

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

TUESDAY, MARCH 20, 1990

SESSION OF 1990

174TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 17

SENATE

TUESDAY, March 20, 1990.

The Senate met at 1:00 p.m., Eastern Standard Time.

The PRESIDENT (Lieutenant Governor Mark S. Singel) in the Chair.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Mr. S. RONALD PARKS, Pastor of the United Methodist Church, Gouldsboro-Thornhurst, Gouldsboro, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

We appeal to You, divine governor and gracious lawgiver, at the beginning of this Session of the Senate to grant that Thy will shall be found in expression in the decisions that are made by this Assembly. We trust that You are always with us, and so in this hour, we ask only that Your spirit will enable us to rejoice in our service to the people of this state and to Your glory. Guide our hearts, inspire our office, instruct our fellowship, supply our needs and chastise our inclinations to pride, that we may more perfectly fulfill our responsibilities, for they are a trust given by Thy hand, and we are stewards of Thy bounty. Amen.

JOURNAL APPROVED

The PRESIDENT. A quorum of the Senate being present, the Clerk will read the Journal of the preceding Session of March 19, 1990.

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

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE GOVERNOR

RECALL COMMUNICATIONS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

The PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications in writing from His Excellency, the Governor of the Commonwealth, which were read as follows, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Executive Nominations:

MEMBER OF THE STATE PLANNING BOARD

March 19, 1990.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In accordance with the power and authority vested in me as Governor of the Commonwealth, I do hereby recall my nomination dated December 4, 1989 for the appointment of Robert J. Davis, 329 Charles Street, Throop 18512-1206, Lackawanna County, Twenty-second Senatorial District, as a member of the State Planning Board, to serve for a term of four years and until his successor is appointed and qualified, pursuant to Act 42, approved July 7, 1989.

I respectfully request the return to me of the official message of nomination on the premises.

ROBERT P. CASEY.

MEMBER OF THE STATE BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY

March 20, 1990.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In accordance with the power and authority vested in me as Governor of the Commonwealth, I do hereby recall my nomination dated February 27, 1990 for the appointment of Ellen K. Myers, 607 Sewickley Street, Greensburg 15601, Westmoreland County, Thirty-ninth Senatorial District, as a member of the State Board of Cosmetology, to serve until March 14, 1992 and until her successor is appointed and qualified, but not longer than six months beyond that period, vice Lisa A. Smith, Hanover, resigned.

I respectfully request the return to me of the official message of nomination on the premises.

ROBERT P. CASEY.

MEMBER OF THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC TELEVISION NETWORK COMMISSION

March 20, 1990.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In accordance with the power and authority vested in me as Governor of the Commonwealth, I do hereby recall my nomination dated March 6, 1990 for the appointment of Raymond Sannie, 2638 Columbia Street, Allentown 18104, Lehigh County, Sixteenth Senatorial District, as a member of the Pennsylvania Public Television Network Commission, to serve for a term of six years and until his successor is appointed and qualified, vice John Scotzin, deceased.

I respectfully request the return to me of the official message of nomination on the premises.

ROBERT P. CASEY.

**RECALL COMMUNICATIONS
LAID ON THE TABLE**

The PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications in writing from His Excellency, the Governor of the Commonwealth, which were read as follows, and laid on the table:

**MEMBER OF THE STATE BOARD
OF CHIROPRACTIC**

March 19, 1990.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In accordance with the power and authority vested in me as Governor of the Commonwealth, I do hereby recall my nomination dated December 6, 1989 for the appointment of Dr. Andrew W. Giran, 1415 Fallen Timber Road, Elizabeth 15037, Allegheny County, Forty-fifth Senatorial District, as a member of the State Board of Chiropractic, to serve for a term of four years or until his successor is appointed and qualified, but not longer than six months beyond that period, vice Louis P. Latimer, D.C., Carbondale, whose term expired.

I respectfully request the return to me of the official message of nomination on the premises.

ROBERT P. CASEY.

TREASURER, MONTGOMERY COUNTY

March 20, 1990.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In accordance with the power and authority vested in me as Governor of the Commonwealth, I do hereby recall my nomination dated December 4, 1989 for the appointment of James W. Maza, Breeze Hill Farm, Box 47, R. D. 2, Pennsburg 18073, Montgomery County, Twenty-fourth Senatorial District, as Treasurer, in and for the County of Montgomery, to serve until the first Monday of January, 1992, vice Floriana Bloss, resigned.

I respectfully request the return to me of the official message of nomination on the premises.

ROBERT P. CASEY.

HOUSE MESSAGES

HOUSE BILL FOR CONCURRENCE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives presented to the Senate the following bill for concurrence, which was referred to the committee indicated:

March 19, 1990

HB 452 — Committee on Judiciary.

**HOUSE CONCURS IN SENATE
CONCURRENT RESOLUTION**

The Clerk of the House of Representatives informed the Senate that the House has concurred in resolution from the Senate, entitled:

Weekly Adjournment.

BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

The PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following Senate Bills numbered, entitled and referred as follows, which were read by the Clerk:

March 20, 1990

Senators DAWIDA, STOUT, JONES, BELAN, HELFRICK, SHAFFER, HOPPER, LYNCH, PUNT and LEWIS presented to the Chair **SB 1528**, entitled:

An Act regulating the practice of certain midwifery; and making repeals.

Which was committed to the Committee on CONSUMER PROTECTION AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE, March 20, 1990.

Senators DAWIDA, RHOADES, BELAN, FISHER and ANDREZESKI presented to the Chair **SB 1529**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of February 19, 1980 (P. L. 15, No. 9), entitled "Real Estate Licensing and Registration Act," further providing for licensing.

Which was committed to the Committee on CONSUMER PROTECTION AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE, March 20, 1990.

Senators DAWIDA, STEWART, REIBMAN, LYNCH, FATTAH, STOUT and BELAN presented to the Chair **SB 1530**, entitled:

An Act providing for the creation of tax increment districts; providing for additional powers and duties to be exercised by redevelopment authorities and by industrial and commercial development authorities; authorizing the creation and approval of project plans for tax increment financing; providing for the establishment of a tax increment base; allocating the payment of positive tax increments; providing for the financing of project costs; and providing for the issuance of tax increment bonds and notes.

Which was committed to the Committee on COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, March 20, 1990.

Senators DAWIDA, JONES, PORTERFIELD, REIBMAN, LYNCH, FATTAH, STOUT, BELAN and LEWIS presented to the Chair **SB 1531**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P. L. 6, No. 2), entitled "Tax Reform Code of 1971," further providing for disposition of the revenues of the realty transfer tax.

Which was committed to the Committee on FINANCE, March 20, 1990.

Senators DAWIDA, JONES, PORTERFIELD, REIBMAN, LYNCH, FATTAH, STOUT, BELAN and LEWIS presented to the Chair **SB 1532**, entitled:

An Act creating programs to provide loans and grants to renovate blighted buildings, to convert obsolete buildings, to build infill housing, to build low-cost rental housing and to modernize public housing; providing for the powers and duties of the Department of Community Affairs regarding the programs; and providing for the use of a portion of the realty transfer tax to fund the programs.

Which was committed to the Committee on URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING, March 20, 1990.

Senators REIBMAN, AFFLERBACH, MELLOW, LINCOLN, STAPLETON, PORTERFIELD, LOEPER, DAWIDA, GREENLEAF, FISHER, RHOADES, BRIGHTBILL, CORMAN, HESS, MUSTO, STEWART, LEWIS, FATTAH and JONES presented to the Chair **SB 1533**, entitled:

An Act providing for cultural facilities; establishing the Cultural Facilities Board and providing for its powers and duties; providing for programs of loans and grants; establishing the Cultural Facilities Loan and Grant Fund; and providing for additional duties of the Department of Community Affairs and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Council on the Arts.

Which was committed to the Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, March 20, 1990.

Senator HOLL presented to the Chair **SB 1534**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 71 (State Government) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, authorizing certain State employees who are veterans to convert medical coverage after retirement.

Which was committed to the Committee on FINANCE, March 20, 1990.

Senators GREENLEAF, SHUMAKER, FISHER, MELLOW, CORMAN, HOPPER, SALVATORE, REIBMAN, MADIGAN, FUMO, PORTERFIELD, HELFRICK, JONES and JUBELIRER presented to the Chair **SB 1535**, entitled:

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

Which was committed to the Committee on JUDICIARY, March 20, 1990.

Senators PETERSON, BRIGHTBILL, ROCKS, CORMAN, WENGER, LOEPER, AFFLERBACH, SCANLON, REIBMAN, WILT, HOPPER, SALVATORE, PUNT, LEMMOND, MADIGAN, PORTERFIELD, FISHER and HELFRICK presented to the Chair **SB 1536**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of July 3, 1985 (P. L. 164, No. 45), entitled "Emergency Medical Services Act," relating to fund expenditures.

Which was committed to the Committee on PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE, March 20, 1990.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

Senator PETERSON, from the Committee on Public Health and Welfare, reported the following bill:

SB 1536 (Pr. No. 2029)

An Act amending the act of July 3, 1985 (P. L. 164, No. 45), entitled "Emergency Medical Services Act," relating to fund expenditures.

Senator BELL, from the Committee on Consumer Protection and Professional Licensure, reported the following bills:

SB 1091 (Pr. No. 2030) (Amended)

An Act amending Title 66 (Public Utilities) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for civil penalties for violations.

SB 1472 (Pr. No. 1946)

An Act amending the act of May 11, 1889 (P. L. 188, No. 210), entitled "A further supplement to an act, entitled 'An act to establish a board of wardens for the Port of Philadelphia, and for the regulation of pilots and pilotage, and for other purposes';....," further regulating the rates of pilotage; and specifying fees for certain services.

HB 11 (Pr. No. 3193) (Amended)

An Act amending the act of February 19, 1980 (P. L. 15, No. 9), known as the "Real Estate Licensing and Registration Act," further providing for the application of the act to persons employed by an owner of real estate for the purpose of managing or maintaining multifamily residential property; regulating time shares, campground memberships and disclosures; and further providing for prohibited acts.

HB 215 (Pr. No. 3194) (Amended)

An Act requiring certain contracts to be written in plain language; and providing remedies and penalties.

REGULATION REPORTED

Senator BELL, from the Committee on Consumer Protection and Professional Licensure, reported Regulation 16A-252 of the State Board of Auctioneer Examiners Fees, Final Form, for submission to the Independent Regulatory Review Commission, without objection.

LEGISLATIVE LEAVE

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, I request a legislative leave for Senator Stapleton.

The PRESIDENT. Senator Mellow requests legislative leave for Senator Stapleton. The Chair hears no objection. The leave will be granted.

CALENDAR

SB 1415 CALLED UP OUT OF ORDER

SB 1415 (Pr. No. 2019) — Without objection, the bill was called up out of order, from page 2 of the Third Consideration Calendar, by Senator LOEPER, as a Special Order of Business.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AND FINAL PASSAGE

SB 1415 (Pr. No. 2019) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 5, 1972 (P. L. 1280, No. 284), entitled "Pennsylvania Securities Act of 1972," adding a definition of "associated person"; and further providing for registration requirements and procedure, for suspension and revocation of registration, for civil liability, for criminal penalties and for fees.

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—49

Afflerbach	Greenleaf	Lynch	Rocks
Andrezeski	Greenwood	Madigan	Salvatore
Armstrong	Helfrick	Mellow	Scanlon
Baker	Hess	Musto	Shaffer
Belan	Holl	O'Pake	Shumaker
Bell	Hopper	Pecora	Stapleton
Bodack	Jones	Peterson	Stewart
Brightbill	Jubelirer	Porterfield	Stout
Corman	Lemmond	Punt	Tilghman
Dawida	Lewis	Regoli	Wenger
Fattah	Lincoln	Reibman	Williams
Fisher	Loeper	Rhoades	Wilt
Fumo			

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

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, prior to caucus, I
would like to place Senator Fattah and Senator Lincoln on
temporary Capitol leaves.

The PRESIDENT. Senator Mellow asks for temporary
Capitol leaves for Senator Lincoln and Senator Fattah. The
Chair hears no objection. The leaves will be granted.

RECESS

Senator LOEPER. Mr. President, at this time I would ask
for a recess of the Senate for the purpose of a Republican
caucus to begin immediately in the first floor caucus room,
with an expectation of returning to the floor at approximately
2:30 p.m.

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, I would like to ask for a
Democrat caucus to be held in our caucus room.

The PRESIDENT. For purposes of Republican and Demo-
cratic caucuses to begin immediately, the Senate will stand in
recess.

AFTER RECESS

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

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR RESUMED

BILL WHICH HOUSE HAS NONCONCURRED
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

BILL OVER IN ORDER

HB 1068 — Without objection, the bill was passed over in
its order at the request of Senator LOEPER.

BILL ON CONCURRENCE IN
HOUSE AMENDMENTS

SENATE CONCURS IN HOUSE AMENDMENTS

SB 851 (Pr. No. 1998) — The Senate proceeded to consider-
ation of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending Title 66 (Public Utilities) of the Pennsylvania
Consolidated Statutes, providing for the regulation of taxicabs in
first class cities.

Senator LOEPER. Mr. President, I move the Senate do
concur in the amendments made by the House to Senate Bill
No. 851.

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the motion?

Senator SALVATORE. Mr. President, I would just like to
make a few comments about Senate Bill No. 851. First of all, I
would like to thank members of the PUC, members of the
taxicab industry, members of the Hotel and Restaurant Asso-
ciation, my staff and all people who were involved in helping
make this become a reality. What I am talking about is a piece
of legislation which is sorely needed to improve the image of
the City of Philadelphia. If anyone has ever ridden in a cab in
Philadelphia, they would know what I was talking about. It is
a disaster. They are decrepit, old, dirty-looking cabs which
certainly do not enhance the image of our city. This piece of
legislation is going to correct that. It is going to do so many
wonderful things, but most importantly, it is going to create a
system where taxicab owners are going to have a medallion
that is going to be worth something. There will be enforce-
ment powers put in place. Drivers will have to know the city,
they will have to speak English, they will have to know the his-
torical landmarks, be courteous and trained and, above all,
the cabs will be clean and no more than six years old or they
will have to be replaced. The gypsy cabs will be removed from
the streets. Right now there are about 700 gypsy cabs running
around in Philadelphia, and we hope the monies that are
derived from the medallion system in buying the medallions
will create enough enforcement powers and enough people
out there to enforce the laws so we can get them off the
streets. We will have one uniform rate for everybody. This is a
step in the right direction with the Convention Center being
built now in Philadelphia and this piece of legislation being
passed, and I hope the Governor will sign it immediately. It is
just another step in the right direction which will help not only
Philadelphia but all of Pennsylvania.

And the question recurring,

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—47

Afflerbach	Fumo	Lynch	Rocks
Andrezski	Greenleaf	Madigan	Salvatore
Armstrong	Greenwood	Mellow	Scanlon
Baker	Helfrick	Musto	Shaffer
Belan	Hess	O'Pake	Shumaker
Bell	Holl	Pecora	Stapleton
Bodack	Hopper	Peterson	Stewart
Brightbill	Jubelirer	Porterfield	Stout
Corman	Lemmond	Punt	Tilghman
Dawida	Lewis	Regoli	Wenger
Fattah	Lincoln	Reibman	Wilt
Fisher	Loeper	Rhoades	

NAYS—2

Jones Williams

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

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate inform the House of Representatives accordingly.

LEGISLATIVE LEAVE CANCELLED

The **PRESIDENT**: The Chair recognizes the presence on the floor of Senator Lincoln. His temporary Capitol leave will be cancelled.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR RESUMED

THIRD CONSIDERATION CALENDAR

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

SB 295 and 408 — Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator LOEPER.

**BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION
AND FINAL PASSAGE**

SB 634 (Pr. No. 677) — 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 the tolling of statute of limitations.

Considered the third time and agreed to,

On the question,

Shall the bill pass finally?

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, I desire to interrogate the gentleman from Cumberland, Senator Hopper.

The **PRESIDENT**. Will the gentleman from Cumberland, Senator Hopper, permit himself to be interrogated?

Senator HOPPER. I will, Mr. President.

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, could the gentleman tell us to whom this bill would apply?

Senator HOPPER. Yes, Mr. President. The bill would apply to anybody who sexually abuses a youngster. The present law is two years and a five-year statute of limitations.

This bill is designed to start the statute of limitations running at age eighteen instead of the time that the incident occurs. For example, if a youngster is five years old and is sexually abused by an uncle, an aunt, a neighbor, a nephew, or anybody, the statute of limitations under the present law starts to run as of the time of the incident. If the youngster is five years old, by the time the youngster is ten years old the statute of limitations has run against that type person. So, we are trying to remedy that problem or plug up that loophole for the statute of limitations not to start running until age eighteen, at the time the person is eligible to sue.

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, I appreciate the answer from the gentleman. I was interested in whom the bill would apply to, and he did go ahead and start to explain the bill and mentioned a hypothetical of a five-year-old child. Could the gentleman further explain what would happen if a child has been assaulted under the proposal that is in Senate Bill No. 634, if there is sexual abuse, rape or whatever that is listed in the bill? Can he explain to us exactly, again, Mr. President, what the procedure would be?

Senator HOPPER. Mr. President, I do not think I understood the question.

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, could Senator Hopper explain to us if a child who is five years old under the law the way it is currently, prior to the enactment of Senate Bill No. 634, what would happen if a child is assaulted under the provisions that are listed in Senate Bill No. 634 under current law? What would happen today?

Senator HOPPER. Mr. President, the statute of limitations would run for two years or five years, depending on the nature of the sexual assault, if the youngster is a minor, unless the assault was by a parent. If it was by a parent, then the statute of limitations does not run until age eighteen.

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, under the current proposal of Senator Hopper, if a child at the age of five years old has been in some way sexually assaulted and the district attorney is notified of a potential assault yet has not brought any charges against an individual, whether it be parent, guardian or other, can Senator Hopper tell us what period of time the district attorney would have before he or she would be compelled to bring criminal charges against the individual?

Senator HOPPER. Mr. President, the charges would have to be brought within the statute of limitations, and under the present law, the statute of limitations would run commencing with the date of the incident, and if the youngster is five years old and a two-year statute ran by the age of seven, and this was used in an actual case where the defense attorney used the statute of limitations to avoid the prosecution.

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, could the gentleman tell us if Senate Bill No. 634 is enacted into law and following the same hypothetical case, what period of time a district attorney would have to bring criminal charges against that individual?

Senator HOPPER. Mr. President, if this bill is enacted, the district attorney, or whoever is bringing the charge, would have until the child is eighteen. That is when the statute of limitations would start running. That would be the time the child is sui juris, or capable of suing.

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, does that mean then that the district attorney at that point in time would have either thirteen years or fifteen years, depending on when the statute would actually kick in, to bring charges against that particular individual?

Senator HOPPER. Mr. President, if this bill passes, the statute of limitations would not start running until the youngster is eighteen years of age.

Senator MELLOW. So then, basically, Mr. President, this bill would have a twenty-year statute of limitations in the proposal. Is that correct?

Senator HOPPER. Mr. President, that would be the practical effect.

Senator MELLOW. Is it possible, Mr. President, that a district attorney might be very selective as to the time, knowing that there is a lengthy period of time when charges could be brought against an individual? Is it possible, in the gentleman's mind, that a district attorney may, in fact, try to delay bringing criminal charges against a person for the purpose of the district attorney's own advantage, whether it be political or other?

Senator HOPPER. Mr. President, is Senator Mellow talking about if this bill passes?

Senator MELLOW. That is correct, Mr. President.

Senator HOPPER. Mr. President, if this bill passes, the district attorney would have up until age 18 of the youngster to bring the charges.

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, and two years after that?

Senator HOPPER. Mr. President, no, age 18, period.

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, can Senator Hopper tell us how many other states have enacted this type of proposal?

Senator HOPPER. Mr. President, what was the question?

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, how many other states have enacted this type of proposal?

Senator HOPPER. Mr. President, we came to this conclusion because of an actual case where the statute of limitations was used as a defense. There was a case that took place in Wilksburg where the defense counsel used the statute of limitations to avoid conviction of his client.

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, the question was how many other states have enacted, have a law on their books, this particular type of proposal which, basically, could be interpreted to mean a twenty-year statute of limitations?

Senator HOPPER. Mr. President, we did not check what other states are doing. We are concerned about the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, does the gentleman know if any other states have this kind of proposal enacted and what the experience has been in these other states?

Senator HOPPER. Mr. President, not at this point.

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, I thank the gentleman. I would just like to make one statement that although I do not think any of us could be opposed to a piece of legislation that would crack down on any individual who perpetrates any type of crime against a child who is under the age of eighteen, I

think we have to be very realistic, Mr. President, in dealing with this particular type of proposal that there is some great latitude in here for individuals, especially those who are serving in the office of the district attorney, to be very, very selective in bringing about prosecution. There is an extreme possibility in this particular type of legislation that if a district attorney is under a two-year mandate that he or she must bring actions because of a statute of limitations having taken place in the two-year period of time that they could go ahead and prolong a case for a number of years based on any particular reason they may want to have, the least of which may be friendship of an individual who may have brought some harm or some injury to a child. Although, Mr. President, right now I am not going to take a position against the proposal, I would hope if this Body does, in final passage, send it down to the House of Representatives, that the House Committee on Judiciary would take a very strong look at this proposal with the possibility of offering some substantial amendments that could make what appears to be a decent proposal much better.

LEGISLATIVE LEAVES

Senator LOEPER. Mr. President, Senator Punt and Senator Armstrong have been called to their offices, and I would request temporary Capitol leaves on their behalf.

The PRESIDENT. Senator Loeper requests temporary Capitol leaves for Senator Punt and Senator Armstrong. The Chair hears no objection. The leaves will be granted.

LEGISLATIVE LEAVE CANCELLED

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the presence on the floor of Senator Fattah. His temporary Capitol leave will be cancelled.

And the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

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

The PRESIDENT. 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—45

Afflerbach	Greenleaf	Lynch	Rhoades
Andrezeski	Greenwood	Madigan	Rocks
Armstrong	Helfrick	Mellow	Salvatore
Baker	Hess	Musto	Shaffer
Belan	Holl	O'Pake	Shumaker
Bell	Hopper	Pecora	Stapleton
Bodack	Jones	Peterson	Stewart
Brightbill	Jubelirer	Porterfield	Stout
Corman	Lemmond	Punt	Tilghman
Dawida	Lincoln	Regoli	Wenger
Fattah	Loeper	Reibman	Wilt
Fisher			

NAYS—3

Lewis	Scanlon	Williams
-------	---------	----------

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.

SB 647 (Pr. No. 2018) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending Title 34 (Game) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the use of a portion of the antlerless deer fee, for licenses, for license and agent fees; and further providing for authorized license-issuing agents.

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—48

Afflerbach	Greenleaf	Lynch	Rocks
Andrezeski	Greenwood	Madigan	Salvatore
Armstrong	Helfrick	Mellow	Scanlon
Baker	Hess	Musto	Shaffer
Belan	Holl	O'Pake	Shumaker
Bell	Hopper	Pecora	Stapleton
Bodack	Jones	Peterson	Stewart
Brightbill	Jubelirer	Porterfield	Stout
Corman	Lemmond	Punt	Tilghman
Dawida	Lewis	Regoli	Wenger
Fattah	Lincoln	Reibman	Williams
Fisher	Loeper	Rhoades	Wilt

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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The PRESIDENT. The Chair would interrupt the proceedings at this time to make an announcement that the meeting of the Senate Committee on Banking and Insurance, which had been scheduled for 3:30 p.m. today, has been postponed to the call of the Chair.

THIRD CONSIDERATION CALENDAR RESUMED

BILL OVER IN ORDER

SB 1059 — Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator LOEPER.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AMENDED

SB 1377 (Pr. No. 1761) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 11, 1949 (P. L. 1116, No. 330), entitled, as amended, "An act to regulate deliveries of light fuel oil to domestic customers;....," specifying information to be included on delivery tickets furnished to consumers; and further providing for penalties.

Considered the third time,

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the bill on third consideration?

Senator SHUMAKER, by unanimous consent, offered the following amendment No. A0765:

Amend Title, page 1, line 6, by inserting after "penalties,"": conferring duties on the Department of Agriculture;

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 11 through 17, by striking out all of said lines and inserting:

Section 1. The title and the definition of "department" in section 1 of the act of May 11, 1949 (P.L.1116, No.330), entitled, as amended "An act to regulate deliveries of light fuel oil to domestic consumers; conferring powers and imposing duties on the Department of Justice and the inspectors of weights and measures of the several counties and cities; and prescribing penalties," amended December 18, 1968 (P.L.1240, No.391), are amended to read:

AN ACT

To regulate deliveries of light fuel oil to domestic consumers; conferring powers and imposing duties on the Department of [Justice] Agriculture and the inspectors of weights and measures of the several counties and cities; and prescribing penalties.

Section 1. Definitions.—The word "department" as used in this act shall mean the Department of [Justice] Agriculture.

Section 2. Section 2 of the act, amended September 29, 1959 (P.L.992, No.406), is amended to read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 2, lines 15 and 16, by striking out "in" in line 15, all of line 16 and inserting: for two years in an orderly and retrievable manner.

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 2, line 25, by inserting after "vehicle's": permanently

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 2, line 25, by inserting a period after "number"

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 2, line 26, by striking out all of said line

Amend Sec. 2, page 2, line 30, by striking out "2" and inserting: 3

Amend Sec. 2 (Sec. 5), page 3, line 6, by striking out "secretary" and inserting: Secretary of Agriculture"

Amend Sec. 3, page 3, line 10, by striking out "3" and inserting: 4

Amend Sec. 4, page 4, line 15, by striking out "4" and inserting: 5

Amend Sec. 4, page 4, line 16, by striking out "1" and inserting: 2

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the amendment?

LEGISLATIVE LEAVE

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, I request temporary Capitol leave for Senator Fumo.

The PRESIDENT. Senator Mellow requests temporary Capitol leave for Senator Fumo. The Chair hears no objection. The leave will be granted.

And the question recurring,

Will the Senate agree to the amendment?

It was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. Senate Bill No. 1377 will go over in its order, as amended.

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

HB 1572 and 1781 — Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator LOEPER.

SECOND CONSIDERATION CALENDAR

BILL REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE
AS AMENDED OVER IN ORDER

HB 1374 — Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator LOEPER.

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

HB 612, SB 717, HB 1141, SB 1307, 1313, 1319, 1397, 1432 and 1442 — Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator LOEPER.

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

SB 1458 (Pr. No. 2001) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending the act of January 17, 1968 (P. L. 11, No. 5), entitled "The Minimum Wage Act of 1968," providing for certain exceptions from the minimum wage provisions.

Considered the second time and agreed to,

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

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION
AND REREFERRED

SB 1507 (Pr. No. 1988) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act providing for the establishment, organization, operation and termination of fraternal benefit societies; imposing additional powers and duties on the Insurance Department and on the Insurance Commissioner; and providing penalties.

Considered the second time and agreed to,

Ordered, To be printed for third consideration.

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

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

SB 1511 (Pr. No. 1992) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 14, 1967 (P. L. 746, No. 345), entitled "Savings Association Code of 1967," providing for reciprocal interstate operations; permitting the formation of mutual holding companies; further providing for acquisitions of the stock of a savings association; revising proxy rules; and making repeals.

Considered the second time and agreed to,

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

SB 1512 (Pr. No. 1993) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending the act of November 30, 1965 (P. L. 847, No. 356), entitled "Banking Code of 1965," permitting the formation of mutual holding companies; and providing for reciprocal interstate operations for savings banks.

Considered the second time and agreed to,

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

SB 1518 (Pr. No. 2007) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 12, 1973 (P. L. 397, No. 141), entitled "Teacher Certification Law," further providing for the Professional Standards and Practices Commission and for certain disciplinary proceedings; and making a repeal.

Considered the second time and agreed to,

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

BILL OVER IN ORDER

HB 1561 — Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator LOEPER.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS
REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE

Senator CORMAN, from the Committee on Transportation, reported the following bills:

SB 278 (Pr. No. 285)

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for pedestrian-control signals.

SB 442 (Pr. No. 2031) (Amended)

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further establishing a duty to stop vehicles at accident scenes; and providing an exception from the duty for emergency vehicles.

SB 676 (Pr. No. 720)

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for the definition of "motor vehicle" to exclude electrical mobility devices used to transport the physically handicapped.

SB 679 (Pr. No. 2032) (Amended)

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for interference with devices, signs or signals.

SB 705 (Pr. No. 768)

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for the offense of driving under foreign license during suspension or revocation.

SB 1113 (Pr. No. 1337)

An Act designating the Birmingham Bridge in Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, as the James A. Romanelli Bridge; and making a repeal.

SB 1373 (Pr. No. 1753)

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, requiring pedalcycle helmets for persons five years of age or younger; and providing a penalty.

HB 59 (Pr. No. 61)

An Act designating a highway bridge on Route 93 in Columbia and Luzerne Counties as the Berwick-Nescopeck Veterans Memorial Bridge.

HB 240 (Pr. No. 3202) (Amended)

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

HB 406 (Pr. No. 3203) (Amended)

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P. L. 177, No. 175), known as "The Administrative Code of 1929," requiring the Department of Transportation to do certain work on manhole covers, drains and other devices at the time a road is repaired or resurfaced at the cost of the utility owner.

HB 704 (Pr. No. 785)

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for inability to pay fine and costs.

HB 1294 (Pr. No. 3204) (Amended)

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, increasing the penalty for certain parking violations relating to handicapped and disabled veterans' parking spaces; and authorizing local authorities to permit handicapped persons and disabled veterans to issue certain notices.

HB 1658 (Pr. No. 1986)

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for handicapped plates and placards.

HB 1769 (Pr. No. 2206)

An Act designating the Puttstown Bridge on State Route 913 in Hopewell Township, Huntingdon County, as the Kenneth Clapper Bridge.

EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Motion was made by Senator WILT,

That the Senate do now resolve itself into Executive Session for the purpose of considering certain nominations made by the Governor.

Which was agreed to.

NOMINATIONS TAKEN FROM THE TABLE

Senator WILT. Mr. President, I call from the table certain nominations and ask for their consideration.

The Clerk read the nominations as follows:

**MEMBER OF THE STATE BOARD OF
EXAMINERS IN SPEECH-LANGUAGE
AND HEARING**

December 18, 1989.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Dorothy Wavrek, 321 Exeter Road, Devon 19333, Chester County, Nineteenth Senatorial District, for appointment as a member of the State Board of Examiners in Speech-Language and Hearing, to serve for a term of three years and until her successor is appointed and qualified, but not longer than six months beyond that period, vice Robert J. Wolfson, M.D., Bala Cynwyd, whose term expired.

ROBERT P. CASEY.

MEMBER OF THE STATE PLANNING BOARD

December 4, 1989.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Joseph Joyce, 926 Main Street, Avoca 18641, Luzerne County, Fourteenth Senatorial District, for appointment as a member of the State Planning Board, to serve for a term of four years and until his successor is appointed and qualified, pursuant to Act 42, approved July 7, 1989.

ROBERT P. CASEY.

MEMBER OF THE STATE PLANNING BOARD

December 4, 1989.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Harold A. Swenson, 1204 Executive House, 101 South Second Street, Harrisburg 17101, Dauphin County, Fifteenth Senatorial District, for appointment as a member of the State Planning Board, to serve for a term of four years and until his successor is appointed and qualified, pursuant to Act 42, approved July 7, 1989.

ROBERT P. CASEY.

MEMBER OF THE STATE PLANNING BOARD

December 4, 1989.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Clyde W. Waite, Esquire, 547 East Washington Avenue, Newtown 18940, Bucks County, Tenth Senatorial District, for appointment as a member of the State Planning Board, to serve for a term of four years and until his successor is appointed and qualified, pursuant to Act 42, approved July 7, 1989.

ROBERT P. CASEY.

DISTRICT JUSTICE

February 7, 1990.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Robert M. Sable, 526 Steiner Street, Pittsburgh 15227, Allegheny County, Forty-third Senatorial District, for appointment as District Justice in and for the County of Allegheny, Magisterial District 5-2-18, to serve until the first Monday of January, 1992, vice Robert R. Graff, resigned.

ROBERT P. CASEY.

On the question,
Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations?

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

YEAS—49

Afflerbach	Greenleaf	Lynch	Rocks
Andrezski	Greenwood	Madigan	Salvatore
Armstrong	Helfrick	Mellow	Scanlon
Baker	Hess	Musto	Shaffer
Belan	Holl	O'Pake	Shumaker
Bell	Hopper	Pecora	Stapleton
Bodack	Jones	Peterson	Stewart
Brightbill	Jubelirer	Porterfield	Stout
Corman	Lemmond	Punt	Tilghman
Dawida	Lewis	Regoli	Wenger
Fattah	Lincoln	Reibman	Williams
Fisher	Loeper	Rhoades	Wilt
Fumo			

NAYS—0

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

Ordered, That the Governor be informed accordingly.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE GOVERNOR TAKEN FROM THE TABLE

Senator WILT, by unanimous consent, called from the table communications from His Excellency, the Governor of the Commonwealth, recalling the following nominations, which were read by the Clerk as follows:

MEMBER OF THE STATE BOARD OF CHIROPRACTIC

March 19, 1990.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In accordance with the power and authority vested in me as Governor of the Commonwealth, I do hereby recall my nomination dated December 6, 1989 for the appointment of Dr. Andrew W. Giran, 1415 Fallen Timber Road, Elizabeth 15037, Allegheny County, Forty-fifth Senatorial District, as a member of the State Board of Chiropractic, to serve for a term of four years or until his successor is appointed and qualified, but not longer than six months beyond that period, vice Louis P. Latimer, D.C., Carbondale, whose term expired.

I respectfully request the return to me of the official message of nomination on the premises.

ROBERT P. CASEY.

TREASURER, MONTGOMERY COUNTY

March 20, 1990.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In accordance with the power and authority vested in me as Governor of the Commonwealth, I do hereby recall my nomination dated December 4, 1989 for the appointment of James W. Maza, Breeze Hill Farm, Box 47, R. D. 2, Pennsburg 18073, Montgomery County, Twenty-fourth Senatorial District, as Treasurer, in and for the County of Montgomery, to serve until the first Monday of January, 1992, vice Floriana Bloss, resigned.

I respectfully request the return to me of the official message of nomination on the premises.

ROBERT P. CASEY.

NOMINATIONS RETURNED TO THE GOVERNOR

Senator WILT. Mr. President, I move the nominations just read by the Clerk be returned to His Excellency, the Governor.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The nominations will be returned to the Governor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION RISES

Senator WILT. Mr. President, I move that the Executive Session do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

SENATE RESOLUTION

DESIGNATING APRIL 22, 1990, AS "EARTH DAY 1990"

Senators BELL, LOEPER, AFFLERBACH, REIBMAN, MELLOW, PECORA, ROCKS, SHUMAKER, MUSTO, HELFRICK, SHAFFER, BRIGHTBILL, LEMMOND and FISHER offered the following resolution (*Senate Resolution No. 148*), which was read as follows:

In the Senate, March 20, 1990.

A RESOLUTION

Designating April 22, 1990, as "Earth Day 1990."

WHEREAS, Almost 20 years ago, more than 20 million Americans joined together on "Earth Day" in a demonstration of concern for the environment, creating an informed public whose collective action resulted in the passage of sweeping new laws to protect our air, water and land; and

WHEREAS, In the 19 years since the first "Earth Day," despite environmental improvements, the environmental health of the planet is increasingly endangered, threatened by global climate change, ozone depletion, tropical deforestation, ocean pollution, toxic wastes, desertification and nuclear waste, requiring action by all sectors of society; and

WHEREAS, "Earth Day 1990" is a national and international call-to-action for all citizens to join in a global effort to save the planet; and

WHEREAS, "Earth Day 1990" activities and events will educate all citizens on the importance of acting in an environmentally sensitive fashion by recycling, conserving energy and water, using efficient transportation and adopting more ecologically sound lifestyles; and

WHEREAS, "Earth Day 1990" activities and events will educate all citizens on the importance of buying and using only those products least harmful to the environment; and

WHEREAS, "Earth Day 1990" activities and events will educate all citizens on the importance of doing business only with those companies that are environmentally sensitive and responsible; and

WHEREAS, "Earth Day 1990" activities and events will educate all citizens on the importance of voting for those candidates who demonstrate an abiding concern for the environment; and

WHEREAS, "Earth Day 1990" activities and events will educate all citizens on the importance of supporting the passage of legislation that will help protect the environment; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Senate of Pennsylvania designate April 22, 1990, as "Earth Day 1990" and that the day shall be set aside for appropriate public activities.

Senator BELL asked and obtained unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of this resolution.

On the question,

Will the Senate adopt the resolution?

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 148, ADOPTED

Senator BELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do adopt Senate Resolution No. 148.

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the motion?

Senator BELL. Mr. President, this designates April 22, 1990, as "Earth Day 1990." If any other Senators desire to cosponsor the resolution, it will be at the desk.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair would remind Members of the Senate that they should feel free to add their signatures to the resolution, which will be held at the desk until the end of Session today.

And the question recurring,

Will the Senate agree to the motion?

The motion was agreed to and the resolution was adopted.

CONGRATULATORY RESOLUTIONS

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

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Maude Herman by Senator Afflerbach.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Paul M. Caron by Senator Baker.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Mr. and Mrs. Leonard Fleming and to Trinity Lutheran Evangelical Church of Mount Oliver by Senator Dawida.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Marvin Barrish by Senator Fattah.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to William L. Fox and to Randall C. Manaka by Senator Greenleaf.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Christian J. O'Neil by Senator Holl.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Mr. and Mrs. Robert L. Kirk, Jr. by Senator Hopper.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Mr. and Mrs. Irwin H. Cook, Mr. and Mrs. Darwin Brown, Sergeant Leo J. Mayeski, Raymond J. Drugotch, Drue J. Patterson, Donald L. Taylor, Robert T. Shedlowski, Ronald H. Ramage and to John E. Creighton by Senator Lemmond.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Mr. and Mrs. Charles R. Gross, Mr. and Mrs. Harold W. Matlock and to Reverend and Mrs. Ernest E. Baker by Senator Madigan.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to John A. Sickles by Senator Pecora.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Brian Cox by Senator Peterson.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Mary Keegan Beran by Senator Porterfield.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to the citizens of the Community of Newville by Senator Punt.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Natale James Regina by Senator Reibman.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to the members of the Mahanoy City Police Department by Senator Rhoades.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Provident Mutual Life Insurance Company of Philadelphia by Senator Salvatore and others.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Holy Name of Jesus Catholic Church of Harrisburg by Senator Shumaker.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Colonel Clyde Henry Smith by Senators Shumaker and Hopper.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Mr. and Mrs. Earl Nolf, Mr. and Mrs. Kendall D. Perrin and to Anthony S. Bernardi by Senator Stapleton.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Mr. and Mrs. Merle Miller and to Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Kendall by Senator Stout.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Dr. James R. Denman and to Daniel J. McGarry, Jr. by Senator Tilghman.

BILLS ON FIRST CONSIDERATION

Senator MUSTO. Mr. President, I move 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 278, 442, 676, 679, 705, 1091, 1113, 1373, 1472, 1536, HB 11, 59, 215, 240, 406, 704, 1294, 1658 and 1769.

And said bills having been considered for the first time,

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

PETITIONS AND REMONSTRANCES

Senator FISHER. Mr. President, on a day when the travel industry is here with their annual dinner in Harrisburg, I think it is important to note that there has been a substantial amount of travel by the Casey Administration throughout the Commonwealth over the last three years which appears that it is going to continue even throughout 1990 in this election year. That is the situation where this administration has taken what they have called the Capital for a Day proposition and moved it from area to area throughout the Commonwealth during these three years, just recently having appeared in

Reading. I am advised that this week, on Thursday and Friday, it will be heading to Lancaster. Mr. President, I rise to note this fact, particularly at a time when our Senate Committee on Appropriations has just completed its hearings on the budget, a budget which was submitted by the Governor a month or so ago in which he called it a realistic budget, an honest budget and a belt-tightening budget. This budget, I daresay, because of the shortage of revenues which appear to be available to us, clearly will be a belt-tightening budget, a belt-tightening budget for all of our local school districts, a belt-tightening budget for our many municipalities, a belt-tightening budget for all of those in the health care industries and a belt-tightening budget for those who are dependent on the appropriation of funds for mental health and mental retardation services. But yet this administration has seen fit, as they did when they traveled to Reading, some fifty-seven miles from Harrisburg, to not only take the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor but all of the Cabinet members, in fact, in total a sum of fifty-one people, down to Reading and stay for those two days and stay in accommodations and run up bills together, not only the food and lodging, but obviously the bills that are incumbent when the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor travel for security and other details.

I raise these points because we sat by and we watched as the Capital for a Day has very adroitly paid visits to those small towns throughout the Commonwealth. I do not remember it having paid a visit yet to Allegheny County, the City of Pittsburgh. I do not remember it having paid a visit to Philadelphia, but certainly through the other small towns it has been rather adroitly done and has been, quite candidly, a pretty good PR result for this administration. However, when you look at the expenditures, the tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars that have been spent and are clearly going to continue to be spent, one has to wonder, when the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor are now announced candidates for the offices they hold, whether or not this is an appropriate use of Commonwealth funds, and even if it is an appropriate use of Commonwealth funds, whether or not those funds could not better be used to help defray the expenses of education and the expenses of mental health and mental retardation. How are we to go back to our constituents and tell them, yes, we have to tighten our belts, but yet the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor and all the Cabinet are traveling around the state in a large entourage on a regular basis? I think this raises a serious fiscal question, a fiscal question which I think is so important that I do not normally rise at the hour of Petitions and Remonstrances as a Member of this Senate to raise these points, but I think it is so important when we look at the outlook for not only the next fiscal year but also for the remainder of this fiscal year as to whether or not this is an appropriate expenditure of taxpayers' dollars. I would ask that this administration closely look at what is being done. We do not have all those figures. We only know what is reported. But we have to say that we think Harrisburg is a fine place to conduct business. We are here on a regular basis conducting the business of the Senate, and our

colleagues in the House are here conducting the business of the House of Representatives. The people of Reading, the people of Lancaster, the people of Johnstown, the people of Uniontown, the people of Erie and the people of other places across this state, yes, they have a right to have the Governor visit, the Lieutenant Governor visit and the Cabinet visit, but to visit during appropriate state functions and during routine state functions during the normal course of business throughout the course of the year. I do not think anybody has the right to expect a whole entourage to literally have the capital moved and to have these kinds of tax dollars spent on a monthly basis.

Mr. President, I think these are serious fiscal facts. Certainly, I think at this time it is incumbent upon us to bring these facts forward and raise them, and, hopefully maybe the Capital for a Day will soon come to an end and remain here in Harrisburg, where it is supposed to be.

Senator O'PAKE. Mr. President, I think it is unfortunate the gentleman from Allegheny should take the floor of the Senate and unleash such a scathing attack without having his facts straight. First of all, Reading welcomed and benefited greatly from the recent visit of Governor Casey to the Reading area. I think, rather than be subject of the kind of partisan bickering that was initiated here, that the Governor ought to be praised for his willingness to go into the Readings and the Lancasters and the Eries and the other cities of the state that probably never get to see a Governor or to see a Lieutenant Governor or to see a Cabinet member, never get the opportunity to talk to the Governor face to face, as the packed house at the town meeting in Reading at the Southern Middle School did, where the Governor sat for over four hours and listened as citizens raised all kinds of questions and objections and got answers, answers from the Governor, answers from the Cabinet member involved.

In today's world, the cynicism and distrust of the voters is fed by the fact that there is an attitude up here that all wisdom resides in Harrisburg. There is an awful lot of wisdom out there in the Readings and the Lancasters and the Eries of Pennsylvania, and this Governor has recognized that and has made himself, his staff and his entire Cabinet available on a one-on-one basis, and I think he deserves our congratulations. I hope these visits will continue. It is not only my opinion but the opinion of skeptical members of the press in Reading. Just as the gentleman from Allegheny, Senator Fisher, viewed with a jaundiced eye the visit of a Governor in an election year, so did some local press. I do not have the columns here with me, but I can tell you the reporters who covered the visit came away impressed with the sincerity and the compassion and the understanding, the strength, the courage, the leadership, the willingness of the Governor to come to the cities of Pennsylvania and listen and try to get the results that were asked for. So, those who were skeptical, those who said that this looks like an election year ploy came away convinced that this was a very good thing and a very great opportunity for the people of Pennsylvania to be heard directly.

Now with regard to the finances, it is my understanding that in every visit the Governor has taken the Capital for a Day to, a local committee was formed to generate the funds to pay for the overnight housing. If there was any expense at all to the state, I am sure it was minimal. When you evaluate that minimal investment from the operating budget of the Governor or the administration against the benefits, in my opinion, the scales are certainly tilted strongly in favor of the people's right to know, the people's right to be heard, the people's right to see and talk to a Governor and his Cabinet. So, lest the record be misstated, the cost of the housing, the meals and the other things involved are not, to the best of my information, items of state government. Rather, they were raised by local communities, local business people and local citizens who were more than willing to help pay the cost of bringing the Capital for a Day to that area. What a wonderful idea and what a shame that some people would seek to gain political mileage out of it. I hope the Governor will continue. I hope that he will get the opportunity to do in other cities what he was able to do in Reading, and that is understand firsthand the problems and the concerns of the people of this state who ultimately have to pay the bill and who certainly want to make sure that their voices are heard. I hope Capital for a Day will be the same success it was in Reading, in other parts of the state, and I certainly do not think for the small amount of money it costs the taxpayers that it should be in any way criticized in the partisan fashion in which it was just done.

Senator BELL. Mr. President, I listened to this byplay. Back home my people want to know how much money was spent, and I am sure if the gentleman from Berks, Senator O'Pake, had sat through two weeks of hearings of the Committee on Appropriations like I did and saw how tight money is this year, I know Senator O'Pake—well, I will put it another way. Why cannot the Democrats, instead of setting minimal amounts and stuff like that, come up front and say this is specifically what was spent with state money? I sat through those hearings and heard that we do not have enough money in our budget to take care of the abused children.

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, the debate that is taking place today that was started by the gentleman from Allegheny, Senator Fisher, followed by the gentleman from Berks, Senator O'Pake, and then the gentleman from Delaware, Senator Bell, and now myself, is a debate of rather interesting proportions. As I reflect back on some of the things that have taken place for the last couple of years, especially those things which have been initiated by the Republican Party in the Senate, I have to wonder as to what the real motives are of being critical of Capital for a Day. Is one of the motives for what has been expounded here on the floor of the Senate the fact that perhaps the gentleman who is conducting the Capital for a Day program and the fellow who ran as his running mate back in 1986 may have been responsible for a defeat of a Member of the Senate who aspired to one of those high offices? I do not know. I am not trying to impugn anyone's character, but maybe that person is still carrying the torch for the fact that he is in the Senate and not in a different

office. I just say maybe, because I really do not know if that is, in fact, taking place. Is perhaps what we are listening to today the outcome of the fact that the GOP candidate for governor basically has refused to appear before the Senate Committee on Appropriations and, I think, has been able to use a Senate Appropriations Committee Chairman, who does an excellent job representing us and has been able to generate some support for not having to appear here? Of course, the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Fumo, then had to question her in front of the House Appropriations Committee.

Could it be, Mr. President, that there have been so many proposals that have come to the floor of this Body? If I am not mistaken, since December 4th of 1989 the Majority Members of the Senate have asked if we would spend an additional \$150 million plus in bucks that we have not made part of the budget, whether it be for 1989-90 or 1990-91. I am really kind of confused because I think what is happening is a political statement on the part of a former statewide candidate has been made on the floor of this Senate today and, perhaps, the only reason why it was made is because the perception is out there that the two candidates who will be running for reelection carrying the Democrat banner for Governor and Lieutenant Governor are doing an outstanding job, and the people have perceived it to be that way.

Let us get the facts and figures straight, if we can. So far, Mr. President, there have been ten, including the one that will take place tomorrow in Lancaster, Capital for a Day programs that have been established. Each and every one of those programs has been very positively received by the people and by the taxpayers where those programs have been held. There are at least an additional twenty requests, Mr. President, from different parts of Pennsylvania where people in those areas, whether they be elected officials or others, have requested that the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania come to their municipality and hold a Capital for a Day program because it gives them the opportunity to realize what is taking place with social programs. It gives them an opportunity to ask questions of the administration as to what is happening with the economy. It gives them the opportunity to discuss educational issues with the Secretary of Education who, in many cases, probably has never been in some of these rural areas. Most importantly, it gives them an opportunity to talk with and to work with the Secretary of DER on the issues and the tremendous problems we have in this Commonwealth of ours in dealing with the environment. So why would anybody—Democrat, Republican, Independent, nonpartisan, bipartisan, whatever—oppose taking government out of Harrisburg and taking it into the real turf, taking it to the real people, those people who make it all possible for us to be here and to serve their needs? Furthermore, Mr. President, how could we go ahead and question the kinds of financial expenditures that supposedly are involved in the Capital for a Day program when we know full well that many of those expenditures are paid for by the local government which made the request for the Governor and his administration and his

Cabinet to be there or paid for by private contributions, by major corporations in the state who think it is important that people in Harrisburg go out into the hinterlands, go out into the other areas that do not exist right here to explain to those people what really is taking place here in Harrisburg?

What are we talking about here today? Are we talking about finances? Are we talking about the budgetary considerations that have to be made? If we are talking about that, then perhaps we should start talking about the recent Commonwealth ruling that has the GOP candidate for Governor where she is going to be forced to take back a number of people whom she fired for political reasons. Or should we talk about the encumbered money that she wanted to set aside, some \$700,000, which I think is going to be peanuts when it comes to what the actual dollar is going to be to pay, for the back wages she is going to have to make restitution for for the eighty-eight people that she went ahead and fired politically. The gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Fumo, said very appropriately today and in a hearing last year when the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Tilghman, brought the Auditor General in front of the Senate Committee on Appropriations prior to her canvassing for Governor, "You are more political than a South Philadelphia ward chairman." What are we really dealing with here? I am kind of confused. I believe the figures will totally indicate and justifiably so that the Governor's Capital for a Day program has cost the taxpayer of Pennsylvania somewhere less than \$5,000 per visit. Now so far we have had nine visits, which is an indication to me that simple mathematics points out that it costs the taxpayers of Pennsylvania about \$45,000 for the Governor, for the Lieutenant Governor and for the members of his Cabinet to go right into rural Pennsylvania, into inner-city Pennsylvania, into urban Pennsylvania and carry the message of what is taking place right here in Harrisburg and giving people for the first time the opportunity of meeting firsthand with the Governor and with the members of his Cabinet. I have news for the gentleman from Allegheny County who is so critical of it. Regardless of what you say on this floor of the Senate here this afternoon, there are going to be two more Capital for a Day programs. One is going to take place in Allegheny County, and I suggest that if the gentleman is not happy with the program, that he is very critical of it, then he should take a strong position against that and see how well that plays in Peoria, see if the people of Allegheny County want to participate in the program, and if they do not like what is happening and they do not think it is a good program, then they will not be there. But if they like what the Governor is doing and they believe that they would like to have government closer to the people, you know the home rule concept, then, Mr. President, I believe they will be there. So, really, what are we talking about? We are talking about a program that goes right here from the banks of the Susquehanna River. It is a program that extends to the farthest northwestern part of this state to Mercer, Erie and Venango counties. It is a program that has gone to the northeastern part of the state and one that has appeared in the southeast and the southwest and will conclude

this year in Allegheny County and then in some other rural part of Pennsylvania. It is a program that the people have wanted. It is a program that the people have supported as evidenced by what just took place in Erie. It is a program where the real voter has the opportunity of meeting the real people of Pennsylvania who say and who set policy as to what is going to take place here. If that has offended some particular Member of the Senate, then I do not say that we apologize for that. I say I am sorry but I really do not understand the motives and the reasons why people have been so upset with it.

Senator ANDREZESKI. Mr. President, Capital for a Day, when they first started it, Erie was one of the first places they had Capital for a Day, and it was important to us up in Erie. We are geographically the farthest point from the state Capitol and the Governor came up there. At first I was going to invite the Governor to stay at my house, but none of my three kids would give up their bedroom so he had to stay at a motel. The Governor and the Cabinet officers came up there. I guess it is easy to stand here in the Senate and hide behind a microphone in this beautiful room and bum rap somebody for doing something, but in Erie the Governor sat in a theater, on stage, and listened to people and answered people for four hours. He had a series of other visits in community places with businesses and with a variety of people in our community. Just as important, his Cabinet officers were out in the field where state employees work, where they are running programs, and they were out there to see what is happening. A lot of times we get caught up in the officialness of Harrisburg and we think, perhaps, that all of Pennsylvania might revolve around what we do out here. But if you never get out, you do not know. If you never go out in the field, if you never listen to those whom you represent, you do not know. I think the Governor of this state understands he represents all the people and he has to listen to the people in Pennsylvania, not just whoever makes it to Harrisburg. Again, just as important, the Cabinet officials who went with the Governor got a firsthand glimpse. They got some firsthand knowledge of what is going on out there, what is needed to be done to improve our system and were given, in some instances, a real eye-opener of what Pennsylvania is all about in terms of what the problems are, what the regional differences are and what is needed to accommodate all the people in this great state.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I think it is rather ironic that we would criticize somebody for doing what we are supposed to do, and that is represent our constituencies.

Senator TILGHMAN. Mr. President, just to correct the gentleman from Lackawanna, Senator Mellow, and I do not know whether he realized it or not, but he said the Auditor General refused to appear before the Committee on Appropriations. That is not correct, and I can understand maybe it was a misstatement. She was not invited, nor did we invite the Treasurer, nor did we invite the State Employees' Retirement Board or the State Teachers' Retirement Board. It was simply a matter of time. We just did not have time to get everybody in. Instead, we invited the Liquor Control Board and the Cost

Containment Council—which we will hear more about later—which is called the costly council. We invited somebody else but I cannot remember who it was. Next year, we may have to go to three weeks of hearings even if we do drop more people because my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, who are very supportive and very patient, realized that I kept charging through trying to keep a time schedule, and some of them did not get the chance to ask all the questions. Indeed, last Wednesday, I believe, we had the Department of Commerce back so the questions could be finished by the Members who were on the Committee on Appropriations. I have never heard of anybody refusing to come before the Committee on Appropriations, and I do not think it would happen in the future.

I would just like to say something about the genesis of this argument, and that is dollars and cents. There is no pretty way to state it, the state is broke. We are PENN broke. If it were a corporation we would be in bankruptcy, but that does not happen to government. We are in a disastrous situation, and there are no fancy words that one can use for it. Therefore, I agree that it would probably behoove the Governor to stay in this building and work on some of the problems that exist in this building. He cannot escape them. He is the captain of the ship, the ship is going down under him and he is responsible. Part of the reasons are economic and they are up and down the eastern seaboard, but they are not all the reasons. He had an inheritance when he came here. He had an inheritance last year and he squandered his inheritance, and there is nobody to blame but him. I think he should stick around. We have some tough, tough weeks ahead of us and some disastrous decisions to make, because whatever decisions we make on the budget are going to result in massive increases in taxes in our school districts and municipalities throughout the state, and there is no escaping that fact. We need a Governor who is going to keep his brain, if you will, or his diligence in this building working on the problems that we all face, and that is what I think he should do in the future.

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, basically, what the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Tilghman, said is not correct, and I am going to, once again, stand to make a clarification. It is true that he did shield the Auditor General from coming in front of the Majority Members of the Committee on Appropriations. However, she was invited to appear in front of the Minority Members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and she declined because, unfortunately, she was not going to have the shield of the Majority Chairman. Secondly, Mr. President, she represents the third largest General Fund outlay in dollars, and if anyone should appear in front of a Committee on Appropriations, especially someone who represents this particular type of expenditure, it should, in fact, be her. She was invited to attend and to appear in front of the Democrat Members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and she declined. She, in fact, would not do that. If we want to discuss the budget, the budgetary considerations and the shortfalls of the budget and the way the Majority Party in the Senate for the past several years has tried to put us in a deficit position, evidenced by the fact

of just within the past several months they have tried to push legislation through of expenditures of an additional \$150 million, when the Majority Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations knows full well that that money is not available, and just within the past month they passed a number of pieces of legislation here that cost a substantial amount of money, knowing full well that money is not available. If you want to be intellectually dishonest with people, do so, but I think when you are on the floor of the Senate and if we are going to talk about the budget, then we should be prepared to do that. We can do it tonight, if you like, or whenever the gentleman would want to do it. But let us set the record straight. She was invited to appear in front of the Democrat Members on the Committee on Appropriations, and she declined.

Senator FISHER. Mr. President, I think that the answers in response given by the gentleman from Lackawanna, Senator Mellow, and the gentleman from Berks, Senator O'Pake, miss the point we are trying to make. The point is not that the Governor should not go to some of these places to meet with some of the people he has met with, and not that the Lieutenant Governor should not go to some of these places and meet with some of the people he has met with, but there is no legitimate need to take fifty-one people, as were taken to Reading, and there is no legitimate reason to support the expenditure of \$500 a night hotel rooms, as was done down in Reading. It is that point we are trying to raise. If, in fact, in response, Senator Mellow said the nine visits averaged only \$5,000 a visit, I want to know who the travel agent was who arranged those visits, because to take fifty-one people—a seven-man State Police detail, the secretaries, the press officers, the communications technicians, the Cabinet officers—and to stay for a night and be there for two days and walk away with only a \$5,000 bill, we should all know about that. If, in fact, those bills were not paid for by taxpayers' dollars, then I think the people of this Commonwealth are entitled to have a full disclosure of who did pay and what sort of financial commitment was made and what monies were raised and raised from where and provided by whom for the payment of bills which, obviously, for groups that size were far in excess of \$5,000. Those are the points we are trying to make.

Senator LEWIS. Mr. President, what a wonderful business this is that we are in. The great profession of the political system has its own peculiar way of giving each of us the special glimpse into our lives, that point in time in which we can discover how any constructive or innocent activity can be viewed in two totally different perspectives, depending upon one's political persuasion and without regard to the appropriateness or value of the act itself. I trust there is no one in this Chamber who has not had a personal experience of that sort, and to talk about the politicalization of these efforts that have been made by the Governor should certainly not come as any surprise to any of us, particularly not in terms of the methods by which they can be distorted to appear to be something they never were and certainly were not intended to be.

Let me begin by saying that with respect to the Capital for a Day program, which was held in Levittown in March of last year, that I believe was the most outstanding governmental event ever in the history of our community. There is no doubt in my mind that opinion is shared by all who came in contact with the Capital for a Day program. To address the point that the gentleman from Allegheny, Senator Fisher, suggested was the most important target of his concern and that is the cost, let me say to you, Mr. President, that whatever the cost might have been, there is no doubt in my mind it was worth it and the Governor should be applauded and should be encouraged to continue to do it across this Commonwealth. Having the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor and the Members of the Cabinet in the schools, in the shelters, in the Chambers of Commerce and in the business places in Levittown was an invaluable experience. Having these people who make the policies of this Commonwealth see firsthand the concerns of our communities with regard to the environment, highways, drug enforcement and education, provided not only a sense among our people in Bucks County that someone really was interested and that these were legitimately concerned, real people making decisions, but I think it also impressed the members of this administration who had the chance to take that experience.

Let me say to you that in the days and the weeks preceding this event, there was a degree of skepticism that was expressed in the media. I also want to tell you that this usually conservative media which we have in Bucks County was the first to heap praise and adulation upon the Governor and his administration at the conclusion of the Capital for a Day program. Those accolades have continued to follow through to this day as various programs and promises and concerns that were expressed are now being implemented, followed up on and, in fact, carried through in the fashion that was promised and committed during those events. I do not know of anyone who was involved with or participated in or was aware of the Capital for a Day program in Levittown who has not come away feeling better about his or her government or who has not felt there is, in fact, some true concern that exists among all of us in Harrisburg who are charged with the responsibility of making the laws of this Commonwealth. As to the specific details of the financing of these programs, they have been made publicly available, certainly in Bucks County, where I can say to you that the entire financing from the private sector was handled by the businesses through the Chamber of Commerce and done with glee and delight at the prospect of having the administration there to see firsthand what the real circumstances were of the men and women who live and work in Bucks County and of the children who go to school there. They were delighted to have this program, and I cannot imagine there is any community in this Commonwealth that would not react and has not reacted as we have in Bucks County. It is an outstanding program. This administration deserves our thanks and deserves to know that we want to encourage them to continue this program because it brings true value to the people of Pennsylvania in its most important

way and that is letting people know that government is real and that it does care and that it is willing to take the time to be with them in their communities.

Let me repeat, there is no doubt in my mind that the most valuable governmental experience ever in the history of our community in Levittown occurred in the two days when this administration brought Capital for a Day to Levittown. I want to publicly, again, thank you, Mr. President, and the Governor and all of the members of this administration for making the effort to make that program possible and bringing all the benefit you did to us in lower Bucks County.

Senator LINCOLN. Mr. President, I had gone to my office and missed the fun and games that have been played up here, and I just happened to catch part of the remarks of the gentleman from Allegheny, Senator Fisher, about Capital for a Day, and I could not allow myself to stay in my office and not have some input into this ludicrous debate. The funny part of the whole thing is that Capital for a Day came to Fayette County back in May of last year. Fayette County is a very strong Democrat county, a county that is rich in the traditions of Democrat politics, and we turn out a Democrat vote in the November election. In case Senator Fisher and his running mate do not remember that, look at the numbers in 1986. Maybe if Lt. Governor Scranton or Senator Fisher would have come into Fayette County during the four years previous to that for anything other than a Republican rally or to meet with a Republican County chairman to discuss an appointment through Governor Thornburgh, they would have realized there are a lot of good people living in Fayette County. Some of them are even registered Republicans. In fact, one of them, the Mayor of the City of Uniontown, ended up being the host and the first person whom Governor Casey talked to when he came into Fayette County. Mayor Machesky, I think, would be very happy to stand here and tell you that he was thrilled to see that happen that day. I think the 1,700 seniors who were brought into Uniontown High School to have the privilege of listening to the Governor and to an astronaut who happened to graduate from Uniontown High School, who are now either working or in college someplace, would probably be very much offended by the kind of rhetoric that we have heard from the other side of the aisle here today. I believe that a gentleman by the name of Bob Eberly, who is a staunch Republican and just finished helping raise over \$300 million for the Penn State University financial drive that just took place—in fact, he and his family donated over \$10 million themselves to Penn State—would be offended, because he opened his home up to Mrs. Casey and the wives of a lot of good people in Fayette County who turned out to see just what the First Lady looked like and what she sounded like. By the kind of rhetoric that I heard here coming from a person whom I have a great deal of respect for—I really do—I am offended to hear the kinds of political shots that are being taken over one of the finest programs I have seen in state government. I believe the Department of Highways employees had the opportunity to meet their Governor at a reception. The people came to the state music hall that night and asked

questions. I have never seen anyone with the patience that Bob Casey displayed that evening in answering the questions for several hours. I think if you would go into Fayette County and ask anybody if they felt their tax dollars were being wasted by the Governor and all the other people who came in for that day, I think you would be surprised to find out you are not helping yourself any politically by being critical of one of the finest efforts I have seen made in my eighteen years in office, and this is the third Governor whom I have had the privilege to serve under. I have never seen anything like it. It was almost like magic, like somebody had spread something over Fayette County. There was hope. Everybody felt alive. There have been some great ideas that came out of the meetings that took place. I can tell you something, if you want to travel with me throughout my district and tell people they were not allowed to have that kind of a visit and you felt that money was wasted, I want you to be there to tell them, because I am not going to tell them because I do not think there was a disappointed person in Fayette County.

The motion was agreed to.
 The Senate adjourned at 4:20 p.m., Eastern Standard Time.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SECRETARY

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

SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 1990

Off the Floor	RULES AND EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS (to consider Senate Bill No. 971 and certain executive nominations)	Rules Committee Conference Room
------------------	--	------------------------------------

FRIDAY, MARCH 23, 1990

9:30 A.M.	JUDICIARY (Hearing to receive testimony regarding prison overcrowding)	Room 8E-B Hearing Room East Wing
-----------	--	--

TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 1990

9:00 A.M.	COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (Public Hearing - On the Sunset of the Pennsylvania Milrite Council)	Room 8E-A Hearing Room East Wing
-----------	---	--

THURSDAY, MARCH 29, 1990

10:00 A.M.	LOCAL GOVERNMENT (Public Hearing - On Senate Bill No. 1284)	College Township Bldg, Rte 322 & Rte 26, State College, Pa
------------	---	---

ADJOURNMENT

Senator LOEPER. Mr. President, I move the Senate do now adjourn until Wednesday, March 21, 1990, at 10:30 a.m., Eastern Standard Time.

