

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 1997

SESSION OF 1997

181ST OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 25

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 11 a.m., e.d.t.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (J. SCOT CHADWICK) PRESIDING

PRAYER

REV. THOMAS W. FRIES, Chaplain of the House of Representatives and pastor of Hempfield United Methodist Church, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Our Heavenly Father, we thank You for Your greatness and we thank You for Your love, and this day I pray that You would grant a spirit of determination to work to make Pennsylvania a great State. I thank You for the way in which You teach us. I thank You for the line on a calendar in a small agricultural store in a small rural town that said, "Great people are ordinary people who are terribly, terribly determined." And I thank You for one of our sacred writers who wrote, "Whatever your hand finds to do, do it with all your might."

And my request today for the men and women who serve You as representatives of the people is that they would be filled with determination to work with all their might to make this a great State, a model State; a beacon of organizational efficiency, of economic strength, of educational excellence and social compassion, built upon the will and the determination of strong people.

I thank You for the letter my mother wrote to me in college once when she said, in a time of great discouragement, "Remember that when you are discouraged and afraid, you are a farmer from Pennsylvania, and they are made tough and strong, and they cannot be defeated, ever."

And I thank You that these are the kinds of people in our State who are represented here and these are the kinds of individuals who represent them. And so I know that nothing is impossible to You and nothing is impossible for our future.

Help us to remember that it is the dirty shovel that the farmer uses and it is the dirty shovel that is most often in his hand. So let us serve You as tools in Your hand to Thy glory and the benefit of people and the future of our great State. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by members and visitors.)

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Tuesday, April 15, 1997, will be postponed until printed. The Chair hears no objection.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 911 By Representatives CIVERA, O'BRIEN, HERSHEY, VAN HORNE, RAYMOND, KENNEY, SEMMEL, BOYES, READSHAW, FICHTER, TIGUE, GANNON, STERN, SCRIMENTI, BROWNE, WALKO, B. SMITH, GIGLIOTTI, SHANER, FLICK, HERMAN, STEIL, HALUSKA, TRELLO, JOSEPHS, SATHER, D. W. SNYDER, BUNT, HENNESSEY, MILLER, BELFANTI, WOGAN, E. Z. TAYLOR, McNAUGHTON, LEH, MCGILL, RAMOS, ADOLPH, MELIO, SEYFERT, ITKIN, PRESTON and SERAFINI

An Act amending the act of July 9, 1990 (P.L.340, No.78), known as the Public Safety Emergency Telephone Act, further providing for definitions, for the powers and duties of the Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency and the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, for county plans, for training and for rules and regulations; and providing for immunity.

Referred to Committee on VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, April 16, 1997.

No. 1325 By Representatives VEON, GEORGE, McCALL, BUXTON, LEVDANSKY, ROONEY, STURLA, COY, CAPPABIANCA, JAROLIN, TANGRETTI, CAWLEY, WOJNAROSKI, STABACK, ITKIN, GEIST, CORPORA, JOSEPHS, CURRY, LUCYK, FEESE, BUNT, BATTISTO, MELIO, DeLUCA, SANTONI, BROWNE, HASAY, WALKO, YOUNGBLOOD, BELARDI, LAUGHLIN, BEBKO-JONES, SEYFERT, TRELLO, SCRIMENTI, OLASZ, RAMOS, GIGLIOTTI, SHANER, BOSCOLA, SURRA, SAINATO, McGEEHAN, STEELMAN, VAN HORNE, COLAFELLA, MIHALICH, THOMAS and A. H. WILLIAMS

An Act designating April 28 of each year as "Workers' Memorial Day."

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, April 16, 1997.

No. 1326 By Representatives SCHULER, FARGO, ZIMMERMAN, MARSICO, McCALL, TIGUE, BELFANTI, SEMMEL, ROHRER, YOUNGBLOOD, ARMSTRONG, OLASZ, ITKIN, BUNT, HENNESSEY and EGOLF

An Act amending the act of June 22, 1964 (Sp.Sess., P.L.84, No.6), known as the Eminent Domain Code, further providing for compensation for delay in payment.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, April 16, 1997.

No. 1327 By Representatives SCHULER, COY, FARGO, B. SMITH, FAIRCHILD, BAKER, RUBLEY, GEIST, GORDNER, HORSEY, HENNESSEY, McCALL, HERSHEY, BELFANTI, MICOZZIE, BATTISTO, ZUG, TRUE, SEMMEL, CURRY, STEELMAN, TRELLO and PISTELLA

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, further providing for the operation of the State System of Higher Education; and making a repeal and editorial changes.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, April 16, 1997.

No. 1328 By Representatives McNAUGHTON, CORNELL, GRUPPO, SAYLOR, READSHAW, DEMPSEY, FEESE, DALEY, BAKER, BROWN, M. N. WRIGHT, WILT, GEIST, LYNCH, LEH, CLARK, SCHRODER, BELARDI, HENNESSEY, McGEEHAN, C. WILLIAMS, CORRIGAN, EGOLF, WAUGH, E. Z. TAYLOR, ARMSTRONG, PLATTS, BROWNE, PETRARCA, THOMAS, BENNINGHOFF, MAITLAND, ITKIN, DeLUCA, STEELMAN, PISTELLA, STEVENSON, TRELLO, STERN, LAUGHLIN and JAMES

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, further providing for home education programs.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, April 16, 1997.

No. 1329 By Representatives BISHOP, SCRIMENTI, COY, TIGUE, CARN, HALUSKA, TRELLO, WALKO, RUBLEY, BELARDI, HORSEY, CLARK, BOSCOLA, NAILOR, PRESTON, McGEEHAN, DeLUCA, BATTISTO, J. TAYLOR, WASHINGTON, PISTELLA, MYERS, STETLER, THOMAS, C. WILLIAMS, JOSEPHS, WAUGH, CORRIGAN, EGOLF, YOUNGBLOOD, OLIVER, RAMOS, MELIO, CIVERA, STEELMAN, ORIE and MUNDY

An Act amending the act of October 20, 1966 (3rd Sp.Sess., P.L.96, No.6), known as the Mental Health and Mental Retardation Act of 1966, providing for the confidentiality of records and the release of records to certain persons.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, April 16, 1997.

No. 1330 By Representatives LAUGHLIN, WALKO, FARGO, E. Z. TAYLOR, OLASZ, BELARDI, GEIST, SCHRODER, TRELLO, STERN, JOSEPHS, CLARK, TIGUE, PESCI, DALEY, ROHRER, YOUNGBLOOD, STEVENSON, STABACK, C. WILLIAMS, ITKIN, GODSHALL, LYNCH, WAUGH, TANGRETTI, McCALL, YEWIC and BENNINGHOFF

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

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, April 16, 1997.

No. 1331 By Representatives WOGAN, D. W. SNYDER, HENNESSEY, MAITLAND, BOSCOLA, RAYMOND, M. N. WRIGHT, PISTELLA, READSHAW, ADOLPH, KENNEY, FARGO, GORDNER, RUBLEY, LEDERER, TIGUE, LYNCH, DENT, BELARDI, COY, GODSHALL, McGEEHAN, LEH, WALKO, BLAUM, BATTISTO, B. SMITH, HUTCHINSON, CIVERA, SEMMEL, BROWNE, STABACK, PHILLIPS, GRUPPO, DeLUCA, ROONEY, McCALL, PLATTS, HESS, MILLER, OLASZ, WAUGH, ROSS, HALUSKA, MELIO, E. Z. TAYLOR, SHANER, McNAUGHTON, SERAFINI, BROWN, MCGILL, SAINATO, KELLER, and TRICH

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

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, April 16, 1997.

No. 1332 By Representatives WOGAN, J. TAYLOR, KENNEY, MAITLAND, GIGLIOTTI, ZUG, MILLER, MELIO, FICHTER, BUNT, PESCI, FAIRCHILD, B. SMITH, PLATTS, HERSHEY, ALLEN, CORNELL, BARD, BROWNE, E. Z. TAYLOR, BOSCOLA, DRUCE, CIVERA, BELFANTI and ROSS

An Act amending the act of August 9, 1963 (P.L.643, No.341), known as the First Class City Public Education Home Rule Act, further providing for grant of powers and authority relating to an elected school board with taxation powers.

Referred to Committee on URBAN AFFAIRS, April 16, 1997.

No. 1333 By Representatives GRUPPO, GEIST, HERMAN, RUBLEY, ARMSTRONG, BELARDI, SATHER, ZUG, LAUGHLIN, TIGUE, LEDERER, CLYMER, TRUE, WAUGH, HENNESSEY, JOSEPHS, EGOLF, HASAY, DiGIROLAMO, PISTELLA, STABACK, SURRA, CAPPABIANCA, MELIO, LaGROTTA, BAKER, B. SMITH, COY, HERSHEY, E. Z. TAYLOR, BENNINGHOFF, BROWNE, RAMOS, COLAFELLA and C. WILLIAMS

An Act amending the act of April 12, 1951 (P.L.90, No.21), known as the Liquor Code, prohibiting certain licensees from advertising on billboards within 1,000 feet of any real property on which a public, private or parochial school is located.

Referred to Committee on LIQUOR CONTROL, April 16, 1997.

No. 1334 By Representatives STETLER, TRELLO, BELARDI, STURLA, MARKOSEK, McGEEHAN, MELIO, WALKO, ROONEY, YOUNGBLOOD, BOSCOLA, HORSEY, PLATTS, ITKIN, MIHALICH, STEELMAN, MANDERINO, JOSEPHS, SAINATO, PRESTON, STERN, BELFANTI and RAMOS

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, further providing for reimbursements for the cost of providing special school police at dangerous intersections or other areas immediately around schools to certain school districts.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, April 16, 1997.

No. 1335 By Representatives STETLER, GEIST, TRELLO, MELIO, BELARDI, WALKO, ROONEY, SHANER, TRAVAGLIO, YOUNGBLOOD, BOSCOLA, HORSEY, MIHALICH, WAUGH, STERN, BENNINGHOFF and RAMOS

An Act amending the act of June 23, 1931 (P.L.932, No.317), known as The Third Class City Code, further providing for special school police.

Referred to Committee on URBAN AFFAIRS, April 16, 1997.

No. 1336 By Representatives ALLEN, LUCYK, ARGALL, BELFANTI, PHILLIPS, HASAY, McCALL, EACHUS, DALEY, STAIRS, RAYMOND, S. H. SMITH, TULLI, READSHAW, SATHER, JAROLIN, SEMMEL, COY, GANNON, MARKOSEK, SERAFINI, LAUGHLIN, COLAIZZO, FARGO, STEELMAN, HERSHEY, LEVDANSKY, HENNESSEY, YOUNGBLOOD, ARMSTRONG, WALKO, TIGUE, GEORGE, GEIST, CORNELL, BENNINGHOFF and PETRARCA

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, providing for a program of tax incentives, including investment tax credits and to stimulate the development of a synthetic fuels industry within the Commonwealth.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, April 16, 1997.

HOUSE RESOLUTION INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 137 By Representatives MAITLAND, READSHAW, FICHTER, OLASZ, DALEY, WOGAN, GEIST, JADLOWIEC, BAKER, GEORGE, PETTIT, BUXTON, ZUG, WALKO, BEBKO-JONES, BELFANTI, BELARDI, GIGLIOTTI, THOMAS, HARHART, MELIO, ALLEN, WAUGH, DeLUCA, ITKIN, LYNCH, SATHER, MUNDY, STURLA, JOSEPHS, BARRAR, L. I. COHEN, CALTAGIRONE, BOSCOLA, PETRARCA, YOUNGBLOOD, STEVENSON, PRESTON, NAILOR, McCALL, STABACK, CLYMER, PISTELLA, GRUPPO, LAUGHLIN, TULLI, CAPPABIANCA, CORPORA,

COY, TRELLO, WOJNAROSKI, MARSICO, HALUSKA, PLATTS, ROEBUCK, SAINATO, E. Z. TAYLOR, SHANER and CURRY

A Resolution memorializing Congress to provide an appropriation to preserve and protect the Gettysburg National Military Park.

Referred to Committee on INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, April 16, 1997.

SENATE BILLS FOR CONCURRENCE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, presented the following bills for concurrence:

SB 147, PN 974

Referred to Committee on LIQUOR CONTROL, April 16, 1997.

SB 200, PN 975

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, April 16, 1997.

SB 585, PN 614

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, April 16, 1997.

SB 635, PN 667

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, April 16, 1997.

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

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

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the following bills be removed from the table and placed on the active calendar:

HB 219;
HB 440;
HB 680;
HB 743; and
HB 792.

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

BILLS RECOMMITTED

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

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the following bills be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations:

HB 219;
HB 440;
HB 680;
HB 743; and
HB 792.

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

**COMMUNICATION FROM
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair acknowledges receipt of a report submitted by the Organ Donation Advisory Committee pursuant to Act 102 of 1994.

(Copy of communication is on file with the Journal clerk.)

**BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE,
CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED**

HB 1027, PN 1132 By Rep. GODSHALL

An Act prohibiting certain fees for the use of State property for the purpose of making commercial motion pictures.

TOURISM AND RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Turning to leaves of absence, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Snyder, who requests a leave for today's session for the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. PETTIT.

Without objection, the leave will be granted. The Chair hears no objection.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Itkin, who requests a leave for today's session for the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. RIEGER, and the gentleman from Bucks County, Mr. CORRIGAN.

Without objection, the leaves will be granted. The Chair hears no objection, and the leaves are granted.

MASTER ROLL CALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is about to take the master roll call. Members will proceed to vote.

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—199

Adolph	Donatucci	Lynch	Schroder
Allen	Druce	Maitland	Schuler
Argall	Eachus	Major	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Egolf	Manderino	Semmel
Baker	Evans	Markosek	Serafini
Bard	Fairchild	Marsico	Seyfert
Barley	Fargo	Masland	Shaner
Barrar	Feese	Mayernik	Smith, B.

Battisto	Fichter	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Bebko-Jones	Fleagle	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Belardi	Flick	McGill	Staback
Belfanti	Gannon	McIlhattan	Stairs
Benninghoff	Geist	McNaughton	Steelman
Birmelin	George	Melio	Steil
Bishop	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Stern
Blaum	Gladeck	Micozzie	Stetler
Boscola	Godshall	Mihalich	Stevenson
Boyes	Gordner	Miller	Strittmatter
Brown	Gruitza	Mundy	Sturla
Browne	Gruppo	Myers	Surra
Bunt	Habay	Nailor	Tangretti
Butkovitz	Haluska	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Hanna	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Olasz	Thomas
Cappabianca	Hasay	Oliver	Tigue
Carn	Hennessey	Orie	Travaglio
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Trello
Casorio	Hershey	Pesci	Trich
Cawley	Hess	Petrarca	True
Chadwick	Horsey	Petrone	Tulli
Civera	Hutchinson	Phillips	Vance
Clark	Itkin	Pippy	Van Horne
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Veon
Cohen, L. I.	James	Platts	Vitali
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Preston	Walko
Colaella	Josephs	Ramos	Washington
Colaizzo	Kaiser	Raymond	Waugh
Conti	Keller	Readshaw	Williams, A. H.
Cornell	Kenney	Reber	Williams, C.
Corpora	Kirkland	Reinard	Wilt
Cowell	Krebs	Roberts	Wogan
Coy	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wojnaroski
Curry	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dally	Lederer	Ross	Youngblood
DeLuca	Leh	Rubley	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Lescovitz	Sainato	Zug
Dent	Levdansky	Santoni	
Dermody	Lloyd	Sather	Ryan,
DeWeese	Lucyk	Saylor	Speaker
DiGirolamo			

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Corrigan Pettit Rieger Rooney

LEAVES ADDED—2

Belfanti Carn

CALENDAR

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of SB 867, PN 872, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation from a restricted revenue account within the General Fund to the Office of Small Business Advocate in the Department of Community and Economic Development.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

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

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 867 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 869, PN 874**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation from the State Employees' Retirement Fund to provide for expenses of the State Employees' Retirement Board for the fiscal year July 1, 1997, to June 30, 1998, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1997.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

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

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 869 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 870, PN 875**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation from the Public School Employees' Retirement Fund to provide for expenses of the Public School Employees' Retirement Board for the fiscal year July 1, 1997, to June 30, 1998, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1997.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

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

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 870 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 871, PN 876**, entitled:

An Act making appropriations from the Workmen's Compensation Administration Fund to the Department of Labor and Industry and the Department of Community and Economic Development to provide for the expenses of administering the Workers' Compensation Act, The Pennsylvania Occupational Disease Act and the Office of Small Business Advocate for the fiscal year July 1, 1997, to June 30, 1998, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1997.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

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

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 871 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 872, PN 877**, entitled:

An Act making appropriations from the Professional Licensure Augmentation Account and from restricted revenue accounts within the General Fund to the Department of State for use by the Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs in support of the professional licensure boards assigned thereto.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

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

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 872 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 873, PN 973**, entitled:

An Act providing for the capital budget for the fiscal year 1997-1998.

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

BILL RECOMMITTED

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

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 873 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1246, PN 1431**, entitled:

An Act providing for an annual grant program for counties and municipalities relating to tax-exempt real property; establishing a special fund in the State Treasury; and imposing powers and duties on the Department of Community and Economic Development.

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

Mr. **DEMPSEY** offered the following amendment No. **A1411**:

Amend Sec. 2, page 2, line 15, by inserting after "Any" of the following:

(1) A

Amend Sec. 2, page 2, line 16, by striking out all of said line and inserting township.

(2) A home rule municipality which is a city, borough, incorporated town or township.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lycoming County, Mr. Dempsey.

Mr. **DEMPSEY**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment is a technical amendment agreed to by all parties. It clarifies the definition of a municipality in the act. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-197

- | | | | |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|
| Adolph | DiGirolamo | Lynch | Schuler |
| Allen | Donatucci | Maitland | Scrimenti |
| Argall | Druce | Major | Semmel |
| Armstrong | Eachus | Manderino | Serafini |
| Baker | Egolf | Markosek | Seyfert |
| Bard | Evans | Marsico | Shaner |
| Barley | Fairchild | Masland | Smith, B. |
| Barrar | Fargo | Mayernik | Smith, S. H. |

- | | | | |
|--------------|------------|------------|------------------|
| Battisto | Feese | McCall | Snyder, D. W. |
| Bebko-Jones | Fichter | McGeehan | Staback |
| Belardi | Fleagle | McGill | Stairs |
| Belfanti | Flick | McIlhattan | Steelman |
| Benninghoff | Gannon | McNaughton | Steil |
| Birmelin | Geist | Melio | Stern |
| Bishop | George | Michlovic | Stetler |
| Blaum | Gigliotti | Micozzie | Stevenson |
| Boscola | Gladeck | Mihalich | Strittmatter |
| Boyes | Godshall | Miller | Sturla |
| Brown | Gordner | Mundy | Surra |
| Browne | Gruitza | Nailor | Tangretti |
| Bunt | Gruppo | Nickol | Taylor, E. Z. |
| Butkovitz | Habay | O'Brien | Taylor, J. |
| Buxton | Haluska | Olasz | Thomas |
| Caltagirone | Hanna | Oliver | Tigue |
| Cappabianca | Harhart | Orie | Travaglio |
| Carn | Hasay | Perzel | Trello |
| Carone | Hennessey | Pesci | Trich |
| Casorio | Herman | Petrarca | True |
| Cawley | Hershey | Petrone | Tulli |
| Chadwick | Hess | Phillips | Vance |
| Civera | Horsey | Pippy | Van Home |
| Clark | Hutchinson | Pistella | Veon |
| Clymer | Itkin | Platts | Vitali |
| Cohen, L. I. | Jadlowiec | Preston | Walko |
| Cohen, M. | Jarolin | Ramos | Washington |
| Colafrella | Josephs | Raymond | Waugh |
| Colaizzo | Kaiser | Readshaw | Williams, A. H. |
| Conti | Keller | Reber | Williams, C. |
| Cornell | Kenney | Reinard | Wilt |
| Corpora | Kirkland | Roberts | Wogan |
| Cowell | Krebs | Robinson | Wojnaroski |
| Coy | LaGrotta | Roebuck | Wright, M. N. |
| Curry | Laughlin | Rohrer | Yewcic |
| Daley | Lawless | Ross | Youngblood |
| Dally | Lederer | Rubley | Zimmerman |
| DeLuca | Leh | Sainato | Zug |
| Dempsey | Lescovitz | Santoni | |
| Dent | Levdansky | Sather | Ryan,
Speaker |
| Dermody | Lloyd | Saylor | |
| DeWeese | Lucyk | Schroder | |

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-2

James Myers

EXCUSED-4

Corrigan Pettit Rieger Rooney

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendment was agreed to.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration as amended ?
Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 provisions of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS-197

Adolph	Donatucci	Maitland	Schuler
Allen	Druce	Major	Scrimenti
Argall	Eachus	Manderino	Semmel
Armstrong	Egolf	Markosek	Serafini
Baker	Evans	Marsico	Seyfert
Bard	Fairchild	Masland	Shaner
Barley	Fargo	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Barrar	Feese	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Battisto	Fichter	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Bebko-Jones	Fleagle	McGill	Staback
Belardi	Flick	McIlhattan	Stairs
Belfanti	Gannon	McNaughton	Steelman
Benninghoff	Geist	Melio	Steil
Birmelin	George	Michlovic	Stern
Blaum	Gigliotti	Micozzie	Stetler
Boscola	Gladeck	Mihalich	Stevenson
Boyes	Godshall	Miller	Strittmatter
Brown	Gordner	Mundy	Sturla
Browne	Gruitza	Myers	Surra
Bunt	Gruppo	Nailor	Tangretti
Butkovitz	Habay	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Haluska	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Hanna	Olasz	Thomas
Cappabianca	Harhart	Oliver	Tigue
Cam	Hasay	Orie	Travaglio
Carone	Hennessey	Perzel	Trello
Casorio	Herman	Pesci	Trich
Cawley	Hershey	Petrarca	True
Chadwick	Hess	Petrone	Tulli
Civera	Horsey	Phillips	Vance
Clark	Hutchinson	Pippy	Van Home
Clymer	Itkin	Pistella	Veon
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Platts	Vitali
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Preston	Walko
Colafiglia	Josephs	Ramos	Washington
Colaizzo	Kaiser	Raymond	Waugh
Conti	Keller	Readshaw	Williams, A. H.
Cornell	Kenney	Reber	Williams, C.
Corpora	Kirkland	Reinard	Wilt
Cowell	Krebs	Roberts	Wogan
Coy	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wojnaroski
Curry	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dally	Lederer	Ross	Youngblood
DeLuca	Leh	Rubley	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Lescovitz	Sainato	Zug
Dent	Levdansky	Santoni	
Dermody	Lloyd	Sather	Ryan,
DeWeese	Lucyk	Saylor	Speaker
DiGirolamo	Lynch	Schroder	

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-2

Bishop James

EXCUSED-4

Corrigan Pettit Rieger Rooney

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the bill passed finally.

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

BILL PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. SB 45 is over for today's session.

The House proceeded to third consideration of SB 179, PN 972, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.177, No.175), entitled The Administrative Code of 1929, further providing for definitions; imposing additional duties on the Auditor General, the State Treasurer and the Attorney General; authorizing the Department of Corrections to assess and collect certain payments from prisoners; providing for delegation of medical services, for bonds for certain wells and for timetable for the review of municipal waste landfill and resource recovery facility permit applications; further providing for campus police; providing for school police officers; and making repeals.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

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

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 179 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

The House proceeded to third consideration of HB 337, PN 1483, entitled:

An Act amending the act of October 27, 1955 (P.L.744, No.222), known as the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, defining "advertisement" and "advertiser"; and providing for certain forms of advertisement, for limitations and for civil penalties.

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

Mr. READSHAW offered the following amendment No. A1435:

Amend Title, page 1, line 11, by striking out "and" where it appears the second time

Amend Title, page 1, line 12, by removing the comma after "advertisement" and inserting ; further providing for restrictions on the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission's authority over pupil school assignments; and providing

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 20 and 21 Section 3. Section 8.2 of the act, added July 12, 1996 (P.L.684, No.117), is amended to read:

Section 8.2. Restriction on Commission Authority Over Pupil School Assignment.--(a) It is the finding of the General Assembly that the neighborhood school is the cornerstone of Pennsylvania's education

policy on the assignment of pupils to public schools and that the assignment of pupils to public schools is a matter that falls within the special competence and expertise of education authorities, and it is the policy of the General Assembly that this act shall not interfere with the neighborhood school system or with the authority of education officials to provide for the assignment of pupils to public schools unless such assignment is necessary to remedy a violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

(b) Neither the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission nor any local human relations commission nor any court, as part of its review of any commission or local commission action or any complaint filed pursuant to this act, shall impose upon the Commonwealth, any school district or other school entity, or any governing body, officer or employe of any of the foregoing, any requirement that pupils be assigned to attend any public school other than the school of appropriate grade level that the pupil qualifies to attend closest to the student's home and shall not impose any other obligation or responsibility with respect to pupil school assignment or pupil transportation related to pupil assignment unless:

(1) imposing that requirement, obligation or responsibility upon such party is necessary to remedy a specific violation by such party that would also constitute a violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

(2) a court would be permitted under decisional law to impose that requirement, obligation or responsibility upon such party to remedy the specific violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

(b.1) Every school district of the first class A shall commence a school integration plan within its territorial jurisdiction that pupils be assigned to attend the public school of appropriate grade level that is closest to the pupil's home and shall not impose any other obligation or responsibility with the pupil school assignment or pupil transportation unless:

(1) imposing that requirement, obligation or responsibility upon such party is necessary to remedy a specific violation by such party that would also constitute a violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

(2) a court would be permitted under decisional law to impose that requirement, obligation or responsibility upon such party to remedy the specific violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

(c) Nothing in this section shall [prohibit a school district from voluntarily continuing or commencing a school integration plan within its territorial jurisdiction or from assigning pupils for any appropriate reason within the scope of its authority under the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the "Public School Code of 1949," or] affect the act of August 9, 1963 (P.L.643, No.341), known as the "First Class City Public Education Home Rule Act," including, but not limited to, the assignment of pupils who request English as a second language to a school other than the school closest to the pupil's home, if such instruction is unavailable at the closest school.

Amend Sec. 3, page 3, line 21, by striking out "3" and inserting

4

Amend Sec. 4, page 6, line 9, by striking out "4" and inserting

5

Amend Sec. 5, page 8, line 19, by striking out "5" and inserting

6

Amend Sec. 6, page 9, line 19, by striking out "6" and inserting

7

Amend Sec. 7, page 9, line 22, by striking out "7" and inserting

8

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Readshaw. Mr. READSHAW. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The content of this amendment is extremely important to my constituents in Pittsburgh, and this amendment will be profiled again and again. However, on this particular day, at the request of several people, I am withdrawing my amendment in HB 337. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, will Mr. Leh consent to interrogation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman indicates that he will stand for interrogation. You are in order and may proceed.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, while this bill deals with advertising and restricting the Human Relations Commission's discretion in advertising, it deals with other things beyond that, does it not?

Mr. LEH. It just deals with procedure aspects, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COHEN. And one of the procedural things that it deals with goes on into all elements of the Human Relations Act, I believe, when it says, "The Commission shall dismiss a case with prejudice, before or after a finding of probable cause, where, in its opinion, appropriate remedy has been offered by the respondent and refused by the complainant."

That deals with all aspects of the Human Relations Act — job discrimination and so forth — does it not?

Mr. LEH. Mr. Speaker, excuse me. We are having trouble hearing the speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will come to order. Members will take their seats. Will the Sergeant at Arms please break up the conversations in the aisle and ask the members to take their seats.

Mr. Cohen, could you repeat the question. Mr. Leh was having trouble hearing you.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we debated at some length last year the advertising provisions of this act, which restrict the discretion of the Human Relations Commission in terms of regulating fair housing advertisements. This bill today though goes beyond the issue of advertising, and I believe, as I read this bill, section (c.1), on page 4, for instance, where it says, "The Commission shall dismiss a case with prejudice, before or after a finding of probable cause, where, in its opinion, appropriate remedy has been offered by the respondent and refused by the complainant."

That applies to all cases before the Human Relations Commission, does it not?

Mr. LEH. That is right, and it was the commission's request that that language be placed in there last year. That language was there last year and still remains there.

Mr. COHEN. And, Mr. Speaker, on page 5, a new section (4) that is added to this bill: "If, after a trial, the Commonwealth Court finds that a respondent has not engaged in any unlawful discriminatory practice as defined in this act, the court may award attorney fees and costs to the prevailing respondent if the court determines that the complaint is frivolous and that the Commission dealt with the party complained against in a wilful, wanton and oppressive manner, in which case, the Commission shall be ordered to pay such costs and attorney fees."

That also applies to all cases, does it not?

Mr. LEH. Yes, and that language was in there last year.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have no further questions for the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman wish to be recognized on the bill?

Mr. COHEN. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill basically does three things. First, it reduces the amount of discretion that the Human Relations Commission has in fair housing cases. It sets up a process by which a certain list of words will be prohibited in advertisements, and that any advertisement which does not include those words is presumed okay. It totally ignores the capacity of the human mind to come up with synonyms or phrases that mean the same thing as the words that are banned. It sets up a huge bureaucratic process for changing those words. And for people who are handicapped, for people who, for one reason or another — by race, religion, national origin — have reason to find that there is housing discrimination against them, these people are going to have a tougher road in terms of dealing with advertisements, in terms of no climate being created, that discourages them from applying, and it makes it difficult for people to seek legal remedies.

Beyond the question of fair housing, this bill does things that restrict the Human Relations Commission. It sets up a means by which people who win litigation against the Human Relations Commission can get money from the Human Relations Commission. Where is that money going to come from? We are going to pay for that money. That is going to be taxpayers' money that is going to go to people who the Human Relations Commission — a State agency — thought were engaging in discriminatory behavior and where the Commonwealth Court disagreed with the Human Relations Commission. Anybody who wins a case is going to get taxpayers' money, and we are going to be paying for that. And that is a very, very rare thing. I am not certain that there are any other agencies where that happens, and certainly, if there is a single agency, there are not very many of them. Getting taxpayers' money because of a wrongful complaint filed is something that does not happen in Pennsylvania.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the question of whether the Human Relations Commission is required to dismiss a complaint with prejudice if a remedy is offered to a respondent for a complaint is dangerous. I mean, an employer who fires an employee, who engages in illegal action, may say, okay, we will give you 6 months' backpay. And that may not be enough. It may be irrelevant, given the loss that the person has suffered. But it substitutes the judgment of the Human Relations Commission,

which, ironically, we are attacking here when we say that if the judgment of the Human Relations Commission is wrong, the State of Pennsylvania has to pay for that error in judgment. At the same time we are attacking the judgment of the Human Relations Commission in terms of creating liability for the State, we are enthroning the judgment of the Human Relations Commission in terms of the rights of any individual claimant, and that is both internally contradictory and wrong.

What the cumulative effect of this act is, is to seriously harm the rights of individuals and to create taxpayer liability for differences of opinion between the courts of Pennsylvania and the Human Relations Commission. We will pay for this literally with taxpayers' dollars. Pennsylvanians who suffer discrimination of one kind or another will literally pay for this by failure to get the remedies they deserve. And all complainants before the Human Relations Commission will have to face the fact that we are setting up a system whereby the Human Relations Commission and the taxpayers can be punished by being on their side and where their rights are going to be limited in terms of applying, and therefore, people are going to feel hopeless and think seeking remedies from the Human Relations Commission is a waste of time.

This is a prodiscrimination bill; this is an antirights bill. I would strongly urge that members of the House vote against this bill. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER (MATTHEW J. RYAN) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pleased to welcome to the hall of the House today, as the guests of Representative John Lawless of Montgomery County, members of the fourth and fifth grade class of St. Teresa of Avila School. Would those guests please rise. They are in the balcony.

And as a guest of the Bucks County delegation, a group from the Bucks County Borough Association. This group is also located in the balcony. Would they please rise to be acknowledged.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 337 CONTINUED

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

Mr. HORSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to concur with my colleague on HB 337. It is bad legislation. It should not be considered. You need to have walked in other folks' shoes and to have been discriminated against, in some cases, to actually know and understand the feelings of those who have been discriminated against.

I oppose HB 337. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Berks, Mr. Leh.

Mr. LEH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just my final comments.

The earlier speaker was concerned about certain language in there, and I would just like to remind the House that that language

was recommended by the commission itself because they do have a 7,000-case backlog.

Also, with regards to the former speaker's remarks about injustices, injustice is a two-way street, and I believe with the work of everybody involved, all the parties and the commission, that we worked out the concerns for everybody's benefit, and it is a good bill, and I would ask their support.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Cohen, for the second time on the issue.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leh said that the Human Relations Commission agreed to it. That is a partial truth. The Human Relations Commission agreed to it under the threat of legislation that was much, much worse. Yes, this legislation hurts people less than other proposed legislation did. Yes, the Human Relations Commission was intimidated into believing that if it did not agree to this legislation, then legislation would come into effect which would hurt the operation of the Human Relations Commission and would hurt the rights of individual complainants far more than this legislation does. But the fact that the Human Relations Commission said that this legislation does not do as much damage as other possible legislation could do does not mean that we ought to feel compelled to support it. It seriously and adversely affects the rights of Pennsylvanians who suffer from discrimination in jobs, housing, education.

And this is the week that we are celebrating Jackie Robinson's 50th anniversary of breaking the color line in baseball, this is a week in which everybody all around the country is paying attention to issues of discrimination in this society, and this is the wrong time, the wrong time to take a dramatic step limiting the rights of persons who suffer discrimination to make complaints to the Human Relations Commission and set all sorts of bureaucratic obstacles up for the Human Relations Commission to surmount and set up possible potential liability for the taxpayers of Pennsylvania in the case that the Human Relations Commission finds discrimination and the courts of Pennsylvania strongly disagree with the Human Relations Commission.

Again I would urge a "no" vote on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. James.

Mr. JAMES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to HB 337 and I would encourage my colleagues to vote against this measure.

As chairman of the Pennsylvania Legislative Black Caucus, last year as I talked about this, I was privileged to take part in a celebration honoring 40 years of service and dedication by one of Pennsylvania's most meaningful State agencies, and that is the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission.

Since its inception in 1955, the Human Relations Commission has proven its fortitude. It has kept pace with the times, evolving to encompass a wide range of intolerance, from discrimination based on race, color, and ancestry to discrimination based on age, gender, and religious creed.

Mr. Speaker, that is 40 years of showing that State government is not insensitive to the needs of Pennsylvanians — at least one agency — particularly those at risk of being unfairly judged because of race, ethnic or religious background, disability, or age.

Through it all, the Human Relations Commission has struggled to alleviate racial tensions and resolve the obstacles preventing individuals from realizing their full potential.

Discrimination, regardless of its form, is harmful not only to the individual but to the Commonwealth as a whole as well.

Specifically, HB 337 is intended to amend the PHRC as it relates to housing advertising. While attempting to address what once appeared to be a problem, this bill actually creates more problems than it solves.

Mr. Speaker, I had a chance, an opportunity, to speak to the Human Relations Commission, and as Representative Mark Cohen has stated, yes, they agreed to some things in it, but that was so it would not be a more harsh bill.

So they play a complex, sensitive role that is critical to the success of Pennsylvania, and they help provide equal access and ensure equal opportunity to every person.

This is a praiseworthy aspiration, especially when recent attacks on affirmative action and cuts in programs benefiting minorities are figured into the formula.

The Human Relations Commission has demonstrated its commitment to removing barriers, pushing to eliminate and prevent and remedy the effects of unlawful discrimination. This represents the hope of tomorrow, when all individuals will feel secure in knowing they have equal access to gainful employment, public accommodations, and adequate housing; which now is threatened by this HB 337.

Mr. Speaker, as policymakers, we need to develop a system that makes equal opportunity a reality for every Pennsylvanian, as we already have. This system is called the Human Relations Commission, and they have worked well over 40 years. They have greatly improved the numbers, working toward the inclusion of individuals because of ability, not preference.

So I urge my colleagues not to interfere with a program that works, and I urge you to vote against HB 337. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The SPEAKER. Agreeable to the provisions of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS—141

Adolph	Donatucci	Lucyk	Sather
Allen	Druce	Lynch	Saylor
Argall	Eachus	Maitland	Schroder
Armstrong	Egolf	Major	Schuler
Baker	Fairchild	Markosek	Semmel
Bard	Fargo	Marsico	Serafini
Barley	Feese	Masland	Seyfert
Barrar	Fichter	Mayernik	Shaner
Battisto	Fleagle	McGeehan	Smith, B.
Belfanti	Flick	McGill	Smith, S. H.
Benninghoff	Gannon	McIlhattan	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Geist	McNaughton	Stairs
Blaum	Gigliotti	Micozzie	Steelman
Boscola	Gladeck	Miller	Steil
Boyes	Godshall	Mundy	Stern
Brown	Gordner	Nailor	Stevenson
Browne	Gruitza	Nickol	Strittmatter
Bunt	Gruppo	O'Brien	Taylor, E. Z.
Caltagirone	Habay	Olasz	Taylor, J.
Carone	Haluska	Orie	Trello

Chadwick	Harhart	Perzel	True
Civera	Hasay	Pesci	Tulli
Clark	Hennessey	Petrone	Vance
Clymer	Herman	Phillips	Vitali
Cohen, L. I.	Hershey	Pippy	Walko
Conti	Hess	Pistella	Waugh
Cornell	Hutchinson	Platts	Wilt
Cowell	Jadlowiec	Raymond	Wogan
Coy	Kaiser	Readshaw	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Keller	Reber	Yewcic
Dally	Kenney	Reinard	Zimmerman
DeLuca	Krebs	Rohrer	Zug
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Ross	
Dent	Lawless	Rubley	Ryan,
Dermody	Lederer	Sainato	Speaker
DiGirolamo	Leh	Santoni	

NAYS-55

Bebko-Jones	DeWeese	Manderino	Surra
Belardi	Evans	McCall	Tangretti
Bishop	George	Melio	Thomas
Butkovitz	Hanna	Mihalich	Tigue
Buxton	Horsely	Myers	Travaglio
Cappabianca	Itkin	Oliver	Trich
Carn	James	Petrarca	Van Horne
Casorio	Jarolin	Ramos	Veon
Cawley	Josephs	Roberts	Washington
Cohen, M.	Kirkland	Robinson	Williams, A. H.
Colafiglia	Laughlin	Roebuck	Williams, C.
Colaizzo	Lescovitz	Scrimenti	Wojnarowski
Corpora	Levdansky	Staback	Youngblood
Curry	Lloyd	Sturla	

NOT VOTING-3

Michlovic	Preston	Stetler
-----------	---------	---------

EXCUSED-4

Corrigan	Pettit	Rieger	Rooney
----------	--------	--------	--------

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the bill passed finally.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 77, PN 195**, entitled:

An Act designating a certain bridge on SR 0011 over the West Branch of the Susquehanna River connecting Point Township, Northumberland County, and Monroe Township, Snyder County, as the Barry A. King Memorial Bridge.

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

Mr. TRAVAGLIO offered the following amendment No. **A0891**:

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

; and redesignating the Pullman Viaduct (SR 3001) in Butler County as the Picklegate Crossing.

Amend Bill, page 1, by inserting between lines 11 and 12 Section 2. Redesignation of Pullman Viaduct.

The Pullman Viaduct (SR 3001) in Butler Township, Butler County, which crosses over several railway tracks of the Bessemer and Lake Erie Railroad or of any successor, is hereby redesignated and shall be known as the Picklegate Crossing.

Amend Sec. 2, page 1, line 12, by striking out "2" and inserting 3

Amend Sec. 2, page 1, line 15, by removing the period after "1" and inserting

and appropriate markers or signs to indicate the redesignation under section 2.

Amend Sec 3, page 1, line 16, by striking out "3" and inserting 4

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

The SPEAKER. On the question of the adoption of the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. TRAVAGLIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment is a redesignation of the Pullman Viaduct in Butler Township, Butler County. It crosses over several railway tracks of the Bessemer and Lake Erie Railroad or of any successor, and it is being asked to rename it the Picklegate Crossing. Thirty years ago that was the name of the roadway, and they would like to go back to that particular name.

I would ask my colleagues to vote "yes."

**THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
(PATRICIA H. VANCE) PRESIDING**

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-199

Adolph	Donatucci	Lynch	Schroder
Allen	Druce	Maitland	Schuler
Argall	Eachus	Major	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Egolf	Manderino	Semmel
Baker	Evans	Markosek	Serafini
Bard	Fairchild	Marsico	Seyfert
Barley	Fargo	Masland	Shaner
Barrar	Feese	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Battisto	Fichter	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Bebko-Jones	Fleagle	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Belardi	Flick	McGill	Staback
Belfanti	Gannon	McIlhatten	Stairs
Benninghoff	Geist	McNaughton	Steelman
Birmelin	George	Melio	Steil
Bishop	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Stern
Blaum	Gladeck	Micozzie	Stetler
Boscola	Godshall	Mihalich	Stevenson
Boyes	Gordner	Miller	Strittmatter
Brown	Gruitza	Mundy	Sturla
Browne	Gruppo	Myers	Surra

Bunt	Habay	Nailor	Tangretti
Butkovitz	Haluska	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Hanna	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Olasz	Thomas
Cappabianca	Hasay	Oliver	Tigue
Carn	Hennessey	Orie	Travaglio
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Trello
Casorio	Hershey	Pesci	Trich
Cawley	Hess	Petrarca	True
Chadwick	Horsey	Petrone	Tulli
Civera	Hutchinson	Phillips	Vance
Clark	Itkin	Pippy	Van Horne
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Veon
Cohen, L. I.	James	Platts	Vitali
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Preston	Walko
Colafella	Josephs	Ramos	Washington
Colaizzo	Kaiser	Raymond	Waugh
Conti	Keller	Readshaw	Williams, A. H.
Cornell	Kenney	Reber	Williams, C.
Corpora	Kirkland	Reinard	Wilt
Cowell	Krebs	Roberts	Wogan
Coy	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wojnaroski
Curry	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dally	Lederer	Ross	Youngblood
DeLuca	Leh	Rubley	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Lescovitz	Sainato	Zug
Dent	Levdansky	Santoni	
Dermody	Lloyd	Sather	Ryan,
DeWeese	Lucyk	Saylor	Speaker
DiGirolamo			

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-4

Corrigan	Pettit	Rieger	Rooney
----------	--------	--------	--------

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendment was agreed to.

On the question,

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

Mr. GORDNER offered the following amendment No. A0908:

Amend Title, page 1, line 4, by removing the period after "Bridge" and inserting ; and designating a certain bridge on S.R.2028 in Mifflin Township and South Centre Township, Columbia County, as the Mifflin-South Centre Veterans Memorial Bridge.

Amend Sec. 1, page 1, line 7, by striking out "designation." and inserting designations.

(a) Barry A. King Memorial Bridge.-

Amend Sec. 1, page 1, by inserting between lines 11 and 12

(b) Mifflin-South Centre Veterans Memorial Bridge.-The bridge located on S.R.2028 at Station 17+27.1 in Mifflin Township and at Station 34+17.96 in South Centre Township, Columbia County, is hereby designated and shall be known as the Mifflin-South Centre Veterans Memorial Bridge.

Amend Sec. 2, page 1, line 15, by striking out "1." and inserting

(a). The Department of Transportation shall erect and maintain signs which shall display the name of the Mifflin-South Centre Veterans Memorial Bridge so designated in section 1(b).

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Columbia, Mr. Gordner.

Mr. GORDNER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

This amendment would name a bridge which is currently unnamed as the Mifflin-South Centre Veterans Memorial Bridge.

I would appreciate a "yes" vote on this amendment. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-198

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

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-1

Williams, A. H.

EXCUSED-4

Corrigan Pettit Rieger Rooney

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. SCRIMENTI offered the following amendment No. A1021:

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

; and designating a section of the Southern Tier Expressway in Erie County as the Forest W. Hopkins Memorial Highway.

Amend Sec. 1, page 1, line 8, by inserting before "The"

(a) Designation.—

Amend Sec. 2, page 1, lines 12 and 13, by striking out all of line 12 and "The" in line 13 and inserting

(b) Signs.—The

Amend Bill, page 1, by inserting between lines 15 and 16 Section 2. Highway designation.

(a) Designation.—The eight-mile segment of Route 17 in Erie County, from Greenfield Township to the New York State line, is hereby designated and shall be known as the Forest W. Hopkins Memorial Highway.

(b) Background.—Forest W. Hopkins was a committed community servant, who served with distinction as a State Representative from the Fourth Legislative District from 1967 to 1978. Mr. Hopkins died in office in 1978.

(c) Signs.—Within 60 days of completion of construction of the highway segment described in subsection (a), the Department of Transportation shall erect and maintain road signs displaying the designation "Forest W. Hopkins Memorial Highway," at the beginning and end of the highway segment.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Erie, Mr. Scrimenti.

Mr. SCRIMENTI. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

This amendment would designate an 8-mile segment of Route 17 in Erie County as the Forest W. Hopkins Memorial Highway.

Those of you who have been here the longest no doubt remember Representative Forest Hopkins, who served in the House as the Fourth District Representative from 1967 until his untimely death in 1978.

The road, also known as the Southern Tier Expressway, is a key transportation link in the district which is now my honor to represent. I believe this official designation by the

General Assembly would be a fitting and lasting tribute to a gentleman who served this State with distinction and dedication.

I urge an affirmative vote. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-199

Table listing names of members who voted 'YEAS' (199 total). Columns include Adolph, Donatucci, Lynch, Schroder, Allen, Druce, Maitland, Schuler, Argall, Eachus, Major, Scrimenti, Armstrong, Egolf, Manderino, Semmel, Baker, Evans, Markosek, Serafini, Bard, Fairchild, Marsico, Seyfert, Barley, Fargo, Masland, Shaner, Barrar, Feese, Mayernik, Smith, B., Battisto, Fichter, McCall, Smith, S. H., Bebko-Jones, Fleagle, McGeehan, Snyder, D. W., Belardi, Flick, McGill, Staback, Belfanti, Gannon, McIlhattan, Stairs, Benninghoff, Geist, McNaughton, Steelman, Birmelin, George, Melio, Steil, Bishop, Gigliotti, Michlovic, Stern, Blaum, Gladeck, Micozzie, Stetler, Boscola, Godshall, Mihalich, Stevenson, Boyes, Gordner, Miller, Strittmatter, Brown, Gruitza, Mundy, Sturla, Browne, Gruppo, Myers, Surra, Bunt, Habay, Nailor, Tangretti, Butkovitz, Haluska, Nickol, Taylor, E. Z., Buxton, Hanna, O'Brien, Taylor, J., Caltagirone, Harhart, Olasz, Thomas, Cappabianca, Hasay, Oliver, Tigue, Carn, Hennessey, Orié, Travaglio, Carone, Herman, Perzel, Trello, Casorio, Hershey, Pesci, Trich, Cawley, Hess, Petrarca, True, Conti, Horsey, Petrone, Tulli, Civera, Hutchinson, Phillips, Vance, Clark, Itkin, Pippy, Van Horne, Clymer, Jadowiec, Pistella, Veon, Cohen, L. I., James, Platts, Vitali, Cohen, M., Jarolin, Preston, Walko, Colafella, Josephs, Ramos, Washington, Colaizzo, Kaiser, Raymond, Waugh, Keller, Readshaw, Williams, A. H., Cornell, Kenney, Reber, Williams, C., Corpora, Kirkland, Reinard, Wilt, Cowell, Krebs, Roberts, Wogan, Coy, LaGrotta, Robinson, Wojnaroski, Curry, Laughlin, Roebuck, Wright, M. N., Daley, Lawless, Rohrer, Yewcic, Dally, Lederer, Ross, Youngblood, DeLuca, Leh, Rubley, Zimmerman, Dempsey, Lescovitz, Sainato, Zug, Dent, Levdansky, Santoni, Dermody, Lloyd, Sather, Ryan, DeWeese, Lucyk, Saylor, Speaker, DiGirolamo

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-4

Corrigan Pettit Rieger Rooney

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendment was agreed to.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. SERAFINI offered the following amendment No. A1323:

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

; and designating a certain bridge in the Borough of Clarks Summit, Lackawanna County, as the Veterans of Foreign Wars Memorial Bridge.

Amend Sec. 1, page 1, lines 7 and 8, by striking out all of line 7 and "The" in line 8 and inserting

Section 1. (a) The

Amend Sec. 2, page 1, lines 12 and 13, by striking out all of line 12 and "The" in line 13 and inserting

(b) The

Amend Bill, page 1, by inserting between lines 15 and 16

Section 2. (a) The bridge carrying Winola Road (SR 4024) over railroad tracks, situated in the Borough of Clarks Summit, Lackawanna County, shall hereafter be known as the Veterans of Foreign Wars Memorial Bridge.

(b) The Department of Transportation shall erect appropriate signs to indicate this designation.

Amend Sec. 3, page 1, lines 16 and 17, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

Section 3. This act shall take effect immediately.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lackawanna, Mr. Serafini.

Mr. SERAFINI. Madam Speaker, this legislation would name a bridge in Clarks Summit the Foreign Wars Memorial Bridge. It is for the veterans of Pennsylvania. Thank you very much.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-197

Table listing names of members who voted 'YEAS-197', including Adolph, Allen, Argall, Armstrong, Baker, Bard, Barley, Barrar, Battisto, Bebk-Jones, Belardi, Belfanti, Benninghoff, Birmelin, Blaum, Boscola, Boyes, Brown, Browne, Donatucci, Druce, Eachus, Egolf, Evans, Fairchild, Fargo, Feese, Fichter, Fleagle, Flick, Gannon, Geist, George, Gigliotti, Gladeck, Godshall, Gordoner, Gruitza, Lynch, Maitland, Major, Manderino, Markosek, Marsico, Masland, Mayernik, McCall, McGeehan, McGill, McIlhatten, McNaughton, Melio, Michlovic, Micozzie, Mihalich, Miller, Mundy, Schroder, Schuler, Scrimenti, Semmel, Serafini, Seyfert, Shaner, Smith, B., Smith, S. H., Snyder, D. W., Staback, Stairs, Steelman, Steil, Stern, Stetler, Stevenson, Strittmatter, Sturla.

Table listing names of members who did not vote or were excused, including Bunt, Butkovitz, Buxton, Caltagirone, Cappabianca, Carn, Carone, Casorio, Cawley, Chadwick, Civera, Clark, Clymer, Cohen, L. I., Cohen, M., Colafella, Colaizzo, Conti, Cornell, Corpora, Cowell, Coy, Curry, Daley, Dally, DeLuca, Dempsey, Dent, Dermody, DeWeese, DiGirolamo, Gruppo, Habay, Haluska, Hanna, Harhart, Hasay, Hennessey, Herman, Hershey, Hess, Horsey, Hutchinson, Itkin, Jadowiec, James, Jarolin, Josephs, Kaiser, Keller, Kenney, Kirkland, Krebs, LaGrotta, Laughlin, Lawless, Lederer, Leh, Lescovitz, Levdansky, Lloyd, Lucyk, Myers, Nailor, Nickol, O'Brien, Olasz, Oliver, Ori, Perzel, Pesci, Petrarca, Petrone, Phillips, Pippy, Pistella, Platts, Preston, Ramos, Raymond, Readshaw, Reber, Reinard, Roberts, Robinson, Roebuck, Rohrer, Ross, Rubley, Sainato, Santoni, Sather, Saylor, Surra, Tangretti, Taylor, E. Z., Taylor, J., Thomas, Tigue, Travaglio, Trello, Trich, True, Tulli, Vance, Van Horne, Veon, Vitali, Walko, Washington, Waugh, Williams, C., Wilt, Wogan, Wojnaroski, Wright, M. N., Yewcic, Youngblood, Zimmerman, Zug, Ryan, Speaker.

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-2

Bishop Williams, A. H.

EXCUSED-4

Corrigan Pettit Rieger Rooney

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendment was agreed to.

On the question recurring,

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 provisions of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS-197

Table listing names of members who voted 'YEAS-197', including Adolph, Allen, Argall, Armstrong, Baker, Bard, Barley, Barrar, Battisto, Bebk-Jones, Belardi, Belfanti, Donatucci, Druce, Eachus, Egolf, Evans, Fairchild, Fargo, Feese, Fichter, Fleagle, Flick, Gannon, Lynch, Maitland, Major, Manderino, Markosek, Marsico, Masland, McCall, McGeehan, McGill, McIlhatten, McNaughton, Schuler, Scrimenti, Semmel, Serafini, Seyfert, Shaner, Smith, B., Smith, S. H., Snyder, D. W., Staback, Stairs, Steelman.

Benninghoff	Geist	Melio	Steil
Birmelin	George	Michlovic	Stern
Blaum	Gigliotti	Micozzie	Stetler
Boscola	Gladeck	Mihalich	Stevenson
Boyes	Godshall	Miller	Strittmatter
Brown	Gordner	Mundy	Sturla
Browne	Gruitza	Myers	Surra
Bunt	Gruppo	Nailor	Tangretti
Butkovitz	Habay	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Haluska	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Hanna	Olasz	Thomas
Cappabianca	Harhart	Oliver	Tigue
Carn	Hasay	Orie	Travaglio
Carone	Hennessey	Perzel	Trello
Casorio	Herman	Pesci	Trich
Cawley	Hershey	Petrarca	True
Chadwick	Hess	Petrone	Tulli
Civera	Horsey	Phillips	Vance
Clark	Hutchinson	Pippy	Van Horne
Clymer	Itkin	Pistella	Veon
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Platts	Vitali
Cohen, M.	James	Preston	Walko
Colafella	Jarolin	Ramos	Washington
Colaizzo	Josephs	Raymond	Waugh
Conti	Kaiser	Readshaw	Williams, A. H.
Cornell	Keller	Reber	Williams, C.
Corpora	Kenney	Reinard	Wilt
Cowell	Kirkland	Roberts	Wogan
Coy	Krebs	Robinson	Wojnaroski
Curry	LaGrotta	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Laughlin	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dally	Lawless	Ross	Youngblood
DeLuca	Lederer	Rubley	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Leh	Sainato	Zug
Dent	Lescovitz	Santoni	
Dermody	Levdansky	Sather	Ryan,
DeWeese	Lloyd	Saylor	Speaker
DiGirolamo	Lucyk	Schroder	

Mr. MICOZZIE offered the following amendment No. A1352:

Amend Second Resolved Clause, page 2, lines 23 through 27, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

RESOLVED, That the task force be composed of a bipartisan panel consisting of 20 persons, as follows: the Majority Chairperson and the Minority Chairperson of the Insurance Committee of the House of Representatives; two members of the House of Representatives, as appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; two members of the House of Representatives, as appointed by the Minority Leader; one member of the Insurance Committee of the House of Representatives, as appointed by the Majority Chairperson of the committee; one member of the Insurance Committee, as appointed by the Minority Chairperson of the committee; four representatives of the automobile insurance industry, two to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and two to be appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives; two district attorneys, one to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and one to be appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives; two representatives of the Department of Transportation, as appointed by the Secretary of Transportation; one representative of the Pennsylvania State Police and one representative of the Philadelphia Police, as appointed by the Governor; two members of the general public, as appointed by the Governor; and be it further

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

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

Mr. MICOZZIE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

This amendment has to do with uninsured motorists, and it spells out the members of the task force. And as many of the members know, it is a burning issue in the State of Pennsylvania, especially in the areas of the southeast and, of course, in Pittsburgh and in the other areas of the State.

I ask for your support on this very important amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Beaver County, Mr. Colafella.

Mr. COLAFELLA. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I rise to support the amendment.

Uninsured motorists is one of the biggest problems that face this State, and it causes people who do have insurance to have to pay more because so many uninsured motorists are driving today.

I support the amendment, and I hope that we can all support it. Thank you very much.

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

Mr. HORSEY. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, may I interrogate the maker of the amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman agrees. You may proceed.

Mr. HORSEY. Madam Speaker, I noticed that you have named several people, suggesting that this committee should be bipartisan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentleman cease just a moment.

Could we have a little quiet. There is an interrogation going on, and they cannot hear. Could you please quiet down. Thank you.

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-2

Bishop Mayernik

EXCUSED-4

Corrigan Pettit Rieger Rooney

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the bill passed finally.

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

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MICOZZIE called up HR 51, PN 451, entitled:

A Resolution directing the Insurance Committee to form a task force to develop solutions to eliminate uninsured motor vehicles from operating on Pennsylvania highways.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

Mr. HORSEY. Madam Speaker, I noticed that in the amendment you named and pointed out several people to be made or put onto this committee or task force. Is there a reason why you did not consider judicial members? I am just curious.

Mr. MICOZZIE. I cannot hear.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would you please repeat the question.

Mr. HORSEY. Madam Speaker, is there a reason why you did not include judicial members? For example—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would you cease just a moment. He is going to go where he can have the earphones plugged in so that he can hear you.

Sorry about that. Would you please ask the question again.

Mr. HORSEY. Madam Speaker, I noticed that you have a number of representatives from different branches of the agency and persons who might have an interest in the issue of uninsured motorists/vehicles, but is there a reason why the judicial branch was left out of this process or off this task force?

Mr. MICOZZIE. I cannot hear. I am sorry, Madam Speaker. We cannot hear a word he is saying. Try again.

Mr. HORSEY. Madam Speaker, I noticed that there are a number of interests represented on this task force. Is there a reason why the judicial branch is not mentioned as members of this task force? I am just asking out of curiosity.

Mr. MICOZZIE. I understand the question.

The resolution is really an agreeable resolution that has been talked about with your leadership and our leadership and the two chairmen. So that is how the resolution came about, as far as the amendment.

Mr. HORSEY. So there is no reason why the judicial branch is not represented on this task force?

Mr. MICOZZIE. That is true.

Mr. HORSEY. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—198

Adolph	Donatucci	Lynch	Schroder
Allen	Druce	Maitland	Schuler
Argall	Eachus	Major	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Egolf	Manderino	Semmel
Baker	Evans	Markosek	Serafini
Bard	Fairchild	Marsico	Seyfert
Barley	Fargo	Masland	Shaner
Barrar	Feese	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Battisto	Fichter	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Bebko-Jones	Fleagle	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Belardi	Flick	McGill	Staback
Belfanti	Gannon	McIlhattan	Stairs
Benninghoff	Geist	McNaughton	Steelman
Birmelin	George	Melio	Steil
Bishop	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Stem
Blaum	Gladeck	Micozzie	Stetler
Boscola	Godshall	Mihalich	Stevenson
Boyes	Gordner	Miller	Strittmatter
Brown	Gruitza	Mundy	Sturla
Browne	Gruppo	Myers	Surra
Bunt	Habay	Nailor	Tangretti
Butkovitz	Haluska	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Hanna	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Olasz	Thomas

Cappabianca	Hasay	Oliver	Tigue
Carn	Hennessey	Orie	Travaglio
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Trello
Casorio	Hershey	Pesci	Trich
Cawley	Hess	Petrarca	True
Chadwick	Horsey	Petrone	Tulli
Civera	Hutchinson	Phillips	Vance
Clark	Itkin	Pippy	Van Home
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Veon
Cohen, L. I.	James	Platts	Vitali
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Preston	Walko
Colafella	Josephs	Ramos	Washington
Colaizzo	Kaiser	Raymond	Waugh
Conti	Keller	Readshaw	Williams, A. H.
Cornell	Kenney	Reber	Williams, C.
Corpora	Kirkland	Reinard	Wilt
Cowell	Krebs	Roberts	Wogan
Coy	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wojnaroski
Daley	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Dally	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
DeLuca	Lederer	Ross	Youngblood
Dempsey	Leh	Rublely	Zimmerman
Dent	Lescovitz	Sainato	Zug
Dermody	Levdansky	Santoni	
DeWeese	Lloyd	Sather	Ryan,
DiGirolamo	Lucyk	Saylor	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—1

Curry

EXCUSED—4

Corrigan

Pettit

Rieger

Rooney

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendment was agreed to.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution as amended?

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

Mr. KENNEY. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I rise to support HR 51, and I want to thank Chairman Micozzie for bringing this resolution to the floor.

Madam Speaker, Pennsylvanians spend, from 1995 statewide statistics, some \$500 million on uninsured and underinsured motorists coverage, and I am sure we could all agree our constituents and our taxpayers throughout the Commonwealth would rather be spending that money on more useful programs such as education and health care for their families.

I again want to thank the chairman for bringing this issue to the floor and moving this task force, and hopefully within 6 months we will have some resolution on how to better spend taxpayers' money in Pennsylvania. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware County, Mr. Micozzie.

Mr. MICOZZIE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

What we plan to do, both Representative Colafella and myself, we plan to have public hearings throughout the State in the different areas of the State, especially Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and central Pennsylvania. So I think it is a good thing to do, because I

know in my district I am receiving many, many phone calls about uninsured motorists and underinsured motorists, and I think that the resolution will go a long way to help us out.

I ask for your support.

On the question recurring,

Will the House adopt the resolution as amended?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-198

Adolph	Donatucci	Lynch	Schroder
Allen	Druce	Maitland	Schuler
Argall	Eachus	Major	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Egolf	Manderino	Semmel
Baker	Evans	Markosek	Serafini
Bard	Fairchild	Marsico	Seyfert
Barley	Fargo	Masland	Shaner
Barrar	Feese	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Battisto	Fichter	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Bebko-Jones	Fleagle	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Belardi	Flick	McGill	Staback
Belfanti	Gannon	McIlhattan	Stairs
Benninghoff	Geist	McNaughton	Steelman
Birmelin	George	Melio	Steil
Blaum	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Stern
Boscola	Gladeck	Micozzie	Stetler
Boyes	Godshall	Mihalich	Stevenson
Brown	Gordner	Miller	Strittmatter
Browne	Gruitza	Mundy	Sturla
Bunt	Gruppo	Myers	Surra
Butkovitz	Habay	Nailor	Tangretti
Buxton	Haluska	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Caltagirone	Hanna	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Cappabianca	Harhart	Olasz	Thomas
Carn	Hasay	Oliver	Tigue
Carone	Hennessey	Orie	Travaglio
Casorio	Herman	Perzel	Trello
Cawley	Hershey	Pesci	Trich
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	True
Civera	Horsey	Petrone	Tulli
Clark	Hutchinson	Phillips	Vance
Clymer	Itkin	Pippy	Van Home
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Veon
Cohen, M.	James	Platts	Vitali
Colaifella	Jarolin	Preston	Walko
Colaizzo	Josephs	Ramos	Washington
Conti	Kaiser	Raymond	Waugh
Cornell	Keller	Readshaw	Williams, A. H.
Corpora	Kenney	Reber	Williams, C.
Cowell	Kirkland	Reinard	Wilt
Coy	Krebs	Roberts	Wogan
Curry	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wojnaroski
Daley	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Dally	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
DeLuca	Lederer	Ross	Youngblood
Dempsey	Leh	Rubley	Zimmerman
Dent	Lescovitz	Sainato	Zug
Dermody	Levdansky	Santoni	
DeWeese	Lloyd	Sather	Ryan,
DiGirolamo	Lucy	Saylor	Speaker

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING--1

Bishop

EXCUSED-4

Corrigan	Pettit	Rieger	Rooney
----------	--------	--------	--------

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the resolution as amended was adopted.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. HR 127 is over temporarily.

Mr. SEMMEL called up HR 128, PN 1437, entitled:

A Resolution directing the Standing Subcommittee on Higher Education of the Education Committee to conduct a study of the 15 community colleges that exist within this Commonwealth.

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolution ?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-199

Adolph	Donatucci	Lynch	Schroder
Allen	Druce	Maitland	Schuler
Argall	Eachus	Major	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Egolf	Manderino	Semmel
Baker	Evans	Markosek	Serafini
Bard	Fairchild	Marsico	Seyfert
Barley	Fargo	Masland	Shaner
Barrar	Feese	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Battisto	Fichter	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Bebko-Jones	Fleagle	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Belardi	Flick	McGill	Staback
Belfanti	Gannon	McIlhattan	Stairs
Benninghoff	Geist	McNaughton	Steelman
Birmelin	George	Melio	Steil
Bishop	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Stern
Blaum	Gladeck	Micozzie	Stetler
Boscola	Godshall	Mihalich	Stevenson
Boyes	Gordner	Miller	Strittmatter
Brown	Gruitza	Mundy	Sturla
Browne	Gruppo	Myers	Surra
Bunt	Habay	Nailor	Tangretti
Butkovitz	Haluska	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Hanna	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Olasz	Thomas
Cappabianca	Hasay	Oliver	Tigue
Carn	Hennessey	Orie	Travaglio
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Trello
Casorio	Hershey	Pesci	Trich
Cawley	Hess	Petrarca	True
Chadwick	Horsey	Petrone	Tulli
Civera	Hutchinson	Phillips	Vance
Clark	Itkin	Pippy	Van Home
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Veon
Cohen, L. I.	James	Platts	Vitali
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Preston	Walko
Colaifella	Josephs	Ramos	Washington
Colaizzo	Kaiser	Raymond	Waugh
Conti	Keller	Readshaw	Williams, A. H.
Cornell	Kenney	Reber	Williams, C.
Corpora	Kirkland	Reinard	Wilt
Cowell	Krebs	Roberts	Wogan
Coy	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wojnaroski
Curry	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dally	Lederer	Ross	Youngblood
DeLuca	Leh	Rubley	Zimmerman

Dempsey	Lescovitz	Sainato	Zug
Dent	Levdansky	Santoni	
Dermody	Lloyd	Sather	Ryan,
DeWeese	Lucyk	Saylor	Speaker
DiGirolamo			

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-4

Corrigan	Pettit	Rieger	Rooney
----------	--------	--------	--------

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the resolution was adopted.

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. MARSICO called up **HR 114, PN 1346**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing April 25, 1997, as "Arbor Day"; promoting public participation in the celebration; and further recognizing the value of trees to our environment.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dauphin County, Mr. Marsico.

Mr. MARSICO. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would like to thank the members for their support of this meaningful resolution. And also I would like to recognize and applaud and thank *International Paper* for supplying us with these seedlings on your desks, the Douglas fir seedlings, and also the handout, the pocketbook which talks about and gives a lot of valuable information on trees and shrubs. So I just want to thank the members for their support and their vote.

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

Mr. HORSEY. Madam Speaker, I just wanted to inform the House here that I think that I shall never see a thing as lovely as a tree and suggest that we support this resolution. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do not want to waste the House's time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and also Joyce Kilmer.

The Chair recognizes the lady from Montgomery County, Representative Williams.

Ms. WILLIAMS. I would just like to remark that while it is very kind of *International Paper* to give us these books, the books are published in Malaysia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady.

On the question recurring,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-198

Adolph	DiGirolamo	Lucyk	Schroder
Allen	Donatucci	Lynch	Schuler
Argall	Druce	Maitland	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Eachus	Major	Semmel
Baker	Egolf	Manderino	Serafini
Bard	Evans	Markosek	Seyfert
Barley	Fairchild	Marsico	Shaner
Barrar	Fargo	Masland	Smith, B.
Battisto	Feece	Mayernik	Smith, S. H.
Bebko-Jones	Fichter	McCall	Snyder, D. W.
Belardi	Fleagle	McGeehan	Staback
Belfanti	Flick	McGill	Stairs
Benninghoff	Gannon	McIlhattan	Steelman
Birmelin	Geist	McNaughton	Steil
Bishop	George	Melio	Stern
Blaum	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Stetler
Boscola	Gladeck	Micozzie	Stevenson
Boyes	Godshall	Mihalich	Strittmatter
Brown	Gordner	Miller	Sturla
Browne	Gruitza	Mundy	Surra
Bunt	Gruppo	Myers	Tangretti
Butkovitz	Habay	Nailor	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Haluska	Nickol	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Hanna	O'Brien	Thomas
Cappabianca	Harhart	Olasz	Tigue
Carn	Hasay	Oliver	Travaglio
Carone	Hennessey	Orie	Trello
Casorio	Herman	Perzel	Trich
Cawley	Hershey	Pesci	True
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	Tulli
Civera	Horsey	Petrone	Vance
Clark	Hutchinson	Phillips	Van Home
Clymer	Itkin	Pippy	Veon
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Vitali
Cohen, M.	James	Platts	Walko
Colafiglia	Jarolin	Preston	Washington
Colaizzo	Josephs	Ramos	Waugh
Conti	Kaiser	Raymond	Williams, A. H.
Cornell	Keller	Readshaw	Williams, C.
Corpora	Kenney	Reber	Wilt
Cowell	Kirkland	Reinard	Wogan
Coy	Krebs	Roberts	Wojnaroski
Curry	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Laughlin	Roebuck	Yewcic
Dally	Lawless	Rohrer	Youngblood
DeLuca	Lederer	Ross	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Leh	Rubley	Zug
Dent	Lescovitz	Sainato	
Dermody	Levdansky	Santoni	Ryan,
DeWeese	Lloyd	Sather	Speaker

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-1

Saylor

EXCUSED-4

Corrigan	Pettit	Rieger	Rooney
----------	--------	--------	--------

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the resolution was adopted.

Mrs. COHEN called up **HR 134, PN 1485**, entitled:

A Resolution declaring May 12, 1997, as "Osteoporosis Prevention and Treatment Awareness Day" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Could we have the resolution up on the board, please — HR 134?

The members will be at ease for a moment until we get this up on the board.

We will be doing committee reports now.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

HB 11, PN 1526 (Amended) By Rep. MICOZZIE

An Act amending the act of May 17, 1921 (P.L.789, No.285), known as The Insurance Department Act of 1921, authorizing financial institutions to sell insurance.

INSURANCE.

HB 96, PN 104 By Rep. GEIST

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for wheel chairs and electrical mobility devices.

TRANSPORTATION.

HB 909, PN 1017 By Rep. GEIST

An Act designating a section of U.S. Route 15 in Union County, Pennsylvania, as the Donald L. Heiter Memorial Highway.

TRANSPORTATION.

HB 1055, PN 1527 (Amended) By Rep. MICOZZIE

An Act amending the act of May 17, 1921 (P.L.789, No.285), known as The Insurance Department Act of 1921, providing for risk-based capital requirements.

INSURANCE.

SB 184, PN 177 By Rep. GEIST

An Act redesignating the Pullman Viaduct (SR 3001) in Butler County as the Picklegate Crossing.

TRANSPORTATION.

SB 361, PN 446 By Rep. GEIST

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for vehicles at railroad crossings.

TRANSPORTATION.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what reason does the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Walko, rise?

Mr. WALKO. Remarks for the record.

I rise to request that I could submit written comments for the record in support of HB 1246.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. You may. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. WALKO. Thank you.

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

I support HB 1246 because I believe that we must invest in our urban centers.

I have talked with mayors, city development officials, and other representatives of aging urban centers throughout the Commonwealth. Almost every official noted directly or alluded to the problem of the concentration of tax-exempt property in their urban centers with no mechanism for recovering the costs of municipal services rendered to the tax-exempt property owners.

Pittsburgh's fiscal problems are well known. They arise in part because of the high percentage of its assessed real estate value which is tax exempt. Estimates of the percentage of all assessed real estate which is tax exempt in Pittsburgh range from 35 to 45 percent.

During the last three decades, municipalities such as Pittsburgh, Johnstown, Bethlehem, Washington, and Erie have experienced severe population losses. At the same time, these aging cities have continued to be the home of tax-exempt institutions such as universities, hospitals, and museums which serve the regions in which they are the "hubs."

While aging urban hubs must provide services such as police and fire protection and street maintenance to tax-exempt institutions within their borders, they have no mechanism to recoup the cost of those services. No tax or other revenue source exists to cover the unreimbursed expenses.

Granted that the institutions are often tremendous job generators. But keep in mind that their employees often do not live in the host municipalities, and, if they do, they are already receiving municipal services for their taxes as residents.

Back when municipalities such as Pittsburgh were dominant regional population centers, they could absorb the unreimbursed cost of providing services to regional tax-exempt institutions. Now, however, with population flight to the suburbs, fewer and fewer taxpayers are forced to bear the burden of the facilities. I have, therefore, cosponsored HB 1246 as a mechanism to address the predicament of our aging urban hubs.

The tax-exempt property grant program was inspired by Pittsburgh City Controller Tom Flaherty, who back in 1987 advocated a similar proposal. He recognized then a time bomb that was ticking away in the city of Pittsburgh. HB 1246 will address in part the structural financial problems of municipalities like Pittsburgh.

While our historic proposal is the first ever to reimburse cities and other municipalities for the burdens which they bear for regional tax-exempt institutions, it is not an unprecedented approach in Pennsylvania. We currently reimburse rural counties for tax-exempt game lands.

Our legislation will have the Commonwealth put museums, colleges and universities, hospitals, and other tax-exempt institutions on a par with game lands.

Our program will recognize the fact that museums, educational institutions, hospitals, and other charitable and educational institutions are important to the people of Pennsylvania, and that their host municipalities must be relieved of unreimbursed financial burdens.

I respectfully request that you support HB 1246.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Michlovic, rise?

Mr. MICHLOVIC. To correct the record, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. You may proceed.

Mr. MICHLOVIC. Madam Speaker, on the final passage vote for HB 337, I inadvertently deactivated my voting switch. I would like the record to show that I be recorded in the negative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman. Your vote will be cast upon the record.

CONSIDERATION OF HR 134 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Returning to page 5 — the board is now in order — HR 134.

On the question recurring,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—199

Adolph	Donatucci	Lynch	Schroder
Allen	Druce	Maitland	Schuler
Argall	Eachus	Major	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Egolf	Manderino	Semmel
Baker	Evans	Markosek	Serafini
Bard	Fairchild	Marsico	Seyfert
Barley	Fargo	Masland	Shaner
Barrar	Feese	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Battisto	Fichter	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Bebko-Jones	Fleagle	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Belardi	Flick	McGill	Staback
Belfanti	Gannon	McIlhattan	Stairs
Benninghoff	Geist	McNaughton	Steelman
Birmelin	George	Melio	Steil
Bishop	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Stern
Blaum	Gladeck	Micozzie	Stetler
Boscola	Godshall	Mihalich	Stevenson
Boyes	Gordner	Miller	Strittmatter
Brown	Gruitza	Mundy	Sturla
Browne	Gruppo	Myers	Surra
Bunt	Habay	Nailor	Tangretti
Butkowitz	Haluska	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Hanna	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Olasz	Thomas
Cappabianca	Hasay	Oliver	Tigue
Carn	Hennessey	Orie	Travaglio
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Trello
Casorio	Hershey	Pesci	Trich
Cawley	Hess	Petrarca	True
Chadwick	Horshey	Petrone	Tulli
Civera	Hutchinson	Phillips	Vance
Clark	Itkin	Pippy	Van Home
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Veon
Cohen, L. I.	James	Platts	Vitali
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Preston	Walko
Colafella	Josephs	Ramos	Washington
Colaizzo	Kaiser	Raymond	Waugh
Conti	Keller	Readshaw	Williams, A. H.
Cornell	Kenney	Reber	Williams, C.
Corpora	Kirkland	Reinard	Wilt
Cowell	Krebs	Roberts	Wogan
Coy	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wojnaroski
Curry	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dally	Lederer	Ross	Youngblood
DeLuca	Leh	Rublely	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Lescovitz	Sainato	Zug

Dent	Levdansky	Santoni	
Dermody	Lloyd	Sather	Ryan,
DeWeese	Lucyk	Saylor	Speaker
DiGirolamo			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Corrigan	Pettit	Rieger	Rooney
----------	--------	--------	--------

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the resolution was adopted.

* * *

Mr. GODSHALL called up **HR 135, PN 1486**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the week of May 4 through 10, 1997, as "Tourism Promotion Week" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—199

Adolph	Donatucci	Lynch	Schroder
Allen	Druce	Maitland	Schuler
Argall	Eachus	Major	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Egolf	Manderino	Semmel
Baker	Evans	Markosek	Serafini
Bard	Fairchild	Marsico	Seyfert
Barley	Fargo	Masland	Shaner
Barrar	Feese	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Battisto	Fichter	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Bebko-Jones	Fleagle	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Belardi	Flick	McGill	Staback
Belfanti	Gannon	McIlhattan	Stairs
Benninghoff	Geist	McNaughton	Steelman
Birmelin	George	Melio	Steil
Bishop	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Stern
Blaum	Gladeck	Micozzie	Stetler
Boscola	Godshall	Mihalich	Stevenson
Boyes	Gordner	Miller	Strittmatter
Brown	Gruitza	Mundy	Sturla
Browne	Gruppo	Myers	Surra
Bunt	Habay	Nailor	Tangretti
Butkowitz	Haluska	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Hanna	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Olasz	Thomas
Cappabianca	Hasay	Oliver	Tigue
Carn	Hennessey	Orie	Travaglio
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Trello
Casorio	Hershey	Pesci	Trich
Cawley	Hess	Petrarca	True
Chadwick	Horshey	Petrone	Tulli
Civera	Hutchinson	Phillips	Vance
Clark	Itkin	Pippy	Van Home
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Veon
Cohen, L. I.	James	Platts	Vitali
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Preston	Walko
Colafella	Josephs	Ramos	Washington
Colaizzo	Kaiser	Raymond	Waugh
Conti	Keller	Readshaw	Williams, A. H.
Cornell	Kenney	Reber	Williams, C.
Corpora	Kirkland	Reinard	Wilt

Cowell	Krebs	Roberts	Wogan
Coy	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wojnaroski
Curry	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dally	Lederer	Ross	Youngblood
DeLuca	Leh	Rubley	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Lescovitz	Sainato	Zug
Dent	Levdansky	Santoni	
Dermody	Lloyd	Sather	Ryan,
DeWeese	Lucyk	Saylor	Speaker
DiGirolamo			

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-4

Corrigan	Pettit	Rieger	Rooney
----------	--------	--------	--------

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the resolution was adopted.

* * *

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. HR 136 is over for today.

RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who calls for an immediate meeting of the Rules Committee at his desk.

RESOLUTION REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HR 133, PN 1473 By Rep. PERZEL

A Resolution creating a legislative commission to study restructuring of urban schools in this Commonwealth.

RULES.

STATE GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Clymer, from Bucks County rise?

Mr. CLYMER. To make an announcement, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. You may proceed.

Mr. CLYMER. Madam Speaker, there will be a brief meeting in the rear of the hall of the State Government Committee upon the declaration of recess.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westmoreland County, Mr. Stairs.

Mr. STAIRS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would like to announce to the Education Committee members that at 1 o'clock we are going to reconvene a meeting that was recessed earlier this morning. So I am asking the members to reassemble again at 1 o'clock in room 22 in the Annex. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. ROHRER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Rohrer, rise?

Mr. ROHRER. Madam Speaker, I have a point of personal privilege, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would you state your point, please.

Mr. ROHRER. I have an announcement for the members of the House.

This Friday is the 6th Annual Pennsylvania Academic Competition that is going to be held here in the House chamber and in the Senate. You have all received communication from me before on that, but we are in need of a couple of additional members to help judge the competition either in the morning or afternoon. Any time that you can contribute would be greatly helpful to us. If you could contact me, we could help to arrange for that, and there is no preparation necessary for the members to do it. A great chance to see the school districts from across the State that have made it to the final competitions and a great opportunity to see what is going on. We would like your help.

Thank you so much. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

RESOLUTION

Mrs. TRUE called up HR 127, PN 1481, entitled:

A Resolution providing for the appointment of a select committee to investigate recent events relating to child abuse and the adequacy of child protective service in general throughout this Commonwealth.

On the question, Will the House adopt the resolution?

Mrs. TRUE offered the following amendment No. A1471:

Amend Title, page 1, line 1, by striking out "committee" and inserting subcommittee

Amend First Resolve Clause, page 4, line 11, by striking out "a select committee be created and" and inserting the Committee on Aging and Youth

Amend First Resolve Clause, page 4, line 12, by inserting after "to" establish a select subcommittee to

Amend Second Resolve Clause, page 4, line 30, by striking out "CHAIRMAN" and inserting select subcommittee consist of seven members

Amend Second Resolve Clause, page 5, lines 1 through 5, by striking out "SHALL APPOINT FIVE MEMBERS TO THE SELECT COMMITTEE, AT" in line 1, all of lines 2 through 4, and "WHOM SHALL BE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGING AND YOUTH" in line 5 and inserting

, four members appointed by the chairman of the committee and three members appointed by the minority chairman of the committee

Amend Third Resolve Clause, page 5, line 8, by striking out "committee" and inserting
subcommittee

Amend Third Resolve Clause, page 5, line 9, by striking out "committee" and inserting
subcommittee

Amend Fourth Resolve Clause, page 5, line 10, by striking out "committee" and inserting
subcommittee

Amend Fourth Resolve Clause, page 5, line 23, by striking out "committee" and inserting
subcommittee

Amend Fourth Resolve Clause, page 5, line 24, by striking out "committee" and inserting
subcommittee

Amend Fifth Resolve Clause, page 5, line 28, by striking out "committee" and inserting
subcommittee

Amend Sixth Resolve Clause, page 5, line 30, by striking out "committee" and inserting
subcommittee

Amend Sixth Resolve Clause, page 6, line 2, by inserting after "the" where it appears the second time

Committee on Aging and Youth and to the

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

RULES SUSPENDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the lady from Lancaster County, Representative True.

Mrs. TRUE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would like to move to suspend—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The lady is in order.

Mrs. TRUE. Madam Speaker, we have been working very diligently on this resolution. The chairmen of Aging and Youth — Representative Blaum, the Democrat chair, and Representative Gruppo — and their staff, going through this, apparently we are in some unchartered territory. I think the resolution speaks for itself, but the amendment would bring the select committee just to the Aging and Youth members, which would help when we are looking at records and looking after confidentiality.

So I would ask to suspend the rules so we can vote the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to suspend.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the motion to suspend, only leaders can speak on the motion to suspend.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BLAUM. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to suspend the rules. The motion to suspend to offer an amendment to tighten the resolution I think is warranted and a good move, and I would ask the members' affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—198

Adolph	DiGirolamo	Lynch	Schroder
Allen	Donatucci	Maitland	Schuler
Argall	Eachus	Major	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Egolf	Manderino	Semmel
Baker	Evans	Markosek	Serafini
Bard	Fairchild	Marsico	Seyfert
Barley	Fargo	Masland	Shaner
Barrar	Feese	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Battisto	Fichter	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Bebko-Jones	Fleagle	McGechan	Snyder, D. W.
Belardi	Flick	McGill	Staback
Belfanti	Gannon	McIlhattan	Stairs
Benninghoff	Geist	McNaughton	Steelman
Birmelin	George	Melio	Steil
Bishop	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Stern
Blaum	Gladeck	Micozzie	Stetler
Boscola	Godshall	Mihalich	Stevenson
Boyes	Gordner	Miller	Stritmatter
Brown	Gruitza	Mundy	Sturla
Browne	Gruppo	Myers	Surra
Bunt	Habay	Nailor	Tangretti
Butkovitz	Haluska	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Hanna	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Olasz	Thomas
Cappabianca	Hasay	Oliver	Tigue
Cam	Hennessey	Orie	Travaglio
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Trello
Casorio	Hershey	Pesci	Trich
Cawley	Hess	Petrarca	True
Chadwick	Horsey	Petrone	Tulli
Civera	Hutchinson	Phillips	Vance
Clark	Itkin	Pippy	Van Home
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Veon
Cohen, L. I.	James	Platts	Vitali
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Preston	Walko
Colafiglia	Josephs	Ramos	Washington
Colaizzo	Kaiser	Raymond	Waugh
Conti	Keller	Readshaw	Williams, A. H.
Cornell	Kenney	Reber	Williams, C.
Corpora	Kirkland	Reinard	Wilt
Cowell	Krebs	Roberts	Wogan
Coy	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wojnaroski
Curry	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dally	Lederer	Ross	Youngblood
DeLuca	Leh	Rubley	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Lescovitz	Sainato	Zug
Dent	Levdansky	Santoni	
Dermody	Lloyd	Sather	Ryan,
DeWeese	Lucyk	Saylor	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—1

Druce

EXCUSED-4

Corrigan Pettit Rieger Rooney

A majority of the members required by the rules having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the motion was agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the lady from Lancaster County, Representative True.

Mrs. TRUE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.
The amendment is being passed out at this time.

Mr. BLAUM. Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Blaum, rise?

Mr. BLAUM. Just that I think the lady deserves the attention of the House, and I can barely hear her.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is an excellent point. I think that we as members are all interested in child abuse. I would direct your attention to the resolution and listen to what the members have to say that are speaking.

Mrs. TRUE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The amendment comes with a great deal of serious thought as we review the child abuse law. Anything the select committee would do, we would not want to do anything incorrectly, and that is why we are offering the amendment, which essentially the chairman of Aging and Youth would appoint four subcommittee members and the minority chairman would appoint three members from the Aging and Youth Committee. The original resolution asked for four task force members to come from the body of the General Assembly, but we were concerned about confidentiality, and that is why we are asking for the amendment.

I urge your support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Luzerne, Representative Blaum.

Mr. BLAUM. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I rise to ask the members for an affirmative vote on the amendment.

Whatever you may think of the resolution, I think the amendment tightens up the resolution and is a necessary change to the resolution.

I would ask for an affirmative vote.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-198

Adolph	Donatucci	Lynch	Schroder
Allen	Druce	Maitland	Schuler
Argall	Eachus	Major	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Egolf	Manderino	Semmel
Baker	Evans	Markosek	Serafini
Bard	Fairchild	Marsico	Seyfert
Barley	Fargo	Masland	Shaner

Barrar	Feese	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Battisto	Fichter	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Bebko-Jones	Fleagle	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Belardi	Flick	McGill	Staback
Belfanti	Gannon	McIlhattan	Stairs
Benninghoff	Geist	McNaughton	Steelman
Birmelin	George	Melio	Steil
Blaum	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Stern
Boscola	Gladeck	Micozzie	Stetler
Boyes	Godshall	Mihalich	Stevenson
Brown	Gordner	Miller	Strittmatter
Browne	Gruitza	Mundy	Sturla
Bunt	Gruppo	Myers	Surra
Butkovitz	Habay	Nailor	Tangretti
Buxton	Haluska	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Caltagirone	Hanna	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Cappabianca	Harhart	Olasz	Thomas
Carn	Hasay	Oliver	Tigue
Carone	Hennessey	Orie	Travaglio
Casorio	Herman	Perzel	Trello
Cawley	Hershey	Pesci	Trich
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	True
Civera	Horsey	Petrone	Tulli
Clark	Hutchinson	Phillips	Vance
Clymer	Itkin	Pippy	Van Home
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Veon
Cohen, M.	James	Platts	Vitali
Colafella	Jarolin	Preston	Walko
Colaizzo	Josephs	Ramos	Washington
Conti	Kaiser	Raymond	Waugh
Cornell	Keller	Readshaw	Williams, A. H.
Corpora	Kenney	Reber	Williams, C.
Cowell	Kirkland	Reinard	Wilt
Coy	Krebs	Roberts	Wogan
Curry	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wojnaroski
Daley	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Dally	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
DeLuca	Lederer	Ross	Youngblood
Dempsey	Leh	Rubley	Zimmerman
Dent	Lescovitz	Sainato	Zug
Dermody	Levdansky	Santoni	
DeWeese	Lloyd	Sather	Ryan,
DiGirolamo	Lucyk	Saylor	Speaker

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-1

Bishop

EXCUSED-4

Corrigan Pettit Rieger Rooney

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendment was agreed to.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution as amended?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-199

Adolph	Donatucci	Lynch	Schroder
Allen	Druce	Maitland	Schuler
Argall	Eachus	Major	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Egolf	Manderino	Semmel
Baker	Evans	Markosek	Serafini
Bard	Fairchild	Marsico	Seyfert
Barley	Fargo	Masland	Shaner
Barrar	Feese	Mayernik	Smith, B.

Battisto	Fichter	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Bebko-Jones	Fleagle	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Belardi	Flick	McGill	Staback
Belfanti	Gannon	McIlhattan	Stairs
Benninghoff	Geist	McNaughton	Steelman
Birmelin	George	Melio	Steil
Bishop	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Stern
Blaum	Gladeck	Micozzie	Stetler
Boscola	Godshall	Mihalich	Stevenson
Boyes	Gordner	Miller	Strittmatter
Brown	Gruitza	Mundy	Sturla
Browne	Gruppo	Myers	Surra
Bunt	Habay	Nailor	Tangretti
Butkovitz	Haluska	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Hanna	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Olasz	Thomas
Cappabianca	Hasay	Oliver	Tigue
Carn	Hennessey	Orie	Travaglio
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Trello
Casorio	Hershey	Pesci	Trich
Cawley	Hess	Petrarca	True
Chadwick	Horsey	Petrone	Tulli
Civera	Hutchinson	Phillips	Vance
Clark	Itkin	Pippy	Van Horne
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Veon
Cohen, L. I.	James	Platts	Vitali
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Preston	Walko
Colaifella	Josephs	Ramos	Washington
Colaizzo	Kaiser	Raymond	Waugh
Conti	Keller	Readshaw	Williams, A. H.
Cornell	Kenney	Reber	Williams, C.
Corpora	Kirkland	Reinard	Wilt
Cowell	Krebs	Roberts	Wogan
Coy	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wojnaroski
Curry	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dally	Lederer	Ross	Youngblood
DeLuca	Leh	Rubley	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Lescovitz	Sainato	Zug
Dent	Levdansky	Santoni	
Dermody	Lloyd	Sather	Ryan,
DeWeese	Lucyk	Saylor	Speaker
DiGirolamo			

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-4

Corrigan	Pettit	Rieger	Rooney
----------	--------	--------	--------

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the resolution as amended was adopted.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

RESOLUTION

Mr. PERZEL called up HR 133, PN 1473, entitled:

A Resolution creating a legislative commission to study restructuring of urban schools in this Commonwealth.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution ?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-195

Adolph	Donatucci	Lynch	Saylor
Allen	Druce	Maitland	Schroder
Argall	Eachus	Major	Schuler
Armstrong	Egolf	Manderino	Scrimenti
Baker	Evans	Markosek	Semmel
Bard	Fairchild	Marsico	Serafini
Barley	Fargo	Masland	Seyfert
Barrar	Feese	Mayernik	Shaner
Battisto	Fichter	McCall	Smith, B.
Bebko-Jones	Fleagle	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belardi	Flick	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Belfanti	Gannon	McIlhattan	Staback
Benninghoff	Geist	McNaughton	Stairs
Birmelin	George	Melio	Steelman
Bishop	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Steil
Blaum	Gladeck	Micozzie	Stern
Boscola	Godshall	Mihalich	Stetler
Boyes	Gordner	Miller	Stevenson
Brown	Gruitza	Mundy	Strittmatter
Browne	Gruppo	Myers	Sturla
Bunt	Habay	Nailor	Surra
Butkovitz	Haluska	Nickol	Tangretti
Buxton	Hanna	O'Brien	Taylor, E. Z.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Olasz	Taylor, J.
Cappabianca	Hasay	Oliver	Thomas
Carn	Hennessey	Orie	Tigue
Carone	Herman	Perzel	Travaglio
Casorio	Hershey	Pesci	Trello
Cawley	Hess	Petrarca	Trich
Chadwick	Horsey	Petrone	True
Civera	Hutchinson	Phillips	Tulli
Clark	Itkin	Pippy	Vance
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Van Horne
Cohen, L. I.	James	Platts	Veon
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Preston	Vitali
Colaifella	Kaiser	Ramos	Walko
Colaizzo	Keller	Raymond	Washington
Conti	Kenney	Readshaw	Waugh
Cornell	Kirkland	Reber	Williams, A. H.
Corpora	Krebs	Reinard	Wilt
Cowell	LaGrotta	Roberts	Wojnaroski
Coy	Laughlin	Robinson	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Lawless	Roebuck	Yewcic
Dally	Lederer	Rohrer	Youngblood
DeLuca	Leh	Ross	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Lescovitz	Rubley	Zug
Dent	Levdansky	Sainato	
Dermody	Lloyd	Santoni	Ryan,
DeWeese	Lucyk	Sather	Speaker
DiGirolamo			

NAYS-3

Curry	Josephs	Williams, C.
-------	---------	--------------

NOT VOTING-1

Wogan

EXCUSED-4

Corrigan	Pettit	Rieger	Rooney
----------	--------	--------	--------

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the resolution was adopted.

HOUSE SCHEDULE

RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, the majority leader, Mr. Perzel.

Mr. PERZEL. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I would ask that we take a break for lunch until 1:30, come back to the floor at 2:30. We are going to have a Rules Committee meeting in the majority caucus room at 1 o'clock.

Just for the information of the members on our side of the aisle, we will be taking a roll-call vote in our caucus at the 1:30 meeting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Does the gentleman, Mr. Cohen, have a caucus announcement?

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, will the majority leader consent to interrogation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman agrees. You may proceed.

Before you start, some of this information is probably going to be very important to the members. I ask for your attention, please.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, you indicated you will be taking a roll-call vote in the Republican caucus. Could you share with us the subject of this roll-call vote?

Mr. PERZEL. Madam Speaker, what we do in our caucus is really none of your business.

Mr. COHEN. Well, Madam Speaker, we would like to know what we ought to be caucusing on.

Mr. PERZEL. HB 67 as amended.

Mr. COHEN. And that gas tax bill that you wish us to be caucusing on, could we get copies of that?

Mr. PERZEL. You will have them in the next 10 minutes, Madam Speaker.

Mr. COHEN. We will have them in the next 10 minutes. At our caucus, Madam Speaker?

Mr. PERZEL. *If you are going to have yours at 1:30 and not in the next 5 minutes, yes.*

Mr. COHEN. Okay.

Madam Speaker, I have no further questions of the majority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Itkin.

Mr. ITKIN. Madam Speaker, would the majority leader and the ex officio chairman of the Rules Committee stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman agrees. You may proceed.

Mr. ITKIN. Madam Speaker, you called for a meeting of the Rules Committee for, I believe, 1 o'clock. What is going to be before the committee at that time?

Mr. PERZEL. It will be HB 67, and there will be an amendment offered to that bill.

Mr. ITKIN. Do we have copies of that amendment? Have they been distributed?

Mr. PERZEL. I just answered the question a few moments ago. You will have it in the next 10 minutes when we have a copy of it.

Mr. ITKIN. So in 10 minutes we will have copies and then we are going to have a committee meeting, which I assume we will be voting at 1 o'clock on something that we have only seen for 20 minutes?

Mr. PERZEL. Madam Speaker, the minority leader has been talking about it for about 3 weeks. It is nothing new.

Mr. ITKIN. How many pages is this amendment going to be?

Mr. PERZEL. 57 pages.

Mr. ITKIN. 57 pages. Since you have been talking about it for 3 weeks, I assume that I can ask you questions on various pages and you will have the answer.

Mr. PERZEL. We are not on that subject, Madam Speaker.

Mr. ITKIN. Starting with page 1, right?

I mean, I do not understand why you will not give us an opportunity to read 57 pages and digest it. We have not seen a copy of that amendment. I am told that it deals with a number, many, many points of change in the law.

Mr. PERZEL. There are four or five pages of new material. All the other 50 pages are existing law.

Mr. ITKIN. So you are telling me that the reason why the amendment is as voluminous as it is, is because the changes have to be inserted in all 57 pages?

Mr. PERZEL. You know that certain sections have to be reprinted, as well as our staff here knows that they have to be reprinted.

Mr. ITKIN. Since I have not seen the document, it is difficult for me to comment on it. If we see it as the minority members of the Rules Committee and we need additional time to digest its contents, would you support us in a modest recess of the Rules Committee?

Mr. PERZEL. We will give you a fair amount of time.

Mr. ITKIN. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House stands in recess to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

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

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

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE
REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**

HB 67, PN 1531 (Amended)

By Rep. PERZEL

An Act amending Titles 74 (Transportation) and 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for annual appropriation and computation of subsidy and for distribution of funding; providing for distribution of supplemental funding; further providing for

use of funds distributed; providing for public transportation grants management accountability, for competitive procurement and for the Public Transportation Assistance Fund; further providing for period of registration, for duties of agents, for registration and other fees, for requirements for periodic inspection of vehicles, for limits on number of towed vehicles, for operation of certain combinations on interstate and other highways, for width and length of vehicles; providing for liquid fuels and fuels permits and bond or deposit of securities, for imposition of liquid fuels and fuels tax, for taxpayer, for distributor's report and payment of tax, for determination of tax, penalties and interest, for examination of records and equipment, for retention of records by distributors and dealers, for disposition and use of tax, for discontinuance or transfer of business, for suspension or revocation of permits, for lien of taxes, penalties and interest, for collection of unpaid taxes, for reports from common carriers, for violations and reward for detection of violations, for refunds, for diesel fuel importers and transporters, for prohibiting use of dyed diesel fuel, for disposition of fees, fines and forfeitures, for certified copies of records and for uncollectible checks; further providing for distribution of State highway maintenance funds and for standards and methodology for data collection; providing for dirt and gravel road maintenance; further providing for imposition of tax and additional tax; providing for tax on alternative fuels; further providing for disposition of tax revenue; making an appropriation; and making repeals.

RULES.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Does the majority leader or minority leader have any further business before declaring a further recess until 3:30 p.m.? The Chair hears none.

Hearing none, this House is in recess until 3:15.

AFTER RECESS

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair returns to leaves of absence and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Itkin, who requests that the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. CARN, be excused for the balance of today's session.

Without objection, the leave shall be granted. The Chair hears no objection.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pleased to welcome to the hall of the House a group of students here today as the guests of Representative Gruitza. These students are from the Hermitage Middle School. Would the students please rise to be recognized.

VOTE CORRECTIONS

Mr. BELFANTI. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Belfanti.

Mr. BELFANTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Prior to the recess, I wanted to make a correction to the record. I would like to do that now, if I can.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. BELFANTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My fear is that after the next vote, everyone will want to leave very quickly. So I would like to change my vote on HB 337 from an affirmative to a negative vote.

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

Mr. BELFANTI. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To correct the record.

The record on the vote taken on April 2 of 1997, HB 891, two amendments — amendment 699, amendment 700 — I was recorded in the "no." I would like to be recorded in the affirmative on both votes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

So long as we are correcting the record, are there any other corrections at this time?

The gentleman, Mr. Conti.

Mr. CONTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On April 2, 1997, on HB 847, amendment 0973, I wish to be recorded in the affirmative.

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

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

HB 1143, PN 1532 (Amended)

By Rep. GANNON

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, defining the offenses of aggravated assault by vehicle and aggravated homicide by vehicle.

JUDICIARY.

SB 299, PN 293

By Rep. CLYMER

An Act authorizing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Governor, to sell and convey to the City of Farrell certain surplus land situate in the City of Farrell, Mercer County.

STATE GOVERNMENT.

SB 732, PN 956

By Rep. CLYMER

An Act changing the name of the Thaddeus Stevens State School of Technology.

STATE GOVERNMENT.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Curry.

Mr. CURRY. Are we still correcting the record?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. CURRY. My switch malfunctioned this morning, and I was not recorded on amendment 1352 to HR-51. I would like to be recorded in the affirmative.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

BILL ON CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS AS AMENDED

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to the following **HB 67, PN 1531**, as further amended by the House Rules Committee:

An Act amending Titles 74 (Transportation) and 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for annual appropriation and computation of subsidy and for distribution of funding; providing for distribution of supplemental funding; further providing for use of funds distributed; providing for public transportation grants management accountability, for competitive procurement and for the Public Transportation Assistance Fund; further providing for period of registration, for duties of agents, for registration and other fees, for requirements for periodic inspection of vehicles, for limits on number of towed vehicles, for operation of certain combinations on interstate and other highways, for width and length of vehicles; providing for liquid fuels and fuels permits and bond or deposit of securities, for imposition of liquid fuels and fuels tax, for taxpayer, for distributor's report and payment of tax, for determination of tax, penalties and interest, for examination of records and equipment, for retention of records by distributors and dealers, for disposition and use of tax, for discontinuance or transfer of business, for suspension or revocation of permits, for lien of taxes, penalties and interest, for collection of unpaid taxes, for reports from common carriers, for violations and reward for detection of violations, for refunds, for diesel fuel importers and transporters, for prohibiting use of dyed diesel fuel, for disposition of fees, fines and forfeitures, for certified copies of records and for uncollectible checks; further providing for distribution of State highway maintenance funds and for standards and methodology for data collection; providing for dirt and gravel road maintenance; further providing for imposition of tax and additional tax; providing for tax on alternative fuels; further providing for disposition of tax revenue; making an appropriation; and making repeals.

On the question,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER. On that question, it is moved by the gentleman, Mr. Geist, that the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate.

The gentleman, Mr. Vitali.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The one thing I have learned in my 4 years up here is that when you have to review a bill that is physically warm, something is being shoved down the throats of the public without their knowing about it, and that is what we have here today.

Mr. Speaker, we received this bill at 1:30 in the afternoon. The public has not had time to review its intricacies nor have the various groups who protect the public and other interest groups.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a significant piece of legislation that has widespread opposition throughout the State. Sixty-nine percent of my constituents oppose, generally, the concept of a gas tax. I believe that they deserve the opportunity, along with the other 12 million residents of this State, to thoroughly digest what is happening here.

Mr. Speaker, I think this House also should adhere to the Pennsylvania Constitution, which requires that all bills be considered on 3 separate days. Mr. Speaker, this bill, this 60-plus, this 112-page bill, was first considered today at 1:30. The document we are using as a pretext, HB 67, the prior printer's number was but three pages long. It is difficult to convince any rational person that this bill really has been considered on 3 separate days.

CONSTITUTIONAL POINT OF ORDER

Mr. VITALI. Mr. Speaker, therefore, I would raise the argument, I would challenge, I would question the constitutionality of considering HB 67 at this time based on Article III, section 4, of the Pennsylvania Constitution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Vitali, raises the point of order that HB 67, PN 1531, is unconstitutional. Under rule 4, it is required that the Speaker submit questions affecting the constitutionality of a bill to the floor for decision, which the Chair now does.

On the question,

Will the House sustain the constitutionality of the bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Geist. Mr. GEIST. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I would oppose it simply because of the fact that the Lloyd language is still part of that bill and that is the intent, and we should go on from here.

The SPEAKER. The question before the House then is, those members of the House believing the bill to be constitutional will vote "aye"; those believing it to be unconstitutional, siding with Mr. Vitali, will vote in the negative.

Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. Most of us on this floor are not constitutional law experts, but most of us who have spent some time here on this floor have heard the reverberating phrase emanating from the dais, "This bill has been agreed to on 3 different days." Since time immemorial, somewhere in the dim mists of our constitutional history, that pronouncement has been offered by the House Speaker, the Pennsylvania House Speaker: "This bill has been read on 3 different days and agreed to. Will the House agree to the amendment?"

Now, despite the comparatively arcane parliamentary procedures under which we operate, men and women in our body politic outside this building do not understand and do not accept, Mr. Speaker, the lie — the lie — that this bill has been agreed to on 3 different days. Only a modicum of common sense has to be garnered in order to realize that the gentleman, Mr. Vitali, is on target — piercingly, unequivocally, unambiguously on target. This bill has not been considered on 3 different days and agreed to. We all know that.

Over 100 pages, encyclopedic, dense, mathematical, inscrutable, a difficult piece of legislation that, according to its structure, will endure for 10 years. This is not a \$400-million tax increase; this is not a \$400-million tax increase. This is a \$4-billion tax increase because it is by structure going to endure for a decade. It is unconstitutional to consider this bill in this way at this time,

especially, especially, when one considers the financial ramifications of \$4 billion being ripped from our taxpayers.

I would ask the Assembly to concur with the gentleman, Mr. Vitali, and vote that today's maneuver, today's parliamentary buccaneering, is unconstitutional.

The SPEAKER. On the question of constitutionality, Mr. Snyder.

Mr. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As the chairman of the Transportation Committee noted, this bill has been considered 3 days by this legislature, and as everyone in this House knows, that every time we do an amendment to a bill, we do not rerun the bill three times. The basic bill is still in the form it was when it left this House, and that is what we are asking. We are asking to vote that it is constitutional, and let us get on to the merits of the bill rather than trying to find a fallacious argument to avoid it. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On the question of constitutionality, the gentleman, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

My only rhetoric to the gentleman from Lehigh County would be that not every day do we put in motion by our actions a measure that will endure for 10 years and will cost Pennsylvania's motoring public \$4 billion. It is \$400 million a year, sir, for the next 10 years. This is a colossal tax increase. This is one of the most aggressive tax increases in the history of our State.

Tom Ridge and his many friends in this room, especially on that side and a few on our side, if you acquiesce to this, you should remember that this gas tax increase, this registration fee increase, this once-every-year increase that our constituents are going to realize, especially our truckers, especially our small and mid-sized truckers are going to realize, is an overwhelming issue, and I would tell the gentleman from Lehigh Valley, this is not just an average amendment or an average day. This is crucial; this is crucial.

I would ask that Vitali be supported. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The question recurs, those believing the matter before the House to be constitutional will vote in the affirmative; those believing it to be unconstitutional will vote in the negative.

On the question recurring,

Will the House sustain the constitutionality of the bill ?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-117

Adolph	Feese	Masland	Semmel
Allen	Fichter	Mayernik	Serafini
Argall	Fleagle	McGeehan	Seyfert
Armstrong	Flick	McGill	Smith, B.
Baker	Gannon	McIlhattan	Smith, S. H.
Bard	Geist	McNaughton	Snyder, D. W.
Barley	Gladeck	Michlovic	Stairs
Barrar	Godshall	Micozzie	Steil
Battisto	Gordner	Miller	Stern
Benninghoff	Gruitza	Nailor	Stevenson
Birmelin	Gruppo	Nickol	Strittmatter
Boyes	Haluska	O'Brien	Taylor, E. Z.
Brown	Hasay	Orie	Taylor, J.
Bunt	Hennessey	Perzel	Tigue
Butkovitz	Herman	Pesci	True
Buxton	Hershey	Phillips	Tulli

Cappabianca	Hess	Pippy	Vance
Carone	Horsley	Pistella	Van Horne
Chadwick	Jadlowiec	Platts	Waugh
Civera	Keller	Raymond	Williams, A. H.
Clark	Kenney	Reber	Wilt
Clymer	Lawless	Reinard	Wogan
Cohen, L. I.	Lederer	Robinson	Wright, M. N.
Conti	Leh	Rohrer	Youngblood
Cornell	Lloyd	Ross	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Lynch	Rubley	Zug
DiGirolamo	Maitland	Sather	
Egolf	Major	Saylor	Ryan,
Fairchild	Markosek	Schroder	Speaker
Fargo	Marsico	Schuler	

NAYS-80

Bebko-Jones	Dent	Laughlin	Santoni
Belardi	Dermody	Lescovitz	Scrimenti
Belfanti	DeWeese	Levdansky	Shaner
Bishop	Donatucci	Lucyk	Staback
Blaum	Eachus	Manderino	Steelman
Boscola	Evans	McCall	Stetler
Browne	George	Melio	Sturla
Caltagirone	Gigliotti	Mihalich	Surra
Casorio	Habay	Mundy	Tangretti
Cawley	Hanna	Myers	Thomas
Cohen, M.	Harhart	Olasz	Travaglio
Colafiglia	Hutchinson	Oliver	Trello
Colaizzo	Itkin	Petrarca	Trich
Corpora	James	Petrone	Veon
Cowell	Jarolin	Preston	Vitali
Coy	Josephs	Ramos	Walko
Curry	Kaiser	Readshaw	Washington
Daley	Kirkland	Roberts	Williams, C.
Dally	Krebs	Roebuck	Wojnarowski
DeLuca	LaGrotta	Sainato	Yewcic

NOT VOTING-1

Druce

EXCUSED-5

Carn	Pettit	Rieger	Rooney
Corrigan			

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

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments as amended by the Rules Committee ?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Clearfield, Mr. George.

Mr. GEORGE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as you well know, with some zeal I attended the Rules meeting today. The main purpose was to cancel out your vote. Unfortunately, my cancel stamp was not long enough. But there are a couple of points— And blame yourself for this, Mr. Speaker, in that just yesterday you told me I was too quiet this year. Your prayers have been answered.

Now, there are several points, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to make even if they may land on some deaf ears.

The Ridge administration is claiming, Mr. Speaker, that this proposal will cost the average motorist about \$30 a year. Obviously the average motorist does not live in areas that are rural like the area I represent, because those folks drive further to get to work, they drive further to get to the store, and they drive further to go to a doctor's visit, to see their family or their friends. They will foot the bill. Now, rural Pennsylvanians do not have the luxury of mass transit so they will not be the recipients of seeing much benefit from the big influx of dollars toward these programs, but they will continue to foot the bill.

Now, typical motorists, Mr. Speaker, do not have a lobbyist sitting in at these meetings projecting the benefit of helping the conglomerates or the trucking industry or whatever. They just do not have anyone in reality that can represent them, because they do not know what is going on unless we tell them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to talk about truck width or truck length, but I am going to say to the gentleman that is the chairman of the Transportation Committee, Mr. Speaker, that a question was asked, and the answer was that local government would have the say, and that is just not true. Local governments will have the say on their own routes, and local government will not have any say on main highways and legislative routes unless the Highway Department gives them that authorization. So I just want to get that straightened up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as a result of this bill, we will not only be paying higher registration fees, we will be paying higher title fees for someone to hit the finger on the automatic machine, we will be paying higher transfer fees, and then we will go ahead and add them up and you will find that they will be more than \$30.

No one will argue that our roads and bridges need to be maintained. That is not even the issue here today in reality. But as I look at the breakdown in funding for each county, I have to ask the question, Mr. Speaker, is this funding dedicated? No, Mr. Speaker, in all cases it is not dedicated. The only thing that is dedicated is the bill that the working men and women will have to pay now and later. Funding formulas change, allocations change, but I want to stand up here as one individual and say that I do not remember the last time a tax was reduced, so that will not change.

Finally and maybe most importantly, Mr. Speaker, I think our Governor has forgotten maybe one basic principle, and that principle is that the half a billion dollars that he has at his disposal does not belong to him; it belongs to the taxpayers of this Commonwealth. They put the money into the Governor's bank all year long through sales taxes, through income taxes, and the current gas tax, which, Mr. Speaker, is pretty high at this time. In fact, it is the second highest in the country. And finally, Mr. Speaker, they made their last payment yesterday on April 15 into the Governor's coffers, so they deserve to see some answers; they deserve some input, but it was clouded.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say this to you in all honesty, there was a motion to insist that this bill is not constitutional, and as you can recognize, I voted in that manner, but I liken that to spitting in the wind, Mr. Speaker. I voted "no" and then ducked very quickly because that is not the issue. The issue is and it will remain that I am going to make my rural constituency understand that they are not all getting more moneys, and they might get more moneys 2 years from now, but we do not know what is going to happen 2 years from now.

I would like to also remind the Governor of one thing: Pennsylvania is not a for-profit corporation; it is a Commonwealth. Before we ask Pennsylvanians to dig deeper in their pockets again, let us first start spreading around a little of our common wealth. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question, the gentleman, Mr. Veon.

Mr. Veon, then Mr. DeLuca, then Mr. Eachus.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

The SPEAKER. Mr. Veon.

Mr. VEON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a motion.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman state his motion.

Mr. VEON. I would like to move to send HB 67 back to the Transportation Committee for the purposes of holding public hearings.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Veon, moves that HB 67 be recommitted to the Committee on Transportation.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. On the question, the gentleman, Mr. Geist.

Mr. GEIST. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I do not think there is anybody in this General Assembly who is not quite aware of what this package is, what it is going to do, and what benefit it is to the State of Pennsylvania.

I would ask for a negative vote on recommitment, and let us get about the business of debating this and final passage.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question of recommitment, Mr. Veon.

Mr. VEON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman is correct, that there are very few members in this General Assembly who at this time of the day, late in the afternoon on April 16, the day after millions of Americans just finished paying their income tax, I do not think there are many members here that do not know what is in this bill and in this package. But I would take tremendous issue with the gentleman, the chairman of the Transportation Committee, the people in Pennsylvania do not know what is in this bill and do not know what the details are and do not know what the tax increases they are going to be paying here very quickly are going to be if this bill passes. The people of Pennsylvania deserve an opportunity to understand what is in this bill. There should be public hearings around this State. This is a multimillion, hundreds of millions of dollars tax increases to the people of Pennsylvania. They deserve the right to look at it. They deserve the right to have some public comment at public hearings across the State of Pennsylvania, and I know the gentleman, the chairman of the Transportation Committee, ought to welcome that opportunity so that the people of Pennsylvania have that opportunity. They do not know the details, they do not know what is in this bill, and I think that we clearly ought to recommit this bill for the purposes of public hearings so that taxpayers in Pennsylvania have an opportunity to tell us whether they think this makes sense or not.

I would encourage a "yes" vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman. Those in favor of recommittal will vote "aye"; opposed, "no."

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-77

Battisto	DeLuca	Levdansky	Scrimenti
Bebko-Jones	Dermody	Lucyk	Shaner
Belardi	DeWeese	Manderino	Staback
Belfanti	Donatucci	Mayernik	Steelman
Bishop	Eachus	McCall	Stetler
Blaum	Evans	Melio	Sturla
Boscola	George	Mihalich	Surra
Caltagirone	Gigliotti	Mundy	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Gordner	Myers	Thomas
Carone	Gruitza	Olasz	Travaglio
Casorio	Hanna	Oliver	Trello
Cawley	Itkin	Petrarca	Trich
Cohen, M.	Jarolin	Petrone	Veon
Colafiglia	Josephs	Preston	Vitali
Colaizzo	Kaiser	Ramos	Walko
Corpora	Kirkland	Roberts	Washington
Cowell	LaGrotta	Roebuck	Williams, C.
Coy	Laughlin	Sainato	Wojnarowski
Curry	Lescovitz	Santoni	Yewcic
Daley			

NAYS-120

Adolph	Feese	Marsico	Schuler
Allen	Fichter	Masland	Semmel
Argall	Fleagle	McGeehan	Serafini
Armstrong	Flick	McGill	Seyfert
Baker	Gannon	McIlhattan	Smith, B.
Bard	Geist	McNaughton	Smith, S. H.
Barley	Gladeck	Michlovic	Snyder, D. W.
Barrar	Godshall	Micozzie	Stairs
Benninghoff	Gruppo	Miller	Steil
Birmelin	Habay	Nailor	Stern
Boyes	Haluska	Nickol	Stevenson
Brown	Harhart	O'Brien	Strittmatter
Browne	Hasay	Orie	Taylor, E. Z.
Bunt	Hennessey	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Butkovitz	Herman	Pesci	Tigue
Buxton	Hershey	Phillips	True
Chadwick	Hess	Pippy	Tulli
Civera	Horsey	Pistella	Vance
Clark	Hutchinson	Platts	Van Horne
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Raymond	Waugh
Cohen, L. I.	Keller	Readshaw	Williams, A. H.
Conti	Kenney	Reber	Wilt
Cornell	Krebs	Reinard	Wogan
Dally	Lawless	Robinson	Wright, M. N.
Dempsey	Lederer	Rohrer	Youngblood
Dent	Leh	Ross	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	Lloyd	Rubley	Zug
Druce	Lynch	Sather	
Egolf	Maitland	Saylor	Ryan,
Fairchild	Major	Schroder	Speaker
Fargo	Markosek		

NOT VOTING-1

James

EXCUSED-5

Carn	Pettit	Rieger	Rooney
Corrigan			

Less than the majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the motion was not agreed to.

On the question recurring, Will the House concur in Senate amendments as amended by the Rules Committee ?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. DeLuca, from Allegheny County.

Mr. DeLUCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, would the chairman of the Transportation Committee stand for some questions ?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates he will. You may proceed.

Mr. DeLUCA. Mr. Speaker, as I read part of this amendment on page 2, I guess on line 29 to line 33, item (IV.1), "Reasonable minimum prequalification standards for prospective transit service subcontractors." Does this open the door for privatization in any way, this statement ?

Mr. GEIST. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand the question, but it is as it reads.

Mr. DeLUCA. Could this be interpreted, Mr. Speaker, to open it for privatization as it reads, Mr. Speaker ?

Mr. GEIST. No.

Mr. DeLUCA. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. Some of this stuff, in our caucus, half of us could not decipher some of this stuff because we did not have time. So how it reads, I venture to say this whole House, 75 percent could not get up here and explain this, so do not tell me how it reads, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GEIST. They have to meet minimum subcontractor specifications and qualifications, and the language is very clear.

Mr. DeLUCA. So your answer—

Mr. GEIST. Let me add, there is no privatization in this bill.

Mr. DeLUCA. I understand that, but this could not be interpreted—

Mr. GEIST. But we will be addressing privatization later.

Mr. DeLUCA. Let me also ask you, pertaining to the trucks and the trailers over 10,000 pounds, has the trucking industry gotten safer, or why are we reducing it to one inspection a year since the Federal Government has deregulated the trucking industry years ago ? All the information that I have seen states that there are a lot of unsafe trucks out there on our roads. Why are we permitting them to only have one inspection a year ? Has that industry gotten safer ?

Mr. GEIST. Are you talking about trailers ?

Mr. DeLUCA. Yes. They used to be inspected twice a year. Now they are being inspected once a year. That is my interpretation.

Mr. GEIST. Mr. Speaker, we are going to allow more licensed trailers in the State of Pennsylvania, and we are going to bring them along with the standards that we currently have. We want to get the trailers out of the States where they do not have inspection and get them into Pennsylvania. That is why we have the \$135 universal registration, lifetime registration for trailers.

Mr. DeLUCA. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding — and maybe I am wrong — presently today in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania they have to be inspected twice a year. Am I wrong or right ?

Mr. GEIST. That is correct.

Mr. DeLUCA. By reducing it to once a year, are we not possibly putting an unsafe vehicle on that road?

Mr. GEIST. Let me answer this question. I do not believe so, and PennDOT has assured us that we will not be. But what we would like to do is get the trailers out of the States where they just get a license and they do not inspect. Let us keep ours at home and let us keep them safe.

Mr. DeLUCA. Mr. Speaker, could we not do that with keeping it at twice a year and making sure it is safe?

Mr. GEIST. I have been assured by PennDOT and everybody else who has worked with this that we will absolutely be safe and protected under the 1-year inspection stipulation.

Mr. DeLUCA. Well, I hope you are right, Mr. Speaker, on that part. I hope we do not open our roads up for unsafe vehicles that will jeopardize the motorists and the citizens out there.

Let me also— Can I make a statement, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. DeLUCA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose HB 67, and I do it because of the fact that I think when we talk about economic development, we keep chipping away, we keep chipping away at disposable income to our constituents and our taxpayers out there, and we ask them to go out there and create more jobs, more businesses. Presently they are working two or three jobs, no benefits, the wages are stagnated, yet we want to continue to take disposable income off them. It is not only on this gas tax. We are doing it more so from the Federal Government cutting down to the States, from the States cutting back and sending it down to the local municipalities, and I really do not know where this is going to end as far as having individuals being able to go out and increase their purchasing power.

We have seen more and more of our constituents going into debt. We have seen more and more of our municipalities creating debt. And mainly, you might as well say they are in the same situation with credit cards like the individuals are. They want to borrow now and pay later with the bonds, and we are seeing more and more of that today, and it just does not seem right to me, when we have a surplus, that we are going to create this tax when we do not even know what the Federal Government is going to do with the ISTEPA (Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act) funding, with the trust fund, the Motor License Trust Fund in Washington. And the other day I read a newsclip of all our congressional delegations, their laundry list, their wish list, for the millions and millions of dollars that they would like for projects in the Commonwealth. Well, if you add all that up and we get all that Federal money and give it to PennDOT, we would not need this tax increase and registration increase.

Therefore, I will be opposing this and certainly letting my constituents know my views on this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Eachus.

Mr. EACHUS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the maker of the amendment stand for interrogation?

Mr. GEIST. All afternoon.

Mr. EACHUS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question, sir, about the Vehicle Code, section 1901(c), which affects senior citizens. Senior citizens now pay \$10 on a reduced rate for their registration fees. Will that be affected by this legislation?

Mr. GEIST. No.

Mr. EACHUS. Thank you.

And I have another question for you, sir, with regard to the increasing in the width of a vehicle that can be transported on State roads. I understand that that will be increased from a little over 8 feet up to 9½ feet without a permit. Is that correct, sir?

Mr. GEIST. Well, let me explain this as best I can. In Pennsylvania now, if you can see this map, it is a truckers' guide to Pennsylvania. The minute the ink is dry, it is outdated. Here are 50-some pages of approved roads in Pennsylvania for 102 inches. There is very little of the State left at 102.

Now, let me explain the rest of this in a little bit of detail. In 1982 when the Surface Transportation Assistance Act was passed, it mandated 53-foot trailers and 102 width and twin trailers at 28½ feet on the interstate and State-designated highways. Access at that time had to be requested to get off the system. In 1983 Pennsylvania passed law to comply with the Federal mandates so 53, 102, and twins would be accepted in Pennsylvania to put us in compliance with the Feds.

On numbered State routes we will show where they cannot travel according to this bill. The roads will be posted. Rural State roads, unnumbered roads, and local roads will still be under the old route approval system where they will have to make application to the district engineer in order to be permitted, if approved, on those roads.

Mr. EACHUS. And what section is that under, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. GEIST. We will look it up for you.

Mr. EACHUS. Thank you.

Mr. GEIST. Let me finish the explanation, if I may, while we are waiting for that answer.

This change will open a few road miles for ease of transportation so Pennsylvania truckers can service Pennsylvania shippers. It is very difficult to find trailers now that are built to the narrow width. Most trailers, the trucking companies, almost all that they are buying is 102 inches. So what we have done, instead of giving them a list of over 50 pages of approved roads, is say that there is so little that has not been done, we will post it instead.

Section 4908 of the Vehicle Code is the correct answer.

Mr. EACHUS. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order, and you may proceed.

Mr. EACHUS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to HB 67 for a number of reasons, but I will be quick and brief.

The people who are paying various fees are going to have increases. They are going to reach into their front pocket, their back pocket, their side pocket. Normal motorists are going to see an increase. Truckers are going to see an increase. Farmers are going to see an increase. Dealers are going to see an increase. Motorcyclists are going to see an increase. Manufacturers are going to see an increase. Animal husbandry, they are going to see an increase. And individuals who are unlucky enough to lose their license will see an increase, and I will use that one as the best and worst example.

The duplicate certificate title fee goes from \$5 to \$22.50, Mr. Speaker. That is a 400-percent increase. It just seems to me that average working families who are struggling to make a budget from my part of the State are going to really struggle to make these fees. It is tough enough to make a family budget go right now, and

my folks sent me here from southern Luzerne County to represent them.

I also think that in the context of having a surplus — and there are various amounts; we perceive there will be about a \$750-million to \$800-million surplus by July — how we can ask the taxpaying public of this Commonwealth, in a time when we have a surplus, to reach deeper into their pockets just does not seem fair to me, Mr. Speaker, and I will oppose this amendment on final passage.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. GEIST. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Geist.

Mr. GEIST. In response to the gentleman, 1977 was the last time the rate that he was talking about was increased. Here we are in 1997 talking about the same thing.

I would also like to say this to the gentleman and to the House: The liquid fuels fund that we have in Pennsylvania is a trust with the motorists of Pennsylvania that what they pay out in fees will be used to maintain their transportation system of highways. It will not be used for mass transit. It will not be used for rail. It is totally dedicated to use on highways. If we get into a fracas in a lean year and we are going to go one way into the General Fund to fund PennDOT, then we will go back into PennDOT and take liquid fuels money for maintenance and put it into General Fund use.

The Highway Trust Fund, as far as I am concerned, is sacred. It is a sacred trust for the people of Pennsylvania, and I do not think that we should be debating using other funds in the manner in which we are doing it.

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Elk County, Mr. Surra.

Mr. SURRA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose HB 67.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot honestly tell you that we do not indeed need to do some work on our roads, and we do not need to do some work on our bridges, and there are not some very needed construction projects in Pennsylvania, and that we did not have damages from floods and winter. Mr. Speaker, I am not afraid to vote for a tax increase, and I voted for tax increases in the past, but when I voted for tax increases, Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania was \$1½ to \$2 billion in debt. We were in a severe deficit situation, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday, April 15, many Pennsylvanians sent their taxes in to the Department of Revenue. Some people think we did not pay enough, because here we are, the day after tax day, raising taxes to the tune of \$4 billion over the next 10 years, at a time, Mr. Speaker, when conservative estimates show us with \$800 million in the black. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I had \$50,000 in my savings account, I would not borrow money to buy a new car. The people of Pennsylvania have paid this money, their hard-earned tax dollars, and we are going to the well once again. That is unconscionable, Mr. Speaker. It is wrong.

So some people think the people of Pennsylvania have not paid enough, and while I only got this bill a couple hours ago, I have tried to look through it to see just exactly what we are doing to the citizens of Pennsylvania. We are raising the gasoline tax by 3½ cents. All the people that drive around in a half-ton pickup truck in my county are going to pay \$19.50 more next year for their license. If they happen to have a three-quarter-ton truck, they are going to be paying \$27 more than they did last year. And if

they happen to be a small contractor or a guy that does lawn and garden or somebody that works in the woods and carries a couple chain saws in the back of the truck, they are paying \$51 more next year. The average person that drives to work, on top of the 3½ cents per gallon, is going to be paying \$12 more to register their Subaru at a time when Pennsylvania is flush with money, Mr. Speaker — \$800 million plus.

Mr. Speaker, to transfer a car in Pennsylvania will go up by 50 percent; for a duplicate registration card, 50 percent; for a certificate of title, \$7.50. But the one that really gets me is for a duplicate title. You know the people that come into your district office: "I want to sell my motorcycle. I lost the title." It is a \$5 duplicate fee. All they have to do is go down and type your name in, no data entry, press a button, a new title. Mr. Speaker, now that will cost \$22.50 — an increase of \$17.50 to get a duplicate title, from \$5 to \$22.50, Mr. Speaker.

And what do some of our counties get for this? I see no programs in the bill; I do not see a route mentioned. People are saying, well, you might get this job done, you might get that job done, just like we were supposed to get a prison up in the northern part of this State last year. That is on the shelf now, Mr. Speaker. We were promised that also. It is not in the bill. I have people from back home calling me saying, they are promising to put \$7 million away a year for Route 219. Well, I hope they are, but that is a promise, Mr. Speaker — for the next 20 years. Is Secretary Mallory going to be our Secretary of Transportation in 20 years? Is Governor Ridge going to be the Governor of Pennsylvania in 20 years?

Mr. Speaker, there are no guarantees in this bill. Just a few months ago I heard Secretary Mallory telling some constituents of mine that 219 as a limited access highway will never happen. "Never happen" were the words. Now, after a fishing expedition for votes and they find that they are a vote short, now all of a sudden it is a great idea. I question the commitment. I hope I am wrong, but I do not see the guarantee in that legislation that is still warm off the presses, Mr. Speaker.

And what do some of our counties get for this huge tax increase? Venango County, over the next 5 years, will get \$11.1 million less in their maintenance formula. Your constituents are going to pay more in taxes, more in registrations, and get \$11.1 million less money. Clearfield and Elk Counties — that is my district — will receive almost \$700,000 less over the next year and 5 years; Cameron County, \$2.2 million less; Sullivan County, \$590,000 less; Carbon County, \$6 million less; Adams County, \$1.75 million over the next 4 years; Franklin County, \$1 million less in the next 3 years; Tioga County next year will receive \$168,000 less after these increases; Union County, \$266,000 less over 3 years. This is a great change for the people of Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker.

And I was glad to hear my friend, the chairman of the Transportation Committee, feel very sure that an 80,000-pound trailer only being inspected one time can run around the State of Pennsylvania. Well, I hope it does not run over any of my constituents. We live in an area, Mr. Speaker, that has many hills, and you have all seen the accidents out here on Interstate 81 and 83 during construction, and the trucks, the drivers and the companies, are fined because the brakes are bad. Now we are only going to inspect them once a year. Well, I just hope it does not run over your wife and your children.

This is a sellout, Mr. Speaker. We are not protecting the citizens of Pennsylvania; we are taxing the citizens of Pennsylvania at a time that we do not have to. And I want to make it clear, there are jobs and construction projects that need to be done, but you do not have to raise taxes when you have an \$800-million surplus, Mr. Speaker. Let us raise taxes when we have to. The people of Pennsylvania have already paid into the fund. Let us use that money, and I request a "no" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Veon.

Mr. VEON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to expand on some of the points that the gentleman from Elk County made. And, Mr. Speaker, as a very partisan Democrat and a member who likes to see the Republican Party have to squirm on tough issues in this legislature, I am just absolutely astounded at what is happening to the Republican Party in Pennsylvania.

Yesterday I had the opportunity to watch C-SPAN most of the day off and on, and the Republican leader and Republican member after member after member talked about taxes and how the people in the United States of America are taxed too much. The Republican National Committee chairman stood across from the White House yesterday in a grim-reaper robe and talked about how terrible taxes are in this country.

Now, we sent him an urgent telegram this morning, Mr. Speaker, asking him to come across from the Capitol in Pennsylvania, because we needed help in Pennsylvania with the Republican Party of Pennsylvania. Somewhere, somehow, they have gone off track, off the beaten path, and we sent him an urgent telegram this morning asking him to come and join with Democrats in Pennsylvania to stop a \$400-million tax increase a year — a \$400-million tax increase a year. And Republican member of Congress after member after member spent hours and hours talking about how terrible tax increases are and how we ought to be lowering taxes, and here in Pennsylvania we have a situation where we have a Republican Governor and a Republican leadership in the legislature who say that with a billion dollars in the bank, ready and available to spend on roads if that is what you want to spend it on, on transit if that is what you want to spend it on, are going to raise the taxes of average, middle-income, middle-class Pennsylvanians.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying with some joy that I do not understand what has happened to the Republican Party in Pennsylvania, the tax-and-spend Republican Party in Pennsylvania, and I really think we have an opportunity, the members on that side of the aisle have an opportunity, to tell the Governor, no, this is wrong; we also watched C-SPAN yesterday and listened to the Republican leadership in that body say that there is no way we should be raising taxes, let alone raising taxes while we have a billion dollars of taxpayers' money already in the bank. Mr. Speaker, I think that is a travesty to the taxpayers in Pennsylvania.

Now, I want to make a couple specific points about this bill, and some of it I find also very befuddling and confusing. I know that most of the members understand that in this bill there is a dedicated piece of this tax increase that is dedicated to the turnpike. Twenty-eight million dollars of this bill, of this tax increase, is going to a dedicated turnpike fund, and all of you members who have been promised projects, all of you members who have difficulties with roads in your districts, you are sending

\$28 million to one project in the State — the Mon Valley Expressway in southwestern Pennsylvania. Twenty-eight million dollars of this tax increase is going in one place — not on your roads, not to fix your highways, but for one project in the State of Pennsylvania — and I do not understand how any of us and particularly those members who are voting for this tax increase, this \$400-million tax increase, can possibly allow \$28 million to go to one highway project.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to make a comment about generally the amount of money that is in this bill. Now, we know that this is a \$400-million tax increase in 1 year, and I know that many members have been promised projects in their district, but any close reading of this bill will very quickly point out to you, there is not enough money to pay for all the projects that they have promised everybody to vote for this bill. Next year alone, next year alone, 88 percent of the money that is generated, of that 88 percent, only 53 percent is actually going to go for new construction or betterment projects. The rest of it goes to annual highway maintenance. The year after that, it is 43 percent. The year after that it is 33 percent. The year after that it is 23 percent, and the year after that it is zero. Zero percent of this money then goes to build these roads. Where are they going to find the money to build these roads? Mr. Speaker, I really believe you have been sold a pig in a poke. You have been made commitments that will just never, ever, ever be honored. Even with good intentions, they just will not be honored.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Elk County also put it very well that when our constituents walk into our district offices next year and the year after that and they have to write that check for that increase in the registration, they are going to want to know how that happened and who was responsible, and I really firmly believe that when they understand — and we are going to work very hard to make sure they understand — that there was a billion dollars in the bank of taxpayers' money and we still raised their taxes, they are not going to be happy.

Mr. Speaker, we have worked very hard over the last few months to try to make this case, and we may lose this case on the floor of the House here today, but I think it is a good case. I think it is an important issue for us to make. The people of Pennsylvania need to understand that the Republican Party of Pennsylvania has gotten off their historical path and become the tax-and-spend party in Pennsylvania, and unfortunately, they are going to take an action today to raise the taxes of millions of Pennsylvanians.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very compelling that members vote "no" on this concurrence motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to allow the Republican national chairman a few more minutes to respond to Mr. Veon's telegram and contact Republican members to urge a change in position.

Today we are considering a monumental tax increase of \$60 to \$80 — conservatively figured — for each family with two drivers to ostensibly benefit Pennsylvania's transportation network. We do this at a time when we are running record revenue surpluses due to an unprecedented 5 years of uninterrupted economic growth. Paraphrasing what Senator Fumo said recently, I have heard of tax-and-spend liberals, Ronald Reagan was a borrow-and-spend

conservative, but this is the first time I ever heard of the policy of tax and hoard being advocated by the Ridge administration — voting monumental tax increases while sitting on monumental budget surpluses.

I realize, however, that it is argued that the budget surplus will not last beyond the next gubernatorial election but the gas tax increase will last forever, and therein lies the key problem with this legislation. We are considering a massive increase in highway funding without reconsidering the public-policy implications of how we spend transportation dollars in this Commonwealth. The concessions made in this bill to public transit were the bare minimum of what was necessary to get some votes for the passage of HB 67, and this bill does nothing whatever to improve our building materials to make our highways last longer. It does not represent any fundamental rethinking of Pennsylvania's transportation needs, and it is clear that we need to fundamentally rethink Pennsylvania's transportation needs.

Both caucuses have recently heard presentations from Pulitzer Prize-winning author Thomas Hylton, whose book "Save Our Land, Save Our Towns" has reignited public debate on Pennsylvania's lack of a land-use policy. This lack of a policy has contributed mightily to the decline of our urban areas and the destruction of farmlands and open spaces. National and State priorities for the construction of new highways over alternative transportation investments and short-term highway repair over long-term highway repair have helped fuel the unbelievably expensive pattern of urban sprawl and endless, nearly permanent, highway repair we see throughout Pennsylvania.

Planners and geographers contend that what we now know as suburban sprawl is largely a product of our highway policy. As a tool to alleviate traffic congestion, highways can often be self-defeating. In and around urban areas, new highways simply tend to become new sprawl corridors, gobbling up farmland and open spaces until the highway itself fails to move traffic and a new highway is proposed, which then opens up a new sprawl corridor. This endless cycle degrades urban centers and destroys farmland, small towns, and the environment.

We have passed brownfield legislation, but building many more highways converts existing greenfields into brownfields far faster than our brownfield legislation can possibly reverse this process. PennDOT has been willfully deaf to the problems its own policies have exasperated. PennDOT is still new-construction oriented, too often ignoring other modes of transportation that move people and goods such as mass transit and light and heavy rail.

On the local level, PennDOT ignores pleas to be sensitive to other modes of transportation. We have heard little or nothing from PennDOT recently about developing high-speed rail, as Rick Geist has long advocated. High-speed rail is very expensive, but PennDOT has also ignored other things that are not nearly as expensive.

In Philadelphia, center-city Representative Josephs has complained that PennDOT refuses to consider the needs of bicyclists when it approves or makes changes on State roads. Preservation groups in Lancaster County complain that PennDOT refuses to consider the needs of the Amish community and buggy traffic when it is approving changes on State roads for big developers. PennDOT has even gone so far as to tell local townships in Lancaster County that they cannot consider the impact that proposed intersection changes will have on buggy

traffic because PennDOT, quote, "has no standards for buggy traffic," unquote.

Should this bill fail to pass, every possible improvement to Pennsylvania's transportation system will still be available for discussion. Passing this bill ends the debate and saddles Pennsylvania with higher taxes of at least \$60 to \$80 a year per driving couple.

What we really need to do is redesign our transportation policy to move people and goods and not just cars. What we really need to do is to redesign our policy to stop the senseless destruction of open spaces and farmland and improve the quality of life, including transportation in and between our existing suburbs and small towns.

I ask for a defeat of HB 67 and a reappraisal of our transportation priorities.

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

Mr. EVANS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here this evening, and I have given this subject matter a lot of thought. Since about April of 1992, Mr. Speaker, or I should say 1991, August of 1991, I along with about 92 Democrats and probably 11 Republicans voted for the highest tax increase in the history of the State. In August of 1991, 92 Democrats, 11 Republicans, voted for \$3.2 billion in taxes under a Democratic Governor. In 1982-83 — Governor Thornburgh, Republican Governor, second-term legislator — Jim Manderino came to me and said to me, State in the middle of a recession; Republican Governor — heyday of Ronald Reagan as President of the United States — Republican Governor needs a tax increase. Democratic leader came back to me, second-term, and said to me, I need you to vote for that tax increase. I voted for that tax increase under a Republican Governor. That Republican Governor also had three gasoline tax increases, three gasoline taxes — one General Fund, three gasoline taxes. May it be a Democrat or a Republican, it is very consistent to me that it seems that as much as people try to paint the picture, the reality is that Democrats, like Republicans, raise taxes, so we should be clear about that on the record.

What did I discover after 1991? I discovered after 1991 that we needed to do business differently. I discovered after 1991 when everyone said to me we needed a tax increase because there was a recession and we needed to address the problems, I, like 92 people on this side and 11 people on that side, we addressed it.

We also in 1991 addressed the question around roads. The deal in 1991 was to be \$200 million for highways, \$200 million for transit. We gave the \$200 million to highways and about \$160 million to transit, and since 1991 we have repealed the number of taxes and we have lost some money to transit.

Now here we are in April of 1997, something different about 1991 and 1982. In 1982 and 1991 we did not have a half a billion dollars in the bank. Let me repeat that: In 1982 when I voted for taxes and in 1991 when I voted for taxes, we did not have a half a billion dollars in the bank. Now, my understanding about economic policy is, it is strange that we have a half a billion dollars in the bank and we want to say to John and Jane Q. Pennsylvanian, give me a little bit more; I do not want to touch this money.

Now, the response from the administration is, well, Dwight, we cannot touch that money because it really will not solve our

problems; we need a long-term strategy. Well, I have tried to suggest a long-term strategy. I have said that we need to look at a number of things. We need to look at redesign of the roads. Our roads only last for about 20 years when they should last 40 or 50 years. I recommended that. No one dealt with that issue. I said we need to look at toll roads. Now that the Federal Government and the President of the United States are talking about toll roads and the Governor has said he supports that, which I support that too, we need to talk about toll roads.

I said we also need to talk about long-term financing. We have done long-term financing. We did long-term financing for the new PennDOT building. Would you believe we are going to finance the PennDOT building but yet we do not finance our roads? How is it that we finance the building but we do not finance the roads? The reason we do not finance the roads is because we have no sort of guarantee on the long-term effect that the roads will last longer than 20 years.

The IMPACCT Commission (Improve Management Performance Commission and Cost Control Task Force). I was a part of the IMPACCT Commission; stood with Governor Ridge and said, yes, we can save \$206 million over 5 years from the IMPACCT Commission. I said that that IMPACCT Commission has some good ideas that we need to consider. We should put those ideas on the table.

I also stood up with a number of you on that side when some of you wanted to move the State Police off the PennDOT budget over to the Motor License Fund, which is like \$265 million. Even under the Governor's current budget, we are still diverting money from the PennDOT budget for the purpose of hiring 80 State Police — hiring; getting new computers. We still continue the diversion of dollars from the PennDOT budget.

So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, should we do something about our roads? Yes. Should we do something about our transit? Yes. But I do not believe that we need to raise taxes in order to do something about that issue.

I just ticked off to you five or six different ways that I think we can begin to address this issue, but the reason that we are doing taxes, let me tell you for those of you who have not been around, because the way that this process works over and over again is I give somebody a bridge, I give somebody a road, I give somebody something, but people do not ask the questions about the policy implications. I know about that. So I am raising with you, how many of you challenge PennDOT in terms of their numbers? How many of you challenge them about how effective and how smart they are operating? Did you just accept that they just told you we need a 3.5-percent gas tax increase, we need an increase on registration fees, and did you just automatically accept that?

I can tell you now, I do not care what department it is, may it be under a Democrat or a Republican, all those departments are the same. They all want more money. You are doing just what we have done in the past. You are going to give them more money, but the difference is that you are going to face, you are going to face the question by the voters out there, why did you give them more money when you have a half a billion dollars in the bank?

See, that is the question you cannot answer. You cannot answer the question of why you are going to give them a tax increase and more revenue while you got a half a billion dollars in the bank. You do not have an answer for that question. You do not have an answer for why you are going to raise people's taxes and why you

are going to raise the registration fees when you got a half a billion dollars in the bank. You do not have an answer for that. So I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is no logical reason to raise the gas tax, to raise the registration fees, when you have money in the bank.

Mr. Speaker, I offered a suggestion. March 7 I sent a letter to Secretary Bittenbender, and I faxed, I put out a copy of that letter to all of you. I recommended to the Secretary that we should take \$25 million immediately and put it in transit; we should take \$50 million and put it toward roads, and a great deal of you voted for that amendment and we sent it to the Senate. I sent that letter to Secretary Bittenbender, and he sent me back a letter and said thanks but no thanks, that is not the way we want to do business. In that letter I said on March 7 to him, I said, look, let us deal with the short term and let us get to the table and talk about the long term. How many of you challenged them in terms of long term? Will you be back here 2 years from now? Will you be back here 3 years from now? We just raised the gas tax in 1991. My point, what I am saying to you, is did you ask the hard questions? Did you force the department, did you force the department to document exactly the justification for their 12-year plan? Did you raise some serious issues about every time Washington, D.C., imposes another earmark, which means that we have to put more money into the fund, did any of you challenge PennDOT on the amount of money they are using? Now, if you cannot answer that question, then you should not be voting for these taxes.

We should be very clear. You should ask the question, do they really need the amount of money that they are asking for? It is a very basic question. We have a responsibility as a legislative group; that is, the executive branch, even though it may be of the same party that you are from, the reality of it is, we should ask questions. We should ask the question, is it justified to give them \$400 million a year? Is it justified to double the cost of the registration? Is that justifiable?

Somebody fired back to me, they said to me, Dwight, the reason we are raising the registration fees is they are just like too low. You know, our registration fees are too low and we need to increase our registration fees. Well, I am telling you, I want you to go back to your constituents and just tell them, just because you say Pennsylvania has low automobile registration, that you all of a sudden want to increase the registration; you want to increase it because it is too low. That is the argument I heard.

I heard the argument also about the gas tax. Some people said, well, we can afford to increase the gas tax because our gas is too low. Well, you know, we already pay on an average from \$1.21 to as much as \$1.60 a gallon. In New Jersey, which is full service — full service in New Jersey — they are cheaper than we are in Pennsylvania. In Delaware, they are cheaper than we are in Pennsylvania. I do not understand, for a party that wants to talk about putting a State in a competitive-advantage position to take advantage of generating jobs and opportunity, I do not understand a party that stands up here and votes for a tax when you got a half a billion dollars in the bank. I do not understand that.

Now, in 1991 we did not have a half a billion dollars in the bank. We had a recession. In 1982 with Governor Thornburgh, a conservative Republican — a conservative Republican — we did not have a half a billion dollars in the bank. Something is wrong. Something is absolutely wrong with this body when you are going to vote for \$400 million and take it out of the pockets of John and

Jane Q. Citizen and then sit here and say, well, we are really going to do it for roads and jobs. Roads and jobs? You got a half a billion dollars. You have a half a billion dollars sitting in the bank now and you want to turn around, you want to turn around and take \$400 million out of people's pockets, and then the rationale you want to make is, I got my bridge; I got my road; I got my transit bus; I got my little project. Well, I am going to tell you something: The registration fee and the tax comes out of everybody's pocket. It comes out of everybody's pocket. And the reality of it is that sooner or later this body, Democrat and Republican alike, is going to begin to realize, is going to begin to realize that there has to be a different way.

Now, I have tried to offer that. I have tried to offer that. I have tried to offer a different way, but it seems to me that this legislature is no more different than when it was under Governor Thornburgh, which was a Republican Governor, and this legislature is no more different than when it was under a Democratic Governor. It is no different. That is why people sit back and they say, well, then what is the difference between Democrats and Republicans? Well, I would like to think the difference in all of us is that we are looking out for the taxpayer. I would like to think that we are concerned that that taxpayer, who is the consumer and the worker, that we are looking out for their interests. We cannot be looking out for their interests if we are talking about doubling the costs on automobile registration. We cannot be looking out for their interests when we start talking about taxing them. We cannot be. You cannot be looking out for their interests when there is \$400 million, \$400 million in the bank, and you are looking out for John and Jane Q. Taxpayer in Pennsylvania? How could you be looking out for them?

There is no rationale, there is no basis for anything at all to see a tax increase. Do I understand when there is a need for additional revenue? Yes. I told you under Governor Thornburgh I voted for it; I told you under Governor Casey I voted for it, but the difference was, they did not have a half a billion dollars, Governor Thornburgh nor Governor Casey.

Now, let me say this to you. You still got a chance to redeem yourselves. Let me repeat that again: You still have a chance to redeem yourselves. Let me tell you how you can redeem yourself. Now, I know the insiders all say, you know, the votes over there are somewhat all wrapped up, but I guess my point is this: The votes are not wrapped up until they go up on that tote board. And you can sit back and you can make a decision. You can sit back quietly, you can sit back and think about it, and you got that green button and that red button in front of you, and you can certainly say to yourself, self, self, I am going to save my taxpayers. I am going to save my taxpayers; I will not impose this on my taxpayers. There is no way I would impose this on the people of Pennsylvania; I just will not do that to them. I cannot in good conscience go home and impose a tax, double the registration; I just cannot go do that. I just cannot go do it.

Do you know something? I know the Republicans cannot do that. I know in good conscience you cannot do that. I understand you cannot do that. I know you cannot do that because you got a half a billion dollars in the bank, and you are saying to yourself that I, that I, that I do not need to raise people's taxes.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me just give some other feelings that I have about this, because I have had even members on my own side over here who said this is the only way, and I have said to the members

on my side that this is not the only way. Unfortunately, this is the only way that the administration wants to address this issue. The legislature is an equal partner in this process, and the legislature has a right, if it does not agree with a recommendation that the Governor has made, we have a right to change, to alter, to put our plan on the table.

And I would not have a problem with this, Mr. Speaker, at least if we, Democrats and Republicans, were to get together and say to the Governor that we have a different way to approach this, and we did it 2 weeks ago. We did it 2 weeks ago when we voted for \$25 million in the transit, \$50 million in the highways, and we sent that bill to the Senate. The Senate turns around and takes that language out and sends that bill back here.

So we had a chance to offer a different approach. I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that what is taking place here in HB 67 is not the only way to address highways and transit. But, Mr. Speaker, the problem is, people have told you this is the only way to address it, because under Governor Thornburgh and Governor Casey, this is the way that they addressed it. I thought under this Governor we were going to have a different approach. I thought we were going to look at a smarter way to operate in government, but it is obvious to me that it is the same business as usual. And whenever this General Assembly wakes up, on the Democratic side and on the Republican side, we must do things differently, and I am saying to you, raising \$400 million in taxes is not doing anything different. It was no more different in 1991 under a Democratic Governor, it was no more different in 1982 under a Republican Governor than under this Governor, who came in and said that it cannot be business as usual in this State. But this Governor came in and basically, no more than 2 years in office, a year in office, started immediately asking about taxes — asked about taxes because initially it was because of the snow cleanup, asked about taxes because they wanted to do something different about the roads.

Well, I am saying to you as someone who has been here for 17 years, there is a different way to do things if we challenge ourselves to do it differently. But I am saying to you, and I know inside each and every one of you on that side of the aisle you want to do it differently, but the problem you face is that you have a Governor and a Secretary of Transportation who have come to you and told you this is the only way. And guess what? Unfortunately, everybody lines up and thinks that this is the only way. This is not the only way to address highways and roads. People tell you it is the only way because they tell you history has demonstrated that it is the only way. It is not the only way to address these issues.

So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I do think roads and transit we need to work with, but I do not think that you should talk about raising taxes as a first resort. Raising taxes should be a last, last, last resort. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the day after income tax day, the day after we all filed our income tax, and I hope you filed your income tax, because April is going to be a fantastic month. We are going to have something like \$100 million. We are going to be up to \$470 million at the end of April, and then in the middle of April, the day after income tax day, we will have raised people's taxes. And then John and Jane Q. Citizen will say, I do not understand that. How do you raise people's taxes, how do raise people's taxes \$400 million — \$400 million — and have \$470 million sitting in the bank? I do not understand. I do not understand how you do it. What justification is there?

In 1982 and 1991, even Governor Thornburgh and Governor Casey did not recommend a tax increase. Do we understand what we are doing? And the cynicism that we are going to continue to create on both sides of the aisle, do we understand that? If we understand that, the thing you will do is you will be "no" on HB 67. You will stand up and you will say no, no, no. That is what you will say. You know full well, in good conscience, that there is no way in the world that you are going to be able to run out here and act like this does not exist, because guess what? From this side — I am going to be honest with you — we are not going to let people forget. Let me be clear: We are not going to let people forget. From this day on, we are not going to let people forget, because every time I get a chance and everyplace I stand, I am not going to let — I am going to say to the voters, I am going to say, hey, voter, you had a clear choice. We had \$470 million in the bank, and they had the choice of raising it \$400 million. And I am going to say to the voter, voter, tell me, what would you have done? What would you have done if you had that choice? Well, voter, I am going to say, you know, in Harrisburg, Democrats and Republicans alike — because I want to be clear; there will be some Democrats — Democrats and Republicans alike did what we did under Governor Thornburgh and Governor Casey. They did the same thing.

I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, we have a chance today to bring this craziness to a halt, because under both parties, Mr. Speaker, this kind of behavior has been perpetuated under a conservative Republican and under a conservative Democrat — this same kind of behavior. Both parties, both parties, are guilty of this same kind of craziness of raising taxes when it is not necessary to raise taxes.

So I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, I want to be helpful. The majority leader knows that. Sometimes he and I agree to disagree, and he knows that he has talked to me, and sometimes I agree with him and sometimes I do not. I will tell him when I agree with him and when I do not, and vice versa; he probably does not agree with me at times, like he does not agree with me now. And I understand that he has to govern, he has a job to do, but I do not think, in my view, that if you go back to your constituents that you can say to them very honestly that you voted for taxes when you got \$400 million in the bank. It does not make any sense. What are we doing to this political process? When will we begin to wake up? You are going to raise money when you got money in the bank. I do not understand that logic. I just ticked off four or five ways I think we can do some things a little differently, but are we willing to challenge ourselves to do things differently? The answer is no. Democrats nor Republicans are willing to challenge themselves to operate differently than the way that we have.

So, Mr. Speaker — Can I get a little order, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will yield.

The gentleman, Mr. Evans.

Mr. EVANS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, I know it is tough. It is tough to especially have me stand up here and say what I am saying to you. It is probably tougher to have me say that, because I just said to you and I admitted up front that under Governor Casey I voted for taxes and under Governor Thornburgh, and you probably say, how can he stand up here and tell us, after he under Casey and under Thornburgh voted for taxes, that we are heading in the wrong direction? Well, you know, there is a certain thing when you can see the wrongs of your ways, and what I guess I am trying to say

to you, I am trying to help you. I am trying to save you. I am trying to convince you. I am trying to show you that you are about ready to make a mistake. There are some people on my side who said, Dwight, you should not tell them that, because this is going to be great campaign literature. I said, well, you know, I understand that, but guess what? The people have got to pay the tax. This may be great campaign literature, but the people have to pay the tax. You see, that is the same thing. We have got to understand that John and Jane Q. Citizen have to pay for the decisions we make here today, and I understand that. But I am saying to you, and I know how tough it is for people to listen in this House, and I have been here long enough to know that all kinds of speeches have been given on this floor, and I have seen very few speeches change people's minds when they sit on the floor. I have seen very few. I have not seen many speakers — K. Leroy Irvis is the only person I saw where he changed some people's minds.

Well, I am just trying to say, I am just trying to give a little suggestion, because I am a "no," emphatically "no." I am absolutely "no." I have made that clear publicly; I make it on this floor. You have got \$400 million in the bank. There is no justification under any circumstances to be raising people's taxes or these voter reg — Or these automobile registrations. I guess I keep saying voter registration because I guess I keep thinking to myself that there are going to be more Democrats who are going to register as a result of this action. I guess that is why I keep saying it, because I keep thinking to myself there are going to be more people that are going to register as a result of this action that is taking place today. I sense that. It is like in my bones. I feel it. I feel it from this day on April 16, 1997, that I got that feeling inside that I am saying to myself, self, self, self, this is it; this is it; this is our day; this is absolutely our day. And you know, I do not want to see it that way. I do not want to take unfair advantage. You know, I am saying I do not want that. Some of the people on my side want to take unfair advantage. They want to take advantage of this. They say, Dwight, let them do it. I do not want to do that.

Prove those other people wrong. Prove them wrong; prove them wrong; prove them wrong. Vote "no" on HB 67. It is not in the interests of the people of Pennsylvania. That is what we are here for. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise not reluctantly but with some circumspection. A tax vote, a tax vote is never, never an easy vote. It is not easy to explain and it is not easy to justify, but in this particular case, there is a valid explanation and a valid justification to vote for this bill.

First, I refer to this not as revenue enhancement but as infrastructure enhancement. Let us look at the positive side. This is not negative; it is positive. And in spite of all the past rhetoric and in spite of all the past bluster, this is good for Pennsylvania in the long run.

I know, last November, when I ran for reelection, a reporter asked me, what were my three, what were my three reasons for running, top priorities. And I said, "They're in this order: number one, economic development; number two, economic development; and number three, economic development." And I cannot think of a vote that more brings on economic development to the

Commonwealth than this one, and I think that is the positive side of this vote.

This is an economic generator, an economic locomotive, that will pull us well into the next century. This is not a 1-year flash in the pan.

There has been a lot of talk today about a surplus. I call that surplus the Hale-Bopp surplus. A big one like that does not come around for another 4,000 years. That surplus is going to be gone if not next year, then the year after. But long after that, this vote will create economic development; this vote will build roads; this vote will put people to work, as our union brethren have suggested. I think this is a good vote for Pennsylvania.

Also, this vote will create a \$400-million income that we can use to leverage approximately \$1 billion every year, ad infinitum, ad nauseam, from the Federal Government to supplement what we make from this gas tax. In other words, for the 3 cents or so that folks will pay in the gas tax, they will get another 8 or 9 or 10 cents back from the Federal Government. I think that is a pretty good investment. I think that is a pretty good deal.

We also talked here about registration fees, and yes, for some vehicles, they are going to be high, but for the most part, the registration on residential vehicles, on regular automobiles, is relatively low now. In fact, it is very low. We almost give it away. We practically do not even pay for our own expenses with the \$24 fee. The average, the average registration in the United States of America for the average car, said to be a Ford Taurus, is \$200 a year. We pay \$24. With this, we will pay \$36. That is still cheap by any other standard. And a previous speaker mentioned that this is something that has not been raised since 1975. I think that is a pretty good deal, and I think we as a legislature can be very proud of the fact that we have kept that cost down.

But lastly, I want to mention that this bill is really for the future. We are not, we are not voting this bill for Tom Ridge. We are not, we are not voting this bill for Brad Mallory. We are not voting on this bill for Representative Joe Markosek. We are voting on this bill for Lesley and Tommy Ridge, for 6-year-old Kathryn Mallory, and for 4½-year-old Brandon Markosek. That is who we are voting this for — for the future — so that when those kids, when those kids, some 15 or 20 years down the line, are looking for a job, have finished their education and are out looking, out interviewing, that those job interviews will occur in Pittsburgh or Erie or Harrisburg or Philadelphia or Scranton. They will not be in Tucson or Austin or Tallahassee or Guadalajara or Barcelona. We want to have jobs for the future here. This may not ensure that, but it will go a long way to doing that.

This vote is not for any of us sitting here today. Sure, it is going to help some of our districts, and yes, it is a very good deal for mass transit. And I might add that the mass transit funding, the \$150 million set aside, is coming out of the surplus. It is General Fund money. It is not gas tax money. It is coming out of the surplus. So we are using part of the surplus with this on a very needed and necessary situation. Mass transit has always been the poor sister of highway roadbuilding, and at least for now, we have a clear, enlightened Secretary of Transportation that has gone to bat in a big way for mass transit, and he deserves our support, and we deserve to support this not only for mass transit but for the massive roadbuilding, the billions and billions of dollars that we will accumulate all over the next years not only in the income from the gas tax but in the leveraged revenue from the

Federal Government, that will build roads in Pennsylvania and fix roads in Pennsylvania and bridges and tunnels for many, many, many years to come, long after the sound of our voice has dissipated here today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to do the right thing, not necessarily the easy thing. Keep in mind that anything worth having has a very high price to it, and the higher the price you pay, the better the thing that you get is. The more you want, the higher the price it is going to cost. This has got a high price, given, but it is a very good deal. We are going to get a lot for it. It is the right vote to make. It is a vote that it is not going to be easy, it is not easy politically, but it is definitely the right vote to make for the economy and the future of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

For the benefit of the members, my list is Jarolin, Bebko-Jones, Olasz, Petrone, Casorio, Adolph, McCall, Petrarca, Walko, Civera, and James.

I simply read the list out so that the speakers may take under advisement the length of their speech.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Jarolin. The gentleman, Mr. Jarolin.

Mr. JAROLIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, I am not up here to argue about the taxes that are being imposed today if they are successful in passing. However, what I am arguing about up here is the people that it is going to affect.

Just the other day, I read, in Pennsylvania, where so many businesses were moving out and so many young people were moving south. Now we are going to be imposing a big license fee on big trucks and trucking corporations. Some of them it is going to cost maybe \$100,000. That is how many trucks and trailers they have. But the irony of the whole situation is, nobody is looking at the little guy downstairs.

And a prime example of it is the lady that came into my office approximately a month ago. She had a \$190 salary, and she kept a budget on that lousy 190 bucks: \$45 in rent, \$37 in heat, \$21 in electricity, \$15 in car expenses, \$11 in insurance, \$39 a week in groceries — now, this is for only a week — clothing. She had in there for herself and her youngster, recreation, per week, \$8. Now we come along with an increase in her car registration, where she has to drive 21 miles to work for a lousy \$5.50, \$6, because she is not of the quality of an individual that has got the expertise as a secretary or court reporter or anybody like that. She is a common laborer with the McDonald's Corp. Taking this into consideration, the increase to her in the car registration means 2 weeks without any recreation money. She is going to have to cut corners for her car insurance. The increase in the gas tax. You know, we are all saying it is a 3½-cent gas tax. Well, you take up there in northeastern Pennsylvania; the gas right now is \$1.26, \$1.27 a gallon for regular. Down here it is \$1.13. When that comes out of the distributor or the wholesaler, you can rest assured that they are going to put a little tag on that, because you have never seen anything such as a half a cent on a gasoline pump. It is nine-tenths of a cent. So let us say they put a penny and a half on or a penny and four-tenths. By the time they finish, this young lady is going to wind up maybe paying an extra \$100, \$120 a year. That throws her budget right out the window. So she has to go out and look for supplemental, additional money for the increases.

Mr. Speaker, it may be good for Pennsylvania in the long run. I do not know that, but I do know it is no good for the poverty-stricken people that we have got in Pennsylvania. I ask for a "no" vote on this. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the lady, Ms. Bebko-Jones. The lady waives off. Thank you.

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

This is not for your benefit, Mr. Olasz, but I have asked the clerk, at the request of one of the members — I thought it was a good idea, incidentally — to run the 5-minute clock. There is no restriction, but it will be interesting. We will have something to watch.

Mr. Olasz.

Mr. OLASZ. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

After about 3 hours or so, do you want to take a pause for station identification and everyone stand up?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry, please.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, is it my presumption that there is or is not a 5-minute clock or is it an informal one at this stage?

The SPEAKER. Yes. I stated, there is no restriction.

Mr. DeWEESE. But, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Do you object to my running it? I will turn it off.

Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I do not think it is necessary. This gentleman is the chairman of the House Transportation Committee on the Democratic side. This is the biggest issue that we will probably deal with in the next decade.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman—

Mr. DeWEESE. Thank you very much. Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman wants me to turn it off? Is that what he is asking?

Mr. DeWEESE. Please.

The SPEAKER. Your request will be granted.

Mr. Olasz, speak away.

Mr. OLASZ. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

That sounds like "your wish is my command." Thank you.

The SPEAKER. It certainly is not.

Mr. OLASZ. Mr. Speaker, would the Republican chairman of the Transportation Committee stand for interrogation, please?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Geist, indicates that he will stand for interrogation. You may begin.

Mr. OLASZ. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that in this afternoon's Rules Committee, it was mentioned that there is funding for rail freight subsidies — something that I am very concerned with, the freights and passenger service. Can you show me or tell me on what page that funding appears?

Mr. GEIST. Mr. Speaker, it is not in this bill. It is a commitment from the administration. You currently have \$3.6 million in rail freight assistance. There will be an additional \$6.4 million from the Governor, giving us \$10 million for rail freight.

Mr. OLASZ. This is not something comparable to giving someone two sticks and telling him we are going out snipe hunting tonight, is it?

Mr. GEIST. Mr. Speaker, I got a bag and a great place for you to hide.

Mr. OLASZ. Since we had approximately 113-or-odd pages of HB 67, would you verify some of the fees for me?

What is the fee going to be for motor homes? Just from what amount to what amount, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GEIST. We will give you the exact amount. Just a second.

What class motor home would you like to know?

Mr. OLASZ. What is it from and to? One, two, and three. I am sorry.

Mr. GEIST. \$30 will go to \$45; \$42 will go to \$63; and \$54 will go to \$81.

Mr. OLASZ. Mr. Speaker, just recently did we not have seasonal plates for some of these mobile homes; pass that legislation?

Mr. GEIST. Yes. It is in this bill.

Mr. OLASZ. We had a bill some weeks ago where there was a reduction. Now we are taking that reduction back and increasing that through these fees?

Mr. GEIST. No. We never gave them a reduction, but what we were—

Mr. OLASZ. On a special seasonal plate?

I am sorry to interrupt you.

Mr. GEIST. What we were trying to attempt and I think what we are going to do is to have it a seasonal plate so we do not have to go through all the hassles of turning plates in and everything else that goes along with it, so that the people that use these in the summer, spring, and fall can park them without going through the hassle that we have had in the past. They do not have to turn in their plates—

Mr. OLASZ. But they still have to pay part of the fee, do they not?

Mr. GEIST. —and they will be able to cancel their liability while it is parked.

Mr. OLASZ. But they still have to pay part of the fee?

Mr. GEIST. Well, they would still have to pay the fee. Once you run the vehicle on the road once, you pay the fee for that year. It is an annual fee.

Mr. OLASZ. For part of the year — to interrupt you — for part of the year.

Mr. GEIST. It is prorated for the first year, and it is prorated by the vehicle.

Mr. OLASZ. But while we pretend to be saving them money, we are still jacking up their fee, are we not?

Mr. GEIST. All registration fees will increase in this bill, including motor homes.

Mr. OLASZ. So their fee is going up.

Mr. GEIST. Yes.

Mr. OLASZ. Thank you.

What about buses? What would their fees—

Mr. GEIST. Did you say "buses"?

Mr. OLASZ. Buses, yes.

Mr. GEIST. As in Allegheny Port Authority transit buses?

Mr. OLASZ. No. As in schoolbuses.

Mr. GEIST. Oh, thank you.

Schoolbuses will remain \$24.

Mr. OLASZ. That stays the same.
 What about farm vehicles and the amount — what it went from and what it is going to?

Mr. GEIST. Are you asking about the biannual exemption?

Mr. OLASZ. No. I am asking for the total fee registration.

Mr. GEIST. It will go to \$76.50.

Mr. OLASZ. From what?

Mr. GEIST. It was \$51.

Mr. OLASZ. From \$51 to \$76.50.

You know, this has certainly been a bad week for farmers, has it not, with Secretary Brosius leaving the family.

You know, back to the schoolbus issue; Mr. Speaker, back to the schoolbus issue. As we both know, many of these are contracts held by special busing firms. How does that apply to them? Are they off the hook?

Mr. GEIST. Mr. Speaker, they will still be \$24.

Mr. OLASZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like you to point that out in the bill, where it specifically states that.

Mr. GEIST. It is not in this bill, because that has not been changed. That has to be done in another place.

Mr. OLASZ. So there is no guarantee, other than word of mouth, that it will stay the same for these contract bus firms, schoolbus firms?

Mr. GEIST. We cannot hear the question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. OLASZ. Mr. Speaker, will this still stay the same for private schoolbus contracting firms?

Mr. GEIST. As long as they are licensed as a schoolbus, yes.

Mr. OLASZ. But it is not in the bill?

Mr. GEIST. That is correct, because we are not changing it.

Mr. OLASZ. Well, I sincerely hope so.

What about ambulances?

Mr. GEIST. It goes from \$36 to \$54, unless it is municipal.

Mr. OLASZ. Taxicabs?

Mr. GEIST. If it is municipal, of course, you know they get free plates.

Mr. OLASZ. Taxicabs? From what to what?

Mr. GEIST. \$36 to \$54 for taxicabs.

Mr. OLASZ. What about limousine services?

Mr. GEIST. Mr. Speaker, it will be 50 percent more than it is today. And you know that they are charged by seat, so you cannot give a specific number because you do not know how many seats. That also pertains to buses or limousines.

Mr. OLASZ. It pertains to buses and limousines. From what to what, once again?

Mr. GEIST. It goes from \$6 a seat to \$9 a seat, and then it is based upon the number of seats in the limousine.

Mr. OLASZ. And once again, the title fees, the duplicate title fees, go from what to what?

Mr. GEIST. There is no more duplicate title.

Mr. OLASZ. So we will pay— What will we pay instead of the \$5? What will that go to?

Mr. GEIST. You will pay \$22.50 for a title, no matter what.

Mr. OLASZ. From \$5 to \$22.50?

Mr. GEIST. Yes. And there is no such thing as a duplicate title anymore. It eliminates that.

Mr. OLASZ. Under this bill, that removes—

Mr. GEIST. That is correct.

Mr. OLASZ. —removes duplicate title.

Mr. Speaker, we also were told earlier about inspections of these tractor-trailers. Can you tell me specifically where in the bill it specifies funding for these inspections?

Mr. GEIST. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. What funding?

Mr. OLASZ. What are the inspections of these tractor-trailers that are now going to be held annually instead of semiannually?

Mr. GEIST. The owner will pay for the inspection. The State will not fund the inspection cost.

Mr. OLASZ. No, but I understood you to say that there would be enforcement of this provision. Who is going to enforce it?

Mr. GEIST. Yes. It is PUC (Public Utility Commission) and motor carrier safety division, and that is their everyday business.

Mr. OLASZ. But in the budget that was passed, has not the Governor authorized privatization of this inspection process, the oversight in the inspection?

Mr. GEIST. There is no privatization in this bill.

Mr. OLASZ. No, but in the budget, the oversight.

Mr. GEIST. Yes. It is my understanding that PennDOT is working in that direction, but it is not currently that way.

Mr. OLASZ. Mr. Speaker, as many of us travel the interstates and the superhighways, it is hard for me to believe that we are going to have safer trucks on the road with one inspection annually, with someone overseeing this inspection process. Is that accurate?

Mr. GEIST. Yes, sir.

Mr. Speaker, responding to that, trailers under 10,000 are already once a year. Pennsylvania has a very, very good safety record. One of the reasons that we offer up to the trucking industry the universal registration of \$135 for a lifetime is that what we would like to do is get them away from the States where they just register and have no other compliance. What we want are the safest possible highways that we possibly can provide for the people of Pennsylvania.

Mr. OLASZ. Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate and I would offer for the record that probably one of the reasons we had safe trucks under 10,000 or, rather, all trucking was the semiannual inspections. And I know there are going to be a lot of motorists that are going to raise their eyebrows when they say, hey, you have these monster trucks out there that are going to be inspected only once a year.

Mr. GEIST. "Monster trucks" I do not think are identified in this legislation.

Mr. OLASZ. No. I will identify them for you later, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you very much for the interrogation.

Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Olasz.

Mr. OLASZ. Comments.

Approximately 3 years ago, after we came out of one of the most severe winters that the Commonwealth experienced in decades, I stood on this House floor and agreed with a colleague of mine that gasoline taxes should be raised. That was then and this is now. Now is a \$750-million cash surplus, and that is what has made the difference in my attitude at this time.

We have heard from other speakers how this tax is going to increase business opportunities in Pennsylvania. I submit, some of those individuals better go back to Econ 101. You tell me, please, where are these job opportunities for these small truckers? We are going to put them out of business, pure and simple. Take a good

look at them, because if this passes, they are history. And also those truckstops along the way, where men stop, take a shower, get a little rest to get back on the road again. I submit they will be part of Pennsylvania history.

And let us go back to those dear old souls where we sing the lullaby every election time, "O Dear Senior Citizen, How I Love You So." Tell me how these senior citizens are going to absorb the extra cost of all those food items that they use, young people trying to raise a family, because we all have been around long enough to know, the major trucking companies are not going to absorb this out of the goodness of their heart; they are going to pass that increase on to those dear old senior citizens that we love so much at election time and those poor young struggling families and those dairy farmers, those poor dairy farmers that feel they are not getting their fair price for their product today. Who absorbs that added tanker cost to take that milk to market? Are we going to be taking milk out of babies' mouths? Are we going to take that milk out of babies' mouths? Ask that and then think about it before you cast your vote.

Basic counting — we have 10 fingers. Go around this Commonwealth and show me anywhere where the price on a gas pump is not \$1.28 9/10, \$1.23 9/10. Whatever, it is going to be nine-tenths of a cent. So add 3.5 on to nine-tenths, and what does that come to? Four-tenths. And you can bet your bottom dollar that that dear old service station dealer is not going to keep it at four-tenths. It is going to be back up to nine-tenths. So in reality, what you are doing is passing a 3 9/10 tax on to the people, where we already have a \$750-million surplus.

And the big baby. I want you all to please listen to this story — monster trucks that I alluded to a few minutes ago. Remember those cartoons that used to be in the paper where those big old monster trucks were chugging down the highway and chewing up people in those little cars? Well, baby, put your seatbelt on and make sure you got air in your airbag, because that day is coming when you are extending the width of a truck another foot on 10-foot roads, and when they pass, you tell me where that bicycle rider is going to go. Maybe you could throw a skyhook out and get away from it.

And go look at our narrow bridges. Ask yourself if your brother, your sister, your mother, your father, your wife, or your children are chewed up by one of these monster trucks that just literally brush you out of the way and chew up that automobile. If we had laws for years preventing that, why are we now in this HB 67 giving the right to go on any road? Are you aware of that? Ask yourself that. I see some smiles out there. But go look at those monster trucks, baby. Come up and down that turnpike, and try to get around them sometime. That is a real treat.

You know, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker— You should be listening, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Olasz.

Mr. OLASZ. You and I—

The SPEAKER. Mr. Olasz, it is necessary for you to get closer to the microphone.

Mr. OLASZ. Oh, okay. Can you hear me now?

I am certain that you and I are about the same age bracket, and I know that you would remember that old Sammy Kaye ballad, "Promise Me We'll Still Be Sweethearts After Graduation Day." And this is graduation day for a lot of our Democrats who are

giving votes away, and I hope that your Republican friends still cherish in their heart and will still be sweethearts to them. But—

The SPEAKER. I suspect we will have new friends by tomorrow.

Mr. OLASZ. And one of the comparisons that I am looking at, the table here, in the last note, Mr. Speaker, it says, "Current Allocation Used Data for FY 96-97. PennDOT would not release Data for FY 97-98."

Now, if this is such a good maintenance formula, why has PennDOT not given us the data? Does someone care to explain that to me? It is right on this printout. Does anyone have an answer for it? What happened to all the bean counters in PennDOT? The batteries gone dead in their calculators?

You know, I am puzzled how anyone can tell me it is a good formula when they will not produce the data for it. Mr. Speaker, does anyone volunteer to respond to my question?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (J. SCOT CHADWICK) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not see anybody at this moment who appears willing to stand for interrogation.

Mr. OLASZ. Gee, this day has been full of surprises. Is that not another one, Mr. Speaker? Surprise.

Where is my colleague, the chairman there? Better get those sticks and bags out. We are going hunting tonight.

But, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion — sometimes "in conclusion" can drag on for hours; remember that; you think about it — but those of you that have traveled extensively, take a look at what we are doing here today. Be very candid about it. We have sold out to the big trucking industries. Those monster trucks are the gainers in here. Do not be deluded into thinking that this is going to solve all the problems. When you get on that highway and people say, my God, where did these trucks come from, tell them they came right here from this General Assembly that voted to hide in a supposedly innocuous gas bill release for these monster trucks to prey on all the automobile public that comes through Pennsylvania.

You think about it. If you can respond in good conscience that this is what you want, then vote for it, but I hope not.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Petrone.

Mr. PETRONE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a few points to my colleagues regarding what we are about to do here and would like to refresh their memory in some way regarding past instances where we have done the same thing and the reasons why.

First, I would like to say, to every thing there is a season and a time to every purpose under the heaven. There is a time to be born, a time to die, a time to plant, a time to be quiet, and a time to speak up. I submit that to Governor Ridge, he is trying to do the right thing the wrong way at the wrong time.

In 1982 I voted for a fuel tax increase that allocated funds for our parkway in Allegheny County and many other projects. And again, we did it two more times since then that helped alleviate the burden of public transit and the repair of roads and bridges, and this was under two different administrations. I am happy to say, it improved the conditions of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County.

But now we have a huge surplus of dollars, and we have not earmarked it in the right way. I do not think it is the right time to do this. Possibly next year will be.

First, we should give back the surplus and reduce the taxes to the people that need it the most. A short time ago, we were cutting \$40 million a year to medical assistance people, people that do not have insurance but needed medical assistance, and we still got 700 or 600 or 500 or 400 or 300 million of Pennsylvania dollars. I think we are going to wind up being the only State to go to the poorhouse in an automobile on new roads paid for on the backs of poor people.

In 1982 the Federal Government held up our tax dollars, our road dollars, because we would not vote on a clean air bill. We voted on a clean air bill that did not make nonsense to appease them, to get our money, and we put in air pollution control by ZIP Codes. Does that make sense? The air stays in ZIP Codes. It is in his but not in mine.

Later on, we had medical cuts from the Federal Government, again to medicare and medicaid people, to the tune of 30 million bucks, that hammered us into raising taxes, which many of us voted for, and that is the reason there is a surplus today. I am not saying we do not have a need. I think we ought to do something else first.

Here are some facts about a company and a close friend of mine who is in the trucking business.

His immediate cost increase will be \$115,907.87. He currently has 600 trucks that are paying \$660,000 a year in use taxes; \$1,100 per vehicle. Now, you know his business is going to go up and the little guy is going to have to pay for it, not counting the people that are going to have to pick up the tab for license fee increases and car increases.

I am not saying that we do not have to care about the exceptional miles of roads that we have in Pennsylvania and that we should not have the proper funding to ensure that they are taken care of and our bridges, but I am saying, it is the wrong tax at the wrong time, and we should consider reducing taxes, using the surplus for a better reason, and then go on from there.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westmoreland County, Mr. Casorio.

Mr. CASORIO. Mr. Speaker, do not blame me; do not blame me and my fellow Democratic colleagues for the large tax increase that we are about to inflict on the constituents and the residents of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; do not blame me.

Mr. Speaker, my fellow Democrats on this side of the aisle are standing up to the tax-and-spend Republicans and we are standing up to the tax-and-spend administration of this Governor. This tax increase is regressive. This tax increase hurts senior citizens, this tax increase hurts working people, this tax increase hurts families with young children, and this tax increase hurts men and women working two and three minimum-wage jobs, Mr. Speaker. We are standing up for those folks in our district. This is not a good deal for the future; this is not a good deal for the Governor's children; this is not a good deal for any of our children.

Mr. Speaker, we are standing with the rank-and-file union members; we are standing with the rank-and-file union members in opposing this tax increase. It is wrong, it is shortsighted, and it hurts working people. We were elected on this side of the aisle to come to Harrisburg to stand up for working people and their

families, and I am proud to say that a majority of my colleagues on this side of the aisle are doing just what they promised their voters that they would do, stand up for working families, Mr. Speaker.

There is a \$400-million surplus in the budget right now; \$700 million by June. We cannot in good conscience ask the residents of our districts and of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to stomach a tax increase while \$400 million exists, Mr. Speaker.

I can go back to my district tomorrow. I am going to be happy to go back to my district tomorrow because I have an issue now to campaign on all summer long — through Memorial Day, through Fourth of July, and into Labor Day: I did not vote to raise your taxes; I did not vote to raise the gas increase.

My problem is how you could justify going back to your district and telling the working folks that you voted for this tax increase. How can you justify going back to the district and telling your family and your friends and your voters that you voted for this tax increase, Mr. Speaker?

I can explain my vote. I hope you can explain yours. I am proud to go back to my district and say, I am standing up for the working families of my district.

Mr. Speaker, again I say, I am standing up proud, asking for a "no" vote, standing with my fellow colleagues and saying, do not blame me; do not blame me; do not blame me.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware County, Mr. Adolph.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to share with my colleagues results of a recent survey that I did in Delaware County. I was reading the newspapers and listening to Mr. DeWeese inform me that we were going to be voting on a gas tax in the near future, so I wanted to find out what the rank-and-file voters in Delaware County thought about this. And I did not try to sweeten my survey, and to tell you the truth, I thought that I would get different results. And I will share with you the questions. Okay?

It says, Pennsylvania State roads and highways are built and maintained primarily through State gas tax revenues. Many maintenance and construction projects have been put on hold due to lack of funding. Governor Ridge has called for a State gas tax increase. What do you think about a gas tax hike?

I do not think I tried to dodge the bullet, throw a curveball to my constituents. Okay?

This survey went out to 21,000 households. I received 17 percent response. That is a high response. I am sure a lot of you are familiar with the rate of response. Okay?

And the question read, "Which of the following choices best reflects your opinion about a state gas tax increase?" Support a 7-cent-per-gallon increase, 374 out of 3,119; support a 4-cent-per-gallon increase, 1,204; opposed, 1,500.

Fifty-one percent of those that took the time out to answer that survey said a 4- or a 7-cent-per-gallon increase to take care of the roads and mass transit problems of Pennsylvania. They remember the snowstorms, the ice storms, the floods, from a year ago. We held a special session here in this House to take care of some of the necessary problems of those winter storms. Some of those problems are still out there.

Now, I want to inform those residents— A previous speaker did not have an allocation of the maintenance schedule. I was

given some information on that, and the county of Delaware will receive a 12-percent increase next year, 15-percent increase the following year, 17.7-percent increase the following year, 20.4-percent the fourth year, and a 26-percent increase in the funding formula the fifth year.

If anybody has driven through Delaware County, Route 291, it is called the Industrial Highway. The largest manufacturing employer in Pennsylvania happens to be on 291, Boeing Helicopters. That road is a disgrace. PECO has a plant down there. Numerous industries are along that waterfront. Other than I-95, it is the main highway to the Philadelphia International Airport. It is a disgrace. With this increase, it is going to be done, along with increase in maintenance over the next 5 years.

There was a question in that survey that had to do with the liquor stores, but the question was, if we sold the liquor stores, what would you do with your money? And I had them rate the questions. Without question, the number one issue that they were concerned about was education. Guess what number two was? Roads and maintenance; roads and maintenance.

Do not be fooled by the special interest groups up here. The people of Pennsylvania know the conditions of our highways.

I am shocked when I hear some Representatives from the city of Philadelphia say vote "no" on this when they see the mass transit funding in there for SEPTA (Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority); I am shocked; I am shocked. The mayor of Philadelphia supports this mass transit funding. I am absolutely shocked that someone from Philadelphia could say vote "no" to \$150 million for mass transit, of which 70 percent SEPTA receives.

Yeah, it is a tough vote, it is a difficult vote, but it is difficult to build highways and it is difficult to keep the mass transit running, and this is a difficult vote that I will make.

And I asked my residents. And no, it is not overwhelming; it is not 70 percent for. It is 51 percent. But it was not a curveball. It was a straight answer. And they ride the roads and they ride mass transit every day into the city of Philadelphia to go to work, and we need to do this.

And we are talking about \$30 a year, the average driver in Pennsylvania; \$30 a year. Four hundred million sounds a lot, but when you break it down individually, it is \$30 a year.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. DeWEESE. A couple quick points, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman who just spoke, an honorable gentleman, said that he did not sweeten his survey. Yes, he did. He sweetened his survey, Mr. Speaker, by not announcing what Robert Bittenbender knows; what that doe-eyed Kewpie, that lickspittle, Mr. Reeves, knows — that there are \$500 million in surplus; \$500 million. How can you tell us about a survey and tell us you did not sweeten that survey when you did not tell them about a \$500-million surplus, one of the most unprecedented — according to one of my friends, almost a Hale-Bopp-phenomenon survey. I do not understand that, sir, and with all due respect, I think your observation about having it unsweetened was disingenuous.

And quite frankly, I think everybody on this floor should know the demographics of the young gentleman's district. We are a Commonwealth's Assembly. From the Pacific Palisades to Cadillac Mountain in Maine, most all of our State legislatures

tonight are dominated by white suburban elements, primarily from the Republican side of the equation. My worthy colleague and my good friend, the gentleman who spoke just a little bit ago, represents all the IBM and FBI white shirts and white perspectives. The gentleman's district is almost 96 percent homogenously Caucasian. That is in and of itself a sweetened survey. There are not too many Hispanics in his district; there are not too many African-Americans or Asian-Americans in his district.

So he is enjoying a survey without telling anybody that there are \$500 or \$600 million in surplus, and he is talking to a group that is utterly homogenous. It sounds sweetened to me, if sweetened and homogenous is not a mixed metaphor.

I just wanted to put that on the record. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Carbon County, Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCALL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman, Mr. Geist, stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Geist, indicates that he is willing to stand for interrogation. You are in order and may proceed.

Mr. McCALL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in your answering questions that were asked by the gentleman from Luzerne and the gentleman from Allegheny, they talked about removing the provision for a truck that is 102 inches wide from traveling just on designated highways to all of the highways of this Commonwealth.

That is correct, we have eliminated that provision, and—

Mr. GEIST. Mr. Speaker, for the record, it is numbered Pennsylvania highways. Nonnumbered will still be permitted the same way with the application through the district engineer and review of the permit.

Mr. McCALL. Well, when I review the language, on page 40, lines 1 through 3, on lines 1 and 2 all of the language is stricken and the only language that prevails is "ON ALL HIGHWAYS." So I am presuming it is on all State highways, the way this law is written.

Mr. GEIST. Mr. Speaker, it is on the record now.

Mr. McCALL. Well, my question to you is, if we are increasing the width of these trucks or allowing 102 inches, 8.5 feet of truck on our roads in this Commonwealth, and the Vehicle Code allows for an additional 6 inches for the mirrors on those trucks, the total width of those trucks is 9½ feet, we are allowing them to drive on 10-foot-wide highways, I just want you to respond to the safety concerns that I have when a schoolbus drives by that truck or if two trucks at 102 inches drive by each other on that 10-foot highway. I would like to hear if you have the same safety concerns that I have.

Mr. GEIST. Mr. Speaker, I have more than the same concerns you have, and I would sure hate to have that schoolbus go over the edge of a berm that is not maintained because we did not put the moneys up to do it. This process of the permitting has gone on now since, I believe, 1982. It has been very successful, it has been very thought-out, and as I showed you earlier, in this document, over 50 pages of permitted roads in Pennsylvania—

Mr. McCALL. No, Mr. Speaker. But then you think, you think that a 102-inch-wide truck traversing a 10-foot-wide road is safe in this Commonwealth?

Mr. GEIST. The 102-inch-wide buses and motor homes do it every day. This is on numbered State highways only.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, moving on to the second part of it, and that is the 80,000-pound trucks only having to be inspected once a year. We are talking about an 80,000-pound missile. And do you think — and again, I want you to respond to the safety concerns that I have — do you think that it is appropriate that we are only mandating that these trucks be inspected one time? And I live in a mountainous region, so I am concerned about this. I am concerned about trucks losing their brakes and accidents. I think we are legislating accidents to happen here. I want you to respond to my safety concern about these trucks only having to be inspected one time.

Mr. GEIST. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am sure that those people out there in Pennsylvania understand the PUC, the spot checking, the enforcement process that goes on out there, and what we are trying to do is to get those people who license those trailers in other States — Maine, Georgia, and others — to make sure that those trailers are safely inspected and are on Pennsylvania roads.

Mr. McCALL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

That ends my interrogation. I would like to make a comment on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, for all of the concerns enumerated by my colleagues — the substantial fee increases, the 3½-cent increase in the gas tax, that my constituents are going to have to pay, working men and working women in my district — for me to ask the constituents of Carbon County to vote for these fee increases and these tax increases when by June 30 we are probably going to have a \$1-billion surplus, I just cannot do.

The citizens of Carbon County are going to pay higher taxes, they are going to pay higher fees, and when you look at the maintenance formula, they are going to get a \$1.3 million less in revenues. How can I in good conscience go back to my constituents and say this is a good deal for Carbon County when they are going to pay more and get less?

Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for this legislation, and I would ask my colleagues to also vote against it.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. McCALL. And at this point I would like to make a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the point.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, this amendment will certainly have some significant fiscal implications, and I am wondering if under rule 19(a) the amendment that was inserted into HB 67 would require a fiscal note before it is voted on by this chamber.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A fiscal note has been prepared, and we can make one available to the gentleman, if he so requests.

Mr. McCALL. I would appreciate that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman, Mr. DeWeese, seek recognition?

Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker, just in order to make sure that the other members get a copy of the fiscal note also.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westmoreland County, Mr. Petrarca.

Mr. PETRARCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to tell a short story about a roadway that was proposed in my area of Westmoreland County entitled the Kiski Valley Expressway and my father, who served in this House for over two decades.

My father, in his two decades here, voted for every gas tax proposal that came down the pike, so to speak, and make no mistake, deals were cut and promises were made. This roadway, the Kiski Valley Expressway, was supposed to be completed by November 1999. It was to replace a section of roadway approximately 6 miles long where 200 accidents have occurred in the last 5 years and a road that has been determined to be 34 percent more dangerous than the average road in Pennsylvania.

All those promises made to my father and the constituents in my area meant nothing. Today that roadway is off the transportation improvement plan; that roadway is off the 12-year plan; that roadway is dead. Those of you who made deals for roadways and projects in your districts, how long will it take for those projects to be completed? How many reelections will you have to go through telling these people that these projects are coming into your area?

Those voting “yes,” you may hope that your constituents do not fully understand the process here, and you can tell them that we need money for mass transit; we need money for new highways; look at your berms; look at your roadways. However, your constituents will understand and do understand what a surplus is, and they will understand it when you tell them this government has to dig into their pocket to take tax money to fix these roads. No one says that our roads are in fine shape; no one says that mass transit does not need help. Some people tell me that our Governor wants to run for President in 3 years. Therefore, this administration may be out of here by the year 2000. I personally think with proposals such as this, he may have trouble next year in 1998.

Will a new administration, a new PennDOT Secretary, fulfill the promises, fulfill their promises made to you and your constituents? They certainly did not to my constituents regarding the Kiski Valley Expressway. To those of you voting “yes” on this proposal, all I can say is, good luck. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair returns to leaves of absence and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Itkin, who requests a leave for the balance of today’s session for the gentleman from Northumberland County, Mr. BELFANTI.

Without objection, the leave is granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 67 CONTINUED

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

Mr. WALKO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to oppose concurrence on HB 67.

I represent communities in the city of Pittsburgh and just outside the city. I do not represent the kind of district which was referred to in the survey earlier. In my district, if you have enough money, you do not go and ask for more money. My taxpayers will not understand, and they do not want me to ask them for more taxes when we have enough money now. I do not understand it.

Furthermore, this gasoline tax hike and registration fee hike is a very, very regressive endeavor. I do not think we are considering the kind of people whom I represent. I represent families who are just making it by on their family budget. They do not have an extra \$5 a week; they do not have an extra hundred dollars a year. I represent families who are itching and scratching for every penny they can get to make up for tuition increases for their children. I represent many elderly couples who are on fixed incomes, who must rely on the automobile, who do not have an extra \$10 a month, who do not have an extra \$20 every 2 months. They do not have any extra money, and they do not understand how I could ask them for more taxes, a tax hike, when I have enough money now as a State Representative to adequately do all the repairs we need. The man struggling with two minimum-wage jobs, the one who used to have health-care coverage, I represent those kinds of people, and they do not want to give us more taxes when we already have enough money to do the job. We are hurting the little guy, and I am against it.

What we are doing with a \$500-million surplus, \$1 billion when you look at all of our accounts, is taxing and hoarding, taxing and hoarding, and I am not going to be on board. I am not going to tax and hoard. I am not on board.

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

Mr. JAMES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, just to reiterate a couple comments that I liked that I heard — I am not on board, and do not blame me.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support a tax increase against the working people of Pennsylvania when the State already boasts and exceeds funds of nearly \$1 billion. That includes a budget surplus that could top \$500 million by the end of this fiscal year in June, money that belongs to the people of Pennsylvania, not Governor Ridge.

I cannot support a tax increase when the State just kicked nearly more than 200,000 Pennsylvanians off medical assistance. It is mean-spirited for the Governor to pave the roads of this State on the backs of Pennsylvania's most vulnerable residents.

I cannot support a tax increase when the legislators in this chamber have had only a few hours to review this 112-page bill. The proposal was officially made public today.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Pennsylvania deserve public hearings so they can review a bill that would cost them millions of dollars.

Once again, the Governor has turned his back on our needy residents. The funding formula in this plan would hurt cities and rural areas while it would help wealthy suburbs, and some counties would get less. The 3.5-percent gas tax increase would take effect May 1, right before most gas and service stations boost their prices to draw revenue from the increased summer traffic. So the people will suffer a greater tax increase than any of us have imagined. There is no doubt that many of our roads need work, but this is not the way to do it.

Mr. Speaker, there are alternatives to raising taxes. There are alternatives to making the working people of this State dig deeper into their pockets to pay for programs when the funding is already available.

Earlier this year, I introduced a tax fairness measure, which would simply add financial securities to those items of commerce that are subject to a sales tax. Although a tax on the transfer or sale

of financial securities has existed in the past, there is currently no sales tax on the selling of stocks, bonds, derivatives, and other such financial investments. My legislation would eliminate the need for a tax increase.

At the small proposed rate of two-tenths of 1 percent, or 20 cents per \$100, the Commonwealth would likely realize revenues, Mr. Speaker, of at least \$1.5 billion — and that is a low estimate — in the first year. This is true even though the small investors would hardly feel it. If someone sells 1,000 dollars' worth of stock, a tax of \$2 would be imposed, and some of the possible allocations, Mr. Speaker, of the \$1.5-billion revenue could be used — \$700 million to establish a fund for community development programs and infrastructure improvements, including the maintenance of roads and bridges at prevailing union wages; and the rest could be divided up among various projects: \$250 million to ensure full funding for medical assistance with the restoration of those individuals that were cut from the system under Act 35; \$200 million for basic and higher education; \$350 million to finance a two-tenths-of-1-percent cut in the personal income tax, from 2.8 to 2.6 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the gas tax is regressive. We need this tax fairness. We need to shift the burden from our overtaxed working people and middle-class population to those who are more able to pay. Everyone is paying at least 6 percent sales tax in Pennsylvania, so why not impose the tax on the million-dollar deals done so casually by the rich.

The administration has slashed services for the needy. Now it wants to raise taxes to pay for road construction in the districts of those who show their support for the mean-spirited tax increase.

Mr. Speaker, since the resources are clearly available to avert a tax increase, I believe it is morally incumbent upon us as responsible public officials to act now. Right now, though, I hope the Governor and his administration open their eyes because at some point the people of Pennsylvania will demand that their public officials be held accountable for the consequences of their actions.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support and hope my colleagues will vote "no" on this tax increase. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westmoreland County, Mr. Mihalich.

Mr. MIHALICH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this administration is nothing if not consistent, and let me draw not an analogy, but let me point out something that is going on in my district.

A couple of decades ago the steel industry as well as the coal industry collapsed. We had a lot of human suffering there. One of the ways that the local community, the city of Monessen, the county of Westmoreland, and the State tried to provide some succor was to establish a Mon Valley Health Center in Monessen in which they would have under one roof services such as Welfare, the Department of Health, several senior citizen organizations, that kind of thing, and have it under one roof at a location easily accessible by public transportation. Just about a few days ago, this administration announced that they were going to close that office and relocate it in Greensburg.

Now, there is no public transportation between the Mon Valley and Greensburg, and it just seems like— And I had one of my constituents call me the other day and say, what the heck are they trying to do to us? They said, first they want to make us walk to

Greensburg to get a check. You know, welfare people do not get that kind of respect that anybody would wonder how they might get to the office. Twenty-eight employees will have to get to Greensburg from the Mon Valley. They are setting up a gauntlet for these people to try to get to Greensburg. Then this person who called me said, it seems like somebody in Harrisburg says, okay, now we are going to force them to take cars to Greensburg to get to that welfare office, the employees as well as the applicants and the recipients, they are going to have to take cars, so how can we squeeze them a little bit more? Why not raise the gas tax?

This is sadistic, Mr. Speaker. We have hurt poor people and middle-income people so much that I can understand this is perfectly in line. This is where we are coming from in this State, at least under this leadership that we have in the State. We cannot have welfare recipients going to a convenient location. Let us make them take cars. I do not know where they are going to get a car — beg, borrow, or steal. But anyway, the cars run on gasoline, and we will increase their gasoline tax, at least get a little back out of them. This is what it seems like. It is onerous; it is sadistic.

In previous correspondence, I had made an analogy for these people in the Mon Valley to get 25, 30 miles away to sign up for benefits. It is like the Batan March or the Trail of Tears from Florida to Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, this is truly sadistic because this is aimed primarily for poor people who cannot afford it.

Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, let me try to answer a question that was raised earlier by somebody but it never received an answer. It was about the width of trucks and the width of the roads. A hundred and two inches is 8½ feet. Two trucks side by side is obviously 17 feet, and if you have any mirrors sticking out, which most trucks do, we are talking about decapitating some bicyclers. I know there are some bicycle enthusiasts in this House, and I was at one time myself, but there are two reasons: Number one, it is pretty hard for me to bicycle anymore with one lung; and number two, I would certainly lose the other one if I went out bicycling on these roads with two 102-inch trucks passing side by side.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank you for allowing me to make those observations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Washington County, Mr. Daley.

Mr. DALEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the chairman of the Transportation Committee stand for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Geist, indicates that he is willing to stand for interrogation. The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. DALEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just two real quick questions, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, the former speaker asked you about on what highways will these vehicles be permitted to travel, and I think you said on all numbered highways. Am I correct?

Mr. GEIST. Numbered State roads.

Mr. DALEY. But it is my understanding, Mr. Speaker — and correct me if I am wrong — that all State roads, all State highways are numbered. Am I correct?

Mr. GEIST. That is not correct. There are rural roads in the State system that are not marked.

Mr. DALEY. Could you repeat that, sir?

Mr. GEIST. There are rural roads in the State system that are not marked.

Mr. DALEY. Could you tell us what percentage of the State highway system is considered unnumbered?

Mr. GEIST. I have no idea. I could not give you that answer. I could take a guess, but I could not tell you.

Mr. DALEY. I have no idea of any unnumbered State roads in rural Washington or Fayette Counties. Maybe you could be more specific as to what type of roads would be unnumbered. Are you talking about paved roads or dirt roads? What type of roads?

Mr. GEIST. Yes, some of them are paved. A lot of them that are dirt were covered in this bill, of course, as you know — \$5 million for the dirt roads.

Mr. DALEY. So for all intents and purposes, what we are saying, with the last speaker's question, is that basically 99 percent of the roads in Pennsylvania that are State roads, that are numbered, would be covered by this exceptional width of these trucks.

Mr. GEIST. I could not hang my hat on a 99-percent number. The majority of roads in Pennsylvania in the State system of 43,000 miles-plus are numbered.

Mr. DALEY. The next question is liquid fuels, Mr. Speaker, and I do not know if someone asked you a question about any liquid fuels and how this affects liquid fuels in this bill. Is there an effect on liquid fuels? I know there is an expansion to alternative fuels. Could you explain to us if it is going to affect liquid fuels and in what way?

Mr. GEIST. If the question is natural gas cars, electric cars, everything will be taxed on an equivalency of the Btu's (British thermal unit) used basis. It takes so many Btu's to fire an automobile with gasoline. The Btu equivalence for electricity and natural gas will be used.

Mr. DALEY. My question to you, Mr. Speaker, then on the liquid fuels formula that goes back to the municipalities, how would this impact on the local municipalities, if at all?

Mr. GEIST. It is going to impact greatly. There will be a 12-percent increase above the amount that they are currently receiving. Currently local municipalities receive 11.7 percent of the total pie. Now they will receive an additional 12 percent — not 12 percent, 12 percent more, then multiplied times the 11.7. It is \$24 million.

Mr. DALEY. Mr. Speaker, is that a one-shot deal for the local municipalities?

Mr. GEIST. No, it is not, Mr. Speaker. That will continue on.

Mr. DALEY. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have no further questions. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Thomas, seek recognition? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I had decided early on or made a decision early on that I was not going to comment with respect to this bill, HB 67, and I am going to hold tight to that. But what I have to do is to at least set the record straight with respect to where Representative Thomas is on this whole issue, and to that end, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary for me to give my colleagues on both sides of the aisle a picture of my legislative district.

I am fortunate. God has blessed me to represent a district where I was born, raised, went to public school, completed undergraduate

school, went to graduate school in the district that I am now representing, and I continue from birth, and as far as I know, I worship and continue to worship in the district that I now represent. Being one of eight children, raised by a single parent, God has been real good, but people need to know something about the 181st Legislative District.

I have, as many other districts do, a growing population of elderly people, elderly people who do not have the luxury of having an automobile to get to and from where they need to go, whether it is to get their medicine or whether it is to do their basic shopping. Many of them do not have access to an automobile. In one part of my district, there are six senior citizen developments alone, not considering other parts of the district. And, Mr. Speaker, I made a decision a long time ago, and that is that the constituents of my district could not afford any increases in mass transit rates. I made a decision a long time ago that my constituents could not face another series of changing routes, another series of not knowing whether the 47 bus was going to run on H Street or whether that line was going to be cut out.

Regardless of what one might think about the Phoenix Report, which somewhat laid out why we need to take some affirmative steps to deal with our roads and bridges, the Phoenix Report indicated that unless mass transit received some additional funding, especially in light of the fact that the Federal Government is diminishing its resources to cities like Philadelphia County and States like Pennsylvania, in light of that, Mr. Speaker, the Phoenix Report indicated that if mass transit was not subject to some affirmative assistance, that routes would have to be changed, rates would have to be increased, and roads, because in my district, I have the luxury of the Broad Street Line, which runs from Vine Street all the way up to Glenwood, and right above Glenwood is the North Philadelphia train station. Broad Street is a State highway, and there are parts of Broad Street in the interior part of my district where you almost have to do a dance in order to avoid the potholes and avoid some of the other problems with that Broad Street Line.

To talk about the subway system, the subway system in many places along Broad Street, you need a gun in order to go in and out of the subway system with some level of comfortability. In many cases, the system stations are dim, dark, and dirty. And, Mr. Speaker, I have constantly raised the question, constantly raised the question that in order to increase constituents' capacity to move back and forth to where they need to go, there needs to be a mass transit system that is reasonable, clean, safe, and provides some level of security.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about interests and when we talk about why we must do the things that we do, we have to take in consideration what is in the best interests of not only the people that we represent but the 12.7 million people in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. So to that end, wherever there has been an opportunity, has been an opportunity to provide my constituents with a transportation system that is reasonable, accessible, safe, and secure, Mr. Speaker, I am bound to take advantage of that opportunity.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I represent in my district three labor organizations — Local 332, Local 57, and another union that deals with highway maintenance and construction — and, Mr. Speaker, over the last couple years they have complained about diminishing work opportunities; they have complained about the need for more

jobs. Now, I do not know whether the data is correct or incorrect, but what they have said to me is that with this increase, it will generate at least 4,500 jobs. Now, I do not know whether that is correct or not. What I do know, additional revenues can bring about additional employment opportunities.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the Building and Trades Council has been, if not aloof, totally removed from people in my district and in other parts of Philadelphia having an opportunity to become a part of the Building and Trades Council and take advantage of employment opportunities that arise out of that council. So, Mr. Speaker, there is a commitment on the table by the Building and Trades Council, and that is that if this bill passes, that they will in fact make more job opportunities available to people not only in my district but in other parts of urban, suburban, and rural Pennsylvania.

So, Mr. Speaker, jobs are extremely important. I remember when I came into this General Assembly and we were talking about at that time raising the minimum wage, and I said at that time, which was my first opportunity to address this august body, that on an increase in basic wages, the minimum wage was not an issue that was negotiable. It was not an issue where we could wait until tomorrow or wait until next year. And on the question of jobs, that has been my basic position — any and all opportunities — because, you see, Mr. Speaker, there are parts of my district where unemployment is literally over 40 percent. There are people who have given up on ever having an opportunity to go to work primarily because there are opportunities there but there are not the opportunities for them to take advantage of the opportunities, and so to that end, doors must be opened; opportunities must be made available. I am confident that if this bill passes, that it is going to afford people who have been locked out from employment opportunities a chance to go to work, a chance to get a skill, and an opportunity to take care of their families in a real and meaningful way.

And last but not least, Mr. Speaker, last but not least, we have been asked through the electoral process to come to this process and not be bound by what is happening today, but our constituents, from wherever they come, asked us to be visionaries, to be visionaries to not be caught up in the whim of the moment or be caught up in the emotionalism of today but take time to look at that larger picture.

When I look at the larger picture, what do I see? Mr. Speaker, I see that if not in the 1997-98 legislative term, definitely in the 1999-year-2000 legislative term, we are going to have to fund the courts 100 percent. That is an issue that we cannot avoid but for so long. We are going to have to put our money where our mouth is, stand by our responsibility, and fund the courts in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to the fullest.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we had a tragedy last year, we had a tragedy last year that dilapidated many of our bridges, our roads, and the maintenance of our roads all across Pennsylvania, and because God is a good God, we have not suffered that same calamity this year. But if we look at neighboring States, if we look at the State of Ohio, if we look at the State of Dakota, if we look at Minnesota, if we look around this country, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we have to be clear about is tragedies are unpredictable, and it is quite possible that this year, next year, we can be faced with another 1996 tragedy, and we will have to look

to our strengths, our talents, and our resources to address those tragedies.

The question of infrastructure repair has been put off too long. It is now time to step up to the plate and come up with an infrastructure repair program that clearly addresses many of the trouble spots throughout Pennsylvania. There is nothing written that says that it has got to be your district or my district. It is written, it is written that we take care of those roads and bridges that are in the worst repair. It is written that we have a responsibility to deal with those issues, and it is written that we have a responsibility to deal with tragedies. Even though we have nothing to do with the existence of the tragedy, we have a responsibility to deal with certain circumstances as they arise. And to that end, to that end, we need to stay as close as possible to what resources that we have or that we might be able to generate, because one thing is for sure: Faced with a calamity, faced with a calamity, you only have two choices — you either can deal with it because you have the capacity to deal with it and have the resources available to deal with it or you can just sit down and pray.

But as the book of Matthew makes very clear, faith without work and work without resources do not mean anything. We can talk all we want about the fire, the tragic fire that killed so many people last week. We can talk all we want about the bridge that goes from Harrisburg or Camp Hill, how that bridge needs to be replaced. We could talk all we want about how we want to do something, but if you do not have the resources to do it, then all it is, is just talk.

And so, Mr. Speaker, last but not least, we have an education problem that we are going to have to resolve very soon. The city of Philadelphia is already saying that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania owes them \$52 million at a minimum — at a minimum — but regardless of what side you come down on with respect to the \$52 million, one thing is clear — that those lawsuits brought by rural Pennsylvanians, those lawsuits brought by urban Pennsylvanians, and those lawsuits that are surely to come from suburban Pennsylvanians on the question of public education are going to find a resting place very soon, and when they do, we cannot just say, oh, I feel bad about public education. No, we are going to have to deal with that issue, and we cannot deal with that issue from a position of weakness or a position of bankruptcy. We can only effectively deal with those issues from a position of strength.

So I felt that it was important to say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle — and I am not going to coin a nice phrase, because I can stand up here and say, blame me for holding the rates down in my district. I could stand up here and say, blame me for preventing a rerouting of major transportation and services in my district. I could stand up here and say that, but I am not going to say that because I totally support and lift up my colleagues on both sides of the aisle whether they are pro or con on this issue. I am standing, I am standing because I have got to stand on any opportunities that allow me to hold down rates for the elderly people in my district. I have got to stand up on any opportunity that allows me to prevent a cutback in transportation services. I have got to stand on any opportunity that allows a generation of additional employment opportunities for not only the 181 but for districts all across this Commonwealth, and I felt that it was imperative that you hear that and that you know that.

And so to that end, if, as we used to say in law school, your situation is similarly situated, then join me in standing up to hold back on rates, to repair damaged bridges and roadways; join me in standing up to prevent a cutback in transportation; join me in standing up to allow for greater employment opportunities for those who need it the most. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For the information of the members, the following members are still waiting to speak: Corpora, Horsey, Bebko-Jones, Dermody, and Itkin.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Northampton County, Mr. Corpora.

Mr. CORPORA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

May I interrogate the Republican chairman of the Transportation Committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Geist, indicates that he will stand for interrogation.

But before you begin, the Chair would like to ask the members to please take their conversations outside the hall of the House. We have been very good tonight, but it is starting to get a little loud in here. It is going to be very difficult for this interrogation to take place. Members, please take your conversations outside the hall of the House.

Mr. Corpora, you are in order.

Mr. CORPORA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have gotten through most of this bill; it is 112 pages, but I notice that it is much more than just a gas tax and fee-increase bill. I am concerned mostly about the truck provisions and the two-trailer provisions. Does this bill in fact allow the size of trucks to be driven on our roads in the Commonwealth to be 9½ feet wide counting the mirror width?

Mr. GEIST. Mr. Speaker, the trucks that will be allowed to run on Pennsylvania roads are the trucks that we agreed to when the Federal Government changed the requirements on length and width. Pennsylvania went along with that. The only thing that we did not change in Pennsylvania was the overall length requirement. We are one of the few States. This will bring our language in the provisions that will match the language of the Federal Government when it comes to trucking so that we are consistent with the rest of the States in the country.

Mr. CORPORA. But just to be clear, we are increasing it to 9½ feet with mirror length, the width of trucks, by this provision in the bill.

Mr. GEIST. We are not increasing anything. Those trucks will be the same today as they were yesterday. That is the same size truck.

Mr. CORPORA. That is not a change in this bill?

Mr. GEIST. It is just an approval process.

Mr. CORPORA. Does the bill contain a provision that would permit these trucks to be driven on roads now that are just 10 feet wide?

Mr. GEIST. Mr. Speaker, we have answered this question now, this is probably the fifth or sixth time. How many more times are we going to do it? The answer is well known over there, and this is almost frivolous interrogation.

Mr. CORPORA. I am just concerned, and I just wanted to make it clear that there are 9½-foot-wide trucks that are going to be driven on 10-foot-wide roads in Pennsylvania, and conceivably, if there are two trucks passing and they are in their proper lane of travel, we could have a foot or less of room space. That is one of

my concerns, and we are permitting that under the language of this bill now. Correct?

Mr. GEIST. We will be permitting it only on numbered State routes that are not marked or posted.

Mr. CORPORA. What about if there is a violation of this width requirement? What happens? It looks like there is no penalty at all. In fact, I think—

Mr. GEIST. Well, you have to go into the penalty section. There are adequate penalties there. And you have many truckers who have probably come to your district office who have gotten written up for the \$300-plus cost.

Mr. CORPORA. Looking on page 41 where it indicates that there is a penalty fee of just \$50 and that if there is a violation of the width ordinance—

Mr. GEIST. If you read the bill, it is only if the sign was not posted.

Mr. CORPORA. I am looking on page 41 of the bill.

Mr. GEIST. That is correct.

Mr. CORPORA. If the road is not posted—

Mr. GEIST. If the State forgets to put the sign up, then the penalty is only \$50. If the road is posted and they run on it, it is a \$300 fine. That has not changed.

Mr. CORPORA. It looks like there is an exclusion under section 4921, which is the width requirement for trucks.

Mr. GEIST. No. We have changed nothing when it comes to length or width of a truck.

Mr. CORPORA. The sentence then that says, "A PERSON CITED UNDER THIS SUBSECTION SHALL NOT BE SUBJECT TO CITATION UNDER SECTION 4921...." What does that mean?

Mr. GEIST. What it means, once again, if the sign is not there and they run on the road, it is a \$50 fine. If the sign is there and they run on that road, it is a \$300 fine.

Mr. CORPORA. Moving on. What is the purpose of the weigh stations in Pennsylvania?

Mr. GEIST. It is pretty answer— If you do not know the answer to that, it is to weigh trucks.

Mr. CORPORA. And how many permanent stationary weigh stations do we have in Pennsylvania— permanent stationary weigh stations?

Mr. GEIST. I do not have the figure in front of me. We can get it for you from PennDOT.

Mr. CORPORA. I heard that—

Mr. GEIST. I could not even tell you the number of portable scales out there, but I can tell you that they do a heck of a job on enforcement now.

Mr. CORPORA. It is my understanding that we have just one— just one— of those stations. Is there any provision in the bill that would fund additional permanent stationary weigh stations?

Mr. GEIST. No, but municipalities are even purchasing their own scales now.

Mr. CORPORA. Are there any provisions in the bill that would aid municipalities in purchasing these scales?

Mr. GEIST. They are already doing it, and they have a 12-percent increase in their liquid fuels moneys.

Mr. CORPORA. But nothing specifically for the weigh station enforcement provisions. We are not aiding that effort with this bill. Correct?

Mr. GEIST. Municipalities can buy anything they want to buy, and they can even do it. They get a return on the fines, and that is what a lot of municipalities are doing.

Mr. CORPORA. My concern about not helping out the weigh station situation is related to the provision on page 37 where it appears we are changing the inspection requirements for the trailers. Now, these are trailers that are in excess of 10,000 pounds. Today—

Mr. GEIST. That is correct, Mr. Speaker. We have had this; we have gone over this now I do not know how many times. We are trying to get the trailers from other States that are not inspected period, and there are some States when I run down the road and when you run down that turnpike and you look at that plate, I instinctively think of something that is not inspected.

We want that \$135 lifetime plate registration for Pennsylvania. We want that trailer that is never inspected to be inspected once a year in Pennsylvania. We want that vehicle to be safe. That is the answer to the question.

Mr. CORPORA. But that is not what my question was. My concern is this, that we are going to have trucks with trailers, double trailers in excess of 10,000 pounds, which we presently require to be inspected two times a year, will now just be inspected one time. We will not be providing additional funding for weigh stations, and we are going to allow them to drive on roads that are more narrow. Is all of that correct?

Mr. GEIST. Could you repeat the question? I am—

Mr. CORPORA. Yes. A truck that has two trailers attached to it, each weighing in excess of 10,000 pounds, presently has to be inspected two times per year.

Mr. GEIST. That is not true.

Mr. CORPORA. That is not true.

Mr. GEIST. That is absolutely. If you have out-of-State registration— we have already said Maine and Georgia— they do not have to be inspected period and they can run down the road today.

Mr. CORPORA. And what change— Not to interrupt you.

Mr. GEIST. We cannot get in the way of ICC (Interstate Commerce Commission). I mean, there are all kinds of things that are out there that we want to improve in Pennsylvania, and the Transportation Committee has been addressing those for the 20 years that I have been here.

Mr. CORPORA. Maybe I am just making the questions be too confusing. A trailer that weighs in excess of 10,000 pounds today has to be inspected how many times per year?

Mr. GEIST. Where?

Mr. CORPORA. Well, I am looking at section 4903.

Mr. GEIST. No. What State?

Mr. CORPORA. Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEIST. If it is in Pennsylvania, that is correct.

Mr. CORPORA. Two times?

Mr. GEIST. In Pennsylvania; if it is a Pennsylvania-registered truck.

Mr. CORPORA. And in Pennsylvania after this bill, it is going to be one time. Correct?

Mr. GEIST. Yes. For all trailers.

Mr. CORPORA. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further questions. I would just like to speak on the bill very briefly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. CORPORA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is not a bill that just increases the cost of gas for consumers or increases their registration fees, but it certainly does all of that. It is also not a bill that forces drivers to leave my district, leave the gas stations in Easton, Pennsylvania, and drive to New Jersey, but it is going to do that also. But in addition to all this, this bill, which just appears to be a simple 3½-cent gas tax increase, raises serious safety concerns.

For all of these reasons I oppose it. Thank you.

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

Mr. HORSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support and ask my colleagues from my particular delegation to support HB 67, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I have been informed, by way of a letter and by phone, that the mayor wants this because he needs to have support for the 300,000 annual riders of my local mass transportation system. He said that between \$90 and perhaps \$400 million over the next 5 years is needed in the city of Philadelphia. We need to have these funds in Philadelphia, and if we do not get them today, Mr. Speaker, by way of vote, we may never, this opportunity may never present itself to Philadelphia mass transportation by way of the State again. So my mayor has requested that I cast a vote in favor of HB 67.

Mr. Speaker, by way of telephone again, the Teamsters Union— Mr. Speaker, one of the largest ports not just in Pennsylvania but in the world, Philadelphia Port brings items in by way of ship. Guess how they get from Philadelphia to Erie or Philadelphia to Dauphin County or Philadelphia to Pittsburgh? They go by way of road driven by drivers and drivers of tractors and trailers, Mr. Speaker, and the Teamsters have said, we are in favor of this particular legislation. Well, they are the largest trucking union in the country and the largest trucking union in the State, Mr. Speaker, and they are the ones who are going to pay additional money, Mr. Speaker, for this gas tax, and it is very strange that they are in favor of this gas tax, which is a gas tax on them to build them better roads.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, a national magazine did a survey, and they did a survey of all the drivers all over the country, and they requested from those drivers their ideas on what they thought were the worst highways in America. Guess what State was chosen, Mr. Speaker, as having the worst roads in America by truckers who were on those roads every day on a daily basis? Texas, California, Washington State; they came from all over, and their response was, Pennsylvania had the worst highways in America.

Now, the third persons who want this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is the building trades, Mr. Speaker, and that sort of makes it personal, because my father was in the building trades for 40 years, and the AFL-CIO, the building trades, Pat Gillespie, has said, we need this; we need to build America and we need to build highways in America. So that is why I am for this legislation, Mr. Speaker. But more than being for this legislation because these three groups have said we need to be for this legislation, this legislation is important to the 190th District, which is my legislative district, and it is important to me.

Now, SEPTA, Mr. Speaker, a year ago, through no prodding of any politicians that I know of, has committed between \$10 and \$50 million in the renovation of the Market and Frankford El, which is a major route in the city of Philadelphia that runs through Philadelphia, and what would that mean to me? That means people who catch the bus or the El at 40th and Market, people who catch the bus or El at 52d and Market, people who catch the El at 60th and Market are guaranteed for another 10 to 20 years that they will have a way of getting to work on time.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this legislation because it is personal, because it means that constituents who need to get to work on time, who need to go back and forth, working people, 52d and Market, can be assured that they will be protected and be able to get back and forth to work.

Mr. Speaker, I have a union that opposed this legislation — I will not name — that approached me and said we are not for this legislation. And I said, well, why not? I heard all the unions were for this legislation. Because there is something about privatization, you know, in this legislation. Well, I went to the legislation, and guess what, Mr. Speaker? I have fulfilled my responsibility in Harrisburg, Mr. Speaker. As a Philadelphia legislator in Harrisburg, I have fulfilled my responsibility because there is no privatization of any services of SEPTA in this legislation, Mr. Speaker. If there is privatization later on, you need to get with the SEPTA board and you need to get with the appropriate people who are able to make decisions about privatization, but on the State level, it is not in this legislation, which is why again, Mr. Speaker, I am supporting HB 67, and I would ask that the Philadelphia delegation also support HB 67. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the lady from Erie County, Representative Bebko-Jones.

Ms. BEBKO-JONES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have no other choice this evening but to vote against HB 67. Why, Mr. Speaker? When my constituents in Erie — and this is where our Governor is from, Erie — were aware of the almost \$1-billion surplus, they asked me, "Linda, is this or is this not our tax money, or does it belong to this administration?" I told them, yes, it is their tax money. Overwhelmingly, my constituents said to me, use that money that we have already given to the State of Pennsylvania to help maintain those roads, Mr. Speaker.

In the last couple days, Mr. Speaker, I have witnessed all kinds of deals being made in exchange for a gas tax increase. In the interest of integrity and fairness, Mr. Speaker, I simply cannot sell out my constituents for a promise of a special project.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the colleagues of mine on both sides of the aisle to go back to the month of December 1996. I want to refresh your memory, the month of December 1996. In December, our Governor said that if we had a surplus — if we had a surplus — I would just as soon give it back to Pennsylvanians rather than put it in the government's pocket. Those are not my words, Mr. Speaker. They are Governor Tom Ridge's words, Mr. Speaker, and I do not believe that HB 67 is giving back to our constituents.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to really think about what you are doing this evening and vote for your constituents. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if we vote for this gas tax increase and this increase in our registration fees, we are also voting for a big change in the road maintenance formula for our highways, and that is a bad decision and a bad vote for Allegheny County.

It is going to change the maintenance formula. I will not try to get too complicated with you, but right now we have a formula that considers vehicle miles and lane miles, and the emphasis will be placed from vehicle miles to lane miles, and there are a lot more lane miles, let us say, in Wayne County than there are in Allegheny County, but if you calculate vehicle miles and all the cars in Allegheny County on the highway and all the gallons of gas and all the registration fees in Allegheny County, we pay more.

Now, I received a letter this week from our county commissioners urging us to support this tax, urging us to support a cut in maintenance for the roads in Allegheny County. Now, if you live and drive in Allegheny County, you know that we need our roads fixed and our bridges repaired and you know that we want this done first — fix our roads, repair our bridges — and to ask us to vote for a cut in our maintenance is incredible.

You ought to consider the balance of payments for the taxpayers of Allegheny County, because what this maintenance formula does, if this passes, is create a situation where the taxpayers of Allegheny County are going to live in Allegheny County, work in Allegheny County, drive in Allegheny County, buy their gasoline in Allegheny County, pay the increased gas tax, pay the increased registration fees. The Commonwealth is going to collect all that money and they are going to send it out of Allegheny County at a disproportionate rate, at an incredible rate, and we lose big. This is a mistake for the residents of Allegheny County, and all we are asking for is fairness. It is not in this formula. Our commissioners should not be asking us to vote for something like this, and we should not vote for something like this. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Erie County, Mr. Scrimenti.

Mr. SCRIMENTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday, April 15, was a day that rings in many of our minds about being the tax deadline date for income tax returns. My wife, who is an accountant, has completed tax returns for the past several weeks and quite a few of them, and not one person told her that they were not paying enough in taxes.

Additionally, I live in a rural legislative district, and the gas tax places just another barrier, just another obstacle for people who already have difficulty accessing services, getting to jobs, things like that. I think we as a State have an obligation that with a surplus, we should not be raising taxes. Plain and simple, it is just not good government to raise taxes with a surplus. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Montgomery County, Mr. Lawless, is recognized on concurrence.

Mr. LAWLESS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight — and I had no intentions of speaking — but I rise out of concern for the taxpayers of Pennsylvania.

I heard tonight a number of Democrat speakers stand up, and since 1991 in my first year in the House, somehow religion has come upon them. They are now against taxes. In 1991 they were for taxes. In 1991 I remember, as a Republican member, our brain

trust in our caucus telling us how we could come up with money for arguments against the 1991 taxes. At that time we had a deficit. I did not vote for taxes at that time, although it passed — a \$3-billion tax increase. I have heard of tax increases tonight anywhere from \$400 million to \$1 billion. In some cases, \$4 billion this is going to wind up being. The fact of the matter is, this is another tax increase.

Tonight we are talking about increasing taxes to the everyday person in Pennsylvania — not the wealthy, not the poor — the people who work every day. What concerns me the most is the politics that happens. The Democrats are for it. Then we get a Republican administration with a Republican Governor and all of a sudden we have Republicans who want to vote taxes. What we have to do is realize the people of Pennsylvania and the commitments that we made when we ran for office that we were going to control taxes. Well, if you want to control taxes, we are talking here tonight about 1 to 2 percent. If you do not believe that there is 1 or 2 percent in our budget that we can cut out, 1 or 2 percent fat, then you go ahead and vote for this. I happen to believe that there is 1 or 2 percent fat in this State, in the appropriations to be given out to the people of Pennsylvania, and I think we can cut it. There is no need for a gas tax; there is no need for a registration tax.

I hope that somewhere Democrats and Republicans begin to believe in the people of Pennsylvania and vote this down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Democratic whip, the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Itkin.

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to get some clarification, and I would like if the chairman of the House Transportation Committee could stand for an interrogation.

THE SPEAKER (MATTHEW J. RYAN) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Geist, will stand for interrogation. You may begin.

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that we have not had much of an opportunity on this side of the aisle to really examine this bill in detail, but I also trust that you have not had that much additional time either. So if you have to resort to staff for help, you know, be my guest, and I understand the problem.

Let me say that the first point I want to try to clarify is that in the Rules Committee when we amended the bill and reported it out, you mentioned to me that there was a 6-cent tax that was imposed on diesel fuel and that that somehow was going to be replaced—

Mr. GEIST. That is correct.

Mr. ITKIN. —by a 5-cent tax that was going to be paid, not at the quarterly reports but I guess integrated into the bulk price.

Mr. GEIST. Yes; that is correct. The actual number is .55 mills, and that is plus or minus, probably on the minus side of a nickel a gallon.

Mr. ITKIN. All right. Now, here is my dilemma, and I hope that you can give me a good response. What I understand is that the 6-cent tax applied to trucks that were in excess of 17,000 pounds.

Mr. GEIST. That is correct.

Mr. ITKIN. But that the new tax of 5 cents will be imposed on all diesel-fuel users.

Mr. GEIST. That is correct.

Mr. ITKIN. So in essence, there are people who own trucks of less than 17,000 pounds or vehicles, cars, that run on diesel fuel which will now pay 3½ cents plus 5 cents, and they are going to experience a whopping 8½-cent tax increase, and I do not believe that was intended, but I think that is part of the bill.

Mr. GEIST. That is exactly what it was intended to do, and that is why the amount is a lesser amount on the top end.

Mr. ITKIN. You intended to impose an additional 8½ cents on the smaller trucks and on cars that use diesel fuel?

Mr. GEIST. No. It is—

Mr. ITKIN. But the bill has—

Mr. GEIST. It is 38½ mills May 1—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will yield.

Mr. GEIST. —on the wholesale price—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will yield.

Conferences on the floor, cease. Conferences in the vicinity of the two speakers, please cease.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. GEIST. 38½ mills on the wholesale price of petroleum May 1; 55 mills October 1 on the diesel fuel.

Mr. ITKIN. Okay. So, I mean, you have already admitted it. From what you are telling me then, as I understand it then, this is not a 3½-cent increase for a certain select group of people who own light trucks under 17,000 pounds or people who use diesel fuels in automobiles. They will be subject to an 8½-cent tax. I mean, you say that was your intention. All right. Well, let us get it out. Let us get it out that the small truck owner is now going to be faced with an 8½-cent tax. I do not know whether your caucus knew about it. We did not know about it, I did not know about it, until we started to peruse the bill and started to see these things in this huge document.

Okay. Let us go to the next question. Now, can you answer—

Mr. GEIST. Do you want to finish that up with the quarterly report then?

Mr. ITKIN. No. I assume the quarterly report only deals with the heavier trucks over 17,000 pounds.

Mr. GEIST. All diesel fuel now will be taxed at the distributor level and not at the pump.

Mr. ITKIN. I understand—

Mr. GEIST. Okay.

Mr. ITKIN. —but the 6 cents that we impose under current law is only applied to trucks over 17,000 pounds—

Mr. GEIST. At the pump.

Mr. ITKIN. —and if you are under 17,000 pounds, you do not pay the 6 cents. So a repeal of the 6 cents is not going to benefit the person with a truck under 17,000 pounds.

Mr. GEIST. Okay.

Mr. ITKIN. All right. Well, a mistake was made. All right. I think a mistake was made. I do not think anyone in the legislature would like to impose an 8½-cent tax on small truck owners. I do not think that was your intention.

Mr. GEIST. Am I still under interrogation?

Mr. ITKIN. No, you are not.

Mr. GEIST. Okay.

Mr. ITKIN. The second point I have is, I guess, you know, I am concerned about the total— And you can have a chance to respond later on, but I have a certain number of questions I would like to get the answer to, and—

Mr. GEIST. I will be more than delighted to try to answer them.

Mr. ITKIN. And I think you were very honest in that answer.

The second question I am trying to find out is, you know, we impose a 40.8-cent gas tax — total; that is State and Federal. Actually, if you divide it, it is 18.4-cent Federal, 22.4 State. But it does not make any difference. Our constituents pay 40.8 cents. Now, a lot of that Federal money is going into the Highway Trust Fund and is unavailable to use in Pennsylvania. Is that correct?

Mr. GEIST. The Highway Trust Fund currently has a huge surplus that is being held by Congress and the President against the deficit, where it truly should not be. It is part of the liquid fuels trust. It should go back to the States where it belongs, and it is probably in the neighborhood of \$1.4 billion that is owed the State by the Federal Government.

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that you said that. I am glad you believe that that money ought to come back to the States, because I would like to refresh your memory, or at least advise you if you do not have a knowledge, that in 1990, that was the first time that the Congress had a gas-tax diversion. In other words, up until that, you imposed a Federal gas tax and it went to the States to be used for projects. But in 1990 the Congress passed a 2½-cents-per-gallon tax, 2½-cents-per-gallon Federal tax, but said that that money would go into the Highway Trust Fund and the States were not, the States were not authorized to spend the extra money. Okay?

Now, we had a Congressman from Erie who voted in 1990 in the Congress to tax Pennsylvanians 2½ cents per gallon — in fact, all Americans — and to take that money and put it into the Highway Trust Fund that the States could not touch. Interesting that that Congressman is now the Governor of the Commonwealth, Tom Ridge, and he is asking us to come up with 3½ cents when he diverted 2½ cents, and we would not need this particular tax at this present time, although many of us, as I, believe we do not even need it now. But if you follow his reasoning, he is one of the principal reasons why you are now at this late hour trying to get the legislature, the House, to vote for a tax increase, because there is 2½ cents that Tom Ridge voted for in the Congress that we do not have access to that we should have access to.

Mr. Speaker, I am finished with my interrogation now.

Mr. GEIST. Do I get a chance to answer?

Mr. ITKIN. You can use your time. I am finished with my interrogation. I have a few comments to make.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, I brought up these two other points just to set the ground for what I believe, that this vote makes absolutely no sense.

You know, in the past, though, we have voted for tax increases, but it was always for a good reason: We needed the money. But this is today; we do not need money. As many speakers have spoken, we are rolling in dough. We have a half-a-billion-dollar budget surplus. We have hundreds of millions of dollars in other funds. You know, you would think we have a printing press churning out thousand-dollar bills in the Capitol basement. So now we are asking Jane and Joe Motorist to pay higher taxes. Is that not a derogation of our duty? Are we not supposed to protect their interests, defend them — defend them — from unreasonable taxation?

Now, when you think about it, this is not just a measly 3½ cents that they pull out of their cars' ashtrays. This 3½ cents, Mr. Speaker, is on top of the 40.8 cents that they already pay in

State and Federal gas taxes. This is not just \$30. This is \$30 added to the \$450 that they are now paying in State and Federal gas taxes every year. This is \$30 added to our State bill of \$246 a year that our constituents already pay in gas taxes. This is not the kind of change that they can dig out of their sofa cushions. This is not the kind of change that adds up in a flash to big bucks. They have paid for these roads, and the money they have paid is right before our eyes, like a giant change bank holding a half a billion dollars' worth of quarters.

For years and years this State has been collecting money for motorists to repair their highways, and for years and years those motorists have complained because this State's highways just do not stack up. As Pennsylvanians crisscross this country, they always ask the same question. How many times have you been asked, "Why can't Pennsylvania's highways be as nice as...," and here just fill in the blank, "...as nice as West Virginia" or "as nice as Georgia," you know, with the name of another State.

So here we are, voting to siphon money from the motorists' pockets into the same old tired highway maintenance system. We are not looking for innovative new solutions. We are not searching the world for better technologies to build better roads. Too many potholes? Do not look for internal efficiencies. Do not investigate new ways to build more durable roads. Just raise taxes. That will fix it. Yeah, more money, same potholes.

Another critical problem in this bill — 28 million additional dollars for the Turnpike Commission, and that is on top of the \$41 million we give them every year, for a grand total of \$69 million. There are no strings attached, no accountability, just a lot of money that for the Turnpike Commission is never enough. In fact, this equals more than 25 percent in toll collections. Can you imagine, we are using taxpayers' money to equal more than 25 percent of all the tolls collected annually on the Pennsylvania Turnpike, and we are giving it to them gratis, without accountability.

Actually, that is not enough. The Turnpike Commission said that they wanted 1½ cents from the gas tax, that simply half a cent was not enough. In order for them to build the projects that we have asked them to build, they are going to need a cent and a half. So here we are, they are telling us that \$28 million is not enough. Well, what are they going to do with money that is not enough? Are they going to build half a highway? You know the answer. In a couple years, they will be back here for the additional half or the additional cent.

This turnpike money is money that the motorists of Pittston, Homer City, and Jeannette are paying every time they buy gas and renew their registrations, but it is also money that they may not benefit from if they do not drive the turnpike. More and more, the turnpike does not pay for itself. All turnpike officials have to do is put their hands out and we fork over the bucks.

Finally, this bill certainly takes care of the trucking industry, especially, as I pointed out, the heavier trucks. Not only will wider trucks be allowed on our roads, these trucks will actually be paying, the heavier trucks, only a 2½-cent increase in the gas tax as Representative Geist has indicated. That is because their diesel tax drops from 6 cents per gallon to 5. Where are individual motorists getting a tax decrease to offset their tax increases?

Truckers; turnpike — this bill is a money trough for special interests, but guess who is filling that trough? Our constituents, Jane and Joe Motorist, the people who rely on their cars to get to

their jobs, drive the kids to Little League practice, take mom to the doctor. These hard-working families deserve better than this. I say vote against this tax, vote against Tom Ridge's tax increase, vote against the problem that Tom Ridge created when in 1990 as a Congressman he voted to tax Pennsylvanians 2½ cents but not give it to the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation but to put it, sequester it, in the Highway Trust Fund.

Thank you very much for your patience, and now I will allow the distinguished chairman of the Transportation Committee to respond.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, Mr. Perzel.

Mr. PERZEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be as brief as I possibly can.

Over the course of the last 5 hours I heard eight different appropriations numbers, and I wrote the members' names down but I am not going to use them, because I do not think that would be fair. There were \$3½ billion, one at the surplus being \$750 million, one at \$800 million, and two at \$1 billion. Now, I mention that, Mr. Speaker, and I took the liberty of calling Secretary Judge at the Department of Revenue, and he said as of this afternoon, the surplus in the bank is \$370 million.

Now, the Governor in his budget, the Governor in his budget spent \$194 million, the Democrats and Republicans on the floor of this House 2 weeks ago spent \$141 million, and I do not mean this; I am going to mention the name because it is true, Representative Lloyd put \$3 million more into Penn State, for a total of \$334 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, in today's bill, we have \$100 million in the bill. This money is going to be used for mass transit. There is more money, but there is \$100 million that comes out of the General Fund surplus for mass transit. That total is \$434 million, and I told you, as of today, we have \$370 million available. So if we do not have a couple of good months, we will not be able to pay for it, but I am sure we will, Mr. Speaker. So I wanted to get that out of the way right away, because it is important that they understand that there is no billion dollars sitting somewhere; there is no \$800 million sitting somewhere. Today, in the bank, we have \$370 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a big difference between the General Fund and the Department of Transportation. We have never, ever, ever mixed those moneys in this General Assembly. So we are confusing the issue when we talk about that right now, Mr. Speaker.

And I wanted to mention, this is not a Democrat or a Republican bill. There is money in there for mass transit, and there is money in there for highways all over the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. We tried as best we could with any Democrat member that indicated that they wanted to be part of this process that we would try to make sure that we met the needs within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that we could meet, and we did that, Mr. Speaker, with both sides of the aisle, not just one side of the aisle.

I have like three or four facts, just as quick as I possibly can.

We maintain 44,000 miles of highway, Mr. Speaker. That is more than all of New York, all of New Jersey, and all of the New England States added together. That is a fact, Mr. Speaker. It is an undisputable fact. We maintain 25,000 bridges, Mr. Speaker. Seventy-nine percent of Pennsylvania's roads are

in poor or moderate condition as of this minute, Mr. Speaker. Forty-four percent of the bridges over 20 feet long are inadequate for the demands that are met on them or they are already obsolete. Two hundred and ninety-nine bridges are currently closed to all traffic, and 3,322 of those are posted for lower-weight limits, Mr. Speaker, right this minute.

I am going to read this; it is a simple paragraph. This is from the Teamsters, not a normally Republican group, Mr. Speaker, but I am going to read it anyway: "If we don't maintain and modernize our roads and bridges, jobs will leave Pennsylvania and will never come back. We strongly urge the members of the Pennsylvania General Assembly to think of workers first," Mr. Speaker, "and to support Governor Ridge's Gas...Bill."

The next one is from another good friend of the Republican Party, Bill George, and he says, "Better highways not only create jobs in construction, but serve as the roadway for economic development," Mr. Speaker. "A good infrastructure is the key to expanding employment in all sectors of our economy."

In Allegheny County, Mr. Speaker, Carnegie Mellon University about 3 or 4 weeks ago came out with a study that said that the six counties in the Allegheny County region are one of the three fastest-growing areas of America. Are we to tell them we are not going to help Pittsburgh Area Transit or to help the Mon Valley Expressway? Three Democrats — I heard one Democrat talk about it as a Republican initiative — three Democrats are being served by that, Mr. Speaker, no Republicans. There are no Republicans in that Mon Valley — yet.

And, Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from the Pennsylvania Roundtable. I have a letter from the Travel Council. I have another from another group that is normally against the things we are doing, the Pennsylvania Building & Construction Trades, who are for this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker. And we have the Philadelphia First corporation for this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill helps an enormous number of people in Pennsylvania. It creates jobs, growth, and opportunity. Our highway system is the key to the Keystone State, and if we do not take care of it, we will not have jobs, economic growth, and viability into the 21st century. We need this, Mr. Speaker, and I urge concurrence on HB 67 and the amendments that were added in. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On the question, the gentleman, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. For that poor benighted soul somewhere in the anonymity of the other side who said "for the second time," I want that person to be momentarily enlightened, Mr. Speaker, that politically speaking, since time immemorial, for over two decades and when I was privileged to be at the dais, you and I were allowed and have allowed floor leaders exceptional discretion relative to how many times we could be at the microphone. So I did want that individual to be alert to our parliamentary history. But thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is obvious that not everyone here tonight is as alert as we would like or else we would not have this predicament.

I admire the steadfastness and the passion of the previous speaker. The floor leader from Philadelphia has done a yeoman's assignment in trying to parlay this unhappy gas tax for Governor Ridge into a successful vote count tonight. With that same kind of passion, I remember when some of my friends, especially the, the guy from Montgomery County, in November—

The SPEAKER. Mr. DeWeese, if I could stop laughing, I would be critical of your comments. You know better.

Mr. DeWEESE. I do. I shall refrain from any more allusions.

Mr. Speaker, in November of 1980, a seminal moment in the history of the Grand Old Party, the campaign of Ronald Wilson Reagan, like an inexorable juggernaut, was advancing to its luminescent conclusion. In Detroit a few months earlier, Ronald Wilson Reagan, dapper, urbane, gentile, oratorical, conservative, conservative, conservative, he went to the microphone in Detroit and he said — and this is a delectable recollection for tonight — he said, I want to say one thing to all you tax increasers out there — Detroit, Michigan; summer 1980 — go ahead and make my day. Ronald Wilson Reagan; Ronald Wilson Reagan. Bill DeWeese — I think I am allowed to use my own name; I do not know, maybe I am not, Mr. Speaker — but anyway, DeWeese and Reagan, honorable floor leader and Bill George. I said it the other day, DeWeese and the other gentleman from Montgomery County in the second row, first seat, my good friend who used to be a Democrat.

I do not know how many people, I do not know how many people put plastic bags over their heads out at that ranch on the West Coast. It was an unhappy moment. Hale-Bopp, which was mentioned the other day at this dais, is not such a faraway illusion when we have this phalanx of Republican Representatives getting ready to push the big green button. And I wish we would change our rules so we could share our appellations with each other, but as the Republican said a few moments ago, what about your campaign promises? What about your campaign promises up in Erie? What about your campaign promises in the Lehigh Valley and up in Pittsburgh? Of course, most of the Republicans from Allegheny County, notwithstanding the enthusiasm of the Republicans in the commissioners' office in Allegheny County, are not voting for this. But all of you Republicans, you hard-chargers, you conservatives, I cannot fathom what is going to happen in a few moments. You are going— And regardless of the honorable majority leader's comments, we are going to have a half a billion dollars minimally in reserve, a half a billion. That does not include the Rainy Day Fund of \$250 million. That is \$750 million. I am being exact. Exactitude has not been my forte year in and year out, but exactitude tonight takes us up, with another \$100 million in the Motor License Fund, to almost \$1 billion.

You know, I told Honorable Tom Ridge through his intermediaries and through some of my own members who are, unfortunately, closer to him than I am, I said to Honorable Tom Ridge through these back channels, but back channels are appropriate in this venue, I said, \$500 million; let us take at least half of that and let us reduce college tuition at Millersville and Bloomsburg and Slippery Rock and Indiana. Why do we not do something with that, then you can probably come and make a better argument for the need for an ongoing funding mechanism. You do need an ongoing funding mechanism. I thought as one of my honorable colleagues from Luzerne on my side of the aisle when he debated an honorable colleague from Allegheny, the chairman of the Education Committee, in our caucus one day about potentially using the surplus to reduce property taxes. We have \$500 million we could roll back, 500 million dollars' worth of property taxes, and then I would vote for this process tonight, because it is an ongoing process. But make

no mistake about it, with over, somewhere over \$750 million available, Governor Ridge, money in the bank, money in the bank, the Governor wants to raise our taxes. And the legacy, the political, the political legacy of Ronald Wilson Reagan, I see so many, all you white shirts and starched collars and conservative ethos-inspired people — that is a tough one on syntax, but forgive me — you are going to vote for a big gas tax with all this money in the bank.

Speaking of Hale-Bopp, holy mackerel, here it is. Jim Broussard, where are you tonight? Where are you? James Broussard, Citizens Against Higher Taxes, heretofore my nemesis, tonight my bed partner — politically speaking. Strange bedfellows; strange bedfellows. In spite of the fact that the honorable gentleman from Delaware County with the 96-percent Caucasian district had an unsweetened survey, in spite of that, Jim Broussard, and I quote, said “Every public opinion survey shows that Pennsylvania voters are against raising the gas tax.” James Broussard. It is almost like the imprimatur of Leo VI, Pius IX. Remember him? Papal infallibility, I think. I am with Jim Broussard, and I sure wish you folks were, too.

Here we go again, a business correspondence. A lot of us are inspired by our new friends in business. Jeffrey Bohn from J. P. Donmoyer, Incorporated; E. H. Arnold from Arnold Industries, Incorporated; Wallace Kephart from Kephart Trucking Company, and I quote: “...make Pennsylvania one of the most expensive states for transportation in the nation, every Pennsylvania business will be affected” — every Pennsylvania business will be affected. You have been their banner carriers. You have been their flag wavers. You have been the quintessence of the business community support ostensibly since you first went to the bully pulpit, since you first went to the soapbox. I see you there from Lancaster County. I know what kind of a conservative you are, and yet with all these hundreds of millions of dollars in the bank, you are going to go out and raise taxes. Ronald Reagan, where are you tonight? Jim Broussard, where are you tonight? And you know what your name is, where are you tonight? What are you doing?

Mr. Kephart, Mr. Arnold, and Mr. Bohn — “Bohn,” not “Blau”; I know what he is saying — say, and I quote, “...an increase of 19% or approximately \$1170 per truck in Pennsylvania taxes and fees this year.” Those are the 18-wheelers. “Except for New York, our fuel taxes are already higher than any” other “state.” I am quoting. “This increase will make us the highest in the nation. What happened” — and I am quoting here; I am quoting businessmen — “What happened to the Tom Ridge, pro-business administration?” I think this went to everyone’s desk tonight. If it did not, I will certainly make it available. In fact, I would like it taken up and put in the record. I think this exquisite commentary needs to be preserved.

Why are we raising taxes tonight? Why are we raising taxes? My happy, ethereal, attractive, suburban golfing pal, why are we raising taxes tonight? Almost every State has a surplus, Mr. Speaker, almost every State in the Union. This is not a Pennsylvania phenomenon. The gentleman from Hershey is aware of that. He travels widely. He has been beyond the pale. He has been to the far western States. He knows that almost every single State in the Union has a surplus. But in New York, in New York, in New York, Governor Pataki, maybe even a Presidential candidate next time — we might even have one of those in our

Commonwealth — but Mr. Pataki has proposed a \$1.7-billion cut in property taxes. In Arkansas — and other than the McDougals, I do not know many people down there anymore — I do not know who the Governor is down there, but they are proposing a personal income tax cut in Arkansas. In Arizona, Mr. Speaker, they are proposing a personal income tax cut. Arizona; Barry Goldwater; 1964. In your heart, you know I am right.

What in the world is wrong with you? I cannot — We have a West Pointer in the audience. We have conservatives in the audience. We have rigid, disciplined conservatives in the audience, and yet you are willing to deliquesce, deliquesce, off into the ether. In Iowa, in Iowa, Mr. Speaker, they are cutting the personal income tax by 10 percent. That is a Brobdingnagian cut. In Maryland, Mr. Speaker, they are also proposing a personal income tax cut of 10 percent — right south of the border, the Mason-Dixon line, 10 percent. In Idaho and Kansas and Mississippi, they are proposing tax cuts. Utah, not a liberal State, Utah has raised motor fuels tax, but do you know what they did, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Majority Leader? Do you know what they did in the State of Utah when they had a night like this? They cut the sales tax. They were tax cutters. You cannot take it away from those Utah Republicans. They are, they are the progenitors. No, they are the antecedents; I do not know. They are Ronald Wilson Reagan’s legacy. You are not. You are not. You, Reagan would be ashamed of you.

Now, now, I cannot believe this one, Mr. Speaker; I have something in my hand that is absolutely unfathomable. I have a report from the Ridge campaign moment, from the NPAT. Huh; everybody knows what the NPAT is. In fact, if I read it here, it is the National Political Awareness Test. On page 6 under “Environment. Responses from Governor Tom Ridge”: “If elected Governor, which of the following general principles” — and make sure the stenographer takes this down verbatim — “If elected Governor, which of the following general principles or specific proposals will you support concerning the environment?” On the gasoline tax, he does not mark a “yes”; he left it blank. He left it blank. Increase gasoline taxes and diesel fuels. So he is just like you folks. In the campaign setting, he is against taxes, but when it gets right down to nut-crunching time, he is for the gas tax — peanuts, almonds, cashews.

What is our State slogan? “Memories last a lifetime”; “memories last a lifetime.” Well, I hope for the gentleman from Warren and I hope for many of you that this tax vote, this tax vote, will be a memory that lasts a lifetime.

We could have, Mr. Speaker, we could have made this tax increase more progressive, more marginal. I hate to pick on my good buddy who had that unsweetened survey, but my speculation is that he has a few more Porsches in his district than I do. The rough-and-tumble hills just beyond the rim of the Alleghenies where I live, we do not have too many. We have pickup trucks and old Chevrolets. But do you know what? Because of the structure of this proposal — and one Expedition; I will come clean. Made in the USA — we are going to have the same amount of money paid by the person that drives the old 1983 Chevrolet as we are by the person, the man or woman, who drives the 1997 Porsche. Many States are going toward a more progressive registration fee. But not only are you cringing and craven as you decide not to stand tall for the taxpayer, you did not even become innovative and make this a progressive tax. It is obviously not fair. Anybody out there

knows it is not fair for an '83 Chevy to pay the same registration as a brand-new Porsche. It is not progressive.

And quite frankly, we are going to be paying probably in some of these mid-sized corporations, and I like to refer to the people, the cleaning people, the people who come in the mid-sized trucks around the neighborhoods — they are not pickup trucks; they are not 18-wheelers — but the 300 or 400 bucks a truck that we are going to nail them over 3, 5, 8, 10 trucks is almost commensurate with what they are going to save from Tom Ridge's workers' compensation ripper bill. I thought I would throw that one in. So workers' comp, he saves a few bucks, and gas tax, fee increase, goes up. He is doing all this, he is doing all this with over a half a billion dollars in the bank, and if you do not believe me, call Bittenbender. There is a telephone probably at every third or fourth seat. Bob Bittenbender — I am not sure — I think 7-2500 you can get ahold of Bittenbender, the Secretary of the Budget. He will aver that we are going to have a half a billion dollars.

Folks, this is an abject and sordid thing we are doing tonight. I cannot believe that the gubernatorial coadjutors have talked you into this, unless you are all, and God forbid, you are not sycophants; you are not sycophants.

The feeling that I have tonight, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, is that a handful of folks might regret this vote. We have never, ever raised taxes in this State when we had this kind of a surplus. This is unprecedented. There is absolutely no reason in the world to do this. The Commonwealth Foundation, Citizens Against Higher Taxes, Ronald Reagan, and the good Republicans from the hinterlands are going to look askance.

I would ask for a negative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady, Mrs. Miller, who asks to submit remarks for the record. The lady will submit the remarks. They will be made part of the record.

Mrs. MILLER submitted the following remarks for the Legislative Journal:

For more than 40 years, Berks County residents have been waiting to see the end of the "road to nowhere" finally constructed. Since taking my seat as the Representative for the 129th District in Berks County in 1993, building this highway to Berks County's future has been a top priority.

Prior to voting for this legislation to provide necessary State dollars for Pennsylvania's highway construction and maintenance, I was pleased to receive a written commitment from Governor Tom Ridge to build the Warren Street bypass/Route 222 extension.

This commitment from Governor Tom Ridge to myself and the people of Berks County will go many miles in connecting our community to greater opportunities for economic development and growth. Finishing the road to nowhere will finally permit motor traffic to traverse Berks County and link Lehigh and Lancaster Counties and points beyond.

The additional maintenance dollars which will come to Berks County for highway repairs through this legislation is also vital to our existing transportation corridors. Maintaining older roads and building new ones — these are important tasks for Pennsylvania's Department of Transportation, and the dollars which these projects demand will be generated as a result of this legislation.

I am submitting a copy of Governor Tom Ridge's letter along with these remarks to be made part of the record.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Office of the Governor
Harrisburg

April 15, 1997

Honorable Sheila Miller
House of Representatives
House Box 202020
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Dear Sheila:

If we enact transportation revenue legislation, we will build the Warren Street bypass as I have publicly committed. To repeat that public commitment, it is as follows: Construction of Warren Street will begin late in 1998. While that work is proceeding, final preparations will be made for construction of the extension of Route 222. Construction of the extension of Route 222 will commence immediately upon completion of the construction of Warren Street.

I need your help to make this important project happen for the people of Berks County.

Sincerely,
Tom Ridge

On the question recurring,
Will the House concur in Senate amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER. Agreeable to the provisions of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS-107

- | | | | |
|--------------|-----------|------------|-----------------|
| Adolph | Fichter | Masland | Semmel |
| Allen | Fleagle | McGeehan | Smith, B. |
| Argall | Flick | McGill | Smith, S. H. |
| Armstrong | Gannon | McIlhattan | Snyder, D. W. |
| Barley | Geist | McNaughton | Stairs |
| Battisto | Gladeck | Michlovic | Steelman |
| Birmelin | Godshall | Micozzie | Steil |
| Bishop | Gordner | Miller | Strittmatter |
| Blaum | Gruitza | Myers | Taylor, E. Z. |
| Boyes | Gruppo | Nailor | Taylor, J. |
| Bunt | Haluska | Nickol | Thomas |
| Butkovitz | Hasay | O'Brien | Tigue |
| Buxton | Hennessey | Perzel | True |
| Cappabianca | Herman | Pesci | Tulli |
| Chadwick | Hershey | Phillips | Vance |
| Civera | Hess | Platts | Van Horne |
| Clark | Horsey | Raymond | Washington |
| Clymer | Jadlowiec | Readshaw | Waugh |
| Cohen, L. I. | Keller | Reber | Williams, A. H. |
| Conti | Kenney | Reinard | Wilt |
| Cornell | Kirkland | Robinson | Wogan |
| Cowell | Lederer | Ross | Wright, M. N. |
| Dempsey | Lloyd | Rubley | Youngblood |
| DiGirolamo | Lynch | Sather | Zimmerman |
| Druce | Major | Saylor | |
| Egolf | Markosek | Schroder | Ryan, |
| Fairchild | Marsico | Schuler | Speaker |
| Fargo | | | |

NAYS-88

- | | | | |
|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Baker | Dermody | Lescovitz | Santoni |
| Bard | DeWeese | Levdansky | Scrimanti |
| Barrar | Donatucci | Lucyk | Serafini |
| Bebko-Jones | Eachus | Maitland | Seyfert |
| Belardi | Evans | Manderino | Shaner |

Boscola	Feese	Mayernik	Staback
Brown	George	McCall	Stern
Browne	Gigliotti	Melio	Stetler
Caltagirone	Habay	Mihalich	Stevenson
Carone	Hanna	Mundy	Sturla
Casorio	Harhart	Olasz	Surra
Cawley	Hutchinson	Oliver	Tangretti
Cohen, M.	Itkin	Orie	Travaglio
Colaifeila	James	Petrarca	Trello
Colaizzo	Jarolin	Petrone	Trich
Corpora	Josephs	Pippy	Veon
Coy	Kaiser	Pistella	Vitali
Curry	Krebs	Preston	Walko
Daley	LaGrotta	Roberts	Williams, C.
Dally	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wojnaroski
DeLuca	Lawless	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dent	Leh	Sainato	Zug

NOT VOTING—2

Benninghoff Ramos

EXCUSED—6

Belfanti Corrigan Rieger Rooney
Cam Pettit

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments as amended by the Rules Committee were concurred in.

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

**HOUSE RESOLUTIONS
INTRODUCED AND REFERRED**

No. 138 By Representatives ZUG, GLADECK, FARGO, M. N. WRIGHT, SAYLOR, RUBLEY, SATHER, CORNELL, TULLI, MELIO, TRUE, BARRAR, EGOLF, ROHRER and HARHART

A Resolution declaring that the House of Representatives shall deem the collective bargaining agreements between the Commonwealth and the four unions representing Pennsylvania Liquor Store employees breached and shall cease to provide State appropriations to the employee benefit funds unless by June 10, 1997, an audit of the funds is completed in accordance with the collective bargaining agreements.

Referred to Committee on RULES, April 16, 1997.

No. 139 By Representatives L. I. COHEN, THOMAS, READSHAW, CAPPABIANCA, GIGLIOTTI, FLICK, PESCI, SHANER, LEDERER, JOSEPHS, JAMES, HORSEY, MILLER, McNAUGHTON, C. WILLIAMS, WOJNAROSKI, E. Z. TAYLOR, YOUNGBLOOD, BARD, CURRY, MANDERINO, BENNINGHOFF and BOSCOLA

A Resolution designating the Philly Pops as the official, pops orchestra of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Referred to Committee on RULES, April 16, 1997.

No. 141 By Representatives ARMSTRONG, HORSEY, SATHER, HALUSKA, GEIST, BROWN, SHANER, PHILLIPS, SAYLOR, HERSHEY, CLYMER, STABACK, TRUE, DeLUCA, YOUNGBLOOD, TIGUE, HENNESSEY, SCHRODER, E. Z. TAYLOR, DRUCE, KENNEY, STERN, OLASZ, BATTISTO, HUTCHINSON, ITKIN, ROHRER, BENNINGHOFF, BARD, LEH, STRITTMATTER, ZIMMERMAN, SCHULER and YEWIC

A Concurrent Resolution urging the Pennsylvania Supreme Court to provide for the election of persons to hold county row offices that are included in the unified judicial system.

Referred to Committee on RULES, April 16, 1997.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR C

RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Ms. WASHINGTON called up HR 142, PN 1534, entitled:

A Resolution marking April 15, 1997, as the 50th Year Anniversary celebrating Jackie Robinson's breaking baseball major league's racial barrier.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution ?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

VOTE STRICKEN

The SPEAKER. Does the lady, Ms. Washington, desire recognition on this ? The clerk will strike the vote.

The Chair recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Ms. Washington.

Ms. WASHINGTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to say that I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the resolution. It just so happens that Mr. Micozzie's seat number is No. 42, and he signed on, and the resolution number is 142.

Jackie Robinson was a wonderful person, played great baseball, the first black, and we ask both sides of the aisle to support this resolution. I thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. Ms. Washington, I have to apologize. Your microphone was not on at the beginning of your remarks, and I did not catch them. Would the House come to order.

Would the lady repeat that, please.

Ms. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I said thank you for recognizing me, and I ask that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle support the resolution for Jackie Robinson, the black baseball player, and that Mr. Micozzie on the other side of the aisle sits in seat No. 42 and it just so happens the resolution number is 142 — and Jackie's number was 42 — and I ask that you leave the resolution open so others can sign on. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Ms. Washington, it is too late to sign on because the resolution, I believe, has already been printed.

On the question recurring,
Will the House adopt the resolution ?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—197

Adolph	Druce	Maitland	Schuler
Allen	Eachus	Major	Scriminti
Argall	Egolf	Manderino	Semmel
Armstrong	Evans	Markosek	Serafini
Baker	Fairchild	Marsico	Seyfert
Bard	Fargo	Masland	Shaner
Barley	Feese	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Barrar	Fichter	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Battisto	Fleagle	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Bebko-Jones	Flick	McGill	Staback
Belardi	Gannon	McIlhattan	Stairs
Benninghoff	Geist	McNaughton	Steelman
Birmelin	George	Melio	Steil
Bishop	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Stern
Blaum	Gladeck	Micozzie	Stetler
Boscola	Godshall	Mihalich	Stevenson
Boyes	Gordner	Miller	Strittmatter
Brown	Gruitza	Mundy	Sturla
Browne	Gruppo	Myers	Surra
Bunt	Habay	Nailor	Tangretti
Butkovitz	Haluska	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Hanna	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Olasz	Thomas
Cappabianca	Hasay	Oliver	Tigue
Carone	Hennessey	Orie	Travaglio
Casorio	Herman	Perzel	Trello
Cawley	Hershey	Pesci	Trich
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	True
Civera	Horsey	Petrone	Tulli
Clark	Hutchinson	Phillips	Vance
Clymer	Itkin	Pippy	Van Horne
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Veon
Cohen, M.	James	Platts	Vitali
Colafella	Jarolin	Preston	Walko
Colaizzo	Josephs	Ramos	Washington
Conti	Kaiser	Raymond	Wagh
Cornell	Keller	Readshaw	Williams, A. H.
Corpora	Kenney	Reber	Williams, C.
Cowell	Kirkland	Reinard	Wilt
Coy	Krebs	Roberts	Wogan
Curry	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wojnaroski
Daley	Laughlin	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Dally	Lawess	Rohrer	Yewcic
DeLuca	Lederer	Ross	Youngblood
Dempsey	Leh	Rubley	Zimmerman
Dent	Lescovitz	Sainato	Zug
Dermody	Levdansky	Santoni	
DeWeese	Lloyd	Sather	
DiGirolamo	Lucyk	Saylor	Ryan,
Donatucci	Lynch	Schroder	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—6

Belfanti	Corrigan	Rieger	Rooney
Cam	Pettit		

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the resolution was adopted.

VOTE CORRECTIONS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Benninghoff.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to go on record; I pulled the file and checked. Mine did not record, and I should be recorded in the negative on HB 67.

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

Are there any other corrections to the record? Does the gentleman, Mr. Daley, desire recognition?

Mr. DALEY. To correct the record, Mr. Speaker.

On amendment 750 to HB 847, my finger failed to function, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to be recorded in the affirmative.

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

The gentleman Mr. Ramos.

Mr. RAMOS. Mr. Speaker, my button malfunctioned. I would like to be recorded in the affirmative on HB 67.

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

AGING AND YOUTH COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman, Mr. Gruppo, desire recognition?

Mr. GRUPPO. Well, Mr. Speaker, I had wanted to call a brief meeting of the Aging and Youth Committee. If there are enough members to make a quorum, I would appreciate it if they would come to the back of the brass rail here for 1 minute. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Members of the committee will go to the area behind the hall of the House.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Trich.

Mr. TRICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer remarks for the record, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send his remarks for the record. One of the pages, pick them up, please.

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

There is a real responsibility that comes with being in majority control. You must be willing to govern. The Ridge administration, along with the House and Senate Republican leadership, are having a problem with governing. They wanted to raise gasoline taxes, and a number of other fees for licenses, totaling more than \$400 million, but they have had great difficulty in getting their own members to vote for it. It seems that their party's popular, yet irresponsible, rhetoric of "no tax increases — ever" has come back to haunt them.

What the Governor has had to do is buy his needed votes, more than 20, from the opposition party. He has done so with direct and indirect promises for new projects and the like. Although Ridge and his party control both chambers of the legislature and the Governor's Mansion, they cannot govern well enough to win the support of enough of their own members.

This Governor has a \$600-million to \$700-million surplus, yet he insists that we raise taxes and fees. In order to gain support, truck safety

issues are being sacrificed. Businesses will find themselves paying much more in higher shipping costs. One business in my district alone will be facing a \$100,000 higher licensing fee for their fleet of trucks, thanks to the Ridge tax increase. Every year, each and every car owner will pay 50 percent more to buy a license plate or renew their driving privilege, thanks to the Ridge tax increase.

There are instances when tax increases are inevitable, and necessary. In those cases, I, too, have voted to increase State revenues. But for Governor Ridge to do so while protecting a major State surplus, only to deliver an election year tax cut, is perhaps "politically correct" but, I believe, lacks compassion for the taxpayers. The Governor and his party seem more concerned about reelection opportunities than they do about leadership and the fiscal well-being of the average Pennsylvanian.

This is not a time for us to hit our taxpayers and the small business people of our Commonwealth. It is not a necessary tax increase — not when a major surplus exists. Therefore, my vote is "no."

BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

HB 1200, PN 1533 (Amended)

By Rep. B. SMITH

An Act amending Title 34 (Game) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for fox hunting; providing for program and financial accountability, for performance measurement, for certain employee complements, for additional classes of licenses, for special stamps and for issuing agent bonds; increasing and adding license fees; and providing for the strategic plan of the Pennsylvania Game Commission and for additional employees of the commission.

GAME AND FISHERIES.

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 184 and SB 361 be removed from the table.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to.

BILLS RECOMMITTED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 184 and SB 361 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. GRUPPO

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Gruppo.

Mr. GRUPPO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to announce that the Aging and Youth Committee did meet behind the hall of the House, and on a motion which I

made in regard to HR 127, we created a select subcommittee of the Aging and Youth Committee members pursuant to the directive of HR 127 so that that subcommittee can now begin to do its work. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HOUSE SCHEDULE

The SPEAKER. There will be no further votes this evening—The Democratic leaders? Mr. Itkin?

There will be no further votes this evening. I am, however, going to hold the desk open. We are going to break now so everybody can go out and eat or whatever. I am holding the desk open so that I can take this bill back from the Senate should they take care of it this evening. There will be a skeleton crew of assistance, hopefully, and we will do that if it comes back from the Senate this evening.

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, do you intend to have a nonvoting session tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman come to the desk.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

The SPEAKER. For the purpose of the record and for those who are listening, after conference with several of the leaders and because of the uncertainty of what is going to take place with this particular bill, I have decided that I will open the House tomorrow at 10 o'clock. The House is going to be open this evening later to accept the bill from the Senate should it come from the Senate, and in all events it will be open tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, most probably only for a token session, but if the Senate has not acted, then it will be open until such time as the Senate does act.

Any questions?

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House is recessed to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

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

SENATE MESSAGE

HOUSE AMENDMENTS
CONCURRED IN BY SENATE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, informed that the Senate has concurred in the amendments made by the House of Representatives to the Senate amendments to **HB 67, PN 1531**.

BILL SIGNED BY SPEAKER

Bill numbered and entitled as follows having been prepared for presentation to the Governor, and the same being correct, the title was publicly read as follows:

HB 67, PN 1531

An Act amending Titles 74 (Transportation) and 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for annual appropriation and computation of subsidy and for distribution of funding; providing for distribution of supplemental funding; further providing for use of funds distributed; providing for public transportation grants management accountability, for competitive procurement and for the Public Transportation Assistance Fund; further providing for period of registration, for duties of agents, for registration and other fees, for requirements for periodic inspection of vehicles, for limits on number of towed vehicles, for operation of certain combinations on interstate and other highways, for width and length of vehicles; providing for liquid fuels and fuels permits and bond or deposit of securities, for imposition of liquid fuels and fuels tax, for taxpayer, for distributor's report and payment of tax, for determination of tax, penalties and interest, for examination of records and equipment, for retention of records by distributors and dealers, for disposition and use of tax, for discontinuance or transfer of business, for suspension or revocation of permits, for lien of taxes, penalties and interest, for collection of unpaid taxes, for reports from common carriers, for violations and reward for detection of violations, for refunds, for diesel fuel importers and transporters, for prohibiting use of dyed diesel fuel, for disposition of fees, fines and forfeitures, for certified copies of records and for uncollectible checks; further providing for distribution of State highway maintenance funds and for standards and methodology for data collection; providing for dirt and gravel road maintenance; further providing for imposition of tax and additional tax; providing for tax on alternative fuels; further providing for disposition of tax revenue; making an appropriation; and making repeals.

Whereupon, the Speaker, in the presence of the House, signed the same.

SUNSHINE NOTICE

The SPEAKER. For the purpose of compliance with the sunshine laws, the public and press and members of the House are notified that the House will convene at 10 a.m. on Thursday, April 17, 1997.

BILL PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the remaining bill on today's calendar will be passed over. The Chair hears no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. Does the majority leader or minority leader have any further business?

Hearing none, the Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, April 17, 1997, at 10 a.m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to, and at 12:13 a.m., e.d.t., Thursday, April 17, 1997, the House adjourned.