

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1999

SESSION OF 1999

183D OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 11

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

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

PRAYER

REV. KENNETH R. ARTHUR, Chaplain of the House of Representatives and executive director of the United Methodist Home for Children and Family Services, Inc., Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Almighty God, we pause in the early moments of this day, hopeful of hearing the voice of God amidst the clamor of the world that surrounds us. The voices we do hear are many. They are voices of dissent, voices of need, voices of hope, and voices of greed. Enable us this day to hear the clarion voice of our creator, defining for us those decisions which must be made for Pennsylvania's people. We promise to listen intently, consider all matters faithfully, and to use our God-given minds to achieve the highest of goals.

Bless now the Speaker of this House, that his voice might bring order to our day and achievement to this session of the legislature.

We ask these things in the hope of Your hearing our prayer and answering our requests. 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 Monday, February 8, 1999, will be postponed until printed. The Chair hears no objection.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair is advised that neither the majority nor the minority whips have requests for leaves of absence.

SELECT COMMITTEE APPOINTED

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to HR 11, the following members have been appointed to the Select Committee on Rules Review: Mr. Chadwick, chairman; Mr. Feese; Mr. Krebs; Mr. Masland; Mr. Nickol; Mrs. Vance; Mr. LaGrotta; Ms. Washington; Mr. Vitali; Mr. Surra.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 110 By Representatives ROHRER, ARMSTRONG, BAKER, BARRAR, HARHAI, HERSHEY, HORSEY, LEH, MAITLAND, McNAUGHTON, ORIE, PETRARCA, RAMOS, SATHER, SEYFERT, SHANER, STABACK, STAIRS, STERN, STEVENSON, J. TAYLOR, THOMAS, TRELLO, BASTIAN, METCALFE, BELARDI, BENNINGHOFF, BIRMELIN, BROWNE, CALTAGIRONE, CLARK, CLYMER, CORRIGAN, EGOLF, FARGO, FEESE, FLICK, FORCIER, GEIST, HENNESSEY, HESS, LAUGHLIN, LYNCH, MARKOSEK, MELIO, PESCI, PLATTS, READSHAW and SCRIMENTI

An Act providing for student and family privacy and protection.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, February 9, 1999.

No. 408 By Representatives GODSHALL, CLARK, PRESTON, READSHAW, THOMAS, TIGUE and E. Z. TAYLOR

An Act amending the act of May 17, 1921 (P.L.682, No.284), known as The Insurance Company Law of 1921, further providing for approval of policies and contracts.

Referred to Committee on INSURANCE, February 9, 1999.

No. 409 By Representatives GODSHALL, MICOZZIE, GEIST, GEORGE, PRESTON, RAMOS and THOMAS

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for duty of driver in construction and maintenance areas.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, February 9, 1999.

No. 410 By Representatives GODSHALL, ADOLPH, ARGALL, BARD, BATTISTO, BENNINGHOFF, CLARK, FARGO, GEORGE, HARHART, MASLAND, MELIO, MICOZZIE, S. MILLER, PRESTON, RAMOS, READSHAW,

SEYFERT, STERN, SURRA, THOMAS, TIGUE, WILT and E. Z. TAYLOR

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for notice of assignment of points.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, February 9, 1999.

No. 411 By Representatives GODSHALL, PRESTON, WILT and E. Z. TAYLOR

A Joint Resolution proposing amendments to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, further providing for the selection of the chairman of the Legislative Reapportionment Commission; providing for the effective date of newly reapportioned districts and for the election of Senators in certain circumstances; and further providing for retirement of justices, judges and justices of the peace.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, February 9, 1999.

No. 412 By Representatives GODSHALL, BENNINGHOFF, CIVERA, CLARK, FICHTER, GEORGE, HASAY, KENNEY, LAUGHLIN, McCALL, MICOZZIE, ORIE, PESCI, RAMOS, ROBERTS, SEMMEL, SEYFERT, TULLI and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending the act of December 20, 1996 (P.L.1504, No.195), known as the Taxpayers' Bill of Rights, creating the Independent Taxpayer Appeals Board; adding definitions; further providing for rights of taxpayers, for installment agreements, for employee evaluations, for taxpayer assistance orders, for board decisions and for the Board of Finance and Revenue; providing for enforcement procedures, for a code of ethical conduct, for audits and for performance review and training of auditors; and making a repeal.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, February 9, 1999.

No. 413 By Representatives STEIL, THOMAS, SEYFERT, ARMSTRONG, TRELLO, CLYMER, STABACK, EGOLF, MELIO, MICHLOVIC, YOUNGBLOOD, DeLUCA, STERN, BARD, SERAFINI and HORSEY

An Act amending the act of July 31, 1968 (P.L.805, No.247), known as the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, further providing for ordinance provisions.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, February 9, 1999.

No. 414 By Representatives LUCYK, FICHTER, PESCI, VANCE, BELARDI, STABACK, EACHUS, BELFANTI, E. Z. TAYLOR, McCALL, BATTISTO, CORRIGAN, M. COHEN, LAUGHLIN, LEDERER, VAN HORNE, TRELLO, PRESTON, THOMAS and CIVERA

An Act amending the act of July 3, 1985 (P.L.164, No.45), known as the Emergency Medical Services Act, transferring the emergency medical services powers and duties from the Department of Health to the Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency.

Referred to Committee on VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, February 9, 1999.

No. 415 By Representatives LUCYK, ALLEN, FICHTER, GEORGE, PESCI, BARRAR, ORIE, MAHER, FAIRCHILD, BEBKO-JONES, STABACK, EACHUS, CAWLEY, SERAFINI, BELFANTI, BAKER, McCALL, STERN, CORRIGAN, M. COHEN, LAUGHLIN, LEDERER, VAN HORNE, TRELLO, ROBERTS, PRESTON, PISTELLA, THOMAS, PETRARCA and CIVERA

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for disabled veterans' real estate tax exemption.

Referred to Committee on VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, February 9, 1999.

No. 416 By Representatives LUCYK, ALLEN, YOUNGBLOOD, ARMSTRONG, ARGALL, STABACK, CAWLEY, BELFANTI, McCALL, MAYERNIK, CORRIGAN, M. COHEN, LAUGHLIN, LEDERER, TRELLO, PRESTON and RAMOS

An Act authorizing and directing the Governor to appoint a site selection committee to locate a site suitable for the placement of a State veterans home in Schuylkill County.

Referred to Committee on VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, February 9, 1999.

No. 417 By Representatives LUCYK, ALLEN, PESCI, YOUNGBLOOD, BELARDI, STABACK, CAWLEY, BELFANTI, McCALL, TIGUE, BATTISTO, M. COHEN, LAUGHLIN, VAN HORNE, TRELLO, PRESTON, PETRARCA, DAILEY and SEYFERT

An Act amending the act of May 24, 1945 (P.L.991, No.385), known as the Urban Redevelopment Law, including boroughs in the definition of "city" for purposes of creation of a redevelopment authority.

Referred to Committee on URBAN AFFAIRS, February 9, 1999.

No. 418 By Representatives LUCYK, FICHTER, PESCI, YOUNGBLOOD, ARMSTRONG, FAIRCHILD, NAILOR, SATHER, BELARDI, STABACK, BELFANTI, McCALL, TIGUE, BATTISTO, MAYERNIK, M. COHEN, LAUGHLIN, LEDERER, TRELLO, PRESTON, PISTELLA and THOMAS

An Act creating a special restricted receipts account to be known as the Fort Indiantown Gap National Cemetery Memorial Fund; authorizing a voluntary contribution from the personal income tax refund of individuals for the purpose of the fund; making an appropriation; and making a repeal.

Referred to Committee on VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, February 9, 1999.

No. 419 By Representatives LUCYK, GEORGE, PESCI, ARMSTRONG, MAHER, BELARDI, STABACK, EACHUS, CAWLEY, BELFANTI, E. Z. TAYLOR, BAKER, McCALL, TIGUE, BATTISTO, MELIO, M. COHEN, LAUGHLIN, LEDERER, VAN HORNE, TRELLO, ROBERTS, PRESTON, PISTELLA, THOMAS, PETRARCA, DALEY and CIVERA

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for disabled veterans' real estate tax exemption.

Referred to Committee on VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, February 9, 1999.

No. 420 By Representatives LUCYK, PESCI, YOUNGBLOOD, ARMSTRONG, MAHER, BELARDI, STABACK, CAWLEY, BELFANTI, E. Z. TAYLOR, BAKER, McCALL, TIGUE, MAYERNIK, MELIO, M. COHEN, LAUGHLIN, LEDERER, WILLIAMS, TRELLO, ROBERTS, PRESTON, PISTELLA, THOMAS, CIVERA and SEYFERT

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for a registration plate for members of AMVETS.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, February 9, 1999.

No. 421 By Representatives LUCYK, ALLEN, PESCI, YOUNGBLOOD, HERSHEY, BELARDI, CAWLEY, BELFANTI, McCALL, TIGUE, MELIO, M. COHEN, LAUGHLIN, LEDERER, WILLIAMS, TRELLO, PRESTON and PISTELLA

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, providing for veterans' preference.

Referred to Committee on VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, February 9, 1999.

No. 422 By Representatives LUCYK, ALLEN, PESCI, MAHER, BELARDI, CAWLEY, BELFANTI, McCALL, TIGUE, M. COHEN, LAUGHLIN, TRELLO, ROBERTS, PRESTON, PISTELLA and CIVERA

An Act authorizing the indebtedness, with the approval of the electors, of \$20,000,000 for low-interest loans to veterans for down payments on first-time home purchases.

Referred to Committee on VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, February 9, 1999.

No. 423 By Representatives LUCYK, YOUNGBLOOD, BELARDI, CAWLEY, BELFANTI, McCALL, MELIO, M. COHEN, LAUGHLIN, TRELLO, ROBERTS, PRESTON, THOMAS and CIVERA

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.177, No.175), known as The Administrative Code of 1929, providing for establishment of the office of veterans' ombudsman in every Commonwealth agency.

Referred to Committee on VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, February 9, 1999.

No. 424 By Representatives LUCYK, ALLEN, PESCI, EACHUS, BELFANTI, McCALL, LAUGHLIN, TRELLO and PRESTON

An Act amending the act of June 17, 1913 (P.L.507, No.335), referred to as the Intangible Personal Property Tax Law, excluding counties from the provisions of this act.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, February 9, 1999.

No. 425 By Representatives LUCYK, PESCI, BELARDI, STABACK, CAWLEY, BELFANTI, E. Z. TAYLOR, McCALL, TIGUE, LAUGHLIN, LEDERER, TRELLO, ROBERTS, PRESTON and THOMAS

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for qualifications of Adjutant General, Deputy Adjutant General and Assistant Adjutant General.

Referred to Committee on VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, February 9, 1999.

No. 426 By Representatives LUCYK, PESCI, BELARDI, STABACK, EACHUS, CAWLEY, BELFANTI, McCALL, TIGUE, MELIO, M. COHEN, LAUGHLIN, TRELLO, ROBERTS, PRESTON and DALEY

An Act requiring the Department of Transportation to establish complete rest areas within certain intervals on all interstate highways within this Commonwealth.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, February 9, 1999.

No. 427 By Representatives LUCYK, PESCI, McCALL, TIGUE, LAUGHLIN, TRELLO and PRESTON

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, providing for residency status at institutions of the State System of Higher Education.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, February 9, 1999.

No. 428 By Representatives LUCYK, ALLEN, PESCI, STABACK, CAWLEY, BELFANTI, McCALL, MAYERNIK, MELIO, LAUGHLIN, VAN HORNE, TRELLO, ROBERTS, PRESTON and PETRARCA

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 the imposition of inheritance tax.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, February 9, 1999.

No. 429 By Representatives LUCYK, ALLEN, PESCI, YOUNGBLOOD, CAWLEY, BELFANTI, MELIO, LAUGHLIN, VAN HORNE, TRELLO and PRESTON

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, repealing provisions relating to inheritance tax.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, February 9, 1999.

No. 430 By Representatives LUCYK, PESCI, BELFANTI, McCALL, LAUGHLIN, TRELLO, PRESTON and THOMAS

An Act amending Title 71 (State Government) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, defining "county employee"; and further providing for creditable nonstate service in the State Employees' Retirement Fund.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, February 9, 1999.

No. 431 By Representatives LUCYK, ALLEN, PESCI, ARMSTRONG, MAHER, FAIRCHILD, BELARDI, ARGALL, STABACK, EACHUS, CAWLEY, E. Z. TAYLOR, BAKER, McCALL, GRUCELA, MELIO, LAUGHLIN, CLARK, VAN HORNE, TRELLO, ROBERTS, PRESTON, L. I. COHEN, DALEY, CIVERA and SEYFERT

An Act exempting volunteer fire, rescue and ambulance companies from all State and local taxes.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, February 9, 1999.

No. 432 By Representatives LUCYK, ALLEN, GEORGE, PESCI, STABACK, EACHUS, CAWLEY, BAKER, McCALL, MELIO, M. COHEN, LAUGHLIN, TRELLO, ROBERTS, PRESTON, THOMAS and DALEY

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for disabled veterans' real estate tax exemption.

Referred to Committee on VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, February 9, 1999.

No. 433 By Representatives ROSS, ARMSTRONG, BARD, CHADWICK, CLYMER, L. I. COHEN, DEMPSEY, FAIRCHILD, FARGO, FLICK, FORCIER, HERSHEY, LEH, MAITLAND, METCALFE, R. MILLER, NAILOR, PLATTS, ROHRER, RUBLEY, SAYLOR, SCHRODER, SEYFERT, STEIL, STEVENSON, E. Z. TAYLOR, TRUE, WILLIAMS, WILT and ZUG

An Act amending the act of August 15, 1961 (P.L.987, No.442), known as the Pennsylvania Prevailing Wage Act, further providing for definitions; and providing for school district options.

Referred to Committee on LABOR RELATIONS, February 9, 1999.

No. 434 By Representatives READSHAW, BELARDI, GIGLIOTTI, BEBKO-JONES, KAISER, WOJNAROSKI, WALKO, CASORIO, CAPPABIANCA, SAINATO, J. TAYLOR, TRELLO, STABACK, CURRY, HARHAI, LAUGHLIN, RUFFING, DeLUCA, ORIE, COLAFELLA, ROSS, DALEY, CIVERA, McCALL, RAMOS, STEELMAN, FREEMAN, YOUNGBLOOD and WILT

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

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, February 9, 1999.

No. 435 By Representatives READSHAW, LAUGHLIN, PESCI, WOJNAROSKI, TRELLO, CURRY, ORIE, HALUSKA, ROBINSON, BARRAR, RUFFING and M. COHEN

An Act amending the act of December 31, 1965 (P.L.1257, No.511), known as The Local Tax Enabling Act, authorizing the levying of tax on admission to motion picture theaters by certain political subdivisions.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, February 9, 1999.

No. 436 By Representatives READSHAW, J. TAYLOR, MARKOSEK, GIGLIOTTI, PESCI, FARGO, WOJNAROSKI, HALUSKA, WILLIAMS, TRELLO, HARHAI, PRESTON, SCRIMENTI and STEELMAN

An Act amending Title 9 (Burial Grounds) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, classifying certain activities by cemetery companies as for-profit.

Referred to Committee on COMMERCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, February 9, 1999.

No. 437 By Representatives READSHAW, LAUGHLIN, GIGLIOTTI, WOJNAROSKI, KAISER, PRESTON, VAN HORNE, TRELLO, SAINATO, WALKO, HALUSKA, ROBINSON, COLAFELLA and WILT

An Act amending the act of August 26, 1971 (P.L.351, No.91), known as the State Lottery Law, providing for special economic development projects; and establishing the Economic Development Fund.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, February 9, 1999.

No. 438 By Representatives ARMSTRONG, HERMAN, CORRIGAN, SEYFERT, ZIMMERMAN, NAILOR, ARGALL, EGOLF, FORCIER, MAHER, MAITLAND, McNAUGHTON, S. MILLER, READSHAW, RUBLEY, B. SMITH, STEELMAN, STERN, TIGUE, YOUNGBLOOD, ZUG, NICKOL, BENNINGHOFF, HERSHEY, LEH, SAYLOR, HARHAI, TRELLO, FARGO and ROSS

An Act amending the act of February 18, 1769 (1 Sm.L.284, No.594), entitled "An act for regulating, pitching, paving and cleansing, the highways, streets, lanes and alleys; and for regulating, making and amending the water courses and common sewers, within the inhabited and settled parts of the city of Philadelphia; for raising of money to defray the expenses thereof; and for other purposes therein mentioned," repealing provisions relating to wood haulers, stacking of wood and penalties for stealing wood in Philadelphia.

Referred to Committee on AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS, February 9, 1999.

No. 439 By Representatives ARMSTRONG, HERMAN, CORRIGAN, SEYFERT, ZIMMERMAN, ARGALL, EGOLF, FORCIER, MAHER, MAITLAND, McNAUGHTON, NAILOR, READSHAW, RUBLEY, B. SMITH, STEELMAN, STERN, TIGUE, YOUNGBLOOD, ZUG, NICKOL, BENNINGHOFF, HERSHEY, LEH, SAYLOR, HARHAI, TRELLO, FARGO and ROSS

An Act repealing the act of April 17, 1861 (P.L.324, No.309), entitled "An act to secure to Farmers certain rights in the Markets of the city of Philadelphia."

Referred to Committee on AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS, February 9, 1999.

No. 440 By Representatives ARMSTRONG, CORRIGAN, SEYFERT, ZIMMERMAN, NAILOR, ARGALL, EGOLF, FORCIER, HERMAN, MAHER, MAITLAND, McNAUGHTON, S. MILLER, READSHAW, RUBLEY, B. SMITH, STEELMAN, NICKOL, BENNINGHOFF, HERSHEY, LEH, SAYLOR, STERN, TIGUE, YOUNGBLOOD, ZUG, HARHAI, TRELLO, FARGO and ROSS

An Act repealing the act of March 11, 1853 (P.L.165, No.124), entitled "An act authorizing the incorporation of a company to plank the old Lancaster road from Henderson's store to the Spread Eagle, in Delaware county, entitled 'The Radnor plank road company;' relative to certain election districts; to fees for adjusting beam and patent balances, in the city and county of Philadelphia; and relative to the real estate of William Crawford, of Erie county; and to extending the chancery powers of certain courts to Erie county."

Referred to Committee on AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS, February 9, 1999.

No. 441 By Representatives ARMSTRONG, HERMAN, CORRIGAN, SEYFERT, ZIMMERMAN, ARGALL, EGOLF, FORCIER, MAHER, MAITLAND, McNAUGHTON, S. MILLER, NAILOR, READSHAW, RUBLEY, B. SMITH, STEELMAN, STERN, TIGUE, YOUNGBLOOD, ZUG, NICKOL, BENNINGHOFF, HERSHEY, LEH, SAYLOR, HARHAI, TRELLO, FARGO and ROSS

An Act amending the act of April 12, 1842 (P.L.262, No.91), entitled "A supplement to an act, entitled 'An act authorizing the Governor to incorporate the Tioga Navigation Company,' passed the twenty-six day of February, one thousand eight hundred and twenty-six, and for other purposes," repealing provisions relating to fees for measuring grain in Philadelphia.

Referred to Committee on AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS, February 9, 1999.

No. 442 By Representatives ARMSTRONG, HERMAN, CORRIGAN, SEYFERT, ZIMMERMAN, ARGALL, EGOLF, FORCIER, MAHER, MAITLAND, McNAUGHTON, NAILOR, READSHAW, B. SMITH, TIGUE, YOUNGBLOOD, ZUG, NICKOL, BENNINGHOFF, HERSHEY, LEH, SAYLOR, HARHAI, TRELLO, FARGO and ROSS

An Act repealing the act of April 26, 1850 (P.L.618, No.364), entitled "An act to vest in Barbara Griffith and Polly Conrad certain supposed escheated personal estate; to incorporate the Delaware and Schuylkill road company; and relative to market stalls in the city of Philadelphia."

Referred to Committee on AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS, February 9, 1999.

No. 443 By Representatives ARMSTRONG, HERMAN, CORRIGAN, SEYFERT, ZIMMERMAN, ARGALL, EGOLF, FORCIER, MAHER, MAITLAND, McNAUGHTON, S. MILLER, NAILOR, READSHAW, RUBLEY, B. SMITH, STERN, TIGUE, YOUNGBLOOD, ZUG, NICKOL, BENNINGHOFF, HERSHEY, LEH, SAYLOR, HARHAI, TRELLO, FARGO and ROSS

An Act repealing the act of May 2, 1876 (P.L.193, No.174) entitled "An act authorizing lumber dealers, in the county of McKean, to adopt each a mark to be put upon logs and lumber of all kinds, and have the same registered in the office of the prothonotary of said county, and also fixing a penalty for defacing said mark or fraudulently taking possession of any logs or lumber so marked or not."

Referred to Committee on AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS, February 9, 1999.

No. 444 By Representatives ARMSTRONG, HERMAN, CORRIGAN, SEYFERT, ZIMMERMAN, ARGALL, EGOLF, FORCIER, MAHER, MAITLAND, McNAUGHTON, S. MILLER, NAILOR, READSHAW, RUBLEY, B. SMITH, STERN, TIGUE, YOUNGBLOOD, ZUG, NICKOL, BENNINGHOFF, HERSHEY, LEH, SAYLOR, TRELLO, FARGO and ROSS

An Act amending the act of March 23, 1819 (P.L.150, No.97), entitled "An act prescribing the form of the Bushel, to be used for measuring Lime, in certain counties therein mentioned," repealing provisions relating to appointment of person to mark bushel for measuring of lime.

Referred to Committee on AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS, February 9, 1999.

No. 445 By Representatives ARMSTRONG, STETLER, DRUCE, DAILEY, MAJOR, CLYMER, STAIRS, HARHART, BARD, MAHER, LEH, ROHRER, RUBLEY, FLICK, BAKER, FORCIER, ORIE, ROSS, MARSICO, SEMMEL, WRIGHT, PIPPY, ZIMMERMAN, McNAUGHTON, BENNINGHOFF, DALLY, HUTCHINSON, BIRMELIN, HENNESSEY, SCHULER, LESCOVITZ, BUTKOVITZ, STEELMAN, BATTISTO, HERSHEY, TRELLO, FARGO and ROSS

An Act providing for the Tobacco Settlement Agreement Act; conferring powers and duties upon the Attorney General and the Department of Revenue; and imposing penalties.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, February 9, 1999.

No. 446 By Representatives McNAUGHTON, ARMSTRONG, BELARDI, MARSICO, THOMAS, WILT, E. Z. TAYLOR, YOUNGBLOOD, HORSEY, BROWNE, BUNT, STEELMAN, ORIE, HARHAI, PLATTS, L. I. COHEN, BARRAR, MELIO, CIVERA, M. COHEN and DALEY

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further defining "school bus."

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, February 9, 1999.

No. 447 By Representatives DALEY, DeWEESE, M. COHEN, READSHAW, SOLOBAY, MARKOSEK, TIGUE, HALUSKA, SHANER, ROBINSON, HENNESSEY, MELIO, PRESTON, ROBERTS, ARGALL, LAUGHLIN, SURRA, HARHAI, COLAFELLA, RAMOS, PETRARCA, VAN HORNE, BELFANTI, STEELMAN, YOUNGBLOOD, McCALL and HORSEY

An Act making an appropriation to the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources for allocation to the Bureau of Topographic and Geologic Survey to conduct coal-related research.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, February 9, 1999.

No. 448 By Representatives DALEY, GEORGE, DeWEESE, M. COHEN, CORRIGAN, READSHAW, BEBKO-JONES, LESCOVITZ, LEDERER, WALKO, STABACK, SAINATO, ROBERTS, HARHAI, LAUGHLIN, PISTELLA, GRUCELA, COLAFELLA, RAMOS, THOMAS, SEYFERT, PETRARCA, VAN HORNE, McCALL, SEMMEL, FREEMAN, YOUNGBLOOD and HORSEY

An Act requiring certain boards, commissions and departments to have senior citizen representatives.

Referred to Committee on AGING AND YOUTH, February 9, 1999.

No. 449 By Representatives DALEY, DeWEESE, M. COHEN, COY, READSHAW, SOLOBAY, MARKOSEK, TIGUE, HERMAN, HALUSKA, SHANER, ROBINSON, MELIO, BATTISTO, ROBERTS, ARGALL, LAUGHLIN, SURRA, HARHAI, COLAFELLA, RAMOS, JOSEPHS, TANGRETTI, PETRARCA, VAN HORNE, McCALL, BELFANTI, STEELMAN, YOUNGBLOOD, DeLUCA and HORSEY

An Act making an appropriation to the Pennsylvania Mining and Mineral Resources Research Institute.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, February 9, 1999.

No. 450 By Representatives DALEY, MELIO, M. COHEN, ARGALL, LAUGHLIN, HARHAI, RAMOS, HANNA, GORDNER, McCALL, STEELMAN and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, further providing for the Board of Governors of the State System of Higher Education.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, February 9, 1999.

No. 451 By Representatives GORDNER, TRELLO, FARGO, SAYLOR, DeWEESE, SOLOBAY, READSHAW, MARKOSEK, JADLOWIEC, BEBKO-JONES, FICHTER, ARMSTRONG, M. COHEN, ORIE, WOJNAROSKI, SHANER, STEVENSON, L. I. COHEN, ROBINSON, HALUSKA, LEDERER, WALKO, MELIO, HENNESSEY, MAHER, TRAVAGLIO, HESS, KENNEY, LYNCH, STABACK, BATTISTO, PRESTON, SAINATO, LEH, ZUG, CURRY, LAUGHLIN, SURRA, BARRAR, RUFFING, STERN, CIVERA, COLAFELLA, SEYFERT, DALEY, PETRARCA, ADOLPH, GODSHALL, VAN HORNE, McCALL, SCRIMENTI, STEELMAN, FREEMAN, YOUNGBLOOD, DeLUCA and BAKER

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 the imposition of inheritance tax.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, February 9, 1999.

No. 452 By Representatives HERMAN, NICKOL, KREBS, PLATTS, SEMMEL and E. Z. TAYLOR

A Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, providing that certain public officers be subject to removal from office by recall.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, February 9, 1999.

No. 453 By Representatives HERMAN, HENNESSEY, ARMSTRONG, BELFANTI, CASORIO, M. COHEN, COLAFELLA, COY, PESCI, PHILLIPS, RAMOS, B. SMITH, STABACK, E. Z. TAYLOR, THOMAS and TRELLO

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for use of firearms.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, February 9, 1999.

No. 454 By Representatives HERMAN, CLARK, BARD, BELARDI, M. COHEN, GEIST, HARHAI, S. MILLER, READSHAW, SATHER, SAYLOR, SEYFERT, STABACK, E. Z. TAYLOR and TRELLO

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for aggravated assault and for use of tear or noxious gas in labor disputes.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, February 9, 1999.

No. 455 By Representatives HERMAN, BELARDI, BUNT, CIVERA, M. COHEN, COLAFELLA, FARGO, GRUITZA, HENNESSEY, HORSEY, HUTCHINSON, LEDERER, McCALL, NICKOL, ORIE, PISTELLA, ROBINSON, SAINATO, SAYLOR, SERAFINI, SEYFERT, STABACK, E. Z. TAYLOR, THOMAS and TULLI

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for issuance and content of driver's license.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, February 9, 1999.

No. 456 By Representatives HARHART, BARLEY, BROWNE, DALLY, ARGALL, BARD, BARRAR, BELARDI, BENNINGHOFF, BUNT, CHADWICK, CIVERA, L. I. COHEN, M. COHEN, CORNELL, COY, DEMPSEY, EACHUS, FICHTER, FLICK, GLADECK, GODSHALL, GORDNER, HARHAI, HASAY, HERMAN, HERSHEY, JOSEPHS, KENNEY, MAITLAND, MASLAND, McCALL, MICOZZIE, S. MILLER, NAILOR, ORIE, PLATTS, PRESTON, RAMOS, READSHAW, ROSS, RUBLEY, SAINATO, SCHULER, SCRIMENTI, SEYFERT, B. SMITH, STEELMAN,

STEVENSON, E. Z. TAYLOR, J. TAYLOR, THOMAS, TIGUE, TRELLO and WILLIAMS

An Act establishing the Safe and Secure Schools Program to assist school districts and area vocational-technical schools in the purchase of equipment, provision of special services and in the development of programs to enhance school safety; providing for duties of the Department of Education; and making appropriations.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, February 9, 1999.

No. 457 By Representatives HARHART, BROWNE, ARGALL, SEMMEL, CHADWICK, CIVERA, CLARK, L. I. COHEN, M. COHEN, DALEY, DALLY, DeLUCA, FAIRCHILD, GEIST, HARHAI, HASAY, HENNESSEY, KENNEY, McCALL, S. MILLER, MUNDY, NAILOR, ORIE, PETRARCA, PLATTS, PRESTON, READSHAW, ROSS, SAINATO, SATHER, SCHULER, SEYFERT, STEELMAN, STERN, E. Z. TAYLOR, TRELLO and ZUG

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for aggravated assault; and providing for the offense of terroristic threats against children and youth services agency employees.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, February 9, 1999.

No. 458 By Representatives STABACK, GEORGE, CAWLEY, SEYFERT, STURLA, PESCI, MAYERNIK, CORRIGAN, BELFANTI, READSHAW, TRAVAGLIO, LAUGHLIN, COY, SURRA, SHANER, BUNT, WOGAN, HENNESSEY, LEDERER, GRUCELA, TRELLO, VAN HORNE, SAINATO, HORSEY, EACHUS, GORDNER, KENNEY, CURRY, ORIE, WALKO, MAHER, DeLUCA, MANDERINO, STEELMAN, McCALL, YOUNGBLOOD, JOSEPHS, PISTELLA, BROWNE, BAKER, M. COHEN, HARHAI, WILT, MUNDY, WILLIAMS and FREEMAN

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 the definition of "income."

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, February 9, 1999.

No. 459 By Representatives STABACK, BELFANTI, CORRIGAN, BUXTON, THOMAS, READSHAW, ALLEN, SURRA, HENNESSEY, TRELLO, EACHUS, DeLUCA, STEELMAN, McCALL, ROBINSON, MAYERNIK, B. SMITH, PISTELLA, SERAFINI, M. COHEN, HARHAI and WASHINGTON

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, regulating paint projectiles.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, February 9, 1999.

No. 460 By Representatives STABACK, McGEEHAN, SEYFERT, BEBKO-JONES, MARKOSEK, NICKOL, WOJNAROSKI, BELFANTI, LAUGHLIN, HERMAN, KREBS, SURRA, PLATTS, TRELLO, E. Z. TAYLOR, SAINATO, ROBERTS, CURRY, DeLUCA, STEELMAN, McCALL,

YOUNGBLOOD, JOSEPHS, GRUCELA, BAKER, M. COHEN, HARHAI, FREEMAN and WASHINGTON

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, further providing for date of application for absentee ballot and for canvassing of official absentee ballots.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, February 9, 1999.

No. 461 By Representatives ZUG, E. Z. TAYLOR, BROWNE, TRUE, BENNINGHOFF, CIVERA, CLARK, FARGO, FLICK, HARHAI, KAISER, MAYERNIK, MELIO, ORIE, PETRARCA, PLATTS, READSHAW, ROEBUCK, ROSS, SEYFERT, B. SMITH, SOLOBAY, THOMAS, TIGUE, TRELLO and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for notice of arrest for school or child-care service employees.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, February 9, 1999.

No. 462 By Representatives ZUG, ADOLPH, ARGALL, BARRAR, BELFANTI, BENNINGHOFF, L. I. COHEN, DALLY, FICHTER, FLICK, FORCIER, GODSHALL, HALUSKA, KAISER, NAILOR, ORIE, ROBINSON, RUBLEY, SCHRODER, SOLOBAY, E. Z. TAYLOR, TRUE and WOGAN

A Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, providing for qualifications of Auditor General and State Treasurer.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, February 9, 1999.

No. 463 By Representatives ZUG, BARRAR, BEBKO-JONES, BELARDI, CHADWICK, CIVERA, L. I. COHEN, COY, DeLUCA, DEMPSEY, FAIRCHILD, FARGO, FORCIER, GEIST, GODSHALL, HASAY, HERMAN, HERSHEY, LAUGHLIN, MARSICO, McILHINNEY, MELIO, S. MILLER, PESCI, PETRARCA, PLATTS, ROBERTS, ROHRER, ROSS, RUBLEY, SATHER, SEYFERT, SHANER, SOLOBAY, STABACK, STEVENSON, E. Z. TAYLOR, TRELLO, TRUE, VAN HORNE, WILT and WOGAN

An Act repealing Article XXI of the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, February 9, 1999.

No. 464 By Representatives ZUG, BENNINGHOFF, GEIST, JOSEPHS, S. MILLER, STERN and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act designating wintergreen, Gaultheria procumbens (teaberry), as the State herb.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, February 9, 1999.

No. 465 By Representatives ZUG, GEIST, BUXTON, CLARK, CORRIGAN, HARHAI, HARHART, RAMOS, READSHAW, ROSS, SATHER, SCRIMENTI, SEYFERT, STERN, E. Z. TAYLOR, TRELLO and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the removal of a constable from office; and making a repeal.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, February 9, 1999.

No. 466 By Representatives ZUG, GEIST, KREBS, FAIRCHILD, GODSHALL, SATHER, S. H. SMITH, TRELLO and WILT

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, reenacting and amending provisions for refunds.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, February 9, 1999.

No. 467 By Representatives ZUG, GEIST, HERSHEY and SAYLOR

An Act regulating private correctional facilities; providing for contracts with, licensing of and employee status for private correctional facilities; and imposing powers and duties on the Department of Corrections.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, February 9, 1999.

No. 468 By Representatives ZUG, HERSHEY, PESCI and SEYFERT

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

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, February 9, 1999.

No. 469 By Representatives ZUG, BARRAR, FARGO, PESCI, ROSS and TRELLO

An Act amending Title 53 (Municipalities Generally) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for limitations on incurring certain types of debt.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, February 9, 1999.

No. 470 By Representatives ZUG, BAKER, BUNT, GEIST, HALUSKA, NICKOL, PESCI, ROBERTS, SATHER, TRELLO and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending the act of June 28, 1995 (P.L.89, No.18), known as the Conservation and Natural Resources Act, requiring the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources to make payments in lieu of taxes for State parks.

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, February 9, 1999.

No. 471 By Representatives ZUG, BENNINGHOFF, BUXTON, GEIST, HALUSKA, HERSHEY, PESCI, ROSS, SEYFERT, TRELLO and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act authorizing and directing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Governor and the Secretary of Conservation and Natural Resources, to convey to Jackson Township a road right-of-way situate in Jackson Township, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania; and authorizing the Department of General Services to convey a tract of land located in Somerset Township, Somerset County.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, February 9, 1999.

No. 472 By Representatives ZUG, MARSICO, BROWNE, BEBKO-JONES, BELARDI, BENNINGHOFF, DeLUCA, FORCIER, FREEMAN, GEIST, HARHAI, HERMAN, S. MILLER, ORIE, PESCI, ROBINSON, SEYFERT, STABACK, E. Z. TAYLOR, J. TAYLOR, TRELLO, TRUE, WILLIAMS and WOJNAROSKI

An Act amending the act of August 9, 1955 (P.L.323, No.130), known as The County Code, further providing for definitions, for payment, for grave markers, for Memorial Day appropriations and for flags to decorate graves.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, February 9, 1999.

No. 473 By Representatives ZUG, BELARDI, CLARK, COY, CURRY, EACHUS, FAIRCHILD, FREEMAN, GEORGE, HERMAN, MAJOR, MELIO, MUNDY, PESCI, PLATTS, SURRA, E. Z. TAYLOR, TRELLO and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending the act of July 7, 1980 (P.L.380, No.97), known as the Solid Waste Management Act, requiring municipal approval for the application of sewage sludge.

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, February 9, 1999.

No. 474 By Representatives ZUG, FICHTER, FORCIER, GODSHALL and PESCI

An Act amending the act of May 25, 1945 (P.L.1050, No.394), known as the Local Tax Collection Law, further providing for collection costs for certain tax withholding requirements.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, February 9, 1999.

No. 475 By Representatives FORCIER, SEYFERT, PESCI, E. Z. TAYLOR and FAIRCHILD

An Act amending Titles 30 (Fish) and 34 (Game) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for trespassing and penalties.

Referred to Committee on GAME AND FISHERIES, February 9, 1999.

No. 476 By Representatives FORCIER, SEYFERT, PESCI and E. Z. TAYLOR

An Act amending Titles 30 (Fish) and 34 (Game) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for trespassing and penalties.

Referred to Committee on GAME AND FISHERIES, February 9, 1999.

No. 477 By Representatives LESCOVITZ, KENNEY, PESCI, CURRY, PRESTON, HORSEY, J. TAYLOR, TANGRETTI, SAINATO, SOLOBAY, WALKO, SURRA, LAUGHLIN, CALTAGIRONE, VAN HORNE, McCALL, RAMOS, THOMAS, BELARDI, KIRKLAND, TIGUE, MELIO and STABACK

An Act amending the act of December 14, 1988 (P.L.1192, No.147), known as the Special Ad Hoc Municipal Police and Firefighter Postretirement Adjustment Act, further providing for special ad hoc postretirement adjustments to certain persons, for financing and certification of payments and for Commonwealth reimbursement.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, February 9, 1999.

No. 478 By Representatives ROEBUCK, JAMES, SEYFERT, DONATUCCI, J. TAYLOR, CORRIGAN, JOSEPHS, TULLI, MICOZZIE, MAITLAND, LAUGHLIN, KIRKLAND, HARHAI, ROBINSON, TRELLO and BELFANTI

An Act imposing civil liability on persons participating in the illegal drug market; providing for the recovery of damages by certain persons; and establishing the procedure for bringing a private action to recover damages.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, February 9, 1999.

No. 479 By Representatives PISTELLA, SCHULER, THOMAS, LEDERER, SOLOBAY, WOJNAROSKI, MELIO, LAUGHLIN, WILLIAMS, MUNDY, PESCI, WALKO, ORIE, CURRY, VAN HORNE, SCRIMENTI, TRELLO, PRESTON, MICHLOVIC, READSHAW, HARHAI, TANGRETTI, STEVENSON, YOUNGBLOOD, JOSEPHS and STEELMAN

An Act providing for pediatric extended care centers, for licensure, for fees, for duties of the Department of Health and for enforcement; regulating construction and renovation; and providing for penalties, for creation of the Pediatric Extended Care Fund and for disposition of fees.

Referred to Committee on AGING AND YOUTH, February 9, 1999.

No. 480 By Representatives E. Z. TAYLOR, SCHRODER, MANDERINO, RUBLEY, BATTISTO, FICHTER, SCHULER, SEMMEL, BUXTON, PESCI, TRAVAGLIO, LEDERER, GEORGE, CORRIGAN, TIGUE, WALKO, MAITLAND, NAILOR, SAINATO, BUNT, BROWNE, HALUSKA, HERMAN, GIGLIOTTI, SEYFERT, HESS, FLICK, HORSEY, STERN, ORIE, MUNDY, DeLUCA, STEELMAN, LAUGHLIN, HERSHEY, McNAUGHTON, HARHAI, YOUNGBLOOD, HENNESSEY, PLATTS, SAYLOR, ROEBUCK, L. I. COHEN, GEIST, S. MILLER, B. SMITH, BARRAR, MELIO, PIPPY, JOSEPHS, SOLOBAY, MARSICO, GRUCELA, CIVERA, ZUG, EGOLF, MAHER, RAYMOND, McCALL, STABACK, STURLA, RAMOS, SCRIMENTI, M. COHEN, WILLIAMS, CURRY, J. TAYLOR, TRELLO, ROSS, BENNINGHOFF and DALEY

An Act amending the act of July 19, 1979 (P.L.130, No.48), known as the Health Care Facilities Act, requiring the Department of Health to make inspections of long-term nursing facilities on an unannounced basis and not near the time of the facilities' annual license renewal.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, February 9, 1999.

No. 481 By Representatives E. Z. TAYLOR, VANCE, DRUCE, SATHER, COY, GEORGE, KENNEY, MAITLAND, LAUGHLIN, SHANER, GIGLIOTTI, HENNESSEY, SOLOBAY, CLARK, PETRARCA, HERMAN, FAIRCHILD, MAJOR, VAN HORNE, NAILOR, ARGALL, CORRIGAN, J. TAYLOR, RUBLEY, ORIE, SEYFERT, McCALL, HALUSKA, SEMMEL, STAIRS, PIPPY, S. MILLER, JOSEPHS, CLYMER, GODSHALL, EGOLF, WILLIAMS, HASAY, SCHRODER, LEH, WALKO, READSHAW, STURLA, HESS, ZIMMERMAN, FORCIER, STABACK, MANDERINO, McNAUGHTON, STEELMAN, DERMODY, MAHER, SURRA, TIGUE, STERN, YOUNGBLOOD, SAYLOR, BAKER, STEVENSON, HARHAI, HERSHEY, BEBKO-JONES, CAPPABIANCA, L. I. COHEN, WILT, SAINATO, BELFANTI, LEDERER, MARSICO, RUFFING, TRELLO, CIVERA, PRESTON, GRUCELA and ROSS

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, providing for a tax credit for long-term care premiums paid by individuals.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, February 9, 1999.

No. 482 By Representatives E. Z. TAYLOR, RUBLEY, ORIE, FARGO, DeLUCA, FICHTER, GEORGE, SCHULER, YOUNGBLOOD, BARRAR, HENNESSEY, SAYLOR, HERMAN, MAHER, VANCE, WOJNAROSKI, SATHER, HERSHEY, BELARDI, JOSEPHS, PIPPY, SEMMEL, BEBKO-JONES, STABACK, SAINATO, MANDERINO, READSHAW, CAWLEY, BROWNE, SCHRODER, GORDNER, McCALL, BAKER, ADOLPH, TIGUE, PLATTS, FAIRCHILD, STEELMAN, WALKO, ZUG, SANTONI, TRUE, SEYFERT, MELIO, FLICK, CORRIGAN, STURLA, GIGLIOTTI, M. COHEN, LAUGHLIN, CLARK, LEDERER, WILLIAMS, CURRY, FREEMAN, PISTELLA, PETRARCA, CIVERA, VAN HORNE, RAMOS, MUNDY, FORCIER, LYNCH, S. MILLER, J. TAYLOR, TRELLO, PRESTON, L. I. COHEN, ROSS, SCRIMENTI, KIRKLAND, THOMAS and COY

An Act establishing the Day-Care Facilities Microloan Program; providing for terms and conditions of loans; providing penalties; and making an appropriation.

Referred to Committee on AGING AND YOUTH, February 9, 1999.

No. 483 By Representatives REINARD, MICOZZIE, CORRIGAN, BAKER, HENNESSEY, E. Z. TAYLOR, COY, STEELMAN, MICHLOVIC, WILLIAMS, SEMMEL, FAIRCHILD, MARSICO, HARHAI, PISTELLA, RAMOS, M. COHEN, NICKOL, ROSS, PIPPY, TRELLO, L. I. COHEN and SEYFERT

An Act establishing a community trust for persons with severe chronic disabilities; and establishing the Community Trust Fund.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, February 9, 1999.

No. 484 By Representatives REINARD, ARMSTRONG, BUXTON, RUBLEY, HENNESSEY, E. Z. TAYLOR, HERSHEY, STERN, BARD, STABACK, STEELMAN, WILLIAMS, BARRAR, SEMMEL, MARSICO, HARHAI, WILT, RAMOS, M. COHEN, THOMAS, NAILOR, FARGO, MICOZZIE, TRELLO, GODSHALL, LEH, SEYFERT, FLICK and CLYMER

An Act amending Title 62 (Procurement) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for alternate security for performance of contracts.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, February 9, 1999.

No. 485 By Representatives REINARD, NAILOR, PIPPY, MICOZZIE, ZUG, TRELLO, L. I. COHEN, RAYMOND, SEYFERT, FLICK, ARMSTRONG, CORRIGAN, ARGALL, BAKER, RUBLEY, HENNESSEY, E. Z. TAYLOR, COY, HERMAN, STABACK, STEELMAN, WILLIAMS, SURRA, SEMMEL, FAIRCHILD, MARSICO, HARHAI, WILT, PISTELLA, M. COHEN and ROSS

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, providing for a credit against the corporate net income tax for the cost of electronic data processing systems.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, February 9, 1999.

No. 486 By Representatives REINARD, THOMAS, NAILOR, FARGO, SEYFERT, PIPPY, MICOZZIE, EGOLF, TRELLO, GODSHALL, LEH, ADOLPH, RAYMOND, FLICK, ARMSTRONG, BAKER, HENNESSEY, E. Z. TAYLOR, STERN, COY, BARD, STABACK, STEELMAN, MICHLOVIC, SEMMEL, FAIRCHILD, JOSEPHS, MARSICO, SERAFINI, HARHAI, RAMOS and ROSS

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for attorney fees.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, February 9, 1999.

No. 487 By Representatives REINARD, MICOZZIE, KENNEY, ZUG, TRELLO, SCHRODER, GODSHALL, L. I. COHEN, ADOLPH, RAYMOND, SEYFERT, CORRIGAN, STURLA, ARGALL, GORDNER, RUBLEY, E. Z. TAYLOR, COY, BARD, STEELMAN, SURRA, STEVENSON, MARSICO, WILT, M. COHEN, BAKER, HENNESSEY, STERN, HERMAN, STABACK, WILLIAMS, SEMMEL, FAIRCHILD, HARHAI, PISTELLA and ROSS

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, providing for a credit against the corporate net income tax for certain child-care programs.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, February 9, 1999.

No. 488 By Representatives REINARD, MICOZZIE, CORRIGAN, GORDNER, BAKER, HENNESSEY, E. Z. TAYLOR, STERN, HERMAN, BARD, STABACK, STEELMAN, WILLIAMS, SEMMEL, JOSEPHS, MARSICO, HARHAI, WILT, RAMOS, M. COHEN, ROSS, FARGO, WOGAN, KENNEY, VANCE, TRELLO, NICKOL, GODSHALL, RAYMOND and SEYFERT

An Act establishing the Long-Term Care Program to be administered by the Department of Public Welfare; providing for long-term care insurance and for the protection of certain assets, for coordination with the Medicaid program, for additional duties of the Insurance Department in relation to the precertification of certain policies offered by private insurers and for additional duties of the Department of Aging.

Referred to Committee on INSURANCE, February 9, 1999.

No. 489 By Representatives REINARD and MICOZZIE

An Act regulating the withdrawal of property and casualty insurance from the Commonwealth; providing for additional duties of the Insurance Department; and imposing penalties.

Referred to Committee on INSURANCE, February 9, 1999.

No. 490 By Representatives REINARD, BAKER, HENNESSEY, E. Z. TAYLOR, BARRAR, SEMMEL, FAIRCHILD, MARSICO, EGOLF, TRELLO, LEH and SEYFERT

An Act providing for the imposition of State and political subdivision limitations on the imposition or increase of taxes or tax rates and on the levels of expenditures with certain exceptions.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, February 9, 1999.

No. 491 By Representatives REINARD, ARMSTRONG, BELARDI, RUBLEY, LEDERER, HENNESSEY, E. Z. TAYLOR, STERN, HERMAN, STABACK, BARRAR, SEMMEL, STEVENSON, FAIRCHILD, MARSICO, HARHAI, WILT, PISTELLA, RAMOS, ROSS, NAILOR, WOGAN, KENNEY and TRELLO

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for false reports to law enforcement authorities.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, February 9, 1999.

No. 492 By Representatives REINARD, BAKER, RUBLEY, MARSICO, FAIRCHILD, STEVENSON, SEMMEL, BARRAR, SURRA, WILLIAMS, STABACK, STERN, HERSHEY, E. Z. TAYLOR, HENNESSEY, GRUCELA, HARHAI, WILT, PISTELLA, M. COHEN, THOMAS, FARGO, WOGAN, MICOZZIE, ZUG, TRELLO, GODSHALL, L. I. COHEN, ADOLPH, RAYMOND and SEYFERT

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 the inheritance tax rate.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, February 9, 1999.

No. 493 By Representatives REINARD, ARMSTRONG, BAKER, MARSICO, SEMMEL, BARRAR, E. Z. TAYLOR, HENNESSEY, FARGO, PIPPY and TRELLO

A Joint Resolution proposing amendments to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, providing for concurrence of three-fifths of all members of each House for the passage of measures imposing new taxes or license fees; and further providing for Commonwealth indebtedness.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, February 9, 1999.

No. 494 By Representatives REINARD, ARMSTRONG, GORDNER, HENNESSEY, E. Z. TAYLOR, STABACK, SURRA, SEMMEL, FAIRCHILD, MARSICO, HARHAI, WILT, PISTELLA, RAMOS, M. COHEN, ROSS, THOMAS, WOGAN, MICOZZIE, TRELLO and SEYFERT

An Act amending the act of November 26, 1978 (P.L. 1212, No. 286), referred to as the Inspection of Employment Records Law, changing the definition of "employee."

Referred to Committee on LABOR RELATIONS, February 9, 1999.

**HOUSE RESOLUTIONS
INTRODUCED AND REFERRED**

No. 34 By Representatives ZUG, ADOLPH, ALLEN, CAPPABIANCA, CLYMER, FARGO, HARHAI, HERSHEY, RUBLEY, SEYFERT, STERN, THOMAS and WILT

A Resolution declaring that the House of Representatives deem the collective bargaining agreements between the Commonwealth and the four unions representing Pennsylvania Liquor Store employees breached and cease to provide State appropriations to the employee benefit funds unless by June 10, 1999, an audit of the funds is completed in accordance with the collective bargaining agreements.

Referred to Committee on RULES, February 9, 1999.

No. 36 By Representatives LESCOVITZ, BATTISTO, PESCI, HALUSKA, PRESTON, HORSEY, TANGRETTI, SAINATO, WALKO, SURRA, CALTAGIRONE, McCALL, RAMOS, PLATTS, GEIST, STEELMAN, MELIO, YOUNGBLOOD, STABACK and BELFANTI

A Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend ERISA to grant authority to the several states to regulate self-funded, employer-based health plans; memorializing the United States Department of Labor to coordinate enforcement efforts; and encouraging other states to enact similar resolutions.

Referred to Committee on INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, February 9, 1999.

MASTER ROLL CALL

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

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—202

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

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

ZION ACADEMY STUDENTS PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Roebuck.

Mr. ROEBUCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

February is Black History Month. I want to thank my colleagues for their unanimous endorsement of the Black History Month resolution. Today we are joined by students from Zion Academy, a nonprofit elementary school here in Harrisburg, under Wesley Union African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church. The children are educated in a way that is designed to create for them a caring environment that will give them a strong academic

foundation, with a rich emphasis upon their history and culture, and we are honored today in that they will sing for us "Lift Every Voice and Sing," and I would ask that my colleagues would join with me in this presentation as the children bring to us this presentation, if we could all stand together.

("Lift Every Voice and Sing" was presented by the students from Zion Academy.)

Mr. ROEBUCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman, Mr. Roebuck, for allowing us to share in some of the talents of these children. I note particularly that, without urging, they joined us in the Pledge of Allegiance. It was very noticeable that they knew the words, and it was also very noticeable that they meant what they said. I thank them.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. On the House floor today is Beverly Freed, a guest of Representative Ellen Bard. Beverly, an alumna of the University of Pittsburgh, attended the school's annual legislative breakfast this morning. We welcome her to the floor of the House. Please stand.

As the guest of Representative O'Brien, serving as a guest page on the House floor, is David Kralle, a student at Our Lady of Calvary in Philadelphia. I am not sure where David is sitting, but I would ask him to stand, if he is— Oh, there he is. Thank you, David.

CALENDAR

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House resumed third consideration of **SB 255, PN 229**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for purchase, consumption, possession or transportation of liquor or malt or brewed beverages by minors.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is about to continue the calendar and debate that was taking place last night at the time of adjournment.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. At the time of adjournment, the gentleman, Mr. McNaughton, had sought recognition.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the lady, Mrs. Cohen, rise?

Mrs. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A point of parliamentary inquiry, please.

The SPEAKER. The lady will please state it.

Mrs. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my husband is a partner in the Philadelphia law firm of Fox, Rothschild, O'Brien & Frankel. They represent the Levy family, which owns the Atlantic City Racetrack. Additionally, they represent Greenwood Racing, which owns Philadelphia Park and Turf Club and also is participating in a joint venture with Penn National and the Ladbroke company. With Penn National, it is in a satellite network to broadcast racing results. I do not know if that is a conflict of interest or not, and I would like a ruling from the Chair, please.

The SPEAKER. For the record, the lady discussed this with the Chair and the Parliamentarian prior to asking the question, which is proper, and it is the opinion of the Chair, agreed to by the Parliamentarian, that you have no conflict of interest, but rather, this is a generic question that is being voted upon.

Mrs. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Accordingly, it is the ruling of the Chair that you have no conflict.

Mrs. COHEN. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

The gentleman, Mr. McNaughton, on the question.

The question is, will the House agree to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Bucks County, Mr. DiGirolamo, being amendment A0188?

Mr. McNAUGHTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday on the floor of the House we heard arguments both pro and con as to the issue of expanding access to gambling in Pennsylvania, and I suspect, based on some of the votes cast yesterday, that there will be a sufficient number of positive votes to pass this first attempt to expand gambling. So today will be the only chance those of us who are opposed to the expansion of gambling will ever get to inform the citizens about the facts related to gambling.

And I suspect that the argument expressed by the gentleman from Delaware County in which he stated that we are a representative democracy here in Pennsylvania and we, the members of the General Assembly, should make this decision and not pass the buck to our uninformed citizens in the way of a referendum has fallen on deaf ears; and the scholarly argument offered by the gentleman from Columbia County, who astutely pointed out that a nonbinding referendum process is not provided for in the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

And how can we forget the pearls of wisdom which seem to effortlessly roll off the tongue of our minority leader when he states that we are a Commonwealth; a Commonwealth. I see no common wealth as part of this proposed referendum, Mr. Speaker. No, on the contrary, I see common despair, poverty, and disease, for gambling is not a lofty economic development project. It is and always will be a parasite that preys on the lowliest of society — the weakest, the poorest, and the sickest. Those with no hope of a better future, those are the individuals who fall victim to the scourges of gambling. And of course, those who benefit are not the Commonwealth, the Commonwealth, but four — count them — four racetrack owners and their affiliated offtrack betting facilities.

And the argument from the gentleman from Tioga County, a fine attorney in his own right, who appropriately pointed out that

the referendum question is nothing more than a push question designed to fool the citizens of this Commonwealth into thinking that this expansion of gambling will be a benefit to the citizenry. As he accurately pointed out, this question, to be truthful, accurate, and truly meant to inform, should say something to the effect of "Do you want gambling expansion in the Commonwealth?"

Mr. Speaker, could I have some order, please?

The SPEAKER. Conferences on the floor will please break up; conferences on the floor will please break up.

The gentleman may continue.

Mr. McNAUGHTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would suggest that this question does not go far enough. To truly inform the electorate, as is the intention of the maker of the amendment — at least that is what he stated yesterday, and I have no reason to question his motives, for I find the gentleman to be an honorable man, and I agree with the gentleman that the citizens of the Commonwealth need to be informed about this issue — but to truly inform and ask a more accurate question, it should state, "Do you want an increased access to gambling and all the affiliated social ills, some of which may include but not be limited to increased murder, auto theft, assaults, drug trafficking, prostitution, suicide, bankruptcy, et cetera?" That, Mr. Speaker, more accurately describes what will occur if and when gambling expansion occurs in this great Commonwealth.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was going to interrogate the maker of the amendment on the floor of the House today, but I do not believe I will do so, for you see, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Bucks County can offer no information as to what money will be generated if any, where and how this money can be spent, who will have oversight powers of gambling, how many slots will be allowed, or more accurately, how to define gaming and gambling floor, and this list could and today probably will go on and on. No, Mr. Speaker, the best answer we can hope for is that we are simply placing this issue on the ballot for the citizens to decide, and we will take up enabling legislation after the voters fail to realize the ramifications of their vote and approve this question in the May primary.

So what about the argument that this is a freedom-to-choose issue? Should not the citizens of the Commonwealth have a right to choose their own fate? Ah, an argument very difficult to argue against, for if you do, you are taking away a basic right of a citizen of the United States: freedom; freedom. However, government often allows freedom but within certain parameters, such as the freedom to drive but only after reaching the age of 16, such as the freedom to drink adult beverages but only after reaching the age of 21. But government does not allow an individual to drink and drive simultaneously. And why? Because, Mr. Speaker, after careful review of the facts, numerous public hearings, study after study, we as elected officials have acted in what we believe to be in the best interest of the citizens of this Commonwealth and have made it a crime to drink and drive. And we all know there are citizens throughout this Commonwealth, Mr. Speaker, that would argue that we have taken away a right of theirs to choose.

Now, Mr. Speaker, yesterday we heard the gentleman from Delaware County, from the other side of the aisle, suggest that if we wanted increased funding for education, we should stop our prison expansions and our ever-increasing budget on crime, which now currently stands at over \$1 billion — \$1 billion, Mr. Speaker — and put some of that money into educating our young people and forget about so-called revenue from "slots for tots," as it was aptly

described yesterday. I would suggest to the gentleman from Delaware County on the other side of the aisle that this idea, although honorable, is not possible if increased gambling comes to Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker, for you see, the facts are that everywhere an increase in gambling or access to gambling has occurred, so has the incidence of crime. I am not talking about minor crimes such as jaywalking or curfew violations, Mr. Speaker. No, with increased access to gambling come the wonderful crimes such as an increase in murder rates. In fact, in one California community, Mr. Speaker, auto thefts rose by 21 percent; drug trafficking offenses increased by 200 percent; property crimes increased by 83 percent. Of course, one may argue that I do not live in those communities so that increased crime will not affect me. Well, I must tell you that to fall for this argument, see, is a ruse, Mr. Speaker, because since gambling has come to Atlantic City, the crime rate within a 30-mile radius of Atlantic City has increased 109 percent — 109 percent, Mr. Speaker.

So one must ask themselves, are these the wonderful types of attributes we want to bring to the citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania? And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, they are not. I would also suggest that the current \$1 billion-plus that we spend on controlling crime in the Commonwealth will dwarf in comparison to the new budget for crime if and when the General Assembly expands access to gambling. In fact, the so-called revenue generated by the expanded gambling operations will not cover the cost of our ever-increasing anticrime budget, let alone generate revenue for education and economic development, unless your definition of economic development is building more prisons and your idea of education is training our prisoners to make more license plates.

For these reasons and many others, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pleased to welcome to the hall of the House today, as the guests of Representatives Zimmerman and Matthew Wright, Dr. Monica Zimmerman and Christina Ferris of Temple University's Small Business Development Center, Joan Weiss of Bucks County Community College, Dr. Hugh Evans of Elizabethtown College, and Dr. Michael Bartolacci of Marywood College, together with four students who are here today representing the Students in Free Enterprise Week. Would the guests please rise, in the balcony.

The Chair is also pleased to welcome to the hall of the House today the fourth grade class of Harrisburg Christian School, here as the guests of Representative Ron Marsico. Would these guests please rise. I am told they just left.

The Chair is pleased to welcome to the hall of the House today the brother of Representative Frank Gigliotti, Joseph Gigliotti. Would he please rise.

Here today as the guests of Representative Saylor are Melissa Carr, Jessica Stuck, and Michael Carr. They are guest pages. And seated in the gallery are Lisa Carr, Ellen Moran, and Matthew Carr, all guests of the gentleman, Mr. Saylor. Would these guests please rise.

This must be York County day. Guests of the entire York County delegation, seated in the rear of the chamber, are students from York County participating in Job Shadow Day '99, sponsored by the Junior Achievement group. Would these guests please rise.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 255 CONTINUED

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

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it has become the fashion to quote famous poets on the floor of the House, so I will take my stab at a modern English poet named Gordon Sumner, who some of you may recognize more commonly as "Sting." He said, "I've lost my faith in the politicians. They all seem like game show hosts to me."

Yesterday we heard that if you just voted for what was behind referendum number one, we would realize all our hopes and desires: school funding, maybe not equitable school funding but school funding. And gosh, if you were a voucher proponent, you might even get vouchers out of it, but certainly, if you are against vouchers, that is not what school funding meant. If you are from a wealthy suburban area, you might get a new pool in your school, and if you are from a rural or urban area, you might actually get books. All you needed to do was trust the politicians. You did not need to know what the referendum was really going to do. We were going to work that all out later. Just trust the politicians that if you picked referendum number one, you were not going to go bust.

Now, my concern is not with the gaming provision itself. I actually will probably vote for some gaming provisions over the next 100 amendments or so. My concern is with the wording of the referendum. Nowhere do we know what the money is going to be spent on, how it is going to be spent, and what we are doing. And as Representative Masland pointed out yesterday, it is very reminiscent of what we did here a year or so ago with, quote, unquote, "tax reform." This ballot question as it is proposed is ambiguous at best. More realistically, it is misleading.

There are better alternatives in our amendment packets. Representative McCall has an amendment that specifically says the money goes for a dollar-for-dollar reduction of property taxes.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield, please.

The question is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Bucks County, not any potential amendments that may or may not be offered by other members.

Mr. STURLA. I understand, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to attempt, and I will not go back to that, but what I am trying to attempt to do is to point out to people that even if they are for the concept behind slots at racetracks, this is not the amendment for them to vote for. And if you do not like any of the other amendments, we can always go draft some more. This amendment, however, is not what we should be voting on to accomplish slots at racetracks. If we are really serious about slots at racetracks, we can spell out some precise features in the amendment or an amendment that would put a referendum on the ballot. We can hold harmless the lottery, we can prohibit expansion into offtrack betting parlors, and we can reduce property taxes for seniors. But this amendment does not do any of those. There are people who can say, well, it could. Well, it could also do a lot of other things. I do not believe that we should

perpetrate the scam on our voters that this amendment does, because this amendment does exactly what the tax reform proposal did a year and a half ago. It says, just trust us; just vote for it, and we guarantee you that when we come back, it will be what you want. And what we got in return was what no one wanted. No one has taken up that tax reform proposal. And my sense is that we will have slots at racetracks and we will be spending the money on various frivolous projects that no one wanted, but it will be too late then. The horse will be out of the barn, pardon my pun.

Mr. Speaker, I rise against this amendment and hope that members would join me so that we can get to other amendments that will allow slots at racetracks but will do it in such a manner that benefits all Pennsylvanians. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Clymer, for the second time on the question.

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out yesterday, we have to take a look at the four racetracks to see whether or not they are in a serious financial situation, and briefly, I pointed out that two of them — Pocono Downs and Penn National — are earning substantial profits, and so they are not in harm's way. The racetrack at Philadelphia Park, its debt has been so structured that when the payments are made on interest and principal, the owner, who has an 80-percent interest in that racetrack and who is located in London, England, that money goes directly to the holding company of the mortgage in Liechtenstein. A little complicated, but that is the way it works. And so you have to say to yourself, they are playing games with the debt, because Mr. Bob Manoukian, who is 80 percent owner, is a specialist in tax laws. He knows how to get money from countries without having to pay the taxes, and he is doing that, unfortunately, at the racetrack in Bensalem.

Mr. Speaker, the other problem that we looked at is that this racetrack is in such a serious situation yet they are able to leverage \$45 million in a way to buy out two racetracks in the State of New Jersey. I think that deal fell through, but the point is, money was available. And at the Bensalem racetrack, not only the racetrack itself is 80 percent owned by foreign interests but the offtrack betting sites as well, and as I pointed out yesterday, that the income, the wager, at the Bensalem track had substantially increased from 1996 of \$303 million being wagered to \$474 million wagers. Think about that. That is a significant increase at this thoroughbred racetrack in Bucks County.

Then I mentioned briefly that in thoroughbred racing, the figure of \$764 million that was wagered in 1996 rose dramatically to \$845 million. Those two racetracks that have thoroughbreds apparently are doing quite well. So I hope that the members put that in proper focus as we vote on whether we need slot machines at racetracks.

Then finally, not finally, but, Mr. Speaker, on Ladbroke at the Meadows, which is in western Pennsylvania, this is another international cartel that owns this particular racetrack, and while it had some modest decline in attendance, I do not think it is near the point of bankruptcy, where things are going to go that badly that they cannot sustain their operations for years to come, and so, Mr. Speaker, I hope the members consider those facts and figures.

I would like to address the problem about crime is down. Someone said crime is down in Pennsylvania; we do not have to fear the efforts of casino gambling coming into the State. True, crime is down, and I agree, but it is down because we do not have

casino gambling in Pennsylvania, and I think that is the point many of us have been making right along, that if we do not have casino gambling, we are not going to have the crime as they do in other States.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I talked briefly about the little guy, that this is the person that we deserve to help. You know, casino gambling of any type brings about regressive taxation, and who is the person that gets hit the most? The person who can least afford to gamble. I know that we are all interested in helping the little guy. I have heard it many times on the floor of the House. Then why in the world would anyone vote to have casino gambling in Pennsylvania, because those are the people that get hurt the most; those are the people that get their pockets emptied very quickly, and they cannot afford that.

You know, if it was a legislation piece for the Department of Environmental Protection or Health and Welfare, we can move in such a way to help those people through those departments, but when we as public policy say we are going to have casino gambling in Pennsylvania, those people are out on their own. We are not there to protect them, and that is a tragedy, and it has been a tragedy in other States that have allowed themselves to be swallowed up with casino gambling.

Mr. Speaker, one other item that just came in, and that was the program last night on ABC called "20/20." They did a television segment on slot machines and women — slot machines and women. They demonstrated that women are addicted to these slot machines and that they spend a minimum of 6 hours. Now, Mr. Speaker, think about this: Slot machines are taking the time of women. In our society there are many women who can ill afford to spend those hours at the slot machines. I mean, that is a tragedy of great proportions.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

Please. The gentleman, Mr. Clymer, is entitled to be heard.

Mr. Clymer.

Mr. CLYMER. Mr. Speaker, in our society in which we live, women, unfortunately, and I say this very compassionately, they have to be responsible because of a marriage problem of raising their children. The last thing we want to put in their way as a stumbling block are slot machines, where they are going to spend hour after hour after hour wasting their time and their money, and I just think that that should be a revelation to all of us that if we are truly interested in helping our families and our citizens, the last thing we want to do is bring about the legalization of casino gambling and especially slots, as the issue before us, slots at the racetracks.

Mr. Speaker, several days ago our majority leader, Representative Perzel, talked about his vision for Pennsylvania. I am going to tell you, I was impressed. He said, "...we...are going to play a pivotal role in building a better Pennsylvania as we move into the next century," and how true that is, and our actions here today could well determine if we believe in the time-honored values of hard work, saving, investment, and opportunity, or will we buy in to the casinos' gambling masquerade that says, spend your money and you can make it rich quick.

Mr. Speaker, the wonderful history and legacy of this Commonwealth can be a tribute to the bold and noble visions of our forefathers who for many years have been a shining example to all of us. Well, those visions and that courage and that boldness that they had could be washed away if we decide to go into casino

gambling. In casino gambling there is nothing inspirational about the legalization of slot machines at racetracks.

For these and for many other reasons, I would ask the members of this House to cast a "no" vote on this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the lady from Lancaster County, Mrs. True.

Mrs. TRUE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to amendment A0188. Just some comments and my reasoning.

I know we have heard a lot and a lot will be repetitive, but I want to speak about our young people in the Commonwealth. Since 1978 I have been involved in trying to secure funds for prevention for the drug problem in the Commonwealth and the country for our children. It is very hard to get money for prevention. It is very hard to have people interested or listen or pay attention when we talk about our kids and what is happening to society in general. Making a little bit of progress, not enough.

This General Assembly at the end of last term unanimously passed legislation to protect children because of irresponsible adults that do not look after them. The House voted unanimously, the Senate voted unanimously, and we have some very good child protective service laws now in place.

I would just pose to this body that we are sending the wrong message as to how we are dealing with our children and how we are actually protecting them. If we are going to start a whole new — I am trying to think of the right word; "vice" comes to mind — but if we are going to start expanding gambling and putting something out there that has never been there before, what kind of message does it send to our kids?

We already have colleges that have problems with binge drinking with our children; we have adults that are not looking after their children, that are beating them and murdering them; and now we bring in another problem that you know we are going to have to deal with in some fashion, and I just feel that this is something in particular that Republicans should not even be dealing with. I know it is bipartisan, but I feel badly that we are doing it under our watch.

So I would just ask — I know most of the minds are made up — but I would just ask that as we look at this expansion and what we are proposing to do, that we do consider our young people first and foremost. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman from Lackawanna, Mr. Serafini, who waives off.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Blair, Mr. Stern.

Mr. STERN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I also stand before you today to ask for a "no" vote on this amendment.

The question before us deals with the Commonwealth and a question of referendum, talking about generating revenues for educational purposes and economic development. We have no plan before us today that deals with educational purposes. There is no number of slot machines that has been included with this legislation today, and basically, what we are doing is asking our voters, our constituents in our legislative districts, to buy a pig in a poke.

What will the cost be socially with this additional form of gambling? I would like to share with you a unique study of social service costs that were conducted in 1994 when Alabama was considering casinos. A group of 40 public and nonprofit agencies in Mobile County issued a report titled the "Social Impact of

Gaming.” Noting that the health and the social service system in Mobile was already overextended and underfunded, the report asked for an additional \$15 million per year within the county to cover the projected increases that would be needed if gaming would be legalized. Agency heads had arrived at the projection by talking to their counterparts in areas around the country that already had casinos.

The group was chaired by Charles White, CEO (chief executive officer) of Franklin Memorial Primary Health Care Center in Mobile, and it included agencies such as Red Cross, United Way, and the Mobile County Public Schools. What it proved was the need for school aides and tutors increases. The schools in New Orleans have noted a marked increase in the number of students who come to school unprepared, hungry, and sleepy. Many report they were up late because their parents were out gambling. Also, the YWCA of Mobile recommended startup funding for a 24-hour child-care program. Casino employees were working nontraditional hours.

Also, the Family Counseling Center in Mobile noted that similar agencies in the Biloxi-Gulfport area reported that their caseload of clients needing both family counseling and consumer credit counseling services had soared. Mobile County has a population of about 378,000, about the same as Pennsylvania’s Chester or Westmoreland Counties.

In 1995 a report from the Attorney General of Maryland, Joseph Curran, entitled “The House Never Loses and Maryland Cannot Win,” was presented to the Joint Executive-Legislative Task Force to Study Commercial Gaming Activities in Maryland. The conclusion I would like to share with you at this time — and I am not going to get into all the different details; the executive summary that the Attorney General mentions in his report talks about a good many things — but the Joint Executive-Legislative Task Force requested that the Attorney General examine the impact of casino gaming and what it could expect as far as the crime impact in the State of Maryland. The impact would be this: Casinos would bring a substantial increase in crime to Maryland. There would be more violent crime, more crimes against property, more insurance fraud, more white-collar crime, more juvenile crime, more drug- and alcohol-related crime, more domestic violence and child abuse, and more organized crime. Casinos would bring us exactly what we do not need — a lot more kinds of crime.

The conclusion of this report — and I am not going to get into the different details, but I just want to share the conclusion — the Attorney General stated: “In sum, if Maryland were to start down this path, there would be no going back. The State could never be assured of retaining enough control over the casino industry to reap the dubious benefits it has been promised, or to deal with the myriad of social costs which would descend upon it. These certain ills and uncertain benefits are not worth the risk to the citizens of Maryland and to their quality of life. The State should not adopt public policy which will increase crime and exacerbate other social ills. The Task Force and the people of this State should act to preserve what is good about Maryland and seek better ways to improve what is not.”

I conclude with this report, Mr. Speaker, that we should preserve what is good about our Commonwealth, the great State of Pennsylvania, and we should seek better ways to improve what is not. This referendum proposal does nothing to answer any

questions any voter may have about the true cost to Pennsylvania’s working families and Pennsylvania’s taxpayers.

Thank you, and I would ask for a nonconcurrency on this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pleased to welcome to the hall of the House today Aisur Belekova, a foreign exchange student from the Republic of Altai, Siberia, and John Madden, her exchange host. They are seated to the left of the Speaker. Would the guests please stand.

The Chair is also pleased to welcome to the hall of the House today, as the guests of Representative Paul Semmel, Joelle Rutt, a guest page, here with her parents, Cindy and Ron Rutt. Would the family please rise.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 255 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Allegheny County, Miss Orié.

MISS ORIE. I rise in opposition to amendment A0188. One of my colleagues yesterday aptly described the ABCs associated with gambling.

The SPEAKER. Will the lady please cease for a moment.

There is entirely too much noise on the floor. Staff members are not encouraged to engage in conversation unless they are working on this bill.

Miss Orié.

MISS ORIE. One of my colleagues yesterday aptly described the ABCs associated with gambling — addiction, bankruptcy, and crime. As a former prosecutor, I would like to focus on the Cs of gambling, the direct correlation between gambling and criminal activity.

I ask my colleagues to consider the following data and alarming statistics prior to casting your vote: In Minnesota within the first 6 years of casinos being implemented, the crime rate increased more than twice as noncasino counties. In Mississippi the same thing. As a result of casinos, a 43-percent increase in crime 4 years after casinos arrived. In Harrison County, right in the Gulf Coast where the casinos are located, there was a 58-percent increase from 1993 to 1996. In Ledyard, Connecticut, the annual number of calls to the police department prior to casinos was 4,000; after casinos, 16,700, within a 5-year period. In San Jose there was a significant increase in crime — narcotics went up 200 percent; property crimes, 83 percent; petty thefts, 56 percent. In Black Hawk, Colorado, within the timeframe from when casinos came, they started with 25 crimes a year, and after casinos it rose to 15,000 to 20,000, which is a significant increase. In regards to Lawrence County, South Dakota, the annual felony cases have increased by 69 percent. Lastly, half of the Louisiana district attorneys surveyed in 1995 noted gambling as a factor in the rising crime rates in these jurisdictions. In essence, this data from gambling — and the data goes on and on and on — bolsters and corroborates the fact that gambling does indeed foster a significant increase in crime. This data is disturbing and it emphasizes the criminal attribute gambling brings to the society.

In 1994 this legislative body conducted or convened a special session on crime to address the inadequacies, the leniencies, and

the lack of deterrence in regards to the criminal law. This legislation, if passed, will put criminal reform in Pennsylvania back centuries. Furthermore, we will be conducting special sessions on crime for many years to come to address the increasing criminal element associated with gambling.

I would ask my colleagues to join me in a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Gordner, for the second— The gentleman waives off.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Franklin County, Mr. Fleagle.

Mr. FLEAGLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard some good, rational arguments on both sides of this issue, and frankly, I think the antigambling side has certainly proved their point a lot better, and I doubt if many of my colleagues are going to be swayed by rational arguments. But I would also think that my colleagues are asked, Mr. Speaker, from time to time – I know I have been, from my constituents – how do you decide whether to vote for or against an issue, and there are issues that lend themselves to rational argument. But, you know, Mr. Speaker, this is one of those issues that I tell my constituents, you have to look inside for an answer; you have to look in your heart, and this is one of those issues, Mr. Speaker. This amendment, this expansion of gambling, is just plain wrong. Look in your hearts. This is wrong.

I cannot stress enough, Mr. Speaker, and will not even try to express what my colleagues have said will be the consequences of a positive vote on this amendment.

Again, I ask you to search your hearts. I think if you do, you will know that this is wrong. I ask for a negative vote on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lebanon, Mr. Krebs. Mr. KREBS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to talk about gambling and the effects on education. I think that we have a lot of other States that have enacted gambling in the hopes that there would be educational benefits, and I think that many States have sold the idea that gambling is a painless substitute for taxes and a way to raise money for good causes such as education. But an exclusive Money Magazine investigation revealed that lottery States collect more in taxes and spend less on schools than States that go without the games. Research has shown that gambling funds earmarked for educational purposes provide an initial windfall, but it is a brief windfall, and that gambling dollars simply supplant other appropriations, leaving a net neutral impact in most cases and a net negative in other cases.

While funding levels remain relatively static, the general public believes that gambling dollars are creating a windfall for the public schools, and therefore, the public is less likely to support bond issues, tax increases, and other actions to improve school funding. Gambling advertising, which promotes the idea that gambling proceeds help educational funding, fosters this false notion among the public.

According to Mary Fulton, a policy analyst at the Education Commission of the States in Denver, "There's a deep and widespread perception among the public that lottery revenues are being used to substantially fund education." This simply is not true. During this decade, States that used gambling proceeds to fund education actually dedicated a declining share of their total

spending to schools. In States that used gambling proceeds to fund education, net education spending declined from 50.1 percent to 49 percent since 1990, according to Money Magazine. At the same time, education spending has inched up in States that lack lotteries from 58.2 percent to 58.9 percent. Gambling dollars do not help education.

If you plan to vote for this amendment because it is an easy way to fund education without raising taxes, I want to assure you that it does not work. Other States' experiences show that educational spending does not go up. The benefits to education that flow from gambling are very small compared to the addictive costs when you have a compulsive gambler.

I urge defeat of the amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pleased to welcome to the hall of the House, as the guests of Representative Phyllis Mundy, Vivian Lambert and Mary Beth Hamilton. They are seated to the left of the Speaker. Would the guests please rise.

As the guest of Representative Karl Boyes, we have with us today, to the left of the Speaker, Dr. William Trice. Would the doctor please rise.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 255 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York County, Mr. Platts. The gentleman is recognized for the second time on this issue.

Mr. PLATTS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wanted to just share a few other points of information for members to consider on why we should rethink this amendment and cast a "no" vote.

We have heard lots of talk of education funding and education resources from the funds from these slot machines, and I want to share a quote with you that I think we could be hearing a few years down the road if we move forward as is being proposed. "When the lottery was approved...the public was promised that it would support education. Implied in that promise was that the lottery would add to state aid, rather than merely replace it. Even today, a new lottery advertising campaign perpetuates THE MYTH that schools receive additional resources from the lottery. The truth is that the Legislature and Governor decide how much state aid will go to local schools and the amount from the lottery is just a small part of that total. Lottery money has never supplemented state aid; it doesn't today and it...never will." That quote is a quote from the comptroller of the State of New York in analyzing their lottery program.

Now, here we are not talking about the lottery; we are talking about slot machines, but I think we will hear that quote when the people say, well, hey, we thought we were doing slot machines for education. Where is the money going to instead of education? What are we doing with that? I think in years to come we are going to hear that similar quote that we really have not improved or increased the funding for education because of doing slot machines, and as the maker of the amendment confirmed yesterday, there is absolutely no guarantee, even if a majority of Pennsylvanians support this, that the money is going to go to education.

Two other statistics I just want to share with you, and this is—
Mr. Speaker, could I get the attention of the chamber, please?

The SPEAKER. Please. Members will take their seats. Members who feel it necessary to confer should do so in one of the rear rooms.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. PLATTS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the attention of the members on this, because these are not numbers from another State. These are numbers concerning Pennsylvania citizens, your constituents.

You may not know, but we have a hotline here in Pennsylvania for gamblers, for people with gambling problems. That hotline averages from 4,000 to 6,000 calls a year, and two numbers I want you to give weight to when you vote. These are your citizens, your constituents. Of the callers to that hotline, 35 percent had a definite suicide plan already in mind; 20 percent had actually attempted suicide. Those are Pennsylvania citizens who have a gambling problem today and have already tried suicide — 20 percent. Ninety-nine percent of those same callers have a serious financial problem. Again, these are Pennsylvanians already with problems.

The numbers show the closer the gambling is to the people, the higher the gambling problems, the higher the compulsion rates. So know when we are talking about the problems, it is your constituents, your citizens, fellow Pennsylvanians, who are going to be facing those problems.

So again I urge a “no” vote. Do what is right for all Pennsylvanians and just say no. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Tioga County, Mr. Baker.

Mr. BAKER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise again to oppose this amendment.

Some of the comments I have heard from some of our members that normally would be voting against this have said, well, what is the problem? It is a referendum. Let the people decide. Well, as indicated earlier, I think we owe it to our citizens and to our voters to provide the statistics, the data, the information to become an informed voter. If we are truly going to put this on a ballot, they need to have additional information.

And what is the hurry anyway? This is not an emergency disaster aid package. This is not an issue that is going to sunset within the next week or two. Why are we taking up a very substantive issue without a committee process, without a public hearing process? Why are we allowing this kind of amendment on the floor of the House of Representatives without the committee process? The process works, and it is not working in this case. This is exactly what the progambling industry wants to see happen. This is what they want to see because it is the path of least resistance publicly, and I think we owe it to our citizens and our taxpayers and our voters to have more information on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it has clearly been indicated here that there is a nexus, there is a causal connection between crime, social costs, and gambling, and that is exactly what this does — it expands gambling in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It is not an economic development package; it is not an educational package. It is a progambling initiative. And I think that the issue has been raised adequately that the referendum question itself is a push question; that is to say, the question itself solicits the desired response, and I think we at least need to have public hearings and receive some comments from the Department of General Services, the Attorney General’s Office to at least have some objectivity to

the question itself, and if we embrace what this amendment says, it will solicit a desired response. I think it is very dangerous, this question, and very misleading to our citizenry. Gambling is not even brought up. So I think we need to slow down the process, and I think we need to have more reason to our approach.

I think we also, Mr. Speaker, should be very careful about, if this amendment passes and this indeed does appear on the ballot, we have to be aware that millions and millions of dollars will be spent in major media markets to push this initiative, and I am very concerned about the more rural conservative areas that do not support this. And I can tell you in my district that most of the firefighters that I have talked with, the senior citizens that I have talked with, police officers that I have talked with, most of the individuals in my district do not support the expansion of gambling in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I think we need to be more deliberate on this issue and we need to slow the process, and if we do not think that crime and organized crime will have any impact whatsoever on this issue in the Commonwealth, I think we are mistaken.

I am just going to use one example. In April of 1997, the Associated Press reported: “A reputed crime syndicate tried to infiltrate and control an Indian casino near San Diego” — of all places — “the second time in 10 years that the casino was allegedly targeted, according to federal indictments.” And what is really important here — and this impacts Pennsylvania — seventeen people were charged, including numerous members of organized crime families from Pittsburgh — organized crime members from Pittsburgh — and Ohio. And in the previous incident, nine reputed Chicago organized crime figures were convicted of racketeering, extortion, and other charges. Now, Mr. Speaker, if organized crime members were involved in a casino operation in San Diego, can you imagine, if we expand gambling in Pennsylvania, what the impact is going to be?

Mr. Speaker, for this and many other reasons, I rise to oppose this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. SCHRODER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning as I began my trip to Harrisburg, I was in the car and I was listening to a Philadelphia news radio station that I listen to some two, three, four times a day sometimes — I will not mention the name of the station — but they had America’s mayor on there talking about this issue, and he made an interesting comment. America’s mayor posed this question: Do you really think that we can prevent addiction in our State by keeping gambling outside our borders?

Now, Mr. Speaker, the logic of that statement I guess is a bit hard to argue with, except I would argue that it totally misses the point, because, you see, Mr. Speaker, I think the mayor of Philadelphia and everyone, if they are looking at this in a sensible way, would have to agree and have to admit that the very availability of gambling will increase addiction in our State. In fact, Mr. Speaker, as gambling has expanded across the country, the number of Gamblers Anonymous chapters in the United States has nearly doubled in the past 8 years. Gamblers Anonymous now has 1,200 chapters meeting regularly across the country, and who knows, there may be a chapter coming to your town real soon as a result of what we do here in the next day or two and provide some interesting opportunities for constituent outreach, I do not know.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, there have been gambling behavior surveys conducted in the State of Minnesota which show a substantial increase in the number of compulsive gamblers coincidental with the expansion of gambling in that State. The lottery was introduced in 1990 and casino gambling was getting a toehold that year – slot machines, among others. By 1994, there were 17 casinos operating in Minnesota. The percentage of Minnesota adults who demonstrated a serious gambling problem climbed from 2.5 percent of the population in 1990 to 4.4 percent in 1994.

Gambling surveys in the State of Iowa show a marked increase in the number of problem and pathological gamblers after the introduction of gambling in that State. In 1989 only 1.7 percent of Iowa adults showed indications of having a serious gambling pattern or problem. By 1995, the percentage had more than tripled to 5.4 percent. Studies undertaken by the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, indicate the incidence of problem gambling in Nevada is 8 or 9 percent, which would be the highest rate in the nation and probably comes as no real surprise for that State.

And, Mr. Speaker, there are more facts and figures that I could rattle off here, but I think those are examples of what we can expect to see in this State, in Pennsylvania, if we allow this expansion of gambling that is being proposed in this form by this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any doubt that not only will the city of Philadelphia or the parks in or around the Philadelphia area, not only will they have an increase in gambling addictions and gambling problems but so will the entire region, Mr. Speaker, so will all the surrounding communities. It is something that will flow out from the epicenter of the gambling activity. That is not exactly what my idea of regionalism is all about, at least I hope it is not, but it could give it an interesting new twist.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that we think long and hard before we take this vote this morning, this afternoon, whenever it will come, and I urge a “no” vote on this amendment. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (PATRICIA H. VANCE) PRESIDING

GUEST INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair welcomes to the hall of the House Kim Wagner, a legislative aide in Representative Lynch's Tionesta district office. Would the lady please rise.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 255 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster County, Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment also.

Much has been said over the last day or so about the consequences of expansion of gambling, primarily in areas of local business, the cannibalization of local businesses and bankruptcy. I have been given some statistics which I would like to share, since we are not taking this through the committee structure and we need to do this on the House floor.

In a survey – and this has to do with cannibalization of local businesses – in a survey of 900 Minnesota restaurant owners, 38 percent said they have lost business due to gambling. The number of independent restaurants in Atlantic City dropped from 48 the year the gambling facilities opened to 16 in 1997. Within just 4 years of the gambling's arrival, one-third of the city's retail businesses had closed. The number of retail businesses in Gilpin County, Colorado, dropped from 31 before gambling to 11 within a couple of years after gambling arrived, and Gilpin County is the home of the majority of the State's gambling facilities. More than 70 percent of the businesses in Natchez, Mississippi, reported declining sales within a few months of the opening of that city's first gambling facility.

A University of South Dakota study showed that retail and service businesses in South Dakota suffered a net loss of approximately \$60 million in anticipated sales in the year following the introduction of gambling. Not only the loss of those sales, but you have to ask your question, the loss of the income into the State because of that.

Next I would like to cover the issue of bankruptcy. A 1997 nationwide study found that the bankruptcy rate in counties with at least one gambling establishment, which would include either a racetrack, a casino, or jai alai frontons – I do not know if I am saying that right – was 18 percent higher than those counties without gambling. The rate was 35 percent higher for counties with five or more gambling facilities.

Iowa counties with a casino, racetrack, or riverboat casino had a bankruptcy rate near 21 percent higher than the State average. Nevada had the fourth highest bankruptcy rate in the nation in 1996. Mississippi, the State with the second highest level of gambling per capita, ranked fifth in the nation in per capita bankruptcy filings. Atlantic County, New Jersey, home of Atlantic City, has by far the highest bankruptcy rate in the State.

Six of the 16 counties with the highest bankruptcy rates in the nation in 1996 were located near the 10 riverboat casinos in Tunica, Mississippi. Shelby County, Tennessee, home of Memphis, had the highest bankruptcy rate in the nation, four times the national average. Memphis, which is within an hour's drive of Tunica, ranks as the number six casino feeder market in the country, producing 6 million casino visits in 1996.

Prince George's County, Maryland, the only county in the State where gambling was legal in 1996, also had by far the State's highest bankruptcy rate that year. The two California counties with that State's highest bankruptcy rates – Riverside and San Bernardino – are both adjacent to Las Vegas, and gambling-related bankruptcies in metro Detroit increased by as much as 40-fold within a year and a half, according to local bankruptcy attorneys.

And finally, various studies of pathological gamblers show that 20 percent or more eventually file for bankruptcy.

I think it goes without saying that what has been occurring in all of these other municipalities and counties definitely gives us the history that we can look at to realize what can happen in our State. And I would hate – I would hate – to live in a municipality where that gambling is allowed to be expanded, knowing that the small businesses can be and will be cannibalized, the bankruptcy rate is going to increase, and not only the bankruptcy rate for the individuals involved of losing that money but all of the local businesses that are going to suffer because of the bankruptcy.

And I find it rather ironic that last week when we dealt with the redevelopment cap and trying to spend a lot more money in redevelopment, that we are turning around this week and trying to allow for expansion of gambling that in and of itself is going to work against the redevelopment projects that we voted on last week.

For all of these reasons and many more that have already been stated, I ask that all of the members consider very heavily the consequences of your vote today and vote "no." Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Columbia County, for the second time, Mr. Gordner.

Mr. GORDNER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would like to make two points, the first being on the issue of constitutionality again, and although I have posed that question and the House has voted, I wanted to reiterate my argument and to respond to something that the Democratic whip had said in regard to that issue.

Again, our Constitution only talks about referendum in two places — one in Article XI, where it talks about amendments to the Constitution and provides for referendums and indicates how those are going to be done and the manner in which they are published. The second area deals with indebtedness by the Commonwealth, and that is found in Article VIII, section 7, where it says specifically how that referendum is supposed to take place.

Now, yesterday the Democratic whip mentioned Article II, where it says, "The legislative power of this Commonwealth shall be vested in a General Assembly,..." and said that through that legislative power, we have the ability to go ahead and issue referenda. But I would like to sort of throw that back to him and indicate that the Constitution specifically vests the legislative power with the General Assembly. For those folks who have advocated initiative and referendum, it is pretty clear that in order to get that in Pennsylvania, it would have to be done by a constitutional amendment, because right now the legislative power is solely within the General Assembly, very specifically stated in Article II, and any effort of initiative or referendum would have to be done through a constitutional amendment.

So what then are we doing? It seems like all we are doing is more of a large-cost, large-scale poll that is not authorized by our constitutional founders.

On that issue I would like to bring up the fiscal note that was prepared on this amendment. The fiscal note indicates that there is not any fiscal impact to the Commonwealth because the Commonwealth is not going to be the one responsible for advertising this referendum. In fact, the fiscal note indicates that each of the 67 counties are going to be the ones that are going to be required to advertise this referendum question. So that Columbia County and Luzerne County and Westmoreland County and Allegheny County and Butler County and Beaver County and all 67 counties, Dauphin, et cetera, are going to be the ones that are going to be required to advertise this question.

I do not know whether the advocates of this amendment have gone to their county commissioners and asked them if they have budgeted for this referendum question. I do not know if any of your counties are looking at tax increases or anything else along those lines, but they are now going to be faced with the cost of advertising this. Some counties have four, five, six, seven newspapers of general circulation.

So I would ask that as you consider this amendment, that you will consider the constitutional problem that I think we have in regard to this; that there is no authorization for us to do this. I am not aware of us, as a General Assembly, ever putting on a nonbinding referendum.

And the second question is that by voting in favor of this amendment, you are passing on a mandate to our counties which they are going to have to fund through the advertising and distribution of this referendum.

For those and other reasons I would urge you to vote against this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Centre County, Mr. Benninghoff.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Madam Speaker, and good morning.

I, too, rise in opposition to this referendum for several reasons, and I hope the members will indulge me for a moment while I share them.

First of all, the slogan "slots for tots" just about punches me between the eyes. I just cannot even imagine it. Let us call it what it really is, one-armed bandits. Why do they call them one-armed bandits? Because bandits only take; they do not give. My father told me that as a young man, stay away from them; they will do you no good. I have remembered that 30-some-odd years later.

Let us take a moment to really think about this amendment, overall what it talks about. Let us talk about the numbers. A referendum to me is not representing all the people. It does not represent half the people, much less a quarter of them. To me that is not fair to the great people of Pennsylvania.

Let us take that a little bit farther. History will show us that voter turnout, especially in a primary like this, is not very high. Most counties are lucky to have 50 percent of their populace registered to vote and lucky to have half of them show up, so we are down to 25 percent. Well, 25 percent of the voters showing up, if we are very lucky, is probably only 15 percent of the public trying to make a decision for 100 percent of the public. To me that is a bad gamble. Even the worst gambler I know, if I knew any, would not take those kinds of odds. I think that that is silly, and to rush this to the May primary is wrong, dead wrong.

I want to share a quick comment that my pastor made recently in our church. He said, in this country we have a tendency to legalize things that we thought at one time were wrong or immoral, be it alcohol, abortion, prostitution, and now gambling. God, do not let us do that here in Pennsylvania. And he went on to say, legalizing it does not make it right. One-armed bandits, Madam Speaker.

Let me share a little bit of statistics with you. For millions of Americans, gambling addiction has become a pathway to pain and misery; it is an addiction. For some it leads to death, not wrestling with the one-armed bandits, but I will share what I mean. Gambling-related suicides have become an increasingly common phenomenon as legalized gambling has spread across America. The extent of this phenomenon remains largely unrecognized, however, due to a variety of reasons, ranging from the desire of the surviving family members to protect the privacy of the attempts of suicides and make their deaths appear accidental due to insurance purposes. Even so, the evidence is beginning to come forth, and it paints a grim picture of the depth of the despondency which often accompanies a gambling addiction.

I stand before you as a concerned member of this body as well as a father of four great children in this State and as a past coroner that served my county. I served that profession because I cared about people, and one of the most frustrating things that I had in that job was dealing with their families and the frustration and the anguish that they went through. Suicide is the most difficult thing for anyone to deal with. The individual takes their life, but oftentimes, more so those who survive them. I am not willing to open the door to that.

In a 1997 study at the University of California, San Diego, a sociologist found that "visitors to and residents of gaming communities experience significantly elevated suicide levels." According to Dr. David Phillips, Las Vegas "displays the highest levels of suicide in the nation, both for residents of Las Vegas and visitors to that setting." I do not want that kind of tag put on Pennsylvania, and I do not think you do either. Phillips found "abnormally high suicide levels for visitors and residents appeared only after gambling casinos were opened." I know, that sounds like that is far away; that cannot happen here. Well, let me tell you, it happens; suicide happens every day even in this great State.

Nevada had the highest suicide rate in the nation from 1990 to 1994, according to statistics from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Here is another one for people who like statistics: In Gulfport, Mississippi, suicide rates increased by 213 percent in the first 2 years after casinos arrived. In neighboring Biloxi, suicide attempts jumped by 1,000 percent in the first year alone. Again, terrible gambles.

The National Council on Problem Gambling, citing various studies, reports that one in five pathological gamblers attempts suicide. For those of you who like numbers, one in five is not a very good number. This is a rate that is higher than any other addictive disorder. Madam Speaker, this referendum is not about freedom of choice; this is about enhancing addictive disorders.

At least 140 clients at Minnesota's six gambling addiction treatment centers — six gambling addiction centers, Madam Speaker — have attempted suicide, according to the Minneapolis Star Tribune. The paper confirmed six gambling-related suicides in the State but noted that the six are "almost certainly a fraction of the total number." I know this to be true, because suicide is something that is still very taboo in our society and we do not talk about it. It does not mean it does not happen.

Let me ask you a question, those of you who may be pondering to vote "yes" on this referendum. Are you willing to vote "yes" for an appropriation to start paying for Pennsylvania's addiction centers that we will have to build later? I would hope not. You have the choice to make that decision now. Suicide hurts families over, over, and over.

I know some of you think, is he ever going to stop? Well, probably not.

I want to share a story with you I recently saw on "20/20" as I sat there and watched with my young children. It talked about a man who had a history of gambling, had lost his fortune, which he had little of, but the greatest fortune he lost was his family. His wife tried over and over again to stand by him and help him through it. He mortgaged the house, mortgaged it again, lost his cars, lost his job, and subsequently lost his wife. Now, that is not necessarily any one individual's fault, but it sure does not help any one individual, and it sure hurt him.

In addition to that, he finally went to Gamblers Anonymous and said, I have got to quit; I have got a major problem. These casinos continued to court him. They knew he was a problem gambler; they knew he was addicted. They sent him invitations. They sent him chauffeur-driven limousines with all the luxuries you could ask for to bring him, entice him, and to steal from him and his family at the casinos. Even after registered letters by him himself, his attorneys asking them, begging them, please, to leave him alone, they continued to court him and lure him back to the casinos.

Those bells, lights, and sirens are for a reason, Madam Speaker. The jingling of that chain entices that little urge inside each of us to get rich quick. There is no "get rich quick" in this world. Hard work is the way to get rich, and it does not go out of style and it is never old-fashioned. Let us not open the doors here in Pennsylvania for this. This is wrong, absolutely wrong.

I want to share one more personal note, because I know some of you may think that suicide is something that is not tangible, something you do not know about, something you do not hear about. Well, let me tell you, in the 12 years I served in the coroner's office, the hardest thing I ever had to do was to walk up to someone's house and pound and pound and pound on that door to wake them out of the dead of night and tell them that their son, daughter, or husband was not coming home; that they thought that their life, because they were out of money or because they made a bad choice, was not worth living for and they took it. That mother, that wife, that daughter who no longer had that father there would have given everything they had to have them back. This can happen to any of us. It happens in the little sleepy town of Bellefonte in Centre County. It can happen anywhere in this State, and sadly, it could happen to one of your friends.

So when you think about your decision today and you think about opening this door, think about some of the information and the time of these gentlemen and ladies that have spoken today. Think about if that referendum is really representing our people. Do we want 15 percent of the public deciding for 100 percent of Pennsylvania and for future generations? Think of the generations that we are making a decision for. Those odds get even worse and farther apart. But most of all, do you want to make a decision that you are going to regret later? I think not. Today is the day. To use a phrase well coined by a great leader in the past, Nancy Reagan, "Just say no."

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Monroe County, Mr. Battisto, for the second time.

Mr. BATTISTO. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, we are here today supposedly, we hear from some of the people who have horse-racing facilities in their district, to save 30-some-thousand jobs. The truth of the matter is, Madam Speaker, what is going to happen eventually is that those jobs are continuing to go and go and go.

Listen to this statistic. In 1985, 78 million people attended live horse racing in this country — 78 million. In 1995, 36 million people attended live horse races in this country. That is a 50-percent reduction in attendance, and that trend continues and continues. Knowing that, the industry came here in 1988, I guess, and asked for offtrack betting parlors, and we granted them 23. I did not, but the General Assembly did. Twenty-one of them,

I think, are in place, two still are not in place yet, and they have begun to clamor for slot machines at racetracks. Why? They realize the live horse-racing industry is dying. It has to. It is a deliberative kind of thing. People come and sit and watch racing, and they watch it. It is not as rapid playing as slot machines are and other kinds of machines are. That is where people are attracted to the machines.

The fact of the matter is, we will not ever save this industry — maybe a decade from now that attendance will drop off to 18 million; I am not sure — but we are not going to save them. The 30,000 jobs are going to dwindle and dwindle and dwindle. The horse racing will not be the thing. And if the truth were known, if the truth were really known, the owners really do not care, because in a facility with 1,000 or 500 slot machines, you do not need much labor to maintain those machines. You see, they are not very labor intensive.

The fact of the matter is, they are rapid playing. That is where the money will be. It will not be in live racing. We are not going to save live racing. Let us not kid ourselves. We are going to create at least four casinos. That is what we are going to do, casinos with slot machines. If that is what you want to do, if that is the public policy you want to promote, then vote for this. The fact of the matter is, it is the wrong thing to do. We ought to be opposing this amendment resoundingly. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Union County, Mr. Fairchild.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I also join my friends and colleagues and urge them to oppose this amendment. It is kind of interesting, we are talking about 31,000 jobs. Just last week we talked about stadiums and the jobs that were there. I suspect that these 31,000 jobs are blue-collar jobs. They are the hard workers. They are not the owners of the major professional sports teams. They are not the multimillion-dollar players.

Perhaps we need to take a different look at this. If Governor Ridge wants to veto this legislation, he can do it. Governor Ridge can veto this legislation. If in fact he wants to help the industry, then perhaps what we need to do and he needs to do is propose something on the order of what this Assembly did with the professional stadiums last week. I did not support that proposal, and I am not advocating today that if that is done I will support the gambling issue, but it is another avenue to look at. If it is an important issue, let us put it out there and let us try to figure out if we can financially help that industry.

My point is that there are other ways that we can do this without opening up gambling in Pennsylvania. I firmly believe that as we continue to discuss this issue, if gambling passes, we are going to up the ante. Other States are going to compete with us. Look at our own lottery and what has happened with that. Every time we come out with a game, another State comes out with a better game. Every time we up our limits, other States up theirs. It is a constant competitive process, and I daresay that each one of you here today wants to protect that lottery, wants to protect that money that makes Pennsylvania one of the top States in the nation as far as supplying funds and resources to our senior citizens.

With that said, I hope I have exercised some dialogue that members may discuss and think about, but again, I urge defeat of this amendment. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MRS. TAYLOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what reason does the lady, Mrs. Taylor, rise?

Mrs. TAYLOR. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would like to make an announcement.

The women who were planning to attend the luncheon to welcome the new members on both sides of the aisle, lunch is now being served in my office, and you can attend that at your pleasure. Thank you.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 255 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Northampton, Mr. Samuelson.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Madam Speaker, I believe it is worthy to target the efforts of this legislature to improving our schools, but I am very concerned about mixing education with gambling. I am very concerned about the message this sends to our children with this financial linkage between education and gambling. Are we sending the message to our children that your education could be better if only your parents would gamble more, if only your communities would gamble more? I do not believe this is the message we should send. I believe that we should be clear to our children, your education could be better if your parents would stay home and read to you at night, if citizens in our communities would continue to be involved in our schools as volunteers and in volunteering for other opportunities to improve our youth.

Madam Speaker, we must focus the efforts of this legislature on improving our communities. We must work together to improve our schools, but expanded gambling in Pennsylvania is not the way to do it. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF AMENDMENT A0188 RECONSIDERED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is in receipt of a reconsideration motion by Representative Stairs, who moves that the vote by which amendment No. A0188 was declared constitutional for SB 255, PN 229, on the 8th day of February, he moves that that be reconsidered.

The Speaker, under rule 4, is required to submit questions affecting the constitutionality of an amendment to the House for a decision, which the Chair now does.

Those voting "aye" will vote to declare the amendment to be constitutional—

Mr. DeWEESE. Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the minority leader rise?

Mr. DeWEESE. Could the Chair respectfully instruct the chamber as to exactly what this motion will be and what an affirmative vote will indicate and a negative vote will indicate? Just because of the lengthy debate, a momentary pause will probably be helpful. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to reconsider. Those voting to reconsider will vote "aye"; those voting not to reconsider will vote "no."

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—177

Adolph	Eachus	Major	Schuler
Allen	Egolf	Manderino	Scrimanti
Argall	Evans	Mann	Semmel
Armstrong	Fairchild	Marsico	Serafini
Baker	Fargo	Masland	Seyfert
Bard	Feese	McCall	Shaner
Barley	Fichter	McGeehan	Smith, B.
Barrar	Fleagle	McGill	Smith, S. H.
Bastian	Flick	McIlhattan	Snyder
Battisto	Forcier	McIlhinney	Solobay
Bebko-Jones	Frankel	McNaughton	Staback
Belardi	Freeman	Melio	Stairs
Belfanti	Gannon	Metcalfe	Steelman
Benninghoff	Geist	Michlovic	Steil
Birmelin	George	Micozzie	Stern
Bishop	Gigliotti	Miller, R.	Stetler
Blaum	Godshall	Miller, S.	Stevenson
Boyes	Gordner	Myers	Strittmatter
Browne	Grucela	Nailor	Sturla
Bunt	Gruitza	Nickol	Surra
Butkovitz	Habay	O'Brien	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Haluska	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Harhai	Orie	Thomas
Cappabianca	Harhart	Perzel	Tigue
Casorio	Hasay	Petrarca	Travaglio
Cawley	Hennessey	Petrone	Trich
Chadwick	Herman	Phillips	True
Civera	Hershey	Pippy	Tulli
Clark	Hess	Pistella	Vance
Clymer	Hutchinson	Platts	Van Home
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Preston	Veon
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Raymond	Vitali
Colafella	Keller	Rieger	Walko
Cornell	Kenney	Roberts	Williams
Corrigan	Kirkland	Robinson	Wilt
Costa	Krebs	Rohrer	Wogan
Coy	LaGrotta	Rooney	Wright
Curry	Laughlin	Rubley	Yewcic
Dailey	Lederer	Ruffing	Yudichak
Dally	Leh	Sainato	Zimmerman
DeLuca	Lescovitz	Samuelson	Zug
Dempsey	Lucy	Santoni	
Dermody	Lynch	Sather	Ryan,
DeWeese	Maher	Saylor	Speaker
Donatucci	Maitland	Schroder	

NAYS—24

Carn	Horsey	Mayernik	Ross
Daley	James	Pesci	Tangretti
DiGirolamo	Kaiser	Ramos	Trello
Druce	Lawless	Readshaw	Washington
Gladeck	Levdansky	Reinard	Wojnaroski
Hanna	Markosek	Roebuck	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—1

Mundy

EXCUSED—0

The majority 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 sustain the constitutionality of the amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Again Mr. Stairs raises the issue of constitutionality.

Those voting “aye” will vote to declare the amendment to be constitutional— The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Gordner.

Mr. GORDNER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I will be very brief. I did not ask for this reconsideration, but just to remind the members as to why it was raised.

Article XI provides that amendments to the Constitution should be put forward before the voters in the form of a referendum. Article VIII, section 7, provides that in certain forms of Commonwealth indebtedness, the referendum should be put before the voters for their consideration. There is nothing in this Constitution, no one can show me anything in this Constitution, that provides for a referendum on binding or nonbinding issues other than those two topics.

Article II of the Constitution states that “The legislative power of this Commonwealth shall be vested in a General Assembly, . . .” and therefore, the issue of anything dealing with our legislative ability and the idea to make decisions on bills and amendments strictly vests with us. There is nothing that gives that power or right to the people of this Commonwealth, and as a result, I do not believe that this amendment is constitutional. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority whip, Mr. Snyder.

Mr. SNYDER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Just for the members’ purpose, this was being brought up at the request of a member because of the record and it was not brought up for any additional debate or the issue has not changed. We just ask members to just please vote the way you did yesterday to establish the record. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks County, Mr. DiGirolamo.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I believe this amendment to be constitutional, and I urge all my colleagues who support this amendment and want to see this issue come up for a vote to vote “yes” on the constitutionality. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the minority leader, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

In 1803 Thomas Jefferson broadly interpreted our Constitution in such a fashion that he was able to purchase Louisiana. To the honorable attorney and colleague on my side of the aisle who spoke a few moments ago, and I am not a lawyer, not even an old country lawyer, but I am interpreting the Constitution in the same way that Jefferson did. I am interpreting it broadly.

There are no prohibitions in our Constitution against this kind of referendum; there are none. This is patently constitutional. This falls under a favorable constitutional ruling. It did yesterday amongst us all, and I certainly hope it will again today. If President Jefferson could purchase Louisiana, broadly interpreting the Constitution, we certainly can have a nonbinding referendum.

The power of the people resides in the people’s chamber. We are the people’s chamber. This is constitutional, and I certainly hope that our collective votes will sustain the constitutional nature of the amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berks County, Mr. Rohrer.

Mr. ROHRER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

You know, we discussed this issue yesterday, and on the way home last night I was thinking about this and other issues, and it amazes me how often, when we as a body bring up the issue of constitutionality, of how flippantly many of us will pursue this issue.

The issue of constitutionality is not simply a parliamentary gimmick. It is a serious matter that ties us to our oath, the only promise that we have all made to the people of this Commonwealth. And when I went home last night, I pulled out the Constitution once again, and even though we are talking about this issue relative to the silence of the Constitution relative to a referendum and thereby implying that therefore it gives us the right, which I do not believe, I happened to read another section — Article III, section 1. It says that “No law shall be passed except by bill, and no bill shall be so altered or amended, on its passage through either House, as to change its original purpose.” Now, we have not even talked about this one, but it is as clear as one can be. This bill before us deals with underage drinking. This amendment deals with gambling. It completely alters and changes every aspect of the bill that started in the Senate. We do not have the authority, we do not have the right, so as to alter any bill as we are attempting to do today by this amendment. Jefferson would have stood to this floor and agreed with the position that I am saying, because he agreed with the Constitution and he agreed with the necessity of maintaining the purity of a bill through the system.

I suggest that we not have but one reason to declare this to be unconstitutional, we have two very clear reasons. This motion should be upheld on unconstitutionality.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Horsey.

Mr. HORSEY. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, there is a principle that is more sacred than some of the things that we do in this chamber, Madam Speaker, and that is the principle that we are here as a result of the people sending us here to do the business of the people, Madam Speaker. For us as a chamber to occasionally return the power back to the people that they have given us through the electoral process — and we do that in the manner by sending issues back through the ballot and people vote on it — it is okay, Madam Speaker.

There are principles that this country is founded under, and that is that we are a constitutional democracy, we are ruled by a Constitution, and that we are a body empowered by the people, and for someone to stand in these chambers, Madam Speaker, and say that it is wrong to revert back to the people for their own sacred rule, for their decision on us and on us as a country, as a State, and as a city, is absolutely outrageous, Madam Speaker. There is nothing more sacred than the people's vote in a constitutional democracy, and they are the only, the only body that is more powerful than this chamber, and that is the people, Madam Speaker. And for us to send this bill back to the people, it is in fact the right thing to do, Madam Speaker. We are ruled and operated by the people.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Those voting “aye” will vote to declare the amendment to be constitutional; those voting “no” will vote to declare the amendment to be unconstitutional.

On the question recurring,

Will the House sustain the constitutionality of the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—134

Allen	Donatucci	Markosek	Scrimenti
Argall	Druce	Marsico	Serafini
Bard	Eachus	Mayemik	Shaner
Barrar	Evans	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Bebko-Jones	Fargo	McGeehan	Snyder
Belardi	Feese	McGill	Solobay
Belfanti	Fichter	McIlhinney	Staback
Bishop	Frankel	Melio	Steelman
Blaum	Freeman	Michlovic	Steil
Browne	Gannon	Micozzie	Stetler
Bunt	George	Mundy	Stevenson
Buxton	Gigliotti	Myers	Surra
Caltagirone	Gladeck	Nickol	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Godshall	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Carn	Grucela	Oliver	Thomas
Casorio	Haluska	Perzel	Tigue
Cawley	Hanna	Pesci	Travaglio
Chadwick	Harhai	Petrarca	Trello
Civera	Hasay	Petrone	Trich
Cohen, L. I.	Hennessey	Pippy	Tulli
Cohen, M.	Herman	Pistella	Van Horne
Colafrilla	Horsey	Preston	Veon
Cornell	James	Ramos	Walko
Corrigan	Kaiser	Raymond	Washington
Costa	Kenney	Readshaw	Williams
Coy	LaGrotta	Reinard	Wilt
Curry	Laughlin	Rieger	Wogan
Dailey	Lawless	Roberts	Wojnaroski
Daley	Lescovitz	Roebuck	Wright
DeLuca	Levdansky	Rooney	Youngblood
Dempsey	Lucyk	Ross	Yudichak
Demody	Major	Ruffing	
DeWeese	Manderino	Sainato	Ryan,
DiGirolamo	Mann	Santoni	Speaker

NAYS—67

Adolph	Forcier	Maitland	Schroder
Armstrong	Geist	Masland	Schuler
Baker	Gordner	McIlhattan	Semmel
Barley	Habay	McNaughton	Seyfert
Bastian	Harhart	Metcalfe	Smith, B.
Battisto	Hershey	Miller, R.	Stairs
Benninghoff	Hess	Miller, S.	Stern
Birmelin	Hutchinson	Nailor	Strittmatter
Boyes	Jadlowiec	Orie	Sturia
Butkovitz	Josephs	Phillips	Taylor, E. Z.
Clark	Keller	Platts	True
Clymer	Kirkland	Robinson	Vance
Dally	Krebs	Rohrer	Vitali
Egolf	Lederer	Rublely	Yewcic
Fairchild	Leh	Samuelson	Zimmerman
Fleagle	Lynch	Sather	Zug
Flick	Maher	Saylor	

NOT VOTING—1

Gruitza

EXCUSED—0

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the constitutionality of the amendment was sustained.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the minority leader, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. And when by false friends you are tempted, the taste of the wine cup to know, with firmness and patience and kindness, have courage, my boy, to say no. That is what my grandma taught me when I was a little boy, and until I was 31, the taste of the wine cup was alien. I was a teetotaler. But last night with my pasta, I had a glass of red wine.

There is nothing inherent about the mass of American society succumbing to the evils that have been projected by some of the previous speakers. With oratorical flourish and strenuous concern, they have discussed this legislation from fissure to fissure and from flaw to flaw. But I am reminded, Madam Speaker, of a term that my high school Latin teacher taught me, "reductio ad absurdum" — "reductio ad absurdum." It does not mean what you might think it means. It just means reducing something to the essence, to the smallest kernel, to the nub, and as we prepare to vote today, Madam Speaker, "reductio ad absurdum" comes to mind, because what we are doing when we reduce all this debate to the nub is we are talking about what the gentleman, Mr. Horsey, said, from Philadelphia. We are talking about a plebiscite, a referendum, allowing the people to make up their minds whether gaming in this State should be legal or illegal.

Tom Ridge — Tom Ridge — Governor of the Commonwealth, a name that reverberates around this State, said that in order for him to feel comfortable signing this legislation, it should go to a referendum. So some of his warrior elders on the GOP side of the aisle and some of us have decided that we should allow the people, Madam Speaker, to have that referendum. Ridge said that was the only way that he would intercede and save, ostensibly, Pocono Downs, the Philadelphia raceway, the Meadows, and Penn National. We have thousands of jobs; we have a lot of rural Pennsylvanians who are involved in agriculture and farming and horse breeding that are interested in this legislation. A lot of rural Pennsylvanians are saying they want a referendum.

Now, I heard some of our foes talk about the adverse and negative perspectives of volunteer firemen and senior citizens, and if that is the case, so be it, Madam Speaker. Let them vote "no" on the referendum.

I heard the honorable gentleman from Tioga and Bradford lament that this measure did not go through the committee system. Those kinds of dialectical crocodile tears are a bit fulsome to me, because he or many of his colleagues do not seem to mind when other major pieces of legislation have stormed through this Assembly without the committee process during the last year or 2 or 3 or 4. That kind of hypocrisy can probably be avoided in some of our future colloquies, Madam Speaker.

This is a referendum. This is a chance for folks back home to say yes or no. Many of our votes today in favor of the referendum will probably not reflect individual members' perspectives on gaming. Some of us will probably vote "no" when they go into the ballot box, or I should say the ballot curtain. But when they vote, Madam Speaker, when they vote here today, it is simply to reduce this to the nub, allowing the folks back home to decide whether we are going to have some gaming in certain parts of the State, to decide whether these four big businesses — these four big businesses — are going to be able to endure.

Penn National is a big business. The Meadows in Washington County, one short drive north of my hometown, is a big business. Twenty-five percent of the Meadows' gross receipts have been lost

to West Virginia tracks. Sixty-five percent of all of West Virginia tracks' money comes from Pennsylvania. One-point-four billion dollars of money flows out of Pennsylvania to New Jersey gambling casinos each year.

As one of my colleagues said a little while ago, we are not moral policemen here. We are not going to be able to eliminate all of the pernicious influences of the world, whether they be gaming or rap music or the disintegration of some of our traditional institutions — family, school, church, whatever. We are not able to do that here in a legislative body.

We are from time to time given the opportunity on a serious question of the day to revert to the people, and that is what this is. This is not a big gambling vote; this is a referendum that Tom Ridge said he needed in order to see if these four big businesses, these four big race facilities, these four big facilities backed up by Pennsylvania agriculture, Pennsylvania horse breeders, and tens and tens of thousands of people who legitimately enjoy the gaming enterprise without, without succumbing to some of the addictions that were described here in florid terms.

Madam Speaker, thank you very much for the indulgence of the Chair. I would ask for a favorable vote on my Republican colleague's very worthy amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York County, Mr. Saylor, for the second time.

Mr. SAYLOR. Madam Speaker, my esteemed colleague from Greene County forgets that referendum may be a great issue for a lot of people out there, and I think a lot of people like referendums, but what we are forgetting is, when we give people an opportunity to go and vote on this referendum, we are not telling them anything. We are not giving them a choice of where the money might come — might come — from and how it is going to be spent. We are not giving the people the choice of whether their local communities are going to have gambling next to their home or their schools. None of that is spelled out in this bill at all. It is very vague, very innocuous, as you would say, until the final bill is passed by this House. And the question I have for those who want to put gambling on the ballot now is, will you put that final proposal on the ballot when you finally have all the things worked out and let the people decide whether they truly want what the final proposal is, and I know the answer to that, and that is no. That is why we are putting on the ballot at this time an issue that nobody can decipher what it is.

This is a joke. It is a joke because it is going to confuse the voters of this Commonwealth into allowing something to happen in this Commonwealth that is criminal and is abusive to the poor people of this Commonwealth and is only going to take money from the working men and women of this Commonwealth, and eventually, as I said yesterday, will have all of us in this House working to have to figure out how we are going to fund our local fire companies and our senior citizens programs across this Commonwealth.

Again, I ask for a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—110

Argall	Eachus	McCall	Scrimenti
Bard	Evans	Melio	Shaner
Barrar	Fichter	Michlovic	Snyder
Bebko-Jones	Frankel	Micozzie	Solobay
Belardi	Gannon	Myers	Staback
Belfanti	Gigliotti	O'Brien	Steelman
Bishop	Gladeck	Oliver	Steiler
Browne	Grucela	Perzel	Stevenson
Bunt	Gruitza	Pesci	Tangretti
Buxton	Haluska	Petrarca	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Hanna	Petrone	Thomas
Cappabianca	Harhai	Pippy	Tigue
Carn	Hennessey	Pistella	Travaglio
Casorio	Horsey	Preston	Trello
Civera	James	Ramos	Trich
Cohen, L. I.	Kaiser	Raymond	Tulli
Cohen, M.	Kenney	Readshaw	Van Horne
Colafella	LaGrotta	Reinard	Veon
Cornell	Laughlin	Rieger	Walko
Corrigan	Lawless	Roberts	Washington
Costa	Lescovitz	Robinson	Williams
Daley	Levdansky	Roebuck	Wilt
DeLuca	Lucyk	Rooney	Wogan
Dermody	Maher	Ross	Wojnaroski
DeWeese	Mann	Ruffing	Wright
DiGirolamo	Markosek	Sainato	Youngblood
Donatucci	Marsico	Santoni	Yudichak
Druce	Mayernik		

NAYS—91

Adolph	Feese	Lynch	Schroder
Allen	Fleagle	Maitland	Schuler
Armstrong	Flick	Major	Semmel
Baker	Forcier	Manderino	Serafini
Barley	Freeman	Masland	Seyfert
Bastian	Geist	McGeehan	Smith, B.
Battisto	George	McIlhattan	Smith, S. H.
Benninghoff	Godshall	McIlhinney	Stairs
Birmelin	Gordner	McNaughton	Steil
Blaum	Habay	Metcalfe	Stern
Boyes	Harhart	Miller, R.	Strittmatter
Butkovitz	Hasay	Miller, S.	Sturla
Cawley	Herman	Mundy	Surra
Chadwick	Hershey	Nailor	Taylor, E. Z.
Clark	Hess	Nickol	True
Clymer	Hutchinson	Orie	Vance
Coy	Jadlowiec	Phillips	Vitali
Curry	Josephs	Platts	Yewcic
Dailey	Keller	Rohrer	Zimmerman
Dally	Kirkland	Rublely	Zug
Dempsey	Krebs	Samuelson	
Egolf	Lederer	Sather	Ryan,
Fairchild	Leh	Saylor	Speaker
Fargo			

NOT VOTING—1

McGill

EXCUSED—0

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. EVANS offered the following amendment No. A0398:

Amend Title, page 1, line 4, by removing the period after "minors" and inserting

; and providing for a nonbinding Statewide referendum to determine the will of the electorate related to riverboat gaming devices and activities.

Amend Bill, page 2, line 2, by striking out all of said line and inserting

Section 2. (a) The Secretary of the Commonwealth shall cause to be placed on the ballot, at the primary election occurring at least 30 days next following the effective date of this act, a nonbinding referendum to determine the will of the electorate of this Commonwealth with respect to riverboat gaming.

(b) The referendum question shall be in substantially the following form:

Do you favor authorizing the General Assembly to adopt legislation to permit licensed and regulated riverboat gaming at a limited number of locations on navigable waterways with tax revenues being applied to education and economic development?

(c) The referendum shall be advertised and conducted in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code.

(d) If more than one referendum question is placed on the ballot, the Secretary of the Commonwealth shall cause each referendum question to be separately numbered.

Section 3. This act shall take effect immediately.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Evans. The gentleman, Mr. Evans, is recognized.

The gentleman deserves to have some order. Could we please have the people move from in front of the speaker. The gentleman is about to speak, and he has a congregation around him.

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, the amendment that I am offering this afternoon is the statewide referendum of riverboat gaming.

I think that we have heard a lot of the debate in the last 2 days on the previous referendum, but this particular referendum, Madam Speaker — let me make it very clear — would not legalize gaming. It would simply authorize the General Assembly to adopt legislation.

The referendum question has four key elements. First, it basically states that the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will go in the voting booth this May and would decide — let me read the question — "Do you favor authorizing the General Assembly to adopt legislation to permit licensed and regulated riverboat gaming at a limited number of locations..." and that the tax revenue would be applied to education and to economic development? The key phrases are "licensed and regulated" and "a limited number of locations" with the tax revenue applied to education and economic development.

Madam Speaker, this is not a new issue. This issue has been debated for the last couple years. In my view, I agree that the people of the Commonwealth should have an opportunity to vote on this particular referendum. This is no more than just allowing

people throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to decide if we should use riverboat as a way to generate additional revenue for the purpose of education and economic development.

I do not think it is hard to make a decision on this. Sixty-plus days from now we can put it on the ballot and let the people decide if we should come back and discuss exactly the use of riverboat as a way of generating additional revenue. You have heard about this over and over again for the last couple months. I think it is now time for us to put up.

I would hope, Madam Speaker, that we would not have to go through a lot of discussion and that members will recognize that we are only putting a question on the ballot, and I hope we can get support on this amendment. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Cohen.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, every once in a while I run into somebody who tells me that he or she enjoys paying taxes and he or she gets a sense of satisfaction that his or her work benefits people when he or she pays taxes, but that is unfortunately a very rare sentiment in this society. The vast majority of people the vast majority of time have been educated to the belief that taxes are an evil and that our duty as State legislators is to see that everybody should pay the least possible amount of taxes, and when we decide what the budget for worthwhile public programs is, we decide in a context in which we are well aware that the average Pennsylvanian wants to pay as little taxes as possible. And Governor Ridge in his statement to us, in his State of the State Address, told us very clearly how proud he was that now the debate in Pennsylvania is not on whether we should cut taxes, but the debate in Pennsylvania today is on what taxes we ought to cut. He bragged about that; he claimed credit for that.

When we look, though, at the money spent for education in this Commonwealth in many, many districts, including my own district in Philadelphia, we see schools that are ancient. I have a school in my district that was built shortly after the turn of the century, and except for a school that is now going up, the vast majority of schools in my district were built before World War II. And we have real problems with textbooks. There is a vast textbook shortage that we have dealt with in the House, but the Senate has felt we do not have the money; we cannot justify to the taxpayers spending money on new textbooks for public schools. And we have huge numbers of people dropping out of the schools in Philadelphia and many other districts. In many schools in Philadelphia, the dropout rate exceeds 50 percent, and that is not unusual in this Commonwealth; there are other districts with similar problems, and this is not a problem which in the collective judgment of the House of Representatives and the Senate is worth spending taxpayers' money on.

And year after year we are confronted with the violence that the institutionalized neglect of many of our public school systems in the country represents, and I listened to the arguments made today on both sides of the aisle. We heard a lot of very good speeches today and yesterday as to the evils that expansion of gambling represents, and as I have said before, I agree with almost all that was said about the evils of gambling, and I really wish there was support from the people who talk about the evils of gambling for increased school funding. I wish I could hear these people say that suicide is terrible, and large numbers of poor kids commit suicide and that we have to improve their educational opportunities so they would not commit suicide. I wish I could hear large sentiment on

that. There are some people who support AIDS (acquired immune deficiency syndrome) education, who worry about this, but there just is not a collective decision here in the legislature to do that.

There is not a collective will to recognize the huge numbers of people who go to our public schools and wind up without any real opportunities and overextend themselves and finally declare bankruptcy. Bankruptcy is a problem that will be aggravated by the successful passage of this legislation. We have tremendous bankruptcy now in Pennsylvania; we have tremendous suicide without this legislation, and there does not seem to be the collective will to deal with this. There is not the collective will to fund education.

And not only is there not a collective will, there is not even a collective will to advocate for education. Every year in the 25 years I have been here, the Governor, whoever he is, announces that education is a very, very serious problem in this Commonwealth and we have to improve education, and therefore, in times of great economic expansion, we will increase education funding slightly more than the rate of inflation, and in times of financial crisis, we will increase education spending less than the rate of inflation. But basically the rate of inflation is the guide, and in the over 25 years that I have been here with Democratic Governors and Republican Governors, we are basically limited to increasing education spending at somewhere around the rate of inflation, which assumes that the basic educational funding in this Commonwealth is adequate, and it is not adequate. It is not adequate at all.

This morning I heard an address by a professor of population at Penn State University, Gordon DeJong, who is well known in the population trend field, and Professor DeJong said that we now have in Pennsylvania less preschool kids today than we had at the turn of the century when our population was several million less than it is today. We have never had fewer preschool kids in Pennsylvania in the 20th century than we have today.

And there has been a lot of talk about whether we lose people in gambling to other States, and it is clear that we do, and it is clear that these amendments will address that. But I personally, and I suspect my constituents, am far more concerned about the people we lose to other States for education. There are large numbers of Pennsylvanians moving to New Jersey and Delaware because the schools are perceived to be better in New Jersey and Delaware than they are in Pennsylvania, and this amendment and the other amendments offer some chance of expanding educational funding beyond a little bit more than inflation in years of great surpluses and less than inflation in years of great financial problems.

Roughly 100 years ago Charles Dickens said in one of his novels, "A Tale of Two Cities," that this is the best of times and this is the worst of times, and that is usually true, and that is true today, and in an era of Pennsylvania surpluses at record levels, with the Rainy Day Fund at record levels, with our pension funds at record levels of solvency, with the Federal government having record surpluses, with cities throughout this State having record surpluses, Governor Ridge says that we now in this era of record prosperity, we can now increase funding for public education at a full 1 percent above the rate of inflation at this time of record prosperity. This shows a lack of sense that education is important, a lack of sense that the fiscal crises in many of our school districts are important, and therefore, although I agree that if the voters choose expanded gambling there will be additional social problems, I believe that the only way to deal with the existing

social problems of inadequate educational funding and inadequate educational opportunity is to put these referendums on the ballot and to see if the voters will vote for it. This will get us for the first time outside of the area of, let us do a little better or a little bit worse than inflation this year; this is the first chance we will have to significantly increase educational funding.

We simply, in my judgment and in the judgment of many Pennsylvanians, cannot afford to spend at the current level. I wish, Madam Speaker, people who are disgusted with the public schools in Pennsylvania would tell their legislators that they are disgusted. On the whole, they do not. What they do is they tell their real estate broker and they put their house up for sale and move out of the State. We have to have an educational system that will encourage people to stay here, and therefore, I support the Evans amendment.

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

Mr. HABAY. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Today we look at the ills of riverboat gambling, and I know in my district in 1995, a major casino company moved in from Minnesota and tried to buy a yacht club and tried to force gambling down our throats where we live in my hometown of O'Hara Township. If we look at their history in Minnesota, they used to manage a casino owned by the White Earth Band of Chippewa Indians, and as we looked back to 1995, we saw that a 44-count criminal indictment and convictions came down against the casino they managed for everything from money laundering to rigging tribal elections. That is not what we need to come to Allegheny County and to come to Pennsylvania.

Let us take a look, Madam Speaker, let us take a look at what has gone on in a few of the other States with riverboat and casino gambling, some of the negative impacts. In Iowa, problem gambling has more than tripled since the casinos have opened, with prevalence rising from 1.7 to 5.4 percent for all adults, according to a 1995 State-sponsored survey. A similar jump in Pennsylvania, which has about 9 million adults, would mean 300,000 new problem gamblers, just slightly lower than the population of the city of Pittsburgh.

Illinois Governor Jim Edgar admitted riverboat gambling has not increased tourism or generated new income. The State's Economic and Fiscal Commission could find no evidence of spinoff benefits, and an independent study in June of 1996 estimated the casinos actually produce \$239 million per year in net losses for local economies — money that is taken out of the local economy that could have been spent on something else.

In Minnesota, one of the biggest problems in crime of riverboat gambling, the State's Hotel and Restaurant Association reported business is down 20 to 50 percent at establishments near the casinos in Minnesota. Gambling-related personal bankruptcies have soared to an estimated 1,000-plus per year, and a State that previously just had one Gamblers Anonymous chapter now has 53.

In Wisconsin, a 1995 survey of customers of casinos found more than 10 percent of the locals would spend more on groceries were it not for the casino, while nearly one-fourth would spend more on clothes. Thirty-seven percent said that their personal savings and the ability to feed themselves and to clothe themselves has been reduced.

In Louisiana, political scandals and organized-crime raids led one gubernatorial candidate in 1995 to joke that the only growth industry that we have here in Louisiana is the FBI

(Federal Bureau of Investigation). Other negatives include a high 7-percent problem gambling rate and a study showing that riverboat casinos drained \$102 million from the metro New Orleans economy in 1994.

In Mississippi, thefts, rape, and other crimes have roughly doubled around the towns of Gulfport and Bay St. Louis after casinos opened. In Biloxi, Mississippi, divorce rates rose 250 percent, crisis calls to a local women's shelter doubled, and total violent crimes rose from 5,072 incidents in 1993 to 7,413 in 1994.

In Nevada, with over 300 casinos, Nevada consistently ranks at or near the top among all States in per capita for the State suicide rate, high school dropout rate, deaths per vehicle mile, and child death by abuse.

If you look at U.S. News and World Report, who exposed that wonderful gang that moved into my district in 1995, the computer analyzed economic and crime data from casino areas across the country. In terms of economic growth, the magazine found no significant difference between casino areas and other areas. But crime rates in casino areas are nearly twice as high — 1,092 incidents per 10,000 population versus 593 for the rest of the nation — and towns with casinos have experienced an upsurge of crime at the same time it was dropping in the nation as a whole.

A final note: 10 years ago, problem and pathological gambling among teenagers in the U.S., among young people, was considered a rarity. In 1995, about 12 percent of the calls nationwide to the 1-800-GAMBLER helpline involved people under 21. This is the wrong message to send to our young people.

And if we look at domestic violence and child abuse neglect in these areas, the statistics are striking, and you should look at them. In Biloxi, the crisis calls to the Gulf Coast Women's Center rose from 400 per month in 1992 and between 700 and 900 per month in 1995. Free alcohol and gambling can fuel the rage that produces violence, Director Jane Philo noted, and Harrison County and the city of Biloxi saw divorce rates jump 250 percent after the casinos opened, from about 400 to nearly 1,100 cases per year.

In Lawrence County, South Dakota, home of the Deadwood casinos, State Attorney General Bloomberg told the U.S. House Committee on Small Business in 1994, "Our office has seen a dramatic increase in the number of child abuse and neglect cases. These run the spectrum from the children left in the cars all night when their parents gamble, which has been a frequent problem at sites not only in South Dakota but riverboat operations in Iowa."

Nevada has the highest rate, as we mentioned, of child death by abuse. These stats need to be looked at.

Now, conventional wisdom on organized crime. Many people say it can be regulated in other States, but if you look across the board, in 1991 the Federal Government took control of Local 54 of the hotel employees and restaurant employees' union in Atlantic City after charges that the union representing thousands of casino workers was infiltrated by a Philadelphia-based crime family.

In Mississippi, since casinos opened, the former president of Bayou Cutty's Jubilee Casino pled guilty to money laundering and using cocaine money, and former employees of that casino have been indicted along with others for Federal racketeering charges.

One thing that we have to look at from the political front, and I will mention these only briefly. TV stations in Illinois have aired a Christmas list recently uncovered by private investigators compiled by casino interests, a list that showed what it used to sway various legislators on this issue. In Kentucky, a movement to

permit racetrack casinos died in 1994 after House Speaker Dan Blanford went to prison for taking bribes from a racing lobby. We saw this happen in South Carolina on riverboat as well, with their Speaker of the House and 17 members of their legislature resigning. In Missouri, House Speaker Bob Griffin was removed from office due to links to casino interests.

To sum up, as a generator for economic development, Madam Speaker, this boat don't float. I can sum up casino riverboat gambling in two words — "organized crime." Thank you very much.

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

The Chair passes over Mr. Sturla and recognizes the gentleman from Bucks County, Mr. Clymer.

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, 10,000 jobs — yes, I said 10,000 jobs — are at risk in the city of Philadelphia if riverboat gambling should come to that city. These are jobs — jobs that are created and used by Teamsters that are direct and indirect in this city; 10,000 good-paying jobs that will be lost if it is riverboat gambling. So, Madam Speaker, let us take a close look at some of the issues that are involved here.

Does anyone know where these riverboats will be located? Are there going to be 15, 17 as in the past, if we go from past records, anywhere between 15, 17 riverboats? Are they all going to be located in eastern Pennsylvania, or are they going to shift some out in western Pennsylvania? How many for the city of Philadelphia? Will there be a half dozen, seven? How about western Pennsylvania? What about the Poconos? The Poconos has seen double-digit increases in its tourism, and its growth has been fantastic, all without riverboat gambling. So we have to look at where these boats are going to be placed.

Then I think another important consideration is that, are we not really talking about floating casinos? There are 13 casinos in Atlantic City. These riverboats will be large enough to carry the gambling that is in the hall or the arena in an Atlantic City casino, they will be able to have as many video poker machines, slot machines, on those boats. So we are really talking about Atlantic City gambling coming to Pennsylvania, and do we really want that blueprint to be placed, all the problems that they have in Atlantic City, take that blueprint and put it on the city of Philadelphia or Allegheny County? I would think not. I would think we would not want those social problems and the fact that they have lost many of their good citizens because of the problems that come with casinos.

We know in previous reports that casinos have the propensity to cannibalize businesses, especially the restaurant business. In the city of Philadelphia, restaurants are a growing attraction — new employment; people love to go to the city to go to the restaurants and the other social activities — and yet be assured if and when these riverboats ever are legalized, Madam Speaker, they will cannibalize those good restaurants in the city of Philadelphia because — and Allegheny County and anywhere else they are placed — simply because they will offer their patrons the same service in the riverboats at cheaper prices.

Madam Speaker, we have in the city of Philadelphia 215,000 schoolchildren and many undergraduate students. We know that, again from statistics and other reports that are coming out daily, that our young people are becoming addicted to gambling, a tragedy beyond means, and what are we doing? We are enticing,

we are enticing the young people in the city of Philadelphia to gamble. The last statistics I had, if my memory serves correctly, in Atlantic City, over 200,000 underage people were stopped from gambling — I believe it may have been the year 1996 or 1997. Young people, addicted; gambling; crime increase. You have heard reports from members on both sides of the aisle that had mentioned how crime had increased dramatically when the casinos were placed in those communities, and that is what we do not need. We do not need additional crime in the city of Philadelphia.

Madam Speaker, who else is concerned about this particular problem? Legislators only? Special interest groups? I submit to you that the people who live in the proximity of where these riverboats would be established have great concern. Now, these are the communities and neighborhoods down by the port. Some time ago I and members from the Philadelphia delegation had an opportunity to tour those neighborhoods, and these are such places as Northern Liberties — that is a community down by the port — Fishtown, Old City, Society Hill, Queen Village, Pennsport, Center City, and then further west, 21st Ward Community Council, an association opposed to this, and Residents United for Greater Manayunk — all opposed to having casino gambling in the city.

Madam Speaker, you cannot buy neighborhoods. The men and women who form these neighborhoods that I just talked about are very concerned about the additional problems, social problems, that these casinos would bring. Do we want to see growing and thriving neighborhoods destroyed, people moving out because they cannot deal with the problems? A city is only as strong and as vibrant as the people that live there. These neighborhoods, without doubt, make up an important segment of the city of Philadelphia, and yet these are the people that would be greatly impacted and would probably have to leave their neighborhoods because of the problems that they would see.

It is also interesting to note, Madam Speaker, that in my remarks on the racetracks, I had mentioned about a particular investor from London, England, Bob Manoukian — I am probably mispronouncing his name, because I do not have the information here in front of me — but it is interesting, as he owns 80 percent of Philadelphia Park, he also owns 23 acres down by the Jack Frost property, which is there on the port. So we have, you know, another situation where money will be transacted back in all probability, should this come about and should he get a license, a permit, to put in a gambling apparatus, money that goes back to Europe. I cannot say that for sure, maybe not, but based on past history, it is always a possibility.

We also look at some of the other problems that we see involved here. We see as a public policy, for those who are promoting riverboat gambling, that the individual who gambles will be that individual who least can afford to lose. We heard that before on the previous issue. But that is as much true for our cities as it is anywhere else in Pennsylvania. People who think that they are going to strike it rich by going to the casino and spending their money foolishly, maybe they have been deceived, but it is the people who least can afford to gamble who will be spending those precious dollars that they really need for food and for shelter and for upkeep. So we have that problem, regressive taxation. Who is going to take care of those people when they lose their money? They fall back on society. We then have to handle that responsibility. Certainly the casinos wash their hands.

And the other problem that we see, and it ties in to the information I just released about the regressive taxation, is that the casinos are there to take all the money from every person who comes in there. People may say, well, I have a good time. Well, you may, but many become addicted to it, addicted to gambling, and they will take your cash in the form of chips and they will take your checks and they will take your credit cards and they will take your letters of indebtedness and they will have an ATM machine (automatic teller machine) there for you to take more of your money. You are not, you are not going to leave those places without spending a lot of money. It has been said that the house is favored to win and the people are going to lose.

And then are we not creating a powerful influence on government? We now create and have in this State powerful lobbyists. Once they are entrenched, as we look at other States, they do not give an inch; they take whatever they want. If they need to be open 365 days a year, as many of them are, that is what they want to get. If they want to be open 24 hours a day, the laws are usually passed to give them that, and so these are the things that we have to look at. Is this a good idea?

We have talked so often about campaign finance reform. It has been mentioned on numerous occasions. And yet, Madam Speaker, if a person truly wants campaign finance reform, how in the world could they vote for legislation that is going to create such a powerful lobbying influence on local and State governments?

And then we know the crime, the crime that does take place; not only the crime in the street but white-collar crime, organized crime. They manifest themselves very adeptly when these casinos come into place.

So, Madam Speaker, we know that whatever the law will give these casinos, they will not be there intact. Delaware Park is a prime example, as is Atlantic City, as is any gambling community. They start off with a few slot machines, a few boats, and pretty soon you have an overpowering number that are making such a bad impact on the communities and the people who go there.

Madam Speaker, we do not need this in Pennsylvania. We do not need to have all the trials and all the problems that come with the advent of casino gambling.

They say jobs is an issue; we want jobs and we want money. I guess they are saying that the city has been shortchanged in some degree in not getting sufficient funds. That may be an argument that we have to look at. In the 1998-1999 nonpreferreds, Madam Speaker, starting with Temple University, which received 100—

THE SPEAKER (MATTHEW J. RYAN) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

Madam Speaker is no longer at the rostrum.

Mr. CLYMER. I did not see the gentleman creep up behind me and take the podium.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I think we, as the Commonwealth, have been generous in helping the city with its problems. In the 1998-1999 nonpreferreds, starting with Temple University — and I voted for these nonpreferreds — we gave Temple University \$159 million; we gave 15 different organizations money to help in their endeavors in the city of Philadelphia, amounting to over \$218 million. I think that is pretty generous.

In a recent report that was in some of the local papers, for the first time in decades, the city is in the process of turning itself around. They had a surplus of 3,000 jobs. That may not be many, but when the city has been losing jobs year in and year out, companies leaving, I think it is noteworthy; I think it is something we can congratulate the mayor and city council and members of the Democrat delegation and Republican delegation for their efforts in turning the city around. I mean, it is breathing. It is a city that certainly is picking itself up and moving forward. Does anyone really believe casino gambling can add to that? Take away your neighborhoods, destroy them, give people false hope — is that what we are about?

It is interesting, as you hear the debate, as though the city needs more moneys for education and for other purposes, and yet the city was able to land Kvaerner shipyard. I do not recall that casino gambling was in place. They got two new sports stadiums. Once again, I do not remember casino gambling having an impact there. This General Assembly gave them money for the Apollo Center at Temple University. The National Republican Committee is going to be there in the year 2000, thanks to the mayor and to the Governor. Again, I do not recall the imprint that casino gambling had in the National Republican Committee making that decision.

I mentioned about the nonpreferreds and the money we have given there. We have given them money for Independence Square, money for the Avenue of the Arts. McDonald's is going to place its headquarters in the city of Philadelphia, one of its regional branches. We have given the city much in revenue to help it with its development of Penn's Landing. Restaurants are growing, which I mentioned before. Walt Disney is interested in coming to the city. There has been a major expansion of the Philadelphia International Airport. The Commonwealth gave them money for the convention center. We give them money for students at both the secondary and undergraduate levels. We give them money for SEPTA (Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority). As the Federal government decreased funding, we gave them, as the Commonwealth, additional dollars, and under the 3-cent tax on liquid fuels, again they received a nice portion. The Philadelphia Art Museum. Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on. I am not going to. But the point is, the city is receiving dollars to help it, and that is fine. We want to see the city grow.

It is interesting, a survey was done not that long ago, and they asked the residents of the city of Philadelphia, what is your greatest concern? Where are the problems that you see? Give us your priority. And they mentioned crime; crime. And yet that is exactly what we are going to see happening not only in the city of Philadelphia; it is going to impact on the four surrounding counties as well. Let us not kid ourselves. But crime was a major concern for the residents of that city. And what are we going to do? We are going to open the floodgates, if you will, if indeed this legislation should pass.

Now, we are talking about a referendum, a referendum, a nonbinding referendum, and we want the people to make the decision — make a decision on all the social negatives that I just talked about.

Mr. Speaker, we should learn from what has happened in other cities about the problems they are experiencing, many problems, monumental problems with this casino gambling. Some of those problems, the towns, the cities, the States did not bring on themselves. Federal law allowed the Indian reservations to become areas of casino gambling, but be that as it may, there they were.

They got the gambling, and they got the problems that went with it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have outlined some problems I have about the amendment that we are dealing with, its lack of specifics, its inability to really point out some of the problems that we know will occur, and the fact that we want to help, we want to help all our cities, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia — I mention Philadelphia because that is the one that we have been discussing at length — all our cities to do well, but let us not do it on the backs of working men and women. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster County, Mr. Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, once again I rise in opposition to this amendment, and it is not because I am inherently opposed to riverboat gambling. This amendment, like the previous amendment, is ambiguous.

We heard earlier from a speaker that because the language in the referendum question would say that tax revenues would be applied to education and economic development, that suddenly we were going to see a boost in education spending in the State of Pennsylvania. Now, nowhere in that referendum question and nowhere in the nonexistent enabling legislation that needs to go along with this is there language that says future Governors would have to spend the rate of inflation plus the additional money that we would get from riverboat gambling on education. It simply says that some of the proceeds — some of the proceeds, not all of the proceeds — some of the proceeds from riverboat gambling would need to be used for education. It does not prohibit those from being substituted for General Fund money that currently goes to education so that we could use that General Fund money for reducing taxes for big business again or doing something like that. It simply says that the money that comes from gambling, some of it needs to go to education.

So there are no guarantees in the language that we are actually going to see more money for education; there are no guarantees that it is actually going to help the schools in Philadelphia or Pittsburgh or Lancaster. It simply says, there is going to be some money for education and it is going to come from a different source than it currently does.

Once again, because of the ambiguity of the question, it says that there will be "...gaming at a limited number of locations on navigable waterways..." I am not quite sure what a navigable waterway is, because if I tried going up the Susquehanna and approaching it through the Chesapeake Bay, it is pretty nonnavigable. There are a lot of dams along the way. But in spots in between, it is navigable. So if "navigable" means that I just need to be able to have a place where I can run a boat for a short distance, then maybe the Conestoga in Lancaster qualifies. You know, 100 years ago, there actually was a riverboat on the Conestoga in Lancaster. There was an amusement park there. They had the river dammed up, a big swimming hole, and a little riverboat called the Lady Gay. Now, if I can airlift that boat back in onto the Conestoga again and have riverboat gambling in Lancaster and see some benefits to the city of Lancaster, I might be for this, but I do not know what a navigable waterway is or whether I am one of those limited numbers that gets it, because we have not seen any of the legislation that goes along with this referendum question.

And that gets to the heart of this referendum question. First off, we are going to run it in a primary election, where if we are lucky, 30 percent of the voters are going to turn out. And if in fact it passes with 51 percent of those 30 percent of the people that turned out voting for it, I guess my next question is to the Governor, who has insisted that we have this referendum: Does 16 percent of the voting public saying they are for an ambiguous idea constitute what he needs in order to sign legislation that we do not even know exists yet? Or does he at that point in time start hedging his bet and saying, well, you know, there were 14 percent of the people against it that showed up, 16 percent that were for it, and heck, 70 percent of the people did not even show up, so I still have some concern about this. All he said, to the best of my knowledge, was that he needed to have a referendum run before he would consider signing legislation.

If in fact the referendum loses in that primary by a 49-to-51 margin, can people come back and say, well, yeah, but it was pretty close; what the heck; it was only a difference of a couple thousand voters from what we talked about before with it winning. I mean, we do not have any guarantees as to any of this. This is all pie in the sky; let us talk about something that is so amorphous we do not know what it is, get the voters to vote on something that they do not know what it is, and we will come back later and see whether we can pass something that we do not know what it is, and we will hope that the Governor signs it, even though he does not know what it is yet.

This is a sham, and until we get some decent language so that the voters have the opportunity to look at the issue and decide up or down, I am going to be a "no" vote on this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware County, Mr. Kirkland.

Mr. KIRKLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition of the amendment, and I rise in opposition for the following reasons, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again using employment or the lack thereof to justify gambling here in Pennsylvania. Once again, Mr. Speaker, here we are using our deteriorating school buildings here in Pennsylvania to justify gambling. And the most troubling aspect of all this, Mr. Speaker, is that we are using, here in Pennsylvania we are using very precious individuals within our Commonwealth to justify gambling. We are using our young people, our children, Mr. Speaker, to justify gambling. This, Mr. Speaker, is plainly and simply wrong. Gambling in Pennsylvania is not the way to support our schools, and, Mr. Speaker, it is not the way to promote economic development and/or jobs in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, if we pass this amendment today, I guarantee you, we will probably be back here in the very, very, very near future asking, Mr. Speaker, for an increase in the budget, an increase in the budget for spending, for building, for new construction of correctional institutions, because you can be guaranteed that there is going to be an increase in crime and there is going to be an increase in persons addicted to gambling.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many of my colleagues watched "20/20" last night, but I did, and when I watched "20/20" last night, Mr. Speaker, it interviewed ladies who had a problem with gambling; it focused on women. Now, all of us know that men and women in this world today find themselves addicted to gambling, but it focused on women, and in doing so, Mr. Speaker,

it showed how some women spend an average of 6 hours a day — not a week, not a month, but 6 hours a day — in the casinos, wasting away not only their time but their life and their money, away from their families. The most troubling part of this interview or this story that went on “20/20,” Mr. Speaker, was the fact that there was a grandmother who had squandered all of her money and was so despondent but was so addicted to the gambling process that she went to a bank, Mr. Speaker, to do an illegal withdrawal; a grandmother went to the bank and robbed the bank. She did not take her money and go away and hide; she did not take her money and jump in the car and go to another State. What she did was, Mr. Speaker, she took that money after she robbed the bank and went back to the very same casino that she had lost all her other money at. Mr. Speaker, she had a serious problem, a problem that involved being addicted to gambling.

Mr. Speaker, persons who believe that the best way to deal with— There are persons in my community, I talked to a gentleman in my community, and he came up with an idea to deal with drug addiction and drug sales. He said, you know what? The best way I believe to deal with illegal drugs — and he was specifically talking about crack cocaine — he said, we need to have machines; we need to have machines so that they can put their money in, the drug addicts can put their money in the machines on the corner, and they can get the drugs, and then they can go on about their way. He thought that that was the best way to deal with the drug addiction problem throughout America — put machines on every corner, give them access. Well, Mr. Speaker, this type of thinking is totally insane.

Mr. Speaker, it is insane to think that gambling is going to produce real jobs in our State when the reality of it is that it is going to simply destroy real families and it is going to destroy real communities. It is insane to think that gambling is going to provide our children with a real education and with brand-new buildings when in fact it will simply corrupt the minds of our young people and encourage them to try and get rich quick instead of really studying to show themselves improved.

Mr. Speaker, let us stop gambling with the lives of our young people; let us stop gambling with the State of Pennsylvania; let us stop gambling with the voters and the constituents who have sent us here to do the work and the will of the people. Let us stop gambling, and let us focus on, once again, Mr. Speaker, the real issues — quality of life, the moral issues, the spiritual issues, the issues that allow our people to gain and not lose.

Again I rise in opposition of the amendment, the Evans amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berks County, Mr. Rohrer. The gentleman waives off.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York County, Mr. Platts.

Mr. PLATTS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the maker of the amendment stand for interrogation, please?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman evidently just left the floor. He was here a moment ago. Is there someone else who can meet your needs?

Mr. PLATTS. Well, I can address some of my other comments, and then I will come back.

The SPEAKER. Or if you like, you can stand down and we will recognize you when— Oh, here he is.

While we are waiting, these are the members who are on my list to be heard: Baker, Gordner, Schroder, Hershey, Vitali, Tigie, Birmelin, Maitland, Armstrong, Benninghoff, and Masland. That is all for the moment.

The gentleman, Mr. Evans, is on the floor and prepared to answer interrogation. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. PLATTS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We went through this yesterday to some degree, but since this is a new amendment, a new issue, and I think it is important for both us as legislators to cast informed votes and for the voters on election day to do so, I would like to address a couple of the terms in your question, again, to see if you have more specific information to share with us and thus with the voters of Pennsylvania.

Your question talks about riverboat gaming that will be “licensed and regulated,” and I was wondering, for us here today and for the voters, in what vision sense do you want these gaming locations to be licensed and regulated? By whom? Is it going to be a new State agency? Is it going to be the State Police? Exactly what do you have in mind by those terms?

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to apologize for holding the House up.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would say that that would be up to the members of this General Assembly. What I would envision is that it would go through the committee process, have public hearings, allow the public as well as members of the General Assembly on both sides of the aisle, in the Senate also as well as the Governor, to have input in terms of is it local or is it State. Basically, Mr. Speaker, this referendum would only try to give a sense to this General Assembly if people would want to use this as a means to fund education and economic development. But to your question, it would be up to members on both sides of the aisle as well as the Senate to have input in terms of what is the best way, is it local or is it State.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, however, it is accurate to say that you envision some public entity, whether it be State or local or at those levels, that will need to be formed to license and regulate these gambling establishments?

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, rather than give my opinion as one person, I mean, you, too, have a right to have some input into this particular process as well as all 203 members, and I think it would be better for the members of this General Assembly, through a committee process as well as in the Senate, to have some say about what takes place. I am just one person in this process, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PLATTS. I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, and I look forward to having input if we get to that point. Hopefully we will not. But my point is, when the voters go to the polls on election day and go in to cast their votes on these issues, they need to make informed votes, and so you are telling us that as the maker of the amendment, you cannot tell the voters of Pennsylvania that there will be a new State agency. Maybe it is going to be a private agency. You are not even able to say how you are going to form that agency. They have no knowledge of what you mean by “licensed and regulated.” Is that accurate by your statements?

Mr. EVANS. No; I do not think that is accurate by my statements, Mr. Speaker. I basically said that if you, again, look at the question, the question is only asking the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do you think that this particular initiative called riverboat gaming should be something that this

General Assembly should entertain? So my view is, from people either answering that yes or no, that would give us some sense.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, and I think you may be aware that there are other States that have other types of initiatives, and sometimes it is controlled either by local, meaning county or local governments, or it is controlled by the State, or it can be controlled by private, as you just described. So it could be any one of those entities. It could be controlled by the State, it could be controlled by the local government, or it could be controlled by the private sector. So any one of those areas could be a part of the governance mechanism, and what I hear you saying is, and I am not trying to put words in your mouth, but I as one individual cannot just automatically be able to say that it is going to be State, local, or it is going to be the private sector. I mean, obviously, that is up for debate of members in this General Assembly.

Mr. PLATTS. However, when the voters go to vote on election day, if this question is on the ballot, their vote may be different if it is State, local, or private, and so looking to get an informed response from those voters is not possible as this is worded, because they do not know what they are voting on; they do not know if it is going to be State or local. And I do not want to get into debate; stay with questions. So I think it is fair to say to the voters of Pennsylvania who are listening today or who will be looking at this perhaps in the future that when they vote, they truly do not know if they are going to be voting for a riverboat casino that is licensed by the State, the local, the private sector; they are just being asked to give a carte blanche approval for riverboat gambling.

Mr. EVANS. I would again agree to disagree with you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PLATTS. Okay.

Mr. EVANS. I think that the options are very clear. It is either managed and operated by the State or it is managed and operated by local government, or it could be managed and operated by the private sector, or it could be some kind of joint partnership between the public and the private. It is either one of those four that I described, and obviously, we are approaching this from the standpoint of really giving people a full opportunity to participate and give their input. We could have public hearings; we could have town meetings. I do not think that we need to approach this from the standpoint of thinking that we already have figured it out before people vote. I think that would be a farce upon the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. This is something where it is a process that we want completely open and we want people to have input into something that would be a major policy change in this State.

Mr. PLATTS. I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, but if we really want the people's input, what we put before them will be specifically what we are going to do, because then their input will mean something because it will be on the specifics.

Let me move on, and we will have to agree to disagree, although I think by your statements, it is fair to say that there will be some regulating entity out there that is going to be likely to cost money to the taxpayers, because in likelihood, it is going to be a local or State public agency, so when they vote, by your statements, they should know they are voting to spend tax moneys to regulate a new industry.

Mr. EVANS. I would not agree with that, Mr. Speaker. I would not agree with that statement, because in my view, you can use a fee-driven system, no more different than what we do with the

Insurance Department, no more different than what we do with the public utility department, where the public utility department is operated by fees that are paid for on the public utility, no more different than what we do with the Insurance Department. As a matter of fact, it was recommended by the Ridge administration to have it be fee-driven. So I do not agree that any taxes will have to be used at all for the purpose of licensing or regulating, because you can build the fee into the entity that can pay for itself to regulate itself. So I do not agree — let me make that very clear — I do not agree that you have to use tax dollars at all. I am not advocating that tax dollars be used. That is something I hear you suggesting to try to send a message to people. I am making it very clear, no, you do not have to use any tax dollars that will come out of the operating budget for this entity to run and be operated.

Mr. PLATTS. I appreciate the analogy to the Insurance Department, but go ask your citizens, do you think the insurance companies are paying those fees to the State or the insurance policyholders, the citizens, paying those fees to the State through their insurance premiums? And the bottom line: Whether it is gambling or insurance, it comes out of the people's pocket in one form or another as a tax or as a fee.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, you could say the same thing about the Public Utility Commission, too. You could say that how exactly are they paying for their fees. Are they paying for it out of the bottom line with electricity, or are they paying it out of the profits of the company? See, we could always get into that debate. I am saying to you, I want to make it very clear: No new taxes, in my view, are connected with this entity. So I want to make it very clear, I am not talking about any new taxes or any sort of taxes out of the existing revenue streams.

Mr. PLATTS. I appreciate your answer and your clarity on that, although I will make it very clear that I think voters should realize that there absolutely will be tax dollars associated with regulating this industry. We are not going to turn it over to the private sector; it is going to be State or local government.

But in keeping with the interrogation—

Mr. EVANS. Well, Mr. Speaker, can I interrupt you for just a second?

Mr. PLATTS. I am sorry.

Mr. EVANS. I would only say to you, Mr. Speaker, again, I am not trying to write this; I am only trying to say to you, I would not eliminate the idea that this could not be a private, market-driven initiative, and you said that you think it would be State or local. I would not be so quick to say that. I think there are ways that it could be a private-operated opportunity. I do not think it just has to be the way you just described.

Mr. PLATTS. Well, I think that is informative for the voters, that they should know that there may be a greater likelihood that we are going to turn over these gambling industries, which many members here today have spoken about the ties to organized crime, and we are not going to regulate them by the State, but more likely, by your comments, by the private sector, and we are going to trust the private sector to regulate gambling, which many people associate with organized crime. I doubt that is going to put citizens at ease. I think maybe it will raise even greater concern that not only is there a tax-dollar question but we are going to turn over the responsibility to ensuring the integrity of these entities to the private sector. I think that will raise more alarm.

But keeping with the interrogation process—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER. The House should be advised that I am now giving permission to Shannon Perrine of WGAL-TV, Lancaster, to be on the floor of the House for still photography, videotaping, and/or recording this procedure concerned with the riverboat gambling amendment.

Permission is also being given to Matthew Krwiss of WFMZ-TV for the same purpose.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 255 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. The Chair apologizes to the gentleman and asks him to please continue.

Mr. PLATTS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Continuing on with the terms of the question, you talk about "riverboat gaming." Can you tell us what you mean by "gaming"? Is that blackjack? Is that poker? What exactly does that include, that the voters should know that when they vote yes on this or no, that they are voting in favor of having blackjack? What games do you envision by this referendum?

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, that, again—and I am not trying to be evasive to your questions or what you are asking—I think that, again, is something that will be defined by this General Assembly, as well as the Governor's input, as well as the public. I would encourage public hearings, public discussion. There are other examples we could look at around the nation in terms of what is taking place in other States. So that question, Mr. Speaker, again, in my view, would be a question that would be more appropriate to have in a hearing process in this General Assembly to answer that question.

Mr. PLATTS. I appreciate your answer, Mr. Speaker, and I do not believe you are being evasive. I appreciate your frankness, because I think your frankness makes the point that voters do not know what they are buying with this vote. They do not know if it means blackjack, you know, if it means poker, if it means poker machines. They do not know what you are asking them to vote on.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman concluded his interrogation?

Mr. PLATTS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No. I will try to stay on interrogating at this point as opposed to commenting.

The other similar terms in your question are the issues of "education and economic development." Am I accurate in saying, as the maker of the amendment yesterday stated, that there is no guarantee when a voter goes and votes, yes, we should have riverboat gambling, there is no guarantee in this question that any money now or in the future will be used from gambling enterprises for education or economic development and that there is a hard guarantee to the voter?

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, if I understand your question, I hate to turn it back around, but what exactly do you mean by "guarantee"?

Mr. PLATTS. That the voters know that if they vote yes and that if we adopt legislation that allows riverboat gambling, that absolutely all revenues or a large portion of the revenues from that new enterprise will go to education and economic development purposes.

Mr. EVANS. Let me read to you, Mr. Speaker. The question says, "...with tax revenues being applied to education and economic development." What I think that understands,

Mr. Speaker, and I think that makes it very clear that "...tax revenues being applied to education and economic development" shows we could always debate on how much money is going to education or how much money is going to economic development. So when you use the word "guarantee," I am not clear. I mean, it says that the money will be "...applied to education and economic development." It says it in the question, first.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, when you say that I am being very honest with the public, I am being honest with the public because I think that that is a part of the process. I think that the public needs to know, when they put this question on them, that, no, it is not like we have some legislation written in the drawer or in the pocket and then suddenly we are going to spring it on them, but what we are looking for is a sense from the public if they think that we should use this revenue source to apply it to education and economic development. It says, "...tax revenues being applied to education and economic development." That is what it says, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PLATTS. I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, but my question is—I will give you a scenario. Is there anything, if this referendum goes on the ballot and it is adopted, is there anything in the referendum or in law that would prohibit this body from coming back in the fall of this year and adopting legislation that allows riverboat gambling and says, you know what, we just gave away \$460 million and interest to four stadiums in this State; we need to come up with that money somewhere? Is there anything that guarantees that we are not going to adopt legislation that says the money from these riverboats, oh, we thought about education, but instead, we are going to send it to the four stadiums to pay off the interest on those four stadiums? Is there anything that guarantees that we will not have the right to do that?

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to think the integrity of this body, the fact that we are elected by those same people to whom we have put a question on the ballot, I would like to think we would not ignore— You know, this is not like Washington, D.C., where they ignore what the public says. I think it would be very clear that if this is on the ballot, I think it would be very difficult for the 203 members in this House, the 50 in the Senate, and the Governor to ignore, to ignore that this referendum has said that the money will be directed to education and economic development. I think I take, Mr. Speaker, that commitment very seriously, and I am saying to you that what we are attempting to do with this question is to get a sense from the public if they want to use this revenue source to direct the money to education and economic development. So I think that is much more sacred than, as you would describe, something written, because the fact is, the public will know, the press will know, your constituents will know. They will either vote yes or no on this particular issue, and then in my view, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the integrity of this body will adhere to what is said by the people of this State.

Mr. PLATTS. I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, but I believe your answer is, no, there is no guarantee that that will happen. You are resting on the integrity of this body, which I well respect, but there is no guarantee. The answer is no, and I will look back to a short week ago. I will wait and get into that when I come back to my comments as opposed to my questioning.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, if I can say, I did not say no; you said no. Let us be clear about who is saying what.

Mr. PLATTS. So you are saying there is—

Mr. EVANS. You said no.

Mr. PLATTS. You are saying there is a guarantee in the bill; there is a guarantee?

Mr. EVANS. I said—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlemen yield.

Mr. Evans.

Mr. EVANS. I said that I did not say no. I want to make that clear. You said no. I said to you, based on the integrity of this body, if the public sends a message and the message is that the tax revenues should be applied to education and to economic development, that I believe, as a result of that message that has been sent to this General Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that that in itself will be the safeguard to ensure the public that the money will be redirected to education and economic development.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, let me ask it more specifically: Is there any statutory guarantee, based on this referendum, that would say that when we pass riverboat gambling, if this would get on the ballot and pass, statutorily guaranteeing that we have to give it to education, not the good character or the integrity of us members but statutorily that the people can say, if I vote yes, there is nothing they can do but give it to education? Statutorily is there a guarantee that that is where the money will go?

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, you know, again, I am not trying to be evasive to your question. I guess I am only repeating what I said before, that the money will be applied to education and economic development.

Mr. PLATTS. You cannot— I am sorry; I interrupted.

Mr. EVANS. That the money will be applied to economic development and education. I repeat that again, because the referendum has to pass in order for us to have the discussion around the enabling legislation. I think that the issues you are raising, in my view, Mr. Speaker — and I am not trying to put words in your mouth — but that my sense is, Mr. Speaker, that debate should take place depending on what happens with the referendum. If the voters should decide yes, then we can have that discussion. If the voters decide no, then we do not have that discussion. But it is kind of difficult for me to be talking about what I view as enabling legislation when we should be concentrating on the referendum.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, since you have raised the issue of us absolutely doing the will of the public and if they say they want to do this only for education and economic development, that is the only thing we will do because we will follow the will of the public, do you believe that the will of the public was that we would give \$500 million, \$600 million, \$700 million to stadiums last week? Were we doing the will of the people?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield. That is off the point of what we are dealing with today.

Mr. PLATTS. I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. Only because he has brought up the integrity of us as members did I—

The SPEAKER. I understand that your intentions were well meaning, but they were against our rules.

Mr. PLATTS. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if this goes on the ballot, in other States where it has, there has been a great inequity between the voice of the people who are opposed to gambling being able to put their message out and all the horrors that go with gambling as opposed to the wealth of the industry and the amount of money they are able to spend. Do you believe— My understanding is that our campaign expense laws would not require a full disclosure as they do in our campaigns. What is your opinion of any money spent lobbying in

favor of these ballot questions or this ballot question? What disclosure is required under State law so the public knows who is spending how much?

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, again, I am not meaning to any way be disrespectful to your question, but I guess what I am saying is, you are kind of asking me speculative questions about other States and what do I believe that the law is. My general sense is, Mr. Speaker, that we will put a referendum on the ballot; people will vote yes or no. I would assume, Mr. Speaker, I would assume that in any type of efforts, they would have to go under the same type of campaign disclosure laws.

Now, if you are suggesting, Mr. Speaker — and I am not putting words in your mouth — if you are suggesting that there should be tighter reins on that, Mr. Speaker, I, along with Representative Levdansky, I have always been for the idea of tightening up contributions from independent organizations or whoever gives money; I am not opposed to that. But the question it seems like you are asking me is something relating to either other States or how strict our campaign finance should be, and I do not think that is the issue. I think the issue is focusing on this issue of referendum, and then if people should vote for this referendum, either yes or no, then I would agree that we could have these discussions about enabling legislation, tightening the loopholes of what kind of money is involved. I would be more than glad to work with you on all of that, Mr. Speaker. I am open for that.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, my question, though, was, on the referendum, where you have emphasized that this is only about getting the feel for the people of Pennsylvania, the only way we get that is if the people have fair and accurate information when they go to vote; thus, the reason for my questions of what your terms mean, but it is also the reason for my question of is the public going to have fair information from both sides, or as in other States, is the gambling side going to spend millions compared to little on the public side?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Platts, please, ask a question without putting facts in that are not on the record. We do not know how much anybody is going to spend to do what. You can ask the question. If he does not know the answer, that is the end of it. Save the rest for argument.

Mr. PLATTS. I appreciate that.

I will conclude my interrogation on that point. I appreciate the maker of the amendment standing for interrogation.

Mr. EVANS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PLATTS. If I may speak on the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. PLATTS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some numbers in those other States of what gambling has spent compared to those opposed to gambling: In Ohio, gambling proponents spent \$8.5 million; opponents were only able to spend \$1.1 million. Florida casino promoters spent a staggering \$16.5 million compared to \$1.7 million from those who are opposed. Missouri gambling interests spent nearly \$15 million on two 1994 referendum questions; opponents spent under \$400,000. And why is that? Because who has all the money? The gambling industry has all the money. And when you are going to seek the opinions of the public, you are not going to have a fair debate, because you are going to have the progambling interests with all the money to spend on TV, on radio, and direct mail, and they are going to talk about education and economic development — which

there is no guarantee; the answer to the question was, no, there is no guarantee that this money will go to education.

And as to the will of the public, I think this body showed that we were willing to disregard the will of the public last week. Pennsylvania citizens overwhelmingly opposed stadium funding, yet we did it. So to say that the people are going to trust us, given our track record of a week ago, I doubt they are going to trust us.

This is promoted, this referendum and this issue, as job creation. The only job creation, in my opinion, is going to be more bureaucracy, because when we bring in organized crime and we bring in gambling, we are going to have to have a bigger and more powerful bureaucracy that is going to be required to regulate this industry, and that does not bode well for taxpayers of Pennsylvania.

When we look at issues, often we bring personal experiences, and I will share just a couple real quickly.

I remember a few years back driving from Florida and the panhandle over to New Orleans and going through one of the new towns in New Orleans that had a riverboat casino, and there was a nice flashy casino there, and all the economic development was in the casino. Around it was a very depressed area that probably under our terms would be a LERTA (Local Economic Revitalization Tax Assistance Act) area here in Pennsylvania; it would be an economic revitalization area because it was so depressed. No one around the casino was benefiting; only the money in the casino, the interests in the casino were making all the money.

We heard comments about the addiction that goes with gambling and how addictive it is. I cannot think of a better example of how addictive it is, and this was a life of an 8-year-old daughter that was taken because her father was so addicted to gambling that after repeated warnings from casino operators, right at the California-Nevada line, for the father to attend to his 8-year-old daughter, whom he had left in the casino kids' area with the games and things, quarter games for kids to play, and the father repeatedly returned to the gaming tables — in the middle of the night, 3 in the morning, repeatedly went back to the gaming tables, deserted his 8-year-old daughter — the daughter was raped and murdered in that casino, raped and murdered because the father was too addicted to gambling, could not take care of his own 8-year-old daughter, and that is what we are asking Pennsylvanians to support if we put this on the ballot.

Today we in York County have a number of students up here with us, and they came up on a school bus, and the school bus driver came into my office today to see if they were ready to go, and he made a comment, a half serious comment about getting up here to Harrisburg because of all this free money we are giving out. My reply was, no, that is not true; we only give free money to millionaires; we are going to take money from the average taxpayers. And this is one example of how we are going to take it from the average taxpayers through gambling, through inappropriate exercises like gambling, and what do we do with it? We give it to millionaires like we did last week.

The importance of this referendum is an informed vote. If we truly want the public's opinion, they need to have all the information. As was discussed here, they do not have all the information; they have no idea what may come down the road if they vote yes. I do not think that is an informed decision. Especially when you look at the wealth of the gambling industry, what they are going to spend, the numbers I cited, I think even

though I thought slots was wrong for us to do, I even more strongly object to us going down the road to riverboat gambling, and I hope you will vote "no," do what is right for all Pennsylvanians, not just a few wealthy Pennsylvanians or non-Pennsylvanians; do what is right for all Pennsylvanians and vote "no." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tioga, Mr. Baker.

Mr. BAKER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this amendment based on two issues, that of economic costs and also on social costs.

On economic costs, I believe that we will weaken Pennsylvania's already robust economy and all that we have worked hard to achieve. In 1992 alone, U.S. gambling losses to players were a record \$30 billion. Atlantic City had a drop in retail businesses by one-third within 4 years of its inception of casino gambling.

The creation of jobs, nominal. The pro-casino coalition admitted, "We estimate that slightly under 40% of jobs created would represent displacements in other sectors of the economy." That should be a real concern for our chamber of commerce and our National Federation of Independent Business and our business community.

Crime. Pennsylvania already spends over \$1 billion on crime and corrections; \$1 billion on locking up people and fighting crime. In Atlantic City, crime jumped incredibly by 25 percent within 1 year and 400 percent during the 10 years after the casinos opened. Rapidly, Atlantic City rose from 50th to 1st in the nation in per capita crimes. Can our taxpayers afford to build more prisons and fight more crimes and suffer more injury? I think not.

Maryland, a State that did not have casino gambling, reported that gambling cost the State \$1½ billion in bankruptcies, unpaid taxes, lost work productivity, public defenders, fighting of crime, and other services. Can Pennsylvania taxpayers afford these costs? Will the expansion of gambling seriously erode our senior citizen programs? I think you know the answers.

Social costs. In 1994, New York State's Office of Mental Health estimated 500,000 — that is a half a million — State residents were classified as pathological or problem gamblers. Opening the gateway to gambling opportunities only intensifies the problem.

It has been estimated that there may be as many as 1.3 million teenagers nationally having some form of gambling problem. Atlantic City reported turning away millions of teenagers at the door and removing another 27,000 — or 75 teenagers per day — from the gambling floor. This is not a problem; this is an epidemic.

Gambling puts faith and trust in chance or luck. Super Bowl Sunday, January 31, 1999, \$5 billion is estimated to have been gambled, \$4 billion of it illegally. It is a serious problem.

It can promote a greedy spirit and selfishness that can be addictive and create all kinds of destruction to the moral fiber of our society. Gamblers Anonymous can testify to the financial, personal, and domestic destruction that it can cause, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is antifamily.

Can Pennsylvania afford overspending, increases in violent crime, broken families, and a behavior that may be harmful, all for the love of money? Will it be worth the burden and responsibility of ensuing consequences? I think not.

A 2-year study by a Professor Goodman, an economic expert from the University of Massachusetts, studied this issue extensively for 2 years. He said it may create a few jobs, but it also

boosts tax revenues nominally, and it siphons off customers from other businesses, it fuels crime, it distorts property values, it creates costly new government bureaucracies to regulate them, and the study also found that the communities rely too much on research done by the casino industry to make decisions that will change their long-term future without giving serious consideration to the true costs.

Experts say that the money spent on legal gambling grew at almost twice the rate of Americans' personal incomes. That is a study out of the University of Massachusetts. The report also said that people spend more on gambling in Minnesota than they do on clothing and shoes. That is amazing. Also, that money spent in restaurants within a 30-mile radius of casinos dropped by up to 50 percent.

The whole idea that the gambling gains of only the few, financed by the losses of the many, benefiting wealthy gambling corporations, is deadly to the best interest of our society that needs moral, social, economic, and spiritual leadership.

Let us not teach our citizens, especially our young, to believe in an ethic of luck instead of an ethic of hard work and investment.

I have spoken with many families in my district, and they are adamantly opposed to this initiative, including Native Americans from the Lenape Nation, and they have seen and witnessed firsthand the negative impact and some of the destruction that gambling has on those that they love.

A little earlier we heard President Thomas Jefferson, his name invoked. I would like to invoke a quote and some words in conclusion by our great President George Washington. On May 2, 1778, George Washington said this about gaming and gambling: "Avoid gaming. This is a vice which is productive of every possible evil; equally injurious to the morals and health of its votaries. It is the child of avarice, the brother of iniquity, and the father of mischief. It has been the ruin of many a man's honor, and the cause of suicide. The successful gamester pushes his good fortune 'till it is overtaken by a reverse; the losing gamester, in hopes of retrieving past misfortunes, goes on from bad to worse, 'till, grown desperate, he pushes at everything and loses his all."

Mr. Speaker, I believe George Washington would be crying crocodile tears over this issue that we are even considering the expansion of gambling here in Pennsylvania.

For these and many other reasons, Mr. Speaker, I oppose this amendment and offer additional comments for the record. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues consider the current legislation proposing the expansion of gambling, I would like to offer my thoughts for consideration as it applies to this idea that riverboat, harness racing, and video poker gambling is a viable solution for economic development and additional revenue to our State's treasury. We should not be deceived; the move to legalize the riverboat gambling industry will serve only to weaken the good work we have done to improve our robust economy here in Pennsylvania.

It has been estimated that the 1992 gambling losses to players in America were a record \$30 billion. This is an average of \$120 for every man, woman, and child, and three times higher than a decade ago!

Atlantic City, a city that was in a deplorable economic condition, had a drop in retail businesses by one-third within 4 years of the inception of casino gambling. This is not quite the booming increase proponents would have you believe. The creation of much-needed jobs falls under suspicion as well. Even a report supported by the pro-casino coalition admitted: "We estimate that slightly under forty percent of jobs created by the gaming industry would represent displacements in other sectors of the economy."

Many opponents believe the expansion of gambling would cause an increase in crime. Facts have proven them correct. Crime in Atlantic City jumped an incredible 25 percent within 1 year after the casinos opened. Rapidly, Atlantic City rose from fiftieth to first in the nation in per capita crimes.

Maryland, a State that did not have casino gambling, reported that gambling cost the State \$1.5 billion per year in bankruptcies, unpaid taxes, lost work productivity, public defenders, fighting of crime, and other services.

More important than the fiscal problems are the social problems associated with gambling. In 1994 it was estimated by the New York State Office of Mental Health that nearly 500,000 State residents were classified as pathological or problem gamblers. Opening the gateway of gambling opportunities would only intensify the problem.

We must ask the question: Does expanding gambling encourage positive values, characteristics, and behavior? Or negative behavior, both to one's family, self, and, to a larger degree, society as a whole?

It has been estimated that there may be as many as 1.3 million teenagers, nationally, having some form of gambling problem. The casino industry in Atlantic City reported turning away millions of teenagers at the door and removing another 27,000 (or 75 per day) from the gambling floor. This is not a problem; this is an epidemic!

Gambling all too often puts faith and trust in chance or luck. It all too often promotes a greedy spirit and selfishness that can be addictive and destructive to the moral fiber of society. Gambling and the addictions that follow represent a powerful force, with widespread repercussions that will affect even those that are furthest from its influence. Can Pennsylvania afford the inevitable overspending, increase in violent crime, broken families, suicides, et cetera, all too often proven to be associated with legalized gambling? Are the few extra dollars worth the burden and the responsibility of the consequences? I think not!

Professor Robert Goodman, a University of Massachusetts economist, directed a 2-year project that resulted in a national study concerning this issue. He concluded that the more gambling is legalized, the more people become addicted to the dice, cards, and colorful machines, and that high school and college-age youths are particularly susceptible to gambling addictions.

Professor Goodman's study also concluded that these activities fuel crime and gambling addictions, distort property values, and require costly new government bureaucracies to regulate them. He said, "The most important message is that communities are getting into gambling casinos without giving serious consideration to what the true costs are, and are relying on research done by the casino industry to make decisions that will change their long-term future."

Experts say that once a State becomes hooked on the tax revenue from gambling, whether they be riverboat, harness racing, casino, video poker, or otherwise, it is difficult to control gambling's political influence. I, too, am very concerned about the future of our great Commonwealth. It seems to me that in many jurisdictions there all too often is a propensity for the gambling industry to continue to push for more. I am very concerned that there will be no such thing as limited gambling. Between 1982 and 1990, the money spent on legal gambling grew at almost twice the rate of America's personal incomes, according to the University of Massachusetts report. The report also went on to say that people spend more on gambling in Minnesota, for instance, than they do buying clothing and shoes. Obviously, the drawbacks are many. The report indicated that in Minnesota, money spent on restaurants within a 30-mile radius of casinos with food service fell by up to 50 percent. And in the 4 years after casinos came to Atlantic City, the number of retail businesses

in that town dropped by one-third. An inquiring mind must ask what the adverse economic impact to jurisdictions, cities, and contiguous communities with like businesses in Pennsylvania will be. Will they also see a decline in business which in turn creates unemployment which in turn creates more of a dependency on unemployment compensation, public welfare assistance, and economic lethargy to our individual and collective businesses?

Gambling by some is perceived as a placebo for governments looking to find a quick fix to budgetary problems or to economically revitalize or capitalize in a financially opportunistic manner. The promise of increased revenues led Pennsylvania to allow horse racing in the first place. However, as we debate and consider expanding the legalization of gambling here in Pennsylvania, and as gambling grows across America, the competition increases dramatically. And each form of gambling may become less lucrative – less likely to pay for what it was supposed to pay for and benefit. We must remember that gambling can be destructive. Too many times it has destroyed people, destroyed families, destroyed careers. The thrill of the wager can be addictive, and often those who bet the most are those who can afford it the least.

I will not attempt to speak for all church-related denominations, but I would like to give you just a few quick quotes from three denominations in particular as to how they believe gambling affects people. The American Baptist denomination deplores the growing legalization of gambling and the State promotion of gambling. They have said in their church policy that “Dependence on gambling revenue has led many States to exploit the weaknesses of their own citizens, collect a disproportionate amount of revenue from those least able to pay, and neglect the development of more equitable forms of taxation....Further, the designation of revenue from gambling for certain segments of society gives gambling the appearance of making a contribution to society while ignoring the social costs of poverty, crime and corruption which accompany gambling....Rather than eliminating corruption and crime, legalized gambling has opened opportunities for them to grow and flourish.”

The United Methodist denomination has indicated that “Gambling is a menace to society. Deadly to the best interests of moral, social, economic, and spiritual life, and destructive of good government.”

The Presbyterian church (USA) has denounced legalized gambling in that it “...often results in increased crimes against persons and property, gambling addiction, exploitation of the poor, land speculation, and instability of communities....”

Indeed, I concur wholeheartedly with Governor Casey’s position and opposition to riverboat gambling casinos. I concur that as a public policy matter, legalized riverboat gambling carries a lot of negative consequences as well as possible racketeering influences and all that is associated with many of the very evils that our Commonwealth and, in fact, our anti-crime funding is budgeted to address. Even under the best regulatory system, I suspect we would see the proliferation of vice and crime inherent to the expansion of legalized gambling.

Gambling as it is defined is putting at risk something of value in the hopes of getting something worth far more; implicit in its meaning is the idea that the winnings of a few are financed by the losses of the many. Compulsive or pathological gambling is defined as a chronic and progressive disorder possessing similar characteristics to drug or alcohol addiction; in 1980, pathological gambling was classified as a mental illness by the American Psychiatric Association. I ask you, my friends, are we supporting public policy that is uplifting, positive, good, wholesome, and productive?

It is estimated that in 1990, Americans placed legal bets worth over \$286 billion. That is equivalent to 5 percent of the gross national product; it is one-third more than the total amount spent on elementary and secondary education in this country; and it is nearly four times the amount given to religious institutions. What we are talking about is a behavior that oftentimes is translated into extremism such as the problem we now have in our national society to help compulsive gamblers. For an estimated 8 to 10 million Americans gambling becomes an addiction. We must ask the questions, will the expansion of gambling encourage or

detract from a potentially compulsive behavior that can ruin the productive life of an individual, cause them to steal, murder, or commit other crimes to support this habit and destroy his marriage and family? Will gambling attract organized crime and many other corollary vices such as prostitution, drugs, corruption, and violent crime? Before you label me as an extremist, let us not ignore the facts. The crime rate rose 400 percent in Atlantic City during the 10 years after casino gambling was introduced. Probably the most destructive aspect of legalized casino gambling or the proliferation of gambling is that it teaches the American people – especially our young – to believe in an “ethic of luck” instead of an ethic of hard work and investment. Expanding and encouraging gambling by passing legislation could result in altering the very value system and moral fiber of our society by advocating a “get rich quick” mentality. Perhaps it even sends the message that there is no need to get an education or work for a living, simply try your luck and hit the big one and you will not have to worry about making a living anymore. To pass this legislation clearly offers a false hope to the poor and underprivileged.

Paul Jones, executive director of the Mississippi Christian Action League, once said: “The whole system of gambling itself presupposes that the bulk of people lose so that a few can win. Let not our State say that we must make losers out of people... That is a moral problem that is unconscionable.”

Francis Flaherty, in his book “Going for Broke,” said, and I paraphrase, that what we are in effect trying to do here is encourage a behavior that is “...a regression and inefficient tax that promotes addiction to gambling, seduces the poor into sleazy skills for a game with infinitesimal odds, and provides ample opportunity for corruption.”

Indeed, Illinois Governor Jim Edgar opposed the proliferation of gambling and has cited a fear of a net loss of jobs statewide, increased crime, and a lower quality of urban life.

Perhaps most importantly, how do we individually and collectively in a reasonable act of conscientiousness vote on gambling that has been hailed as a panacea for economic development when in fact it has been clearly documented that it can lead to a destructive behavior that affects one’s financial health, family, and society at large? Let us not be deceived, expanding gambling potentially creates negative and harmful consequences to society’s moral, ethical, and financial health. Experience and, indeed, wisdom call out to us to realize that the real benefactors of increased gambling are not the citizens of the Commonwealth but the multibillion-dollar corporations that operate and provide gaming. They testify to all the benefits and jobs that they will create but never mention the long-term and eventual loss of jobs due to job dislocation, competition, seasonal layoffs, increased crime, addictive behavior that also can lead to social costs of poverty and possible corruption of the very moral fibers of our society. To vote for the expansion of gambling, I believe, would be a poor stewardship vote and sends the wrong message to our families, our children, and indeed, our Commonwealth. It sends the wrong message to a society that I believe is begging for strong moral and ethical values in leadership. I suspect that the further legalization of gambling can lead to additional addictive behavior that has all too often broken up homes and marriages and has led to domestic violence of untold proportions.

Finally, I will conclude with a quote from President George Washington, in which he said on May 2, 1778: “Avoid gaming. This is a vice which is productive of every possible evil; equally injurious to the morals and health of its votaries. It is the child of avarice, the brother of iniquity, and the father of mischief. It has been the ruin of many a man’s honor, and the cause of suicide. The successful gamester pushes his good fortune ‘till it is overtaken by a reverse; the losing gamester, in hopes of retrieving past misfortunes, goes from bad to worse, ‘till, grown desperate, he pushes at everything and loses his all.”

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I oppose the legislation to expand gambling, and I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in the negative.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to advise the members that he has given permission to Joan Fairman Kanes of the Philadelphia Inquirer to take still photographs on this legislation on the floor of the House.

GUEST INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to take this opportunity to welcome Allan Wehler from Gettysburg, who is serving as a guest page. He is here today as the guest of Representative Steve Maitland from Adams County. He is located on the page bench. Would he please rise. Is he here? Welcome to the hall of the House.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 255 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Columbia County, Mr. Gordner, is recognized on the amendment.

Mr. GORDNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Did you know that Americans gamble more money each year than they spend on groceries? Or that more than \$600 billion is wagered legally in the United States annually? Or that nearly one in five homeless people admit that gambling contributed to their poverty and yet 37 percent said that they will continue to gamble? Or that 5 to 8 percent of American adolescents are already addicted to gambling? Or that 75 percent of pathological gamblers admitted that they had committed at least one felony to support their habit? 75 percent. Or that more money is spent on gambling in the State of Mississippi than on all retail sales combined? Or that a decade ago, only New Jersey and Nevada permitted casinos but now 48 States have legalized some form of gambling?

It has recently been said that Atlantic City, New Jersey, has been such an extraordinary success story because of the casinos. That is almost impossible to believe and makes you almost want to gag when you hear that. The unemployment rate in Atlantic City for 1998 was almost three times the national average. They have an unemployment rate of over 12 percent. While lavish casinos light up the main thoroughfare of the city, the vacant land a block or two on either side resembles a bombed-out war zone. Businesses used to stand on those locations, but they are yesterday's hopes and dreams. More than 200 restaurants have gone broke since the arrival of the casinos in Atlantic City; 200. Dry cleaners and specialty shops have all but disappeared. And even Donald Trump has admitted that "People will spend a tremendous amount of money in casinos, money that they would normally spend on buying a refrigerator or a new car. Local business will suffer because they'll lose customer dollars to the casinos," end quote.

An article in the New York Times recently stated, "Pawnbrokers..." in Mississippi "tell of late night gamblers who, unable to get more cash on their credit cards, buy televisions and radios at 24-hour discount stores, then pawn them for one-third of their value. Others pawn whatever they have because they cannot wait until midnight, when their bank cards will allow them to

withdraw" even "more money.... 'I've sat in this window at 4 in the morning and had people willing to pawn their wives,' " said one owner in this New York Times article.

It is a shame that we have these sorts of things, and I could go on and on and on.

This amendment is clearly worse than the previous one. If we have riverboat gambling — and it is not gaming — if we have riverboat gambling in Pennsylvania, we will create all sorts of horrible social problems throughout our great Commonwealth. You know, all you need to do is read the stories that have been in the New York Times and Time magazine and on CNN, stories for Mississippi and New Jersey and other places where casinos have operated, and you have seen the broken families, the broken lives, the increased crime, the felonies. Money that should be going for groceries and kids' clothing is going to feed a habit; a very, very bad habit. If this passes today, this will certainly be a red-letter day in our 200-and-some-year history.

I would ask all folks to make sense of this issue, to look at the facts and the figures, and think about what happens if we have these casinos — and they will be just like casinos in Las Vegas and New Jersey — in our State, and I would urge a "no" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Chester County, Mr. Schroder, is recognized on the amendment.

Mr. SCHRODER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if I were to interrogate the prime sponsor of the amendment, which I am not, I have decided against doing, because there are a couple things, I think, that are obvious about the amendment that I would just like to point out for the benefit of the members and the benefit of the folks viewing back home.

Mr. Speaker, nowhere in this amendment is the word "gambling" even mentioned. In fact, they stay far away from that term, and I guess for very good reasons if you are coming at it from their perspective. But the word "gaming devices" and "gaming" is proposed to be used in the referendum that would go on the ballot. Now, I guess, Mr. Speaker, that is a little more innocuous term, it is a little softer term, it might sell a little better with the voters, and it might; who knows. But I guess that is one of the things that bothers me most about this whole debate, that the casino industry and the gambling industry tries to promote this really as something that it is not. It is gambling, and I do not think anyone out there should be misled by the softer, kinder, gentler term, whatever you want to call it, of "gaming."

Something else I would like to point out about the proposed referendum is it talks about navigable waterways, having riverboats on navigable waterways, but everyone should know that nowhere in here is there a requirement that the boat navigate anywhere. There is no requirement that it be an actual seaworthy boat that will navigate any of our rivers in this State. It will, most likely, be tied and moored to a dock and will never leave the dock and will actually be no different than any other land-based casino. So I think those are a few of the important facts that needed to be pointed out about the amendment that we are being asked to vote on here today.

Mr. Speaker, when this debate on riverboat gambling started a few hours ago, there were some comments made that I think need to be addressed. It was made by a distinguished Representative from Philadelphia on the other side of the aisle, and basically, it was a call, in my opinion, it was a call to fight social problems by merely adding and compounding our social problems.

We are being asked to gamble on education in this amendment and in this whole concept, is what we are being asked to do — gamble with our kids' education. We are being asked to increase addiction, bankruptcy, and suicide all in the name of solving various social problems. Mr. Speaker, I must profess I do not understand the concept and the argument and why we are even being asked to do that, but nonetheless, that is what is being suggested that we do here today.

Mr. Speaker, I hope there will be a lot of economic development if this thing passes. I hope there will be a lot of economic development moneys coming into the Commonwealth, because we are going to need them, because we are going to have to rebuild what we destroy through this process.

A case in point: There was an article from the Philadelphia Inquirer, a 1996 article, that talks about riverboat gambling in Illinois, and far from it being a bonanza, the article reports that it is draining as much as \$500 million a year from the State's economy.

The study for the Better Government Association, which is a Chicago-based watchdog group, said that the social costs of gambling, along with the infrastructure and regulatory expenses associated with floating casinos, exceeded \$250 million a year in Illinois. At the same time, the study said, the communities surrounding the State's 10 riverboats lose \$240 million every year, and that is money that would have been spent otherwise in shops, restaurants, and the local economies. It is lost at the casinos. That is the cannibalization effect that we have heard about from other speakers here today.

The author of the study says, there is an overwhelming problem here, a fundamental flaw in logic, a mistake of dramatic proportions at the heart of this concept. It was all dependent on tourists in Chicago and Illinois, and they did not come. Only new out-of-State tourists spending new money in the casino would create jobs and economic development. That did not happen. It also points out that that is the way it is likely to occur in Philadelphia as well. It says it is more likely the customers of riverboats on the Delaware in Philadelphia would be new gamblers from Philadelphia, said this professor, William M. Thompson, of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and he predicts it will be a net economic loss for Philadelphia.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I hope we have a lot of economic development money that comes from this, because we are going to need it. We are going to need to rebuild what we destroy through this riverboat gambling.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned about the amendment, the promoters of this concept frequently soft-pedal their intentions while pitching their plans to citizens and public officials. Once they get a foot in the door, however, gambling interests push relentlessly for expansion until they receive virtually wide-open, unlimited gambling, the carte blanche that they always desired in the first place.

Just a few cases in point. The Louisiana legislature approved riverboat gambling on ships that cruise, but the State now has dockside gambling. The gambling interests, the gambling vessels in Louisiana, routinely flout the cruising requirements and instead remain moored at their docks in order to earn greater profits.

Iowa became the first State to allow riverboat casinos in 1991 with loss limits of \$5 per bet or \$200 per riverboat excursion. A few years later, under heavy pressure from the casino interests, the

legislature voted to drop the betting limits and also to permit slot machine gambling at racetracks.

So, you see, Mr. Speaker, once we allow the foot in the door, once the camel gets his nose under the tent, they will be back for more and more and more and more, and if we do not have the ability to say no here today, this time, to draw the line in the sand to protect the people of Pennsylvania, how are we ever going to say no in the future?

So I hope you think about that this afternoon as we approach this vote, and I of course ask for a "no" vote, and I thank you for your time.

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to advise the members that he has given permission to John Foyt of channel 6 in Philadelphia to videotape with audio these House proceedings.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 255 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Chester County, Mr. Hershey.

Mr. HERSHEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I urge a "no" vote on amendment A0398, the riverboat gambling.

When I think of riverboat gambling, I think of the Delaware River; I think of Philadelphia, the City of Brotherly Love. When I think of Philadelphia, I think of sports, cheesesteaks, museums, concerts, history. Philadelphia is the cradle of liberty, Independence Hall. I think of the historic district. I think of Penn's Landing, beautiful places to visit and learn of the city's great past. If riverboat gambling goes in, this atmosphere will change.

Gambling is a negative method to raise money. It is bad public policy. Gambling preys on society's weaknesses. Government then will have to appropriate money to treat these weaknesses. We should not be going down this road.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware County, Mr. Vitali.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to the Evans amendment, and I am not going to repeat the opposition I expressed to slots at racetracks which concern the ills of gambling, which we have heard plenty of today, nor will I address the inappropriateness of the use of referendum.

I want to add a different element here. I just want to make the House members aware that the environmental community — in particular, the Sierra Club — also opposes riverboat gambling for very interesting reasons.

Mr. Speaker, riverboat gambling, particularly in rivers like the Susquehanna around Harrisburg or in the Wilkes-Barre area or in the Lehigh River in Allentown, would necessitate either the construction of new dams or the dredging of areas around these casinos and perhaps both. This would involve the destruction of fish and other aquatic life habitat, reducing spawning areas. It would also cause development on sensitive riverbanks. It would cause a loss of access to our public waterways. It would also reduce the quality of life along the riverfront. It would increase parking and pollution and otherwise degradate the quality of our

rivers, and also the riverboat discharge would also reduce the quality of our waters in Pennsylvania.

So, Mr. Speaker, I know in this issue we have heard many points on many issues, but if there is still one member out there on the fence and has sensitivity to environmental concerns, maybe this will be the point that will cause this amendment to be defeated. I certainly hope so. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Luzerne County, Mr. Tigie, is recognized on the amendment.

Mr. TIGUE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to interrogate the maker of the amendment, please, or someone else who may have the answer to a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Evans, is he willing to stand for interrogation? The gentleman indicates that he will stand for interrogation. You are in order.

Mr. TIGUE. Mr. Speaker, in the amendment that we are looking at, it mentions "navigable waterways," I believe. Could you tell me what waterways they are in the Commonwealth?

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, there are four different definitions of what is described as navigable waterways, and basically, these definitions, if you like, either I can provide it to you or read it to you.

Mr. TIGUE. I would prefer if we read them so we know what areas we are talking about in this question that is being asked.

Mr. EVANS. There is what you call navigable-in-fact, which basically describes rivers and other waterways which are used or could be used as highways of commerce. Then there is the State law definition of public highways. The General Assembly, by statute, could declare waterways to be public highways. And then there is the Federal Commerce Clause, which are Federal water pollution laws, and then there is the navigation servitude, which the Federal courts have broadened this definition. There are four different definitions, and the four different definitions would have to be defined by the General Assembly.

Mr. TIGUE. Well, my question is, we are asking people to vote on this question, and this question, based on your answer, your response is that we do not know what that means by "navigable waterways." We cannot determine when we vote what waterways are navigable.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, the definitions that I have here would have to be defined by the General Assembly. Even though that language is there that says "navigable waterways," there are four different definitions, and it would be up to the General Assembly to decide which definition would be used.

Mr. TIGUE. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. EVANS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TIGUE. I would like to make a comment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. TIGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the wording of this based on the answer I just received. I thought I would receive a different answer which would explain what waterways are navigable and where these casinos and riverboats would be allowed, and having received an answer which does not explain that, I guess I will vote "no." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. BIRMELIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will make my remarks brief as well, but I would just leave you with this thought: It is not right to do wrong to do right; it is not right to do wrong to do right.

We have heard over and over again from the proponents of this amendment, which has been rightly described by some of my fellow colleagues as a sham because we know it will be controlled by the pro-gambling interests; we know they will outspend those that are against it something like \$10 or \$20 to \$1, and so we know that this is not going to be a true objective measure of the people. So we know that we are going to hear this argument that, oh, it is a wonderful thing that we are doing because we are going to put money into education or we are going to do some economic development with it, and it is this old, flawed argument that somehow it must be right if we do something wrong in order to do a little bit of right, and I would ask members to, in their consciences, really examine that rationale.

Is it right for us to foist upon the people of Pennsylvania additional gambling, additional attempts to destroy families and all that it brings with it in order to throw a few bucks back into solving some of the problems of society? I submit to you that that is flawed reasoning. It ought to be rejected, and we ought to recognize that the reason we are doing this, the reason why we would be promoting riverboat gambling, as we would have been the slots in the tracks, is to make a few people a lot richer at the expense of a lot of other people.

And so I would ask that you would reject this amendment that calls for a sham of a public referendum, that is not going to measure anything, and will certainly be bought and paid for by gambling interests. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Adams County, Mr. Maitland.

Mr. MAITLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to this amendment as well as any others seeking to expand legalized gambling in Pennsylvania.

I have surveyed my constituency on this issue. They have wisely preferred not to support more gambling in Pennsylvania by the resounding margin of 70 percent.

I have visited riverboat casinos on a few occasions. I witnessed firsthand the unfulfilled promises of riverboat gambling on the Gulf Coast of Mississippi. For a time the small towns enjoyed a brief false prosperity — new sidewalks and repaired streets abounded — but the industry overbuilt, and I saw failing casinos and half-built ones that would never be finished, standing like skeletal monuments to glib promises, and the tax revenues ceased flowing.

Consider the great jobs created by casinos — low-wage, hourly-rate jobs without benefits; working late at night in smoke-filled, alcohol-soaked, cacophonous halls where every employee is treated like a potential thief, mistreated and surveilled by their heartless overseers. And I saw the money — thick wads of big bills — vanish down the slots, at the tables at a rate to make the Federal government green with envy, gone to no productive purpose. There is only one word fit to describe a person who leaves a casino after gambling, and it is "loser."

The hope of getting casino money, be it winnings or tax revenue, is a fool's hope for fool's gold. Let us not make losers of our people or our State. Our message should be, not with our blessing, not in our State. We have so much more to offer. Work hard and save your money.

Vote "no" on more gambling in Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster County, Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a girl, a 17-year-old student, from the Tunica Institute of Learning. She is an 11th grade honor student, and she lives in Mississippi, in Tunica County, that recently realized riverboat gambling. And I would like to read her letter. It will not take me long, but I would like to read it to give you an idea as to what kind of effects that she has seen in her community.

"My home, Tunica County, Miss., isn't what it used to be. This quiet, farm-based community has been turned upside down by a new arrival – the gambling industry.

"A few years ago, the casinos were allowed to set up business along the Mississippi River in our county. On levees where my father once herded cattle and in fields where cotton and soybeans used to grow, there has arisen the second biggest center of gambling in the United States.

"Now, because of the 10 big casino-hotel complexes, U.S. 61 from Memphis carries 300,000 vehicles a day instead of the 4,000 a day in 1990, before the first casino arrived.

"Many people thought the coming of the casinos would be the opportunity of a lifetime for our county. Some thought they'd get rich by opening businesses that catered to the visitors who were sure to flock in.

"But the casinos are outside of town by the levee, and the road leading to them bypasses Tunica's central business area. Already, the dreams of many local business people have been replaced by FOR SALE signs in windows. The old town is drying up. Soon the local restaurants will close, and the only alternative for dining will be the buffets and restaurants at the casinos.

"Folks were under the illusion that casino money would trickle down to every person in the county and improve everyone's lives.

"The reality is that only a few people benefitted, and most of them had never set foot in Tunica County before the casinos were built. They arrived already employed by big international gambling firms like Bally's, Circus Circus, and Harrah's. And the casino profits? They aren't invested in the local economy. They are sent back to corporate headquarters in places like Las Vegas and New York.

"We are led to believe that everybody wins at the casinos. You can eat a fancy meal on the cheap, take a chance on winning big, and then head...home having had a great time.

"Wrong! The casinos use their persuasive power to bring you back for more so they can take you for all you have. Why else all the free gimmicks? Why else would they allow people to cash their paychecks at the casinos?

"And the promised local benefits? Sure, there are more tax dollars for the local schools than we've ever seen" before, but listen to this: "But it hasn't changed the test scores. In fact, the state has just recently taken control of the failing Tunica County public school system.

"And a few thousand folks – many of them former farm workers – are being paid minimum wage for jobs in casinos. But to get and hold these jobs, they put their children in casino-run day-care centers where the kids learn to blow their allowances on arcade machines conveniently housed in the day-care facilities.

"I fear a false illusion of prosperity will soon be replaced by an economic disaster for our county. I hope my generation will fight for traditional values and against that which will destroy us. These levees were a better place when my father herded cattle on them.

"Other rural communities beware. Life won't be the same once the casinos come."

Mr. Speaker, this expansion of gambling – and that is what it clearly is – it probably could have been argued with the last vote that we had that we have facilities that already have gambling and we are going to provide slots in them and that maybe that is not an expansion. I beg to differ, but that could be argued. But this is clearly an expansion of gambling, and gambling is used – I believe it has even been said before here – it really is a tax against the poor.

I would like to read something further about this aspect: "Gambling is not the 'painless' tax that gambling promoters like to claim. Rather, it is a highly regressive form of taxation that thrives by inducing false hopes among the financially destitute. Government's multibillion-dollar annual take from gambling activities comes disproportionately from the pockets of America's poor. This has been most clearly evidenced in numerous statewide studies of lottery behavior over the last couple of decades. However, as casinos, racetracks and the like are made more accessible, it has become increasingly clear that all forms of gambling prey heavily on those with meager financial resources.

"A 1996 Mississippi State University study found that poor Mississippians living in counties with casinos lost a far greater percentage of their income in the casinos than did wealthier gamblers. Gamblers earning less than \$10,000 per year lost about 10 percent" – that is \$1,000 – "of their family income to casinos, while those earning more than \$40,000 spent only about 1 percent" – \$400 – "of their earnings on casino gambling.

"In a 1994 survey, 50 percent of Wisconsin casino gamblers reported an annual household income below \$30,000....

"A study of 1,800 Minnesotans in state-run gambling treatment programs found that 52 percent had yearly incomes of \$20,000 or less. The study also discovered that the amount of debt, as a proportion of income, was highest among the poorest gamblers seeking treatment.

"University of North Florida researchers reported: 'Gambling expenditures in Las Vegas indicate a regressive pattern for gambling taxes because the percentage of household income devoted to gambling falls consistently as income rises.' For instance, Las Vegas casino gamblers with household annual incomes of less than \$10,000 lost 3.25 percent of their income to casino gambling. Those with annual incomes between \$50,000 and \$60,000, by comparison, lost only .8 percent of their income to the casinos.

"Seven percent of Illinois casino gamblers surveyed reported annual incomes below \$10,000. Half of these individuals reported losing at least \$1,900 to the casinos in the previous year.

"The 32 Colorado counties with the highest per-capita lottery sales all have per-capita income levels below the state average.

"In New York, those living in the most impoverished areas of the state spent eight times more of their income on lottery tickets than did those living in the most affluent sections.

"Almost half...of California lottery players have household incomes below \$35,000.

"The three poorest counties in New Mexico all rank among the state's top 10 counties in per-capita lottery sales. New Mexico's

wealthiest county accounts for the fewest lottery ticket purchases per resident.

“An Associated Press survey of Wisconsin lottery purchases found that residents living in the poorest neighborhoods in the state spent, on average, four times as much of their income on lottery tickets as did those in wealthier neighborhoods.

“A University of Louisville study showed that Kentuckians with annual incomes less than \$15,000 spent \$9.23 per week” on an average “on lottery tickets, while those earning above \$35,000 spent only \$7.36.

“A Texas A&M study found that the lowest-income group of Texans, who earn only 2 percent of the state’s total income, provide 10 percent of the lottery’s revenue.

“Research among Maryland’s largest counties revealed that per-capita lottery sales are highest in the state’s poorest county, while the richest county has the lowest per-capita lottery sales.”

And then finally, “The 1976 U.S. federal gambling commission found that the poorest Americans spend three times as much of their income on gambling compared to the wealthiest Americans.”

Mr. Speaker, we argue from time to time on this House floor about trying to help those that are financially stressed – trying to provide the tax breaks for them, trying to provide the income and the jobs for them – and now we are going to turn around and put something that we know – we know; it has been documented over and over again – is going to hurt them. It is going to take more money out of their pockets. Well, maybe the tax that we have forgiven them over this past budget cycle, we are just going to take that back; we are going to take that back, Mr. Speaker. We are Indian givers. We are taking that money back.

Please, for the sake of the poor in our communities, vote “no” on this amendment.

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to advise the members that he has given permission to Gregg Hamlin of WPHL-TV to videotape with audio the House floor proceedings on SB 255, and that he has given permission to Joe Camut of WHTM-TV to videotape with audio the proceedings on SB 255.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 255 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Centre County, Mr. Benninghoff, is recognized on the amendment.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Mr. Speaker, for a “no” vote from everybody, I will waive off.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman from Butler County, Mr. Metcalfe, is recognized on the amendment.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

I have got a question for everybody. Why are all free governments instituted? As we read in the Pennsylvania Constitution, free governments are instituted for our peace, safety, and happiness. So my question to every member here and those who are not, does this legislation promote peace, safety, and happiness?

I would like to share some facts with you, unlike the hollow promises that you see in this amendment. I would like to compare Nevada to 49 other States: Nevada being the first in suicide, the first in divorce, the first in high school dropouts, the first in

homicide against women, at the top in gambling addictions, third in bankruptcies, fourth in rape, fourth in alcohol-related deaths, fifth in crime, sixth in the number of prisoners locked up, in the top third of our nation in child abuse, and guess what – dead last in voter participation.

Mr. EACHUS. Mr. Speaker?

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

Mr. EACHUS. Sir, we are a little bit far afield of the content on this issue, sir. I would like some help from the Chair to try and hone in on the debate, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will pay closer attention. The Chair was engaged in a conversation up here.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. METCALFE. I think all of what I have said is relevant. Gambling is harmful to our communities and to our Commonwealth.

Peace, safety, and happiness, which our government has been instituted for, are not what gambling will help. Do the statistics that I read here today sound like peace, safety, and happiness? No, they do not.

We are not moral policemen, as was already said here today. We are lawmakers in this Commonwealth. We should be making laws that promote peace, safety, and happiness, for as we know, that is why our free government has been instituted.

And in this constitutional republic in which we live, in this constitutional republic where the voters of our districts have voted us to come and represent them, we should be looking out for their peace, safety, and happiness today, and I would urge you to do that by voting “no” for this amendment and for this bill. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Clymer, is recognized for the second time. The gentleman defers? Defers. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Mr. Rohrer, from Berks County is recognized. The gentleman waives off. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Mr. Masland, on the amendment.

Mr. MASLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will be brief, Mr. Speaker, because I think we are nearing the opportunity to vote on this amendment.

I only want to make a few points. First of all, I think it is important to point out that even if you supported the DiGirolamo amendment, to vote against this amendment is not inconsistent. This is not a question of just saying, well, I am for referendum in general. The fact is that there is a big difference between that amendment and this. On the positive side for the DiGirolamo amendment, at least it only dealt with slot machines at existing racetracks. Now, we do not know what the language will end up being, but that was the focus of it.

On the other hand, this amendment deals with riverboats on any navigable waterway. What is that? What really is a riverboat? Is a riverboat any boat in any river? Is it a big boat in a big river? A little boat in a little river? A boat in a mote? Is it all of the above, or is it none of the above? I think we have a vote over here for none of the above. I think, hopefully, it will be none of the above.

I urge you to vote your conscience on this. Your conscience is the most important thing, more important than a sense of whether or not you are being inconsistent because they are both referendums. We are asking the people to vote on something totally different than the DiGirolamo amendment and something

so big, so large, that we cannot put a handle on it here today and the voters surely will not be able to put a handle on it in May or November or anytime in the near future.

So again I urge a "no" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. James, is recognized on the amendment.

Mr. JAMES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that all we are asking for here is to allow a referendum to be put on the ballot so that therefore we can let the people decide on whether or not they want riverboat gambling. So I will say, Mr. Speaker, that since we represent the people, we work for the people, that we should just let the people decide, and that we should support this amendment so that they can have a referendum so that people can make a wise decision as to their vote.

So again, I would ask my colleagues to support the Evans amendment.

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to advise the members that he has given permission to Paul Feiling of WPXI-TV in Pittsburgh to videotape with audio the House floor proceedings on SB 255.

GUEST INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to welcome Gail M. Greth, a district justice, who is here as a guest of the Berks County delegation, and she is seated to the left of the Speaker. Would she please rise. Welcome to the hall of the House.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 255 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Horsey, from Philadelphia County.

Mr. HORSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are numerous people for the last 2 years that I have been here who have been advocating property tax reform, Mr. Speaker, and now, Mr. Speaker, the Evans amendment offers us some type of property tax reform, Mr. Speaker, because the Evans amendment requires — requires — that a portion of the profits from this enterprise go to education, Mr. Speaker. And what fuels education in this State? Property taxes. So whatever is not paid in property taxes will be assumed by the profits of this particular venture.

There are persons from other areas of the State, Mr. Speaker, who have said, well, I want a fire station and I think that, you know, my district should have a fire station out of this venture or a police station or a new police car, and I am not getting anything out of it, so I am not— Well, Mr. Speaker, another component of the Evans amendment, Mr. Speaker, is a call for economic development, Mr. Speaker. The profits will be used for education and economic development, and I happen to believe in my heart, Mr. Speaker, and I may be wrong, that fire stations and police stations qualify as economic development in certain areas, Mr. Speaker.

Now, there is a recent report that provided a statement regarding the amounts of money that New Jersey made.

New Jersey made \$4.3 billion in profits last year, and it has been estimated, Mr. Speaker, that close to \$1 billion of that \$4 billion came from out of Pennsylvania generally and Philadelphia specifically, Mr. Speaker. Just recently Delaware implemented gambling, Mr. Speaker, and in 60 days they made \$50 million, and they are less than 20 minutes away from the Pennsylvania borderline and/or Philadelphia.

Every State that borders Pennsylvania has some form of gambling, Mr. Speaker. Now, this particular amendment, the Evans amendment, Mr. Speaker, says that gambling will be on waterways. Most of the State is landlocked, Mr. Speaker. It is only for certain areas of the State that would benefit from this.

So, please, for the previous speakers, please. As the song goes, "Don't cry for me." In Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Erie, we will handle it; we will handle it. Trust me, we will handle it, Mr. Speaker, because it has been estimated that if this bill passes, it will mean about 4,000 jobs to Philadelphia alone.

We cannot afford not to vote on this, Mr. Speaker, because while there is a booming economy all over the State, guess what? It has not arrived in many of the urban areas and in Philadelphia specifically, Mr. Speaker. There was a time in Philadelphia just recently where Philadelphia was losing an average of 1,000 jobs a week, Mr. Speaker. This amendment by Mr. Evans will allow us to recapture some of those jobs lost.

I feel very strange here speaking on this particular issue, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER (MATTHEW J. RYAN) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

There are too many conversations taking place on the floor. If you must engage in conversations, please do so in one of the rear chambers. Again, there are too many conversations on the floor. Members, please take your seats.

By way of general information, I have been advised by a member of the Senate staff that no further votes will be taken in the Senate today, although the Senate will hold its desk open to receive any bills that we might send them, and that they are shortly going to adjourn until March 8, I think it is.

The gentleman, Mr. Horsey.

Mr. HORSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When the gentleman previous to me spoke, he spoke about safety and peace, but I do not know where he comes from, but to me, Mr. Speaker, government is for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and the Evans bill provides liberty — the ability to choose — and the pursuit of happiness is, if people choose to vote or choose to go and play, gamble, then this bill allows them to do that; it allows additional freedom. It allows the public to go to the polls and choose whether they want gambling in their State; it allows people, if they choose to gamble, to in fact do that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the Evans amendment, amendment A0398. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. GIGLIOTTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Dwight Evans amendment on riverboat gambling.

I guess everybody in this chamber knows that I have been pushing for riverboat gambling for the last 10 years, and I have been sitting here, like all of us, and listening to the opposition of expanding gaming in Pennsylvania.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me give you some facts about gambling in Pennsylvania. Has anybody in this room ever been to Las Vegas? Has anybody visited the Las Vegas Commission? Let me tell you, they have a picture of every major city in the United States in Las Vegas. Pennsylvania is rated the fourth largest State for gambling. That means all residents, whether you like it or know it or believe it, go elsewhere to gamble.

Number two, all the lobbyists you see out in the hallways there are being paid by Delaware, West Virginia, Atlantic City, and including Las Vegas. They do not want you to vote on expanding gambling in Pennsylvania. You know, the single and the most important reason why is because 68 percent of our residents go elsewhere to gamble. Whether we pass this or do not pass this, it is going to continue to happen.

All this bill does is require a referendum. We will come back in the summer and the fall and do substance legislation. I am asking you to give me a vote on a referendum; that is all. And if you are not happy with the bill that we all construct through the summer or in the fall from the result of these referendums, I will stand with you and vote it down, but give me a chance and give the people that we all represent a chance to vote this up or vote it down. I am asking you to vote for expansion of riverboat gaming in Pennsylvania. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Trello.

Mr. TRELLO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for all three of these initiatives today, but that does not mean I support all three of them, and that is an actual fact. The only thing that I support is to allow the people of Pennsylvania to tell us once and for all to kill this issue or keep it alive one way or the other, and I will abide by whatever they decide.

We do not have to have gambling in Pennsylvania for people to gamble. For goodness' sakes, at the Super Bowl do you know how much money was bet on the Super Bowl? They estimate \$10 billion was bet on the Super Bowl, and nobody benefited a dime. We did not get one penny in taxes from that \$10 billion on the Super Bowl.

A gentleman got up and talked about, you know, promises that we are making that we cannot keep. Well, the only promise I want to make is that I will keep a promise and abide by the will of the people.

And, you know, you talk about gambling. Every one of our newspapers— You pick up the newspaper in the sports page and what will you see? The morning line. And it will tell you who is going to beat whom. Will Villanova beat Seton Hall or will Pittsburgh beat Duquesne, and they give you the spot — 7½, favored by 10, or favored by 15. I guarantee you, the newspapers do not print that for Sunday school. They print that to let the people of Pennsylvania that want to bet know what the line is.

So, I mean, you know, even our lottery. There was doom and gloom when we initiated the lottery bill here. You talk about it is terrible and illegal and it is immoral to gamble. I am willing to say that maybe everyone in this chamber today or almost everyone in this chamber today has bought a lottery ticket for \$1. I think everybody has bought a scratch-off. We have even got things for Valentine's Day, you know, the Valentine thing to scratch off.

I think everybody has bought a ticket. If you bought a ticket and you are speaking against this, then you are a gambler, because we have legalized gambling in Pennsylvania. If you bought a ticket, you have gambled.

So, you know, if you are telling me how terrible gambling is — and I will have to admit it is terrible for somebody that has an addiction — but, you know, I am not sure if our lottery has any money set aside for habitual gamblers. I am told that it does not, but I guarantee you that if any one of these issues would come up, I will make sure that there are issues in here to help people that have a problem with gambling.

So, I mean, the bottom line here is this: You know, we can think what we want, but the only thing that this amendment is doing is asking the people of Pennsylvania, do you want to expand gambling? Your "yes" vote does not mean that you support it. Your "yes" vote only means that you want the people of Pennsylvania for a change to tell you whether they want it or not, and I promise you, whatever they decide, I will abide by it. So let us give them a chance to express their views on this issue and vote "yes" on this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware County, Mr. Gannon.

Mr. GANNON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

There is a vision of riverboats that is sold by the spin doctors who want to push this enterprise in Pennsylvania and around the country, and the vision is of the serene riverboat with genteel people, ladies with their parasols, and nice music flowing forth, and nice restaurants, and bands and dancing and people enjoying themselves, and taking us back to those nostalgic years, days of yesteryear, when things were not quite as complex or technical as they are today, but that vision is not the reality.

The reality is that these are gambling, these are floating casinos; that is it. No-holds-barred, bust-out, wide-open gambling — craps, cards, slot machines, keno, you name it — that is what is going to be there, and it is going to be there for one purpose, and that is to take money from the people that go on board that boat, and better yet, if they leave the dock, because they will be captive for several hours, so they will not be able to leave when they feel their luck has run out. They will only be able to leave when they are broke.

And what will happen with this amendment? Look at the amendment, Mr. Speaker. This is wide open, no holds barred. At least when we were dealing with the slots at the tracks, we were looking at four specific locations in Pennsylvania where there is some type of gambling already, albeit betting on horses. We know the locations. We know the limitations. We have a pretty good idea of what is going to happen. With this amendment, we have no idea how many boats are going to be out there, Mr. Speaker. We are going to be lining the docks of Philadelphia with riverboat after riverboat after riverboat with its neon lights and its girlish appearance casting dark shadows over the skyline of Philadelphia. I think that is what we are looking at, Mr. Speaker.

And what we are looking at is millions and millions of dollars dumped into Pennsylvania by national casino interests who are going to want to have a piece of a riverboat. We are going to see billboards up and down the turnpike, up and down Interstate 95, and it is going to show the happy gambler throwing the dice. That is not the reality, Mr. Speaker. The reality is, gambling will be the

principal enterprise in Pennsylvania, and I do not think we want that.

This amendment is too wide open; it is too much for mischief. There are not enough parameters here. I am very concerned, because we do not know how many boats we are talking about or where they are going to be, what the table limits will be, whether or not there is going to be credit, how much they are going to pay in taxes and revenues, what type of benefit will they be to the economy.

And you have to remember, when we looked at this issue several years ago, the economy—the economy—at that time was driving this issue. Pennsylvania has been thriving over the past several years. There is no need for this type of enterprise to raise taxes, to raise money for our governments. We have a surplus here in Pennsylvania. Most of our major cities are doing very well. They do not need this type of enterprise to raise revenue. The money is there already, and that, Mr. Speaker, is the only reason that we should consider riverboats in Pennsylvania.

And look at what will happen to our riverfronts. Go down to Philadelphia today to our waterfront. It is beautiful. We have fine restaurants; we have fine hotels. It is a place you will not be ashamed to take your family to to enjoy a day.

Well, what is going to happen with riverboats? Are you going to take your family down? You will not have any view because it is going to be blocked by gambling ships, because they will line them up as close as they can and as many as they can. And make no mistake about it, the national gambling interests will be in Pennsylvania and they will be spending every penny that they think it is going to take to put boats on the eastern and western parts of Pennsylvania.

We just do not know what is going to happen, Mr. Speaker. This amendment is too broad; it is too generic; it is too open for mischief, and I urge a “no” vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Mr. Evans. Will the gentleman yield.

Members, please take your seats. Conversations on the floor, please.

Mr. Evans.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I am going to say something to you that is probably a surprise to you. That last gentleman who spoke, would you believe he and I are from the same neighborhood?

The SPEAKER. Is that a rhetorical question, Mr. Evans?

Mr. EVANS. Yes. He and I are from the same neighborhood, and, Mr. Speaker, I promised him, since the other gentleman was trying to get me to guarantee, I had promised him a T-shirt, and the T-shirt would say, something is happening in West Oak Lane. I am still going to give him the T-shirt, Mr. Speaker, because he is still my friend. Even though he and I agree to disagree, we are from the same neighborhood. The neighborhood is still good, and you can help the neighborhood. You can help the neighborhood by giving the voters of my neighborhood, like your neighborhood, a chance to vote. I understand your frustration and I understand your feeling, but give our neighbors a chance to vote, because I know you want people in West Oak Lane and Philadelphia and Delaware County and Lancaster and Greene and all those places to have an opportunity to vote.

I know that even though he was expressing some anger, Mr. Speaker, I know he believes in democracy. I know he believes in the marketplace. I know he believes that government cannot do it all, and he recognized that we need the private sector and we

need private dollars. I know that he fully understands that it is the marketplace that creates jobs. It is not government that creates jobs; it is not surpluses that create jobs; it is the private sector that creates jobs.

Just think about this entire industry we can create, Mr. Speaker. The State cannot create that industry, but the private sector can create that. So when the gentleman talks about using the surplus—and the Governor gave a speech a couple weeks ago and said we need that money in the Rainy Day Fund, that \$700 million to \$800 million—I cannot believe, Mr. Speaker, that that gentleman was talking about spending that money that is in that Rainy Day Fund; I cannot believe he was talking about spending that money. The fact of the matter is that we need to have a private-sector initiative drive the opportunity for everybody in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

You know, Mr. Speaker, if people are probably listening to this on the radio, they are probably thinking something is wrong with our roles; it is like a switch in our roles. We have a Republican talking about spending more money out of the surplus and you have got a Democrat talking about using the marketplace to create entrepreneurship and opportunity. Well, you know, miracles will never cease, Mr. Speaker.

I would only say this to my friend from West Oak Lane—and he is my friend—I would say this to him: I know he did not mean what he said. I know that he understands that jobs and businesses are driven by the marketplace. This is a job-education initiative that the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will decide. They will decide yes or no if they think we should use this revenue for the purposes of education and economic development. And we need to be clear about that, that the ultimate decision is not going to be made in this room; it is going to be made among the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. This is a market-private sector initiative. This is something that everybody should be for, because if we understand that government is not going to be able to solve all of our problems and needs, the fact is we need to put this on the ballot and we need to vote “yes.”

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. Briefly, Mr. Speaker.

I have some folks in Greene and Fayette and Washington Counties, Mr. Speaker, that are in favor of riverboat gaming, and I have some folks in Greene and Fayette and Washington Counties that are against riverboat gaming. But we have a broad-bosomed Monongahela River running right through our area, and it could accommodate this kind of facility, which could help raise hundreds of millions of dollars, which would defray our State tax burden.

All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, on this amendment is, if we vote favorably on this amendment, on the Evans amendment, the people in Greene, Fayette, and Washington Counties will be able to decide for themselves whether they want a riverboat down at Greene Cove, whether they want a riverboat up in Brownsville. We have some entrepreneurs, we have some small business and some medium-sized business men and women back home that want to pursue this, and we have some interests back home that are dead set against this.

In this multifaceted, multifold, multiplex democracy of ours, gaming as an issue, in my view, in our State, a la the comments of Governor Ridge, should be put on the ballot. This is only a vote to put riverboat gaming on the ballot so that the majority of people who are either in favor or against can express their will.

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

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Mr. Speaker, the amendment before us now, A0398, proposes a major and very serious expansion of the gambling industry into Pennsylvania. Unlike the prior, rather limited authorization of slot machines at just four racetracks across the State, this riverboat gambling proposal would cultivate a new industry where none now exists, and where our laws have always, with good common sense, prevented them from germinating.

Our Commonwealth should turn back the transient appeal of this "get rich quick" mentality, which would undoubtedly bring with it an attendant long-term social cost we cannot afford. It is foolish to fall prey to the "quick fix" mentality while trying to carry on the hard work of underpinning our economic redevelopment. Let us reject the easy solution in favor of the tried-and-true. Let us defeat this proposal.

Thank you.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair apologizes for its failure to recognize a group of 25 students from the Philadelphia area who have traveled to Harrisburg today. The purpose of their visit is to meet with legislators and members of the administration to talk about teenage highway fatalities, graduated driver licensing systems, and the enforcement of our seatbelt laws. These 25 students are seated in the balcony. They are the guests of Representative Myers. Will the guests please rise.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 255 CONTINUED

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—92

Table listing names of members who voted 'YEAS' (92 total). Includes names like Bard, Barrar, Bebk-Jones, Belardi, Belfanti, Bishop, Butkovitz, Buxton, Caltagirone, Cappabianca, Cam, Casorio, Civera, Cohen, L. I., Cohen, M., Colafella, Corrigan, Costa, Daley, DeLuca, Dermody, DeWeese, DiGirolamo, Donatucci, Eachus, Evans, Fichter, Frankel, Gigliotti, Gladeck, Grucela, Gruitza, Haluska, Harhai, Horsey, James, Kaiser, Keller, Kenney, LaGrotta, Laughlin, Lawless, Lederer, Lescovitz, Levdansky, Lucyk, Mann, Marsico, Mayernik, McGeehan, Melio, Michlovic, Micozzie, Myers, O'Brien, Oliver, Perzel, Pesci, Petrone, Pistella, Preston, Ramos, Raymond, Readshaw, Rieger, Roberts, Robinson, Roebuck, Rooney, Ruffing, Sainato, Santoni, Scrimenti, Shaner, Staback, Tangretti, Taylor, J., Thomas, Travaglio, Trello, Trich, Tulli, Van Horne, Veon, Walko, Washington, Williams, Wogan, Wojnaroski, Wright, Youngblood, Yudichak.

NAYS—110

Table listing names of members who voted 'NAYS' (110 total). Includes names like Adolph, Allen, Argall, Armstrong, Baker, Barley, Bastian, Battisto, Benninghoff, Birmelin, Blaum, Boyes, Browne, Bunt, Cawley, Chadwick, Clark, Clymer, Cornell, Coy, Curry, Dailey, Dally, Dempsey, Druce, Egolf, Fairchild, Fargo, Feese, Fleagle, Flick, Forcier, Freeman, Gannon, Geist, George, Godshall, Gordner, Habay, Hanna, Harhart, Hasay, Hennessey, Herman, Hershey, Hess, Hutchinson, Jadlowiec, Josephs, Kirkland, Krebs, Leh, Lynch, Maher, Maitland, Major, Manderino, Markosek, Masland, McCall, McGill, McIlhattan, McIlhinney, McNaughton, Metcalfe, Miller, R., Miller, S., Mundy, Nailor, Nickol, Orije, Petrarca, Phillips, Pippy, Platts, Reinard, Rohrer, Ross, Rubley, Samuelson, Sather, Saylor, Schroder, Schuler, Semmel, Serafini, Seyfert, Smith, B., Smith, S. H., Snyder, Solobay, Stairs, Steelman, Steil, Stern, Stetler, Stevenson, Strittmatter, Sturla, Surra, Taylor, E. Z., Tigie, True, Vance, Vitali, Wilt, Yewcic, Zimmerman, Zug, Ryan, Speaker.

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

Mr. TRELLO offered the following amendment No. A0397:

Amend Title, page 1, line 4, by removing the period after "minors" and inserting;

and providing for a nonbinding Statewide referendum to determine the will of the electorate related to gaming devices and activities.

Amend Bill, page 2, line 2, by striking out all of said line and inserting

Section 2. (a) The Secretary of the Commonwealth shall cause to be placed on the ballot, at the primary election occurring at least 30 days next following the effective date of this act, a nonbinding referendum to determine the will of the electorate of this Commonwealth with respect to gaming devices at establishments licensed by the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board.

(b) The referendum question shall be in substantially the following form:

Do you favor the passage of legislation by the General Assembly to permit the licensing and strict regulation of limited electronic gaming in certain liquor-licensed establishments in order to provide additional funding for education and economic development?

(c) The referendum shall be advertised and conducted in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code.

(d) If more than one referendum question is placed on the ballot, the Secretary of the Commonwealth shall cause each referendum question to be separately numbered.

Section 3. This act shall take effect immediately.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On the question of the adoption of the Trello amendment.

Mr. TRELLO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Just a minute, Mr. Trello.

The amendment that Mr. Trello is offering is on your desk labeled as a Veon amendment.

Mr. Trello.

Mr. TRELLO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment today allows video gaming in liquor-license establishments, veterans clubs, fraternal organizations, and other establishments that have a liquor license.

It is only a question for our constituents to tell us yes or no on this issue. As chairman of the Finance Committee when I was majority chairman, we traveled all over this State on video poker and had public hearings all over the State, from Erie to the Poconos to Delaware down to Fayette and Greene Counties, and we took testimony from everybody from both sides of this issue, and we were fair.

Not only did we have issues on video poker but we also had public hearings on other issues such as the manufacturer's exemption. Boeing had a problem because they did not fall under the manufacturer's exemption, so we went to Delaware County and heard their problems, and we solved it by allowing them to fall under the manufacturer's exemption. We have also done that for different industries such as the automobile industry that rehabs automobile parts and we got them covered under the manufacturer's exemption. We also took care of the ma-and-pa bakeries throughout this Commonwealth so that they could qualify and be competitive with the big people in the baking industry under the manufacturer's exemption.

Today I bring to you a question about an industry that creates, that not creates but has about 340,000 jobs in Pennsylvania. They are probably the largest employer in the State of Pennsylvania — the liquor-license establishments in this great State of ours — and right now they tell me they need help. Because of the drunk driving law, Mr. Speaker, people just are not entertaining out anymore; they are entertaining at home, and they create these jobs and they pay an awful lot of taxes.

So I am asking you — and I am not going to continue this dialogue very long because everything that has been said about gambling has already been said — I ask you to do one thing that would allow this to let the people of Pennsylvania decide whether we should have video gaming in our liquor-license establishments, and I ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question, Mr. Clymer.

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to this amendment, A0397, the Trello amendment, that would allow for video poker machines in liquor-license establishments.

My major concern, and I hope it is yours as well, is that we have somewhere between 13,000 to 14,000 liquor-license establishments here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Now, while the bill does not indicate how many each would receive that is waiting for the enabling legislation — hopefully, we will defeat this proposal today — but if at a very conservative estimate — very conservative estimate — each of those liquor-license establishments receive three, three video poker machines, that would, simple mathematics, mean 36,000 — 36,000 — video machines across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. That is more video machines in Pennsylvania than they have in all the casinos in Atlantic City. So we are going into casino gambling in a major way.

And of course, we always have to look at the State of South Carolina, and that is a good example of what happens when a State tries to exert control over a few pinball machines. That is what the law was, I think back in 1988. They wanted to allow payout in South Carolina, a few pinball machines, help the mom-and-pops. What they did not realize when they passed it is that court action said that they could not only make payouts, but they could allow a kind of gambling to take place, and soon it grew. There were restrictions, so-called restrictions, in each of the establishments, that they could have only a few in one room. So you build extra rooms onto the establishment, add a few more machines — 32,500 video-type machines in South Carolina. The Governor tried to exercise some constraint and say, you know, this thing is getting out of hand; you know, this is not good for our people; we are receiving complaints. He tried to use the legislature to modify, to crack down a little bit on this issue, and what happened? The gambling cartels provided the money at the last election to his opponent, millions of dollars, and he was defeated.

My point is this, that once the door is open and once the gambling cartels are allowed to make their millions — and that is what they do — they have the ability to exercise control on government, and we do not need that here in Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania, a wonderful State; a hardworking group of legislators, a Governor. We have no need for these kinds of things.

And then there are the social problems. You know, I am not going to go into a litany of all the social problems; they have been outlined before, but just think about this. Think about this. We say drinking and driving, do not do it; it does not mix; we are going to penalize you. How about gambling and drinking — gambling and drinking — and that is what happens at many of these liquor-license establishments. And what happens? Dad, who had a paycheck, has none, goes in there and spends it, and many of you know firsthand of the problems that I am talking about. Many of you understand exactly the problems that I am outlining.

And of course, one of the problems in all of these things with slot machines and video poker machines is, how much can you spend? Is it a quarter? A dollar? The casinos in Atlantic City take \$20, \$50. So that is a problem you have to say to yourself, you know, we are going to legalize this; what are the total dollars that one machine will take, and be assured, be assured, the owners of the machines will get whatever they think they can from the public. So those are the kinds of concerns that I have.

As we talked about the very issue with riverboat gambling, as many of you have mentioned on both sides of the aisle, where are they going to be located? I mean, what ports, what rivers, would

they be able to exist? Well, video poker machines, because of the nature of our liquor-license establishments throughout the width and breadth of this Commonwealth, throughout the width and breadth of this Commonwealth, you would have these video poker machines, because there are liquor licenses all over. Out in the Pocono region, up in northern Pennsylvania, out in Erie, central Pennsylvania — no area can escape the fact that they will have these video poker machines. And of course, you know, we take pride in the Pocono region, and rightfully so, a place where families can go and have a good time, and yet with the attraction of video poker machines, be assured that many will become addicted to that gambling craze and not only destroy themselves but their families in the process.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have pointed out many of the concerns that I have, just a few of the concerns, quite frankly, I have with this kind of legislation. It is not good legislation. It is something that this General Assembly has looked at in the past and has, under very close scrutiny, not been very favorable to it, and I would hope that today as we continue this debate, that many will say this is not the kind of gambling apparatus we need for this Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Again, I just would like to remind the members, what are our efforts all about here today? It is to strengthen families, help the children, do those things that are going to make our communities and our neighborhoods strong, and I do not see how this adds any effort, any meaningful effort, into those efforts that all of us want to see occur. So, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment. Thank you.

GUEST INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair at this time is pleased to welcome to the hall of the House Ms. Jody Doherty, vice president of the world-class Pittsburgh Symphony. She is here as the guest of Representative Maher. Would she please stand.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 255 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Centre County, Mr. Benninghoff.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to speak with the maker of this amendment, please. Mr. Speaker, if I could, I would like to interrogate the maker of this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Trello, indicates he will stand for interrogation. You may begin.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to know how many machines that we are speaking of total, if he happens to know that number.

Mr. TRELLO. I am sorry; I did not hear the question.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. I am looking to see how many machines we are speaking of statewide, and in addition to that, is there a quota per establishment?

Mr. TRELLO. Well, there is no particular language dealing with that subject; this is only the referendum, but I would like to have you know that in 1990, this bill — video poker — passed the House by 127 votes, it passed the Senate by 37 votes, and Governor Casey vetoed it. In that piece of legislation, each liquor-license establishment was allowed to have three machines.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. In addition to that, does the maker know who will own these, or has anything been established as far as who will actually own the machines? Will it be the clubs or the taverns?

Mr. TRELLO. Well, that will be decided in the enabling legislation. In the bill that I had passed before, because of the maintenance problem and all the expense that went along with repairing these machines, they were owned by corporations that were responsible for all the repairs and maintenance at no expense to the State.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Is the maker aware that some of these establishments do allow underage individuals in them, some of our taverns?

Mr. TRELLO. No; that is not true. You have to be 21 under— Under my previous legislation, you had to be 21, and there were very stiff penalties. As a matter of fact, the penalties were a loss of your liquor license — first offense — a loss of your liquor license and a \$5,000 fine.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Well, I respect that that is the previous amendment, but we are talking about today's amendment, which really does not have much clarification on it, and my concern is that there are those establishments that do have a liquor license that allow minors into them. So therefore, we are going to have a complicated issue as far as—

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman, Mr. Benninghoff, asking a question?

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. I will place it as a question.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Mr. TRELLO. Well, I am sure that you and I and many members of this General Assembly have taken our family out to dinner to a restaurant that had a liquor license. What is the big problem?

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. My concern is that this will have an increased concern about children having access to these machines as well. Who will be policing that?

Mr. TRELLO. Well, I as a parent and I am sure you as a parent would not allow that, and I am sure that most Pennsylvanians would have the same feeling about that subject.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Well, if I might share with you a statistic that happened in New Jersey. It reports that last year 52,000—

The SPEAKER. Mr. Benninghoff, that would be more properly part of the debate in your argument stage rather than your question stage what is going on in other places. The purpose of what we are doing right now is to elicit information rather than to give information, if you please.

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

The SPEAKER. We have just got to tighten our rules up and get this over with.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. I respect that, Mr. Speaker. I thank you.

I thank the maker of the amendment as well, and again, I ask the members to think very carefully about this decision and to vote "no."

The SPEAKER. The question recurs, will the House adopt the amendment?

Mr. TRELLO. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware County, Mr. Kirkland.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Kirkland. After Mr. Kirkland, the gentleman, Mr. Trello, will be recognized.

Mr. Kirkland.

Mr. KIRKLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition of the Trello amendment.

Mr. Speaker, here we are again asking for an opportunity for gambling to take place within our communities. Here we are again, Mr. Speaker, saying how well this is going to help our communities and how this is going to help economic development and education. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, all we are doing now is providing our persons in Pennsylvania with compound addictions, multiple addictions now, Mr. Speaker. Not only will you have the opportunity to become addicted to gambling by way of video poker, but you can drink at the same time. Multiple addictions, Mr. Speaker: an addiction to alcohol and an addiction to gambling. This is not how we should be talking about bringing positive employment, positive economic development, to our constituents and to our communities.

Mr. Speaker, earlier I heard the speaker say that he has never heard of anyone lose their life savings, or I am sorry, he has never— He asked the question, Mr. Speaker, has anyone here in this House not gone to the store and purchased a lottery ticket, and he said more than likely everyone has. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am here to say that I never heard of anyone lose their life savings on one lottery ticket. I have never heard of one lose their life savings on one of those scratch-and-see or scratch-and-sniffs or whatever they are. I never heard of anyone lose their life savings on them. I have never heard of anyone lose their life savings on one Lay's potato chip. But, Mr. Speaker, I have heard of persons losing their life savings by sitting down at a video poker game putting coin after coin after coin after coin after coin in those machines, losing money, losing life savings, and at the same time beginning to find themselves indulging in drinking because they are so despondent. They are so frustrated that they are not winning, now they are trying to drown their sorrows.

Mr. Speaker, again, let us not compound the problem. Let us not continue to do that which is wrong, do that which is immoral. Let us do the right thing, Mr. Speaker. Again, let us get back to focusing on the real things, the real issues, that people want us to focus on. Folks say that this is a referendum and they are going to do it during the primary and what have you. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, most of the people probably will not be here to vote on it. Why? They will be losing their money in Atlantic City during that time.

Mr. Speaker, let us be real; let us be honest with our constituents. Let us vote this amendment down. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Venango, Mr. Hutchinson. The gentleman will yield.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pleased to welcome to the hall of the House today Mr. Rocco Bovalino and Brian Yaworsky, here today as the guests of the Beaver County delegation. They are seated to the left of the Chair. Would the gentlemen please rise.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 255 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Hutchinson.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to amendment A0397.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong the debate today, but I just wanted to touch on a few points that I do not think were stressed enough yet. Part of that is something that I continue to hear from the proponents of the expansion of gambling in Pennsylvania, and those proponents are trying to say that prosperity is free and that we can have everything we want and not have to pay a penny for it, that this is going to solve all our problems. You know, our property taxes are going to go down, we are going to have the greatest education, all because of gambling, but, Mr. Speaker, that is just not true.

I think we have heard many others prior to me that laid out a great case that gambling brings with it addiction, bankruptcy, crime, but one other thing that I wanted to talk about today is based on an article that, I believe it was in this morning's newspaper. It talks about the problems that gambling has caused among the teen population. It seems that many of our young people today, they have grown up in a very computer-oriented computer society, high-tech video games, and that has made them more susceptible to the high-tech slot machines and the appeal of those kinds of things. And not only that, you know, other than that, we find that in States that gambling is legal, young people are finding their way, illegally maybe, but it is much easier for them to get into, you know, bars or other establishments by making fake IDs in order to pursue that instant gratification that they get from gambling.

I think that gambling by minors is a very sad situation and something that we cannot stand for in Pennsylvania. I think other States like Ohio and Indiana, where there is easier access to gambling, the numbers prove that more and more minors are becoming addicted at younger and younger ages, and I think that is something, another great reason, for us to oppose this amendment, to oppose the expansion of gambling in Pennsylvania, and I ask my colleagues to join me in defeating this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Mr. Trello.

Mr. TRELLO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to respond to some of the remarks that were made.

They talk about the evils of gambling and how terrible it is, but yet we have one of the most successful lotteries in the country. We are the biggest bookie in the country. Yet some of the gentlemen that got up and spoke about the horrors of gambling and how terrible it is, I would ask them to sponsor legislation to eliminate the lottery being played in their district. I will cosponsor it if they want to do that and they feel so strongly about gambling, but I will tell you one thing: If you do sponsor a piece of legislation like that, you better pack your bags and leave town, because they will run you out of town on the next election.

Another gentleman talked about the problem of what happened in South Carolina. We all know that South Carolina is probably the most conservative State in the South. This past gubernatorial election in South Carolina, the incumbent Governor campaigned against gambling and video poker machines and the horrors and how terrible it is. His opponent, who was a Democrat, ran against him and supported the video poker for economic development, for education and other things. Guess who won the election? The Democrat that was supporting the gambling to support issues such as education and economic development. So do not tell me about

South Carolina, because we do not know how people are going to vote.

I do not know how people are going to vote on this issue, and you do not either. The only thing that this amendment does is to allow us to find out how they are going to vote and what their feeling is on this subject, and that will solve our problem once and for all. If what you say is true, that you know what your constituents are thinking, then we have nothing to worry about; they are going to vote this thing down, but you do not know that for sure.

The gentleman from Bucks County indicated that if we put three machines in every liquor-license establishment, we will have about 36,000 machines in Pennsylvania. Well, let me tell you a little story. In Allegheny County, we got more than that right now. We have about 40,000 illegal video poker machines in Allegheny County, and let me tell you something: Nobody is benefiting one dime. The people that own those machines, once or twice a week they are opening up that little door, taking all the money out of it, stuffing it in their pockets, and they are not paying their fair share of taxes to the State government, local government, or the Federal government. And I will tell you another thing: There just might be people, just might be people in high places that maybe have their hand out, you know, to allow them to operate. Knock it off.

Let me tell you a little story about my hearings back in 1989 and 1990. There was a superintendent of police that testified against this video poker bill and told us the evils and how terrible it was. About 6 months later I picked up a newspaper, and guess what? This superintendent of police was indicted for taking payoffs from video poker machines. Now, let me tell you, if this is legalized, if we allow the people to tell us whether to legalize this or not, there will not have to be any illegal payoffs because it is legal, and who is going to get the money? Not the guy with that key that opens up that door, you know, once or twice a week, takes out the money, and stuffs it in his pocket and does not pay his fair share of taxes; we will get the money, and what we decide to do with it will be in the enabling legislation. You will decide. So let us not kid ourselves. Let us not kid ourselves one bit. It is going on right now in Allegheny County, your county, and every county in this State, and we are not benefiting one dime.

You know, we had a problem with small business when I was chairman of the Finance Committee. They came to us about subchapter S and that it would help expand our business, and because they, the small business community in Pennsylvania, are creating most of the jobs, they needed help. We introduced legislation immediately to have them qualify under subchapter S, and you in this chamber voted to support it and gave that small businessperson a break.

We also gave the big businesses a break by reducing their taxes by \$3 billion, but you know, the funny part about that, only about 15 percent of the industries in Pennsylvania are big businesses. They are the only ones that enjoyed that \$3 billion. Well, here we are talking about small business men and women. They go to the same churches you do, the owners. Their kids go to the same schools that you go to. They pay taxes just like you. They run legitimate businesses, and they employ about 340,000 people in this State. Are they second-class citizens? When they come to you for help, are we going to say, no, you are not a big businessman, you are not this, you are not that? They need help. What we want to do is legalize something that is already taking place, and we are not benefiting by it by one dime.

By making it legal, we will take away that person that comes by the back door every once in a while for a handout so they can keep operating. We will make it legal. We will make this a better place for Pennsylvania. But most of all, we will preserve an awful lot of jobs and protect the men and women who in all sincerity do a great job for this State. They provide a wonderful place for you to take your secretary on Secretaries Day. They provide a wonderful facility for you for your Christmas parties and your other parties. They are good business people, and I am offering this amendment on their behalf, not mine. They have made the request for this amendment, and I am complying with their wishes, and I wish you would, too, and stop and think about it.

The gentleman over there said he did not know anybody that went bankrupt and lost all their money by buying one lottery ticket. Well, I am going to tell you something. I never met or knew anybody that lost everything they own through gambling. I do not personally know. And another thing, I do not know anybody that starved to death either, but I do know people that died from eating too much. So, you know, let us put this in the proper perspective here.

The machines are there; they are operating right now. We are not benefiting a dime. Let us make it legal. We will do two things if we make it legal. We will enjoy an awful lot of revenue for other programs in Pennsylvania, and we will eliminate that ugly source of people that want payoffs so that they can continue to operate. This is a good amendment because it allows the people of Pennsylvania for a change to tell us what they want rather than us telling them what is good for them. They know what is good for them; they are adults. They are good, taxpaying citizens. They know right from wrong. They know their limitations. Let us give them an opportunity to tell us what they want or what they do not want, and vote "yes" for this amendment. Thank you all.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Mr. Speaker, the proposal to allow electronic/video games of chance in taverns across the State should be rejected in the same way the riverboat gambling proposal was rejected.

The proposal would also set the stage for a large-scale expansion of gambling in liquor-licensed establishments all across the State. With a change like this one, gambling would suddenly be legitimized in thousands upon thousands of taverns, bars, and restaurants.

We know that gambling has many consequences, some of them very severe and costly to our society. If we are to countenance an expansion, we should assure ourselves that its growth is a limited one, and one which can be carefully monitored. The present proposal takes the opposite approach and sets in motion major changes in the status quo.

We should creep before we walk. We should limit our risks, rather than rushing headlong into dangerous waters without regard to the consequences. We should defeat this amendment.

Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—104

Allen	Eachus	Mayemik	Scrimenti
Bard	Evans	McCall	Shaner
Barrar	Frankel	McGeehan	Solobay
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	Michlovic	Staback
Belardi	George	Micozzie	Steelman
Belfanti	Gigliotti	Myers	Stetler
Bishop	Grucela	O'Brien	Stevenson
Bunt	Gruitza	Oliver	Sturla
Butkovitz	Haluska	Perzel	Surra
Buxton	Hanna	Pesci	Tangretti
Caitagirono	Harhai	Petrarca	Taylor, J.
Cappabianca	Horsey	Petrone	Tigue
Carn	James	Pistella	Travaglio
Casorio	Kaiser	Preston	Trello
Civera	Keller	Ramos	Trich
Cohen, L. I.	Kenney	Raymond	Tulli
Cohen, M.	LaGrotta	Readshaw	Van Home
Colafella	Laughlin	Rieger	Veon
Cornell	Lawless	Roberts	Walko
Corrigan	Lederer	Robinson	Washington
Costa	Lescovitz	Roebuck	Williams
Daley	Levdansky	Rooney	Wogan
DeLuca	Lucyk	Ross	Wojnaroski
Dermody	Mann	Ruffing	Wright
DeWeese	Markosek	Sainato	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Marsico	Santoni	Yudichak

NAYS—95

Adolph	Fargo	Maher	Saylor
Argall	Feese	Maitland	Schroder
Armstrong	Fleagle	Major	Schuler
Baker	Flick	Manderino	Semmel
Barley	Forcier	Masland	Serafini
Bastian	Freeman	McGill	Seyfert
Battisto	Geist	McIlhattan	Smith, B.
Benninghoff	Gladeck	McIlhinney	Smith, S. H.
Birmelin	Godshall	McNaughton	Snyder
Blaum	Gordner	Metcalfe	Stairs
Boyes	Habay	Miller, R.	Steil
Browne	Harhart	Miller, S.	Stern
Cawley	Hasay	Mundy	Strittmatter
Chadwick	Hennessey	Nailor	Taylor, E. Z.
Clark	Herman	Nickol	True
Clymer	Hershey	Orie	Vance
Coy	Hess	Phillips	Vitali
Curry	Hutchinson	Pippy	Wilt
Dailley	Jadlowiec	Platts	Yewcic
Dally	Josephs	Reinard	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Kirkland	Rohrer	Zug
Donatucci	Krebs	Rubley	
Druce	Leh	Samuelson	Ryan,
Egolf	Lynch	Sather	Speaker
Fairchild			

NOT VOTING—3

Fichter	Melio	Thomas
---------	-------	--------

EXCUSED—0

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. MASLAND offered the following amendment No. A0485:

Amend Sec. 2, page 1, line 8 (A0188), by striking out "primary" and inserting

general

Amend Sec. 2, page 1, line 9 (A0188), by striking out "30" and inserting

90

Amend Sec. 2, page 1, line 10, by striking out "this act" and inserting

legislation authorizing the type of gambling described in the referendum

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

VOTE CORRECTIONS

The SPEAKER. Mr. Melio; correction of the record, I understand.

Mr. MELIO. Yes. Mr. Speaker, on the last vote my machine malfunctioned. I want to be in the affirmative. Thank you.

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

The gentleman, Mr. Thomas; correction of the record.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, is it in order to correct the record?

My button malfunctioned on the Trello amendment. I would like to be recorded in the affirmative.

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

CONSIDERATION OF SB 255 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Mr. Masland, do you have an amendment to offer?

Mr. MASLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment does what I suggested we should do yesterday with respect to all these issues, and that is, first of all, it changes the vote from the primary election to the general election. I believe that is a better time for us to take the pulse of the State for a number of reasons. First of all, we get a better and more consistent statewide turnout, and we also get all of the third-party voters, the Independent voters, who generally will not come out in a primary, even if they could vote on a referendum. But in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, this amendment also would require legislation authorizing the specific slot machines that are being proposed here by Mr. DiGirolamo's amendment, it would specifically state that the legislation authorizing that type of gambling must be effective 90 days prior to the date of the general election. In other words, we would have to have specific language in place so that the voters could see what they were actually voting on ahead of time.

I urge the members to consider the ramifications of what we have been doing yesterday and today. We have spoken time and again, people on both sides, of the need to have an informed vote, of the need for the citizenry of Pennsylvania to actually make a statement, but not just to make any old statement but to make an informed statement. We do not want people going behind the curtain in the ballot room and making a vote that they really do not understand, one where they do not understand the implications of

what they are doing and they realize that in effect, if they knew, they could be opening up a can of worms.

So for those reasons and many other reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge a positive vote on amendment 485. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks County, Mr. DiGirolamo.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is a very simple vote. If you want to kill the amendment to put slot machines in racetracks, vote "yes" on this amendment. If you want to allow the slot machines in our racetracks and let our racetracks and the horse-racing industry compete with the other States, then you will vote "no" on this amendment. It is a simple vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Mr. Gordner.

Mr. GORDNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am rising in support of the Masland amendment, and I am really torn by what I say, because I think what the gentleman before me just said is really a bunch of bunk, to be straightforward about it. I have heard from all the advocates of these amendments that we have got to let the people decide; let us let the people decide; let us put these out — it does not matter whether you are for it or against it — let us let the people decide. There is no time when there will be more people voting than there will be at the general election. You know, I know, that Independents are basically disenfranchised during the primary election. You also know many folks, and the studies bear it out, that do not vote in primary elections. They vote in general elections, but they do not vote in primary elections. Oftentimes there are a lot of local races that are uncontested at primary elections, and it is only the general election where there is competition between the parties.

So if the folks that have previously spoken yesterday and today are really sincere about what they said — let the people decide — then you have to support this amendment, because it is at that general election when there will be historically more people — Democrats, Republicans, Independents — to vote on this issue. And if we really want to hear what our constituents and the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, if we want to really hear from them and hear what they have to say on this issue, then we can let them decide it in the general election when the most amount of people vote.

Let us keep on the same playing field, let us be consistent upon what we are saying, and let us support this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berks, Mr. Rohrer.

Mr. ROHRER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to stand and add my support to the amendment as offered as well. I think both of the speakers just prior to me have voiced quite clearly the reasons to support the amendment.

We have spent hours now on debating these issues as before us. We all know that we are not able to stand here today and accurately know what the referendums as stated mean. If we do not know what they mean, I can assure you the people of the State will also know not what they mean. The intent of this amendment, I am sure, is just to assure that there is better opportunity for the people of this State to make an informed decision.

We have been sitting here and have had the liberty of hearing discussion on both sides of this issue. Those who are going to vote on this have not heard this, and I think that in the pure interest, if there is in fact an interest, of providing somewhat full disclosure

to the people who are going to be asked to vote, that at the minimum they be provided the opportunity when most will be there and provided the maximum number of days for them to find out what their vote in fact is going to be all about.

I think that, clearly, I can see no reason, no justified reason, to oppose this amendment. The evidence in all clearly suggests that we ought to support it, and so I ask for a support of the Masland amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Horsey. The gentleman waives off.

The gentleman, Mr. Preston.

Mr. PRESTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have listened to the previous three speakers, and in all honesty, for the citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I am embarrassed that they would continue to insult their intelligence in that way.

First of all, one of our most knowledgeable voters, as we know, across this State has been the Independent voter. They stay in tune; they read the newspaper; a higher source of education and a higher source of income, and they are eligible to vote in the primary on these referendum questions. So I ask you, do not insult the Independent voter.

The other issue is, when you want to talk about voting, well, we are not running this year. If you want to go out there and push a particular issue, you are going to be free to go out there and push that, but let us talk about politics and the electoral process. This ballot, other than the Presidential primary election year with the amount of delegates that are on the ballot, is going to be the largest and the busiest ballot in the 4-year election process that we deal with. There will be more people on this ballot than at any other time out of eight elections in a 4-year cycle. If you want to talk about whether it is school board, whether it is local council people, whether it is county, the county council, county managers, township and borough officials, and the local judicial, what better time to put something on the ballot, not after people have been eliminated in a primary election to go to the general, when you will have more elected officials who can be out there and voicing their opinion and speaking to the general people. Do not disenfranchise, do not try to preach this form of elitism, and do not think that the voters are going to be that ignorant. The largest ballot in eight cycle elections, of having more people running for office, voicing their opinions about the electoral process and where they stand on their respective local communities. This is the municipal election process that we are dealing with, and you want to disenfranchise and take away some of the pressure from an awful lot of elected officials. It is not about the general election. This is going to be a very busy election year. To put something off only delays it.

I will also disagree with the gentleman's comments that if he goes by the history, and he has been here for a while, that once the people have spoken, if they approve this, if they approve this, then we will sit down and put everything on the table. You do not even know what modern technology may be inventing in 6 months. Do not try to lock in and practice this Madisonian thought and theory about elitism and saying that the voter is ignorant and does not have the cognitive ability to be able to understand what is going to go on in the election process. I think it is an insult to the general public.

I think that we need to be responsible. We are always talking about turning something back and hearing the opinion of the

general public, and that is what this does. I have heard individuals say, well, I want to be for "happy" legislation. Well, you know, I would like to say, well, then offer a "happy" bill. Let us try to see that for a change. Offer a "happy" bill.

You know, this is more than just about families; this is also about putting something together in a good, effective manner. This just gives the people to be able to say, I want us to do this, and then we know that you are going to come back and present it to us to give us different options. But give the people a voice. Do not be able to say that one election is going to be more than the other. We live in America. Anybody has the right to be able to come out to vote, and unfortunately for those people who do not go out and vote, they still voted, because the vote counts against them twice.

You ought to be out there pushing and encouraging people to vote each and every election. Do not try to put it off any longer. Let us vote this amendment down.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Lancaster County, Mr. Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, will the maker of the amendment rise for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Masland, indicates he will stand for interrogation. You may begin.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, while I am generally supportive of the concept you are trying to accomplish here, I have a question about the way your amendment is actually worded.

Line 7 of your amendment says, "Amend Sec. 2, page 1, line 10, by striking out 'this act' and inserting" the language "legislation authorizing the type of gambling described in the referendum." The way I read it, the new way section 2 would read then would say, "The Secretary of the Commonwealth shall cause to be placed on the ballot, at the primary election occurring at least 30 days next following the effective date of legislation authorizing the type of gambling described in the referendum...." Now, I am assuming what you want us to do is pass the enabling legislation and have it become effective and then, 30 days later, have a question be placed on the ballot that says, do you favor the legislation that we have already enacted and has become law and has taken effect already? I do not think that is what you want to do, but that is what I think the effect of the amendment does.

Mr. MASLAND. First of all, I should point out that it is the general election, and it would have to be 90 days following that. So in effect, my intention is to require us to pass legislation before we break for our summer recess. We would have to have legislation in place in June that would outline how we would authorize, in this case, the type of gambling would be the slot machines at the racetracks. That legislation technically would have an effective date that would be contingent on later passage of the referendum. That is how I discussed this with the Reference Bureau. That was my intention, and this is what they told me would do that.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, if I could end my interrogation and make a comment.

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

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I understand what the gentleman's intent was, but even as he pointed out, the legislation would have to be in effect and law, and if it was contingent upon a later effective date, then in fact you would never be able to get to that point where you

could put it on the ballot, because the effective date would never occur to get it on the ballot 30 days later.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. STURLA. I guess, if I could, I would like to ask for a ruling on your part as to whether or not this amendment is actually in order. I think it has got a catch-22 in it where it can never actually be accomplished.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has been advised that the gentleman, Mr. Masland, requests that the amendment to— Forgive me.

On the parliamentary inquiry, we find that it is moot at this point, but it is an interesting question. The gentleman, Mr. Masland, I am told, is going to move to divide this question between lines 6 and 7 on the amendment and withdraw the second half of that amendment, so that the vote will simply be on the "30" being stricken and the number "90" being placed in the amendment.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. And the word "general" on line 3.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STURLA. I would just like to wish my wife a happy 19th wedding anniversary today. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. She is long suffering.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 255 CONTINUED

AMENDMENT DIVIDED

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Masland, who moves that amendment A0485 be divided between lines 6 and 7.

PART 2 OF AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the gentleman is withdrawing lines 7, 8, 9, and 10. Is that correct, Mr. Masland?

Mr. MASLAND. That is correct, Mr. Speaker, although I have spoken with the drafter at Reference; we have talked about this. I feel that the language, although there may be some ambiguity, still could be effective so that we could have the legislation in place. For the sake of our purposes here today, I am withdrawing that and merely offering the first section, which would require the vote on Mr. DiGirolamo's amendment to be at the general election in November.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question of the amendment as divided, the first part of the amendment, those in favor will vote "aye"; opposed, "no."

This is lines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

On the question,

Will the House agree to part 1 of the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—97

Allen	Forcier	McGeehan	Serafini
Argall	Freeman	McIlhatten	Seyfert
Armstrong	Geist	McNaughton	Smith, B.
Baker	Gordner	Metcalfe	Stairs
Barrar	Gruitza	Miller, R.	Steelman
Bastian	Habay	Miller, S.	Steil
Battisto	Hanna	Mundy	Stern
Benninghoff	Hasay	Nailor	Stetler
Birmelin	Hennessey	O'Brien	Stevenson
Boyes	Herman	Orie	Strittmatter
Butkovitz	Hershey	Phillips	Sturla
Cawley	Hess	Pippy	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Hutchinson	Platts	Taylor, J.
Clark	Jadlowiec	Ramos	Tigue
Clymer	Keller	Rieger	True
Curry	Kirkland	Robinson	Vitali
Dally	Krebs	Rohrer	Wogan
Dempsey	Lederer	Ross	Wright
Donatucci	Leh	Rubley	Yewcic
Eachus	Lynch	Samuelson	Zimmerman
Egolf	Maher	Sather	Zug
Fairchild	Maitland	Saylor	
Fargo	Major	Schroder	Ryan,
Feese	Marsico	Schuler	Speaker
Fleagle	Masland	Scrimenti	

NAYS—104

Adolph	Dermody	Levdansky	Ruffing
Bard	DeWeese	Lucyk	Sainato
Barley	DiGirolamo	Manderino	Santoni
Bebko-Jones	Druce	Mann	Semmel
Belardi	Evans	Markosek	Shaner
Belfanti	Fichter	Mayernik	Smith, S. H.
Bishop	Flick	McCall	Snyder
Blaum	Frankel	McGill	Solobay
Browne	Gannon	McIlhinney	Staback
Bunt	George	Melio	Surra
Buxton	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Tangretti
Caltagirone	Gladeck	Micozzie	Thomas
Cappabianca	Godshall	Myers	Travaglio
Carn	Grucela	Nickol	Trello
Casorio	Haluska	Oliver	Trich
Civera	Harhai	Perzel	Tulli
Cohen, L. I.	Harhart	Pesci	Vance
Cohen, M.	Horsey	Petrarca	Van Horne
Colafiglia	James	Petrone	Veon
Cornell	Josephs	Pistella	Walko
Corrigan	Kaiser	Preston	Washington
Costa	Kenney	Raymond	Williams
Coy	LaGrotta	Readshaw	Wilt
Dailey	Laughlin	Roberts	Wojnaroski
Daley	Lawless	Roebuck	Youngblood
DeLuca	Lescovitz	Rooney	Yudichak

NOT VOTING—1

Reinard

EXCUSED—0

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

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

Mr. VAN HORNE offered the following amendment No. A0266:

Amend Title, page 1, line 2, by inserting after "Statutes,"
authorizing the gambling game of keno; and
Amend Bill, page 1, lines 7 and 8, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

Section 1. Title 18 of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes is amended by adding a section to read:
§ 5513.1. Keno.

(a) Authorization.—The Secretary of Revenue may institute the gambling game of keno to be administered by the division of the State Lottery. The secretary shall have the powers and duties given him under the act of August 26, 1971 (P.L.351, No.91), known as the State Lottery Law. All proceeds from keno shall be placed into the State Lottery Fund in accordance with section 311 of the State Lottery Law.

(b) Definition.—As used in this section, the term "keno" means a game of chance using 80 numbers in which 20 random numbers are drawn. Players may win cash prizes based on how many numbers they match to the numbers randomly drawn by the State. The game may be played in locations, such as, but not limited to, taverns, restaurants, bowling alleys, airports and hotels, as approved by the Secretary of Revenue.

Section 2. Section 6308(a) of Title 18 is amended to read:

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

3

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

The SPEAKER. On the question of the adoption of amendment 0266, the gentleman, Mr. Van Horne, is recognized.
Mr. VAN HORNE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A0266 is a very simple amendment, and it deals with two venerable institutions in our Commonwealth — the lottery bureau, which has been in place in this Commonwealth since 1971, and our senior citizens, which have been the beneficiaries of over 10 billion dollars' worth of profits in that time period.

Amendment 0266 basically will clarify the authority of the Secretary of the Department of Revenue to be able to offer the lottery game of keno, and I would like to stand before the body today and ask for an affirmative vote on this amendment.
Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. DiGirolamo, from Bucks County.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I ask for a negative vote on this amendment; again, a negative vote on this amendment. If this amendment goes in, it is going to kill the slot machines.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker; a negative vote.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—48

Belfanti	DeWeese	McCall	Sainato
Benninghoff	Egolf	Melio	Seyfert
Bishop	Frankel	Michlovic	Solobay

Casorio	George	Myers	Sturla
Civera	Haluska	Pesci	Tangretti
Cohen, M.	Keller	Petrarca	Trello
Colafella	Kenney	Petrone	Trich
Corrigan	LaGrotta	Pistella	Van Horne
Costa	Levdansky	Preston	Walko
Daley	Lucyk	Ramos	Washington
DeLuca	Mann	Readshaw	Wojnarowski
Dermody	Mayemik	Ruffing	Youngblood

NAYS—150

Adolph	Fargo	Manderino	Schuler
Allen	Feese	Markosek	Scrimenti
Argall	Fichter	Marsico	Semmel
Armstrong	Fleagle	Masland	Serafini
Baker	Flick	McGeehan	Shaner
Bard	Forcier	McGill	Smith, B.
Barley	Freeman	McIlhattan	Smith, S. H.
Barrar	Gannon	McIlhinney	Snyder
Bastian	Geist	McNaughton	Staback
Battisto	Gladeck	Metcalfe	Stairs
Bebko-Jones	Godshall	Micozzie	Steelman
Belardi	Gordner	Miller, R.	Steil
Birmelin	Grucela	Miller, S.	Stern
Blaum	Gruitza	Mundy	Stetler
Boyes	Habay	Nailor	Stevenson
Browne	Hanna	Nickol	Strittmatter
Bunt	Harhai	O'Brien	Surra
Butkovitz	Harhart	Oliver	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Hasay	Orie	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Hennessey	Perzel	Thomas
Cappabianca	Herman	Phillips	Tigue
Carn	Hershey	Pippy	Travaglio
Cawley	Hess	Platts	True
Chadwick	Horsey	Raymond	Tulli
Clark	Hutchinson	Reinard	Vance
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Rieger	Veon
Cohen, L. I.	Josephs	Roberts	Vitali
Cornell	Kirkland	Robinson	Williams
Coy	Krebs	Roebuck	Wilt
Curry	Laughlin	Rohrer	Wogan
Dailey	Lawless	Rooney	Wright
Dally	Lederer	Ross	Yewcic
Dempsey	Leh	Rubley	Yudichak
DiGirolamo	Lescovitz	Samuelson	Zimmerman
Donatucci	Lynch	Santoni	Zug
Eachus	Maher	Sather	
Evans	Maitland	Saylor	Ryan,
Fairchild	Major	Schroder	Speaker

NOT VOTING—4

Druce	Gigliotti	James	Kaiser
-------	-----------	-------	--------

EXCUSED—0

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

On the question recurring,

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

The SPEAKER. I am advised by the— May I have your attention for a moment?

Those of you who have submitted amendments — with the exception of Mr. George; his amendments are completely different — many of you have submitted amendments that probably have

been addressed, and I would appreciate it if the members who are on our list that intend to offer their amendments would signal to us in some way, either by coming up here or raising their hands. The Chair has a list of about 70 amendments, and I know many of them will be withdrawn because they are duplicative of what we have already done.

Now, as I view the General Assembly, there is no one with further amendments with the exception of Mr. George.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. George, who offers the following amendment, which the clerk will read.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. George.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I am reminded that there are going to be several bills that we can attach this similar amendment to, so not to belabor and delay this day's session, I am going to remove my amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. DALEY offered the following amendment No. A0411:

Amend Title, page 1, line 2, by inserting after "Statutes," providing for resort gaming; and

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 7 and 8, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

Section 1. Title 18 of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes is amended by adding a section to read:

§ 5513.1. Resort gaming.

(a) Authorization.—All forms of gaming, gambling and wagering authorized by law in this Commonwealth, except as provided by the act of August 26, 1971 (P.L. 351, No. 91), known as the State Lottery Law, at any site shall be permitted in a resort that offers 275 or more separately rented rooms for overnight accommodations of guests.

(b) Other laws.—A resort shall be subject to the same laws and regulations as applicable to any other site that engages in gaming, gambling or wagering.

(c) Definition.—As used in this section, the term "resort" means a lodging facility whose main business is to provide visitors with recreation and relaxation and whose facilities include significant components for recreational, spa and athletic activities within the same property or on properties immediately adjacent to the principal facility and that are legally connected to the ownership of the principal facility.

Section 2. Section 6308(a) of Title 18 is amended to read:

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

3

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On the question of the adoption of the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Daley. The gentleman will yield for a moment.

The conferences in the vicinity of Mr. Daley, please disperse. Mr. Daley.

Mr. DALEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment A0411 will provide and permit all forms of gaming, gambling, and wagering authorized by law in this Commonwealth to be offered in those resorts that have 275 or more separately rented rooms.

This amendment basically identifies what a resort is, and it basically states that "...the term 'resort' means a lodging facility whose main business is to provide visitors with recreation and relaxation and whose facilities include significant components for recreational, spa and athletic activities within the same property or on properties immediately adjacent to the principal facility and that are legally connected to the ownership of the principal facility."

We had a fiscal note done, and it has been identified that 56 facilities as such are in Pennsylvania, and, Mr. Speaker, I ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. DiGirolamo.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Mr. Speaker, this goes beyond the scope of what we are trying to do here today, and I urge everyone who supported my amendment to vote "no" on this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to interrogate the maker of the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Daley, indicates he will stand for interrogation. You may begin.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, does your amendment deal with just those facilities that are already established, or will there be an ability to build such facilities and also allow for this expansion of gambling into those facilities?

Mr. DALEY. This amendment does not identify nor grandfather any specific current resort facilities in Pennsylvania. I would assume that a facility that is developed in the future that meets the criteria in this amendment shall be eligible for this type of gaming.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am done with my interrogation. Just to make a remark, please.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would oppose this amendment, as this is definitely a blatant expansion of gambling across the State. So I would ask for your negative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Mr. Lawless.

Mr. LAWLESS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Daley, indicates he will stand for interrogation. You may begin.

Mr. LAWLESS. Mr. Speaker, all day long I voted in favor of the initiatives for a referendum on the gambling issues. I just want to make it clear in my own mind, this piece of legislation has nothing to do with referendums. Am I correct in that this is just enabling legislation which you are providing here? This is not, if we pass this here, this is not a referendum.

Mr. DALEY. Yeah; you are absolutely right. It does not authorize anything beyond the scope of the referendum. It is any gaming that is permitted in Pennsylvania, which the referendum would identify.

Mr. LAWLESS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, may I speak on the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. LAWLESS. Mr. Speaker, very quickly, I just want the members to know that this is enabling legislation for gambling. I have been supportive all day long of issues dealing with the referendum and let the people decide, and I reluctantly stand here to oppose this amendment by my friend, Mr. Daley. But I want people to know that this is enabling legislation, and that is not the

purpose in what we have done throughout the day today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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—17

Cohen, M.	Lucyk	Roberts	Trello
Corrigan	Perzel	Robinson	Trich
Daley	Preston	Shaner	Van Home
DeWeese	Ramos	Solobay	Veon
Haluska			

NAYS—185

Adolph	Evans	Maitland	Sather
Allen	Fairchild	Major	Saylor
Argall	Fargo	Manderino	Schroder
Armstrong	Feese	Mann	Schuler
Baker	Fichter	Markosek	Scrimenti
Bard	Fleagle	Marsico	Semmel
Barley	Flick	Masland	Serafini
Barrar	Forcier	Mayernik	Seyfert
Bastian	Frankel	McCall	Smith, B.
Battisto	Freeman	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	McGill	Snyder
Beardi	Geist	McIlhattan	Staback
Belfanti	George	McIlhinney	Stairs
Benninghoff	Gigliotti	McNaughton	Steelman
Birmelin	Gladeck	Melio	Steil
Bishop	Godshall	Metcalfe	Stern
Blaum	Gordner	Michlovic	Stetler
Boyes	Grucela	Micozzie	Stevenson
Browne	Gruitza	Miller, R.	Strittmatter
Bunt	Habay	Miller, S.	Sturla
Butkovitz	Hanna	Mundy	Surra
Buxton	Harhai	Myers	Tangretti
Caltagirone	Harhart	Nailor	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Hasay	Nickol	Taylor, J.
Carn	Hennessey	O'Brien	Thomas
Casorio	Herman	Oliver	Tigue
Cawley	Hershey	Orie	Travaglio
Chadwick	Hess	Pesci	True
Civera	Horsey	Petrarca	Tulli
Clark	Hutchinson	Petrone	Vance
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Phillips	Vitali
Cohen, L. I.	James	Pippy	Walko
Colafella	Josephs	Pistella	Washington
Cornell	Kaiser	Platts	Williams
Costa	Keller	Raymond	Wilt
Coy	Kenney	Readshaw	Wogan
Curry	Kirkland	Reinard	Wojnaroski
Dailey	Krebs	Rieger	Wright
Dally	LaGrotta	Roebuck	Yewcic
DeLuca	Laughlin	Rohrer	Youngblood
Dempsey	Lawless	Rooney	Yudichak
Dermody	Lederer	Ross	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	Leh	Rublely	Zug
Donatucci	Lescovitz	Ruffing	
Druce	Levdansky	Sainato	Ryan,
Eachus	Lynch	Samuelson	Speaker
Egolf	Maher	Santoni	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

Mr. CLYMER offered the following amendment No. A0377:

Amend Title, page 1, line 4, by removing the period after "minors" and inserting

; and limiting certain referenda.

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 1 and 2

Section 2. No referendum on gaming devices and activities at horse racetracks shall be placed on the ballot more than once every five years.

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

3

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

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

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment states that "No referendum on gaming devices and activities at horse racetracks shall be placed on the ballot more than once every five years."

The SPEAKER. Mr. DiGirolamo.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Again, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask for a "no" vote on this amendment. If you are in support of the amendment that passed, my amendment, you will vote "no" on this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—93

Allen	Geist	Masland	Schuler
Argall	George	McGill	Semmel
Armstrong	Godshall	McIlhattan	Serafini
Baker	Gordner	McNaughton	Seyfert
Bard	Habay	Metcalfe	Smith, B.
Barley	Hanna	Miller, R.	Smith, S. H.
Bastian	Harhart	Miller, S.	Snyder
Battisto	Hasay	Mundy	Stairs
Benninghoff	Hennessey	Nailor	Steil
Birmelin	Herman	Nickol	Stern
Blaum	Hershey	O'Brien	Stevenson
Boyes	Hess	Orie	Strittmatter
Clark	Hutchinson	Phillips	Sturla
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pippy	Taylor, E. Z.
Curry	Josephs	Platts	Taylor, J.
Dailey	Kenney	Ramos	Tigue
Dally	Kirkland	Robinson	True
Egolf	Krebs	Rohrer	Vance
Fairchild	Leh	Ross	Vitali
Fargo	Lynch	Rubley	Wogan
Feese	Maher	Sather	Yewcic
Fleagle	Maitland	Saylor	Zimmerman
Flick	Major	Schroder	Zug
Forcier			

NAYS—105

Adolph	DiGirolamo	Markosek	Scrimenti
Barrar	Donatucci	Marsico	Shaner
Bebko-Jones	Eachus	Mayernik	Solobay
Belardi	Evans	McCall	Staback
Belfanti	Fichter	McGeehan	Steelman
Bishop	Frankel	McIlhinney	Stetler
Browne	Freeman	Melio	Surra
Bunt	Gannon	Michlovic	Tangretti
Butkovitz	Gigliotti	Micozzie	Thomas
Buxton	Gladeck	Myers	Travaglio
Caltagirone	Grucela	Oliver	Trello
Cappabianca	Gruitza	Perzel	Trich
Carn	Haluska	Pesci	Tulli
Casorio	Harhai	Petrarca	Van Horne
Cawley	Horsey	Petrone	Veon
Civera	James	Pistella	Walko
Cohen, L. I.	Kaiser	Preston	Washington
Cohen, M.	Keller	Raymond	Williams
Cornell	LaGrotta	Readshaw	Wilt
Corrigan	Laughlin	Reinard	Wojnaroski
Costa	Lawless	Rieger	Wright
Coy	Lederer	Roberts	Youngblood
Daley	Lescovitz	Roebuck	Yudichak
DeLuca	Levdansky	Ruffing	
Dempsey	Lucyk	Sainato	Ryan,
Dermody	Manderino	Samuelson	Speaker
DeWeese	Mann	Santoni	

NOT VOTING—4

Chadwick	Colafella	Druce	Rooney
----------	-----------	-------	--------

EXCUSED—0

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

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

Mr. CLYMER offered the following amendment No. A0379:

Amend Title, page 1, line 4, by removing the period after "minors" and inserting

; and limiting certain referenda.

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 1 and 2

Section 2. No referendum on gaming devices and activities at horse racetracks shall be placed on the ballot more than once every three years.

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

3

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

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

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment really is in tune with what many members have said; you know, let us get this over with once and for all and not revisit the issue again. This is more of a compromise between the last amendment. It says, "No referendum

on gaming devices and activities at horse racetracks shall be placed on the ballot more than once every three years.”

It certainly is a compromise amendment and one, I am sure, which we can all support. I ask for a positive vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. DiGirolamo.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again I am asking the members for a negative vote for the same reason that the last amendment failed. I am asking everyone to vote “no.” Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. On the question of the adoption of the amendment, the gentleman, Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

I wanted to be recognized on the last amendment, but I will speak on this one.

I think it is only—

The SPEAKER. It is late in the day. You have to move quickly.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes. Well, I did wave; you just did not see me.

But I sure hope we are not going to plague our voters back home with votes every year, and I think this makes a lot of sense that if this is going to be put on the ballot, that we should not have to force the voters to have to go through this every year or every other year.

So this makes sense, 3 years. Please vote for it. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Gordner.

Mr. GORDNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If this sounds familiar, it is, because in Article XI of our Constitution that deals with how often you can offer a constitutional amendment, it says, “...but no amendment or amendments shall be submitted oftener than once in five years.” So if you want to do a constitutional amendment right now to our Constitution, you can only do it once every 5 years. That is provided by our founders. So I think this proposal that we can only put this on the ballot once every 3 years is certainly a very fair request and certainly in line with our Constitution.

I would ask for a favorable vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Egolf.

Mr. EGOLF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to interrogate the maker of amendment 188 of the slot machines, if I may.

The SPEAKER. The only thing before the House at this time is 0379.

Mr. EGOLF. Well, Mr. Speaker, he made a statement that this would kill the slots at the racetracks, and I would like to ask him why. May I do that?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman, Mr. DiGirolamo, agree to stand for interrogation? You may proceed.

Mr. EGOLF. I would like to, if you could explain to us why that will kill slots at the racetracks if we vote for this amendment.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Mr. Speaker, as my amendment is currently drafted, we have guarantees that the Senate will consider that and vote on that. If any other amendment today goes into that bill, we do not have those guarantees. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Egolf, you are recognized.

Mr. EGOLF. Now, I understand then that you are saying that they are guaranteeing a vote, a favorable vote, unless we put this amendment on.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Mr. Speaker, I am not guaranteeing a favorable vote; I am just guaranteeing that they will consider the bill with the amendment in it.

Mr. EGOLF. You cannot tell us why they would be against this then. Is that my understanding? You cannot tell us why they would be against this amendment then.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. No, Mr. Speaker. The only thing I can tell you is that the Senate will consider this bill with my amendment but with no other amendments included in it. Thank you.

Mr. EGOLF. Okay. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Horsey.

Mr. HORSEY. Mr. Speaker, I think sometimes we get a kick out of listening to ourselves. Mr. Speaker— Exactly.

Mr. Speaker, there is a sanctity to the Constitution because it is the nexus between this House and the people. So it should not be changed that often. It should be changed once every 5 or 10 or 15 years. That document should be left unchanged. But for someone to say that we should not take an issue to the people when the people are the ones who have decided that we be here, that we do what we do in this chamber, is absolutely, totally outrageous, Mr. Speaker. If an issue could come up every day and we as a chamber had a way or a system for us to push that issue to the public and let them decide, Mr. Speaker, we are living in a democracy. The people are the ones that we represent, and they are the ones who have empowered us through the electoral process.

Referendums, it is okay. It is us as a legislative body doing what democracy is supposed to do, and that is taking issues back to the people. They have empowered us, Mr. Speaker. It is okay for us as a legislative branch to empower the people. So an issue like the one we are considering to put, you know, timetables on how often we as a legislative body present an issue to the public is a terrible idea, Mr. Speaker, and I urge a vote against this particular amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Preston. He waives off.

The gentleman, Mr. Clymer, for the second time.

Mr. CLYMER. Mr. Speaker, the Representative from Bucks County said if this amendment were to go in, it would somehow kill the bill. Well, we have already put in the Trello amendment. I mean, that is an amendment into the bill. So all I am doing is putting an amendment, another amendment, into the bill. I am not sure how that is going to kill the bill when we already have an amendment in.

So I would ask for an affirmative vote. As I said before, this is a good compromise, and that is what the General Assembly likes; they like compromises. I got one here, and I ask for a positive vote. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—99

Adolph	Flick	Marsico	Serafini
Argall	Forcier	Masland	Seyfert
Armstrong	Geist	McCall	Smith, B.
Baker	George	McIlhattan	Smith, S. H.
Bard	Godshall	McNaughton	Snyder
Barley	Gordner	Metcalfe	Stairs

Barrar	Gruitza	Miller, R.	Steelman
Bastian	Habay	Miller, S.	Steil
Battisto	Haluska	Mundy	Stern
Benninghoff	Hanna	Nailor	Stevenson
Birmelin	Harhart	Nickol	Strittmatter
Blaum	Hasay	O'Brien	Sturla
Boyes	Hennessey	Orie	Surra
Chadwick	Herman	Pippy	Taylor, E. Z.
Clark	Hershey	Platts	Tigue
Clymer	Hutchinson	Ramos	True
Cohen, M.	Jadlowiec	Robinson	Vance
Coy	Josephs	Rohrer	Vitali
Curry	Kirkland	Rublely	Wogan
Dally	Krebs	Sather	Yewcic
Dempsey	Leh	Saylor	Zimmerman
Egolf	Lynch	Schroder	Zug
Fairchild	Maher	Schuler	
Fargo	Maitland	Scrimenti	Ryan,
Feese	Major	Semmel	Speaker
Fleagle			

NAYS—103

Allen	Donatucci	Mann	Ruffing
Bebko-Jones	Druce	Markosek	Sainato
Belardi	Eachus	Mayernik	Samuelson
Belfanti	Evans	McGeehan	Santoni
Bishop	Fichter	McGill	Shaner
Browne	Frankel	McIlhinney	Solobay
Bunt	Freeman	Melio	Staback
Butkovitz	Gannon	Michlovic	Stetler
Buxton	Gigliotti	Micozzie	Tangretti
Caltagirone	Gladeck	Myers	Taylor, J.
Cappabianca	Grucela	Oliver	Thomas
Carn	Harhai	Perzel	Travaglio
Casorio	Hess	Pesci	Trello
Cawley	Horsey	Petrarca	Trich
Civera	James	Petrone	Tulli
Cohen, L. I.	Kaiser	Phillips	Van Home
Colafella	Keller	Pistella	Veon
Cornell	Kenney	Preston	Walko
Corrigan	LaGrotta	Raymond	Washington
Costa	Laughlin	Readshaw	Williams
Dailey	Lawless	Reinard	Wilt
Daley	Lederer	Rieger	Wojnaroski
DeLuca	Lescovitz	Roberts	Wright
Dermody	Levdansky	Roebuck	Youngblood
DeWeese	Lucy	Rooney	Yudichak
DiGirolamo	Manderino	Ross	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

On the question recurring,

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

The SPEAKER. Mr. Clymer, it is my understanding you have no further amendments. Is that accurate? That is inaccurate. Do not clap.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Clymer, who offers the following amendment, which the clerk will read. Would you give us the number of your amendment?

Mr. CLYMER. Yes. A0384.

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

Mr. CLYMER offered the following amendment No. A0384:

Amend Title, page 1, line 4, by removing the period after "minors" and inserting

; and limiting certain referenda.

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 1 and 2

Section 2. No referendum on video gaming or gambling devices and activities shall be placed on the ballot more than once every five years.

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

3

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair now recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Clymer.

Mr. CLYMER. Mr. Speaker, very similar to the one I put in before: No referendum on video poker gambling or gambling devices and activities shall be placed on the ballot more than once every 5 years.

I think it is a good amendment. We have talked about, you know, let us not revisit this time and time again, and as a result, based on the sentiment of many of the distinguished members of this House of Representatives, I have put this amendment in, and I would ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. DiGirolamo.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Mr. Speaker, for the same reasons that I indicated before, I ask the members to vote "no." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Clymer.

Mr. CLYMER. Let me make it clear what this amendment applies to. It applies to video gambling at the liquor-license establishments. This does not have anything to do with slots at the racetracks, although the gentleman from Bucks County certainly has the opportunity to make comment on it. But just so everyone is clear in their own mind what we are talking about.

The SPEAKER. Mr. DiGirolamo.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Again, Mr. Speaker, I oppose this amendment for the same reasons. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Fargo.

Mr. FARGO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think we really ought to stop and think about the process here. It seems to me that if this amendment is put in as a referendum or the amendments which we have passed are put on a referendum in the primary of this year and they are defeated, I am not sure that we want to go through year after year all the advertising that would be necessary, all the problems that we would be causing the people of this State to have this done every year or every 2 years or even every 3 years. I think it is only reasonable that if it gets defeated in the primary, that we should not consider this and go through the process again in such a hurry. I honestly believe that this is a very, very reasonable amendment, and I would like to see it passed.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of the amendment—
Mr. Lawless. I am sorry.

Mr. LAWLESS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAWLESS. There has been a lot of talk about whether we can offer an amendment. If Mr. Clymer's amendment goes in, I mean, 2 years or next session, could not the body here again just vote to put a referendum on? I mean, I guess I am wondering what the purpose in the amendment is. We would go—

The SPEAKER. You should interrogate the gentleman, Mr. Clymer.

Mr. LAWLESS. May I interrogate the maker of the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates he will stand for interrogation. You may begin.

Mr. LAWLESS. Mr. Speaker, I guess I am interested in understanding what the purpose in this amendment is, because we as a body would have to go through this process a year from now or 2 years from now for an amendment to be offered, and even if your amendment is put into law, we are here to change laws. We could have a new body in here in the next session, and therefore, frankly, to me, it does not make sense, but if you can convince me, I will vote for it. But I mean, I guess I need you to explain to me how you can conduct business for the next 5 years or dictate the business that is done in this House over people who may or may not be elected 2 years from now.

Mr. CLYMER. Mr. Speaker, he has asked a fair question, and it is the responsibility of the General Assembly, if they so wish, to repeal laws. If you think that this is something that is not going to fit, then you have the right to repeal it, but if no one would do that, then I think we have set a standard, we have set a policy that is very important for the members to consider, and that is a 5-year break between the time we do these kinds of proposals.

Mr. LAWLESS. But even with your amendment, we would still need to go through a process like this if we wanted to put another referendum on the ballot, with or without this amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. CLYMER. You would have to repeal this if you wanted to put a referendum in the next year, in the year 2000.

Mr. LAWLESS. But without this amendment, we would still have to bring it before the body and the body would still have to either okay it or not okay it.

Mr. CLYMER. That is true.

Mr. LAWLESS. Mr. Speaker, on the amendment?

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

Mr. LAWLESS. Mr. Speaker, real quickly, I think that we just heard from the maker of the amendment that there is really no substance within this amendment. I mean, his attempt to dictate what occurs in this body over the next 5 years simply is not going to take place, because there is going to be a new body in 2 years, and one way or the other, we are going to have to come discuss this if in fact that has to take place.

I recommend that we vote this amendment a "no." Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Melio.

Mr. MELIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just do not think it is a good policy for this organization, this Assembly, to limit the referenda abilities of the people that we represent, and if this would pass, that would mean that they could not vote again for 5 years. What difference does it make? If we are going to hear from the people that we represent, this is a good way to do it.

I would oppose this amendment, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is interesting today we are talking about how we are limiting people's rights. I mean, we already limit their rights to referendum. We already have a law on the books that says that if citizens petition for certain ordinances or other issues in local municipalities, those issues cannot come back on the ballot by a citizens' petition in less than 5 years away. Our State Constitution says constitutional amendments cannot come before this body for 5 years, and now we are saying that this is unfair to the taxpayers? I think we have got to quit speaking out of both sides of our mouths in this General Assembly and quit saying what is right for taxpayers on one hand and stieking it to them on the other hand. We have been doing that far too long, and that is why politicians in this Assembly sometimes are not treated with the respect they should be, because we each keep pointing fingers at each other and saying, you are not doing it or you are not doing it. It is time that we sit here and we truly reflect that our responsibility is to do, if we live by the rules that we ask the citizens and taxpayers of this Commonwealth to live by, we should live by those same rules, and that is why this House should pass this amendment. We should live by the same things that we tell the taxpayers back in our local districts, that if they cannot bring something on the ballot for 5 years after it is already there, then this General Assembly surely can live with those same rights and privileges that our taxpayers have to live with.

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

Mr. FLEAGLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here rather stewing in some of the rationale that we have been hearing about why we should not vote for this amendment. We have been told, do not vote for this amendment because it is good or bad but vote for this amendment because we have this deal with the Senate. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am just another dog pulling the sled in here, but I think I have a right to vote for this. If you want to cut your deals with the Senate, do it in conference committee, where it should be done. Vote "yes" on this amendment and assert the right that you have to pass legislation in this General Assembly.

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

Mr. HORSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that there are people in the chamber who just do not get it. It is bad government to limit the people. And, Mr. Speaker, this idea that we should not take issues. The only reason why we do not operate presently, Mr. Speaker, by referendum is because of the volume of bills that we consider, is A, and B is because of the time it would take to take every issue to the people. But the idea of whether it is on the books or not, Mr. Speaker, it is bad law not to give the people a say-so in the government if they choose to have it, Mr. Speaker. And every opportunity we get, we should extend, we should extend, Mr. Speaker, the privilege of the people to participate in their government and in how they are going to live or not live. It is bad government, Mr. Speaker, to limit the opportunity of people to have a say-so in their government, if this is truly a democracy. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote against the Clymer amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Warren, Mr. Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was not going to say anything until the gentleman from Philadelphia got up and started talking. I wish he would not leave so he could hear this.

You know, I guess I am tired, quite frankly, of this debate and hearing about, well, we can take it to the people with a referendum. Well, I got an idea. We are Representatives. If you do not want to be a representative of the people, let us pass a referendum, let us hire two more clerks to handle it, and let us all go home forever.

The SPEAKER. It is getting late.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—96

Adolph	Feese	Major	Semmel
Allen	Fleagle	Markosek	Serafini
Argall	Flick	Marsico	Seyfert
Armstrong	Forcier	Masland	Smith, B.
Baker	Geist	McIlhattan	Smith, S. H.
Bard	George	McNaughton	Snyder
Barley	Godshall	Metcalfe	Stairs
Barrar	Gordner	Miller, R.	Steelman
Bastian	Habay	Miller, S.	Steil
Battisto	Hanna	Mundy	Stern
Benninghoff	Harhart	Nailor	Stevenson
Birmelin	Hasay	Nickol	Strittmatter
Blaum	Hennessey	Orie	Surra
Boyes	Herman	Phillips	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Hershey	Pippy	Tigue
Clark	Hess	Platts	True
Clymer	Hutchinson	Ramos	Vance
Coy	Jadlowiec	Robinson	Vitali
Curry	Josephs	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dailey	Kirkland	Rubleby	Zimmerman
Dally	Krebs	Sather	Zug
Dempsey	Leh	Saylor	
Egolf	Lynch	Schroder	Ryan,
Fairchild	Maher	Schuler	Speaker
Fargo	Maitland		

NAYS—106

Bebko-Jones	Eachus	McCall	Samuelson
Belardi	Evans	McGeehan	Santoni
Belfanti	Fichter	McGill	Scrimenti
Bishop	Frankel	McIlhinney	Shaner
Browne	Freeman	Melio	Solobay
Bunt	Gannon	Michlovic	Staback
Butkowitz	Gigliotti	Micozzie	Stetler
Buxton	Gladeck	Myers	Sturla
Caltagirone	Grucela	O'Brien	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Gruitza	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Carn	Haluska	Perzel	Thomas
Casorio	Harhai	Pesci	Travaglio
Cawley	Horsey	Petrarca	Trello
Civera	James	Petrone	Trich
Cohen, L. I.	Kaiser	Pistella	Tulli
Cohen, M.	Keller	Preston	Van Horne
Colafella	Kenney	Raymond	Veon
Cornell	LaGrotta	Readshaw	Walko
Corrigan	Laughlin	Reinard	Washington
Costa	Lawless	Rieger	Williams
Daley	Lederer	Roberts	Wilt
DeLuca	Lescovitz	Roebuck	Wogan
Dermody	Levdansky	Rooney	Wojnaroski
DeWeese	Lucyk	Ross	Wright
DiGirolamo	Manderino	Ruffing	Youngblood
Donatucci	Mann	Sainato	Yudichak
Druce	Mayernik		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

Mr. CLYMER offered the following amendment No. A0385:

Amend Title, page 1, line 4, by removing the period after "minors" and inserting

; and limiting certain referenda.

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 1 and 2

Section 2. No referendum on video gaming or gambling devices and activities shall be placed on the ballot more than once every three years.

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

3

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

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

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Very briefly, this again deals with no referendum on video gambling or gambling devices and activities that shall be placed on the ballot more than once every 3 years. This again is video gambling at the liquor-license establishments. It says once every 3 years, and as I said previously, this seems to be a good compromise, one I think that we can all live with, and I hope the members will support it. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On the question, those in favor of the Clymer amendment will vote "aye"; opposed, "no." Mr. DiGirolamo, do you wish to be recognized? Go ahead.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a negative vote again on this amendment for the same reasons. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. What a surprise.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—100

Adolph	Flick	Major	Semmel
Argall	Forcier	Markosek	Serafini
Armstrong	Geist	Marsico	Seyfert
Baker	George	Masland	Smith, B.
Bard	Godshall	McIlhattan	Smith, S. H.
Barley	Gordner	McNaughton	Snyder
Barrar	Gruitza	Metcalfe	Stairs
Bastian	Habay	Miller, R.	Steelman
Battisto	Haluska	Miller, S.	Steil
Benninghoff	Hanna	Mundy	Stern
Birmelin	Harhart	Nailor	Stevenson
Blaum	Hasay	Nickol	Strittmatter

Boyes	Hennessey	Orie	Surra
Chadwick	Herman	Phillips	Taylor, E. Z.
Clark	Hershey	Pippy	Tigue
Clymer	Hess	Platts	True
Coy	Hutchinson	Ramos	Vance
Curry	Jadlowiec	Robinson	Vitali
Dailey	Josephs	Rohrer	Wogan
Dally	Kirkland	Rubley	Yewcic
Dempsey	Krebs	Sather	Zimmerman
Egoff	Leh	Saylor	Zug
Fairchild	Levdansky	Schroder	
Fargo	Lynch	Schuler	Ryan,
Feese	Maher	Scrimenti	Speaker
Fleagle	Maitland		

NAYS—101

Allen	Donatucci	Mayernik	Sainato
Bebko-Jones	Druce	McCall	Samuelson
Belardi	Eachus	McGeehan	Santoni
Belfanti	Evans	McGill	Shaner
Bishop	Fichter	McIlhinney	Solobay
Browne	Frankel	Melio	Staback
Bunt	Freeman	Michlovic	Stetler
Butkovitz	Gannon	Micozzie	Sturla
Buxton	Gigliotti	Myers	Tangretti
Caltagirone	Gladeck	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Cappabianca	Grucela	Oliver	Thomas
Carn	Harhai	Perzel	Travaglio
Casorio	Horsey	Pesci	Trello
Cawley	James	Petrarca	Trich
Civera	Kaiser	Petrone	Tulli
Cohen, L. I.	Keller	Pistella	Van Horne
Cohen, M.	Kenney	Raymond	Veon
Colafella	LaGrotta	Readshaw	Walko
Cornell	Laughlin	Reinard	Washington
Corrigan	Lawless	Rieger	Williams
Costa	Lederer	Roberts	Wilt
Daley	Lescovitz	Roebuck	Wojnaroski
DeLuca	Lucyk	Rooney	Wright
Dermody	Manderino	Ross	Youngblood
DeWeese	Mann	Ruffing	Yudichak
DiGirolamo			

NOT VOTING—1

Preston

EXCUSED—0

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

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER. The Chair advises the members that permission is being given to Sandra Gayle Raab of WTXF, Fox, Philadelphia, to videotape with audio on the floor for the next 15 minutes.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 255 CONTINUED

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Clymer, do you have another amendment?

Mr. CLYMER. Honest; this is the last one. This is absolutely the last amendment.

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. CLYMER offered the following amendment No. A0380:

Amend Title, page 1, line 4, by removing the period after "minors" and inserting

; and limiting certain referenda.

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 1 and 2 Section 2. No referendum on gaming devices and activities at horse racetracks shall be placed on the ballot more than once every two years.

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

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

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

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment, A0380, says no referendum on gambling devices and activities at horse racetracks shall be placed on the ballot more than once every 2 years; once every 2 years. That is activities at horse racetracks, no referendum more than once every 2 years.

This has got to be a good compromise amendment, and I would ask for support. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On the question, Mr. DiGirolamo.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Again, Mr. Speaker, if you are in favor of my amendment, vote "no" on this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. George.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I am like the boy who had an accident; I have not said too much today, and I am not going to say anything, but I do not know whether the Senate controls us or we control what, and what I am going to say has nothing to do with the bill itself. What I am really going to say is that Mr. Clymer continues to place an amendment, and even though there must be 30 of our fine legislators on the Liquor Control Committee, and if in fact they want to help somebody, they ought to understand that in liquor laws you place a referendum locally, and that referendum cannot be placed the next year in order to protect an individual that made an investment. So I do not see what is wrong with him saying, well, let us put a referendum on for 2 years or 3 years, whatever. In essence, he is protecting the individual that made the investment. So the amendment is not bad. It may be what we are doing today is bad, but the amendment is not bad. 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—102

Adolph	Flick	Markosek	Serafini
Allen	Forcier	Marsico	Seyfert
Argall	Freeman	Masland	Smith, B.
Armstrong	George	McIlhattan	Smith, S. H.
Baker	Godshall	McNaughton	Snyder
Bard	Gordner	Metcalfe	Stairs
Barley	Gruitza	Miller, R.	Steelman
Barrar	Habay	Miller, S.	Steil
Bastian	Haluska	Mundy	Stern
Battisto	Hanna	Nailor	Stevenson
Benninghoff	Harhart	Nickol	Strittmatter
Birmelin	Hasay	O'Brien	Sturla
Blaum	Hennessey	Orie	Surra
Boyes	Herman	Phillips	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Hershey	Pippy	Tigue
Clark	Hess	Platts	True
Clymer	Hutchinson	Ramos	Vance
Coy	Jadlowiec	Robinson	Vitali
Curry	Josephs	Rohrer	Wilt
Dally	Kirkland	Rublely	Wogan
Dempsey	Krebs	Samuelson	Yewcic
Egolf	Leh	Saylor	Zimmerman
Fairchild	Lynch	Schroder	Zug
Fargo	Maher	Schuler	
Feese	Maitland	Scrimenti	Ryan,
Feagle	Major	Semmel	Speaker

NAYS—98

Bebko-Jones	Druce	Mayernik	Ruffing
Belardi	Eachus	McCall	Sainato
Belfanti	Evans	McGeehan	Santoni
Bishop	Fichter	McGill	Sather
Browne	Frankel	McIlhinney	Shaner
Bunt	Gannon	Melio	Solobay
Butkovitz	Geist	Michlovic	Staback
Buxton	Gigliotti	Micozzie	Stetler
Caltagirone	Gladeck	Myers	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Grucela	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Carn	Harhai	Perzel	Thomas
Casorio	Horsey	Pesci	Travaglio
Cawley	James	Petrarca	Trello
Civera	Kaiser	Petrone	Trich
Cohen, L. I.	Keller	Pistella	Tulli
Cohen, M.	Kenney	Preston	Van Home
Colafella	LaGrotta	Raymond	Veon
Cornell	Laughlin	Readshaw	Walko
Corrigan	Lawless	Reinard	Washington
Daley	Lederer	Rieger	Williams
DeLuca	Lescovitz	Roberts	Wojnaroski
Dermody	Levdansky	Roebuck	Wright
DeWeese	Lucyk	Rooney	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Manderino	Ross	Yudichak
Donatucci	Mann		

NOT VOTING—2

Costa	Dailey
-------	--------

EXCUSED—0

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. George, taught us all a lesson.

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. Masland. It is the understanding of the Chair that the gentleman, Mr. Masland, desires to suspend the rules of the House to permit him to offer amendment— Kindly give me your numbers.

Mr. MASLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is my intention to move to suspend the rules of the House for the purpose of offering amendment A0510, which would in essence eliminate the language from Mr. DiGirolamo's initial bill so that it would read, and this is very simple: "Shall the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania authorize slot machines at the State's racetracks?" period. No frills; up or down; that is it.

Since it is a nonbinding referendum, I believe the other language is extraneous and irrelevant and that this language trims it down to where it should be.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. On the question before the House, that of suspension of the rules, the majority leader has yielded to the gentleman, Mr. DiGirolamo.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Mr. Speaker, this amendment was not filed in a timely manner. We have debated this issue for long enough. I oppose suspension of the rules. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. On the question of suspension of the rules— This is not debatable except by the floor leaders.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—96

Adolph	Freeman	Masland	Semmel
Armstrong	Geist	McIlhattan	Serafini
Baker	Gladeck	McNaughton	Seyfert
Barley	Godshall	Metcalfe	Smith, B.
Barrar	Gordner	Miller, R.	Snyder
Bastian	Habay	Miller, S.	Staback
Battisto	Haluska	Mundy	Stairs
Belardi	Hanna	Nailor	Steelman
Benninghoff	Harhart	Nickol	Stern
Birmelin	Hasay	O'Brien	Stevenson
Blaum	Hennessey	Orie	Strittmatter
Boyes	Herman	Phillips	Sturla
Cawley	Hershey	Pippy	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Hess	Platts	True
Civera	Hutchinson	Ramos	Vance
Clark	Jadlowiec	Robinson	Vitali
Clymer	Josephs	Rohrer	Wilt
Curry	Kirkland	Rublely	Wogan
Dally	Krebs	Samuelson	Yewcic
Egolf	Leh	Sather	Zimmerman
Fairchild	Lynch	Saylor	Zug
Fargo	Maher	Schroder	
Feagle	Maitland	Schuler	Ryan,
Flick	Major	Scrimenti	Speaker
Forcier	Marsico		

NAYS—103

Allen	DeWeese	Mann	Sainato
Argall	DiGirolamo	Markosek	Santoni
Bard	Donatucci	Mayernik	Shaner
Bebko-Jones	Eachus	McCall	Smith, S. H.

Belfanti	Evans	McGill	Solobay
Bishop	Feese	McIlhinney	Steil
Browne	Fichter	Melio	Stetier
Bunt	Frankel	Michlovic	Surra
Butkovitz	Gannon	Micozzie	Tangretti
Buxton	George	Myers	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Gigliotti	Oliver	Thomas
Cappabianca	Grucela	Perzel	Tigue
Carn	Gruitza	Pesci	Travaglio
Casorio	Harhai	Petrarca	Trello
Cohen, L. I.	Horsev	Petrone	Trich
Cohen, M.	James	Pistella	Tulli
Colafella	Kaiser	Preston	Van Horne
Cornell	Kenney	Raymond	Veon
Corrigan	LaGrotta	Readshaw	Walko
Costa	Laughlin	Reinard	Washington
Coy	Lawless	Rieger	Williams
Dailey	Lederer	Roberts	Wojnaroski
Daley	Lescovitz	Roebuck	Wright
DeLuca	Levdansky	Rooney	Youngblood
Dempsey	Lucyk	Ross	Yudichak
Dermody	Manderino	Ruffing	

NOT VOTING—3

Druce	Keller	McGeehan
-------	--------	----------

EXCUSED—0

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.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Montgomery County, Mrs. Dailey.

Mrs. DAILEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the amendment 380, my switch malfunctioned, and I would like to correct that. I voted in the affirmative.

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

CONSIDERATION OF SB 255 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,

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

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

The SPEAKER. Mr. Masland, you had two amendments. Do you wish to move that the rules be suspended to permit you to offer the second one?

Mr. MASLAND. Yes, Your Honor. I had this amendment drafted—

The SPEAKER. That is better than “Madam Speaker.”

Mr. MASLAND. Did I say “Your Honor”? I tell you, when you are not thinking clearly, you just slip into old habits.

The SPEAKER. I thought it was the gray hair.

Mr. MASLAND. Well, I thought perhaps your wife was up there for a change.

The SPEAKER. The listening audience is going to have trouble with that one.

The gentleman, Mr. Masland.

Mr. MASLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment had been drafted to other amendments which I thought were going to be offered by Mr. Trello but were not, so this was not drafted to amendment A0397, which did ultimately pass, and the purpose of my amendment A0513 is to do the same thing that I proposed to do to the DiGirolamo amendment, take out the frills from the language on the referendum question so that it would merely read, “Do you favor the passage of legislation by the General Assembly to permit limited electronic gaming in liquor-licensed establishments in order to provide additional funding for education and economic development?”— Or excuse me, Mr. Speaker. The question would end, “...liquor-licensed establishments.” It would not have the language about “education and economic development.”

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman moves that the rules of the House be suspended to allow him to offer amendment A0513.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. On the question of suspension, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. DiGirolamo, who speaks in lieu of the majority leader, who has yielded to him. Mr. DiGirolamo.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Again, Mr. Speaker, very simply, I would oppose the suspension of the rules. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Veon, on the question of suspension of the rules, stands in the place of the gentleman, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. VEON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I concur with the gentleman. We have had this debate. We have had this discussion. We should defeat this motion, and I would ask for a negative vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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—89

Adolph	Fleagle	Major	Schuler
Allen	Flick	Marsico	Semmel
Argall	Forcier	Masland	Serafini
Armstrong	Freeman	McIlhattan	Seyfert
Baker	Geist	McNaughton	Smith, B.
Barley	Gordner	Metcalfe	Snyder
Barrar	Habay	Miller, R.	Stairs
Bastian	Haluska	Miller, S.	Steelman
Battisto	Hanna	Mundy	Stern
Benninghoff	Hasay	Nailor	Stevenson
Birmelin	Hennessey	Nickol	Strittmatter
Blaum	Herman	Orie	Taylor, E. Z.
Cawley	Hershey	Phillips	True
Chadwick	Hess	Pippy	Vance
Clark	Hutchinson	Platts	Vitali
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Ramos	Wogan
Curry	Josephs	Robinson	Yewcic
Dally	Kirkland	Rohrer	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Krebs	Rubley	Zug
Egolf	Leh	Samuelson	
Fairchild	Lynch	Sather	Ryan,
Fargo	Maher	Saylor	Speaker
Feese	Maitland	Schroder	

NAYS—112

Bard	Donatucci	Markosek	Santoni
Bebko-Jones	Eachus	Mayernik	Scrimenti
Belardi	Evans	McCall	Shaner
Belfanti	Fichter	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Bishop	Frankel	McGill	Solobay
Boyes	Gannon	McIlhinney	Staback
Browne	George	Melio	Steil
Bunt	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Stetler
Butkovitz	Gladeck	Micozzie	Sturla
Buxton	Godshall	Myers	Surra
Caltagirone	Grucela	O'Brien	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Gruitza	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Carn	Harhai	Perzel	Thomas
Casorio	Harhart	Pesci	Tigue
Civera	Horsey	Petrarca	Travaglio
Cohen, L. I.	James	Petrone	Trello
Cohen, M.	Kaiser	Pistella	Trich
Colafella	Keller	Preston	Tulli
Cornell	Kenney	Raymond	Van Horne
Corrigan	LaGrotta	Readshaw	Veon
Costa	Laughlin	Reinard	Walko
Coy	Lawless	Rieger	Washington
Dailey	Lederer	Roberts	Williams
Daley	Lescovitz	Roebuck	Wilt
DeLuca	Levdansky	Rooney	Wojnaroski
Dermody	Lucyk	Ross	Wright
DeWeese	Manderino	Ruffing	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Mann	Sainato	Yudichak

NOT VOTING—1

Druce

EXCUSED—0

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?

AMENDMENT A0398 RECONSIDERED

The SPEAKER. The Chair has before it a motion by the gentleman, Mr. DeWeese, that the vote by which amendment No. 398 was defeated to SB 255, PN 229, this 9th day of February be reconsidered.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—151

Adolph	Flick	Marsico	Shaner
Allen	Forcier	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Argall	Frankel	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Bard	Freeman	McGeehan	Snyder
Battisto	Gannon	McGill	Solobay
Bebko-Jones	George	Melio	Staback
Belardi	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Stairs
Belfanti	Gladeck	Miller, R.	Steelman
Bishop	Godshall	Mundy	Stetler

Blaum	Gordner	Myers	Stevenson
Boyes	Grucela	Nickol	Sturla
Browne	Gruitza	O'Brien	Surra
Bunt	Haluska	Oliver	Tangretti
Butkovitz	Hanna	Orie	Taylor, E. Z.
Caltagirone	Harhai	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Cappabianca	Harhart	Pesci	Thomas
Carn	Hasay	Petrarca	Tigue
Casorio	Hennessey	Phillips	Travaglio
Cawley	Hershey	Pippy	Trello
Civera	Hess	Pistella	Trich
Cohen, L. I.	Horsey	Preston	Vance
Cohen, M.	Jadlowiec	Ramos	Van Horne
Cornell	James	Raymond	Veon
Corrigan	Kaiser	Readshaw	Vitali
Costa	Keller	Reinard	Walko
Coy	Kenney	Rieger	Washington
Dailey	Krebs	Robinson	Williams
DeLuca	LaGrotta	Roebuck	Wilt
Dempsey	Laughlin	Rooney	Wogan
Dermody	Lederer	Rubley	Wojnaroski
DeWeese	Leh	Ruffing	Wright
DiGirolamo	Lescovitz	Sainato	Youngblood
Donatucci	Levdansky	Samuelson	Yudichak
Eachus	Lucyk	Santoni	Zimmerman
Evans	Maher	Scrimenti	Zug
Fairchild	Manderino	Semmel	
Fargo	Mann	Serafini	Ryan,
Feese	Markosek	Seyfert	Speaker
Fichter			

NAYS—48

Armstrong	Daly	Major	Rohrer
Baker	Egolf	Masland	Ross
Barrar	Fleagle	McIlhattan	Sather
Bastian	Geist	McIlhinney	Saylor
Benninghoff	Habay	McNaughton	Schroder
Birmelin	Herman	Metcalfe	Schuler
Buxton	Hutchinson	Micozzie	Steil
Clark	Josephs	Miller, S.	Stern
Clymer	Kirkland	Nailor	Strittmatter
Colafella	Lawless	Petrone	True
Curry	Lynch	Platts	Tulli
Daley	Maitland	Roberts	Yewcic

NOT VOTING—3

Barley Chadwick Druce

EXCUSED—0

The majority 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 amendment?

The clerk read the following amendment No. A0398:

Amend Title, page 1, line 4, by removing the period after "minors" and inserting

; and providing for a nonbinding Statewide referendum to determine the will of the electorate related to riverboat gaming devices and activities.

Amend Bill, page 2, line 2, by striking out all of said line and inserting

Section 2. (a) The Secretary of the Commonwealth shall cause to be placed on the ballot, at the primary election occurring at least 30 days next following the effective date of this act, a nonbinding referendum to

determine the will of the electorate of this Commonwealth with respect to riverboat gaming.

(b) The referendum question shall be in substantially the following form:

Do you favor authorizing the General Assembly to adopt legislation to permit licensed and regulated riverboat gaming at a limited number of locations on navigable waterways with tax revenues being applied to education and economic development?

(c) The referendum shall be advertised and conducted in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code.

(d) If more than one referendum question is placed on the ballot, the Secretary of the Commonwealth shall cause each referendum question to be separately numbered.

Section 3. This act shall take effect immediately.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On the question of the adoption of the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Evans.

Mr. EVANS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to clarify those issues that some members had with this particular referendum. I would ask for their reconsideration on this issue as we have done with the other two issues, that this is again an issue to go on the ballot.

To those members who had some concerns regarding the navigated waterways, I have indicated to them that this issue, in my view, can be decided by this General Assembly. It is very clear, and I would ask for their reconsideration to support this referendum. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Clymer, on this issue.

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Indeed, we have talked about this issue before, about the unknown factors which I think all of us have to be very much conscious about. What are these riverboats going to be about? How many are there going to be? As I mentioned before, could there be 10? 15? 17? Let us assume that there are 17 riverboats. Are there going to be half of them in Philadelphia and half in Allegheny County? Are we going to see some up in Erie, some in the Poconos, some here in Harrisburg? That will be drawn up by those who wish to put these riverboats throughout this Commonwealth, and these riverboats will carry the same amount of gambling apparatus that the average casino has in Atlantic City, so we are going to have instantaneous casino gambling here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. What is so bold and courageous and noble about picking up an idea that destroys people, destroys lives, takes money from people who can ill afford to gamble and takes their last dime? What is so glorious about that?

And I have not lived in the city of Philadelphia. I guess I can relate to the people that live there. We had some hearings down there. Neighborhoods are scared to death about this — neighborhoods that are picking themselves up by their bootstraps; neighborhoods where families are working together, where the schools are just outstanding schools — and you are going to put them right next to these neighborhoods. You think that parents are going to be around that long to witness that?

How do you build a community? The impression is, bring us money; dump the money in the black hole, and somehow we will

mix it up and everything will come up roses. Well, we all know that it takes work — work of parents, teachers, and the churches working together to build a community, to build individual lives.

These people are not going to sacrifice their children when these riverboats come into the city of Philadelphia or the area of Pittsburgh. These neighborhoods are something that are extremely important, and yet we are going to make the tradeoff. We will trade off the neighborhoods, the people who work hard, the people who do the right things, in order for some dollars that we are going to take, take from the people who can ill afford to gamble. And who is going to be the beneficiary? Obviously, the owners. A few nickels and dimes will trickle down into the city coffers, but the real money will go to the gambling interests, the people who own the riverboats, who take the money and probably send it out of town. They are the real winners. We all lose. And as a suburbanite, I am concerned about the beginnings of this kind of gambling activity in the city, very much concerned. It is regressive taxation at its worst. It is going to create more crime — more organized crime, street crime, white-collar crime. Trust me. We have enough testimony from people who have been involved in these kinds of situations to tell us that.

So, Mr. Speaker, for these and some of the reasons I enumerated earlier in the afternoon, I ask that the members stay with us on this very important vote and say “no” to gambling. Thank you.

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

Mr. GANNON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise once again and ask for a “no” vote on this amendment.

When I spoke a few moments ago in opposition, I talked about the vision of riverboats that is sold by the spin doctors that work for these gambling interests — the vision of Rhett Butler and Scarlett O’Hara cruising down the river in their wonderful riverboat and gentle music and food and dancing and a good time. But that is not the reality, Mr. Speaker. The reality is, those were days when things were less complicated, less technical. The reality is that these are gambling platforms. Their only purpose is to take money out of the pockets of the passengers.

I talked about we have no idea how many boats would be involved in this question. At least with the horse-racing industry, we know those locations. We know where they are. We know that there is existing gambling activity taking place there. So we are not doing anything new. We are simply giving our horse-racing industry in Pennsylvania an opportunity to thrive and to grow, considering the competition that they are facing from States that surround Pennsylvania.

Over 40,000 people or somewhere around 40,000 people are presently employed in our horse-racing industry in Pennsylvania. We want to protect those jobs. We want to protect those people. They live close to Harrisburg, many of them. You do not have to drive very far to see the horse farms in Pennsylvania. Drive down the road to Hanover Farms and see those wonderful, beautiful horses that are raised here in Pennsylvania and are sold and raced around the world, and they are extremely valuable, and they create and provide jobs for Pennsylvania residents. They are existing jobs. We have an obligation to protect them.

How many people are employed by riverboats in Pennsylvania today? Zero, none — excluding the lobbyists in the back. And where are those interests, Mr. Speaker? Most of them are not

located here in Pennsylvania. The casino, the gambling interests are in Nevada, Atlantic City, or wherever and are looking at Pennsylvania and looking at us as a target of opportunity. And what happens when we get all those riverboats lining the Philadelphia wharf and the Pittsburgh piers? We get competition, and it is going to be competition for our tracks and our taverns that today we supported, that we felt that they should have an opportunity to have some type of expansion of gaming; new competition.

And we are not talking about some limited type of gaming, as we did with the tracks and as we did with the taverns. We are talking about wide-open casino gambling. We are talking about craps, cards, wheels, slots, whatever. There is no limit, and the sky will be the limit, and if this is adopted and passed, I guarantee you, multiply the number of lobbyists out back by 10, 20, 30, because they will hire whomever they think they need to get the maximum gambling on those boats.

Let us talk about what will happen the moment those lights go up and if they are all green or they are green enough that they are going to pass this amendment. Mr. Speaker, we will make a handful of people in Pennsylvania and around this country instant millionaires. You can drive along Interstate 95 or Delaware Avenue in Philadelphia and see that vacant land that looks like it is abandoned; nobody wants it; it is worthless. And I tell you that if this amendment passes, tomorrow morning drive down there; you are going to see cyclone fences and security guards, because that land will be worth millions of dollars, and the people that own it will be maybe not millionaires but they will be multimillionaires, because they are waiting for this General Assembly to do something.

And I do not think that is fair to what we have done for our racetracks, which I support, and I want to see that industry thrive, I want to see that business grow, I want to see them compete with other States, and I think our taverns need help also. But I am not sure I think we should be making people from other States wealthy at the expense of people who live and work in Pennsylvania today.

We heard another speaker talk, well, this is private business and we need them here to grow and develop. It is not private business that presently exists in Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker. It is private business that wants to come in and exploit the residents of Pennsylvania, take money from the people of Pennsylvania.

We do not need riverboats. Maybe at one time when our economy was bad and we needed the additional revenues, that would have been the driving force to expand that type of gambling in Pennsylvania, but we do not need it today. We need to keep our riverfronts clear. We need to keep them clean. We need to make it so that the families who go down there today can enjoy a tomorrow and not have their view blocked by some riverboat. We do not need those gaudy neon lights casting shadows over the city of Philadelphia or the city of Pittsburgh.

I urge a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair has on his list of speakers the gentlemen, Messrs. Saylor, Veon, Armstrong, Trello, Gordner, Thomas, and Horsey.

At this time the gentleman from York, Mr. Saylor, is recognized.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

One more time, maybe the Speaker before we adjourned last night should have prescribed that our homework was watching "20/20" last night because they had a program on gambling.

You know, it is interesting when I hear that side of the aisle talking over the years that I have been here — the last 6 years — they have always talked about quality jobs, family-supporting jobs, jobs with health insurance benefits. Today we are talking about creating jobs that are minimum wage, no benefits. We need to look at what we are talking about here today. Job creation is not what this bill is about; it is about putting money in special interest pockets.

We have programs in this Commonwealth that this General Assembly should be very proud of: our PACE (Pharmaceutical Assistance Contract for the Elderly) Program, helping senior citizens who are in dire need of medication that costs hundreds and thousands of dollars on a monthly basis and can now afford that medication because of what this General Assembly did under Governor Casey many years ago. This General Assembly enacted a Property Tax and Rent Rebate Program — again, something that was needed to help our senior citizens across this Commonwealth — a program that is working, and now we really should be expanding it. We have a program to assist homeowners who default on loans for hard economic times in this Commonwealth — good program. I have heard members on that side of the aisle, again, talk about the need to expand that program and put more money into that program. We have fire companies in this Commonwealth who are in dire need of additional funding, funding to help them support saving lives through their firefighting efforts and through their ambulance services that they provide in our communities, from rural to suburban and urban communities. All fire companies need more financial assistance.

We have heard a lot today about why this needs to be done, but all this does and what little revenue it actually produces for the people of this Commonwealth is actually going to cost this Commonwealth far more bucks than it will ever bring in. Our PACE Program and our Property Tax and Rent Rebate Program will be destroyed, economically destroyed, by gambling in this Commonwealth. If you do not believe me, you need to look at other States. You need to look at what the media has put right in front of you. You do not have to go very far to search for failures and what gambling has done to other States.

Where is the money going to come from? Tax increases — is that what this General Assembly is going to be about as we pass this gambling initiative? Are we going to ask the people of this Commonwealth, because of special interests, that we are going to raise your tax? You know, we all have come out in favor of this great bill to cut the personal income tax in Pennsylvania. Well, if we pass this bill, I can guarantee you, we are not only going to not be cutting personal income taxes but we will be back here raising personal income taxes to make up for what the gambling people have taken out of each and every one of our communities. We will be hurting the poor people in our communities, the handicapped people in our communities, and more importantly, the children in our communities of the future.

This General Assembly, it has been mentioned earlier, spent weeks passing special crime legislation, and continually members of this General Assembly this session are already introducing more crime legislation. What are we doing today? We are voting to expand criminal activities in this Commonwealth, and that is

exactly what you are doing. Do not kid yourself. You know it. It is a fact, and it cannot even be argued about.

We need to wake up today, and we need to realize, this is not good medicine for Pennsylvania. What this General Assembly and this Governor has done for this Commonwealth in the last 4 years has been some of the best economic times and best legislation that this General Assembly has passed in decades, and today this General Assembly goes to passing legislation that reverts a lot of that good stuff that we have done over the last 4 years and makes it a travesty.

So today I ask for a "no" vote on this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Beaver County, Mr. Veon. Pass Mr. Veon at this time.

The gentleman from Lancaster, Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I like going to Philadelphia, and I like going to Pittsburgh, and I like taking my family to those two cities. I would like to read a quote out of the Philadelphia Inquirer of this past Sunday, January 31, and it says, "One city convention planner" — in Philadelphia — "has even pointed out that conference organizers say they prefer Philadelphia over Atlantic City because this city doesn't have casinos and gambling. Hard to market yourself as the cradle of liberty when you're looking more like Las Vegas."

Do the right thing, and vote "no" on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Trello.

Mr. TRELLO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the event of the day about gambling makes me very, very proud to be a member of this General Assembly. I know that members on both sides of this issue stood up and they spoke from their heart, and what they said, they really meant, and I respect that and I appreciate that.

Some of the gentlemen got up and spoke about their concerns about what would happen with legalized gambling, and I share their concerns. I can remember when the first bill that came out dealing with riverboat gambling came to my committee, and I read it over, and it said that anybody can get a riverboat gambling license; the fee would be \$50,000. And the first thing that came to my mind was, are we going to hand somebody a multimillion-dollar business for only \$50,000? So I amended the bill in committee, and I put a franchise fee for each riverboat gambling unit of \$50 million, for each, and that is no different than what other cities did, and the reason why they did it is because of Atlantic City, the blighted areas around the casino, and that \$50 million is to be used to revitalize the area around casinos to make sure we never have that problem.

So the concerns of the gentlemen that are opposing this for those reasons are legitimate. I know that, and I respect it. In fact, I respect everyone that spoke on either side of this issue because you spoke from your heart. But I think the answer to the real question came from the gentleman from Chester. When I made a remark about everybody buying a lottery ticket for a dollar, he said that nobody went bankrupt by buying a dollar ticket, and he is 100 percent right. But what he said — maybe you did not get it — but what he said, he actually said that the people of Pennsylvania have been very responsible to gambling. I know people that go to Atlantic City. They only take what they can afford to lose and they come home. Sometimes they win. But he said that we are very

conservative, and as far as gambling is concerned, we gamble our limits. We are responsible people.

And I think we are acting responsible today by saying, look; let us not do a thing until the people of Pennsylvania tell us it is okay. That is all this is. I believe that. If you believe that I am trying to do something other than that, you are wrong. I really believe that we should have the people of Pennsylvania say and end this issue once and for all. We do not have to worry about 1 year, 2 years, or 3 years by putting it on the ballot. I can promise you this: If the people of Pennsylvania say no to video poker, I will never ever offer a bill or an amendment dealing with video poker ever again, and that is my promise to you, but I am anxious to hear what the people have to say about gambling.

So in closing, I would just-like to tell everybody in this room that spoke on either side of this issue that you were fantastic and you spoke from your heart. Let us let the people of Pennsylvania speak from their heart and tell us yes or no. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Columbia, Mr. Gordner.

Mr. GORDNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am going to have great faith in this General Assembly, and the reason why is because around 3 o'clock today we took up this amendment and defeated it by a vote of 92 to 110. That was at 3 o'clock. In order for this to now pass, there would have to be 10 people change their minds on this issue, and I have got about 5 o'clock, and I cannot think of anything that could have happened over the last 2 hours that could possibly do that. Just looking at some of the statistics, the fact that more people gamble than spend money on groceries, that has not changed in the last 2 hours. The fact that \$600 billion was wagered legally in the United States annually, that has not changed. The fact that 75 percent of pathological gamblers admitted that they had committed at least one felony to support their habit, that has not changed in the last 2 hours. Atlantic City, the fact that they have over a 12-percent unemployment rate, that has not changed in the last 2 hours. More than 200 restaurants have gone broke in Atlantic City since the arrival of casinos; that has not changed in the last 2 hours. All of these statistics — and I could go on and on and on, and I will not — but all of these statistics have not changed in the last 2 hours, so I am going to have great faith in this General Assembly that we will again defeat this amendment like we did 2 hours ago. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have sat for 2 days and listened to this debate, and it has been a very spirited debate, and there are those who would have us believe that the debate is really about riverboat gambling and whether or not riverboat gambling should be used as a vehicle to generate additional revenues for education and some other things, and there are those who would have us to believe that we are embarking on a dark, deep mystery that will send Pennsylvania into the Dark Ages if we continue along the path that we are going. Mr. Speaker, both sides of the debate have done an excellent job in articulating their positions, but at the end of the day, the question remains the same regardless of what side of the debate you stood up on. At the end of the day, the question is whether or not the eligible voters of the Commonwealth of

Pennsylvania should have something to say about whether riverboat gambling should be permitted in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. That is the only factual question that we are really dealing with.

So, Mr. Speaker, at this time of the evening, it really comes down to choosing fiction over fact. It is a fiction to believe that this is going to send Pennsylvania into the Dark Ages. It is also fiction to believe that this is really about a resurgence of crime or it is about turning loose bad behavior. No, Mr. Speaker, the factual part of this issue is about whether or not the eligible voters of Pennsylvania have something to say about gaming in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

During my five terms, I have taken part in this debate in one form or another. For 10 years, we in the legislature have been wrestling with the question of whether gaming should be expanded or should be permitted in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. And even prior to my tenure in the Pennsylvania House, we have had Governors in this great State, some who have supported gaming, others who have said, over my dead body; gaming will not be permitted. So Governors have spoken. The legislature, in one form or another, has spoken. But at no time in the last decade have the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania stood up and said yea or nay on the issue of gaming in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. So I think that the fitting thing to do as we enter the 21st century, because in just a few months, we will be passing from this decade into another decade, and I say one of the most fitting things that we can do, as we make this transition from yesterday to tomorrow, is to hear what the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania have to say on the issue of gaming. And it is of little consequence whether that issue is asked in May of 1999 or whether it is asked in November of 1999. The important thing is that the people be given a chance to speak out. I have some personal feelings about gambling. I am not a proponent of gambling, but I at least want the luxury, I want the luxury of being able to participate in moving that discussion one way or another.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say, let us stop the games; let us stop the whole academia around gambling; let us stop going at one another about what I think versus what you think. Let us come together, Republicans, Democrats, tall people, short Representatives, African-American Reps, white Reps, let us all come together around a very basic question, and that is, give the people of Pennsylvania a chance to speak; support the Evans amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perry, Mr. Egolf.

The Chair is in error. The gentleman, Mr. Horsey, was next on the list. Mr. Egolf, you follow Mr. Horsey.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Horsey.

Mr. HORSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very strange on this side of the aisle being an advocate for free enterprise, but I guess there will be many, many strange days in this particular chamber, because this party on this side usually stands for jobs and the other party usually stands for free enterprise, but today I am arguing for free enterprise, Mr. Speaker — yes, the right of individuals to make millions. It is a very strange world we live in.

Initially when I stood up, Mr. Speaker, I talked about "Evita" and asked them not to talk or not to think about Philadelphia and that we would handle gambling if we were given the right to have gambling in Philadelphia, Mr. Speaker. But then again, I was

wondering, Mr. Speaker, why are so many people who are not from Philadelphia or Pittsburgh or Erie or even the Poconos opposed to gambling, and I thought about the movie, Mr. Speaker, "Field of Dreams," and there is a little saying in that movie that goes this way: "If they build it, they will come." And there are people in this chamber who know, Mr. Speaker, that if we have gambling in these areas, people will not go to Jersey; people will not go to West Virginia; people will not go to Delaware.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, in New Jersey last year they made \$4 billion in gambling, Mr. Speaker. Over a billion of those dollars came from guess where? Pennsylvania and Philadelphia, Mr. Speaker. We need to do something, Mr. Speaker, in the State of Pennsylvania to keep those dollars in Pennsylvania. That is why we need to pass the Evans amendment, Mr. Speaker. We need to provide them with the same options and be as competitive in Pennsylvania as West Virginia and as Delaware and as Jersey are.

Now, I had asked the question earlier, Mr. Speaker, and you said it was an inappropriate question about what are the States that border Pennsylvania, and I am back to that question again, Mr. Speaker, in a rhetorical manner, because every State that surrounds Pennsylvania — New York, Ohio, West Virginia, even Maryland — okay? — Delaware, Jersey — all those States have a form of gambling, Mr. Speaker; all of them. And in some of them, like West Virginia and Delaware and even Jersey, they are winning, Mr. Speaker, and how are they winning? Because they have extended the right to people that we refuse in this chamber to extend, and that is the right for people to decide whether they want to have gambling or not. And because we in this chamber, Mr. Speaker, will not make that decision, people are making that decision. You know how they are doing that, Mr. Speaker? They are voting with their feet, because they are going to West Virginia, they are going to Delaware, and they are going to Jersey to gamble, Mr. Speaker, because we do not do it in Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker. And I am here to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if we extended the right to people in Pennsylvania to gamble in Pennsylvania, I believe that those dollars will stay in the State of Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker.

Now, for 2 years, Mr. Speaker, longer than 2 years, Mr. Speaker, people in this chamber have been talking about tax reform, Mr. Speaker; we need to do something with tax reform. The Evans amendment says, once again, sure, let us have gambling, with the proceeds to go to education and economic development. Mr. Speaker, tax reform means that property taxes that are paid to education could be lowered or at least kept at a level because gambling will subsidize those dollars, Mr. Speaker, and in return, we would not have to every year come into this chamber and consider hundreds of millions of dollars for education. Now, I do not understand what the problem is there with people. I do not understand why people do not get that, Mr. Speaker. It is not very difficult.

And I am going to sit down, Mr. Speaker, with one more comment, and that comment is, New Jersey made \$4 billion last year, Mr. Speaker, and over \$1 billion came from Pennsylvanians. Somebody explain that to me, Mr. Speaker. How do you rationalize that? And you worry about millionaires becoming millionaires in the State of Pennsylvania? You better worry about millionaires becoming millionaires in Jersey, Delaware, and West Virginia, because those are not Pennsylvanians either.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I urge support for the Evans amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question of the adoption of the Evans amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Egolf.

Mr. EGOLF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It was said by several speakers earlier here that we are just letting the people decide. We are not letting the people decide. First of all, this is not a binding referendum. If we want to let the people decide or let them give us and tell us what they want, let us just take a poll; let us just go and commission a poll and go out and find out, poll the voters. I know why we do not want to do that, because we want to let the gambling industry have time to go out and spend their millions and try to convince the people why it is a good thing, because if we polled them right now, we know what they would vote for.

The other thing several speakers said about the money going to Las Vegas, that Las Vegas said that Pennsylvania was number four of the people that go out there, so let us bring them back to Pennsylvania. Well, if we want to bring them back, do we also want to bring the other statistics back that Las Vegas or Nevada is bragging about? I do not think they are bragging, but they have these statistics. Let me just tell you again what some of those are. They are first in the nation, in all 50 States, they are first in the number of suicides. They are first in divorce. They are first in high school dropouts. They are first in homicide against women. They are first in gambling addictions. They are third in bankruptcies. They are third in abortion; fourth in rape; fourth in out-of-wedlock births; fourth in alcohol-related deaths; fifth in crime. They rank in the top third in the nation in child abuse. Are those the things we want to bring along with that money that comes back to Pennsylvania?

You talk about some of the other States around us. Maybe they have not had the time yet to build up those statistics. You look at New Jersey and some of the other States. I think we need time maybe to study and see if there is a trend on these other States. Let us not rush into this. There is something about this, that Nevada has been gambling for many years; they built up these statistics. Maybe that will also go for Pennsylvania. Is that what we want? Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Roebuck.

Mr. ROEBUCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand to affirm the right of the voters of Pennsylvania to make a choice, and the choice that they should have the opportunity to make is whether or not they want this particular form of gambling along with the other options that we voted to give them today.

Now, we have heard a long dialogue of horror stories about all the evils that come with gambling, and I am struck by some of these stories, because we have had images created that have no relationship to reality. One of my colleagues suggested that we are going to have casinos lining the Delaware, even suggesting we might have as many as 17 such facilities along the river. But it seems to me that does this not come back to this body for enabling legislation should the people vote to have riverboat gambling? Do we not as legislators have the final say whether there is 1 such riverboat on the Delaware or 10 or however many, or did we forget that indeed we have the ultimate say over that process?

It has been suggested that it was a positive vote for other parts of this legislation because we were preserving jobs in taverns or jobs in racetracks, and the question was asked, how many jobs are there in riverboats in Pennsylvania, and the answer was none. That

speaks very clearly, Mr. Speaker, to what is the reality for many of the people who live in areas of Pennsylvania. There are not jobs. There are not jobs now in the taverns for them. There are not jobs in the racetracks. As we move towards welfare reform, as we turn people off of welfare, where are the jobs, Mr. Speaker? I would like to believe there will be jobs certainly as we expand this particular opportunity. They might not be the best jobs. They might not be the jobs I would prefer. But believe me, when you need a job, you need a job, and if the opportunity is there, Mr. Speaker, I believe we ought to seize that opportunity.

It has been suggested that if we adopt this particular amendment, we are going to destroy the PACE Program; we are going to undermine rent rebates. Where is the factual foundation, Mr. Speaker, for that assertion? I see none; I have heard none.

It is suggested that if we pass this amendment, we are voting to expand criminal activity. I think that certainly is an appeal to fear; it is an appeal to misinformation. I do not even think it is an appeal that should have been made on the floor of this House.

It has been noted that there are problems in other States that have gambling, and I am struck at the long litany of statistics about Nevada, and they are taken clearly out of any context. Are we to say that these things happen because there is gambling in that State? Well, I suggest not, Mr. Speaker. It has been noted that Nevada has the number one divorce rate in the country, but what is not told to you, of course, is that it is easier to get a divorce in Nevada, and people go to Nevada for that reason, just like it used to be easier to go to Maryland to get married than it was to stay in Pennsylvania, so people went to places like Elkton to get married rather than waiting for a longer period in this State. So let us get beyond the misinformation, Mr. Speaker. Let us look at what we are talking about.

It has also been noted that we now see nice clean riverbanks, with no development along them, and that might be nice, but again, I go back to the reality that no development many times means no progress, and for those who want progress, those particularly who need the opportunity for employment, we need to provide as many opportunities as we can to give them that right.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle join in supporting the Evans amendment. Put the question on the ballot; let the people decide. I have faith in the people of my legislative district to make a good decision, whichever way they vote, but I believe that they have the right to make that decision. I would trust that all of us together can give all the citizens of Pennsylvania the right to make a choice. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland County, Mr. Masland.

Mr. MASLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to briefly interrogate the maker of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Evans.

Mr. MASLAND. You might as well stand at that podium.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Evans has indicated he will stand for interrogation. You may begin.

Mr. MASLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what is the definition of a riverboat?

Let me extend that a little bit. Must a riverboat float, or can it be a boat that is moored into the side, into the creekside or the riverside?

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, and I know the gentleman is trying to be very serious in the question he is asking, but what I have said consistently is that issue needs to be decided by the members of the

General Assembly here in the House and the Senate to define the questions, does it float? Is it connected to a pier? That issue is decided here by the General Assembly. This, Mr. Speaker, is a referendum, and the people of this State will vote on the referendum.

Mr. MASLAND. Well, then it is correct, is it not, Mr. Speaker, that these so-called riverboats would not necessarily have to navigate any waterway; they could be docked to the pier; they could be permanent structures that merely appear to be riverboats? Is that not correct, depending on how we pass the legislation?

Mr. EVANS. You said the correct thing, Mr. Speaker, when you said it depends on how we pass the legislation, because it is the legislative body, once the people give us a sense that they would like for us to pass this legislation, that we then would go through that type of debate and discussion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MASLAND. Thank you. I have no further questions.

On the amendment, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. MASLAND. Well, Mr. Speaker, if this amendment passes, if the bill passes, I can see it now. No longer when you drive up Route 83 or cross over the Walt Whitman Bridge or come into whatever bridge it is out in Pittsburgh — I have never been out that way too often — or whatever road it is on Route 76, when you enter Pennsylvania now, you will not see the sign "Welcome to Pennsylvania"; you will not see "Pennsylvania Starts Here." What you will see is, "Welcome to Pennsylv-Vegas," because that is what we might as well change the State to. It is not going to be Penn's Woods. It is going to be Penn's Casinos, because, Mr. Speaker, these riverboats are in effect going to be casinos.

We can try to fool ourselves and say, well, that will be decided later and that is not for us to decide now, but the voters of this State are going to be asked to vote on something with very few details as we have been asked to push this through today and yesterday without any details. And, you know, the interesting thing is—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MASLAND. Yes. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Will the Sergeant at Arms clear the area behind the rail. Members, please take your seats. We have only one more speaker after Mr. Masland.

Mr. Masland, you are recognized. Members, take your seats, please.

Mr. Masland.

Mr. MASLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Similar legislation was considered in New York State last year, and it was defeated because it was not precise enough; it was defeated in the legislature, and their legislation actually specified the location and the number of the establishments. We do not even do that, Mr. Speaker.

I recognize that sooner or later we are going to need to have a referendum on these various issues, but that vote should be taken at a time when we know what the details are.

My good friend from Columbia County noted just a little while ago that the vote at approximately 3 o'clock was 110 to 92 against this amendment. Well, just as this bill has been pushed through, I know that a number of you have been pushed to change your votes, some of you against your will, against your better judgment, and against your gut feeling, and this is not the first time it has happened. It may not be the first time that it has happened to you,

but just because someone other than a person like me has the leverage that they can use to get you to—

The SPEAKER. Mr. Masland?

Mr. MASLAND. —change your vote does not make it right.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

You are skirting very close to being out of order by making suggestions that anything improper has been done here. I would ask that you shy away from that area of your topic.

Mr. MASLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have tried to get as close to that line as possible because that is what is happening.

The SPEAKER. I think you just crossed it with that. Please, be careful of your remarks. If you impugn the reputation of the members of this House, you are impugning your own by association. It is not proper, and I am going to rule you out of order with the making of such remarks. I am voting with you, but I cannot stand those remarks being made in this House.

Mr. MASLAND. I apologize, Mr. Speaker.

Let me simply ask those of you who voted in the negative the last time to stand firm this time.

The important number though for all of us to remember if this does pass is not the final vote tally but the 800 number that we are going to all need to give to our constituents on our mailers for the compulsive gambling hotline; that is, 1-800-848-1880 — 800-848-1880. Write it down. You are going to need it in your district offices; you are going to need it in your Harrisburg office. And the only other number that I would respectfully request the Speaker to enforce is that of rule No. 64, requiring members to be present and in their seats to have their votes recorded. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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—101

Bard	Donatucci	McGeehan	Santoni
Barrar	Eachus	McGill	Scrimenti
Bebko-Jones	Evans	Melio	Shaner
Belardi	Fichter	Michlovic	Solobay
Belfanti	Frankel	Micozzie	Staback
Bishop	Gigliotti	Mundy	Steelman
Bunt	Gladeck	Myers	Stetler
Butkovitz	Grucela	O'Brien	Tangretti
Buxton	Gruitza	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Haluska	Perzel	Thomas
Cappabianca	Harhai	Pesci	Travaglio
Carn	Horsey	Petrarca	Trello
Casorio	James	Petrone	Trich
Chadwick	Kaiser	Pistella	Tulli
Civera	Keller	Preston	Van Home
Cohen, L. I.	Kenney	Ramos	Veon
Cohen, M.	LaGrotta	Raymond	Walko
Colafella	Laughlin	Readshaw	Washington
Cornell	Lawless	Rieger	Williams
Corrigan	Lederer	Roberts	Wilt
Costa	Lescovitz	Robinson	Wogan
Daley	Levdansky	Roebuck	Wojnaroski
DeLuca	Lucyk	Rooney	Wright
Dermody	Mann	Ruffing	Youngblood
DeWeese	Marsico	Sainato	Yudichak
DiGirolamo			

NAYS—98

Adolph	Fleagle	Major	Schuler
Allen	Flick	Manderino	Semmel
Argall	Forcier	Markosek	Serafini
Armstrong	Freeman	Masland	Seyfert
Baker	Gannon	McCall	Smith, B.
Barley	Geist	McIlhattan	Smith, S. H.
Bastian	George	McIlhinney	Snyder
Battisto	Gordner	McNaughton	Stairs
Benninghoff	Habay	Metcalfe	Steil
Birmelin	Hanna	Miller, R.	Stern
Blaum	Harhart	Miller, S.	Stevenson
Browne	Hasay	Nailor	Strittmatter
Cawley	Hennessey	Nickol	Sturta
Clark	Herman	Orie	Surra
Clymer	Hershey	Phillips	Taylor, E. Z.
Coy	Hess	Pippy	Tigue
Curry	Hutchinson	Platts	True
Dailey	Jadlowiec	Reinard	Vance
Dally	Josephs	Rohrer	Vitali
Dempsey	Kirkland	Ross	Yewcic
Druce	Krebs	Rubley	Zimmerman
Egolf	Leh	Samuelson	Zug
Fairchild	Lynch	Sather	
Fargo	Maher	Saylor	Ryan, Speaker
Feese	Maitland	Schroder	

NOT VOTING—3

Boyes	Godshall	Mayernik
-------	----------	----------

EXCUSED—0

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?

**AMENDMENT A0485, PART 1,
RECONSIDERED**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Masland, who moves that the vote by which part 1 of amendment No. A0485 was defeated to SB 255, PN 229, on the 9th day of February be reconsidered.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—123

Adolph	Fargo	Maitland	Serafini
Allen	Feese	Marsico	Seyfert
Argall	Fichter	Masland	Smith, B.
Armstrong	Fleagle	Mayernik	Smith, S. H.
Baker	Flick	McGill	Snyder
Bard	Forcier	McNaughton	Staback
Barley	Freeman	Michlovic	Stairs
Barrar	Gannon	Miller, R.	Steelman
Battisto	Geist	Myers	Steil
Belardi	George	Nailor	Stern
Belfanti	Gordner	Nickol	Stetler
Benninghoff	Habay	Orie	Stevenson

Birmelin	Haluska	Perzel	Strittmatter
Bishop	Hanna	Petrone	Sturla
Blaum	Harhart	Phillips	Surra
Boyes	Hasay	Pippy	Taylor, E. Z.
Browne	Hennessey	Pistella	Taylor, J.
Bunt	Herman	Platts	Thomas
Butkovitz	Hershey	Ramos	Tigue
Cawley	Hess	Reinard	Tulli
Clark	Hutchinson	Robinson	Vance
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Roebuck	Veon
Cohen, L. I.	Josephs	Rohrer	Vitali
Cornell	Kirkland	Rooney	Wilt
Dailey	Krebs	Rubley	Wright
Dally	Laughlin	Samuelson	Yewcic
Dempsey	Lawless	Sather	Youngblood
DeWeese	Leh	Saylor	Zug
Echus	Lescovitz	Schroder	
Egolf	Lynch	Schuler	Ryan, Speaker
Evans	Maher	Semmel	
Fairchild			

NAYS—76

Bastian	Donatucci	Mann	Ross
Bebko-Jones	Druce	Markosek	Ruffing
Buxton	Frankel	McCall	Sainato
Caltagirone	Gigliotti	McGeehan	Santoni
Cappabianca	Gladeck	McIlhinney	Scrimonti
Carn	Grucela	Melio	Shaner
Casorio	Gruitza	Metcalfe	Solobay
Chadwick	Harhai	Micozzie	Tangretti
Civera	Horsey	Miller, S.	Travaglio
Cohen, M.	James	Mundy	Trello
Colafella	Kaiser	O'Brien	Trich
Corrigan	Keller	Oliver	True
Costa	Kenney	Pesci	Van Home
Coy	LaGrotta	Petrarca	Walko
Curry	Lederer	Preston	Williams
Daley	Levdansky	Raymond	Wogan
DeLuca	Lucyk	Readshaw	Wojnaroski
Dermody	Major	Rieger	Yudichak
DiGirolamo	Manderino	Roberts	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—3

Godshall	McIlhattan	Washington
----------	------------	------------

EXCUSED—0

The majority 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 part 1 of the amendment?

The clerk read the following amendment No. **A0485, part 1:**

Amend Sec. 2, page 1, line 8 (A0188), by striking out "primary" and inserting

general

Amend Sec. 2, page 1, line 9 (A0188), by striking out "30" and inserting

90

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to part 1 of the amendment?

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

Mr. Masland, when this amendment was earlier offered, the amendment had been divided. It is my understanding that you continue to seek support just for the first six lines of that amendment as printed. Is that accurate?

Mr. MASLAND. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes him.

Mr. MASLAND. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief.

I was approached by a couple of members who said that their vote had been recorded incorrectly, and they suggested that this be reconsidered, and therefore, I am asking for this vote.

Just to remind the members, all this amendment does — and it is significant — is change “primary” to “general” election, which would basically require the DiGirolamo amendment to be voted on, or the referendum to be voted on, in the November general election.

The SPEAKER. On the question of the adoption of the Masland amendment, Mr. DiGirolamo.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This issue has been around for a decade or longer. It is time that we allow the people of Pennsylvania—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield. Will the gentleman yield.

Conferences in the immediate vicinity of the gentleman, Mr. DiGirolamo, please break up.

Mr. DiGirolamo.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, this issue has been around for long enough. It has been around for a decade. It is time that we allow the people of Pennsylvania to vote on this in the May primary.

I ask for a negative vote on the Masland amendment. Thank you.

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

Mr. CORRIGAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I also rise to oppose the Masland amendment for many, many reasons.

In the interest of being brief, the DiGirolamo amendment passed this House. It is the amendment of the House. I hope that it remains the way it is. The Masland amendment is nothing more than a ruse in trying to bring about a minority opinion on this bill.

I would strongly support the DiGirolamo amendment and oppose the Masland amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to part 1 of the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—87

Adolph	Flick	Maitland	Serafini
Allen	Forcier	Major	Seyfert
Argall	Freeman	Marsico	Smith, B.
Armstrong	Geist	Masland	Stairs
Baker	Gordner	McIlhattan	Steelman
Barrar	Habay	McNaughton	Steil
Bastian	Hanna	Metcalfe	Stern
Battisto	Harhart	Miller, R.	Stevenson
Benninghoff	Hasay	Miller, S.	Strittmatter
Birmelin	Hennessey	Nailor	Sturla
Butkovitz	Herman	Orie	Taylor, E. Z.

Cawley	Hershey	Phillips	Tigue
Clark	Hess	Pippy	True
Clymer	Hutchinson	Platts	Vance
Curry	Jadlowiec	Rohrer	Vitali
Dailey	Keller	Rubley	Wogan
Dally	Kirkland	Samuelson	Yewcic
Dempsey	Krebs	Sather	Zimmerman
Egoif	Lederer	Saylor	Zug
Fairchild	Leh	Schroder	
Fargo	Lynch	Schuler	Ryan,
Feese	Maher	Semmel	Speaker
Fleagle			

NAYS—114

Bard	Druce	McCall	Ruffing
Barley	Eachus	McGeehan	Sainato
Bebko-Jones	Evans	McGill	Santoni
Belardi	Fichter	McIlhinney	Scrimenti
Belfanti	Frankel	Melio	Shaner
Bishop	Gannon	Michlovic	Smith, S. H.
Blaum	George	Micozzie	Snyder
Boyes	Gigliotti	Mundy	Solobay
Browne	Gladeck	Myers	Staback
Bunt	Godshall	Nickol	Stetler
Buxton	Grucela	O'Brien	Surra
Cappabianca	Gruitza	Oliver	Tangretti
Carn	Haluska	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Casorio	Harhai	Pesci	Thomas
Chadwick	Horsey	Petrarca	Travaglio
Civera	James	Petrone	Trello
Cohen, L. I.	Josephs	Pistella	Trich
Cohen, M.	Kaiser	Preston	Tulli
Colafella	Kenney	Ramos	Van Horne
Cornell	LaGrotta	Raymond	Veon
Corrigan	Laughlin	Readshaw	Walko
Costa	Lawless	Reinard	Washington
Coy	Lescovitz	Rieger	Williams
Daley	Levdansky	Roberts	Wilt
DeLuca	Lucyk	Robinson	Wojnaroski
Dermody	Manderino	Roebuck	Wright
DeWeese	Mann	Rooney	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Markosek	Ross	Yudichak
Donatucci	Mayernik		

NOT VOTING—1

Caltagirone

EXCUSED—0

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

On the question recurring,

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

AMENDMENT A0188 RECONSIDERED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Hanna, who moves that the vote by which amendment No. A0188 was passed to SB 255, PN 229, on the 9th day of February be reconsidered.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—134

Adolph	Fargo	Marsico	Serafini
Allen	Feese	Masland	Seyfert
Argall	Fichter	McGill	Smith, B.
Armstrong	Fleagle	McIlhattan	Smith, S. H.
Baker	Flick	McNaughton	Snyder
Bard	Forcier	Metcalfe	Staback
Barley	Freeman	Michlovic	Stairs
Barrar	Gannon	Micozzie	Steelman
Bastian	Geist	Miller, R.	Steil
Battisto	Gladeck	Miller, S.	Stern
Belardi	Gordner	Mundy	Stevenson
Benninghoff	Grucela	Nailor	Strittmatter
Birmelin	Habay	Nickol	Sturla
Bishop	Haluska	O'Brien	Surra
Blaum	Hanna	Orie	Taylor, E. Z.
Boyes	Harhart	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Browne	Hasay	Petrone	Thomas
Bunt	Hennessey	Phillips	Tigue
Chadwick	Herman	Pippy	True
Civera	Hershey	Pistella	Tulli
Clark	Hess	Platts	Vance
Clymer	Hutchinson	Reinard	Van Home
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Robinson	Veon
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Rohrer	Vitali
Cornell	Kirkland	Rooney	Washington
Coy	Krebs	Rublej	Wilt
Curry	Leh	Ruffing	Wogan
Dailey	Lescovitz	Samuelson	Wright
Dally	Lucyk	Sather	Yewcic
Dempsey	Lynch	Saylor	Zimmerman
DeWeese	Maher	Schroder	Zug
Egolf	Maitland	Schuler	
Evans	Major	Scrimenti	Ryan,
Fairchild	Manderino	Semmel	Speaker

NAYS—68

Bebko-Jones	Druce	Levdansky	Roberts
Belfanti	Eachus	Mann	Roebuck
Butkovitz	Frankel	Markosek	Ross
Buxton	George	Mayernik	Sainato
Caltagirone	Gigliotti	McCall	Santoni
Cappabianca	Godshall	McGeehan	Shaner
Carn	Gruitza	McIlhinney	Solobay
Casorio	Harhai	Melio	Stetler
Cawley	Horsej	Myers	Tangretti
Colafella	James	Oliver	Travaglio
Corrigan	Kaiser	Pesci	Trello
Costa	Keller	Petrarca	Trich
Daley	Kenney	Preston	Walko
DeLuca	LaGrotta	Ramos	Williams
Dermody	Laughlin	Raymond	Wojnaroski
DiGrolamo	Lawless	Readshaw	Youngblood
Donatucci	Lederer	Rieger	Yudichak

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

The majority 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 amendment?

The clerk read the following amendment No. A0188:

Amend Title, page 1, line 4, by removing the period after "minors" and inserting ; and providing for a Statewide referendum on slot machines at horse racetracks.

Amend Bill, page 2, line 2, by striking out all of said line and inserting

Section 2. (a) The Secretary of the Commonwealth shall cause to be placed on the ballot, at the primary election occurring at least 30 days next following the effective date of this act, a nonbinding referendum to determine the will of the electorate of this Commonwealth with respect to slot machines at racetracks.

(b) The referendum question shall be in substantially the following form:

Shall the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania generate revenues for educational purposes and economic development by authorizing a limited number of strictly regulated slot machines at the State's racetracks that already permit wagering on horse racing?

(c) The referendum shall be advertised and conducted in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code.

(d) Should there be more than one referenda question on the ballot, the secretary shall place the slot machine at racetracks referendum question in the first position on said ballot.

Section 3. This act shall take effect as follows:

(1) The amendment of 18 Pa.C.S. § 6308 shall take effect in 60 days.

(2) The remainder to this act shall take effect immediately.

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

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Hanna. The gentleman, Mr. Hanna, do you care to be recognized on this?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—111

Argall	Evans	McCall	Scrimenti
Bard	Fichter	McGeehan	Shaner
Bebko-Jones	Frankel	McGill	Snyder
Belardi	Gannon	Melio	Solobay
Belfanti	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Staback
Bishop	Gladeck	Micozzie	Steelman
Browne	Grucela	Myers	Stetler
Bunt	Gruitza	O'Brien	Stevenson
Butkovitz	Haluska	Oliver	Tangretti
Buxton	Harhai	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Hennessey	Pesci	Thomas
Cappabianca	Horsej	Petrarca	Tigue
Casorio	James	Petrone	Travaglio
Civera	Kaiser	Pippy	Trello
Cohen, L. I.	Keller	Pistella	Trich
Cohen, M.	Kenney	Preston	Tulli
Colafella	LaGrotta	Ramos	Van Home
Cornell	Laughlin	Raymond	Veon
Corrigan	Lawless	Readshaw	Walko
Costa	Lederer	Reinard	Washington
Daley	Lescovitz	Rieger	Williams
DeLuca	Levdansky	Roberts	Wilt
Dermody	Lucyk	Robinson	Wogan
DeWeese	Maher	Rooney	Wojnaroski

DiGirolamo	Mann	Ross	Wright
Donatucci	Markosek	Ruffing	Youngblood
Druce	Marsico	Sainato	Yudichak
Eachus	Mayernik	Santoni	

NAYS-91

Adolph	Fargo	Lynch	Schroder
Allen	Feese	Maitland	Schuler
Armstrong	Fleagle	Major	Semmel
Baker	Flick	Manderino	Serafini
Barley	Forcier	Masland	Seyfert
Barrar	Freeman	McIlhattan	Smith, B.
Bastian	Geist	McIlhinney	Smith, S. H.
Battisto	George	McNaughton	Stairs
Benninghoff	Godshall	Metcalfe	Steil
Birmelin	Gordner	Miller, R.	Stern
Blaum	Habay	Miller, S.	Strittmatter
Boyes	Hanna	Mundy	Sturla
Carn	Harhart	Nailor	Surra
Cawley	Hasay	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Herman	Orie	True
Clark	Hershey	Phillips	Vance
Clymer	Hess	Platts	Vitali
Coy	Hutchinson	Roebuck	Yewcic
Curry	Jadlowiec	Rohrer	Zimmerman
Dailey	Josephs	Rublely	Zug
Daily	Kirkland	Samuelson	
Dempsey	Krebs	Sather	Ryan,
Egolf	Leh	Saylor	Speaker

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-0

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?

AMENDMENT A0266 RECONSIDERED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Van Horne, who moves that the vote by which amendment 266 was defeated to SB 255, PN 229, on the 9th day of February be reconsidered.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-163

Adolph	Fargo	Mayernik	Semmel
Allen	Feese	McCall	Serafini
Bard	Fichter	McGill	Seyfert
Barley	Fleagle	McNaughton	Shaner
Barrar	Flick	Meio	Smith, B.
Bastian	Forcier	Michlovic	Smith, S. H.
Battisto	Frankel	Micozzie	Snyder
Bebko-Jones	Freeman	Miller, R.	Staback
Belardi	Gannon	Miller, S.	Stairs
Belfanti	Geist	Mundy	Steelman
Benninghoff	Gigliotti	Myers	Steil
Bishop	Gladeck	Nailor	Stern

Blaum	Gordner	Nickol	Stetler
Boyes	Gruitza	O'Brien	Stevenson
Browne	Haluska	Oliver	Strittmatter
Bunt	Hanna	Orie	Sturla
Buxton	Harhai	Perzel	Surra
Caltagirone	Harhart	Pesci	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Hasay	Petrarca	Taylor, E. Z.
Casorio	Hennessey	Petrone	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Herman	Phillips	Thomas
Chadwick	Hershey	Pippy	Tigue
Civera	Hess	Pistella	Travaglio
Cohen, L. I.	Horsey	Platts	Trello
Cohen, M.	Jadlowiec	Preston	Trich
Colafella	Josephs	Ramos	Tulli
Cornell	Kaiser	Readshaw	Vance
Corrigan	Keller	Reinard	Van Horne
Costa	Kirkland	Rieger	Veon
Coy	Krebs	Roberts	Vitali
Curry	LaGrotta	Robinson	Walko
Dailey	Laughlin	Rooney	Washington
Daily	Lescovitz	Rublely	Wogan
DeLuca	Lucyk	Ruffing	Wojnaroski
Dempsey	Maher	Sainato	Wright
Dermody	Maitland	Samuelson	Youngblood
DeWeese	Major	Santoni	Zimmerman
Donatucci	Manderino	Saylor	Zug
Eachus	Markosek	Schroder	
Egolf	Marsico	Schuler	Ryan,
Evans	Masland	Scrimenti	Speaker
Fairchild			

NAYS-39

Argall	Druce	Leh	Rohrer
Armstrong	George	Levdansky	Ross
Baker	Godshall	Lynch	Sather
Birmelin	Grucela	Mann	Solobay
Butkovitz	Habay	McGeehan	True
Carn	Hutchinson	McIlhattan	Williams
Clark	James	McIlhinney	Wilt
Clymer	Kenney	Metcalfe	Yewcic
Daley	Lawless	Raymond	Yudichak
DiGirolamo	Lederer	Roebuck	

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-0

The majority 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 amendment?

The clerk read the following amendment No. A0266:

Amend Title, page 1, line 2, by inserting after "Statutes,"
authorizing the gambling game of keno; and
Amend Bill, page 1, lines 7 and 8, by striking out all of said lines
and inserting

Section 1. Title 18 of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes is amended by adding a section to read:

§ 5513.1. Keno.

(a) Authorization.—The Secretary of Revenue may institute the gambling game of keno to be administered by the division of the State Lottery. The secretary shall have the powers and duties given him under the act of August 26, 1971 (P.L.351, No.91), known as the State Lottery Law. All proceeds from keno shall be placed into the State Lottery Fund in accordance with section 311 of the State Lottery Law.

(b) Definition.—As used in this section, the term “keno” means a game of chance using 80 numbers in which 20 random numbers are drawn. Players may win cash prizes based on how many numbers they match to the numbers randomly drawn by the State. The game may be played in locations, such as, but not limited to, taverns, restaurants, bowling alleys, airports and hotels, as approved by the Secretary of Revenue.

Section 2. Section 6308(a) of Title 18 is amended to read:
Amend Sec. 2, page 2, line 2, by striking out “2” and inserting

3

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman.
Mr. VAN HORNE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The reason for reconsideration is, when this was first brought before the House, the prime sponsor of amendment 188 misspoke in that he thought this language struck the language from his amendment. In fact, after discussions and discussions with staff, that, in fact, is not the case. This is an amendment to perpetuate senior programs in the Commonwealth by clarifying the Secretary of Revenue’s authority on the keno game and the lottery bureau.

I appreciate an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Clymer.

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

While I recognize the intention of the maker of the amendment to provide additional funds for the lottery using casino gambling-type methods to do it – the keno, very addictive, getting people to spend their money on games that they should not be spending – to me just does not make any sense.

I think the vote originally on this legislation was the correct vote when the members voted it down. That was a good vote, and I ask the members to consider staying with their vote and would ask for opposition to this particular measure.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. DiGirolamo.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am going to agree with my colleague from Bucks, Mr. Clymer.

I appreciate what the gentleman is trying to do. I hope he gets an opportunity to do it at a later time. This is not the right time to vote “yes” on this amendment. I ask the members to vote “no.” Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—53

Bebko-Jones	Hanna	Melio	Santoni
Caltagirone	James	Michlovic	Shaner
Cappabianca	Kaiser	Myers	Solobay
Casorio	Keller	Pesci	Sturla
Cohen, M.	Kenney	Petrarca	Tangretti
Colafella	LaGrotta	Petrone	Taylor, J.
Corrigan	Laughlin	Pistella	Trello
Costa	Lederer	Preston	Van Horne
Daley	Lescovitz	Ramos	Veon
DeLuca	Levdansky	Readshaw	Walko
Dermody	Lucyk	Roberts	Washington
Frankel	Mayernik	Ruffing	Wojnaroski
Gigliotti	McCall	Sainato	Youngblood
Haluska			

NAYS—149

Adolph	Eachus	Major	Schuler
Allen	Egolf	Manderino	Scrimenti
Argall	Evans	Mann	Semmel
Armstrong	Fairchild	Markosek	Serafini
Baker	Fargo	Marsico	Seyfert
Bard	Feese	Masland	Smith, B.
Barley	Fichter	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Barrar	Fleagle	McGill	Snyder
Bastian	Flick	McIlhattan	Staback
Battisto	Forcier	McIlhinney	Stairs
Belardi	Freeman	McNaughton	Steelman
Belfanti	Gannon	Metcalfe	Steil
Benninghoff	Geist	Micozzie	Stern
Birmelin	George	Miller, R.	Stetler
Bishop	Gladeck	Miller, S.	Stevenson
Blaum	Godshall	Mundy	Strittmatter
Boyes	Gordner	Nailor	Surra
Browne	Grucela	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Bunt	Gruitza	O’Brien	Thomas
Butkovitz	Habay	Oliver	Tigue
Buxton	Harhai	Orie	Travaglio
Cam	Harhart	Perzel	Trich
Cawley	Hasay	Phillips	True
Chadwick	Hennessey	Pippy	Tulli
Civera	Herman	Platts	Vance
Clark	Hershey	Raymond	Vitali
Clymer	Hess	Reinard	Williams
Cohen, L. I.	Horsely	Rieger	Wilt
Cornell	Hutchinson	Robinson	Wogan
Coy	Jadlowiec	Roebuck	Wright
Curry	Josephs	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dailey	Kirkland	Rooney	Yudichak
Dally	Krebs	Ross	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Lawless	Rubley	Zug
DeWeese	Leh	Samuelson	
DiGirolamo	Lynch	Sather	Ryan, Speaker
Donatucci	Maher	Saylor	
Druce	Maitland	Schroder	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

Mr. CLYMER offered the following amendment No. A0383:

Amend Title, page 1, line 4, by removing the period after “minors” and inserting

; and limiting certain referenda.

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 1 and 2

Section 2. No referendum on riverboat gambling devices and activities shall be placed on the ballot more than once every two years.

Amend Sec. 2, page 2, line 2, by striking out “2” and inserting

3

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks County, Mr. Clymer.

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just a brief amendment that says, "No referendum on riverboat gambling devices and activities shall be placed on the ballot more than once every two years." There was an amendment that we just recently passed on another gambling issue, and I again, recognizing the support for good compromise, would ask support for this amendment as well. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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—118

Adolph	Fargo	Maher	Scrimenti
Allen	Feese	Maitland	Semmel
Argall	Fleagle	Major	Serafini
Armstrong	Flick	Markosek	Seyfert
Baker	Forcier	Marsico	Smith, B.
Bard	Freeman	Masland	Smith, S. H.
Barley	Gannon	McCall	Snyder
Barrar	Geist	McLhattan	Stairs
Bastian	George	McNaughton	Steelman
Battisto	Gladeck	Metcalfe	Steil
Benninghoff	Godshall	Miller, R.	Stern
Birmelin	Gordner	Miller, S.	Stetler
Blaum	Gruitza	Mundy	Stevenson
Boyes	Habay	Nailor	Strittmatter
Browne	Haluska	Nickol	Sturla
Bunt	Hanna	O'Brien	Surra
Buxton	Harhart	Orie	Taylor, E. Z.
Carn	Hasay	Petrarca	Tigue
Cawley	Hennessey	Phillips	True
Chadwick	Herman	Pippy	Tulli
Clark	Hershey	Platts	Vance
Clymer	Hess	Robinson	Vitali
Cornell	Hutchinson	Roebuck	Wilt
Coy	Jadlowiec	Rohrer	Wogan
Curry	Josephs	Rublely	Yewcic
Dailey	Kirkland	Samuelson	Zimmerman
Dally	Krebs	Sather	Zug
Dempsey	Leh	Saylor	
Egolf	Levdansky	Schroder	Ryan,
Fairchild	Lynch	Schuler	Speaker

NAYS—83

Bebko-Jones	Eachus	McGeehan	Sainato
Belardi	Evans	McGill	Santoni
Belfanti	Fichter	McIlhinney	Shaner
Bishop	Frankel	Melio	Solobay
Butkovitz	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Staback
Caltagirone	Grucela	Myers	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Harhai	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Casorio	Horsley	Perzel	Thomas
Civera	James	Pesci	Travaglio
Cohen, L. I.	Kaiser	Petrone	Trello
Cohen, M.	Keller	Pistella	Trich
Colafella	Kenney	Preston	Van Horne
Corrigan	LaGrotta	Ramos	Veon
Costa	Laughlin	Raymond	Walko
Daley	Lawless	Readshaw	Washington
DeLuca	Lederer	Reinard	Williams
Dermody	Lescovitz	Rieger	Wojnaroski
DeWeese	Lucyk	Roberts	Wright
DiGirolamo	Manderino	Rooney	Youngblood
Donatucci	Mann	Ross	Yudichak
Druce	Mayernik	Ruffing	

NOT VOTING—1

Micozzie

EXCUSED—0

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

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

The gentleman, Mr. Clymer.

Mr. CLYMER. Mr. Speaker, I promise to be very brief, but I do want to—

The SPEAKER. The House will come to order.

Mr. CLYMER. Indeed, it has been a long day for all of us.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield. Closure is in sight; please.

Mr. Clymer.

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I do promise to be brief.

I just want to take a few moments and tell you that as we address these issues, I cannot help but think about, as I mentioned yesterday I believe it was, about our House leader, Representative Perzel, making the comments when the Governor came before us last week. He said it was a proud moment for Pennsylvania, listening to him outline a strong vision for our State. It was a proud moment knowing we, members of this House, are going to play a pivotal role in building a better Pennsylvania as we move into the next century. Building a better Pennsylvania — indeed, that is the issue.

And, Mr. Speaker, we have done marvelous things in this State over the past 4 years in a very bipartisan way. Members working together have built Pennsylvania's economy until we have one of the strongest economies in the nation. We have created new jobs, over 250,000 new jobs. We are running surpluses in our State Treasury. Unemployment is down. Companies are coming into our State as never before because of the quality of life that they see.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

Conferences, please break up; conferences on the side aisles, both sides. Staff personnel, please be seated.

Mr. Clymer.

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I point that out because that is the vision that the Governor and this body have.

Mr. Speaker — and this is paramount to what I want to say — as a legislator, I ran in my district to represent my people to present to them the vision, the vision of Pennsylvania that William Penn gave us, and that vision is not one in which we have to bow to casino gambling for growth. It is a vision that we work together to provide better jobs and better opportunities and hope and promise for future generations. I did not say that I would not accept their

comments or their recommendations, but I would make the decisions; I would build that vision for them, and if they felt that I could not build the vision for them, then they could vote me out, but to say that we should let the people decide on issues that are so important to the quality of life to Pennsylvania, to me makes no sense at all.

Issues that provide no hope, does provide no better future for them, the job opportunities are minimal, it is regressive taxation, creates a whole series of negatives. I mean, that is what the reports say. That is not what Paul Clymer says. It is what tons of materials that have come across our desks have said about this issue of casino gambling, and even the Teamsters in Philadelphia are very upset. As I said earlier, we are going to lose 10,000 jobs, direct and indirect, if riverboat gambling comes to the city of Philadelphia. I did not say that. That is what the Teamsters said.

But getting back to the future. Mr. Speaker, we can build a wonderful future. We can continue what we have started over these many years working in a bipartisan effort, but we are going to drag our heels, we are going to stumble, we are going to get mired down if we have to deal with legalized casino gambling of any sort in Pennsylvania.

And whom does it hurt? Yes, it hurts the children; it hurts the women; it hurts the families. And someone had said that they are not sure of whom it really hurts, that they are not sure of anyone who has been really damaged by it. May I just bring to your remembrance the former Attorney General of Pennsylvania who got caught with this thing called video poker game, and there is a Representative over here on the Democrat side who was involved in that, in that he knew what was happening, and so do not tell me that people do not get caught and go to jail. I mean, he was our highest law enforcement officer. I could give other listings as well, but that is not my point at this time.

So, Mr. Speaker, yes, I agree with our Governor and with our leader over here, John Perzel. Let us have a vision. Let us have memories that last a lifetime, pleasant memories, memories that we can think good about, not about the human misery, the dysfunctional lives that are brought about by casino gambling, and I would urge defeat on final passage of SB 255.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Thomas, desire recognition?

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I just rise to lift up the former speaker in saying that this is what democracy is all about. This is democracy in its finest hour. The people of Pennsylvania will now decide what path we should be taking in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on the issue of gaming.

The Teamsters that the former speaker referred to, I have a lot of respect for the Teamsters organization, and I hope and trust that they will respect the process and get involved. If they are opposed to gaming in Pennsylvania, then they truly have the manpower and the capacity to get out and get their message out.

To the disabled and to the other groups of people that have been referred to as being possibly disenfranchised as a result of this, this is an opportunity for those groups to rise up.

Mr. Speaker, we should be elated here in the House of Representatives and the 12.7 million people in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania should also be elated, because now they have an opportunity to put this issue to rest once and for all. And to the people of the 181st Legislative District, let me say to you that if you say no to riverboat gaming, if you say no to gaming in the

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, then W. Curtis Thomas will stand up and support that and will not support gaming in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, yes, this is what democracy is all about. Let us vote for SB 255. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. DiGirolamo.

It is the information of the Chair that there are no further speeches other than Mr. DiGirolamo.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will be less than a minute. I had a speech prepared. I am not going to read it. I would like to submit it for the record.

I would just like to leave you with a couple thoughts. One, from the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau. There is a memo they sent around to all the members. The Farm Bureau's new policy position is slot machines be allowed at the racetracks in Pennsylvania. How many of you have farms in your districts? AFL-CIO, same thing.

There has been a lot of talk the last couple days about families. Think about it. Thirty-five thousand jobs, already existing jobs, in Pennsylvania related to the horse-racing industry, and how many more thousands of jobs are we going to create?

I heard one of the members mention that their constituents were going to make an uneducated and an uninformed vote in the May primary. Well, I will tell you what. The constituents in my district, the 18th District, are educated and they will make an educated vote. I can think of no fairer way to do this than to let the people of Pennsylvania decide.

I ask everyone for an affirmative vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Slot machines at racetracks in the neighboring States of Delaware and West Virginia are bringing enormous benefit to those States. The problem is that a great portion of that benefit is at Pennsylvania's expense. That is not taking into account the amount of money Pennsylvanians wager in Atlantic City. One-third of revenues come out of Pennsylvania and most of those revenues come from slot machine play. Put simply, hundreds of millions of dollars are leaving Pennsylvania across State lines. This revenue should remain in Pennsylvania and be rightfully used for the benefit of the people of this Commonwealth.

It is imperative that the racing and associated agricultural industries in Pennsylvania are allowed to compete on a level footing. At stake are:

- 35,000 jobs
- \$750 million economic output
- 530,000 acres of open space

Plus we have the opportunity to create thousands of new jobs, produce hundreds of millions of new revenue and significantly increase tourism and economic development.

This is an economic issue. The people of Pennsylvania are currently playing slot machines but they are playing them everywhere else except in Pennsylvania. Allowing our Pennsylvania racetracks to provide slot machines as they do in Delaware and West Virginia makes a lot of sense.

Let us keep Pennsylvania's money in Pennsylvania. Let us strictly regulate slot machines at the Pennsylvania tracks and use the revenues wisely for the benefit of the people of this Commonwealth.

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.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—108

Bard	Eachus	McCall	Santoni
Barrar	Evans	McGeehan	Scrimenti
Bebko-Jones	Fichter	Melio	Shaner
Belardi	Frankel	Michlovic	Solobay
Belfanti	Gannon	Micozzie	Steelman
Bishop	Gigliotti	Myers	Stetler
Browne	Gladeck	O'Brien	Stevenson
Bunt	Grucela	Oliver	Sturla
Butkovitz	Gruitza	Perzel	Tangretti
Buxton	Haluska	Pesci	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Harhai	Petrarca	Thomas
Cappabianca	Horsey	Petrone	Tigue
Carn	James	Pippy	Travaglio
Casorio	Kaiser	Pistella	Trello
Civera	Keller	Preston	Trich
Cohen, L. I.	Kenney	Ramos	Tulli
Cohen, M.	LaGrotta	Raymond	Van Horne
Colafrella	Laughlin	Readshaw	Veon
Cornell	Lawless	Reinard	Walko
Corrigan	Lederer	Rieger	Washington
Costa	Lescovitz	Roberts	Williams
Daley	Levdansky	Robinson	Wilt
DeLuca	Lucy	Roebuck	Wogan
Dermody	Mann	Rooney	Wojnaroski
DeWeese	Markosek	Ross	Wright
DiGirolamo	Marsico	Ruffing	Youngblood
Donatucci	Mayernik	Sainato	Yudichak

NAYS—93

Adolph	Fargo	Lynch	Schroder
Allen	Feese	Maher	Schuler
Argall	Fleagle	Maitland	Semmel
Armstrong	Flick	Major	Serafini
Baker	Forcier	Manderino	Seyfert
Barley	Freeman	Masland	Smith, B.
Bastian	Geist	McGill	Smith, S. H.
Battisto	George	McIlhattan	Snyder
Benninghoff	Godshall	McIlhinney	Stairs
Birmelin	Gordner	McNaughton	Steil
Blaum	Habay	Metcalfe	Stem
Boyes	Hanna	Miller, R.	Strittmatter
Cawley	Harhart	Miller, S.	Surra
Chadwick	Hasay	Mundy	Taylor, E. Z.
Clark	Hennessey	Nailor	True
Clymer	Herman	Nickol	Vance
Coy	Hershey	Orie	Vitali
Curry	Hess	Phillips	Yewcic
Dailey	Hutchinson	Platts	Zimmerman
Dally	Jadlowiec	Rohrer	Zug
Dempsey	Josephs	Rubley	
Druce	Kirkland	Samuelson	Ryan,
Egolf	Krebs	Sather	Speaker
Fairchild	Leh	Saylor	

NOT VOTING—1

Staback

EXCUSED—0

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.

The SPEAKER. The Chair advises the members that we will now take up SB 273. After that, we will take up a series of resolutions under rule 35. So it will not be long.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 273, PN 293**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of July 28, 1953 (P.L.723, No.230), entitled, as amended, Second Class County Code, providing for nomination petitions for the offices of district county council member and at large county council member in certain counties of the second class; and making a repeal.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Mr. DeLuca. The gentleman is in order to proceed.

Mr. DeLUCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had an amendment on this bill with Representative John Maher, and together we were going to introduce this amendment, but we are going to withdraw it.

But I want to make a statement before I withdraw this amendment on behalf of Representative Maher, the Republicans in Allegheny County, and the Democrats in Allegheny County. We feel it is unfair that in 1998 a common pleas court judge, Stan Wettick, ordered the Allegheny County Board of Assessment and Appeals and the County Board of Review to increase the real estate assessments on all Allegheny County properties by 2 percent in 1999 and 2 percent in the year of 2000, which is a total assessment of a 4-percent increase in those 2 years. This order effectively acts as a backdoor tax increase through which the judge circumvented the legislative process. Judge Wettick has clearly overextended his authority by mandating such an increase. Our constituents in Allegheny County and throughout this State look to us to control their taxes. However, in this case there was no legislative involvement. The judge simply increased on our constituents their tax bills by 4 percent. Mr. Speaker, the reassessment process was never intended to be a vehicle for local governments to increase property taxes. That is why we have established the millage rates.

Additionally, the judicial branch was never intended to impose or increase taxes. This order is just another example of the judicial branch usurping the authority of this legislative body, and we have a commitment from the Senate – Senator Murphy and Senator Hart – when they come back in March, myself, Representative Maher, the Republican delegation from Allegheny County, the Democratic delegation in Allegheny County, to move this legislation on behalf of the Allegheny taxpayers.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I withdraw the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Mr. Kaiser.

Mr. KAISER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My remarks will be very short.

This legislation will increase the number of signatures required for an individual running for county council, and as a member of the Charter Drafting Committee, I did want to take a minute for several remarks.

First of all, the Charter Drafting Committee had no authority to stipulate the required number of signatures. Election procedures are established by the Pennsylvania Election Code, and both the Second Class County Charter Law and the Home Rule Charter and Optional Plans Law forbid charters from limiting or enlarging powers granted by acts of the General Assembly for certain subjects including the registration of electors and the conduct of elections.

I just want to thank the House for passing this. It was a part of the Charter Drafting Committee's feeling that we did want to increase the signatures beyond the 10-voter limit – I should say the 10-signature requirement – but we did not have it within our authority. So I thank the members for this vote.

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

Mr. VEON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just so we are clear. This bill only affects Allegheny County and is an agreed-to bill by the caucus on both sides of the aisle in Allegheny County, and I would encourage an affirmative vote.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—199

Adolph	Fairchild	Mann	Schroder
Allen	Fargo	Markosek	Schuler
Argall	Feese	Marsico	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Fichter	Masland	Semmel
Baker	Fleagle	Mayernik	Serafini
Bard	Flick	McCall	Seyfert
Barley	Forcier	McGeehan	Shaner
Barrar	Frankel	McGill	Smith, B.
Bastian	Freeman	McIlhattan	Smith, S. H.
Battisto	Gannon	McIlhinney	Snyder
Bebko-Jones	Geist	McNaughton	Soiboy
Belardi	George	Melio	Staback
Belfanti	Gigliotti	Metcalfe	Stairs
Benninghoff	Gladeck	Michlovic	Steelman
Birmelin	Godshall	Micozzie	Steil
Bishop	Gordner	Miller, R.	Stern
Blaum	Grucela	Mundy	Stetler
Boyes	Gruitza	Myers	Stevenson
Browne	Haluska	Nailor	Strittmatter
Bunt	Hanna	Nickol	Sturla
Butkovitz	Harhai	O'Brien	Surra
Buxton	Harhart	Oliver	Tangretti
Caltagirone	Hasay	Orie	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Hennessey	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Carn	Herman	Pesci	Thomas
Casorio	Hershey	Petrarca	Tigue
Cawley	Hess	Petrone	Travaglio
Chadwick	Horsey	Phillips	Trello
Civera	Hutchinson	Pippy	Trich
Clark	Jadlowiec	Pistella	True
Clymer	James	Platts	Tulli
Cohen, L. I.	Josephs	Preston	Vance
Cohen, M.	Kaiser	Ramos	Van Horne
Colafella	Keller	Raymond	Veon
Cornell	Kenney	Readshaw	Vitali
Corrigan	Kirkland	Reinard	Walko
Costa	Krebs	Rieger	Washington

Coy	LaGrotta	Roberts	Williams
Curry	Laughlin	Robinson	Wilt
Dailey	Lawless	Roebuck	Wogan
Daley	Lederer	Rohrer	Wojnaroski
Dally	Leh	Rooney	Wright
DeLuca	Lescovitz	Ross	Yewcic
Dempsey	Levdansky	Rubley	Youngblood
Dermody	Lucyk	Ruffing	Yudichak
DeWeese	Lynch	Sainato	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	Maher	Samuelson	Zug
Donatucci	Maitland	Santoni	
Eachus	Major	Sather	Ryan, Speaker
Egolf	Manderino	Saylor	
Evans			

NAYS—2

Habay Miller, S.

NOT VOTING—1

Druce

EXCUSED—0

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

Ordered, That the clerk return the same to the Senate with the information that the House has passed the same without amendment.

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 273, PN 293

An Act amending the act of July 28, 1953 (P.L.723, No.230), entitled, as amended, Second Class County Code, providing for nomination petitions for the offices of district county council member and at large county council member in certain counties of the second class; and making a repeal.

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

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. ZIMMERMAN called up **HR 16, PN 181**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the week of February 8 through 12, 1999, as "Students in Free Enterprise Week" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?
Resolution was adopted.

* * *

Mr. GORDNER called up **HR 31, PN 338**, entitled:

A Resolution declaring the month of March 1999 as "Pennsylvania Middle School Education Month."

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?
Resolution was adopted.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. GEIST called up **HR 33, PN 421**, entitled:

A Resolution declaring February 1999 as "American Heart Month" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?
Resolution was adopted.

* * *

Mr. BENNINGHOFF called up **HR 37, PN 425**, entitled:

A Resolution designating February 7 through 13, 1999, as "Future Business Leaders of America - Phi Beta Lambda Week" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?
Resolution was adopted.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. WALKO called up **HR 40, PN 516**, entitled:

A Resolution urging the City Council of Pittsburgh to name a bridge and walkway in the city the Charles J. Lieberth Bridge and Walkway.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?
Resolution was adopted.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. For the information of the members, there are no further votes.

Dinner, however, was ordered prior to our getting through these last amendments, so that there are hot meals prepared for both the majority and minority caucuses. Do what you think best with that information.

Tomorrow will be a nonvoting day.

VOTE CORRECTIONS

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask that we have the record corrected, please.

On amendment A0380 to SB 255, I voted in the negative. The button malfunctioned. I was recorded as not voting. I would like to be on the record as voting "no."

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

Mr. COSTA. Thank you.

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

Mr. STABACK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on final passage of SB 255, my vote failed to register. I would like the record to show that I was voting in the affirmative.

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

Any further corrections?

The gentleman, Mr. Roebuck.

Mr. ROEBUCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the reconsideration motion for amendment A0188, the DiGirolamo amendment, I was voted in the negative. I wish to be voted in the affirmative.

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

The Chair recognizes the lady from Lancaster, Mrs. True.

Mrs. TRUE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To correct the record.

On the reconsidered vote on A0485, SB 255, I was recorded in the negative. I would like to be recorded in the affirmative.

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

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to the members of the House of Representatives the following citation of merit honoring Jeffrey Pfaff.

Whereas, Jeffrey Pfaff earned the Eagle Award in Scouting. This is the highest award that Boy Scouts can bestow and as such represents great sacrifice and tremendous effort on the part of this young man. He is a member of Troop 147.

Now therefore, Mr. Speaker and the members of the House of Representatives, it is my privilege to congratulate and place in the Legislative Journal the name of Jeffrey Pfaff.

* * *

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to the members of the House of Representatives the following citation of merit honoring Jonathan Koenig.

Whereas, Jonathan Koenig earned the Eagle Award in Scouting. This is the highest award that Boy Scouts can bestow and as such represents great sacrifice and tremendous effort on the part of this young man. He is a member of Troop 5.

Now therefore, Mr. Speaker and the members of the House of Representatives, it is my privilege to congratulate and place in the Legislative Journal the name of Jonathan Koenig.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

HB 78, PN 515 (Amended) By Rep. SCHULER

An Act providing for supervision of child-care facilities; conferring powers and duties on the Department of Public Welfare; and making a repeal.

AGING AND YOUTH.

HB 217, PN 208 By Rep. GANNON

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

JUDICIARY.

HB 237, PN 234 By Rep. GANNON

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

JUDICIARY.

HB 285, PN 282 By Rep. GANNON

An Act amending the act of October 12, 1984 (P.L.964, No.188), referred to as the Philadelphia Quarter Sessions Clerk Fee Law, increasing fees; and providing for additional fees.

JUDICIARY.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. Any further announcements, reports of committee, corrections to the record?

Does the majority leader have any further business? Does the Democratic floor leader have any further business?

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

Mr. RUFFING. Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until Wednesday, February 10, 1999, at 11 a.m., e.s.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to, and at 5:52 p.m., e.s.t., the House adjourned.