

Legislative Journal

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1984

SESSION OF 1984

168TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 9

SENATE

TUESDAY, February 7, 1984.

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m., Eastern Standard Time.

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Mr. ROBERT R. ANDERSON, Pastor of Silver Spring Presbyterian Church, Mechanicsburg, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord God, You are the source of all things good. You have given us this day and its opportunities like manna of old to be used sufficient for the day.

Grant that we, who are inclined to remember only the things we do not have, may never forget what we do have. We come to You dependent upon You because if we did not have Your wisdom there would be no way to govern in unity, in justice and in peace.

This Session of the Senate is about to hear some delicate and sensitive matters about a budget. Help them to be open and able to be surprised, Lord. Grant them to be creatively critical. Endow them with the leadership that comes from those who serve the people with trust.

Bless the Governor as he speaks to them. Grant him clarity of thought and freedom of expression.

Help us to remember that what we really believe is written in our calendar books and our check stubs and what this Body really stands for will appear in the budget items.

Thank You for these people who have the responsibility to govern and to make this Commonwealth either a community or chaos.

Grant them vision, patience, courage and sacrifice but most of all the honesty to be obedient to You.

Deliver us from all cowardice that dares not face the truth or laziness that is content with half-truths or even arrogance that thinks it knows all the truth, but make us sensitive to the One who is the truth. Forgive us Lord, when we think it is all in our hands. Grant us the humility to know that we are Your servants. In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

JOURNAL APPROVED

The PRESIDENT. A quorum of the Senate being present, the Clerk will read the Journal of the preceding Session of February 6, 1984.

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

LEGISLATIVE LEAVES

Senator SCANLON. Mr. President, I request legislative leaves of absence for today for Senator Romanelli and Senator Lynch who will be attending a meeting of the Committee on Transportation in Philadelphia. I also request a temporary legislative leave of absence for Senator Ross.

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

CALENDAR

SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS

HB 85 CALLED UP OUT OF ORDER

HB 85 (Pr. No. 1877) — Without objection, the bill was called up out of order, from page 2 of the Third Consideration Calendar, by Senator JUBELIRER, as a Special Order of Business.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AND FINAL PASSAGE

HB 85 (Pr. No. 1877) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act designating the portion of Interstate Route 95 in Pennsylvania as the "Vietnam Veterans' Memorial Highway."

Considered the third time and agreed to,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

YEAS—47

Andrezeski	Holl	Mellow	Shaffer
Bell	Hopper	Moore	Shumaker
Bodack	Howard	Musto	Singel
Brightbill	Jubelirer	O'Connell	Snyder
Corman	Kelley	O'Pake	Stapleton
Early	Kratzer	Pecora	Stauffer
Fisher	Kusse	Reibman	Stout

Greenleaf	Lewis	Rhoades	Tilghman
Hager	Lincoln	Rocks	Wenger
Hankins	Lloyd	Romanelli	Williams
Helfrick	Loeper	Ross	Zemprelli
Hess	Lynch	Scanlon	

NAYS—0

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

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate return said bill to the House of Representatives with information that the Senate has passed the same without amendments.

COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO ESCORT THE GOVERNOR TO THE HALL OF THE HOUSE

The PRESIDENT. The President pro tempore has appointed the following Senators to act as a committee on the part of the Senate to escort the Governor to the Joint Session: the gentleman from Delaware County, Senator Bell, Chairman; the gentleman from Lehigh County, Senator Kratzer; and the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Senator Rocks.

The committee will leave immediately to discharge its duties.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS SENATE

Senator FUMO asked and obtained unanimous consent to address the Senate.

Senator FUMO. Mr. President, I was not on the floor a few minutes ago when House Bill No. 85 was voted. I would like the record to reflect that had I been here I would have voted "aye."

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

Senator JUBELIRER. Mr. President, to review what appears to be the schedule for today, we are, of course, momentarily going to the Joint Session for the budget message and, therefore, I request a recess of the Senate. We will then call the Republican Members of the Senate to report to the first floor caucus room at 2:00 p.m. It is my expectation to return to the floor at approximately 3:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. For that purpose we request a recess of the Senate at this time.

Senator ZEMPRELLI. Mr. President, there is no reason for the Democratic caucus to act any differently than the Republican caucus. Therefore, we ask all the Members to report to caucus at 2:00 p.m. and we will be on the floor when the Republicans decide they want to call the Session.

HOUSE NOTIFIES SENATE IT IS READY TO CONVENE IN JOINT SESSION

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Sergeant-at-Arms.

The SERGEANT-AT-ARMS. Mr. President, I have the honor to present a committee on behalf of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT. The Sergeant-at-Arms will bring the committee forth, please.

The SERGEANT-AT-ARMS. Mr. President, I have the honor to present the chairman of the escort committee from the House, Representative Lucyk.

Mr. LUCYK. Mr. President, we are a committee of the House appointed to inform the Senate that the House is ready to receive the Members of the Senate in Joint Session and to escort the Members of the Senate to the Hall of the House.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair thanks Chairman Lucyk and the committee from the House.

SENATE PROCEEDS TO HOUSE TO HEAR GOVERNOR'S MESSAGE

The PRESIDENT. Members of the Senate will please form a line in the center aisle immediately behind the Sergeant-at-Arms and the House committee, in order that we may now proceed to the Joint Session.

The Chair declares the Senate in recess.

AFTER RECESS

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

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

REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE SUBMITTED

Senator HOLL submitted the Report of Committee of Conference on SB 300, which was placed on the Calendar.

LEGISLATIVE LEAVES

Senator JUBELIRER. Mr. President, I request temporary legislative leaves of absence for Senator Street and Senator Kusse. I do not know if it has been previously requested, but Senator Brightbill has requested a legislative leave of absence to speak to the Pennsylvania Conference Association of Housing and Redevelopment Agencies.

Senator SCANLON. Mr. President, I request a legislative leave of absence for Senator Stout who went on the trip to Philadelphia to have meetings with the SEPTA people.

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

LEGISLATIVE LEAVES CANCELLED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair notes the presence on the floor of Senator Ross. His temporary legislative leave of absence has now expired.

Senator JUBELIRER. Mr. President, I would like to have the Chair recognize the fact that Senator Brightbill is on the floor and I request his legislative leave of absence be cancelled.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The record will so indicate.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR NO. 1

REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

REPORT ADOPTED

SB 300 (Pr. No. 1704) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further defining "local authorities" to include airport authorities which are not located within counties of the first class or counties of the second class; further providing for financial responsibility; providing for notice relating to chemical tests and driving under the influence; further providing for motor carriers road tax identification markers and axle tax; and making repeals.

Senator JUBELIRER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adopt the Report of Committee of Conference on Senate Bill No. 300.

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

SENATOR MOORE REQUESTED TO PRESIDE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will Senator Moore please approach the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (William J. Moore) in the Chair.

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

Senator SCANLON. Mr. President, I know there are several Members on this side who would like to make a few remarks on this bill. We are trying to get them to the floor. May we be at ease for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be at ease.
(The Senate was at ease.)

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

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

YEAS—41

Andrezeski	Jubelirer	Musto	Shumaker
Brightbill	Kelley	O'Connell	Singel
Corman	Kusse	O'Pake	Snyder
Fumo	Lewis	Reibman	Stapleton
Greenleaf	Lincoln	Rhoades	Stauffer
Hankins	Lloyd	Rocks	Stout
Helfrick	Loeper	Romanelli	Street
Hess	Lynch	Ross	Wenger
Holl	Mellow	Scanlon	Williams
Hopper	Moore	Shaffer	Zemprelli
Howard			

NAYS—7

Bell	Early	Kratzer	Tilghman
Bodack	Fisher	Pecora	

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

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

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

POINT OF ORDER

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The gentleman from Allegheny, Senator Zemprelli, will state it.

Senator ZEMPRELLI. Mr. President, I may have to leave the Chamber very shortly and a matter has been called to my attention relative to certain legislation which has been reported from committee. My point of order is, how long does a committee chairman have to refer a bill which has been passed by the committee to the floor of the Senate either in original or amended form?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In response to the gentleman's inquiry, the Rules of the Senate are silent as to any period of time after committee action during which the chairman of the committee is compelled to report the bill to the floor.

Senator ZEMPRELLI. Mr. President, is there any supporting direction, rule or regulation as it would apply to those Rules that the Senate historically falls back upon in the absence of speaking specifically of the Rules of the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator, to the certain knowledge of the Chair, there appears to be nothing in Roberts Rules or in any other source secondary to the Rules of the Senate upon which the Senate usually relies.

Senator ZEMPRELLI. Mr. President, is it not a fact that in legislative interpretation that where similar matters are involved, it might be concluded as a reasonable presumption that the same Rule would apply to legislation or proposed legislation of a lesser standard as to compulsion and time for consideration? I refer without identification to a specific Rule, but a Rule which does exist with relation to ten days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is unable to answer the question as asked. Will the gentleman please restate it?

Senator ZEMPRELLI. Mr. President, is it not a fact that, under certain circumstances, the Senate of Pennsylvania is required to act upon legislation on its Calendar within ten days or that bill reverts back to committee or, so to speak, falls off the Calendar? Then is it not reasonable to presume if that is the Rule and regulation as it would apply to the passage of legislation, that in the consideration of any other matter of a lesser standing or a lesser degree or of the same nature that it would be at least or not more than that number of days for which a bill would have to be processed in some fashion or another from one step in the legislative process to another?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator, I do not believe that the Chair should speculate or engage in presumptions. The two situations are clearly not analogous. The Senate Rules very specifically speak to ten days for a bill on the Calendar before it reverts to committee, and the Rules are silent as to the main question which the gentleman asks.

Senator ZEMPRELLI. Mr. President, calling upon the expertise of the Chair and understanding his long legislative record and also understanding his training and experience, would the Chair, as the Presiding Officer, not conclude that if it took ten days to pass upon a bill in terms of final legislative action by the Senate, it is reasonable to conclude that a committee chairman of this Senate would have the ability to report a bill from committee to the floor within that same period of time, or not a greater period of time than that?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All appearances to the contrary notwithstanding, the Chair is the Chair and not a personality. It is the opinion of this person presently presiding over the Senate that the Chair should not engage in speculation or give opinions other than those based on the Rules or other supporting documentation ordinarily used by the Senate. It is lacking in this case, Senator.

EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Motion was made by Senator LOEPER,

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

Which was agreed to.

NOMINATION TAKEN FROM THE TABLE

Senator LOEPER. Mr. President, I call from the table for consideration certain nomination previously reported from committee and laid on the table.

The Clerk read the nomination as follows:

MEMBER OF THE STATE EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT BOARD

October 21, 1983.

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

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Honorable Murray G. Dickman, 1074-7 Lancaster Boulevard, Mechanicsburg 17055, Cumberland County, Thirty-first Senatorial District, for appointment as a member of the State Employees' Retirement Board, to serve until September 26, 1986, vice Milton Melman, Harrisburg, resigned.

DICK THORNBURGH.

On the question,

Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

LEGISLATIVE LEAVE

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection and the leave is granted.

And the question recurring,

Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, I would like to request a negative vote on the nominee.

And the question recurring,

Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

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

YEAS—24

Bell	Helfrick	Kratzer	Shumaker
Brightbill	Hess	Kusse	Snyder
Corman	Holl	Loeper	Stauffer
Fisher	Hopper	Moore	Street
Greenleaf	Howard	Pecora	Tilghman
Hager	Jubelirer	Rhoades	Wenger

NAYS—23

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

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

Ordered, That the Governor be informed accordingly.

RECONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATION

NOMINATION LAID ON THE TABLE

Senator LOEPER. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the nomination of the Honorable Murray G. Dickman was defeated be reconsidered and the nomination be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be laid on the table.

NOMINATIONS TAKEN FROM THE TABLE

Senator LOEPER. Mr. President, I call from the table for consideration certain nominations previously reported from committee and laid on the table.

The Clerk read the nominations as follows:

MEMBER OF THE STATE ART COMMISSION

October 31, 1983.

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

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Robert J. Breslin, R. D. 1, Balsam Road, Center Valley 18034, Lehigh County, Sixteenth Senatorial District, for reappointment as a member of the State Art Commission, to serve until the third Tuesday of January, 1987, and until his successor shall have been appointed and qualified.

DICK THORNBURGH.

MEMBER OF THE STATE ART COMMISSION

October 31, 1983.

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

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate John Rea, Jr., 33 Sylvan Drive, Hollidaysburg 16648, Blair County, Thirtieth Senatorial District, for reappointment as a member of the State Art Commission, to serve until the third Tuesday of January, 1987, and until his successor shall have been appointed and qualified.

DICK THORNBURGH.

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
CONNELLSVILLE STATE GENERAL HOSPITAL

December 23, 1983.

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

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Floyd C. Huggins, Leisenring 15455, Fayette County, Thirty-second Senatorial District, for appointment as a member of the Board of Trustees of Connellsville State General Hospital, to serve until the third Tuesday of January, 1989, and until his successor is appointed and qualified, vice Paul J. Rohal, South Connellsville, whose term expired.

DICK THORNBURGH.

MEMBER OF THE HEALTH CARE
POLICY BOARD

October 31, 1983.

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

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Arthur Edmunds, 121 Crestline Place, Pittsburgh 15221, Allegheny County, Thirty-eighth Senatorial District, for reappointment as a member of the Health Care Policy Board, to serve until April 29, 1987, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

DICK THORNBURGH.

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
OF LAURELTON CENTER

December 23, 1983.

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

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Marlyn Smith, Box 129-A, R. D. 2, Mill Hall 17751, Clinton County, Thirty-fourth Senatorial District, for reappointment as a member of the Board of Trustees of Laurelton Center, to serve until the third Tuesday of January, 1989, and until her successor is appointed and qualified.

DICK THORNBURGH.

MEMBER OF THE ALLEGHENY COUNTY
BOARD OF ASSISTANCE

November 25, 1983.

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

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Paul L. Pyeritz (Republican), 423 Salem Drive, Pittsburgh 15243, Allegheny County, Thirty-seventh Senatorial District, for appointment as a member of the Allegheny County Board of Assistance, to serve until December 31, 1985, and until his successor is duly appointed and qualified, vice Edward P. Riehl, Pittsburgh, resigned.

DICK THORNBURGH.

MEMBER OF THE ALLEGHENY COUNTY
BOARD OF ASSISTANCE

December 2, 1983.

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

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Richard G. Lewis (Republican), 216 Lingrove Place, Pittsburgh 15208, Allegheny County, Forty-third Senatorial District, for appointment as a member of the Allegheny County Board of Assistance, to serve until December 31, 1983, and until his successor is duly appointed and qualified, vice Addie Knox, Pittsburgh, resigned.

DICK THORNBURGH.

MEMBER OF THE DELAWARE COUNTY
BOARD OF ASSISTANCE

January 6, 1984.

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

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Regina O. Killian (Republican), 3401 Highland Avenue, Drexel Hill 19026, Delaware County, Twenty-sixth Senatorial District, for appointment as a member of the Delaware County Board of Assistance, to serve until December 31, 1986, and until her successor is duly appointed and qualified, vice Jeannette Page, Parkside, resigned.

DICK THORNBURGH.

MEMBER OF THE NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY
BOARD OF ASSISTANCE

January 6, 1984.

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

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate Michael S. Repella (Republican), Box 275, R. D. 1, Elysburg 17824, Northumberland County, Twenty-seventh Senatorial District, for appointment as a member of the Northumberland County Board of Assistance, to serve until December 31, 1986, and until his successor is duly appointed and qualified, vice Suzanne Memapace, Mount Carmel, whose term expired.

DICK THORNBURGH.

On the question,

Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations?

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

YEAS—48

Andrezski	Hess	Mellow	Shaffer
Bell	Holl	Moore	Shumaker
Bodack	Hopper	Musto	Singel
Brightbill	Howard	O'Connell	Snyder
Corman	Jubelirer	O'Pake	Stapleton

Early	Kelley	Pecora	Stauffer
Fisher	Kratzer	Reibman	Stout
Fumo	Kusse	Rhoades	Street
Greenleaf	Lincoln	Rocks	Tilghman
Hager	Lloyd	Romanelli	Wenger
Hankins	Loeper	Ross	Williams
Helfrick	Lynch	Scanlon	Zemprelli

NAYS—0

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

Ordered, That the Governor be informed accordingly.

CONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATION

Senator EARLY. Mr. President, I would like to move that we remove from the table and vote today on Thomas R. Butler, D.C., as a member of the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator Early moves that the nomination of Thomas R. Butler, D.C., to be a member of the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners be removed from the table.

Senator EARLY. Mr. President, I withdraw my motion.

EXECUTIVE SESSION RISES

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

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE LEAVES

Senator JUBELIRER. Mr. President, I request a temporary legislative leave of absence for Senator Pecora for the remainder of today's Session.

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, I request a temporary legislative leave of absence for Senator Scanlon who has been called off the floor.

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

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR RESUMED

BILLS ON CONCURRENCE IN HOUSE AMENDMENTS BILLS OVER IN ORDER

SB 288, 503 and 506 — Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator JUBELIRER.

THIRD CONSIDERATION CALENDAR BILLS OVER IN ORDER

HB 8, 224 and SB 1017 — Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator JUBELIRER.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AMENDED

SB 1034 (Pr. No. 1620) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 12, 1951 (P. L. 90, No. 21), entitled "Liquor Code," further providing for special occasion permits.

Considered the third time,

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the bill on third consideration?

Senator KRATZER, by unanimous consent, offered the following amendment:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 408.4), page 2, line 9, by striking out the brackets before and after "six nonconsecutive"

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 408.4), page 2, line 9, by inserting after "nonconsecutive": or

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 408.4), page 2, line 17, by striking out the bracket before "no"

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 408.4), page 2, line 18, by inserting a bracket before "The"

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 408.4), page 2, line 21, by striking out "permits" and inserting: or in the alternative, one permit

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the amendment?

It was agreed to.

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the bill on third consideration, as amended?

Senator O'CONNELL, by unanimous consent, offered the following amendment:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 408.4), page 2, line 27, by inserting after "LICENSEES.": The hours during which a nonprofit corporation engaged in the performing arts in a city of the third class may sell liquor or malt or brewed beverages pursuant to a special occasion permit shall be limited to those hours set forth in section 408.3(g.1).

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the amendment?

Senator O'CONNELL. Mr. President, this amendment puts into compliance the provisions herein dealing with amusements and suggests that they comply with the same requirements as other nonprofit corporations such as the performing arts. What it really provides is that it specifies the hours of operation and the provision would be one hour before the opening or presentation time and one hour after. That is the thrust of the amendment. It would absolutely comply with similar circumstances throughout the Commonwealth.

Senator KELLEY. Mr. President, I desire to interrogate the gentleman from Luzerne, Senator O'Connell.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Luzerne, Senator O'Connell, permit himself to be interrogated?

Senator O'CONNELL. I will, Mr. President.

Senator KELLEY. Mr. President, would the gentleman set forth with some degree of particulars what abuses there are

under the current practice? This seems to be a restriction that I have no familiarity with as to what the practices are as proposed by the amendment of the gentleman. I wonder if he could enlighten the other Members of the Body as to whether or not there are abuses under the present provisions.

Senator O'CONNELL. Mr. President, I believe that these exceptions are to provide nonprofit corporations with the opportunity of entertaining their guests. I do not really believe it is an attempt to be in the business itself and to have the same latitude that bars, taverns, restaurants and hotels have. I think it is intended to give them the opportunity to be somewhat restrictive. If the language was stricken, they would be able to operate from 7:00 a.m. in the morning until 2:00 a.m., the same hours permitted now by other licensees. That does not seem to be quite right.

Senator KELLEY. Mr. President, I agree with the gentleman, but the direct question I have for the gentleman is, are there abuses presently in the law which is broader than the gentleman cares to have it? Are there abuses? Are there facilities being operated beyond those periods that the gentleman's amendment directs itself to, an hour before and an hour after?

Senator O'CONNELL. Mr. President, not to my knowledge. I know of no abuses. What has taken place here is that there is a constant expansion of the permission to serve alcoholic beverages which is having an adverse impact on a lot of people who have substantial investments, who have people on the payroll or are attempting to meet the obligation and it is somewhat of an infringement. If it continues, it is questionable as to whether a license is going to have any value at all or whether they will all just go into brown bagging. That is what happens here. It is an attempt to make this bill which deals with museums conform to the same regulations and the same requirements as performing arts.

Senator BELL. Mr. President, I desire to interrogate the gentleman from Luzerne, Senator O'Connell.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Luzerne, Senator O'Connell, permit himself to be interrogated?

Senator O'CONNELL. I will, Mr. President.

Senator BELL. Mr. President, let us assume a performing arts group has a dance marathon that goes from 7:00 in the morning to 7:00 the next morning. How would the gentleman's restrictions apply to that?

Senator O'CONNELL. Mr. President, if that were the case, I would suggest they would have to conform with the existing law which is universal. I am not sure about that, Senator.

Senator BELL. Mr. President, would that be 7:00 to 2:00, or would it be 7:00 to 8:00 the next morning?

Senator O'CONNELL. Mr. President, I am sorry I cannot answer the question. It is a technical question and it is a good one but I cannot answer that. It would just be presumptuous on my part, but I would presume that they would have to comply with the laws dealing with the rest of the licensees.

And the question recurring,

Will the Senate agree to the amendment?

The yeas and nays were required by Senator O'CONNELL and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—45

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

NAYS—3

Bodack	Ross	Singel
--------	------	--------

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate Bill No. 1034 will go over, as amended.

BILL OVER IN ORDER

SB 1053 — Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator JUBELIRER.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION AMENDED

SB 1139 (Pr. No. 1492) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P. L. 343, No. 176), entitled "The Fiscal Code," providing additional powers for the investment of moneys; providing for the issuance and refinancing of tax anticipation notes; and further providing for the temporary financing and refinancing of capital projects prior to the sale of bonds.

Considered the third time,

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the bill on third consideration?

Senator JUBELIRER, on behalf of Senator HOWARD, by unanimous consent, offered the following amendment:

Amend Sec. 2 (Sec. 1602-A), page 7, line 3, by removing the period after "purposes" and inserting: except as may be provided under Article XVI of the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the "Tax Reform Code of 1971."

Amend Sec 2 (Sec. 1602-B), page 10, line 8, by removing the period after "forty-nine" and inserting: and projects which the Department of General Services is authorized to construct, improve, equip, furnish, maintain, acquire or operate.

Amend Sec. 2 (Sec. 1602-B), page 12, line 19, by inserting after "borough,": town,

Amend Sec. 2 (Sec. 1603-B), page 15, lines 2 and 3, by striking out "in the form of a bill and shall thereafter proceed to consideration" and inserting: and shall thereafter be considered in the form of a bill

Amend Sec. 2 (Sec. 1603-B), page 15, line 19, by striking out On or before March 31, 1969 and in each succeeding and inserting: Each

Amend Sec. 2 (Sec. 1603-B), page 15, line 23, by striking out "bill,"

Amend Sec. 2 (Sec. 1608-B), page 23, line 14, by removing the period after "purposes" and inserting: except as may be provided under Article XVI of the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the "Tax Reform Code of 1971."

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the amendment?

It was agreed to.

Without objection, the bill, as amended, was passed over in its order at the request of Senator JUBELIRER.

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

HB 1209, SB 1220, HB 1241 and 1445 — Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator JUBELIRER.

SECOND CONSIDERATION CALENDAR

BILL REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE AS AMENDED OVER IN ORDER

SB 952 — Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator JUBELIRER.

NONPREFERRED APPROPRIATION BILLS OVER IN ORDER

SB 1130 and 1131 — Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator JUBELIRER.

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

HB 128, 559, SB 582, HB 793 and SB 814 — Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator JUBELIRER.

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

SB 1081 (Pr. No. 1651) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending Title 66 (Public Utilities) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the appointment, terms and qualifications of commission members.

Considered the second time and agreed to,

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

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

SB 1175, 1176 and 1217 — Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator JUBELIRER.

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

HB 1405 (Pr. No. 2394) — The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

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

Considered the second time and agreed to,

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

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

HB 1565, 1616 and 1617 — Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator JUBELIRER.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE

Senator SNYDER, from the Committee on Judiciary, reported the following bills:

SB 1032 (Pr. No. 1700) (Amended)

An Act exempting owners of firing ranges from any civil or criminal actions relating to noise pollution.

SB 1218 (Pr. No. 1655)

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for additional judges in the fifth, ninth, seventeenth, nineteenth, twenty-fourth, forty-sixth and fifty-third judicial districts.

GENERAL COMMUNICATIONS

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication, which was read by the Clerk as follows:

In the Senate, February 7, 1984.

We, the Senators whose signatures are affixed hereto respectfully request that the Honorable William W. Scranton, III, as presiding officer of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, place the nomination hereafter set forth before the Senate for a vote pursuant to the provisions of Article IV, Section 8(b) of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which provides in part "... The Senate shall act on each executive nomination within 25 legislative days of its submission. If the Senate has not voted upon a nomination within 15 legislative days following such submission, any five members of the Senate may, in writing, request the presiding officer of the Senate to place the nomination before the entire Senate body whereby the nomination must be voted upon prior to the expiration of five legislative days or 25 legislative days following submission by the Governor, whichever occurs first...."

We respectfully set forth the following facts relative to the nomination hereinafter set forth:

1. The nomination was presented to the Senate on November 14, 1983; and
2. The nomination has been before the Senate for a period of time in excess of 15 legislative days.

The nominee in the position is as follows:

Alvin Holm

Member
State Art Commission

Edward P. Zemprelli
Eugene F. Scanlon
Robert J. Mellow
Francis J. Lynch
James E. Ross

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication, which was read by the Clerk as follows:

In the Senate, February 7, 1984.

We, the Senators whose signatures are affixed hereto respectfully request that the Honorable William W. Scranton, III, as presiding officer of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, place the nomination hereafter set forth before the Senate for a vote pursuant to the provisions of Article IV, Section 8(b) of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which provides in part "... The Senate shall act on each executive nomination within 25 legislative days of its submission. If the Senate has not voted upon a nomination within 15 legislative days following such submission, any five members of the Senate may, in writing, request the presiding officer of the Senate to place the nomination before the entire Senate body whereby the nomination must be voted upon prior to the expiration of five legislative days or 25 legislative days following submission by the Governor, whichever occurs first...."

We respectfully set forth the following facts relative to the nomination hereinafter set forth:

1. The nomination was presented to the Senate on November 14, 1983; and
2. The nomination has been before the Senate for a period of time in excess of 15 legislative days.

The nominee in the position is as follows:

Richard Rittelmann	Member State Art Commission
Edward P. Zemprelli	
Eugene F. Scanlon	
Robert J. Mellow	
Francis J. Lynch	
James E. Ross	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication, which was read by the Clerk as follows:

In the Senate, February 7, 1984.

We, the Senators whose signatures are affixed hereto respectfully request that the Honorable William W. Scranton, III, as presiding officer of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, place the nomination hereafter set forth before the Senate for a vote pursuant to the provisions of Article IV, Section 8(b) of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which provides in part "... The Senate shall act on each executive nomination within 25 legislative days of its submission. If the Senate has not voted upon a nomination within 15 legislative days following such submission, any five members of the Senate may, in writing, request the presiding officer of the Senate to place the nomination before the entire Senate body whereby the nomination must be voted upon prior to the expiration of five legislative days or 25 legislative days following submission by the Governor, whichever occurs first...."

We respectfully set forth the following facts relative to the nomination hereinafter set forth:

1. The nomination was presented to the Senate on November 14, 1983; and
2. The nomination has been before the Senate for a period of time in excess of 15 legislative days.

The nominee in the position is as follows:

Constance E. Clayton	Member Council of Trustees of Cheyney University
Edward P. Zemprelli	
Eugene F. Scanlon	
Robert J. Mellow	
Francis J. Lynch	
James E. Ross	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication, which was read by the Clerk as follows:

In the Senate, February 7, 1984.

We, the Senators whose signatures are affixed hereto respectfully request that the Honorable William W. Scranton, III, as presiding officer of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, place the nomination hereafter set forth before the Senate for a vote pursuant to the provisions of Article IV, Section 8(b) of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which provides in part "... The Senate shall act on each executive nomination within 25 legislative days of its submission. If the Senate has not voted upon a nomination within 15 legislative days following such submission, any five members of the Senate may, in writing, request the presiding officer of the Senate to place the nomination before the entire Senate body whereby the nomination must be voted upon prior to the expiration of five legislative days or 25 legislative days following submission by the Governor, whichever occurs first...."

We respectfully set forth the following facts relative to the nomination hereinafter set forth:

1. The nomination was presented to the Senate on November 14, 1983; and
2. The nomination has been before the Senate for a period of time in excess of 15 legislative days.

The nominee in the position is as follows:

Joyce Carr	Controller McKean County
Edward P. Zemprelli	
Eugene F. Scanlon	
Robert J. Mellow	
Francis J. Lynch	
James E. Ross	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication, which was read by the Clerk as follows:

In the Senate, February 7, 1984.

We, the Senators whose signatures are affixed hereto respectfully request that the Honorable William W. Scranton, III, as presiding officer of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, place the nomination hereafter set forth before the Senate for a vote pursuant to the provisions of Article IV, Section 8(b) of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which provides in part "... The Senate shall act on each executive nomination within 25 legislative days of its submission. If the Senate has not voted upon a nomination within 15 legislative days following such submission, any five members of the Senate may, in writing, request the presiding officer of the Senate to place the nomination before the entire Senate body whereby the nomination must be voted upon prior to the expiration of five legislative days or 25 legislative days following submission by the Governor, whichever occurs first...."

We respectfully set forth the following facts relative to the nomination hereinafter set forth:

1. The nomination was presented to the Senate on November 14, 1983; and
2. The nomination has been before the Senate for a period of time in excess of 15 legislative days.

The nominee in the position is as follows:

William A. Murray Member
Health Care Policy
Board

Edward P. Zemprelli
Eugene F. Scanlon
Robert J. Mellow
Francis J. Lynch
James E. Ross

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication, which was read by the Clerk as follows:

In the Senate, February 7, 1984.

We, the Senators whose signatures are affixed hereto respectfully request that the Honorable William W. Scranton, III, as presiding officer of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, place the nomination hereafter set forth before the Senate for a vote pursuant to the provisions of Article IV, Section 8(b) of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which provides in part "... The Senate shall act on each executive nomination within 25 legislative days of its submission. If the Senate has not voted upon a nomination within 15 legislative days following such submission, any five members of the Senate may, in writing, request the presiding officer of the Senate to place the nomination before the entire Senate body whereby the nomination must be voted upon prior to the expiration of five legislative days or 25 legislative days following submission by the Governor, whichever occurs first...."

We respectfully set forth the following facts relative to the nomination hereinafter set forth:

1. The nomination was presented to the Senate on November 14, 1983; and
2. The nomination has been before the Senate for a period of time in excess of 15 legislative days.

The nominee in the position is as follows:

William G. Williams Member
Health Care Policy
Board

Edward P. Zemprelli
Eugene F. Scanlon
Robert J. Mellow
Francis J. Lynch
James E. Ross

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication, which was read by the Clerk as follows:

In the Senate, February 7, 1984.

We, the Senators whose signatures are affixed hereto respectfully request that the Honorable William W. Scranton, III, as presiding officer of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, place the nomination hereafter set forth before the Senate for a vote pursuant to the provisions of Article IV, Section 8(b) of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which provides in part "... The Senate shall act on each executive nomination within 25 legislative days of its submission. If the Senate has not voted upon a nomination within 15 legislative days following such submission, any five members of the Senate may, in writing, request the presiding officer of the Senate to place the nomination before the entire Senate body whereby the nomination must be voted upon prior to the expiration of five legislative days or 25 legislative days following submission by the Governor, whichever occurs first...."

We respectfully set forth the following facts relative to the nomination hereinafter set forth:

1. The nomination was presented to the Senate on November 14, 1983; and
2. The nomination has been before the Senate for a period of time in excess of 15 legislative days.

The nominee in the position is as follows:

Richard M. Cyert Member
Pennsylvania Higher
Education Assistance
Agency

Edward P. Zemprelli
Eugene F. Scanlon
Robert J. Mellow
Francis J. Lynch
James E. Ross

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication, which was read by the Clerk as follows:

In the Senate, February 7, 1984.

We, the Senators whose signatures are affixed hereto respectfully request that the Honorable William W. Scranton, III, as presiding officer of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, place the nomination hereafter set forth before the Senate for a vote pursuant to the provisions of Article IV, Section 8(b) of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which provides in part "... The Senate shall act on each executive nomination within 25 legislative days of its submission. If the Senate has not voted upon a nomination within 15 legislative days following such submission, any five members of the Senate may, in writing, request the presiding officer of the Senate to place the nomination before the entire Senate body whereby the nomination must be voted upon prior to the expiration of five legislative days or 25 legislative days following submission by the Governor, whichever occurs first...."

We respectfully set forth the following facts relative to the nomination hereinafter set forth:

1. The nomination was presented to the Senate on November 14, 1983; and
2. The nomination has been before the Senate for a period of time in excess of 15 legislative days.

The nominee in the position is as follows:

Alice M. Davenport Member
Columbia County
Board of Assistance

Edward P. Zemprelli
Eugene F. Scanlon
Robert J. Mellow
Francis J. Lynch
James E. Ross

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication, which was read by the Clerk as follows:

In the Senate, February 7, 1984.

We, the Senators whose signatures are affixed hereto respectfully request that the Honorable William W. Scranton, III, as presiding officer of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, place the nomination hereafter set forth before the Senate for a vote pursuant to the provisions of Article IV, Section 8(b) of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which provides in part "... The Senate shall act on each executive nomination within 25 legislative days of its submission. If the Senate has not voted upon a nomination within 15 legislative days fol-

lowing such submission, any five members of the Senate may, in writing, request the presiding officer of the Senate to place the nomination before the entire Senate body whereby the nomination must be voted upon prior to the expiration of five legislative days or 25 legislative days following submission by the Governor, whichever occurs first....”

We respectfully set forth the following facts relative to the nomination hereinafter set forth:

1. The nomination was presented to the Senate on November 14, 1983; and

2. The nomination has been before the Senate for a period of time in excess of 15 legislative days.

The nominee in the position is as follows:

Mrs. Jonnie L. Rowe Member
 Lebanon County
 Board of Assistance

Edward P. Zemprelli
Eugene F. Scanlon
Robert J. Mellow
Francis J. Lynch
James E. Ross

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication, which was read by the Clerk as follows:

In the Senate, February 7, 1984.

We, the Senators whose signatures are affixed hereto respectfully request that the Honorable William W. Scranton, III, as presiding officer of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, place the nomination hereafter set forth before the Senate for a vote pursuant to the provisions of Article IV, Section 8(b) of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which provides in part “.... The Senate shall act on each executive nomination within 25 legislative days of its submission. If the Senate has not voted upon a nomination within 15 legislative days following such submission, any five members of the Senate may, in writing, request the presiding officer of the Senate to place the nomination before the entire Senate body whereby the nomination must be voted upon prior to the expiration of five legislative days or 25 legislative days following submission by the Governor, whichever occurs first....”

We respectfully set forth the following facts relative to the nomination hereinafter set forth:

1. The nomination was presented to the Senate on November 14, 1983; and

2. The nomination has been before the Senate for a period of time in excess of 15 legislative days.

The nominee in the position is as follows:

Roberta W. Longsworth Member
 Lehigh County
 Board of Assistance

Edward P. Zemprelli
Eugene F. Scanlon
Robert J. Mellow
Francis J. Lynch
James E. Ross

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication, which was read by the Clerk as follows:

In the Senate, February 7, 1984.

We, the Senators whose signatures are affixed hereto respectfully request that the Honorable William W. Scranton, III, as presiding officer of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, place the nomination hereafter set forth before the Senate

for a vote pursuant to the provisions of Article IV, Section 8(b) of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which provides in part “.... The Senate shall act on each executive nomination within 25 legislative days of its submission. If the Senate has not voted upon a nomination within 15 legislative days following such submission, any five members of the Senate may, in writing, request the presiding officer of the Senate to place the nomination before the entire Senate body whereby the nomination must be voted upon prior to the expiration of five legislative days or 25 legislative days following submission by the Governor, whichever occurs first....”

We respectfully set forth the following facts relative to the nomination hereinafter set forth:

1. The nomination was presented to the Senate on November 14, 1983; and

2. The nomination has been before the Senate for a period of time in excess of 15 legislative days.

The nominee in the position is as follows:

Robert D. Bowersox Member
 Mifflin County
 Board of Assistance

Edward P. Zemprelli
Eugene F. Scanlon
Robert J. Mellow
Francis J. Lynch
James E. Ross

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication, which was read by the Clerk as follows:

In the Senate, February 7, 1984.

We, the Senators whose signatures are affixed hereto respectfully request that the Honorable William W. Scranton, III, as presiding officer of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, place the nomination hereafter set forth before the Senate for a vote pursuant to the provisions of Article IV, Section 8(b) of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which provides in part “.... The Senate shall act on each executive nomination within 25 legislative days of its submission. If the Senate has not voted upon a nomination within 15 legislative days following such submission, any five members of the Senate may, in writing, request the presiding officer of the Senate to place the nomination before the entire Senate body whereby the nomination must be voted upon prior to the expiration of five legislative days or 25 legislative days following submission by the Governor, whichever occurs first....”

We respectfully set forth the following facts relative to the nomination hereinafter set forth:

1. The nomination was presented to the Senate on November 14, 1983; and

2. The nomination has been before the Senate for a period of time in excess of 15 legislative days.

The nominee in the position is as follows:

Rudolph F. Szollar Member
 Monroe County
 Board of Assistance

Edward P. Zemprelli
Eugene F. Scanlon
Robert J. Mellow
Francis J. Lynch
James E. Ross

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication, which was read by the Clerk as follows:

In the Senate, February 7, 1984.

We, the Senators whose signatures are affixed hereto respectfully request that the Honorable William W. Scranton, III, as presiding officer of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, place the nomination hereafter set forth before the Senate for a vote pursuant to the provisions of Article IV, Section 8(b) of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which provides in part "... The Senate shall act on each executive nomination within 25 legislative days of its submission. If the Senate has not voted upon a nomination within 15 legislative days following such submission, any five members of the Senate may, in writing, request the presiding officer of the Senate to place the nomination before the entire Senate body whereby the nomination must be voted upon prior to the expiration of five legislative days or 25 legislative days following submission by the Governor, whichever occurs first...."

We respectfully set forth the following facts relative to the nomination hereinafter set forth:

1. The nomination was presented to the Senate on November 14, 1983; and
2. The nomination has been before the Senate for a period of time in excess of 15 legislative days.

The nominee in the position is as follows:

William P. Dwyer, Jr.	Member Northampton County Board of Assistance
--------------------------	---

Edward P. Zemprelli
Eugene F. Scanlon
Robert J. Mellow
Francis J. Lynch
James E. Ross

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication, which was read by the Clerk as follows:

In the Senate, February 7, 1984.

We, the Senators whose signatures are affixed hereto respectfully request that the Honorable William W. Scranton, III, as presiding officer of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, place the nomination hereafter set forth before the Senate for a vote pursuant to the provisions of Article IV, Section 8(b) of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which provides in part "... The Senate shall act on each executive nomination within 25 legislative days of its submission. If the Senate has not voted upon a nomination within 15 legislative days following such submission, any five members of the Senate may, in writing, request the presiding officer of the Senate to place the nomination before the entire Senate body whereby the nomination must be voted upon prior to the expiration of five legislative days or 25 legislative days following submission by the Governor, whichever occurs first...."

We respectfully set forth the following facts relative to the nomination hereinafter set forth:

1. The nomination was presented to the Senate on November 14, 1983; and
2. The nomination has been before the Senate for a period of time in excess of 15 legislative days.

The nominee in the position is as follows:

Dennis G. Gambler	Member Northampton County Board of Assistance
Edward P. Zemprelli	
Eugene F. Scanlon	
Robert J. Mellow	
Francis J. Lynch	
James E. Ross	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication, which was read by the Clerk as follows:

In the Senate, February 7, 1984.

We, the Senators whose signatures are affixed hereto respectfully request that the Honorable William W. Scranton, III, as presiding officer of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, place the nomination hereafter set forth before the Senate for a vote pursuant to the provisions of Article IV, Section 8(b) of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which provides in part "... The Senate shall act on each executive nomination within 25 legislative days of its submission. If the Senate has not voted upon a nomination within 15 legislative days following such submission, any five members of the Senate may, in writing, request the presiding officer of the Senate to place the nomination before the entire Senate body whereby the nomination must be voted upon prior to the expiration of five legislative days or 25 legislative days following submission by the Governor, whichever occurs first...."

We respectfully set forth the following facts relative to the nomination hereinafter set forth:

1. The nomination was presented to the Senate on November 14, 1983; and
2. The nomination has been before the Senate for a period of time in excess of 15 legislative days.

The nominee in the position is as follows:

Theodore T. Johnson	Member Sullivan County Board of Assistance
Edward P. Zemprelli	
Eugene F. Scanlon	
Robert J. Mellow	
Francis J. Lynch	
James E. Ross	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The communications will be laid on the table.

CONGRATULATORY RESOLUTIONS

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

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Gregory Pekich by Senator Early.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Ms. Barbara L. Boyer by Senator Helfrick.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Rodney Blake by Senator Loeper.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to the Hanover Junior-Senior High School Football Team by Senator Musto.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to James E. Horan, Joan T. Chew, Robert Cleland, John Wise, Clair K. Halstead, Merle Roth and to Richard J. Schontz by Senator Shaffer.

BILLS ON FIRST CONSIDERATION

Senator KRATZER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do now proceed to consideration of all bills reported from committees for the first time at today's Session.

The motion was agreed to.

The bills were as follows:

SB 1032 and 1218.

And said bills having been considered for the first time,

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

PETITIONS AND REMONSTRANCES

Senator ROCKS. Mr. President, tonight I rise under our order of business of Petitions and Remonstrances because of the technical, but parliamentary, question raised by the Democratic Leader of the Senate. I think the seriousness of that question—and I know many of us paid very close attention to the exchange between the Chair and the Democratic Leader—merits some thought for each Senator in this Chamber.

If, in fact, Mr. President, we are to be the deliberative Body that I believe constitutionally we are charged with being, if, in fact, the committee process to this Legislature is going to have in our future the very significant meaning that I believe it has, I think it is absolutely imperative that this Body be able to address the question by its Rules of when a bill duly voted by a Standing Committee of this Senate be reported to the floor by its chairman. I say this, Mr. President, and I am sure each Senator can project the very real difficulties we may have at a future point in time if we do not bring this to a point of resolution.

In the immediate future I know the Democratic side of the aisle will be proposing a rule consideration for us, as a Body, to adopt. I would say that to allow our process to continue in a way that a chairman ultimately controls the vote taken by a Standing Committee by delaying the reporting of a bill to this floor is a very, very dangerous legislative precedent.

I share twelve years, my entire adult life, of legislative experience with the Members in standing tonight to address what I think is a very serious problem. Twenty-three days have passed since one committee of this Senate has taken a vote on a bill which was amended and reported out of that committee. I do not know what the intent is, nor do I care to question the intent of that individual chairman, in delaying his reporting of that bill to this floor. I ask that we be very, very sensitive to what will be proposed as a rule change for the future of our legislative process and for the meaning of the committee process to our deliberations as a Senate Body.

Senator FUMO. Mr. President, I rise to echo some of the comments made by my colleague from Philadelphia, Senator Rocks, about what I consider to be, quite frankly, outrageous conduct on the part of the chairman of the Committee on Law and Justice in exercising what can only be characterized as a pocket veto of House Bill No. 667, which was reported from that committee a number of weeks ago.

Mr. President, my problem with this particular issue goes further than that because of the fact that a local television station in Philadelphia, KYW Television, known to us all, on which the chairman of that committee is a frequent guest, has been for the last few weeks lambasting the members of the Philadelphia delegation for bottlenecking this legislation when, in fact, this legislation is not before the Senate. Perhaps, Mr. President, in addition to the rules change that the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Rocks, talks about, which I intend to introduce shortly that would limit this kind of action to four legislative days, it might be very nice if the editors at KYW Television in Philadelphia were smart enough, informed enough and educated enough to understand who is the real culprit if, in fact, there is a culprit on this issue.

I submit the real culprit is not a member of the Philadelphia delegation. In short, Mr. President, I end as I started by stating that this conduct is intolerable, outrageous and sets a very dangerous precedent in the Senate of Pennsylvania. If a chairman can treat important legislation such as this in this manner, it entirely subverts the legislative process and when it is done with impunity, it seriously questions the validity of the power of the Senate. As I have indicated before, quite shortly, perhaps tomorrow, but no later than next week, we in the Democratic caucus intend to introduce a rules change which I hope will be acted upon much more expeditiously than House Bill No. 667 has been acted upon that would prohibit this type of conduct in the future by any chairman of a committee in the Senate.

Senator BELL. Mr. President, I would be more impressed with those two speeches if either of the gentlemen had said he would put a demand on the chairman to report the bill out. I think before we get righteous, we ought to do the preliminaries.

I did put a demand on the chairman. I put it on him because I want to vote on the substance of the bill. I do not want any folderol this time. I do not want to vote on a motion to recommit or a motion to table, I want to vote on the substance of the bill. I have not as yet made up my mind as to which way I am going to vote. I have asked the gentleman to please bring the bill out. I will let the gentleman speak for himself because he is the chairman of the committee. I also searched Mason's Manual of Legislative Procedure and I cannot find any reference. Surely this has happened before in some Legislature.

Years ago, I can recall the chairman of a committee giving people the bills and saying, "take these home and hide them." Let me remind the Members that when these bills were recodified here in the Senate, it was the Democratic Majority that drew the present Rules, so do not muck your own nest.

Senator GREENLEAF. Mr. President, I find it particularly peculiar and curious to hear the comments of the Minority in regard to the bill dealing with the State Stores, which, I believe, we are referring to. In fact, two years ago it was the same group of gentlemen who floored a debate on the issue and who made a motion to table the legislation so we were not able to debate this issue. It was these gentlemen who did not want to vote on the merits, who did not allow amendments to the bill, who did not allow the people of this state to have a full discussion and debate on these issues. Unfortunately, I think there are those in the Legislature who are captives of special interest groups, who are carrying the water for special interest groups and who have tried to effectively thwart the deliberate consideration of this legislation. Clearly—it has not been disputed—a review of the public opinion polls would indicate that anywhere between 70 percent to 85 percent of those people were polled in the Philadelphia-Allegheny areas. In some areas in the middle of the state they are not as high, but they are always over 50 percent, at least the ones that I have seen. Those opponents of this legislation have not denied that. They have not denied that public opinion is silently in favor of dealing with this legislation. In spite of that, there are those who have stated, and those who are on the floor here tonight have indicated that as soon as that bill pokes its head up on the Calendar, they will make a motion to table it. Of course, we know a motion to table is not debatable. Although that is within the Rules, as it is within the Rules for a committee chairman to hold the bill within his discretion and report it at his discretion, it is also within the Rules for those Members to make a motion to table the legislation as well. I often wondered what the fear is in having a full debate on this issue.

I challenge the Members, and I ask the Members to vote on the merits of this legislation next week, to allow a full debate on the merits and to allow the Members of this Body to put their votes up, yes or no, on whether they are in favor or against this legislation and to give the Members of this Body an opportunity to offer amendments to the bill, to change it to their liking and to have a full discussion of it. Certainly that tabling motion, which has been guaranteed by the other side to be forthcoming when the bill is reported out in the very near future, as I say, is certainly within the Rules but certainly thwarts the full discussion of this issue.

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, this is an extremely emotional issue. It is probably the most emotional issue I have dealt with in my years here in the Senate with basically one exception, and that probably is the large amount of debate that has taken place over the years with regard to pro-life.

I think it is important, Mr. President, that I take exception to a few of the things that have been stated by the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Greenleaf, the Chairman of the Committee on Law and Justice, the gentleman who has been sitting on House Bill No. 667 for the past two months, the gentleman who wants us to believe that everything he does is in the open when, in fact, the gentleman has not been open to the people of Pennsylvania, nor has he been open to the Members of the Pennsylvania State Senate. I think it is also

important that I tell the gentleman from Delaware, Senator Bell, relative to his statement that he would be more impressed with the statements of my two colleagues, the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Rocks, and the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Fumo, if one of them had made the demand on the chairman to report the bill from committee. I am here standing before the gentleman from Delaware, Senator Bell, to tell him that in a very nice way I asked the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Greenleaf, when he would be making this report, because there were a number of people who were prepared to attack the gentleman. We did not do that until this evening because the gentleman told me that he would be making the report from committee on Tuesday, after the Governor's budget presentation. Today happens to be Tuesday, the day of the Governor's presentation and as we stand here, the gentleman, as yet, has not made the report on House Bill No. 667.

There are many issues, Mr. President, we have to talk about. If the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Greenleaf, would like the opportunity to discuss and debate the merits of divestiture with the State Stores, then I want to tell him that at twenty minutes after 7:00 on February 7th, we are prepared to stay here tonight to debate with him the issues and the pros and cons as to whether the state should or should not maintain their monopoly in the sale of liquor.

Mr. President, the gentleman said it was the Minority who made the motion to table the proposal two years ago. I would like to inform him that I am the gentleman who made the motion to table. The Minority in this Senate cannot do one thing without the consent of the Majority. So, in fact, it was not the Minority who tabled the proposal two years ago but, in fact, it was the majority of the people who reside in this Body, who are elected officials, that voted to table the gentleman's proposal back in 1982. It was done on a very bipartisan basis, the same way the opposition today to his proposal of divestiture is on a bipartisan basis.

The gentleman has talked about the fact that we should discuss and deliberately debate the issue before us, but the truth of the matter is, when I asked the gentleman if we could have public hearings throughout the state to find out exactly what the feelings are of our people and to get the proper type of public input that was asked of him on December 12th or 13th—the date this bill was supposed to be reported from the Committee on Law and Justice—the gentleman refused to have a public debate. In fact, the only input the public has had on this proposal was the input that took place by the Members of that committee in the several hours that the meeting took place back several months ago.

There are a number of pitfalls we are not talking about and we are not dealing with here and, yes, the truth of the matter is, when he reports the bill from committee, there probably will be a motion to table the issue and if twenty-six Members of this Senate feel it is not an issue that should be discussed in the Senate, then, in fact, the bill will be tabled. But, if the majority of the Members of the Senate think the bill should not be tabled and that it should be discussed and further delib-

erated, then the gentleman will prevail and we will be able to discuss, as he says, the merits of the issue. I want to tell the gentleman we are here to discuss the merits of the issue this evening. I have nowhere to go. The other gentlemen on this side of the aisle have nowhere to go. If the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Greenleaf, would like to discuss those issues, he can discuss them with us. I am sure if the President pro tempore, Senator Hager, has somewhere to go, we could, in fact, have the gentleman from Cumberland, Senator Hopper, who I think is enjoying the debate, and would be only too happy to take over the Chair of the Senate or, if he will not, the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Fumo, certainly would be only too happy to take over the Chair of the Senate.

What we are talking about here is a system that has been in place since 1933. We are not here to discuss the merits of the issue. The only thing we are here to discuss this evening is the fact that the gentleman has had the obligation to report to the full Senate House Bill No. 667, and he, in fact, for the past two months has not given us the opportunity to discuss and to debate the issue right here in the Senate where it belongs.

During this past week, the Governor has traveled throughout this state and has talked about what he feels should take place with regard to the passage of this proposal. The one thing he has not indicated in any of his deliberations or in any of his news conferences is the fact that we, as we stand here this evening, have no issue before us because the gentleman has not reported the divestiture issue to the Members of the Senate. I think it is appalling and a shame that what has taken place over the past two months, in fact, has taken place. I am going to tell the Members that when this debate has been concluded this evening, we are going to ask the Chair if we can return to original resolutions where, we, the Democratic Members of the State Senate, can offer a change in the Rules of the Senate which will mandate that a committee chairman must report within four legislative days any affirmative action taken by a committee, so that the gentleman who has been able to sit on this proposal for several months would not be able to do this. If the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Greenleaf, wants to discuss the merits and the issue involved in divestiture of the state's current liquor system and he wants to talk about a controlled state versus an uncontrolled state and if he wants to talk about the saving of 4,000 jobs, if he wants to talk about the excess of \$200 million that has been turned over to the General Fund in this past fiscal year because of the state's involvement in liquor, and if he wants to talk about the fact that Pennsylvania through its \$750 million worth of purchases of liquor is the number one wholesale purchaser in the nation, if he wants to discuss all of these issues, Mr. President, and if he wants to talk about the vested interest groups, the fact the vested interest groups in Pennsylvania, big business in this state, are pushing the proposal the Governor has advanced and endorsed, then I want to tell the gentleman that we will be prepared to stay here this evening as long as it takes to discuss the issue.

Senator ROCKS. Mr. President, I am sensitive to the hour in the Senate Chamber and I do have Senate business to do as I know many of my colleagues do. There is a dinner meeting I am supposed to be attending, but I wanted to reinforce what the gentleman from Lackawanna, Senator Mellow, attempted to point out, which is that we raise the question here of process and procedure.

I, for one, listen attentively with great respect whenever the gentleman from Delaware, Senator Bell, addresses this Body. I want to assure the gentleman there was no righteousness intended in the remarks which I previously made, but, in fact, I have a concern for the future of our legislative process as a Body in this General Assembly. I understand fully the responsibilities of a chairman and I believe that the onus of the reporting function after the action by a Standing Committee of the Senate falls on a chairman to report back to this floor and to the Senate Body as a whole. Along with the gentleman from Lackawanna, Senator Mellow, in response to the outburst of the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Greenleaf, on the issue, I am willing to stay until we reconvene the entire Senate tomorrow. As a matter of fact, if the gentleman wants to report his bill to the floor, I assure him there is no reluctance on this side of the aisle for full and open debate. As a matter of fact, if the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Greenleaf, wants to quit hiding behind Channel 3 in the City of Philadelphia and come into the middle of the Fourth Senatorial District for a full and open debate about our Senatorial duties here in Harrisburg, I welcome that opportunity and I will accept the time and challenge whenever the gentleman wants to issue it before we leave here this week.

Mr. President, I assure you the concern on this side of the aisle with the issue we have raised tonight is one of procedure. If the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Greenleaf, wants to stay until dawn breaks, count me on the deliberations. We have great latitude under this order of business on our Calendar called Petitions and Remonstrances and we do not mind a debate.

Please understand what the gentleman from Lackawanna, Senator Mellow, and the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Fumo, have tried to explain and what the Democratic Leader of this Senate raised as a point of order on our floor tonight, which was a question of process and a question of procedure which we hope to have addressed because, without addressing that, the potential for abuse by any chairman in the future is almost unlimited. I hope, if anything, we get across the point that a rule change to our Senate Rules which would require a chairman charged by a vote of his committee to report a bill would be followed. I say to the gentleman from Delaware, Senator Bell, that I was not around when chairmen may have instructed Senators to take bills home with them, but I assure the gentleman that Pennsylvania's public, or at least the people who sent me to Harrisburg to represent them, would not smile favorably upon that in 1984. I hope we are far removed from those antics as a deliberative and legislative Body.

Senator KELLEY. Mr. President, I have listened to the debate on the issue of the procedure of reporting a bill by the chairman to the full Senate and the additional collateral matter about the substance of that bill. A number of my colleagues on this side of the aisle have inferred with some degree of unanimity that everyone on this side of the aisle is rather outraged.

Mr. President, I have to depart from my brothers and sister on this side of the aisle. I have heard less enthusiastic criticism of people who violate a Rule. Bear in mind that what was not done was found by the Chair—I have researched it also and I am sure that my colleagues on this side of the aisle have likewise researched it—that there is no authority to show that the omission of a degree of time was violated. There is nothing in the Rules as the Chair indicated. I am not outraged because that is how Rules come to be. What is going to be done by those on this side of the aisle is to attempt to amend the Rules to have four legislative days and I wholeheartedly support that, but that would not affect what they are talking about in this particular bill because it cannot be retrospective, it can only be prospective.

I am saying, Mr. President, that we should not be outraged. We should all be happy and take joy in the imagination of some of our colleagues who happen to be on the other side of the aisle. They saw a weakness in the Rules and utilized it. Some of us are incensed to some degree and we are going to offer an amendment to correct that in the Rules. That is the way the process has always worked and will work and we are participating in it. We should all be rather calm about it and realize that this, too, shall pass. I am more concerned about dealing with the subject of the bill in its substance. I heard one of my colleagues say he would stay here all night and debate it, and so will I. The point is we want to face the issue on the substance. I am often accused of being too involved in the process and procedure and let us not get too lost in that. Let us thank and compliment the gentleman from Montgomery for having the imagination to utilize and identify a weakness. Let us bear the responsibility of offering a Rule to correct it.

Senator GREENLEAF. Mr. President, as the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Rocks, indicated about the people of this state smiling, I say the people of this state will not be smiling when there is a motion, whoever makes it, to table this legislation and to prevent the debate on the merits of the bill as it appears in front of us. If the gentleman feels at this point that he would like to withdraw from that position as he has said in the past that he would not make a motion to table the bill, this bill would have been out a couple of weeks ago. The fact is that the gentleman has stated publicly on numerous occasions that he, meaning the gentleman from Lackawanna, Senator Mellow, was going to table the legislation as soon as it poked its head on the Calendar. If we have a change of heart tonight about that, then fine and the matter will be dealt with differently. Until that situation changes, I have to deal with it in another way. If the gentleman has a change of heart at this point and is willing to have a full debate on the issue while the bill is on the Calendar and deal with it in the general, normal

course as any other bill would be dealt with, that is, placing it on first, second and third readings and give the opportunity to amend the bill during the course of the time the legislation appears on the Calendar, then fine. We can abide by that. Otherwise, I think it is somewhat ironic for the gentleman to say that the bill has been held up and has not been able to be debated upon when the gentleman wants to table it and prevent debate on the bill.

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, I would only like to acknowledge what the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Greenleaf, stated about the tabling motion. I would like to inform the gentleman that if I do not move to table, there are at least half a dozen other Members of the Senate who would move to table. In fact, it might be a race as to who can get to the microphone first.

I also would like to indicate to the gentleman that if he is interested in a full and profitable discussion and debate on the proposal, then what he should do is travel throughout the state and conduct various types of public hearings. I think once we have an opportunity to get the proper input from our people throughout the state with regard to their position, then we will be in a better position on the Senate floor to more ably debate the pros and cons of this proposal, but the gentleman has refused under any consideration to take this proposal across the state for the right type of public debate. He has only held committee meetings here in Harrisburg and has precluded the public from giving any meaningful input. However, anytime there has been any indication that there might be some wrongdoing in the Liquor Control Board, then immediately he has taken his "dog and pony show" throughout the state to try to best emphasize the areas in the Commonwealth where, in fact, a problem may be taking place. It is unfortunate that the gentleman is interested in trying to belittle people when, in fact, many of the accusations which have been made in front of this committee have not been substantiated. It is my understanding that this past week in the Federal Court in Philadelphia there was an acquittal made on an individual who was wrongly accused in front of the Committee on Law and Justice. I think if the gentleman would put as much responsibility on divestiture as far as holding public hearings across the state as he has on sensationalism when there has been alleged wrongdoing, we would not be in the position we are in here this evening.

Senator FUMO. Mr. President, this is my second time to speak. However, I do not recall there is a rule on Petitions and Remonstrances as to speaking three times. I would not object to the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Greenleaf, making his comments for the third time and I believe there are not that many of us here who would. Having been advised by the Majority Leader that he might object to the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Greenleaf, talking a third time, I just want to reiterate and clarify some of the problems with regard to this issue. I have heard it said that the gentleman, Senator Greenleaf, has found a weakness in the system and is utilizing that to help pass his bill. That may be true, and I am not one who usually says life is fair, however, it is certainly

hypocritical for the chairman of this committee to use that methodology and allow his friends at Channel 3 to continue to castigate us for our inactivity, when, in fact, it is the gentleman who is causing the inactivity. I do not ask for fairness, but I do ask for truth.

If the gentleman's fear is that someone is going to move to table the bill, I have to ask myself, during these last few months, does he now think that someone is not going to make a motion to table the bill and have these last few months been productive in that vein? I submit from what I have seen in this Chamber, that he is not. Perhaps there is another issue. Perhaps the gentleman has been able to garner some more publicity, and I do not fault him for that, but I say let us stop being hypocritical about this issue and really talk about the merits. If the merits are to get publicity on an issue, fine, let us admit it. If the timing today was originally scheduled so that it could be the Frick and Frack Show, with the Governor kicking it off with his budget message to us today about the State Stores and then the one-two punch followed up by the report of this bill from committee, even that, Mr. President, has not been done. It is the Rule of this Senate and it is certainly the privilege and the prerogative of this Senate and the responsibility of this Senate to make a motion to table a bill whenever it sees fit. I have seen Members on the other side of the aisle use the same legislative maneuvering to kill some very good legislation. What the gentleman from Lackawanna, Senator Mellow, will or will not do, should not be the guiding light by which the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Greenleaf, decides to report a bill to this floor or not. He should report the bill and then fight for his bill if, in fact, he believes in his bill.

I am reminded by a lesson I have been taught in this Chamber quite often in the last few years, that is, the Minority will have its say and the Majority will have its way. But what the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Greenleaf, has been able to do is attempt to get his say and his way. Again I would remind him, the people at Channel 3 and everybody else, that while the games are being played, the State Store system is still in existence. I do not happen to think that is wrong, but if there are those in this Chamber who talk of true reform, they are frustrating us by not allowing us to act on the reform bill of the gentleman from Allegheny, Senator Zemprelli, and the gentleman from Lackawanna, Senator Mellow. In fact, they are frustrating us in not permitting us to do anything about this piece of legislation except listen to their crying antics and that, I submit, is not good for the citizens of Pennsylvania, not good for the Liquor Control Board, not good for the system, and not good for this Senate.

In closing, Mr. President, I submit to the Members that the time has come for the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Greenleaf, to stop playing games, to put his money where his mouth is, so to speak, and report the bill to the floor and let the legislative process take its course. If his position is meritorious, I have no doubt he will prevail, but if his position is mere media puffing, then I have to let him know that he will suffer the consequences in defeat. We cannot talk about

debate. We cannot speculate about motions to table. We cannot do anything at all with regard to the liquor store problem until we have before us a bill which addresses that issue. I submit that what I mean by that is we cannot do anything until the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Greenleaf, decides to bring to this floor the bill which was reported out of his committee almost two months ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the interest of truth and fairness, the Chair has researched the Rule on speaking twice or to the prevention of some other Member and finds the Chair is absolutely incorrect. The Rule deals with speaking more than once on one question and there is no question before the Body.

Senator FUMO. That is what I thought it was, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair corrects itself with some reluctance.

Senator FUMO. Mr. President, perhaps it is time for a change in the Chair. No offense is intended.

Senator GREENLEAF. Mr. President, in regard to the issue of public hearings, this issue has been debated statewide for a number of years. The committee chairman, previous to myself, held numerous hearings. I have held numerous hearings on the issue of the LCB. We have held hearings in the past with regard to the State Store issue. I do not think that is necessary. We have studied the issue to death and all too often that does not result in additional light. It also seems peculiar to me that the gentleman has asked for additional hearings and then offers a motion or at least will support a motion or vote for a motion to table the legislation, thereby thwarting any attempt to discuss and fully debate the issue. It seems to me that is contrary to his position in regard to holding public hearings on this legislation. It has been referred to, by one of the gentlemen, that there is a Senate Rule that allows a Member to make a motion to table. There is also no Senate Rule that says that a committee chairman may not hold the legislation until he feels fit to report it to the full Senate. If we are talking about Rules, I think we should then point to a particular Rule that prohibits an action or then ask that an amendment of the Rules be made at a later time. If the gentleman really means and really intends to have a full discussion on the merits in the debate, then I ask the gentleman from Lackawanna, Senator Mellow, to agree to support a motion to waive the Rules if there is a motion to table, that there would be a waiver of the Rules on the debate of the issue, so if there is a motion to table we can fully debate the issues of that bill. If he really, genuinely intends and means to have a full debate of the issue, then I think he would support such a proposal.

Senator HANKINS. Mr. President, I am not debating this issue, I have another one. It is completely different.

After all of these years, it is hard to get excited about another budget, especially when dollars are so tight and there is so little to really get excited about. After reviewing the Governor's budget these last few hours, there are some items that deserve praise, such as an additional \$1 million for libraries,

\$6 million for our community colleges and \$248 million for public schools. While the libraries and community colleges could use far more money, it is important to note that in a time of limited funds, the Governor is proposing to give them some additional funds.

However, I am very displeased to see the continued difference in treatment for two educational institutions, both of which are very important to me. I am speaking about Lincoln University and Temple University. For 1984-85, Lincoln University is budgeted for a \$300,000 increase, while Temple is getting a \$6 million increase, or a budget contribution of \$6.2 million versus \$96.69 million. Given the problems the state has had in Federal Court because of its slowness in dealing with desegregation of Pennsylvania's universities, the Governor's failure to improve the allocation to Lincoln is outrageous.

Looking at the Department of Commerce, the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Agency is going from \$15 million to \$20 million, while the Pennsylvania Minority Business Development Authority is going from \$2 million to \$3 million. Granted, black businesses are eligible for other state assistance programs, but they need an extra boost to overcome some of the redlining and other discriminatory practices. I believe PMBDA deserves more funds to work with.

I must also protest the Governor's proposal that we reduce the Low Income Energy Assistance program by \$2 million. Given the high cost of energy today, we must continue to help people weatherize their homes and do other things to reduce their energy needs.

Finally, Mr. President, the Governor said we need to raise people from the "shackles of despair." To do this, he wants to provide them with educational opportunities that will help them find meaningful jobs. The Governor himself helped create those "shackles of despair" by cutting off thousands of people from welfare when there were no jobs. While he is proposing a modest 5 percent increase in benefits, we must remember how many people he stranded without help in this recession. We must remember there are other ways to cure this despair he speaks about.

As we go to work on the budget for the next year, we must remember the many people who are still suffering because of lack of employment. While the Governor may know about 250,000 people who are now working that were not working last year, those jobs are not evident in my district. The depression is still raging there. I see it every day. We need to find a way to help these people see the same recovery the Governor is so proud of. Mr. President, I would like every one of the Members to look and review this budget as I did for a few hours today.

Senator LLOYD. Mr. President, in the budget address which was given by the Governor today, I was pleased to note that Governor Thornburgh and the Administration have embraced many of the economic development initiatives that have been offered on the floor of the Senate and House during the course of the last two years. I would indicate, Mr. President, that, certainly, I personally look forward to

working closely on a bipartisan basis with the Administration and with Members of both sides of the aisle in the House and Senate toward achieving the goals of those initiatives as outlined during the past two years, and as, once again, outlined today during the budget address.

On another front, however, Mr. President, I do have an expression of deep concern and that is with regard to the treatment of the Lottery Fund in the budget which was offered today by Governor Thornburgh. During the negotiations, Mr. President, on the prescription drug legislation, one of the things that became important legislation, I might add, which was ultimately passed on a bipartisan basis in this Chamber, one of the things we realized was that we were going to have to get to one set of numbers, one set of numbers on what we really thought the prescription drug program would cost at different income eligibility limits, and what we really thought the projected revenue for the lottery would be through 1989.

In that process we worked very closely with the Department of Revenue, the Thornburgh Administration, the Senate Democratic Appropriations staff, the gentleman from Delaware, Senator Loeper, and his staff and with the House Democratic Appropriations staff. During that process, Mr. President, I felt one of the things that finally led to the passage of that bill was because there was general agreement on how much money is in the lottery system and how much is likely to be taken in between now and 1989. One of the things we found, Mr. President, during that process was that to have initiated the prescription drug program at the \$12,000 and \$15,000 income levels of eligibility, all other things being equal, would have taken a very healthy system and smashed it to pieces by 1989, and we would have had a \$60 million deficit at that time. The very last thing that any of us wanted to do was to take a healthy, vibrant lottery system and break it. For that reason, Mr. President, the compromise was reached at \$9,000 and \$12,000. Myself and others expressed concern in that we want to get it up to \$12,000 and \$15,000 as soon as possible, but what that would require would be for there to be more revenue than is projected. In other words, there have been projections as to what revenue would come into the lottery system and we would not be able to increase eligibility unless the revenue exceeded that. It would not have to exceed it by much, but if it exceeded it by 2 or 3 percent, we would be able to meet that goal. The Administration expressed deep ongoing concern throughout the negotiations on this very point. Let us not break this system.

Today, Mr. President, only a couple of months later, February 7, 1984, what to my wondering eyes does appear but a budget proposal that includes the following to be funded from the lottery system:

The mortgage assistance program by borrowing \$26 million a year for three years; \$12 million for in home services to the aging; \$5 million for preadmission in home services; \$10 million for senior center renovations; \$10 million for early intervention for handicapped children; \$8 million for services to the visually handicapped; \$14.5 million for early intervention for the mentally retarded; \$5 million for attendant

care; an additional \$40 million above the existing \$100 million for medical assistance long-term care; increases in the rent rebate and mass transit program. Mr. President, in direct allocations, not counting the mortgage assistance program, that is \$104 million a year that was never figured in during the negotiation process with regard to prescription drugs. If this proposal is passed, Mr. President, I must tell my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that the lottery system will go broke. That system will be bankrupt in Pennsylvania and it will happen soon. It will happen within four years. The Governor may have the luxury of leaving town in 1986, but this building is still going to be here and the people in it are going to have a responsibility to protect the needs of those who have had their rights outlined in the law. I cannot imagine what is behind this set of initiatives. Anyone who has a thorough familiarity with the available funds in the lottery system knows that this will, in fact, break that system. We do not have the luxury of funding these services from that system.

Mr. President, I intend to work very closely with people on both sides of the aisle in an information generation process so everybody really knows what is going on here. We do not want to be like the federal government was last year, dealing with a crisis in the Social Security System. If we are fortunate enough to have revenue exceed projected income in this system, then we can properly fund the programs that exist, we can potentially talk about some new programs, but as much as I hate to say it, these initiatives are absolutely irresponsible. We must insure the fiscal integrity of the lottery and I think we are going to have to bite some bullets in the process and realize that we simply cannot say yes to every idea that sounds good on paper.

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, I desire to interrogate the gentleman from Blair, Senator Jubelirer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Blair, Senator Jubelirer, permit himself to be interrogated?

Senator JUBELIRER. I will, Mr. President.

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, the resolution, which I will introduce on behalf of several Members of the Democratic caucus, brings about a change in the Rules and talks about the chairman's duty to report. It says, "The Chairman shall report any bill to the floor of the Senate within four legislative days of the committee's vote to report it." Basically, Mr. President, this Rule change will go a long way toward rectifying the situation which we have discussed here for the past hour where the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Greenleaf, has refused for the past two months to report a bill that has been duly voted on by the majority of the committee Members to be reported to the Senate floor.

My question to the gentleman from Blair, Senator Jubelirer, who acts as Chairman of the Committee on Rules and Executive Nominations is, if we can extract a commitment from him this evening, that in the very near future he will put on the agenda of the Committee on Rules and Executive Nominations this particular Rule change so that we can discuss it in the Committee on Rules and Executive Nominations?

Senator JUBELIRER. Mr. President, the matter has not been referred as yet. I suspect that in time it will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Executive Nominations. I would answer the gentleman's inquiry by saying at some point I would expect we would deal with the issue. I cannot say it is going to be this week, next week or what have you, but it is something that, I assure the Members, will get some consideration.

RESOLUTION IN PLACE

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, with the indulgence of the Chair, may we revert to original resolutions?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has no objection. We will revert to original resolutions. The gentleman may proceed.

Senator MELLOW. Mr. President, I offer the following resolution on behalf of myself and several Democratic colleagues.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE GOVERNOR

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate communication in writing from His Excellency, the Governor of the Commonwealth, advising that the following Senate Bill had been approved and signed by the Governor:

SB 877.

1984-85 BUDGET MESSAGE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication in writing from His Excellency, the Governor of the Commonwealth, which was read as follows:

1984-85 BUDGET MESSAGE OF
GOVERNOR DICK THORNBURGH
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1984

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly:

One year ago on this occasion, we shared the view that Pennsylvania was facing what I then called "the harsh trial of an economy in transition."

It would be a trial, we knew, in which our mighty manufacturing heritage would either be subdued or renewed by the rise of foreign competition, the challenge of aging resources and the march of advanced technology—a trial that would offer no worker, no business and no field or profession the luxury of isolation, or the comfort of immunity.

While the final judgment of this trial may need to be deferred, our transition clearly is under way in Pennsylvania, and the verdict for our future looks far more promising this February of 1984 than it did in February of 1983.

Last year, we were seeking to prepare Pennsylvania for the national economic recovery we hoped and believed would soon be on our horizon.

Today, Pennsylvania is ready—ready to take full advantage of such a recovery, and the recovery is in sight.

Last year, inflation and interest rates were high, and unemployment and production rates were down.

Today, inflation and interest rates are down, and employment and production rates are going up.

Nearly 250,000 Pennsylvanians who did not have work a year ago, in fact, are on the job today.

Last year, the rise of foreign competition seemed to threaten our heritage as a resourceful state of skilled workers making quality products for world and national consumption.

Today, the rise of foreign investment seems to promise a renewal of that heritage in ways that blend Pennsylvania's experience from the past with Pennsylvania's vision for the future.

Last year, our state revenues were plummeting, and the search was on for ways in which to maintain vital services without unduly raising burdensome taxes.

Today, our revenues are on the rise again, and we actually are in a position to roll back some of those taxes, while enhancing our services and realizing a modest, but welcome, surplus.

Clearly, we can be encouraged by the breeze of economic recovery now moving across this Commonwealth.

Yet just as clearly, we must remember that recovery always has come slower and harder to Pennsylvania than to many other states, and that lasting renewal will be even more difficult to nurture and sustain as our trial of transition continues.

That is why we must continue to pursue an economic development strategy geared to the proposition that the future of free enterprise is fundamental to the future of Pennsylvania.

We must continue to help Pennsylvania firms remain and expand within Pennsylvania.

We must continue to encourage firms from other states and nations to locate and expand within our borders.

We must continue to encourage not only new investment in those advanced-technology firms of the future in Pennsylvania, but reinvestment, as well, in our traditional manufacturing heritage on which much of that future will be based.

We must continue to encourage the establishment and development of small businesses, for they offer the best chance for new long-term job opportunities for Pennsylvania's working men and women.

We must continue, indeed, to see that the promising breeze of economic recovery grows into a refreshing wind of economic renewal for Pennsylvania.

And I suggest we begin today by accelerating our evolution of Pennsylvania's business tax structure, an evolution which is spreading the word to present and potential employers alike, that our policy is not to inhibit, but rather to promote; not to obstruct, but rather to expand; not to be a foe, but rather a friend of free and productive enterprise.

We took major steps in that direction as recently as last December, with legislation reducing the tax rate on small, closely held corporations and simplifying the capital stock and franchise tax.

But we must go even further if we expect to break through the "psychological barrier" which the Pennsylvania Tax Commission found to be discouraging many firms from considering our state as a place in which to locate.

Our corporate net income tax rate presently is the third highest in the nation. It is double the rate in some of the Sunbelt states, and it clearly hampers our effort to compete effectively for new investment, new business and new jobs.

I believe that we should send a clear and unmistakable signal this year: that Pennsylvania not only held the line on business taxes for five straight years, including a period of deep recession, but that Pennsylvania had the ability and resolve to actually cut those taxes when times improved, so that it could free millions of dollars for new investment in a revitalized economy.

I therefore recommend that we reduce the rate of our corporate net income tax this year by 10 percent, from 10.5 to 9.5 percent.

In doing so, we will free nearly \$180 million over the next three years for private investment in jobs and economic expansion for Pennsylvania.

Nationally, the U.S. Commerce Department anticipates that increased capital spending will inject more than \$333 billion for new plants and equipment into the economy this year. Pennsylvania must capture its fair share of that activity, and I suggest we see that we do just that.

If part of the equation for a more vibrant economy is business investment, however, another must be consumers and taxpayers who are able to afford the goods and services produced by business and its workers.

In fact, one stimulus for the current national recovery has been a resurgence in consumer spending.

To enhance the ability of Pennsylvania's own consumers to contribute to this recovery, and to give our hard-pressed taxpayers the relief they not only deserve, but have been promised, I recommend that we also allow the personal income tax rate to drop on schedule this year, from 2.45 to 2.35 percent.

This alone should produce nearly \$100 million a year in new buying power for the consumers and taxpayers of Pennsylvania.

The temptation to maintain so-called "temporary" tax increases is always great—and it is all the greater once the sting of its implementation has been absorbed.

But we should resist that temptation now, and demonstrate that this government has not dropped the word "temporary" from its vocabulary.

Nor are we about to foresake "fiscal responsibility" and "sound management" as allies in our effort at economic revitalization. Those principles are as important to the operation of good government as they are to the practice of good business, and I have no intention of altering the course we set five years ago, in this very Chamber, a course which has produced austere budgets designed to deliver a dollar's worth of work or service for each dollar spent.

That resolve was the impetus for reducing a once-bloated state government work force by more than 9,000 positions,

and for identifying and implementing more than \$300 million in specific cost savings over the last five years.

Remembering William Penn's admonition that "we should be cured of two extremes, want and excess," the budget I am submitting to you today provides for an affordable, yet disciplined growth rate of 5.7 percent in General Fund spending next year—once again less than the projected rate of inflation.

It recommends that we target our resources as carefully in our time of recovery as we did in our time of recession, that we resist the temptation to spend foolishly, but that we accept our obligation to invest aggressively when the opportunity for human, social, cultural and economic dividends becomes apparent.

Our first and foremost priority must be to continue on a sound course toward jobs and economic recovery, and Pennsylvania is ready.

One reason we are ready is the Ben Franklin Partnership—that consortium of business, labor, educational, scientific and governmental resources we created together to help place Pennsylvania on the cutting edge of the advanced-technology revolution.

Through this partnership, an \$11 million state investment in advanced-technology research and development has thus far generated more than \$32 million in matching funds from private and other resources—more than \$43 million in just two years.

The work now under way at our four new Ben Franklin advanced-technology centers, in fact, is projected to create or preserve as many as 10,000 Pennsylvania jobs over the next four years.

Clearly, we were on target when we created this partnership in 1982, and when we increased its funding tenfold in 1983.

I recommend that we once again invest aggressively in an effort so well begun—by doubling the current Ben Franklin Partnership appropriation to \$20 million for fiscal 1984-85.

The thrust of the Ben Franklin Partnership, of course, is to provide training, research and development assistance for the birth and growth of advanced-technology enterprises in Pennsylvania, many of which tend to be smaller firms.

Yet these and other potential employers often face start-up problems for which the partnership was neither designed nor equipped to address.

Central to those problems is a shortage of venture capital in an age of limited resources, high prices and intense competition.

As you know, it often has been suggested that our public school and state employee retirement funds represent rich and ready sources for such capital, and that these funds should be used as such.

As you also know, I have opposed, and I will always oppose, any action that would threaten the security of these funds, and the peace of mind of those Pennsylvanians whose retirement years they were created to protect.

I believe, however, that careful legislation, authorizing the use of no more than one percent of these retirement holdings as venture capital for Pennsylvania, is an idea whose time has come.

I recommend that you approve such legislation this year, and thereby allow as much as \$100 million in new capital to be provided to potential employers at the discretion of the fund managers themselves.

I also recommend a state appropriation of \$2 million this year, to supplement \$6.2 million in federal grants, to assure that job-intensive, smaller firms across the state can apply for low-cost, start-up or expansion loans under the Pennsylvania Capital Loan Fund we established two years ago.

A new state appropriation of only \$500,000 also would make possible the nonprofit "Labor/Management Resource Center," the productivity project I discussed with you last year on this occasion.

This center—merging management, labor and academic resources to focus on the productivity and work environment in our existing mills and factories—could yield great dividends in relation to the investment required, and I suggest again that we reach for those dividends in this budget.

I also suggest, once more, that we fund the Pennsylvania Energy Development Authority (PEDA) with an appropriation of \$2 million, and thereby certify, with dollars, that commitment to the strong and diversified energy mix you ordered for our Commonwealth when you voted to create this agency in 1982.

While these creative initiatives offer new hope in and of themselves, they are only part of our comprehensive economic development blueprint, a strategy which has been described as the "state of the art" for older, industrial states.

That strategy has included a variety of other time-tested initiatives that have proved invaluable to our efforts over the years, and for which I recommend renewed or enhanced commitments in the coming year.

I recommend, for example, that you provide for a 33 percent increase in our appropriation for the low-interest loan program of the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority (PIDA), from the current level of \$15 million, to a new level of \$20 million in the coming year, and that we move ahead with a \$50 million bond issue to add to the job-creating potential of this proven pioneer in its field.

As you know, we redirected PIDA several years ago to place a greater emphasis on small businesses, on advanced technology and on areas of especially high unemployment, as we substantially accelerated its levels of funding and activity.

Since 1979, we have committed a total of \$290 million for 605 PIDA loans made to Pennsylvania firms, and we have increased dramatically the proportions directed to smaller and advanced-technology firms, through such innovative concepts as the "small business incubators" which are emerging in several of our communities.

Thousands of new jobs have been created with the help of PIDA, and thousands more are needed.

So, again, let us not be shy about investing where the employment dividends have clearly justified the effort.

I also recommend that we increase by 15 percent, to \$8 million, our advertising and promotional efforts on behalf of business and industrial development, and travel and tourism.

The travel and tourism industry alone produces over \$7 billion in revenues and employs nearly 200,000 persons, many in the kinds of unskilled or semi-skilled positions without which they might never have been able to enter the work force.

In addition, I recommend that we:

Increase by 50 percent, to \$3 million, our commitment to the Pennsylvania Minority Business Development Authority (PMBDA), so that all Pennsylvanians can share in the progress we make toward a resurgent economy.

Renew our commitments to the Small Business Action Center, PennTAP and the Small Business Research Seed Grant Program, commitments which have helped us earn a number one ranking among the states in aid to small business.

And renew our commitment to our overseas trade promotion offices, which were instrumental in identifying three European firms which agreed last month to locate facilities here, bringing new jobs into the Commonwealth.

The message, indeed, has gone international, to small and large firms alike, that "You've got a friend in Pennsylvania."

As we cut taxes, offer direct assistance to business and take various other steps to encourage investment in Pennsylvania, however, we must remember that without a skilled work force, all these pursuits would be fruitless indeed.

Pennsylvanians who lack the necessary skills for employment in our developing economy must be provided training and education that will enable them to enter the job market.

Once given the opportunity for self-improvement, they must be provided with job-placement help so they can open the door to real jobs, real careers, real achievement and real paychecks.

Thousands of displaced former workers, on the other hand, rightfully have earned, through their conscientious labor in our steel mills, factories and other industries over the years, the right to our support in coping with those elements of the economic transition that have altered the job market and changed the very fabric of their lives.

For these and countless others, the federal Job Training Partnership Act offers new hope. I therefore recommend that we provide for the full \$12 million in state matching funds necessary to qualify us for \$151 million in federal block grant assistance next year under that act.

But it is not enough merely to train or retrain workers. We must do so in a fashion that ensures they will go from the classroom to the assembly line, shop floor or laboratory. For all the training in the world will be of no avail if we fail to match the trainee to real and available jobs.

The "Customized Job Training" program we initiated two years ago helped more than 3,000 Pennsylvanians win jobs or promotions in its first eighteen months of operation.

The success of this program suggests that the tailoring of training efforts to specific employer needs can and ought to be applied to the whole range of job programs available to us today, including those under the federal Job Training Partnership Act.

Our state-funded program works; people who use it are working, and we have an obligation to share the obvious

success of customized job training with as many Pennsylvanians as we can, as quickly as we can.

I therefore recommend that we increase funding in this area by 30 percent—from the \$4.6 million appropriated last year to \$6 million for fiscal year 1984-85.

There are other things that can be done to help secure and promote our economy and jobs for our people outside of the budget process. I am pleased that bipartisan discussions are even now underway to explore and develop these possibilities. We pledge our full cooperation with such efforts.

Our commitment to job training programs recognizes that when those of us in public service can help Pennsylvanians find work in private enterprise, it is our obligation to do so.

Perhaps, only once in a generation, however, if even that often, does fate allow us, with a single stroke of the pen, to actually add to the private sector itself—to its diversity, its vitality, its services, its competitive drive and, of course, to the jobs it can provide our people.

This happens to be one of those times.

Two months ago, I proposed a more comprehensive plan to free Pennsylvania taxpayers, at last, from the inefficiency, corruption and declining profitability of the state liquor monopoly, and to rescue Pennsylvania consumers, at last, from the arrogance, mismanagement, inconvenience and shoddy service offered by that monopoly.

Consumer complaints about the State Store system are as varied and abundant as the consumers themselves. Their inability to obtain reasonable selections and service at reasonable prices drives thousands of Pennsylvanians to other states with their business, denying us vital revenues. The inconvenient hours and locations, combined with poor service and selection, surely threaten, as well, the continued development of our tourism and convention business.

Editorial opinion has been nearly unanimous in support of the abolition of this dinosaur from the past. Public opinion polls, both statewide and those conducted in many of your districts, consistently have demonstrated that Pennsylvanians want the wine and liquor monopoly abolished and replaced by private stores, with private owners who understand the meaning of the term "customer service."

I am prepared, for the remainder of my term if necessary, to help the people persuade either this or future General Assemblies to act on this consensus.

I suggest, however, that we spare ourselves a protracted struggle over this issue—a struggle that the people are destined to win, sooner or later.

It's simply a matter of time.

Let the time be now.

Let the triumph go to the public.

And let the credit be yours.

As you know, I have recommended that the estimated \$150 million in revenue to be realized from the sale of state liquor franchises be committed primarily to education.

Specifically, I propose that we use that revenue to purchase scientific, engineering and other technical equipment for our schools, colleges and universities, providing them with the

“state of the art” capability they will need as we seek to counter what the National Commission on Excellence in Education has called a “rising tide of mediocrity” in the classrooms of America.

The broader process of turning that tide into one of quality in Pennsylvania, however, cannot be deferred while we debate other issues.

This process must be pursued through the traditional education appropriations I am asking you to approve this year, and through a series of non-traditional reforms as contained in the “Agenda for Excellence” we introduced last fall.

Here again, I believe that Pennsylvania is ready.

On the traditional side of the equation I recommend:

That we provide a 7 percent increase, or an additional \$124 million next year, in the basic instructional subsidy for our local school districts.

A 7 percent increase, or an additional \$44.7 million, for the State System of Higher Education, our state-related institutions and our community colleges.

A 7 percent increase, or an additional \$5.6 million, in our scholarship aid program administered by the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency (PHEAA).

A 7 percent increase, or an additional \$15.3 million, in aid to current special education programs, a commitment that should maintain Pennsylvania’s standing as a national leader in this particular field.

And increased levels of support, as well, for vocational education and adult literacy programs.

Our “Agenda for Excellence,” meanwhile, calls for new standards relating to what is being taught in Pennsylvania schools, how well it is being taught by Pennsylvania teachers and how much of it is being learned by Pennsylvania students.

It proposes, as you know, tougher high school graduation requirements, new statewide testing and remedial instruction and financial and other incentives for outstanding work by teachers and students.

When fully implemented, this agenda will call for a new state investment in education of more than \$100 million annually.

In the first year, I ask that you appropriate \$48 million over and above the traditional education spending proposals I just enumerated, as a special commitment to “Turning the Tide” toward quality in our public schools.

In doing so, you will be providing for a total of \$310 million in increased state funding for education next year—or 68 percent of all new funding proposed in the entire General Fund budget.

The philosophy underlying this commitment, tested time and time again by great Americans who have risen from poverty and obscurity to the pinnacle of their professions, is, quite simply, that education is the key to unlocking the shackles of despair, and our best investment in the future of this Commonwealth.

But the fact remains that thousands of Pennsylvanians continue to be trapped in poverty because of advancing years, handicaps and disabilities, or other economic and personal

circumstances beyond their control. For them, we must provide a variety of other human services as well. And Pennsylvania is ready to do so.

For the third time since taking office, I am recommending a 5 percent increase in the level of state-paid public assistance that we provide to the least fortunate among us. Our public assistance effort, following the reforms you enacted in 1982, remains among the most generous in the nation, and the additions I recommend today will help to keep it so.

As you know, I proposed and you recently delivered to me, legislation that would enable us to use \$6.1 million to help homeless and destitute Pennsylvanians find the shelter and care they need. It was my privilege this morning to sign that legislation.

There is still more we can do to aid those facing health and medical problems. I am recommending an 8.4 percent increase in appropriations for medical assistance this year, a total of \$972.1 million—including \$5 million in fee increases for surgical, medical and diagnostic services.

But we must devote equal attention to cost-containment matters in this budget, especially where the cost of health care is concerned.

Our health-care expenses have soared in the last ten years—from \$369 million in 1972 to \$1.9 billion in 1982, an astronomical 400 percent increase. In-patient hospital services accounted for about a third of that alarming figure.

We simply must contain such expenses before they overwhelm us. On the federal level, the Medicare trust fund already faces potential bankruptcy in the 1990’s, barring swift and effective reform.

Each and every one of us here today has an obligation to ensure that Pennsylvania does not come face to face with a similar plight.

We are obligated to preserve and reform our system, so that it can continue to deliver services at realistic and compassionate levels.

And we are obligated to act in a manner that recognizes that it will be the destitute who will suffer tomorrow if we fail to act today. While we have made significant progress in cutting down on waste, fraud and abuse in our medical assistance program, we must do all that we can to encourage more efficiency in the medical industry itself.

That is why we propose to implement, on July 1, a new method of paying hospitals for certain medical services received by the state’s 1.2 million Medicaid patients, a method based on a predetermined schedule of fees for such services, one that was recommended by our Cost Containment Task Force.

For the same reasons, we also are instituting, in accordance with federal guidelines, a “copay plan,” under which patients would contribute as little as fifty cents and no more than three dollars toward payment of medical services.

By establishing fair and reasonable fees in advance, and by implementing the federal guidelines on copayment, we hope to discourage the squandering of limited public funds on “overcare,” so that we retain the funds we need for care that is truly necessary and essential.

There is, of course, another group of Pennsylvanians who require our help and understanding. I am speaking of those mentally retarded and mentally ill citizens who, we are learning, often are best cared for in community-based programs that provide an appropriate setting for the maximum development of their capacities.

Our efforts so far in this regard have enabled nearly 6,000 mentally retarded clients to find places in community residential programs. Yet, there are still individuals seeking places in society and homes to call their own. I recommend we use an additional \$5.9 million in block grant funds to expand residential services for mentally retarded persons statewide.

We also must continue to provide for the treatment and housing of mentally ill citizens in community-based programs. I recommend that an additional \$2 million in block grant funds be made available to increase aftercare services for patients who have been released from institutions.

While the challenge of stretching available federal and state dollars to aid large segments of our population is, in most cases, one to test the wisdom of a Solomon, the service we provide our elderly is a particularly bright spot in the budget framework I am setting forth today. As you know, \$100 million in lottery funds were dedicated to the prescription-drug assistance program on which we worked together last year. Even so, the burgeoning state Lottery Fund is expected to realize a \$267 million surplus at the end of the fiscal year.

To further serve our elderly Pennsylvanians, I propose that we commit additional lottery funds for transit services, the property tax and rent rebate program, expansion of in-home services for the aging and capital improvement programs to be implemented in more than 500 senior citizen centers.

I also am recommending that the General Fund be tapped to provide the first cost-of-living increase in five years for those older Pennsylvanians who are retired teachers and retired state employees, and that we continue, at the same time, to explore ways in which to contain the rapidly escalating cost of our public employee retirement systems.

In keeping with the original legislative intent in establishing lottery assistance programs, I further propose that we provide an expanded early intervention program to help preschool handicapped children, a substantial increase in funding for the visually handicapped and \$5 million for non-medical attendant care for the adult handicapped.

There is, of course, a debt to another group of Pennsylvanians—our veterans—that we never can pay in full.

To continue our installment payments on that debt, however, I recommend we provide a \$1.3 million appropriation this year for the Veterans Assistance Program, which provides emergency financial grants to veterans who temporarily require shelter, food, clothing and heat; a sustained commitment for our nationally recognized network of Veterans Outreach and Assistance Centers and veterans homes, and a \$50,000 increase for the Vietnam Herbicides Information Commission, an organization which holds the promise of breaking new ground in assistance to veterans who may be suffering the effects of deadly Agent Orange.

Quality of life for all Pennsylvanians, however, depends upon much more than the levels of support we provide for human service programs. It requires that we do all within our power, as well, to uphold the first civil right of all Pennsylvanians: the right to be free from fear in our homes, on our streets and in our communities.

Working together, we have strengthened our criminal laws in Pennsylvania in ways that have won national recognition. With minimum, mandatory sentencing, with tougher standards for probation and parole, with expanded prisons and with a crackdown on drunken driving and drug trafficking, would-be criminals have much to fear in our Commonwealth today. And Pennsylvania is ready, ready to give them even more to worry about tomorrow.

An 11.5 percent increase in appropriations for the Attorney General's Office, for example, will enable him to maintain his highly successful assault on organized crime, official corruption, drug trafficking, white collar crime and other serious offenses that can threaten the very fabric of life in our Commonwealth, and I recommend that you provide it.

A 7.9 percent increase for the state police will continue the march toward the unprecedented level of professionalism we seek in Pennsylvania law enforcement, and I recommend that you provide it, including funding for four new cadet classes next year.

And a 16.1 percent increase in corrections support will permit the hiring of nearly 400 more guards and other personnel at our prisons, and I recommend that you provide it, as well as funds for additional cell-space and a much-needed expansion at Farview State Hospital.

In order to better administer and focus our attention on the enormous challenges raised by criminal incarceration today, I reiterate my call for elevation of this bureau to a cabinet-level Department of Corrections.

And in order to ensure, once and for all, that a sentence given will be a sentence served in Pennsylvania, I recommend, again, substantial reform of our system of parole.

Making our streets safe is of limited value, however, if they pass through neighborhoods without joy, where human comfort is a stranger, and where vacant storefronts and gutted or abandoned houses are only haunting reminders of lost prosperity.

Our preoccupation with economic development must never cause us to fail to recognize the relationship it shares with the conservation of our communities.

This is why I established community conservation as a companion priority to economic development early in this Administration, and why I continue to advocate conserving, enhancing and renewing those many treasures of hard work and ingenuity handed down to us by previous generations of Pennsylvanians.

At a time when energy, money, material and other resources are limited, at a time when we are compelled to do more with less, our answers must be found in carefully building upon what we have. And, yes, Pennsylvania is ready.

Our Enterprise Development Area Program (EDAP) is one of many initiatives designed to help us do just that by targeting state services and resources to encourage and support private reinvestment in the most distressed of Pennsylvania communities, with the focus, of course, on the kind of activity that can bring jobs to those communities and to the people who need them.

Last fall, we designated neighborhoods in seven Pennsylvania cities as the state's first Enterprise Development Areas, using money available from preceding years, and seventeen other communities have been granted a total of \$800,000 to plan for the development of similar areas.

This year, I believe an appropriation of \$9 million for Enterprise Development Areas, to be administered through the Departments of Commerce and Community Affairs, coupled with a \$1 million appropriation to assist workers and municipalities in developing specific recovery strategies, will help make it clear that Pennsylvania does care about the quality of life in all of its communities, and I recommend that you approve such a commitment.

While some of our communities may not meet the technical definition of "distressed" today, many of their residents certainly meet the human definition.

They are, of course, the unemployed workers and distressed farmers and their families who face the potential loss of their residential properties, through no fault of their own, to mortgage foreclosure.

To your credit, you responded to their need last year with an emergency mortgage assistance plan which I signed into law. But I had misgivings then, and I harbor them now, about the financial base of that plan, a base which is rickety, to say the least.

The act you sent to my desk included only \$5 million in state start-up funds, and a provision to raise an additional \$21 million annually in corporate contributions, for which Neighborhood Assistance Program tax credits would be used.

The conclusion is inescapable that the mortgage assistance program cannot possibly match the expectations we may have raised with its passage, and unless it is amended, it will force the withdrawal of tax credits from the Neighborhood Assistance Program as well.

Clearly, we must look elsewhere for funding, and I suggest, once again, that the only logical place to turn is the only state revenue source that has continued to grow dramatically, even during the recession—the lottery.

I suggest that we borrow \$26 million from the lottery in each of the next three years, specifically to prevent mortgage foreclosures.

This is less than one-fourth the amount I initially recommended that you borrow for this purpose last year, and it would be the cruelest of hoaxes for us to fail now, through reliance on some sort of "phantom funding," to make good on a promise we made last year as a matter of law.

As was the case last year, we are proposing that every dime borrowed from the Lottery Fund for homeowner loans be returned when the specter of a sheriff at the door becomes,

instead, the reality of a paycheck in the pocket for these particularly hard-pressed Pennsylvanians.

Special circumstances or needs in communities and regions often require special treatment outside the realm of normal state programs and services. Therefore, I also recommend:

That your appropriation of \$2 million to help farmers and rural communities deal with the avian flu epidemic be followed with an initial appropriation of \$500,000 to aid in research and promotional activities designed to regain lost markets and restore our poultry industry to profitability.

That you allocate \$1.1 million for the cleanup of the Canonsburg Industrial Park and that you continue our support for the relocation of residents from Centralia.

That you increase, by \$1 million, our funding to libraries, representing a 90 percent increase in funding during this Administration for this vital community resource.

That you increase your appropriations by 19 percent, to a total of \$5 million, for arts organizations.

That you appropriate \$500,000 for aid in the preservation and maintenance of state historical sites.

That you provide a \$5 million increase for mass transit operational costs, a service that has become indispensable to thousands of urban commuters, and for which we have increased support by 90 percent during this Administration.

Community revitalization, job expansion or any of the other goals we pursue for our citizens would mean little in an environment in which they could not breathe the air, or drink the water or enjoy the mountains, lakes and forests—those perishable treasures that keep us in touch with life as the Creator first made it here in Pennsylvania.

Yet toxic chemicals, industrial and municipal waste, the presence of radioactive contamination at Three Mile Island and other threats to the environment continue to demand our attention.

The answers to these problems are neither simple, nor cheap, nor obvious—nor can they be delivered by Pennsylvania standing alone.

But Pennsylvania is ready to make a difference as well, by marshaling our limited state resources, especially in match with federal funds and other forms of support.

We have made a considerable difference already, by providing \$75 million in state funds for the maintenance and operation of municipal sewage treatment systems since 1979, and by distributing more than \$550 million in federal funds for the construction of such systems, which are vital to the improvement of water quality in Pennsylvania.

However, the needs of our municipalities will be even greater in October, when a twenty-seven percent reduction in federal funds will make it more difficult for them to undertake construction of sewage treatment facilities.

I, therefore, propose that we reallocate \$9.4 million from two existing Department of Environmental Resources programs to help our municipalities with front-end financing for such projects.

We have made a difference, too, by encouraging the development of environmentally sound methods for recycling and

disposing of trash. I propose a \$3.8 million appropriation this year to continue this work.

We have made a difference with the \$3 million we appropriated last year to qualify for federal "superfund" assistance in removing the hazardous and toxic waste dumps that threaten many of our communities. I propose we add \$2 million to that effort this year, qualifying us for a total of \$11.5 million in superfund assistance.

We have made a difference with the \$10 million we have contributed so far to the cleanup of Three Mile Island, to help free central Pennsylvania communities from the radioactive nightmare they have had to face since March 28, 1979. I propose we make our third-year commitment to this effort.

We also can make a difference with the \$2 million in state and federal funds I propose we use for the planning, research, education and technical and financial assistance needed for the part Pennsylvania has accepted in a regional effort to "Save the Chesapeake Bay."

While we do not border on the Chesapeake, we are its neighbors, beneficiaries of its bounty, its beauty and its recreational offerings. While being good neighbors always makes good sense, this is especially true where this great estuary is concerned.

I also believe we can and should make a difference by continuing our effort to form a national consensus on an effective and reasonable approach to acid rain abatement in this country.

We are engaged in such an effort, and I assure you that process will continue.

Now Mr. President, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly:

This is, as you know, my sixth appearance before you for the purposes of recommending a budget for the Commonwealth we all were elected to serve.

On each of the five previous years, we were compelled to ask you for more transportation revenue to patch potholes, repair old bridges, build new bridges, close missing links, rebuild highways, claim federal dollars and restore one of the nation's largest, oldest, and most neglected state transportation networks to the level of safety and efficiency that once made it a key to the success of our keystone state.

Once convinced that PennDOT had, indeed, been reformed into a lean, clean agency of transportation professionals, you responded to our requests for necessary revenues.

I am happy to report today that the restoration of our transportation primacy is ahead of schedule in Pennsylvania—as motorists from the Parkway East in Pittsburgh to Interstate 95 in Philadelphia are becoming aware. I also am happy to report that I have nothing to ask of you this year in the way of new transportation revenues.

On that note, let me say, in conclusion, that I never fail to be impressed when I come into this Chamber, surrounded as we are by paintings portraying Pennsylvania's magnificent past, and awed as we are by the air of expectancy with which our citizens look to all of us. Long ago, James Madison, whose compatriots in liberty are portrayed on these walls,

wrote: "A good government implies two things: first, fidelity to the object of government, which is the happiness of the people; secondly, a knowledge of the means by which that object can be obtained."

Despite our partisan differences, we can all agree on the first, and the second is why we are here today.

Pennsylvania is indeed ready, ready to seek "the happiness of its people."

We have means to sow new seeds of commercial and business activity that can produce new jobs and economic vitality in our Commonwealth.

I suggest we use them.

We have means to help thousands of Pennsylvanians recover from the trauma of unemployment.

I suggest we use them.

We have means to help our communities and neighborhoods help themselves to a spiritual renewal, as well as an economic recovery.

I suggest we use them.

We have means to begin the process of turning the tide toward quality in Pennsylvania education.

I suggest we use them.

We have means to relieve suffering, deprivation and fear resulting from crime or poverty or illness.

I suggest we use them.

In short, we have means for helping Pennsylvania not only to survive, but to prevail, when the final verdict of our trial of transition has been handed down to our successors.

I suggest we use them.

Our duty is clear and the course before us is true. We must continue to call upon the greatness of our heritage, the diversity of our resources and the wisdom of our people in moving Pennsylvania to a new day of resurgence and renewal.

The need and the opportunity for us to resist the temptations of partisan and special interest politics, and to work cooperatively for the common good, never has been greater than it is today.

I urge you, then, to work with each other and with us, to meet our constitutional responsibilities not only in timely fashion, but in a way that promotes and protects the interests of all our citizens.

That is the clearest, most positive sign we can send this year to any who would doubt that Pennsylvania is ready, indeed, to claim its rightful place of leadership in America's future.

Let us work together now to send that signal—on behalf of the Pennsylvania of the past, the Pennsylvania of the present, and, most of all, the Pennsylvania that is yet to come.

Too much is at stake to do any less.

Thank you.

HOUSE MESSAGES

SENATE BILL RETURNED WITH AMENDMENTS

The Clerk of the House of Representatives returned to the Senate **SB 152**, with the information that the House has passed the same with amendments in which the concurrence of the Senate is requested.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill, as amended, will be placed on the Calendar.

HOUSE CONCURS IN SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

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

Weekly Adjournment.

GENERAL COMMUNICATIONS BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

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

February 7, 1984

Senators SINGEL, ROCKS, EARLY, LINCOLN, STOUT, KELLEY, MELLOW, LLOYD, ANDREZESKI, SHAFFER, ZEMPRELLI and FISHER presented to the Chair **SB 1244**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 10, 1939 (P. L. 111, No. 51), entitled "Commerce Law," establishing a program of intercity cooperation and exchange in the areas of economic development.

Which was committed to the Committee on COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, February 7, 1984.

Senators RHOADES, KUSSE, O'CONNELL, CORMAN, HELFRICK, SHAFFER, SHUMAKER, PECORA, STAUFFER, MOORE, REIBMAN, SINGEL, STOUT, LYNCH, MUSTO and MELLOW presented to the Chair **SB 1245**, entitled:

An Act empowering the Department of Transportation to preserve and improve rail freight service in the Commonwealth by making grants, loans or other assistance available to qualified applicants; authorizing a comprehensive rail study; making an appropriation; and making repeals.

Which was committed to the Committee on TRANSPORTATION, February 7, 1984.

Senator SHUMAKER presented to the Chair **SB 1246**, entitled:

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

Which was committed to the Committee on CONSUMER PROTECTION AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE, February 7, 1984.

Senator KUSSE presented to the Chair **SB 1247**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for certain width vehicles and permits for such vehicles.

Which was committed to the Committee on TRANSPORTATION, February 7, 1984.

RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

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

February 7, 1984

AMENDING SENATE RULE XXII

Senators MOORE, STAUFFER, LOEPER, TILGHMAN, JUBELIRER, HOWARD, MELLOW and REIBMAN offered the following resolution (**Senate Resolution No. 100**), which was read and referred to the Committee on Rules and Executive Nominations:

In the Senate, February 7, 1984.

A RESOLUTION

Amending Senate Rule XXII.

RESOLVED, That Senate Rule XXII be amended to read:

XXII VOTING

Must be Present and Vote

1. No Senator shall be permitted to vote on any question unless he or she is present in the Senate Chamber at the time the roll is being called, or prior to the announcement of the vote: [Provided, however, That if a Senator is performing a legislative duty to which he was duly appointed by the Senate or any officer thereof, he may be voted by his respective floor leader.]

Legislative Assignment

2. A Senator who is performing a legislative assignment in the Capitol Complex in behalf of the body of the Senate and to which he or she was duly appointed by the Senate or the appropriate officer thereof, he or she may be voted by his respective floor leader.

Legislative Leave

3. A Senator who is performing a legislative assignment outside of the Capitol Complex in behalf of the body of the Senate and to which he or she was duly appointed by the Senate or the appropriate officer thereof, he or she may be voted by his respective floor leader. A specific reason for the legislative leave must be given by the respective floor leader.

Personal or Private Interest

[2] 4. Senators who have a personal or private interest in any measure or bill proposed or pending before the Senate shall disclose the fact to the Senate, and shall not vote thereon.

Senators Must be Present

[3] 5. Every Senator shall be present within the Senate Chamber during the sessions of the Senate, unless duly excused or necessarily prevented, and shall be recorded as voting on each question stated from the Chair which requires a roll call vote unless excused by the Senate. The refusal of any Senator to vote shall be deemed a contempt unless he be excused by the Senate or unless he has a direct personal or pecuniary interest in connection with the pending question.

Excused from Voting

[4] 6. A Senator desiring to be excused from voting shall, when his name is called, make a brief statement of the reasons for making such request, and the question on excusing him shall then be decided by the Chair without debate.

Changing Vote

[5] 7. No Senator may vote or change his vote after the result is announced by the Chair. Before the announcement of the final result, however, a Senator may change his vote, or may vote, if previously absent from the Chamber. Should a Senator be erroneously recorded on any vote, he may at any time, with the permission of the Senate, make a statement to that effect which shall be entered in the Journal. Similarly, should the Senator be absent

when a vote is taken on any question, he may later, with the permission of the Senate, make a statement for entry upon the Journal, indicating how he would have voted had he been present when the roll was taken and the reasons therefor shall be submitted in writing or delivered orally not to exceed five minutes.

Persons Allowed at Desk During Roll Call

[6] 8. No Senator or other person, except the majority or minority leader or other person designated by them, shall be permitted at the Reading Clerk's desk during the recording, counting or verification of a roll call vote.

Two-Thirds Vote

[7] 9. When bills or other matters, which require a two-thirds vote are under consideration the concurrence of two-thirds of all the Senators elected shall not be requisite to decide any question or amendment short of the final question short of the final one, a majority of Senators voting shall be sufficient to pass the same.

Majority Vote Defined

[8] 10. A majority of the Senators elected shall mean a majority of the Senators elected, living, sworn and seated.

Majority Vote

[9] 11. When bills or other matters, which require a vote of the majority of all Senators elected are under consideration, the concurrence of a majority of all the Senators elected shall not be requisite to decide any question or amendment short of the final question; and on any question short of a final one a majority of Senators voting shall be sufficient to pass the same.

Announcement of Vote

[10] 12. Upon completion of a roll call vote or a voice vote the result shall be announced immediately unless the majority or minority leader requests a delay.

Explanation of Vote

[11] 13. Any Senator may, with the consent of the Senate, make an explanation of his vote on any question and have the explanation printed in the Journal.

Tie Vote

[12] 14. In the case of a tie vote the President of the Senate may cast his vote to break such tie so long as by doing so it does not violate any provisions of the Constitution of Pennsylvania. In the event there is a tie vote on a question requiring a constitutional majority, the question falls.

Verifying Vote

[13] 15. Any Senator may demand a verification of a vote immediately upon the completion of a roll call or after the announcement of vote by the presiding officer. In verifying a vote the Clerk shall first read the affirmative roll at which time any additions or corrections shall be made. Upon the completion and verification of the affirmative roll call, the Clerk shall proceed with the reading of the negative roll at which time any additions or corrections shall be made. Upon the completion and verification of the negative roll call the roll call shall be declared verified. It shall not be in order for a Senator to change his vote after the verified roll call is announced. A demand for a verification shall not be in order when all Senators vote one way. The demand for a verification of a vote is not debatable.

Voice Vote

[14] 16. Unless otherwise ordered or demanded, a voice vote may be taken. Any Senator who doubts the accuracy of a voice vote may demand a roll call vote. Such request must be made immediately upon the announcement of the vote by the presiding officer and shall not be in order after other business has intervened. The demand for a verification of a voice vote shall not be in order.

DESIGNATING FEBRUARY 12, 1984 AS WORLD MARRIAGE DAY

Senators LLOYD, LYNCH, WENGER and ANDREZESKI offered the following resolution (**Senate Res-**

olution No. 101), which was read and referred to the Committee on Rules and Executive Nominations:

In the Senate, February 7, 1984.

A RESOLUTION

Designating February 12, 1984 as World Marriage Day.

WHEREAS, We are a world of families, deriving our strength, fostering our values and enduring our crises on the firm foundation of the family unit; and

WHEREAS, At the heart of the family is a healthy marriage, committed to mutual trust, communication and shared responsibilities of husband and wife; and

WHEREAS, The joy, respect and growth fostered by marriage provides us with vision and hope for our State, Nation and world; and

WHEREAS, This era of technological and sociological change has adversely influenced the vitality of marriage and family life; and

WHEREAS, The strengthening of marriage and family relationships is an ongoing process demanding the commitment and concern of all citizens; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That February 12, 1984 be observed as World Marriage Day in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

BILL SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Henry G. Hager) in the presence of the Senate signed the following bill:

HB 85.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SECRETARY

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

SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1984

9:30 A.M.	CONSUMER PROTECTION AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE (to consider House Bill No. 1448 and Senate Bill No. 988)	Room 460, 4th Floor Conference Rm., North Wing
11:00 A.M.	Public Employee Retirement Study Commission	Room 459, 4th Floor Conference Rm., North Wing
11:00 A.M.	Conference Committee on Senate Bill No. 730	Room 461, 4th Floor Conference Rm., North Wing

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1984

10:00 A.M.	URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING (Public Hearing on Senate Bill No. 1229)	Room 117, Temple University Law School, 1719 N. Broad St. Philadelphia
------------	--	--

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1984

9:00 A.M. Legislative Budget Room 461,
and Finance Committee 4th Floor
(to release a report Conference Rm.,
entitled "Interim Report North Wing
on a Performance Audit of
the Pennsylvania Department of
Transportation - Report on the
Results of Preliminary Survey
Activities and Areas Selected
for Detailed Audit" and asso-
ciated documents)

11:00 A.M. LOCAL GOVERNMENT Room 461,
(to consider Senate Bills 4th Floor
No. 508, 893, 894, 895, Conference Rm.,
896, 897, 898, 993, North Wing
1121, 1168, 1215, 1216,
1231; House Bills No. 712,
713 and 714)

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1984

1:00 P.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
Department of Transportation)

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1984

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

7:30 P.M. LAW AND JUSTICE Norriton Fire Co.
(to hear testimony 2830 Swede Rd.,
from concerned citizens E. Norriton Twp.
and other interested Norristown
persons on the proposed
transfer of a restaurant
Liquor license to premises
located at 2014 Old Arch Road,
East Norriton Township)

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1984

9:00 A.M. PUBLIC HEALTH AND Henderson Room
to WELFARE (Public Hearing Thiel College
5:00 P.M. regarding Senate Bill 1177) Greenville, PA

THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 1984

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

MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1984

9:30 A.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
Department of Education)

2:00 P.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
State System of Higher
Education)

TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 1984

9:00 A.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
Department of Public Welfare)

10:00 A.M. COMMUNITY AND Room 461,
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT 4th Floor
(to consider Senate Bills Conference Rm.,
No. 664, 1056, 1151, 1170 North Wing
and any other business that
may come before the committee)

3:00 P.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with Penn- Caucus Room
sylvania State University)

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 1984

9:00 A.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
Department of Labor and
Industry)

11:00 A.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
Department of Insurance)

1:00 P.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
Governor's Office)

3:00 P.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
Bureau of Correction)

THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 1984

9:00 A.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
Department of Health)

11:00 A.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
Department of State)

1:00 P.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
Department of General
Services)

MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1984

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

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

11:30 A.M. APPROPRIATIONS Senate Majority
(Budget Hearing with the Caucus Room
Lincoln University)

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

TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 1984

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

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 1984

9:00 A.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Department of Environmental Resources)	Senate Majority Caucus Room
1:00 P.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Pa. Historical and Museum Commission)	Senate Majority Caucus Room
2:00 P.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Pennsylvania State Police)	Senate Majority Caucus Room
3:00 P.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Department of Commerce)	Senate Majority Caucus Room

THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1984

9:00 A.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Public Utility Commission)	Senate Majority Caucus Room
11:00 A.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Auditor General)	Senate Majority Caucus Room
1:00 P.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Treasury)	Senate Majority Caucus Room
2:00 P.M.	APPROPRIATIONS (Budget Hearing with the Department of Community	Senate Majority Caucus Room

Affairs)

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

ADJOURNMENT

Senator JUBELIRER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do now adjourn until Wednesday, February 8, 1984, at 11:00 a.m., Eastern Standard Time.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned at 8:04 p.m., Eastern Standard Time.