

Legislative Journal

WEDNESDAY JULY 2, 1975

Session of 1975

159th of the General Assembly

Vol. 1, No. 41

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, July 2, 1975.

The Senate met at 10:00 a.m., Eastern Daylight Saving Time.

The PRESIDENT (Lieutenant Governor Ernest P. Kline) in the Chair.

PRAYER

The following prayer was offered by the Secretary of the Senate, Hon. MARK GRUELL, JR.:

You don't have to tell how you live each day,
 You don't have to say if you work or if you play,
 A tried true barometer serves in its place,
 However you live will show on your face.
 The false, the deceit that you bear in your heart
 Will not stay inside where it first got its start,
 For sinew and blood are a thin veil of lace,
 What you wear in your heart, you wear in your face.
 If your life is unselfish, if for others you live,
 For not what you get, but how much you can give,
 If you live close to God in His infinite grace,
 You don't have to tell it, it shows in your face. Amen.

JOURNAL APPROVED

The PRESIDENT. A quorum of the Senate being present, the Clerk will read the Journal of the preceding Session.

The Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the preceding Session, when, on motion of Senator NOLAN, further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

SENATOR NOLAN TO VOTE FOR SENATOR ORLANDO

Senator NOLAN. Mr. President, Senator Orlando is on legislative business and I will be voting him today.

The PRESIDENT. Senator Nolan requests that Senator Orlando be excused on legislative business for today's Session.

Hearing no objection, the request is granted.

SENATOR WOOD TO VOTE FOR SENATOR FRAME AND SENATOR JUBELIRER

Senator WOOD. Mr. President, I would like to request a leave of absence for Senator Frame, who is on legislative business with the Secretary of Highways, and also for Senator Jubelirer, who is attending a meeting here in the Capitol and I will be voting for them.

The PRESIDENT. Senator Wood asks for an approved

legislative leave for Senator Frame and for Senator Jubelirer.

Hearing no objection, the request is granted.

HOUSE MESSAGES

HOUSE BILLS FOR CONCURRENCE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives being introduced, presented for concurrence **HB 379** and **1468**, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

He also presented for concurrence **HB 854**, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented for concurrence **HB 1199**, which was referred to the Committee on Business and Commerce.

He also presented for concurrence **HB 711**, which was referred to the Committee on Consumer Affairs.

He also presented for concurrence **HB 738**, **1164**, **1189**, **1346** and **1417**, which were referred to the Committee on Environmental Resources.

He also presented for concurrence **HB 1135**, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented for concurrence **HB 306**, **683**, **752** and **1103**, which were referred to the Committee on Judiciary.

He also presented for concurrence **HB 527** and **803**, which were referred to the Committee on Law and Justice.

He also presented for concurrence **HB 332**, **361**, **373**, **940**, **1219** and **1473**, which were referred to the Committee on Local Government.

He also presented for concurrence **HB 1104**, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and Welfare.

He also presented for concurrence **HB 78**, **577**, **981** and **1409**, which were referred to the Committee on State Government.

He also presented for concurrence **HB 258**, **728**, **1493** and **1494**, which were referred to the Committee on Transportation.

He also presented for concurrence **HB 924**, which was referred to the Committee on Urban Affairs and Housing.

HOUSE CONCURS IN SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

He also informed the Senate that the House has concurred in resolution from the Senate, entitled:

Weekly Adjournment.

HOUSE CONCURS IN SENATE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL

He also informed the Senate that the House has concurred in amendments made by the Senate to **HB 631**.

HOUSE CONCURS IN SENATE BILLS

He also returned to the Senate **SB 150**, **230** and **310**,

with the information that the House has passed the same without amendments.

BILLS SIGNED

The President (Lieutenant Governor Ernest P. Kline) in the presence of the Senate signed the following bills:

SB 150, 230 and 310.

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE

Senator SNYDER, from the Committee on Judiciary, reported, as amended, **SB 714.**

BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

Senators REIBMAN, NOLAN, EARLY and DWYER presented to the Chair **SB 910**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P. L. 30, No. 14), entitled "Public School Code of 1949," further providing for the powers of the intermediate unit board of directors.

Which was committed to the Committee on Education.

Senators STAPLETON, ORLANDO, MELLOW, COPPERSMITH, DWYER, O'PAKE, SMITH, MURPHY, ROSS and STAUFFER presented to the Chair **SB 911**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 12, 1951 (P. L. 90, No. 21), entitled "Liquor Code," providing a priority for liquor, alcohol, and wines produced or bottled in Pennsylvania.

Which was committed to the Committee on Law and Justice.

Senators KURY and MOORE presented to the Chair **SB 912**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 31, 1893 (P. L. 188, No. 138), entitled "An act designating the days and half days to be observed as legal holidays, and for the payment, acceptance and protesting of bills, notes, drafts, checks and other negotiable paper on such days," providing that Memorial Day shall be May thirtieth.

Which was committed to the Committee on State Government.

Senators SWEENEY and McKINNEY presented to the Chair **SB 913**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 29, 1959 (P. L. 58, No. 32), entitled "The Vehicle Code," further providing for inspections.

Which was committed to the Committee on Transportation.

Senators SWEENEY, LEWIS and McKINNEY presented to the Chair **SB 914**, entitled:

An Act relating to the rights of grandparents to visit or have temporary custody of their grandchildren in certain cases.

Which was committed to the Committee on Judiciary.

They also presented to the Chair **SB 915**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 29, 1959 (P. L. 58, No. 32), entitled "The Vehicle Code," further providing for the equipment required for school buses.

Which was committed to the Committee on Transportation.

Senators SWEENEY, LEWIS, McKINNEY and EARLY presented to the Chair **SB 916**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 21, 1937 (P. L. 774, No. 211), entitled "Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission Act," requiring an emergency telephone along each mile of the Pennsylvania Turnpike and its extensions.

Which was committed to the Committee on Transportation.

Senators STAPLETON, ORLANDO and MELLOW presented to the Chair **SB 917**, entitled:

An Act declaring and adopting the song "Pennsylvania, the Mountain Laurel State!" by Dorothy Master Green, as the State song of the Commonwealth.

Which was committed to the Committee on State Government.

Senators MELLOW and KURY presented to the Chair **SB 918**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 15, 1959 (P. L. 1779, No. 673), entitled, as amended, "The Fish Law of 1959," providing free fishing licenses for the totally blind.

Which was committed to the Committee on Environmental Resources.

Senators MESSINGER, REIBMAN, O'PAKE, COPPERSMITH, ORLANDO, STAUFFER, SWEENEY, HOLL, SMITH, MOORE, MURPHY and DOUGHERTY presented to the Chair **SB 919**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P. L. 30, No. 14), entitled "Public School Code of 1949," changing the basis for determining the minimum salary of substitute teachers.

Which was committed to the Committee on Education.

Senators MESSINGER, REIBMAN, DWYER, O'PAKE, HAGER, COPPERSMITH, STAUFFER, SWEENEY, HOLL, SMITH, STAPLETON, MOORE, MURPHY and DOUGHERTY presented to the Chair **SB 920**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 30, 1975 (No. 8-A), entitled "General Appropriation Act of 1975," providing for certain limitations on the expenditure of funds appropriated to the Department of Education for the State colleges and State-owned university.

Which was committed to the Committee on Appropriations.

Senators SWEENEY, MURRAY, NOLAN, EARLY, ORLANDO, KELLEY, SMITH, DOUGHERTY, NOSZKA, SCANLON, O'PAKE, MELLOW and HANKINS presented to the Chair **SB 921**, entitled:

An Act providing for equal educational opportunities for every child in the Commonwealth; establishing a grant system; imposing powers and duties on the Departments of Education and Treasury and providing for penalties.

Which was committed to the Committee on Education.

Senators MOORE, STAPLETON, JUBELIRER, HESS, SNYDER, DOUGHERTY, ANDREWS and HAGER presented to the Chair **SB 922**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 21, 1937 (P. L. 1944, No. 376), entitled, as amended, "An act providing for the erection, construction and equipment of a new Pennsylvania Industrial School, to take the place of the present Pennsylvania Industrial School at Huntingdon; . . .," further providing for commitments to the State Correctional Institution at Camp Hill.

Which was committed to the Committee on Judiciary.

Senators HAGER and KURY presented to the Chair **SB 923**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 31, 1911 (P. L. 468, No. 193), entitled "Sproul Highway Law," authorizing the Secretary of Transportation to pay for certain steel prior to fabrication.

Which was committed to the Committee on Transportation.

Senators HAGER, TILGHMAN and SNYDER presented to the Chair **SB 924**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P. L. 31, No. 21), entitled "Public Welfare Code," further providing for regulations relating to protection of information.

Which was committed to the Committee on Public Health and Welfare.

Senator CIANFRANI presented to the Chair **SB 925**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of July 20, 1968 (P. L. 652, No. 220), entitled "An act amending the act of March 31, 1949 (P. L. 372, No. 34), entitled 'An act to promote the welfare of the people of the Commonwealth; . . . , empowering the Authority to construct and acquire projects for certain State-related universities; . . . , adding the acquisition of Temple University Hospital as an additional project and reducing the authorization for construction of one of the projects.

Which was committed to the Committee on State Government.

Senators REIBMAN, SCANLON, HANKINS, McKINNEY and DWYER presented to the Chair **SB 926**, entitled:

An Act authorizing the Secretary of Education to make grants to educational institutions, agencies and consortia for the development and operation of special educational programs and counseling services to provide educational and career opportunities for Pennsylvania adults and for other related educational purposes and making an appropriation.

Which was committed to the Committee on Education.

Senator KELLEY presented to the Chair **SB 927**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P. L. 30, No. 14), entitled "Public School Code of 1949," further providing for intermediate unit board of directors.

Which was committed to the Committee on Education.

He also presented to the Chair **SB 928**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P. L. 30, No. 14), entitled "Public School Code of 1949," providing referendum procedure for withdrawal from a reorganized district by a district having no bonded indebtedness.

Which was committed to the Committee on Education.

Senators WOOD, FRAME, HOBBS and TILGHMAN presented to the Chair **SB 929**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P. L. 30, No. 14), entitled "Public School Code of 1949," further providing for exceptional children and reimbursements for certain special education services, and making appropriations.

Which was committed to the Committee on Education.

Senators EWING, SCANLON and NOLAN presented to the Chair **SB 930**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of July 7, 1947 (P. L. 1368,

No. 542), entitled "Real Estate Tax Sale Law," further providing for the definition of taxing district.

Which was committed to the Committee on Local Government.

Senators KURY and MURPHY presented to the Chair **SB 931**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 18, 1929 (P. L. 612, No. 253), entitled, as amended, "An act for the election of the mayor, members of town council, and auditors, in incorporated towns of the Commonwealth; . . . , authorizing town council to appoint an independent auditor.

Which was committed to the Committee on Local Government.

RECESS

Senator NOLAN. Mr. President, I request a recess of the Senate until 12:30 p.m., for the purpose of holding a Democratic caucus and a Republican caucus.

The PRESIDENT. Are there any objections? The Chair hears no objection, and declares a recess of the Senate until 12:30 p.m., Eastern Daylight Saving Time.

AFTER RECESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Martin L. Murray) in the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of recess having elapsed, the Senate will be in order.

BILLS SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Martin L. Murray) in the presence of the Senate signed the following bills:

HB 331, 364, 560, 631, 665, 671, 693, 722, 973 and 1335.

CALENDAR

FINAL PASSAGE CALENDAR

BILL OVER IN ORDER

HB 307—Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator NOLAN.

BILL ON FINAL PASSAGE

SB 811 (Pr. No. 993)—And the amendments made thereto having been printed as required by the Constitution,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

Senator BELL. Mr. President, I rise to oppose this bill. This will give local municipalities the power by way of zoning to curtail Commonwealth operations. As I said on the Floor yesterday, this would give a township the power, by zoning, to block the construction of an interstate highway.

Mr. President, we have in Delaware County a situation involving a very important interstate highway called Mid-County Expressway. This is very important for the economy of all southeastern Pennsylvania. It means tens of thousands of jobs in my District. If this bill is passed along with the sister bill that is on the Calendar, it would permit one of our townships, where the af-

fluent citizens live who do not care about the unemployment in the ghettos of Chester, by zoning, to kill that road, and I am voting against it.

Senator MESSINGER. Mr. President, I will also oppose this because if you really check into it, it would hamper the work of PennDOT; they could zone areas, for instance, where they could not have sheds or put in supplies, even supplies for the protection of the public in the wintertime, as well as building supplies. In addition, it would prevent the Commonwealth from really putting to use the idea of community treatment centers in various categories, including prerelease centers for prisoners, the community treatment centers for people who are mentally disturbed but capable of operating in society, various treatment centers for drug addicts and—well you can name it, any social services, because by zoning, municipalities could exclude this type of enterprise. I think it is certainly a move in the wrong direction.

Mr. President, the same remarks also apply to Senate Bill No. 185.

And the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

(During the calling of the roll, the following occurred:)

Senator HOLL. Mr. President, I would like to change my vote from "no" to "aye."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The gentleman will be so recorded.

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—29

Andrews,	Hankins,	Lewis,	Ross,
Arlene,	Hobbs,	Manbeck,	Smith,
Dougherty,	Holl,	Mellow,	Snyder,
Dwyer,	Howard,	Moore,	Stapleton,
Early,	Jubelirer,	Murphy,	Stauffer,
Ewing,	Kelley,	Murray,	Tilghman,
Frame,	Lentz,	Myers,	Wood,
Hager,			

NAYS—16

Ammerman,	Kury,	Nolan,	Reibman,
Bell,	Lynch,	Noszka,	Scanlon,
Fleming,	McKinney,	O'Pake,	Sweeney,
Hess,	Messinger,	Orlando,	Zemprelli,

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk present said bill to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

THIRD CONSIDERATION CALENDAR

PREFERRED APPROPRIATION BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AND FINAL PASSAGE

SB 774 (Pr. No. 969)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

And the amendments made thereto having been printed as required by the Constitution,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—45

Ammerman,	Hess,	McKinney,	Reibman,
Andrews,	Hobbs,	Mellow,	Ross,

Arlene,	Holl,	Messinger,	Scanlon,
Bell,	Howard,	Moore,	Smith,
Dougherty,	Jubelirer,	Murphy,	Snyder,
Dwyer,	Kelley,	Murray,	Stapleton,
Early,	Kury,	Myers,	Stauffer,
Ewing,	Lentz,	Noian,	Sweeney,
Fleming,	Lewis,	Noszka,	Tilghman,
Frame,	Lynch,	O'Pake,	Wood,
Hager,	Manbeck,	Orlando,	Zemprelli,
Hankins,			

NAYS—0

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk present said bill to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AMENDED

HB 45 (Pr. No. 960)—Considered the third time,

On the question,
Will the Senate agree to the bill on third consideration?
Senator KELLEY, by unanimous consent, offered the following amendment:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 203), page 2, lines 6 through 9, by striking out "THE" in line 6 and all of lines 7 through 9

On the question,
Will the Senate agree to the amendment?
It was agreed to.

Without objection, the bill, as amended, was passed over in its order at the request of Senator KELLEY.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AND FINAL PASSAGE

HB 70 (Pr. No. 72)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—43

Ammerman,	Hobbs,	Mellow,	Ross,
Andrews,	Holl,	Messinger,	Scanlon,
Arlene,	Howard,	Moore,	Smith,
Dougherty,	Jubelirer,	Murphy,	Snyder,
Dwyer,	Kelley,	Murray,	Stapleton,
Early,	Kury,	Myers,	Stauffer,
Ewing,	Lentz,	Nolan,	Sweeney,
Fleming,	Lewis,	Noszka,	Tilghman,
Frame,	Lynch,	O'Pake,	Wood,
Hankins,	Manbeck,	Orlando,	Zemprelli,
Hess,	McKinney,	Reibman,	

NAYS—2

Bell, Hager,

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk return said bill to the House of Representatives with information that the Senate has passed the same without amendments.

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AMENDED

HB 141 (Pr. No. 1757)—Considered the third time,

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

Senator KELLEY, by unanimous consent, offered the following amendments:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1202), page 2, line 3, by removing the comma after "erection" and inserting: and/or

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1202), page 2, line 3, by striking out "and" and inserting: and/or

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the amendments?

They were agreed to.

Without objection, the bill, as amended, was passed over in its order at the request of Senator KELLEY.

HB 142 (Pr. No. 1790)—Considered the third time,

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the bill on third consideration?

Senator KELLEY, by unanimous consent, offered the following amendments:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 702), page 2, line 5 by removing the comma after "erection" and inserting: and/or

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 702), page 2, line 5 by striking out "and" and inserting: and/or

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the amendments?

They were agreed to.

Without objection, the bill, as amended, was passed over in its order at the request of Senator KELLEY.

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AND FINAL PASSAGE

HB 153 (Pr. No. 1883)—Considered the third time and agreed to.

And the amendments made thereto having been printed as required by the Constitution,

On the question,

Shall the bill pass finally?

Senator KURY. Mr. President, I desire to interrogate the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Smith.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Smith, permit himself to be interrogated?

Senator SMITH. I will, Mr. President.

Senator KURY. Mr. President, in looking at this bill, page 4, the amendment that was offered yesterday, I would like to ask several questions with regard to that amendment.

First, Mr. President, with regard to lines 12 to 17, which provide that corporations or unions may make political contributions in an amount not to exceed \$5,000 in any year; do I take it that that \$5,000 is for all purposes in all elections in any one year? That is the maximum or total money that could be spent by a corporation or a union out of its funds in one year?

Senator SMITH. That is correct, Mr. President.

Senator KURY. In other words, Mr. President, this is authorizing corporations to expend up to \$5,000 from corporate funds or a union to take \$5,000 from its dues or whatever other funds it has, to spend for political purposes?

Senator SMITH. That is right, Mr. President.

Senator KURY. Now with regard to the provision, Mr. President, would this be subject to the reporting and disclosure requirement of the Election Code?

Senator SMITH. It would, yes, Mr. President. The candidate receiving the moneys would also be required to report it.

Senator KURY. Mr. President, going now to the next section, Section (D), it states that the law shall not be construed to prohibit corporations or unions from establishing separate segregated funds to be utilized by such corporations or unions for political purposes and it also says this fund shall not be construed to be a political committee.

Now, my question is: Does that mean that a corporation or a union could set up a separate fund and not have to disclose or report that if it is not considered a political committee?

Senator SMITH. That is true, Mr. President. The recipient of the moneys granted by the union or the corporation would have to report the receipt of the moneys under the present law.

Senator KURY. Mr. President, I did not understand that. Who would have to report it?

Senator SMITH. The candidate, Mr. President. The political campaign committee.

Senator KURY. In other words, Mr. President, there is no requirement that there be any public notice of the fact that a given corporation or union has the separate fund. As I read the bill, could not this be kept undisclosed until after the election, when the candidate discloses it if he files a return?

Senator SMITH. That is true, Mr. President, as if the present day law were not changed. In the present day law, if I were to contribute to a campaign or a candidate, I necessarily do not have to make the report. The candidate receiving my donation or gift would have to report it under the present law.

Senator KURY. Mr. President, under this separate segregated fund, is there any limit on the amount of contributions that could be spent from the separate segregated fund?

Senator SMITH. Mr. President, \$5,000.

Senator KURY. Mr. President, with all due respect to the gentleman from Philadelphia, I am not sure it is clear from the language of this bill that there is a \$5,000 limit on it. As I read it, the amendment has two portions, one is that corporations and unions can spend up to \$5,000; and there is another section saying they could set up a segregated fund that is not considered a political committee. I do not read the language as putting any limitation on the funds that could be spent from the separate segregated fund. This is one of the things that troubles me about this amendment and I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment on it?

Senator SMITH. Mr. President, the thrust of the language is simply to say that a corporation, if it solicits funds in the name of a candidate, does not itself become a political committee, therefore subject to the State law. We are simply saying that the soliciting of funds does not create a political committee, as we would understand the candidate would establish his own political committee.

Senator KURY. Mr. President, I would say I appreciate what the gentleman has tried to do with this amendment but I am still troubled by the fact that there is no preelection disclosure requirement on this. I am particularly concerned when I think of the size of some of the entities like some of the large corporations or unions in Pennsylvania, the large entities involved. I think to pass this amendment, this bill, without public

disclosure of what is going on, creates the element in our political system which we have not really had a chance to consider and, therefore, I am going to vote against the bill, for that reason.

Senator SMITH. Mr. President, the Committee on State Government is doing an in depth study of Election Code reform. We had noted this from having our investigator going throughout the country. We had him in nine states, I think, and, at this time he has come back with this particular amendment. There are thirteen states presently doing what we are doing in this amendment to House Bill No. 153.

Senator BELL. Mr. President, I am going to vote "no" on this bill. I think this bill is opening the door for political assassination of Members of the General Assembly.

Mr. President, maybe President Nixon and his committee to reelect himself did not think much of \$5,000, but \$5,000 can sway some legislative elections in this Commonwealth. Now, what we are doing, we are permitting corporate political contributions from corporations and from unions, and this is where the money is. As an example, I do not have too much use for certain public utility companies, and this is an open invitation for each one of them to put \$5,000 into my District and shoot me down.

Mr. President, shortly we are going to have bills on the floor of this Senate—it is on the Calendar now, the railroad bills. If I vote with the union, this is an open invitation for the corporations who operate railroads, whether bankrupt or not, to put \$5,000 into my District to "tommy-hatchet" me. If I vote with the corporations, it is an open invitation for every local of the United Transport Workers to raise a similar fund and "tommy-hatchet" me. How in the name of God can I win? So I say when you permit large sums of money, or any sums of money to come from corporate entities or from unions, into campaigns, it is an open invitation for the power brokers to operate. Now I have heard the story that some of them do it anyway but that is no excuse for making it legal.

Senator TILGHMAN. Mr. President, I support this legislation. I would like to go back to one thing I think I heard the gentleman from Northumberland, Senator Kury, say. If I am incorrect, he can speak after me. He said there is no requirement in this for preelection reporting.

I do not know any place in the Election Code where there is a requirement for preelection reporting. Some candidates do sometimes. The gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Hill, did make a preelection report. However, I do not know of any requirement that a giver or receiver must make a preelection report. You are supposed to make a report within thirty days after the election.

I do not see any great fear of a corporation in Pennsylvania being allowed to give a maximum of \$5,000. To the gentleman from Delaware, Senator Bell, I doubt that they would give him the full \$5,000, because that is it. If I were running the corporation's political fund raising and donations, I would be tempted to probably give \$100 to fifty people.

I think, as the gentleman from Delaware, Senator Bell, mentioned, if a Member of the General Assembly is swayed by that munificent gift, that is up to the man. However, it would be very hard for me to see that a

\$100 donation is going to have me in the traces for whoever gives me the money.

I do not think there is anything wrong with it. I did not hear what the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Smith, said, but I have been led to believe that there are twenty-six states that do this now.

Senator BELL. Mr. President, my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Tilghman, did not hear what I said either. I did not say they would give the money to me. I said they would give the money to my opponent to "tommy-hatchet" me.

Senator KURY. Mr. President, in response to my good friend, the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Tilghman, I would like to clarify what I said. That is, I read the language of this amendment, and Section (D) allows the establishment of separate segregated funds which are not political committees.

This means that the people disclosing it are not under any disclosure requirements. It is true that the candidates after the election may have to report it, but when I think of the size of some of these entities involved—to take a corporation such as U. S. Steel, a union, AFS-CME, or something like that—I think of how much money they might be able to put into a separate segregated fund; I think that should be disclosed in advance of the election, not afterward.

I know it is not there now, but when you create corporations and unions as having separate segregated funds that are not political committees, you are creating the possibility of a tremendous fund. I think under those circumstances that should be made public in advance of the election.

Mr. President, that is my problem or at least one of the reasons why I have difficulty with this amendment.

Senator SMITH. Mr. President, to put this back on key, there is a bill in my Committee that does exactly what the amendment does. However, because of the time schedule of the Senate, we thought we had better bring it out now so that anyone who would be running for office next November would understand just what we are doing.

What we are doing, Mr. President, is simply limiting a corporation or a union or an unincorporated association to donate \$5,000. As you know and I know, being a candidate, any corporate officers collectively may take \$5,000 and singularly give it to the candidate.

What we are saying is this: A corporation has the right, under this amendment to House Bill No. 153, to give \$5,000 in any one year in the aggregate. That is all we say. We are only living up to reality. They do it anyway. We are simply saying, we are going to limit you. This is the amount you may give, no more.

Mr. President, that is the whole thrust of the amendment. It was done by amendment because of the time schedule of the Senate. We want everyone on notice that this is what we are changing. You know it if you are a candidate next November.

Senator HAGER. Mr. President, I desire to interrogate the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Smith.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Smith, permit himself to be interrogated?

Senator SMITH. I will, Mr. President.

Senator HAGER. Mr. President, looking at this Section (D), a couple of questions occur to me. Let us assume that we have a corporation with 100,000 investor-

owners who are asked to contribute to a fund. Have they any control, Mr. President, over to what candidates the contributions would be made by the corporation?

Senator SMITH. Mr. President, I would assume that they would solicit funds in the name of a given candidate. That would be my assumption.

Senator HAGER. Mr. President, I guess the same thing would then apply, would it not, to unions? In other words, however the money might be solicited, those persons who gave the money would really have no control over what candidates received the money or what political campaign committees received the money.

Senator SMITH. Mr. President, I would assume that a union could solicit funds for either one of the two major parties or in the name of a given candidate. I do not think they would take the money under some pretense of it going to a political contribution and end it there.

I am sure if I were going to give \$1,000 I would know just whom it was going to, whether it was going to one of the two major parties or whether it was going to a candidate by name.

Senator HAGER. Mr. President, my next question would be: Is there any control in this bill or is there any envisioned law somewhere else which would limit the permissible investments of this fund, if all of the money in the fund is not used in any one particular campaign?

Senator SMITH. Mr. President, if I understand the Election Code properly, a candidate with funds which have not been expended may hold them and acknowledge them, or he may give them to another political campaign committee or another candidate. That is, if I understand the Code correctly.

If the moneys held by this corporation were not expended in any given year, the assumption would be that it would be held for political purposes for the next Primary Election or General Election.

Senator HAGER. Mr. President, I understand that. However, is the gentleman from Northumberland, Senator Kury, correct in his assumption that this is not a political campaign committee and is not subject to the same laws and would not be subject to the Election Code? It appears to me that he is correct. This is not that kind of a committee.

Senator SMITH. Mr. President, it is not a campaign committee per se. What you must remember is that we have a safeguard built in—in any calendar year, they may not expend more than \$5,000.

Senator HAGER. Yes, Mr. President, that is why I asked the question, because it seems conceivable to me that any large corporation or any large union would be able to solicit funds far in excess of \$5,000 in any one given year which would then make it almost impossible for the individual donor to that campaign fund to be sure that his money is going where he wanted it to go, particularly if it was not spent until a year or two or three or ten years after he made his original donation.

Is that not a possibility, Mr. President?

Senator SMITH. Mr. President, I guess if you took the extension of all things, that could be possible.

Senator HAGER. Mr. President, for those reasons and because it appears to me that there are insufficient safeguards to make sure that the individual contribution of a person will go where he intended it to go, I intend to vote against this bill.

I would very much like to vote for a bill of this nature

because I agree with the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Smith, that there are things being done by subterfuge which would be much better done in the public eye. However, I am afraid that, for me, this amendment is neither detailed enough nor comprehensive enough to solve all of the problems it will create.

Senator TILGHMAN. Mr. President, I do not mean to belabor this, but I would like to point out to my colleagues that on your Federal income tax form, if you check off at the bottom the funds that are to go into the United States Treasurer's bank account, so to speak, for political purposes, you have no idea where that money is going to go.

One of my sons did check off that figure on his income tax and he asked what was going to happen to the money. I told him it was going to go into the pot and, as the law now reads, if you can raise, I think it is \$5,000 in each of twenty states or something like that, then you participate in that fund. You have no idea where the money is going.

It might be that I gave some money and had some money checked off on that form, and it may well be that my money is going to help Governor Shapp's candidacy. I do not know.

And the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—26

Andrews,	Holl,	Messinger,	Ross,
Arlene,	Kelley,	Murphy,	Scanlon,
Dougherty,	Lewis,	Murray,	Smith,
Ewing,	Lynch,	Nolan,	Tilghman,
Fleming,	Manbeck,	Noszka,	Wood,
Frame,	McKinney,	Orlando,	Zemprelli,
Hankins,	Mellow,		

NAYS—19

Ammerman,	Hess,	Lentz,	Snyder,
Bell,	Hobbs,	Moore,	Stapleton,
Dwyer,	Howard,	Mvers,	Stauffer,
Early,	Jubelirer,	O'Pake,	Sweeney,
Hager,	Kury,	Reibman,	

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk return said bill to the House of Representatives with information that the Senate has passed the same with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

HB 154 (Pr. No. 1758)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

And the amendments made thereto having been printed as required by the Constitution,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—45

Ammerman,	Hess,	McKinney,	Reibman,
Andrews,	Hobbs,	Mellow,	Ross,
Arlene,	Holl,	Messinger,	Scanlon,
Bell,	Howard,	Moore,	Smith,
Dougherty,	Jubelirer,	Murphy,	Snyder,
Dwyer,	Kelley,	Murray,	Stapleton,
Early,	Kury,	Myers,	Stauffer,

Ewing,
Fleming,
Frame,
Hager,
Hankins,

Lentz,
Lewis,
Lynch,
Manbeck,

Nolan,
Noszka,
O'Pake,
Orlando,

Sweeney,
Tilghman,
Wood,
Zemprelli,

NAYS—0

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk return said bill to the House of Representatives with information that the Senate has passed the same with amendments in which concurrence of the House is requested.

SB 185 (Pr. No. 185)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

(During the calling of the roll, the following occurred:)
Senator EARLY. Mr. President, I would like to change my vote from "no" to "aye."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The gentleman will be so recorded.

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—36

Ammerman,
Andrews,
Arlene,
Dougherty,
Dwyer,
Early,
Ewing,
Frame,
Hager,

Hankins,
Hobbs,
Holl,
Howard,
Jubelirer,
Kelley,
Lentz,
Lewis,
Lynch,

Manbeck,
McKinney,
Mellow,
Moore,
Murphy,
Murray,
Myers,
Nolan,
Orlando,

Ross,
Scanlon,
Smith,
Snyder,
Stapleton,
Stauffer,
Tilghman,
Wood,
Zemprelli,

NAYS—9

Bell,
Fleming,
Hess,

Kury,
Messinger,

Noszka,
O'Pake,

Reibman,
Sweeney,

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk present said bill to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AMENDED

HB 190 (Pr. No. 211)—Considered the third time,

On the question,
Will the Senate agree to the bill on third consideration?
Senator KELLEY, by unanimous consent, offered the following amendments:

Amend Title, page 1, line 6, by removing the period after "County" and inserting: and adding a route in Westmoreland County and making a repeal.

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 12 and 13:

Section 2. The act is amended by adding the following route in Westmoreland County:

WESTMORELAND COUNTY

New Stanton Borough

Route . Beginning at the intersection of Legislative Route 117 and Legislative Route 64125; thence in a northerly direction over former Township Road 678, now a Borough Street;

thence in a northwesterly direction to the intersection with Byer's Avenue; thence in a northerly direction to former Township Road 539, now a Borough Street; thence in a northeasterly direction to the intersection of Legislative Route 64110 in the Borough of New Stanton, Westmoreland County, a distance of about .8 of a mile.

Section 3. Section 65, act of June 22, 1931 (P. L. 594, No. 203), entitled "An act establishing certain township roads as State highways; authorizing their construction, maintenance and improvement under certain conditions and restrictions; limiting the obligation of the Commonwealth in the construction of certain structures located on such highways; conferring certain powers upon the Department of Highways and local authorities, persons, associations and corporations for sharing the cost of the maintenance and construction of such highways; and making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of said act," is repealed in so far as it relates to Route 64211.

Amend Sec. 2, page 2, line 13, by striking out "2." and inserting: 4.

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

Senator KELLEY. Mr. President, I should like to explain to my colleagues that yesterday I offered the same amendments and then asked unanimous consent for their withdrawal upon the request of the Minority Leader.

The reservation which the Minority Leader had at that time was whether or not these amendments were an exchange of approximately equal distances in mileage from and to the State highway system. Subsequently I contacted the Legislative Reference Bureau and was told that Section 3, which is a deletion, is the withdrawal of the similar amount of mileage from the State highway system.

These amendments represent an exchange of approximately the same mileage. It is less than one mile additional and less than one mile extraction from the same.

And the question recurring,
Will the Senate agree to the amendments?
They were agreed to.

Without objection, the bill, as amended, was passed over in its order at the request of Senator KELLEY.

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

HB 242 and 244—Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator NOLAN.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AND FINAL PASSAGE

SB 254 (Pr. No. 982)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

And the amendments made thereto having been printed as required by the Constitution,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—45

Ammerman,
Andrews,
Arlene,
Bell,
Dougherty,

Hess,
Hobbs,
Holl,
Howard,
Jubelirer,

McKinney,
Mellow,
Messinger,
Moore,
Murphy,

Reibman,
Ross,
Scanlon,
Smith,
Snyder,

Dwyer, Early, Ewing, Fleming, Frame, Hager, Hankins,	Kelley, Kury, Lentz, Lewis, Lynch, Manbeck,	Murray, Myers, Nolan, Noszka, O'Pake, Orlando,	Stapleton, Stauffer, Sweeney, Tilghman, Wood, Zemprelli,
--	--	---	---

NAYS—0

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk present said bill to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

BILL OVER IN ORDER

SB 260—Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator NOLAN.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AND FINAL PASSAGE

SB 285 (Pr. No. 979)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

And the amendments made thereto having been printed as required by the Constitution,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—45

Ammerman, Andrews, Arlene, Bell, Dougherty, Dwyer, Early, Ewing, Fleming, Frame, Hager, Hankins,	Hess, Hobbs, Holl, Howard, Jubelirer, Kelley, Kury, Lentz, Lewis, Lynch, Manbeck,	McKinney, Mellow, Messinger, Moore, Murphy, Murray, Myers, Nolan, Noszka, O'Pake, Orlando,	Reibman, Ross, Scanlon, Smith, Snyder, Stapleton, Stauffer, Sweeney, Tilghman, Wood, Zemprelli,
---	---	--	---

NAYS—0

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk present said bill to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

BILL OVER IN ORDER

SB 309 (Pr. No. 991)—Considered the third time,

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

Senator EARLY. Mr. President, I desire to interrogate the gentleman from Allegheny, Senator Nolan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Allegheny, Senator Nolan, permit himself to be interrogated?

Senator NOLAN. I will, Mr. President.

Senator EARLY. Mr. President, with the fund that is established in this particular bill, I would like to know if a project is to be determined under the emergency grant we have here, will that be done under competitive bidding or would this be something that the Department would arbitrarily decide, that since it is emergency funding, they will forego any competitive bids.

Senator NOLAN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that on emergency projects it is not done on a bid basis. In the case that it would be an emergency, it would be let out as soon as possible without bids.

Senator EARLY. Mr. President, is it possible then that this bill could be held over so that we could debate an amendment which would state in there that we would have competitive bids on something of this nature?

Senator NOLAN. Mr. President, I think that would have to be decided by the Senate as a whole. I am not prepared to answer that. It was decided in the caucus today to run the bill in its present form.

Senator EARLY. Mr. President, could we be at ease for a moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be at ease.

(The Senate was at ease.)

REQUEST FOR BILL OVER IN ORDER

Senator EARLY. Mr. President, I would like to request that this bill go over in its order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, at the request of the gentleman from Allegheny, Senator Early, Senate Bill No. 309 will go over in its order.

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AND FINAL PASSAGE

SB 312 (Pr. No. 313)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—40

Andrews, Arlene, Bell, Dougherty, Dwyer, Early, Ewing, Fleming, Frame, Hager,	Hankins, Hess, Hobbs, Holl, Howard, Jubelirer, Kelley, Lentz, Lewis, Lynch,	McKinney, Mellow, Messinger, Murphy, Murray, Myers, Nolan, Noszka, O'Pake, Orlando,	Reibman, Ross, Scanlon, Smith, Stapleton, Stauffer, Sweeney, Tilghman, Wood, Zemprelli,
--	--	--	--

NAYS—5

Ammerman, Kury,	Manbeck,	Moore,	Snyder,
--------------------	----------	--------	---------

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk present said bill to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

SB 399 (Pr. No. 980)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

And the amendments made thereto having been printed as required by the Constitution,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—44

Ammerman, Andrews, Arlene,	Hess, Hobbs, Holl,	McKinney, Mellow, Messinger,	Reibman, Ross, Scanlon,
----------------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------

Dougherty,	Howard,	Moore,	Smith,
Dwyer,	Jubelirer,	Murphy,	Snyder,
Early,	Kelley,	Murray,	Stapleton,
Ewing,	Kury,	Myers,	Stauffer,
Fleming,	Lentz,	Nolan,	Sweeney,
Frame,	Lewis,	Noszka,	Tilghman,
Hager,	Lynch,	O'Pake,	Wood,
Hankins,	Manbeck,	Orlando,	Zemprelli,

NAYS—1

Bell,

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk present said bill to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

**BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION,
DEFEATED ON FINAL PASSAGE**

SB 418 (Pr. No. 421)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

Senator SNYDER. Mr. President, on the substance of the bill it seems to me that a ceiling of \$12,000 may be too low but to remove the ceiling completely is an open invitation to excessive building for roadside rests.

For that reason, Mr. President, I am going to vote "no" on this bill.

Senator DWYER. Mr. President, I would like to urge the defeat of this bill. I base it on the experiences I have had in my District regarding roadside rests.

Some of the recently constructed roadside rests are becoming Taj Mahals and also constitute a tremendous waste of maintenance dollars and our scarce electrical energy. If you go past some of these or visit some of the recently installed roadside rests, you will find a tremendous amount of electrical lighting, many more expensive stainless steel lighting standards than would be necessary to do the job.

In my particular District we have two standards of which the local traffic safety council has complained because the glare of the lights, which exceeds that of a football field, actually distorts the highway when motorists are driving past. The payment for the electrical heating and the lighting, the excessive lighting of these rest areas, also comes from the county maintenance funds. In the month of February, the shortest month of the year, the heating and lighting for these two rest areas in my District came to \$1,280. That was just for one month for heating and lighting two of these Taj Mahal rest areas. Of course, we know the critical situation regarding the shortage of maintenance funds.

Therefore, I think it is extremely important that we keep a ceiling on this because Taj Mahals are being built under the current spending limitations and I would hate to think what would happen if the ceiling was removed.

And the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

(During the calling of the roll, the following occurred:)

Senator KURY. Mr. President, I would like to change my vote from "aye" to "no."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The gentleman will be so recorded.

Senator ARLENE. Mr. President, I would like to change my vote from "aye" to "no."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The gentleman will be so recorded.

Senator HANKINS. Mr. President, I would like to change my vote from "aye" to "no."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The gentleman will be so recorded.

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—9

Ammerman,	Murphy,	Nolan,	Ross,
Lynch,	Murray,	Orlando,	Scanlon,
McKinney,			

NAYS—36

Andrews,	Hager,	Lentz,	Reibman,
Arlene,	Hankins,	Lewis,	Smith,
Bell,	Hess,	Manbeck,	Snyder,
Dougherty,	Hobbs,	Mellow,	Stapleton,
Dwyer,	Holl,	Messinger,	Stauffer,
Early,	Howard,	Moore,	Sweeney,
Ewing,	Jubelirer,	Myers,	Tilghman,
Fleming,	Kelley,	Noszka,	Wood,
Frame,	Kury,	O'Pake,	Zemprelli,

Less than a majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the negative.

**BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AND
FINAL PASSAGE**

SB 420 (Pr. No. 983)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

And the amendments made thereto having been printed as required by the Constitution,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

Senator O'PAKE. Mr. President, I would like to support this bill and give one specific example as to the value of this legislation to the taxpayers of the Commonwealth. Yesterday I was advised that the City of Reading is being asked to pay approximately \$60,000 in overtime salaries to the police department and the officers of the Reading police force to take care of overtime, mostly incurred as a result of forced appearance at court hearings involving criminal cases. I have no idea what these figures are statewide.

However, I think that in our concern for making sure that local taxes are being used to provide local services, this step is a valuable contribution in making sure that the costs of the criminal proceeding be borne by the defendant or the county, when the county loses, rather than on the police force which is providing the witnesses in court.

Mr. President, I support the bill and commend the sponsors for their foresight in helping to take care of a problem which has just arisen in my District yesterday.

Senator KELLEY. Mr. President, it is not very often that I have an opportunity to disagree with my esteemed colleague and roommate of the Senate offices, the gentleman from Berks, Senator O'Pake, but there is one phrase in here which I believe is not going to accomplish what the gentleman addressed himself to.

On page 1, line 8, it states it is upon the defendant or the county. My experience has been, in most instances, that the majority of times the courts impose the cost upon the counties. Therefore, what this bill

is going to do is shift the greater burden of paying for the true law enforcement, which is all the way through prosecution, of municipal law enforcement offices, upon the counties rather than on the local municipality.

As long as my colleagues are aware of that, I will be satisfied. For this reason I intend to vote "no" on the bill.

Senator O'PAKE. Mr. President, it is my understanding from the law that the costs are imposed upon the county only when the defendant is acquitted. It is unconstitutional, as the result of a Supreme Court decision, to impose court costs on a defendant when he wins. Therefore, if the county has not properly prepared its case, when the crime has not been made out, then I think that the county, through its district attorney, is responsible for those costs. I do not think the individual township or city or borough or whoever has provided the police witness, should have to pay the costs while that policeman sits around in court waiting for the district attorney to call a case to trial. I would like to emphasize that the defendant pays the court costs, or at least the sentence includes payment of court costs, whenever the defendant is found guilty.

And the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—41

Ammerman,	Hess,	McKinney,	Orlando,
Andrews,	Hobbs,	Mellow,	Reibman,
Arlene,	Holl,	Messinger,	Ross,
Dougherty,	Howard,	Moore,	Smith,
Dwyer,	Jubelirer,	Murphy,	Snyder,
Early,	Kury,	Murray,	Stauffer,
Ewing,	Lentz,	Myers,	Sweeney,
Fleming,	Lewis,	Nolan,	Tilghman,
Frame,	Lynch,	Noszka,	Wood,
Hager,	Manbeck,	O'Pake,	Zemprelli,
Hankins,			

NAYS—4

Bell,	Kelley,	Scanlon,	Stapleton,
-------	---------	----------	------------

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk present said bill to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

HB 477 (Pr. No. 1812)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

And the amendments made thereto having been printed as required by the Constitution,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—45

Ammerman,	Hess,	McKinney,	Reibman,
Andrews,	Hobbs,	Mellow,	Ross,
Arlene,	Holl,	Messinger,	Scanlon,
Bell,	Howard,	Moore,	Smith,
Dougherty,	Jubelirer,	Murphy,	Snyder,
Dwyer,	Kelley,	Murray,	Stapleton,
Early,	Kury,	Myers,	Stauffer,
Ewing,	Lentz,	Nolan,	Sweeney,
Fleming,	Lewis,	Noszka,	Tilghman,
Frame,	Lynch,	O'Pake,	Wood,

Hager,	Manbeck,	Orlando,	Zemprelli,
Hankins,			

NAYS—0

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk return said bill to the House of Representatives with information that the Senate has passed the same with amendments in which concurrence of the House is requested.

HB 496 (Pr. No. 1884)—Considered the third time,

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

REQUEST FOR BILL OVER IN ORDER

Senator NOLAN. Mr. President, I request House Bill No. 496 over in its order.

Senator DOUGHERTY. Mr. President, I object to the bill going over.

MOTION FOR BILL OVER IN ORDER

Senator NOLAN. Mr. President, I move that House Bill No. 496 go over in its order.

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

Senator DOUGHERTY. Mr. President, I would request the membership to vote "no" on the motion for this bill to go over in order so that we may immediately consider its contents.

And the question recurring,
Will the Senate agree to the motion?

(During the calling of the roll, the following occurred:)
Senator KURY. Mr. President, I would like to change my vote from "no" to "aye."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The gentleman will be so recorded.

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—19

Ammerman,	McKinney,	Nolan,	Ross,
Arlene,	Messinger,	Noszka,	Scanlon,
Early,	Murphy,	O'Pake,	Stapleton,
Hankins,	Murray,	Orlando,	Zemprelli,
Kury,	Myers,	Reibman,	

NAYS—26

Andrews,	Hager,	Lentz,	Smith,
Bell,	Hess,	Lewis,	Snyder,
Dougherty,	Hobbs,	Lynch,	Stauffer,
Dwyer,	Holl,	Manbeck,	Sweeney,
Ewing,	Howard,	Mellow,	Tilghman,
Fleming,	Jubelirer,	Moore,	Wood,
Frame,	Kelley,		

So the question was determined in the negative, and the motion was defeated.

And the question recurring,
Will the Senate agree to the bill on third consideration?

It was agreed to.
And the amendments made thereto having been printed as required by the Constitution,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

(During the calling of the roll, the following occurred:)

Senator HANKINS. Mr. President, before the roll is taken is it possible that I can make a statement on the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At this time there is nothing in order, Senator, but the announcement of the vote. I will recognize you as soon as the vote is tallied.

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—32

Andrews,	Hager,	Lentz,	Orlando,
Bell,	Hess,	Lewis,	Smith,
Dougherty,	Hobbs,	Lynch,	Snyder,
Dwyer,	Holl,	Manbeck,	Stapleton,
Early,	Howard,	Mellow,	Stauffer,
Ewing,	Jubelirer,	Moore,	Sweeney,
Fleming,	Kelley,	Myers,	Tilghman,
Frame,	Kury,	O'Pake,	Wood,

NAYS—13

Ammerman,	Messinger,	Nolan,	Ross,
Arlene,	Murphy,	Noszka,	Scanlon,
Hankins,	Murray,	Reibman,	Zemprell,
McKinney,			

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk return said bill to the House of Representatives with information that the Senate has passed the same with amendments in which concurrence of the House is requested.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS SENATE

Senator HANKINS asked and obtained unanimous consent to address the Senate.

Senator HANKINS. Mr. President, how many times do we have to play this broken record? How many times are we going to try to knock the props from under an effort that has been more than ten years in the making? This is a ripper amendment or bill, pure and simple. This amendment will destroy ten years of progress, ten years of hard work by responsible people in our effort to make us one nation, indivisible.

Mr. President, as he did the last time, Governor Shapp must, and most certainly will, veto this kind of legislation. On the face of it, it is a ripper bill; it is designed to rip the guts out of the Human Relations Commission. If we, at the State level, abdicate this responsibility, and that is what the bill will do, we are turning the program over to the Federal government and the Federal courts. What Pennsylvania has been doing, in a reasoned and careful way, will be removed from our jurisdiction—and Pennsylvania has been doing well. Quietly and deliberately in twenty cities across the State, busing has been implemented in those localities. It will be reopening wounds that have been healed. The morning after this became law, it would throw twenty localities into chaos.

Mr. President, as I said last November, this ripper heads in a dangerous and wrong direction. If our children cannot learn together, then how, in God's name, can we expect their parents to ever learn to live together? I am asking and will ask the Governor to veto this particular bill.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR RESUMED

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

HB 503—Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator NOLAN.

SB 519 (Pr. No. 538)—Considered the third time,

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the bill on third consideration?

REQUEST FOR BILL OVER IN ORDER

Senator NOLAN. Mr. President, I request Senate Bill No. 519, Printer's No. 538 over in its order.

Senator HAGER. Mr. President, I respectfully object to Senate Bill No. 519 going over.

MOTION FOR BILL OVER IN ORDER

Senator NOLAN. Mr. President, I move that Senate Bill No. 519, Printer's No. 538, go over in its order.

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the motion?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—22

Ammerman,	Lewis,	Nolan,	Scanlon,
Arlene,	Lynch,	Noszka,	Smith,
Early,	McKinney,	O'Pake,	Stapleton,
Hankins,	Mellow,	Orlando,	Sweeney,
Kelley,	Messinger,	Ross,	Zemprell,
Kury,	Murray,		

NAYS—21

Andrews,	Frame,	Howard,	Reibman,
Bell,	Hager,	Jubelirer,	Snyder,
Dougherty,	Hess,	Manbeck,	Stauffer,
Dwyer,	Hobbs,	Murphy,	Tilghman,
Ewing,	Holl,	Myers,	Wood,
Fleming,			

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate Bill No. 519 will go over in its order.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION, DEFEATED ON FINAL PASSAGE

SB 553 (Pr. No. 584)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

On the question,

Shall the bill pass finally?

(During the calling of the roll, the following occurred:) Senator MESSINGER. Mr. President, I would like to change my vote from "aye" to "no."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The gentleman will be so recorded.

Senator EARLY. Mr. President, I would like to change my vote from "aye" to "no."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The gentleman will be so recorded.

Senator WOOD. Mr. President, I would like to change the vote of the gentleman from Venango, Senator Frame from "aye" to "no."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The gentleman will be so recorded.

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—19

Arlene, Dougherty, Dwyer, Hankins, Hobbs,	Kelley, Lentz, Lynch, McKinney, Mellow,	Murray, Nolan, Noszka, Orlando, Ross,	Scanlon, Smith, Wood, Zemprelli,
---	---	---	---

NAYS—26

Ammerman, Andrews, Bell, Early, Ewing, Fleming, Frame,	Hager, Hess, Holl, Howard, Jubelirer, Kury, Lewis,	Manbeck, Messinger, Moore, Murphy, Myers, O'Pake,	Reibman, Snyder, Stapleton, Stauffer, Sweeney, Tilghman,
--	--	--	---

Less than a majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the negative.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AND FINAL PASSAGE

SB 659 (Pr. No. 988)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

And the amendments made thereto having been printed as required by the Constitution,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—45

Ammerman, Andrews, Arlene, Bell, Dougherty, Dwyer, Early, Ewing, Fleming, Frame, Hager, Hankins,	Hess, Hobbs, Holl, Howard, Jubelirer, Kelley, Kury, Lentz, Lewis, Lynch, Manbeck,	McKinney, Mellow, Messinger, Moore, Murphy, Murray, Myers, Nolan, Noszka, O'Pake, Orlando,	Reibman, Ross, Scanlon, Smith, Snyder, Stapleton, Stauffer, Sweeney, Tilghman, Wood, Zemprelli,
---	---	--	---

NAYS—0

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk present said bill to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

SB 519 CALLED UP

SB 519 (Pr. No. 538)—Without objection, the bill, which previously went over in its order, was called up, from page 5 of the Third Consideration Calendar, by Senator HAGER.

RECONSIDERATION OF SB 519

BILL OVER IN ORDER AND RECOMMITTED

SB 519 (Pr. No. 538)—Senator HAGER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was previously passed over in its order a few moments ago. I would ask for a roll call vote.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Senator HAGER and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—21

Andrews, Bell, Dougherty, Dwyer, Ewing, Fleming,	Frame, Hager, Hess, Hobbs, Holl,	Howard, Jubelirer, Lentz, Manbeck, Moore,	Reibman, Snyder, Stauffer, Tilghman, Wood,
---	--	---	--

NAYS—24

Ammerman, Arlene, Early, Hankins, Kelley, Kury,	Lewis, Lynch, McKinney, Mellow, Messinger, Murphy,	Murray, Myers, Nolan, Noszka, O'Pake, Orlando,	Ross, Scanlon, Smith, Stapleton, Sweeney, Zemprelli,
--	---	---	---

So the question was determined in the negative, and the motion was defeated.

In accordance with Senate Rule 2, Order of Business, as amended by Senate Resolution, Serial No. 13, Session of 1969, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Local Government.

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AND FINAL PASSAGE

SB 660 (Pr. No. 989)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

And the amendments made thereto having been printed as required by the Constitution,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—46

Ammerman, Andrews, Arlene, Bell, Cianfrani, Dougherty, Dwyer, Early, Ewing, Fleming, Frame, Hager,	Hankins, Hess, Hobbs, Holl, Howard, Jubelirer, Kelley, Kury, Lentz, Lewis, Lynch, Manbeck,	McKinney, Mellow, Messinger, Moore, Murphy, Murray, Myers, Nolan, Noszka, O'Pake, Orlando,	Reibman, Ross, Scanlon, Smith, Snyder, Stapleton, Stauffer, Sweeney, Tilghman, Wood, Zemprelli,
---	---	--	---

NAYS—0

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk present said bill to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

HB 723 (Pr. No. 1275)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—46

Ammerman, Andrews, Arlene, Bell, Cianfrani, Dougherty, Dwyer, Early, Ewing, Fleming,	Hankins, Hess, Hobbs, Holl, Howard, Jubelirer, Kelley, Kury, Lentz, Lewis,	McKinney, Mellow, Messinger, Moore, Murphy, Murray, Myers, Nolan, Noszka, O'Pake,	Reibman, Ross, Scanlon, Smith, Snyder, Stapleton, Stauffer, Sweeney, Tilghman, Wood,
---	---	--	---

Frame, Lynch, Orlando, Zemprelli,
Hager, Manbeck,

NAYS—0

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk return said bill to the House of Representatives with information that the Senate has passed the same without amendments.

BILL OVER IN ORDER

SB 750—Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator NOLAN.

BILL OVER IN ORDER
ON FINAL PASSAGE

SB 793 (Pr. No. 857)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

Senator ANDREWS. Mr. President, I wish to rise in opposition to Senate Bill No. 793. As I read this bill, it simply mandates that before a coroner may have an autopsy conducted of a body, he would have to have the approval of the court.

It would appear to me that we are doing a couple of things here. We are going to handcuff the coroner if he is in a position where he believes that there was suspicious cause of death; and in order to perform an autopsy, he is going to have to get the judge to allow it. Of course, if he does this, I would surmise that the judge would have to be advised as to the facts of the case and so forth. This requires that the court is going to have to become involved in the investigation. It means that the coroner and the police may have to tip their hand with respect to any suspicions they may have.

REQUEST FOR BILL OVER IN ORDER

Senator ANDREWS. I request that this bill go over in order at this time.

Senator NOLAN. Mr. President, I concur with the gentleman from Lawrence, Senator Andrews, that the bill go over in its order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, at the request of the gentleman from Lawrence, Senator Andrews, Senate Bill No. 793 will go over in its order on final passage.

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AND
FINAL PASSAGE

SB 794 (Pr. No. 858)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—46

Ammerman,	Hankins,	McKinney,	Reibman,
Andrews,	Hess,	Mellow,	Ross,
Arlene,	Hobbs,	Messinger,	Scanlon,
Bell,	Holl,	Moore,	Smith,
Cianfrani,	Howard,	Murphy,	Snyder,

Dougherty,	Jubelirer,	Murray,	Stapleton,
Dwyer,	Kelley,	Myers,	Stauffer,
Early,	Kury,	Nolan,	Sweeney,
Ewing,	Lentz,	Noszka,	Tilghman,
Fleming,	Lewis,	O'Pake,	Wood,
Frame,	Lynch,	Orlando,	Zemprelli,
Hager,	Manbeck,		

NAYS—0

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk present said bill to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

HB 794 (Pr. No. 897)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—46

Ammerman,	Hankins,	McKinney,	Reibman,
Andrews,	Hess,	Mellow,	Ross,
Arlene,	Hobbs,	Messinger,	Scanlon,
Bell,	Holl,	Moore,	Smith,
Cianfrani,	Howard,	Murphy,	Snyder,
Dougherty,	Jubelirer,	Murray,	Stapleton,
Dwyer,	Kelley,	Myers,	Stauffer,
Early,	Kury,	Nolan,	Sweeney,
Ewing,	Lentz,	Noszka,	Tilghman,
Fleming,	Lewis,	O'Pake,	Wood,
Frame,	Lynch,	Orlando,	Zemprelli,
Hager,	Manbeck,		

NAYS—0

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk return said bill to the House of Representatives with information that the Senate has passed the same without amendments.

SB 795 (Pr. No. 859)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—46

Ammerman,	Hankins,	McKinney,	Reibman,
Andrews,	Hess,	Mellow,	Ross,
Arlene,	Hobbs,	Messinger,	Scanlon,
Bell,	Holl,	Moore,	Smith,
Cianfrani,	Howard,	Murphy,	Snyder,
Dougherty,	Jubelirer,	Murray,	Stapleton,
Dwyer,	Kelley,	Myers,	Stauffer,
Early,	Kury,	Nolan,	Sweeney,
Ewing,	Lentz,	Noszka,	Tilghman,
Fleming,	Lewis,	O'Pake,	Wood,
Frame,	Lynch,	Orlando,	Zemprelli,
Hager,	Manbeck,		

NAYS—0

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk present said bill to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

SB 796 (Pr. No. 860)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—46

Ammerman,	Hankins,	McKinney,	Reibman,
Andrews,	Hess,	Mellow,	Ross,
Arlene,	Hobbs,	Messinger,	Scanlon,
Bell,	Holl,	Moore,	Smith,
Cianfrani,	Howard,	Murphy,	Snyder,
Dougherty,	Jubelirer,	Murray,	Stapleton,
Dwyer,	Kelley,	Myers,	Stauffer,
Early,	Kury,	Nolan,	Sweeney,
Ewing,	Lentz,	Noszka,	Tilghman,
Fleming,	Lewis,	O'Pake,	Wood,
Frame,	Lynch,	Orlando,	Zemprelli,
Hager,	Manbeck,		

NAYS—0

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk present said bill to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

HB 813 (Pr. No. 916)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—46

Ammerman,	Hankins,	McKinney,	Reibman,
Andrews,	Hess,	Mellow,	Ross,
Arlene,	Hobbs,	Messinger,	Scanlon,
Bell,	Holl,	Moore,	Smith,
Cianfrani,	Howard,	Murphy,	Snyder,
Dougherty,	Jubelirer,	Murray,	Stapleton,
Dwyer,	Kelley,	Myers,	Stauffer,
Early,	Kury,	Nolan,	Sweeney,
Ewing,	Lentz,	Noszka,	Tilghman,
Fleming,	Lewis,	O'Pake,	Wood,
Frame,	Lynch,	Orlando,	Zemprelli,
Hager,	Manbeck,		

NAYS—0

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk return said bill to the House of Representatives with information that the Senate has passed the same without amendments.

SB 834 (Pr. No. 910)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—46

Ammerman,	Hankins,	McKinney,	Reibman,
Andrews,	Hess,	Mellow,	Ross,
Arlene,	Hobbs,	Messinger,	Scanlon,
Bell,	Holl,	Moore,	Smith,
Cianfrani,	Howard,	Murphy,	Snyder,
Dougherty,	Jubelirer,	Murray,	Stapleton,
Dwyer,	Kelley,	Myers,	Stauffer,
Early,	Kury,	Nolan,	Sweeney,
Ewing,	Lentz,	Noszka,	Tilghman,
Fleming,	Lewis,	O'Pake,	Wood,

Frame,	Lynch,	Orlando,	Zemprelli,
Hager,	Manbeck,		

NAYS—0

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk present said bill to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

SB 835 (Pr. No. 911)—Considered the third time and agreed to,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—27

Ammerman,	Hobbs,	Murphy,	Scanlon,
Arlene,	Kelley,	Murray,	Smith,
Cianfrani,	Lewis,	Myers,	Stauffer,
Ewing,	Lynch,	Nolan,	Tilghman,
Fleming,	McKinney,	Noszka,	Wood,
Frame,	Mellow,	Orlando,	Zemprelli,
Hankins,	Messinger,	Ross,	

NAYS—19

Andrews,	Hager,	Kury,	Reibman,
Bell,	Kelley,	Hess,	Snyder,
Dougherty,	Holl,	Manbeck,	Stapleton,
Dwyer,	Howard,	Moore,	Sweeney,
Early,	Jubelirer,	O'Pake,	

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk present said bill to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

SB 850, 851, 852, 881, 882 and 883—Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator NOLAN.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AMENDED

HB 907 (Pr. No. 1792)—Considered the third time,

On the question,
Will the Senate agree to the bill on third consideration?
Senator KELLEY, by unanimous consent, offered the following amendments:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1502), page 1, line 18 by removing the comma after "erection" and inserting: and/or

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1502), page 1, line 18 by striking out "and" and inserting: and/or

On the question,
Will the Senate agree to the amendments?
They were agreed to.
Without objection, the bill, as amended, was passed over in its order at the request of Senator KELLEY.

SECOND CONSIDERATION CALENDAR

PREFERRED APPROPRIATION BILL
ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

SB 533 (Pr. No. 557)—Considered the second time and agreed to,

Ordered, To be transcribed for a third consideration.

PREFERRED APPROPRIATION
BILLS OVER IN ORDER

SB 772, 775, 776, 778 and 861—Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator NOLAN.

NONPREFERRED APPROPRIATION
BILLS OVER IN ORDER

SB 721, 722, 723, 725, 726, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 769, 770, 771, 777, 779, 792 and 899—Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator NOLAN.

BILL OVER IN ORDER

SB 170—Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator NOLAN.

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

HB 208 (Pr. No. 1132)—Considered the second time and agreed to,
Ordered, To be transcribed for a third consideration.

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

HB 287 and 408—Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator NOLAN.

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

HB 409 (Pr. No. 955), HB 451 (Pr. No. 1853) and HB 516 (Pr. No. 1567)—Considered the second time and agreed to,
Ordered, To be transcribed for a third consideration.

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

SB 545, 586 and 640—Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator NOLAN.

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

SB 674 (Pr. No. 718), SB 679 (Pr. No. 723) and SB 693 (Pr. No. 1011)—Considered the second time and agreed to,
Ordered, To be transcribed for a third consideration.

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

SB 744 and 745—Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator NOLAN.

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

SB 832 (Pr. No. 908), SB 863 (Pr. No. 943), SB 864 (Pr. No. 944) and SB 865 (Pr. No. 945)—Considered the second time and agreed to,
Ordered, To be transcribed for a third consideration.

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

SB 867, 868, 869 and 871—Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator NOLAN.

BILL RECOMMITTED

SB 885 (Pr. No. 965)—Upon motion of Senator NOLAN, and agreed to, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Insurance.

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

HB 910 and 1121—Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator NOLAN.

SB 640 CALLED UP

SB 640 (Pr. No. 984)—Without objection, the bill, which previously went over in its order, was called up, from page 17 of the Second Consideration Calendar, by Senator NOLAN.

BILL REREFERRED

SB 640 (Pr. No. 984)—Upon motion of Senator NOLAN, and agreed to, the bill was rereferred to the Committee on Appropriations.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

Senator KELLEY, from the Committee on State Government, reported, as committed, **SB 600 and 816**; as amended, **SB 800, 831 and 904**.

Senator KURY, from the Committee on Consumer Affairs, reported, as committed, **SB 560**; as amended, **SB 162**.

BILL REREFERRED

Senator KURY, from the Committee on Consumer Affairs, returned to the Senate **SB 264**, which was rereferred to the Committee on Aging and Youth.

BILLS ON FIRST CONSIDERATION

Senator NOLAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do now proceed to consideration of all bills reported from Committees for the first time at today's Session.

The motion was agreed to.

The bills were as follows:

SB 162, 560, 600, 714, 800, 816, 831 and 904.

And said bills having been considered for the first time,
Ordered, To be laid aside for second consideration.

PETITIONS AND REMONSTRANCES

Senator DOUGHERTY. Mr. President, I only want to make a brief comment on the remarks made by my colleague from Philadelphia, Senator Hankins.

Mr. President, the action of the Senate today, in my mind, is not an attempt to destroy the Human Relations Commission. As the gentleman may remember, many of the people who today voted for that amendment last year voted to recommit Senate Bill No. 1306. I would hope the gentleman would recognize that there are very strong indications that the attempts at busing simply do not work. Professor Coleman's report, which I noted yesterday, and the court decisions in Englewood, California that reversed the decision of five years ago and the like, I think substantiate that fact.

Mr. President, I hope my good friend would recognize that honest and sincere people can disagree on the means to achieve what I honestly believe is a common goal.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SECRETARY

The following announcements were read by the Secretary of the Senate:

SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Eastern Daylight Saving Time

Time	DATE AND COMMITTEE	Room
	MONDAY, JULY 7, 1975	
2:30 P.M.	TRANSPORTATION	156
	TUESDAY, JULY 8, 1975	
11:30 A.M.	APPROPRIATIONS to consider Senate Bills No. 724, 727 and 768 and House Bill No. 1333	350
12:00 Noon	RULES AND EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS to consider Executive Nominations	Committee meeting room
	WEDNESDAY, JULY 9, 1975	
9:30 A.M.	ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES to consider Senate Bills No. 259, 738 and House Bills No. 854, 1346 and 1417	Minority Caucus room
9:30 A.M.	LOCAL GOVERNMENT to consider Senate Bills No. 419, 675, 808, 809, 810 and Senate Resolution No. 25 and House Bills No. 50, 678, 751, 951, 996, 1119 and 1120	Majority Caucus room

THURSDAY, JULY 10, 1975

10:00 A.M.	CONSUMER AFFAIRS to investigate the PUC	Majority Caucus room
10:00 A.M.	INSURANCE Public Hearing on Senate Bill No. 885	House Majority Caucus room

FRIDAY, JULY 11, 1975

9:30 A.M.	INSURANCE Public Hearing on Senate Bill No. 885	Majority Caucus room
-----------	--	----------------------

TUESDAY, JULY 15, 1975

10:00 A.M.	EDUCATION to consider Senate Bills No. 580 and 801 and House Bill No. 97	188
------------	---	-----

THURSDAY, JULY 17, 1975

9:30 A.M.	TRANSPORTATION Public Hearing on Senate Bill No. 528	Majority Caucus room
-----------	---	----------------------

The SECRETARY. The Judiciary Committee meeting scheduled for next Monday, July 7, at 11:00 a.m. has been cancelled.

ADJOURNMENT

Senator NOLAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do now adjourn until Tuesday, July 8, 1975, at 1:00 p.m., Eastern Daylight Saving Time.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned at 2:40 p.m., Eastern Daylight Saving Time.