okay.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that this is not germane. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Mr. Evans.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise with real strong mixed feelings. I rise with mixed feelings, Mr. Speaker, on this issue of germaneness, because as I have in the past, I have been supportive of this concept. However, Mr. Speaker, I today do not think that this is germane, and the reason I do not think that this is germane, Mr. Speaker, is because in my particular view on this particular issue, I think that we all are aware and understand exactly what is taking place here.

I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that the system should change, and I have stood here before and I have said that, but I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, at this particular time on this particular issue, Mr. Speaker, that this debate should take place. And obviously, Mr. Speaker, that will be up to the members of this House, but my one vote and the vote that I have will be against the idea of this being germane.

So, Mr. Speaker, maybe at another time in another moment I will be prepared to support this gentleman and his concept, and my record speaks for itself; I have supported it, but today, Mr. Speaker, I will ask not that this be a partisan issue but that members on my side of the aisle really look at it carefully and understand what is in this bill and that this is not germane. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Petrone, for the second time.

Mr. PETRONE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will be brief.

Mr. Speaker, if this is not germane, nothing we do here today is germane, Mr. Speaker. Its time has come. It is good government, and it is right. It is germane. If it is voted down, then everything we do here today should be considered not germane. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. Vitali, for the second time.

Mr. VITALI. Mr. Speaker, I might ask that I be afforded the courtesy of the final word on this.

The SPEAKER. I see no one else on the subject seeking recognition. I am therefore recognizing you at this time.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With regard to the issue of germaneness, Mr. Speaker, again I ask the members to keep their eye on the ball. Look at section 15 of this bill that says "Issue of bonds." The amendment deals with bonds; the bill deals with bonds. That makes it germane, in my view. We broadly interpreted germaneness to, again, be either the same title or the same subject matter. We have both here. It is germane.

In all due respect to the gentleman from Philadelphia who urged a negative vote, I respect his views, but I suggest he simply have the courage on final passage to vote "no," not on a procedural vote. Do it on the amendment itself, not on germaneness.

With regard to the gentleman from Delaware County raising the issue of politicizing this issue, I have not politicized this issue. I have, in the literature I have presented, have had the campaign figures, the contributions received by Auditor General Casey, of Governor Casey—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will yield.

Mr. VITALI. —of Democrat and Republican—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will yield.

The question is one of germaneness. You are into an argument that deals with the merits of the amendment. Now, stick to germaneness, please.

Mr. VITALI. Mr. Speaker, I was only responding to the political arguments—

The SPEAKER. And I stopped the gentleman from continuing that argument, and I am going to now restrain you, too.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With regard to the majority leader and his interpretation of germaneness, in yesterday's floor proceedings when we were dealing with a tax bill, his rationale was since that bill contained the word "tax" and since the amendment contained the word "tax," therefore it is germane, no further questions required. Well, let me use his line of argument the same way. This bill contains the word "bond," the amendment contains the word "bond"; therefore, I am sure the majority leader would agree this is germane.

If you do not like the concept, vote "no" on the amendment, but at least have the intellectual honesty of calling this the way you see it, and this is clearly germane. I ask that you find this germane. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. On the question of germaneness, those believing the amendment to be germane will vote "aye"; those believing the amendment to be nongermane will vote in the negative.

On the question recurring,
Will the House sustain the germaneness of the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-99

Battisto	Daley	Levdansky	Sainato
Bebko-Jones	DeLuca	Lloyd	Santoni
Belardi	Dermody	Lucyk	Scrimenti
Belfanti	DeWeese	Lynch	Shaner
Benninghoff	Eachus	Manderino	Staback
Birmelin	George	Masland	Stairs
Bishop	Gigliotti	Mayernik	Steelman
Blaum	Gordner	McCall	Steil
Boscola	Gruitza	McGeehan	Stetler
Boyes	Haluska	Melio	Sturla
Butkovitz	Hanna	Michlovic	Surra
Buxton	Hennessey	Mundy	Tangretti
Caltagirone	Itkin	Olasz	Tigue
Cappabianca	James	Oliver	Travaglio
Cam	Jarolin	Pesci	Trello
Carone	Josephs	Petrone	Trich
Casorio	Kaiser	Pistella	Veon
Cawley	Keller	Preston	Vitali
Cohen, M.	Kirkland	Readshaw	Walko
Colafrèlla	Krebs	Rieger	Washington
Colaizzo	LaGrotta	Roberts	Williams, C.
Corpora	Laughlin	Robinson	Wogan
Corrigan	Lawless	Roebuck	Wojnaroski
Cowell	Lederer	Rooney	Yewcic
Curry	Lescovitz	Rubley	

NAYS-99

Adolph	Fairchild	Marsico	Semmel
Allen	Fargo	McGill	Serafini
Argall	Feese	McIlhattan	Seyfert
Armstrong	Fichter	McNaughton	Smith, B.
Baker	Fleagle	Micozzie	Smith, S. H.
Bard	Flick	Miller	Snyder, D. W.

Barley	Gannon	Myers	Stern
Barrar	Geist	Nailor	Stevenson
Brown	Gladeck	Nickol	Strittmatter
Browne	Godshall	O'Brien	Taylor, E. Z.
Bunt	Gruppo	Orie	Taylor, J.
Chadwick	Habay	Perzel	Thomas
Civera	Harhart	Phillips	True
Clark	Hasay	Pippy	Tulli
Clymer	Herman	Platts	Vance
Cohen, L. I.	Hershey	Ramos	Waugh
Conti	Hess	Raymond	Williams, A. H.
Cornell	Horsey	Reber	Wilt
Dally	Hutchinson	Reinard	Wright, M. N.
Dempsey	Jadlowiec	Rohrer	Youngblood
Dent	Kenney	Ross	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	Leh	Sather	Zug
Donatucci	Maher	Saylor	
Druce	Maitland	Schroder	Ryan, Speaker
Egolf	Major	Schuler	
Evans			

NOT VOTING-1

Markosek

EXCUSED-3

Coy Petrarca Van Horne

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

The SPEAKER. On the question of germaneness, the vote is 99 to 99. Less than a majority having voted that the amendment is germane, the amendment is not found to be germane.

I might say historically, that is the first time I have ever had to rule on a matter such as that, and my recollection, I do not recall ever hearing a ruling such as that, but I believe I am absolutely right on it. Very interesting.

The gentleman, Mr. Krebs.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, normally when we have a tie vote, we say that the motion fails. I think what we had here was a motion to say that it was not germane; that was what the motion was, and the vote was tie. Therefore, I think your ruling is incorrect.

The SPEAKER. Every motion on this floor is stated in the affirmative, has always been stated in the affirmative.

Mr. KREBS. I think if you go back and look at the record, you will see that the majority whip said that "I move that this amendment is not germane."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman raised a question of germaneness, and the question as put was, those believing it to be germane will vote in the affirmative; those believing it to be nongermane will vote in the negative. I am paraphrasing perhaps a little bit.

Mr. KREBS. But in this case you are then allowing less than a majority to determine something.

The SPEAKER. Well, that would have been the case either way, and I have done it based on the historical precedent as I have lived it, and that is that these matters are placed in the affirmative. I have also done it after seeking the advice of the Parliamentarian.

RULING OF CHAIR APPEALED

Mr. KREBS. Well, I guess then I want to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Krebs, appeals the decision of the Chair that the amendment was not germane based on the tie vote and the way the vote had been put.

The question before the House now is, shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House? Those in favor of sustaining the Chair's decision will vote "aye"; those opposed, "no."

On the question,
Will the House sustain the ruling of the Chair?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-101

Adolph	Fairchild	Major	Semmel
Allen	Fargo	Marsico	Serafini
Argall	Feese	Masland	Seyfert
Armstrong	Fichter	McGill	Smith, B.
Baker	Fleagle	Mellhattan	Smith, S. H.
Bard	Flick	McNaughton	Snyder, D. W.
Barley	Gannon	Micozzie	Stairs
Barrar	Geist	Miller	Steil
Benninghoff	Gladeck	Nailor	Stern
Birmelin	Godshall	Nickol	Stevenson
Brown	Gruppo	O'Brien	Strittmatter
Browne	Habay	Orie	Taylor, E. Z.
Bunt	Harhart	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Chadwick	Hasay	Phillips	True
Civiera	Hennessey	Pippy	Tulli
Clark	Herman	Platts	Vance
Clymer	Hershey	Raymond	Wangh
Cohen, L. I.	Hess	Reber	Wilt
Conti	Hutchinson	Reinard	Wogan
Cornell	Jadlowiec	Rohrer	Wright, M. N.
Dally	Kenney	Ross	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Lawless	Rubley	Zug
Dent	Leh	Sather	
DiGirolamo	Lynch	Saylor	Ryan,
Druce	Maher	Schroder	Speaker
Egolf	Maitland	Schuler	

NAYS-97

Battisto	Dermody	Lloyd	Sainato
Bebko-Jones	DeWeese	Lucyk	Santoni
Belardi	Donatucci	Manderino	Scrimenti
Belfanti	Eachus	Markosek	Shaner
Bishop	Evans	Mayernik	Staback
Blaum	George	McCall	Steelman
Boscola	Gigliotti	McGeehan	Stetler
Boyes	Gordner	Melio	Sturla
Butkovitz	Gruitza	Michlovic	Surra
Buxton	Haluska	Mundy	Tangretti
Caltagirone	Hanna	Myers	Thomas
Cappabianca	Horsey	Olasz	Tigue
Carr	Itkin	Oliver	Travaglio
Carone	James	Pesci	Trello
Casorio	Jarolin	Petrone	Trich
Cawley	Josephs	Pistella	Veon
Cohen, M.	Kaiser	Preston	Vitali
Colaella	Keller	Ramos	Walko
Colaizzo	Kirkland	Readshaw	Washington
Corpora	Krebs	Rieger	Williams, A. H.
Corrigan	LaGrotta	Roberts	Williams, C.

Cowell	Lederer	Robinson	Wojnaroski
Curry	Lescovitz	Roebuck	Yewcic
Daley	Levdansky	Rooney	Youngblood
DeLuca			

NOT VOTING-1

Laughlin

EXCUSED-3

Coy Petrarca Van Horne

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the ruling of the Chair was sustained.

Will the majority leader come to the desk.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

The SPEAKER. For the information of the members— May I have the attention of the House? For the information of the members during this brief interval, on December 12 of 1995 Mr. Cohen raised a point of order. Representative Chadwick was in the Chair as pro tem, and Mr. Cohen stated, "Mr. Speaker, the motion was made that this was not germane. The motion failed on a vote of 100 to 100. It requires a majority of the vote for any motion to pass.

"The SPEAKER pro tempore. A question is always put in the affirmative. The gentleman, Mr. Argall, raised the question of germaneness, and the question was put, those who believe the amendment to be germane will vote 'aye'; those opposed, 'nay'; less than a majority having voted in the affirmative, the amendment was not germane.

"Mr. COHEN. The way you have described it, the question was not put any way. It was just 100— You...expressed it neutrally. The fact is, Mr. Argall made a motion....

"The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman" – well, then there is conversation – "The gentleman, Mr. Argall, raised the issue of germaneness; he did not make a motion. There was no motion on the issue. He simply raised the issue, and on the question, less than a majority having voted that it was germane, it is not germane," and I pass that on as prior precedent for this ruling.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair returns to leaves of absence and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Itkin, who asks that the lady from Philadelphia County, Ms. WASHINGTON, be placed on leave. Without objection, leave will be granted. The Chair hears none.

GUEST INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pleased to welcome to the hall of the House today an intern working for Representative Manderino, Debbie Chun, a University of Pennsylvania law student. Ms. Chun, would you please rise.

COMMITTEE MEETING CANCELED

Mr. MICOZZIE. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Mr. Micozzie.

Mr. MICOZZIE. For an announcement.

We have a scheduled Insurance meeting tomorrow, and with all due respect to the death of Representative Mihalich and the viewing tomorrow, the Insurance meeting tomorrow is canceled.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 188 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,

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

The SPEAKER. Mr. Casorio.

Mr. CASORIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to make a motion to suspend the rules so that I can offer an amendment, please.

The SPEAKER. Prior to taking that, I have a reconsideration motion on the Vitali amendment germaneness question.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER QUESTION OF GERMANENESS

The SPEAKER. I frankly cannot read the signatures of the members. I think Mr. Daley is the principal sponsor of the motion. He moves that the vote by which the question of germaneness—Members will please take their seats.

Mr. Daley moves that the vote by which the question of germaneness of amendment 3825 was defeated to SB 188, PN 1348, on the 1st day of October be reconsidered.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. On the question of reconsideration, Mr. Perzel. Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, the germaneness issue was defeated and then your ruling was upheld. I would like to ask the members to vote "no" on reconsideration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question of reconsideration, those in favor—

Mr. VITALI. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Mr. Vitali.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would urge a "yes" vote on the motion for reconsideration. It is a common courtesy in this House which I have extended to others and I would expect to be extended to me on a motion to reconsider this amendment, or this motion, rather.

Mr. Speaker, there was confusion and there was a close vote. I ask that we have a chance to simply do it again. Nothing will be prejudiced by granting this motion. It will be an opportunity after cooler heads have prevailed to revisit the issue again. It is a courtesy I have extended to you. It is an important issue, and you lose nothing by simply having this thing run again. So I ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. On the question, those in favor of reconsideration—

Mr. OLASZ. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Mr. Olasz.

Mr. OLASZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion to reconsider. It was obvious when you looked at that board there was a lot of dancing going on, and I am certain by the reflections that we witnessed on that board, a lot of members were not sure of the issue.

So for that reason I rise to support the reconsideration motion and ask you to do the same. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On the question, those in favor of reconsideration will vote "aye"; opposed, "no."

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—98

Battisto	Dermody	Lloyd	Rooney
Bebko-Jones	DeWeese	Lucyk	Sainato
Belardi	Donatucci	Manderino	Santoni
Belfanti	Eachus	Markosek	Scrimenti
Bishop	Evans	Mayernik	Seyfert
Blaum	George	McCall	Shaner
Boscola	Gigliotti	McGeehan	Staback
Boyes	Gordner	Melio	Steelman
Butkovitz	Gruitza	Michlovic	Stetler
Buxton	Haluska	Mundy	Sturla
Caltagirone	Hanna	Myers	Surra
Cappabianca	Horsey	Olasz	Tangretti
Cam	Itkin	Oliver	Thomas
Carone	James	Pesci	Tigue
Casorio	Jarolin	Petrone	Travaglio
Cawley	Josephs	Pistella	Trello
Cohen, M.	Kaiser	Platts	Trich
Colaella	Keller	Preston	Veon
Colaizzo	Kirkland	Ramos	Vitali
Corpora	Krebs	Readshaw	Walko
Corrigan	LaGrotta	Rieger	Williams, C.
Cowell	Laughlin	Roberts	Wojnaroski
Curry	Lederer	Robinson	Yewcic
Daley	Lescovitz	Roebuck	Youngblood
DeLuca	Levdansky		

NAYS—100

Adolph	Fairchild	Major	Semmel
Allen	Fargo	Marsico	Serafini
Argall	Feese	Masland	Smith, B.
Armstrong	Fichter	McGill	Smith, S. H.
Baker	Fleagle	McIlhattan	Snyder, D. W.
Bard	Flick	McNaughton	Stairs
Barley	Gannon	Micozzie	Steil
Barrar	Geist	Miller	Stern
Benninghoff	Gladeck	Nailor	Stevenson
Birmelin	Godshall	Nickol	Strittmatter
Brown	Gruppo	O'Brien	Taylor, E. Z.
Browne	Habay	Orie	Taylor, J.
Bunt	Harhart	Perzel	True
Chadwick	Hasay	Phillips	Tulli
Civera	Hennessey	Pippy	Vance
Clark	Herman	Raymond	Waugh
Clymer	Hershey	Reber	Williams, A. H.
Cohen, L. I.	Hess	Reinard	Wilt
Conti	Hutchinson	Rohrer	Wogan
Cornell	Jadlowiec	Ross	Wright, M. N.
Dally	Kenney	Rubley	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Lawless	Sather	Zug

Dent	Leh	Saylor	
DiGirolamo	Lynch	Schroder	Ryan,
Druce	Maher	Schuler	Speaker
Egolf	Maitland		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Coy	Petrarca	Van Horne	Washington
-----	----------	-----------	------------

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

Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. —and the question will not be reconsidered.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. DeWEESE. A point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DeWEESE. I would like the Parliamentarian to do some research over the next week or two and find out if a Speaker of the House ever voted against a motion to reconsider. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You are quite welcome.

On the question recurring,

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

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Casorio.

Mr. CASORIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, I would like to make a motion to suspend the rules so that I can offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Would the gentleman give us some means of identifying the amendment?

Mr. CASORIO. Yes, Mr. Speaker; 3855, and I would like to briefly explain why I am doing this, if you would hear me out.

The SPEAKER. Our records seem to reflect that this was the Fairchild amendment.

Mr. CASORIO. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. And you want to offer it now?

Mr. CASORIO. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. That amendment has been offered and defeated and cannot be reoffered.

Mr. CASORIO. I would like to redo the motion, please. I would like to renew the motion to suspend the rules, please. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose?

Mr. CASORIO. The amendment was not voted on. There seemed to be some confusion on this side of the aisle. I wanted to make clear that only money for sports stadiums was going to be

removed from the capital budget and the money for the cultural centers and the convention centers would remain in the capital budget.

The SPEAKER. Well, that information should have been provided at the time, at some time, but—

Mr. CASORIO. Mr. Speaker, we did not have the amendment. If you recall, the Representative from Allegheny County, Representative Gigliotti, rose to ask for an explanation of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. My recollection, when Mr. Gigliotti was interrogating, he was interrogating Mr. Lynch, not Mr. Fairchild—

Mr. CASORIO. I stand corrected, Mr. Speaker. You are correct.

The SPEAKER.—and he was referring to an amendment other than the amendment you have referred us to.

Mr. CASORIO. That is correct. That was my error.

The SPEAKER. Would you tell us now which amendment you are referring to?

Mr. CASORIO. The original amendment that I stated, 3855, the Fairchild amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Which is the Fairchild amendment.

Mr. CASORIO. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUNT. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Mr. Bunt. Does the gentleman, Mr. Bunt, seek recognition?

Mr. BUNT. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I had approached the Chair in order to correct the record on this same particular motion to suspend the rules on 3855, and I wish to correct that record, but if this particular motion to suspend is going to be considered, I would like to join in with the gentleman to further ask that that motion to suspend be reconsidered.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

MOTION WITHDRAWN TEMPORARILY

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

Mr. CASORIO. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion temporarily.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Itkin, who asks that the Chair return to leaves of absence and asks that the gentleman, Mr. OLASZ, be placed on leave. Without objection, the gentleman is placed on leave. The Chair hears none.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 188 CONTINUED

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

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

Mr. DeLUCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask for suspension of the rules to permit me to offer amendment A3832, which will remove the Philadelphia Shipyard appropriation in the capital budget.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, this Kvaerner shipyard would create thousands of jobs for Pennsylvanians all across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, not just Philadelphia, Mr. Speaker. They estimate they are going to use 40,000 tons of steel a year there, Mr. Speaker. We do not make steel, that much steel, in the Delaware Valley, Mr. Speaker, but they do make it in western Pennsylvania where those jobs would be created, Mr. Speaker.

This project would breathe new life into the steel mills in Pennsylvania. It would renew for the first time a major shipbuilder coming to America, Mr. Speaker, a company that is already here, Mr. Speaker. Kvaerner already has an office here in Pennsylvania.

Under the last deal that the Governor saw, they were not committing any ships to the shipyard. Kvaerner has committed to build the first three ships here in Pennsylvania. That is a big difference, Mr. Speaker. The last shipyard was going to put in \$10 million. This shipbuilder is going to put in approximately \$250 million, Mr. Speaker — a good deal for Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker. This shipyard is going to pay taxes at the State and local level, which was not the case of the first shipbuilder that wanted to come to Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker.

This means jobs all across Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker. We started doing all the things, and I know some of them were tough — when we cut the business taxes, when we did workers' compensation reform, when we did utility deregulation. Now we have a chance to put our vote on the board in order to say, we want jobs in Pennsylvania.

And, Mr. Speaker, I strongly want to see positive results in Pennsylvania, and I would strongly oppose the motion to suspend the rules, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Mr. DeLuca, do you desire recognition on this subject ?

Mr. DeLUCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the majority leader. We want jobs in Pennsylvania. We all want jobs in Pennsylvania, but I wish the Governor would have thought of that when we lost 750 jobs with LTV coke works in western Pennsylvania and Allegheny County just a short while ago, which were 750 direct jobs. I wish the Governor last year—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will yield.

Now—

Mr. DeLUCA. Wait a minute, Mr. Speaker. Do I not have the latitude—

The SPEAKER. Just a minute; just a minute, Mr. DeLuca.

Mr. DeLUCA. Excuse me.

The SPEAKER. Please. I gave Mr. Perzel latitude. He was talking about the Philadelphia Shipyard issue. Now you are talking about something that has nothing to do with the Philadelphia Shipyards. The issue, which we really should not be talking about but I have given latitude to, is the Philadelphia Shipyards, not about something that happened years ago with the steel mills.

Mr. DeLUCA. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Mr. Pistella, please.

Mr. DeLUCA. Mr. Speaker, the only reason I injected that into the conversation is because the majority leader had that much latitude to mention about jobs. We all care about jobs. We know the Philadelphia Shipyard is talking about jobs, but I also am talking about jobs and I figure that relates to it. I will try to stay on track, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I guess what a difference an election year makes. Two years ago Governor Ridge had to be dragged kicking and screaming in offering Meyer Werft \$90 million—

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker ?

Mr. DeLUCA. —for 2,000—

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker ?

Mr. DeLUCA. —direct jobs.

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker ?

The SPEAKER. Again, Mr. DeLuca, the question is suspension of the rules.

Mr. DeLUCA. Are we speaking about the Philadelphia Shipyard? This relates to the Philadelphia Shipyard.

The SPEAKER. We are talking about suspension of the rules, and then we will be talking about the Philadelphia Shipyard.

Mr. DeLUCA. You know, Mr. Speaker, one way or another I am going to speak on this, either final passage or suspension of the rules. I mean—

The SPEAKER. Well, then wait for final passage.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DeWEESE. And I have no idea what the answer is. Sometimes that is imprudent to ask a question under those circumstances, but—

The SPEAKER. That is what most lawyers say, yeah.

Mr. DeWEESE. —but if I defer as the floor leader to another member of our caucus, does that individual have the same flexibility at that moment that the floor leader would have, yes or no? I am sorry; I do not remember what the past history has been.

The SPEAKER. The latitude— Yes and no. The latitude that is given to a floor leader was originally given so that a floor leader could tell the members just what it was that was about to take place. It was never intended that they debate the merits with that latitude.

Now, I have allowed the floor leaders to go a little bit beyond that, both you, Mr. DeWeese, and the Republican floor leader. The members should not do it, and I have tried to hold it in. They cannot be debating the merits at this time. There is a time and a place for it. Our rules are very specific. There is no debate, no debate at all, on suspension of the rules. Now, maybe we have to go back to that, no debate at all, and then it would be very clear, but I think it would be wrong. So I am simply trying to hold Mr. DeLuca into some— I would even hold you in on this one.

If I may, if I may, one final thing, Mr. DeLuca, and I am reading: "The Chair recognizes" — and I do not know who the Speaker is; I suspect it is Jack Seltzer — "Mr. Manderino.

"Mr. MANDERINO. A further point of parliamentary inquiry: Is it within any of the rules of this House, Mason's Manual, or Jefferson's Manual, which govern the conduct of this House, or is it within the precedents of this House that even though a motion is

not debatable, that a statement can be made by the majority and minority leader ?

“The SPEAKER. I cannot respond from a rule of this House, but, from experience, the Chair would suggest that it would be proper for a majority and minority leader to make a brief statement on the motion; not to debate it, but to make a brief statement of their position on the motion. Unless I hear objection from the members of the House, I would suggest that it would be proper, and the Chair would recognize Mr. Manderino at this time for a brief statement on his position,” blah, blah, blah.

So brief statements are in order, and if you yield, a brief statement is in order.

Mr. DeLUCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We will make this brief then.

The reason I am asking for the suspension of the rules is this House knows the Philadelphia Shipyard amendment was a separate amendment to the capital budget. A lot of members on both sides of the aisle would like to vote on this separately, but because the votes were not there and their projects are in, this wish list of \$6 billion — and I say a wish list — they are being forced to vote on this package—

The SPEAKER. The members understand what you want to do.

Mr. DeLUCA. I am asking that the members be able to vote separately on this package without the Philadelphia Shipyard in it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question of suspension of the rules, those in favor will vote “aye”; opposed, “no.”

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion ?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—50

Bebko-Jones	Gigliotti	Lucyk	Scrimenti
Belardi	Gordner	Markosek	Shaner
Belfanti	Gruitza	McCall	Staback
Caltagirone	Haluska	Mundy	Steelman
Colaifella	Hanna	Pesci	Sturla
Colaizzo	Jarolin	Preston	Surra
Corpora	Kirkland	Readshaw	Tangretti
Curry	LaGrotta	Roberts	Trello
Daley	Laughlin	Robinson	Walko
DeLuca	Lawless	Rooney	Williams, C.
Dermody	Lescovitz	Sainato	Wojnaroski
Eachus	Levdanski	Santoni	Yewcic
George	Lloyd		

NAYS—146

Adolph	Dent	Lynch	Sather
Allen	DeWeese	Maher	Saylor
Argall	DiGirolamo	Maitland	Schroder
Armstrong	Donatucci	Major	Schuler
Baker	Druce	Manderino	Semmel
Bard	Egolf	Marsico	Serafini
Barley	Evans	Masland	Seyfert
Barrar	Fairchild	Mayermik	Smith, B.
Battisto	Fargo	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Benninghoff	Feese	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Fichter	McIlhattan	Stairs
Bishop	Fleagle	McNaughton	Steil
Blaum	Flick	Melio	Stern
Boscola	Gannon	Michlovic	Stetler

Boyes	Geist	Micozzie	Stevenson
Brown	Gladeck	Miller	Strittmatter
Browne	Godshall	Myers	Taylor, E. Z.
Bunt	Gruppo	Nailor	Taylor, J.
Butkovitz	Habay	Nickol	Thomas
Buxton	Harhart	O'Brien	Tigue
Cappabianca	Hasay	Oliver	Trich
Carn	Hennessey	Orie	True
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Tulli
Casorio	Hershey	Petrone	Vance
Cawley	Hess	Phillips	Veon
Chadwick	Horsey	Pippy	Vitali
Civera	Hutchinson	Pistella	Waugh
Clark	Itkin	Platts	Williams, A. H.
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Ramos	Wilt
Cohen, L. I.	James	Raymond	Wogan
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Reber	Wright, M. N.
Conti	Kaiser	Reinard	Youngblood
Cornell	Keller	Rieger	Zimmerman
Corrigan	Kenney	Roebuck	Zug
Cowell	Krebs	Rohrer	
Dally	Lederer	Ross	Ryan, Speaker
Dempsey	Leh	Rubley	

NOT VOTING—1

Travaglio

EXCUSED—5

Coy	Petrarca	Van Horne	Washington
Olasz			

Less than a majority of the members required by the rules having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the motion was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,

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

The SPEAKER. Mr. Gigliotti.

Mr. GIGLIOTTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Do you have an amendment, or are you seeking recognition to suspend rules to offer an amendment ?

Mr. GIGLIOTTI. Absolutely.

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. GIGLIOTTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer a suspension of the rules to introduce amendment A3818, which will insert \$200 million into—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will yield.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion ?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman, Mr. DeWeese, yield his time to the gentleman, Mr. Gigliotti ? The gentleman is recognized to briefly describe what his amendment would do.

Mr. GIGLIOTTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What this amendment would do is it would insert \$200 to save the last steel mill in the city of Pittsburgh, the LTV — \$200 million,

I said — \$200 million to save the last steel mill in the city of Pittsburgh, which announced in April that they were closing in December.

Now, I have been in touch with the Governor's Office trying to save this mill, and I just heard the majority leader say that Philadelphia's port, the money they are going to get to save their port, the steel is going to be in western Pennsylvania. Well, there are no steel mills to supply that. All the steel mills have been closing. There are only a very few that are open. This is the last one in the city limits, and I am asking for an affirmative vote to suspend the rules so that I can offer this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Mr. Barley.

Mr. BARLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to oppose this motion to suspend. This has been a very fair and a very open process that I have provided for all members on both sides of the aisle to have their amendments filed in a very timely fashion with the Appropriations Committee. I worked very closely with the Democrat chairman of the House Appropriations Committee so that we could avoid last-minute suspensions of the rules such as we are being confronted with now on significant issues, as is in this amendment.

So I rise, for that reason, to oppose this motion to suspend the rules.

The SPEAKER. On the question, those in favor of suspension will vote "aye"; opposed, "no."

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-98

Battisto	Donatucci	Manderino	Santoni
Bebko-Jones	Eachus	Markosek	Scrimenti
Belardi	Evans	Mayernik	Shaner
Belfanti	George	McCall	Staback
Bishop	Gigliotti	McGeehan	Stairs
Blaum	Gordner	Melio	Steelman
Boscola	Gruitza	Michlovic	Stetler
Butkovitz	Habay	Mundy	Stevenson
Buxton	Haluska	Myers	Sturla
Caltagirone	Hanna	Oliver	Surra
Cappabianca	Horsey	Orie	Tangretti
Cam	Itkin	Pesci	Thomas
Casorio	James	Petrone	Tigue
Cawley	Jarolin	Pippy	Travaglio
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Pistella	Trello
Colafella	Kaiser	Preston	Trich
Colaizzo	Keller	Ramos	Veon
Corpora	Kirkland	Readshaw	Vitali
Corrigan	LaGrotta	Rieger	Walko
Cowell	Laughlin	Roberts	Williams, A. H.
Curry	Lederer	Robinson	Williams, C.
Daley	Lescovitz	Roebuck	Wojnaroski
DeLuca	Levdansky	Rooney	Yewcic
Dermody	Lloyd	Sainato	Youngblood
DeWeese	Lucyk		

NAYS-99

Adolph	Druce	Lynch	Schroder
Allen	Egolf	Maher	Schuler
Argall	Fairchild	Maitland	Semmel
Armstrong	Fargo	Major	Serafini
Baker	Feese	Marsico	Seyfert

Bard	Fichter	Masland	Smith, B.
Barley	Fleagle	McGill	Smith, S. H.
Barrar	Flick	McIlhatten	Snyder, D. W.
Benninghoff	Gannon	McNaughton	Steil
Birmelin	Geist	Micozzie	Stern
Boyes	Gladeck	Miller	Strittmatter
Brown	Godshall	Nailor	Taylor, E. Z.
Browne	Gruppo	Nickol	Taylor, J.
Bunt	Harhart	O'Brien	True
Carone	Hasay	Perzel	Tulli
Chadwick	Hennessey	Phillips	Vance
Civera	Herman	Platts	Waugh
Clark	Hershey	Raymond	Wilt
Clymer	Hess	Reber	Wogan
Cohen, L. I.	Hutchinson	Reinard	Wright, M. N.
Conti	Jadlowiec	Rohrer	Zimmerman
Cornell	Kenney	Ross	Zug
Dally	Krebs	Rubley	
Dempsey	Lawless	Sather	Ryan,
Dent	Leh	Saylor	Speaker
DiGirolamo			

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-5

Coy	Petrarca	Van Horne	Washington
Olasz			

Less than a majority of the members required by the rules having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the motion was not agreed to.

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

Mr. Rooney? The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Rooney.
Mr. ROONEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
The SPEAKER. The gentleman will yield.

Before debate begins, let me remind the members that we have made certain commitments to some of our members that they can leave early today. I would appreciate it, and I know they would, if debate were held to a minimum.
The gentleman may proceed.
Mr. ROONEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose SB 188, principally because of the excessive allocation of scarce taxpayer dollars to fund the former Philadelphia Naval Shipyard.

Mr. Speaker, I support the concept of using public resources to spur job creation. There must, there must, however, be limits to our largesse. Take, for example, the general rule for economic development projects typically financed by the Commonwealth which limits, again typically, financial assistance to \$15,000 per job created. The information that has been provided to me suggests the following: The Kvaerner project will initially create 1,000 jobs. There is a public subsidy — that is, taxpayer dollars, both Federal, State, and local — to fund this project to the tune of \$340 million.

That comes, Mr. Speaker, to a total taxpayer-dollar-per-job cost of \$340,000.

Now, the gentleman during the suspension debate suggested that this is going to create an excessive number of jobs at the former Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. Mr. Speaker, if you gave me \$340,000 per job each job I would create, I would guarantee I could do at least as good a job as what is being proposed.

It has also been suggested that this project has the potential to create some 6,000 jobs. Now, I need not remind my colleagues that this proposal, what we have seen of it, has been primarily focused on other economic multipliers for construction and supplier jobs, and again, I need not remind my colleagues that these numbers tend to be and often are overly exaggerated.

It is no secret that the administration has been actively seeking replacement for this facility after botching the Meyer Werft deal. They deserve commendation for their efforts. However, when you focus on the taxpayer-dollar investment in this proposal, some \$340,000 per job created, you have to begin to ask where the helping-partner aspect of our assistance ends and the governmental rollover begins.

We have witnessed successful public-private partnerships in recent years. Take the Bush Industries project in Erie County, or the Berg Electronics project in Huntingdon County. Together, both projects created in excess of 1,500 jobs, but at a public-taxpayer-dollar cost per job of \$9,500 and \$25,000 respectively, far less, far less, Mr. Speaker, than the \$340,000 we are being asked to spend here.

Now, I am empathetic to the men and women who lost their jobs when the naval shipyard closed. I further sympathize with them for having their hopes raised and dashed during the Meyer Werft debacle. But I am sorry, I cannot bring myself to support this bill today. My region, Mr. Speaker, in the Lehigh Valley has suffered a great loss of jobs over the recent years. The Bethlehem Steel Corporation has ended its steelmaking in my legislative district, the garment industry has been decimated by foreign competition, and Mack Truck is a shell of what it used to be.

I shall vote "no" on SB 188, because when I go home this week, I intend to look my displaced steelworkers and downsized garment workers in the eye and explain to them that they are my priority, and until such time as I have the opportunity to allocate \$340,000 for them to be called back to work, they will not be sold short by my vote.

I respectfully ask my colleagues to reject SB 188.

The SPEAKER. The lady from Montgomery County, Mrs. Cohen, is recognized.

Mrs. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, particularly the provisions to rescue the Philadelphia Navy Yard. I have missed the 12:15 train to go home, which is the last train that I can get to be home in time for a very important Jewish holiday. I stayed because I believe that my vote here is important for all Pennsylvanians.

We are all elected by about 60,000 people to represent their separate interests, but when we come to Harrisburg, we are here for the good of the entire Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Sometimes projects help one portion of the Commonwealth; other times projects favor other parts of the Commonwealth. But we are here, Mr. Speaker, to help the entire Commonwealth, and in this instance, we have to band together to support the revitalization of the Philadelphia Navy Yard.

Early this morning I spoke to a gentleman named Bill Cabana. He is the manager of Long Lane Appliance in Upper Darby. His company is 9 miles from the Philadelphia Navy Yard. When the navy yard closed, he lost 40 percent of his business. There are jobs, there are people's lives that are at stake, and it is incumbent upon us not to have a parochial attitude. These people deserve—There are thousands of people; they deserve our support, and there is only one way to do it, and that is to approve this proposal to rescue the Philadelphia Navy Yard.

There will be other times when we in the eastern and the southeastern section of the Commonwealth will be supporting projects in Pittsburgh, in Washington County, but today we have to support this vital project. We are talking about jobs that will affect everyone in the Commonwealth, not just people in Philadelphia. I am not a member of the Philadelphia delegation, but I and my people in Montgomery County depend upon the good health of this Philadelphia Navy Yard.

I urge my fellow Representatives, please, support SB 188, particularly the provisions to rescue the Philadelphia Navy Yard. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (J. SCOT CHADWICK) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For the benefit of the members, so that if you are intending to speak you need not stand at the microphone for a long time, I will read the order of the list in which the Speaker intends to call on the members: DeLuca, Argall, Gigliotti, Horsey, Taylor, Williams, George, and Birmelin, in that order.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. DeLuca.

Mr. DeLUCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago Governor Ridge turned down an offer for Meyer Werft that was half the size of the offer today. It was \$90 million for 2,000 direct jobs. He took a lot of criticism for that, from both parties. He probably took a lot of criticism from the Democratic Party because they wanted to play politics with it. But as I was going through the clips to find out what happened on this project, I believe Governor Ridge was right when he turned that project down and when he said, quote, it was his responsibility to weigh the interests of Philadelphia shipyard workers and the city against the State's taxpayers, and that is what this is all about — all our taxpayers in this State. But this year, 13 months away from an election, Governor Ridge is willing to offer \$180 million for only 1,000 direct jobs. That is twice the money for half the jobs.

Now, Governor Ridge, if he thought as he was quoted in the paper that that offer for Meyer Werft was "pure fantasy," what are the taxpayers going to think about this offer? Maybe they are going to call it pure lunacy.

You know, I am all for creating jobs at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, and I have voted for many, many projects over my 15 years for Philadelphia, but I also recognize the duty we have in this House to our constituents to question what Governor Ridge has proposed. This proposal does not have to come back to this House.

What is in the fine print? What are we really committing to ask the taxpayers for their support in this project? Do the taxpayers get a reasonable return on their investment? Taxpayers are putting up \$242 million for this project. That, Mr. Speaker, is

\$242,000 a job for each of the thousand direct jobs. That is a lot of money for one job, and we in this House should be asking whether we could create even more jobs by using the money for other job creation projects, not just in Philadelphia but all over Pennsylvania. Taxpayers in South Carolina and Alabama have lived to regret their big deals with foreign companies: \$185 million for BMW in South Carolina; \$253 million for Mercedes-Benz in Alabama. Will Pennsylvania be the next State to wonder whether we have been had? Or should I say, Mr. Speaker, have we been had again? Because you remember not too long ago, in 1976, under a Governor, a Democratic Governor, we were had by the Volkswagen plant — \$80 million that was supposed to provide 20,000 jobs. In their full capacity, they only provided 6,000 jobs and closed within 10 years.

We are told that Kvaerner, the Norwegian shipbuilding firm, has pledged to sign a 20-year lease, but we are not being told how much they are paying in rent. How much is it? A dollar a year? Who knows.

We are told that the Commonwealth — the taxpayers — will continue to own this shipyard, as if it is a good thing. But will someone tell me why taxpayers want to own a shipyard, if this deal does not go through? Taxpayers do not even own many buildings in Harrisburg where State offices are located. The Department of Revenue, the Department of Banking, the Attorney General's Office, the Department of Education, and many, many other State offices are housed in buildings that the State leases from the private sector. That is supposed to be a smart arrangement that saves taxpayers money. But for this shipyard deal, it is supposed to be smart for us to own the shipyard and lease it to the private sector.

Now, someone is giving us double-talk, and I do not know who it is.

We are told that some kind of public authority is going to run the shipyard. What authority? Who knows about it? Who sits on the authority? Whose interests do they represent?

And then there are other questions about priorities: Is this the best possible use of taxpayers' money when buildings at our State universities are crumbling? Pennsylvania ranks near the bottom in terms of having computers for children to learn in schools. In the long run — longer than a 20-year lease — will not a well-educated workforce pay us greater dividends if we invest our money there?

Just as important, why must we act on this proposal in such haste? Why can this not wait for at least a weekend so that we can understand the proposal, get the fine print of the proposal, and hear from the people we represent what they think about how Governor Ridge proposes to spend their money, not our money?

Finally, as a legislator from southwestern Pennsylvania, I have to point out the differences between how southwestern Pennsylvania is treated and how southeastern Pennsylvania is treated.

This past summer we were asked and a lot of you voted to give us in southwestern Pennsylvania the opportunity to tax ourselves to prosperity; tax ourselves to prosperity, you said; put it on the referendum and let the voters decide, a half-a-percent sales tax. Yes, you people in southwestern Pennsylvania are being asked to tax yourselves to prosperity and economic development. Well, I say to the southeastern region, why do you not put this as a vote and on a referendum, and we will give you the votes so that you can tax yourselves to prosperity and economic development.

Let me also say, at that time, it is my understanding — I am looking at the clips, and there are a lot of clips on this stuff — this proposal was only getting \$50 million of Federal funds. The previous proposal was a guarantee of \$170 million of Federal funds along with a proposal from the Governor of New Jersey to ante up over \$30 million, because a lot of those workers, a lot of those workers live in New Jersey. They come over to Philadelphia, work, take their money back to New Jersey.

Let me also say, when we talked about the Mercedes plant, let me read you a headline: "O Governor, Won't You Buy Me a Mercedes Plant?" I guess, not too soon after we pass this, the headlines might be, "Governor, Won't You Please Build Me a Ship Plant?"

We have been having hearings, and I commend the chairman of the Finance Committee, Chairman Boyes, for having these hearings on taxpayer incentives. Let me just read a little bit from this, a lot of these economic specialists who came before the committee and spoke out; let me just read you this one: "Government has a lousy record in picking business winners. State governments are throwing billions" — billions — "of taxpayer dollars to attract plants of industrial behemoths from other states or countries. Yet most new jobs" — remember this, Mr. Speaker — "most new jobs come from existing firms in all kinds of industries within a state, many of them small-to medium-sized companies. Public policies geared toward streamlining the tax code and investing in the workforce would benefit all businesses rather than a favored few."

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot, lot more. Let me say, how many bad investments have been made throughout the States and we in Pennsylvania have not learned. I just hope that this proposal will not come back to haunt us, but I will be voting against it mainly because of the fact that the southwestern part of the State is being asked to tax themselves into prosperity and economic development while the eastern part is asking our taxpayers to send their tax dollars to the State so they can have economic development and jobs. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to once again gently remind the members that a number of our members would like to leave Harrisburg as soon as possible today and would again request that to the extent possible, this is an important issue, but to the extent possible, members keep their remarks brief.

With that, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Schuylkill County, Mr. Argall.

Mr. ARGALL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to briefly direct the attention of the House about 80 miles north, along the Schuylkill River, from the city of Philadelphia, and if I may, I would like to direct a question to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Representative Barley.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Barley, indicates that he is willing to stand for interrogation. You are in order and may proceed.

Mr. ARGALL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Contained within the bill is funding for four large coal-burning facilities at Kutztown University, Clarks Summit State Hospital, Norristown State Hospital, and Dallas State Correctional Institution. Funding is included for renovation and upgrade of the boiler systems. Several people, after seeing this provision, have contacted Representative Allen and me, also Representative

Lucyk, concerned that these funds could be used to convert those boilers from coal to other fuels.

It was also, however, recently brought to our attention that the amendment that we had considered may not be necessary because section 2420 of the Administrative Code requires that all State-owned facilities be heated with Pennsylvania coal.

So I guess our question today is, in light of this, has the Secretary of the Department of General Services contacted you, as required by the Administrative Code, to inform you that any funding requested in SB 188 be used for anything other than the renovation of the existing coal boilers?

Mr. BARLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The answer is, no, the Secretary of General Services has not contacted me and indicated that he would be doing anything other than just simply making the appropriate renovations.

Mr. ARGALL. Am I correct then that it would be our understanding that the funds appropriated in this bill for these State institutions could not be used to convert those institutions away from coal but that these funds would have to be used to upgrade the boilers for the continued use of Pennsylvania coal?

Mr. BARLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the funds that we are making available in this bill would be required to be used for upgrading the current system and in no way used to make a conversion.

Mr. ARGALL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Gigliotti.

Mr. GIGLIOTTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the members who voted for my previous amendment, and I thought and still do think it is a great project to keep the steel mill open in the city of Pittsburgh.

But the reason I rise today on final passage of SB 188 is to congratulate all the members of Philadelphia County, Delaware County, and the majority leader, who is a bulldog when he wants something, and I will tell you the reason why. I mean, if you look at this capital budget, \$2 billion is going to Philadelphia in the east, and in the west, we get \$800 million, which is not a lot of money.

The Black Caucus, the white caucus, the Republicans, the Democrats of Philadelphia, unite when it comes to a project for Philadelphia in the eastern part of the State, and I commend them for doing that. We should learn to do that in the west, instead of electing officials back home that when a mill closes down and puts 3,000-some people out of work, the mayor comes out and supports rebuilding the mill; instead, he said, well, when they tear it down, we will develop the land. Well, that is bull.

I am very, very thankful for this bill, and let me tell you the reason why, because just like the previous speaker said, just like the previous speaker said, I want to thank you for letting us vote on the sales tax and for putting all this money into the budget, even though it is a wish list, I want to thank you again, because now my people back in western Pennsylvania can vote "no" on the sales tax, because in this budget is over \$500 million for stadiums, convention centers, cultural centers. Yes, we have got to come up with matching dollars, but let the private sector and the Pirates and the Steelers do this. They already said they are going to come up with \$35 million for the Pirates, \$50 million for the Steelers. We do not need the sales tax.

So again, I want to congratulate the members of

Philadelphia — Democrat, Republican — and you, the majority leader, you got cajones, chief. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Horsey, on final passage.

Mr. HORSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support SB 188, and I would encourage all my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I am a little confused here, and I do not really know if I am coming or going. I think that Mr. Roosevelt would be turning over in his grave about right now — and that is Teddy Roosevelt — because we have members in our caucus who are opposed to people getting jobs, and at the same time we are opposed to people getting jobs, we are fighting for lawyers to make \$20 million and \$30 million. I have got a problem with that, Mr. Speaker. I have got a problem with people talking about monster trucks this and that when truck drivers are working-class people and highway workers who will repair those highways are working-class people, and this party, Mr. Speaker, the Democrats, stands for working-class people — at least I thought, Mr. Speaker; at least I thought.

On this issue today, Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues on this side of the aisle to be in the right position. It has nothing to do with Democrat, Republican. It has to do with — the bottom line, Mr. Speaker — jobs and people going to work, Mr. Speaker. This particular project, the navy yard, is estimated to raise between 1,000 and 6,000 jobs in the Philadelphia area and across the State.

One of my colleagues from Philadelphia passed out a list that had over 100 contractors located from eastern Pennsylvania to western Pennsylvania. One of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle who threatened to vote against it had 10 contractors in his district. A gentleman who has already spoken, a gentleman from Lehigh County who opposed it, who opposed it, is going to have between \$10 million and \$20 million spent in his district as one of the primary trainers. We live in a world gone mad. What more does he want? He is going to be doing the primary training for this project, and he is opposed to it. They are going to be spending between \$10 million and \$20 million in his district. What more does he want?

Mr. Speaker, I support SB 188 primarily because it represents jobs, and people in my district send me up here to see what I can bring back. I have double-digit unemployment in my district, Mr. Speaker, and there are no promises here, no guarantees, but there are no guarantees in life. There is a possibility that people in my district might get some of those jobs, and I am going to support this legislation, and I am going to ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Taylor, is recognized on final passage.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would hope today that we can capitalize on what I think is an extremely unique opportunity embodied in SB 188. Specifically, I am referring to the naval shipyard money, which will be crucial to the Philadelphia area.

I do not need an economic impact study, I do not have to worry about economic multipliers or economic indicators to tell you the devastation that was brought to many areas in the southeast by the closure of that naval shipyard. We have an opportunity here to bring a world-class facility, a shipbuilding facility that will be not

only the only one in Pennsylvania but the only one in the United States, and we cannot lose sight of that.

For those of you who have talked about welfare reform over the years and supported the concept of moving people from welfare to work, I can suggest to you that one of the best ways to fulfill that goal is to pass this particular legislation. In Philadelphia alone, there were many skilled laborers who became unemployed and had to go after unskilled jobs. People that were highly technical workers are now bartenders in Philadelphia; they are now security guards. They are doing unskilled labor, which makes jobs for unskilled laborers that much more scarce. To move people from welfare to work, we need to make those jobs available and put skilled workers in skilled jobs, and this bill presents that opportunity.

One of the previous speakers mentioned that he is not in favor of this legislation because he is not getting money for his steel mills. I think as sad as it is to see the unoccupied naval shipyard, it is just as sad to ride through central or western Pennsylvania and see unoccupied steel mills. This bill will provide an opportunity to make those jobs come back and make those steel mills active again.

We heard comments about, why do we have to rush through this legislation? We probably do not have to go back that far in time to see that a delay could cost us this entire project. I am sure that Virginia and Georgia and Florida and other places in the United States would love to have this, and we have an opportunity to capitalize on this now.

We are not investing in a new project. This naval shipyard was put together and sustained by millions upon millions of taxpayer dollars throughout the years at the Federal level. We are just keeping that investment and saving that investment, to put that money down there and put this back into shape.

Mr. Speaker, the cost is minor compared to the total dollars that we spend in this State. Combined with the Federal money that we spend, \$30 billion, this is a minor investment in what could stimulate the economy not only for the southeast region but the entire State.

I ask that you look ahead, look on behalf of the interests of the entire State, and pass SB 188.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For the information of the members, the list of members still waiting to speak reads, Williams, George, Birmelin, Walko, Sturla, Thomas, Corrigan, Kirkland, Rooney, Keller, and the leaders.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Williams, on final passage.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I guess, as we have gone through this, I would have hoped that the comments or commentary or observations, whatever, would have really, frankly, related to economic prosperity for all of Pennsylvania. That is usually what this kind of conversation has been and should be relegated to, because that is in fact why we are here today. We are talking about a capital budget for capital prosperity for all of Pennsylvania. Instead, frankly, a lot of the rhetoric has been targeted at one area, and in particular, the county from which I come — Philadelphia.

Well, for those members who do not know this and do not recognize this, Pennsylvania is the size that it is across the nation because Philadelphia is a part of Pennsylvania. The Federal dollars that we draw down every year in large part come because

Philadelphia exists as a part of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The voting population, and we can go on and on, but the bottom line is, like it or not, Philadelphia is indeed a part of Pennsylvania, and frankly, a very significant part of Pennsylvania.

Certainly, there are problems which are associated with any urban center in Pennsylvania, and each one of those urban centers has come to the Commonwealth asking for help, not just Philadelphia. I thought it was kind of ironic when I was sitting here in my chair listening to some of the speakers earlier go on and on and on and on about how they want to break out the Navy deal when in this capital budget there is plenty of pork for their parts of the Commonwealth. So let us not be hypocrites today; let us be honest about the economic viability for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Philadelphia is not the only line item in this capital budget, and we are certainly not getting the majority of dollars when it comes to this capital budget. That is ridiculous to even comment in that manner. And by the way, for every speaker who has come to this mike today, every speaker — and I am not excepting anyone — any Democrat that comes to this mike today, there has been a time when I sat in my seat, pushed a button for another part of Pennsylvania to get something in terms of the capital budget process. The only difference is, I am not going to come to a mike today and talk about it.

Now, if you choose to campaign back home and talk about how we beat up Philadelphia, that is fine and dandy with me, but do not do it with any high-toned kind of commentary with me, because I can go letter and verse with any member, hear about how we have helped those different regions.

Today, Philadelphia County is not asking for themselves. For those who thought kicking people off welfare was an appropriate thing to do, that is fine, but those people that you kicked off welfare or put on welfare, in large part, a lot of those folks worked at the navy yard. They are people who have dignity, who have mortgages, who have families. And they do not just come from Philadelphia County, by the way. They come from all the surrounding regions of Philadelphia. They even go as far as Lancaster County.

The fact is that this is not just, quote, unquote — while we have to carry the burden of it — “the Philadelphia Navy Yard.” Forget my opinion. The facts speak to what the region has suffered because of the closure of the Philadelphia Navy Yard. That has gone across Pennsylvania to, frankly, some of the counties which have spoken against it.

Now, obviously, you are not going to benefit if you are not in Philadelphia County or the surrounding suburbs; you are not going to send your constituents to work there. But once I would like somebody to stand at this mike as I have when I have voted for other parts of Pennsylvania and gone back to my district and said, it was not just for Philadelphia, because there are no walls; it was a responsible thing to do for Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania's economy is held by a fragile thread at this point in time, a very fragile thread, and while people make legitimate arguments about, well, the cost of doing this is a bit questionable and suspect, I would have to agree, but the other side of that cost can be multiplied not only by 10 but the consequences to individuals' lives.

I am more than happy to come back here today or another day or any other day when members will stand and say, hey, look; we have a problem in our area, and we need your considerable help, not your irresponsible rhetoric but your considerable help. I mean in a way that is packaged with private industry, as this is; international trade, as this is; a local government, as this is; a county, as this is; and finally, a State. All of those components are involved. The State is not running in and rescuing the navy yard by themselves.

There is considerable, considerable input from a variety of necessary parties to get this thing done, and it will not be done just simply because we have done the capital budget. There is much more work to be done after that. But if we are going to engage in this dialogue, let us engage in it responsibly, fairly, appropriately, and balanced. Let us recognize that the capital budget has helped many, many, many counties across this Commonwealth when it has not done a thing for Philadelphia County. Let us be honest when we step to this mike and talk about this capital budget when I see a lot of other counties which are earmarked for this capital budget.

Now, if we want to go by the process, we can go line by line. We can let each county come to the mike and make their argument for how they are going to benefit by their capital budget, and I guarantee, by the time we reach the end of the day, you will be running up to the front of the room, talking to your respective leaders, saying, hey, I do not want to stand by myself; let us package this together; let us do this as a body. That is all we are doing today, which makes sense, and it does not just make sense for Philadelphians, it makes sense for Pennsylvanians. It makes sense that the navy yard get off the social back of all taxpayers; that those people who want to work, that those vendors who want to come to Pennsylvania and do business, that those parties who are interested from a governmental standpoint are given a bridge or, frankly, a Band-Aid.

The consequences to this, we cannot even imagine today. Well, the money that we are putting into this is a pimple in terms of the prosperity that we will feel as Pennsylvanians down the road. So I would hope that those members who are in their seats listening and those future members who may come to the mike, who may want to speak, remember that this is not about Philadelphia; this is about them as it is to me. And frankly, for those members who think that there is a black caucus and a white caucus who have arranged a deal, I am still looking for the white caucus, but for those who think that there is a white caucus and a black caucus who have arranged a deal in Philadelphia County, this gentleman who is cochairman of the Philadelphia delegation, black and white, knows that we have looked at our respective responsibilities in such a way that cuts across color, cuts across gender, cuts across counties, frankly, and relates to how Pennsylvanians will benefit today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. George, from Clearfield County is recognized on final passage.

Mr. GEORGE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I heard a couple of moments ago somebody say, you know, let us limit the speaking to 2 minutes and let us go home, and I will do that, but first I am going to say, if I may, that I thought I would get up and talk and then I thought I would not, and then I heard the majority leader saying, this is going to help all of Pennsylvania, not just Philadelphia, and I heard the gentleman

from Philadelphia, Mr. Taylor — if I can use his name, because I am not going to criticize him — say that you ought to understand what the layoffs at the shipyard did to our people; they laid off thousands of people, and they took skilled employment, and what we wound up with was unskilled employment, and we have been devastated. Well, Mr. Speaker, it might be a surprise to those two fine gentlemen, but in Clearfield County, when we have somebody that loses a job, they anguish the same as they do in Philadelphia, and in Clearfield County, when we lose our jobs and we lose our medical protection and we have a sick kid and we cannot attend to the matter like we would like to, just like Philadelphia, we continue to anguish.

Now, I understand that a couple of years ago, when the Governor had an opportunity to do the same thing, maybe in a smaller way, in Philadelphia, he did not make that decision, and now he is back and he is trying to right a situation that was not, probably in his opinion, the proper decision at that time.

So what I am really trying to say is, all of us understand, but I think we have got to tell His Excellency that we are going to issue you a challenge, Governor; we are going to remind you that when you stood out in the new side of our Capitol and raised your hand and took the oath, there were statements that you made that even I agreed with, because I said, maybe he is not a Democrat, but he wants to help the rural area. Over the last couple of years, I have had my doubts.

Now, I understand as well as anyone else what has happened here on the floor of this House in the last couple of years, but I am just saying to those of you that are Republicans that we on this side that are Democrats, we understand, and I am saying to some of you that are Democrats, there are Republicans over there that understand equally as well, especially those of us that come from the rural area.

Now, I am not going to challenge and question the \$186 million that will go into Philadelphia, because I am happy that that is going to happen, and it is not up to me because I was not in on the proceedings and where they put together something like \$3½ billion, but it does not change the fact that in Clearfield and in Indiana and in Elk and all those counties closer to Erie than Philadelphia, we need help.

So I say to you, Governor, I challenge you to live up to your commitment; I challenge you to understand that even a few million dollars goes a lot further up there than it does in the denser populations.

I am going to vote for this bill because I want the people from Philadelphia to know that we are going to come to you pretty soon and we are going to say, hey, remember us. I am going to vote this way because I want the majority leader to understand that he should be the majority leader for all that sit in this esteemed, august body, and that he ought to understand that it is not a game when you are dealing with people and it is not funny when you become frustrated because you cannot take back home something that they deserve.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me these couple of minutes, but I just want to set something very straight: When we run for election, we tell those back home what we intend to do, Governors and the United States Senators and legislators and what, but the truth of the matter is, when you go back home, you ought to be able to face those people and you ought to be able to let them

find that trust that they placed in you when they sent you down here, and if it is right, it is right.

Yesterday we lost a colleague, Herman Mihalich, and he helped me become a chairman, and when he was elected, many times he would come into the meetings in which I was a chairman of the Environmental Committee, and even though he did not follow me completely in my philosophy, he stayed with me on the principle of the matter, and I am going to stay with you people today simply on the principle. Thank you very much.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wayne County, Mr. Birmelin, is recognized on final passage.

Mr. BIRMELIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am going to save everybody a lot of time and submit my comments for the record. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair joins the members in thanking the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, SB 188, a capital budget bill, is essentially a wish list. In it are contained hundreds of projects valued at billions of dollars. The reality is that few of them will ever be accomplished by the use of these funds being requested from the State's Treasury.

If we were to pass SB 188 into law, each line item would still require the approval of the Governor for any State moneys to be actually expended. Even at that, the Governor need not authorize the full amount listed herein, but could designate some smaller percent to be expended and he would also have the option of negotiating certain terms or conditions that the recipient would be obligated to meet in return for receiving funds.

Included in SB 188 is an appropriation for \$7.5 million for a Pike County Arts/Cultural Center. This is a proposal that is currently being developed in Pike County that is estimated, at completion, at \$20 million.

I am voting "no" on SB 188 because of the inclusion of this \$7.5 million. I believe it is inappropriate for taxpayers to finance projects of this type. If the arts are wanted and appreciated, I believe they should be supported by those who enjoy them. I do not consider this to be an area of government necessity requiring the use of tax dollars.

While my inquiries into this project have convinced me that it is a legitimate effort and holds great potential for Pike County, I must remain firm in my opposition to using tax dollars for its development.

The State cannot and should not be involved in every legitimate community development project. Taxpayers should not be forced to underwrite nonessential programs that then detract from our ability to do those things we should be doing.

I hope the Pike County Arts/Cultural Center becomes a reality and has all the wonderful impact that its proponents are predicting. It should be done, however, without State tax moneys.

I am also opposed to the fact that we are including in this bill hundreds of millions of dollars for ball parks in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. While I recognize that this sporting industry is an important part of tourism in Pennsylvania, I do not believe that our State tax dollars should be used to subsidize it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Walko, is recognized on final passage.

Mr. WALKO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this capital budget bill today. While I do not agree that every single item in it is appropriate, I believe that it is generally a good plan for the investment in Pennsylvania.

I am particularly pleased with the \$145-million line item for the expansion of the David L. Lawrence Convention Center. Together with the new hotel tax funding stream and the increased revenue stream from the expanded center, our investment will obviate the need for the people of Allegheny County to raise our already high sales tax for the expansion of the center.

Another high point in SB 188 is the authorization of \$26 million for the development of high-precision manufacturing technology, to be developed by the Institution for Precision Technologies, for use in bridge construction and fabricated metal infrastructure components for transportation systems generally known as magnetically levitated trains.

Through this capital budget, the people of Pennsylvania are setting forth their ideas for investment in the future and they are also backing it up with needed resources. We know that the people's commitment to economic development must be matched by local support, either private or public dollars or in-kind contributions.

In southwestern Pennsylvania, the citizens are being asked to hike their sales tax to provide some portion of those matching funds. They are being asked to do so even after they have made this commitment today. Well, I say our citizens are paying enough and that they have made enough of a commitment and that they should not hike the regressive sales tax.

Now, in addition to the local matches, which are already in place, like that hotel tax for the convention center, it is time for the corporate community of Pennsylvania to come to the table, to pony up, to make their commitment to Pennsylvania, to ante up, just like the citizens are doing today.

The fund which I am proposing, well, would be funded— For example, since 1995 through 1999, our total business tax cuts in Pennsylvania will amount to \$2.4 billion. Each year since 1995, the CNI (corporate net income) tax cuts have surpassed one-half billion dollars per year. The people of Pennsylvania have not only made this commitment today, they have over the years continued to give tax breaks to the corporate community. Now it is time for corporate Pennsylvania to come to the table, to pony up. I am asking the Pennsylvania corporate community to contribute to an economic development trust fund in the amount of the lesser of one-half billion dollars per year or one-half penny of their corporate net income tax for a period of 7 years.

The fund will be administered by regionally structured boards throughout Pennsylvania. The fund will be used on economic development projects which are specified in our capital budget and provide up to \$3.5 billion in local matching funds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman suspend.

The question before the House is final passage of SB 188. Would the gentleman please limit his remarks to that.

Mr. WALKO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This capital budget is meaningless unless it is matched by local funds. I am very much on target. I am not only talking about voting on things that we get on a laundry list; as we all call it, the wish list. I am talking about bringing these line items authorized in this budget to fruition, to real jobs. It is meaningless if we do not provide local matching initiatives. The citizens of Pennsylvania

have ponied up, and it is time for the corporations in Pennsylvania to come to the table.

This corporate trust fund will be privately funded and privately administered. They can make the decisions on which of our economic development items we have put in our capital budget—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Walko, please, please, restrain your remarks to final passage of SB 188.

Mr. WALKO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I support final passage. I want to make it meaningful, and I want the corporate community of Pennsylvania to come to the table. The people of Pennsylvania, through us, have made their commitment to the future of Pennsylvania in this capital budget. I ask that corporate Pennsylvania come forth with its commitment today. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster County, Mr. Sturla, on final passage.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will be brief, because I along with several of my colleagues are supposed to be at an Urban Education Commission meeting, and despite reassurances by the majority leader's staff that we would not be doing any substantive voting on days when we had those meetings, I decided I would stay here and see whether in fact we did anything of substance today, and I believe we actually will do something of substance here, which is why I stuck around to vote.

I rise rather reluctantly in support of SB 188, and I say that for rather Machiavellian reasons. If we really look at SB 188, it is not a "shall" bill; it is merely a "may" bill. The Governor does not have to fund the navy yard. The Governor does not have to fund stadiums in Pittsburgh. The Governor does not have to fund some other projects in the State that are in this bill that I think and most members would probably agree are rather ludicrous expenditures of taxpayer dollars. But if the Governor does choose to fund those projects, I think it actually gives me leverage in my district to get my State School of Technology funded, the museum in my region funded, or to have the transportation links for intermodal transportation funded in my district, because when the Governor comes to visit my district, he will have to explain to my constituents why he wanted to fund some other project that really did not make sense at the expense of the projects in my district that I believe do make sense, that are conservative projects, that do get a big bang for the buck.

Today we have talked about what will happen if we do this and if in fact their shipyard goes on, and we have had promises that there will be steel produced in Pennsylvania, and I hope that is part of the contract, and we have had promises that there will be jobs in Pennsylvania, and I hope that they are in Pennsylvania and not in New Jersey, but ultimately, if they are not, it will be the Governor's choice as to whether or not those things happen. So understanding his position as Governor, I will give him that option and hope that he makes the best decision, because ultimately, he will have to explain to the voters why he chose to make the wrong decision if in fact he does. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman, Mr. Thomas, on the floor of the House?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks County, Mr. Corrigan, on final passage.

Mr. CORRIGAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I need about 30 seconds. I think the gentleman, the elder statesman, Bud George, said it all, and I think he said it very well.

What we need to do today is show a vote of confidence in the economy. The economy today is good. We need the economy to continue into the year 2000 and beyond. These kinds of measures will do a great deal for Pennsylvania and the five-county Philadelphia area.

We have the finest workforce in the world in Pennsylvania. The Philadelphia Building Trades Council produces some of the finest craftsmen in the United States. This is an opportunity for us to put those people to work. Whether it be 3 ships or 300 ships, we need to do this. When there is an opportunity in other parts of this State, this House of Representatives, I am sure, will come to their aid in some fashion.

This is an opportunity that may not present itself again. I would encourage a "yes" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman, Mr. Kirkland, on the floor of the House?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Rooney, for the second time on final passage.

Mr. ROONEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I promise to be brief.

There has been some characterization of those of us who have risen in opposition to SB 188 that either we are uncaring or unconcerned about the economic future of the southeastern part of this State or somehow that it is our intent to bash the people of Philadelphia, and that is certainly not for a moment my intent.

My point, Mr. Speaker, as I stated before, is that the public cost per job in this project is \$340,000. As the gentleman from Clearfield suggested, when his constituents are out of work, they feel anguish; when my constituents are out of work, I feel anguish. So I do not begrudge for a moment the efforts to attract new industry to the city of Philadelphia. I do, however, question the sensibilities of allocating \$340,000 for each job that is created. That also, as I am told by a colleague of mine, may be a bit of an understatement, because by the time we pay this \$180 million back, there will be another \$100 million in accrued interest, which further drives the per-job cost.

But for the moment, I think that the question of fairness is one that is legitimate, one that needs to be raised, because as I have asked for my colleagues' support in other instances to help projects in the Lehigh Valley, I have never asked for them to provide \$340,000 to help me create jobs, nor would I.

Now, finally, Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested by one of my colleagues who has risen to support the bill that somehow I am negligent or diligent in my duties because I intend to vote against this, and yet somehow there is an idea that Lehigh University, which is located in my district, may, through one of their branch campuses, stand to be awarded a contract somewhere in the neighborhood of \$10 million to \$20 million.

Now, listen: You know, I have only been here for 5 years. There are many, many more senior people on this floor that I respect immensely. But I guess it just brings me back to the idea advanced in a recent movie in terms of "Show me the money." You know, when we debated other issues on this floor, there was a great hue and cry for more specifics. Now, if Lehigh University stands to be awarded \$10 million or \$20 million for one of their branch campuses to train some workers yet to be identified, well, then I guess I am going to have to answer to my constituents. I do

not, however, need to be lectured on the floor of the House by anybody who would question my motivation, question my intention, or question why I am standing up and asking why we need to spend \$340,000 to create jobs at the former Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. I will answer to my constituents; I will answer to anybody who wants to ask of me why I voted the way I did. But I just think it is important, A, for my colleagues to understand, those of us who have risen in opposition are not intending to bash Philadelphia; we are just simply stating an important point that needs to be made: When it comes to the expenditure of taxpayers' dollars, why should you be treated any differently than the people I represent?

I thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware County, Mr. Kirkland, on final passage.

Mr. KIRKLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose SB 188 for the following reasons, Mr. Speaker, and, Mr. Speaker, I am not here to bash anybody, but I am here to try to hopefully encourage us to get our priorities in order, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about spending millions upon millions upon millions of dollars for professional sports stadiums. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about giving millionaires millions of dollars. I have a problem with that, Mr. Speaker. We are talking about taking poor persons' tax dollars and encouraging them to put those tax dollars into a stadium that many of them will never even have an opportunity to go into — that is, unless they are selling popcorn, peanuts, and warm beer.

I have a problem with that, Mr. Speaker. It seems that the rich continually get richer in our State here. It is unnecessary to provide these professional athletes with this kind of money to build these stadiums, especially when our universities are crumbling around us, especially when our schools are falling apart.

Mr. Speaker, if I am not mistaken, I remember seeing Deion Sanders drive around in a Mercedes-Benz golf cart, while our children are riding around in a 1963 Chevy educational system, and that is not right, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that Curt Schilling and Ricky Watters and Deion Sanders, their children are set for life when it comes to the academics, because they are going to make sure that their kids get the best of education, and we are going to make sure that their kids get the best of education because we are going to build a stadium for them, but our kids, our kids, get absolutely nothing. Oh, they may get a ticket or two to go to the game, they may get a ticket or two to go and sit in the hot sun, but they will not get a proper education because we are going to put our dollars into building stadiums and not building educational facilities. Our priorities are all messed up around here, Mr. Speaker.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we do not want to give cash assistance to poor folks, we do not want to give food stamps to those who are hungry, we do not even want to give elderly folks a tax break, but we want to give millionaires millions of dollars to build these facilities. Something is wrong here, Mr. Speaker. Our priorities are all messed up.

The other piece, Mr. Speaker, is the shipyard. Mr. Speaker, I want to see Pennsylvania grow; I want to see Pennsylvania boom economically; I want to see us zoom into the 21st century. But, Mr. Speaker, where are the guarantees? Where are the

guarantees? I say this because, Mr. Speaker, I supported a shipyard, a shipbuilding company in my own district, Metro Machine, and they made all these promises. They are going to come to the city of Chester, and all the Chester residents are going to get all these jobs, hundreds and hundreds of jobs. I stood up there and I supported them, Mr. Speaker, and you know what, Mr. Speaker? Every day I see tags from Virginia, Delaware, Maryland, and New Jersey flow into my city and park their cars down there at Metro Machine, and I see the people of Chester standing on the outside, begging for jobs that they cannot get.

Where are the guarantees, Mr. Speaker? That is my problem with the shipyard situation. Here we are saying we are going to provide thousands of jobs to Philadelphians, thousands of jobs to Pennsylvanians. Mr. Speaker, where are the guarantees?

The previous speaker said that there was one member of this House that had 10 companies, or 10 businesses, who would benefit from the shipyard. He was wrong. It is 11; it is 11, Mr. Speaker. I want you to know he was wrong. He was wrong when he said that Philadelphia was the first city in the State of Pennsylvania; he was wrong. He was wrong when he said that Philadelphia was the oldest city in the State of Pennsylvania; he was wrong. And he is wrong now with his math. So if he is wrong with his math, I know he is going to be wrong with his vote.

Mr. Speaker, there are 11 businesses in my district, and guess what, Mr. Speaker? Not one of them, not one of them called me and said, vote for SB 188; not one of them. Why? Because they are probably tired of getting peanuts, too. Squirrels live off peanuts, not people, and we are tired of getting peanuts. Show me the guarantees.

Mr. Speaker, someone said that there are no guarantees in life, but let me give you a guarantee right now. You can be guaranteed that if you do not show me the guarantees that Pennsylvanians and Philadelphians will get the jobs, if you do not show me that my children in Pennsylvania will be placed high on the priority list and buildings that allow them to be educationally stable are not built, you can be guaranteed that I will not vote for this bill. There are guarantees in life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues on the House floor to oppose SB 188. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Thomas, is recognized on final passage.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of SB 188, and I rise in support of SB 188 for the following reasons.

Number one, Mr. Speaker, SB 188 makes good economic sense. It makes good economic sense simply because we are talking about a project that is going to require a \$700-million investment, and we as lawmakers are being asked to provide one-seventh of the overall investment in this particular project — one-seventh of the overall investment in this particular project. This project will become a reality only through a collaborative effort, not totally on the backs of Pennsylvania taxpayers. So, Mr. Speaker, the project makes good economic sense.

Politically, Mr. Speaker, the project makes good sense. This is an international company desiring to come to Pennsylvania, desiring to use a Pennsylvania facility for not only its development activities but also for its transportation activities of bringing goods and services in and out of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the

international community is watching what Pennsylvania is doing or will do in reference to this particular issue, and, Mr. Speaker, if Pennsylvania does the right thing, then let me assure you that other international companies who have not thought about doing business in Pennsylvania, other companies who have not thought about doing business in Pennsylvania will consider Pennsylvania to be an ideal place to do business, because this deal represents not a single-source responsibility but a collaborative effort between government and the private sector. So politically, it is the right thing to do to support SB 188.

Mr. Speaker, socially, it is the right thing to do. From the first day that I arrived, that I arrived in this august body, there have been three issues at the head of the agenda: jobs, education, economic development, and inclusion of all Pennsylvanians in the share of the economic pie. Those have been the issues of paramount importance to me, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have heard colleagues from both sides of the aisle, from both sides of the aisle, talk about the need for jobs, and yet, and yet when confronted with an opportunity to create jobs, what do we do, Mr. Speaker? We start talking about territorialism; we start talking about geography; we start talking about my city, my State; we start talking about selfish reasons on the question of jobs that are going to benefit Pennsylvanians.

It is not so important whether you live in Erie or whether you live in Philadelphia. A job putting people to work, whether it be in southeastern Pennsylvania or northeastern Pennsylvania or southwestern Pennsylvania, is putting people to work, and as long as people are working, then they are contributing to the overall economy of this Commonwealth. They are not just contributing to the municipality or to the county in which they are working; they are contributing to the overall Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

So, Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford, we cannot afford to debate the question of job opportunities. We cannot afford to reduce that question to geography; to territorialism; to my this, you that. No, Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to do that on this particular issue.

Pennsylvania is falling in the overall number of States that have had a job boom in their particular economies. Pennsylvania is down at the bottom, not at the top. So we can ill afford to throw away this opportunity. Socially, this issue is the right issue for us to support.

Mr. Speaker, I just say in closing that I am not going to get caught up into whether we have guarantees or not. Mr. Speaker, 60,000, 60,000 residents of our particular districts sent us here to exercise leadership and to exercise good judgment, and so, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, it is wrong, it is wrong for us to get caught up into whether or not we have a guarantee. As a representative of your district, you have a responsibility to make sure that your district benefits from any investment that you either make for or against a particular issue. So I am not going to get caught up in that.

Mr. Speaker, I will close on this: I remember one time hearing a story about two people in India, and it was at night, Mr. Speaker, and they were walking up a very steep hill, and the two people, Mr. Speaker, one was a priest and one was a beggar, and, Mr. Speaker, as they were walking up this steep hill and walked past an alley, a dark street, Mr. Speaker, as they turned and looked down this dark street, they saw a man lying in this dark street, and, Mr. Speaker, the man looked like he had blood on him; the man looked like he had been robbed and beat up. So, Mr. Speaker, as

the two men noticed this man lying in the street, it looked like he might be dying. They looked at each other, Mr. Speaker, and the question that they raised to each other, one asked the other, "What will happen to me if I stop to help that man? Will the robber come back and harm me if I stop to help that man? What will happen to me if I take time out to find out whether that man has been hurt or whether that man needs some help?" Mr. Speaker, the other looked at the gentleman who raised the question about what would happen to him if he stopped to help that man, and the other looked at him and he said, Mr. Speaker, "The question is not, 'What will happen to me if I stop to help that man?' The question," Mr. Speaker, "is, 'What will happen to me if I don't stop to help that man lying in that dark street?'"

By analogy to this issue, the issue is not whether or not what will happen to you if you vote for SB 188; the question is not whether you will be reelected or you will be unelected if you vote for SB 188. Mr. Speaker, it is time to reverse the question. The real question is, what will happen to you if you do not vote for SB 188? Look at the jobs that will be lost, look at the economic opportunity that the State will lose, look at the social consequences that we will have to suffer for failing to deal with this issue, and, Mr. Speaker, look at the political consequences that the people of Pennsylvania, whether they be in the northwest, southwest, southeast, or northeast, the political consequences of turning this deal away.

So the question is not, what will happen to us if we put up a "yes" vote? The question is, what will happen to the people of Pennsylvania if we fail to put up a "yes" vote on SB 188?

Mr. Speaker, it is time to put up, to put up. We have been saying all along, Pennsylvania needs jobs; the people of Pennsylvania need jobs. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is time to either put up or shut up. If you have been about jobs, then vote "yes" on SB 188. If you have been about just conversation and not commitment, then vote "no" on SB 188. But the people of Pennsylvania have watched each and every one of us. They have watched us talk that talk about wanting jobs. Now they are going to watch us walk that walk about whether we are serious about jobs.

Vote "yes" for SB 188, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For the information of the members, there are still eight members seeking recognition, including the leaders.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Keller, on final passage.

Mr. KELLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think this basically comes down to very simple terms. Number one is jobs. Everyone knows that is what we talk about. That is the most important thing a person has. That is how he raises his family; that is how he pays his bills.

I remember going to a committee meeting in Pittsburgh out in Allegheny County, and they were saying, what do you want to see? Let us see the steel mills. Well, they took me out and showed me acres and acres and acres of empty fields, fields that were once full of workers and a lively industry that was gone. As soon as I looked at that, I knew what was going to happen to the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard.

I cannot believe that members from Allegheny County cannot remember that themselves, because it all came after that. The breakup of the families, the loss of self-esteem because they did

not have a job, divorce, suicide, all came with the closing of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. The job is the most important thing a person has, and we have the ability to get that back today, and I promise that whenever we get a chance to do the same for any project that will create jobs in Pennsylvania, I will stand tall and we will create jobs in Pennsylvania.

But the second thing — and it is not \$330,000 a job or whatever is the hip thing to say now — the thing Pennsylvania gets from this deal is technology. What do we pay for technology? We do not know how to build ships, commercial ships, in the United States anymore. Europe has it, everywhere else has it in the world — the Koreans have it; the Germans have it; the Norwegians have it. The Americans do not have it. We need the technology that this deal will bring to the United States. What price tag do we put on that, making Philadelphia, yes, Philadelphia, because we have the dry docks there, but Pennsylvania, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the new leader not in America, not in North America, but the whole hemisphere in shipbuilding? With this deal, with SB 188, we will be catapulted into the 21st century of shipbuilding, and then we will see what other benefits we get out of that.

Thank you, and I would appreciate a positive vote on SB 188.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware County, Mr. Raymond, on final passage.

Mr. RAYMOND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of SB 188, and I rise in support of the comments made by my colleague from South Philadelphia.

He and I shared in the dubious distinction of having the most employees laid off when they closed the doors of the navy yard. We also had many businesses that were affected and were suppliers to the navy yard. We understand firsthand what happened when that went out of business.

The other point I would like to make, it really is a pretty simple simplification for my constituents back home watching: A “yes” vote on SB 188 does nothing more than move these projects ahead and allow us to debate them and look at them in the future; a “no” vote on SB 188 kills all these projects, stops them in their tracks, and prevents the State, prevents the Governor, prevents the mayor of Philadelphia, our congressional delegation, the legislature, from pursuing this project in South Philadelphia. It is a simple vote: “Yes” you want to go ahead and try to negotiate it; “yes” we will go ahead and find out the details of the deal, we will find out the impact in our area, in the State, and on everybody; a “no” vote, we will never find out, we will never know because we send the wrong message not only to Pennsylvania but to the world that we do not want to pursue projects like this.

So I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote “yes,” and let us move ahead with this project and move Pennsylvania ahead. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington County, Mr. Daley, on final passage.

Mr. DALEY. Will the majority leader stand for a brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Daley, requests that the majority leader stand for a brief interrogation. Is the gentleman willing to stand for interrogation? The gentleman indicates that he is. The gentleman, Mr. Daley, is in order and may proceed.

Mr. DALEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in your opening remarks, the remarks about supporting SB 188, you stated that there would be steel industry jobs created in western Pennsylvania. As a Representative that my legislative district includes a steel mill and I am sure if Representative Herman Mihalich were with us today, our colleague and my friend that shares the Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel facility in Monessen, the question needs to be asked, could you tell us specifically for the record what mills in western Pennsylvania are going to be producing steel that will be used at this facility in Philadelphia?

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell you specifically which mills they will use. They are telling us they are going to use 40,000 tons of steel a year. And by the way, in the Pittsburgh area right now, they have 950 jobs at Kvaerner and they expect to add another 50, so they will have 1,000 jobs in the Pittsburgh area as soon as we pass — well, within a very short time of passing this piece of legislation. But, no, I do not know the exact steel mills; no.

Mr. DALEY. Could you tell me if it is structural steel, sheet steel, flat steel? What type of steel is going to be utilized?

Mr. PERZEL. As was proper, I was corrected when I called the people that worked at the shipyard before sheet metal workers; they were iron workers. I do not know what types of steel they are, so I do not think I should try to answer it, because I do not know.

Mr. DALEY. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. DALEY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard from a lot of people this afternoon that the steel jobs in western Pennsylvania are going to be enhanced by the passage of this bill, and I think it would be remiss upon me and other members of western Pennsylvania if we would vote against this bill simply because it is creating and saving jobs in Philadelphia. However, once again we are asked to belly up to the table in western and central and northeastern and the northern tier in northeastern Pennsylvania, to belly up to the table for Philadelphia.

Let me ask you these questions: Where was the Commonwealth when Sue Laughlin lost 25,000 jobs in Beaver County, and where was the Commonwealth when Stanley Jarolin in Luzerne County lost 15,000 garment workers, and where was the Commonwealth when we lost the coal industry in southwestern Pennsylvania, and where was the Commonwealth when we lost over 450,000 jobs in western Pennsylvania? We knocked at the door and no one answered.

We are going to be asked to belly up to the table today, and I think that is wonderful, but I want you to realize, as this gentleman asked about guarantees, I am quite sure that we have the guarantee that once again we are going to lose jobs in Pennsylvania and once again we will be voting for those jobs, and I guarantee you it will include Philadelphia and other parts of Pennsylvania.

And I guarantee you, if we do not start sharing the wealth around Pennsylvania, there is going to be a revolution, because we that do not represent southeastern Pennsylvania say it is time we share the wealth for Republican districts, Democrat districts, northeast, northern tier, central, northeast, northwest, and southwestern Pennsylvania. Let us share the wealth. I guarantee you the revolution is coming.

I ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the lady from Indiana County, Representative Steelman, on final passage.

Ms. STEELMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My objection to the capital budget bill is not founded on the Philadelphia Shipyard project. I have heard a lot about the Philadelphia Shipyard project, and I think that no matter what the failures of the Commonwealth in past years have been with regard to trying to maintain some of our good manufacturing jobs, those past failures are not necessarily reasons to oppose a project that has a chance of bringing good manufacturing jobs back into Philadelphia and opening up the Philadelphia Yard again.

Indeed, if the project goes through, if the shipbuilding company employs 1,000 people in Philadelphia, I hope they do use steel from western Pennsylvania. I hope we can put some of my laid-off coal miners in Indiana County back to work digging coal so that they are providing the electricity to refine that steel and the power to make that steel in the first place. I am not holding my breath, but I am willing to hope for that.

No, what bothers me about this capital budget bill is not the projects in the bill that are likely to create good manufacturing jobs. What bothers me about this bill is the fact that there is a line item of \$200 million for stadiums in Philadelphia; that there is a line item of \$75 million for a stadium in Pittsburgh; that there is a line item of \$361 million, 55 percent of which we understand is dedicated to more stadiums in Pittsburgh; that there is a \$200-million line item for the expansion of the Pennsylvania Convention Center in Philadelphia.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has already invested more than \$150 million in the Pennsylvania Convention Center in Philadelphia, and many of us were in that convention center this summer as part of the National Conference of State Legislatures' meeting. It is a beautiful facility; it is a spacious facility. It is a facility that is in wonderful shape. Why on earth do they need another \$200 million from the people of Pennsylvania in order to fix something that by all accounts is not broken?

When you sum up these projects, these perhaps desirable but hardly necessary projects, you get a sum total that is greater than all the sums of money that this capital budget would allocate to construction and repairs at the 14 campuses of the State-owned System of Higher Education; more money for convention center expansion and sports stadiums than we are prepared to spend on heating systems, on computers, on Internet connections, on leaky roofs in the buildings that we, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, already own and where we educate our young people to prepare them for a productive life.

I do not mind at all voting for a capital budget that provides funds that we hope will help to put bread into the mouths of Pennsylvania workers and their children, and I do not mind voting for a capital budget that, as the old union song says, puts both bread into children's mouths and roses into their hands. I can vote for bread, I can vote for bread and roses, but I do not think that I can vote for bread and circuses, and that is what we are being asked to do today.

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

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Mrs. Lederer.

Mrs. LEDERER. Mr. Speaker, out of respect for the Jewish members of this Assembly, I will submit my remarks for the record and ask that everyone vote "yes" on SB 188. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

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

As I sit in my district office, I look out on post-industrial wasteland that was once the KENSINGTON DRY DOCK COMPANY and THE CRAMP SHIPYARD. Its 32 acres employed 6,000 people, using Pennsylvania steel, coal, and lumber in the construction of so many ships that the Delaware River was referred to as the "American Clyde" and the "Work Shop of the World."

Farther down river was the American International Shipbuilding Corporation, employing 35,000 people, their work fueled by up to 300 freight cars a day. During World War II the shipbuilders of the Delaware River launched an average of a minesweeper every 30 days.

From colonial times to very recently the shipbuilders of the Delaware River have fueled the Pennsylvania economy, drawing upon all the resources of the Commonwealth. This legislation, SB 188, is the important first step to returning this Commonwealth to its historical position of a global giant in the maritime community.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster County, Mr. Barley.

Mr. BARLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, during the last 2½ years, members of this body, and if I may add, in a bipartisan manner, have partnered with Governor Ridge, and we have really genuinely moved Pennsylvania forward, and we have certainly a better Pennsylvania today. We have created a Pennsylvania where more people are working than at any time in the history of the Commonwealth, and together we have launched Pennsylvania on a very positive course, and with this bill today, SB 188, we continue that. This bill by its many, many authorizations will create even more jobs for the working families in Pennsylvania.

I would just like to thank all of the members that have participated in a timely fashion and in a very cooperative manner, and the chairman, the Democrat chairman of the Appropriations Committee in their cooperation with us as well.

I would just again urge the members of the House to vote affirmatively on this bill to continue to move Pennsylvania on that positive path.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Belfanti.

Mr. BELFANTI. I forgot about that automatic microphone switch that does not work without a jacket.

The SPEAKER. Semper fidelis.

Mr. BELFANTI. Mr. Speaker, I stand here as one member who has every reason to vote against this bill. I have two little projects in it that have been in it probably since 1981 to restore some creek walls in my hometown, and I would probably have a heart attack if Governor Ridge released that money.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to stand here and support this legislation. As what many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have explained, it is good manufacturing jobs; it is new technology. These are the kinds of jobs we want to bring to this

State. I am going to look at this legislation as what is good for the entire Commonwealth as opposed to being my typical provincial self in looking at legislation like this and seeing what is good for Northumberland, Columbia, and Montour Counties.

I would hope that more of my colleagues would hopefully support this bill. Although there is a lot of money in it for southwestern and southeastern Pennsylvania, perhaps this time next year or the year after, if the economy remains as good as it is and the State continues to accumulate a surplus, those of us in northeastern and north-central and south-central Pennsylvania can come before our members and ask the Philadelphia delegation and the Allegheny County delegation and those who are getting a huge piece of this pie to look at our parts of the State and give us a helping hand.

So for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am going to take that chance and vote "yes" for this bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Evans.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to rise and support SB 188.

Over the last couple hours we have heard an awful lot of debate and discussion about the needs of generating jobs, but I think that this goes beyond just the question of generating jobs. It really goes to the question of creating new opportunities. This industry is something new. We have lost it over the years, and we have a chance to begin to make reinvestment and make it happen again.

I have heard constantly debate over and over again about this section versus that section. The reality of it is, we are a Commonwealth, 67 counties. I can recall in the 17 years I have been here, I have supported an awful lot of projects; not all of them have been in the southeast. The fact is, every time we support a capital bill or every time we support a budget, it is not limited to any one particular area; we as Pennsylvanians all benefit from it.

I want to say that this has been probably one of the best bipartisan actions that has taken place in an awful long time — Democrat and Republican working together to try to make a difference with this one. I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that I hope we will continue down that track, because I have said over and over again, although we are the minority party on this side, we deserve just as much input as anyone else. You only have to ask us.

So I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that I would hope that it is 203 votes up on the board for SB 188. We should send a message that as Pennsylvanians, we are determined to bring this industry to Pennsylvania.

I hope we support SB 188. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. When King Herod built the port city of Caesarea, I doubt if he talked to the Roman Senate.

The same phenomenon is true today. Because I am a State Representative and because of the State obligations that I share, I will vote in the affirmative for this measure, but the process again is wrong.

Business and commerce. The capital budget is quintessentially an advancement of our Commonwealth's business and commerce. The gentleman from the 117th District in northeastern Pennsylvania who chairs the Business and Commerce Committee did not have any hearings on this proposal. The business and commerce of the Port of Philadelphia was not a subject of

deliberations by this chamber. The executive branch, Tom Ridge, from up on high, after botching the Meyer Werft proposal that would have brought us twice as many jobs for one-half as much money, has scrambled aggressively to try to patch something back together.

This is a capital budget bill with many good projects in it. The Port of Philadelphia and its resuscitation is central to the southeastern economy and to our collective State business and commerce, and that is why when the vote board lights up, I shall unequivocally vote in favor. But I would be remiss as a leader of the caucus, I would be remiss as a Democrat, I would be remiss as a member of this body in this magnificently marbled hall to just allow the executive branch once again to hand us a proposal on Friday, that I read about in the Philadelphia papers on Saturday, and it was ramrodded through the State General Assembly with such great celerity. Wrong.

Where was the Business and Commerce Committee? Business and commerce — \$182 million, \$340,000 per job. Where was the Business and Commerce Committee? This is an achingly difficult vote for some of us. We want to help the port, we want to help our brothers and sisters in Philadelphia, and we shall, and this will pass with 150 or 160 votes on the big board.

In 1957 Noel Coward crossed the Atlantic Ocean. Noel Coward was getting ready to produce a play on Broadway called "Naked With a Violin," and during one of the rehearsals for that play, Mr. Speaker, a young fumbling actor made several mistakes, and Noel Coward said, do not worry about the motivation; just remember your lines and do not trip over the furniture. Well, Noel Coward-Tom Ridge has told the Republican leadership team, do not worry about the motivation; just memorize your lines and do not trip over the furniture. One hundred and eighty-two million dollars and the Business and Commerce Committee, the chairman of the Business and Commerce Committee, does not know any more about it than my Aunt Ruth.

This is the way we are doing business. This is wrong. Our committee system is ruptured and fractured and sundered beyond repair. Governor Ridge is running this chamber, and quite adroitly, I might add, notwithstanding the blandishments of the gentleman from South Side, or as they say down there, Southside, concerning the floor leader's aggression. This should not be a unilaterally dominated process. We should be sharing in this, and the fundamental rupture of the committee structure should be brought to light. We should have had hearings. This should have been a summertime opportunity for us to learn more.

The results are going to be the same. Probably if we had idealism and motivation to be State Representatives and help Philadelphia, as we should and as we have time and time again, from the convention center to the Avenue of the Arts to a variety of programs over the years, we have rightfully helped that wonderful city, the crowning jewel in our Commonwealth — Philadelphia.

But notwithstanding that, this again is sloppy legislation. Taking bills that name bridges and putting something else in them about helmets and now giving us a massive, massive, one of the most massive projects in the history of the State, we read about it for the first time; the State General Assembly leadership team learns about it last week. The executive branch, Tom Ridge, has been working on this for a couple of years, after he blew the big Meyer Werft deal.

It is essential to remember the lamentation of the man from Lehigh County when he said that we are only getting half as many jobs for twice as much money. We are supporting a deal today because it is the best we can get. We are supporting a deal today because we do not have much of an alternative.

I was very glad to hear the gentleman from Lancaster County, the honorable Appropriations chairman in the majority, when he talked about bipartisanship, when he talked about all the successes we have had in this economy in Pennsylvania. He forgot to give credit — he gave credit to almost everyone else — but he forgot to give credit to Bill Clinton. I am surprised. I thought that the President of the United States as well as the Governor of Pennsylvania and the Congress and the Assembly all had some share in this success.

If we are all going to share any successes in the future as an Assembly, we are going to have to work with a committee system, a committee system that has failed, or else — or else — we are going to do like we did today, we are just going to have our legislative leaders take their mission from Noel Coward up in the executive branch: memorize your lines and do not trip over the furniture.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the majority leader, Mr. Perzel.

Mr. PERZEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First I would like to thank the Jewish members for their patience here today knowing that their holy day is coming here at sundown. I deeply appreciate that.

I wanted to mention a couple things that are very important, at least from the debate that I heard. Number one, from my standpoint we have tried to help any county that had a problem that came and spoke to us. I mean, I was supportive of the airport project in Pittsburgh several years ago, and I know that was before my time. Right now we are looking at the fact that they are going to be closing the tunnels into the city of Pittsburgh and looking at the rail line to use it as a way for people to get in and out of the city of Pittsburgh while they repair the tunnels that take the cars in and out, and that is something that is very important, I am sure, to the people of Allegheny County. We did the Regional Renaissance — we created the county form of government that they came and asked us for. The city of Pittsburgh last year, when the Federal Government required them to buy a new computer in order to be able to keep track of traffic violations, we put that in the budget last year, Mr. Speaker. And when one of the members from Allegheny County, Fred Trello, asked us to go after the bakery tax, we did that, Mr. Speaker. When Larry Sather came and said he had a problem with Berg Electronics up in Huntingdon County, we passed a bill here that allowed them to hire those 500 people. When Erie County was trying to redo the — and I hate to say this because Representative Clymer is here — but they would repair riverboats up in Erie County, we all voted for that, Mr. Speaker. That was a project that created a number of jobs. The Scranton Tissue Bank, Mr. Speaker. They are all things that we did here to try to help members that came to us and said these were projects that would create jobs. We did not deny anybody an opportunity.

There are like four quick things that I would like to bring out, and then I will submit the real formal remarks for the record. First off, a lot of things were said today about Meyer Werft and Kvaerner. The difference is — and there are only four of them, Mr. Speaker — point number one is, Kvaerner is putting up \$250 million, 25 times the amount of money that Meyer Werft was

putting up. Meyer Werft was putting up \$10 million. Point number two is, the Commonwealth will own this facility when it is complete. Under the Meyer Werft deal, the company owned the facility. Kvaerner is responsible for all cost overruns. Under the Meyer Werft project, the Commonwealth was picking up half of the cost overruns. And last but most importantly, Kvaerner has said they will build the first three ships, and they are out there getting those projects to bring to Pennsylvania, while Meyer Werft was not guaranteeing one ship would be built in Pennsylvania.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mr. PERZEL. I would like to submit again the formal remarks for the record.

I would like to take this time to personally thank Representative Tony Williams for the help that he gave me on this project. Tony, thank you. That was very, very kind of you to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge an affirmative vote on SB 188. Thank you.

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

We are on the cusp of an opportunity to bring world-class shipbuilding back to Philadelphia and Pennsylvania. This is an opportunity to create 6,000 jobs and to make our shipyard the center of shipbuilding in the United States.

These jobs would not only be at the naval shipyard complex, but in businesses and industries who will supply the shipyard with the materials needed to build the world's best ships. Jobs would be created in the small businesses serving the area around the shipyard who were hurt by its closing. There is a tremendous potential in the ripple effect of economic growth through the region and across the State in this proposal.

The shipyard will use an enormous amount of raw materials and sophisticated technology to build ships. For example, the shipyard will use 40,000 tons of steel each year. It will buy 75 million dollars' worth of computer software.

Governor Ridge has been working with the city and the Federal government to attract Kvaerner ASA to the naval shipyard. Kvaerner is one of the world's leading shipbuilders.

The company has committed a very substantial commitment of resources to the naval shipyard. Our capital budget investment would be used for the redevelopment of a 90-acre tract in the naval shipyard. Dry docks four and five would be enclosed and there would be a series of other improvements made to develop a shipyard for 21st century ships.

Under the proposal being developed with the Ridge administration, the shipyard would be leased to Kvaerner ASA for 20 years. The company would pay all State and local taxes and a public entity created by the Commonwealth would retain ownership of the yard.

This is an important and substantial investment not only in Philadelphia and the Delaware Valley's future, but for the future of every community in Pennsylvania.

This investment will show Pennsylvania is serious in its efforts to compete for and create new jobs and economic development in

the global marketplace. It will prove that Pennsylvania is a force to be reckoned with.

The cooperative way the General Assembly, the Rendell administration in Philadelphia, and the Ridge administration have worked together, along with our delegation to Congress, shows how intent we are to do everything possible to make this happen.

This is a viable economic development package that benefits every Pennsylvanian. The House's action today is an important step in that process.

Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker?

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

Mr. DeWEESE. Notwithstanding some of the saccharine-like observations that I have to listen to from time to time, I think it is essential to know that even the gentleman, Mr. Williams, found out about this project on Friday, but the things that were just enumerated by the floor leader some of us just found out about 30 seconds ago.

Just like the monster-truck facet of the gasoline tax that was put in in the middle of the night, many of us do not know how organized labor is going to be treated in this proposal. This is a very complex and recondite piece of legislation. The committee system did not act. I am voting on it on a whim and a prayer like many of my colleagues.

So notwithstanding the smarmy, saccharine-like bipartisanship that seems to ooze forward from the dais, we have not been a part as a General Assembly; we have not been a part of this capital budget process. This is a manifestation of the executive branch lock, stock, and barrel.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

YEAS-177

- | | | | |
|--------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Adolph | Druce | Major | Scrimenti |
| Allen | Egolf | Manderino | Semmel |
| Argall | Evans | Markosek | Serafini |
| Armstrong | Fargo | Marsico | Seyfert |
| Baker | Feese | Masland | Shaner |
| Bard | Fichter | Mayernik | Smith, B. |
| Barley | Fleagle | McCall | Smith, S. H. |
| Barrar | Flick | McGeehan | Snyder, D. W. |
| Battisto | Gannon | McGill | Staback |
| Bebko-Jones | Geist | McIlhattan | Stairs |
| Belardi | George | McNaughton | Steil |
| Belfanti | Gigliotti | Melio | Stern |
| Bishop | Gladeck | Michlovic | Stetler |
| Blaum | Godshall | Micozzie | Stevenson |
| Boscola | Gordner | Miller | Strittmatter |
| Brown | Gruitza | Mundy | Sturla |
| Browne | Gruppo | Myers | Surra |
| Bunt | Habay | Nailor | Tangretti |
| Butkovitz | Haluska | Nickol | Taylor, E. Z. |
| Buxton | Hanna | O'Brien | Taylor, J. |
| Caltagirone | Harhart | Oliver | Thomas |
| Cappabianca | Hasay | Orie | Tigue |
| Carn | Hennessey | Perzel | Travaglio |
| Cawley | Herman | Pesci | Trello |
| Chadwick | Hershey | Petrone | Trich |
| Civera | Hess | Phillips | True |
| Clymer | Horsey | Pippy | Tulli |
| Cohen, L. I. | Hutchinson | Pistella | Vance |

- | | | | |
|------------|-----------|----------|-----------------|
| Cohen, M. | Itkin | Platts | Veon |
| Colaafella | Jadlowiec | Preston | Vitali |
| Colaizzo | James | Ramos | Walko |
| Conti | Jarolin | Raymond | Waugh |
| Cornell | Josephs | Readshaw | Williams, A. H. |
| Corpora | Kaiser | Reinard | Williams, C. |
| Corrigan | Keller | Rieger | Wogan |
| Cowell | Kenney | Roberts | Wojnaroski |
| Curry | LaGrotta | Robinson | Wright, M. N. |
| Daley | Laughlin | Roebuck | Yewcic |
| Dally | Lederer | Ross | Youngblood |
| Dempsey | Lescovitz | Rubley | Zimmerman |
| Dent | Levdansky | Sainato | Zug |
| Dermody | Lloyd | Santoni | |
| DeWeese | Lucyk | Sather | Ryan, |
| DiGirolamo | Maher | Saylor | Speaker |
| Donatucci | Maitland | Schuler | |

NAYS-20

- | | | | |
|-------------|-----------|---------|----------|
| Benninghoff | Clark | Krebs | Rohrer |
| Birmelin | DeLuca | Lawless | Rooney |
| Boyes | Eachus | Leh | Schroder |
| Carone | Fairchild | Lynch | Steelman |
| Casorio | Kirkland | Reber | Wilt |

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-5

- | | | | |
|-------|----------|-----------|------------|
| Coy | Petrarca | Van Horne | Washington |
| Olasz | | | |

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

Ordered, That the clerk return the same to the Senate with the information that the House has passed the same with amendment in which the concurrence of the Senate is requested.

CONDOLENCE RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER. Will the members stay in their seats. The Sergeant at Arms will close the doors of the House.

We are about to take up a condolence resolution on the death of a former member of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will close the doors of the House. The members will take their seats.

The clerk will read the resolution.

The following resolution was read:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Connie Black McHugh of Philadelphia, former member of the Pennsylvania State Legislature, passed away September 20, 1997 at the age of fifty-eight; and

WHEREAS, Ms. McHugh was elected to the House of Representatives in 1990, and she served her constituents from South Philadelphia with distinction and excellence during her term. In 1993 she was named a legislative assistant to Representative John M. Perzel and in 1994 she returned to the court system as a trial commissioner. She began her career as a court crier for the Common Pleas Court in the early 1970s, serving for nearly twenty years. Her civic involvement gradually led her into

politics and she became an ardent campaigner for the late Mayor Frank Rizzo; and

WHEREAS, Ms. McHugh will always be remembered for her firebrand leadership in South Philadelphia's Pennsport section. She led the fight in the early 1970s against a planned ramp to Interstate 95 at Front Street and the ramp was eventually redesigned to accommodate the residential area it would have affected. She also helped secure the Ralph Rizzo ice rink; was a founder and board member of the Mummies Museum; and raised funds for the senior citizens of the community; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania note with great sadness the passing of Connie Black McHugh, beloved family member, esteemed governmental leader and loyal servant of the community; extend heartfelt condolences to her son, Joseph DiGrazio, daughters, Kathleen Malatesta and Constance Adams; father, Archibald Black; and six grandchildren; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution, sponsored by Representative John M. Perzel, be transmitted to the Family of Connie Black McHugh.

Matthew Ryan
Speaker of the House
ATTEST:
Ted Mazia
Chief Clerk of the House

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of the resolution will rise and remain standing as a mark of respect for the deceased former member. Guests will also please rise.

(Whereupon, the members of the House and all visitors stood in a moment of silence in solemn respect to the memory of the Honorable Connie Black McHugh.)

The SPEAKER. The resolution has been unanimously adopted. The Sergeant at Arms will open the doors of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. There will be a memorial service on Monday in memory of Herman Mihalich. So I would ask that the members be on the House floor promptly at 1 o'clock.

VOTE CORRECTIONS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Casorio, and others. The following members have asked that the record reflect a change, that they wish their vote to reflect that it should have been cast in the affirmative in the matter of SB 188, amendment A3855 on the motion to suspend: Casorio, Colaizzo, DeLuca, Haluska, Walko, Veon, Tangretti, Surra, Rooney, Roberts, Olasz, Bunt, McGill, and Ms. Seyfert.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Trich.

Mr. TRICH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to offer remarks for the record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will submit them for the record.

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

This issue today is about investing in our Commonwealth's future, and 6,000 jobs. Notice that I said our Commonwealth's future — not merely Philadelphia's future. If Philadelphia is economically healthy, then so too is Pennsylvania. If Philadelphia is economically competitive in the world market, so too is Pennsylvania competitive.

As I understand it, Pennsylvania stands to gain not only jobs, but stands to gain a new technology in an old and proven industry. Shipbuilding and how the world market will be served by that industry is changing. Pennsylvania has the opportunity to be at the forefront of this industry. We need to move the process forward.

Additionally, as I understand it, the resurrection of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyards will mean spinoff business to companies throughout the Commonwealth. In my county of Washington alone, more than a half dozen companies who previously did work for the shipbuilding industry will be able to do so again.

As a matter of fact, we have been shown that more than 130 legislative districts will be impacted economically, in that they each have companies that have contracts tied directly to shipbuilding. Therefore, this investment makes a great deal of sense — it is about jobs.

Not that many months ago Governor Ridge dropped the ball in landing a similar investor for the shipyards. Many of us were critical of how his administration handled Meyer Werft, and rightly so. This time let us make certain we do not drop the ball.

It should also be noted that a number of other economic development projects are also contained in this capital budget bill (SB 188, with amendments). Certainly not all will be or can be funded in this budget cycle. They will, however, at least be positioned for future, if not immediate, consideration. My county stands to gain from such projects. That is equally true for many House members who have done their homework. For all these reasons I vote "yes" on SB 188 and would urge my colleagues to do the same.

VOTE CORRECTIONS

The SPEAKER. Mr. James.

Mr. JAMES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to correct the record, if it is possible.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. JAMES. On a Senate bill on Monday, Mr. Speaker, SB 279, amendment A3412, I was voted. My switch was malfunctioning and it had me in the negative. I would like to be recorded in the affirmative.

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

Mr. JAMES. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Vitali. Did the gentleman, Mr. Vitali, seek recognition?

Mr. VITALI. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

To correct the record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. VITALI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was recorded as not voting on HR 248. I would like to be recorded in the affirmative.

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

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

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, informed that the Senate has concurred in the amendments made by the House of Representatives to **SB 755, PN 1345**.

BILL SIGNED BY SPEAKER

Bill numbered and entitled as follows having been prepared for presentation to the Governor, and the same being correct, the title was publicly read as follows:

SB 755, PN 1345

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), entitled, as amended, The Fiscal Code, further providing for redevelopment assistance capital projects; providing for the Local Government Capital Project Loan Fund and for limitations on redevelopment assistance capital projects; making a repeal; and making editorial changes.

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

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL Mr. Speaker, I move the following bills from the table:

HB 21;
HB 656;
HB 1347;
HB 1487;
HB 1567;
HB 1768;
SB 55; and
SB 220.

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

BILLS RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the following bills be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations:

HB 21;
HB 656;
HB 1347;
HB 1487;
HB 1567;

HB 1768;
SB 55; and
SB 220.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Does the majority leader or minority leader have any further business?
Hearing none, this House stands in recess until 3:30 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

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 188, PN 1351**.

BILL SIGNED BY SPEAKER

Bill numbered and entitled as follows having been prepared for presentation to the Governor, and the same being correct, the title was publicly read as follows:

SB 188, PN 1351

A Supplement to the act of July 11, 1996 (P.L.595, No.101), entitled Capital Budget Project Itemization Act for 1996-1997, itemizing public improvement projects, furniture and equipment projects, transportation assistance projects, redevelopment assistance and redevelopment assistance capital projects, flood control projects, Keystone Recreation, Park and Conservation projects and forestry bridge projects to be constructed or acquired or assisted by the Department of General Services, the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, the Department of Environmental Protection, the Department of Community and Economic Development, the Department of Transportation, the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission or the Pennsylvania Game Commission, together with their estimated financial costs; authorizing the incurring of debt without the approval of the electors for the purpose of financing the projects to be constructed or acquired or assisted by the Department of General Services, the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, the Department of Environmental Protection, the Department of Community and Economic Development or the Department of Transportation; stating the estimated useful life of the projects; authorizing certain waivers; making appropriations; and making repeals.

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

BILLS PASSED OVER

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. Does the majority leader or minority leader have any further business?

Hearing none, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until Monday, October 6, 1997, at 1 p.m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to, and at 3:33 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.