

# Legislative Journal

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1973

Session of 1973

157th of the General Assembly

Vol. 1, No. 86

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 1 p.m., e.s.t.

THE SPEAKER (Kenneth B. Lee) IN THE CHAIR

### PRAYER

REVEREND G. MATTHEW DALY, pastor of Saint Lawrence Church, Albion, Erie County, Pennsylvania, guest chaplain and guest of the gentleman from Erie, Mr. D. S. Hayes, offered the following prayer:

As I stand in this awesome surrounding, I am humbled at the power and the importance of the men who manage the government of these United States of America and this Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in particular. As elected Representatives of the people of this state, you hold in your voting power the devices fashioned to direct the actions of many men and the standards needed to pass judgment on a plurality of their involvements. To represent men and yet govern them requires unaffected humility, an impregnable justice, and an unquenchable charity or love, if we can label it that. To act in your position or in any other position without constantly endeavoring to bring your personal virtue into polished perfection would limit your integrity and curtail your effectiveness. For these reasons, let us open our session today with prayer.

Help us, Oh Almighty God, to recognize the paramount fact that without You we would be nothing. The power and abilities which we have and practice come to us as a gift from You. Only our endeavor to use them or abuse them is in our hands. Therefore, help us to act as men only in reflection of Yourself particularly when we direct our actions toward the welfare of other men. Your Representatives of earthly government gathered here in this room must share their authority as though it were You Yourself judging the needs of men. If otherwise, then personal ambition, selfish satisfaction, and ill-directed aims make not only them but our government a sham and even a diabolical tool. You, the God Who is the beginning and the end of everything, must so direct our minds, open our hearts, and direct our wills so that we act with the dignity which You surrounded man in his creation and want to see him robed in when this life comes to an end.

We ask You to help us all see the dignity of created man in all of our actions and in our concern for each other. Whether our legislation pertains to the governing of cities and towns or to the education of and medical administering of our citizens, make our concerns meaningful and real. Help us see the dignity of life in all of us, the young and the old, the sick and the weak, the unborn and those ready to die. Let us work with life, not endeavor to control it since life itself comes from You. Thus, we must administer to it and care for it as

Legislators as though we were handling a precious jewel loaned to us for a time, to be handled carefully and returned to You, polished and unharmed by the hands of men. This is as You see us, Your created beings. Let us hold the same high regard for each other.

Finally, we bow to the law You gave us as the essential guidelines for the laws made by men. Your laws are sufficient to save us. Our laws only augment peace, strengthen right-doing, and help preserve a sense of order in the chaos man so frequently creates on earth. Judge us, Dear Lord, according to our efforts and sincere intentions. Forgive us for only too often being too human and for the errors we commit because of these human failings.

Dear God, during this week of national holiday, we thank You for these men who so involve themselves in our Commonwealth to accept this awesome task which You and ourselves set before them. Help them to serve effectively, following the unswerving principles of good administration which You Yourself can ask them to accept as the Supreme Lawgiver and Just Judge.

Heavenly Father, we Your children thank You for the reasonable peace and prosperity which we as members of this state and of the United States of America can enjoy in this "land of the free and the home of the brave." Keep us under Your protective care so that we can continue in this luxury of tranquility and can progress with the powers You have given us.

In God's name we pray. Amen.

### WELCOME

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pleased to welcome to the hall of the House today the second-grade classes of the Hampden Elementary School in Cumberland County. The students are with us today as the guests of the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Kistler.

### JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, approval of the Journal for Saturday, November 17, 1973, will be postponed until printed.

### HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

By Mr. DAGER

HOUSE BILL No. 1593

An Act amending the "Pharmacy Act," approved September 28, 1961 (P. L. 1700, No. 699), further providing for the return of original prescriptions and the retaining of a copy.

Referred to Committee on Health and Welfare.

By Messrs. FINEMAN, BONETTO, PRENDERGAST,  
and ENGLEHART

HOUSE BILL No. 1594

An Act amending "The Vehicle Code," approved April

29, 1959 (P. L. 58, No. 32), further providing for speed restrictions and penalties for violation thereof.

Referred to Committee on Transportation.

By Messrs. McCLATCHY, SCIRICA, YOHN, POLITE, McGINNIS and Mrs. FAWCETT

**HOUSE BILL No. 1595**

An Act amending "The Vehicle Code," approved April 29, 1959 (P. L. 58, No. 32), providing for the issuance of a regular operator's license to persons age seventeen who have graduated from high school.

Referred to Committee on Transportation.

By Messrs. M. E. MILLER and WRIGHT

**HOUSE BILL No. 1596**

An Act authorizing the Department of Property and Supplies with the approval of the Executive Director of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission and the Governor, to transfer certain Project 70 lands in Lancaster County to the Commissioners of Manheim Township, Lancaster County, for a highway project under certain conditions.

Referred to Committee on Transportation.

By Messrs. M. E. MILLER and WRIGHT

**HOUSE BILL No. 1597**

An Act authorizing the Department of Property and Supplies with the approval of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission and the Governor, to transfer certain Project 70 lands in Manheim Township, Lancaster County, to the trustees of the Landis Valley Mennonite Church in exchange for another tract of land therein situate.

Referred to Committee on Transportation.

By Mr. VIPOND

**HOUSE BILL No. 1598**

An Act amending the "Public School Code of 1949," approved March 10, 1949 (P. L. 30, No. 14), providing for reimbursement by school districts of costs of certain pupil transportation.

Referred to Committee on Education.

By Mr. VIPOND

**HOUSE BILL No. 1599**

An Act amending "The County Code," approved August 9, 1955 (P. L. 323, No. 130), creating a civil service commission; providing for its powers and duties; and providing penalties.

Referred to Committee on Local Government.

By Mr. VIPOND

**HOUSE BILL No. 1600**

A Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, providing for the appointment of judges and inspectors of election on a nonpartisan basis.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

By Messrs. THOMAS, KAHLF, MORRIS, A. K. HUTCHINSON, RENWICK, GRIECO, RUANE, NOYE, HALVERSON, HILL, KENNEDY, WEIDNER, YAHNER, WAGNER and SHANE

**HOUSE BILL No. 1601**

An Act amending "The Local Tax Enabling Act," approved December 31, 1965 (P. L. 1257, No. 511), removing the rate limitation on wage taxes and repealing occupation taxes based on a percentage or millage basis.

Referred to Committee on Local Government.

By Messrs. McCURDY, BUTERA, MEBUS, SCHEAFFER, JONES, ZEARFOSS, RYAN, HEFFORD, GRIECO, McCLATCHY, HALVERSON,

DICARLO, RENNINGER, DOMBROWSKI, BELLOMINI, GOODMAN, WILLIAMS, McGINNIS, ENGLEHART, PRENDERGAST and BRUNNER

**HOUSE BILL No. 1602**

An Act providing for the maximum interest rate on loans secured by residential real property and for remedies and penalties.

Referred to Committee on Business and Commerce.

By Mrs. WHITTLESEY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HILL, Mrs. TOLL, Messrs. BARBER, M. E. MILLER, JR., KATZ, PERRI, SALVATORE, VIPOND, JONES and VOLPE

**HOUSE BILL No. 1603**

An Act amending the act of August 14, 1967 (P. L. 239, No. 91), entitled "An act relating to gross physical neglect of, or injury to, children under eighteen years of age; \* \* \*" further providing for protective custody, reports, imposing further duties on the county public child welfare agency, and providing for reimbursements by the Commonwealth.

Referred to Committee on Health and Welfare.

By Messrs. A. C. FOSTER, ANDERSON, PIPER, FOOR, LEHR, ZELLER, YAHNER, SHANE, SHELHAMER, SHUMAN, C. S. SMITH, COMER, McMONAGLE, KOLTER and VOLPE

**HOUSE BILL No. 1604**

An Act prohibiting the construction of any new gas and service stations for a period of one year.

Referred to Committee on Business and Commerce.

By Mr. WESTERBERG

**HOUSE BILL No. 1605**

An Act imposing an additional State tax on certain fuels; providing for collection, lien and administration of the tax; and making an appropriation.

Referred to Committee on Transportation.

By Mr. WESTERBERG

**HOUSE BILL No. 1606**

An Act amending "The Vehicle Code," approved April 29, 1959 (P. L. 58, No. 32), increasing and providing for certain fees.

Referred to Committee on Transportation.

**HOUSE RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED**

By Messrs. THOMAS, KENNEDY, R. W. WILT, MORRIS, W. W. FOSTER, C. S. SMITH, YAHNER, WEIDNER, BRANDT and DeVERTER

**(Concurrent) RESOLUTION No. 140**

The General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorializes the Congress of the United States to utilize the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS) of the United States Department of Agriculture and its staff and facilities in a productive manner, specifically in implementing Title 10 of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 and to fund said Title 10 programs accordingly.

Referred to Committee on Rules.

By Messrs. HASAY, M. E. MILLER, JR., GRIECO, HARRIER, M. E. MILLER, O'CONNELL, SALOOM, USTYNOSKI, HEFFORD, SEMANOFF, MUSTO, CAPUTO, BUTERA, JOHNSON, RICHARDSON, LaMARCA, FOX, PARKER, TURNER, NOYE, D. S. HAYES, SHUPNIK, HASKELL, SULLIVAN and BELLOMINI

**(Concurrent) RESOLUTION No. 141**

The General Assembly of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the Pennsylvania Congressional delegation to introduce and support the necessary legislative measures to investigate and study the need for, and the desirability of, having new cars equipped with such safety equipment.

Referred to Committee on Rules.

### LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority whip.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I request leaves of absence for Messrs. SALVATORE and FOX for the week's session.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority whip.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, I request leave of absence for Mr. MALADY for the week's session.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, leaves are granted.

### CALENDAR

#### BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to second consideration of **House bill No. 794, printer's No. 2026**, entitled:

An Act amending the "Community College Act of 1963," approved August 24, 1963 (P. L. 1132, No. 484), further providing for payments by the Commonwealth to community colleges on account of their operating costs.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

#### BILL RECOMMITTED

Mr. BUTERA moved that House bill No. 794 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to.

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to second consideration of **House bill No. 860, printer's No. 1011**, entitled:

An Act authorizing residents of Pennsylvania to purchase black powder for sporting purposes in contiguous states.

And said bill having been considered the second time and agreed to,

Ordered, to be transcribed for third consideration.

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to second consideration of **House bill No. 1077, printer's No. 2058**, entitled:

An Act requiring the State Board of Education to adopt a plan for career education; creating the Career Education Commission to review and render advice concerning the plan; and prescribing the powers of the commission.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

#### BILL RECOMMITTED

Mr. BUTERA moved that House bill No. 1077 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to.

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to second consideration of **House bill No. 1397, printer's No. 2028**, entitled:

An Act amending "The Pennsylvania Occupational Disease Act," approved June 21, 1939 (P. L. 566, No. 234), further defining "occupational disease" and providing for the running of certain statutes of limitation applicable to certain benefits.

And said bill having been considered the second time and agreed to,

Ordered, to be transcribed for third consideration.

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to second consideration of **House bill No. 1398, printer's No. 2029**, entitled:

An Act amending "The Pennsylvania Workmen's Compensation Act," approved June 2, 1915 (P. L. 736, No. 338), further defining "occupational disease" and providing for the running of certain statutes of limitation applicable to certain benefits.

And said bill having been considered the second time and agreed to,

Ordered, to be transcribed for third consideration.

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to second consideration of **House bill No. 1399, printer's No. 2030**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 28, 1935 (P. L. 477, No. 193), entitled, as amended, "An act providing for the payment of the salary, medical and hospital expenses of members of the State Police Force, of the enforcement officers and investigators employed by the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board, and the parole agents \* \* \*" providing for the running of certain statutes of limitations applicable to occupational disease and workmen's compensation benefits.

And said bill having been considered the second time and agreed to,

Ordered, to be transcribed for third consideration.

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to second consideration of **Senate bill No. 101, printer's No. 1385**, entitled:

An Act reenacting and amending the title and act of September 9, 1965 (P. L. 499, No. 254), entitled "Motor Vehicle Salesmen's License Act," extending the provisions of the act to motor vehicle manufacturers and dealers, increasing the size of the board, establishing certain fees, providing for licensure and the imposition of penalties, and providing certain civil remedies.

And said bill having been considered the second time and agreed to,

Ordered, to be transcribed for third consideration.

#### BILLS ON FINAL PASSAGE

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to the consideration on final passage of **House bill No. 1306, printer's No. 2062**, entitled:

An Act amending the "Legislative Code of Ethics," approved July 10, 1968 (P. L. 316, No. 154), further defining gift and member and adding definition; further providing for standards of conduct and prohibitions; providing for economic interest statements; and further providing for penalties.

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Mr. BUTERA moved that House bill No. 1306, printer's No. 2062, be placed on the final passage postponed calendar.

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

Agreeable to order, The House proceeded to the consideration on final passage of House bill No. 1378, printer's No. 2059, entitled:

An Act amending "The Second Class Township Code," approved May 1, 1933 (P. L. 103, No. 69), further regulating the sale of property owned by townships.

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS—159

- Anderson, J. H. Gelsler McGinnis Shelton
Bellomini Gekas McMonagle Shuman
Bennett Gelfand Mebus Smith, C.
Beren Gleason Miller, M. E. Smith, E.
Berkes Gleason Miller, M. E., Jr. Smith, L.
Bittle Grieco Morris Spencer
Blackwell Halverson Mullen, M. P. Stahl
Brandt Hamilton, J. H. Murtha Stout
Burkardt Hammock Musto Sullivan
Burns Harrier Myers Taddonio
Butera Hasay Novak Tayoun
Byerly Hayes, D. S. Noye Thomas
Caputo Hayes, S. E. O'Connell Toll
Cessar Hepford Pancoast Trusto
Checchio Hill Parker, H. S. Turner
Comer Hopkins Perri Ustynoski
Crawford Hutchinson, A. Pievsky Vacca
Dager Dinnini Hutchinson, W. Piper Vann
Davis, D. M. Irvis Pitts Vipond
Davis, R. Iukin Polite Volpe
DeMedio Kahle Prendergast Walsh, T. P.
Deverter Kelly, J. B. Renninger Wargo
Dicarlo Kennedy Renwick Weidner
Dinnini Kester Richardson Wells
Dombrowski Kistler Rieger Westerberg
Dorr Klingaman Ritter Whittlesey
Dorsey Klingaman Romanelli Wilson
Dreibelbis Kowalshyn Rowe Will, W. W.
Eckensberger Kusse Worriow
Englehart LaMarca Ruggiero Wright
Fawcett LaRadio Ryan Yahner
Fee Laudadio Saloom Yohn
Laughlin Laughlin Scanlon Zearfoss
Fineman Lehr Schaeffer Zeller
Foor Letterman Lincoln Zimmerman
Foster, A. Lincoln Scirica Zord
Foster, W. Maloney Semanoff Zwinkl
Frankenburg Manderino McClatchy Lee, Speaker
Fryer McClatchy McCue
Gallagher McCue
Gallen McCurdy
Geesey

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—44

- Arthurs Gillette Lederer Salvatore
Barber Goodman Lynch, Frank Savitt
Berson Greenfield Malady Schmitt
Bixler Gring Martino Shupnik
Bonetto Haskell McGraw Valicenti
Brunner Homer O'Brien Wagner
Doyle Johnson, J. Oliver Walsh, J. T.
Early Jones Perry Williams
Fenrich Katz Petrarca Wilt, R. W.
Fischer Kelly, A. P. Rappaport Wise
Fox Knepper Rhodes Wojdak

The majority required by the constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

Agreeable to order, The House proceeded to the consideration on final passage of House bill No. 1379, printer's No. 2060, entitled:

An Act amending "The Borough Code," approved February 1, 1966 (P. L. 1656, No. 581), further providing for the sale of property owned by boroughs.

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS—166

- Anderson J. H. Geesey McCurdy Shupnik
Arthurs Geisler McGinnis Smith, C.
Bellomini Gekas Mebus Smith, E.
Bennett Gelfand Miller, M. E. Smith, L.
Beren Gleason Miller, M. E., Jr. Spencer
Berkes Gleason Morris Stahl
Bittle Greenfield Mullen, M. P. Stout
Blackwell Grieco Murtha Sullivan
Brandt Halverson Musto Taddonio
Burkardt Hamilton, J. H. Myers Tayoun
Burns Hammock Novak Thomas
Butera Harrier Noye Toll
Byerly Hasay O'Connell Trusto
Caputo Hayes, D. S. Pancoast Turner
Cessar Hayes, S. E. Parker, H. S. Ustynoski
Checchio Hepford Perri Vacca
Comer Hill Petrarca Valicenti
Crawford Hopkins Pievsky Vann
Dager Hutchinson, A. Piper Vipond
Davis, D. M. Hutchinson, W. Pitts Volpe
Davis, R. Irvis Polite Wagner
DeMedio Itkin Prendergast Walsh, J. T.
Deverter Kahle Renninger Walsh, T. P.
Dinino Kelly, J. B. Renwick Wargo
Dinnini Kennedy Richardson Weidner
Dombrowski Koster Rieger Wells
Dorr Kistler Ritter Westerberg
Dorsey Klingaman Romanelli Whittlesey
Dreibelbis Koller Rowe Wilson
Eckensberger Kowalshyn Rowe Wilt, W. W.
Englehart Kusse Ruggiero Worriow
Fawcett LaMarca Ryan Wright
Fee Laudadio Saloom Yahner
Laughlin Laughlin Scanlon Yohn
Fineman Lehr Schaeffer Zearfoss
Foor Letterman Lincoln Zimmerman
Foster, A. Lincoln Scirica Zeller
Foster, W. Maloney Semanoff Zord
Frankenburg Manderino McClatchy Zwinkl
Fryer Shane Shelhamer
Gallagher Shilton Lee, Speaker
Gallen McCue Shuman

NAYS—0

NAYS—37

- Barber Goodman Lederer Rhodes
Berson Gring Lynch, Frank Salvatore
Bixler Haskell Malady Savitt
Bonetto Homer McGraw Schmitt
Brunner Johnson, J. McMonagle Seltzer
Doyle Jones O'Brien Williams
Early Katz Oliver Wilt, R. W.
Fenrich Kelly, A. P. Perry Wise
Fox Knepper Rappaport Wojdak
Gillette

The majority required by the constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

**QUESTIONS OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montour, Mr. Wagner. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WAGNER. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, had I been here, I would have voted "yes" on House bill No. 1378.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will be so recorded.

The two votes that we are now taking are not going to be used for the master roll. The master roll will be taken immediately upon the recall of the House after caucuses.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. McMonagle.

Mr. McMONAGLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded in the affirmative on House bill No. 1379.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will be so recorded.

**REPUBLICAN CAUCUS**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. BUTERA. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that you call a recess until 3 p.m.

For the benefit of the Republican members, we only have a need for a very brief meeting at 2 p.m. So if the Republican members will report to the caucus room at 2 p.m., we should be finished by 2:15.

**DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. FINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that every Democrat—and I repeat, every Democrat—immediately upon the call of the recess report promptly to the Democratic caucus room where we will review primarily the supplemental budget bill and the amendments that are going to be offered today and also the tax-relief proposal.

We will need every moment of the hour-and-a-half recess, and I would urge you to report promptly.

**QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington, Mr. Fischer. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. FISCHER. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FISCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as voting in the affirmative on House bill No. 1378, printer's No. 2059.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's remarks will be spread upon the record.

**RECESS**

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair now declares a recess until 3 p.m.

The Chair hears no objection.

**AFTER RECESS**

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

**THE SPEAKER (Kenneth B. Lee) IN THE CHAIR****RECESS**

The SPEAKER. For the information of the Republican members who are still in their offices, the Democrats have requested an additional half hour for caucusing.

Therefore, without objection, the Chair now declares an additional recess of one-half hour, until 3:30 p.m.

The Chair hears no objection.

**AFTER RECESS**

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

**THE SPEAKER (Kenneth B. Lee) IN THE CHAIR****QUESTIONS OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Crawford, Mr. Haskell. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HASKELL. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as voting in the affirmative on House bill No. 1378, printer's No. 2059, and on House bill No. 1379, printer's No. 2060.

Thank you.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington, Mr. Brunner.

Mr. BRUNNER. Mr. Speaker, had I been in my seat, I would have voted in the affirmative on House bill No. 1378, printer's No. 2059, and on House bill No. 1379, printer's No. 2060.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Rappaport.

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as voting in the affirmative on House bill No. 1378, printer's No. 2059, and on House bill No. 1379, printer's No. 2060.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Bonetto.

Mr. BONETTO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as voting in the affirmative on House bill No. 1378, printer's No. 2059, and on House bill No. 1379, printer's No. 2060.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Luzerne, Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as voting in the affirmative on House bill No.

1378, printer's No. 2059, and on House bill No. 1379, printer's No. 2060.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Oliver.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as voting in the affirmative on House bill No. 1378, printer's No. 2059, and on House bill No. 1379, printer's No. 2060.

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

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

Mr. BIXLER. Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate. I wish to be recorded as supporting House bill No. 1378 and House bill No. 1379.

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

**QUESTION OF INFORMATION**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Walsh. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. J. T. WALSH. I rise to a question of information. The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. J. T. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, has there been a master roll call as yet?

The SPEAKER. There has not been. There is about to be one.

**CALENDAR**

**PREFERRED APPROPRIATION BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION**

Agreeable to order.

The House proceeded to third consideration of House bill No. 988, printer's No. 1179, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the Department of Community Affairs for housing and redevelopment assistance.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration? Bill was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

**MASTER ROLL CALL**

The SPEAKER. This roll call will also serve as the master roll call.

On the question recurring, Shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provisions of the constitution, the yeas and nays were taken and were as follows:

**YEAS—175**

Anderson, J. H.	Gelfand	Mendertno	Shane
Arthur	Gillette	Martino	Shelhamer
Barber	Gleason	McCurdy	Shelton
Bellommi	Gleeson	McMonagle	Shuman
Bennett	Greenfield	Mebus	Shupnik

Berkes	Grieco	Miller, M. E.	Smith, L.
Berson	Halverson	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Spencer
Bixler	Hamilton, J. H.	Morris	Stahl
Blackwell	Hammock	Mullen, M. P.	Stout
Bonetto	Harrier	Murtha	Sullivan
Brandt	Hesay	Musto	Taddonio
Brunner	Haskell	Myers	Tayoun
Burns	Hayes, D. S.	Novak	Thomas
Butera	Hayes, S. E.	Noye	Toll
Caputo	Hepford	O'Brien	Trusto
Cassar	Hill	O'Connell	Turner
Checchio	Homer	Oliver	Ustynoski
Comer	Hopkins	Pancoast	Vacca
Crawford	Hutchinson, A.	Parker, H. S.	Valicenti
Dager	Hutchinson, W.	Perrit	Vann
Davis, D. M.	Irvia	Perry	Vipond
DeMedio	Itkin	Petrarca	Volpe
Devertar	Johnson, J.	Pievsky	Wagner
Dicarlo	Jones	Piper	Walsh, J. T.
Dimit	Kahle	Polite	Walsh, T. P.
Dombrowski	Katz	Prendergast	Wargo
Dorr	Kelly, A. P.	Rappaport	Weidner
Dorsey	Kelly, J. B.	Renninger	Wells
Doyle	Kennedy	Renwick	Westerberg
Drcibebis	Kester	Rhodes	Williams
Farty	Kistler	Richardson	Wilson
Eckensberger	Klingaman	Rieger	Wilt, R. W.
Engelhart	Knepper	Ritter	Wilt, W. W.
Fawcett	Kolter	Romanelli	Wiss
Fco	Kowalshyn	Rowe	Worriow
Fenrich	Kusse	Ruane	Wright
Fineman	LaMarca	Ruggiero	Yahner
Foor	Laudadio	Ryan	Yohn
Poster, A.	Laughlin	Saloom	Zearfos
Poster, W.	Lehr	Scanlon	Zeller
Fryer	Letterman	Schmitt	Zwikel
Gallagher	Lincoln	Scirca	
Gallen	Lynch, Frank	Seltzer	
Geisler	Maloney	Semanoff	Let, Speaker
Gekas			

**NAYS—17**

Burkardt	Gessey	Pitts	Smith, E.
Byerly	McClatchy	Scheaffer	Whittlesey
Davis, R.	McCue	Schulze	Zimmerman
Fischer	McGinnis	Smith, C.	Zord
Frankenburg			

**NOT VOTING—11**

Beren	Goodman	Malady	Savitt
Bittle	Gring	McCraw	Wojdak
Fox	Lederer	Salvatore	

The majority required by the constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

Agreeable to order.

The House proceeded to third consideration of Senate bill No. 919, printer's No. 1004, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the Department of Transportation for the payment of services of the Civil Air Patrol.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration? Bill was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage.

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

**YEAS—180**

Anderson, J. H.	Gelfand	McCurdy	Semanoff
Arthur	Gillette	McGinnis	Shane
Barber	Gleeson	McMonagle	Shelhamer
Bellommi	Greenfield	Mobus	Shelton
Bennett	Grieco	Miller, M. E.	Shuman

Berkes	Halverson	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Shuprik
Berson	Hamilton, J. H.	Morris	Smith, E.
Bixler	Hammock	Mullen, M. P.	Smith, L.
Blackwell	Harricr	Murtha	Spencer
Bonetto	Hasay	Musto	Stahl
Brandt	Haskell	Myers	Stout
Brunner	Hayes, D. S.	Novak	Sullivan
Burkardt	Hayes, S. E.	Noye	Taddonto
Burns	Hepford	O'Brien	Tayoun
Butera	Hill	O'Connell	Trusio
Caputo	Homer	Oliver	Turner
Cessar	Hopkins	Pancoast	Ustynoski
Checchio	Hutchinson, A.	Parker, H. S.	Vacca
Comer	Hutchinson, W.	Perri	Valcenti
Crawford	Irvic	Perry	Vann
Dager	Ikin	Petrarca	Vipond
Davis, D. M.	Johnson, J.	Pievsky	Volpe
Davis, R.	Jones	Ptper	Wagner
DeMedio	Kahle	Pitts	Walsh, J. T.
Deverter	Katz	Polite	Walsh, T. P.
Dininni	Kelly, A. P.	Prendergast	Wargo
Dombrowaki	Kelly, J. B.	Rappaport	Weidner
Dorsey	Kennedy	Renninger	Wells
Doyle	Kester	Renwick	Westerberg
Dreibelbis	Kilngaman	Rhodes	Whittlesey
Early	Knopper	Richardson	Williams
Eckensberger	Kolter	Rieger	Wilson
Engelhart	Kowalshyn	Ritter	Wilt, R. W.
Fawcett	Kusse	Romanelli	Wilt, W. W.
Fee	LaMarca	Rowe	Wise
Fenrich	Laudadio	Ruane	Worrlow
Fineman	Laughlin	Ruggiero	Wright
Foster, A.	Lehr	Ryan	Yohn
Foster, W.	Letterman	Saloon	Zearfoss
Frankenburg	Lincoln	Scanlon	Zeller
Fryer	Lynch, Frank	Scheaffer	Zord
Gallagher	Maloney	Schmitt	Zwickl
Gallen	Manderino	Schulze	
Geesey	Martino	Scirica	Lee,
Geisler	McClatchy	Seltzer	Speaker
Gekas	McCue		

NAYS—6

Byerly	Fischer	Smith, C.	Zimmerman
Dorr	Gleason		

NOT VOTING—17

Beren	Goodman	Malady	Thomas
Bittle	Gring	McGraw	Toll
Dicarlo	Kistler	Salvatore	Wojdak
Foor	Laderer	Savitt	Yahner
Fox			

The majority required by the constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the clerk return the same to the Senate with information that the House has passed the same without amendment.

**HIGHLAND PARK BROWNIE TROOP WELCOMED**

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pleased to welcome to the hall of the House today Brownie Troop No. 726 from Highland Park. The Brownies are here today with their leaders, Mrs. Mayer and Mrs. Greenlund, and are the guests of the gentleman from Cumberland County, Mr. Scheaffer.

**QUESTIONS OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Snyder, Mr. Thomas. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. THOMAS. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as voting in the affirmative on Senate bill No. 919, printer's No. 1004.

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

The Chair recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Mrs. Toll.

Mrs. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as voting in the affirmative on Senate bill No. 919, printer's No. 1004. My lever did not work.

Thank you.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westmoreland, Mr. Petrarca.

Mr. PETRARCA. I would like to be recorded as voting in the affirmative on House bill No. 1378, printer's No. 2059.

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

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of Senate bill No. 1058, printer's No. 1563, entitled:

An Act amending the act of July 12, 1973 (No. 11-A), entitled "The General Appropriations Act of 1973," changing, adding and deleting appropriations.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. FINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, before we proceed to the amendments, I would very much appreciate having the opportunity to make some observations.

The SPEAKER. On the general bill?

Mr. FINEMAN. About the amendments to be offered, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. FINEMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago on the floor of this House, I made casual reference to a speech that had been made by the nationally-known opinion researcher, Louis Harris, at a gathering at the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders that was held in Seattle. Based upon his measurement and his analysis of public opinion, Mr. Harris made some observations as to the mood, as to the state of mind, of America today.

He pointed out that there were very dramatic and very critical important shifts in the mood of American people, and he warned those legislators who were present to hear him—and they were considerable in number—that if they ignored these shifts, they did so at considerable political peril to themselves.

I want to refer, once again—and more specifically this time—to only certain portions of Mr. Harris' statement, only those portions that seem particularly and pointedly applicable to the matter now before us—the matter of the budget and the amendments that are going to be offered to Senate bill No. 1058.

First of all, Mr. Harris noted that, for the most part, voters today are very much more educated than they have been in past years, and, as more educated individuals, they help make up part of a society that is capable of thinking in larger terms about the quality of life in America.

He went on to say that the voters will quickly turn aside the glib rhetoric of any politician who promises easy

panaceas. He also noted that survey after survey which he had conducted conclusively demonstrated that the message of American people today is that the issues which are going to move elections in the future have to do with what is done by the legislators to improve the quality of life in this country.

His research further indicated that our citizens now want to see government assuming proper responsibility for the delivery of social services and other public services.

He made, for instance, specific reference to the Federal revenue-sharing program, and he made the observation, based on these surveys, that there just is no mood of tolerance in America today for using these revenue-sharing funds in any kind of manner that will, in any way, result in less spending for services for the people of this country.

To quote Mr. Harris, he said: ". . . we are undergoing a basic change of the central pivot of what matters to a majority of people. What matters now, more than ever before, is what happens to the quality of life, what happens to the concern of people for people."

Now in my opinion, these were very dramatic revelations, and I am certain that they did not fail to have a tremendous impact on those legislators who had gathered to hear Mr. Harris.

Now it may be that there are—and probably this is true—many legislators here today who, while not being insensitive to the needs of people, have, nonetheless, become so enamored with what they believe to be the politically-popular game of calling for reduced taxes and, hence, correspondingly reduced services, that they fail to comprehend what they are doing; that their actions are, indeed, tantamount to insensitivity and even callousness.

The single most important function of government, as I view it, is, indeed, to improve the quality of life in this state and in the country. And when we seek, on this side of the aisle, to provide adequate funds for mental health and mental retardation; when we seek to restore full funding for the aged, the blind, or the disabled, when we seek to increase funds for sheltered workshops, or when we seek to put money in for any of the other programs for which we will be offering amendments today, we are only expressing our concern for the quality of life in Pennsylvania. There can be no other motivation for such action, in spite of the derisive laughs coming from the majority side.

Certainly it would be just as politically popular for us as it is for you to spend less for services and have more for tax relief. We would like to buy that ball game, too. I choose to believe that what is being done in the way of offering amendments is a response to being responsive and being responsible.

Now we have been attempting to prevail upon your side of the aisle to do this all year. The issue of adequate funding was first joined back in February when you passed a resolution establishing a ceiling budget of \$3.72 billion and later when you passed a budget that sought to implement, although in higher sums, that ceiling. At that time you turned aside every amendment that had been offered by the Democrats.

What has happened since that time?

The Republican Party today is now proffering a budget to the people of this state that is \$196 million more than that budget ceiling you established back in February, \$196 million more. And I think that the disparity between the figures of your present budget proposal and

the ceiling that you sought to mandate back in February characterizes what has been done up until today as just folly, improvidence.

Now I am happy to note, even belatedly, that the Republican Party has begun to concur in the Democratic point of view about funding, even if it is only part of the ball game. I am thankful for the movement that has occurred in this direction.

In Senate bill No. 1058, which we have before us today, you are now restoring some \$80 million in general fund moneys that we have been seeking all year.

In Senate bill No. 920, which we passed last week, you restored many other millions of dollars to other programs and to a level that we previously asked you to abide by and which you rejected.

But Senate bill No. 1058 does not complete the job, as I am certain you must surely know. I am asking you today to respond to the amendments which the Democrats are offering, just as we urged amendments upon you earlier in the year, which you rejected at that time, and which you subsequently, on your own initiative, put back into the budget.

It occurs to me that the loss of time and the needless expenditure of energy which is inevitably involved in fighting these battles on the floor represents a frightful waste that need not be repeated.

There may be some of you in this House who will say the viewpoint expressed by Mr. Harris is without foundation. If you subscribe to that point of view, then I ask you to reflect for a moment upon one election result that took place on November 6, that very carefully bears out the credibility of what Mr. Harris has been saying to American lawmakers.

In the State of California, Governor Ronald Reagan had proposed to the people of that state that, by their vote, they should establish that there should be a ceiling on a state income tax. If that ceiling had, in fact, been enacted by a referendum vote of the people, it would have had the effect of immediately reducing the state income tax by 7½ percent.

The people put the question on the ballot by their own initiative, and it was a referendum vote. The Democrats in that state opposed that referendum on two grounds. They said, if you pass this kind of proposal, the inevitable result will be less services from government, and the people want services. Secondly, if you pass this proposal, an additional inevitable result will be that local governments are going to have to pick up the tab.

These are arguments that we have been making on this floor all year, and the people of California, soundly and thoroughly, by what I believe was a 2-to-1 majority, beat that proposal. They clearly delivered the message in California, just as Lou Harris has been saying has been the message of all Americans, that people are demanding full funding of services without glib rhetoric supposedly holding out panaceas for all the other problems that beset the American people.

There is a lesson to be learned by us in Pennsylvania by what happened in California. It is to your political advantage to try to learn from that lesson. This does not have to be a partisan point of view. It is a point of view that reflects the concern of people today.

And when we seek to put these moneys back—and you for the most part have put these moneys back, all but \$80 million out of a budget that almost approximates \$4 bil-



lion; you have put back \$196 million. When we seek to put the balance back—we are responding to what the people are telling us. It is a message that has been delivered now in a state where one would believe, via the instrumentality of Governor Reagan, that the people would have bought it, but they did not buy it; they defeated it 2 to 1.

I am merely saying to you now that that proposition of the Democrats in California was vindicated at the polls—the proposition not to cut services. I am saying to you likewise that the proposition of the Democrats in Pennsylvania not to cut services will likewise be vindicated at the polls.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party today is offering 22 amendments. There will be several other amendments offered by some of our members on their own. I have submitted to you the list of the amendments and the names of the members who are going to be offering them, and I would hope we could proceed to that order of business at this time.

### QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery, Mr. Beren. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BEREN. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BEREN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my name could be added to the master roll.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will be so recorded.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berks, Mr. Gallen.

Mr. GALLEN. Could I interrogate the minority leader, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Will the minority leader consent to interrogation?

Mr. FINEMAN. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. GALLEN. Mr. Speaker, you indicated that there are 22 amendments to be offered to this bill. Could you tell us the total amount of additional dollars that would be amended into the bill?

Mr. FINEMAN. About \$62 million.

Mr. GALLEN. About \$62 million. How about the additional amendments? You do not know about those of the Democrats?

Mr. FINEMAN. The \$62 million represents the total of the 22 amendments which the Democratic Party is offering today.

Mr. GALLEN. If the \$62 million additional were voted into the budget, what effect would this have on the tax-cut proposal which we have offered?

Mr. FINEMAN. Whether or not the amendments go in, so far as the Democratic point of view is concerned, it will have no effect on the Republican tax proposal.

I do not want to go into all the reasons for that position at this time, because we are going to be dealing with the tax proposition tomorrow, but it would have no effect whatsoever.

Mr. GALLEN. The additional \$62 million would have no effect?

Mr. FINEMAN. It would have no effect in terms of what the Democratic position will be. So far as fiscal effect is concerned, it will mean that the deficit next

year, if your proposal goes into effect, instead of being \$110 million approximately, your deficit next year will be \$110 million plus \$62 million, or \$172 million.

Mr. GALLEN. Thank you.

I think this is really another indication of the really fuzzy fiscal thinking which has gone into the minority negotiations on the entire budget proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I happened to have heard Mr. Harris speak in Seattle also and I thought he did have quite a message. I really did not quite hear it the way Mr. Fineman did, and I do not think the people in my legislative district really feel at all as Mr. Harris felt in giving that dissertation.

I feel, if I am hearing the message from people in my own district and people whom I have spoken to throughout the state, that the thing which they are most concerned about is the increased state spending. It really has gone up, up and up. We did try to thwart it. We have been unsuccessful. We have now tried to give a pretty good inch, as far as the majority side is concerned, with regard to the entire fiscal situation, but I think, Mr. Speaker, it has got to stop some place.

No matter how worthy these amendments may be, I think we should vote them down.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### QUESTIONS OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Savitt. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SAVITT. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I would like my name placed on the master roll.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will be so recorded.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Wojdak.

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, I would like my name placed on the master roll.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will be so recorded.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Erie, Mr. Bellomini.

Mr. BELLOMINI. Mr. Speaker, I would like my name placed on the master roll.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will be so recorded.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Bittle.

Mr. BITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like my name placed on the master roll.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will be so recorded.

The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. FINEMAN. I just want to say briefly in response to the gentleman from Berks that if he does not recall accurately the thrust of what Mr. Harris said—and I can assure him that what I stated was taken directly from Mr. Harris' speech—I have a copy of the speech here and I will be glad to make it available.

Secondly, if what we are saying today reflects fuzzy thinking, I can only point out that you apparently made the same observation earlier in the year when we urged upon you the full funding of these programs which you summarily turned aside and rejected. Yet today we

find you in a position where you, of your own initiative, have put back \$196 million of the moneys we asked you to put back. Of the remaining sums, the sums that are left, there is only a total difference of \$80 million. And of that \$80 million, you wiped away \$20 million when you spent all of the moneys from Federal revenue sharing in Senate bill No. 920, which precluded our using any of those moneys for pothole repairs. So we are talking now about a difference of \$60 million between the Democrats and the Republicans.

I can only say that if you say our thinking is fuzzy, then it must be equally applicable to your point of view, to the Republican side. There is only a difference now of \$60 million. You have come a long way—\$196-million worth. And I say to you that that represents, once you bring it into cold clarity, not fuzzy thinking, but a response as being a responsible legislator and giving the people what they want. That is the sole purpose for which we are here.

I would like to join you as a politician, purely as a politician, in giving massive tax relief. There is no easier cure in the world for a legislator. It does not take political courage to vote for tax relief, but it does take some modicum of courage to stand on the floor and say, we have got to give less tax relief and do more by way of providing funds so that people are properly taken care of in this state.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. Zeller. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. ZELLER. Mr. Speaker, may I make an observation?

The SPEAKER. The only matter before the House at the present time would be an amendment to House bill No. 1058. Is the observation on some amendment?

Mr. ZELLER. Well, it is the same observation that Mr. Gallen was given the privilege of making, so I do not know why I cannot give an observation.

The SPEAKER. Well, the only problem is that once you open the door to a statement that was made by the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Fineman, then you open the door to a lot of observations which are inappropriate at this time and which ought to be made on the amendment.

Mr. ZELLER. Well, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. ZELLER. Thank you very much.

The only reason I would like to make a statement is, with all respect to my colleague, Mr. Gallen, the fact that he talked about fuzzy thinking.

I remember earlier in the year when Mr. Seltzer and Mr. O'Connell got up on this floor and stated that there was no need for \$1.54 million for criminal justice, finding money to match the Federal funds. But all of a sudden, after about 3 months later, they change their minds, you know, after Uncle Joe did a lot of work on the road and we enlightened them. All of a sudden they saw the light. So it became a political picture. Not only that, they went out and prostituted my bill.

I just thought I would let you know that when it comes to fuzzy thinking, let us get the record straight.

Also, I do not intend to go along with all of the amendments myself, but I think we should quit playing politics. Okay?

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. McMONAGLE requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 17, line 8 by striking out "3,600,000" and inserting: 9,600,000

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. McMONAGLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As you are all aware, for some months I have been trying to submit an amendment, but I had to wait for an appropriation bill to be presented.

Several weeks ago I addressed this House and asked the members to use their individual thinking in concern for mental health and retardation. I am happy and pleased to see that there are \$7.6 million appropriated in the budget.

I would like to say that I personally would like to think that that was all right, but, as I have pointed out before, as an individual, anybody concerned with mental health and retardation knows there is no area here for compromise.

For that reason, I ask that you restore the full amount and accept this amendment restoring the additional \$6 million.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lebanon, Mr. Seltzer.

Mr. SELTZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the members to vote "no" on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. FINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, of all the amendments which are being offered today, I think the one we have got to be most concerned about is the action we take on this particular amendment, the one dealing with mental health and mental retardation.

When this ball game first began, you said we needed less than the \$13.6 million or \$13.7 million that the administration proposed. Okay, I do not argue with that point. It is a point of view. This state government said we need \$13.6 million more; you said we need nothing more. Now you are coming along and giving \$7.6 million of that \$13.6 million which you earlier said was not needed, still leaving it \$6 million short.

I raise this proposition to you: Obviously, you are in error or we are in error. One of the two of us is in error. But when we are dealing with the matter of mental health, is it not better that we err, if we err at all, in favor of too much money? When you err in that direction, you hurt nobody, because that money will come back to us. But when you err on the short side of the ledger, you could conceivably be hurting a lot of people desperately in need of these funds.

Two weeks ago I introduced a bill in this House that, in essence, raised on a one-shot proposition \$17 million. These were moneys we had never counted upon. You never counted upon these moneys when you were figuring up the amount of money that you were going to be making available for tax relief. They were within nobody's contemplation until I introduced this legislation

officially lapsing money that had been appropriated in earlier years to the legislative and judicial branches of government and which had never been used. And in this bill I said we are earmarking, of the \$17 million, \$13.6 million or \$13.7 million for mental health and mental retardation. Even if you appropriated the \$13.6 million, you would still have another \$3 million almost left over from those new-found moneys to be voted for tax relief.

How can we in good conscience, even though it could conceivably be erroneous on our part, turn away what the administration and the officials say is absolutely imperative to fully run a mental health and mental retardation program?

I have never yet once this year, in any debate, ever said that you are callous or you are insensitive to these people programs. I have never said it and I did not say it today. If you were listening earlier to what I said today, I had said there may be people in here, indeed, who are not insensitive to these programs but who have become so enamored with the politically-popular call, the alleged political-popular call, of reducing taxes that they fail to see the gravity of what they are doing, and thus what they are doing may assume—it may assume—the proportions of insensitivity. And that is the most I said.

I am saying to you today that you should not allow yourself, at least in this one instance, to get into that kind of situation where you can be accused by anybody, be it another legislator, be it somebody out in the field, somebody who works for mental health and mental retardation, of in fact being insensitive.

This is a program that is vital to many people in this state. If we make a mistake here in appropriating moneys, let us make it on the side of too much money and not too little money.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Delaware, Mrs. Whittlesey.

Mrs. WHITTLESEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments in response to the minority leader, Mr. Fineman.

Mr. Fineman has used the expression, how can we, in good conscience, vote against this bill? I would say to Mr. Fineman, in response, how can he come before this body and, in good conscience, ask for additional funds when the Secretary of Welfare in this administration has allocated those funds in a patently outrageous and unfair manner?

I would like to document this for the record for you. As you all know, the Mental Health and Mental Retardation Act of 1966 authorized the Department of Welfare to develop a formula for disbursing funds appropriated under the act. In other words, the department devises its own formula.

In accordance with that directive, the department developed a weighted formula utilizing population but based principally upon two extraneous factors which actually control the weighted formula.

The first factor was "the number of identifiable mentally ill receiving treatment that the county units would have to assume responsibility for providing ongoing services." The second was basically the public assistance case load in a particular area.

In addition, the formula components were made up, and the department applied the formula to the annual grants distributed under the act. However, it modified

the formula by giving out additional moneys in 1969 and 1970 to those counties already having programs in existence.

Since then, the department has used the 1969 annual grant as a base for allocating each successive year's grant. In other words, the money has not been allocated according to need but on the basis of each previous year's expenditures.

Using the department's proposed basic allocation of funds for the fiscal year 1974, application of the formula will result in a shocking imbalance in the distribution of funds. For example, Philadelphia County, with one-sixth of the population, receives roughly one-third of the state-wide budget. On a per capita basis, 34 of the 41 MHI/MR areas do not receive their per capita share of the budget. The per capita allocations throughout the Commonwealth range between a high of \$9.40 per person in Philadelphia to \$2.51 per person in Clarion, Forest, Venango and Warren Counties.

I would like to read into the record exactly what the counties receive: Philadelphia, \$9.40; Allegheny, \$6.11; Cameron, Elk, McKean and Potter, \$5.98; Beaver, \$5.42; Butler, \$5.39.

This takes too long, Mr. Speaker. I will not burden you with all of this, except to say that the majority of these counties are receiving below the \$5 per capita expenditure. I will submit the list of counties and their budget allocations for the record.

In addition, the 1969-70 formula, which was used as a base, used the 1960 census as its population basis. Since that time, the 1970 census has become available and indicates the need for adjustment to bring the formula in line with the population change revealed by the 1970 census.

Second, the department's use of "identifiable mentally ill" relied heavily on the census of patients in the state mental hospital system at the time the formula was devised, i.e., 1969-1970.

Since that time, the number of patients at the state hospitals has dropped drastically, resulting in the department's consideration of the closing of some hospitals. The Philadelphia State Mental Hospital is an excellent example of this trend. Between June of 1969 and April of 1973, the daily census dropped by 31 percent, yet the department still uses the 1969 patient census in the formulation of its funding allocation.

Furthermore, the use of factors developed from the public assistance case load do not take into consideration medical assistance payments that already compensate areas with high public assistance case loads. Thus, an area with a high public assistance case load receives extra compensation, double compensation, from the MH/MR program, plus \$15 per outpatient visit. Because mental assistance is reimbursing the high public assistance case load areas, it seems to me there is no need to doubly compensate for that factor in the funding formula.

In addition, there is in the present allocation system a funding discrimination in favor of areas which had programs in existence in 1969. In other words, there is in the formula a bonus for existing programs. Areas which developed new programs, or wanted to, after 1969 have not received a similar advantage in funding.

Moreover, the formula does not take into consideration the tremendous alternative services available in the urban areas. For example, Philadelphia alone has six teaching hospitals with clinics staffed with residents and

interns. No such facilities are available in the suburban and rural areas. In addition, the large number of psychiatrists in the urban areas has not been taken into consideration.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I agree with you that people are demanding full funding of services but on an equitable basis. That is where we differ, and I am concerned that those funds be distributed with an eye to what actually are the needs of the people, not only in Philadelphia and Allegheny County but throughout the Commonwealth. And I think I am concerned about them but I also am concerned about the people who pay the bills. Therefore, I intend to vote "no" as a protest.

### LIST SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mrs. WHITTLESEY presented the following list for the Legislative Journal:

Appendix C—The per capita breakdown and ranking by county on MH/MR area of the Department's 1974 fiscal year budget.

1. Philadelphia	\$9.40
Allegheny	\$6.11
Cameron-Elk-McKean-Potter	\$5.98
Beaver	\$5.42
Butler	\$5.39
Lebanon	\$5.32
Erie	\$5.01
Bradford	\$4.98
Dauphin	\$4.86
Carbon-Monroc-Pike	\$4.71
Washington-Greene	\$4.48
Huntingdon-Mifflin-Juniata	\$4.37
York-Adams	\$4.31
Blair	\$4.26
Montgomery	\$4.25
Northampton	\$4.25
Berks	\$4.05
Bucks	\$3.96
Crawford	\$3.92
Lehigh	\$3.86
Luzerne-Wyoming	\$3.60
Westmoreland	\$3.54
Somerset-Bedford	\$3.52
Northumberland	\$3.44
Schuylkill	\$3.36
Armstrong	\$3.30
Lancaster	\$3.30
Lawrence	\$3.26
Lackawanna-Susquehanna-Wayne	\$3.24
Delaware	\$3.19
Lycoming-Clinton	\$3.18
Fayette	\$3.17
Centre	\$3.16
Columbia-Snyder-Union	\$3.16
Cumberland-Perry	\$3.12
Clearfield-Jefferson	\$3.09
Chester	\$2.97
Cambria	\$2.71
Franklin-Fulton	\$2.56
Mercer	\$2.53
Clarion-Forest-Venango-Warren	\$2.51

The per capita entitlement, derived by dividing the Commonwealth's population into the Secre-

tary of Welfare's proposed budget, is \$5.00 per person.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fayette, Mr. Lincoln.

Mr. LINCOLN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today as the co-author of this amendment with Mr. McMonagle from Allegheny County.

In my 10½ months in the House, Mr. Speaker, I have found that this instrument of Beelzebub that I am speaking into has a great magnetism and I see quite a few of my colleagues who tend to flock to it at each and every opportunity they have. I have, at times, almost had to sit on myself to not get up to the microphone, and I think if I develop one thing for which I would like to have my fellow members have a little respect for me 2 years from now, if I am fortunate enough to be reelected, or 10 years from now, it is that when I get up to speak on something, I sincerely believe in what I am going to say, and I will speak only at that time.

I support the additional \$6 million which we are asking to be added to the mental health-mental retardation program. I think there are several reasons. One of them, I believe, could be the fact that my wife and I were, within the last 4 weeks, blessed with a normal, healthy son, and he is the fourth normal and healthy son we have been blessed with. I think I have gone through the apprehension and the anxiety of wondering if that is going to be the case, if you are going to be blessed with that child, and I have also witnessed several of my friends who have not been so fortunate.

I think one of the things we must keep in perspective today is the fact that mentally-ill and mentally-retarded people are a part of our society. We have heard in the past several weeks people allude to facts that they are being kept in cages and they are institutionalized in big hospital-type things where there is very little tender loving care. I was glad to see that the \$7.8 million that had already been added to the budget will include the group homes, which I think is a step in the right direction. But we also need the additional \$6 million to keep our individual counties going.

I think I would like to relate just a short observation to my colleagues.

In the short time I have been in the House, I feel that I have really received an education. I have had the opportunity to learn from my more experienced colleagues and I think I probably could not find better teachers anywhere in the world than those we have sitting on the floor of this House. I have been enlightened in many ways, some good and some bad. And one of the things I am afraid of, which I may learn from my more experienced colleagues, is that in time I will become like them and feel that every decision must be made on that board up there. Your "yesses" and "noes" will be made by coldly and very analytically becoming a political animal.

I would hope that for something as important as a mental health program within the Commonwealth, you would find that you have to use more than your mind sometimes to make a decision. And I would hope, whenever your "yes" or your "no" goes up on that board today, that you allow your heart and your conscience to guide you as much as your mind. If you feel that you must vote against it under those circumstances, then I will have to say that you have done what is right, but

I would hope that you would consider this not just on a political basis.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Berkes.

Mr. BERKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment offered by Mr. McMonagle.

I somehow get a strange feeling here today that all the great activity, all the words, all the rhetoric, the prepared speeches, indicate that somehow, maybe, all the minds are made up. I would hope they are not, and I would hope the people on both sides of the aisle would for a moment listen not to the words of those of us who are speaking in favor of this amendment, or those who have spoken against it, but to the cries and the needs of the people and the children of Pennsylvania who have in the past few years been prevented from attaining their full measure of development by the callous disregard of their needs by those of us who do not know any better.

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about areas; we are not talking about which county gets more money; we are not talking about which hospital gets more money; we are not even talking about which kinds of mental illness gets more help; we are talking about the needs of helpless people all over this Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. We are not talking about funding discrimination. What we are trying to do is to provide for everybody's needs. That is what this is all about.

We are not fixing potholes; we are trying to fix minds. We are not taking care of roads; we are trying to smooth the way for people who otherwise do not know how to walk or how to talk or how to take care of themselves.

I have heard one of the previous speakers say that she will vote against this amendment in the form of a protest, and the price of that protest, Mr. Speaker, will be paid by helpless people, by the mentally ill, the mentally retarded, who cannot fight for themselves but who hope, in their little helpless way, that somebody will fight for them.

It is easy to find a rationalization to support a party position. It is more difficult to look an autistic child in the eye and then vote "no" on providing for his basic needs. It is tough to face a Mongoloid teenager and then deny him the help he needs to at least have him attain some measure of self-control. That is what we are talking about today, Mr. Speaker.

We are talking about poor helpless people who need help but who cannot ask for it, who need support and do not know how to get it. If we, who are the leaders of this Commonwealth, turn a deaf ear to those cries, which, if you stop and listen, you will hear, we will be committing what, to me, would be a very grave injustice. We will be condemning many more poor people, helpless people, to continued years of mental illness from which there is no coming around without the help which we can provide.

Mr. Speaker, we have it in our hands to provide that help. We have it in our hands to do something about the problems of the mentally ill. It is a simple thing, and it is the total picture of all we are talking about. We have heard figures thrown around here—\$196 million added to the budget, and we are only asking \$6 million more.

We have talked about providing tax relief, and who provides relief for autistic children? I would hope that every member of this legislature, sometime soon, gets a

chance to visit his or her favorite neighborhood mental hospital. I hope you get a chance to visit the schools for the mental retardates and I hope you get a chance to try to talk with autistic children. Had you done that before today, I am convinced we would see all green lights on this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to question the gentleman from Lebanon, Mr. Seltzer, for a moment, please.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Lebanon, Mr. Seltzer, consent to interrogation?

Mr. SELTZER. I shall, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BERKES. In Senate bill No. 1058, as amended, on page 17, you have line-itemed the three items for mental health and mental retardation services. Under which of those three items would we be able to restore the cuts that were made in staffing at Harrisburg State Hospital?

Mr. SELTZER. Mr. Speaker, out of the community services for the mentally ill and the small unit of residential treatment programs. These were programs in House bill No. 850 which were not line-itemed. Therefore, that money could be taken out of there for this purpose, if the Secretary saw fit.

Apparently, the Secretary did not particularly care about these programs, because she gave the vast majority of the \$33-million increase to the state hospitals and cut these programs needlessly.

Mr. BERKES. Are you then saying, Mr. Speaker, that these line items are not really line items and, if passed in this present form, the Secretary could take some of the money out of there and use it elsewhere?

Mr. SELTZER. No, I did not say that, Mr. Speaker. These are line items and these dollars can only be spent for the purposes for which they are being appropriated.

Mr. BERKES. Fine.

Under which of those three line items would we be able to restore the cuts at Harrisburg State Hospital?

Mr. SELTZER. Out of the \$33-million increase, which this General Assembly already gave her in House bill No. 850.

Mr. BERKES. I do not see that you have—

Mr. SELTZER. Mr. Speaker, you are not administering the program, therefore, I understand why you cannot see.

Mr. BERKES. Just a minute, you are not answering the question, and that, I think, is the problem.

Mr. Speaker, we happen to be a body of persons here charged with the responsibility of running state government and providing the funds to do that. You are trying to fool people into saying that the cuts which have been announced in Harrisburg State Hospital are going to be restored by three line items. I am asking you where?

Mr. SELTZER. No, Mr. Speaker, I am saying that the cuts at the Harrisburg State Hospital were made on paper by the Secretary of Welfare and not by this General Assembly. We increased the budget by \$33 million. We did not cut it.

Mr. BERKES. You did not meet those needs, and that, I think, is the key.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I can holler as loud as you, so if you want to holler, we will holler.

But you did not meet those needs, and that is the key.

Mr. SELTZER. Mr. Speaker, we have met more than the needs. It is the Secretary of Welfare who is having the problem, who has arbitrarily cut programs needlessly, because the money was provided by this General As-

sembly and, as I recall, Mr. Speaker, you even supported the appropriation.

Mr. BERKES. I did not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SELTZER. Then shame on you.

Mr. BERKES. No, shame on you, because you did not provide the funds needed to properly run the mental health and mental retardation programs of this state.

What you are trying to do is to fool the people of Pennsylvania into believing that you provided enough funds for the Secretary to run all the programs which she spelled out and which you have deducted \$13 million from arbitrarily and still expect her to run all those programs. That does not make sense.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster, Mr. Miller. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. M. E. MILLER, JR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman from Bucks has indicated or inferred that moneys for Harrisburg State Hospital would be in here. I point out that this \$9.6 million is solely for community treatment.

Mr. BERKES. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. I suggest the opposite.

Mr. M. E. MILLER, JR. I further point out that the State Administrators Association has an agreement that their total budget figure lacking was approximately \$5 million for community services, and that Senate bill No. 1058 restores that, and it brings us to a very interesting point.

If you are interested in additional moneys for hospitals, we should say specifically that, because I would like to point out that state hospitals, out of the additional \$33 million, received \$26 million at a time when average daily patient population has dropped from 1966 to only 19,000 per day compared to 35,000, the difference being picked up in community services.

The instances of autistic children which the gentleman refers to is just one example of community treatment versus institutionalization treatment.

Our big impetus is on community treatment, and I suggest we keep going in that direction by not voting this amendment. If we are seriously interested in improving community treatment, we should approve Senate bill No. 1058 in its present form.

I say that as an individual who has consistently voted the amendments for increases for MH/MR. This is one where, in all honesty, I believe is correct and does address the current community treatment need, and I strongly urge the defeat of the amendment.

Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Berkes.

Mr. BERKES. Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand the logic of the gentleman who stands here before us and says that if you are really interested in providing treatment services, you should vote against providing the funds to do that.

In my original question to the gentleman from Lebanon, Mr. Seltzer, I pointed out precisely what the gentleman, Mr. Miller, said, that nowhere in the three line items, which he has put into Senate bill No. 1058, does he provide for additional services for Harrisburg or Byberry or for Polk State or any of the others, the mistake again being that they have line-itemed and specifically

designated the \$7.6 million which has been put back into the budget.

It has been clearly shown for a long time that the amount of money needed was \$13.6 million. For the life of me, I just do not understand why people, who are well-meaning—and there are many people on both sides who are well-meaning—can take a need of \$13.6 million, fold it like an accordion, and expect to get the job done with only \$7.6 million.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that putting the additional \$6 million back into the budget will provide the means to further treat and take care of our autistic children and our many, many people who are retarded and mentally ill throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I urge your support for this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Kester.

Mr. KESTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a logistics problem, if I may.

May I interrogate the minority leader, please?

The SPEAKER. Will the minority leader consent to interrogation?

Mr. FINEMAN. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. KESTER. I do not too often get confused, Mr. Speaker, but I am a little confused here right now.

Ever since the debate started, I have been handed amendments. I have so many amendments I do not know which amendment is which amendment. I have a sheet here which shows in type 22 proposed amendments, which I assume are the amendments you referred to initially in your remarks today. That covers various sections of the budget, various items in the budget, and also shows the sponsor who is going to offer the amendment. Are you familiar with that sheet?

Mr. FINEMAN. I do not know if we have the same sheet, Mr. Speaker, but I—

Mr. KESTER. I think we do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FINEMAN. A one-page sheet?

Mr. KESTER. Yes. Then I see noted down at the bottom there two other written-in amendments by Mr. Williams. Is that correct?

Mr. FINEMAN. Right.

Mr. KESTER. The amendments which have been handed to me are numbered—some of them are numbered—1, 2, 3, and I have all the way through to 16 at this time. I assume that is your particular party's package of amendments. Is that correct?

Mr. FINEMAN. I cannot answer that honestly, because I did not know how the amendments were numbered. As a matter of fact, I did not personally handle the amendments, except to get this single sheet together of those amendments which were going to be prepared.

Mr. KESTER. The only thing I am trying to assume—

Mr. FINEMAN. I have just been told that they do have numbers which correspond to the numbers on the list.

Mr. KESTER. Okay. Now I also have amendments to the same bill offered by various gentlemen on the other side, stamped and written with their signature. I assume these are independent amendments of the package which you are proposing today. Is that correct?

Mr. FINEMAN. If they are not within the list of 22, then they are independent and separate and apart from the list which we had compiled.

Mr. KESTER. I think you answered the gentleman, Mr. Gallen, that the 22 amendments which you have on this list would amount to something in the neighborhood of \$60 million. Is that correct?

Mr. FINEMAN. About \$62 million, I think.

Mr. KESTER. I noticed that you have down at the bottom written in—I do not know whether you wrote it or somebody else—Mr. Williams' amendment. I cannot read that figure, but it looks to me to be \$55 million. Is that correct?

Mr. FINEMAN. That was not part of the 22 amendments.

Mr. KESTER. Yes, but the amendment which Mr. Williams is offering, if this is it, amounts to \$75 million. That is one point I wanted to try to develop there.

Mr. FINEMAN. The figure which I was told was incorporated in Mr. Williams' amendment was \$55 million. I am not familiar with any other amendment that he might have offered, which now shows \$75 million.

Mr. KESTER. All right, another amendment I have is one introduced by the gentleman, Mr. Berkes, and that would change one of the appropriations from \$254,000 to \$2,600,000. That is not one of the 22. Is that correct?

Mr. FINEMAN. That is his own, yes.

Mr. KESTER. All right, now I have some others here. I assume all these amendments, including your package of 22 or 23, depending on whether Mr. Williams' amendment is included, all are meritorious and they all have some basis in fact or the sponsor would not have sponsored them. But I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, if you realize what these two packages of amendments total. I added them up. Do you know what they total?

Mr. FINEMAN. I cannot accept any responsibility for any amendments which are being offered by members on their own, other than the 22 which I submitted to Mr. Ryan this morning.

Mr. KESTER. Yes, the point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, without belaboring this argument, is that if we, in good conscience, all felt that these amendments which I hold were of such value that they should be adopted, which you have argued for your package that we should, my total comes to \$125,557,000—and the majority whip just reminded me—plus another \$55,000 for a half year's funding of some other program, for Mr. Williams'.

But the problem is, Mr. Speaker, that if we go this route, even though these areas are sensitive and even though I feel we have done our best to fund them in our budget and have backed away in some cases from what we originally started out to do, there would be no moneys left in this particular Commonwealth for tax relief for next year.

Even though I feel some of these areas are sensitive enough to warrant such discussion, I, in good conscience, cannot vote for them. I am just trying to point out that the more money you add to it, the more weight you put on it and the less you are going to have for tax relief, if that is one of our objectives, to give tax relief.

Mr. FINEMAN. Well, obviously, this body has to make some hard decisions about priorities.

All we are saying today is, listen carefully to the arguments that are being advanced without having preciously foreclosed the possibility of your viewing these things favorably.

Now a lot of members, who I apparently do not even know about, are going to be offering amendments. As a matter of fact, there are some amendments increasing

funds coming from your side of the aisle today. So it will happen from both sides of the aisle, but I am saying to you that there are certain programs that are of particular significance that we should be receptive to and one of the most important programs is the one which we are on at the moment, namely, mental health and mental retardation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Shanc.

Mr. SHANE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Another logistical comment: It has been said that an army marches on its stomach. I am not sure what part of the human anatomy legislators legislate on but I suggest that perhaps our leaders, who have these generous contingency funds, provide for our nourishment, because it is going to be a long evening.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. BUTERA. That will not happen from this side. We attempted to go into session today at 1 o'clock for that very reason. It did not work that way, sobeit.

I have a few remarks on this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I think each of these issues we are going to discuss today, particularly this one, has at least two sides to it. One of them is the human issue and the other is the economic issue.

I think so far we have addressed ourselves to the human issue, and perhaps not as well as we could have on the particular question of mental health-mental retardation. A lot of us know a lot about mental health, and I include myself at the top of that list in this House from personal experiences. That does not make me any better than anybody else, but I kind of get tired of hearing people articulate the issue who seem to over-emphasize the emotions of it.

The fact is that what we are doing is not unlike what the Governor has already done on this particular issue and, indeed, on all issues contained in any budget, in any state, in any municipality in this country, that is, we look at the human aspect of an issue and then we apply that to the economic facts which surround a budget into which that issue may fall.

I think if you talk to anyone in the mental health field who, indeed, understands the costs and the needs for treatment—both sides—they will tell you that rather than give a \$40-million increase in this program, which we are suggesting today, really what we should do is give about a \$100-million increase.

Indeed, I would presume, although I do not know, because all of it is kept very secret, that is exactly what those people in the field had requested of this Governor.

Now he, in his wisdom, tried to fit the pieces of his budget puzzle together and he came up with a suggestion that we increase the mental health-mental retardation portion of the budget approximately \$43 million. The reason he did not give more—\$50 million, why not \$50 million? Why not \$75 million? Why not \$100 million? Why not \$200 million? It is pretty obvious, because he had to fit, as every one of his predecessors has had to do and as every legislator has had to do, a need into an economic scheme, and, thus, a budget.

I suggest that is exactly what we are doing. And as long as in that process we are not ignoring the economic facts, I think we are not, then, ignoring the human need.

The economic facts, as we see it, in order to get a

handle on the entire problem of state spending, dictate that we only increase the mental health budget by \$33 million. And then we have suggested to the Secretary of Welfare that that being the second largest increase of any program in this budget, that she then allocate it in the proper way among the various programs within the field.

Today we are increasing that to approximately a \$40-million increase. So we do not have our heads in the sand; we are not ignoring the obvious human need. What we are trying to do is fit that into the economic picture.

The basic reason we are adding this additional money is that the Secretary of Welfare, after receiving our suggested \$13 million increase in House bill No. 850, arbitrarily cut the community programs. It is just that simple.

In Allegheny County, for example, where we gave almost a 12-percent increase in every one of the programs, she cut back the community program to about a 2-percent increase. Hence, a lot of heat was justly generated by those people from Allegheny County in this House on both sides, because what she did not do was fit the human need into the economic picture. She obviously did just the opposite. She ignored the human need, as it pertained to the community program in Allegheny County, and overemphasized the economic need in other parts of the state.

I say to you that what we are doing here accomplishes both things. We are certainly looking at the human need and the obvious need for increases in the mental health-mental retardation budget, which will now approximate 15 percent this year; and we are, at the same time, trying to have that particular part of this budget fit the total budget.

None of us today has even talked about the huge increase, additional increase, which this program receives from the general salary increase. We are not even talking about that. We are just talking about basic program increases.

I think we have done more than enough in any one year and I think we should be satisfied with that. I do not think we have done anything different from what the Governor did when he initially submitted his request. He cut somebody; we do not know whom he cut, but he cut somebody, because there is a bottomless pit when it comes to mental health-mental retardation, as long as we have people in our society who need this kind of treatment.

I think we should vote the amendment down and get on with the business of the day.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. FINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I gather the thrust of what the majority leader had to say was that while perhaps they do not dispute the need amount, they have got to work with the proposition that they have got to fit that human concern into the economic situation.

I would point out to him again, as I did earlier, that we generated 17 million new dollars with a new piece of legislation, which had not been counted upon by you, which were moneys not previously anticipated as being available to you for the economic situation; and that we are not disturbing the structure of the economic situation one iota by asking you to put the remaining \$6 million in,

because we found \$17 million which, in fact, you are now including in your very own budget calculations.

It may be true—indeed, it is true—that you have got to be concerned about fitting human needs into the whole economic situation, but there are certain priorities that cannot be neglected.

If any member in this House had a child who was ill in the year 1972 and it cost you \$100 in medical expenses to make sure that your child was being properly cared for, and in the year 1973 you spent \$130 for that child, and now in planning for the year 1974 you are setting aside \$150 for that child but the doctors are saying to you that it is going to cost you \$170, not \$150, you do not say, well, that is all there is; we have to fit it into the economic structure of this household. Somehow you go out and you find the money because that priority is there to take care of that sick child.

That is a very heavy simplification of the problem. You do not make a budget for mental health and mental retardation by saying that we gave the \$33-million increase and that represents "X"-percent increase and that should be enough. You make a budget in this particular area by first establishing the amount of dollars needed to care for these unfortunate people. Then we meet that priority.

That is more of a priority than fixing potholes or giving more money in other areas where perhaps we can wield a sharper scalpel. When you are dealing with a priority like this, it is never enough by way of justification to say that we gave \$33 million more and that represents 12 percent or 15 percent over last year and that should be adequate. There is only one sum which is adequate—whatever amount of dollars is needed to properly care for your child.

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

Mr. McMONAGLE. I would just like to make a few comments on what the majority leader talked about here.

I am sure you are all aware that I did not address anything emotional in my presentation of my amendment, although I know that I or any member of this House or anybody who is associated with mental health and mental retardation could go into that matter. So I do not think that is justified. But when he talks about its being an emotional issue and not an economic issue, I want to tell him that people who are unfortunate enough to have this set of circumstances are certainly concerned economically.

There is job loss in the families. There are all kinds of hardships endured here, and particularly I want to tell him that the people in Allegheny with whom I attended meetings talked to me and talked to other legislators. They did it in Montgomery County and every county throughout this state, not only in Allegheny County.

I am telling you that they are the people to whom I talked. I did not talk to the secretary, the administration or anybody else. And I will tell you that since I have been in this House we have had problems with mental health and mental retardation, long before Mrs. Wohlgenuth became the secretary. So I hope that you are not going to influence any votes here on your side of the aisle with a personal attack on anybody in this administration.

Thank you very much.



The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. BUTERA. Mr. Speaker, what I was referring to, among other things, is that there have been 28 meetings this year of the Health and Welfare Committee and subcommittee of which you are a member. You have attended one.

Mr. McMONAGLE. You are absolutely right. I was waiting for you to say that, and I can tell you that you are very right. The reason I did not attend any of those meetings is that we are getting the same thing as when you introduced a resolution here when you did not even have the decency to tell me, nor could anybody on your side tell me, what your cut was in mental health-mental retardation. You did not even know what your cut was. You did not know what your appropriation was. And the truth of the matter is that this is what you have been doing all year long. I do not intend to attend any meetings and be a sham for anybody.

Thank you very much.

**QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. McGraw. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. McGRAW. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McGRAW. I would like to have my name added to the master roll, please.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will be so recorded.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, I was checking with my watch. We started the vote at 4 minutes after 5. It is now 15 minutes after 5. I believe we have now exceeded the 10-minute rule, and I would ask that the board be closed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. FINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a request on the floor that the board be closed. We are abiding by the rules of the House. We are beyond the 10-minute rule. I would ask that you close the board, sir.

These were the Republican rules established this year.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that.

Mr. FINEMAN. Well, will you close the board? Will you close the board, Mr. Speaker?

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. McMONAGLE and SELTZER and were as follows:

**YEAS—98**

Arthurs	Fischer	McGraw	Schmitt
Barber	Frankenburg	McMonagle	Shane
Bellomini	Fryer	Morris	Shelhamer
Bennett	Gallagher	Mullen, M. P.	Shelton
Berkes	Geisler	Murtha	Shuman
Berson	Gelfand	Musto	Shupnik
Bixler	Gillette	Myers	Stout
Blackwell	Gleeson	Novak	Sullivan
Bonetto	Greenfield	O'Brien	Tayoun

Brunner	Hammock	Oliver	Toll
Burns	Homer	Perry	Trusio
Caputo	Hutchinson, A.	Petrarca	Valicenti
Comer	Irvis	Pievsky	Vann
Davis, D. M.	Itkin	Prendergast	Walsh, J. T.
DeMedio	Johnson, J.	Rappaport	Walsh, T. P.
Dicarlo	Kelly, A. P.	Renwick	Wargo
Dombrowski	Kolter	Rhodes	Williams
Doyle	Kowalyszyn	Richardson	Wilson
Dreibelbis	LaMarca	Rieger	Wise
Early	Laudadio	Ritter	Wojdak
Eckensberger	Laughlin	Romanelli	Wright
Englehart	Letterman	Ruggiero	Yahner
Fee	Lincoln	Savitt	Zeller
Finrich	Mandorino	Scanlon	Zwikel
Fineman	Martino		

**NAYS—98**

Anderson, J. H.	Halverson	McCurdy	Smith, L.
Beren	Hamilton, J. H.	McGinnis	Spencer
Bittle	Horricr	Mebus	Stahl
Brandt	Hassy	Miller, M. E.	Taddonio
Burkardt	Haskell	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Thomas
Butera	Hayes, D. S.	Noye	Turner
Syerly	Hayes, S. E.	O'Connell	Ustynoski
Cessar	Hepford	Pancoast	Vacca
Checchio	Hill	Parker, H. S.	Vipond
Crawford	Hopkins	Perri	Volpe
Dager	Hutchinson, W.	Piper	Wagner
Davis, R.	Jones	Pitts	Weidner
Deverter	Kable	Polte	Wells
Dininni	Kelly, J. B.	Renninger	Westerberg
Dorr	Kennedy	Rowe	Whittlesey
Dorsey	Kester	Ruane	Wilt, R. W.
Fawcett	Kistler	Ryan	Wilt, W. W.
Foor	Klingaman	Saloon	Worrlow
Foster, A.	Knepper	Scheaffer	Yohn
Foster, W.	Kusse	Schulze	Zearfoss
Gallen	Lehr	Scirias	Zimmerman
Geesey	Lynch, Frank	Seitzer	Zord
Gekas	Maloney	Semanoff	
Gleason	McClatchy	Smith, C.	Lee, Speaker
Grieco	McCue	Smith, E.	

**NOT VOTING—7**

Fox	Gring	Lederer	Salvatore
Goodman	Katz	Malady	

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

**REVOTE REQUESTED**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berks, Mr. LaMarca.

Mr. LaMARCA. I may not understand the interplay and I may not understand the politics. I am just an ordinary member and all I have to go by is that board. I respectfully request that there be a rerun of that vote.

The SPEAKER. There will be no rerun of the vote. Every member who had his vote cast was on the board, except the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. McMonagle, and his vote was recorded in the affirmative.

The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. FINEMAN. I move that the vote by which the amendment to this bill was defeated be reconsidered and I am submitting a written request.

**RECONSIDERATION OF VOTE ON AMENDMENTS TO SENATE BILL NO. 1058**

Mr. FINEMAN moved that the vote by which the McMonagle amendments to Senate bill No. 1058 were defeated be reconsidered.

Mr. ROMANELLI seconded the motion.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Gelfand. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GELFAND. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GELFAND. Mr. Speaker, do we have any rule in this House dealing with the length of time the electric roll-call board can remain open after the roll has been called for?

The SPEAKER. I believe the length of time is 10 minutes.

Mr. GELFAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few brief comments pertaining to the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. GELFAND. It was my impression, when we discussed the rules earlier this year, that we were making the rules so that we could have an orderly process in the business of the House. Great pains were taken, after considerable debate and consideration, to end up with a series of rules which would lead to administration on an efficient and orderly basis.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things which bothered a considerable number of the members was the length of time the board was held open in order to permit the respective whips to do their whipping up and down the aisles. I think we decided that having the board open an inordinate period of time was demeaning to the House and did not lead to proper conduct by the membership.

We found it so disturbing that we changed the rule this year and we said that under no circumstances shall the board be open more than 10 minutes in order to permit the respective whips to do their jobs. We decided that if a whip could not do his job during that period of time, then the membership should be free to act in such a way that the roll could be taken and we could have the business terminated.

During the last roll call, because of circumstances that had occurred on the floor of this House on previous occasions, we took great pains on this side to carefully denote the length of time the board was open. From the time you called the roll and from the time you asked us to cast our votes, almost 16 minutes transpired.

It was our distinct feeling that if we are going to have an orderly process in this House, then all members on both sides of the House should abide by what the rules say, or we are going to have a disorderly body and one which cannot function properly in order to reflect the views of the member or to reflect the views of the constituencies which they represent.

It is our hope that in the future the Speaker and the majority whip will take great pains to observe the rules of the House. Otherwise, we ought to take whatever steps are necessary to discontinue the rule and change the rule, so it can be one which is more pliable to the needs of the membership.

We feel the Speaker should abide more closely by what is required by the rules of the House, or allow someone to do so who is willing to do it. It is certainly improper, to say the least, for the Speaker to evade the dictates of the membership of this House as established by the rules. Hereafter we intend to be more strict in our requirement of adherence to the rules, even by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Would the gentleman be satisfied if the Chair said it was sorry?

Mr. GELFAND. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we could accept the roll as it was at 10 minutes, I think we would all be happy and we would be willing to accept the apology.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dauphin, Mr. Hepford.

Mr. HEPFORD. Mr. Speaker, briefly, for the benefit of the new members, the reason for this rule was not the matter of those responsible in leadership conversing with their members. But what happened in the past was that members from that side of the aisle were hauled into the Governor's office and brought back on this floor and traded, while that switch and roll were running for 1 hour, 2 hours, 3, 4.

I want to say to the members of this House, the new members and the fellow members on the other side, in all fairness, the rule of 10 minutes may be unreasonable; but the length of time it was open here certainly is not unreasonable, and the Speaker certainly has reasonable discretion.

You may want to change that rule to amend it to 15 minutes or 20 minutes. But I say do not come back here with an unreasonable comment like that, when the very reason this rule went into effect was because that roll call was running from 1 o'clock in the morning until 4 o'clock in the morning, until the members got browbeaten into line by Governor Shapp in the front office.

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

Mr. BELLOMINI. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Mr. Hepford remembers when your party brought the state police into this building in 1964?

Mr. HEPFORD. Mr. Speaker, I remember it very well. It was because the leadership on that side of the aisle took the 34 trained seals and marched them off the floor, out of the door, away from their responsibilities, and I remember it because there were labor-organized organizations in that balcony cursing and carrying on and threatening the lives of members.

You may laugh, you may laugh all you wish, but I tell you when the orderly process of state government cannot function, when these balconies in this Capitol are surrounded by union members, when people have to get court orders to get the right to work, and when you have a lot of other factors taking place, this society is not operating under law. It is operating under the influence and motivation of men, and I want to say that is an improper motivation.

It does no good to recant all of the bad acts of one side or the other, but the question is whether or not the 10-minute rule should be strictly enforced. I frankly say, Mr. Speaker, I could not even see if the gentlemen were in their seats who were voted over there, because they were all standing up and milling around. When the roll call is taken, if we are to have an opportunity to see if the gentlemen are in their seats and voted, then I would respectfully suggest they should have the courtesy to remain in their seats so that we can check the vote. They should not leave the floor of the House or have somebody else pressing their vote, as has happened in the past.

So it may be that 10 minutes is not reasonable. Maybe it ought to be 15, and maybe we will change the rule to 20. But I say to you the question is a reasonable extension of time, and it was intended by this member when he voted for a 10-minute rule that we should have

order in the House and the members in their seats so you could see who was voted so you could verify the roll.

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

Mr. TADDONIO. Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire to extend the debate on this floor, but there are a few remarks I would like to make to bring a little enlightenment on what happened in California in November. First of all—

### POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. FINEMAN. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FINEMAN. There is a motion on the floor now for reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was defeated, and that is the subject matter and the question before the House.

The SPEAKER. Would the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Taddonio, yield until the reconsideration is considered?

Mr. TADDONIO. I will, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. BUTERA. Mr. Speaker, on the motion, I rise to oppose the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I think the issue is very clear before us. We have had extensive debate on the issue for the past 5 months. We can stay here tonight and handle all 22-plus of these amendments and ask for a reconsideration of each one.

I say that we set the precedent now that we take one vote on each amendment. It is probably the third or fourth time we have taken the vote on the particular amendment in this session in these recent months.

I would urge all members to vote against the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. FINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, number one, that request by the majority floor leader certainly flies in the face of the tradition that we have established over the years, which has been reiterated this year, namely, that when a motion for a reconsideration of a question is made, it is automatically given as a matter of courtesy.

Now when there is a clear-cut defeat of an amendment, there will be no motion for reconsideration; it will be finished business. But we do not view what happened on this particular amendment as a clear-cut defeat. As a matter of fact, for almost 10 minutes of the 14 or 15 minutes that the board was held open, the amendment was prevailing. And we are not satisfied that we do not have the votes. If you put the votes up on the board and we are defeated, so be it, with this amendment or any other amendment. And I am saying to you, as a matter of courtesy, that this was extended to you year after year when we were in the majority party. Any motion for reconsideration was automatically granted, and I am asking that the same be done this year.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. FINEMAN and BUTERA and were as follows:

### YEAS—98

Arthura	Fischer	Martino	Savitt
Barber	Frankenburg	McCue	Scanlon
Bellomini	Fryer	McGraw	Schniff
Bennett	Gallagher	McMonagle	Shane
Berkes	Gelsler	Morris	Shelhamer
Berson	Gelfand	Mullen, M. P.	Shelton
Bixler	Gillette	Murtha	Shuprik
Blackwell	Gleeson	Musto	Stout
Bonetto	Greenfield	Myers	Sullivan
Brunner	Hammock	Novak	Tayoun
Caputo	Homer	O'Brien	Toll
Comer	Hutchinson, A.	Oliver	Trusio
Davis, D. M.	Irvin	Perry	Valicenti
DeMedio	Itkin	Petrarca	Vann
Dicarlo	Johnson, J.	Pievsky	Walsh, J. T.
Dombrowski	Kelly, A. P.	Prendergast	Walsh, T. P.
Doyle	Kolter	Rappaport	Wargo
Dreibelbis	Kowalshyn	Rienwick	Williams
Early	LaMarca	Rhodes	Wise
Eckensberger	Laudadio	Richardson	Wojdak
Engelhart	Laughlin	Rieger	Wright
Fee	Letterman	Ritter	Yahner
Fenrich	Lincoln	Romanelli	Zeller
Fineman	Manderino	Ruggiero	Zwilk

### NAYS—98

Anderson, J. H.	Halverson	McGinnis	Spencer
Beren	Hamilton, J. H.	Mebus	Stahl
Bittle	Harrier	Miller, M. E.	Taddonio
Brandt	Hasay	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Thomas
Burkardt	Haskell	Noye	Turner
Burns	Hayes, D. S.	O'Connell	Ustynoski
Butera	Hayes, S. E.	Pancoast	Vacca
Byerly	Hepford	Parker, H. S.	Vipond
Cessar	Hill	Perri	Volpe
Crawford	Hopkins	Piper	Wagner
Dager	Hutchinson, W.	Pitts	Weidner
Davis, R.	Jones	Polite	Wells
Deverter	Kahle	Renninger	Westerberg
Dininni	Kelly, J. B.	Rowe	Whittlesey
Dorr	Kennedy	Ruane	Wilson
Dorsey	Kester	Ryan	Witt, R. W.
Fawcett	Kistler	Saloom	Witt, W. W.
Foor	Klingaman	Scheaffer	Worriow
Foster, A.	Knopper	Schulze	Yohn
Foster, W.	Kusse	Scirica	Zearfoss
Gallen	Lehr	Seltzer	Zimmerman
Geesey	Lynch, Frank	Sernanoff	Zord
Gekas	Maloney	Smith, C.	
Gleason	McClatchy	Smith, E.	Lee, Speaker
Grieco	McCurdy	Smith, L.	

### NOT VOTING—9

Checchio	Gring	Lederer	Salvatore
Fox	Katz	Malady	Shuman
Goodman			

So the question was determined in the negative and the motion was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. FINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say something. There is no reason why we cannot have reasonable and honest differences of opinion about any subject matter, including the amounts of appropriations. Whatever position you will take, I will respect it, if it is a sincere position—and I am assuming that your position on mental health is a sincere one—but I would ask that when we disagree, at least we disagree in an agreeable fashion. I would ask that we conduct ourselves like gentlemen. I would ask that we do not run this House in an unseemly fashion.

What has happened here today does not inure to our benefit. And I say this to you not as a Democrat; I say this to you as a fellow legislator. You have acted discourteously when the situation commanded that you act with courtesy and respect. Members have not been

given an opportunity to express their points of view with due and full receptivity to what they are saying.

We hope that, on occasion, we can change a vote or two; that we can prevail upon some minds to see a point of view differently from how they see it when they first come to this floor. If we fail in that, so be it. But we have a right to expect that we run our shop decently and respectfully and in a manner that will not subject us to demeaning characterizations by the press or anybody else.

You have not run that shop this way. You did not run it last week when you stormed over us when we asked for a delay until today on Senate bill No. 920. You did not do it today when you stormed over us when we said today that courtesy demands and tradition demands that we be given an opportunity for reconsideration.

How many times I remember, as the Speaker of this House myself, in the light of opposition that was expressed to me on the floor by Democrats, in response to Republicans saying they want a reconsideration and the Democrats on the floor saying "no," that I said courtesy and tradition demand that we give every member the right to vote twice around on any proposition.

If you want to run the game, okay; if you want to run it that way, okay. But I am telling you that the rules of this House are going to get a sharp undergoing and a sharp review next year when the Democrats are back in the majority. And when you complain, we will turn you aside like you are turning us aside because you have the numbers.

The very least that your position demands of you is a little bit of respect and a little bit of courtesy. Differ with us, if you will, on any proposition; vote as you will on any proposition. I do not fault you for that, but I fault you seriously when you do not act responsibly on the floor and when you do not extend courtesies to other members.

I repeat to you once again, when the cards are turned in numbers, do not complain to us when you get short shrift on a lot of propositions.

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

Mr. TADDONIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to change the subject slightly and get back to what happened in California last November at the election.

The proposition which Governor Reagan had went down to defeat not by 2 to 1, but by 54 percent to 46 percent. There were three basic ingredients to this tax initiative.

### POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Rappaport. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. RAPPAPORT. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAPPAPORT. I would be grateful to know what order of business we are presently on.

The SPEAKER. The Chair inadvertently did not recognize the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Taddonio, at the conclusion of the remarks of the minority leader on this same subject, on the same bill, on the same amendment process, and agreed to recognize him as soon as the preceding amendment had been disposed of.

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. TADDONIO. One feature would return \$826 million in surplus taxes to the people. Still another portion would totally eliminate the state income tax for families earning \$8,000 or less.

However, the most significant aspect of the tax initiative was the provision that it would finally put an overall limit on how much the state could take from the taxpayers collectively.

Because the income of the people of California grows each year, the state budget would automatically grow as well. The state budget would grow from \$9 billion to \$27 billion.

As far as the proposition goes, when the opposition frantically assailed the amendment as an assault against the poor which would only shift taxes from the state to the localities, the Los Angeles Times, a frequent critic of the Governor, responded in an editorial endorsement of the measure. They said:

... [U]nlikely are the forecasts of increased local and school tax burdens, and of heavier tax loads on the elderly and other defenseless elements of our society.

Any legislature so minded can bring about these shifts under the present arrangements, in some cases more easily than would be possible under the initiative's restrictions. In any case, the legislators would still have to bear the political consequences.

It is also clear, we think, that the governor's initiative is not a hastily conceived scheme whose main purpose is political. Instead, it is a carefully prepared proposal that he and his supporters sincerely believe will strengthen this society through fiscal controls.

But the opposition managed to clobber Reagan's constitutional amendment anyway through clever strategy.

First of all, the Democratic-controlled legislature, growing alarmed by the built-in appeal of the Reagan proposal, decided to approve two of its critical portions through legislation. Thus, the legislature voted to return the \$826-million tax surplus to the people and to eliminate the state income tax for families earning \$8,000 or less. Hence the state legislators, captained by Assembly Speaker Bob Moretti, a gubernatorial aspirant, removed two essential reasons why the voters might want to come to the polls to approve the Reagan measure.

Then the opposition revved up a massive scare campaign—through the media and direct mail operations—to convince the voters that the overall limitation on state spending in the initiative would produce a shortfall of funds, drastically curtail state services and force local taxes, particularly property taxes, to zoom upward.

In the last weeks of the campaign, the "anti" forces saturated the media, outspending the "pro" forces by five and six to one, and sent scare mail to virtually every segment of the California population, warning the voters that passage of Proposition 1 would trigger a calamity.

The opposition campaign paid off handsomely. In a poll released November 1, the voters had turned against Proposition 1. When the "no" voters were asked if they thought the proposition would limit or increase spending by the state government—and this is important—35 percent of the "noes" said the proposition would increase state government spending, a direct contradiction to what the measure does. Some 69 percent of the "noes" re-

sponded that it was far more likely that taxes would go up if Proposition 1 passed. Clearly, the scare tactics had worked wonders.

I submit that the defeat of this resolution does not herald a shift in public sentiment. And next month, I understand, our United States Senate will be covering a proposition to limit spending on a national level. I believe that this is a shadow of things to come, that some controls must be placed on state spending and they must be rational controls that we all can live with.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. MURTHA requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 14, by inserting between lines 29 and 30: For the establishment of State-wide information and assistance centers for providing one-stop services and follow through action for Pennsylvania veterans ..... 500,000

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Murtha.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, there are 29 million veterans in the United States. There are approximately 2 million veterans in Pennsylvania—just under 400,000 Vietnam veterans.

These young men, whom we have supported strongly in this General Assembly, went away to war quietly while others were burning their draft cards, while others were going to Canada. These young men went away and fought an unpopular war. They took tremendous harassment and criticism.

The majority of the members in this House and the Pennsylvania Senate supported these young men. For instance, the bonus plan has been a step in the right direction and so has the PHEAA scholarship. But now we are asking for a little more help.

These young men have come back quietly, some of them embarrassed to wear their uniform. Some are ashamed to admit they were in Vietnam. They worked in water up to their knees and, as Sam Hayes knows, they were in mud up to their necks sometimes.

Fifty percent of the casualties in Vietnam were from land mines, which are serious casualties, and 23,000 were totally disabled in the Vietnam War.

I remember in 1966 talking to a young fellow, Bobby Layne, who stayed an extra month in Vietnam in order to lead his company. I was down listening to the radio when he had a tremendous explosion, and he came back and talked to the colonel commanding the battalion and said, "Colonel, I'm going to have to give up my company because I've lost both my legs." Well, I am going to tell you, he said when it was all over that he was going to come back and talk about these young fellows.

And that is not enough; we have to do more than talk about what these young fellows have done. We have to help them find jobs. Their unemployment rate is substantially higher than the unemployment rate in the civilian work force. They are not seeking the educational benefits that they need. They need counseling, as this experimental center in Harrisburg proved. Eleven hundred men went there—42 percent for educational benefits and 18 who were seeking employment.

There is a tremendous disparity in the benefits following World War II and the benefits now. We have done part of our job, but these young fellows do not know where to go. Many of them were just 18; many of them were high school dropouts. When they come back, they need counseling. They need somebody to talk to them and tell them where to go to get help, and that is what these experimental centers do.

This bill asks for \$500,000 to set up 15 experimental centers to give these young men the counseling they need, to give these young men the counseling and education. After the Second World War, at Harvard University, 59 percent of the students were World War II veterans. Today that figure is 1.5 percent of the veterans.

At Penn State, our own university, after World War II, 44 percent of the students were veterans. Today 8.3 percent of the student body of Penn State are veterans.

We have an obligation, Republicans and Democrats, to support these young fellows. This is a bill we need badly so that we can send young Vietnam veterans into these centers to counsel, to talk to and to help them, and I urge every member of this House to support this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Shuman.

Mr. SHUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have to read what I say because I wrote it down just recently.

I seldom rise to this mike to talk about legislation, but I would like to give you my views. I wish to speak on the sudden amendment to House bill No. 1058, as changed by someone during the last 24 hours from \$1 million to \$500,000 and not channeled through the Appropriations Committee or even talked about in the Military and Veterans Affairs Committee.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, it is not popular to vote against Boy Scouts and motherhood or veterans. I am for veterans, but I am going to cast my vote against this amendment.

I charge that although the original thought seemed appetizing, it has ended more with political motives rather than the need or real worth for the veteran. And allow me to explain, if you will.

There is a bill now in the Appropriations Committee for \$1 million. As my good friend, Mr. Murtha, said, it is supposed to cover 65 telephone centers, and it remained that way until this amendment came forth last night.

Now one-half year has expired, 6 months, practically. The whole thought, Mr. Speaker, is to lapse next July, 6 months hence, when most of the Vietnam veterans' benefits expire.

Now I am not a mathematician, but I know 2 and 2 are 4. I contend, since only 6 months are left, and centers are now said to be reduced to 12 or 15—some say only 10—that is less than one-fifth of the original number, and one-fifth into \$1 million should be \$200,000, not \$500,000, if you figure it that way.

The telephone centers, I say, will be manned by men or veterans with little knowledge of veterans' laws and with little experience.

This legislation was never approved by the convention or in whole by any state veterans' organization.

I would like to speak on priorities and need. We need some money to implement the 21 bills that originated from the task force which went all over the state to find out the needs of the Vietnam veterans. We need

to pay a little money to the 100 percent blind veteran or the hospitalized veteran while his family is going hungry.

We have free telephone service now. Anyone can pick up the telephone—and we have had it on the radio for months and months and months—and call the Veterans' Administration free of charge in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, or wherever it may be.

We have at least one or more veterans' affairs officers in each county or district and more than that in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. We have active service officers in the various state veterans' organizations.

This bill did not originate in any veterans' group; it originated in the Department of Military Affairs which has written all the veterans' groups in Pennsylvania that all legislation should go through them, by them, approved by them and promoted by them, which, as I told them, is ass-backwards.

I am casting my vote against the proposition for the following four reasons, which I want to go into the record:

1. The figures are entirely wrong, according to my arithmetic. If we were going to approve anything, it should be \$200,000, from the figures given by Mr. Murtha.

2. The people who will man these veterans telephone centers will not be skilled in veterans law and will not be experienced.

3. They will only be employed on a temporary basis until next July. They will be exactly what it says—one-shot telephone receptionists.

4. After studying the amendment and meeting and talking in many places, I think it is more politically motivated for party posture than practical needs. And the defeat of this amendment will not, in any way, detract one iota from the veteran in Pennsylvania.

Now I want to let you in on what I feel is another politically-motivated action.

Next year, they tell us, the administration is going to introduce legislation whereby we will give 25 cents per capita to all the legion members and all the VFW members, and so on, in the state of Pennsylvania for service work. How can you vote against that? But I am inclined to think that perhaps those who are recommending these things realize that because of the economic matter and because of its impracticality, it will never take place.

This present piece of legislation, this amendment, I feel, is somewhat in the same category. It sounds politically nice, but it is not practical or economically good for the veteran of Pennsylvania.

Thank you very much.

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

Mr. J. T. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this amendment.

As all of you know, I have had a lot of experience with veterans. I am a World War I veteran. I have been a service officer for the Veterans of Foreign Wars for 40-some years. Regardless of what my good friend, Bill Shuman, says—with all due respect to Mr. Shuman—he does not know the score.

If you will check the records, you will find that the average veteran coming back has no idea of what he is entitled to. My post—and I am the service officer of that post—maintains a full-time office. We have widows of veterans of World War I coming in who are just finding out that they are entitled to pensions. I had a young

gentleman in the other day from World War II who did not know that he was entitled to a bonus.

These service officers in the veterans' organizations are like us up here—they have other jobs. When a man needs service, he wants it at that time. The service officer at practically every post has another job. He devotes maybe one day or two nights a week for service work.

We told these veterans when they went over that we would do everything we could for them. Now this is a chance to show these boys. As Mr. Murtha said, they are in need. They are in need of an education. They want to know where to go and how to get it. And this is one way they can get it.

So I urge everyone here who has the interest of the veteran at heart, who promised that nothing was too good for these boys, to vote for this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Murtha.

Mr. MURTHA. I just want to make one comment about Mr. Shuman's speech.

I am very disappointed that a person who has been involved in veterans' affairs so long, who urged the support of the President during this recent divisive war, would promise these young fellows all of these things that are needed in support of the men who are fighting in Vietnam and then come back here as a World War II veteran receiving the benefits that were received after World War II—a war that was popular, if you want to talk about a popular war, and these young fellows received such embarrassing comments they were ashamed to admit they were even in the service—and tell me this is a political war. I am ashamed to say that he is the chairman of the legislative committee of one of our large veterans' organizations. He stands back here and says it is a political move by the Military and Veterans Affairs Committee. They know that these young fellows need help.

I ask the support of this Assembly, on both sides of the aisle, for this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Shuman.

Mr. SHUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I, like that same veterans' organization, which I believe he mentioned, am very skeptical of this piece of legislation, as is the sister organization. The state has not endorsed it fully, and so on. I am like many of them who are very skeptical that we are going to get anything out of it for the veteran. That is all I am saying. And I wanted to give my view as to why I actually cannot endorse this as I have other things. We are sort of skeptical of it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. Zeller.

Mr. ZELLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring a point to your thoughts about this matter, as a veteran of the Korean War and World War II.

Let us take some simple mathematics. Let us take 400,000 Vietnam vets and let us divide that figure into the \$500,000 we are talking about. We are talking about \$1.25 a vet. These fellows are worth a million dollars apiece, and here we are talking about a measly \$1.25. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves if we vote against this bill.

And another point that bothers me is this: I have not heard much noise about the closing of all the hospitals

where they need the help. Take a look at Valley Forge and some of the other areas. Take a look at the basket cases. I get down there quite often.

Let us think it over. We are talking about \$1.25 per vet. Let us give them a million dollars apiece. Why talk about a lousy \$1.25. Let us vote for it and get it over with.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Armstrong, Mr. McCue.

Mr. McCUE. Mr. Speaker, I think we are all agreed as to the patriotism of the Vietnam veterans as well as the veterans of other wars.

I think the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the General Assembly have a history of attempting to help rehabilitate the veterans. This has been evident in the bonuses and in the various education supplements. However, I think that we should determine whether or not what we are doing is actually helping the veteran.

I was fortunate to have been a member of the special committee in the last legislature which held hearings around the state. As a result of those hearings, various pieces of legislation were offered. Many of them have been enacted into law.

However, as I understand this proposal, this does nothing directly for the veteran. As I understand it, this is to set up information centers in armories.

The armories of Pennsylvania are used primarily for the Pennsylvania National Guard for their housing, the storage of their equipment, their training and their education. I understand that many of the armories of Pennsylvania are rather old buildings. They are in need of maintenance and many of them are inadequate for further use.

I understand that this provision also would have a completely new payroll, a new bureaucracy, if you will, and their sole function would be that when a veteran comes in, they would tell him, well, now you go down to the county courthouse to the veterans' office or you go to the United States Veterans' Administration Office or you go to the PHEAA or you go to the unemployment service or you go from one place to another. In other words, this would be strictly a duplication of existing services.

Now in our county governments there is at the present time a civilian veterans' officer in each county. I can only speak directly of the office in my county. I have been familiar with it for as long as I have been active in the county, some 30 years. I know that this is an active office. It has done a good job, and is doing a good job today. Veterans are directed to this office, and this office advises these veterans and the veterans' widows and the veterans' children of their rights, fills out the forms and helps them obtain their benefits.

It has been said that the present generation of veterans of the Vietnam War, being a divisive war, are perhaps disillusioned. I would think that it would be easier to get such a veteran to go to a civilian agency in the public courthouse where he could obtain this information than to go into a military setup, like a military post or an armory, to seek this help.

I ask the rhetorical question, how does this veteran, who does not know what his rights are, know that he could go to a military armory to find out what his civilian rights are?

With all due respect to the gentleman who has offered this amendment, and certainly with due respect to the

veterans—and I give my great admiration to them—I think this expenditure of money would do nothing whatsoever to help the veterans. All it would do would be to increase the payroll and bureaucracy of this Commonwealth.

For that reason, I would urge the defeat of this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berks, Mr. LaMarca.

Mr. LaMARCA. Mr. Speaker, I am not here to particularly recite my misdeeds during the war or even recount some of the tales, but I would like to point out to this House that regardless of the fact of whether we are just setting up information centers or not, I sat in this House for 9 years and year after year I saw moneys going to state universities and to state-related universities where each and every man in this House knew there were a bunch of long-haired professors who would have office hours every afternoon, teaching kids how not to have to go to Vietnam. I never heard a voice raised in this House. The only thing which was raised, year after year, was more money for those same "long-hairs" to coach kids how to avoid the draft.

Mr. Speaker, without getting patriotic, without waving any flag and without any baloney, I think it is simple. If it is an information center, if it helps, if it is a lousy half million dollars, then we can afford to spend it and we can afford to spend it without this haranguing and hassling. We did not hassle when those moneys went to coach kids how not to go to Vietnam. The very least we can do now is help them maybe to adjust themselves, since they did have the guts to go. All the haranguing over a half million dollars can go on for an hour.

If every member here wants to get up and recite his war record and he wants to wave his veterans' organizations, that is fine. But I think all we need to do is put our money where our mouth is and that will speak for our record.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Shuman.

Mr. SHUMAN. I am surely not against the veteran, but we did not talk about this thing much at all, as far as the membership of this House goes.

But from my figuring, we are going to pay \$40,000. We figure that that money can go for other causes which will much better help the veteran rather than for those telephone receptionists for 6 months. It is not quite realistic.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. MURTHA and SHUMAN and were as follows:

## YEAS—93

Arthuris	Fryer	Martino	Savitt
Barber	Gallagher	McGraw	Scanlon
Bellommi	Geister	McMonagle	Schmitt
Bennett	Gelfand	Morris	Shane
Berkes	Gillette	Mullen, M. P.	Shephamer
Berson	Gleason	Murtha	Shelton
Bixler	Greenfield	Musto	Shuprik
Blackwell	Hammock	Myers	Stout
Bonetto	Hassay	Novak	Sullivan
Brunner	Homer	O'Brien	Tayoun
Caputo	Hutchinson, A.	Oliver	Toll
Comer	Irvic	Perry	Trusio
Davis, D. M.	Itkin	Petrarca	Vallcenti
DeMedio	Johnson, J.	Pievsky	Vann
Dicarlo	Kelly, A. P.	Prendergast	Walsh, J. T.

Dombrowski	Kolter	Rappaport	Walsh, T. P.
Doyle	Kowalskyshyn	Renwick	Wargo
Dreibelbita	LaMarca	Rhodes	Williams
Early	Laudadio	Richardson	Wise
Eckensberger	Laughlin	Rieger	Wojdak
Engelhart	Letterman	Ritter	Yahner
Fee	Lincoln	Romanelli	Zeller
Fenrich	Mandinio	Ruggero	Zwickl
Fineman			

## NAYS—100

Anderson, J. H.	Grieco	McCurdy	Smith, I.
Beren	Halverson	McGinnis	Spencer
Bittle	Hamilton, J. H.	Melius	Stahl
Brandt	Harrier	Miller, M. E.	Taddonio
Burkhardt	Haskell	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Thomas
Burns	Hayes, D. S.	Noye	Turner
Butera	Hayes, S. E.	O'Connell	Ustynowski
Byerly	Hepford	Pancoast	Vipond
Cassat	Hill	Parker, H. S.	Wagner
Crawford	Hopkins	Perri	Weidner
Dager	Hutchinson, W.	Piper	Wells
Davis, R.	Jones	Pitts	Westerberg
Deverter	Kahle	Polite	Whittlesey
Dionisi	Katz	Rowe	Wilson
Dorr	Kelly, J. B.	Ruane	Wilt, R. W.
Dorsey	Kennedy	Ryan	Wilt, W. W.
Fawcett	Kestet	Saboom	Worrlow
Fischer	Kistler	Scheaffer	Wright
Foor	Klingsman	Schulze	Yohn
Foster, A.	Knepper	Scirica	Zearfoss
Foster, W.	Kuse	Seltzer	Zimmerman
Frankenburg	Lehr	Semaphoff	Zord
Gallen	Lynch, Frank	Shuman	
Geesey	Maloney	Smith, C.	Lee, Speaker
Gekas	McClatchy	Smith, E.	
Gleason	McCue		

## NOT VOTING—10

Checchio	Gring	Ronninger	Vacas
Fox	Lederer	Salvatore	Volpe
Goodman	Malady		

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. SHUPNIK requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 17, by inserting between lines 6 and 7:

\* \* \*

For the operation, maintenance and administration of the State medical and surgical hospitals \_\_\_\_\_  
[3,500,000] 7,000,000

In addition to this amount, all income and all moneys not subject to refund and collected at the State General Hospitals or received from the Federal Government or from any other source and paid into the General Fund of the State Treasury under existing laws are hereby appropriated out of the General Fund to the State General Hospitals for the same purpose.

\* \* \*

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Luzerne, Mr. Shupnik.

Mr. SHUPNIK. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is SA. It changes the appropriations to the general state hospitals from \$3.5 million to \$7 million. It actually restores to the appropriation the same amount of money which these hospitals received last year.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lebanon, Mr. Seltzer.

Mr. SELTZER. Mr. Speaker, the subject of state general hospitals and whether or not the Commonwealth

should continue to fund them has been before us each year for many years past, and it is again before us.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has tried very diligently, I believe—at least the Governor's Office has—to get the boards of trustees of these hospitals to attempt to get these hospitals on a paying basis. When I say "paying basis," I mean from the moneys they collect from their patients, most of which are through third parties—Blue Cross, Blue Shield, private carriers, Medicare, Pennsycare and all the others—they try to get the augmentations to meet the costs of operating these state hospitals.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, this General Assembly appropriated \$1.5 million to do this. That was the amount of money which was requested by the Governor. Sometime during the year, the Budget Office determined that these various boards of directors of these state general hospitals had not cooperated with the plan which was attempting to be instituted by the Governor. They did not increase their fees, and again, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of which would have been paid by third parties.

Subsequently then, a deficiency or supplemental appropriation bill was passed. I recall—and I think most of you members recall—the vehement arguments which were presented against that supplementary appropriation bill. Mr. Speaker, it was ironic. I can recall I stood before my caucus and I defended that increase at the time, because I thought the Governor was attempting to bring these institutions on a current basis.

Mr. Speaker, again this year I think the Governor was attempting to do this, but it has come to light today, as this amendment to meet a deficit is again before us, a deficit which I feel and the facts show is not trying to be eliminated at the local level.

I stand here in opposition to this amendment today, Mr. Speaker, because the facts which came to me today were that no one knows what the collections are as of date in this fiscal year. The various boards have not requested permission to raise their fees from the Cost of Living Council as they were directed by the Governor to do last year. These hospitals have not made an attempt to put their house in order. Mr. Speaker, I think they have had more warning than many other departments or agencies of this government have ever had, and it is about time this General Assembly stands up and means what it has been saying.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the members of this House to vote against this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Luzerne, Mr. Shupnik.

Mr. SHUPNIK. First of all, Mr. Speaker, many of these hospitals have requested an increase. You know and I know, Mr. Speaker, that it is a very slow process getting an increase from the Federal Government.

Number two—

Mr. SELTZER. Mr. Speaker, if I may interrupt the gentleman, if the gentleman will permit himself to be interrupted, I want to put the record straight. They have not requested an increase.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Luzerne, Mr. Shupnik.

Mr. SHUPNIK. Mr. Speaker, let us keep this at a low key. I came here to help people—individuals, children, older people and the indigent.



Mr. Speaker, I am a little perturbed when he comes here—I did not come here to try to pull a fast one—and there is an amendment here for \$4.5 million. I made inquiries in regard to it and I found out it was \$3.5 million.

But I am going to ask you, Mr. Speaker, how many nursing homes in this state, or in this Commonwealth, are being closed down now, right now? In one of my hospitals, one of their biggest debts is the fact that they have taken in a number of people from these nursing homes and they have no place to put them. Valley Crest up there has no more room for them. They need hospital care. What are we supposed to do with them?

One of the biggest reasons you had a deficiency in money for hospitals is the fact that they lost around 14,000 patient-care days for these people. When you lose that amount of money, you are bound to have a deficiency.

But right now, with these people coming in from the nursing homes, what are we to do with them? If you can tell me, I would like to tell these hospitals. We need it and we need it badly.

I ask for a "yes" vote on this amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lebanon, Mr. Seltzer.

Mr. SELTZER. Mr. Speaker, I think the subject has been adequately discussed, not today necessarily, but last year and the year before and the year before.

The members of this House certainly know that when the general hospitals in their areas are meeting those deficits, as they are meeting them every year, they are not coming to the Commonwealth to meet them; they are doing it at a local level with local funds.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dauphin, Mr. Zimmerman.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot conceive of this House increasing this appropriation to \$3.5 million for state general hospitals, when at the same time we are closing mental hospitals for people who really need it in Pennsylvania.

This certainly does not make sense. I do not see how anybody can vote for this amendment, when we need it in so many other places.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lackawanna, Mr. Wargo.

Mr. WARGO. Mr. Speaker, very briefly, in reply to Mr. Seltzer, in regard to the Scranton State Hospital, their total operating budget was \$5.11 million in 1973. Their total collections were \$4,239,548, which leads me to believe that they are making an effort to be self-sustaining.

To make a profit in an institution, certainly your rate of occupancy should be at least 85 percent. The Scranton State Hospital operates at 64 percent. As Mr. Shupnik said, we are absorbing some of the patients from our nursing homes.

I agree that eventually these hospitals must be phased out, but at this particular time, I think it is imperative that this legislature at this point support this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lebanon, Mr. Seltzer.

Mr. SELTZER. Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting these hospitals be phased out; I am suggesting these hospitals be continued. But I am also suggesting that the deficit

be made up locally like the rest of the general hospitals in Pennsylvania make up theirs.

Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that in the gentleman's hospital in Scranton, the anticipated revenues this year are less than the anticipated revenues in the prior year.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lackawanna, Mr. Wargo.

Mr. WARGO. Mr. Speaker, very briefly, we have a situation in Lackawanna County similar to perhaps Luzerne County, wherein the ambulance people are instructed to take patients, if they have money, to the Community Medical Center or the Mercy Hospital, but if they have nothing, take them to the Scranton State Hospital. Once again here we are helping indigent people.

I urge support of the amendment.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. SHUPNIK and SELTZER and were as follows:

## YEAS—99

Arthur	Fryer	McGraw	Scanlon
Barber	Gallagher	McMonagle	Schmitt
Bellomini	Gelsler	Morris	Semanoff
Bennett	Golfand	Mullen, M. P.	Shane
Berkes	Gillette	Murtha	Shelburne
Berson	Gleason	Musto	Shelton
Bider	Greenfield	Myers	Shupnik
Blackwell	Hammock	Novak	Stout
Bonetto	Hassay	O'Brien	Sullivan
Brunner	Homer	Oliver	Toll
Caputo	Hutchinson, A.	Perry	Trusio
Cecchio	Hutchinson, W.	Petrarca	Ustynoski
Comer	Irvig	Pievsky	Valicenti
Davis, D. M.	Itkin	Prendergast	Vann
DeMedio	Kelly, A. P.	Rappaport	Vipond
Dicarlo	Klingaman	Renwick	Volpe
Dombrowski	Koller	Rhodes	Walsh, J. T.
Doyle	Kowalshyn	Richardson	Walsh, T. P.
Dreibelbis	LaMarea	Rieger	Wargo
Early	Laudadio	Ritter	Williams
Eckensberger	Laughlin	Romanelli	Wojcik
Engelhart	Letterman	Ruane	Yahner
Fec	Lincoln	Ruggiero	Zeller
Fenrich	Mandertino	Saloom	Zwick
Fiseman	Martino	Savitt	

## NAYS—94

Anderson, J. H.	Gekas	McCue	Smith, L.
Beren	Gleason	McCurdy	Spencer
Bittle	Gricco	McGinnis	Stahl
Brandt	Halverson	McBus	Taddio
Burkardt	Hamilton, J. H.	Miller, M. E.	Thomas
Burns	Haskell	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Turner
Butera	Hayes, D. S.	Noye	Vacca
Eyerly	Hayes, S. E.	O'Connell	Wagner
Cessar	Hepford	Pancoast	Weidner
Crawford	Hill	Parker, H. S.	Wells
Dager	Hopkins	Perri	Westerberg
Davis, R.	Jones	Piper	Whittlesey
Deverter	Kable	Pitts	Wilson
Dintani	Katz	Polte	Wilt, R. W.
Dorr	Kelly, J. B.	Renninger	Wilt, W. W.
Dorsey	Kennedy	Howe	Worrlow
Fawcett	Kester	Ryan	Wright
Fischer	Kistler	Scheaffer	Yohn
Foor	Knepper	Schulze	Zehn
Poster, A.	Kusse	Seirica	Zimmerman
Poster, W.	Lehr	Seltzer	Zord
Frankenburg	Lynch, Frank	Shuman	
Gallen	Maloney	Smith, C.	Lee,
Geesey	McClatchy	Smith, E.	Speaker

## NOT VOTING—10

Fox	Harrier	Malady	Tayoun
Goodman	Johnson, J.	Salvatore	Wise
Gring	Lederer		

So the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. ECKENSBERGER requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 13, line 6 by striking out "6,760,000" and inserting: 7,564,000

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. Eckensberger.

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, the amendment which I am proposing would provide an additional \$804,000 for the administration of the Bureau of Drug Control and Drug Law Enforcement lodged with the Department of Justice.

The bureau, as of the moment, has not received any money for the 1973-1974 fiscal year, and this \$804,000 would be in addition to the \$1 million which is presently appropriated, or will be appropriated, by Senate bill No. 1058.

A budget of a million dollars will simply not support the personnel costs of the existing staff of the bureau. Projected personnel costs for existing staff are \$1.122 million for 85 existing positions. However, to be effective in the continuing fight against drug abuse, the bureau cannot stand still. Therefore, the bureau has requested 20 new drug investigators and 17 new clerk-steno positions. These 37 new positions would cost \$182,000 for half of the year, beginning January 1 through June 30, 1974. In other words, the total personnel cost is projected at \$1.304 million, or \$304,000 more than Senate bill No. 1058 presently provides. That is simply for employing sufficient personnel.

Moreover, with the establishment of eight regional offices to combat drug abuse and the operation support of 100 state police assigned to those offices, total operating cost is projected at \$520,000. An estimated \$70,000 to equip these offices brings the total budgetary needs to \$1.894 million, less the \$90,000 which we would obtain from the Federal law enforcement assistant administration funds.

So, therefore, the total budget for the Bureau of Drug Control for fiscal 1973-1974 would be \$1.804 million of state funds.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I need spell out to you the problems which are brought about directly and indirectly by drug abuse. The money would be well spent. I urge everyone to support this amendment.

Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to interrogate the sponsor of the amendment, if he will consent.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. Eckensberger, consent to interrogation?

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I shall.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, you refer to 20 new positions. Could you tell me how those positions are selected, and whether or not there are any guidelines or any procedures which the selectees would go through before they are hired, if you know? You may not know.

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. I do not know, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to get some information. Apparently, the gentleman may not have the information and might not be expected to know. I do not want to subject him to that.

I assume I am correct, Mr. Speaker. It has to do with the selection of personnel and the procedure which the new trainees go through, promotions and all that.

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. I do not have immediately available whatever regulations may be in effect with regard to the selection of personnel.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will not subject you to that if you do not know.

Maybe you do know if there are any Federal funds or guidelines connected with this program.

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. There are Federal funds, as I pointed out in my remarks, in the amount of \$90,000 which would be provided for the program. I assume, but, again, I do not have them immediately available, there are certain regulations that must be complied with in order to qualify for those funds.

Mr. WILLIAMS. To your knowledge, is there anything in the Federal regulations regarding minority employment in this program?

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. I again state that I do not have those regulations immediately before me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The only reason I asked you that is because there are some problems which came to my attention. I thought maybe you could answer those questions. I am sorry I had to subject you to that.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. ECKENSBERGER and SELTZER and were as follows:

YEAS—94

Arthurs	Finneman	Manderino	Ruggiero
Barber	Fischer	Martino	Savitt
Bellommi	Fryer	McCraw	Scanlon
Bennett	Gallagher	McMonagle	Schmitt
Berkes	Geisler	Morris	Shane
Berson	Gelfand	Mullen, M. P.	Shehnamer
Bixler	Gillett	Murtha	Shelton
Blackwell	Gleeson	Musto	Shupnik
Bonetto	Greenfield	Myers	Stout
Brunner	Hammock	Novak	Sullivan
Caputo	Homer	O'Brien	Toll
Comer	Hutchinson, A.	Oliver	Trusio
Crawford	Irvis	Perry	Valicenti
Davis, D. M.	Itkin	Petrarca	Vann
DeMedio	Johnson, J.	Pievsky	Walsh, J. T.
DiCarlo	Kelly, A. P.	Prendergast	Walsh, T. P.
Dombrowski	Kester	Rappaport	Wargo
Doyle	Kolter	Renwick	Williams
Dreibelbitz	Kowalshyn	Rhodes	Wise
Early	LaMarca	Richardson	Wojdak
Eckensberger	Laudatto	Rieger	Yahner
Engelhart	Laughlin	Ritter	Zeller
Fee	Letterman	Romanelli	Zwickl
Fenrich	Lincoln		

NAYS—102

Anderson, J. H.	Halverson	McGinnis	Spencer
Beren	Hamilton, J. H.	Mobus	Stahl
Bittle	Harricr	Miller, M. E.	Taddonio
Brandt	Hasay	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Thomas
Burkardt	Haskell	Noye	Turner
Burns	Hayes, D. S.	O'Connell	Ustynoski
Butera	Hayes, S. E.	Pancoast	Vacca
Eyerly	Hepford	Parker, H. S.	Vipond
Cessar	Hill	Perri	Volpe
Cheechio	Hopkins	Piper	Wagner
Dager	Hutchinson, W.	Pitts	Weidner
Davis, R.	Jones	Polite	Wells
Deverter	Kable	Reuninger	Westerberg
Dinanti	Katz	Rowe	Whittlesey

Dorr	Kelly, J. B.	Ruane	Wilson
Dorsey	Kennedy	Ryan	Wilt, R. W.
Fawcett	Kistler	Saloom	Witt, W. W.
Foor	Klingaman	Scheaffer	Worrlow
Foster, A.	Knepper	Schulze	Wright
Foster, W.	Kusse	Scirica	Yohn
Frankenburg	Lchr	Seltzer	Zearfoss
Gallen	Lynch, Frank	Semanoff	Zimmerman
Geesey	Maloney	Shuman	Zord
Gekas	McClatchy	South, C.	
Gleason	McCue	Smith, E.	Lee,
Grieco	McCurdy	Smith, L.	Speaker

NOT VOTING—7

Fox	Gring	Malady	Tayoun
Goodman	Lederer	Salvatore	

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

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

Mr. BERKES requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 17, by inserting between lines 12 and 13: General administration of mental health and mental retardation programs ..... 6,000,000

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

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BUTERA. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUTERA. Has not this amendment been considered once today?

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment which is being offered by the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Berkes, is, in effect, the same amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. McMonagle.

It is, in effect, an increase in the general appropriation bill of \$6 million.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Berkes.

Mr. BERKES. Mr. Speaker, that interpretation is just not so.

In the amendment which was presented by the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. McMonagle, he was adding \$6 million to the amount of money which was specifically line-itemed for community services for the mentally ill and mentally retarded.

In this amendment—for the benefit of the members of the House, it is the last one distributed—we are adding \$6 million for the purposes of general administration.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that during my interrogation of the gentleman from Lebanon, I asked him whether or not the funds in that previous amendment could be used for the purposes of keeping Harrisburg Hospital and Byberry and other institutions open to their full strength. His answer, if I understood it, was that that specific item could not, because it was specifically earmarked and line-itemed for community services.

That is why I prepared another amendment, so that we can use these funds to keep open the facilities at Harrisburg State Hospital and Byberry and others which are threatened with closing.

This is a different amendment in that it is not specifically earmarked for community services and is for general, mental health purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. BUTERA. Mr. Speaker, I think what we are really arguing about is a matter of semantics. We are playing with words. We obviously considered the same amendment earlier today, and I think the rules prohibit it to be considered twice. I object to it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Berkes.

Mr. BERKES. Mr. Speaker, it is not semantics and it is not playing with words. It is correcting what was pointed out to me in previous debate. It is trying to do what we would really like to do, and that is, provide additional funds for general purposes in the mental health and mental retardation programs, which could be used for the very programs which are threatened with being closed and which, under Senate bill No. 1058, will remain threatened with being closed.

Mr. Speaker, it is obviously different. It is a new line; it is completely different.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has ruled that the amendment is in violation of rule No. 27 of the House rules, together with section 457 of Mason's Legislative Manual.

The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. FINEMAN. Will the Speaker repeat that last statement?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has indicated that the amendment is in violation of rule No. 27 of the House, together with section 457, paragraph 2, of Mason's Manual.

Mr. FINEMAN. Will the Speaker read that section to the House for its benefit?

The SPEAKER. "To prevent abuse of the motion to reconsider, the same question cannot be reconsidered a second time. When a motion has been so changed as to present a substantially different proposition, it can be reconsidered again in the new form."

Mr. FINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have a considerably different proposition before us this time, and there, in fact, has been no play on words, as suggested by the majority party. We are not playing with words at all. I am suggesting the majority party is playing with the rules of this House, and you are trying to flex them and turn them and change them any way you want in order to suit that point of view which you want to make known.

The constraints which appear in the spending of this money in this amendment are entirely different—

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. FINEMAN. I am not through, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RYAN. I am asking a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, and I think, as a matter of courtesy, I am entitled to interrupt you for that purpose and as a matter of rule, in addition to a matter of courtesy.

Mr. FINEMAN. You are big with courtesy.

Mr. RYAN. That is right.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Ryan. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. RYAN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that if any member of this House disagrees with the Chair, he appeals the ruling of the Chair. Is that not correct?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RYAN. Why does not Mr. Fineman do that?

Mr. FINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not tell you how to run yourself on this floor of this House and do not you tell me, because any member—

Mr. RYAN. You do not have to tell me how to run myself. You tend your own store.

Mr. FINEMAN. Any member has the right to make his point of view known before taking an appeal, and I am making my point of view known.

The constraints which appear in the spending of the money in this amendment are entirely different from the constraints which appear in the first amendment that was defeated.

What really is taking place here is that—

### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Ryan. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. RYAN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Fineman, accurate when he says he is entitled to make his thoughts known prior to making his motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair?

The SPEAKER. For the information of the gentleman, until the ruling of the Chair is actually contested, the subject matter which is under discussion would be out of order.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I would then respectfully request that Mr. Fineman appeal the ruling of the Chair and then go on with his speech.

Mr. FINEMAN. That makes a whole lot of difference. That is a real important suggestion you just made.

### RULING OF CHAIR APPEALED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. FINEMAN. I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

May I talk now, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Is there a second? The Chair sees several seconds.

The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. FINEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What you are doing now merely reflects your concern about the possibility of this mental health amendment finally getting put into this bill. If you were not concerned about it, you would not be resorting to these kinds of parliamentary tactics to try to block a vote on it.

If you have the votes, do not be afraid to put them on the board, but let us get the members expressing their views about this amendment on record. There were at least 12 members on your side of the aisle who had cast an affirmative vote for this amendment. Those votes were holding, until there was a march up and down the aisle by the leadership on the other side showing us once again democracy in action, as they said last week. If you are not afraid of your votes, put them on the board and stop trying to block this by a parliamentary trick.

Mr. RYAN. Give us a chance to vote it then.

Mr. FINEMAN. That is exactly what I want you to do, to vote the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Berkes.

Mr. BERKES. Just a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, we heard the gentleman from Dauphin, Mr. Zimmerman, make a very eloquent plea here in opposition to one of the amendments providing additional funds for general hospitals, in which he said he would much rather approve voting for mental health money. We want to give him that chance.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Ryan. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. RYAN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RYAN. Is the gentleman speaking on what is before the House now?

Mr. BERKES. Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RYAN. And that is the appeal of the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. BERKES. That is the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that some people want an opportunity to vote once again on this matter of whether or not we are properly funding mental health programs. Mr. Zimmerman expressed himself very well, and maybe we ought to give him that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, this is a different proposition, and it is different for several reasons. I mentioned before and I just want to repeat it: Harrisburg State Hospital has been cut back and, under the previous amendment, that would not have been—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

### POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berks, Mr. Gallen. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GALLEN. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GALLEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is not speaking on the motion at all.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman is not speaking on the motion.

The only issue before the House is whether or not the ruling of the Chair is correct.

Mr. BERKES. Mr. Speaker, in line with—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

### POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Rappaport. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. RAPPAPORT. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAPPAPORT. I thank the majority whip for the courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding—and I did not

want to raise this before, until the Speaker had made another ruling—it is customary in this House, on an appeal from the ruling of the Chair, that another member be asked to preside during that procedure. I raise that respectfully to the Chair. I had waited—

The SPEAKER. The Parliamentarian is trying to find the reason for it, but the custom, as I recall it, is that the Speaker does remove himself from the Chair while the ruling is being appealed.

#### MR. SELTZER REQUESTED TO PRESIDE

The SPEAKER. The Chair requests the gentleman from Lebanon, Mr. Seltzer, to preside specially for that purpose.

#### THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (H. Jack Seltzer) IN THE CHAIR

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, since you are a new Speaker, who really has the floor right now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. You have the floor, Mr. Gallagher. The Chair has recognized you.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I find the Speaker's decision is inadequate. Since he has made that decision, we might need the Speaker at a microphone, so he can answer the questions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Gallagher, repeat his statement?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I will repeat it.

I thought the former Speaker would like to hear the question I will raise to him, since he made the decision that the amendments were identical and, therefore, they could not be offered at this time.

Amendment No. 1 is an amendment to Senate bill No. 1058, printer's No. 1563. It is written as follows: "Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 17, line 8 by striking out '3,600,000' and inserting 9,600,000."

The amendment offered by Mr. Berkes is an amendment to Senate bill No. 1058, printer's No. 1563: "Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 17, by inserting between lines 12 and 13" and the language continues—"General administration of mental health and mental retardation programs . . . 6,000,000." That is completely different from the one which was originally offered.

On that basis, unless the Speaker can show me how his ruling is in order, I think the House should have to find itself voting against the Speaker's decision.

Will the Speaker want to answer that question or should we just try to fabricate it ourselves?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker has ruled that the amendment is not a proper amendment under the rule he cited. That rule has been appealed by a member of this House.

The question before this House is, Will the House sustain the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, in the past—and I am going back to 1959 and 1960—when appeals were made on the Speaker's decision, the Speaker who made such decision came down here on the floor and answered the questions and supported his position.

The question, why we oppose the Speaker's appeal, is that we do not see it the same way as he sees it or his

Parliamentarian sees it. The amendments are not identical; they are completely different.

So for that reason, we oppose the decision of the Speaker, unless he can show us some way they are identical.

I do not want to listen to the rhetoric from Mr. Ryan that we are trying to do something unusual. All we are trying to do is do things right, Mr. Speaker. We are not trying to play games.

You know, if you have the votes—and you are rather cocky over there—why do you not just let everybody do their right thing and then put the votes up. But if you want to go into rhetoric, all I want to do is go to reality and say, you show us they are identical amendments. You show us somehow, and you cannot show us that.

So, Mr. Speaker, unless the Speaker or the Parliamentarian can give us the reasons, other than you might be afraid that the votes will be up there in favor of this amendment, I think the House will have to, unfortunately, oppose the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Ryan. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the very question that Mr. Gallagher is raising is the question that is before the House today. The Chair made a ruling. He disagrees with the ruling of the Chair; Mr. Fineman disagreed with the ruling of the Chair; an appeal has been taken of that ruling. It is as simple as that. We vote whether to sustain the Speaker or to overrule the Speaker.

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

Mr. FINEMAN. What the ruling of the Speaker, in effect, says is this: If, under the Department of Welfare—to simplify this situation—there is \$1,000 being appropriated for the entire department, and it is broken down into program A, line item \$500, program B, line item \$500, and then someone offers an amendment to increase the \$500 in program B to \$700 and that amendment is defeated, then the Speaker's ruling is, in essence, a ruling which would prevent a member from subsequently offering a \$200 amendment to program A.

The two programs are entirely different. The constraints on each are different. What Mr. Berkes is doing, although it is true that it is the same amount of money, is taking that money and trying to put it into a different line item. In no way can that be construed to be the same amendment.

If the first amendment passed, the moneys that could be spent under that amendment would be entirely different from the fashion of which the moneys could be spent if the second amendment passed. They are two different things.

How anyone could have made the ruling that it is the same amendment is just beyond me. It is stretching the rules beyond any proportion of reasonableness. It is beyond the bounds of intelligence to make such a ruling. It makes a farce out of these rules.

The rules are applicable equally to everybody. They are not your rules; they are not Republican rules. They are Republican rules and Democratic rules, and they were put in there for us to abide by, all of us.

I say to you that it destroys the credibility of having rules at all, if you are going to mold them and bend them

just to suit your point of view. To do so would be to run contrary to what is the clear, logical explanation of those rules. They are two different things.

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

Mr. BERKES. Will the majority leader consent to interrogation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the majority leader consent to interrogation?

Mr. BUTERA. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BERKES. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my interrogation is to try to pinpoint the difference between the two amendments, and, hopefully, we will be able to do that.

In Mr. McMonagle's amendment, what was done was that the line item for community services for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded was changed from \$3.6 million to \$9.6 million.

Mr. Speaker, in your opinion, does that item of community services permit the expenditure of funds for Harrisburg State Hospital, for example?

Mr. BUTERA. Mr. Speaker, I have already expressed myself on this issue, and the gentleman can make whatever point he is trying to make, without interrogation.

Mr. BERKES. Are you refusing to be interrogated, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. BUTERA. Mr. Speaker, I will consent to be interrogated on any new matter, on any matter where facts are attempted to be gleaned which are already not known to everybody.

We know the gentleman's position which he just stated, and we will go on to the next speaker.

I think we have misused the interrogation method in this House all the time and I think it is ridiculous. I just do not feel like participating in it.

Mr. BERKES. Are you agreeing then with my facts?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman yield?

### QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Vann. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. VANN. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VANN. Mr. Speaker, we convened at 1 o'clock. It is now almost 7 o'clock. I am wondering if the Speaker can tell all of us, not just me, what the procedure will be from here. Are we going to work right through—it is apparent we are going to be here all night—or are we going to break to get something to eat?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has no knowledge of the answer to his question, but by the time this subject is completed, I would hope to have an answer for the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Berkes. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BERKES. Mr. Speaker, I never yielded the floor. I was interrogating the majority leader. I just want to make the point, and then we can get on with the vote. He suggested that I make the point instead of him helping me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is entitled to be heard and may continue.

Mr. BERKES. Okay, so the point is that Mr. McMonagle's amendment would not have permitted the use of any of the new funds for Harrisburg State Hospital, the problems there, or at Byberry or Polk State Hospitals, or any of the other places that do not depend upon community services for the solution to their problems.

My amendment, which we are now offering, would do that and would permit those funds to be used for Polk State Hospital and for Harrisburg State Hospital and Byberry. That is the difference between the two amendments.

I ask that the ruling of the Chair be overruled.

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

Mr. BUTERA. Mr. Speaker, the contrary point is that this is a rather substantial appropriation, a total appropriation, to those programs in which the department is given very broad discretion. They can take money which is not so earmarked either way, either with Mr. McMonagle's amendment, with our amendment, with Mr. Berkes' amendment, and divert it however they wish to fund the very necessary programs which we are all discussing. I think that is what makes them the same.

It is just so clear that I do not see any sense in dragging this on and on, because we have a number of amendments to go and we have a number of nonpreferred appropriations to go. I think everybody knows the positions very well. Let us vote the issue.

Mr. BERKES. Mr. Speaker, that is just not so.

The Speaker pro tempore said before that you cannot take money from a line item that is specifically earmarked for a line item and spread it anyplace. That is what this gentleman—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Berkes, yield?

Mr. BERKES. Yes.

### POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Checchio. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CHECCHIO. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHECCHIO. Mr. Speaker, we are going around in a circle here. The matter has been debated. We have a motion on the floor, duly seconded. I suggest we get to vote on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman raises an excellent point.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Berkes. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BERKES. I just want to make sure that that point was made, that the majority leader was incorrect, that you cannot take items that are line items and use them anywhere else.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman yield?

The point was well made. In fact, it was so well made that the House—

Mr. BERKES. Thank you.

**POINT OF ORDER**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tioga, Mr. Spencer. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SPENCER. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPENCER. Inasmuch as a lot has been heard about adhering to the rules today, I would like to hereby invoke paragraph 3 of rule 10, whereby a speaker may not speak more than twice on any issue, with the exception of the majority and the minority leaders.

Mr. FINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is okay for you to prostitute the rules anyway you want to to suit your convenience, but it is not okay when we trespass against the rules, is it?

On the question,

Will the House sustain the ruling of the Chair?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. FINE-MAN and BUTERA and were as follows:

**YEAS—100**

Anderson, J. H.	Gleason	Maloney	Smith, C.
Beren	Grieco	McClatchy	Smith, E.
Bittie	Halverson	McCurly	Smith, I.
Brendt	Hamilton, J. H.	McGinnis	Spencer
Burkardt	Harrier	Mebus	Stahl
Burns	Hesay	Miller, M. E.	Taddo
Buters	Haskell	Mittler, M. E., Jr.	Thomas
Eyerly	Hayes, D. S.	Noye	Turner
Cassar	Hayes, S. E.	O'Connell	Ustynoski
Checchio	Hepford	Pancost	Vacca
Crawford	Hill	Packer, H. S.	Vipond
Dager	Hopkins	Perri	Volpe
Davis, R.	Hutchinson, W.	Piper	Wagner
Deverter	Jones	Pitts	Weidner
Dimitri	Kahle	Polite	Wells
Dorr	Katz	Renninger	Westerberg
Dorscy	Kelly, J. B.	Rowe	Whittlesey
Fawcett	Kennedy	Ruane	Wilson
Foor	Kester	Ryan	Will, R. W.
Foster, A.	Kistler	Saloom	Will, W. W.
Foster, W.	Klingaman	Scheaffer	Worrlow
Frankenburg	Knepper	Schulze	Yohn
Gallen	Kusse	Seirica	Zearfos
Geehey	Lehr	Seltzer	Zimmerman
Gekas	Lynch, Frank	Semanoff	Zord

**NAYS—95**

Arthurs	Fischer	McCue	Schmitt
Barber	Fryer	McCraw	Shane
Bellomini	Gallagher	McMonagle	Shephamer
Bennett	Goisler	Morris	Shelton
Berkes	Gelfand	Mullen, M. P.	Shuman
Berson	Gillette	Murtha	Shuppik
Bixler	Gleason	Musto	Stout
Blackwell	Greenfield	Myers	Sullivan
Bonetto	Hammock	Novak	Tayoun
Brunner	Homer	O'Brien	Toll
Caputo	Hutchinson, A.	Oliver	Trusio
Comer	Irvic	Perry	Valleona
Davis, D. M.	Itkin	Petrarca	Vann
DeMedio	Johnson, J.	Plevsky	Walsh, J. T.
Dicarlo	Kelly, A. P.	Rappaport	Walsh, T. P.
Dombrowski	Kulter	Reinick	Wargo
Doyle	Kowalshyn	Rhodes	Williams
Dreifelbitz	LaMarea	Richardson	Wise
Early	Laudadio	Rieger	Wojdak
Eckensberger	Laughlin	Ritter	Wright
Englehart	Letterman	Romanelli	Yahner
Fer	Lincoln	Ruggiero	Zoller
Finrich	Mandirino	Savitt	Zwinkl
Fineman	Martino	Scanlon	

**NOT VOTING—8**

Fox	Ledcter	Prendergast	Lee,
Goodman	Malady	Salvatore	Speaker
Gring			

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

**GAVEL RETURNED TO THE SPEAKER**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair now returns the gavel to the Speaker.

**THE SPEAKER (Kenneth B. Lee) IN THE CHAIR**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mercer, Mr. Bennett.

Mr. VANN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could get an answer to my question now.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield for just one moment?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mercer, Mr. Bennett.

Mr. BENNETT. I will yield to Mr. Vann, because I was just about to try to get an answer to the question he raised, to which the interim Speaker was about to give us an answer.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not discussed the issue with the rest of the leadership of the House. The Chair would be disposed to run until around 8 o'clock and then break off and come back tomorrow.

The only admonition I give to the House is that how late we run tonight probably is going to be the determining factor of how late we run on Wednesday.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. WISE requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 10, by inserting between lines 7 and 8:

For payment into the Social Security Contribution Fund the Commonwealth's share of Federal Social Security taxes for public school employes ..... [46,500,000] 47,500,000

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lycoming, Mr. Wise.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, with that in mind, I will be as brief as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment which I am submitting would increase the appropriation for school employes' social security—that is the state's contribution—from \$46.5 million to \$47.5 million, or an increase of \$1 million.

This appropriation is a mandated obligation. The state shares 50-50 with local school districts on each school employe, and the reason we are a million dollars short at this time is because the local school districts hired more people than we figured on when we passed House bill No. 850. It is just that simple.

It is a mandated obligation, and unless we pass this amendment, we are going to have to come back next year, as every one of us here knows, and pass a deficiency appropriation bill for \$1 million. That is a foolish thing to do.

So I urge each member to vote "yes" on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lebanon, Mr. Seltzer.

Mr. SELTZER. Mr. Speaker, we have suggested the appropriation that the Governor's office has requested, and all of these are estimated amounts. If there is additional need at any time, additional appropriations are made. But from all of the information we have, the \$46.5 million is sufficient.

I ask the members to vote "no."

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. WISE and SELTZER and were as follows:

YEAS—88

Table listing names of members who voted 'Yeas' in four columns: Arthur, Fenrich, Lincoln, Romanelli; Barber, Fineman, Manderino, Ruggiero; Bellomonte, Fryer, Martino, Savitt; Bonnett, Gallagher, McGraw, Scanton; Berkes, Geister, McMonagle, Schmitt; Berson, Gelfand, Morris, Shane; Rixler, Gillette, Mullen, M. P., Shelhamer; Blackwell, Gleason, Murtha, Shupnik; Bonetto, Greenfield, Musto, Stout; Brunner, Hammock, Myers, Sullivan; Caputo, Homer, Novak, Toll; Comer, Hutchinson, A., O'Brien, Trusio; Davis, D. M., Irvis, Oliver, Valicenti; DeMedio, Hkin, Perry, Vann; Dicario, Johnson, J., Potarca, Walsh, J. T.; Dombrowski, Kelly, A. P., Flevsky, Wargo; Doyle, Koller, Rappaport, Williams; Dreifelbitz, Kowalshyn, Benwick, Wise; Early, LaMarca, Rhodes, Wojdak; Eckensberger, Laudadio, Richardson, Yahner; Englehart, Laughlin, Hiegor, Zeller; Fee, Letterman, Ritter, Zwick

NAYS—105

Table listing names of members who voted 'Nays' in four columns: Anderson, J. H., Grieco, McCurdy, Spencer; Beren, Halverson, McGinnis, Stahl; Bittle, Hamilton, J. H., McBus, Tardonto; Brandt, Harrier, Miller, M. E., Thomas; Burkardt, Hassay, Miller, M. E., Jr., Turner; Burns, Haskell, Noye, Ustyonski; Butera, Hayes, D. S., O'Connell, Vacca; Byerly, Hayes, S. E., Fancoast, Vipond; Cossaf, Hepford, Parker, H. S., Volpe; Checchio, Hill, Perri, Wagner; Crawford, Hopkins, Piper, Weidner; Dagr, Hutchinson, W., Pitta, Wells; Davis, R., Jones, Polite, Westerberg; Deverter, Kahle, Renninger, Whittlesey; Dininni, Katz, Rowe, Wilson; Dorr, Kelly, J. B., Ruane, Wilt, R. W.; Dorsey, Kennedy, Ryan, Wilt, W. W.; Fawcett, Kester, Saloom, Worrlow; Fischer, Kistler, Schoaffer, Wright; Foor, Klingaman, Schulze, Yohn; Foster, A., Knepper, Seirica, Zearloss; Foster, W., Kusse, Seltzer, Zimmerman; Frankenburg, Lehr, Semanoff, Zord; Gallen, Lynch, Frank, Shuman; Geesey, Maloney, Smith, C.; Gekas, McClatchy, Smith, E.; Gleason, McCue, Smith, L., Speaker

NOT VOTING—10

Table listing names of members who did not vote: Fox, Lederer, Salvatore, Tayoun; Goodman, Malady, Shelton, Walsh, T. P.; Gring, Prendergast

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

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

Mr. TADDONIO requested and obtained unanimous

consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 10, by inserting between lines 7 and 8:

For advance payments to participating school districts on account of their share of expenses in the establishment, acquisition, construction or improvement of or additions to the Forbes Road East Area Vocational Technical School, Allegheny County, which shall be in addition to other payments made by the Commonwealth and which shall be deducted from subsequent reimbursements made by the Commonwealth to such school districts pursuant to law on account of such establishment, acquisition, construction, improvement or addition.. 1,260,000

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westmoreland, Mr. Taddonio.

Mr. TADDONIO. Mr. Speaker, the Forbes Road East Area Vocational Technical School is in a crisis not of their own making. When they applied to the Department of Education for funds for construction of a second building, the department indicated, under DEBE 444, that they would be granted \$1.3 million more than they were actually entitled to. Based on this information, the board of Forbes went ahead and committed themselves to a bond issue and to construction.

In early spring of this year the error was discovered, and the legislators who represented the Forbes Area Vocational Technical School met with the school's board. Subsequent to this, a meeting was arranged with the Governor. At that time, the Governor said the state would borrow the money, give it to the school districts and reclaim it out of future state subsidies. This satisfied everyone.

On May 29, Mr. Connelly, the president of the Forbes Road East Board of Directors, received this letter:

Dear Mr. Connelly:

This is to assure you that it is the intention of this Department to provide additional funds to the Forbes Road East Area Vocational Technical Schools, . . . in an amount not to exceed \$1,280,000, which is necessary to complete that construction project such funds to be paid in installments beginning in July or August, 1973.

So on and so forth.

When August rolled on and no money was forthcoming, the directors got itchy and began inquiring. Finally, on September 28, over 6 months from the original meeting, they received this letter:

Dear Mr. Connelly:

We regret to advise you that we cannot advance the additional funds needed to complete the Forbes Road East Area Vocational School . . . in the amount of \$1,280,000 as we fully intended to do.

All the options available to us have been reviewed by the Department of Justice and we have been advised that there is no legal provision whereby we may advance any subsidies. The law only provides for reimbursements based on your expenditures.

So on and so forth.

The situation is this: The members' school districts



are in a bind. They have a partially completed school building and a broken promise from the state. As I feel it was the state that caused this problem, the state should resolve it. If the executive branch cannot, maybe we have to resort to the legislature. If this could be taken to a court of law, I feel the state would be held liable for damages.

I now appeal to my colleagues to help correct this problem by appropriating \$1.26 million to the Forbes Road Vo-Tech School, which would be deducted from future subsidy payments to the members' school districts. Thank you.

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

Mr. BONETTO. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to explain to the General Assembly that I am well aware of Mr. Taddonio's problem. Forbes Tech happens to be in his area and it was previously in my legislative area. We have met on several occasions on this problem and we have come to the conclusion that there are other schools in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the same situation.

I met with the Department of Education and worked up a bill which is now in the Senate, which would provide the necessary funding for all 12 schools in vocational tech that need the same type of help.

I am quite surprised that the legislator from Westmoreland County did not contact me or any of the other legislators within that district who participated in Forbes Tech. I understand there are only three members of the Republican Party who are sponsors of this amendment. The rest of us who represent that particular district were not given that opportunity.

In view of all that has happened and at the meeting on Saturday morning with the school directors of this district, we are submitting, in the Senate, a capital budget bill which would provide the necessary funding for 12 vocational schools in the Commonwealth that have the same type of situation. In view of that fact, I ask that this amendment be opposed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westmoreland, Mr. Taddonio.

Mr. TADDONIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. Bonetto, for his remarks.

First of all, I am not aware that there are other vo-tech schools in this Commonwealth which have exactly the same situation; namely, that they were promised by the state and actually proceeded with construction and have their building half completed at this stage.

The other one is regarding sponsorship. I am more than glad to welcome Mr. Bonetto and the other legislators and I would hope they would not oppose it on that kind of basis. I apologize for not consulting him. Forbes is in my area. I was told Mr. Bonetto did not consult me on the bill that he talked about. So I think on that basis, being a freshman, I guess it does not make any difference when you are here a few terms either.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. FINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is another reason that forms a basis for opposing this particular amendment, and that is that this amendment properly belongs in the capital budget and not in the general fund budget.

Traditionally, any item in excess of \$300,000 for a capital expenditure goes into the capital budget and not into the general operating budget.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. TADDONIO and BONETTO and were as follows:

YEAS—37

Burkardt	Halverson	Noye	Thomas
Byerly	Haskell	Parker, H. S.	Turner
Cessar	Hayes, D. S.	Pitts	Vipond
Dininni	Hutchinson, W.	Saloom	Volpe
Dorr	Itkin	Schmitt	Wagner
Early	Katz	Schulze	Wells
Poster, A.	Kelly, J. B.	Smith, L.	Westerberg
Frankenburg	Knooper	Stahl	Wilt, R. W.
Gillette	Mebus	Taddonio	Zearfoss
Grieco			

NAYS—158

Anderson, J. H.	Gallen	McClatchy	Scirica
Arthurs	Gecey	McCue	Seltzer
Barber	Geisler	McCurdy	Semanoff
Bellomini	Gekas	McGinnis	Shane
Bennett	Gelfond	McGraw	Shelhamer
Beren	Gleason	McMonagle	Shelton
Berkes	Gleason	Miller, M. E.	Shuman
Berson	Greenfield	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Shupnik
Bittle	Hamilton, J. H.	Morris	Smith, C.
Bixler	Hammock	Mullen, M. P.	Smith, E.
Blackwell	Harrier	Murtha	Spencer
Bonetto	Hasay	Musto	Stout
Brandt	Hayes, S. E.	Myers	Sullivan
Brunner	Hepford	Novak	Toll
Burns	Hill	O'Brien	Trusio
Butera	Homer	O'Connell	Ustynoski
Caputo	Hopkins	Oliver	Vacca
Checchio	Hutchinson, A.	Pancoast	Valicenti
Comer	Irvig	Perri	Vann
Crawford	Johnson, J.	Perry	Walsh, J. T.
Dager	Jones	Petrarca	Walsh, T. P.
Davis, D. M.	Kahle	Pievsky	Wargo
Davis, R.	Kennedy	Piper	Weidner
DeMedio	Kelly, A. P.	Polite	Whittlesey
Deverter	Kester	Prendergast	Williams
Dicarlo	Kistler	Rappaport	Wilson
Dombrowski	Klingaman	Renninger	Wilt, W. W.
Dorsey	Kolter	Renwick	Wise
Doyle	Kowalyszyn	Rhodes	Wojdek
Dreifelbts	Kusse	Richardson	Worrilow
Eckensberger	LaMarca	Rieger	Wright
Englehart	Laudadio	Ritter	Yahner
Fawcett	Laughlin	Romanelli	Yohn
Fee	Lehr	Rowe	Zeller
Fenrich	Letterman	Rusne	Zimmerman
Fineman	Lincoln	Ruggiero	Zord
Fischer	Lynch, Frank	Ryan	Zwikel
Foor	Maloney	Savitt	
Fryer	Manderino	Scanlon	Lee,
Gallagher	Martino	Schaeffer	Speaker

NOT VOTING—8

Poster, W.	Goodman	Lederer	Salvatore
Fox	Gring	Malady	Tayoun

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

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

Mr. ENGLEHART requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendments, which were read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 22 by inserting between lines 20 and 21:

Salaries and wages for per diem and session officers and employes, including returning officers .....	[600,000]
	616,500

Salaries of employes of the President of the Senate ..... [77,000]  
 79,000  
 Salaries of salaried employes of the Senate [3,000,000]  
 3,082,500

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 23 by inserting between lines 6 and 7:

For the payment of the expenses of the Committee on appropriations of the Senate in investigating schools, colleges, universities, correctional institutions, mental hospitals, medical and surgical hospitals, homes and other institutions, and agencies supported, in whole or in part, by appropriations from the State Treasury in analyzing reports, expenditures and the general operation and administration of said institutions and agencies, in examining and analyzing requests of the same and of the various departments, boards and commissions of the Commonwealth, and for the collection of data from other states attending seminars, conferences, and in cooperation and exchanging information with legislative budget and financial committees of other states, and for the necessary clerical assistance and other assistance travel expense and all other expenses in compiling data and information connected with the work of said committee in compiling comparative costs and other fiscal data and information for the use of said committee and the Senate during Legislative Session to the discharge of such duties. The committee shall have the authority to examine and inspect all properties, equipment, facilities, files, records and accounts of any State office, department, institution, board, committee, commission or agency or any institution or agency supported, in whole or in part, by appropriation from the State Treasury and to administer oaths. The committee may issue subpoenas under the hand and seal of the chairman to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of any papers, books, accounts, documents and testimony touching matters properly being inquired into by the committee and to cause the deposition of witnesses either residing within or without the State to be taken in the manner prescribed by laws for taking depositions in civil actions. The sum appropriated shall be paid on warrant of the State Treasurer in favor of the chairman of said committee on the presentation of his requisition for the same. The Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations shall not later than thirty days after the termination of his term of office, or until his successor is elected and also within thirty days after the adjournment of any regular or special session, file an account, [together with supporting documents whenever possible] in the office of the Appropriation Committee of the committee's expenses since the filing of the prior account ..... [238,000]  
 244,000

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 24 line 17 by inserting brackets before and after "238,000" and inserting immediately thereafter: 244,000

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 24 by inserting between lines 17 and 18:

For the payment to the Majority Leader for payment of salaries, wages and all other incidental expenses incurred in hiring personnel and staff for services which in the opinion of the Majority Leader may be required or arise during Legislative Sessions and during the interim between Legislative Sessions and for the payment of all other expenses related to the performance of his duties and responsibilities. The sum appropriated shall be paid on warrant of the State

Treasurer in favor of the Majority Leader on the presentation of his requisition for the same. The Majority Leader shall, not later than thirty days after the termination of his term of office or until his successor is elected and also within thirty days after the adjournment of any regular or special session, file an account together with supporting documents whenever possible in the office of the Majority Leader of such expenses since the filing of the prior account.....

[350,000]  
 358,000

For the payment to the Minority Leader for payment of salaries, wages and all other incidental expenses incurred in hiring personnel and staff for services which in the opinion of the Minority Leader may be required or arise during Legislative Sessions and during the interim between Legislative Sessions and for the payment of all other expenses related to the performance of his duties and responsibilities. The sum appropriated shall be paid on warrant of the State Treasurer in favor of the Minority Leader on the presentation of his requisition for the same. The Minority Leader shall, not later than thirty days after the termination of his term of office or until his successor is elected and also within thirty days after the adjournment of any regular or special session, file an account together with supporting documents whenever possible in the office of the Minority Leader of such expenses since the filing of the prior account..

[350,000]  
 358,000

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 26 by inserting between lines 7 and 8:

Salaries and wages for per diem and session officers and employes, including returning officers .....

[1,840,000]  
 1,890,800

Salaries of salaried employes of the House of Representatives .....

[2,956,000]  
 3,080,000

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 26 by inserting between lines 13 and 14:

For the payment of the expenses of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives in investigating schools, colleges, universities, correctional institutions, mental hospitals, medical and surgical hospitals, homes and other institutions and agencies supported, in whole or in part, by appropriations from the State Treasury in analyzing reports, expenditures and the general operation and administration of said institutions and agencies in examining and analyzing requests of the same and of the various departments, boards and commissions of the Commonwealth, and for the collection of data from other states attending seminars, conferences, and in cooperating and exchanging information with legislative budget and financial committees of other states, and for the necessary clerical assistance and other assistance, travel expense and all other expenses in compiling data and information connected with the work of said committee in compiling comparative cost and other fiscal data and information for the use of said committee and the House of Representatives during Legislative Sessions and during the interim between Legislative Sessions to the discharge of such duties. The committee shall have the authority to examine and inspect all properties, equipment, facilities, files, records and accounts of any State office, department, institution, board, committee, commission or agency or any institution or agency supported in whole or in part by appropriation from the State Treasury and to administer oaths. The committee

may issue subpoenas under the hand and seal of the chairman to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of any papers, books, accounts, documents and testimony touching matters properly being inquired into by the committee and to cause the deposition of witnesses either residing within or without the State to be taken in the manner prescribed by law for taking depositions in civil actions. The sum appropriated shall be paid on warrant of the State Treasurer in favor of the chairman of said committee on the presentation of his requisition for the same. The Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations shall, not later than thirty days after the termination of his term of office or until his successor is elected and also within thirty days after the adjournment of any regular or special session, file an account [together with supporting documents whenever possible] in the office of the Appropriation Committee of the committee's expenses since the filing of the prior account.....

[238,000]  
244,000

For the payment of the expenses of one minority party member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives designated by a majority vote of the minority party House of Representatives Caucus for investigating schools, colleges, universities, correctional institutions, mental hospitals, medical and surgical hospitals, homes and other institutions and agencies supported, in whole or in part, by appropriations from the State Treasury in analyzing reports, expenditures, and the general operation and administration of said institutions and agencies in examining and analyzing requests of the same and of the various departments, boards and commissions of the Commonwealth and for the collection of data from other states attending seminars, conferences, and in cooperating and exchanging information with legislative budget and financial committees of other states, and for the necessary clerical assistance, and other assistance, travel expense and all other expenses in compiling data and information connected with the work of said committee in compiling comparative cost and other fiscal data and information for the use of said committee and the House of Representatives during Legislative Sessions and during the interim between Legislative Sessions to the discharge of such duties. The sum appropriated shall be paid on warrant of the State Treasurer in favor of the member so designated by the majority vote of the minority party House of Representatives Caucus on the presentation of his requisition for the same. Such member so designated shall, not later than thirty days after the termination of his term of office, or until his successor is elected, and also within thirty days after the adjournment of any regular or special session, file an account [together with supporting documents whenever possible,] in the office of the minority party member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives of his expenses since the filing of the prior account .....

[238,000]  
244,000

For the payment to a committee of the House of Representatives composed of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader, the Majority Whip, the Majority Caucus Chairman and the Majority Caucus Secretary of the House of Representatives for allocation in its discretion to the several committees of the House of Representatives for payment of the expenses

of hiring such additional personnel and staff and for conducting such research and study projects as may be required or arise in connection with the work of such committees during Legislative Sessions and during the interim between Legislative Sessions. The sum appropriated shall be paid on warrant of the State Treasurer in favor of the Majority Leader on the presentation of his requisition for the same. The Majority Leader shall, not later than thirty days after the termination of his term of office or until his successor is elected and also within thirty days after the adjournment of any regular or special session, file an account together with supporting documents whenever possible in the office of the Majority Leader of such expenses since the filing of the prior account .....

[350,000]  
358,500

For the payment to a Committee of the House of Representatives composed of the Minority Leader, the Minority Caucus Chairman, and the Minority Caucus Secretary for allocation in its discretion to the several committees of the House of Representatives for the payment of the expenses of hiring such additional personnel and staff and for conducting such research and study projects as may be required or arise in connection with the work of such committees during Legislative Sessions and during the interim between Legislative Sessions. The sum appropriated shall be paid on warrant of the State Treasurer in favor of the Minority Leader on the presentation of his requisition for the same. The Minority Leader shall, not later than thirty days after the termination of his term of office or until his successor is elected and also within thirty days after the adjournment of any regular or special session, file an account together with supporting documents whenever possible in the office of the Minority Leader such expenses since the filing of the prior account .....

[350,000]  
358,500

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 28, line 4 by striking out "750,000" and inserting: 765,000

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 28, by inserting between lines 17 and 18:

To the Legislative Data Processing Committee

For the operation of the Legislative Data Processing Center .....

[725,000]  
744,000

In addition to this amount, all money received as reimbursement for data processing services shall be paid into the General Fund and credited to this appropriation.

To the Joint State Government Commission

For the salaries, wages and all necessary expenses for the work of the Joint State Government Commission to be paid on warrants of the State Treasurer in favor of the chairman of said commission on the presentation of his requisition for the same, the chairman shall file an accounting of said expenses [together with supporting documents whenever possible] in the office of the Joint State Government Commission .....

[805,000]  
826,000

To the Local Government Commission

For the salaries, wages and all expenses necessary for the work of the Local Government Commission .....

[182,000]  
184,500

\* \* \*

To the State Legislative Air and Water Pollution Control Commission

For the salaries and expenses of the  
State Legislative Air and Water Pollution  
Control Commission .....

[103,000]  
105,000

\* \* \*

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Englehart.

Mr. ENGLEHART. Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that the amendment I am about to offer is going to have nothing to do with Democrat-versus-Republican politics.

I am proposing an amendment which will allow enough money to pay the employes of the House and the Senate and our agencies a 5.5-percent pay increase, effective January 1, 1974.

Some might say that this is too generous, unwarranted—

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Chester, Mr. Schulze. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SCHULZE. If the gentleman could please identify the amendment for us—we have about 30—it would be very much appreciated.

Mr. ENGLEHART. It is about seven pages and it has my name on it, Mr. Speaker, and no number. It is eight pages long. It has my name beautifully engraved on the front, but it does not have a number.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. ENGLEHART. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 1973, all employes of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania except those who work for us got a pay increase. They got their regular normal increment which averaged out at 4 percent. In addition to that, they got a prior union-negotiated raise of 2.5 percent. Then, retroactive to July 1, just a few weeks ago, AFSCME negotiated another pay raise for all state employes in this Commonwealth except ours.

In this additional pay raise, all state employes got an across-the-board \$520 increase; they got provision for payment for their medicines; they got a better Blue Cross and Blue Shield program; they got paid for shift differentials, and they got allowances for overtime and double time. And in the bill that we are now considering, Senate bill No. 1058, there is provision, although somewhat inadequate, to pay this pay raise to every employe of the Commonwealth except our own.

I am standing at this microphone this evening solely to ask that if the people who work for the Commonwealth deserved this raise, which they did, I do not think it is too much to say or to ask that the people who work for us deserve the same attention.

Now it might be said, in answer to it, that we are going to do it later—that is the old story we always give them—or that it requires a special piece of legislation. Mr. Speaker, there is only one way that you pay a pay raise, and that is with money. And the only way you raise money and pay it is by making an appropriation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask wholehearted endorsement of this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. BUTERA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the only people who work for us to whom we cannot give meritorious raises are those statutory

employes. It is that group that we are attempting to address ourselves to as to not only their pay but also their categories, et cetera.

A bill has been drafted; it is in its final stage; it will be introduced very shortly. We would hope that it would pass quickly, and we will also fund it. That is the way to do this, not just merely go across the board or any other way. It is something which I think you have advocated more so than we have during the past 5 years. I think we are finally at a point of agreement and I suggest that we approach the problem that way rather than this way.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Englehart.

Mr. ENGLEHART. Mr. Speaker, I believe the majority leader would like you to believe that our employes have been well taken care of because they are getting a raise in November. He entirely missed the first point that I made. Every state employe in this Commonwealth got that same meritorious raise in July of this year—4 or 5 months ago—and, in addition, got, by negotiation, 5.7 percent on top of all that. I am only asking that our own employes be treated in the same way, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, no one in this House will fall for the line that we will do it later.

The bill that the majority leader is talking about was talked about 3 years ago, 2 years ago, 1 year ago, 5 months ago, 4 months ago, 3 months ago and now, and it is not any closer to coming out now than it was then. I ask for support.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. BUTERA. Mr. Speaker, quite the contrary; maybe the gentleman did not understand me. What I said was that the only people—let me state it the other way. The people who are employed by us under our special funds, several of them, can be and we have considered it in many instances—increased during the course of a year. The statutory employes cannot be beyond the normal increment which the gentleman spoke of.

It is for that reason that we are presently trying to recategorize all of the statutory employes, as well as set pay ranges and treat the problem as it should be treated for the first time. And I think we are close, if not agreed, at least at the staff level and some partial leadership level, as to how that bill should read.

I suggest that that is the proper way to handle this situation rather than by an amendment to the general appropriations bill as the gentleman has suggested.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Englehart.

Mr. ENGLEHART. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the majority leader is begging the question. No matter what we do with the statutory employes—reclassify them or do anything else—it still takes an appropriation of money. All I want to show our employes tonight is that we have faith in them and we are going to appropriate the money now. It does not say that it is for a pay increase. We will implement it later. But let us show them, for a change, that we are serious and that we are going to do it.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. ENGLEHART and BUTERA and were as follows:

YEAS—88

Arthur	Fryer	Martino	Ruggiero
Barber	Gallagher	McGraw	Savitt
Bellommi	Geisler	McMonagle	Scanlon
Bennett	Gelfand	Miller, M. E.	Schmitt
Berkes	Gillette	Morris	Shane
Berson	Gleason	Mullen, M. P.	Shelhamer
Blackwell	Greenfield	Murtha	Shelton
Bonetto	Hammock	Musto	Shupnik
Brunner	Homer	Myers	Stout
Caputo	Hutchinson, A.	Novak	Sullivan
Comer	Irvis	O'Brien	Toll
Davis, D. M.	Itkin	Oliver	Trusio
DeMedio	Johnson, J.	Perry	Valcenti
Dicarlo	Kelly, A. P.	Petrarca	Vann
Dombrowski	Kolter	Pievsky	Walsh, T. P.
Doyle	Kowalshyn	Prendergast	Wargo
Dreibelbis	LaMarca	Rappaport	Williams
Eckensberger	Laudadio	Ronwick	Wise
Englehart	Laughlin	Rhodes	Wojdak
Fee	Letterman	Rieger	Yahner
Fenrich	Lincoln	Ritter	Zeller
Fineman	Manderino	Romanelli	Zwick

NAYS—105

Anderson, J. H.	Cokas	McClatchy	Spencer
Beren	Gleason	McCue	Stahl
Bittle	Grieco	McCurdy	Taddonio
Bixler	Holverson	McGinnis	Thomas
Brandt	Hamilton, J. H.	Mebus	Turner
Burkardt	Harrier	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Ustynoski
Burns	Hasty	Noye	Vacca
Butera	Haskell	O'Connell	Vipond
Byerly	Hayes, D. S.	Pancost	Volpe
Cassar	Hayes, S. E.	Parker, H. S.	Wagner
Chocchilo	Hepford	Perri	Weidner
Crawford	Hill	Piper	Wells
Dager	Hopkins	Pitts	Westerberg
Davis, R.	Hutchinson, W.	Polite	Whittlesey
Deverter	Jones	Renninger	Wilson
Dininni	Kahle	Rowe	Witt, R. W.
Dorr	Katz	Ruane	Witt, W. W.
Dorsey	Kelly, J. B.	Ryan	Worrilow
Early	Kennedy	Saloom	Wright
Fawcett	Koster	Scheaffer	Yahn
Fischer	Kistler	Schulze	Zaroff
Foor	Klingaman	Sedra	Zimmerman
Foster, A.	Knepper	Seltzer	Zord
Foster, W.	Kusse	Shuman	
Frankenburg	Lehr	Smith, C.	Lee,
Gallen	Lynch, Frank	Smith, E.	Speaker
Geesey	Maloney	Smith, L.	

NOT VOTING—10

Fox	Lederer	Salvatore	Tayoun
Goodman	Malady	Semanoff	Walsh, J. T.
Gring	Richardson		

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendments were not agreed to.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. YAHNER requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 8, by inserting between lines 2 and 3:

To the Department of Agriculture

For payment into the State Farm Products Show Fund to pay for that portion of the Farm Show and maintenance to Farm Show Building that is not paid from Farm Show revenues

[155,000]  
250,000

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Yahner.

Mr. YAHNER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is a very important amendment. It would restore \$250,000 to the state farm products show fund to pay for that portion of the Farm Show and maintenance of the Farm Show buildings that is not paid from the Farm Show revenues.

Actually, the budget would result in a reduction of almost \$400,000 from the amount of money available to the state farm products show fund from the last year. Historically, the transfers ran at the rate of \$350,000 from 1968-69 through 1970-71 and then were set at \$550,000 for the 1971-72 session, including a \$200,000 deficiency appropriation.

Last year, besides the \$143,000 appropriation from the general fund, the state farm products show fund also received \$500,000 in flood money. Not all of that money was used in cleanup work; much of it went for regular operating costs.

The Agriculture Department had dropped its request substantially in the belief that new and higher rental and service charges would balance the budget. Part of that money was expected to come from rentals from a parking lot. However, the parking lot has been used since the flood to park trailers in which flood victims are living. This was estimated at \$260,000. With 75 percent of the parking lot covered by trailers, the department feels that it cannot presently start charging for parking. In fact, at the time the budget was formulated, the department hoped that the parking lot would be entirely available for paid parking sometime this year. Now that appears very doubtful.

I know that at this late hour you people are all hungry, so I will be brief and request that you vote for this amendment.

You know the old saying, "the farmer feeds them all." Without us you would all be in trouble. So let us see the green lights up there.

Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lebanon, Mr. Seltzer.

Mr. SELTZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the members to vote against the amendment.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. YAHNER and SELTZER and were as follows:

YEAS—94

Arthur	Fryer	McMonagle	Scanlon
Barber	Gallagher	Miller, M. E.	Schmitt
Bellommi	Geisler	Morris	Shane
Bennett	Gelfand	Mullen, M. P.	Shelhamer
Berkes	Gillette	Murtha	Shelton
Berson	Gleason	Musto	Shuman
Bixler	Greenfield	Myers	Shupnik
Blackwell	Hammock	Novak	Stout
Bonetto	Homer	O'Brien	Sullivan
Brunner	Hutchinson, A.	Oliver	Toll
Byerly	Irvis	Perry	Trusio
Caputo	Itkin	Petrarca	Valcenti
Comer	Johnson, J.	Pievsky	Vann
Davis, D. M.	Kelly, A. P.	Prendergast	Wagner
DeMedio	Kolter	Rappaport	Walsh, J. T.
Dicarlo	Kowalshyn	Ronwick	Walsh, T. P.
Dombrowski	LaMarca	Rhodes	Wargo
Doyle	Laudadio	Richardson	Williams
Dreibelbis	Laughlin	Rieger	Wise
Eckensberger	Letterman	Ritter	Wojdak
Englehart	Lincoln	Romanelli	Yahner
Fee	Manderino	Ruggiero	Zeller

Fenrich Fineman	Martino McGraw	Savitt	Zwilk
NAYS—102			
Anderson, J. H.	Gleason	McClatchy	Smith, L.
Beren	Grieco	McCue	Spencer
Bittle	Halverson	McCurdy	Stahl
Brandt	Hamilton, J. H.	McGinnis	Taddonio
Burkardt	Harrier	Mebus	Thomas
Burns	Hasay	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Turner
Butera	Haskell	Noye	Ustynowski
Cessar	Hayes, D. S.	O'Connell	Vacca
Checchio	Hayes, S. E.	Pancoast	Vipond
Crawford	Hepford	Parker, H. S.	Volpe
Dager	Hill	Perri	Weidner
Davis, R.	Hopkins	Piper	Wells
Deverter	Hutchinson, W.	Pitts	Westerberg
Dininni	Jones	Polite	Whittlesey
Dorr	Kahle	Renninger	Wilson
Dorsey	Katz	Rowe	Wilt, R. W.
Early	Kelly, J. B.	Ruane	Wilt, W. W.
Fawcett	Kennedy	Ryan	Worrilow
Fischer	Kester	Saloom	Wright
Foor	Kistler	Scheaffer	Yohn
Foster, A.	Klingaman	Schulze	Zearfoos
Foster, W.	Knepper	Schrica	Zimmerman
Frankenburg	Kusse	Seltzer	Zord
Gallen	Lehr	Semanoff	
Geesey	Lynch, Frank	Smith, C.	Lee,
Gekas	Maloney	Smith, E.	Speaker

NOT VOTING—7

Fox	Gring	Malady	Tayoun
Goodman	Lederer	Salvatore	

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. SHELHAMER requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 14 by inserting between lines 29 and 30:

To the Milk Marketing Board

For payment into the Milk Marketing Fund in the State Treasury for the purpose for which such fund is appropriated .....	(650,000)
	750,000

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Columbia, Mr. Shelhamer.

Mr. SHELHAMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment I offer today would restore \$100,000 to the Milk Marketing Board. This is the \$100,000 the Governor originally suggested in his budget.

I know that when we speak about the milk marketing law there are many people here in the House who immediately feel that this is not the right concept, but I would like to suggest to those people that if you disagree with the milk marketing concept, you should then abolish the law.

I would like to read just one paragraph—I am not going to get involved in the statistics here—from a letter from the chairman of the Milk Marketing Board that I think wraps up and explains the situation they find themselves in now.

He says: "The data"—and he is referring to the need for the \$100,000—"indicates we are \$92,000 short of funds in the area of operational expenscs. With the increased cost of lodging, meals, rentals, etc., we estimate that we

will be out of funds in this area by March of 1974, with no funds for the rest of the year."

I would hope that everyone would vote in the affirmative on this amendment.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. SHELHAMER and BUTERA and were as follows:

YEAS—73

Arthurs	Geisler	Mullen, M. P.	Shane
Barber	Geifand	Murtha	Shelhamer
Bennett	Gillette	Musto	Shelton
Berkes	Hammock	Myers	Shuman
Berson	Hutchinson, A.	O'Brien	Shupnik
Blackwell	Irvis	Oliver	Stout
Bonetto	Johnson, J.	Perry	Sullivan
Brunner	Kelly, A. P.	Petrarca	Toll
Comer	Kolter	Plevsky	Trusto
Davis, D. M.	Kowalshyn	Prendergast	Vann
DeMedio	LaMarca	Rappaport	Walsh, J. T.
Doyle	Laudadio	Renwick	Walsh, T. P.
Eckensberger	Letterman	Rhodes	Wargo
Englehart	Lincoln	Richardson	Williams
Fee	Manderino	Rieger	Wise
Fenrich	Martino	Ritter	Yahner
Fineman	McMonagle	Ruggerio	Zeller
Fryer	Morris	Scanlon	Zwilk
Gallagher			

NAYS—118

Anderson, J. H.	Geesey	Lehr	Semanoff
Bellommi	Gekas	Lynch, Frank	Smith, C.
Beren	Gleason	Maloney	Smith, E.
Bittle	Gleason	McClatchy	Smith, L.
Bixler	Greenfield	McCue	Spencer
Brandt	Grieco	McCurdy	Stahl
Burkardt	Halverson	McGinnis	Taddonio
Burns	Hamilton, J. H.	McGraw	Thomas
Butera	Harrier	Mebus	Turner
Byerly	Hasay	Miller, M. E.	Ustynowski
Caputo	Haskell	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Vacca
Cessar	Hayes, D. S.	Noye	Vipond
Checchio	Hayes, S. E.	O'Connell	Volpe
Crawford	Hepford	Pancoast	Wagner
Dager	Hill	Parker, H. S.	Weidner
Davis, R.	Horner	Perri	Wells
Deverter	Hopkins	Piper	Westerberg
Dicarlo	Hutchinson, W.	Pitts	Whittlesey
Dininni	Itkin	Polite	Wilson
Dombrowski	Jones	Renninger	Wilt, R. W.
Dorr	Kahle	Romanelli	Wilt, W. W.
Dorsey	Katz	Rowe	Worrilow
Early	Kelly, J. B.	Ruane	Wright
Fawcett	Kennedy	Ryan	Yohn
Fischer	Kester	Saloom	Zearfoos
Foor	Kistler	Scheaffer	Zimmerman
Foster, A.	Klingaman	Schmitt	Zord
Foster, W.	Knepper	Schulze	
Frankenburg	Kusse	Schrica	Lee,
Gallen	Laughlin	Seltzer	Speaker

NOT VOTING—12

Dreibelbis	Gring	Novak	Tayoun
Fox	Lederer	Salvatore	Valicenti
Goodman	Malady	Savitt	Wojdak

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. GALLAGHER requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 10, by inserting between lines 21 and 22:

For the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency

\* \* \*  
For the purpose of being held in reserve to guarantee loans granted for payment of possible losses of such loans granted and for the payment of lender participation incentives ...

[1,600,000]  
3,600,000

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment would add an additional \$2 million to the \$1.6 million for the scholarship grant and loan agency. The \$2 million would establish a revolving loan account whereby PHEAA could collect interest and principal payments on behalf of the lending institutions. This would relieve the banks of excessive administrative costs included in servicing a number of small individual loans.

The major reason for this proposal is the reluctance of many lenders to continue those loan programs. Some lenders are refusing loan considerations for the first-time borrowers regardless of their family situation. The loan value to first-time borrowers is now down by 37 percent. Other lenders have not only cut the first-time borrowers but are limiting renewals to only those who qualify under the Federal interest subsidy under the new Federal guidelines. Loan renewals are now down by 30 percent.

PHEAA believes that the past expansion of the program is a strong indication that Pennsylvania lenders are willing to cooperate in the loan program. The combination of new Federal guidelines and the current economic conditions force them to curtail activities. This proposal is designed to ease the paper work that banks must now undertake to secure a loan. And this would make student loans again available, particularly to the middle-income students. Therefore, it is very important that we consider this.

Many of our students in our districts were rejected for a renewal of a loan. Last year, if they had maybe \$1,000, under the new Federal guidelines, they would only be entitled to maybe \$500 or nothing at all, and the lenders, the banks, will not participate in the program because they will not get the interest.

What the scholarship grant and loan agency is trying to do is to take care of those students who are entitled to loans because of their family income problems, to pay the interest to the bank so that the student does not have to pay the interest.

It would encourage at least 30 percent of roughly 120,000 students who received a grant and were entitled to a loan who could not get that loan. Seventy percent of them got some loans and the other 30 percent were really up against it and were very seriously strapped because they could not go to their local banks and get a guaranteed loan.

We are also interested in encouraging students to get loans, guaranteed loans, and have the interest paid while they are going through their colleges, but by the new Federal guidelines, those who need it the most are not getting it.

Therefore, I would urge the House to consider this amendment and I would like to see Mr. Seltzer's approval for this kind of support.

Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I was finishing my statement.

I did direct it to Mr. Seltzer. I said I hope he would agree with my statement that the scholarship agency dearly needs this and that he would urge his membership to support this amendment. He, I think, fully understands the serious problem and knows, if we do not do it now, those students might be knocking on his door. Maybe Mr. Seltzer might have a reply to that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lebanon, Mr. Seltzer.

Mr. SELTZER. I disagree with the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, but I think before this session and next year's session are completed, the Education Committee, which is taking a very serious look at this question, will come up with some recommendations.

Therefore, I ask the members to vote "no" on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned that the Education Committee will be considering that. The Education Committee of this House has reported out House bill No. 1310, which is on our calendar, which caused the appropriation of this amount of money.

All we are trying to do is to put it into this bill. If that is successful, then we would take that amount of money out of House bill No. 1310, which is on the calendar, and then Mr. Seltzer would understand that it is not my words, my thoughts, but it would be that of the Education Committee.

The information which I read to this House was from a dear friend of his, the Budget Secretary, Mr. McIntosh, and he considers his statements to be of great value.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. GALLAGHER and SELTZER and were as follows:

YEAS—92

Arthur	Fineman	Martino	Savitt
Barber	Fryer	McGraw	Scanlon
Bellommi	Gallagher	McMonagle	Schmitt
Bennett	Gelsler	Morris	Shane
Berkas	Gelfand	Mullen, M. P.	Shelhamer
Berson	Gillette	Murtha	Shelton
Bixler	Gleason	Musto	Shupnik
Blackwell	Greenfield	Myers	Stout
Bonetto	Hammock	Novak	Sullivan
Brunner	Homer	O'Brien	Toll
Caputo	Hutchinson, A.	Oliver	Trusio
Comer	Irvia	Perry	Valicenti
Davis, D. M.	Itkin	Petrarca	Vann
DeMedio	Johnson, J.	Pievsky	Walsh, J. T.
Dicarlo	Kelly, A. P.	Prendergast	Walsh, T. P.
Dombrowski	Kolter	Rappaport	Wargo
Doyle	Kowalshyn	Renwick	Williams
Dreibelbis	LaMarea	Rhodes	Wise
Early	Laudadio	Richardson	Wojdak
Eckensberger	Laughlin	Rieger	Wright
Engelhart	Letterman	Ritter	Yahner
Fee	Lincoln	Romanelli	Zeller
Fenrich	Manderino	Ruggiero	Zwickl

NAYS—103

Anderson, J. H.	Grieco	McCue	Smith, E.
Beron	Halverson	McCurdy	Smith, L.
Bittle	Hamilton, J. H.	McGinnis	Spencer
Brandt	Harrier	Mebus	Stahl
Burkardt	Hesay	Miller, M. E.	Taddonio
Burns	Haskell	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Thomas
Butera	Hayes, D. S.	Noye	Turner
Syerly	Hayes, S. E.	O'Connell	Uslyneski
Cessar	Hepford	Pancoast	Vacca
Checchio	Hill	Parker, H. S.	Vipond
Crawford	Hopkins	Perri	Volpe

Dager	Hutchinson, W.	Piper	Wagner
Davis, R.	Jones	Pitts	Weidner
Deverter	Kahle	Polite	Wells
Dinnini	Katz	Renninger	Westerberg
Dorr	Kelly, J. E.	Bowe	Whittlesey
Dorsey	Kennedy	Buane	Wilson
Fawcett	Kester	Ryan	Wilt, R. W.
Fischer	Kistler	Saloom	Worrlow
Foor	Kingsman	Scheaffer	Yohn
Foster, A.	Knepper	Schulze	Zearfoss
Foster, W.	Kusse	Scirica	Zimmerman
Frankenburg	Lehr	Seltzer	Zord
Gallen	Lynch, Frank	Semanoff	
Geesey	Maloney	Shuman	Lee,
Gekas	McClatchy	Smith, C.	Speaker
Gleason			

NOT VOTING—8

Fox	Gring	Malady	Tayoun
Goodman	Lederer	Salvatore	Wilt, W. W.

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. M. E. MILLER, JR. requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 5, by inserting between lines 23 and 24: Of the above amount three million six hundred thousand dollars (\$3,600,000) shall be allocated for general salary or wage and benefits increases for fiscal year 1973-1974 for employes of the State colleges and State-owned university.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster, Mr. Miller.

Mr. M. E. MILLER, JR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A brief explanation of the amendment is that it seeks to amend Senate bill No. 1058, on page 5, by inserting between lines 23 and 24 language which would earmark from the \$30 million for general salary increases, \$3.6 million to be allocated for general salary, or wage and benefit increases, for the fiscal year 1973-74 for all employes of the state colleges and the state-owned university.

I would like to emphasize that this does not call for additional funds, but earmarks, of the \$30 million, those dollars needed to implement salary and faculty increases at the 13 state-owned colleges and the state university at Indiana.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Shane.

Mr. SHANE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to join my colleague, Mr. Miller, in vigorously supporting this particular amendment and pointing out that the figure he is talking about has been endorsed by the Pennsylvania State Education Association, the presidents of the state-owned institutions, the state-owned colleges, Indiana University, the faculty union and also the noninstructional employes.

I would point out that a rough breakout of the money has been set forth by the presidents. These are not exact figures, but I thought the members might be interested in them, since some of the members have these institutions in their district: Bloomsburg, \$337,000; California State, \$620,000; Cheyney State, \$303,000; Clarion, \$438,000; East Stroudsburg, \$362,000; Edinboro, \$623,000;

Indiana, \$623,000; Kutztown, \$530,000; Lock Haven, \$307,000; Mansfield, \$394,000; Millersville, \$487,000; Shippenburg, \$482,000; Slippery Rock, \$625,000; and West Chester, \$919,000.

I strongly urge the members to consider the needs of 76,000 students at the state-owned institutions, primarily kids who are the first generation to go to college.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. M. E. MILLER, JR., and SHANE and were as follows:

YEAS—191

Anderson, J. H.	Gallen	McCurdy	Shane
Arthurs	Geesey	McGinnis	Shelhamer
Barber	Geisler	McGraw	Shelton
Bellomini	Gekas	McMonagle	Shupnik
Bennett	Gelfand	Mebus	Smith, C.
Beran	Gleason	Miller, M. E.	Smith, E.
Berkes	Greenfield	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Smith, L.
Berson	Grisco	Morris	Spencer
Bittle	Halverson	Mullen, M. P.	Stahl
Bixler	Hammock	Murtha	Stout
Blackwell	Harrier	Musto	Sullivan
Bonetto	Hassy	Myers	Taddonio
Brandt	Haskell	Novak	Thomas
Brunner	Hayes, D. S.	Noyc	Toll
Burkardt	Hayes, S. E.	O'Brien	Trusto
Burns	Hepford	O'Connell	Turner
Butera	Hill	Oliver	Ustyanski
Byerly	Hornor	Pancoast	Valicenti
Caputo	Hutchinson, A.	Parker, H. S.	Vacca
Cassar	Hutchinson, W.	Perri	Vann
Checchito	Irvia	Perry	Vipond
Comer	Itkin	Petrarca	Volpe
Crawford	Johnson, J.	Pievsky	Wagner
Dager	Jones	Piper	Walsh, J. J.
Davis, D. M.	Kahle	Pitts	Walsh, T. P.
Davis, R.	Katz	Polite	Wargo
DeMedio	Kelly, A. P.	Prndergast	Weidner
Deverter	Kelly, J. B.	Rappaport	Wells
Dicarlo	Kennedy	Renninger	Westerberg
Dinnini	Koster	Renwick	Whittlesey
Dombrowski	Kistler	Rhodes	Williams
Dorr	Kingsman	Richardson	Wilson
Dorsey	Knepper	Riegler	Wilt, R. W.
Doyle	Kolter	Ritter	Wilt, W. W.
Dreibelbis	Kowalshyn	Romanelli	Wise
Early	Kusse	Rowe	Wojdak
Eckensberger	LaMarca	Ruane	Worrlow
Englehart	Laudadio	Ruggiero	Yahner
Fawcett	Laughlin	Ryan	Yohn
Fee	Lehr	Saloom	Wright
Fenrich	Letborman	Savitt	Zearfoss
Fineman	Lincoln	Scanlon	Zeller
Fischer	Lynch, Frank	Scheaffer	Zimmerman
Foor	Maloney	Schmitt	Zord
Foster, A.	Manderino	Schulze	Zwick
Foster, W.	Martino	Scirica	
Frankenburg	McClatchy	Seltzer	
Fryer	McCue	Semanoff	Lee,
Gallagher			Speaker

NAYS—3

Gleason	Hamilton, J. H.	Shuman
---------	-----------------	--------

NOT VOTING—9

Fox	Gring	Lederer	Salvatore
Gillette	Hopkins	Malady	Tayoun
Goodman			

So the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NOT OFFERED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Shane.

Mr. SHANE. Mr. Speaker, due to the generosity and foresight of my colleagues, it will not be necessary for me to offer my amendment. I thank all my fellow members from the bottom of my heart.



**QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Gleason. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GLEASON. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GLEASON. I would like to be recorded as voting in the affirmative on the Miller amendments to Senate bill No. 1058.

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. WISE requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 10 by inserting between lines 7 and 8: To provide funds for matching grants in accordance with Federal requirements for training programs under the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 where such programs are approved by the Department of Education ..... [250,000] 500,000

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lycoming, Mr. Wise.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, this would raise, from the \$250,000 which we appropriated in House bill No. 850, the appropriation for manpower development to \$500,000.

This program provides for community training efforts, through local school districts, for unemployed and disadvantaged persons to teach skills related to the job opportunities perceived in that geographical area.

This would raise the appropriation only to that level which it was the last 2 fiscal years. This appropriation was the same 2 years ago, \$500,000, and last year, \$500,000. Without this appropriation, we could lose \$2.5 million in Federal matching funds. We could lose that much because this is a 10-for-1 match. For every dollar we put up, the Federal Government puts up \$10.

It is possible for the local school districts to come up with this money, the difference. But I suggest that where these programs do the most good, we have the greatest fiscal problems—in the local school districts. So it is entirely possible that the local school districts could not come up with the local match and we would lose the effect of this program which has been so successful in helping to train people to useful skills and to keep them off the welfare rolls.

One final thought. If we do not come up with this money, the state is not nearly as able to coordinate the program on a statewide basis. It would then be, more or less, left to drift locally.

Finally, I want to mention that we have already spent \$200,000 on this program. We only have \$50,000 to go right now at the state level.

I strongly urge the members to support this much-needed amendment, which would restore the program only to that level where it was the last 2 fiscal years.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lebanon, Mr. Seltzer.

Mr. SELTZER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct as far as he went, but the rest of the story is that the Commonwealth has never spent the amount of money which was appropriated in this program. They continually lapse a big share of it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest we defeat the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lycoming, Mr. Wise.

Mr. WISE. I do not like to take issue with my good friend from Lebanon, but we may not have spent it, Mr. Speaker, but we certainly have encumbered it in the prior 2 fiscal years.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. WISE and SELTZER and were as follows:

**YEAS—91**

Arthurs	Fineman	Manderino	Savitt
Barber	Fryer	Martino	Scanlon
Bellomini	Gallagher	McGraw	Schmitt
Bennett	Gelsler	McMonagle	Shane
Berkes	Gelfond	Morris	Shelburner
Berson	Gillette	Mullen, M. P.	Shelton
Bixler	Gleason	Murtha	Shupnik
Blackwell	Groenfield	Musto	Stout
Bonetto	Grieco	Myers	Sullivan
Brunner	Hammock	Novak	Toll
Caputo	Homer	O'Brien	Trusio
Comer	Hutchinson, A.	Oliver	Valteenti
Davis, D. M.	Irvic	Perry	Vann
DeMedio	Itkin	Petrarca	Walsh, J. T.
Dicarlo	Johnson, J.	Pievsky	Walsh, T. P.
Dombrowski	Kelly, A. P.	Prendergast	Wargo
Doyle	Kolter	Renwick	Williams
Drelbelbis	Kowalshyn	Rhodes	Wise
Early	LaMarca	Richardson	Wojdak
Eckensberger	Laudadio	Rieger	Yahner
Engelhart	Laughlin	Ritter	Zeller
Fee	Letterman	Romanelli	Zwickl
Fenrich	Lincoln	Ruggiero	

**NAYS—105**

Anderson, J. E.	Halverson	McGinnis	Spencer
Beren	Hamilton, J. H.	Mebus	Stahl
Bittle	Harrier	Miller, M. E.	Taddonio
Brandt	Hasay	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Thomas
Burkardt	Haskell	Noye	Turner
Burns	Hayes, D. S.	O'Connell	Ustynoski
Butera	Hayes, S. E.	Pancoast	Vacca
Byerly	Hepford	Parker, H. S.	Vipond
Cessar	Hill	Perri	Volpe
Checchio	Hopkins	Piper	Wagner
Crawford	Hutchinson, W.	Pitts	Weidner
Dager	Jones	Polite	Wells
Davis, R.	Kahle	Rappaort	Westerberg
Deverter	Katz	Renninger	Whittlesey
Dininni	Kelly, J. B.	Rowe	Wilson
Dorr	Kennedy	Ruane	Wilt, R. W.
Dorsey	Kester	Ryan	Wilt, W. W.
Fawcett	Kistler	Saloom	Worriow
Fischer	Klingaman	Scheaffer	Wright
Foor	Knepper	Schulze	Yohn
Foster, A.	Kusse	Scirica	Zearfoss
Foster, W.	Lehr	Seltzer	Zimmerman
Frankenburg	Lynch, Frank	Semanoff	Zord
Gallen	Maloney	Shuman	
Geesey	McClatchy	Smith, C.	Lee,
Gekas	McCue	Smith, E.	Speaker
Gleason	McCurdy	Smith, L.	

**NOT VOTING—7**

Fox	Gring	Malady	Tsayoun
Goodman	Lederer	Salvatore	

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

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

Mr. HAMMOCK requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 10, by inserting between lines 21 and 22: For higher education equal opportunity program grants .....[2,160,000] 3,000,000  
\* \* \*

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Hammock.

Mr. HAMMOCK. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is offered to restore to the Higher Educational Equal Opportunity Act the funds which we attempted to restore back in May, of \$840,000, which would bring the total amount to \$3 million.

I do not think I have to labor long on this point. I would just like to point out some facts and statistics for the members of the House.

Currently, at this time, there are two field staff persons who are attempting to observe a very large program. This program services about 5,000 students at some 38 institutions across the Commonwealth.

What we are attempting to do here is to provide those moneys necessary for students who are from disadvantaged educational backgrounds. At the same time, I think it is important to point out that several months ago, in House bill No. 811, we removed the term "economically disadvantaged" and replaced it with the term "educationally disadvantaged." I think at this time many private institutions would want to take part in the program.

What the program essentially does is take young people who would not normally qualify for college, admit them into a college program in August, prior to the beginning of the September school term, and attempt to raise their standards and put them through college.

I would just like to give you a few brief statistics as to what is happening currently with the program. At the present time there is a 90-percent retention rate from the students who are taking part in this program. Seventy percent have entered directly from high school. The students are maintaining, on the average, a 2. quality-point average on the 4. system.

I would also like to offer for the record a letter which was submitted to me by Clarence R. Moll, the president of Widener College, as an example of the effectiveness of the program.

The president of Widener College indicates that the students taking part in the program for 16 to 24 students, which is a 7-week summer program at Widener College, are preparing for a Bachelor of Arts or a Bachelor of Science degree.

They have a project called Project Prepare. It was initiated in the summer of 1969, and they have just graduated their first class. Of 18 students who entered at that time, 13 have graduated. Of those students, one is entering Temple Medical School, two students are entering Temple Law School and one is entering a PhD program at the University of Chicago.

Their class also contains one Danforth Fellowship winner, one Ford Foundation winner, one summa cum laude graduate, one cum laude graduate, and three students who maintained dean's list honors throughout the past 2 years.

I think that is a good example of the kind of program that it has been.

I would like to also mention that it services some of the following schools: Bryn Mawr College, Chestnut Hill College, Duquesne University, St. Francis College, Swarthmore College and Widener College—as examples of institutions—all the state-related schools, Lincoln University, Penn State University, Temple University, the University of Pittsburgh, many of the community colleges and quite a few of the state colleges.

I think the program is a good program. At the same time, it also generates additional moneys from the Federal Government. Because of the government's participation, which generates money in addition to the moneys given by the state, the Federal Government contributes also a kind of matching fund. I think it is the kind of program we need to continue.

In the State of New York, this kind of program is funded to the level of about \$38 million, and I think we are way behind in this area.

It seems to me the statement made by Mr. Rhodes on May 2 is what we are looking for, and I would like to read that into the record.

Mr. Rhodes said at that time: ". . . there are students who attend Commonwealth schools, both private and public, who do not have the educational background to survive in a normal higher education environment. The intent of Act No. 101 is to provide them with the necessary support—academic, counseling, whatever assistance—they need to enable the educationally-disadvantaged students to survive within a higher educational environment."

I would urge the membership to support this amendment.

Thank you.

#### LETTER SUBMITTED FOR RECORD

Mr. HAMMOCK presented the following letter for the Legislative Journal:

June 11, 1973

The Honorable Charles Hammock  
1526 W. Atlantic Street  
Philadelphia, Pa.

Dear Mr. Hammock:

I am writing you concerning the proposed budgeting of the Pennsylvania Higher Education Equal Opportunity Act of 1971 (Act 101) at \$3,000,000 for fiscal 1973-74.

On May 20, 1973, 13 young men and women from the financially depressed areas of Chester and Philadelphia received degrees from Widener College. These young people are a part of Widener's Project Prepare, which has received Act 101 grants to assist its program for the educationally and financially disadvantaged from the community of Chester and vicinity.

The funding from Act 101 helps Widener provide a seven-week summer program for from 16 to 24 students, designed to prepare them for regular admission; in the following fall, to any academic curriculum leading to a B.A. or B.S. degree. The Project also provides tutoring and counseling service for the students in the fall and winter semesters.

Project Prepare was initiated in the summer of 1969 and we have just graduated our first class. Of 18 students who entered at that time, 13 have graduated. Of those graduates, one is entering Temple Medical School, two are entering Temple Law School, and one is entering a Ph.D. program at the University of Chicago. Their class also contained one Danforth Fellowship winner, one Ford Foundation winner, one Summa cum Laude graduate, one Cum Laude graduate, and three students who maintained Dean's List or Honors throughout the last two years of their college careers.

The projected budget for Project Prepare 1973-74 is \$89,757.60. This is an increase over the previous years because of program improvements and an enlarged freshman class, which will contain 24 students, an increase of 50 percent over other years. This will bring the total number of students serviced under Act 101 to 74.

I am writing in appeal to you to support this Act which provides badly needed assistance to Pennsylvania Institutions of Higher Education so that they might furnish academic and counseling services to academically and financially disadvantaged students from the Commonwealth.

Your consideration of the 3 million dollar budget figure for 1973-74 is respectfully requested.

Sincerely yours,  
Clarence R. Moll  
President

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Ryan.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman consent to a brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Hammock, consent to interrogation?

Mr. HAMMOCK. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. RYAN. On that list of yours, Mr. Speaker, do you find Villanova University, from where you graduated?

Mr. HAMMOCK. No; Villanova is not on the list.

Mr. RYAN. I know it is not either.

By way of information, Mr. Hammock and I both graduated from Villanova.

Villanova applied for funds under this program and was turned down, incidentally. And one of the reasons assigned to it was that they had used up the \$2.16 million, but if Mr. Hammock adds up the awards on that list, he will find that it comes to \$2.4 million. I just say that as an item of interest.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Hammock.

Mr. HAMMOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad Mr. Ryan raised that. Perhaps this is not the appropriate forum, but I think perhaps Mr. Ryan and I should get our heads together.

One of the problems that we have had at Villanova University is getting minority students admitted in the first place. And over the past several years, I must note that there has been a substantial increase in that area. Many of us who are alumnae have been attempting to get many of the economically- and educationally-disadvantaged students admitted to Villanova.

I think there is a lot that we can do on both sides of

the aisle to see that that one particular institution is able to do that. And I think, Mr. Ryan, if you join us in this amendment, we will be on the right step in getting Villanova some extra finances that we both know they need.

Thank you.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. HAMMOCK and RYAN and were as follows:

## YEAS—92

Arthur	Wineman	Manderino	Ruggiero
Barber	Fischer	Martino	Savitt
Bellomini	Fryer	McGraw	Scanlon
Bennett	Gallagher	McMonagle	Schmitt
Berkes	Geisler	Morris	Shane
Berson	Geitand	Mullen, M. P.	Shelhamer
Bixler	Gillette	Murtha	Shelton
Blackwell	Gleeson	Musto	Shupnik
Bonetto	Greenfield	Myers	Stout
Brunner	Hammock	Novak	Sullivan
Caputo	Homer	O'Brien	Toll
Comer	Hutchinson, A.	Oliver	Trusto
Davis, D. M.	Irvis	Perry	Valicenti
DeMedio	Itkin	Petrarca	Vann
Dicarlo	Johnson, J.	Pievsky	Walsh, J. T.
Dombrowski	Kelly, A. P.	Prendergast	Walsh, T. P.
Doyle	Kolter	Rappaport	Wargo
Dreibelbis	Kowalskyshyn	Ronwick	Williams
Early	LaMarca	Rhodes	Wise
Eckensberger	Laudadio	Richardson	Wojdak
Engelhart	Laughlin	Rieger	Yahner
Fee	Letterman	Ritter	Zeller
Fenrich	Lincoln	Romanelli	Zwickl

## NAYS—103

Anderson, J. H.	Halverson	McCurdy	Spencer
Beren	Hamilton, J. H.	McGinnis	Stahl
Bittle	Barrier	Mebus	Taddonio
Brandt	Basay	Miller, M. E.	Thomas
Burkardt	Haskell	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Turner
Burns	Rayce, D. S.	Noye	Ustynockt
Butera	Hayes, S. E.	O'Connell	Vacca
Byerly	Hepford	Pancost	Vinond
Cassar	Hill	Perri	Volpe
Chicchido	Hopkins	Piper	Wagner
Crawford	Hutchinson, W.	Pitts	Weidner
Dager	Jones	Polite	Wells
Davis, R.	Kable	Renninger	Westerberg
Deverter	Katz	Rowe	Whittlesey
Dinanzi	Kelly, J. B.	Ruone	Wilson
Dorr	Kennedy	Ryan	Wilt, R. W.
Dorsey	Kester	Saloom	Wilt, W. W.
Fawcett	Kistler	Scheaffer	Worrlow
Foor	Klingaman	Schulze	Wright
Foster, A.	Knepper	Selrica	Yohn
Foster, W.	Kusse	Seltzer	Zarfoes
Frankenburg	Lehr	Semanoff	Zimmerman
Gallen	Lynch, Frank	Shuman	Zord
Geesey	Maloney	Smith, C.	
Gekas	McClatchy	Smith, E.	
Gleason	McCue	Smith, L.	
Grieco			Speaker

## NOT VOTING—8

Fox	Gring	Malady	Salvatore
Goodman	Lederer	Parker, H. S.	Tayoun

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. SCANLON requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 13, line 17 by striking out "44,876,000" and inserting: 45,376,000

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I am amending page 13, line 17, from \$44.876 million to \$45.376 million, which is a \$500,000 increase in our prison system. Now the Senate passed it at \$42.876 million and the Appropriation Committee raised it to \$44.876 million, which was an increase of \$2 million.

However, the information which we received from the Bureau of Correction on November 19 indicates that they really need \$2.5 million to adequately fund the bureau during this year, the \$2 million given by the Appropriations Committee falling \$500,000 short.

One of the major areas is in the area of maintenance of the buildings at the prisons. And according to the information that I have, the maintenance problem has been neglected so seriously over the past couple of years that they have had to close down certain portions of the institutions which were rendered unusable and, in a couple of cases, this increased the probability of escape and, in a couple of cases, actual escape.

In the area of food, clothing and fuel, we all have our own home budgets and we know what has happened in the past year to the cost of food and clothing and fuel. This is another one of the major items that the Appropriations Committee certainly did not consider adequately.

Therefore, in the interest of improving our prison system, which I feel every member of this House is definitely interested in, I request that you grant this additional \$500,000.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. SCANLON and BUTERA and were as follows:

YEAS—88

Arthurs	Fineman	Munderfao	Romanelli
Barber	Fryer	Martino	Ruggiero
Bellomini	Gallagher	McGraw	Scanlon
Bennett	Geisler	McMonagle	Schmitt
Berkes	Gelfand	Morris	Sheihamer
Berson	Gillette	Mullen, M. P.	Shilton
Bixler	Gleeson	Murtha	Shupnik
Blackwell	Greenfield	Musto	Stout
Bonetto	Hammock	Myers	Sullivan
Brunner	Homer	Novak	Toll
Caputo	Hutchinson, A.	O'Brien	Trusio
Chocchlo	Irvis	Oliver	Valicenti
Comer	Itkin	Perry	Vann
Davis, D. M.	Johnson, J.	Petrarca	Vipond
DeMedio	Kelly, A. P.	Plevsky	Walsh, J. T.
Dicarlo	Kelly, J. E.	Prendergast	Walsh, T. P.
Dombrowski	Kolter	Rappaport	Wargo
Doyle	Kowalshyn	Ronwick	Williams
Eckensberger	LaMarca	Rhodes	Wise
Eglehart	Laudadio	Richardson	Yahner
Fee	Laughlin	Rieger	Zeller
Fenrich	Lincoln	Ritter	Zwickl

NAYS—103

Anderson, J. H.	Halverson	McCurdy	Smith, L.
Beren	Hamilton, J. H.	McGinn's	Spencer
Bittle	Harrier	Mebus	Stahl
Brandt	Hesay	Miller, M. E.	Taddonto
Burkardt	Haskell	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Thomas
Burns	Hayes, D. S.	Noye	Turner
Butera	Hayes, S. E.	O'Connell	Ustyonski
Byerly	Hepford	Pancoast	Vacca
Cessar	IFH	Parker, H. S.	Volpe
Crawford	Hopkins	Porri	Wagner
Dager	Hutchinson, W.	Piper	Weidner
Davis, R.	Jones	Pitts	Wells
Deverter	Kable	Polite	Westerberg
Dinioni	Katz	Henninger	Whittlesey
Dorr	Kennedy	Rowe	Wilson
Dorsey	Kester	Ruane	Witt, R. W.

Early	Kistler	Ryan	Witt, W. W.
Fawcett	Klingsman	Saloom	Worrlow
Fischer	Kocpper	Schoaffer	Wright
Foor	Kusse	Schulze	Yohn
Foster, A.	Lehr	Scirica	Zearfoer
Foster, W.	Letterman	Seltzer	Zitnerman
Gallen	Lynch, Frank	Sernanoff	Zord
Gecsey	Maloney	Shuman	
Gekas	McClatchy	Smith, C.	Lee,
Gleason	McCue	Smith, E.	Speaker
Grieco			

NOT VOTING—12

Dreibelbis	Goodman	Malady	Shane
Fox	Gring	Salvatore	Tayoun
Frankenburg	Lederer	Savitt	Wojdak

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

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

Mr. SCHMITT requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 19, line 5, by striking out "39,547,000" and inserting: 42,000,000

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westmoreland, Mr. Schmitt.

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. Speaker, my amendment deals with the payment to counties for child welfare programs. It strikes out \$39.547 million and substitutes in its place \$42 million, which is an increase of \$2.453 million, which is less than 5 percent.

If it is not the question of human compassion in funding these programs for the benefit of these children who are in need of our help, I think it should be pointed out specifically that Act No. 333 mandates that the court costs must be paid to the extent of 50 percent by the county and reimbursed by the state, and that the reimbursement to the child welfare program itself shall be to the extent of 60 percent.

If this amendment does not go through and if the funds are held down, it will mean that we will only be able to compensate the counties on the level of 51 percent, which means either a deficiency appropriation or a cutback in the program.

I urge everyone to support the amendment.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. SCHMITT and BUTERA and were as follows:

YEAS—90

Arthurs	Fryer	McGraw	Ruggiero
Barber	Gallagher	McMonagle	Scanlon
Bellomini	Geisler	Morris	Schmitt
Bennett	Gelfand	Mullen, M. P.	Shane
Berkes	Gillette	Murtha	Sheihamer
Berson	Gleeson	Musto	Shilton
Bixler	Greenfield	Myers	Shuman
Blackwell	Hammock	Novak	Shupnik
Bonetto	Homer	Noye	Stout
Brunner	Hutchinson, A.	O'Brien	Sullivan
Caputo	Irvis	Oliver	Toll
Comer	Itkin	Perry	Trusio
Davis, D. M.	Johnson, J.	Petrarca	Valicenti
DeMedio	Kelly, A. P.	Plevsky	Vann
Dicarlo	Kolter	Prendergast	Walsh, J. T.
Dombrowski	Kowalshyn	Rappaport	Walsh, T. P.
Doyle	LaMarca	Ronwick	Wargo
Early	Laudadio	Rhodes	Williams

Eckensberger	Laughlin	Richardson	Wise
Englehart	Letterman	Rieger	Yahner
Fee	Lincoln	Ritter	Zeller
Fenrich	Manderino	Romanelli	Zwikel
Fineman	Martino		

NAYS—103

Anderson, J. H.	Grieco	McCue	Spencer
Beren	Halverson	McCurdy	Stahl
Bittle	Hamilton, J. H.	McGinnis	Taddonio
Brandt	Harrier	Mebus	Thomas
Burkardt	Hasay	Miller, M. E.	Turner
Burns	Haskell	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Ustynoski
Butera	Hayes, D. S.	O'Connell	Vacca
Byerly	Hayes, S. E.	Pancoast	Vipond
Cessar	Hepford	Parker, H. S.	Volpe
Chechio	Hill	Perri	Wagner
Crawford	Hopkins	Piper	Weldner
Dager	Hutchinson, W.	Pitts	Wells
Davis, R.	Jones	Polite	Westerberg
Deverter	Kahle	Reininger	Whittlesey
Dinnini	Katz	Rowe	Wilson
Dorr	Kelly, J. B.	Ruano	Wilt, R. W.
Dorsey	Kennedy	Ryan	Wilt, W. W.
Fawcett	Kester	Saloam	WorriLOW
Fischer	Kistler	Scheaffer	Wright
Foor	Klingaman	Schulze	Yohn
Foster, A.	Knepper	Scirica	Zearfoss
Foster, W.	Kusse	Seltzer	Zimmerman
Frankenburg	Lehr	Semanoff	Zord
Gallen	Lynch, Frank	Smith, C.	
Geesey	Maloney	Smith, E.	Lee, Speaker
Gekas	McClatchy	Smith, L.	
Cleason			

NOT VOTING—10

Dreibelbis	Gring	Salvatore	Tayoun
Fox	Lederer	Savitt	Wojdak
Goodman	Malady		

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. ARTHURS requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 18, by inserting between lines 21 and 22: For assistance payments and their administration to maintain the level of cash grants to the aged, blind and disabled ..... 5,500,000

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Butler, Mr. Arthurs.

Mr. ARTHURS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of supplemental assistance for the aged, the blind and the disabled.

The expected increase of \$130 million-plus in the aged, the blind and the disabled caseload is projected at one and a half times the present caseload of 87,000. There is really no reason to expect a lesser caseload, since the Social Security Administration has begun its search for these aged, the blind and the disabled who are eligible for social security insurance but who are not on the present caseload.

It is expected that through the efforts of the Social Security Administration and because there will be less stigma attached to receiving social security payments than there is now for receiving cash assistance, the caseload will continue to increase.

Also, the elimination of property liens and legally responsible relative requirements will lift the fear of re-

ceiving assistance that so many of these old people now have.

This caseload projection for the first 6 months of 1974 will cost this state \$14 million to supplement the social security insurance payment by \$20. Social security regulations require that the state must supplement each Federal payment so that no one on the present caseload will receive less than they are now receiving. However, recent implementation indicates that this mandatory statement interpretation indicates that this mandatory state supplement must be distributed as a flat rate.

In order to cover the present caseload at the same rate, it is necessary to make a \$20 supplement. In addition, there are social security proposed regulations which require the state to make its supplementary payment for one month in advance. This means that the state must send its payment to the Federal Government before December 1, 1973, and pay for July supplemental grants on June 1, 1974. In effect, the state must make seven payments in fiscal year 1973-74 instead of six.

Here is the cost of the state's supplement to the social security insurance: The additional caseload of 130-plus dependents on the supplement level agreed to for 1974-75 will be \$14 million. The estimate for one month's advance payment for a raising caseload is \$2.5 million. For this reason, we need a total of \$16.5 million or the additional supplement of \$5.5 million.

So that the older people will not have to take less and so that we meet the Federal requirements, I ask for an affirmative vote on this amendment.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. ARTHURS and BUTERA and were as follows:

YEAS—92

Arthurs	Fineman	Martino	Savitt
Barber	Fryer	McGraw	Scanlon
Bellommi	Gallagher	McMonagle	Schmitt
Bennett	Gaister	Morris	Shane
Berkes	Gelfand	Mullen, M. P.	Shelbamer
Berson	Gillette	Murtha	Shelton
Bizler	Gleeson	Musto	Shuman
Blackwell	Greenfield	Myers	Shupnik
Bonetto	Hammock	Novak	Stout
Brunner	Homer	O'Brien	Sullivan
Caputo	Hutchinson, A.	Oliver	Toll
Comer	Irvic	Perry	Trusto
Davis, D. M.	Itkin	Petrarca	Valicenti
DeMedio	Johnson, J.	Pievsky	Vann
Dicarlo	Kelly, A. P.	Prendergast	Walsh, J. T.
Dombrowski	Kolter	Rappaport	Walsh, T. P.
Doyle	Kowalshyn	Kenwick	Wargo
Dreibelbis	LaMarca	Rhodes	Williams
Early	Laudadio	Richardson	Wise
Eckensberger	Laudadio	Rieger	Wojdak
Englehart	Laughlin	Ritter	Yahner
Fee	Letterman	Romanelli	Zeller
Fenrich	Lincoln	Ruggiero	Zwikel
	Manderino		

NAYS—100

Anderson J. H.	Halverson	McGinnis	Stahl
Beren	Hamilton, J. H.	Mebus	Taddonio
Bittle	Harrier	Miller, M. E.	Thomas
Brandt	Hasay	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Turner
Burkardt	Haskell	Noye	Ustynoski
Burns	Hayes, D. S.	O'Connell	Vacca
Butera	Hayes, S. E.	Pancoast	Vipond
Cessar	Hepford	Parker, H. S.	Volpe
Crawford	Hill	Piper	Wagner
Dager	Hutchinson, W.	Pitts	Weldner
Davis, R.	Jones	Polite	Wells
Deverter	Kahle	Reininger	Westerberg
Dinnini	Katz	Rowe	Whittlesey
Dorr	Kelly, J. B.	Ruano	Wilson
Dorsey	Kennedy	Ryan	Wilt, R. W.

Fawcett	Kester	Saloom	Wilt, W. W.
Fischer	Kistler	Scheaffer	Worrlow
Foor	Klingaman	Schulze	Wright
Foster, A.	Knepper	Scirica	Yohn
Foster, W.	Kusse	Seltzer	Zearfoss
Frankenburg	Lehr	Semanoff	Zimmerman
Gallen	Lynch, Frank	Smith, C.	Zord
Geesey	Maloney	Smith, E.	
Gekas	McClatchy	Smith, L.	Lee, Speaker
Gleason	McCue	Spencer	
Grieco	McCurdy		

NOT VOTING—11

Byerly	Goodman	Lederer	Salvatore
Checchio	Gring	Malady	Tayoun
Fox	Hopkins	Perri	

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

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

Mr. GELFAND requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 20, by inserting between lines 6 and 7: To guarantee a minimum wage rate of \$1.00 per hour for physically handicapped or mentally retarded workers employed in sheltered workshops ..... 4,000,000

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Gelfand.

Mr. GELFAND. Mr. Speaker, up until now not too many amendments met favorable treatment, but this is a noteworthy one and certainly one which should touch the hearts of everybody here very, very dearly, because it provides a way for people who generally are unable to help themselves to help themselves.

What this does is make an appropriation of \$4 million to the Department of Welfare for sheltered workshops. This is to enable people who work in these sheltered workshops, generally the mentally retarded, the mentally handicapped, to at least receive a minimum wage of \$1 for the efforts they put forth in working in these sheltered workshops.

These sheltered workshops are institutions which are operated by nonprofit corporations throughout the entire Commonwealth. As a matter of fact, I have a list here which delineates the various agencies which do maintain this and which offer a way for people who generally cannot find work to find something to do, so they can gainfully occupy their time and at least partially become citizens who can contribute to the community.

For instance, these workshops are located in places like Ephrata, Harrisburg, Laurelton, Lebanon, Reading, Gettysburg, Lancaster, Hamburg, Carlisle, Chambersburg, Bellefonte, Huntingdon, Sunbury, York, Altoona, Lewistown, West Wyomissing, Uniontown, Kittanning, Arnold, Indiana, Greensburg, Youngwood, Johnstown, Du Bois, Meyersdale, Washington, Meadow Lands, Newton, Croydon, Doylestown, Sellersville, Philadelphia, Havertown, Lansdowne, Devon, et cetera, et cetera—all throughout the entire Commonwealth.

If you really want to do something for people whom you say you are trying to help and whom you say you want to make productive citizens, rather than people who are just a product of our society who erode and turn into nothing, this is your one opportunity to do it.

At least open your minds and be receptive to something which you know is gainful and better for our community. Vote "aye" in favor of this amendment.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. GELFAND and BUTERA and were as follows:

YEAS—96

Arthurs	Fineman	Manderino	Ruggiero
Barber	Fischer	Martino	Savitt
Bellomini	Fryer	McCue	Scanlon
Bennett	Gallagher	McGraw	Schmitt
Berkes	Geisler	McMonagle	Shane
Berson	Gelfand	Morris	Shelhamer
Bixler	Gillette	Mullen, M. P.	Shelton
Blackwell	Gleeson	Murths	Shuman
Bonetto	Greenfield	Musto	Shupnik
Brunner	Hammock	Myers	Stout
Caputo	Homer	Novak	Sullivan
Checchio	Hutchinson, A.	O'Brien	Toll
Comer	Irvic	Oliver	Trusio
Davis, D. M.	Itkin	Perry	Valicenti
DeMedio	Johnson, J.	Petrarca	Vann
Dicarlo	Katz	Pievsky	Walsh, J. T.
Dombrowski	Kelly, A. P.	Prendergast	Walsh, T. P.
Doyle	Kolter	Rappaport	Wargo
Dreibelbis	Kowalyszyn	Renwick	Williams
Early	LaMarca	Rhodes	Wise
Eckensberger	Laudadio	Richardson	Wojdak
Englehart	Laughlin	Rieger	Yahner
Fee	Letterman	Ritter	Zeller
Fenrich	Lincoln	Romanelli	Zwilk

NAYS—99

Anderson, J. H.	Halverson	McGinnis	Stahl
Beren	Hamilton, J. H.	Mebus	Taddonio
Bittle	Harricr	Miller, M. E.	Thomas
Brandt	Hassay	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Turner
Burkardt	Haskell	Noye	Ustynoski
Burns	Hayes, D. S.	O'Connell	Vacca
Butera	Hayes, S. E.	Pancoast	Vipond
Byerly	Henford	Parker, H. S.	Volpe
Cesar	Hill	Piper	Wagner
Crawford	Hopkins	Pitts	Weidner
Dager	Hutchinson, W.	Polite	Wells
Davis, R.	Jones	Renninger	Westerberg
Deverter	Kahle	Rowe	Whittlessey
Dintoni	Kelly, J. B.	Rusne	Wilson
Dorr	Kennedy	Ryan	Wilt, R. W.
Dorsey	Kester	Saloom	Wilt, W. W.
Fawcett	Kistler	Scheaffer	Worrlow
Foor	Klingaman	Schulze	Wright
Foster, A.	Knepper	Scirica	Yohn
Foster, W.	Kusse	Seltzer	Zearfoss
Frankenburg	Lehr	Semanoff	Zimmerman
Gallen	Lynch, Frank	Smith, C.	Zord
Geesey	Maloney	Smith, E.	
Gekas	McClatchy	Smith, L.	
Gleason	McCurdy	Spencer	Lee, Speake
Grieco			

NOT VOTING—8

Fox	Gring	Malady	Salvatore
Goodman	Lederer	Perri	Tayoun

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

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

Mr. DiCARLO requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 20, line 15, by striking out "33,846,000" and inserting: 34,194,000

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Erie, Mr. DiCarlo.

Mr. DiCARLO. Mr. Speaker, my amendment adds \$348,000 to the Department of Revenue's operating budget.

The need for the additional funds is a result of a loss of revenue totaling \$400,000 from the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation for the use of computer services last fiscal year.

As you are all aware, PennDOT has phased out the use of their computer operations from the Department of Revenue by installing their own system in the PennDOT office. On top of this, the Department of Revenue has also been added the responsibility of the personal income tax, the senior citizens property tax assistance, and certain other phases of the lottery operations. Accordingly, the department will have to assure the total cost of the computer operations.

Because of this loss of revenue of \$400,000, I am asking for an affirmative vote on this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, would I be in order to interrogate the Appropriations Committee chairman to ask what the opposition is to this appropriation?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Lebanon, Mr. Seltzer, consent to interrogation?

Mr. SELTZER. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to answer.

In the document before you, the Department of Revenue does not only receive an 8-percent increase, but out of the \$30-million general salary increase, since they are one of the larger departments, will get a great share of that increase also to pay these increased costs to which you just referred.

I ask the members to vote "no."

Mr. DiCARLO. Let me emphasize for my colleagues in the House that the additional money is not for the expansion of new programs or for additional jobs. In fact, 102 such positions were abolished in the department.

Again, I ask the Appropriations Committee chairman: Last fiscal year, the Department of Transportation shared the computer costs out of the Department of Revenue. In this new fiscal year they no longer have the opportunity to share the costs in the Department of Revenue. Now the department is stuck with the complete total tab, and there has been no provision or anything else to absorb this added cost for the operation of that department. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering, do you have any idea what the total amount paid out for computer contracts is in the Department of Revenue?

Mr. SELTZER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman is indicating that the department cannot utilize all the contracts and the computers it is using, it should either give up its contracts or have the office of administration, in which there is a certain bureau which handles contracts for the entire Commonwealth in computers, assign some other workload to this computer.

This General Assembly cannot and should not fund individual computers for every department on the hill, unless those departments can utilize the computer to its fullest. We just cannot afford it, Mr. Speaker, and it is wrong.

Mr. DiCARLO. Here is the thing, Mr. Speaker: Again, the total cost to run those computers in that department is \$2,787,000. Last year, the Department of Transportation picked up \$400,000 of this tab. Now they are completely computerized.

I agree with the gentleman on the surface that one department, if they have excess computers or something like that, they should not be paying for that extra time. But what has happened is that this new year the Depart-

ment of Revenue has been charged with the responsibilities of the personal income tax, the senior citizens property tax and other phases of the lottery operations.

In past years, when the budgets were set up, I am sure you took into consideration, with giving the Department of Revenue their funds, the amount of money which would be paid back to them by the contracts without the Department of Transportation.

What I am asking again is to have the operations of the Department of Revenue to continue, not for any new jobs, not for any new ventures or anything else, but for the continuity of that department. They, indeed, do need this appropriation.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. DiCARLO and SELTZER and were as follows:

YEAS—87

Arthurs	Fineman	McGraw	Savitt
Barber	Gallagher	McMonagle	Scanlon
Bellomini	Gelsler	Morris	Schmitt
Bennett	Gelfand	Mullen, M. P.	Shelhamer
Berkes	Gillette	Murtha	Shelton
Berson	Gleason	Musto	Shupnik
Bixler	Greenfield	Myers	Stout
Blackwell	Hammock	Novak	Sullivan
Bonetto	Homer	O'Brien	Toll
Brunner	Irvin	Oliver	Trusio
Caputo	Itkin	Perry	Valicenti
Comer	Johnson, J.	Petrarca	Vann
Davis, D. M.	Kelly, A. P.	Pievsky	Walsh, J. T.
DeMedio	Koiter	Prendergast	Walsh, T. P.
DiCarlo	Kowalyshyn	Rappaport	Wargo
Dombrowski	LaMarca	Renwick	Williams
Doyle	Laudadio	Rhodes	Wise
Dretbelbis	Laughlin	Richardson	Wojdak
Eckensberger	Letterman	Rieger	Yahner
Engelhart	Lincoln	Ritter	Zeller
Fee	Manderino	Romanelli	Zwickl
Fenrich	Martino	Ruggiero	

NAYS—107

Anderson, J. H.	Gleason	McClatchy	Smith, L.
Beren	Grieco	McCue	Spencer
Bittle	Halverson	McCurdy	Stahl
Brandt	Hamilton, J. H.	McGinnis	Taddonio
Burkardt	Harrier	Mebus	Thomas
Burns	Hassay	Miller, M. E.	Turner
Butera	Haskell	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Ustynoski
Byerly	Hayes, D. S.	Noye	Vacca
Cessar	Hoyes, S. E.	O'Connell	Vipond
Checchio	Repford	Panocast	Volpe
Crawford	Hill	Parker, H. S.	Wagner
Dager	Hopkins	Piper	Weidner
Davis, R.	Hutchinson, A.	Pitts	Wells
Deverter	Hutchinson, W.	Polite	Westerberg
Dininni	Jones	Renninger	Whittlesey
Dorr	Kahle	Rowe	Wilson
Dorsey	Katz	Ruane	Wilt, R. W.
Early	Kelly, J. B.	Ryan	Wilt, W. W.
Fawcett	Kennedy	Saloom	WorriLOW
Fischer	Kester	Scheaffer	Wright
Foor	Kistler	Schulze	Yohn
Foster, A.	Klingaman	Sefrica	Zearfoss
Foster, W.	Krueger	Seltzer	Zimmerman
Frankenburg	Kusse	Semanoff	Zord
Fryer	Lehr	Shuman	
Gallen	Lynch, Frank	Smith, C.	Lee, Speaker
Geesey	Maloney	Smith, E.	
Gekas			

NOT VOTING—9

Fox	Lederer	Perri	Shane
Goodman	Malady	Salvatore	Tayoun
Gring			

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

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

Mr. CAPUTO requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 21 by inserting between lines 18 and 19: For administration of the Municipal Employees' Retirement System ..... 30,000

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

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

Mr. CAPUTO. Mr. Speaker, one night last week a funny thing happened to me on the way to the Forum. I was walking with my hands thrust deeply into my top-coat when I was accosted by an elderly gentleman, somewhat the worst for wear, with a strong breath of alcohol.

He asked me for some money, and as I pulled my hands out of my pockets, I dropped a quarter on the ground. He grabbed the quarter and ran. He was happy about getting the quarter, and I was happy because I was reaching into my pants pocket to give him a dollar when he did it.

We have heard a lot of figures here today—and I point out that it is just 8 o'clock, and I hope when the Speaker said we would quit around 8 o'clock, he meant we would quit voting "no."

I have an amendment here that calls for a mere \$30,000. It is an amendment which would give to the municipal employees' retirement system \$30,000 with which to operate for at least the next 4 months.

Since the municipal employees' retirement system has been activated—was activated in 1962—the cost of operations has been met through a \$10-per-member-per-year fee, increased to \$20 on January 1, 1974. This money has been charged to the municipalities, together with a general fund appropriation ranging between \$30,000 to \$60,000 each fiscal year.

Last year the budget office advised the municipal employees' retirement board that the administration had taken the position that the fund, having grown to \$13 million, was large enough to be self-supporting and no further general fund appropriations would be requested from the legislature.

The administration suggested that legislation be drafted to provide that the operating expenses of the system would be paid out of excess interest earnings in a manner similar to that employed by the state employees' retirement board and the school retirement board.

A bipartisan bill passed in the Senate unanimously. Senate bill No. 471 was introduced this year and has been sent over here, but it still awaits action.

This bill with an amendment would take care of their problem and would provide the \$30,000; however, the bill does not become effective until 90 days after it is passed. It has not been reported out of committee here, so it looks like it will at least go until March or April of next year before we will even be able to get the \$30,000 by an amendment to that bill.

Make me as happy as that beggar I met last week. Go for \$30,000.

Thank you.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. CAPUTO and SELTZER and were as follows:

YEAS—89

Arthurs	Fryer	Martino	Scanlon
Barber	Gallagher	McGraw	Schmitt
Bellomina	Geister	McMonagle	Shane
Pennott	Gelfand	Morris	Shelhamer
Berkes	Gillette	Mullen, M. P.	Shelton
Berson	Gleason	Murtha	Shuman
Bixler	Greenfield	Musto	Shupnik
Blackwell	Hammock	Myers	Stout
Bonetto	Homer	O'Brien	Sullivan
Brunner	Hutchinson, A.	Oliver	Toll
Caputo	Irevis	Perry	Trusio
Comer	Itkin	Petrarca	Valicenti
Davis, D. M.	Johnson, J.	Pievsky	Vann
DeMedio	Kelly, A. P.	Prendergast	Walsh, J. T.
Dicarlo	Kolter	Rappaport	Walsh, T. P.
Dombrowski	Kowatyshyn	Ronwick	Wargo
Doyle	LaMarca	Rhodes	Williams
Dreibelbis	Laudadio	Richardson	Wise
Early	Laughlin	Rieger	Wojcik
Eckensberger	Letterman	Hitter	Yahner
Engelhart	Lincoln	Ruggiero	Zeller
Fee	Manderino	Savitt	Zwikel
Fenrich			

NAYS—102

Anderson, J. H.	Gleason	McCue	Spencer
Beren	Grieco	McCurdy	Stahl
Bittle	Halverson	McGinnis	Taddonto
Brandt	Hamilton, J. H.	Mebus	Thomas
Burkardt	Harrier	Miller, M. E.	Turner
Burns	Hasay	Mitter, M. E., Jr.	Uatynoski
Butera	Haskell	Noye	Vacca
Byerly	Hayes, D. S.	O'Connell	Vipond
Cessar	Hayes, S. E.	Pancoast	Volpe
Checcchio	Hepford	Parker, H. S.	Wagner
Crawford	Hill	Perrri	Weidner
Dager	Hutchinson, W.	Piner	Wells
Davis, R.	Jones	Pitts	Westerberg
Deverter	Kabie	Polite	Whittlesey
Dinnant	Katz	Renninger	Wilson
Dorr	Kelly, J. H.	Rowe	Wilt, R. W.
Dorsey	Kennedy	Ruane	Wilt, W. W.
Fawcett	Kester	Ryan	Worrlow
Fischer	Kistler	Sabour	Wright
Foot	Klingaman	Scheaffer	Yohn
Foster, A.	Knepper	Schulze	Zearfoss
Foster, W.	Kusse	Seirice	Zimmerman
Frankenburg	Lehr	Seltzer	Zord
Gallen	Lynch, Frank	Smith, C.	
Geesey	Maloney	Smith, E.	Lee,
Gekas	McClatchy	Smith, L.	Speaker

NOT VOTING—12

Fineman	Gring	Malady	Salvatore
Fox	Hopkins	Novak	Semenoff
Goodman	Lederer	Romanelli	Tayoun

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

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

Mr. ENGLEHART requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 5, line 23, by striking out "30,000,000" and inserting: 37,600,000

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Englehart.

Mr. ENGLEHART. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is a little bit different from the one which was passed out to the members. What it asks for now is an increase of \$7,600,000 in the appropriations to pay for salary increases.

About a half hour ago, the gentleman, Mr. Miller, introduced an amendment which allegedly paid a general



salary increase to the state college faculties. I must confess that the members on our side of the aisle were not forewarned or advised of how he did this, but he did it by the simple expedient of taking the same amount of money that the Republicans had offered and earmarked \$3.6 million specifically for salary increases and told the colleges to go sweat for the rest of the money they need to run their colleges.

So I have had to add that \$3.6 million back into my amendment to recoup for the state colleges.

The other \$4 million is to completely pay the bill for the pay increases for the Pennsylvania state employees, which was negotiated by a contract and effective July 1, 1973.

The present appropriation carries \$30 million for this project, and the actual costs, according to the budget office and AFSCME and everybody who is concerned with it who has figured it out, is \$34 million.

It is very easy to say, you can always find \$4 million, so do not worry about it; we will take care of that later, too. The real truth is that \$4 million is the shortage. If you are going to estimate that the average state employee makes \$8,000 a year, and he has already worked 6 months at the new salary rate, this means that 1,000 employees are going to disappear from the payroll in order to balance it.

I know it is nice to applaud because 1,000 people are unemployed and their families no longer eat, but it is not quite that simple. What I am really worried about, to tell you the truth, is that the poor gentleman from Dauphin, Mr. Hepford, and the gentleman from Lebanon, Mr. Seltzer, are going to have to get on that microphone and they are going to put one of these deep, resonant, impassioned speeches on that we laid somebody off who lives in their district. I have to worry about those people, but I am more worried about them because today they were almost white. I think they are going to have a heart attack.

This is going to happen. You simply cannot do it any other way. Mr. Seltzer will tell you that they have allowed for this amply because every department in the government got an 8-percent pay increase. It is true. Every department of the government got an 8-percent increase in their appropriations, but that 8 percent was long since consumed.

Whenever you told me you were not interested in raising our own employees' salaries, I pointed out to you that they had a 4-percent increase given to them by the normal increments. They had another 2.5 percent on a contract they negotiated before that, and they had another half a percent in side benefits with increased retirement and social security, plus the cost of living, inflation, the cost of supplies and everything else. That 8 percent is long since gone.

You can go ahead and kid yourself and say, well, \$30 million will do the job. The real fact is that \$30 million will not do the job. It takes \$4 million more.

If you do not do it, someone is going to leave government service, and they are going to leave it on January 1.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. ENGLEHART and SELTZER and were as follows:

## YEAS—91

Arthurs	Fineman	Martino	Savitt
Barber	Fryer	McGraw	Scanlon
Bellommi	Gallagher	McMonagle	Schmitt
Bennett	Geisler	Morris	Shane
Berkus	Gelfand	Mullen, M. P.	Shelbamer
Berson	Gillette	Murtha	Shelton
Bixler	Gleason	Musto	Shupnik
Blackwell	Greenfield	Myers	Stout
Bonetto	Hammock	Novak	Sullivan
Brunner	Homer	O'Brien	Toll
Caputo	Hutchinson, A.	Oliver	Trusio
Comer	Irvic	Perry	Valicenti
Davis, D. M.	Itkin	Petrarca	Vann
DeMedio	Johnson, J.	Pievsky	Walsh, J. T.
Dicarlo	Kelly, A. P.	Prendergast	Walsh, T. P.
Dombrowski	Kolter	Rappaport	Wargo
Doyle	Kowalshyn	Renwick	Williams
Dreibelbis	LaMara	Rhodes	Wise
Early	Laudadio	Richardson	Wojdak
Seckensberger	Laughlin	Rieger	Yahner
Engelhart	Letterman	Ritter	Zeller
Fee	Lincoln	Romanelli	Zwikel
Fenrich	Manderino	Ruggiero	

## NAYS—104

Anderson, J. H.	Grieco	McCurdy	Spencer
Beren	Halverson	McGinnis	Stahl
Bittle	Hamilton, J. H.	McBus	Taddonio
Brandt	Harriser	Miller, M. E.	Thomas
Burkardt	Hasay	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Turner
Burns	Haskell	Noye	Ustynoski
Rutera	Hayes, D. S.	O'Connell	Vacca
Ryerly	Hayes, S. E.	Pancoast	Vipond
Cassar	Hepford	Parker, H. S.	Volpe
Checchio	Hill	Perri	Wagner
Crawford	Hopkins	Piper	Weidner
Dager	Hutchinson, W.	Pitts	Wells
Davis, R.	Jones	Polite	Westerberg
Deverter	Kahle	Renninger	Whittlesey
Dinnant	Katz	Rowe	Wilson
Dorr	Kelly, J. E.	Ruane	Wilt, R. W.
Dorsey	Kennedy	Saloom	Wilt, W. W.
Fawcett	Kester	Scheaffer	Worrlow
Fischer	Kistler	Schulze	Wright
Foor	Klingsman	Seirica	Yohn
Foster, A.	Knepper	Seltzer	Zearfoss
Foster, W.	Kusse	Semanoff	Zimmerman
Frankenburg	Lehr	Shuman	Zord
Gallen	Lynch, Frank	Smith, C.	
Geesey	Maloney	Smith, E.	Lee, Speaker
Gekas	McClatchy	Smith, L.	
Gleason	McCue		

## NOT VOTING—8

Fox	Gring	Malady	Salvatore
Goodman	Lederer	Ryan	Tayoun

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

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

Mr. ENGLEHART requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 5, line 23, by striking out "30,000,000" and inserting: 34,000,000

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Englehart.

Mr. ENGLEHART. Mr. Speaker, this amendment adds an additional \$4 million to cover state employees only, in the event that some members may have voted "no" because they feel the state college faculty has already been taken care of.

All of the same arguments prevail, we are still going to be short on January 1, and I request support for the amendment.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. ENGLEHART and SELTZER and were as follows:

YEAS—88

Arthurs	Gallagher	McGraw	Savitt
Barber	Gelsler	McMonagle	Scanlon
Bellommi	Gelfand	Morris	Schmitt
Bennett	Gillette	Mullen, M. P.	Shane
Berkes	Gleeson	Murtha	Shelhamer
Berson	Greenfield	Musto	Shelton
Bixler	Hammock	Myers	Shupnik
Blackwell	Horner	Novak	Stout
Bonetto	Hutchinson, A.	O'Brien	Sullivan
Brunner	Irvn	Oliver	Toll
Caputo	Itkin	Perry	Trusio
Comer	Johnson, J.	Petrarca	Valcenti
Davis, D. M.	Kelly, A. P.	Pievsky	Vann
DeMedio	Kolter	Prendergast	Walsh, J. T.
Dicarlo	Kowalshyn	Rappaport	Walsh, T. P.
Dombrowski	LaMarca	Renwick	Wargo
Doyle	Laudadio	Rhodes	Williams
Eckensberger	Laughlin	Richardson	Wise
Englehart	Letterman	Rieger	Wojdak
Fee	Lincoln	Ritter	Yahner
Fenrich	Mandacino	Romanelli	Zeller
Fryer	Martino	Ruggiero	Zwikel

NAYS—104

Anderson, J. H.	Crieco	McCurdy	Smith, L.
Beren	Halverson	McGinnis	Spencer
Bittle	Hamilton, J. H.	Mebus	Stahl
Brandt	Harrier	Miller, M. E.	Taddonio
Burkardt	Hasay	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Thomas
Burns	Haskell	Noye	Ustynoski
Butera	Hayes, D. S.	O'Connell	Vacca
Byerly	Hayes, S. E.	Pancoast	Vipond
Cassar	Hepford	Parker, H. S.	Volpe
Checchio	Hill	Perr	Wagner
Crawford	Hopkins	Piper	Weidner
Dager	Hutchinson, W.	Pitts	Wells
Davis, R.	Jones	Polite	Westerberg
Deverter	Kahle	Renninger	Whittlesey
Dinnai	Katz	Rowe	Wilson
Dorr	Kelly, J. B.	Ruane	Wilt, R. W.
Dorsey	Kennedy	Ryan	Wilt, W. W.
Fawcett	Koster	Saloom	Worrlow
Fischer	Kistler	Scheaffer	Wright
Foor	Killgaman	Schulze	Yohn
Foster, A.	Knepper	Scirica	Zearfoss
Foster, W.	Kusse	Seltzer	Zimmerman
Frankenburg	Lehr	Semanoff	Zord
Gallen	Lynch, Frank	Shuman	
Geesey	Maloney	Smith, C.	Lee,
Gekas	McClatchy	Smith, E.	Speaker
Gleason	McCue		

NOT VOTING—11

Drefbelbs	Fox	Lederer	Payoun
Early	Goodman	Malady	Turner
Fineman	Gring	Salvatore	

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. ITKIN requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 17, line 8, by striking out "3,600,000" and inserting: 6,600,000

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, this amendment, I hope, will attempt to resolve an impasse that has developed with respect to the mental health and mental retardation funding.

Earlier today an amendment was offered which would increase the appropriation in Senate bill No. 1058 from \$3.6 million to \$9.6 million.

A majority of the membership of this House, present at that time, felt that at the \$9.6 million figure it was a worthy project and worth the consideration of incorporating it into the bill.

I recognize that this particular issue has become partisan. I know that most individuals on both sides of the aisle want to provide the necessary funding in this very worthwhile endeavor.

There are no hard and fast figures. The \$3.6 million appropriated by Mr. Seltzer is no magic number. I would suggest that the \$9.6 million presented by the Democratic side, too, is no magic figure. But what I am suggesting to this House is, let us leave tonight committed to mental health and mental retardation funding. Let us consider a compromise, and that is what this amendment attempts to do. This amendment will split the difference, \$6.6 million for MH-MR.

What I am asking of this House now is that it consider appropriating an additional 30 cents per capita to fund mental health-mental retardation. That is not a lot to ask. I would hope that this would be the type of compromise that both sides of the aisle could live and agree with.

I respectfully submit this as a compromise version to resolve this whole mental health-mental retardation battle. It is only \$3 million more than is in Senate bill No. 1058.

It is a very important issue, as most members will agree. If we can leave tonight and go home knowing that this House has committed itself to a realistic appropriation for MH-MR, then we will all go home heroes. There should not be any villains in this House when it comes to this type of appropriation. Remember, it is \$3 million. It is 30 cents per capita.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. ITKIN and SELTZER and were as follows:

YEAS—93

Arthurs	Frankenburg	McCue	Savitt
Barber	Fryer	McGraw	Scanlon
Bellommi	Gallagher	McMonagle	Schmitt
Bennett	Gelsler	Morris	Shane
Berkes	Gelfand	Mullen, M. P.	Shelhamer
Berson	Gillette	Murtha	Shuman
Bixler	Gleeson	Musto	Shupnik
Blackwell	Greenfield	Myers	Stout
Bonetto	Hammock	Novak	Sullivan
Brunner	Horner	O'Brien	Toll
Caputo	Hutchinson, A.	Oliver	Trusio
Comer	Itkin	Perry	Valcenti
Davis, D. M.	Johnson, J.	Petrarca	Vann
DeMedio	Kelly, A. P.	Pievsky	Walsh, J. T.
Dicarlo	Kolter	Prendergast	Walsh, T. P.
Dombrowski	Kowalshyn	Rappaport	Wargo
Doyle	LaMarca	Renwick	Williams
Early	Laudadio	Rhodes	Wise
Eckensberger	Laughlin	Richardson	Wojdak
Englehart	Letterman	Rieger	Wright
Fee	Lincoln	Ritter	Yahner
Fenrich	Mandacino	Romanelli	Zeller
Fineman	Martino	Ruggiero	Zwikel
Fischer			

NAYS—97

Anderson, J. H.	Halverson	McCurdy	Smith, L.
Beren	Hamilton, J. H.	McGinnis	Spencer
Bittle	Harrier	Mebus	Stahl

Brandt	Hassy	Müller, M. E.	Taddone
Burkardt	Haskell	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Thomas
Burns	Hayes, D. S.	Noye	Turner
Butera	Hayes, S. E.	O'Connell	Ustynoski
Eyerly	Hepford	Pancoast	Vacca
Cassar	Hill	Parker, H. S.	Vipond
Checchio	Hopkins	Piper	Volpe
Crawford	Hutchinson, W.	Pitts	Wagner
Dagor	Jones	Polite	Weidner
Davis, R.	Kable	Reininger	Wells
Deverter	Katz	Rowe	Westerberg
Dinnini	Kelly, J. B.	Ruane	Whittlesy
Dursey	Kennedy	Ryan	Will, E. W.
Fawcett	Kestor	Saloom	Will, W. W.
Foor	Kistler	Schaeffer	Worrlow
Foster, A.	Klingaman	Schulze	Yahn
Foster, W.	Knepper	Scirca	Zearfoss
Gollen	Kusse	Seltor	Zimmerman
Geesey	Lehr	Semanoff	Zord
Gekas	Lynch, Frank	Smith, C.	Lee,
Gleason	Maloney	Smith, E.	Speaker
Grieco	McClatchy		

NOT VOTING--13

Dorr	Gring	Melady	Shelton
Dreibelbis	Iris	Ferri	Tayoun
Fox	Ledorer	Salvatore	Wilson
Goodman			

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. MULLEN requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendments, which were read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 31, line 2, by striking out the bracket before "FOR"

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 31, line 28, by striking out "17,000,000]" and inserting: 20,000,000

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Mullen.

Mr. MULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief.

We have given increases to almost every category in the budget except court costs. Last year we had appropriated \$17 million for court costs, and the Governor recommended that we give another \$30 million this year. Even the Republican leadership certainly recognized that additional money was required, and they introduced House bill No. 1315 which would have provided an additional \$14 million.

All of us know that a couple of years ago we passed a bill which provided for 50 additional judges throughout the Commonwealth and all of us realize that, in most of the large jurisdictions, we are behind in the criminal and civic portion of the courts.

Now the only thing that the state had paid, up until the passage of this bill a couple of years ago, was the salaries of the judges. Certainly we recognize that we do have an obligation. Even with this amendment, which increases the figure from \$17 million to \$20 million in this particular bill, it is totally inadequate to fund the programs that we are trying to fund. So we are asking you to increase this appropriation from \$17 million to \$20 million, and that would be in addition to the revenue-yielding amount that we passed the other day. It will help all of the counties in the Commonwealth to help pay part of their costs for their courts.

One of the problems we face is that we would not want to see our colleague, Mr. Gelfand, without a staff. This could very well happen to him, and the same with

Mr. Savitt and Mr. Lederer, if we do not provide the money. You know, Mayor Rizzo in Philadelphia said he did not intend to provide any more money, and maybe Mr. Gelfand might have to resign his job as judge and come back to us again. So I would suggest that we vote for it or we may have Mr. Gelfand back with us again next year.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. BUTERA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this appropriation.

As you know, it does not quite do just as the gentleman said in his brief remarks—raise the appropriation from \$17 million to \$20 million. In fact, it raises the appropriation from zero to \$20 million in this particular bill. That is a \$20-million increase.

There are a couple of reasons we oppose this particular appropriation at this particular time. I think that the appropriation, basically, is for the purpose of putting a block of money into Philadelphia so that Philadelphia can balance its municipal budget. That is what it is, and we know that. That is not altogether wrong. We have already given the city of Philadelphia an additional \$20 million jointly to help it balance its school budget. We have given the southeastern part of the state, the bulk of which goes to Philadelphia, roughly \$28 million in mass transit—something less than that—to balance that budget. We have today increased the appropriation for child welfare to the counties, the bulk of which goes to Philadelphia, by \$5 million.

There comes a time, when you look at your priorities, that we decided that we could not go any further. It is for that reason we decided to put more money into the various programs— the mental health programs, the day-care program, the salary increase for the state employees, et cetera—and thought that those areas were more important than this particular item. And it is really for those reasons that I rise to oppose this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Mullen.

Mr. MULLEN. Very briefly again, I would like to correct a few things the gentleman said.

First of all, when he was talking about moncys for SEPTA, you must always remember that Philadelphia is really not the beneficiary of that money totally. The four counties—Chester, Bucks, Montgomery and Delaware—are really the beneficiaries because we carry those people who work in those areas into Philadelphia and we carry them home again at night.

Now the only point I want to try to make is that the Republican leadership recognized earlier, when they introduced House bill No. 1315, that additional money was required for this category, because in that particular bill they had line-itemed \$14 million. This bill was introduced after we had passed the general appropriation bill which had already provided \$17 million. So you recognized then that we needed the additional \$14 million.

And I might say this is not all for Philadelphia; it is for the whole state.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. MULLEN and BUTERA and were as follows:

YEAS—68

Arthurs	Fenrich	Laudadio	Richardson
Barber	Fineman	Manderino	Rieger
Bellomito	Gallagher	Martino	Romanelli
Bennett	Gelsler	McMonagle	Savitt
Berkes	Gelfand	Mullen, M. P.	Scanlon
Berson	Gillette	Murtha	Schmitt
Blackwell	Gleeson	Musto	Shane
Bonetto	Greenfield	Myers	Shupnik
Brunner	Hamilton, J. H.	Novak	Stout
Caputo	Hammock	O'Brien	Sullivan
Checchio	Homer	Oliver	Toll
Comer	Ivins	Parri	Vacca
DeMedio	Itkin	Perry	Valicenti
Dombrowski	Johnson, J.	Petrarca	Vann
Dreibelbis	Katz	Plevsky	Wargo
Englehart	Kelly, A. P.	Prondogast	Williams
Foe	LaMarea	Rhodes	Wofdak

NAYS—127

Anderson, J. H.	Grieco	McGinnis	Spencer
Beren	Hulverson	McGraw	Stahl
Bittle	Harter	Mebus	Taddonto
Bicler	Hasay	Miller, M. E.	Thomas
Brandt	Haskell	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Trusco
Burkardt	Hayes, D. S.	Morris	Turner
Burns	Hayes, S. E.	Novak	Ustynski
Butera	Hepford	O'Connell	Vipond
Everly	Hill	Pancoast	Volpe
Cassar	Hopkins	Parker, H. S.	Wagner
Crawford	Hutchinson, A.	Piper	Walsh, J. T.
Dager	Hutchinson, W.	Pitts	Walsh, T. P.
Davis, D. M.	Jones	Polite	Weidner
Davis, R.	Kahle	Rappaport	Wells
Deverter	Kelly, J. B.	Renninger	Westerberg
Dicarlo	Kennedy	Renwick	Whittlesey
Dinhart	Kester	Ritter	Wilson
Dorr	Kistler	Rowe	Wilt, R. W.
Dorsey	Klingaman	Ruano	Wilt, W. W.
Doyle	Knepper	Ruggiero	Wise
Early	Kolter	Ryan	Worrlow
Eckensherger	Kowalshyn	Saloom	Wright
Fawcett	Kusso	Schaeffer	Yehner
Fischer	Laughlin	Schulze	Yohn
Foor	Lehr	Seitica	Zarfooss
Foster, A.	Letterman	Selber	Zeller
Foster, W.	Lincoln	Sernanoff	Zimmerman
Frankenburg	Lynch, Frank	Shehamer	Zord
Fryer	Maloney	Shuman	Zwick
Gallen	McClatchy	Smith, C.	
Geesey	McCue	Smith, E.	Lee, Speaker
Gekas	McCurdy	Smith, L.	
Gleason			

NOT VOTING—8

Fox	Gring	Malady	Shelton
Goodman	Lederer	Salvatore	Tayoun

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendments were not agreed to.

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

Mr. ENGLEHART requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendments, which were read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 22, by inserting between lines 18 and 19: Notwithstanding any provision of this act to the contrary, all moneys appropriated to the Senate shall be expended and accounted for in accordance with rules and accounting procedures adopted by the Senate Committee on Rules.

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 26, by inserting between lines 1 and 2: Notwithstanding any provision of this act to the contrary, all moneys appropriated to the House of Representatives shall be expended and accounted for in accordance with rules and accounting procedures adopted by the House Committee on Rules.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Englehart.

Mr. ENGLEHART. Mr. Speaker, I might have won by agreement.

The SPEAKER. Apparently no one has seen the amendment. Would the gentleman just briefly explain his amendment?

Mr. ENGLEHART. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

As you recall, at the end of June or July I tried to amend the appropriation bill to provide that auditing of the contingency accounts and the moneys spent by the legislature should be done in accordance with an accounting manual to be prepared by the Legislative Auditing Commission.

At the time there were several reasons involved, but the principal one was that the accounting manual was not ready. The accounting manual is now ready. It was approved by the full Auditing Commission last week. It is in print. It will be in the hands of all the members of the Rules Committee this week, and the only—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. BUTERA. Mr. Speaker, I suggest we support the amendment.

On the question recurring,  
Will the House agree to the amendments?  
Amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Englehart.

Mr. ENGLEHART. Mr. Speaker, will you tell Mr. Bonetto that I am one for nine?

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

Mr. COMER requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 27, by inserting between lines 29 and 30:

For the establishment and maintenance of legislative offices in the legislative districts, each member of the House of Representatives upon request shall be supplied by the Commonwealth with postage and office equipment, and shall be entitled to the sum of six thousand dollars (\$6,000) per year as compensation for a secretary and one hundred dollars (\$100) per month for rental of the office. The Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives shall provide for the postage and office equipment, pay the secretaries and pay the rentals to the owner of the premises. No rental payments shall be made on account of a legislative office established and maintained at a member's residence ..... 2,000,000

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Comer.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I am willing to take the same vote on this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this, in my estimation, is about one of the last of the improvements we have been trying to get in the legislature for years. I would like to point out to the House that we are the only one of the major states in the country which does not provide its legislators with home offices.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment will establish and maintain legislative offices in a member's home district. I

would like to point out that each member, upon request, would be supplied by the Commonwealth with a secretary at \$6,000 per year, \$100 per month toward the rental of an office, and will also be provided with postage and office equipment. Payment of secretary and rental would be made by the chief clerk directly. No member would be paid rental for an office established in his home.

Mr. Speaker, I have come up with a figure of \$2 million, which is a little high, but it is better to lay it on the line than use figures which would not give the real story. For instance, the first year of operation of this would be much higher than thereafter, after the office equipment was purchased.

I know the hour is late, Mr. Speaker, and I will not continue, but I ask the full support of the members on both sides of the aisle.

Thank you.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. COMER and SELTZER and were as follows:

YEAS—32

Belomini	Gallagher	LaMorus	Rhodes
Berkes	Geisler	Leflerman	Richardson
Blackwell	Gelfand	Manderno	Rieger
Caputo	Gleeson	Mullen, M. P.	Romanelli
Comer	Hutchinson, A.	Myers	Sullivan
Dicarlo	Ireis	Oliver	Ustynoski
Dombrowski	Johnson, J.	Prendergast	Vann
Fipeman	Kelly, A. P.	Rappaport	Williams

NAYS—155

Anderson, J. H.	Gillette	McGraw	Shupnik
Arthurs	Gleason	McMonagle	Smith, C.
Barber	Grieco	McBus	Smith, E.
Bennett	Halverson	Miller, M. E.	Smith, I.
Beran	Hamilton, J. H.	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Spencer
Berson	Harrier	Morris	Stahl
Bittle	Husay	Murtha	Stout
Bixler	Huskell	Musto	Taddonio
Bonetto	Hayes, D. S.	Novak	Thomas
Brandt	Hayes, S. E.	Noye	Toll
Burkardt	Hepford	O'Brien	Trusto
Burns	Hill	O'Connell	Turner
Butera	Homer	Pencoast	Vacca
Eyerly	Hopkins	Parker, H. S.	Valicenti
Cassar	Hutchinson, W.	Perrt	Vipond
Cicchio	Itkin	Perry	Wagner
Crawford	Jones	Petrarca	Walsh, J. T.
Dager	Kahle	Picvasky	Walsh, T. P.
Davis, D. M.	Katz	Piper	Wargo
Davis, R.	Kelly, J. B.	Pitts	Weidner
DeMedio	Kennedy	Polite	Wells
Deverter	Kester	Renninger	Westerberg
Diniardi	Kistler	Renwick	Whittlesey
Dorr	Klingaman	Ritter	Wilson
Lorsey	Knopper	Rowe	Witt, R. W.
Doyle	Koller	Rumme	Witt, W. W.
Early	Kowalychyn	Ruggiero	Wise
Eckensberger	Kusse	Ryan	Worrlow
Englehart	Laudadio	Saloom	Wright
Fawcett	Laughlin	Scanlon	Yahner
Fee	Lehr	Schaeffer	Yohn
Fischer	Lincoln	Schmitt	Zearfos
Foor	Lynch, Frank	Schulke	Zeller
Foster, A.	Maloney	Scirica	Zimmerman
Foster, W.	Martino	Seltzer	Zord
Frankenburg	McClatchy	Semanoff	Zwld
Fryer	McCue	Shane	
Gallen	McCurdy	Shelhamer	
Geesoy	McGiunta	Shuman	
Gekas			

NOT VOTING—16

Brunner	Goodman	Lederer	Sheldon
Dreibelbis	Greenfield	Malsdy	Tavoun
Fenrich	Gring	Salvatore	Volpe
Fox	Hammock	Savitt	Wojdak

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 17, line 18, by striking out all of said line and inserting: 450,464,400

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have two amendments here which should have been one. Due to an oversight by the Legislative Reference Bureau, they were made into two amendments, but the impact is the same, so I will speak to both of those amendments at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, we have turned down the mentally ill; we have turned down the veterans; we have turned down people in sheltered workshops; we have turned down the educationally disadvantaged; we have even turned down our own employes.

Some of us clapped when we found out 1,000 people would not be working. Therefore, I do not expect that there will be any favorable response to this amendment, which proposes to increase the basic assistance grant—commonly known as welfare—20 percent and appropriates therefor \$50 million for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that in this country we have four major delivery systems—one, income maintenance, which is money; the other, physical and mental health; public education; and fourthly, juvenile and criminal justice.

Frankly, we have failed. We just do not deliver in those four major delivery systems. Today we have been debating and shouting as though we really believe the philosophy of service. We do not. It is only a question of whom we serve. In my opinion, in this country the four major systems fail because we serve the affluent and we do not serve the poor. We serve two other systems—one for the rich and one for the poor; one for the fortunate and one for the unfortunate. Two of our major problems in this country undergird the failure in those systems; that is, racism and poverty—our country's two most urgent domestic problems. We do not have the guts to face up to poverty or racism. Both, mind you, are economically unsound.

We are here, both sides, hoodwinking the public in the context of some promised tax relief. Remove poverty, remove racism, and you relieve taxes. Remove poverty, remove racism, and you reduce unemployment. Remove poverty and remove racism, and you remove and eradicate conflict that reflects itself in crime and racial conflict.

This amendment merely makes a cost-of-living increase for people who are poor. The Federal Government, in recognizing the need of the elderly, the disabled and others, granted a 21-percent increase in which this state will participate. There was no allowance and no recognition for those who are poor. We are sitting here, I would suggest, and in fact we do not give a darn about the poor; we do not recognize that that is a responsibility,

Lee, Speaker

And yet, is there any sound reason that we should not at this time grant a cost-of-living increase to those who have been recognized as poor? The money is there. The money is there because we have saved \$66 million because the Feds have taken over their program. It is there because we have saved \$4 million through the operation SWEEP. It is there because we have saved \$4 million additional because some banks now process these checks.

Some of you will say that these people do not deserve this increase because they do not work. Why, therefore, should the poor and the widowed get anything? The powerless have no forum. There have been good and substantial reasons for the program we call welfare, and that has been long since settled. But no one says when Boeing gets millions of dollars, that is considered policy. When the Democrats are burglarized, that is considered national security. When Dr. Ellsberg is burglarized, that is considered national security. When ITT settles out, that is national policy. When San Clemente gets improved to the tune of millions of dollars, that is considered national security. When national corporations overfill the coffers of a presidential campaign illegally and get public subsidies and favors and private gain at public expense, that is considered policy. When \$10 million in this state is misappropriated for some landfill contracts, that is considered good business policy. That \$10 million on that one contract alone is more than all the alleged cheating that was supposed to be in welfare which has been cleaned up to the tune of \$8 million. I wonder how many more subsidies or good business contracts exist in this state.

We will not face it, Mr. Speaker. We do not want to face an honest challenge to meet one of the most basic questions of our country, that is, poverty. We would rather appropriate \$42 million in this bill, \$70 million in the bill we passed last week for mass transit, and that is good, but mass transit on top of mass malnutrition is basically wrong, immoral and inhuman.

In this country alone, one-third of our children are malnourished, and that rate equals some of the most depressed areas of this world. Growth retardation is connected with that malnutrition which is connected with the poverty that exists in this country, and that is our challenge.

I say, we do not care. We talk about \$150 million, so to speak, for mass transit; we talk about potholes, and we do not care about potbellies.

Mr. Speaker, I propose this amendment which will increase the basic welfare allotment because it is right and correct at this time. I propose this amendment, although I know the response of this legislature, to bring what is, in my mind, some recognition of what our basic responsibilities are in this country and in this state.

Poverty stares us in the face every day. The problem that we wrestle with is injustice, because that is infected with the contagion of inefficiency, injustice, racism and also poverty.

The same thing is true in our public education system. Those who have the money get the education; those who do not have money do not. It is true with our people who do not get health services or mental health services. Those who do not have money do not get it. It is again true, as I have pointed out, when we handle the money—those who have it get it in billions and billions of dollars, and that is policy.

I want to propose this amendment, Mr. Speaker, in the light only of what our challenges, I think, ought to be. Someday and sometime we will not use people as scapegoats for our own self-interest. We will not dare raise our salaries, we will not dare raise the salaries of those who already have it, and at least not recognize the very commonsense immoral connections.

We are looking at that proposition now. The money is there, partly because those who asked for this basic increase have helped us save \$8 million, have helped us to find the money that many of you talked about all year as welfare cheaters.

It was policy when Mr. Agnew, for many years, talked about the welfare cheaters, and little did we know the moneys that were hidden in contracts that may have emanated from his own activities.

That is the balance I am talking about; that is the morality I am talking about; that is the human priority I am talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to find the money, as someone said. I suggest it is already here.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. WILLIAMS and SELTZER and were as follows:

## YEAS—44

Barber	Gelslor	LaMarca	Rhodes
Bellomini	Gelfand	Manderino	Richardson
Berkes	Gillette	Martino	Romanelli
Berson	Gleeson	Mullen, M. P.	Ruggiero
Blackwell	Hammock	Novak	Scanlon
Checchio	Homer	Oliver	Toll
Comer	Irvin	Perry	Vacca
Dicarlo	Itkin	Petrarca	Vann
Dombrowski	Johnson, J.	Pievsky	Wargo
Fineman	Kelly, A. P.	Prendergast	Williams
Gallagher	Kowalshym	Rappaport	Wright

## NAYS—138

Anderson, J. H.	Callen	McGinnis	Smith, E.
Arthurs	Cecsey	McGraw	Smith, L.
Bennett	Gakas	McMonagle	Spencer
Beren	Cleason	Mebus	Stahl
Bittle	Gricco	Miller, M. E.	Stout
Bixler	Halverson	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Taddonio
Bonetto	Hamilton, J. H.	Morris	Thomas
Brandt	Harrier	Murtha	Trusto
Brunner	Hasay	Musto	Turner
Burkardt	Haskell	Nove	Ustynoski
Burns	Hayes, D. S.	O'Brien	Valicenti
Butera	Hayes, S. E.	O'Connell	Vipond
Byerly	Hepford	Pancoast	Volpe
Caputo	Hill	Parker, H. S.	Wagner
Cessar	Hopkins	Piper	Walsh, J. T.
Crawford	Hutchinson, W.	Pitts	Walsh, T. P.
Dager	Jones	Polite	Weidner
Davis, D. M.	Kahle	Renninger	Wells
DeMedto	Katz	Renwick	Westerberg
Deverter	Kelly, J. B.	Ritter	Whittlesey
Dinnini	Kester	Rowe	Wilson
Dorr	Kistler	Ruane	Wilt, R. W.
Dorsey	Klingaman	Ryan	Wilt, W. W.
Doyle	Knepper	Saloom	Wise
Early	Kolter	Scheaffer	Worrtlow
Eckensberger	Kusse	Schmitt	Yahner
Englehart	Laudsdio	Schulze	Yohn
Fawcett	Laughlin	Scirica	Zearfoss
Fee	Lehr	Seltzer	Zeller
Fischer	Lincoln	Semanoff	Zimmerman
Foor	Lynch, Frank	Shane	Zord
Poster, A.	Maloney	Shelhamer	Zwinkl
Poster, W.	McClatchy	Shuman	
Frankenburg	McCue	Shupnik	Lee,
Fryer	McCurdy	Smith, C.	Speaker

## NOT VOTING—21

Davis, R.	Gring	Malady	Savitt
Dreibelbis	Hutchinson, A.	Myers	Shelton
Fenrich	Kennedy	Perri	Sullivan
Fox	Lederer	Rieger	Tayoun
Goodman	Letterman	Salvatore	Wojdak
Greenfield			

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. WILLIAMS requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 18, line 10, by removing the period after "Governor" and inserting: : And, provided further, That the Secretary of Public Welfare shall increase the amount of cash grants to individual recipients by twenty per cent effective thirty days after the effective date of this act.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment to Senate bill No. 1058 proposes \$5 million to be available for use by nursing homes and homes for the aged in order to have them comply with the Life and Safety Code of the Federal Government and any state regulations that are made in accordance therewith.

The problem here, Mr. Speaker, is that the code requirements would just completely take out of business many institutions which have been doing our job. I refer to at least four homes for the black aged or infirm which would, in fact, financially not be able to make it by meeting these codes. In that context, Mr. Speaker, to me, it is some sort of genocide.

I would just like to refer to words of Mr. Hobart Jackson, who is the administrator of the Stephen Smith Geriatric Center in Philadelphia, which is a home that has housed the black aged for almost a hundred years. He refers to the plight of some people of triple jeopardy—they are aged, they are poor, and they are black.

Mr. Speaker, that institution, as many of the other institutions, has no endowments. They basically house poor people. These same people do not get into the other institutions. They have a waiting list; the other institutions have empty beds.

Throughout this country the black elderly make up perhaps 8 percent of the aged population, and yet only 3 percent have some institutional care.

Mr. Speaker, in our state alone, if those institutions are not able—and they will not be able—to meet those codes, then I suggest, if we are committed to some human improvement for people who cannot take care of themselves and who have others who are so concerned and so committed to their care and improvement, that we, indeed, need some government intervention.

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, will make available moneys, not to be utilized across the board, but in those established and impoverished homes—and not just homes for the black, but homes which do not have the support of government or the support of endowments—to, indeed,

be able to quickly meet those codes and to conduct and to carry on their programs.

I would like to urge upon my fellow members the peculiarities and the uniqueness of the problem I am referring to. It is one which I could not articulate too very well because these are people who are old and these are people who are infirm and these are people who have made contributions in their lifetime. They do have many people who are so concerned about their care and welfare, yet the financial task so far has been borne by these institutions themselves. They need help if government is going to impose upon them widespread and substantial regulations for compliance.

I urge your support for the amendment.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. WILLIAMS and SELTZER and were as follows:

## YEAS—83

Arthurs	Gelfand	McMonagle	Scanlon
Barber	Gillette	Morris	Schmitt
Bellomini	Gleeson	Mullen, M. P.	Shane
Berkes	Greenfield	Musto	Shellhamer
Berson	Hammock	Myers	Shupak
Bixler	Homer	Novak	Stout
Blackwell	Hutchinson, A.	O'Brien	Sullivan
Bonetto	Irvig	Oliver	Toll
Caputo	Itkin	Perry	Trusco
Cicchio	Johnson, J.	Petrarca	Vaeco
Davis, D. M.	Katz	Pievsky	Valicenti
Dicarlo	Kelly, A. P.	Prendergast	Vann
Dombrowski	Kolter	Rappaport	Vipond
Doyle	Kowalshyn	Renwick	Walsh, T. P.
Eckensberger	LaMarda	Rhodes	Wargo
Englehart	Laughlin	Richardson	Williams
Fenrich	Lincoln	Rieger	Wise
Fineman	Manderino	Ritter	Wojdak
Fischer	Martino	Romanelli	Zeller
Gallagher	McCue	Ruggiero	Zwickl
Getzler	McGraw	Saloom	

## NAYS—107

Anderson, J. H.	Geesey	Maloney	Smith, L.
Bennett	Gekas	McClatchy	Spencer
Beren	Gleeson	McCurdy	Stahl
Bittle	Grieco	McGinnis	Taddonio
Brandt	Halverson	Miller, M. E.	Thomas
Brunner	Hamilton, J. H.	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Turner
Burkardt	Harrier	Murtha	Ustynoski
Burns	Hasay	Noye	Volpe
Butera	Haskell	O'Connell	Wagner
Byerly	Hayes, D. S.	Pancoast	Walsh, J. T.
Cassar	Hayes, S. E.	Parker, H. S.	Weidner
Crawford	Hepford	Perri	Wells
Dager	Hill	Piper	Westerberg
Davis, R.	Hopkins	Pitts	Whittlesey
DeMedio	Hutchinson, W.	Polite	Wilson
Deverter	Jones	Renninger	Wilt, R. W.
Dintona	Kahle	Rowe	Wilt, W. W.
Dorr	Kelly, J. B.	Ruane	Worrlow
Dorsey	Kennedy	Ryan	Wright
Early	Kester	Scheaffer	Yahner
Fawcett	Kistler	Schulze	Yohn
Fee	Klingaman	Scirca	Zearfoss
Foor	Knepper	Seltzer	Zimmerman
Foster, A.	Kusse	Sernanoff	Zimmer
Foster, W.	Laudadio	Shuman	
Frankenburg	Lehr	Smith, C.	Lee, Speaker
Fryer	Lynch, Frank	Smith, E.	
Gallen			

## NOT VOTING—13

Comer	Gring	Malady	Savitt
Dreibelbis	Lederer	Mebus	Shelton
Fox	Letterman	Salvatore	Tayoun
Goodman			

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. SHELHAMER requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 14, by inserting between lines 14 and 15: The funds provided for court cost reimbursement to the Department of Justice shall be distributed on the same formula basis as was used to distribute funds appropriated for court cost reimbursement in Appropriation Act No. 27-A of 1971.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Columbia, Mr. Shelhamer.

Mr. SHELHAMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I know the hour is late, but what I have to bring to the House tonight is very important to every member of the House, be he a Democrat or Republican.

What my amendment seeks to do is change the formula of the court costs that was earlier passed by this House. It seems that the formula has been changed from the original formula that all of us had been reimbursed under. And I would like to cover just a few of those changes in those court costs and show where the increases have come and where the decreases have come.

Now, basically, the increases have come in counties like Montgomery, Delaware, Lebanon, Sullivan and, of course, the two largest cities in Pennsylvania. Philadelphia comes in for an additional \$304,000 and Allegheny County was not forgotten. They got \$9,000.

Counties that lose under this particular formula are counties such as Adams County, which loses \$16,000; Lancaster County loses about \$162,000; Luzerne County loses \$22,000; Lycoming County, Mercer County, Northumberland County and York County lose.

I believe that the original formula was ill-conceived. My amendment will place it back to the original writing by which court costs were divided, under the original inception here in the General Assembly. For that reason, I would ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westmoreland, Mr. Manderino.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, briefly, when we first passed court costs, where the state began reimbursing counties for court costs, we appropriated \$8 million. In that particular appropriation bill, we did not include a formula under which that money would be reimbursed to the various counties. As a result, in order to distribute the money, the appellate court—I believe the Supreme Court—was asked to define what court costs were. They did. They outlined the category of costs that counties have that they felt amounted to court costs. That is the way the money was distributed in the first year of operation.

In the second year of operation, we appropriated additional moneys and an attempt was made to change the formula in the legislation. This General Assembly voted to continue the manner in which it had been distributed the first time, and that is the manner in which it was distributed last year. This year was the first time that a change was again made. I, frankly, missed it when House bill No. 850 passed.

I think that the change of the formula, as suggested

by the gentleman, is one that we ought to adopt. It is consistent with the manner in which the money was distributed the last two years.

Thank you very much.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. SHELHAMER and MANDERINO and were as follows:

YEAS—82

Arthurs	Halverson	Lincoln	Shelhamer
Bellommi	Hammock	Maloney	Shuman
Berkos	Hasay	Manderino	Shupnik
Bittle	Haskell	McCue	Smith, C.
Bixler	Hayes, D. S.	McGinnis	Stahl
Byorly	Hayes, S. E.	McGraw	Stout
Davis, D. M.	Homer	McMonagle	Trusto
DeMedio	Hopkins	Miller, M. F., Jr.	Turner
Dicarlo	Hutchinson, A.	Musto	Ustynoski
Dombrowski	Hutchinson, W.	Noye	Vipond
Dorr	Itkin	O'Brien	Volpe
Eckensberger	Kable	O'Connell	Wagner
Fischer	Kennedy	Petrarca	Wargo
Foor	Kester	Piper	Weidner
Foster, A.	Klingaman	Ritter	Wilt, R. W.
Foster, W.	Kolter	Ruane	Wilt, W. W.
Fryer	Kowalyszyn	Ruggiero	Wise
Gallagher	LaMarca	Salloom	Wright
Gallen	Laudadio	Schmitt	Zeller
Geesey	Laughlin	Somanoff	Zwidi
Grieco	Lehr		

NAYS—105

Anderson, J. H.	Fineman	Morris	Shane
Barber	Frankenburg	Mullen, M. P.	Smith, E.
Bennett	Gessler	Murtha	Smith, L.
Beren	Gekas	Myers	Spencer
Berson	Gelfand	Novak	Sullivan
Blackwell	Gillette	Pancoast	Tadonilo
Bonetto	Gleason	Parker, H. S.	Toll
Brandt	Gleeson	Ferri	Valicenti
Bruner	Greenfield	Perry	Vacca
Burkardt	Hamilton, J. H.	Pievsky	Vann
Burns	Harricr	Pitts	Walsh, T. P.
Butera	Hepford	Polite	Wells
Caputo	Jill	Prendergast	Westerberg
Cassar	Irvis	Rappaport	Whittlesey
Chicchio	Johnson, J.	Reminger	Williams
Crawford	Jones	Renwick	Wilson
Dager	Katz	Rhodes	Wojdak
Davis, R.	Kelly, A. P.	Richardson	Worrlow
Deverter	Kelly, J. B.	Rieger	Yahner
Dishol	Kistler	Romanelli	Yohn
Dorsey	Knepper	Rowe	Zearfoss
Doyle	Kusco	Ryan	Zimmerman
Early	Lynch, Frank	Scanlon	Zord
Engelhart	Martino	Schaeffer	
Fawcett	McClatchy	Schulze	Lee,
Fee	McCurdy	Seiries	Speaker
Fenrich	Mebus	Seltzer	

NOT VOTING—16

Cramer	Gring	Miller, M. E.	Shelton
Dreibolbis	Ledurer	Oliver	Tayoun
Fox	Letterman	Salvatore	Thomas
Goodman	Mslady	Savitt	Walsh, J. T.

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. BERKES requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 4, by inserting between lines 26 and 27:

For the administration and operation of the Governor's Council on Drug and Alcohol Abuse .....

[254,000]  
2,600,000



In addition to this amount, all moneys received from the Federal Government or from any other source as contributions to this program shall be paid into the General Fund and credited to this appropriation.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Berkes.

Mr. BERKES. Mr. Speaker, earlier today when Mr. Eckensberger presented an amendment to put additional funds back into the budget for the purposes of drug law enforcement, that was defeated.

The purpose of this amendment is different. This is not for drug law enforcement; it is for treatment and rehabilitation of drug abusers.

The reason this amount of money is needed, Mr. Speaker, is that earlier this year when we adopted a reorganization plan, it changed the whole scope of operations of our Governor's Council on Drug and Alcohol Abuse. We had, prior to that, allotted funds through the Department of Welfare for the treatment and rehabilitation of drug and alcohol abusers.

Because of the confusion in the budgeting, and because at that particular time the entire budget was not adopted, we wind up with \$2.6 million short on what was budgeted for the rehabilitation and treatment of drug abusers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if, earlier this year, we had been able to have adopted our welfare budget as it was originally proposed, there would be no need for this amendment. But in the shuffle with the welfare funds and the confusion over the reorganization plan, this item was overlooked.

What will happen if we are not able to put this money back in is that many of our treatment programs in the counties will be getting less money than they might otherwise have received. Many of our newly emerging drug treatment and rehabilitation programs will not be able to be funded at the levels at which we thought we would be able to fund them. For that reason, I am asking that this amendment be approved.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. BERKES and SELTZER and were as follows:

YEAS—90

Arthurs	Fineman	Martino	Ruggiero
Barber	Fryer	McGraw	Scanlon
Bellomini	Gallagher	McMonagle	Schmitt
Bennett	Geisler	Morris	Shane
Berkes	Gelfand	Mullen, M. P.	Shelhamer
Borson	Gillette	Murtha	Shupnik
Bixler	Gleeson	Musto	Stout
Blackwell	Greenfield	Myers	Sullivan
Bonetto	Hammock	Novak	Toll
Brunner	Homer	O'Brien	Trusto
Burns	Hutchinson, A.	Oliver	Valicenti
Caputo	Irvia	Perry	Vann
Comer	Itkin	Petrarca	Walsh, J. T.
Davis, D. M.	Johnson, J.	Pievsky	Walsh, T. P.
DeMedio	Kelly, A. P.	Prendergast	Wargo
Dicarlo	Kolter	Rappeport	Williams
Dombrowski	Kowalyszyn	Renwick	Wise
Doyle	LaMarcus	Rhodes	Wojdak
Early	Laudadio	Richardson	Wright
Eckensberger	Laughlin	Rieger	Yahner
Engelhart	Letterman	Ritter	Zeller
Fee	Lincoln	Romanelli	Zwikel
Fenrich	Mandolino		

NAYS—102

Anderson, J. H.	Grizzo	McCue	Smith, L.
Beren	Halverson	McCurdy	Spencer
Bittle	Hamilton, J. H.	McGinnis	Stahl
Brandt	Harrier	Mebus	Taddonio
Burkardt	Hasay	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Thomas
Butera	Haskell	Noye	Turner
Ryerly	Hayes, D. S.	O'Connell	Ustynoski
Cessar	Hayes, S. E.	Pancoast	Vacca
Checchio	Hopford	Parker, H. S.	Vipond
Crawford	Hill	Perri	Volpe
Dager	Hopkins	Piper	Wagner
Davis, R.	Hutchinson, W.	Pitts	Weidner
Deverter	Jones	Polite	Wells
Dintini	Kahle	Henninger	Westerberg
Dorr	Katz	Rowe	Whittlesey
Dorsey	Kelly, J. B.	Ruane	Wilson
Fawcett	Kennedy	Ryan	Wilt, R. W.
Fischer	Kester	Saloom	Wilt, W. W.
Foor	Kistler	Schesifer	Worrlow
Poster, A.	Klingaman	Schulze	Yohn
Poster, W.	Knepper	Scirica	Zearfoss
Frankenburg	Kusse	Seltzer	Zimmerman
Gallen	Lehr	Semanoff	Zord
Geesey	Lynch, Frank	Shuman	
Gekas	Maloney	Smith, C.	Lee,
Gleason	McClatchy	Smith, E.	Speaker

NOT VOTING—11

Dreibelbs	Gring	Miller, M. E.	Shelton
Fox	Lederer	Salvatore	Tayoun
Goodman	Malady	Savitt	

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

Ordered, that the bill as amended be prepared for final passage.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berks, Mr. Gallen.

Mr. GALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out that I feel it is somewhat significant that not one of the amendments offered by the other side had to do with any kind of a cut in the budget.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HOUSE SCHEDULE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. BUTERA. Mr. Speaker, before everybody leaves, as to the schedule, we will convene at 1 p.m. tomorrow and we will begin voting immediately on the non-preferred appropriation bills.

BILLS AND RESOLUTION NOT CALLED UP

The SPEAKER. Remaining bills and the resolution on today's calendar are not called up.

SENATE MESSAGE

AMENDED HOUSE BILL RETURNED FOR CONCURRENCE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned bill from the House of Representatives numbered and entitled as follows:

HOUSE BILL No. 903

An Act relating to certification of teachers in the public schools of the Commonwealth and creating a Professional Standards and Practices Commission.

With the information that the Senate has passed the same with amendments in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives is requested.

The SPEAKER. The bill will appear on the calendar.

### SENATE MESSAGE

#### SENATE APPOINTS COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE ON HOUSE BILL No. 924

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, informed that the Senate has appointed Messrs. MAZZEI, NOSZKA and STAUFFER a committee of conference to confer with a similar committee of the House of Representatives (already appointed) on the subject of the differences existing between the two Houses in relation to **HOUSE BILL No. 924**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 11, 1971 (P. L. 104, No. 3), entitled "Senior Citizens Property Tax Assistance Act," providing for rent assistance; redefining certain terms; changing the percentage allowed as assistance; changing certain procedures and the date for filing of claims; changing the limitation on the amount allocated for claims; and further providing for appeals.

### QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Bittle. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BITTLE. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BITTLE. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the following bills: House bills Nos. 1378, 1379, 988 and Senate bill No. 919, I was not in my seat when the votes were taken, but I would like to have the record show I would have voted in the affirmative.

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

### COMMUNICATION FROM GOVERNOR

The Secretary to the Governor, being introduced, presented the following communication in writing from His Excellency, the Governor, which was read:

#### APPROVAL OF HOUSE BILLS Nos. 999, 1000 and 1001

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
Governor's Office, Harrisburg

November 15, 1973

To the Honorable, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

I have the honor to inform you that I have this day approved and signed House bill No. 999, printer's No. 2012, entitled "A Supplement to the act of April 1, 1963 (P. L. 213, No. 227), entitled 'An act to accept the grant of Public Lands, by the United States, to the several states, for the endowment of Agricultural Colleges,' making appropriations for carrying the same into effect, providing for a basis for payments of such appropriations and providing a method of accounting for the funds appropriated."

MILTON J. SHAPP  
Governor

November 15, 1973

To the Honorable, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

I have the honor to inform you that I have this day approved and signed House bill No. 1000, printer's No.

2013, entitled "A Supplement to the act of July 28, 1956 (Special Session No. 3, P. L. 87, No. 3), entitled 'An act providing for the establishment and operation of the University of Pittsburgh as an instrumentality of the Commonwealth to serve as a State-related university in the higher education system of the Commonwealth; providing for change of name; providing for the composition of the board of trustees; terms of trustees, and the power and duties of such trustees; authorizing appropriations in amounts to be fixed annually by the General Assembly; providing for the auditing of accounts of expenditures from said appropriations; providing for public support and capital improvements; authorizing the issuance of bonds exempt from taxation within the Commonwealth; requiring the chancellor to make an annual report of the operations of the University of Pittsburgh,' making appropriations for carrying the same into effect, providing for a basis for payments of such appropriations, and providing a method of accounting for the funds appropriated."

MILTON J. SHAPP  
Governor

November 15, 1973

To the Honorable, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

I have the honor to inform you that I have this day approved and signed House bill No. 1001, printer's No. 2014, entitled, "A Supplement to the act of November 30, 1965 (P. L. 843, No. 355), entitled 'An act providing for the establishment and operation of Temple University as an instrumentality of the Commonwealth to serve as a State-related university in the higher education system of the Commonwealth; providing for change of name; providing for the composition of the board of trustees; terms of trustees, and the power and duties of such trustees; providing for preference to Pennsylvania residents in tuition; providing for public support and capital improvements; authorizing appropriations in amounts to be fixed annually by the General Assembly; providing for the auditing of accounts of expenditures from said appropriations; authorizing the issuance of bonds exempt from taxation within the Commonwealth; requiring the President to make an annual report of the operations of Temple University,' making appropriations for carrying the same into effect, providing for a basis for payments of such appropriation and providing a method of accounting for the funds appropriated."

MILTON J. SHAPP  
Governor

### COMMUNICATION FROM GOVERNOR

#### REORGANIZATION PLAN PRESENTED

The Secretary to the Governor, being introduced, presented the following communication in writing from His Excellency, the Governor, which was read:

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
Office of the Governor  
Harrisburg

November 19, 1973

#### TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA:

By the authority vested in me by the Reorganization Act of 1955, Act No. 8 of the General Assembly, approved April 7, 1955, providing for the reorganization of agencies and functions of the State Government subject to the approval or disapproval by the General Assembly, I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1973.

The impact of federal law and federal funds on Commonwealth operations has grown tremendously in the last two decades. Continuous planning and coordination are required at the state level in order to meet changing eligibility requirements for federal funding of state programs, to take advantage of new federal-state pro-

grams, and to come into compliance with many new areas of federal regulation.

At present four different offices participate in federal program coordination: the Office of the Budget, the Office of State Planning and Development, the Commonwealth's Washington, D. C. office, and my own executive office. Specific responsibilities created by federal law have been assigned to these various offices from time to time and, where necessary, staff were hired and trained. Their overlapping or fragmented responsibilities, however, have resulted in conflicting efforts and a lack of coordinated action.

After thorough discussion with all offices I have determined that federal program coordination will be significantly strengthened by transferring responsibility for the State Clearinghouse and the State Plan Review from the Office of State Planning and Development to the Office of the Budget. The transfer will result in more clearly defined functional responsibilities for the different offices and greater organizational effectiveness. It will also enable the U. S. Office of Management and Budget to plan and coordinate through a single state agency. Finally, this Administration is currently attempting to develop several new initiatives in this area, including an automated data system, improved research and analytical capability, and a program to help local governments take advantage of federal programs. A stronger, better coordinated effort by the Commonwealth is important to the success of these initiatives.

I, therefore, transmit to you and urge your approval of Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1973.

MILTON J. SHAPP  
Governor

#### REORGANIZATION PLAN No. 8

Section 1. The functions, powers and duties of the State Office of Planning and Development with regard to the State Clearinghouse Project Notification and Review System and State Plan Review for certain Federal funds, pursuant to section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 and Title IV of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968; Coordination of direct Federal development programs and projects with State, areawide and local planning and programs, pursuant to Title IV of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968; and securing the comments and views of State and local agencies which are authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards on certain Federal or Federally assisted projects affecting the environment, pursuant to section 102 (2) (c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, are transferred to the Governor's Office of the Budget.

Section 2. There are hereby transferred to the Governor's Office of the Budget to be employed in connection with the functions, powers and duties transferred by section 1 of this Reorganization Plan: the three personnel and/or positions, records and files now being used or held in connection with such functions, powers and duties; and the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations and any other funds available or to be made available for use in connection with such functions, powers and duties.

Section 3. This Reorganization Plan shall take effect immediately.

RESOLVED, That Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1973 transmitted to the General Assembly under date of November 19, 1973 which is incorporated herein by reference, be approved.

#### SENATE BILLS SIGNED BY SPEAKER

Bills numbered and entitled as follows having been

prepared for presentation to the Governor and the same being correct, the titles were publicly read as follows:

#### SENATE BILL No. 487

An Act amending the act of June 1, 1945 (P. L. 1242, No. 428), entitled "State Highway Law," regulating the construction of fringe parking facilities adjacent to the Federal-Aid Highway System by the Secretary of Transportation.

#### SENATE BILL No. 513

An Act amending the act of November 25, 1970 (No. 230), entitled "Consolidated Pennsylvania Statutes," changing the penalty for corruption of minors and removing certain other provisions relating to corrupting children.

#### SENATE BILL No. 632

An Act amending the act of April 29, 1959 (P. L. 58, No. 32), entitled "The Vehicle Code," reducing to eighteen years of age the minimum age requirements of persons who may operate a motor bus.

#### SENATE BILL No. 687

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

#### SENATE BILL No. 804

An Act amending the act of April 29, 1959 (P. L. 58, No. 32), entitled "The Vehicle Code," clarifying provisions relating to fertilizer trailers.

#### SENATE BILL No. 1011

An Act amending the act of July 27, 1955 (P. L. 288, No. 104), entitled, as amended, "An act making it unlawful for owners of certain property in cities of the first class and in cities of the second class to sell or agree to sell such property without first delivering to the purchaser a certification of the District classification and without first delivering a certification disclosing any notice of an uncorrected violation of any housing, building, safety or fire ordinance; . . .," making the act available to cities of the third class.

Whereupon,

The SPEAKER, in the presence of the House, signed the same.

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS

EDUCATION, Mr. Pancoast, chairman, Room 140, Tuesday, November 20, 1973, at 9:30 a.m., e.s.t. (Hearing)

HEALTH AND WELFARE, Mr. Hill, chairman, Room 401, Tuesday, November 20, 1973, at 9:30 a.m., e.s.t.

TRANSPORTATION, Mr. Westerberg, chairman, Room 243 A, Tuesday, November 20, 1973, at 9:30 a.m., e.s.t.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DeVERTER moved that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, November 20, 1973, at 1 p.m., e.s.t.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to, and (at 9:01 p.m., e.s.t.) the House adjourned.