

Legislative Journal

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1984

SESSION OF 1984

168TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 16

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, February 29, 1984.

The Senate met at 11:00 a.m., Eastern Standard Time.

The PRESIDENT (Lieutenant Governor William W. Scranton III) in the Chair.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Mr. MARK A. SANTUCCI, Pastor of Saint Andrew's Episcopal Church, Harrisburg, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, giver of all good things. We thank You for the natural majesty and beauty of this land. We thank You for the great resources. We thank You for the men and women who have made it strong and for the torch of liberty which has drawn people here from every land.

Help us, Lord, to finish the good work here begun. O Lord, we beseech Thee to guide and bless the Senators of this Commonwealth that they may enact such laws as please Thee. To the glory of Your name and the welfare of Your people. Amen.

JOURNAL APPROVED

The PRESIDENT. A quorum of the Senate being present, the Clerk will read the Journal of the preceding Session of February 28, 1984.

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

LEGISLATIVE LEAVES

Senator STAUFFER. Mr. President, I request a temporary legislative leave of absence for Senator Hopper who is meeting with the State Grange.

Senator SCANLON. Mr. President, I request a temporary legislative leave of absence for Senator Zemprelli.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection and the leaves are granted.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Senator STAUFFER asked and obtained leave of absence for Senator JUBELIRER, for today's Session, for personal reasons.

Senator SCANLON asked and obtained leaves of absence for Senator FUMO and Senator LYNCH, for today's Session, for personal reasons.

REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND INSURANCE ON SUNSET EVALUATION OF THE SAVINGS ASSOCIATION BOARD

The PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the report of the Senate Committee on Banking and Insurance on Sunset Evaluation of the Savings Association Board.

This report will be filed in the Library.

GENERAL COMMUNICATIONS RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

The PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolution (Sunset Review Resolution No. 9), which was read as follows:

February 29, 1984

CONTINUING EXISTENCE OF THE STATE BOARD OF BARBER EXAMINERS SCHEDULED FOR TERMINATION UNDER SUNSET ACT

A RESOLUTION

Continuing existence of the State Board of Barber Examiners scheduled for termination under Sunset Act.

WHEREAS, Section 6(a) of the act of December 22, 1981 (P.L.508, No.142), known as the Sunset Act, provides that the State Board of Barber Examiners shall terminate on December 31, 1983; and

WHEREAS, Section 7(b) of that act provides that, unless legislation is enacted prior to November 1 reestablishing an agency, the presiding officer of each House shall cause to be placed on their respective calendars for the first legislative day in November, the question, in the form of a resolution, of whether an agency scheduled for termination on December 31 of that year shall be continued; and

WHEREAS, Section 7(b) further provides that, if a majority of the members elected to each House approve the resolution prior to the scheduled termination date of December 31, the agency shall be continued until the next review and termination cycle scheduled for the agency; and

WHEREAS, Under the authority of section 4(4) the Sunset Leadership Committee postponed the termination date of the State Board of Barber Examiners from December 31, 1983, to April 30, 1984; and

WHEREAS, In view of the postponement of the termination date of the State Board of Barber Examiners it appears that the

time for action date of November 1, 1983, is extended by implication to March 1, 1984; and

WHEREAS, Legislation reestablishing the State Board of Barber Examiners has not been enacted prior to March 1, 1984, and it is desirable that the agency continue in existence; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the State Board of Barber Examiners continue in existence until the next review and termination cycle scheduled for the agency.

The PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolution (**Sunset Review Resolution No. 10**), which was read as follows:

**CONTINUING EXISTENCE OF THE STATE
BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY SCHEDULED FOR
TERMINATION UNDER SUNSET ACT**

A RESOLUTION

Continuing existence of the State Board of Cosmetology scheduled for termination under Sunset Act.

WHEREAS, Section 6(a) of the act of December 22, 1981 (P.L.508, No.142), known as the Sunset Act, provides that the State Board of Cosmetology shall terminate on December 31, 1983; and

WHEREAS, Section 7(b) of that act provides that, unless legislation is enacted prior to November 1 reestablishing an agency, the presiding officer of each House shall cause to be placed on their respective calendars for the first legislative day in November, the question, in the form of a resolution, of whether an agency scheduled for termination on December 31 of that year shall be continued; and

WHEREAS, Section 7(b) further provides that, if a majority of the members elected to each House approve the resolution prior to the scheduled termination date of December 31, the agency shall be continued until the next review and termination cycle scheduled for the agency; and

WHEREAS, Under the authority of section 4(4) the Sunset Leadership Committee postponed the termination date of the State Board of Cosmetology from December 31, 1983, to April 30, 1984; and

WHEREAS, In view of the postponement of the termination date of the State Board of Cosmetology it appears that the time for action date of November 1, 1983, is extended by implication to March 1, 1984; and

WHEREAS, Legislation reestablishing the State Board of Cosmetology has not been enacted prior to March 1, 1984, and it is desirable that the agency continue in existence; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the State Board of Cosmetology continue in existence until the next review and termination cycle scheduled for the agency.

The PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolution (**Sunset Review Resolution No. 11**), which was read as follows:

**CONTINUING EXISTENCE OF THE CRIME
VICTIM'S COMPENSATION BOARD SCHEDULED
FOR TERMINATION UNDER SUNSET ACT**

A RESOLUTION

Continuing existence of the Crime Victim's Compensation Board scheduled for termination under Sunset Act.

WHEREAS, Section 6(a) of the act of December 22, 1981 (P.L.508, No.142), known as the Sunset Act, provides that the Crime Victim's Compensation Board shall terminate on December 31, 1983; and

WHEREAS, Section 7(b) of that act provides that, unless legislation is enacted prior to November 1 reestablishing an agency, the presiding officer of each House shall cause to be placed on their respective calendars for the first legislative day in November, the question, in the form of a resolution, of whether an agency scheduled for termination on December 31 of that year shall be continued; and

WHEREAS, Section 7(b) further provides that, if a majority of the members elected to each House approve the resolution prior to the scheduled termination date of December 31, the agency shall be continued until the next review and termination cycle scheduled for the agency; and

WHEREAS, Under the authority of section 4(4) the Sunset Leadership Committee postponed the termination date of the Crime Victim's Compensation Board from December 31, 1983, to April 30, 1984; and

WHEREAS, In view of the postponement of the termination date of the Crime Victim's Compensation Board it appears that the time for action date of November 1, 1983, is extended by implication to March 1, 1984; and

WHEREAS, Legislation reestablishing the Crime Victim's Compensation Board has not been enacted prior to March 1, 1984, and it is desirable that the agency continue in existence; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Crime Victim's Compensation Board continue in existence until the next review and termination cycle scheduled for the agency.

The PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolution (**Sunset Review Resolution No. 12**), which was read as follows:

**CONTINUING EXISTENCE OF THE HAZARDOUS
SUBSTANCES TRANSPORTATION BOARD
SCHEDULED FOR TERMINATION
UNDER SUNSET ACT**

A RESOLUTION

Continuing existence of the Hazardous Substances Transportation Board scheduled for termination under Sunset Act.

WHEREAS, Section 6(a) of the act of December 22, 1981 (P.L.508, No.142), known as the Sunset Act, provides that the Hazardous Substances Transportation Board shall terminate on December 31, 1983; and

WHEREAS, Section 7(b) of that act provides that, unless legislation is enacted prior to November 1 reestablishing an agency, the presiding officer of each House shall cause to be placed on their respective calendars for the first legislative day in November, the question, in the form of a resolution, of whether an agency scheduled for termination on December 31 of that year shall be continued; and

WHEREAS, Section 7(b) further provides that, if a majority of the members elected to each House approve the resolution prior to the scheduled termination date of December 31, the agency shall be continued until the next review and termination cycle scheduled for the agency; and

WHEREAS, Under the authority of section 4(4) the Sunset Leadership Committee postponed the termination date of the Hazardous Substances Transportation Board from December 31, 1983, to April 30, 1984; and

WHEREAS, In view of the postponement of the termination date of the Hazardous Substances Transportation Board it appears that the time for action date of November 1, 1983, is extended by implication to March 1, 1984; and

WHEREAS, Legislation reestablishing the Hazardous Substances Transportation Board has not been enacted prior to March 1, 1984, and it is desirable that the agency continue in existence; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Hazardous Substances Transportation Board continue in existence until the next review and termination cycle scheduled for the agency.

The PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolution (**Sunset Review Resolution No. 13**), which was read as follows:

**CONTINUING EXISTENCE OF THE SAVINGS
ASSOCIATION BOARD SCHEDULED FOR
TERMINATION UNDER SUNSET ACT**

A RESOLUTION

Continuing existence of the Savings Association Board scheduled for termination under Sunset Act.

WHEREAS, Section 6(a) of the act of December 22, 1981 (P.L.508, No.142), known as the Sunset Act, provides that the Savings Association Board shall terminate on December 31, 1983; and

WHEREAS, Section 7(b) of that act provides that, unless legislation is enacted prior to November 1 reestablishing an agency, the presiding officer of each House shall cause to be placed on their respective calendars for the first legislative day in November, the question, in the form of a resolution, of whether an agency scheduled for termination on December 31 of that year shall be continued; and

WHEREAS, Section 7(b) further provides that, if a majority of the members elected to each House approve the resolution prior to the scheduled termination date of December 31, the agency shall be continued until the next review and termination cycle scheduled for the agency; and

WHEREAS, Under the authority of section 4(4) the Sunset Leadership Committee postponed the termination date of the Savings Association Board from December 31, 1983, to April 30, 1984; and

WHEREAS, In view of the postponement of the termination date of the Savings Association Board it appears that the time for action date of November 1, 1983, is extended by implication to March 1, 1984; and

WHEREAS, Legislation reestablishing the Savings Association Board has not been enacted prior to March 1, 1984, and it is desirable that the agency continue in existence; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Savings Association Board continue in existence until the next review and termination cycle scheduled for the agency.

The PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be placed on the Calendar.

CALENDAR

SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS

SB 898 CALLED UP OUT OF ORDER

SB 898 (Pr. No. 1766) — Without objection, the bill was called up out of order, from page 2 of the Third Consideration Calendar, by Senator STAUFFER, as a Special Order of Business.

**BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION
AND FINAL PASSAGE**

SB 898 (Pr. No. 1766) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending the act of February 1, 1966 (1965 P. L. 1656, No. 581), entitled "The Borough Code," eliminating certain mandatory retirement.

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

Andrezeski	Holl	O'Connell	Singel
Bell	Hopper	O'Pake	Snyder
Bodack	Howard	Pecora	Stapleton
Brightbill	Kelley	Reibman	Stauffer
Corman	Kratzer	Rhoades	Stout
Early	Kusse	Rocks	Street
Fisher	Lincoln	Romanelli	Tilghman
Greenleaf	Lloyd	Ross	Wenger
Hager	Loeper	Scanlon	Williams
Hankins	Mellow	Shaffer	Wilt
Helfrick	Moore	Shumaker	Zemprelli
Hess	Musto		

NAYS—0

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

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

**MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE
ON EDUCATION**

Senator HESS. Mr. President, as soon as we recess the Senate, I would like the Members of the Committee on Education to report to the Rules Committee room for a very short meeting of the Committee on Education which has just recessed upstairs.

RECESS

Senator STAUFFER. Mr. President, I request a recess of the Senate until 11:45 a.m., for the purpose of holding a Republican caucus and a Democratic caucus.

The PRESIDENT. For purposes of a meeting of the Committee on Education which will convene immediately in the Rules Committee room at the rear of the Chamber, to be followed by Republican and Democratic caucuses, the Chair declares the Senate in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Henry G. Hager) in the Chair.

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

LEGISLATIVE LEAVES

Senator MOORE. Mr. President, I request a legislative leave of absence for Senator Pecora who has to go back to his home district for a meeting. I also request a temporary legislative leave of absence for Senator Corman who is meeting with Members of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection and the leaves are granted.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR RESUMED

THIRD CONSIDERATION CALENDAR

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION
AND FINAL PASSAGE

SB 582 (Pr. No. 1768) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 13, 1915 (P. L. 286, No. 177), entitled, as amended, "Child Labor Law," providing for transferable work permits.

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 **PRESIDENT** (Lieutenant Governor William W. Scranton III) in the Chair.

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

YEAS—46

Andrezeski	Holl	Musto	Shumaker
Bell	Hopper	O'Connell	Singel
Bodack	Howard	O'Pake	Snyder
Brightbill	Kelley	Pecora	Stapleton
Corman	Kratzer	Reibman	Stout
Early	Kusse	Rhoades	Street
Fisher	Lewis	Rocks	Tilghman
Greenleaf	Lincoln	Romanelli	Wenger
Hager	Lloyd	Ross	Williams
Hankins	Loeper	Scanlon	Wilt
Helfrick	Mellow	Shaffer	Zemprelli
Hess	Moore		

NAYS—0

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

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

LEGISLATIVE LEAVES CANCELLED

The PRESIDENT. The Chair notes the presence on the floor of Senator Hopper and Senator Zemprelli. Their legislative leaves of absence will be cancelled.

THIRD CONSIDERATION CALENDAR RESUMED

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

HB 712, 713 and 714 — Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator MOORE.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION
AND FINAL PASSAGE

SB 910 (Pr. No. 1086) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

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

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

Andrezeski	Holl	Musto	Shumaker
Bell	Hopper	O'Connell	Singel
Bodack	Howard	O'Pake	Snyder
Brightbill	Kelley	Pecora	Stapleton
Corman	Kratzer	Reibman	Stout
Early	Kusse	Rhoades	Street
Fisher	Lewis	Rocks	Tilghman
Greenleaf	Lincoln	Romanelli	Wenger
Hager	Lloyd	Ross	Williams
Hankins	Loeper	Scanlon	Wilt
Helfrick	Mellow	Shaffer	Zemprelli
Hess	Moore		

NAYS—0

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

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

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

SB 952 (Pr. No. 1695) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P. L. 31, No. 21), entitled "Public Welfare Code," providing for an increase in individual ceilings for allowable net operating costs for intermediate care facilities; and making appropriations.

Considered the third time,

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the bill on third consideration?

Senator MOORE. Mr. President, I request that Senate Bill No. 952 go over in its order.

Senator LINCOLN. Mr. President, Senate Bill No. 952 is an extremely important piece of legislation that has been on the Senate Calendar now for seven legislative days.

The PRESIDENT. Does the gentleman object to it going over in its order?

Senator LINCOLN. Yes, Mr. President. Could I do that myself?

The PRESIDENT. The debate on this would be limited. It would be correct for the gentleman to merely voice his objection and then prepare for any further motions that might occur.

Senator LINCOLN. Mr. President, my interpretation of the Rules is that as long as I am within the parameters of the motion and do not discuss anything specifically in the bill—and I do not think I have done that—

The PRESIDENT. There is no motion on the floor at the present time, Senator, there is merely a request.

Senator LINCOLN. Mr. President, may we be at ease for one second?

The PRESIDENT. The Senate will be at ease.

(The Senate was at ease.)

Senator LINCOLN. Mr. President, I have been advised by my bevy of attorneys that at this point I should object to Senate Bill No. 952, Printer's No. 1695, going over in its order.

The PRESIDENT. Senator Lincoln objects to the Senator's request.

MOTION FOR BILL OVER IN ORDER

Senator MOORE. Mr. President, I move that Senate Bill No. 952 go over in its order.

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the motion?

Senator LINCOLN. Mr. President, I would ask for a "no" vote on this motion. This piece of legislation is very vital, not just to Democrats but to Republicans and Democrats throughout the Commonwealth. It has been on the Calendar for seven legislative days and I think we should demonstrate as a Body our interest in correcting a very serious problem that we have with our nursing homes. I ask for a "no" vote.

And the question recurring,

Will the Senate agree to the motion?

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

YEAS—26

Bell	Hess	Moore	Shumaker
Brightbill	Holl	O'Connell	Snyder
Corman	Hopper	Pecora	Street
Fisher	Howard	Reibman	Tilghman
Greenleaf	Kratzer	Rhoades	Wenger
Hager	Kusse	Shaffer	Wilt
Helfrick	Loeper		

NAYS—20

Andrezeski	Lewis	O'Pake	Singel
Bodack	Lincoln	Rocks	Stapleton
Early	Lloyd	Romanelli	Stout
Hankins	Mellow	Ross	Williams
Kelley	Musto	Scanlon	Zemprelli

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

The PRESIDENT. Senate Bill No. 952 will go over in its order.

SB 1032 — Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator MOORE.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AND FINAL PASSAGE

HB 1209 (Pr. No. 2595) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for parking for handicapped persons; further providing for the use of hearing impairment devices; providing for inspection of motorcycles; and adding provisions relating to motorcycle safety.

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

Andrezeski	Holl	Musto	Shumaker
Bell	Hopper	O'Connell	Singel
Bodack	Howard	O'Pake	Snyder
Brightbill	Kelley	Pecora	Stapleton
Corman	Kratzer	Reibman	Stout
Early	Kusse	Rhoades	Street
Fisher	Lewis	Rocks	Tilghman
Greenleaf	Lincoln	Romanelli	Wenger
Hager	Lloyd	Ross	Williams
Hankins	Loeper	Scanlon	Wilt
Helfrick	Mellow	Shaffer	Zemprelli
Hess	Moore		

NAYS—0

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

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate 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.

LEGISLATIVE LEAVE CANCELLED

Senator MOORE. Mr. President, I request the record show that Senator Corman has returned to the floor.

The PRESIDENT. Senator Corman has returned to the floor and his temporary legislative leave of absence is therefore cancelled.

THIRD CONSIDERATION CALENDAR RESUMED

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AND FINAL PASSAGE

HB 1405 (Pr. No. 2597) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act relating to the rights of purchasers of defective new motor vehicles.

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

Andrezeski	Holl	Musto	Shumaker
Bell	Hopper	O'Connell	Singel
Bodack	Howard	O'Pake	Snyder
Brightbill	Kelley	Pecora	Stapleton
Corman	Kratzer	Reibman	Stout
Early	Kusse	Rhoades	Street
Fisher	Lewis	Rocks	Tilghman
Greenleaf	Lincoln	Romanelli	Wenger
Hager	Lloyd	Ross	Williams
Hankins	Loeper	Scanlon	Wilt
Helfrick	Mellow	Shaffer	Zemprelli
Hess	Moore		

NAYS—0

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

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate 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.

GUESTS OF SENATOR JAMES R. KELLEY PRESENTED TO SENATE

Senator KELLEY. Mr. President, I would like the special indulgence of my colleagues for a very special and personal privilege which I would like to exercise. Today we have a special guest in the gallery watching the proceedings of this Body. He is a gentleman of high esteem in the community of Greensburg in Westmoreland County and he is a very successful lawyer who happens to have the name of Bernard Patrick Costello. As it is so close to St. Patrick's Day, I expect and hope we would afford him the warm welcome of this Body.

The PRESIDENT. Would Mr. Costello please rise so the Senate may give you its traditional welcome?

(Applause.)

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR RESUMED SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 89, CALLED UP OUT OF ORDER

Senator MOORE, without objection, called up out of order, as a Special Order of Business, from page 7 of the Calendar, **Senate Resolution No. 89**, entitled:

Directing the President pro tempore of the Senate to appoint a select committee to study the feasibility of using certain existing military installations and other Federal and Commonwealth installations as facilities to house prisoners who may be released because of overcrowded conditions in our existing prisons.

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

On the question,
Will the Senate adopt the resolution?

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 89, ADOPTED

Senator MOORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do adopt Senate Resolution No. 89.

The motion was agreed to and the resolution was adopted.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 100, CALLED UP OUT OF ORDER

Senator MOORE, without objection, called up out of order from page 7 of the Calendar, **Senate Resolution No. 100**, entitled:

Amending Senate Rules XVII and XXII.

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

On the question,
Will the Senate adopt the resolution?

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 100, ADOPTED

Senator MOORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do adopt Senate Resolution No. 100.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Senator KELLEY. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman from Westmoreland, Senator Kelley, will state it.

Senator KELLEY. Mr. President, I make a point of order that the resolution is out of order for consideration. It does not conform with today's Calendar. The printer's number is in error, Mr. President, and I object to its consideration.

The PRESIDENT. The Senate will be at ease.

(The Senate was at ease.)

Senator KELLEY. Mr. President, at this time I withdraw my point of order and would like to offer an amendment.

KELLEY-LLOYD AMENDMENT

Senator KELLEY, on behalf of himself and Senator LLOYD, offered the following amendment:

Amend Second Resolve Clause, page 1, line 13, by striking out the bracket before "No"

Amend Second Resolve Clause, page 1, lines 13 and 14, by striking out "](A) EXCEPT AS MAY BE OTHERWISE PROVIDED BY THIS RULE, NO"

Amend Second Resolve Clause, page 2, line 1, by inserting a bracket before the colon

Amend Second Resolve Clause, page 2, line 1, by striking out the bracket before "Provided"

Amend Second Resolve Clause, page 2, line 4, by inserting a bracket after "leader"

Amend Second Resolve Clause, page 2, line 4, by striking out the bracket after "leader."

Amend Second Resolve Clause, page 2, lines 5 through 21, by striking out all of said lines

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the amendment?

Senator KELLEY. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to eliminate a practice of this Body which is unique and exceptional. I, for one, happen to believe this uniqueness and exceptionalness is something that is very undesirable, if not irresponsible, and I would even say politically obscene. What this amendment will do is eliminate from the Rules of this Body the practice of voting when we are not on the floor.

Mr. President, I do not know of a deliberative legislative Body, nationally, in any country or in any state in this nation that permits legislative leaves, and in the absence of that Member to be voted by another Member. I would like to direct everyone's attention to the provisions and the terms of the Constitution of this Commonwealth which specifically directs those elected to the other Body as well as this Body that the oath be administered within the Chamber to which they were elected. I, therefore, suspect it was never a thought in the minds of the framers of the Constitution of this Commonwealth that there would ever be a vote cast by someone who constitutionally was required to be sworn in to his term in a Chamber and to think they could cast a vote when they were not within that Chamber. I think it is appalling and irresponsible. I do not believe it is necessary for me to go on with any deliberations to any extent. I think the issue is very clear and we all understand it. I am not necessarily even talking about the abuses that have been reported in the media. What I am saying is, it is a unique and exceptional practice that is not justifiable and it is highly irresponsible. I think it is time for us to be responsible and fulfill our duties to be present, like it has historically been the practice in Parliamentary Law in all deliberative Bodies, that those Members who are within a Body must be present to vote on anything within that Body. I urge an affirmative vote and hope it is unanimous.

Senator BELL. Mr. President, I rise to oppose this amendment. Like the gentleman from Westmoreland, Senator Kelley, I have fumed and fretted in righteous indignation when Members were not here and were being voted. The present Rules that we are adopting are tightening this up.

For instance, at 1:30 this afternoon I have a public hearing downstairs on a confirmation of a consumer advocate. Fortunately, there is only one witness, the consumer advocate, and I am going to ask him to politely wait until my committee can finish its legislative duties up here. Suppose this afternoon, when we were not supposed to be in Session, that I had a full schedule of twenty witnesses coming from throughout the Commonwealth. I am then faced with a dilemma. Should we not permit any of the Senators to leave here to go to a public hearing in this building and develop legislation that is very keenly needed for confirmation? That is the question. If this practice was unconstitutional, I know my colleague, Senator Kelley, would have taken somebody to court, but it has not been ruled unconstitutional. I oppose ghost voting. If the Transportation Commission holds a meeting on Wednesday afternoon in this Harrisburg Capitol complex and there are

two legislative Members on the commission, does that mean the Senate should not be represented at that commission? I suggest we tighten up the enforcement of this Rule and quit playing games by taking legislative leaves. I had been absent two times and I had my name in the paper. Both times I was attending public hearings or holding public hearings here in this building. I could not see leaving that public hearing. I turned my Members loose, but I stayed there and conducted it. This is what we have to weigh. I think this matter should be brought up at another time and in another way.

Senator ZEMPRELLI. Mr. President, I have some brief remarks. I have mixed emotions over the proposed amendment. When we are in leadership, we are here more often than some of the other Members. However, I had a sad experience one day when I attended a meeting at the Transportation Department with constituents on the construction of a highway which was very important to the district. It happened to be, Mr. President, the same day we were running nonpreferreds. In the course of about three quarters of an hour during that day's Session, approximately forty bills were run and passed of which I was not carried on the vote simply because I had not gotten legislative leave. I had not thought much of it at the time, and I did not realize that there was a lack of sophistication in the field as to what the meaning was of a vote. In an election campaign I found it on the front page of one of the ads indicating I had missed these roll calls, and for the first time I began to appreciate the importance of having the roll calls met. There are times when there are situations that are simply unavoidable, but I think we have come a long way through this particular resolution to tighten up a perception of what our responsibilities are, albeit not perfect, and for that reason I would not want to have an amendment adopted, the full consequences of which we could not appreciate at this particular time.

Senator ROCKS. Mr. President, I think we are about a very serious Rules consideration here. I, for one, would like to be very sure as to what this amendment proposes.

Mr. President, I desire to interrogate the gentleman from Westmoreland, Senator Kelley.

The PRESIDENT. Will the gentleman from Westmoreland, Senator Kelley, permit himself to be interrogated?

Senator KELLEY. I will, Mr. President.

Senator ROCKS. Mr. President, do I understand that the effect of this amendment would be the elimination of any legislative leave provision to include what we now know as temporary legislative leave?

Senator KELLEY. Yes, it would, Mr. President.

Senator ROCKS. I thank the gentleman, Mr. President.

Mr. President, along with many others here, I have a very real concern about what has been an abuse of a legislative leave privilege. However, I rise against this amendment based on the fact that, many days, an orderly flow of business in this Chamber requires for each of us a conflict in time in being on this floor. I believe every one of us takes seriously our committee assignments. I believe that for many of us a charge from our leadership on an issue that might take us off of this

floor while we are here in Harrisburg, and the elimination of the provision to be temporarily on leave and voted would be a grave disservice to the carrying out of our daily responsibilities.

Mr. President, I will share with the Members a personal example of that, if I may. For several long and difficult weeks in the spring and early summer of this past legislative year, I was charged, as was the Republican Chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Industry, with important and difficult negotiations to bring to this Legislature a solution to our Unemployment Compensation Fund problem. The hours required in those negotiations meant that on some days I had to request temporary legislative leave to be in the center of very sensitive negotiations. I consider that to have been as important a part of my Senate responsibilities as being here at the same time casting a vote. In due fashion, as each of us does, I looked over the Calendar and left with my leadership my intent on the votes that would be coming up while I was merely a phone call away.

Mr. President, I hope we will consider the seriousness of this Rule change. I am anxious, along with all of the Members, to solve what has been the abusive use of legislative leave. I do not believe we do it with this amendment. I do believe we are responsibly addressing this issue today.

Senator LLOYD. Mr. President, I have cosponsored this amendment with Senator Kelley and am in support of this amendment for a number of reasons. I believe the issue before us is simply one of establishing priorities. If, in fact, our presence on the floor of the Senate of Pennsylvania is our priority, either individually or collectively, then that can be best demonstrated by our presence on this floor to participate constructively in the activities which occur here. If, for whatever reasons, our priority at a given time for a given legitimate reason is different, then we should simply respond to that priority and take the trouble to sufficiently communicate to our constituents, to the media, if necessary, and to our colleagues the reason that priority has been changed.

I also suspect, Mr. President, that if, in fact, we abolish legislative leave entirely, one of the by-products of that would be a more tightly disciplined structure in terms of the fashion in which we conduct business here. By that I mean I would anticipate we would ultimately evolve into a system in which clearly defined Senate floor hours are established which obviously would vary periodically according to debate and issues which arise. But I think what would happen is, because of our collective desire to maintain a good attendance record, it would be in a practical sense worthwhile to clearly know in advance when we would be in Session and make an effort for that to happen.

Additionally, Mr. President, it has become abundantly clear over the years that without this type of strong action called for in this amendment, the potential for abuse is simply too great. We must step forward, eliminate that potential for abuse and recognize our responsibility to properly structure for the future our public policy regarding our presence on the floor of the Senate. It sometimes takes tough measures to

achieve these things, however, I think the priorities are clear. It is important for us to go the whole mile, not to go the half mile that Senate Resolution No. 100 and Senate Resolution No. 106 currently present. An example of going the half mile, in my assessment, is what is currently happening in the House. There has been an effort to clean up that act and take away the ghost voting process there. As every one of us in this Chamber knows, there is currently a great deal of activity in the House where people who are not present, or who may not even be in the city for that matter, are cast as voting on issues by colleagues who are pushing buttons accordingly. Mr. President, it appears to me, as it does to the gentleman from Westmoreland, Senator Kelley, and others, that the only answer to this entire problem is to simply abolish legislative leave. Therefore, I ask for a "yes" vote on the amendment before us.

Senator STREET. Mr. President, may I ask if it would be appropriate for me to ask for a temporary leave of absence now? I have been called to my office.

The PRESIDENT. Temporary leaves of absence are requested by the floor leadership, Senator.

Senator WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment because it is the only way I know to provide any clear standard here. There is a lot of discussion going on here on the floor about abuses. I do not know what that means, but it seems to me that, under the present Rules, the Members who do legislative work are entitled to legislative leave. I think the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Lloyd, is absolutely right about the priorities of some of the Members. Some are negotiating labor contracts or UC benefits, some are talking to constituents, some Members talk to two and some talk to fifty, and some Members do other work in the meantime. In any event, everybody has a reason for saying that not being present is meritorious.

The only way I know that we could judge each other is by the amendment of the gentleman from Westmoreland, Senator Kelley. That amendment says that we must be here to vote. Everybody will understand that and that will be clear. There will be no chipping away at any individual's evaluation on how good an excuse is or how meritorious an activity. For that reason, Mr. President, I support the amendment. Since I have been a Member of the Senate, this is the first time I have had the experience where the allowance even existed. I do know if we are going to make different stages or categories of exceptions, it absolutely cannot work. Therefore, we either have the present system or we have the system the gentleman from Westmoreland, Senator Kelley, suggests, which I think would be fair and objective to everybody.

Senator BELL. Mr. President, as I debate this, I want to advise the Senate Members of my committee that the hearing will start at 2:30 p.m. If we are still talking about this Rule at 2:30 p.m., it will be held at 3:30 p.m.

As far as arranging things orderly, I suggest that the gentleman who made that suggestion serve as a committee. We have a hard enough time getting people on Wednesday afternoons after Session. I also suggest that if this goes through, my com-

mittee meetings will be held on Thursdays and I will insist there be no legislative leave given to committee Members who want to go home on Wednesdays.

Senator ROMANELLI. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment. The simple reason is my people elected me to represent them in Harrisburg, not necessarily on the floor of this Senate. To do that, there are many times I am called out of this building and must attend hearings and meetings in other parts of the Capitol complex. If this amendment passes, that will no longer be the case, then they will not need the gentleman from Westmoreland, Senator Kelley, or me here, anybody could come up and do the voting.

Senator STREET. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment. The amendment reminds me of last night when I went home and turned on the television. There was a commercial that jumped right out in front of me. There was a little old lady standing there and she said, "Where's the beef? Where's the beef?"

Then she said, "I don't believe there's anybody back there."

Yesterday afternoon there was a group of students here in Harrisburg in my office and I met with those students. But when we go back to our districts and we miss a vote, the people say, "Where's the vote? Where is the vote?"

We try to explain, and they say, "Well, I don't believe you're up there." My point is that when we have students or we have community groups who come to Harrisburg to meet with us when we are here in the Capitol or in close proximity to the Capitol, and we are dealing with issues that affect those people, then the responsibility is to take time and meet with those people. If we are efficient in dealing with our responsibilities, we look at our legislative Calendar and we direct our leadership as to how to cast our vote. That is extremely important.

I have an issue in my district right now where I missed the vote because I was meeting with some people who were camped under the Rotunda. Those very same people are now saying, "Where's the vote?" I was meeting with them and they are saying, "Well, he wasn't up there." They know I was up there.

Let us not put ourselves in a position where we cannot do our job or we have to ignore our constituents when they come here to see us. In this case, they come from a hundred and two and three-fifths miles to get here, and for me to run on the floor of the Senate when many times the issues that are before the Senate are ones that I am not going to participate in or debate and I know how I am going vote. In the interest of this Senate, I would ask the prime sponsor to withdraw the amendment so that we could move forward. If the gentleman is not of the mind to withdraw it, I would ask that we vote it down, unanimously.

Senator LINCOLN. Mr. President, I think this is an issue that we could probably talk about forever because there are good examples of the proper use of legislative leave and there are good examples of the improper use of legislative leave. I think one of the things we tend to do at times is become too

set in our mind and think the easy way we do things is the proper way.

I remember my second term in the House when we took control of the Majority and elected Herb Fineman as the Speaker. A program and a procedure was instituted where we would be in Session one week and then we would have committee meetings the following week and then the following week we would be in Session. I think there are ways that the fine minds of the fifty people who represent all their constituencies throughout Pennsylvania, who come here as Senators, could work together to find a way where we could avoid the necessity of the many times we have to use legislative leave.

I have, on occasion, been at committee meetings and availed myself of legislative leave, but I still do not agree with it. I think it is wrong. I think when we have Sessions scheduled we should make better use of our time. Yesterday was a very good example. We came in, supposedly at 1:00 p.m., and I do not know what time it was finally determined that we came in to have the first vote, and then we broke again and it was another couple of hours before we finally got back on the floor. There should be a more conscious effort to determine the time we have available to us, and if we properly spent time doing our legislative duties on the floor of the Senate, we would obviate a considerable number of times that we would have to use legislative leave. I am going to support this amendment. I know that by supporting it there may be times I may have the problem that our good Senator, the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Street, had, and is having now, in explaining not being here for a vote. I have not had to do that many times in twelve years and I do not look forward to doing it in the future. I think the amendment that the gentleman from Westmoreland, Senator Kelley, is offering is a good one. I think it would lend to a more proper functioning of this Senate and at times I think it is going to lend to some boredom sitting here listening to some of the people speak. If we do adopt this amendment, I am certain we will find the Senate operating much better and much more efficiently.

Senator KELLEY. Mr. President, the question and issue is not "Where is the beef?" and it is not "Where is the vote?" The question is, "Where is the body?" That is the important question. Where should the body be? What is the priority as some of my colleagues have said? My cosponsor, the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Lloyd, indicated that it is a question of prioritizing. The gentleman from Delaware, Senator Bell, spoke up and said he had a dilemma because he scheduled committee meetings. I do not have to remind the gentleman that the leadership and the Secretary of this Body forward the projected days of Session to each Member, and a committee meeting can be called accordingly and be adjusted therefrom. The gentleman had a good suggestion to have meetings on Thursdays. I remember when his colleague on that side of the aisle, the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Greenleaf, had many, many hearings throughout this Commonwealth on the non-Session days and they were well attended. That is what we are supposed to be doing.

The gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Street, the gentleman from Allegheny, Senator Romanelli, and the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Rocks, talk in terms of the constituent who comes to Harrisburg to see us. They talk in terms of our duties to the constituent as well as trying to work out problems of great magnitude to this Commonwealth. But the answer lies with the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Lloyd. It is a question of priority. The body should be here to vote. If the body is not here to vote, there should be no vote. It is as simple as that.

I dare suggest, Mr. President, that all the constituencies of this Commonwealth who cumulatively elected us to this Body would dare understand. May I suggest that if they have the intelligence to elect any one or all of us, they would have the intelligence to understand why we would not be with them here in the Capitol no matter how many miles they travelled to be with us when there are votes being done. They would really expect us—and nothing less—to be here in body. There would be no beef if the body was here voting.

The question is, Mr. President, "Where is the body?" Where should it be when a vote is taken which is critical to legislate the fundamental purpose for which we hold this office and to be consistent with our constitutional charge. I urge an affirmative vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Henry G. Hager) in the Chair.

Senator GREENLEAF. Mr. President, I rise in favor of this amendment. I do agree with the gentleman that our first priority is to be here on this floor and to cast our votes personally, and not only to have that vote cast personally but also to participate or to listen to the debate that is offered on the floor.

In addition, Mr. President, I think there have been a number of occasions where I had to give up the opportunity to visit with constituents when they were visiting in the Capitol in my effort to be here on the floor and to vote. I think that it is important for us to do so. I ask for an affirmative vote.

And the question recurring,

Will the Senate agree to the amendment?

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

YEAS—14

Early	Kratzer	Musto	Stapleton
Fisher	Lewis	O'Pake	Tilghman
Greenleaf	Lincoln	Singel	Williams
Kelley	Lloyd		

NAYS—32

Andrezeski	Hess	O'Connell	Shaffer
Bell	Holl	Pecora	Shumaker
Bodack	Hopper	Reibman	Snyder
Brightbill	Howard	Rhoades	Stout
Corman	Kusse	Rocks	Street
Hager	Loeper	Romanelli	Wenger
Hankins	Mellow	Ross	Wilt
Helfrick	Moore	Scanlon	Zemprelli

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

And the question recurring,

Will the Senate agree to the motion to adopt the resolution?

Senator KELLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that—on the Calendar for today on page 7—the printer's number under Senate Resolution No. 100 be amended from number 1769 to number 1771.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that number will be amended to that. The resolution which is before the Members of the Senate does bear the correct printer's number which is 1771. The Calendar is in error.

And the question recurring,

Will the Senate agree to the motion?

The motion was agreed to and the resolution was adopted.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 104, CALLED UP OUT OF ORDER

Senator MOORE, without objection, called up out of order from page 7 of the Calendar, **Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 104**, entitled:

Memorializing the Governor to proclaim March 20, 1984 as Pennsylvania Agriculture Day.

On the question,

Will the Senate adopt the resolution?

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 104, ADOPTED

Senator MOORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do adopt Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 104.

The motion was agreed to and the resolution was adopted.

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate present the same to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 106, CALLED UP OUT OF ORDER

Senator MOORE, without objection, called up out of order from page 7 of the Calendar, **Senate Resolution No. 106**, entitled:

Amending or adding Senate Financial Operating Rules I, section 4; II, sections 4a, 5a(2) and 6; III, sections 3a, 4 and 10a and c; IV, sections 1 and 4; V, section 2; and VI, sections 2 and 3.

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

On the question,

Will the Senate adopt the resolution?

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 106, ADOPTED

Senator MOORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do adopt Senate Resolution No. 106.

The motion was agreed to and the resolution was adopted.

SECOND CONSIDERATION CALENDAR**BILL REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE
AS AMENDED OVER IN ORDER**

SB 1085 — Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator MOORE.

BILL OVER IN ORDER

HB 58 — Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator MOORE.

BILL REREFERRED

HB 226 (Pr. No. 2594) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending the "Local Health Administration Law," approved August 24, 1951 (P. L. 1304, No. 315), further providing for State grants to county departments of health and to certain municipalities.

Upon motion of Senator MOORE, and agreed to, the bill was rereferred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REQUEST FOR LEGISLATIVE LEAVE

Senator MOORE. Mr. President, I request a temporary legislative leave of absence for Senator Fisher who has been called to his home office on legislative business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the granting of temporary legislative leave to Senator Fisher? The Chair hears none. Without objection, that leave will be granted. Is there objection?

Senator LEWIS. Mr. President, in light of the adoption just a few minutes ago by this Senate of Senate Resolution No. 100, it would seem to me that request and the reason specified for it must now be in writing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Senator MOORE. Mr. President, I withdraw the request for temporary legislative leave for Senator Fisher.

SECOND CONSIDERATION CALENDAR RESUMED**BILLS OVER IN ORDER**

SB 250 and 277 — Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator MOORE.

HB 355 (Pr. No. 2598) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending the "Liquor Code," approved April 12, 1951 (P. L. 90, No. 21), further providing for hours of sale in cities of the first and second class.

The bill was considered.

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the bill on second consideration?

Senator MOORE. Mr. President, I request that House Bill No. 355 go over in its order.

Senator ZEMPRELLI. Mr. President, I object to House Bill No. 355 going over in its order.

MOTION FOR BILL OVER IN ORDER

Senator MOORE. Mr. President, I move that House Bill No. 355 go over in its order.

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the motion?

Senator ZEMPRELLI. Mr. President, I object to House Bill No. 355 going over in its order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has been moved by Senator Moore that House Bill No. 355, Printer's No. 2598, go over in its order.

Senator ZEMPRELLI. Mr. President, yesterday as a result of bipartisan support, a bill was to be introduced with the support of both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator yield? The motion calls for limited debate as to the propriety of this bill going over and not as to any extraneous matter which might be attached to this bill.

Senator ZEMPRELLI. Mr. President, I understand the parameters of the debate. I assure you I will be brief. I only say that my objection to this bill going over in its order is for the purpose of offering, by amendment form, that bill which was introduced yesterday as a reform measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator, the ruling of the Chair is that the debate is limited to the propriety of this bill going over, not what might be done to this bill as a vehicle.

Senator ZEMPRELLI. Mr. President, all I want to do is to put upon the record my reasons for objecting to the bill going over and that is for the purpose of offering amendments that would be a reform package to the Liquor Control Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator, it is the ruling of the Chair that your remarks are out of order.

MOTION TO REREFER

Senator KELLEY. Mr. President, I move that House Bill No. 355 be rereferred to the Committee on Law and Justice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator Kelley, we were informed by the Parliamentarian that such a motion does not take precedence over the motion which is already upon the floor.

The motion before the Senate is to pass over House Bill No. 355 in its order.

And the question recurring,

Will the Senate agree to the motion?

Senator FISHER. Mr. President, I just want the record to reflect prior to this vote that I was on the floor and remained on the floor and will be here voting.

Senator O'CONNELL. Mr. President, back on the original debate and the motion to put the bill over—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator, we are on the very limited debate of the propriety of passing over this bill.

Senator O'CONNELL. Mr. President, I will engage in a limited debate and I will try to confine my remarks.

Mr. President, I support the motion to put the bill over only because it is a very substantial amendment and because the Members on our side have not had an opportunity to take a look at it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The gentleman's remarks are just as out of order as those that preceded him.

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

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

YEAS—25

Bell	Hess	Loeper	Shumaker
Brightbill	Holl	Moore	Snyder
Corman	Hopper	O'Connell	Street
Fisher	Howard	Pecora	Tilghman
Greenleaf	Kratzer	Rhoades	Wenger
Hager	Kusse	Shaffer	Wilt
Helfrick			

NAYS—21

Andrezeski	Lincoln	Reibman	Singel
Bodack	Lloyd	Rocks	Stapleton
Early	Mellow	Romanelli	Stout
Hankins	Musto	Ross	Williams
Kelley	O'Pake	Scanlon	Zemprelli
Lewis			

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. House Bill No. 355 will go over in its order.

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION AMENDED

SB 717 (Pr. No. 1716) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 16, 1921 (P. L. 579, No. 262), entitled, as reenacted and amended, "An act providing for the better management of the jails or county prisons in the several counties of this Commonwealth of the third, fourth, fifth classes and in certain counties of the sixth, seventh and eighth classes by creating, in such counties, a board to be known by the name and style of inspectors of the jail or county prison, with authority to appoint a warden of such prison, and by vesting in said board, and the officers appointed by it, the safe-keeping, discipline, and employment of prisoners and the government and management of said jails or county prisons," deleting the judge of the court of common pleas in any judicial district having only one judge from the board of inspectors of the jail or county prison.

The bill was considered.

On the question,
Will the Senate agree to the bill on second consideration?
Senator MOORE offered the following amendment:

Amend Title, page 1, line 13, by striking out "in any judicial district having only one judge" and inserting: and the district attorney

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

On the question,
Will the Senate agree to the bill on second consideration, as amended?

Senator O'CONNELL offered the following amendment and, if agreed to, asked that the bill be considered for the second time:

Amend Title, page 1, line 14, by removing the period after "prison" and inserting: ; deleting the district attorney from the board of inspectors; and making a repeal.

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 25 and 26:

Section 2. The act of April 13, 1868 (P.L.917, No.860), entitled "An act relative to the Luzerne county prison, and to discharged convicts," is hereby repealed.

Amend Sec. 2, page 2, line 26, by striking out "2" and inserting: 3

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

And the question recurring,
Will the Senate agree to the bill on second consideration, as amended?

It was agreed to.

Ordered, To be printed on the Calendar for third consideration.

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

SB 934, HB 946, SB 948, 988, 1083, 1084 and 1100 — Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator MOORE.

BILL REREFERRED

SB 1112 (Pr. No. 1443) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act regulating the practice of speech-language pathologists, audiologists and teachers of the hearing impaired; creating the State Board of Examiners in Speech-Language and Hearing with certain powers and duties; and prescribing penalties.

Upon motion of Senator MOORE, and agreed to, the bill was rereferred to the Committee on Appropriations.

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

HB 1155, SB 1168 and 1181 — Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator MOORE.

BILL REREFERRED

SB 1200 (Pr. No. 1767) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending the act of January 22, 1968 (P. L. 42, No. 8), entitled, as amended, "Pennsylvania Urban Mass Transportation Law," rewording definitions; increasing the level of loss reimbursement; and further providing for State appropriation for subsidies for local transportation organizations or companies.

Upon motion of Senator MOORE, and agreed to, the bill was rereferred to the Committee on Appropriations.

BILL OVER IN ORDER

SB 1213 — Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator MOORE.

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

SB 1231 (Pr. No. 1728) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act establishing the fees to be charged and received by sheriffs.

Considered the second time and agreed to,
Ordered, To be printed on the Calendar for third consideration.

SB 1239 (Pr. No. 1689) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, defining hazardous material; providing for the effect of amendments to Federal regulations; repealing the penalty for violating Federal law when driving a vehicle; providing for the transportation of hazardous materials; and making a repeal.

Considered the second time and agreed to,
Ordered, To be printed on the Calendar for third consideration.

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

SB 1255 and **HB 1643** — Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator MOORE.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

Senator RHOADES, from the Committee on Game and Fisheries, reported the following bills:

SB 1153 (Pr. No. 1772) (Amended)

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P. L. 1225, No. 316), entitled "The Game Law," further providing for deer-proof and elk-proof fences.

SB 1154 (Pr. No. 1773) (Amended)

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P. L. 1225, No. 316), entitled "The Game Law," further providing for unlawful methods of hunting; further providing for killing wildlife which destroys property; and providing penalties.

SB 1155 (Pr. No. 1774) (Amended)

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P. L. 1225, No. 316), entitled "The Game Law," providing for nonlicensed hunting and trapping on detached farmlands within ten air miles of the primary farm.

HB 686 (Pr. No. 1488)

An Act amending "The Game Law," approved January 3, 1937 (P. L. 1225, No. 316), further providing for prohibited property damage; providing for civil liability for property damage; prohibiting hunting or trapping in unharvested fields; and imposing penalties.

Senator HESS, from the Committee on Education, reported the following bill:

HB 1397 (Pr. No. 2599) (Amended)

An Act amending the "Public School Code of 1949," approved March 10, 1949 (P. L. 30, No. 14), requiring public hearings prior to closing schools; further providing for an alternative payment plan for illness or accidental injury; and authorizing the State Treasurer to recover Social Security overpayments on behalf of school employees.

BILL IN PLACE

Senator ROCKS presented to the Chair a bill.

CONGRATULATORY RESOLUTIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following resolutions, which were read, considered and adopted:

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Mr. and Mrs. C. Bruce Johnsonbaugh and to Mr. and Mrs. John L. Wilkes by Senator Corman.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Mr. and Mrs. Sam Galore, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Nagy and to Mr. and Mrs. Milan Getting by Senator Early.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Dennis A. Joyner by Senator Kelley.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to the Westmoreland County Boroughs Association by Senator Kelley and others.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Mary Zampogna by Senator Kusse.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to James C. Byrne, Corporal George A. Minner and to The Honorable Thomas A. White by Senator Lynch.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Mabel Shoemaker by Senator Moore.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Nello S. Carozzoni and to Robert M. Mandak, Jr. by Senator Musto.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Jon David Odenwelder by Senator Reibman.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Mr. and Mrs. Thomas G. Derr, Mr. and Mrs. Norwood Klotz, Sr. and to Mr. and Mrs. Fred M. Witmer by Senator Rhoades.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to the Big Beaver Falls School District Principals by Senator Ross.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Mr. and Mrs. James Pellegrino and to Mr. and Mrs. Clayton Sunderland by Senator Stapleton.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Margaret DeAngelis by Senator Stauffer.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to the Eagle Scouts of the East Valley Area Chamber of the Boy Scouts of America by Senator Zemprelli and others.

BILLS ON FIRST CONSIDERATION

Senator ROSS. 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 1153, 1154, 1155, HB 686 and 1397.

And said bills having been considered for the first time,

Ordered, To be printed on the Calendar for second consideration.

PETITIONS AND REMONSTRANCES

Senator LINCOLN. Mr. President, I very seldom rise in Petitions and Remonstrances, but I am somewhat frustrated today about an action the Senate took or, in a sense, failed to take on Senate Bill No. 952.

Mr. President, the issue that Senate Bill No. 952 speaks of is very clear. On January 8th, the Department of Public Welfare promulgated regulations, proposed regulations, which affected the ceilings on nursing home care, both skilled and intermediate. Those regulations were disapproved by both the House Committee on Public Health and Welfare and the Senate Committee on Public Health and Welfare and, in spite of that, were approved by the IRRC.

Mr. President, what does this mean? We will go back to last year. On April 1, 1983, the Department of Public Welfare increased its intermediate care rate by 6 percent applicable for the period April 1, 1983 through December 31, 1983. The so-called case mix adjustment was approved to partially offset the effects of reclassification. The 6 percent adjustment translated into reimbursement in the amount of \$38.80 a day for each intermediate care patient. As scheduled, this 6 percent case mix adjustment terminated on December 31, 1983, and nursing homes across this Commonwealth are presently being reimbursed again at the rate of \$36.80 per day for any intermediate care patients. In effect, nursing homes are losing approximately two dollars per patient per day for caring for those intermediate care patients whose nursing care needs have not changed since the reclassification process took place. Not only do the effects of this regulation and the termination of the 6 percent interim case mix adjustment translate into a shortfall in revenue for nursing homes, but an even more serious problem is that it jeopardizes quality care and access to care for our frail, elderly nursing home patients. In addition, staff cutbacks will increase unemployment in Pennsylvania which is already at a dangerously high level. Senate Bill No. 952 seeks to extend the 6 percent case mix adjustment for medical assistance intermediate care net operating ceilings and to change and provide for 3.0 hours of nursing care from January 1st through June 30, 1984. This measure would provide needed relief for our nursing homes in the Commonwealth where reimbursements have been cut due to the change in regulations. This extension of funds is crucial for our nursing homes to continue to care for our elderly, indigent patients.

I find myself here today speaking under Petitions and Remonstrances out of frustration because Senate Bill No. 952 does answer the question and provide what is needed to continue the level of care necessary for the patients in these homes. What is so frustrating about this, there are thirty-nine Members of the fifty Members in this Senate who have cosponsored this legislation. It has been on the Calendar for the better part of this calendar year and it will be on its eighth legislative day when we come back on March 19th. I cannot understand why the Majority Members—and one of them is a prime sponsor of this bill—would object to passing this legislation. It does not make any sense. Then I start asking myself,

could it be that the Majority party is protecting the Governor again because it is the Governor's idea to cut back on nursing home reimbursements? It is the Governor's Department of Public Welfare which has promulgated past and now is operating under regulations which are stifling nursing home care in county operated and nonprofit nursing homes. I want to tell the Members I resent that because I have respect for all the Members who sit in this Body, but I served under a Democratic Governor when I was in the Majority, and we not only would pass this kind of legislation whenever this Body or the House, where I served at that time, felt it was necessary legislation, but I also took part in voting to override vetoes of a Governor of my own party when I thought he was wrong. Evidently, quite a few Members of the Majority party feel that their Governor is wrong by putting their name on this legislation, Senate Bill No. 952. It is incredible how far they can carry party loyalty and how far they can try to explain and how they can try to explain that we can sit with a piece of legislation on our Calendar for week after week and not take action on it when we have people in homes like the one in my district—and I know that is no different than the other forty-nine Members who serve in this Body—where we have indigents who cannot be asked for any more funds. We have had a situation where the reclassification has taken place due to federal changes in the law which have moved a lot of our skilled people from skilled to intermediate which means the nursing home gets less money. That has already taken place. Now we see a meager \$7.2 million that would be necessary to adequately fund the nursing homes, and I do not mean fully fund, I mean adequately fund so they can get through.

In my case, I have a nursing home where out of ninety-nine patient beds, ninety-four of them are filled by indigents. I can tell the Members that is not unusual in poor areas. There are a lot of homes that will not be bothered by this because they will not be bothered with indigent patients. My nursing home is going to lose \$3,000 a month. There is nowhere to get that money, it is impossible. I am telling the Members if we do not pass something like Senate Bill No. 952 pretty soon, it is not just going to be my nursing home that will be closing its doors or having some patient die because of inadequate service or the quality of the service has decreased.

I know there is nothing to be done about this at this time because we will not be back in Session until March 19th, but I think it is a shame. It is a shame that at times we have to consider partisan politics above the good of all of our constituencies. That is what we have done here today. I was so impressed when I saw Senate Bill No. 952 with the number of sponsors on it because it indicated to me that the Majority party in this Body was prepared to stand up and say to the Governor, "You are wrong and we are going to do something about it." I have been in this business now for twelve or fourteen years and I know there are subtle ways of cutting back that enthusiasm if their Governor is of the same party. I have been down that road. I have had the arm twisting. I have had all the other reasons given why I should not do what was right and I am telling them there were many occasions when I stood

on the floor of the House and berated my Governor and, in fact, asked him to resign at one point because of how I felt he was operating as a Governor. The Members have a responsibility to the people they represent and not to the Governor of this Commonwealth to uphold his ideas. They must do what is right. What is really sad about this is that just recently, within the last couple of days, we found out—and I do not mean we on this side, I mean we as a Body—that there is approximately \$34 million available that will lapse in the Welfare budget because, for some unexplained reason, the 40,000 people who were taken off of the welfare rolls in January, February and March of 1983 have disappeared. There was \$34 million put in and the case load has not gone up by that amount, so the Governor and the Welfare Department have, at this point, in excess of \$34 million, and only \$7.2 million of that money would be needed if Senate Bill No. 952 passed. I do not like to get up and be critical of the Majority party like this. I think we get more done when we do it together and if Senate Bill No. 952 was the effort it appeared to be, an effort together, then I hope when we get back on the 19th of March this bill will be acted upon and passed. I do not think we have the luxury anymore of delaying it simply for partisan reasons. I urge the Majority Members of this Senate to look at this bill and work out whatever difficulties they are having and come back on the 19th and give us an opportunity to vote and pass it and solve a very serious problem in Pennsylvania.

Senator SINGEL. Mr. President, as the previous speaker has stated, if Senate Bill No. 952 were passed today by this Body, it would have provided for an increase in the ceilings for the operating costs of certain intermediate care facilities. This is a crying need that could have and should have been addressed today. By going over this bill, we have failed to take immediate action on a critical problem. I think the gentleman from Fayette, Senator Lincoln, has properly and articulately addressed that problem.

In addition, I would be remiss if I did not point out that we also lost an opportunity today to do two other things. The nature of our Rules regarding the limited debate on the motion to go over a bill precluded us from discussing this. We had every intention of offering an amendment to Senate Bill No. 952 that would have provided for two very vital needs. I would like to address those needs for just a minute. When we enacted the Emergency Homeowners Mortgage Assistance bill in December, we provided a funding mechanism that included a \$5 million reduction in the Neighborhood Assistance Act tax credit program operated by the Department of Community Affairs. Little did we know at that time that we were doing such significant damage to a very worthwhile program.

I am advised that for fiscal year 1983-84, the state has already entered into 165 contracts through the Neighborhood Assistance Act totaling \$7,571,000. These are legally binding contracts that we have every obligation to uphold. What we have done, by reducing the amount of funding in the Neighborhood Assistance Tax Program from \$8.75 million to \$3.75 million, is to assure that we have already overextended ourselves. All 165 of those contracts are now in jeopardy. All of

them will be or have been contacted regarding the shortfall, and unless we provide more funding for that program, we are going to see a lot of YMCAs, we are going to see a lot of community facilities and we are going to see a lot of bona fide worthwhile community endeavors go right down the tubes. It was our intention today, had Senate Bill No. 952 not been taken over, to add a provision to it that would have restored the Neighborhood Assistance Act funding to its full level of \$8.75 million. This would have resulted in an ability to leverage \$15 million in tax credits and community endeavors as opposed to the \$7.5 million we are limited to and have already exceeded in this fiscal year.

A second item that we were ready, willing and able to address today was a more logical funding base for the Mortgage Assistance Program itself. At the time of the debates on the Mortgage Assistance Program, we were under the assumption that about 4,000 homeowners across the state were in imminent danger of losing their homes to foreclosure. From the Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency we now find that the number is actually closer to 9,000, that there are 9,000 families who probably will be eligible for participation in the Mortgage Assistance Program. This means we are faced with an immediate funding crunch that must be addressed in order for this program to be effective right from the beginning. We have allocated only \$5 million for fiscal year 1983-84 and the executive director of PHFA says that approximately \$2 million of that will be needed for administrative costs. In order to get this program off and running and to give it a fair chance for success, we will need an additional \$5 million very quickly in this fiscal year, and then we will have to look at a stable funding source for subsequent years. It was our intention in the amendment today to remedy that situation by providing \$5 million from the General Fund that is available in the form of certain lapsed funds. It is there and we would have raised the amount of money available to the Mortgage Assistance Program to a level of \$10 million for this fiscal year. That would have been more than enough to get it off the ground, to get it functioning and to take us well into the next fiscal year when we could decide how we are going to fund it in the context of the upcoming budget debate.

Mr. President, what I am saying is, we missed an opportunity today to take immediate action on three fronts: the nursing care home increases, the Neighborhood Assistance Act and the Mortgage Assistance Program. That is a sorry record for one day's work in the Senate, and I hope and pray that when we return on March 19th, this will be among our first orders of business.

Senator ROCKS. Mr. President, I just want to bring a little further emphasis to the very serious concerns of the going over of Senate Bill No. 952. The nursing home concerns as expressed by the gentleman from Fayette, Senator Lincoln, I think, are obvious to all of us here, and it is a piece of legislation that our nursing homes very much need to have addressed. Beyond that critical problem, the issue of neighborhood assistance that has become clouded in the context of how we are funding the Mortgage Foreclosure Assistance Act

in our state is one that is cause for the very serious problems of a whole network of constituencies. The reason for the strong feelings from this side of the aisle at this point today are simply that the bill that would alleviate that problem, the concerns that have been expressed by the entire United Way network, the concerns expressed by a large segment of the banking community in the southeastern and western parts of the state, by the Catholic Conference, by the Jewish Federation, whereby we have encouraged, permitted and obviously legislated a system of tax credits for vitally needed programs in our communities, and because of a lack of funding in our Neighborhood Assistance Program, which the amendment we hope today to propose would solve, has run out.

We are seeing programs threatened today. We feel it is imperative that a piece of legislation so overwhelmingly passed in the House of Representatives to provide a solution to this problem be addressed by this Senate. One vote in opposition in the House of Representatives and, yet, a bill that finds itself stymied in a committee of the Senate at a time when agencies which rely fully on the tax credit dollars that would be made available to them from some of the most significant corporate concerns of our Commonwealth, those programs are threatened, and threatened today. Obviously, in our remarks today, since we have nothing left to do for the next two weeks by way of legislative action, we are very hopeful that we can press forward in a solution to the serious concerns surrounding the Neighborhood Assistance Program. Coupled with it in our amendment, as expressed by the gentleman from Cambria, Senator Singel, we are not, nor have we ever, attempted to walk away from our responsibilities of funding the Mortgage Assistance Act. We believe there are now \$5 million fully available in this Commonwealth by way of lapsed funds and cash grants in assistance, and we hope we would provide for those unemployed persons who are waiting for that act to save their homes and this amendment would do it.

One final point, Mr. President, if I may, and I hesitate to delay the Members and those who are being patient with my remarks, regards the introduction of a bill today that is for me personally one of the most unhappy bills I ever had to introduce in the Legislature. This Senate and House of Representatives passed very significant amendments to reform unemployment compensation in our Commonwealth. Because of the seriousness of that problem, the fact of a \$3 billion debt, in what was a negotiated agreement between the captains of industry and the leaders of labor and then legislated through our General Assembly, we formed an advisory council whose function it would be to monitor that fund so that never again would we find ourselves in debt, threatening employers and their entire taxing structure for their own economic stability, or threatening an unemployed worker who today relies too many times over in our state on an unemployment check as his only income.

MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PROTECTION AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE

Senator MOORE. Mr. President, Senator Bell would like to hold a brief meeting of the Committee on Consumer Protection and Professional Licensure in the Majority caucus room on the first floor, beginning at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will repeat that Senator Bell will be holding a short meeting of the Committee on Consumer Protection and Professional Licensure at 2:30 p.m., that is right now, in the Majority caucus room. With our apologies, Senator Rocks, you may continue.

PETITIONS AND REMONSTRANCES (Continued)

Senator ROCKS. Mr. President, the amendments to the Unemployment Compensation Act that I have described and the formation of that all-important advisory council were signed into law by the Governor of this state on July 21st. The legislation required that within sixty days of the signing of that act that the advisory council be named. In what is now an all too publicized disagreement with the Governor's Office, the Pennsylvania Chamber of Commerce and the Pennsylvania AFL-CIO, over what names should be submitted and who would be acceptable to this Governor, we stand today, on the 29th day of February in 1984, with the Governor breaking the law and no advisory council monitoring one of the most important funds in this Commonwealth. The legislation that has been introduced today—and I almost feel sorry for this bill's introduction—would remove the right to name that advisory council from the Governor of this Commonwealth and would place it as a legislative responsibility, a responsibility which I know we will face up to because of the very, very serious concerns and, also, some of the most courageous political acts I have ever witnessed in passing those amendments to secure that fund for our foreseeable future. Mr. President, the bill now goes to the Senate Committee on Labor and Industry. It would be my hope that we would act as a Body as expeditiously as possible. I regret very much what has transpired in this issue because of its importance to every employer and every working person in this state. I probably should be seeking counsel on a mandamus action in a courtroom against a Governor who has so blatantly violated the law of this state. However, rather than delay even further the need for the naming of this council, I believe the most constructive steps we can take would be to take the matter into the hands of this Legislature and be about the business of protecting the Unemployment Compensation Fund. For your patience and tolerance, Mr. President, I thank you.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SECRETARY

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

SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 1984

- 2:30 P.M. Independent Regulatory Heritage Rm. A,
Review Commission (Regu- 333 Market St.
lations to be considered:
141 - Dept. of Banking
3-18 - Savings Deposit
Accounts (Stafford/Braswell)
142 - Dept. of Public Welfare
14-228 - Inpatient Hospital
Services (McGinley/Kent)
143 - Dept. of Health 10-60 -
Clarification of Definition
of Certain Retailers of Drugs
and Devices (Zimmerman/Stevenson)
144 - Dept. of Public Welfare
14-214 - Computation of Claims
(Harbison/Braswell)
145 - Dept. of Public Welfare
14-226 - Dentists' Services
(Harris/Stevenson)
146 - Dept. of Public Welfare
14-234 - Client Liability -
Community Services (Harbison/
Stevenson)
147 - Dept. of Commerce 4-01 -
Science and Engineering Grants
(Commissioner Stafford))

MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1984

- 9:30 A.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
Department of Education)
- 10:00 A.M. Act 195 Task Force (to Room 461,
consider what should be 4th Floor
done once a strike occurs Conference Rm.,
including legislation to North Wing
require compliance with
certain criteria prior to a
strike, to expand who may seek
a court injunction, to define
what constitutes a danger to
the public health and welfare,
to impose strike penalties and
to suspend the 180 day rule)
- 2:00 P.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
State System of Higher
Education)
- 7:00 P.M. URBAN AFFAIRS AND Zion
to HOUSING (Public Hearing Educational
9:30 P.M. on Senate Bill No. 1235) Annex, 3601 N.
Broad Street,
Philadelphia

TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 1984

- 9:00 A.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
Department of Public Welfare)
- 11:30 A.M. Subcommittee of Room 459,
JUDICIARY (to consider 4th Floor
Senate Bills No. 924, Conference Rm.,
1007 and Crime Commission North Wing
Legislation)
- 3:00 P.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with Penn- Caucus Room
sylvania State University)

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 1984

- 9:00 A.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
Department of Labor and
Industry)
- 11:00 A.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
Department of Insurance)
- 1:00 P.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
Governor's Office)
- 3:00 P.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
Bureau of Correction)
- 7:00 P.M. URBAN AFFAIRS AND Berean Institute
to HOUSING (Public Hearing 1901 W. Girard Ave.
9:00 P.M. on Senate Bill No. 1229) Philadelphia

THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 1984

- 9:00 A.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
Department of Health)
- 11:00 A.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
Department of State)
- 1:00 P.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
Department of General
Services)

MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1984

- 9:30 A.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
State Employees' Retirement
Board)
- 10:30 A.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
School Employees' Retirement
Board)

11:30 A.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with Lincoln University)	Senate Majority Caucus Room
1:00 P.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the University of Pittsburgh)	Senate Majority Caucus Room
2:00 P.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with Temple University)	Senate Majority Caucus Room
3:00 P.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Department of Military Affairs)	Senate Majority Caucus Room

TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 1984

9:00 A.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Department of Revenue)	Senate Majority Caucus Room
1:00 P.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Department of Agriculture)	Senate Majority Caucus Room
2:30 P.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Attorney General)	Senate Majority Caucus Room
3:30 P.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Department of Aging)	Senate Majority Caucus Room

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 1984

9:00 A.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Department of Environmental Resources)	Senate Majority Caucus Room
11:00 A.M.	Public Employee Retirement Study Commission	Room 459, 4th Floor Conference Rm., North Wing
1:00 P.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Pa. Historical and Museum Commission)	Senate Majority Caucus Room
2:00 P.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Pennsylvania State Police)	Senate Majority Caucus Room
3:00 P.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Department of Commerce)	Senate Majority Caucus Room

THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1984

9:00 A.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Public Utility Commission)	Senate Majority Caucus Room
-----------	--	--------------------------------

11:00 A.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Auditor General)	Senate Majority Caucus Room
1:00 P.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Treasury)	Senate Majority Caucus Room
2:00 P.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Department of Community Affairs)	Senate Majority Caucus Room
2:30 P.M.	Independent Regulatory Review Commission	Heritage Rm. A, 333 Market St.

TUESDAY, MARCH 20, 1984

10:30 A.M.	COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (to consider Senate Bills Nos. 664, 1056, 1151, 1170; House Bill No. 1751 and any other business that may come before the committee)	Room 459, 4th Floor Conference Rm., North Wing
------------	---	---

THURSDAY, APRIL 5, 1984

2:30 P.M.	Independent Regulatory Review Commission	Heritage Rm. A, 333 Market St.
-----------	---	-----------------------------------

THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1984

2:30 P.M.	Independent Regulatory Review Commission	Heritage Rm. A, 333 Market St.
-----------	---	-----------------------------------

ADJOURNMENT

Senator MOORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do now adjourn until Monday, March 19, 1984, at 2:00 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, unless sooner recalled by the President pro tempore.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned at 2:35 p.m., Eastern Standard Time.