

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 2000

SESSION OF 2000

184TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 27

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

THE SPEAKER (MATTHEW J. RYAN) PRESIDING

PRAYER

REV. JULIANN PUGH, Chaplain of the House of Representatives and pastor of Camp Hill Presbyterian Church, Camp Hill, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Sovereign God, for the day You have given us, with all its possibilities, we thank You. For Your gifts of life and love, of labor and rest, we praise Your name. Forgive us that we too often are unappreciative while Your goodness surrounds us, that we feel alone when there are many who love us, that we despair when Your strength is near at hand. Tear down the walls that isolate us, make strong the ties that bind us, and help us to walk together with joy in Your way.

O Most Precious God, we confess that we spend much of our lives on that which does not satisfy. We do not always count our time and resources as precious gifts but squander them in meaningless activities and seemingly urgent needs. Look kindly upon us, for the temptation to waste is overwhelming in our world. Enable us to understand what is important and to use the gifts of life responsibly.

God of grace and hope, we thank You for life, love, and good memories, for the gift of age, and for the wisdom that comes from experience. Give us the courage and faith to accept life as it comes, confident that the future is Yours.

Save us from self-pity; recover us from our whimpering complaints. Build into us stout hearts, that we in our generation may stand undaunted by fear, unconquered by adversity, unstained by cowardice. Lift us from vindictiveness to good will. If we are harboring grudges, bring sympathy and understanding back to us and the fair grace to put ourselves in others' places before we judge them. Lift us above malice. Awaken in us our forgotten kindness.

We come into Your presence admitting our humanness, yet strengthened by the knowledge that we stand before You, You who continues to call us to struggle for justice, peace, and liberation, personal and corporate, here and around the globe. Strengthen our resolve, and free us to be fully human with all of our brothers and sisters.

Lift us from our cynicism and skepticism into a courageous faith and certitude concerning God and divine promises. Help us not to flinch away from daily responsibilities but to serve this

State well and to do it with all the gifts You have given us, the greatest of which is love.

Hear this our common prayer. Amen

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Tuesday, May 2, 2000, will be postponed until printed. The Chair hears no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. I have been requested by the leaders of both the Democrat and Republican Caucuses to announce that the caucuses are continuing at this time and members are requested to report to their caucus rooms.

Our guests, Representative Dwight Evans' guests, who joined us in saying the Pledge of Allegiance, I understand will be leaving the House floor now but will be back at 12:45 to 1 o'clock and will do a presentation for us at that time. We thank the children for their patience and consideration.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Any further announcements?
Without more, the House will stand in recess until 12:30.

RECESS EXTENDED

The time of recess was extended until 12:45 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

The SPEAKER. Members in your offices, please come to the floor right now. There is a group that has waited patiently for the members of both the House Republican and Democrat Caucuses to be on the floor, and I do not want to disappoint them. I would greatly appreciate it if you would all come to the floor at this time.

SENATE MESSAGE**AMENDED SENATE BILL RETURNED
FOR CONCURRENCE AND
REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES**

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, informed that the Senate has concurred in the amendments made by the House of Representatives by amending said amendments to **SB 652, PN 1920.**

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the House of Representatives for its concurrence.

**COMMUNICATION FROM
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY**

The SPEAKER. The Chair acknowledges receipt of the annual report submitted by the Department of Labor and Industry.

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

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader. Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the following bills be taken from the table:

HB 178;
HB 324;
HB 1284; and
HB 2139.

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

BILLS TABLED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader. Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the following House bills be placed back upon the table:

HB 178;
HB 324;
HB 1284; and
HB 2139.

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

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader. Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the following bills from the table:

HB 483;
HB 866;
HB 152;
HB 190;
HB 350;
HB 488;
HB 661;
HB 819;
HB 879;
HB 1086;
HB 1143;
HB 1159;
HB 1161;
HB 1195;
HB 1523;
HB 1537;
HB 1813;
HB 2083;
HB 2116;
HB 2152;
HB 2209;
HB 2214;
HB 2268;
HB 2313;
HB 2463;
SB 598;
SB 705;
SB 708;
SB 709;
SB 710;
SB 711;
SB 976;
SB 1109;
SB 1130; and
SB 1134.

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

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The following bills, having been called up, were considered for the second time and agreed to, and ordered transcribed for third consideration:

HB 483, PN 1958; HB 866, PN 1954; HB 152, PN 2262; HB 190, PN 178; HB 350, PN 2311; HB 488, PN 1586; HB 661, PN 699; HB 819, PN 877; HB 879, PN 1890; HB 1086, PN 3415; HB 1143, PN 1291; HB 1159, PN 1312; HB 1161, PN 1314; HB 1195, PN 1352; HB 1523, PN 3460; HB 1537, PN 1854; HB 1813, PN 2222; HB 2083, PN 2698; HB 2116, PN 2758; HB 2152, PN 3416; HB 2209, PN 3233; HB 2214, PN 2903; HB 2268, PN 2998; HB 2313, PN 3294; HB 2463, PN 3343; SB 598, PN 623; SB 705, PN 765; SB 708, PN 1405; SB 709, PN 769; SB 710, PN 770; SB 711, PN 775; SB 976, PN 1132; SB 1109, PN 1650; SB 1130, PN 1726; and SB 1134, PN 1500.

BILLS RECOMMITTED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Barley.

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

- HB 483;
- HB 866;
- HB 152;
- HB 190;
- HB 350;
- HB 488;
- HB 661;
- HB 819;
- HB 879;
- HB 1086;
- HB 1143;
- HB 1159;
- HB 1161;
- HB 1195;
- HB 1523;
- HB 1537;
- HB 1813;
- HB 2083;
- HB 2116;
- HB 2152;
- HB 2209;
- HB 2214;
- HB 2268;
- HB 2313;
- HB 2463;
- SB 598;
- SB 705;
- SB 708;
- SB 709;
- SB 710;
- SB 711;
- SB 976;
- SB 1109;
- SB 1130; and
- SB 1134.

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

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair is advised by both the majority and minority whips that there are no leaves of absence requested for today's session.

Will the members come to the floor. The Chair is going to take the master roll call in 2 minutes.

ESSAY CONTEST WINNERS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. In the meantime, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Kenney, who has

some guests he would like to introduce to the House. Mr. Kenney.

Mr. KENNEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Colleagues in the House, I am happy today to introduce some students from my legislative district in northeast Philadelphia. Over the past several months, over 900 students from 7 elementary schools of my district participated in a "There Ought To Be a Law" contest, and I just wanted to introduce the winners from each individual school that are here with their families – Tim Grasela from Maternity BVM School; Shannon LaSalle from St. Christopher School; Esther Tetrushvily from Anne Frank School; Eric Yaary from Watson Comly School; Andrew Lapatina from St. Martha School; Lance Kalbacher from Loesche School; Christine Seonia from Philadelphia Academy Charter School; and Robert Ropars, our grand-prize winner, from the Philadelphia Academy Charter School. I would like everyone in the House to wish them a warm welcome. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair returns to leaves of absence and recognizes the majority whip, who asks that the gentleman from Chester, Mr. HERSHEY, be placed on leave for the balance of today's session. Without objection, the leave will be granted. The Chair hears none.

MASTER ROLL CALL

The SPEAKER. The Chair is about to take today's master roll call. Members, report to the floor. Members will proceed to vote.

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—197

Adolph	Evans	Mann	Schroder
Allen	Fairchild	Markosek	Schuler
Argall	Fargo	Marsico	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Feese	Masland	Semmel
Baker	Fichter	Mayernik	Shaner
Bard	Fleagle	McCall	Smith, B.
Barley	Flick	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Barrar	Forcier	McGill	Snyder
Bastian	Frankel	McIlhattan	Solobay
Battisto	Freeman	McIlhinney	Staback
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	McNaughton	Stairs
Belardi	Geist	Melio	Steelman
Belfanti	George	Metcalfe	Steil
Benninghoff	Gladeck	Michlovic	Stern
Birmelin	Godshall	Micozzie	Stetler
Bishop	Gordner	Miller, R.	Stevenson
Blaum	Gruccela	Miller, S.	Strittmatter
Boyes	Gruitza	Mundy	Sturla
Browne	Habay	Myers	Surra
Bunt	Haluska	Nailor	Tangretti
Butkovitz	Hanna	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Harhai	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Oliver	Thomas
Cam	Hasay	Orie	Tigue
Casorio	Hennessey	Perzel	Travaglio
Cawley	Herman	Pesci	Trello
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	Trich
Civera	Horsey	Petronc	True
Clark	Hutchinson	Phillips	Tulli
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pippy	Vance
Cohen, L. I.	James	Pistella	Van Horne

Cohen, M.	Josephs	Platts	Veon
Colafella	Kaiser	Preston	Vitali
Cornell	Keller	Ramos	Walko
Corrigan	Kennedy	Raymond	Washington
Costa	Kirkland	Readshaw	Waters
Coy	Krebs	Reinard	Williams
Curry	LaGrotta	Rieger	Wilt
Dailey	Laughlin	Robinson	Wogan
Daley	Lawless	Roebuck	Wojnaroski
Dally	Lederer	Rohrer	Wright
DeLuca	Leh	Rooney	Yewcic
Dempsey	Lescovitz	Ross	Youngblood
Dermody	Levdansky	Rublely	Yudichak
DeWeese	Lucyk	Ruffing	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	Lynch	Sainato	Zug
Donatucci	Maher	Samuelson	
Druce	Maitland	Santoni	
Eachus	Major	Sather	Ryan,
Egolf	Manderino	Saylor	Speaker

ADDITIONS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-5

Cappabianca	Hershey	Roberts	Seyfert
Gigliotti			

LEAVES ADDED-1

LaGrotta

LEAVES CANCELED-1

Hershey

HOUSE BILLS
INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 2504 By Representatives GEIST, HESS, ARGALL, FORCIER, DRUCE, LEH, MARSICO, PIPPY, NICKOL, S. H. SMITH, PETRARCA, DALEY, STRITTMATTER, STAIRS, MAHER, BARD, SANTONI, LAUGHLIN, SATHER, STERN, ARMSTRONG, BAKER, BARLEY, BENNINGHOFF, BOYES, BUNT, BUXTON, CALTAGIRONE, CASORIO, CIVERA, CLARK, M. COHEN, DeWEESE, EACHUS, EGOLF, FEESE, FICHTER, FLEAGLE, GANNON, GODSHALL, HASAY, HERSHEY, LESCOVITZ, LUCYK, LYNCH, MAITLAND, MASLAND, McCALL, McNAUGHTON, METCALFE, S. MILLER, NAILOR, PESCI, PETRONE, RAYMOND, READSHAW, ROHRER, SAINATO, SHANER, B. SMITH, SOLOBAY, STURLA, TANGRETTI, E. Z. TAYLOR, TRAVAGLIO, TRUE, TULLI, VAN HORNE, VANCE, VEON, WALKO, WILT, YEWIC, ZIMMERMAN, ZUG, SURRA, WOGAN and FARGO

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for motorcycle parking.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, May 3, 2000.

No. 2505 By Representatives DALLY, M. COHEN, McGILL and GRUCELA

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, providing for interim permits for substitute teachers.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, May 3, 2000.

No. 2506 By Representatives MELIO, GEORGE, MANN, STABACK, M. COHEN, FRANKEL, HARHAI, HENNESSEY, HERSHEY, PETRARCA, PISTELLA, RUBLEY, SHANER, J. TAYLOR, WOJNAROSKI, CURRY, CIVERA, HORSEY, MAHER, CASORIO, ROONEY, STEELMAN, TANGRETTI, TRELLO, YOUNGBLOOD, JAMES, WASHINGTON, LESCOVITZ, SURRA, SOLOBAY, WILLIAMS, COLAFELLA and BATTISTO

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, prohibiting sale of liquid fuels and fuels containing methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE).

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, May 3, 2000.

No. 2507 By Representatives TRICH, LESCOVITZ, DALEY, DeWEESE and SOLOBAY

An Act amending the act of May 25, 1945 (P.L.1050, No.394), known as the Local Tax Collection Law, providing for interim assessment, duplicate, warrant; further providing for installment payment of taxes, for collection and payment over of taxes and for settlement of duplicates, audit; and providing for appointment of delinquent tax collector.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, May 3, 2000.

No. 2508 By Representatives L. I. COHEN, BUNT, CLYMER, DERMODY, FARGO, GANNON, HENNESSEY, KENNEY, LaGROTTA, LAUGHLIN, MELIO, RAYMOND, STAIRS, TANGRETTI, WILLIAMS and J. TAYLOR

An Act authorizing a tobacco access control tax credit; and imposing powers and duties on the Secretary of Revenue.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, May 3, 2000.

No. 2509 By Representatives FREEMAN, ARMSTRONG, BARRAR, BATTISTO, BELARDI, BELFANTI, BLAUM, BOYES, CAPPABIANCA, CAWLEY, L. I. COHEN, M. COHEN, CORRIGAN, COY, DALEY, GEORGE, GRUCELA, HALUSKA, HENNESSEY, HERMAN, HESS, HORSEY, LaGROTTA, LAUGHLIN, LEDERER, LEVDANSKY, MANN, MARKOSEK, McCALL, McGILL, MELIO, MUNDY, NAILOR, ORIE, PETRARCA, PISTELLA, ROBINSON, RUBLEY, RUFFING, SANTONI, SOLOBAY, STABACK, SURRA, TANGRETTI, VAN HORNE, VEON, WOGAN, WOJNAROSKI, WRIGHT, YUDICHAK, BROWNE, COSTA, FRANKEL, TRAVAGLIO, CASORIO, YOUNGBLOOD and SAMUELSON

An Act amending the act of March 11, 1971 (P.L.104, No.3), known as the Senior Citizens Rebate and Assistance Act, further providing for the definition of "income."

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, May 3, 2000.

No. 2510 By Representatives FREEMAN, ARMSTRONG, BARRAR, BATTISTO, BELARDI, BELFANTI, BLAUM, BOYES, CAPPABIANCA, CAWLEY, L. I. COHEN, M. COHEN, CORRIGAN, COY, DALEY, GEORGE, GRUCELA, HALUSKA, HENNESSEY, HERMAN, HESS, HORSEY, LaGROTTA, LAUGHLIN, LEDERER, LEVDANSKY, MANN, MARKOSEK, McCALL, McGILL, MELIO, MUNDY, NAILOR, ORIE, PETRARCA, PISTELLA, ROBINSON, RUBLEY, RUFFING, SANTONI, SOLOBAY, STABACK, SURRA, TANGRETTI, VAN HORNE, VEON, WOGAN, WOJNAROSKI, WRIGHT, YUDICHAK, BROWNE, COSTA, FRANKEL, TRAVAGLIO, CASORJO, YOUNGBLOOD and SAMUELSON

An Act amending the act of August 26, 1971 (P.L.351, No.91), known as the State Lottery Law, further providing for the definition of "income."

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, May 3, 2000.

No. 2511 By Representatives DALLY, BROWNE, FLICK, NAILOR, TIGUE, TULLI, HENNESSEY, E. Z. TAYLOR, RUBLEY, WOGAN, SCRIMENTI, SEYFERT, COLAFELLA, FARGO, YOUNGBLOOD, ORIE, GEIST, EGOLF, HERSHEY and TRELLO

An Act establishing a procurement procedure for certain contracts for legal services entered into between Commonwealth agencies and private attorneys.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, May 3, 2000.

No. 2512 By Representatives WRIGHT, GEIST, McILHINNEY, WILT, STEVENSON, KENNEY, SATHER, MAHER, HENNESSEY, CORRIGAN, SHANER, BELARDI, M. COHEN, CURRY, HARHAI, HORSEY, JOSEPHS, McCALL, McILHATTAN, MELIO, PETRONE, READSHAW, SAMUELSON, WALKO, WOJNAROSKI and YOUNGBLOOD

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 deduction for job-seeking expenses.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, May 3, 2000.

No. 2513 By Representatives GLADECK, L. I. COHEN, FARGO, HORSEY, MAITLAND, MASLAND, McGILL, PETRONE, RAMOS, ROSS, RUBLEY, SCHRODER, SEYFERT, TULLI, WILT and FLICK

An Act amending the act of April 12, 1951 (P.L.90, No.21), known as the Liquor Code, providing for private retail wine stores.

Referred to Committee on LIQUOR CONTROL, May 3, 2000.

No. 2514 By Representatives BISHOP, MYERS, M. COHEN, PESCI, WATERS, CURRY, YOUNGBLOOD, WILLIAMS, MANDERINO and THOMAS

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 distress in first class school districts.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, May 3, 2000.

No. 2515 By Representatives FLICK, BARRAR, E. Z. TAYLOR, FARGO, BUNT, CLYMER, L. I. COHEN, DAILEY, EGOLF, GEIST, GODSHALL, HENNESSEY, HERSHEY, HESS, MAHER, McGILL, McNAUGHTON, MELIO, R. MILLER, RUBLEY, SEYFERT and TRUE

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

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, May 3, 2000.

No. 2516 By Representatives FLICK, HENNESSEY, O'BRIEN, PETRARCA, CALTAGIRONE, FICHTER, LAUGHLIN, McCALL, McILHATTAN, MUNDY, PESCI, PLATTS, RAYMOND, SATHER, SCHRODER, SCHULER, SHANER, TANGRETTI, TULLI, VAN HORNE, WILT, WOJNAROSKI and WRIGHT

A Joint Resolution proposing integrated amendments to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, providing for retention election and tenure of justices of the peace.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, May 3, 2000.

SENATE BILLS FOR CONCURRENCE

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

SB 552, PN 1873

Referred to Committee on PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE, May 3, 2000.

SB 955, PN 1853

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, May 3, 2000.

SB 1173, PN 1875

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, May 3, 2000.

CALENDAR

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 1352, PN 1876**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation from a restricted revenue account within the General Fund and from Federal augmentation funds to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1352 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 1353, PN 1754**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation from a restricted revenue account within the General Fund to the Office of Consumer Advocate in the Office of Attorney General.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1353 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 1354, PN 1755**, 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. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1354 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 1355, PN 1756**, 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, 2000, to June 30, 2001, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2000.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1355 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 1356, PN 1757**, 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, 2000, to June 30, 2001, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2000.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1356 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 1357, PN 1758**, 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. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1357 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 1359, PN 1760**, entitled:

An Act providing for the capital budget for the fiscal year 2000-2001.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1359 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 1364, PN 1765**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the Trustees of Drexel University, Philadelphia.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1364 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 1365, PN 1766**, entitled:

An Act making appropriations to the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1365 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 1366, PN 1767**, entitled:

An Act making appropriations to the Philadelphia Health and Education Corporation for the MCP Hahnemann University and for continuation of pediatric services.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1366 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 1367, PN 1768**, entitled:

An Act making appropriations to the Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1367 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 1368, PN 1769**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine, Philadelphia.

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

BILL RECOMMITTED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1368 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 1369,**
PN 1770, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the Pennsylvania College of
Optometry, Philadelphia.

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

BILL RECOMMITTED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1369 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 1370,**
PN 1771, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the University of the Arts,
Philadelphia.

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

BILL RECOMMITTED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1370 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 1371,**
PN 1772, entitled:

An Act making appropriations to the Trustees of the Berean
Training and Industrial School at Philadelphia for operation and
maintenance expenses and for payment of debt service.

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

BILL RECOMMITTED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1371 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 1372,**
PN 1773, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the Johnson Technical Institute
of Scranton for operation and maintenance expenses.

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

BILL RECOMMITTED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1372 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 1373,**
PN 1774, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the Williamson Free School of
Mechanical Trades in Delaware County for operation and maintenance
expenses.

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

BILL RECOMMITTED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1373 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 1374,**
PN 1775, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the Fox Chase Institute for Cancer Research, Philadelphia, for the operation and maintenance of the cancer research program.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1374 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 1375, PN 1776**, entitled:

An Act making appropriations to the Wistar Institute, Philadelphia, for operation and maintenance expenses and for research.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1375 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 1376, PN 1777**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the Central Penn Oncology Group.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1376 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 1377, PN 1778**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to St. Francis Hospital, Pittsburgh, for cardiovascular studies.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1377 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 1378, PN 1779**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the Lancaster Cleft Palate for outpatient-inpatient treatment.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1378 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 1379, PN 1780**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the Pittsburgh Cleft Palate for outpatient-inpatient treatment.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1379 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 1380, PN 1781**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the Burn Foundation, Philadelphia for outpatient and inpatient treatment.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1380 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 1381, PN 1782**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to The Children's Institute, Pittsburgh for treatment and rehabilitation of certain persons with disabling diseases.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1381 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 1382, PN 1783**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia for comprehensive patient care and general maintenance and operation of the hospital.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1382 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 1383, PN 1784**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the Beacon Lodge Camp.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1383 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 1384, PN 1785**, entitled:

An Act making appropriations to the Carnegie Museums of Pittsburgh for operations and maintenance expenses and the purchase of apparatus, supplies and equipment.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1384 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 1385, PN 1786**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the Franklin Institute Science Museum for maintenance expenses.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1385 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 1386, PN 1787**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the Academy of Natural Sciences for maintenance expenses.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1386 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 1387, PN 1788**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the African-American Museum in Philadelphia for operating expenses.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1387 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 1388, PN 1789**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the Everhart Museum in Scranton for operating expenses.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1388 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 1389, PN 1790**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the Mercer Museum in Doylestown, Pennsylvania, for operating expenses.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1389 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 1390, PN 1791**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the Whitaker Center for Science and the Arts in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, for operating expenses.

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

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1390 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 1391, PN 1792**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation to the Arsenal Family and Children's Center.

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

BILL RECOMMITTED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that SB 1391 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

**WEST OAK LANE CHARTER SCHOOL
PRESENTED**

The SPEAKER. Mr. Evans.
Members, please take your seats.
The Chair is requesting the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Evans, to temporarily preside for the purpose of introducing guests of his and guests of ours.
Members, please take your seats. Sergeant at Arms, have the members and staff people behind the rail seated, please. Members, please take your seats.
Mr. Evans.

**THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
(DWIGHT EVANS) PRESIDING**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. Speaker and members of the General Assembly, I have the pleasure today to introduce a group of young people. This week is National Charter School Week. The President of the United States and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania gave out proclamations on Monday about National Charter School Week.

We, as members of this General Assembly, along with the Governor, passed a law in 1997, Democrat and Republican alike. I have said consistently that the issue of education should transcend partisan politics. These young people who are here today will demonstrate that.

The West Oak Lane Charter School has been in existence for 2 years. This is its second year. It has 621 children; class size, 27; schoolday from 8 to 3:30. The young people wear uniforms; the teachers wear uniforms. Its focus is in technology and science. The principal is Dr. Margaret Briggs-Kenney. If she could stand, you could see the principal. In addition to the principal, there are a number of parents who have also come. I would like for you to give them a hand. In the audience, the parents of the West Oak Lane Charter School.

There are 50 charter schools in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and there are 25 in the city of Philadelphia. These young people, these young people one day will be sitting in these seats. I have asked these young people to come here and to present to you a couple of songs from their choir. Their teacher is Mr. Joseph, and I would like to give Mr. Joseph a hand. So can we give them a warm welcome to the General Assembly, the West Oak Lane Charter School choir.

Anytime you are ready, Mr. Joseph.

(A musical program was presented by West Oak Lane Charter School choir.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Speaker and members of the General Assembly, I want to thank you sincerely for being as patient as you have. These young people, these young people who came here today just wanted to show and to demonstrate that the action that we take here does have an effect upon our young people. So I want to sincerely thank you for your patience and sincerely thank you for the Charter School Law. Thank you again, Mr. Speaker, for allowing them. Thank you.

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

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pleased to welcome to the hall of the House today, as the guests of Representative Kirkland of Delaware County, a group known as the Second Time Around Parents Organization of Delaware County. They are seated in the balcony. Would they kindly wave to be recognized. Thank you. Welcome to Harrisburg.

RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. ROHRER called up HR 392, PN 3081, entitled:

A Resolution declaring May 7 through 13, 2000, as "Pennsylvania Home Education Week" in this Commonwealth.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—197

Adolph	Evans	Mann	Schroder
Allen	Fairchild	Markosek	Schuler
Argall	Fargo	Marsico	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Feese	Masland	Semmel
Baker	Fichter	Mayermik	Shaner
Bard	Fleagle	McCall	Smith, B.
Barley	Flick	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Barrar	Forcier	McGill	Snyder
Bastian	Frankel	McIlhattan	Solobay
Battisto	Freeman	McIlhinney	Staback
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	McNaughton	Stairs
Belardi	Geist	Melio	Steelman
Belfanti	George	Metcalfe	Steil
Benninghoff	Gladeck	Michlovic	Stern
Birmelin	Godshall	Micozzie	Stetler
Bishop	Gordner	Miller, R.	Stevenson
Biaum	Grucela	Miller, S.	Strittmatter
Boyes	Gruitza	Mundy	Sturla
Browne	Habay	Myers	Surra
Bunt	Haluska	Nailor	Tangretti
Butkovitz	Hanna	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Harhai	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Oliver	Thomas
Carn	Hasay	Orie	Tigue
Casorio	Hennessey	Perzel	Travaglio
Cawley	Herman	Pesci	Trello
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	Trich
Civera	Horsey	Petrone	True
Clark	Hutchinson	Phillips	Tulli
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pippy	Vance
Cohen, L. I.	James	Pistella	Van Horne
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Platts	Veon
Colafella	Kaiser	Preston	Vitali
Cornell	Keller	Ramos	Walko
Corrigan	Kenney	Raymond	Washington

Costa	Kirkland	Readshaw	Waters
Coy	Krebs	Reinard	Williams
Curry	LaGrotta	Rieger	Wilt
Dailey	Laughlin	Robinson	Wogan
Daley	Lawless	Roebuck	Wojnaroski
Dally	Lederer	Rohrer	Wright
DeLuca	Leh	Rooney	Yewcic
Dempsey	Lescovitz	Ross	Youngblood
Dermody	Levdansky	Rubley	Yudichak
DeWeese	Lucyk	Ruffing	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	Lynch	Sainato	Zug
Donatucci	Maher	Samuelson	
Druce	Maitland	Santoni	
Eachus	Major	Sather	Ryan, Speaker
Egolf	Manderino	Saylor	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Cappabianca	Hershey	Roberts	Seyfert
Gigliotti			

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

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pleased to welcome to the hall of the House today, as the guests of the gentleman, Mr. Belardi, Kay Hunter and her son, Abraham. Along with the Hunters are friends of Abraham's, Crane Holmes and Matt Cardamone. Abraham is 12 years old today. So we wish him a happy birthday and welcome him and his friends to Harrisburg. Will the guests please rise. They are to the left of the Speaker.

RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. SCRIMENTI called up **HR 477, PN 3447**, entitled:

A Resolution declaring that May 7 through 13, 2000, be observed as "National Nursing Home Week" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—197

Adolph	Evans	Mann	Schroder
Allen	Fairchild	Markosek	Schuler
Argall	Fargo	Marsico	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Feese	Masland	Semmel
Baker	Fichter	Mayernik	Shaner
Bard	Fleagle	McCall	Smith, B.
Barley	Flick	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Barrar	Forcier	McGill	Snyder
Bastian	Frankel	McIlhattan	Solobay
Battisto	Freeman	McIlhinney	Staback
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	McNaughton	Stairs
Belardi	Geist	Melio	Steelman
Belfanti	George	Metcalfe	Steil
Benninghoff	Gladeck	Michlovic	Stern
Birmelin	Godshall	Micozzie	Stetler

Bishop	Gordner	Miller, R.	Stevenson
Blaum	Grucela	Miller, S.	Strittmatter
Boyes	Gruitza	Mundy	Sturla
Browne	Habay	Myers	Surra
Bunt	Haluska	Nailor	Tangretti
Butkovitz	Hanna	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Harhai	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Oliver	Thomas
Carn	Hasay	Orie	Tigue
Casorio	Hennessey	Perzel	Travaglio
Cawley	Herman	Pesci	Trello
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	Trich
Civera	Horsey	Petrone	True
Clark	Hutchinson	Phillips	Tulli
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pippy	Vance
Cohen, L. I.	James	Pistella	Van Horne
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Platts	Veon
Colafella	Kaiser	Preston	Vitali
Cornell	Keller	Ramos	Waiko
Corrigan	Kenney	Raymond	Washington
Costa	Kirkland	Readshaw	Waters
Coy	Krebs	Reinard	Williams
Curry	LaGrotta	Rieger	Wilt
Dailey	Laughlin	Robinson	Wogan
Daley	Lawless	Roebuck	Wojnaroski
Dally	Lederer	Rohrer	Wright
DeLuca	Leh	Rooney	Yewcic
Dempsey	Lescovitz	Ross	Youngblood
Dermody	Levdansky	Rubley	Yudichak
DeWeese	Lucyk	Ruffing	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	Lynch	Sainato	Zug
Donatucci	Maher	Samuelson	
Druce	Maitland	Santoni	
Eachus	Major	Sather	Ryan, Speaker
Egolf	Manderino	Saylor	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Cappabianca	Hershey	Roberts	Seyfert
Gigliotti			

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

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1686, PN 3445**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 30, 1995 (P.L.170, No.25), known as the Pennsylvania Voter Registration Act, providing for change of addresses, for approval of applications, for district registers, for fees, for information lists, for reports, for physical disabilities, for removal of voters, for affirmations and for incorrect records.

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

Mr. CLYMER offered the following amendment No. **A1999**:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 901), page 11, line 19, by inserting after "902."

An elector may vote in the election district of the elector's last residence not more than one time following the elector's removal.

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 from Bucks, Mr. Clymer.

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, amendment 1999 is a technical amendment. What happened, the language in this amendment was left out of the bill, just totally left out of the bill when it was drafted, and what we are doing is putting in this language. It is as simple as that, and 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—197

Adolph	Evans	Mann	Schroder
Allen	Fairchild	Markosek	Schuler
Argall	Fargo	Marsico	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Feese	Masland	Semmel
Baker	Fichter	Mayemik	Shaner
Bard	Fleagle	McCall	Smith, B.
Barley	Flick	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Barrar	Forcier	McGill	Snyder
Bastian	Frankel	McIlhattan	Solobay
Battisto	Freeman	McIlhinney	Staback
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	McNaughton	Stairs
Belardi	Geist	Melio	Steelman
Belfanti	George	Metcalf	Steil
Benninghoff	Gladeck	Michlovic	Stern
Birmelin	Godshall	Micozzie	Stetler
Bishop	Gordner	Miller, R.	Stevenson
Blaum	Gruceja	Miller, S.	Strittmatter
Boyes	Gruitza	Mundy	Sturla
Browne	Habay	Myers	Surra
Bunt	Haluska	Nailor	Tangretti
Butkovitz	Hanna	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Harhai	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Oliver	Thomas
Cam	Hasay	Orie	Tigue
Casorio	Hennessey	Perzel	Travaglio
Cawley	Herman	Pesci	Trello
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	Trich
Civera	Horsey	Petrone	True
Clark	Hutchinson	Phillips	Tulli
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pippy	Vance
Cohen, L. I.	James	Pistella	Van Horne
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Platts	Veon
Colafella	Kaiser	Preston	Vitali
Cornell	Keller	Ramos	Walko
Corrigan	Kenney	Raymond	Washington
Costa	Kirkland	Readshaw	Waters
Coy	Krebs	Reinard	Williams
Curry	LaGrotta	Rieger	Wilt
Dailey	Laughlin	Robinson	Wogan
Daley	Lawless	Roebuck	Wojnaroski
Dally	Lederer	Rohrer	Wright
DeLuca	Leh	Rooney	Yewcic
Dempsey	Lescovitz	Ross	Youngblood
Dermoddy	Levdansky	Rublely	Yudichak
DeWeese	Lucyk	Ruffing	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	Lynch	Sainato	Zug
Donatucci	Maher	Samuelson	
Druce	Maitland	Santoni	
Eachus	Major	Sather	
Egolf	Manderino	Saylor	Ryan, Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Cappabianca Hershey Roberts Seyfert
Gigliotti

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. CARN offered the following amendment No. A1992:

Amend Title, page 1, line 4, by inserting after "repeals," " further providing for qualifications to register;

Amend Title, page 1, line 5, by removing the comma after "addresses," and inserting

; further providing for government agencies and for preparation and distribution of applications; providing

Amend Sec. 1, page 1, line 12, by inserting after "(4)," 525, 527,

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 501), page 2, line 6, by inserting after "CHAPTER."

If an individual owes court-ordered restitution pursuant to 18 Pa.C.S. §§ 1106 (relating to restitution for injuries to person or property) and 1107 (relating to restitution for theft of timber) as a result of a felony conviction within the last five years and the appropriate official as provided for in 18 Pa.C.S. § 1106(e) provides evidence that the individual is in compliance with such restitution order, the individual shall be entitled to be registered as provided in this chapter.

Amend Sec. 1, page 6, by inserting between lines 4 and 5 Section 525. Government agencies.

(a) General rule.—The secretary shall administer a system whereby all offices in this Commonwealth that provide public assistance, each county clerk of Orphan's Court, including each marriage license bureau, all offices in this Commonwealth that provide State-funded programs primarily engaged in providing services to persons with disabilities and all armed forces recruitment centers do all of the following:

(1) Distribute voter registration applications with each application; reapplication; and application for recertification, renewal or change of address.

(2) Assist applicants with completion of the registration application unless assistance is refused.

(3) Accept completed registration applications.

(4) Transmit completed applications to the appropriate registration commission.

(b) Forms.—An agency designated in subsection (a) shall provide a form for office visits or, if the agency provides services to persons with disabilities, for home visits which contains all of the following:

(1) The question, "If you are not registered to vote where you live now, would you like to apply to register to vote today?"

(2) If the agency provides public assistance, the statement, "Applying to register or declining to register to vote will not affect the amount of assistance that you will be provided by this agency."

(3) Boxes for the applicant to check to indicate whether the applicant would like to register or decline to register to vote. In close proximity to the boxes the following words shall appear in prominent type: "IF YOU DO NOT CHECK EITHER BOX, YOU WILL BE CONSIDERED TO HAVE DECIDED NOT TO REGISTER TO VOTE AT THIS TIME."

(4) The statement, "In order to be qualified to register to vote, you must be at least 18 years of age on the day of the next election, you must have been a citizen of the United States for at least one month prior to the next election and have resided in Pennsylvania and the election district where you plan to vote for at least 30 days prior to the next election, and you must [not have been confined to a penal institution for a conviction of a felony within the last five years.]" provide evidence from the appropriate official as provided for in 18 Pa.C.S. § 1106(e) (relating to restitution for injuries to person or property) that you are in compliance with a restitution order if you owe court-ordered restitution as a result of a felony conviction within the last five years."

(5) The statement, "If you would like help in filling out the voter registration application form, we will help you. The decision whether to seek help is yours. You may fill out the form in private."

(6) The statement, "If you believe that someone has interfered with your right to register or to decline to register to vote, your right to privacy in deciding whether to register or in applying to register to vote or your right to choose your own political party or other political preference, you may file a complaint with the Secretary of the Commonwealth, Pennsylvania Department of State, Harrisburg, PA 17120." The secretary shall establish and publish a toll-free telephone number for the purpose of receiving complaints.

(c) Effect.—Failure to check either box under subsection (b)(3) shall be considered a declination to register to vote.

(d) Staff.—Agency employees assisting in the completion of voter registration applications shall conduct themselves in a manner consistent with the following principles:

(1) They shall not seek to influence an applicant's political preference or party registration or display political preference or party allegiance.

(2) They shall not make any statement to an applicant or take any action the purpose of or effect of which is to discourage the applicant from registering to vote.

(3) They shall not make any statement to an applicant or take any action the purpose or effect of which is to lead the applicant to believe that a decision to register or not to register has any bearing on the availability of services or benefits.

Agency employees who violate this subsection shall be removed from employment, provided that the agency at its discretion may impose a penalty of suspension without pay for at least 30 days, but not more than 120 days, if it finds that the violation does not warrant termination.

(e) Encouraging registration.—An agency designated in subsection (a) shall provide reasonable space for nonpartisan signs or posters encouraging voter registration. The signs and posters shall be provided by the secretary.

(f) Transmission.—An agency designated in subsection (a) shall forward all completed registration applications to the appropriate registration commission within ten days after the date of receipt. If a voter registration application is received within five days before the last day to register before an election, the application shall be transmitted to the appropriate commission not later than five days after the date of its receipt by the agency.

(g) Confidentiality.—The identity of the voter registration agency through which any particular voter is registered in accordance with this section shall not be disclosed to the public.

(h) Use of information.—No information relating to a declination to register to vote in connection with an application made at an office described in this section may be used for any purpose other than voter registration.

(i) Assistance.—Each agency shall provide to each applicant who chooses to register to vote the same degree of assistance with regard to the completion of the registration application form as is provided by

the office with regard to the completion of its own forms, unless the applicant refuses such assistance.

(j) Regulation.—The secretary shall promulgate regulations regarding the maintenance and destruction of forms used pursuant to this section.

Section 527. Preparation and distribution of applications.

(a) Form.—

(1) The secretary shall prescribe the form of official voter registration application. The official voter registration application shall provide space for the following information about the applicant:

(i) Full name.

(ii) Address of residence. If the residence is a portion only of the house, the location or number of the room, apartment or floor which is occupied.

(iii) Mailing address if different than address of residence.

(iv) Name and residence address on previous registration and the year of that registration.

(v) Designation of political party, for the purpose of voting at a primary election.

(vi) Date of birth.

(vii) Telephone number. An application shall not be rejected because of noncompliance with this subparagraph.

(viii) Race. An application shall not be rejected because of noncompliance with this subparagraph.

(2) Data required on the voter registration application shall not be more nor less than the minimum data elements permissible for Federal voter registration.

(3) Any person who assists in the completion of the registration application shall sign the application and indicate the person's address. In the case of those registering under sections 523 and 525, the person providing assistance shall insert the person's initials or employee or agent identification number on a separate or detachable portion of the application or computer data file.

(4) A voter registration application shall be printed on stock of good quality and shall be of suitable uniform size. Nothing in this act shall prohibit the design and use of an electronic voter registration application which includes the applicant's digitized signature. The registration application shall contain the following information; however, the information may be provided on a separate form for voter registration made under section 523 or 525:

(i) Notice that an individual currently registered does not need to reregister unless the individual has moved.

(ii) Instructions on how to fill out and submit the application and notification of when the application must be submitted to a voter registration office in order to be registered for the ensuing election.

(iii) Notice that the registrant must be a citizen of the United States for at least one month prior to the next election and a resident of this Commonwealth and the election district for at least 30 days and must be at least 18 years of age by the day of the next ensuing election and [has not been confined in a penal institution for a conviction of a felony within the last five years.] is able to provide evidence from the appropriate official as provided for in 18 Pa.C.S. § 1106(e) (relating to restitution for injuries to person or property) that he or she is in compliance with a restitution order issued pursuant to 18 Pa.C.S. §§ 1106 and 1107 (relating to restitution for theft of timber) as a result of a felony conviction within the last five years. The notice required in this subparagraph shall be in print identical to the declaration under subsection (b).

(iv) Notice that political party enrollment is mandatory to vote in a primary election of a political party.

(v) Notice that the commission will mail by nonforwardable mail to the applicant a voter's identification card upon acceptance of the application and that the registrant should contact the commission if the identification card is not received within 14 days from the date the application is sent to the registration office.

(vi) Notice that registration is not complete until the application is processed and accepted by the commission.

(vii) A warning to the registrant that making a false registration or furnishing false information is perjury. The notice required in this subparagraph shall be in print identical to the declaration under subsection (b).

(viii) Instructions to Federal or State employees who wish to retain voting residence in county of last residence to so indicate on the application.

(ix) Notice that, if an applicant declines to register to vote, the fact that the applicant has declined to register will remain confidential and will be used only for voter registration purposes. The notice required in this subparagraph shall be in print identical to the declaration under subsection (b).

(x) Notice that, if an applicant does register to vote, the office at which the applicant submits a voter registration application will remain confidential and will be used for voter registration purposes only. The notices required in this subparagraph shall be in print identical to the declaration in subsection (b).

(5) The official voter registration application may be designed in a manner to be inserted in the district register or for transfer to a registration card to be placed in the district register.

(6) In jurisdictions where there is a single language minority, the secretary may print a bilingual application.

(7) In jurisdictions where a single language minority exceeds 5% of the population, the secretary shall:

(i) print a bilingual application; and

(ii) conduct a public educational program among that language group alerting both organizations and individuals of that group of the availability of the bilingual application and encouraging unregistered voters to register.

(8) To implement section 524, the secretary shall print an official voter registration mail application designed to preserve the confidentiality of the information required to be submitted. The application shall contain information required by this section and shall include the name of each county seat, its post office mailing address and zip code and its telephone number. Voter registration mail applications shall contain information indicating whether the application is a new registration, change of party enrollment, change of address or change of name.

(9) Nothing in this act shall prohibit a private organization or individual from printing blank voter registration applications or shall prohibit the use of such applications by any other individual, provided that the form, content and paper quality of such voter registration application complies with department regulations for the forms or has received prior approval from the secretary.

(b) Registration declaration.—

(1) The official voter registration application shall contain a registration declaration. On the declaration, the applicant shall state all of the following:

(i) The applicant has been a citizen of the United States for at least one month prior to the next election.

(ii) On the day of the next ensuing election, the applicant shall be at least 18 years of age.

(iii) On the day of the next ensuing election, the applicant shall have resided in this Commonwealth and in the election district for at least 30 days.

(iv) The applicant [has not been confined in a penal institution for a conviction of a felony within the last five years.] is able to provide evidence from the appropriate official as provided for in 18 Pa.C.S. § 1106(e) that he or she is in compliance with a restitution order pursuant to 18 Pa.C.S. §§ 1106 and 1107 as a result of a felony conviction within the last five years.

(v) The applicant is legally qualified to vote.

(2) The applicant shall affirm all of the following:

(i) The information provided in the registration declaration is true.

(ii) The applicant understands that:

(A) the registration declaration will be accepted for all purposes as the equivalent of an affidavit; and

(B) if the registration contains a material false statement, the applicant shall be subject to penalties for perjury.

(3) The registration declaration shall contain the printed name and signature of the applicant and the date of signing. An applicant unable to sign the voter registration application shall make a mark before a person of the applicant's choice other than the applicant's employer or an agent of the applicant's union. Such person shall insert the person's name, address and telephone number. If such person is an employee or agent of the Department of Transportation or another agency, as provided under section 525, and is assisting the applicant in an official capacity, such employee or agent shall insert the initials and identification number of the employee or agent. In the case of applicants registering under section 523 or 525, the person providing assistance shall insert initials or employee or agent identification number on a separate or detachable portion of the application or computer data file.

(4) The official registration application shall contain a notice entitled "PENALTY FOR FALSIFYING DECLARATION." The notice shall advise the applicant that, if a person signs an official registration application knowing a statement declared in the application to be false, the person commits perjury. The notice shall specify the penalty for perjury.

(c) Distribution.—

(1) The secretary shall supply official registration applications to commissions.

(2) The secretary shall make available for distribution official voter registration applications to public libraries, public schools, State-related institutions of higher education, offices operated by the Department of Revenue, offices operated by the Department of Aging, area agencies on aging, offices operated by the Pennsylvania Game Commission or any of its authorized license-issuing agents, offices operated by the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission or any of its issuing agents, and offices that provide unemployment compensation.

(3) Each participating agency identified under paragraph (2) shall:

(i) Provide that official voter registration mail applications are available on the premises and displayed prominently in a conspicuous location during normal business hours.

(ii) Provide an official voter registration mail application to any individual requesting one.

(iii) Provide reasonable space for nonpartisan signs or posters indicating the availability of official voter registration mail applications on the premises.

(4) The secretary may provide technical assistance to commissions upon request and agencies designated under paragraph (2).

(5) The secretary shall print and distribute mail registration applications which are not postage paid and which shall not be specific to any county registration office. Along with the distribution of such applications, the secretary shall also include instructions to inform the applicant where the application is to be sent.

(6) The secretary and commissions shall supply applications to all of the following:

(i) Persons and organizations who request applications.

(ii) Federal, State and political subdivision offices.

(iii) Political parties and political bodies.

(iv) Candidates.

(d) Staff.—Agency employees assisting in the distribution of voter registration applications under subsection (c) shall conduct themselves in a manner consistent with the following principles:

(1) They shall not seek to influence an applicant's political preference or party registration or display political preference or party allegiance.

(2) They shall not make any statement to an applicant or take any action the purpose of or effect of which is to discourage the applicant from registering to vote.

(3) They shall not make any statement to an applicant or take any action the purpose or effect of which is to lead the applicant to believe that a decision to register or not to register has any bearing on the availability of services or benefits.

Agency employees who violate this subsection shall be removed from employment, provided that the agency at its discretion may impose a penalty of suspension without pay for at least 30 days, but not more than 120 days, if it finds that the violation does not warrant termination.

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

The SPEAKER. On the question of the adoption of the Carn amendment, the gentleman is recognized.

Mr. CARN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment would make it a requirement that those felons who leave prison that are required to pay restitution would have to have their restitution current in order for them to register to vote.

I ask for a "yes" vote on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Clymer.

Mr. CLYMER. Mr. Speaker, a number of weeks ago Representative Birmelin had offered a bill that is very compatible to this amendment that we are now going to vote on, an amendment that would allow a person who has been convicted of a felony, they now must wait 5 years before they can vote. This simply removes that 5-year period, and as long as they are doing restitution, as the gentleman just mentioned, they will be allowed to vote. So I am going to support the amendment.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—130

Argall	Evans	Masland	Schuler
Armstrong	Fairchild	Mayernik	Scrimenti
Barley	Fleagle	McCall	Smith, B.
Bastian	Forcier	McGeehan	Snyder
Battisto	Frankel	McIlhinney	Staback
Bebko-Jones	Freeman	Melio	Steelman
Belardi	Geist	Michlovic	Steil
Belfanti	George	Miller, R.	Stetler
Birmelin	Godshall	Mundy	Strittmatter
Bishop	Gordner	Myers	Sturla
Blaum	Grucela	Nailor	Surra
Butkovitz	Gruitza	Nickol	Tangretti
Buxton	Haluska	Oliver	Taylor, E. Z.
Caltagirone	Hanna	Perzel	Thomas
Carn	Harhai	Pesci	Tigue
Casorio	Hasay	Petrarca	Travaglio
Cawley	Herman	Petrone	Trello
Chadwick	Horsey	Pistella	Trich
Clymer	James	Platts	True
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Preston	Vance
Colafella	Kaiser	Ramos	Van Horne
Corrigan	Keller	Readshaw	Veon
Costa	Kirkland	Reinard	Vitali
Coy	LaGrotta	Rieger	Waiko
Curry	Laughlin	Robinson	Washington
Daley	Lederer	Roebuck	Waters
DeLuca	Lescovitz	Rooney	Williams
Dermody	Levdansky	Ross	Wojnaroski
DeWeese	Maitland	Ruffing	Wright
DiGirolamo	Major	Sainato	Yewcic
Donatucci	Manderino	Samuelson	Youngblood
Druce	Mann	Santoni	Zimmerman
Eachus	Markosek		

NAYS—66

Adolph	Fargo	Maher	Schroder
Allen	Feese	Marsico	Semmel
Baker	Fichter	McGill	Shaner
Bard	Flick	McIlhattan	Smith, S. H.
Barrar	Gannon	McNaughton	Solobay
Benninghoff	Habay	Metcalfe	Stairs
Boyes	Harhart	Micozzie	Stern
Browne	Hennessey	Miller, S.	Stevenson
Bunt	Hess	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Civera	Hutchinson	Orie	Tulli
Clark	Jadlowiec	Phillips	Wilt
Cohen, L. I.	Kenney	Pippy	Wogan
Cornell	Krebs	Raymond	Yudichak
Dalley	Lawless	Rohrer	Zug
Dally	Leh	Rubley	
Dempsey	Lucyk	Sather	Ryan,
Egolf	Lynch	Saylor	Speaker

NOT VOTING—1

Gladeck

EXCUSED—5

Cappabianca	Hershey	Roberts	Seyfert
Gigliotti			

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?

Mr. DeWEESE offered the following amendment No. A2093:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 501), page 2, line 17, by striking out "AN" and inserting

Except as otherwise provided by this act, an

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 901), page 11, line 13, by striking out "NEW" and inserting last

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

The SPEAKER. The House will be momentarily at ease. This amendment will require a suspension of the rules.

RULES SUSPENDED

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. DeWeese. Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the rules of the House be suspended to permit me to offer amendment 2093.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-188

- Adolph, Allen, Argall, Armstrong, Baker, Bard, Barley, Barrar, Bastian, Battisto, Bebkco-Jones, Belardi, Belfanti, Benninghoff, Birmelin, Bishop, Blaum, Boyes, Browne, Bunt, Butkovitz, Buxton, Caltagirone, Carn, Casorio, Cawley, Chadwick, Civera, Clark, Clymer, Cohen, L. I., Cohen, M., Colafella, Cornell, Corrigan, Costa, Coy, Curry, Dailey, Daley, Dally, DeLuca, Dempsey, Dermody, Eachus, Egolf, Evans, Fairchild, Fargo, Fichter, Fleagle, Flick, Forcier, Frankel, Freeman, Gannon, Geist, George, Gladeck, Godshall, Gordner, Grucela, Gruitza, Habay, Haluska, Harhai, Harhart, Hasay, Herman, Hess, Horsey, Hutchinson, Jadlowiec, James, Josephs, Kaiser, Keller, Kenney, Kirkland, LaGrotta, Laughlin, Lawless, Lederer, Leh, Lescovitz, Levdansky, Lucy, Lynch, Mann, Markosek, Marsico, Masland, Mayernik, McCall, McGeehan, McIlhattan, McIlhinney, McNaughton, Melio, Metcalfe, Michlovic, Micozzie, Miller, R., Miller, S., Mundy, Myers, Nailor, Nickol, O'Brien, Oliver, Perzel, Pesci, Petrarca, Petrone, Phillips, Pippy, Pistella, Preston, Ramos, Raymond, Readshaw, Reinard, Rieger, Robinson, Roebuck, Rohrer, Rooney, Ross, Rubley, Ruffing, Sainato, Saylor, Schroder, Schuler, Scrimenti, Semmel, Shaner, Smith, B., Smith, S. H., Snyder, Solobay, Staback, Stern, Stetler, Stevenson, Strittmatter, Sturla, Surra, Tangretti, Taylor, E. Z., Taylor, J., Thomas, Tigue, Travaglio, Trello, Trich, True, Tulli, Vance, Van Horne, Veon, Vitali, Walko, Washington, Waters, Williams, Wilt, Wogan, Wojnaroski, Wright, Yewcic, Youngblood, Yudichak, Zimmerman, Zug

- DeWeese, DiGirolamo, Donatucci, Druce, Maher, Maitland, Major, Manderino, Samuelson, Santoni, Sather, Ryan, Speaker

NAYS-6

- Feese, Hanna, Krebs, Platts, Steelman, Steil

NOT VOTING-3

- Hennessey, McGill, Stairs

EXCUSED-5

- Cappabianca, Gigliotti, Hershey, Roberts, Seyfert

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 bill on third consideration as amended?

Mr. DeWEESE reoffered the following amendment No. A2093:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 501), page 2, line 17, by striking out "AN" and inserting

Except as otherwise provided by this act, an

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 901), page 11, line 13, by striking out "NEW" and inserting last

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

The SPEAKER. The House will stand momentarily at ease.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. DeWeese. That is an improvement, Mr. DeWeese. I wonder, Mr. DeWeese, for the benefit of the cameras and the other members, if you could pose again for us.

Mr. DeWEESE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is an agreed-to amendment which protects the voting opportunities and rights of government and military personnel, and I would ask for its favorable consideration. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Clymer.

Mr. CLYMER. This is agreed to.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-197

- Adolph, Allen, Argall, Armstrong, Baker, Evans, Fairchild, Fargo, Feese, Fichter, Mann, Markosek, Marsico, Masland, Mayernik, Schroder, Schuler, Scrimenti, Semmel, Shaner, Saylor, Schroder, Schuler, Scrimenti, Semmel, Shaner

Bard	Fleagle	McCall	Smith, B.
Barley	Flick	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Barrar	Forcier	McGill	Snyder
Bastian	Frankel	McIlhattan	Solobay
Battisto	Freeman	McIlhinney	Staback
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	McNaughton	Stairs
Belardi	Geist	Melio	Steelman
Belfanti	George	Metcalfe	Steil
Benninghoff	Gladeck	Michlovic	Stern
Birmelin	Godshall	Micozzie	Stetler
Bishop	Gordner	Miller, R.	Stevenson
Blaum	Grucela	Miller, S.	Strittmatter
Boyes	Gruitza	Mundy	Sturla
Browne	Habay	Myers	Surra
Bunt	Haluska	Nailor	Tangretti
Butkovitz	Hanna	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Harhai	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Oliver	Thomas
Carn	Hasay	Orie	Tigue
Casorio	Hennessey	Perzel	Travaglio
Cawley	Herman	Pesci	Trello
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	Trich
Civera	Horsey	Petrone	True
Clark	Hutchinson	Phillips	Tulli
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pippy	Vance
Cohen, L. I.	James	Pistella	Van Horne
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Platts	Veon
Colafella	Kaiser	Preston	Vitali
Cornell	Keller	Ramos	Walko
Corrigan	Kenney	Raymond	Washington
Costa	Kirkland	Readshaw	Waters
Coy	Krebs	Reinard	Williams
Curry	LaGrotta	Rieger	Wilt
Dailey	Laughlin	Robinson	Wogan
Daley	Lawless	Roebuck	Wojnaroski
Daily	Lederer	Rohrer	Wright
DeLuca	Leh	Rooney	Yewcic
Dempsey	Lescovitz	Ross	Youngblood
Dermody	Levdansky	Rubley	Yudichak
DeWeese	Lucyk	Ruffing	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	Lynch	Sainato	Zug
Donatucci	Maher	Samuelson	
Druce	Maitland	Santoni	
Eachus	Major	Sather	Ryan,
Egolf	Manderino	Saylor	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Cappabianca	Hershey	Roberts	Seyfert
Gigliotti			

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. 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.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—197

Adolph	Evans	Mann	Schroder
Allen	Fairchild	Markosek	Schuler
Argall	Fargo	Marsico	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Feese	Masland	Semmel
Baker	Fichter	Mayernik	Shaner
Bard	Fleagle	McCall	Smith, B.
Barley	Flick	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Barrar	Forcier	McGill	Snyder
Bastian	Frankel	McIlhattan	Solobay
Battisto	Freeman	McIlhinney	Staback
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	McNaughton	Stairs
Belardi	Geist	Melio	Steelman
Belfanti	George	Metcalfe	Steil
Benninghoff	Gladeck	Michlovic	Stern
Birmelin	Godshall	Micozzie	Stetler
Bishop	Gordner	Miller, R.	Stevenson
Blaum	Grucela	Miller, S.	Strittmatter
Boyes	Gruitza	Mundy	Sturla
Browne	Habay	Myers	Surra
Bunt	Haluska	Nailor	Tangretti
Butkovitz	Hanna	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Buxton	Harhai	O'Brien	Taylor, J.
Caltagirone	Harhart	Oliver	Thomas
Carn	Hasay	Orie	Tigue
Casorio	Hennessey	Perzel	Travaglio
Cawley	Herman	Pesci	Trello
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	Trich
Civera	Horsey	Petrone	True
Clark	Hutchinson	Phillips	Tulli
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pippy	Vance
Cohen, L. I.	James	Pistella	Van Horne
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Platts	Veon
Colafella	Kaiser	Preston	Vitali
Cornell	Keller	Ramos	Walko
Corrigan	Kenney	Raymond	Washington
Costa	Kirkland	Readshaw	Waters
Coy	Krebs	Reinard	Williams
Curry	LaGrotta	Rieger	Wilt
Dailey	Laughlin	Robinson	Wogan
Daley	Lawless	Roebuck	Wojnaroski
Daily	Lederer	Rohrer	Wright
DeLuca	Leh	Rooney	Yewcic
Dempsey	Lescovitz	Ross	Youngblood
Dermody	Levdansky	Rubley	Yudichak
DeWeese	Lucyk	Ruffing	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	Lynch	Sainato	Zug
Donatucci	Maher	Samuelson	
Druce	Maitland	Santoni	
Eachus	Major	Sather	Ryan,
Egolf	Manderino	Saylor	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Cappabianca	Hershey	Roberts	Seyfert
Gigliotti			

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 **SB 262, PN 1913**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for explicit sexual materials.

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

The SPEAKER. There are entirely too many meetings going on.

BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. SB 262 is over temporarily.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the Democratic Caucus wishes to reassemble for a period of one-half hour. Under the circumstances, the Chair indicated to the Democratic leaders that it had no objection to an additional caucus in order that the members could come up to the floor to watch the children from the charter school, and I had agreed that they could go back into another caucus, which at this time I would ask the Democrat members to go immediately to their caucus room and to return to the floor at 10 after 2.

Mr. DeWeese has indicated that a 5-minute recess may solve our problems. So the House is going to stand in recess for a period of 5 minutes so that he can talk to some of his members.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. Mr. Casorio, you, I understand, wish to correct the record. You are recognized for that purpose.

Mr. CASORIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On HB 1686, amendment 1992, I was cast in the affirmative. I would like to be recorded as a negative vote, HB 1686.

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

Mr. CASORIO. Thank you.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pleased to welcome to the hall of the House today, as a guest page for Mr. Saylor, Victoria Min from Red Lion High School. She is a guest page today, as I say, for Representative Saylor. Would she please rise.

We have another guest page today. Here as the guest of Representative Sam Rohrer is Alicia Godlove. She is a junior at Wyomissing High School in Wyomissing, Pennsylvania, in Berks County. Would she please rise.

The House will stand at ease.

The House will come to order.

RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

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

BILL ON CONCURRENCE REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

SB 652, PN 1922 (Amended)

By Rep. PERZEL

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, providing for reports; requiring school districts to file management information reports; further providing for auxiliary services to nonpublic schools, for reports on exceptional students, for continuing professional development, for school lunch and breakfast reimbursement, for basic education grants, for higher education funding, for full-time student community college reimbursement, for small district assistance, for basic education funding, for payments to intermediate units, for special education payments, for school and institute operation, for vocational education funding and payments, for minimum basic education payments, for extraordinary special education payments and for school performance incentives; adding a definition and provisions relating to education empowerment; and providing for an education empowerment list and education empowerment school districts and for their operation and for a Mandate Waiver Program.

RULES.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILL ON CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE AMENDMENTS AS AMENDED

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to House amendments to the following **SB 652, PN 1922**, as further amended by the House Rules Committee:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, providing for reports; requiring school districts to file management information reports; further providing for auxiliary services to nonpublic schools, for reports on exceptional students, for continuing professional development, for school lunch and breakfast reimbursement, for basic education grants, for higher education funding, for full-time student community college reimbursement, for small district assistance, for basic education funding, for payments to intermediate units, for special education payments, for school and institute operation, for vocational education funding and payments, for minimum basic education payments, for extraordinary special education payments and for school performance incentives; adding a definition and provisions relating to education empowerment; and providing for an education empowerment list and education empowerment school districts and for their operation and for a Mandate Waiver Program.

On the question,

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

The SPEAKER. Moved by the gentleman, Mr. Perzel, that the House do now concur.

The question recurs, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate to House amendments as amended?

On the question of concurrence, Mr. Veon, do you desire recognition?

Mr. VEON. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Veon.

Mr. Cohen. Mr. Veon yields to the gentleman, Mr. Cohen.

The gentleman, Mr. Cohen, is recognized. Will the gentleman yield, please.

Members, please, this is an important debate. Take your seats and show the members that have the microphone the respect that they are entitled to, as I judge it.

Mr. Cohen.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this bill raises very forcefully the question of whether or not the problems of school districts in this State in educating children are due to the fact that the school districts are unionized. If you believe that the problems facing Philadelphia and every other school district that has problems are due to the fact that there is union representation in the schools, then you should vote for this bill. If you have been around long enough to know that union representation is a relatively recent phenomenon that only really began in the mid-1960s and that before union representation the problems were even greater than they are today, you should not vote for this bill.

What this bill does is it gives every school district in the State in different degrees — it most clearly affects 11 school districts but it does other things for all the other school districts — it gives the school districts in this State the power to take away union rights. Now, why is this a bad idea? For those to whom that is not obvious, I would answer as follows: Teaching is a very, very difficult job. It requires both enormous skill; it requires significant education; it requires enormous patience in dealing with frustrations day to day.

It is not easy in many school districts to find teachers. In the Philadelphia School District this year, they started out with 2,500 vacancies at the start of the year. With a massive recruitment effort, spending millions and millions of dollars to recruit new teachers, they have got it down. As the year is coming to an end now, there are only 100 vacancies in the Philadelphia School District. There are 100 vacancies in a district in which people are guaranteed a job if they meet certain performance standards.

Now, what this bill does is this enables, first in the 11 school districts, clearly, absolutely, without equivocation, it allows the school board to decide if the performance of the school is too low, and therefore, every teacher can be fired and the principal can be fired and every janitor can be fired and the school nurse can be fired.

And maybe if these salaries were really great, Mr. Speaker, people would say, yeah, I will work here because the salary is so great, but the fact of the matter is that in the low-performing districts, the teachers are among the lowest paid in their region of the State. The fact is, already in teaching in these low-performing districts, teachers are teaching at a financial sacrifice. It is a financial sacrifice because they are getting lower than many other people in surrounding districts for doing the same job under easier conditions are getting, and they are getting much lower, much lower than they would if they would pursue other occupations that college-educated people have

open to them. What this bill does is it creates a whole wave of uncertainty in the teaching profession as to whether or not this makes any real economic sense as an occupation for people to devote their lives to.

Now, why should somebody teach in one of the 11 school districts where the powers of the board are absolute to immediately fire if they could get a job in another school district where the powers are lesser to fire the teachers? Why should anybody want to teach in such a school district? There is less and less reason as time goes on for people to want to teach, where people would want to serve in an administrative capacity, where people would want to serve in a support capacity.

This is a really bad bill. There are problems in the Philadelphia School District and there are problems in all the other 11 districts, but this bill does not deal with any solution other than giving the administrators and the school boards the power to arbitrarily lay off teachers.

Now, I send my daughter, Amanda, to a charter school. The charter school has all sorts of great innovations. The innovations deal with parental involvement. There is nothing in this bill dealing with parental involvement. The innovations deal with improved curriculum. There is nothing in this bill dealing with improved curriculum. The innovations deal with afterschool support activities and before-school support activities. There is nothing in this bill dealing with before-school or afterschool activities. There is nothing in this bill dealing with other charter school innovations like a longer schoolday, longer school year, nothing. The only innovations in this bill are aimed at cutting union rights and cutting the rights of individual teachers and individual school staffers to hold on to their job.

When I was a high school student in Philadelphia, the Philadelphia School District commissioned a study named after its chief author, a Ph.D. named Odell, to look at the Philadelphia School District in the days before there was a union with collective-bargaining rights, and the school study documented that there were many, many thousands of vacancies of qualified teachers in the school district. They documented that there were massive problems in the school system, massive problems of student achievement, and allowing teachers to organize, allowing principals to organize, allowing school nurses to organize were considered great reforms that would improve the Philadelphia School District.

I think it is a serious, serious mistake to go back to the days before unions, to take away union rights, to try to drive the salaries even lower than they are now. This bill has nothing whatever to do with improving education. If this bill passes, students and teachers will look very fondly on the year 2000 as the last year there was decent education in the school districts that are most clearly affected by this bill.

This bill makes things worse. It does not make things better. Five years, 10 years from now people in large numbers who voted for this bill will be ashamed of themselves, will be ashamed to look people in the eye and say they voted for this bill. This bill sends a message that anybody is crazy to teach in one of those 11 school districts, that any parent is crazy to send their kids there. This bill is an abandonment of public schools; it is not an improvement of public schools.

I strongly urge people to vote against this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On the question of concurrence, the gentleman, Mr. Colafella.

Mr. COLAFELLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this is a very, very sad day in the legislature. What we are doing today is we are saying to every legislator in this House, you no longer have any authority anymore in education. We are going to give all of our authority to the Secretary of Education. The Secretary of Education can waive anything that he wants to do. Bravo. That is terrific.

Over 50 percent of our budget is spent on education, and what are we doing? We are giving all the authority to the Secretary of Education to make these decisions. Think about it. What kind of a legislature is this? Legislatures that have a Secretary of Education who conducts all the business for education generally are legislatures who meet for very short periods of time. That is what we are asking for. We are asking for the Secretary to do everything in education in this bill, and believe me when I tell you, if we were just talking about these 11 districts, and what is ironic is that when you talk to the superintendents of these 11 districts whom we are supposed to help, guess what they have said? They think this bill is a joke. So we are going to give them an extra \$450,000 to sweeten the pot a little bit to each district, and guess what? The superintendents said it will cost them millions to do what we want to do.

Shame on us. This is wrong what we are doing today. We are giving up every right that we have to guide the educational process in this State; we are giving it up today, and why are we giving it up? You all know why we are giving it up. Because one man wants to be Vice President of the United States and he wants to appeal to the conservative element that says, let us get rid of unions; let us have charter schools and independent schools. That is why we are doing it. It is funny how he is not worried about us.

We have a history in this State where every year or two we have a different Secretary of Education. This Secretary will not be around a year and a half from now, but guess what? Most of us will be here, and when we are here, we will have no input on education in this State. That is what we are doing if we pass this bill today. Shame on us.

Our top leader should be worried about the education in this State and not just about his own pursuits, and we know that. That is why this legislation is being passed.

Any school superintendent in this State will tell you this is a lousy bill; it is a lousy bill. We know it is a lousy bill. It is ridiculous to have a mayor of a city set up a school board. Why do we not have the mayor of the other cities that are in these 11 districts, why do they not run their school board? What is so special about Mayor Reed that he can run a school board, he can run a school district, but the mayor of Duquesne cannot? That is not right. That makes no sense. This whole bill makes no sense.

We are following something that has taken us down the tubes as far as the legislature, because if 50 percent of this budget is spent on education and we have no input in education, what good are we? What good are we coming down here if we have no input? Everything is going to go to the Secretary for his approval. So if 2 years from now we get a Democratic Governor and we get a new Secretary of Education, now we are going to change things around again.

You know, most of us have been here a long time; we have been here a long time, and many, many years we have heard from school boards back home and teachers back home about

all the problems with collective bargaining. That is all we ever heard. If you had a town meeting, you heard about collective bargaining. Do you remember that? Now that collective bargaining is in place, there are very few strikes in Pennsylvania. The teachers are happy; the school boards are happy. So what are we going to do now? We are going to turn things around now. We are going to eliminate waivers. We are going to ruin the collective-bargaining agreements that were made. This State is going to be in a shambles over this bill.

How proud are we to have a mayor of a city run a particular school district? What good is it to have school superintendents? Why do we pay school superintendents over \$100,000 a year and say to them, you know what? You cannot run a school district; the mayor is going to run the school district. I mean, what is this? This is crazy.

Let us face it. We know what this bill is all about. This bill is not designed to help the Duquesnes and the Aliquippa School District. Aliquippa is in my district. Their superintendent thinks this is a joke; it is a joke. Why do we not have the mayor of Aliquippa run the school district of Aliquippa? He may have a better education than the mayor of Harrisburg. Why cannot he do it? If somebody could ever answer that question, I would be amazed. But, no, it is one more way of maybe picking up a few more votes or maybe it is another way of rewarding someone for helping them. What a disgrace.

You know, the kids in Pennsylvania rely on us. That is why people send us to Harrisburg. They send us to Harrisburg to make sure that no matter what we hear about from our constituents, that we run a thorough and efficient system of education in Pennsylvania. That is why they elected us. They did not elect us to have a mayor of a city run the schools. They did not do that. We are doing it today though. We are going to tell the mayors, you run the schools. We are going to tell the Secretary of Education, you make any decision that you want, because right now we are giving up. We cannot do the job. That is what we are doing today. Shame on us. We should be embarrassed by what we are doing today.

In the final analysis, after this bill is passed and you will see over the next year or so the Secretary making this decision on this and on that and people complain to you, we will have a good excuse. We will be able to say from now on, you know what? It is not our fault; it is the Secretary of Education's fault, because, quite frankly, we no longer will have any responsibility in overseeing the education of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER. The Chair advises the members that permission is now being given to James Romeo of the WGAL-TV news organization to videotape with audio on the House floor for the next 15 minutes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. The Chair notes the presence on the floor of the House of the gentleman, Mr. Hershey. He shall be removed from the leave list.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pleased to welcome to the hall of the House, as the guests of Representative Steil, classes of fifth graders from Quarry Hill Elementary School in Bucks County. The fifth grade classes are very welcome to Harrisburg.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 652 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware County, Mr. Kirkland.

Mr. KIRKLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition of SB 652.

Mr. Speaker, I am kind of confused and dismayed, because I was asked to be a part of a committee here in Harrisburg. The committee in question or in name is the Education Committee, and my understanding is that there is a process, there is a reason why we have these committees – so that we can go over bills, discuss bills, bring them to discussion, debate the bills in committee, and even sometimes have hearings on the bills so that the community would have an opportunity to have input. But for some strange reason, here we are again at the close of a budget session, here we are again being bypassed, being overlooked as a committee, and here we are today debating an education bill, a bill that is going to affect school districts throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and quite frankly, will probably, more than likely, affect those school districts in a negative way, Mr. Speaker.

SB 652 simply tells persons who have dedicated their lives to educating our children, Mr. Speaker, that their services are simply no longer needed. That is what we are saying today to the educators. It tells young persons who may have chosen or had an idea or a thought, Mr. Speaker, of becoming an educator that there is no reason for me to continue in my thinking or continue in the quest to become an educator because there is a bill out there called SB 652 that tells educators that they are no longer needed, that their services are no longer wanted.

Mr. Speaker, this bill allows for corporations to come in and take over school districts, and if you think about it, Mr. Speaker, a corporation's bottom line, their bottom line is not educating our kids, but their bottom line is trying to find out how much money they can walk away with without spending a lot of money; it is not about educating our kids, and the bottom line is corporations, once they make enough money, they have the opportunity to pull up stakes and simply walk away. Our public schools and our educators are not doing that, Mr. Speaker. They have stood their ground and they have continued to work with our children with little or no resources.

Mr. Speaker, the Chester-Upland School District, the school district that lies within my district, will fall immediately, not 2 years, not 3 years down the line, but immediately under this act. It would do so because it is already under a board of control. Mr. Speaker, this board of control is already in place in my district, and they are there because of financial reasons, not academic reasons but financial reasons. And they have asked this Governor over time and time and time again, Mr. Speaker, they have asked him for financial resources, and that has not happened; that has not happened in a big way. We are not talking about the peanuts that they keep giving out to our district but to the real financial resources that are needed within

our district. That has not happened, Mr. Speaker, and now today we are talking about a complete dissolving of the Chester-Upland School District and bringing in the so-called corporations.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have the data; I have the data that indicates that Chester-Upland School District is on the rise, that their test scores are rising. I know this, Mr. Speaker, because we have received awards – the Governor's Award, grant awards – because in our elementary schools, in some of our junior high schools, we are showing academic performance, and we received grant awards for that, but now for some reason we need to take this school district and we need to wipe it out; we need to wipe out its history, its heritage. We need to do away with the Chester-Upland School District as we know it. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is wrong; that is wrong.

In this bill they talk about \$20 million or maybe even a little more, \$20 million going to the 11 school districts that would fall under the Empowerment Act; \$20 million with \$16 million or more going to the Philadelphia School District. Where is the equity in this? Are the other 10 school districts supposed to spend and fight over \$4 million? This is not fair, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope and encourage my colleagues from Philadelphia not to be bought and paid for or sold out and buy this garbage, because that is what it is; that is the bottom line; that is what it is. It is not about helping our kids. It is about helping self. It is not about educating our kids.

This is not fair, Mr. Speaker; it is not fair. We want to talk about equity. We want to talk about fairness. We want to talk about educating our kids. This is not fair. If you want to talk about being fair, then let me flip the script. Let me tell my Philadelphia colleagues and all those who want this so much, then you allow your school district to fall under it immediately – you allow your school district to fall under it immediately – not mine, not my kids, not my teachers. You do it for your school district and allow my kids to have at least 3 1/2 years to get their act together, and I guarantee you they will, because they are doing it right now. The educators are doing it right now. The administrators are doing it right now. They are doing it right now.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that everybody else knows what is needed in Chester-Upland. That is kind of funny, because I have never seen any of you, Mr. Speaker, none of my colleagues, none of them have come to Chester-Upland School District and walked the hallways. None of them have come to Chester-Upland School District and talked to the students. None of them have come to Chester-Upland and worked with the students; none of them, Mr. Speaker, not one; not one. They have not come there and spent the day with my students and seen the skills of my students.

It is amazing; it is amazing. The children performed beautifully today. I guess that was a prelude to SB 652.

Mr. Speaker, I had a group of students, I had a group of students that came up from Hempfield High School, a school that is not located in my district; some students came up, and we always have frank conversation. We talk about education and what have you, and they asked me, what does it take to be an elected official? And I told them, three things. I said, in order to be an elected official, first of all, always be honest. I said, secondly of all, always be committed. Thirdly of all, I told them, never sell your soul. Today I am ashamed because some folks have sold their soul. They have sold their soul for a few

projects, and I told my folks back home, this may cost me some projects. So what. They never give me anything anyway. But I am committed to seeing my district and my young folk educated.

Now, when you start this plan, if you vote for this, let me make it clear. I will be putting phone calls in to the Wallingford-Swarthmores; I will be putting phone calls in to the Ridleys; I will be putting phone calls in to all those surrounding districts, to all those surrounding districts, and make sure that my kids have an opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, this is unfair; this is wrong, and I need to send a message to my Philadelphia colleagues. I have supported you before. Today we will find out if that support continues. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (PATRICIA H. VANCE) PRESIDING

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

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, it is time for people to be honest with one another. This SB 652 is not about Democrats, Republicans; it is not about adults; it is not even about elected officials. SB 652 is about children; it is about children. And very simply I say to my colleague from Delaware County and from all other counties in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, you are absolutely correct that this is not a perfect bill. You are absolutely correct that there is confusion in SB 652. You are absolutely correct that there is disparity in the distribution of dollars as outlined in SB 652. You are absolutely correct. But, Madam Speaker, what I would like for you to do, to my colleague from Delaware County and from all other counties, is come to Philadelphia County, go to Northumberland County, go to some of these other counties, and see the misery and sadness on the faces of children, because all children want to learn, need to learn, should have an opportunity to learn. All children are entitled to that. Some of us who are standing here today would not be standing here if we were denied access to an education at the level that it is being done throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Madam Speaker, it is no mystery that those children that my colleague from Delaware County talks about can get a better education in prison than they can in some of these dilapidated school buildings. Waymart State Correctional Institution has the best of computer technology, has the best of books and resources, has the best of materials. Madam Speaker, when are we going to stop and come face to face with reality that we have a system that is bankrupt, that is bankrupt from beginning to end?

Sure, there are some kids that are rising. I have children in my district that are rising. But for the majority of kids trapped in a system, and, Madam Speaker, let us not forget, it was many of my colleagues right here that voted some years ago to change the formula by which basic education is funded in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and because that formula was changed, we now have a situation where a county like Philadelphia County has lost almost \$100 million. We have got counties in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania where children are not getting \$3,500 for a quality education. How do we continue to think that it is okay to spend \$26,000 to keep a man

in jail, but we do not want to spend \$15,000 to make sure a child from Delaware County or Philadelphia County has an opportunity to go to Yale? Whom are we kidding, Madam Speaker?

I do not like SB 652, but I know that in Philadelphia County we are looking at a \$20- to \$30-million deficit. I know that. I also know that the mayor of Philadelphia County and the president of the board in Philadelphia County have said that they are not going to deny another child a book, access to computers, full-day kindergarten, afterschool programs, that they are not cutting any more. No more will they cut or deny a child access to the tools and resources that are needed to compete in the 21st century.

So, Madam Speaker, they have a choice, and that choice is very simply this: Either we go bankrupt all of the way, or, Madam Speaker, we get some help to try to keep things somewhat in place. This money in SB 652 will allow Philadelphia County to continue full-day kindergarten, which is required, and people keep talking about Philadelphia County. Let me tell you something. What other district has 210,000 children, 80 percent of which are living on fixed incomes, a majority of which come from homes that are ravaged with drugs and all kinds of other social problems? How many other school districts have a situation where teachers are not only asked to teach, but they have to be social workers, criminologists, behavioralists, and all kinds of other competencies?

I have not seen a proposal from one of these people from these other counties that keep talking about unfairness. You have been unfair for the last decade when it comes to the children of Philadelphia County. A child is very precious. We should not, we should not temper what happens with children based on where they are geographically located. Because a child comes from Philadelphia County does not mean that that child should be denied a quality education just because he or she comes from a county that has 210,000 other children.

Madam Speaker, SB 652 is not perfect; SB 652 is convoluted, but at the end of the day, SB 652 is going to provide almost an additional \$20 million toward education. Now, I know \$20 million is not going to go a whole lot of ways, but guess what? It will be better than what we have today; it will be better than what we have today. I would like to ask my colleague from Delaware County to come and go to 11th and Thompson with me which is right down the street from my office, and I want him to tell that principal of Harrison Elementary School that you should not have a library, because they have not seen a library at Harrison Elementary School for almost the last decade. Tell those children at 11th and Thompson who do not have books to take home so that they can learn to read that we cannot let Philadelphia County get more than any other county. Tell those children in Philadelphia County that this \$15 million, those parents that are taking advantage of full-day kindergarten, those parents that have access to afterschool programs, tell them that they are not entitled to that because they do not live in Delaware County.

Madam Speaker, we have got to stop kidding ourselves. We have got to stand up. I have been here for five terms now, and we have been battling this issue of education over and over and over again, and I say to you today that I will support any proposal, because this issue must come to an end. We cannot keep functioning in the way that we are. I say to young people every day that I stand up today as an elected official, but with

God's grace and the resources, you can become an elected official tomorrow. But, Madam Speaker, we can want all we want for young people, but if you do not provide the resources, I do not care whether it is not all that you want it to be, but if you do not provide the resources, then you are not doing anything but walking around staying fat while children are walking around suffering, and we cannot continue to do that.

I understand the problems with labor. Nobody has been a bigger supporter of labor than W. Curtis Thomas, and I will continue to support labor, and I will say to you that as it relates to Philadelphia County, teachers in Philadelphia County do not have to worry, principals in Philadelphia County do not have to worry, because we have a board president and a mayor who care about working people and who will not engage in any conduct that is in derogation of the interests of working people. So we are not going to have that problem in Philadelphia County.

Madam Speaker, I ask all good people, Republican or Democrat, short or tall, fat or skinny, white or black, green or yellow, to stand up and say yes to children today and no to their own self-interests. Say yes to children having an opportunity to become all they want to be and no to the same old rope-de-dope, the same old conversation that does not result in anything positive for the interests of children.

Concur on SB 652.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster County, Mr. Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I will try and be brief, because it is my observation that there are several members missing from the floor of the House that are still out trying to round up some votes for this, and I think the quicker we are, the better chance we have of defeating this.

I will also preface my comments by stating that in response to the previous gentleman who stated that other members from other counties do not care about Philadelphia, that I and other members in this chamber do care about Philadelphia and all the children in Pennsylvania, and I would cast one idea back, that when I look at the list of counties and their taxing efforts for education, school districts and their taxing efforts for education, oddly enough, out of the 501 school districts in the State of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia ranks 499th on that list in terms of their taxing effort, and if they would just go to the average taxing effort that the rest of the citizens of Pennsylvania make, they would have an additional \$100 million-plus for their own school district by taxing their own citizens at the same rate that the rest of us tax our citizens locally for education. So this is not about whether or not we are willing to help children in Philadelphia or children in any other place; this is about what we are going to do to children with this Senate bill.

Let me point out a few facts.

I talked to my superintendent of my school district, which is on this empowerment list should this legislation pass, and I said to my superintendent, what are the things that you would need to do to help improve scores in your district? What are the key issues? She said, first, we need transition programs and extended learning. For those kids that are falling behind that just cannot keep up with the pace of the rest of the class, we need to have summer school for those kids. We need to have afterschool programs for those kids where they have learning opportunities. We need to have private tutors for those kids, and, she said, that would cost our school district about \$1 million a year. And she

said, secondly, we would like to do the one thing that we have already started to do just this past year in my school district; we would like to have full-day kindergarten, which the State does not pay for, not one red cent. And I said, well, how much did it cost us to implement that program in our school district, and she said, that was a cost of \$1.2 million last year, and it will continue to be \$1.2 million-plus for all continuing years, because that is just for the additional teachers required to do full-day kindergarten, the additional staffing time, not for any extra buildings. And I said, give me three things. She said, thirdly, I would like to lower class sizes in grades K through 3, because that is where it is real critical that the kids learn how to read and write and do arithmetic, and those are some of the things that are mentioned in this legislation as possibilities of what people could do with some of this \$20 million. And I said, and how much would that cost in my district, and she said, approximately \$3 million.

Now, I have already got a price tag here of about \$5 million to do things that will improve the test scores of the students in my district in grades K through 3, just grades K through 3, \$5 million, and up until earlier this morning we were guaranteed \$800,000. And then we got a little bit of a boost in the latest amendment, but we are still \$4 million shy of what we would need, and that is in a district where the property values declined last year. They did not go up; they declined. That is in a district where the poverty rate is around 60 percent.

There is no more well to go to locally, but what we are doing today, if you pass this legislation, is saying to the citizens of my district, it does not matter whether you can afford to do this; we are not going to help you; we are going to say you have got to try doing something, and we are not going to let you have the money to do it with. So we are going to hold out promise for the children in my district and then tell them they cannot have it anyway.

If we really want to do something about education and helping children in the State of Pennsylvania, we will not do \$20 million, we will do \$100 million, and we will not strap the school district with additional mandates as required in this Senate bill. We will give them that money and we will say, reduce class sizes, do extended learning programs, and do full-day kindergarten. That is real simple. That is what they want to do anyway. They do not want to have to go before the Secretary of Education to find out that he really wants them to get rid of a teacher contract or he really wants them to do something else that they do not need to do. They know what they need to do. My district and the other districts just do not have the money to do it; they are impoverished. You look at the list of districts, the 11 districts, and look at the poverty rates in those districts. I got them here. You can find them on the department's Website: 64.6 percent low-income students; 92.4 percent low-income students; 82.3 percent low-income students; 75.7 percent low-income students; 59 percent low-income students; 70.5 percent low-income students, and the list goes on.

This is not about we do not know what to do. You know, some of the things that are prescribed in this Senate bill say that we ought to have a plan. I have got news for you; here is the plan for my school district. It talks about achieving goals and vital signs and school readiness and attendance in school and achievement in core subjects and achievement levels that have to be met, and my superintendent is on a performance contract.

If she does not perform, if we do not raise test scores a certain percentage, she loses her job.

My school district has implemented ISO (International Organization for Standardization) 9000 standards. We perform at a better level than most corporations in this State and have for the last 2 years on a management basis, and we are distressed? We are not doing the right things? We are going to have to jump through more hoops because somebody over in the administration thinks it would be nice to label us distressed? This is ridiculous. This has nothing to do with the students in the State of Pennsylvania.

This is supposed to help improve community participation; that is one of the things we want to do. Well, I have got news for you. I got some statistics from my district. Last year at my daughter's elementary school, poetry night drew 30 people; this year it drew 278 people. At one of the other elementary schools they have a celebration before the holidays. Last year it drew 25 people; this year it drew 475 people. One of the other elementary schools has a literacy night. Last year it drew 7 people; this year it drew 208 people. We are doing those things, and yet we are going to get whopped up the side of the head and told, you just are not doing the job.

We are not overidentifying on special ed. The administration's own report that was done says we do not overidentify on special ed, and yet our special education rate is 23 percent in my school district, and yet we are told we just are not performing; those kids are not coming up to standard.

We did testing on our students coming into kindergarten for readiness. Get a load of this one: 2 out of 10 students were at a level ready to enter kindergarten, and when we get them up to standard by second or third or fourth grade, we are told, you guys just did not perform well enough. Yet there are other school districts that have 10 out of 10 students entering kindergarten that are doing just fine, and yet when they start to slide a little bit, we say, that is okay; you still are not below the 50-percent arbitrary line, so you are doing a good job, even though your kids lost track in the last 5 years; your kids have lost progress, but you are doing okay, because you are still above the 50-percent line, this arbitrary line we set.

The money that we are putting into this plan is pitiful. It is 1 percent of these school districts' budgets. Now, I tell anyone, figure out what your income for your household budget is; figure out a 1-percent increase. Tell me that you are going to be able to turn your lifestyle around with that. Tell your job, tell your boss, I really only need a 1-percent increase for the rest of my life, because, boy, am I going to be able to perform better with a 1-percent increase in my pay for the next 10 years. That is what I want, a 1-percent increase. That is going to help me out; that is going to turn things around. It is ridiculous.

This bill unfairly stigmatizes those schools in those targeted districts that are already performing. There are many schools in my school district, in Philadelphia, and in various other districts that are on this empowerment list that are performing above the statewide average, well above the statewide average, but they all get lumped in the empowerment zone; they are just not doing the job. And conversely, there are many of your districts that are not on this empowerment list because the district is above that arbitrary 50-percent line, but there are individual schools in those districts that are way below that 50-percent line. We do not send a dime to those schools because we say, well, it does not really matter if there is one school in that district that only

has 25 percent of the students reading at an average level in this State; that is okay, because that is only a few kids times 500 other school districts. This legislation just does not make sense.

Among other things, this bill also weakens the academic standards and assessments that we have been working for the last several years to set. It eliminates the writing standard. I mean, where are we going with this? This is like four steps backwards.

Finally, Madam Speaker, because I want to get this over with, because I do not think the votes are here yet, this legislation is cruel to students in Pennsylvania. It sets out this idea that somehow this is going to be the cure-all; this is what is going to make kids wonderful, when in fact it does not deal with kids at all. It deals with changing administrations, changing schoolteachers, changing all sorts of other things, and does not address children at all. I urge you to vote "no" for the sake of the children in Pennsylvania, so that we can get back to actually doing something for the children in Pennsylvania.

Please vote "no" on concurrence. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Elk County, Mr. Surra.

Mr. SURRA. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I think it was about 2 years ago on this House floor that we passed legislation which allowed the State to take over the Philadelphia school system if they did not improve. Well, where are we? The Governor and his Secretary of Education have the power to take over the Philadelphia school system; why do they not? I believe, Madam Speaker, because it is a very difficult and expensive problem, that they really do not want to take over, and they would rather keep that problem firmly in the laps of the people of Philadelphia.

You know, here we are again, debating a bill that was amended in the Rules Committee with a major public policy change, and the Republican majority of this House and the Republican leadership are forcing upon the members a major change with no public hearings, no input from the Education chairmen on both sides of the aisle, no input from the members of the Education Committee who should have some expertise, and do, in those issues. So here we are, this is it; take it or leave it. It comes out of the Rules Committee in a form that we cannot amend, and there are members out here that really do want to help these failing school districts. There are members that have plans. There are all kinds of good ideas out there. And people are saying, well, we have to vote for this because this is our chance. It does not matter if it is a bad idea; it is our only chance to vote for it.

And I want to go back to Act 50 on tax reform and the homestead exemption. The homestead exemption was the same thing: We have to vote for this because it is our only chance. And I stood at this microphone and said, what, it is a bad idea, but it is my only chance to vote for an idea, so let us do it, and we all know how successful the homestead exemption has been at reducing property taxes in this Commonwealth. It is a terrible way for the Republican majority to do the people's business, and I bring that back time and again: no public hearings, no input from the chairs of the Education Committees or the members of those committees; take it or leave it.

You know, the Governor and his Secretary of Education have spent the last 6 years trying to deal with vouchers and

charter schools and all these nifty little schemes and have basically turned their back on some of the serious problems in public education which we should be addressing, that concurrence with these amendments will not address. We had a golden opportunity that we floundered with hundreds of millions of dollars in surpluses every year, billions of dollars which we could have helped the children of this State, and we could have given them adequate books, adequate access to computers, preschool help, all those things that work, that the education establishment and people that know these issues know they work. Instead, here we are in, you know, some scheme where they can privatize education, fire teachers, do away with certification, do away with mandates that we all passed, these evil mandates that people speak about. These are things that this General Assembly says are important in public education, and we are going to give that power to the Secretary of Education, who has turned his back on public schools for the last 6 years. I heard our Secretary of Education a couple years ago just demeaning our public school system. I was embarrassed. If I were the head of our public schools for 4 or 5 years and our schools were in that bad a shape, I would resign. But those mandates that we all put in the law to protect our children, to ensure that our children have qualified, certified staff, to ensure that they have enough nurses in their schools, to ensure that the proper things are being taught in safe buildings, all those protections for our children are going to be waived under this legislation, Madam Speaker.

And it is not just going to be done for the empowerment school districts. I am quoting now from a sheet that was put out by the Department of Education: "In addition to the empowerment school districts, every Pennsylvania school district will have the option of applying to the Department of Education to have mandates waived for their districts if they believe the waiver will allow it to improve its instructional program or to operate in a more effective, efficient, or economical manner." So the board of the school directors must submit an application for a waiver to the Department of Education. So mandates that we feel are very important to children getting a quality, safe education in Pennsylvania, if it saves money, well, we can just waive those mandates. Is that the kind of bill we want to pass? Is that going to help these distressed schools?

The children of Pennsylvania deserve better. The children of Pennsylvania deserve us to sit down together in our Education Committee, not like this where we have no input, no amendment, take it or leave it. The Republican majority once again, this is how you are going to do it. There is a better way to do this. There are proven changes that we can implement that will help the children of Pennsylvania, that will do some good for these kids in these distressed schools. This is not going to do it. This is going to be just like Act 50 was for tax reform, and you all remember that.

So what are we doing in this legislation, in these amendments, for our at-risk schools? Twenty million dollars; \$20 million, \$15 million which will go to the Philadelphia School District — \$20 million. Fifteen million dollars will go to Philadelphia, and the other distressed schools will scavenge among the remaining \$5 million. That equates to \$75 per child.

Now, there have been a lot of speakers who talked about poor school districts, poor kids, drug abuse, teachers having to worry about fights and guns and everything else. This is not

going to help that. Seventy-five dollars per student is not going to build a library in a school. It may buy one book in that school, maybe, for those kids. With the surpluses that we have had in this Commonwealth, if there was a commitment from this Governor and this Secretary of Education to public schools, we could have done much better, and now that we are at this point, we should be doing much better, and we are not. This is a paltry sum. This is like a drizzle on a forest fire; it is not going to help.

Madam Speaker, we have turned our backs on public— Not we; the administration and the Secretary of Education have turned their backs on public schools for the last 6 years, in my humble opinion. We have an opportunity to do something right. We have to vote "no" on the concurrence of these amendments. Let our Education Committee work on proven things, things that we know will work, things that we can afford to spend money on that will help these children in these distressed school districts. This is all about children. It should not be about busting unions; it should not be about getting uncertified teachers in our schools. It is about children, Madam Speaker, and we should vote "no." Thank you.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, up until now, except for one of my colleagues from Philadelphia, everyone has gotten up and really criticized this legislation and talked about aspects of it that I do not think get to the crux of what this legislation does, and I commend my colleague from Philadelphia to really have the courage to get up and talk about what this legislation really does.

We have already heard the concept that this legislation is an attack on union representation in our schools, that we are giving up our authority, that we are penalizing schools that are doing the job, that we are stigmatizing those schools. Madam Speaker, I do not think you will hear anybody take this mike today and say Philadelphia is right now doing the job. And we are being accused of giving up our authority, and I would submit to you that if in fact we have authority over the Philadelphia public schools, and knowing the poor condition that those schools are in, if we have authority, we should give up that authority, because the problems in those schools are not this year or last year but have been going on for decades.

Madam Speaker, one of our critics of this legislation got up and said that if we pass this legislation, the year 2000 will be known as the last year that a decent education was provided to our students. I think that is grossly incorrect in terms of the education we are providing in Philadelphia, Madam Speaker, where 19 of our 22 public schools, 80 percent of those students are performing at the lowest level. You have heard me and others give you this statistic before, but I will give it to you again: 19 of our 22 high schools in Philadelphia, there are 80 percent of those students performing at the basic level.

Madam Speaker, I think this is an opportunity to do something for those districts. I agree with my colleague who supported this bill. This is not perfect legislation, but I and members of the Subcommittee on First Class Cities of Urban Affairs have spent the last 6 or 7 months looking at the problem of violence and the way the Philadelphia School District deals with that, and that investigation will go on, and unfortunately, that problem will go on. But some things that

came up in those hearings are very telling about the conditions of our schools, when we have a family that appeared before that committee and said they had to move to Camden, New Jersey, to get a safe and efficient education; that they had to move to Camden, New Jersey. And we have reports on high schools that are so chaotic, that they reported 73 fires in a school. So bad was that situation that a student testified that when an alarm goes off in that school, they are not allowed to get up from their seats. Disbelieving, I said to that person, do you mean that they are false alarms, and they said, no, they are not false alarms; there are actually fires, but we are still not allowed to get up from our seats. And an administrator commented, if every time there was a fire in that school, if the kids had to leave the school, they would be on the pavement all day long every day. Is that a situation, Madam Speaker, where something should be reconstituted, where a school should be reconfigured or something needs to happen in those situations, and we are not doing anything about it.

Madam Speaker, I would like to tell you that the kids from West Oak Lane Charter School, I wish I could tell you that that is what every school looks like in the city of Philadelphia, but it is just not so, and we have an opportunity today to provide some help. First of all, this particular Senate bill is providing assistance to special education, to nonpublic schools, and is really providing money throughout our school budget. But in particular what the amendment that is causing so much controversy is doing, it is simply listing the schools that need help and assisting those schools. What is the problem with that? We have schools that need help, we are listing them, and we are providing assistance. What kind of assistance are we providing? We are going to limit class size in grades K to 3; we are going to provide instructional materials that you know and I know are lacking in many school districts in Pennsylvania, but particularly in Philadelphia; we are going to promote preschool and afterschool programs for those schools; and yes, it is \$15 million for Philadelphia, but, Madam Speaker, I would submit to you, that opens the door for what we have advocated many times, that we are going to need specific programs to which to attach any new money. This is an opportunity to do that.

I would like the House to vote to concur. I do not want to lose this opportunity. Yes, there are many other good ideas that could come forth. There is no reason that they cannot come in conjunction with SB 652, and I ask for your concurrence.

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York County, Mr. Saylor.

Mr. SAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I would like to suspend the rules for the purpose of offering an amendment to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. And that amendment number is?

Mr. SAYLOR. A2090.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from York, Mr. Saylor, moves that the House rules be suspended in order for him to offer amendment A2090.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. PERZEL. Madam Speaker, I would just respectfully ask the members to vote "no" on the gentleman's motion. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the minority leader, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would respectfully ask the gentleman from the 94th District to explain his amendment so that our membership can be more enlightened as to whether we should vote to suspend the rules or not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may briefly explain his amendment.

Mr. SAYLOR. My proposal is a proposal that will appropriate \$50 million to distressed school districts as well as offer an alternative to the Governor's proposal for distressed school districts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Those in favor of suspension—The minority leader for the second time.

Mr. DeWEESE. With all due respect, Madam Speaker, if it is for the 102d time, I think that is inconsequential.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I did not mean to ruffle your ego, sir. You may proceed.

Mr. DeWEESE. Nor I yours.

I do not know exactly what is in the gentleman's proposal, but it certainly, from the snippet of information we have received, makes sense that it is an advancement over what we are dealing with.

Mayor Street's acquiescence to roughly \$15 million is a command decision and an administrative perspective on his part that I have yet to embrace, especially when the city of Philadelphia tells all of us that the problems are somewhere between \$250 and \$300 million. So although I think that the Republican bosses of Lancaster County and the Republican bosses of Philadelphia who dominate this chamber are being quite parsimonious with a \$15-million proposal, the gentleman's desire to suspend the rules makes sense to me, because it would advance our flag beyond our current position.

So I would ask for a favorable vote on the suspension so the gentleman's amendment can be considered. It certainly would take us beyond where we are today, and a favorable vote would get the ball rolling. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—105

Battisto	Frankel	McIlhattan	Scrimenti
Bebko-Jones	Freeman	McNaughton	Semmel
Belardi	George	Melio	Shaner
Belfanti	Gordner	Michlovic	Smith, B.
Benninghoff	Grucela	Miller, R.	Solobay
Birmelin	Gruitza	Mundy	Staback
Bishop	Haluska	Myers	Stairs
Blaum	Hanna	Nickol	Steelman
Boyes	Harhai	Pesci	Stetler
Buxton	Hennessey	Petrarca	Sturla
Caltagirone	Herman	Petrone	Surra
Casorio	Hess	Pistella	Tangretti
Cawley	James	Platts	Thomas
Cohen, L. I.	Josephs	Preston	Tigue

Cohen, M.	Kaiser	Ramos	Travaglio
Colafella	Kenney	Reinard	Trello
Costa	Kirkland	Robinson	Trich
Coy	Laughlin	Roebuck	Van Horne
Curry	Lawless	Rooney	Veon
Daley	Lescovitz	Ruffing	Vitali
DeLuca	Lucyk	Sainato	Walko
Dermody	Manderino	Samuelson	Williams
DeWeese	Mann	Santoni	Wilt
Donatucci	Markosek	Sather	Wojnaroski
Eachus	Mayernik	Saylor	Yewcic
Evans	McCall	Schuler	Yudichak
Forcier			

NAYS—90

Adolph	Druce	Maher	Rubley
Allen	Egolf	Maitland	Schroder
Argall	Fairchild	Major	Smith, S. H.
Armstrong	Fargo	Marsico	Snyder
Baker	Feese	Masland	Steil
Bard	Fichter	McGeehan	Stern
Barley	Fleagle	McGill	Stevenson
Barrar	Flick	McIlhinney	Strittmatter
Bastian	Gannon	Metcalfe	Taylor, E. Z.
Browne	Geist	Micozzie	Taylor, J.
Bunt	Gladeck	Miller, S.	True
Butkovitz	Godshall	Nailor	Tulli
Carn	Habay	O'Brien	Vance
Chadwick	Harhart	Oliver	Washington
Civera	Hasay	Orie	Waters
Clark	Hershey	Perzel	Wogan
Clymer	Hutchinson	Phillips	Wright
Cornell	Jadlowiec	Pippy	Youngblood
Corrigan	Keller	Raymond	Zimmerman
Dailey	Krebs	Readshaw	Zug
Dally	Lederer	Rieger	
Dempsey	Leh	Rohrer	Ryan,
DiGirolamo	Lynch	Ross	Speaker

NOT VOTING—3

Horsley	LaGrotta	Levdansky
---------	----------	-----------

EXCUSED—4

Cappabianca	Gigliotti	Roberts	Seyfert
-------------	-----------	---------	---------

Less than a majority of the members required by the rules 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 to House amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair again recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Saylor.

Mr. SAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I would like at this point to make a motion to revert to the prior printer's number.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman would have to suspend the rules in order to do that.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to make a motion to suspend the rules to do so, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from York, Mr. Saylor, moves that the rules be suspended in order to move to PN 1920. Is that correct, Mr. Saylor?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the motion, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Perzel.

Mr. PERZEL. Madam Speaker, I would ask the members to please vote "no" on the suspension of the rules. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the minority leader, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Would the gentleman allow 2 minutes' explication on the rules suspension, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Again, the gentleman may briefly state.

Mr. SAYLOR. My purpose is to revert to the prior printer's number as it came over from the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Those in favor of suspension will vote—

Mr. DeWEESE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I did not realize that you were recognized, sir. The Chair does now recognize the minority leader.

Mr. DeWEESE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I would favor the gentleman's motion to suspend the rules.

A quintessential focus of this chamber has historically been the work of our Education Committee. As everyone knows, the Education Committee of the State House of Representatives has been purposely shunted to the sidelines during this crucial debate. The gentleman asks for a suspension of the rules because the Rules Committee only met minutes ago, and encyclopedic volumes of language have been incorporated into a very basic funding proposal. If we suspend the rules and revert to a prior printer's number, then, Madam Speaker, we are only dealing with a funding matter that is easily comprehensible, easily discernible, and easy to make up our minds upon, whether we vote in the affirmative or the negative.

Yesterday the gentleman, Mr. Clymer, committee chairman of State Government, discussed a 10-month program of analysis and dissection and focus on campaign funding reform, but today the Rules Committee meets like that, and we are getting ready to change the way we fund and deal with basic education in this State.

My Republican colleague from York makes a good proposal. We should revert to a prior printer's number, deal with the fiscal matter in this the budget season, not ravage the School Code, not ravage the way we run basic education in our Commonwealth. This is a bipartisan request. I join with my Republican colleague from York County and ask for a favorable vote on the suspension of the rules for the purpose of reverting to a prior printer's number.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—107

Battisto	Forcier	McIlhattan	Scrimenti
Bebko-Jones	Frankel	McNaughton	Semmel
Belardi	Freeman	Melio	Shaner
Belfanti	George	Michlovic	Smith, B.
Benninghoff	Gordner	Miller, R.	Solobay
Birmelin	Grucela	Mundy	Staback
Bishop	Gruitza	Myers	Stairs
Blaum	Haluska	Nickol	Steelman
Boyes	Hanna	Pesci	Stetler
Butkovitz	Harhai	Petrarca	Sturla
Buxton	Herman	Petrone	Surra
Caltagirone	Hess	Pistella	Tangretti
Casorio	Horsey	Platts	Thomas
Cawley	James	Preston	Tigue
Cohen, L. I.	Josephs	Ramos	Travaglio
Cohen, M.	Kaiser	Readshaw	Trello
Colafella	Kirkland	Reinard	Trich
Costa	Laughlin	Robinson	Van Horne
Coy	Lawless	Roebuck	Veon
Curry	Lescovitz	Rooney	Vitali
Dailey	Levdansky	Ruffing	Waiko
DeLuca	Lucyk	Sainato	Williams
Dermody	Manderino	Samuelson	Wilt
DeWeese	Mann	Santoni	Wojnaroski
Donatucci	Markosek	Sather	Yewcic
Eachus	Mayernik	Saylor	Yudichak
Evans	McCall	Schuler	

NAYS—84

Adolph	Egolf	Lynch	Ross
Allen	Fairchild	Maher	Rublely
Argall	Fargo	Maitland	Schroder
Armstrong	Feese	Major	Smith, S. H.
Baker	Fichter	Marsico	Snyder
Bard	Fleagle	Masland	Steil
Barley	Flick	McGeehan	Stern
Barrar	Gannon	McGill	Stevenson
Bastian	Geist	McIlhinney	Strittmatter
Browne	Giadeck	Metcalfe	Taylor, E. Z.
Bunt	Godshall	Micozzie	Taylor, J.
Chadwick	Habay	Miller, S.	True
Civera	Harhart	Nailor	Tulli
Clark	Hasay	O'Brien	Vance
Clymer	Hennessey	Oliver	Wogan
Cornell	Hershey	Orie	Wright
Corrigan	Hutchinson	Perzel	Zimmerman
Dailey	Jadlowiec	Phillips	Zug
Dally	Keller	Raymond	
Dempsey	Krebs	Rieger	
DiGirolamo	Lederer	Rohrer	Ryan,
Druce	Leh		Speaker

NOT VOTING—7

Cam	LaGrotta	Washington	Youngblood
Kenney	Pippy	Waters	

EXCUSED—4

Cappabianca	Gigliotti	Roberts	Seyfert
-------------	-----------	---------	---------

Less than a majority of the members required by the rules 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 to House amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair again recognizes the gentleman from York County, Mr. Saylor.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My final motion, Madam Speaker, is to commit the bill back to the Education Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from York County moves that—

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SAYLOR. A parliamentary procedure, if I may, Madam Speaker.

May I recommit the bill to Education?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. SAYLOR. That would be my motion, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would you like to make the whole motion again, please?

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to make the motion that we commit the bill, SB 652, to the Education Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Saylor, moves that SB 652 be recommitted to the Education Committee.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the Chair recognizes the minority leader, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. Now we will get to see some real hypocrisy.

Campaign finance reform needs 10 months-plus to percolate through the notable Clymer committee. Yesterday, all you Republican conservatives said, hold off on campaign finance reform; it has got to go through the committee, work groups. Slowly, slowly, you said; let us not do anything drastic on campaign finance reform. Fast-forward the clock, 24 hours later. Now all you Republican conservatives, or at least most all of you Republican conservatives, now have a chance to put your money where your mouth is.

The noble and esteemed gentleman from York, your own Republican colleague, says send this measure back to the Education Committee. How could you be against that? It just got here. It just came over from the Senate hours ago. It is complicated. It is fundamentally changing collective bargaining, fundamentally changing the way waivers may be granted to our school districts, fundamentally changing the amount of juice that Gene Hickok today or some subsequent Secretary of Education is going to have.

This is a big proposal. So we want it, my Republican colleague from York and several of us, want it to go back to the Education Committee for some focus, for some study. We have only had it a couple of hours. You voted yesterday to allow the Clymer committee to do its work. Today, honorable colleagues, you have a chance to allow the Stairs-Colafella Education Committee to do its work.

It is a good idea that the gentleman proffers. I hope we can suspend the rules and send this back to the Education Committee. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair would correct the gentleman. This is not a suspension of the rules; it is a simple motion to recommit. It requires a simple majority.

Those in favor of— Mr. Platts.

Mr. PLATTS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of the motion to commit. As a member of the Education Committee, as a member of the Education Committee, I would appreciate the opportunity to gain some feedback on such a substantive proposal. I first saw this proposal 4 hours ago in writing. There are some good parts to it; there are some bad parts, but I would like to be able to go back to my district and get feedback from my school board members, my superintendents, and see if we can make maybe something that is headed in the right direction better.

Our delegation— Mr. Speaker, can I have the attention of the chamber, please?

The SPEAKER. Members, please take your seats. Conferences in the aisles, please break up.

Mr. Platts.

Mr. PLATTS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Our delegation was scheduled to meet with the superintendent of the York City schools, one of the schools identified if this proposal moves forward, on Friday of this week. I was looking forward to that meeting, the chance to get some firsthand feedback from one of the schools that will supposedly be helped by this proposal. By manipulating the process, as we have today, we will not have that opportunity if we move forward with this vote on the substantive bill. If we recommit it to Education, I, our delegation, and each member here has the chance to get that type of feedback. If it is about helping the kids, what are we afraid of? Let us have the opportunity to get feedback and do what is right.

So I urge a "yes" vote on the motion. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Stairs.

Mr. STAIRS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This motion that we are talking about to recommit to the Education Committee, I speak as the chairman of the Education Committee and as the ranking Republican member of the Education Committee that we would be more than welcome to take this bill. Our committee through the years has very seriously and deliberately, sometimes too deliberately, I might add, debated legislation. The idea that we have had this for an hour or so, we would have loved to have had this 6 months ago and worked on it and had something on the floor today that you could approve of overwhelmingly.

But to answer the question and be very specific, we welcome it. And I say one thing to my fellow Republican chairmen of other committees: We have in this House probably 24, 25 other committees that we have chairmen, Republican and minority, Democrat chairmen, and I just ask you today as my committee that I serve on, as we are being bypassed, as we are being end run, I ask you chairmen, my colleagues of other committees, your turn may be next, and how will you feel when your committee is end run? So think about this when you vote on this. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Perzel.

Mr. PERZEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this vote is the same as a vote on final passage. If this goes back to the Education Committee— I know; I heard the ohs. I was elected here in 1978, and never has anybody had the courage to bring this issue up. You were here 12 years in charge and did not do it; I gave our Education Committee 6. So 18 years of combined neglect by both sides, and what have we gotten for that? Eleven school districts where more than 50 percent of the kids fail every year, year after year after year, and we should be ashamed of ourselves as members of this General Assembly for allowing all those kids to fail. And the first time we bring it up, and you all knew about it last year when we gave you a copy of it; it has not changed; we took schools of choice out of it, but you let those kids fail, and if you send it back to committee now, there is never another chance for those kids to make it.

Now, it is nice; it is nice. You know, I asked the members on my side of the aisle, and a vast majority of them are going to do this, and we are going to be helping kids from some very, very poor school districts, and they have got to go home and tell their people they gave more money to the poorer school districts in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. That is what they have got to go do, when Radnor is getting 400, Lower Merion is getting 300 or 400, the Speaker's district is getting 300 or 400, and all those districts we are trying to help are getting thousands, Mr. Speaker, but we know they have been a failure. They have been a failure. By any, any measure or any standard that is out there, they have been a failure. Mr. Speaker, Harrisburg, eighth grade math, 79 percent of the kids are in the bottom 25 percentile; 76 percent of the kids in reading, eighth grade. Chester-Upland, math, 75 percent of the kids in the bottom quarter; reading, 69 percent of the kids. I am not going to go on. They only get worse; they do not get any better.

You have a chance today with your vote to say, I have had enough; I am not going to let any more kids fail, and shame on you if you vote to send it back to a committee where you know they will never let that bill out. Every one of you knows that. So I am asking you, I know it is a tough vote and I know it is a hard thing to do, and I know they are standing back there trying to beat you, but it is the only opportunity you have to help the children of Pennsylvania, 11 school districts that have failed every year.

I beg you, I implore you to stick with this, and do not send it back to that committee.

The SPEAKER. On the question, Mr. Preston.

The House will come to order.

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

It is not shame on me; it is shame on you, Mr. Speaker. I have in my district the only school district that was privatized in the country of the United States of America, led by — and I do respect the gentlemen — the Governor and the Secretary of Education, and led by, again, the majority leader. I have invited them to visit the school in their experiment of just what he said, shame on you, that they tried for 2 1/2 or 3 years where the test scores went down. Test scores went down. Now you want to try to bribe us with \$182,000. That is what you want these people to go home and vote for — \$182,000 for the borough of Wilkesburg — after what you already tried once has failed. They had everything they wanted. They even put in the teachers that were not officially certified, and the certifications caught up. We hired managers from Eat'N Park that people wanted.

and they got certified later on. They hired everybody that they wanted to hire, they kicked out all the students they wanted to kick out, and the test scores went down — their way, your way, sir. Now for \$182,000 you found a better idea; come on. But yet in a sense you are wanting to help, with all due respect, the county of Philadelphia. Well, my school board there, they do not get paid extra staff; no, they volunteer. They do not get three or four personal staff. We do not have the low tax effort and collection that you have. We have a very high— As a matter of fact, we reassess every 3 years. We made every single effort, and yes, there are problems, and I am willing to bite a bullet from time to time when there are tough problems, and we need to be able to address this, but \$182,000 — Mr. Speaker, as you said, shame on you — just does not get it when I have several thousand students, and you try to break that down. We do not have teachers that live in New Jersey and the other side of the State and do not even pay taxes there. We do not have computer systems that break down. We have a problem in Pennsylvania, not just in Philadelphia, but this just does not address it, and I do not think that we should be misled. Somewhere along the line in Pennsylvania we cannot continue to come up with these short fix-it ideas, and we have to be able to work at it, but \$182,000 this time does not get it. And I would like the majority leader to tell me then, how is \$182,000 going to turn the borough of Wilksburg around, and if he feels that confident about it, he should be able to say so, because they already had the first chance, now this is the second chance, but he even wants to give even less. They gave more than that the first time when they privatized it. They pumped hundreds of thousands of dollars into that district.

And perhaps maybe the members do not know what has happened in Kansas City. They just certified it. They just certified a school district that the State had put hundreds of millions of dollars in — Olympic-sized swimming pools, computers, more lighting — and for the gentleman's purview, you know, there are better techniques right now—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Preston, I have been very lenient—

Mr. PRESTON. Yes, sir. I agree—

The SPEAKER. —in the rules—

Mr. PRESTON. I will agree. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. —but the question is recommittal.

Mr. PRESTON. I think that we really need to look at this situation. I wish that the Rohrer amendment had been able to pass so we could try to look at it. But again, it is not just about throwing money into the issue. I think that we need to adequately be able to look at this. We should recommit this bill, but not only that, we should have an obligation to the children to come up with things, not just with money but to come up with what makes education work, and this just does not do it, especially \$182,000 for Wilksburg.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. COLAFELLA. Mr. Speaker, I just simply want to say this: Today is the day that the chairman of the Education Committee and the minority chairman of the Education Committee are saying to all of you ladies and gentlemen, it is time that we run our House. It is time that we run the business of this House and not the Governor's Office. Let him run his

office; that is the executive branch. It is time that we stand up and run our business like the people back home, the 60,000 people, send you here to do, and that is to do business here in Harrisburg for them back home and not one person to do everything.

Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. Flick, Chester County.

The question before the House is recommittal.

Mr. FLICK. Mr. Speaker, I serve on the Education Committee, and I would just like to say that I think Representative Stairs and Representative Colafella do an excellent job on the Education Committee. But, but, I would like to say that this is an issue today that I think is one of the most important issues since I have been here. We are either going to vote for the kids— Just give me my second, Mr. Speaker. We are either going to vote for the kids and help them, or we are going to support PSEA (Pennsylvania State Education Association). That is this vote. This is PSEA versus the kids. It most certainly is. You know it, and we will see by the board whether you are voting for kids or for PSEA.

This is an important vote.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Belfanti.

Mr. BELFANTI. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief, and Chairman Colafella mentioned much of what I wanted to say, also in a brief period of time.

But I think the majority leader's comments are the very reason we should recommit this bill. Somewhere in this bill, Mr. Speaker, is a good bill. And I have heard a number of my colleagues both in caucus and here on the floor say, there is a lot of bad stuff in here, there is a lot wrong with this bill, but it is better than nothing; that is why I have to vote for it.

Well, let us send this bill back to committee and take the garbage out, take the unilateral powers that we are going to give to an appointed, unelected Secretary of Education. No one here wants to make a single Cabinet-level official a czar of anything, let alone the Secretary of Education that we have in this Commonwealth today, who does not believe in public education.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us find the 40 percent or 50 percent of this legislation that is good and kick it back out and get rid of the crap. Send it back to committee. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Platts, for the second time.

Mr. PLATTS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do not want to belabor things here, but I feel the need to respond.

As a member of the Education Committee, the reference of benign neglect for 6 years in the majority on that committee, I think the record needs to be set straight that we have passed numerous bills out of committee that deal with specific efforts to improve our schools. I am going to give you an example: special ed. One hundred and twenty-five or more members of this House have cosponsored with Representative Stairs the special ed legislation, so that schools like York City that now have to spend millions of their local funds on making up the unfunded mandate that we are not funding instead of other issues that would help improve their schools at the local level, well, we are trying to correct that. We passed that bill out of committee. Where is it? Is it in committee? Not in our committee. It is in Appropriations. It is not in the Ed Committee. We passed one after another proposal to help

our schools. It maybe is not what is embraced by those supporting this proposal—

The SPEAKER. Mr. Platts—

Mr. PLATTS. —so those have not moved forward.

The SPEAKER. —recommittal.

Mr. PLATTS. My apologies, Mr. Speaker.

I just felt the need— The suggestion by a previous speaker that our committee has not taken up issues to improve our schools I do not believe is correct. We will gladly make a good-faith effort, and I think I can make a commitment — I know I can on my behalf and the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle — that we will take a serious look at this, Representative Saylor's proposed amendment, and make an effort to come forward with a proposal to the House that will be well thought out, not rushed for any reason but let us improve the schools for our children, and I think we should have that opportunity as a committee to do so, and I thank the Speaker for his indulgence. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Mr. Evans, waives off.

The gentleman, Mr. Battisto.

Mr. BATTISTO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this might be a great day in this legislature. You heard the majority leader say that he is sick and tired of 18 years without solving this problem. I agree with him. I hate to see 1 school district fail, let alone 11, and many others on the brink maybe of failing. The fact of the matter is, this may be a good day because there are some good things in this amendment — some terrible things, too. I think there are some great things embedded in Representative Saylor's amendment. So I think this is a good day, because let us send this bill back to the Education Committee; let us put them on the spot — the world knows they are on the spot now — let them meld the two proposals and come up with something decent to solve the problems that the majority leader is concerned about, I am concerned about, Representative Evans is concerned about, we are all concerned about.

Let us do something good, forget about politics, and send it back to committee right now.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Saylor, for the second time.

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

I was a little offended a little bit ago when I heard that this is about the PSEA versus children. Today we are talking about children, period. This is not about one group or one faction or anything else; this is about children. I do not think there is any member— And I doubt nobody's loyalty to the children of this Commonwealth of any member of this House, nor in the Governor's Office. It is a difference of opinion.

And today what I ask is for a chance for us to work out what is best for all of this Commonwealth, a chance for the Education Committee, and I believe if you ask the chairman of the Education Committee, he will have a bill out here on this House floor, and you can amend it and you can do whatever you want with it to make it suit whatever you want, and the majority of this House can rule. We did not have a chance to have input in this proposal. We deserve that right as House members. This is not a dictatorship. This is a place where we work together. We win by majority rule.

I want to see those 11 school districts that we have and the children grow and prosper. We do not do it by proposals that come on this House floor within a few hours after being

proposed, and I have heard, I think, every member of this House floor yell and scream about that day in and day out. You know, unless you put a stop to it, it is going to continue to happen, and that goes for both sides of the aisle.

So if we truly want to live up to these things today, here is our chance, and let us put the pressure back where it belongs, on the Education Committee, to come up with a proposal that will solve the problems of the children of this Commonwealth in all 501 school districts. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Roebuck.

Mr. ROEBUCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, serve on the Education Committee, and I know how hard that committee works, as other committees in this House work. If we have a process, let us follow the process. The process says that you have the ability in committees to mesh ideas, to debate ideas, to discuss them. In this form that we are dealing with today, we get something and we cannot even amend it on this floor, because our majority leader gets up and says, do not amend it. That is wrong, Mr. Speaker. That is fundamentally wrong.

This bill is not the end of the world. We have been told that this is the only opportunity we are going to have; that somehow if we do not pass this bill today, the world is going to end for kids. That is nonsense, and we know that is nonsense. If it is a good bill, it can go to committee; it could be made better, and I believe it could be made better. But let us not be railroaded by some kind of hysterical statement that this is the only chance we are going to have; that if we do not do this, all kids in 11 districts are never going to have another opportunity to improve. That simply is wrong, Mr. Speaker, and this bill deserves better attention than we are giving it. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Michlovic, on the question of recommittal.

Mr. MICHLOVIC. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I was not going to get up until one of the gentlemen talked about the interests of one of the groups involved, the PSEA, and made the statement that those of us voting for this motion to recommit are just playing to that tune.

I represent Duquesne, 1 of the 11 school districts, and even though that is a distressed school district and even though those kids are struggling and have a difficult time in their scores, I respect the people that make the effort day in and day out to try to teach them.

We had one of the members get up here and talk about the compassion of the mayor and that he cares about the kids and the compassion of the delegation. I believe that we are not the only ones that have compassion. I believe that those teachers, despite the fact that they belong to a union, I believe that they care about those kids. I believe so do the principals and the superintendents, the administrators.

And the opportunity that Mr. Platts is arguing for and Mr. Saylor is arguing for is to get input, to get input about this very important issue. And all of those people that are involved in education, they all oppose this legislation, maybe because they do not know enough about it. This is our opportunity to get their input. This is our opportunity to take this bill back and ask them, what do you think? Let us respect them. Let us respect them and recommit the bill and ask their opinion and come back and deal with this issue later. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Strittmatter.

Mr. STRITTMATTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like permission to interrogate the maker of the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Saylor, indicates he will stand for interrogation. You may proceed.

Mr. STRITTMATTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you have not served that many years, but I wanted to ask the question to know, is it not true that with your last debate, you misled everyone in the House believing that ideas can be meshed together in committee when a bill on concurrence returned to a committee, you do not have the power in the committee to amend? Is that not true?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

I think that is a question that should more properly be put to the Chair, and the Chair would advise, as a matter of parliamentary ruling, that the committee does not have the right to amend this bill if it is returned to committee.

Mr. STRITTMATTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. I do not think that is a question for Mr. Saylor to discuss, but rather, it is a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. Saylor.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I said that they would amend it, but I said in my comments that they would report a bill out.

The SPEAKER. Whatever. I think the sense of Mr. Strittmatter's remarks was to the effect that a committee does not have the power to amend this particular bill, this Senate bill, if it is recommitted to committee, and in that respect, Mr. Strittmatter is accurate; the committee would not have the right to amend the bill if it is returned to the committee. That is under rule 30.

Mr. STRITTMATTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

That is what I wanted to clarify, because I think there is a lot of misinformation that there would be something done. I think we should pass this bill today, and then if the committee wants to have other changes, it is certainly within their power in the next coming weeks to propose a bill—

The SPEAKER. Mr. Strittmatter, this was a question of parliamentary inquiry or interrogation and not an opportunity to debate.

Mr. STRITTMATTER. Thank you. I am finished. Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Stairs.

Mr. STAIRS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do not want to dwell on this subject, because I think we are ready to vote it and we know how we are going to vote it, but I wanted to assure the members, there has been some maybe undermining of thought and some suspicion that this is going to come to the committee and we are going to hide it, we are going to bury it, and we are not going to do anything. Well, you can bank on it, Mr. Speaker, that if we get this bill in our committee, we are going to take the appropriate action with regard to the Speaker's rules that we have to abide by, of course, but we are going to act in an expeditious manner and resolve the problem of our children, which that is what we are here to do in the first place. So we will be very fast and very thorough. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. On the question of recommittal, Mr. Perzel.

Mr. PERZEL. I think the gentleman made an appropriate point, Mr. Speaker, and that point is, if it goes back to the

Education Committee, where they cannot do anything to the bill, the only thing that they can do to it is hold it and kill it.

So I would ask the members again to vote "no" on sending it back to the Education Committee. The school subsidy is in there; the mental health/mental retardation money is in there; special ed is in there. All those things are in there. It can go back to that committee, but they cannot really do anything to it, Mr. Speaker. The only thing they could do to it is hold it and kill it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for a "no."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Battisto, for the second time.

Mr. BATTISTO. Mr. Speaker, I was not going to pop up like this, but the majority leader said, all they can do is kill the bill. They do not have to kick this bill out. They can take this bill back, look at the good things in this bill, the good things in Representative Saylor's amendment, and kick out a bill that will be a credit to all of us—to the children of those 11 districts and everybody else. They can do that, and they can still do what we have to do here. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. Perzel, do you seek further recognition?

Mr. PERZEL. I did not want to do this, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to go back and remind him that the 12 years that he was in charge and the 6 that we were in charge, nothing happened. This is an opportunity to do something.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—95

Battisto	Freeman	Michlovic	Shaner
Bebko-Jones	George	Mundy	Smith, B.
Belardi	Gordner	Myers	Solobay
Belfanti	Grucela	O'Brien	Staback
Blaum	Gruitza	Pesci	Stairs
Boyes	Haluska	Petrarca	Steelman
Butkovitz	Hanna	Petrone	Stetler
Buxton	Harhai	Pistella	Sturla
Caltagirone	Herman	Platts	Surra
Casorio	Hess	Preston	Tangretti
Cohen, L. I.	James	Readshaw	Thomas
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Rieger	Tigue
Colafella	Kaiser	Robinson	Travaglio
Costa	Kirkland	Roebuck	Trello
Coy	Laughlin	Rooney	Van Horne
Curry	Lawless	Ruffing	Veon
Daley	Lescovitz	Sainato	Vitali
DeLuca	Lucyk	Samuelson	Walko
Dermody	Manderino	Santoni	Washington
DeWeese	Mann	Sather	Williams
Donatucci	Markosek	Saylor	Wojnaroski
Eachus	McCall	Schuler	Yewcic
Forcier	McNaughton	Scrimenti	Yudichak
Frankel	Melio	Semmel	

NAYS—97

Adolph	DiGirolamo	Leh	Rohrer
Allen	Druce	Levdansky	Ross
Argall	Egolf	Lynch	Rubley
Armstrong	Evans	Maher	Schroder
Baker	Fairchild	Maitland	Smith, S. H.
Bard	Fargo	Major	Snyder
Barley	Feese	Marsico	Steil
Barrar	Fichter	Masland	Stern

Bastian	Fleagle	McGeehan	Stevenson
Benninghoff	Flick	McGill	Strittmatter
Birmelin	Gannon	McIlhattan	Taylor, E. Z.
Bishop	Geist	McIlhinney	Taylor, J.
Browne	Gladeck	Metcalfe	True
Bunt	Godshall	Micozzie	Tulli
Carn	Habay	Miller, R.	Vance
Cawley	Harhart	Miller, S.	Wilt
Chadwick	Hasay	Nailor	Wogan
Civera	Hennessey	Nickol	Wright
Clark	Hershey	Oliver	Youngblood
Clymer	Hutchinson	Orie	Zimmerman
Cornell	Jadlowiec	Perzel	Zug
Corrigan	Keller	Phillips	
Dailey	Kenney	Pippy	
Dally	Krebs	Ramos	Ryan,
Dempsey	Lederer	Raymond	Speaker

NOT VOTING—6

Horsley	Mayernik	Trich	Waters
LaGrotta	Reinard		

EXCUSED—4

Cappabianca	Gigliotti	Roberts	Seyfert
-------------	-----------	---------	---------

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 to House amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Grucela. The question is on concurrence.

The gentleman, Mr. Grucela, has been recognized. The conferences in the vicinity of the gentleman, please disband. The conferences generally on the floor, please, this is a difficult bill; please take your seats.

Mr. Grucela.

Mr. GRUCELA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on two points: one, to oppose the Education Empowerment Act, but secondly, to apologize to all those students that I taught American Government to for 30 years in the classroom. Many textbooks talk about the committee system. When we take students on tours here in the Capitol, we tell them about the process and we talk about the committee system. And I realize I have only been here a very short time, and perhaps I am a bit idealistic because I believed in the committee system, but I am learning that some things seem to be superficial and can supersede the committee system.

So as a member of the Education Committee, I applaud those that wanted to recommit to the Education Committee and I applaud all those members on the Education Committee. I think we have two fine chairmen, and I have been very pleased to be a member of that committee.

I believe also, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of what we just did when we bypassed the process and we bypassed what we teach in the schools — and ironically, this bill is about education — that it probably is a reason for a lot of the low voter turnout, especially among young people. I remember when I tried to encourage the young people to vote, I can remember many of

the negative comments they made about public service in general and the way we sometimes operate.

So, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Education Committee, I would have preferred to study this and deal with the good points and deal with those points that are not so good to some of us or some of our opinions. As a member of the body of the House of Representatives, I would like to have been able to practice that which I preached for 30 years in the classroom.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the way we handled this bill in general, and I am opposed to the amendment in particular. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

There are too many members standing around on the floor. It is difficult to keep control of the debate.

Now, the staff members are going to have to take their seats. They are not engaged in this part of the debate. Please, take seats. Members, please take seats. Mr. DeLuca is entitled to the attention of the floor.

Mr. DeLuca.

Mr. DeLUCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose concurrence on SB 652.

I have heard a lot of rhetoric here today, a lot of people talking, and I respect what they say, but I think what we are talking about and what we should be doing is not piecemealing what is wrong with education. We all know we have problems in education. We all know that we need to do more for the kids in reading and writing and arithmetic. We all know about safety in our school districts. We all know that we need to do more to make our schools safer and put more money into the physical plants. We know that. This bill does not do it though.

Every one of us, every one in this chamber, is for providing a good education for the schoolchildren of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It is not just these 11 school districts that we talk about funding. Let us look at the funding. A majority of the funding only goes to two school districts. The Philadelphia area and Harrisburg get the bulk of the \$20 million. There are other ways that we should be addressing this situation, but we do not do it with this bill. And it has nothing to do with supporting the PSEA. It has to do with kids. It has to do with every one of our school districts.

A little while ago, over 2 years — and then finally a decision came against them — 200-and-some school districts, poor and rural school districts, went to Commonwealth Court because of the funding they were not getting. We need to do a better job in funding education. This does not do it. This only takes care of 11 school districts and mostly the money going into two.

We need to address the issues out there that affect all our children, and it is not only happening in our schools. We know there are economic conditions out there that pertain to our schools. We need to address them. We talked about putting more money into our prison system. My God, we need to invest more in the front end of education so these children do not end up at \$30,000 a year in our prison systems.

We can do it, but this is not the way to do it. We need to make a concerted effort together, Republicans and Democrats, to work for all of the children in the school districts. We all have problems in our school districts — the city of Pittsburgh, Penn Hills. All the districts have problems. You cannot tell me

one school district that does not have a problem out there, and we need to address those problems.

But SB 652 does not do it, and I ask for a “no” vote on concurrence. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Buxton.

Mr. BUXTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a very heavy heart that I stand before my colleagues today to discuss this legislation which is before us, for you see, the Secretary of Education in Pennsylvania has placed two schools within my legislative district on his academic distressed list. I believe the legislation before us today, however, does not address the mistakes of the past and offers very little hope for the future to the children in Pennsylvania’s urban school districts.

Studies conducted in Baltimore, Milwaukee, and Chicago have systematically shown that privatizing public schools failed to increase any scores. It fails to save dollars, it fails in test scores, and it fails to reduce education bureaucracy. If we do not learn from the mistakes, we will cost taxpayers of this State millions of dollars.

We need only look at the Wilksburg School District and the Turner Elementary School fiasco to see how 2 years of privatizing a school cost taxpayers a \$4-million failure. I do not want to see another 2-year period, such as the one suggested in today’s legislation, cost Pennsylvania taxpayers one more red cent in privatizing public education.

The legislation will stigmatize students and schools for problems directly related to poverty, not education. Education empowerment is being touted as giving more money to the distressed districts and, with the Department of Education’s approval, eliminating certain mandates. How many programs can a school district offer its students with the proposed \$70- to \$80-a-pupil appropriation? How many smaller class sizes can we create with this money? Are we actually going to ask the taxpayers to pick up the bill once again? When we address the issue of poverty, will we then effectively address the issue of academic achievement?

This bill is little more than a legislative placebo that has been proven to be embarrassingly ineffective in raising test scores. Urban New Jersey schools have been under State control for the past 10 years and still have not seen an improvement in a number of State and local benchmarks. There is already enough bureaucracy in education. Adding another layer will not improve the education of our children. Addressing their basic needs will.

Urban schools have a higher percentage of families at or below the Federal poverty level. This in itself creates an atmosphere not conducive to learning, and when you throw in a biased testing standard, as is found in the PSSA test (Pennsylvania System of School Assessment test), you are creating a caste system that by design will prove a biased, inadequate system of education. The PSSA test is a moving target that does not keep in line with new education standings and will unfairly, unfairly, keep a school district on the distressed list and scar its children.

Children cannot and will not learn if they are hungry, if they are tired, if they have disruptive home environments. They must be given the individual attention necessary to address the social issues that affect their learning ability, and this must be addressed the first day that they enter our public school system.

This legislation is deficient in providing those necessary resources, and I would respectfully request a negative vote.

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

Mr. GEORGE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to belabor this, and I had some questions, but there is no use asking them.

I look at page 19 of the bill, and I wonder what we are going to do with these public schools; that we turn them into public-private, for-profit schools, and I am concerned about that. I am concerned whether a profit margin is more important than those kids that we all talk about.

Mr. Speaker, there is not anybody in this hall that does not love kids and want to see that we do the best for them. That is why I am a little bit confused on what is going on in that we look around and a bill is provided for us that we cannot get answers to. And then it has been agreed by both chairmen, Mr. Speaker, that they gave their word that they would take the bill in and bring another bill out. And then the majority leader says, it will never come out again, and I am wondering why he would be concerned, Mr. Speaker, in that he simply has to control the Rules Committee and bring anything out at any time, whichever way he wants, and I really believe he wants to help the kids, like anyone else.

I wonder what we are going to do with these for-profit schools when they buy equipment. Today if we buy equipment, we have a routine to go through — hundreds of pages of rules and regulations. Mr. Speaker, we have more rules for buying milk cartons for these kids in school than simply we ought to understand.

So there are a lot of things that we could have done to make it cheaper for the schools, and there are a lot of things that we could do to protect the schools and the kids within them. So if we are going to take a meat-ax approach, then I guess that is what will happen today, but I warn that it will be like spitting into the wind; it is going to come back and hit some of you, and then you are going to worry why we acted so foolishly, so quickly, when we could have delayed a couple of days and really done something for the kids in that we have been talking about it, the majority leader said, for 18 years and there is no better time than now, but what we are doing now is not the answer. That is why I have to vote “no.” Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Preston. Mr. Preston, you are recognized.

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

We are in the process of trying to help solve some of Philadelphia’s problems as far as their budget is concerned. I am still trying to figure out if they are going to have, as they have been telling us, a \$200-million shortfall, how it is going to really solve and push the cushion. At the same time, I have heard the majority leader stand up and speak, and if he addresses the issue again about the last 12 years, on what we have or have not done, then he needs to answer the question that after this administration, along with his help, gave the Wilksburg School District an extra couple million dollars and the test scores still went down under privatization, what \$182,000 is going to do, and I would like to be able to interrogate him with that if he brings these points up about the last 12 years.

I can remember several years ago, on our side of the aisle, when the late great Jim Manderino proposed, along with Mr. Irvis, trying to give computers, \$200 million just for computers for elementary schools, shot down. It is not the first time that we have done some things, tried to do things. Forty million dollars for education for teachers, shot down again.

Over and over again, we have had to bail out the School District of Philadelphia, and it is still not enough, and they still have a deficit. My local school district in Pittsburgh has a deficit of around \$30 million, and I have just reached this point where these little drips are not going to help.

We really need to be able to address this issue about quality education. How does a young person from the kindergarten or preschool start off on an equal basis and receive a good, basic, quality education? How do people wind up having meaningful employment? And I heard several statistics, about 80 percent of the people on one stand of the line, and I look at the gentlemen here in Harrisburg, and I sit down and I wonder, we are not answering the questions about good, basic, quality education.

And again, if you read what is happening in Kansas City now, it is not just about throwing money around. In the previous statements, I have heard the majority leader talk about, we have got to make the School District of Philadelphia more accountable, not just throw money at them. Well, now we are going to throw another \$15 million at them, but everybody else does not get a fair share. I guess in this House and in this body, there are a lot of different ways to discriminate, and I guess we continue to find new ways to be able to do that.

It is a shame that we are going to have this issue in front of us and not answer the kids in my district. Again, Wilksburg, \$182,000, but yet in a sense, nothing is being done. Over again for many years, Mr. Speaker, I have always, when it was time that things were on the floor of the House that I thought did not give enough, I did not vote for, and I did not vote for those things because I thought Philadelphia deserved a little bit more. Well, never again; never, as long as I am elected, will this ever happen to me again. I have had it. I am getting absolutely tired of it. It is unfortunate, but I am proud to say at least that I have been in this House for 18 years and still have not been bought, have not been sold, have not accepted any trips in relationship to being able to trade in any vote or anything of any material, nor will I ever be.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sham, this is a quiet embarrassment, and it is a shame that some people can be bought so cheaply. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Michlovic. He waives off. Thank you.

The gentleman from Northampton, Mr. Samuelson.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, one of the previous speakers said that this proposal can limit class sizes in kindergarten through third grade, and yes, when you look at the bill, on page 24 it talks about reducing class sizes. When you look closer, you realize that this proposal is for smaller class sizes in only 11 school districts across Pennsylvania. There is some irony, because this bill, SB 652, is the very same bill that we voted last June in this House of Representatives. When it left the House of Representatives in June of 1999, it included an amendment by Representative Costa that this House overwhelmingly approved

which would have provided for smaller class sizes across Pennsylvania.

Another speaker said this proposal before us today includes an additional \$20 million for education. Once again, we are talking about an additional \$20 million for only 11 school districts.

Mr. Speaker, there are better plans out there, better solutions for our students across Pennsylvania. In fact, just 3 weeks ago this House of Representatives voted on two such plans. This line item in the proposed budget for school improvement grants for only 11 school districts, we voted on two amendments to redirect this funding. We voted to redirect \$10 million of this funding for the Read to Succeed program, a very successful initiative that started a year ago. Governor Ridge proposed it. This legislature approved Read to Succeed overwhelmingly at a level of \$35 million for year 1. Right now that funding is in place in 275 school districts across Pennsylvania. The proposed budget cuts that to \$25 million, but our amendment 3 weeks ago would have restored that funding to the \$35-million level.

We also voted to redirect \$10 million of this funding for smaller class sizes, for smaller class sizes that could benefit students across Pennsylvania. The proposal before us today directs the funding to 11 school districts. Mr. Speaker, I have to ask, what about the other 490 school districts in Pennsylvania?

I believe we should be talking about programs, we should be talking about educational solutions that can benefit students in all 501 school districts across Pennsylvania. Let us get serious about smaller class sizes throughout the Commonwealth. Let us say yes to reading programs that can benefit students across Pennsylvania. Let us say no to this proposal, which directs \$20 million to only 11 school districts, and let us say yes to educational solutions that can benefit our students across Pennsylvania.

I respectfully ask for a "no" vote on concurrence.

The SPEAKER. The lady from Indiana, Ms. Steelman.

Ms. STEELMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to make two points, one of which has also been touched on by some previous speakers and one of which has not been mentioned before.

The first one is that we have heard from a number of people that SB 652 in its current form is about children, and by voting to concur in this form, we will be voting for children. If you take a look at the amendment itself, that is obviously not what SB 652 and the amendment are about. There are more than 600 lines in this amendment. Fewer than 35 of them are actually devoted to any listing or discussion of programs that might affect children's performance on the Pennsylvania State assessments. Most of the amendment and SB 652 at present is given over to the development of elaborate and convoluted bureaucracies empowered beyond the wildest dreams of previous administrations.

That is what the bill is about. It is about political power. It is about controlling money. It is not about children, because the other thing that makes that clear is that when you look at the language that actually has to do with school improvement programs and you look at the money that is available through the bill to institute those school improvement programs, there is, shall we say, a more than digital divide.

Let me give you one example. One of the items that is suggested in the school improvement plan is a system of school selection that to the greatest extent possible allows parents to

choose the public school in the district their child can attend. Now, there are cities, school districts, in which public school choice has been instituted and has had very positive effects. One of those school districts is Cambridge, Massachusetts, which instituted complete, required public school choice more than a decade ago. They have gotten very good results out of that program. They have gotten it at a serious cost. In their first year of widespread public school choice, their transportation costs went from \$1 million to \$10 million. They figured that was worth it. But can a school district do that with the money that is available in this bill, even a relatively small school district? Probably not.

How many of these school districts with a grant base of \$450,000 and up to, which actually means somewhere between zero and \$75 per child, can they institute widespread school choice; can they institute summer programs; can they institute smaller class sizes; can they institute changes in curriculum, programming, teacher development — all the things that we actually know work to help students improve their performance — for \$75 or less per child? No, they cannot.

I understand from hearing Representatives from Philadelphia on the floor today that they are desperate and that they will do just about anything in order to get even a pittance for their school district, and I have also seen that it is very clear in the message from the majority leader that they are not going to be allowed to get more than a pittance. This is, it has been made very clear, their only chance to get anything at all. And so I do not blame them for being desperate, but I do blame them for giving up their responsibility to all of the students of Pennsylvania and for accepting something that is so poor in terms of providing any relief for the children in all of these 11 school districts and providing no relief at all for the children in other school districts who are not performing up to the level of the Pennsylvania State standards. As far as helping children, this bill is designed to fail. It cannot do otherwise.

My second point has to do with the Pennsylvania State assessments. At the very beginning of the amendment, there is a section that says, "...THE ACT OF MARCH 10, 1949...KNOWN AS THE PUBLIC SCHOOL CODE...IS AMENDED BY ADDING A DEFINITION TO READ:...WHEN USED IN THIS ACT" — the Public School Code — "THE FOLLOWING WORDS AND PHRASES SHALL HAVE THE FOLLOWING MEANINGS:...PENNSYLVANIA SYSTEM OF SCHOOL ASSESSMENT..." SHALL MEAN A TEST DEVELOPED AND IMPLEMENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION TO DETERMINE ONLY ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT RELATING TO OBJECTIVE ACADEMIC STANDARDS IN THE AREAS OF READING, MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE."

Once upon a time, in Pennsylvania, we had a writing requirement; we had, but we are about to dispose of, a requirement that students in grade 6 and grade 9 had to demonstrate that they could write at a level of proficiency characteristic of their grade, and we are about to deep-six that. Will it not make a terrific impression when you go back to your district and tell business people, what I did for education this week was terrific: I got rid of any requirement that students have to demonstrate in order to graduate from high school that they can write as much as a coherent paragraph, and I hope that you fully appreciate what I have done for you. I am sure they

will. I am sure they will. I cannot think, in the face of the competition that we face from other States for attracting business and for keeping business in Pennsylvania, what could make us more popular than doing away with any statewide requirement for writing proficiency whatsoever.

So when you vote for SB 652, you should know that you are casting a vote against writing requirements, and if you happen to think as I do that people graduating from high school in Pennsylvania should demonstrate that they can write, then you will agree with me that a vote for SB 652 is not a vote for children, it is not a vote for Pennsylvania, and it is not a vote that makes sense for us today.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (J. SCOT CHADWICK) PRESIDING

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

Mr. STAIRS. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

As the day draws on, I think our minds are pretty well made up. I know in my case, my mind is made up. I am voting against this matter.

There were two reasons that I had planned to vote against it. One was the method of moving the legislation, and certainly, I guess there has been some relief to me on that. Obviously, the chamber spoke a few moments ago and liked the way it is being moved, so obviously, my objections to that were in vain, so I guess I have got to backtrack on that.

But my objection remains the process and what we are doing. I think we all in this chamber want to help children, and maybe sometimes in some different ways we all want to help children, but I think the end results of this legislation will be some help to children, I guess, but probably the biggest will be an ego thing for ourselves. We are going to feel good that we did something, but unfortunately, there is not going to be much substance to it.

You know, it is difficult to look at a bill that is volumes in size in a matter of hours and to digest it. There are a lot of good things in the bill, but you know, I sense a lot of problems. One of the problems that I think we are making a tragic mistake is that the legislative branch of government is giving up a power base that we have had over the years, and the recipient, of course, is the Secretary of Education.

As much as I am dismayed by that, I also, as I read the bill — and I can say, without an expert opinion, that sometimes you miss a few things — but one thing in there that kind of caught my eye was that we are really taking away from local government, too. The elected school boards that we have, certainly like the legislature, we are not perfect; we do make mistakes. But one of the things that really kind of stuck out to me — and I hope I was seeing things that were not there and I was reading into it — but what kind of startled me was that our presently elected school boards are going to be superseded, you might say, by this advisory group or this select group that is going to be picked, and although this select group cannot vote on taxes or make changes like that — our Constitution, or I think our law requires, our School Code requires that the school board make those decisions — but you know, something stuck out to me that changes the present system. The present system is that a majority or more of the school board members must vote to

raise taxes, to make these significant changes, but as I read it, one person could do that on the board. It takes away the majority vote. And I am sure that this is something that needs very much clarification, and I hope I am wrong there, but this is one of many things that I just have a concern about, and I am afraid that we are losing power to the executive branch, and maybe we will feel good about it today, but there is going to be a day when it is going to come back to bite us, and I have got to vote for that reason and regretfully so.

So thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to give these remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On concurrence, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster County, Mr. Sturla, for the second time. No? The gentleman waives off.

The gentleman from York County, Mr. Platts, is recognized on concurrence.

Mr. PLATTS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A number of the points that I had planned to make have already been addressed by previous speakers, so I will not go into them, but I think there are two important items that need to be reemphasized.

A lot of focus has been on the so-called education empowerment portion of this proposal, but we should make sure we know it also deals with special ed funding, and well over 120 members of this House have cosponsored legislation to try to fix the problem in special ed funding. There is additional money in this proposal to take steps towards that fix, but it does not go anywhere near what 125 or 130 members of this House said is necessary. So when you vote for this, you are basically saying you approve somewhat of a status quo. Your school districts are still going to be under the gun when it comes to raising property taxes largely because of what we are doing here in Harrisburg, because we are not willing to pay our fair share of the cost of education throughout the Commonwealth, specifically dealing with special ed. That is in this bill. So whether you are a wealthy school district, a suburban, an urban, a poor district, everyone is being hit by the way we fund special ed. One of my school districts is one of the wealthiest in the State, but when it comes to special ed, we are underfunding them in the sense of our share dramatically. It cuts across the board, and that is in this bill.

Also, I think we are setting a dangerous precedent when we are giving one person — no matter how highly we regard the Secretary of Education, he is a political appointee — we are giving that one person the authority, with the wave of his hand in essence, to wipe away laws that took 102 House members, 26 Senators, and the Governor's signature to become law. That is a dangerous precedent. We are giving one political appointee the right to do away with State law. Many of those items that can be waived are things that maybe I agree should be waived, but it should be done appropriately through the legislative process. If it was 5 years ago, 10 years ago, 20 years ago that a majority of this House, the Senate, and the Governor said, this is a good idea, it should not be allowed that one political appointee can say, well, I disagree. It should take this House, this current Senate, and our current Governor to decide that we need to do away with it.

So I ask you to give thought not just to the Education Empowerment Act but to how we are going to fund special ed. We are going to continue to shortchange our schools. When their property taxes go up and your school board members say,

look at the State, you are going to be hard pressed not to accept blame, because it is a reality that we are a big part of the problem when it comes to property tax increases, and we are giving away the authority of the General Assembly to a political appointee.

So I urge a "no" vote. Let us do the right thing across the board on all issues that are included in this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands the gentleman, Mr. Sturla, wishes recognition to make a motion. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and move to suspend the rules to allow the offering of amendment A2119, and if I could, at an appropriate time, I will give a brief description of what that is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Moved by the gentleman, Mr. Sturla, that the rules of the House be suspended so that he may offer amendment A— What is the amendment number, Mr. Sturla?

Mr. STURLA. A2119.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. —2119 to SB 652.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Sturla, it is in order for you to give a brief description of the amendment.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation as it currently stands would allow these school districts, the 11 school districts, to do certain things once they are on this empowerment list, and I wanted to add one more thing to that list of things that they could do. It has been alluded to that these school districts perhaps are not run properly and that there are various things that need to be done, and so what this amendment would do is allow the school district, by a majority vote of the board, to dissolve the school district that is on the empowerment list, and by that, I do not mean to turn it over to the State; I mean to dissolve the school district. It would then empower the Department of Education to redistrict that school district into the surrounding adjacent school districts, because in all of these cases, the surrounding adjacent school districts are deemed to be much better than those on the empowerment list, and so I think if those districts are well run and are doing well with their kids and their scores are good, all we need to do is be able to get our kids into those school districts. So that is what this amendment does.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Perzel, do you seek recognition on the motion?

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the members to please vote "no" on the motion to suspend the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. DeWeese, would you like to speak on this, or do you want to defer to Mr. Sturla? How would you like to handle this?

Mr. Sturla, you are recognized.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that this will be unpopular with school districts that surround these empowerment districts, and I really do not believe that there are going to be a whole lot of school districts that want to opt to do this, but it has been pointed out by those people speaking in favor of this legislation today on numerous occasions that these school districts just do not know how to teach our kids, they just are not doing the job for our kids, and that if we could just make some changes, they could do the job for their kids. Now, my sense is that the fact that the administration has failed to fund these schools, the fact that they are landlocked in districts that in most cases have declining and depreciating values on their land values, we have not done tax reform, we have not given these districts and in this legislation we are not going to give these districts the tools necessary to do that, and my sense is that maybe 1, maybe 2 of these 11 school districts will just say, you know what? You are right; we have not done the job, and there is no way, given what you are allowing us to do, to do that job.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Sturla, even the leaders are only supposed to give a brief reason why we should or should not suspend the rules. Could you wrap this up, please.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will be brief.

So I would urge members to vote to allow the rules to be suspended so that this can happen, so that there is another tool in the toolbox of those school districts that are on this empowerment list. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—86

Battisto	Eachus	Melio	Soiboy
Bebko-Jones	Evans	Michlovic	Staback
Belardi	Frankel	Mundy	Stairs
Belfanti	Freeman	Myers	Steelman
Bishop	George	Oliver	Stetler
Blaum	Gordner	Pesci	Sturla
Butkovitz	Grucela	Petrarca	Surra
Buxton	Gruitza	Petrone	Tangretti
Caltagirone	Haluska	Pistella	Tigue
Cam	Hanna	Preston	Travaglio
Casorio	Harhai	Readshaw	Trello
Cawley	James	Robinson	Van Horne
Cohen, M.	Kirkland	Roebuck	Veon
Colafella	Laughlin	Rooney	Vitali
Costa	Lescovitz	Ruffing	Walko
Coy	Levdansky	Sainato	Washington
Curry	Lucyk	Samuelson	Waters
Daley	Manderino	Santoni	Williams
DeLuca	Mann	Scrimenti	Wojnaroski
Dermody	Markosek	Shaner	Yewcic
DeWeese	Mayermik	Smith, B.	Yudichak
Donatucci	McCall		

NAYS—108

Adolph	Fargo	Maitland	Rublep
Allen	Feese	Major	Sather
Argall	Fichter	Marsico	Saylor
Armstrong	Fleagle	Masland	Schroder
Baker	Flick	McGeehan	Schuler
Bard	Forcier	McGill	Semmel
Barley	Gannon	McIlhattan	Smith, S. H.
Barrar	Geist	McIlhinney	Snyder

Bastian	Gladeck	McNaughton	Steil
Benninghoff	Godshall	Metcalfe	Stern
Birmelin	Habay	Micozzie	Stevenson
Boyes	Harhart	Miller, R.	Strittmatter
Browne	Hasay	Miller, S.	Taylor, E. Z.
Bunt	Hennessey	Nailor	Taylor, J.
Chadwick	Herman	Nickol	Trich
Civera	Hershey	O'Brien	True
Clark	Hess	Orie	Tulli
Clymer	Hutchinson	Perzel	Vance
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Phillips	Wilt
Cornell	Kaiser	Pippy	Wogan
Corrigan	Keller	Platts	Wright
Dailey	Kenney	Ramos	Youngblood
Dally	Krebs	Raymond	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Lawless	Reinard	Zug
DiGirolamo	Lederer	Rieger	
Druce	Leh	Rohrer	
Egolf	Lynch	Ross	Ryan, Speaker
Fairchild	Maher		

NOT VOTING—3

Horsey	Josephs	Thomas
--------	---------	--------

EXCUSED—5

Cappabianca	LaGrotta	Roberts	Seyfert
Giogliotti			

Less than a majority of the members required by the rules 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 to House amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On concurrence, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Trello.

Mr. TRELLO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I represent 1 of the 11 school districts that come under this Educational Empowerment Act, and it is the Sto-Rox School District. There is not anybody in this chamber and anybody in this administration that knows the Sto-Rox School District better than I do.

Let me tell you a little bit about Sto-Rox. Sto-Rox several years ago was financially distressed, and it was taken over, the control, by the Department of Education, and those few years that they were under financial distress, they must have eliminated about 250 jobs and made a lot of corrections, and now they are doing just fine, absolutely fine. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of Education came to Sto-Rox last October and told them what a wonderful job they are doing there and they have set an example not only for Allegheny County but for the whole State of Pennsylvania. Then all of a sudden this idea comes up with academically distressed schools. He comes back with a statement in February and says, Sto-Rox is terrible; they are academically distressed and all that kind of stuff. So I mean, I think the Secretary of Education speaks out of both sides of his mouth. In one month they are telling how great Sto-Rox is doing and how proud they are of Sto-Rox, and the very next month, they tell them, simply because of this economically distressed crap that came out of the Department of Education, that they are not doing any good.

But let me tell you something about the teachers in Sto-Rox. Forty percent of the kids that go to Sto-Rox High School come from single parents that live in a housing project. Those kids are the first ones in school every morning, and I will tell you why, because they know they are going to get something to eat and they know they are going to get a hug from their teachers. These teachers go above and beyond the call of duty taking care of those kids and teaching them. They buy them clothes and coats in the wintertime; they buy them boots. I am there often, and I see that. I myself hold a Christmas party for them every year, those underprivileged kids.

The few dollars that they are going to get out of this program here, let me tell you how it is going to be spent. For the kindergarten, it is going to cost about \$250,000. To reduce the class size for the first, second, and third grade, it is going to cost about another \$350,000. So when you add up what they are going to get out of here, it is minus about \$150,000. So what good is that going to do?

Statements have been made here earlier that this is not a perfect bill but this is the best we can do. With my kids and every kid that I represent, if it is not perfect, it is not good enough; it is not good enough, and there is nothing in this bill here—

There has been dialogue today about this West Oak Lane Charter School. Now, let me tell you one of the very important reasons why this school is doing very well. Active parental participation is a major component, an important philosophy of our school. Parents are responsible for making sure their children attend school each day. Now, those 40 percent of students that live in the projects that have single parents that maybe have one, two, or three jobs or maybe they are just not good parents at all, are they going to get parental guidance? Absolutely not. I do not care how much money you spend on these 11 school districts, I do not care how many people you send from Harrisburg down to try to correct what you think might be their problem, if you do not have parents to look out for these kids, this program is not going to work, and because of that, there is nothing in this legislation dealing with parental participation.

For that reason and other reasons, I am going to vote "no," and for those reasons I think you ought to vote "no," too. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On concurrence, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh County, Mr. Snyder.

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

Mr. Speaker, I, like many other people in this chamber, may have some concerns about the empowerment provision of this act. As has been said many times, this is not a perfect bill, yet I think we very seldom pass a perfect bill in this legislature. The thing to keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, is since most of the focus is in that provision of the act, that most of the implementation of the empowerment section of SB 652 is not even going to be implemented for 3 to 4 years. Now, knowing this General Assembly for the many years that I have been here, this provides us with many opportunities between now and then to look at this bill, to make changes as we feel are necessary. There are three or four budgets to be enacted prior to that to address some of the needs that have been raised.

Mr. Speaker, the Empowerment Act brings together, finally, the issue of what to do with those failing school districts. We have talked around the corner a lot about academically

distressed schools but nothing has been done. This at least finally gives us a lightning rod to bring attention to the issue, to force people to begin to talk about what really can be done for these school districts. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that rather than focusing on what may happen over the next 3 or 4 years, we need to also look at SB 652 and see what is in this bill that we need right now. This bill provides almost \$5 billion of funding for basic and special education, for vocational education, for our intermediate unit operations, and for community colleges.

Mr. Speaker, this part of the bill we need right now. We need to have this legislation in effect before we do our State budget, and we need this in effect to continue the many programs that we have all supported in this General Assembly.

Let me just highlight for the record just a few of the provisions of this bill. The school lunch and breakfast program. This has been a program that has been of concern for many people in this hall, people who, particularly the urban cities and the rural areas, whose kids come to school hungry or with not the proper nutrition. This provides a 45-percent increase in school lunch and breakfast programs for a total of \$24 million for that program.

The Link to Learn program, which was supposed to be a 3-year program, is continued because of the fact that we recognize there are many needs out there to continue to expand this program into the new technologies, provide software and equipment not only for our public schools, our nonpublic schools, and some of our higher educational institutions. There is an initial \$21 million in here for those programs.

We have discussed the fact that there are incentives here for community colleges to expand their programs. There is \$183 million in there for community colleges, a \$12-million increase in this budget alone, plus additional money that will be in the General Fund budget.

There is a 20-percent increase in vocational education. Many of us are very concerned about the fact that our students need job-training skills at the K through 12 level. This increases it by \$10 million— This is a 22-percent increase with \$10 million alone going for equipment grants. Most of us have been visited by the directors of our vocational educational schools saying they need the equipment in those schools to provide the proper educational opportunities for those students.

Basic education funding — almost \$3.8 billion of subsidies to our schools, a \$115-million increase.

Special education — \$783 million for special ed, a \$63-million increase, over 8-percent increase.

School performance incentives — a 100-percent increase for not only schools to improve their academic performance but also to maintain higher academic performance; 100-percent increase to raise it to \$33 million.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are putting some of the provisions of this bill out of the context that it deserves. When you look at \$5 billion of funding for public school education in this Commonwealth, I think we need to be able to support SB 652 and realize that there will be other opportunities in the future to address the one problem that seems to be of most concern to people, the empowerment portion.

I think that we have many good ideas in this General Assembly to look at this bill again in the future, not under the pressure of a budget session, but to give the educational committees opportunities to come up with proposals and changes. I am confident that we will be able to take care of

some of the concerns that were raised. There is time to do that, but there is not time to delay the passage of a \$5-billion appropriation for public education, which I think we all support. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington County, Mr. Daley, on concurrence.

Mr. DALEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This reminds me of Abraham Lincoln and his famous quote in Gettysburg. He said that the world will little note what we say here but will long remember what we do here. And I think what we are going to see, Mr. Speaker, is that Pennsylvania's education will be changed radically, and I guess history will tell us if it is going to be to the good or to the bad from what we do here today.

I think the thing that bothers me the most, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that we constantly have ramrod legislation that is so paramount, that is so historically precedent-setting that we have to push it down the legislature's throat. The House Education Committee, both majority and minority chairmen, are willing to run this issue and work on this issue, but that does not seem to be quite good enough.

The Sto-Rox School District, as the former speaker has spoken regarding, has worked diligently. I know Dr. Hisiro personally and the fine job he has done at Sto-Rox to bring that district around, but we are not talking about 11 districts that are distressed. We are talking about all the school districts that need help, and it is a more comprehensive package, a more in-depth study to address those needs, because in those 11 school districts, it is not the education that is the problem, it is the poverty; it is the things that are going on with the lack of the mills in Clairton and Duquesne; it is the problems in Aliquippa; it is the problems in the Mon Valley and throughout Fayette County; it is the problems in Chester with the high unemployment. We are only touching the top of the issue. We are not really going to the basic issue, and that is the economic development problems that we face in pockets of poverty in Pennsylvania where the school districts are now suffering.

Albert Gallatin School District, which is in southwestern Pennsylvania in Fayette County, over 32 percent of the kids are special education kids; 32 percent. Brownsville Area School District, where 80 percent of the kids are eligible for reduced or subsidized lunches, 80 percent. What does that say? It says that it is not the education, it is the problems that are at home and the fact that there is not the education going on because there is the need to survive; it is the lack of economic opportunity.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. DALEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise as opposed to this legislation because it just is not right the way we are going about this, and that is why I move that we table this bill until Tuesday, May 9, 2000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Daley, it is the Chair's understanding that you attempted to make a motion to table this bill until a date certain. If you make a motion to table, you just make a motion to table generally. Would that be your preference?

Mr. DALEY. No, Mr. Speaker. My motion would be to table this bill—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I stand corrected. You can make a motion to table it until a date certain. I apologize. What was the date?

Mr. DALEY. It was Tuesday, May 9. I think May 9 is next Tuesday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Moved by the gentleman, Mr. Daley, that SB 652 be tabled until Tuesday, May 9, 2000.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a debatable motion.

Mr. Perzel, would you like to make a brief statement on the motion?

Mr. PERZEL. Very brief, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask the members to vote "no" on the motion to table. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. I would just like to point out for the legislative and historical record the majority leader's impetuosity. He wants to deal with this measure even though we have only had it for a few hours, even though it deals with the whole panoply of issues involving basic education in the State, and so often when it comes to campaign finance reform, he wants to send it back for more study.

I am just pointing out the inherent hypocrisy in the gentleman's negative commentary. This is a debating forum. We want to table the bill so it can get more attention. We have the Republican Education Committee chairman and a wide swath of GOP partisans that want to have more time to deal with this matter.

I cannot understand why it would hurt to table the measure. We are going to have an early budget this year. We are a full-time legislature. We are going to be in session through May and part of June. We have time to deal with this matter. It is an appropriate measure to put this very complicated, very controversial piece of legislation on the table. The votes keep oscillating back and forth with parliamentary questions 97 to 95, 99 to 94. This is a very closely contested issue. It would not hurt to put it on the table.

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

The SPEAKER. On the question of the motion to table, those in favor of tabling will vote "aye"; opposed, "no."

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—87

Battisto	Eachus	McCall	Smith, B.
Bebko-Jones	Forcier	Melio	Solobay
Belardi	Frankel	Michlovic	Staback
Belfanti	Freeman	Mundy	Stairs
Blaum	George	Myers	Steelman
Boyes	Gordner	Pesci	Stetler
Butkovitz	Grucela	Petrarca	Sturla

Buxton	Gruitza	Petrone	Surra
Caltagirone	Haluska	Pistella	Tangretti
Casorio	Hanna	Platts	Thomas
Cawley	Harhai	Preston	Tigue
Cohen, L. I.	James	Ramos	Travaglio
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Readshaw	Trello
Colafella	Kaiser	Robinson	Van Horne
Costa	Kirkland	Roebuck	Veon
Coy	Laughlin	Rooney	Vitali
Curry	Lawless	Ruffing	Walko
Daley	Lescovitz	Sainato	Williams
DeLuca	Lucyk	Samuelson	Wojnarowski
Dermody	Manderino	Santoni	Yewcic
DeWeese	Mann	Scrimenti	Yudichak
Donatucci	Markosek	Shaner	

NAYS—101

Adolph	Egolf	Maitland	Sather
Allen	Evans	Major	Saylor
Argall	Fairchild	Marsico	Schroder
Armstrong	Fargo	Masland	Schuler
Baker	Feese	McGeehan	Semmel
Bard	Fichter	McGill	Smith, S. H.
Barley	Fleagle	McIlhattan	Snyder
Barrar	Flick	McIlhinney	Steil
Bastian	Gannon	McNaughton	Stern
Benninghoff	Geist	Metcalfe	Stevenson
Birmelin	Gladeck	Micozzie	Strittmatter
Bishop	Godshall	Miller, R.	Taylor, E. Z.
Browne	Habay	Miller, S.	Taylor, J.
Bunt	Harhart	Nailor	True
Carn	Hasay	Nickol	Tulli
Chadwick	Hennessey	O'Brien	Vance
Civera	Herman	Orie	Wilt
Clark	Hershey	Perzel	Wogan
Clymer	Hess	Phillips	Wright
Cornell	Hutchinson	Pippy	Youngblood
Corrigan	Jadlowiec	Raymond	Zimmerman
Dailey	Keller	Reinard	Zug
Dally	Lederer	Rieger	
Dempsey	Leh	Rohrer	
DiGirolamo	Lynch	Ross	Ryan,
Druce	Maher	Rubley	Speaker

NOT VOTING—9

Horsley	Levdansky	Oliver	Washington
Kenney	Mayernik	Trich	Waters
Krebs			

EXCUSED—5

Cappabianca	LaGrotta	Roberts	Seyfert
Gigliotti			

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 to House amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware County, Mr. Kirkland, on the question of concurrence.

Mr. KIRKLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, once again I rise in opposition of SB 652.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say one more time that this bill is unfair, and especially unfair not only to the 11 other

school districts, but most importantly, it is unfair to the Chester-Upland School District.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader gave a few quotes, a few numbers earlier. I would like to give a few numbers, Mr. Speaker, concerning the district. He said something about reading scores. Mr. Speaker, in 1997 and 1998 the reading scores for our 10th graders were — he was correct — in the bottom part of 57 percent. Today, Mr. Speaker, that bottom part is now only 28 percent. There is progress, not just gradual progress but a lot of progress being made, Mr. Speaker, within the district. The same with our Smedley Middle School, Mr. Speaker, progress being made that the majority leader did not talk about.

The majority leader did not talk about the Wetherill fourth grade reading scores and how they jumped 38 percent. He did not talk about that, Mr. Speaker; progress being made. He did not talk about Stetser Elementary School and their third grade reading scores and how progress is being made, how scores are jumping rapidly because people are working vigorously with our children and making an improvement in our school district. I say all that, Mr. Speaker, because, again, I believe that the Chester-Upland School District is being treated unfairly.

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

Mr. KIRKLAND. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I rise asking for a suspension of the rules so that I may offer amendment A2130 so that Chester-Upland can be treated fairly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Kirkland, moves that the rules of the House be suspended to permit him to offer immediately amendment A2130 to SB 652.

On the question of suspension of the rules—

Mr. KIRKLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. Kirkland, there is some confusion about your amendment. The amendment I have in my hand shows that it is A2130, yet the— Is that the number you have, 2130?

Mr. KIRKLAND. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. All right. Let the board reflect 2130.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. On the question of suspension of the rules to allow the gentleman to offer this amendment, the minority leader, Mr. DeWeese, yields, I assume, to the gentleman, Mr. Kirkland? Mr. Kirkland, you are recognized.

Mr. KIRKLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, this is about fairness. This is about providing all school districts with an opportunity to just simply be fair, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment, my amendment, would allow Chester-Upland School District the same opportunities as the other 10 school districts. It would give them the 2 years with the third-year option of righting itself rather than falling immediately under this Empowerment Act.

Mr. Speaker, we have the data; we have the statistics. The students in the Chester-Upland School District are scoring higher on their reading tests; they are scoring higher on their math tests. This is an opportunity, Mr. Speaker. This amendment, my amendment, simply asks for this body to give

Chester-Upland school students the same opportunity as every other school student in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Does the gentleman, Mr. Perzel, desire recognition on the question of suspension of the rules?

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, only to ask the members if they would please respectfully vote "no" on this motion. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—91

Battisto	Eachus	McCall	Staback
Bebko-Jones	Evans	Melio	Stairs
Belardi	Frankel	Michlovic	Steelman
Belfanti	Freeman	Mundy	Stetler
Bishop	George	Myers	Sturia
Blaum	Gordner	Oliver	Surra
Boyes	Grucela	Pesci	Tangretti
Butkovitz	Gruitza	Petrarca	Thomas
Buxton	Haluska	Petrone	Tigue
Caltagirone	Hanna	Pistella	Travaglio
Carn	Harhai	Preston	Trello
Casorio	James	Ramos	Trich
Cawley	Josephs	Readshaw	Van Horne
Cohen, M.	Kaiser	Robinson	Veon
Colafella	Kirkland	Roebuck	Vitali
Costa	Laughlin	Rooney	Walko
Coy	Lescovitz	Ruffing	Washington
Curry	Levdansky	Sainato	Waters
Daley	Lucyk	Samuelson	Williams
DeLuca	Manderino	Santoni	Wojnaroski
Dermody	Mann	Scrimenti	Yewcic
DeWeese	Markosek	Shaner	Yudichak
Donatucci	Mayernik	Solobay	

NAYS—104

Adolph	Fargo	Major	Sather
Allen	Feese	Marsico	Saylor
Argall	Fichter	Masland	Schroder
Armstrong	Fieagle	McGeehan	Schuler
Baker	Flick	McGill	Semmel
Bard	Forcier	Mclhattan	Smith, B.
Barley	Gannon	Mclhinney	Smith, S. H.
Barrar	Geist	McNaughton	Snyder
Bastian	Gladeck	Metcalfe	Steil
Benninghoff	Godshall	Micozzie	Stern
Birmelin	Habay	Miller, R.	Stevenson
Browne	Harhart	Miller, S.	Strittmatter
Bunt	Hasay	Nailor	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Hennessey	Nickol	Taylor, J.
Civera	Herman	O'Brien	True
Clark	Hershey	Orie	Tulli
Clymer	Hess	Perzel	Vance
Cohen, L. I.	Hutchinson	Phillips	Wilt
Cornell	Jadlowiec	Pippy	Wogan
Corrigan	Keller	Platts	Wright
Dailey	Krebs	Raymond	Youngblood
Dally	Lawless	Reinard	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Lederer	Rieger	Zug
DiGirolamo	Leh	Rohrer	
Druce	Lynch	Ross	
Egolf	Maher	Rublely	
Fairchild	Maitland		Ryan, Speaker

NOT VOTING—2

Horsey	Kenney
--------	--------

EXCUSED—5

Cappabianca	LaGrotta	Roberts	Seyfert
Gigliotti			

Less than a majority of the members required by the rules 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 to House amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Veon.

Mr. VEON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly oppose concurrence in SB 652.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly understand the frustration of a number of members, Democratic members from Philadelphia, primarily in this caucus, who have expressed great frustration here on the floor today about the problems that they have in the City of Philadelphia School District. Mr. Speaker, I wish that we were in fact passing a bill or working on a bill in a collaborative way, in a bipartisan way, in a way that most of the people in this House believed would actually make that school district better. And, Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that someday we will in fact do that, because we know this bill will not make positive change in the Philadelphia School District or any other school district in this State.

Mr. Speaker, we can certainly pass this bill, and I can even understand with frustration that some people want to pass this bill and say that we did something good for those troubled schools and for failing students, and, Mr. Speaker, that simply will not happen.

We have been up here before, and the majority leader makes a compelling case about the critical importance of this issue and how imperative it is that it pass today. I heard that same speech on property tax reform, and 4, 5 years later we have no property tax reform in this State; Act 50 has been a failure. But at that time it was compelling, imperative that we had to pass that property tax bill that day, and we knew then that there would not be any property tax reform in this State even though we passed Act 50.

And we are here today, and I must say that I am sad, in my judgment, there will not be any positive education changes in this State as a result of this bill, unfortunately, and that this Governor will be long gone in one way, shape, or form before most of these provisions are ever even possibly acted on in any school district in the State.

Mr. Speaker, those reforms in other States that have proven to work are not in this bill. This bill does nothing to reduce class size. This bill does nothing to help school districts implement full-day kindergarten. This bill does nothing to implement Head Start programs in the State. This bill does nothing to help poorer school districts cross that digital divide. This bill does nothing to strengthen academic standards, and I believe this bill does nothing to hold teachers and students accountable, and I think that is unfortunate, because I believe we could have produced a positive bill here today.

Mr. Speaker, I have to comment on one other part of this bill that troubles me very significantly. I believe that even in those 11 school districts that are enumerated in this bill, that we have teachers that care about what they do; we have teachers that are good at what they do. We have teachers that have been there for 20, 30 years trying under tremendously adverse, difficult circumstances to teach kids in these very troubled school districts. So I am very troubled that in fact in this bill, when that teacher's contract is over, that this bill gives the authority for that teacher to be fired for no reason, for some reason, for any reason, for a good reason, for a bad reason. This bill gives the authority for that teacher to be fired regardless of what kind of job they have done in that school district for 20 or 30 years working under extremely adverse circumstances. I think that is a tremendously unfair attack on those teachers in those difficult and troubling schools.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that this bill does not allow the law to abrogate an existing union contract — no question about that; it does not — but make no mistake, when that contract is over, that this bill does provide the authority, does provide the authority for essentially the board or the Secretary, who has granted that waiver, to now say that that teacher can be replaced. That troubles me very significantly. I have seen over the last 16 years I have been in the legislature in the private sector what they call that when that happens in the private sector. Contract is over; employee is threatened. You either take it or you leave it, and if you do not take it, I am bringing in replacement workers. Mr. Speaker, I have to say that that provision in this bill troubles me tremendously. I do not think that is fair to those teachers. I do not think that is an answer for what is troubling these schools. We could have done better.

And, Mr. Speaker, I finally say that we had a number of amendments here today that we tried to offer, and unfortunately, the Republican majority party and the Governor really will not allow that kind of debate, those kinds of votes, to take place here in the House. They shut out any effort to offer any substantive amendments here on the floor, whether it be by a Republican or by a Democrat. Members that have worked on these issues for the whole time they have been in the legislature, they were not permitted to offer their ideas to this bill. This was a take-it-or-leave-it provision for every member of this House here today.

And so, yes, we have some frustrated members on our side of the aisle who were hoping — in my judgment, beyond hope — that this bill does in fact help their school district, and I know if they had the opportunity to offer good, positive recommendations and amendments here today on this floor, they would have done so, Mr. Speaker, but that opportunity was denied by the Republican Party. I think that is a mistake, and I think that as an end result, this bill will not accomplish what so many people here today claim that it will.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly ask for a negative vote on concurrence. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The lady, Ms. Manderino, please.

Ms. MANDERINO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to concurrence in the Senate bill.

I listened very carefully, and I wish that I could believe that this would help the kids in my school district in Philadelphia. I know that any money is desperately needed in my city of Philadelphia, and it is not an easy decision for me to say no to

\$15 million, but I am going to say no because I think that the \$15 million is a sham for the kids of the School District of Philadelphia, I think the \$20 million is a sham for the kids in these 11 school districts, and I think the whole proposal is a sham for every schoolchild in Pennsylvania. Make no mistake about it, this is this administration's proposal to deal with everything that we know will improve school performance, and it is worth the \$20-million price tag to them and no more.

Look at the proposal. With this proposal, these distressed schools, they can purchase new instructional materials including textbooks and technology and related educational materials and supplies; they can reduce class size in kindergarten through grade 3; they can establish afterschool, summer, and weekend programs; they can fund curriculum development; they can fund enhanced staff professional development; they can fund any other program contained in their school district improvement plan, and they can do it all for \$75 per student.

Now, each and every one of you knows that we have passed, we have passed legislation out of this chamber and out of our committees dealing with almost each and every one of those issues. We have passed legislation for reduced class size that would help all of the children of Pennsylvania; we have passed legislation that would make sure that all of the children in Pennsylvania have textbooks in their school; we have passed legislation to deal with afterschool programs, to deal with professional development, to deal with curriculum development. We have passed that legislation for all of the schoolchildren of Pennsylvania, and how come none of that legislation has become law? Because this administration does not want it and we do not want to properly fund it.

So make no mistake about it, this proposal today for \$20 million for only 11 school districts is all we are ever going to see for purchasing equipment, for purchasing textbooks, for purchasing computers, for reducing class size, for making afterschool programs, for funding curriculum development, for professional development for our teachers, or for any other school reform measure we think is needed. This is it. If it is enough for you, go ahead and vote "yes." It is not enough for me. It is not enough for the schoolkids in Philadelphia. It is not enough for the schoolkids in these 11 districts. It is not enough for any schoolkid in Pennsylvania. It is an easy "no."

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Wilt, who submits remarks for the record.

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

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, since we have been discussing education empowerment, I have been uncomfortable and I have figured out why. It is the word "empowerment." Who is empowered by this legislation? We in the legislative branch believe in the legislative process. We do not like it when our Supreme Court, Superior Court, Commonwealth Court, or any other court usurps the power of the legislative branch by legislating from the bench. We campaign vigorously for candidates who vow not to do that.

Here we have a bill that empowers the executive branch to do exactly the same thing. Instead of going into a school district and changing the school board through the elective process — doing the

hard work of recruiting quality candidates and getting them elected — we swoop in with a band of executive branch appointees to usurp the power of the elected officials. Many of us fight long and hard to uphold the principle of local control, and this bill flies in the face of it.

Let us not replace the power of the electorate with the will of some executive branch appointee. The problems were created at the local level, and they can be solved at the local level. The solution to the problems in our 501 school districts lies in the hearts and minds of the parents and grandparents within each of those districts. This executive branch takeover has not been successfully done anywhere else, and we have no evidence that it will work here. If we have a problem in our local schools, we will fix them by replacing those who created the problem at the local level at the ballot box.

Each of us has some political power back home. Let us use it to fix our broken schools. Empowering the executive branch is not the proven answer. Vote “no” on concurrence on SB 652.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was not going to say anything. It has been kind of a lengthy debate, but after hearing the same old, tired arguments about 10 times — and I am going to vote “yes” on this bill — I just want to let you know, if anybody is going to be changing their opinion on the rest of the debate, I have got a dollar in my pocket to give you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Mr. DeWeese.

The House will come to order. Please.

There are three members yet to be heard from. Mr. DeWeese is one of the three.

The gentleman, Mr. DeWeese, yields to the gentleman, Mr. Evans.

Mr. EVANS. I would like to, Mr. Speaker, thank the gentleman from Greene County, the Democratic leader.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I have been pondering what I would say when I come to this mike, and I guess that what I could say is West Oak Lane Charter School — West Oak Lane Charter School — and the reason I will say West Oak Lane Charter School is because those 44 children that were in the well of this House, that is what this is all about.

We too often, too many times, in my view, are involved in what I call adult food fights, and I want to put my record on the line because this has been a rather difficult issue, because, you know, whenever you have these issues on the floor, sometimes members have a way of being so personal and taking them personally when in reality we can agree to disagree.

But I want to talk about my record and then tell you why I think this bill should pass. Dick Thornburgh, Governor of Pennsylvania, needed a tax increase, and I voted for that tax increase. I voted for that tax increase because at that particular time the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was in trouble. Governor Casey, \$3.2 billion. I voted for that tax increase because that was something that was needed for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Governor Thornburgh was a Republican and Governor Casey was a Democrat. I think sometimes what is missing in this process is that we talk past each other rather than to each other. I think sometimes what is missing in this process is that we kind of have the extremes on both sides.

The fact of the matter is, do I believe that SB 652 in itself magically will solve every single problem in those 11 districts? The answer is no, I do not believe that. I do not believe that SB 652 in itself will solve every single problem, but I do understand this: I do understand, may it be the city of

Philadelphia or the city of Chester, when we as Democrats were in charge for 12 years and there was a Democratic Governor, like there now is a Republican Governor, I do realize that something has to be done, and I am not under any illusion that I think magically SB 652 in itself will solve all of the problems that are faced in those 11 school districts, but I do know this; I do know this: I do know something has to be done.

Now, I have played the political game as much as anybody. I have been on both sides of it. I have understood it, but I also know that those who complain about the process — there have not been hearings and there have not been discussions — you know, that is usually the same kind of process that we have gone through for 20 years, Democrat and Republican alike. We do that. We kind of go back and forth. We kind of play those little games, but the reality of it is we have some serious problems, and I understand that, no, this bill will not magically solve them, but I do realize that we have got to do something.

And, no, I do not disagree that the members on this side of the aisle should have had much more opportunity to participate in the process, to sit in the process; I do not disagree with that, because I am never against the idea of members having a chance to be involved in the process, but I do know this: I do know that there is a problem. I do know that something has to be done, and it is always not easy with some of the choices that are put before us. A decision has to be made, and I hope once this decision is made, those who are for it and those who are against, that they recognize that this is just the beginning. There are many other things that we have to do.

I was the first one to push back in 1991 that we have to change the way we fund public education. I said that back in 1991 that we have to change the way we fund public education. I will be the first one to say it. I will be prepared. I have said that the way we fund public education is not the way to go. However, I do believe there needs to be accountability of teachers and principals and students and legislators and all of us. There needs to be accountability to every single one of us.

I also know that when it really boils down to it, it is about having family support; it is about having a good teacher; it is about having good principals; and it is about having community support, and I do understand that money is a factor. I do not believe — I am not one who is going to say that money is not a factor, but I also understand this, that after we go back and forth and we kind of play these games back and forth, the bottom line is we have some failing school districts in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

No, SB 652 is not perfect. So I do not want anybody leaving here putting out press releases thinking that SB 652 in itself magically is going to solve things. But guess what? It is an attempt to do something; it is an attempt to do something for failing school districts, for districts that have been failing for an awful long time, and we can no longer put our heads, our heads in the ground and say, well, this is not it. We have got to wait until we completely get reduced class size or we have got to fix the property tax system or we always have got to fix these systems until we do something. Well, let me tell you something. Those 44 children that you saw come here today do not have time while we sit around like Ping-Pong and go back and forth. Something has to be done.

No, I am not looking for applause. I am serious; I am not, because at some point in this process education cannot be as partisan as it has been, and I would be the first one to say that I

have been as guilty in playing that same game, but now I have made a pledge. May it be ideas from this side or ideas from this side or ideas from the Governor, I am willing to put the ideas on the table and give them a chance to work. I am willing to look at them and see. No, I do not think so. I do not want anybody to think you think, because I am voting for this, that I think magically every single failed school in the city of Philadelphia is going to turn around. I do not want you to believe that; I do not want you to believe that.

And for those who run around and say, well, this is just not enough money, well, you know, we put \$5 billion into public education, and I voted for it, and I voted for the taxes to go with it. So I want you to be clear about that. I am not one who said I voted for the budget. I voted for the taxes that went with this budget. So I can say that my credentials are there about voting for more money for public education. That is not an issue. The issue has to be once and for all us facing up to that nobody has the silver bullet. Republicans, Governor Ridge, Democrats, the PSEA, PFT (Pennsylvania Federation of Teachers), they do not have the silver bullet. We all have got to come together and figure out a strategy to make the school system work for every single child, every single child.

For those who keep saying, well, I am not going to go for this until I get something perfect, well, you cannot do that in life, because if you wait until something perfect, guess what? We are not going to do anything; we are not going to do anything if you keep telling me, well, this bill is just not right; it is not the right fit; it is not the right fit. Well, what is the right fit? When is it going to be the right fit?

Now, I understand the one-upmanship; I understand that, because I play just as much as anybody else with the one-upmanship, but I am saying to you very sincerely, no, I do not think SB 652 magically will solve it, but I will vote for it, and I will vote for anything else if it comes from a Democrat, a Republican, a liberal, moderate, conservative, black, white, yellow, that I think is an attempt to do something. That is what I am going to do. I want you to understand that. I am at the point in the stage at this point in this career that I want to see what I saw with those 44 kids that you saw on this floor, and they would not have had the opportunity if we did not pass the Charter School Law 3 years ago; they would not have had the opportunity.

So let us give it a chance. It is not as extreme as everybody says. You know, we are going to lose this thing; we are going to lose that thing. You know, you would think sometimes with the stuff that takes place on this floor that the world was going to come to a stop. You would think that by these votes that we do on this floor, you would really think that all of a sudden everything will come to a stop based on what we do here. Let me tell you something. I hate to tell you. I do not want to bust your bubble. I do not know how many people, unfortunately, pay attention to us at all, because voting participation is down. People think less and less of our ability to get things done.

So I am saying to you, look, would I like for members to have more input? Yes. Would I like for there to be public hearings? Yes. Would I like for dialogue and discussion? Yes. I would like for all of that to happen, but guess what? It is not happening.

I am going to vote for SB 652, and I would encourage you just once— And Mr. Lynch is right, because speeches do not mean anything around here. I know you have got your mind

made up, but I just thought I needed just to say this. You know, I wanted to say, so when I vote for this, I want you to understand that I am voting for this because, in my view, it is an attempt to do something about these failing schools.

Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Belfanti.

Mr. BELFANTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I did not intend to rise at the end of this debate, but because of the public policy matter before us, and more importantly, the process that brought us here, and most importantly, the comments made by two of my party leaders in the past 15 minutes, I feel obliged to say a few things.

Mr. Speaker, over the course of the past three legislative sessions, every major piece of controversial public policy has been voted upon by these members in the same manner — a last-minute, eleventh-hour encyclopedia placed into another bill, in a conference committee or a Rules Committee, and sent to this floor without the possibility for the committee process to do its job or for members on this floor to amend the bills — and up until we had the supermajority rules imposed upon us by some members of my own caucus, we had the ability vote by vote, amendment by amendment, to try and impact a controversial bill such as this, and that was taken away from us a couple of terms ago, and that has been one of the biggest hammers that the majority party has had to beat that anvil, to beat that drum, and to stop my 60,000 constituents from having a say or a voice on this floor.

I mentioned two of my leaders made remarks. One of them, Mike Veon, chastised the Republicans for refusing to allow Democratic members to take part in this process, and he was 90 percent right, because 90 percent of that caucus voted to do that on every procedural motion. Then one of my other leaders stood up and gave his pitch, excuse, or whatever you want to call it, for his rationale for being for this bill that contains some very good parts. I think I held it up about 2 hours ago and said, there is a good bill somewhere inside of this bill, but that leader would vote for anything to correct his problems in Philadelphia. Unfortunately, it is at the expense of 490 school districts who are not having the problem. I have school districts in my district that are underfunded because we are now only funding 35 or 36 percent of our obligation, of our 50-percent obligation. So I do not want the problems in Philadelphia to be foisted upon me.

I have supported Philadelphia and I have supported Pittsburgh on very highly emotionally charged controversial bills, but I do know one thing. As the Appropriations chairman on my side of the aisle has every right to vote his conscience on matters of controversy such as this, when he, as my leader, forces me and has the help of a small minion of people to preclude my constituents from having a voice, then I also have some rights. I have rights on whom I will vote for for leadership next time around, next election year, and my votes for leaders are going to be for people who are going to vote— If they have a problem in their legislative district, I will be there to help them. Do not fix one in mine when I do not have one, and I do not appreciate my leadership—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, the question before the House is one of concurrence. Please.

Mr. BELFANTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will stick to the issue of concurrence.

The reason we are forced to vote on this bill in this manner — unamendable, with all of the bad stuff in it — is because of

participation from members of my caucus, and for whatever reason they have done that, that is their reason, but again, I have my own votes next year to make, and I will make them in the best of my conscience. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman, Mr. Cohen, desire recognition?

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, in the course of this debate, we have heard admissions which are commendable in the sense that they show an absence of demagoguery.

We have heard that this bill is not perfect. We have heard this bill has problems. We have heard that this bill will not solve all problems. What we have not heard in the course of the debate is any defense of this bill which points to specific provisions of this bill and shows how these specific provisions are going to create specific results.

We have in Philadelphia and all the other of the 11 districts and in some of the nondirectly affected districts here, we have a very high dropout rate. We have not heard any statement from anybody that the dropout rate in the affected districts is going to go down if this bill passes; nobody said that.

We have low test scores in the districts most directly affected by this bill. Nobody has said test scores are going to go up if this bill passes.

We have huge problems with school violence. Nobody has said there is going to be less school violence if this bill passes.

Now, in a way, as I said, the absence of promises is somewhat refreshing; it is also an absence of demagoguery, but I still think this bill imposes significant costs. The costs that this bill imposes is that on certain dates in the very near future, people who now have a secure job are going to lose that security, and being rational people, what they are going to do is spend an enormous amount of time applying for jobs elsewhere. Currently in Philadelphia there are about 100 vacancies. At the start of the school year in Philadelphia there were 2,500 vacancies. I think it is safe to predict that at the start of the next school year there are going to be a lot more than 2,500 vacancies in the Philadelphia School District. I think it is safe to say that vacancies all over are going to go up.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this bill is bad because it only makes minor changes which are going to only produce minor benefits. I think this bill is going to produce virtually no benefits. It is going to make major adverse changes, and as I said earlier, with all of the problems of the Philadelphia schools, with all of the problems in other districts, 5, 10 years later we are going to look at the year 2000 and it is going to be the golden days; it is going to be the good old days. The school districts are going to get worse; they are going to get dramatically worse, and we are not going to be very proud of what we have done.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman, Mr. Cohen.

Mr. Roebuck, the question of concurrence.

Mr. ROEBUCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A previous speaker alluded to the young people who performed here today, and I think we indeed ought to be proud of those young people who come from a charter school in Philadelphia. Indeed, they represent perhaps what all of us would like young people to be, but if we look at that particular charter school, Mr. Speaker, if memory serves me correctly, the road to this legislative body was not an easy one. As I remember, there were particular problems when that school was first established in terms of organization and structure, and we

are to be proud today that those problems have been overcome and those students stand before us representative of a successful charter school, but if we put that particular charter school in the context of this bill, the charter school has been in existence, the bill has been in existence for 3 years and we say we are giving these distressed districts only 2 years to do what this school had difficulty doing.

What are we saying, Mr. Speaker? Are we saying that somehow we can now magically resolve the problems of districts that have been distressed for many, many years in the short span of 2 years, when indeed even schools of substantial support, created with lots of parental involvement, with substantial financial resources, have difficulty doing that? What are we saying, Mr. Speaker? That somehow we found a solution that allows us to overcome that difficulty? If we have, I wish that someone would share that with us, because I think we could all benefit from it.

Mr. Speaker, further, we have heard a lot about the fact that this is not a bill that solves all the problems we have but that we have to do something. We have heard that this is somehow the only opportunity that we will have to address this issue and that we cannot afford to wait any longer, because indeed, if I take the language that has been used, the rhetoric that has been used, it seems as if we stand at the edge of a cliff and we are on the verge of being pushed over or we are slipping down the slope or somehow we are falling over into utter darkness and chaos.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I recognize that we have problems, but what are we doing? Are we saying that we are solving those problems by addressing the needs of individual kids? No. Do we provide in this bill money that talks about individual students who need help? No. Do we address the problem of all the kids in these districts who need help? No. What do we say? We say we are giving money to schools. Well, in my district, which is a very large district, we are giving money to the schools even if they do not have problems? Or if they do, are we going to target those kids in the schools that are working who need help somehow? Or what is the magical formula that produces the result that we want? How do we get the services that are needed, the help that is needed to those individual kids, some of whom in fact are in good schools that are achieving but who need help? Nothing in this bill addresses that. Somehow we think that we can target a school and say, you are somehow inadequate; you are in distress, and somehow we give them a bit of money that will solve the problem.

There has been talk here also about accountability. Well, somehow I think there should be a measure of accountability, but accountability must be very cheap, Mr. Speaker, because we are buying it for \$15 million. That is very cheap accountability. I know the students in my school district are worth far more than \$15 million. They deserve far more from this legislative body.

I think that we need, Mr. Speaker, to look, if we want to address this problem, we need to look seriously at it. We need not to believe that somehow, somewhere, there is going to be an additional pot of money; somehow, somewhere, in some weeks beyond this there will be new solutions that will be offered to us to solve the problems of our school districts. The reality is, Mr. Speaker, you have before you what you are going to get, plain and simple.

This is a flawed, it is a bad piece of legislation. I am particularly distressed, Mr. Speaker, that in identifying those

districts that are in greatest distress, we somehow have targeted those districts that have a large minority population. There is something wrong if we as a legislative body cannot deliver educational services to kids in a better way than this, particularly to minority kids. I think as a legislative body, we need to look at that particular responsibility, and if we can solve it for \$15 million, well, then maybe we can work indeed the greatest miracle of all time when we say that that is what those kids are worth, because that is what we put into this bill to address their particular problems.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to vote against this measure, but let me also make one other point. Let us measure accountability in a real way. If you want this legislation, then be accountable for it. If you vote for it, be accountable for that vote. Let us come back and have you come before us in 1 year or 2 years and tell us how this bill has worked and how this measure of accountability at the cost of \$15 million that you might vote for produces a significant difference in the lives of our kids in this State. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I am wrong. I hope that when we go those 2 years, indeed if we should pass this bill, which I hope we will not, members can come before us and say, yes, there have been measurable and substantial differences, but if we cannot, then indeed the onus of this particular piece of legislation will rest very heavily on every member who chooses to put up a "yes" vote on the board today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Thomas. Do you desire further recognition?

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise for two reasons. Number one, I want to caution members on both sides of the aisle. We all come from 66 different counties, all having different interests. There will be a number of things that we can agree on; there will be some things that we will not be able to agree on. And, Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we keep our eyes on the prize, and our eyes on the prize is really about coming up with public policy that is going to deal with this whole issue of education, public education.

And so I caution us that just because you and I disagree is no reason why we should have these conversations going on about what I am going to or not going to do for Philadelphia in the future, because, Mr. Speaker, I rise to say on the whole issue of concurrence, I keep a record of everything that I do, and I know that probably, as many other members, I have voted for issues that have been endemic to counties throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and more often than not, Philadelphia was not included in it. Philadelphia has been extremely supportive of both suburban and rural and other urban parts of the State. So I caution members to let us not let this get out of hand.

I also, secondly on the issue of concurrence, I caution us and I urge us to really look at this issue in its proper venue. Mr. Speaker, I have been here five terms, and this issue of public education in funding is an issue that has been before us in all five terms. There are budgets that I have refused to vote for simply because there was inadequate funding in that budget for basic education and there was an unwillingness to come up with a formula that was equitable. I have seen and voted for a whole variety of proposals, and at the end of the day very few of those proposals actually provided substantive dollars to try to do

something regardless of whether it was Philadelphia County or some other county.

Mr. Speaker, the children of Pennsylvania, whether they be from Philadelphia County or from Northumberland County, need us to take a step forward today, not a step that is going to represent the end gain, not a step that is going to represent completeness on this issue, but just a step forward.

I trust and hope that when we return to session after this vote, that the Education Committee and any other committee gets busy in coming up with a way to deal with this issue all across Pennsylvania, because it is not going to go away. School districts are still on their way to State court, some of those school districts are even in Federal court, and have basically said that we have reneged on our obligation to provide for an educational system that is efficient, and the fundamental question that comes into play when we talk about a system that is thorough and efficient is a question of resources.

This is the first time that I have seen a bill to provide for technology and access to technology. Now, think about it for a minute. The year 2000 is the first time that a prescription has been laid out to try and bring school districts and many schools into the 21st century. I recall the Governor saying at one point that the day that Pennsylvania established its Web page, that within a very short period of time, there were over 3 million entries on that Web page. Now, Mr. Speaker, 3 million entries in a very short period of time. What are we asking of our children? Our children, we need to provide the resources so that our children cannot only become practitioners of the Internet but become craftsmen of the Internet. We all have these laptop computers; we have access to technology here in the House and in the Senate; why should not children have access to technology at the local level? Many of us have schools. I have several schools that cannot even put a computer in the administrative offices simply because the building is not wired in a way to provide for that. This bill will help with that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to people from both sides of the aisle, colleagues from both sides of the aisle, from upstate, downstate, and in the middle of the State, no, 652 is not going to solve all of the problems, but 652 represents a first step. It is almost analogous to what we did last week when we said that it was time to eliminate property taxes as a venue for funding public education. Now, we took that stand without any definitive explanation as to how we were going to replace the property tax or how we were going to fund public education. We did that without any understanding of what was going to happen, but we were committed to doing something, and that is why that bill was able to move forward.

By analogy, 652 is not going to solve the problems, and in many cases it might create problems that we are going to have to deal with. But as the old people used to say, sometimes you have to take what you got, put it in a bag, shake it up, and if more good than bad comes out, then stand for it. If more bad than good comes out, then dismiss it. I think when you take 652, put it in a bag, shake it up, there is more good than bad that comes out. It represents a first step, and let us not make it the last step. Let us take it and build on it until every child in Pennsylvania, regardless of where that child comes from, has access to a quality, to a quality educational system that is going to become a real bridge of opportunity for them to go as far as they want to go.

Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Horsey.

Mr. HORSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard both sides of the aisle and leadership make comments on this particular SB 652 on concurrence, and there is an overriding point that a multitude of members in this chamber do not understand, and that is, in Philadelphia there are 215,000 kids, and 8 out of every 10 kids in Philadelphia are black. Now, there are issues, Mr. Speaker, that supersede politics, party lines, leadership, and everything else, and this is one of those issues — I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker — and as a result, over the years, I heard my colleague, Mr. Evans, suggesting, as a result, over the years with this chamber posturing on different issues and, you know, which way we should go here and which way we should go there and we should do this and we should not do that, 8 out of, you know, every 10 kids are black, and most of them are failing.

If you mention digital divide to kids—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will yield, please.

There is a strong undercurrent of noise on the floor. The gentleman deserves to be heard. Please, conferences move to the outer rooms.

Mr. Horsey.

Mr. HORSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, if you mention digital divide in Philadelphia, most people, and especially kids, do not know what you are talking about. If you mention laptops in Philadelphia, most of the kids think you are talking about a dance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are issues that are very close to us and they supersede party lines and everything else, Mr. Speaker, and this is one of those votes, Mr. Speaker, and no one can tell you, generally speaking, on these real personal issues how to vote and what to do. We are going to vote our conscience, and that is what this type of vote is, Mr. Speaker; this is a vote of conscience.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. DeWeese. The gentleman will yield.

Please. There are two speakers left, the two floor leaders.

Mr. Myers desires recognition. Mr. DeWeese, do you want to yield?

Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I would like to follow this gentleman or not.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to first talk about a young man who was elected in the city of Philadelphia as mayor in the most recent election and who has come out of the gate totally committed to education for our children. Mr. Street has been the most active mayor I can remember in my lifetime, and some of you all may be a little older than me, but in my lifetime the most active mayor I have ever seen, who is totally committed to educating and full funding of public education as we know it, who is totally committed to technological advancement in our schools, who is totally committed to standards of performance and measurable outcomes. Mr. Street has met with every organization in the city of Philadelphia that has an interest in education. He has had town meetings in every single sector of Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Myers, concurrence.

Mr. MYERS. On concurrence — thank you, Mr. Speaker — on concurrence, I just got a letter, and I want to read the last sentence in this letter so people can understand where I am, because as I said before, I am committed to my mayor and his

stance on children, on concurrence. From the mayor's secretary of education: "The Street administration supports the concept of this legislation" and asks that we all do the same.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. DeWeese.

Members, please.

Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. On concurrence, Mr. Speaker.

I believe that SB 652 is a lie. I believe it is a lie to the children of Pennsylvania. As the gentleman, Mr. Veon, asserted, this bill does nothing to reduce class sizes in our State. This bill does nothing to provide for full-time kindergarten in our State. This bill does nothing, Mr. Speaker, to end social promotion in our State. It is a lie to the children of the State.

I would ask for a nonconcurrence vote, but I realize that the procedural votes earlier in the day are indicative of only about 90 of us probably, and maybe fewer, that will vote to nonconcur. What should be remembered from today is that not all that long ago we came here to remedy property taxes, and the proposal that was passed by the Assembly and signed by the Governor on a similar concurrence motion, Act 50, was embraced by 3 — 3 school districts out of 501. The property tax dilemma was not solved. The problems of the Philadelphia schools and our other challenged schools will not be solved by this proposal. This is a lie. This is an ignominious and, as Mr. Surra said, a paltry effort.

Now, I am in favor of helping the Street administration in Philadelphia, but they assert that they need \$200 or \$300 million. This is a \$20-million proposal, and the Republican bosses on this floor from Philadelphia are making certain, for the GOP rural delegation to take note of, that 75 percent of the money that we spend here today will go to Philadelphia, \$15 million out of \$20 million, but that is only about 3 or 4 percent, 3 or 4 percent, 3 or 4 percent of the amount of money that it will take to attack the problem, according to officials in the city of Philadelphia itself.

On the procedure, Mr. Speaker, we do not seem to do things the way our traditions provide. We did workers' compensation on a similar concurrence vote; the gasoline tax within a couple of hours; HMO (health maintenance organization) reform within a couple of hours; the stadium vote, which I supported, within a couple of hours; vouchers; electric dereg. Again and again and again, our committee system is moribund if not defunct, except for the campaign finance reform effort in the State Government Committee.

We are abrogating our job to Eugene Hickok today. My reason for being against concurrence is not that I have anything against the Honorable Eugene Hickok, the Secretary of Education, but I think by doing this we are the same as a centralized State bureaucracy. Eugene Hickok, Czar Eugene, Eugene the First — he will be by virtue, by virtue of this legislation able to take over—

The SPEAKER. Mr. DeWeese, would you yield for a moment, please.

Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for the courtesy.

I do not want to dwell on Czar Eugene the First, but nevertheless, I think that the takeover mechanisms that will be instigated by this proposal will allow the Secretary of

Education, whether it is Mr. Hickok or one of his successors, with two appointed people at his or her side to be dominant influences within these 11 districts and create waivers that could impact and will impact many other districts.

When I look across the aisle — and this has been today in the procedural realm an 80-20 divide or an 85-15 divide — but when I look at the Republicans, I think of the rhetoric of so long ago and even in contemporary times about local control — local control. The reason I do not want to concur in this matter is that school boards, who are the only statutorily authorized entity to raise the revenue, to raise the taxes to support these matters, will be superseded by Mr. Hickok and his collaborators. Who in their right mind is going to want to participate at the elemental, fundamental school board level when their only obligation will be to raise the revenue, to raise the taxes, to pay for whatever Czar Eugene the First decides to promulgate? I thought I was dealing with people on your side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, the Republican side of the aisle, before the big Republican liberal bosses from Lancaster and Philadelphia got involved in the process. To bring this, a centralized State ethos, is beyond my ability to imagine. I thought you folks were for local control.

Czar Eugene the First, if he wishes, can hire unlicensed teachers by this matter. If we are going to hire unlicensed teachers, if that is going to be a decision in Inc. Magazine and Forbes Magazine and the Wall Street Journal, and other entities advocate that, then that should be a decision made by local school boards, locally elected school boards. This centralized State bureaucracy is what we taught against at West Point during the cold war for 50 years, and now we have people on your side of the aisle embracing it. Contracting out to private companies for support within the school district, if that is a good idea, let the local school districts through their elected boards decide. I do not want to concur on this, because I do not think that the Secretary of Education should unilaterally be contracting out for private services unless there is a school board vote on the matter. I am not arguing the efficacy of contracting out right now; I am saying it is a local control matter.

Charter schools. The Secretary of Education can come forward and bring us charter schools, at the drop of the proverbial hat, if this legislation is adopted. If you are for charter schools, then why not, why not, Mr. Speaker, allow local school boards, local governing bodies, to make those decisions, not — not — legislators from Philadelphia, or Greene County for that matter.

The honorable majority leader time and time and time again — his rhetoric is refreshingly consistent on this matter — has declared that he does not want to throw money at the Philadelphia schools, but that is what he is doing today, Mr. Speaker. Twenty million dollars is chicken feed when you look at the overall problem just in the city of Philadelphia, which is a \$200- to \$300-million problem, and statewide we are talking about something, as Nick Colafella, the chairman of our Education Committee on our side of the aisle, said, that consumes 50 percent of the State dollars. Half of all the money we spend in this Commonwealth is for education, and by your leave, by your leave, we are making a decision that will impact public education throughout the State for a long, long time to come, and the majority leader and his caucus and our Governor, notwithstanding their protestations to the contrary heretofore,

are throwing money — throwing money — at the Philadelphia School District and certainly not in a well thought out manner.

I would ask that we nonconcur for all the reasons enumerated by the gentleman from Elk County, the gentleman from Beaver County, from some of my colleagues from Philadelphia County. It is imperative for you to realize that in Act 50 of the property tax debate, you heard all this grandiose rhetoric about how this was going to take care of our property taxes in the State of Pennsylvania. Please remember, only 3 school districts out of 501 got involved and worked forward on Act 50, and we will be back here within months, we will be back here in short order, Mr. Speaker, to try to attack the real problems of our State.

It is an ignominious shame, and as one of my colleagues from Indiana County, I believe, one of my colleagues said, a sham of the first magnitude, that with hundreds and hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars, a couple of billion dollars in the last six budget cycles, that we have not reduced class sizes, that we have not made full-time kindergarten a priority, that we have not done more for Head Start, that we have not done more against social promotions. This is gossamer; this is inconsequential. This is typical of the Republican promulgations from the well of the majority leadership pulpit. This bill is a lie.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Perzel, on concurrence.

Mr. PERZEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was just commenting, I did not know that I was a boss, but I guess I am a boss.

Mr. Speaker, the easiest thing for us all to do is to continue on with the status quo. That is easy. Leading is the hard thing to do. You all know that this has been a difficult day, but the number one issue that we need to do as leaders is to improve the quality of life for the children that we are trying to help out there. It is 246,000 children that are in those 11 failed school districts. We cannot continue to sacrifice the children and their futures while we engage in endless political debate here on the floor. We need leaders for this issue, Mr. Speaker. We need leaders who are going to say that they are not going to put up with a quarter of a million kids failing year after year after year.

You all believe that no matter what school district a child lives in, that they should have the opportunity to succeed. They should have the opportunity to get ahead, to get a good job, to own a home, to own a car, and be productive members of society, and we have sat here, truthfully, for years and years and years and never really done that. I am not going to say this is the end of the debate, but truthfully, you are debating it. You may have not liked being here all these hours, but I will tell you what, you are about to do one of the major changes in education that we have ever done in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and I hope that every one of those 250,000 kids, roughly, makes it. I really do hope that.

But I am asking you all to be leaders and do the right thing here this afternoon, this evening now. This is your only chance right now to do this, and you know that you have been here, a lot of you a long time, and you never had the chance. This is the only chance that you will have to make this type of change in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and I am asking you please to support us and please vote "yes" to support this issue.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question of concurrence, those in favor of concurring—

Mr. COLAFELLA. Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Mr. Colafella, I am going to recognize you, but being fair, we always have allowed the last two speeches to be the two floor leaders or the proponent and the opponent to the measure. You knew that, I had announced it, and I am slightly offended by your seeking recognition; however, I recognize you at this time.

Mr. COLAFELLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to interrogate the majority leader, please.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates he will not stand for interrogation.

Mr. COLAFELLA. So I will make a brief statement.

Mr. Speaker, the question that I was going to ask the majority leader was, was there any legislator involved in the composition of this legislation, and quite frankly, I do not think so, and what bothers me about what we are doing today is that we are being sold out. This legislature is being sold out. We had no input on the major educational legislation, one of the most significant pieces of education legislation. I would be willing to bet that not one legislator here had anything to do with it, and that is sad. It is a sad day for this legislature.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope everyone who votes is in their seat tonight.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—104

Adolph	Egolf	Maher	Rohrer
Allen	Evans	Maitland	Ross
Argall	Fairchild	Major	Rublely
Armstrong	Fargo	Marsico	Schroder
Baker	Feese	Masland	Smith, S. H.
Bard	Fichter	McGeehan	Snyder
Barley	Fleagle	McGill	Steil
Barrar	Flick	McIlhattan	Stern
Bastian	Gannon	McIlhinney	Stevenson
Birmelin	Geist	Metcalfe	Strittmatter
Bishop	Giadeck	Micozzie	Taylor, E. Z.
Browne	Godshall	Miller, R.	Taylor, J.
Bunt	Habay	Miller, S.	Thomas
Carn	Harhart	Myers	Trich
Cawley	Hasay	Nailor	True
Chadwick	Hennessey	Nickol	Tulli
Civera	Horsey	O'Brien	Vance
Clark	Hutchinson	Oliver	Waters
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Orie	Wogan
Cornell	James	Perzel	Wright
Corrigan	Keller	Phillips	Youngblood
Dailey	Kenney	Pippy	Zimmerman
Dally	Krebs	Ramos	Zug
Dempsey	Lederer	Raymond	
DiGirolamo	Leh	Reinard	
Donatucci	Levdansky	Rieger	Ryan,
Druce	Lynch		Speaker

NAYS—91

Battisto	Frankel	McNaughton	Shaner
Bebko-Jones	Freeman	Melio	Smith, B.
Belardi	George	Michlovic	Solobay
Belfanti	Gordner	Mundy	Staback
Benninghoff	Gruccela	Pesci	Stairs
Blaum	Gruitza	Petrarca	Steelman
Boyes	Haluska	Petrone	Stetler

Butkovitz	Hanna	Pistella	Sturla
Buxton	Harhai	Platts	Surra
Caltagirone	Herman	Preston	Tangretti
Casorio	Hess	Readshaw	Tigue
Cohen, L. I.	Josephs	Robinson	Travaglio
Cohen, M.	Kaiser	Roebuck	Trelo
Colafella	Kirkland	Rooney	Van Horne
Costa	Laughlin	Ruffing	Veon
Coy	Lawless	Sainato	Vitali
Curry	Lescovitz	Samuelson	Walko
Daley	Lucyk	Santoni	Williams
DeLuca	Manderino	Sather	Wilt
Dermody	Mann	Saylor	Wojnaroski
DeWeese	Markosek	Schuler	Yewcic
Eachus	Mayernik	Scrimenti	Yudichak
Forcier	McCall	Semmel	

NOT VOTING—2

Hershey	Washington
---------	------------

EXCUSED—5

Cappabianca	LaGrotta	Roberts	Seyfert
Gigliotti			

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments to House amendments as amended by the Rules Committee were concurred in.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. FRANKEL called up HR 486, PN 3484, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the naming of the Forbes Quadrangle at the University of Pittsburgh as the Wesley W. Posvar Hall.

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—192

Adolph	Evans	Markosek	Schroder
Allen	Fairchild	Marsico	Schuler
Argall	Fargo	Masland	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Feese	Mayernik	Semmel
Baker	Fichter	McCall	Shaner
Bard	Fleagle	McGeehan	Smith, B.
Barley	Flick	McGill	Smith, S. H.
Barrar	Forcier	McIlhattan	Snyder
Bastian	Frankel	McIlhinney	Solobay
Battisto	Freeman	McNaughton	Staback
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	Melio	Stairs
Belardi	Geist	Metcalfe	Steelman
Belfanti	George	Michlovic	Steil
Benninghoff	Godshall	Micozzie	Stern
Birmelin	Gruccela	Miller, R.	Stetler
Bishop	Gruitza	Miller, S.	Stevenson
Blaum	Habay	Mundy	Strittmatter
Boyes	Haluska	Myers	Sturla
Browne	Hanna	Nailor	Surra
Bunt	Harhai	Nickol	Tangretti
Buxton	Harhart	O'Brien	Taylor, E. Z.

Caltagirone	Hasay	Oliver	Taylor, J.
Cam	Hennessey	Orie	Thomas
Casorio	Herman	Perzel	Tigue
Cawley	Hershey	Pesci	Travaglio
Chadwick	Hess	Petrarca	Trelio
Civera	Horsey	Petrone	Trich
Clark	Hutchinson	Phillips	True
Clymer	Jadlowiec	Pippy	Tulli
Cohen, L. I.	James	Pistella	Vance
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Platts	Van Horne
Colafella	Kaiser	Preston	Veon
Cornell	Keller	Ramos	Vitali
Corrigan	Kenney	Raymond	Walko
Costa	Kirkland	Readshaw	Washington
Coy	Krebs	Reinard	Waters
Curry	Laughlin	Rieger	Williams
Dailey	Lawless	Robinson	Wilt
Daley	Lederer	Roebuck	Wogan
Dally	Leh	Rohrer	Wojnaroski
DeLuca	Lescovitz	Rooney	Wright
Dempsey	Levdansky	Ross	Youngblood
Dermody	Lucyk	Rublek	Yudichak
DeWeese	Lynch	Ruffing	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	Maher	Sainato	Zug
Donatucci	Maitland	Santoni	
Druce	Major	Sather	
Eachus	Manderino	Saylor	Ryan,
Egolf	Mann		Speaker

NAYS—2

Gordner Samuelson

NOT VOTING—3

Butkovitz Gladeck Yewcic

EXCUSED—5

Cappabianca LaGrotta Roberts Seyfert
Gigliotti

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

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Flick, for the purpose of making a committee announcement.

Mr. FLICK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to call an immediate meeting of the House Intergovernmental Affairs Committee in the rear of the House to consider two resolutions.

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING

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

Mr. O'BRIEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There will also be a meeting of the Health and Human Services Committee immediately behind the rail in the back of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

VOTE CORRECTIONS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Philadelphia County, Ms. Washington.

Ms. WASHINGTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My switch did not operate. I want to be recorded as a "yes" on SB 652.

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

Any further corrections? Mr. Pippy.

Mr. PIPPY. SB 652, the motion to suspend the rules, I was not recorded. I would like to be recorded in the negative.

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

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 SB 380, PN 1895.

BILLS SIGNED BY SPEAKER

Bills numbered and entitled as follows having been prepared for presentation to the Governor, and the same being correct, the titles were publicly read as follows:

SB 380, PN 1895

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for guardians ad litem in juvenile matters; further providing for counsel in juvenile matters, for adjudications in certain juvenile matters and for the registration of sexual offenders; and making a repeal.

SB 544, PN 562

An Act designating a bridge over the Susquehanna River in Clinton County as the Constitution Bridge.

Whereupon, the Speaker, in the presence of the House, signed the same.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Gordner.

Mr. GORDNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GORDNER. Am I correct that HB 1686 is currently being held at the Speaker's desk and we will be considering a reconsideration motion when we return on Monday?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. GORDNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. I do not know that it will be Monday, but it is being held here, and a reconsideration motion has been submitted which we will take up.

Mr. GORDNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The House will be at ease awaiting the results of the committee meetings.

There will be no further votes this evening. I am also awaiting advice as to whether or not there will be a token session tomorrow. By the time you are down in your offices, I will have announced that.

Are there any further corrections to the record? Do the majority or minority leaders have any further business?

The House will stand at ease.

SUNSHINE NOTICE

The SPEAKER. The clerk will read the sunshine notice for tomorrow's session.

The following communication was read:

House of Representatives
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Harrisburg

NOTICE
SESSION TIME
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Notice is hereby given, in accordance with the Act of July 3, 1986, P.L. 388, No. 84, that the House of Representatives will convene in open session in the Hall of the House on the following date and time:

Thursday, May 4, 2000
11:00 a.m.

Ted Mazia, Chief Clerk

Thursday, May 4, 2000

BILL REPORTED AND REREFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

HB 2502, PN 3457

By Rep. O'BRIEN

An Act amending the act of July 3, 1985 (P.L. 164, No. 45), known as the Emergency Medical Services Act, adding definitions; providing for duties of municipalities, counties and public service answering points, for certain civil immunity and for designation of quick response services; and further providing for legislative findings and intent, for the emergency medical services system, and for duties of the Department of Health, the Pennsylvania Trauma Systems Foundation, the emergency medical services councils and the State Advisory Council.

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HR 347, PN 2890

By Rep. FLICK

A Resolution concerning the killings of human rights lawyers Rosemary Nelson and Patrick Finucane.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.

HR 472, PN 3394

By Rep. FLICK

A Concurrent Resolution urging the United States Senate to ratify the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.

The SPEAKER. Is there any further business?

SUNSHINE NOTICE

The SPEAKER. The clerk at this time will read a revised sunshine notice.

The following communication was read:

House of Representatives
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Harrisburg

NOTICE
SESSION TIME
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Notice is hereby given, in accordance with the Act of July 3, 1986, P.L. 388, No. 84, that the House of Representatives will convene in open session in the Hall of the House on the following date and time:

Thursday, May 4, 2000
10:00 a.m.

Ted Mazia, Chief Clerk

Thursday, May 4, 2000

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, all remaining bills and resolutions on today's calendar will be passed over. The Chair hears no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. Is there any further business?

Hearing none, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westmoreland County, Mr. Harhai.

Mr. HARHAI. Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, May 4, 2000, 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 6:03 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.