

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
Legislative Journal

FRIDAY, JULY 6, 2007

SESSION OF 2007 191ST OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 54

SENATE

FRIDAY, July 6, 2007

The Senate met at 1 p.m., Eastern Daylight Saving Time.

The PRESIDENT (Lieutenant Governor Catherine Baker Knoll) in the Chair.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Reverend GLEN BAYLY, of Mifflinburg Alliance Church, Mifflinburg, offered the following prayer:

Shall we pray.

Our gracious Heavenly Father, we pause at this time to recognize You and to seek Your presence in the work and labors of this Chamber today. We thank You for Your many blessings as we have celebrated our nation's heritage and its independence, and we give thanks for so many blessings that we have as Americans.

We thank You for the great provisions that we have, material blessings of abundant food and shelter, the blessings of family, friends, and of course the blessings of freedom. We give You thanks today for our freedoms, the freedoms that we have as Americans, like no other nation in the world.

We are certainly blessed, and as we come to You today, we give You thanks for this nation. We give You thanks for those who, by offering their lives, have sacrificed and brought it into existence. We thank You today for those who, by putting their lives in jeopardy, even at this very hour, preserve our freedoms and offer freedom to other nations. We pray for the troops in Iraq and Afghanistan today, and pray for that situation that peace might come to those parts of the world at this time.

We pray for wisdom today for President Bush, Governor Rendell, and for the Members of this Chamber. We ask for the wisdom of Solomon as we face a serious deadlock at this point on the budget, and we pray that we might have wisdom from above and guidance by Your Holy Spirit. We pray for the compassion of Christ on the issues that are faced.

God, we thank You for this time and the opportunity and ability that we have to serve You. Thank You that You have called us into Your service, and that these truly are our public servants. We commit them to Your care, asking You to minister to each individual Senator today in body, soul, and spirit, that they might know Your blessing. We will give You thanks as You give guidance and as You answer our prayers, and we pray this in Your holy and precious name. Amen.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair thanks Reverend Glen Bayly, who is the guest today of Senator Madigan.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by those assembled.)

HOUSE MESSAGES

**HOUSE NONCONCURS IN SENATE
AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL**

The Clerk of the House of Representatives informed the Senate that the House has nonconcurred in amendments made by the Senate to **HB 842**.

The PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

**HOUSE RECEDES FROM ITS AMENDMENTS
NONCONCURRED IN BY THE SENATE**

The Clerk of the House of Representatives informed the Senate that the House has receded from its amendments nonconcurred in by the Senate to **SB 796**.

BILL SIGNED

The PRESIDENT (Lieutenant Governor Catherine Baker Knoll) in the presence of the Senate signed the following bill:

SB 796.

LEGISLATIVE LEAVES

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Allegheny, Senator Orie.

Senator ORIE. Madam President, I request temporary Capitol leaves for Senator Pippy, Senator Pileggi, and Senator Punt.

The PRESIDENT. Senator Orie requests temporary Capitol leaves for Senator Pippy, Senator Pileggi, and Senator Punt. Without objection, the leaves will be granted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Senator O'PAKE asked and obtained a military leave of absence, pursuant to Senate Rule XXI(3), for Senator STACK.

**SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS
JOURNAL APPROVED**

The PRESIDENT. The Journal of the Session of June 11, 2007, is now in print.

A quorum of the Senate being present, the Clerk will read the Journal of the Session of June 11, 2007.

The Clerk proceeded to read the Journal.

Senator ORIE. Madam President, I move that further reading of the Journal be dispensed with and that the Journal be approved.

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

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

YEA-49

Armstrong	Fontana	O'Pake	Tomlinson
Baker	Fumo	Orie	Vance
Boscola	Gordner	Piccola	Washington
Browne	Greenleaf	Pileggi	Waugh
Brubaker	Hughes	Pippy	White, Donald
Corman	Kasunic	Punt	White, Mary Jo
Costa	Kitchen	Rafferty	Williams, Anthony H.
Dinniman	LaValle	Regola	Williams, Constance
Earll	Logan	Rhoades	Wonderling
Eichelberger	Madigan	Robbins	Wozniak
Erickson	McIlhinney	Scarnati	
Ferlo	Mellow	Stout	
Folmer	Musto	Tartaglione	

NAY-0

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

The PRESIDENT. The Journal is approved.

LEGISLATIVE LEAVE CANCELLED

The PRESIDENT. Senator Pileggi has returned, and his temporary Capitol leave is cancelled.

**SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS
GUEST OF SENATOR JAY COSTA
PRESENTED TO THE SENATE**

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Senator Costa.

Senator COSTA. Madam President, I would like to take a moment to introduce Zachary Walton, who is in the gallery. This is Zachary's second year working as an intern during the summer in my Harrisburg office. He is a graduate of Cumberland Valley High School, and a constituent of Senator Vance. This fall he will be returning to the University of Pittsburgh as a junior, where he will be studying biomedical engineering.

Zachary is very interested in witnessing the operations of government and public policy, and as I indicated, for the past two summers he has worked in our Harrisburg office. In addition to his interest in biomedical engineering, he has worked very closely with Ron Jumper, our chief counsel of the Committee on Judiciary, on a number of judiciary matters.

In the next couple of weeks he will be traveling to India for the opportunity to study there this summer. I ask my colleagues to join me in giving our usual warm welcome to Zachary Walton.

The PRESIDENT. Zachary Walton, please stand so we can give you a warm welcome from the Senate.

(Applause.)

The PRESIDENT. Good luck on your trip to India.

LEGISLATIVE LEAVE CANCELLED

The PRESIDENT. Senator Punt has returned, and his temporary Capitol leave is cancelled.

RECESS

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Allegheny, Senator Orie.

Senator ORIE. Madam President, I request a recess of the Senate for the purpose of a Republican caucus until approximately 3 p.m.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berks, Senator O'Pake.

Senator O'PAKE. Madam President, I request that the Democrats report to our caucus room immediately upon recess.

The PRESIDENT. For purposes of Republican and Democratic caucuses, without objection, the Senate stands in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The PRESIDENT. The time of recess having expired, the Senate will come to order.

LEGISLATIVE LEAVE

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware, Senator Pileggi.

Senator PILEGGI. Madam President, I request a temporary Capitol leave for Senator Piccola.

The PRESIDENT. Senator Pileggi requests a temporary Capitol leave for Senator Piccola. Without objection, the leave will be granted.

CALENDAR

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE IN
HOUSE AMENDMENTS**

SENATE CONCURS IN HOUSE AMENDMENTS

SB 86 (Pr. No. 1250) -- The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 2, 1947 (P.L. 143, No.62), entitled "An act regulating the sale and resale for profit and the carrying on of the business of selling or reselling tickets or other devices for admission to places of amusement; providing for the licensing of persons reselling such tickets for profit; providing for the suspension and revocation of such licenses; imposing duties on licensees and owners or operators of places of amusement; imposing powers and duties on the Department of Revenue, county treasurers, district attorneys, and the receiver of taxes, and city solicitors in cities of the first class; making disposition of moneys collected and providing penalties," further providing for reselling of tickets and for printing prices on tickets.

On the question,

Will the Senate concur in the amendments made by the House to Senate Bill No. 86?

Senator PILEGGI. Madam President, I move that the Senate do concur in the amendments made by the House to Senate Bill No. 86.

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

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

YEA-49

Armstrong	Fontana	O'Pake	Tomlinson
Baker	Fumo	Orie	Vance
Boscola	Gordner	Piccola	Washington
Browne	Greenleaf	Pileggi	Waugh
Brubaker	Hughes	Pippy	White, Donald
Corman	Kasunic	Punt	White, Mary Jo
Costa	Kitchen	Rafferty	Williams, Anthony H.
Dinniman	LaValle	Regola	Williams, Constance
Earl	Logan	Rhoades	Wonderling
Eichelberger	Madigan	Robbins	Wozniak
Erickson	McIlhinney	Scamati	
Ferlo	Mellow	Stout	
Folmer	Musto	Tartaglione	

NAY-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 inform the House of Representatives accordingly.

THIRD CONSIDERATION CALENDAR

BILL REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE AS AMENDED OVER IN ORDER

HB 1590 -- Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator ORIE.

BILL OVER IN ORDER

HB 202 -- Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator ORIE.

BILL OVER IN ORDER TEMPORARILY

HB 1295 -- Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order temporarily at the request of Senator ORIE.

SECOND CONSIDERATION CALENDAR

BILL REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE AS AMENDED, AMENDED

HB 896 (Pr. No. 2178) -- The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 12, 1951 (P.L.90, No.21), known as the Liquor Code, further providing for definitions, for special occasion permits, for wine auction permits, for limiting number of retail licenses to be issued in each county, for unlawful acts relative to liquor, malt and brewed beverages and licensees and for limited wineries.

On the question,
Will the Senate agree to the bill on second consideration?
Senator RAFFERTY offered the following amendment No. A2823:

Amend Title, page 1, line 21, by inserting after "LICENSES": for qualifications for licenses, for applications for certain licenses

Amend Sec. 1, page 2, line 17, by striking out "DEFINITION OF" and inserting: definitions of "mixed-use town center development project" and

Amend Sec. 1, page 2, line 20, by inserting after "AMENDED" where it appears the first time and inserting: or added

Amend Sec. 1, page 2, line 20, by striking out ", IS" and inserting: and November 29, 2006 (P.L.1421, No.155), are

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 102), page 2, by inserting between lines 24 and 25:

"Mixed-use town center development project" shall mean a planned development, with no building construction commenced prior to July 1, 2006, situated on no fewer than one hundred contiguous acres, with at least one million square feet of actual or proposed development, with a mix of retail, hospitality, commercial and residential uses, with community facilities and which has been designated as a mixed-use town center development project by the municipality in which it is located. A mixed-use town center development project may have one or multiple owners and may be developed in one or more phases, all of which shall be included in determining the actual or proposed development. If the site meets additional criteria stated in section 461(b.4)(5), a project comprising ninety-five contiguous acres will meet the size requirement in this definition.

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 102), page 4, line 3, by striking out "OR AN ALUMNI FOUNDATION OR ASSOCIATION," and inserting: or a university which is a member of the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education which is operated by a university foundation or alumni association.

Amend Sec. 4, page 5, lines 21 and 22, by striking out all of said lines and inserting:

Section 4. Section 461(b.4) and (c) of the act, amended February 21, 2006 (P.L.42, No.15), are amended by adding paragraphs

Amend Sec. 4 (Sec. 461), page 5, by inserting between lines 25 and 26:

(b.4) ***

(5) A development site of at least ninety-five acres that meets the following additional criteria shall satisfy the size requirement to qualify as a mixed-use town center development project:

(i) at least seventy-five acres of the project were secured, whether by purchase or lease, by the developer prior to July 1, 2004;

(ii) at least sixty acres of the project have been entered into the program of the Department of Environmental Protection relating to land recycling and environmental remediation standards;

(iii) at least thirty-five acres of the project have been designated as a Brownfields action team site by the Department of Environmental Protection and overlap, in whole or part, between the areas in sub-clauses (ii) and (iii); and

(iv) the project site is bounded by a township road and a State road.

Amend Bill, page 9, by inserting between lines 15 and 16:

Section 6. Section 503 of the act is amended to read:

Section 503. Qualifications for License.—No license shall be issued under the provisions of this article to any person unless (a) in case of individuals, he or she is a citizen of the United States of America, (b) in case of companies or incorporated associations of individuals, each and every one is a citizen of the United States of America, (c) in case of corporations, each and every stockholder thereof is a citizen of the United States of America. This section shall not apply to bailees for hire.

Amend Sec. 6, page 9, line 16, by striking out "6" and inserting: 7
Amend Sec. 7, page 11, line 18, by striking out "7" and inserting:

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 ORIE.

HB 1295 CALLED UP

HB 1295 (Pr. No. 2173) -- Without objection, the bill, which previously went over in its order temporarily, was called up, from page 2 of the Third Consideration Calendar, by Senator ORIE.

BILL AMENDED

HB 1295 (Pr. No. 2173) -- The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, providing for Commonwealth employees group life insurance; further providing for the State System of Higher Education and for budget implementation; providing for general budget implementation and for 2007-2008 budget implementation and restrictions on appropriations for funds and accounts; and making a related repeal.

On the question,
 Will the Senate agree to the bill on third consideration?
 Senator EARLL offered the following amendment No. A2655:

Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 1720-G), page 43, line 21, by inserting after "(B)": The transfer of funds under this subsection shall not preclude the Secretary of the Budget from authorizing property tax reduction allocations in accordance with section 503 of the Taxpayer Relief Act.

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 ORIE.

SECOND CONSIDERATION CALENDAR RESUMED

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

HB 131, HB 363, SB 916 and SB 962 -- Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator ORIE.

EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Motion was made by Senator ROBBINS,
 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 by voice vote.

NOMINATIONS TAKEN FROM THE TABLE

Senator ROBBINS. Madam President, I call from the table certain nominations and ask for their consideration.
 The Clerk read the nominations as follows:

MEMBER OF THE PENNSYLVANIA INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

May 7, 2007

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, Jamie L. Sheller, Esquire, 920 Morris Avenue, Bryn Mawr 19010, Montgomery County, Seventeenth Senatorial District, for appointment as a member of the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority, to serve until July 24, 2012, and until her successor is appointed and qualified, vice Kenneth Tepper, Philadelphia, whose term expired.

EDWARD G. RENDELL
 Governor

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF NORRISTOWN STATE HOSPITAL

June 25, 2007

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, Geoffrey G. Jordan, 535 Stanbridge Street, Norristown 19401, Montgomery County, Seventeenth Senatorial District, for appointment as a member of the Board of Trustees of Norristown State Hospital, to serve until the third Tuesday of January 2013, and until his successor is appointed and qualified, vice Mark Ostrander, Norristown, resigned.

EDWARD G. RENDELL
 Governor

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT JUDGE

June 18, 2007

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, George Gregory, HC 1 Box 190, Marionville 16239, Forest County, Twenty-first Senatorial District, for appointment as Magisterial District Judge, in and for the Counties of Forest/Warren, Magisterial District 37-4-03, to serve until the first Monday of January 2008, vice Curtis E. Carbaugh, resigned.

EDWARD G. RENDELL
 Governor

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

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

YEA-49

Armstrong	Fontana	O'Pake	Tomlinson
Baker	Fumo	Orie	Vance
Boscola	Gordner	Piccola	Washington
Browne	Greenleaf	Pileggi	Waugh
Brubaker	Hughes	Pippy	White, Donald
Corman	Kasunic	Punt	White, Mary Jo
Costa	Kitchen	Rafferty	Williams, Anthony H.

Dinniman	LaValle	Regola	Williams, Constance
Earl	Logan	Rhoades	Wonderling
Eichelberger	Madigan	Robbins	Wozniak
Erickson	McIlhinney	Scarnati	
Ferlo	Mellow	Stout	
Folmer	Musto	Tartaglione	

NAY-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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION RISES

Senator ROBBINS. Madam President, I move that the Executive Session do now rise.
The motion was agreed to by voice vote.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS SENATE RESOLUTION ADOPTED

Senators WOZNIAK and EARLL, by unanimous consent, offered **Senate Resolution No. 152**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing with great sadness the supreme sacrifice of Army Sergeant First Class Raymond R. Buchan, who died from enemy fire on July 1, 2007, while courageously serving our nation in Iraq.

On the question,
Will the Senate adopt the resolution?

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Senator Wozniak.

Senator WOZNIAK. Madam President, although many people in this nation may be separated mentally, physically, and politically by the war in Iraq, the people of the United States, out of many, one - e pluribus unum - one thing we know for sure is we respect each and every one of our men and women who are serving overseas, and that it is truly a tragedy when one of them falls.

On July 1, 2007, Army Sergeant First Class Raymond R. Buchan died from his wounds sustained from enemy fire in the Ta'meen region of Iraq, paying the supreme sacrifice for our nation in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Sergeant Buchan, age 33, was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 18th Infantry Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 1st Infantry Division based in Schweinfurt, Germany.

A native of Johnstown, Pennsylvania, Sergeant Buchan was an outstanding athlete at Westmont Hilltop High School where he played basketball and football before graduation in 1991, and played in the Ken Lantzy Finest 40 All-Star Football Game in the summer following his graduation. He then entered the Army, where he served for 16 years before his tragic death.

In the fall of 2006, Sergeant Buchan was redeployed to Iraq from Schweinfurt. He is survived by his wife, Laura, a native of Erie, their two sons, Hayden and Andrew, his parents, Carol Jean and Richard, of Southmont, and his brother, Philip.

The Senate wishes to honor Sergeant Buchan posthumously for his courageous service to his nation, and therefore, I would like the Senate to give a final goodbye to one of our fallen soldiers in Iraq.

(Whereupon, the Senate en bloc stood in a moment of silence in solemn respect to the memory of Army Sergeant First Class RAYMOND R. BUCHAN.)

And the question recurring,
Will the Senate adopt the resolution?

A voice vote having been taken, the question was determined in the affirmative.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair declares the resolution unanimously adopted.

CONGRATULATORY RESOLUTIONS

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

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Mr. and Mrs. Dominic Sciulli and to the Penn Hills Baptist Church of Verona by Senator Costa.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Frederick W. Rohland, Joshua P. Clancy and to Begin With Us Child Care and Preschool of Altoona by Senator Eichelberger.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Betty Mae Johnson by Senator Logan.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to John D. Jameson by Senator McIlhinney.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Saint Rose of Lima Church of Carbondale by Senator Mellow.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Duane Brentzel by Senator Regola.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to the Punxsutawney Area High School Baseball Team by Senator Scarnati.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Mr. and Mrs. Edward Kenneth Cornell, Sr., by Senator Tartaglione.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Bruce E. Robinson, Marjorie Giddings and to Rhonda Bethel by Senator Washington.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Mr. and Mrs. Jerry Allen Cobler, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Guntrum, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur McLaughlin, Mr. and Mrs. Dwight Wedekind and to the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center Northwest by Senator M.J. White.

Congratulations of the Senate were extended to Our Lady of Lebanon Maronite Catholic Church of Easton by Senator Wonderling.

CONDOLENCE RESOLUTIONS

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

Condolences of the Senate were extended to the family of the late Christopher A. Thull by Senator LaValle.

Condolences of the Senate were extended to the family of the late Thomas Rawlings Pitts, Jr., by Senator Washington.

PETITIONS AND REMONSTRANCES

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Montgomery, Senator Connie Williams.

Senator C. WILLIAMS. Madam President, I rise today to add my 45 cents to the budget. In particular, I want to address the question of what should be included in the budget with another question, what exactly is the budget?

To me, Madam President, a budget is more than a spending plan. A budget reflects priorities and necessities, and is a way the General Assembly expresses what our constituents want and what they are willing to pay to get it. By that definition, the Governor's energy independence strategy not only deserves a vote as part of our consideration of the budget, but it will also, in time, become one of the most important, in fact one of the most historic and responsible things we can do this year for the future of our Commonwealth, the future of our country, and the future of our children.

Madam President, if you were to take this budget apart line by line and put each expenditure to a vote, I suggest that very, very few lines would receive the support that has been expressed in the energy plan. In a recent statewide poll, most Pennsylvanians expressed concern about taxes, and yet two out of three support spending 45 cents a month on the Governor's energy plan. Men and women, rich and poor, northeast, southwest, conservative or liberal, the poll said it did not matter. Across Pennsylvania, everyone is worried about the future of our energy supply and what we are doing to our earth. They said it was a priority and were willing to pay to make it happen.

That is what a budget is, a list of priorities. If we leave here this summer without doing what two out of three Pennsylvanians want us to do, we will deserve the predictable backlash that will come. My colleagues talk about putting this off for more study. Why have we not been able to do this at the same time we do the budget? Do we need to hear these words again and be reminded that we have one of the largest and most expensive legislatures in the country? Do we need 4 months to study a program that costs 45 cents a month? Let us debate this proposal on its merit and not on its politics.

At this late hour on Friday afternoon, July 6, at 3:25 p.m., let us listen to the citizens of Pennsylvania and align our priorities with our problems. Let us pass a budget that takes one small step toward escaping the servitude to Middle East despots and big oil. That is right, I said big oil, and as many of you know, I know a thing or two about oil. It has been, as the saying goes, very good to me. But I am not here to do what is good to me, I am not here to shape our Commonwealth to fit my needs and my priorities.

As someone schooled in the energy supply of the past, I understand very well the need for new priorities in the future. I am here to pass a budget that understands what Pennsylvanians want and what they want to pay. I do not know how things are going to turn out in the next few days, but the sniping and gamesmanship among us have already touched off the drumbeat. It is not surprising that the Philadelphia Inquirer is openly questioning the motives of the opponents to the energy plan, but when the York Dispatch, a newspaper that endorsed Republicans for the General Assembly in the last election, calls this stance amateurish and bush league, it might do well for us to pay attention.

Madam President, I urge my colleagues to make this budget reflect not only the priorities of political strategists and contributors, I ask that this budget reflect the priorities of Pennsylvanians.

Thank you.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Venango, Senator Mary Jo White.

Senator M.J. WHITE. Madam President, I rise to respectfully disagree with the lady from Philadelphia. I know what my constituents want. They want a budget done on time according to the Constitution and balanced with no new fees or taxes. The Governor makes much of the fact that this is only going to cost you the price of a cup of coffee. Really? He neglects to tell you that it will cost businesses up to \$10,000 a year.

I think my Committee on Environmental Resources and Energy has had one call from the Governor's Office on this issue. That was last week. The Governor spoke about his energy plan in February, but the bills were not introduced until March. In early June, Senator Tomlinson and I held two joint public hearings on the issue where we received tons of very good feedback from all interested parties, manufacturers, consumers, the Consumer Advocate, the Public Utility Commission, and the administration.

Madam President, it is clear to me that these bills, while they may be well-meaning and there may be pieces of them that have merit, need a lot of work. We have had a lot of trouble matching the rhetoric with what is actually in this legislation. You know, they say the devil is in the details, but sometimes it is in the lack of the details.

The four bills which constitute the Governor's energy package are so poorly drafted that staff cannot even match them up. There are numerous subtle provisions that give me pause as well. For example, the bills themselves place no limit on the amount of money that the State can borrow. The Governor throws a number around, but it is not in there. There is also no number matching the appliance strategies for energy efficiency. The administration is given broad leeway over how this money is to be spent once the bonds are issued. My constituents do not want more taxes or more borrowing, and they do not want unlimited power given to the Governor to spread money around the State for systems unrelated to the benefits that they will see on their electric bills.

Alternative fuel development is a very complicated field, and one in which I also have some experience, having worked in the oil industry for 19 years. I am more than willing to work with the administration on alternative fuels, just as I worked with them on alternative energy proposals in the electric bill, but not with a gun to my head, and that is what we are doing here. We are holding the budget hostage to cave in to proposals that are simply half-baked.

I urgently ask this Governor to pass a reasonable, responsible budget, and let us work together to craft an energy policy that is responsible.

Thank you.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Montgomery, Senator Connie Williams.

Senator C. WILLIAMS. Madam President, with all due respect, although I am very proud to be a neighbor to Philadelphia, I am very proud that I represent Montgomery and Delaware Counties.

I just want to say to my worthy colleague's remarks that we have, in the past, been able to work with, put in and put forth amendments that we think are more appropriate to bills that we

have been given, and it is disappointing that we have not done that as well.

Yes, I agree that this is not perfect legislation, but I think there are some parts of it that are so important that we ought to be doing it. This is a priority for our Commonwealth and the people of Pennsylvania have spoken, and it is a priority for our country, so I am disappointed that we are not going forward with this at this time. As we know, the budget is being debated right now in a conference committee. There are plenty of us here who can certainly be working on the energy plan.

Thank you.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Senator McIlhinney.

Senator McILHINNEY. Madam President, I rise to agree with my colleague, Senator Mary Jo White. To date, the Governor has not contacted me, nor has anyone from his office contacted me about the energy program, although he took it upon himself to make phone calls into my district saying that I am blocking it. It is actually an issue that I would like to see move forward, but right now the Governor is acting like a 12-year-old schoolboy who is taking his ball and going home because he does not get his legislative priorities.

This is a budget and he is holding 25,000 people hostage, and moreover, he is holding 12 million people in Pennsylvania hostage who expect a budget to be done on time. At this late hour to come in and say you want your legislative social agenda added to the budget or you will not sign it is just plain irresponsible.

I am calling on Governor Rendell to grow up, start negotiating a budget, and let us get this thing done. We can take up his legislative priorities in the fall the regular way. The way it takes any legislation to get through is to work hard, gather the votes and support, and then pass it into law.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Senator Tomlinson.

Senator TOMLINSON. Madam President, I rise to let the constituents of the Sixth Senatorial District know that I am, in fact, here in Harrisburg at 3:30 on a Friday afternoon, and I would like to refute the information passed to my constituents and I would just like to briefly read the information. I do not know who is actually putting it out, but they are obviously not friends of mine.

It says, six months after opening a casino at Philadelphia Park, officials in Bensalem agreed to use \$7 million in gambling and tax revenue to build massive athletic facilities and give each homeowner a \$200 check.

First of all, Madam President, that is not true. There was a \$2 million grant from the State from Governor Schweiker and \$2 million from Mayor Joe DiGirolamo of Bensalem, which are going to build an athletic facility at the high school. The \$200 check does come from the gaming money, but the \$10 million that comes from gaming in Bensalem is guaranteed and does not matter whether the casinos open or close, Bensalem gets \$10 million. So if the casino closes, they still get their \$10 million and the people in Bensalem will still get their \$200 check. The children will still get the athletic facilities that the mayor and Governor Schweiker have provided for, not the casinos, by the way.

The letter, e-mail, robocall, or phone call goes on to say that it is my fault that the casinos are going to close, and that I am not in Harrisburg trying to fight to keep the casinos open. The irony is that I spent, as you know, 10 years fighting to get casinos and racetrack casinos in Pennsylvania, and now someone is out there saying that I am trying to close them and that I need to get back to Harrisburg to make sure that the casinos stay open.

Madam President, as you know, we have had a couple of hearings recently in the last couple of days trying to get to the bottom of why we are actually closing down the casinos. I have been at both of those hearings, and we have tried to get information from the administration. I do not agree with the Governor that he can declare the seven or eight Department of Revenue employees nonessential. I do not agree with that legal opinion. I think we have presented a good legal argument against that. I think we should continue to keep the casinos open. Most of the people who work on the computers in the casinos are private contractors, G-Tech, the people who installed the casino computers, and the central control computer. What I really feel bad about is that this information is being disseminated in my district, trying to raise the heat, raise the rhetoric, and put pressure on me, while I am here in Harrisburg trying to mediate this, trying to cool tempers, and get everybody working together. Yet, I have to put up with these calls and e-mails going into the district saying to contact me to get to Harrisburg, which I already am, saying to contact me to say I am not engaged or I want to shut the casinos down when, in fact, I have been spending most of my time trying to keep the casinos open. I think it is improper to leverage the casinos in this fight on energy. I think we have a lot of common ground on energy and a lot of common ground on the budget. I would like everybody to just step back away from the ledge, and not jump off. I would like people to sit down to talk and work through some of the problems we have on energy. I would like us to certainly work on the budget, because it is after June 30, and I am very encouraged to hear that the administration now has people working on the budget in the negotiations. I think that is good news, and I am very encouraged to hear inside channels that we are doing some work on energy.

The point is, we are here and we have differences of opinion, but it is after June 30, and constitutionally, we should be getting this budget done. We have a long weekend coming up, and I think we are all dedicated to being here over the weekend. I know I will be here Saturday, Sunday, and Monday, and I think we should all be working on this. Since I do not see the leaders in the hall, it is my hope that the leaders are meeting right now and working on this, negotiating, and moving it forward. I do not think that we are that far apart on this budget and are in striking distance.

This is not 1991. We do not have a \$1 billion deficit. We do not need \$3 billion to solve this. We have a surplus over \$600 million, so we should be working on this. I do not think the differences are that important and I do not think we should be leveraging an industry that we just started in Pennsylvania, this new, young industry, that is in its infantile stages and in transition. I do not think we should shut that industry down. I have 700 employees at the track at Philadelphia Park, we have 3,500 employees across the State, and we should not shut them down. If we shut them down for any length of time, they will go somewhere else

and look for a job. We should not allow that to happen. We should be working here and negotiating. I am prepared to negotiate.

It is a bold-faced lie that I am not here, it is a bold-faced lie that I am not trying to mediate these differences. I am trying to bring the competing interests together. It is not good politics, Madam President, and we should not be deploying these types of politics, and we should not be using a new industry like the casino industry to leverage an energy policy. We are not even leveraging the budget, we are leveraging the energy policy with the casinos, and we should not do that.

Madam President, we have made great inroads into the markets in Atlantic City. Their revenues are down over 8 percent, and revenues at Philadelphia Park and Harrah's in Chester are doing wonderfully. If we close those casinos down, who knows what happens to that market share. If we lose that market share and do not get those customers back because they stay in Atlantic City, then we have ruined an industry before it even got started. This is not about the owners. The owners of casinos are in other States. This is about an industry in Pennsylvania that we need to grow, mature, nurture, and help get along. We cannot shut that down right now. I think it is inappropriate to do that, and it is inappropriate to leverage that against an energy policy.

As Senator White said, we had two hearings, and if you read the transcripts of those hearings, there was a lot of conflicting opinion as to whether these issues were right or wrong. I think it will take a little more than 30 or 45 days or a couple of weeks to address the difference of opinions of people in the industry, the consumers, and everyone.

Madam President, I probably agree with more of what the Governor wants to do than what I do not agree with, and I want to help bring those sides together. I think the rhetoric is heating up a little too much and we are getting a little cranky, and I think it is going to get a little crankier over the weekend, but I would like my constituents to know I am here. I am going to be here as long as it takes. I am not here angry and I am not here mad. I am here very disappointed that some have to use a tactic of lying to the constituents in my area and then sit up here and say, well, we have to shut this casino down because of the law. That is not true. We might have to shut the casino down to get leverage, and to say that is not a political move is not honest. It is a political move. We have good legal precedent to make sure that these casinos stay open and preserve those jobs and the \$1.7 million a day that these casinos are providing in taxes to this State, in addition to what is going to local communities. Guess what? Every day that they do not operate, you cannot make up that \$1.7 million.

Madam President, I just want to let my constituents know I am here in Harrisburg and happy to work with my friends on the other side of the aisle, I am happy to work with my friends on this side of the aisle, I am happy to work with the Governor's Office, and Secretary McGinty, whom I asked to come to my office today. I am still waiting. I have gotten a phone call, but I would love to see her and sit down and talk about the differences and try to resolve them. I think we have a lot of time. There are a lot of hours in the days ahead of us over this weekend, and I am telling you that I am letting my constituents know that I am prepared to be here and work as long as it takes.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT. Thank you, Senator Tomlinson. On behalf of Governor Rendell and myself, I wish to apologize to all of the Senators and assure all of your constituents that we know all of you have been here every day, and will be until we get this budget settled. I assure all of your constituents that we are all here in working agreement.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Allegheny, Senator Orié.

Senator ORIE. Madam President, my colleague from Montgomery County stood up to give her 45 cents' worth regarding the energy plan of the Governor, and I feel compelled to give my \$850 million worth in regard to this issue, because this issue is about putting Pennsylvania further in debt, and \$850 million worth of debt is one thing that this Governor is not speaking about in regard to Pennsylvanians.

When you talk about the \$850 million of debt that is associated with this, I think it is very important to also emphasize the history of debt that this Governor has built in Pennsylvania. This administration, in its first term, has borrowed close to \$3 billion worth of debt that is not to be paid back by us, but by future generations, generation after generation, picking up the Rendell legacy.

Let me share the debt to date that Pennsylvania has accrued under Governor Rendell. There has been \$1.3 billion under the Commonwealth Financing Authority, and we are looking at having to pay back \$1.8 billion in principal, interest, and fees. In addition, he has pursued \$650 million for Growing Greener, which will cost \$975 million to pay off. The Redevelopment Capital Assistance Projects were raised by \$500 million under this Governor.

He is now holding the State employees and this budget hostage for further debt for Pennsylvania. I would like to share what that entails, and not just the \$850 million in regard to this energy plan, but also the \$500 million he wants to borrow for the Jonas Salk Legacy Fund, which will cost \$840 million for Pennsylvania to pay back the principal, interest, and fees. Along with mentioning the \$850 million with the energy plan, there is unlimited borrowing under his energy independence fund, which becomes a superWAM program for this Governor.

Madam President, there are concerns with this, and for this Governor to hold State workers hostage for an issue that really needs to be vetted and looked at, especially when Pennsylvania will be looking at a total of \$10 billion worth of debt under this Governor, which is about half of our State budget and about future generations with interest accruing on this, and there are going to be future tax increases for Pennsylvanians. Unfortunately, when I speak about \$10 billion, it just echoes this Governor's insatiable appetite to spend and borrow, and we are putting a halt to that, saying, wait a second, Governor, let us vet these issues out, let us look to see if we have to borrow. Are there other alternatives? Is this the right thing to do for Pennsylvania? It is not about 45 cents or a cafe latte at Wawa that the Governor talks about, it is much more than that.

We have to get a grip on this insatiable appetite for spending in Pennsylvania because, unfortunately, Governor Rendell will be long out of office by the time this comes due and Pennsylvani-

ans really have to face the music with this \$10 billion worth of debt.

Madam President, to hold a budget hostage, and more importantly, when I look at a Philadelphia Inquirer newspaper article shared by one of my colleagues where the Governor said, as much as I do not like the fact that someone who works for the State would lose a week or two of salary, I think there are issues on the table that are important to the quality of life for 12.5 million Pennsylvanians. Well, Madam President, \$10 billion worth of debt is something that is very important to Pennsylvanians, and to hold those State employees hostage for an agenda which may or may not have aspects that we can work through is not right, and neither is holding Pennsylvania's workers and Pennsylvania back based on this insatiable appetite for borrowing, debt, and taxes.

Madam President, I am hoping that the Governor will come to his senses and pass the bill that the Senate, in a bipartisan fashion, put together. It does not have a lot of these new programs, but we are finally sending a message that we will live within our means. That is the message that we are going to send, and even though these programs sound wonderful, we are not going to put it on a credit card and make future generations pay them off. Instead, we are going to get back control of this State budget.

I am hoping that the Governor and the public, as they learn more and more about this energy proposal, recognize that what we are trying to do is the people's business. We are trying to keep Pennsylvanians at work and put together a budget that future generations will not have to pay off, and do what is sensible and right for Pennsylvania. The issue is not about 45 cents' worth, but about \$10 billion.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Senator Ferlo.

Senator FERLO. Madam President, we have met the enemy, and it is us in this room, as well as our colleagues in the House. I hesitate to enter the field of verbal jujitsu with my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle, but we should not engage in revisionist history when it comes to the budget process and where we are to date.

If I am not mistaken, I believe the honorable Governor, to his credit when he gave his Budget Address, which seems like many, many months ago, outlined a number of serious proposals, some of them were controversial and far-reaching. When the Governor gave his Budget Address to all of our assembled colleagues, he spoke not only about the actual operating budget, but if I am not mistaken, he also outlined a broad agenda which some may refer to as social policy. There was no hidden secret that the Governor wanted us to talk about and act on all kinds of legislation, from the issue of a smoking ban to the gaming and economic development fund, and he urged us to come up with creative financing in a way that would create dedicated revenue sources for our transportation needs, and certainly first and foremost for the bigger public transit systems in the east and west, but also for the smaller transit and paratransit systems all over the Commonwealth.

He spoke vaguely about energy independence and began to lay the foundation and groundwork for new ideas on how we can move our State forward in a progressive fashion on wresting back control of our environment and economy by facing full steam the

harsh reality of what the economics are of electricity deregulation and the need to reduce dependency. He put forward a very serious proposal months ago, and as one State Senator from the tri-county area of Allegheny, Westmoreland, and Armstrong, I sat here for months waiting for, either through the committee process or on the Senate floor, the opportunity to at least talk about these different proposals. We sat idly by. We did some minor pieces of legislation, and I do not want to demean any of them, but none of them were as critical as the policy initiatives the Governor, to his credit, set out in his Budget Address earlier this year.

To my knowledge, we really did not engage in coming to grips with his proposals and never had an opportunity as voting Members of the Senate to move that agenda forward. We were denied, and now we find ourselves in the eleventh hour hard-pressed to try to grapple with an operating budget that we are constitutionally mandated to adopt by June 30. We have now passed that date by many days, and now we hear all the rumblings and discussion about robocalls. I do not like or have ever engaged in robocalls, I do not know that I have ever been victimized by robocalls, and I hope I do not. In my opinion, I think it is a waste of human capital and resources, politically offensive, and not an effective advocacy.

The fact of the matter is that the Governor, to his credit, wants us to bring home the bacon. In his eyes, that is not only consideration of the operating budget for the Commonwealth, so he can maintain services and keep government functioning, but he also wants us to approve a transportation bill and a gaming economic development bill. Unless I am hearing wrong from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, it seems like we are pretty much in agreement on those three bills, even if there may be small bits and pieces that we need to work out, so I go back to my opening statement that we have met the enemy and it is us. Surely, the greater minds and resources of the collective Senate, regardless of partisan politics and party persuasion, should be able to wrest control and bring some finality to those three critical areas so we can move comprehensively and forthrightly to get the work done this weekend so there is no disruption.

The Governor is the Governor. That is why he is the Governor, and he has the power of the bully pulpit and the power to engage in his advocacy. If I am not mistaken, it would even appear as though the Governor is saying it is not good enough. He wants our action on his health care reforms and a number of other initiatives he suggested, and I guess he is willing to push the envelope here a little bit and demand that we get our act together and come up with some resolution. Honestly, I do not know if that is unreasonable because the fact of the matter is, and I think everybody and the public certainly knows, that once we sign off on a budget, transportation, and gaming, there is going to be a lot less urgency of movement here in the Republican-controlled Senate to take up his other initiatives. I hope that is not the case and they prove me wrong.

I am impressed with the gentlewoman from Allegheny who spoke eloquently with her calculator adding up the collective debt, but it is debt that the Republican Majority in the House and Senate pretty much supported in votes for Growing Greener and the other enumerated columns that she suggested. I do not know that finger-pointing at this point is going to be very helpful in this

process, and I am sure that I speak for every other rank-and-file Senator with the shared frustration.

We want to get the work done, and it would be the height of irresponsibility for any employee to be furloughed, whether they are independently employed in the gaming industry, the few individuals in the Department of Revenue who are the brain trusts keeping the gaming and accountability going, or whether every single State employee who has a family to feed and a mortgage to pay and is, at least in my book, equally as important as we elected officials, and it would be outrageous if we did not post-haste finalize and adopt a budget in a way that the Governor can also sign off on some of his measures.

Let us have a spirited and principled debate on the floor, but let us get to the work and to the task. I would implore the leadership of the Senate to move accordingly and work with the Governor's administration so that before we leave here this weekend, we can resolve the critical issues that I have just outlined.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Senator Tomlinson.

Senator TOMLINSON. Madam President, I would like to join my colleague and give this Governor a lot of credit. He has thought outside the box and has pushed the envelope on mass transit, highways, and bridges. We would not have come to the accommodation that we have come to on mass transit, roads, and bridges, if he had not proposed some of the proposals that he did. I did not agree with those proposals, but because of those proposals, we were able to come to an accommodation. We did not end up selling or leasing the turnpike, but we did leverage the turnpike. We could not get to the profits tax, but we have figured a way out, and I think we should give the Governor credit for pushing that rock uphill. We would not have gotten where we are on mass transit and highways if he would not have proposed those. But, there was a lot of work, a lot of consternation and controversy in trying to come to those accommodations.

On health care, I was happy to move out the scope of practice bills for the Governor, and they are over in the House right now. Energy is just as controversial. There are a lot of people with real honest differences of opinion to the Governor. Some of the things I agree with the Governor, and some of the things I do not. I would say that even in the Democratic Caucus, there are some "no" votes as to what the Governor wants to do. Certainly, there are enough "no" votes in the House Democratic Caucus for that proposal to not even get over here. So what I am asking of my colleagues, and I am sure what our leadership is doing, is to let us just step back from the cliff, calm down a little bit, calm the rhetoric down, and try to go at this reasonably. But, it is not fair to leverage all the State employees and put them at risk because we have an honest difference of opinion. It is not fair to risk a brand new industry in this State because we have a difference of opinion. I think we have worked well together and have more accomplishments than we do failures. I am trying to look at this optimistically and on the bright side of this. I want to get through this weekend, want people to work, and I want to see an accommodation. It is not going to be exactly what the Governor wants, and never is. It is not going to be exactly what we want, and never is. It has to be an accommodation.

Transportation is exactly the perfect example. We came to an accommodation, but energy is a little more complicated, and I think there are still some very, very large questions to be answered. Senator White and I held hearings, and it became very apparent to us that there are big differences in this legislation, and it is going to take a lot more than just 30 or 45 days to try to resolve this, but I give the Governor credit for putting that proposal forward.

We have to resolve these things, and I do thank you for your comments today. I want to thank my colleagues on this side of the aisle, but we owe the people of this Commonwealth some hard work this weekend. We do not owe them rhetoric or stances, we do not need to tell them that somebody is not in Harrisburg who is in Harrisburg, and we do not need to spread false rumors and lies. We need to cut out the rhetoric, get to business, get behind our leadership, and push our leadership a little bit so that they can move things forward. That is the way we get budgets done around here and address hard issues.

I do not know that we can get all these issues done, but I give the Governor credit for putting all those issues out there. I have only been here a few years and have never seen such an ambitious agenda. You are asking this legislative body that is very deliberative, both the House and Senate, to digest this, work through this, take the competing interests and work with them to try to get an accommodation.

That is not easy, so we need to calm everybody down, lower tempers, including the Governor's, and bring us from the precipice saying we are going to jump. We cannot jump and hurt these employees, they are good, faithful employees. We cannot hurt the employees at my racetrack, State employees, or private industry employees. We have to resolve this, and I am hoping that our leadership, right now as we speak, is accommodating that.

Thank you.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York, Senator Waugh.

Senator WAUGH. Madam President, I rise to respond in some ways to the comments from the good gentleman from Pittsburgh.

Before I begin, I would also like to echo Senator Tomlinson's commendations to the Governor for such an ambitious agenda. There are a number of items on the additional programs that he has proposed in the last couple of months that I am sure a lot of us could come to some grips and agree on. The difficulty, however, as I see it, is that the Governor has waited until the last hour to really begin to advocate and work. There is no doubt that a number of months ago he proposed these agenda items when he spelled out his budget, when for many of them, it was the first time we heard it. I have been here a number of years and have lived through a couple of governors and a good number of budgets. As I see it, the difference this time around, quite frankly, is that once he laid it out there back in the spring with his budget announcement, it was as if, and actually, I think one of the speakers earlier said, it was, by golly, I am the Governor and here is my agenda, so I expect it to happen.

After that, to be honest with you, and I am here every day just like everyone else, there was very little said; in fact, very little said until just the last couple of weeks when it became an integral part of moving the budget forward. Therein lies the problem, because today we are 6 days past the deadline that we have a

constitutional requirement to meet. Madam President, the rub really is that there are a number of us here who, unlike some of the speeches we have heard in the last 2 days, prefer not to talk about these programs now. Maybe once we get a budget done, but we are up against a deadline, and we are faced with the very real prospect in less than 72 hours of seeing State departments and offices shut down, State employees furloughed, and services that our constituents rely on which may seem trivial to some, but services that most all of our districts count on day-in and day-out, coming to a close. There is absolutely no reason why this manufactured, and I repeat that, why this manufactured and packaged shutdown and furlough stares us directly in the eyes. There is absolutely no reason, with a \$600 million surplus in the past year's State budget, why we stand here today concerned about how we can pass this budget.

So, I will finish where I began and say I think there are a lot of items under the Governor's proposals that we have common ground on. It is unfortunate that we have not crossed some of that ground and heard from the front office, and I mean heard from in a meaningful way, not in a speech and not in some explanation or indication that it is expected the General Assembly will just tag along. I am talking about doing the hard work and selling programs the way it should be done, and it has not been done. Now is not the time to do it, unfortunately. Now is the time to pass a core State budget in order to avoid what is about to happen within the next 3 days. Madam President, we stand ready to discuss the rest of the items when the timing is right. I leave that to my leaders, along with the Governor's Office, to determine.

I would like to close with just one last comment. The gentleman from Montgomery, a lady for whom I have a lot of respect, we served together in the House of Representatives for a number of years and then came to the Senate, commented on an article from the York Dispatch, which is a newspaper that I know very well. In fact, for the most part, the York Dispatch is a paper with which I have worked well. I am one of those Republican candidates whom she talked about having been endorsed a number of times by the York Dispatch, but I can tell you this, in my opinion, the York Dispatch got it wrong last night. The York Dispatch is ill-informed on the issue of how this budget matter has been handled in the last several days, and I would simply, if they are listening, encourage them to get the facts straight and pay a little more attention to the details before they pen editorials like the one yesterday evening.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Schuylkill, Senator Rhoades.

Senator RHOADES. Madam President, we are supposed to do a budget, a State budget. I would like to call it the KISS system - keep it simple, stupid.

There must be something wrong, because we stand here with a surplus of over \$600 million. The State of Maryland would love to have that, because they are \$1.5 billion in the hole and are looking for cuts. We propose a State budget with a \$600 million surplus, and all we are asking for is a no-tax increase, stay within the rate of inflation, and no hidden fees budget, and that is being held hostage? Does that make sense? How do you hold that hostage? We hold that hostage because everyone from this Chamber, the House Chamber, and the Governor have told school districts

to do the same thing. You know, we do not want them to have tax increases, that go beyond inflation because we set the rate for them, we do not want them to put in any hidden fees, we are saying that is what you have to do. But when it comes to us, well, it is all right to go \$10 billion in the hole. Let us borrow down and continue to spend. I have problems with that.

I think it is time we take a good look at it, and that is what we are trying to do. Look at the past 10 years in terms of the spending growth rates. It was 4.9 percent in 1997-98, 4.8 percent in 1998-99, 6.5 percent in 1999-00, 3.6 percent in 2000-01, 4.0 percent in 2001-02, -.3 percent in 2002-03, which was after the September 11 attacks, and it was 3.6 percent in 2003-04. During the last 3 years, it was 7.3 percent in 2004 -05, 6.4 percent in 2005-06, and 7.5 percent in 2006-07.

What are we doing? I am not blaming the Governor, because we did it with him. He did not do it by himself. It had to be approved by us, so do not go pointing a finger at him, we point it back and look in the mirror.

It is time to get our house in order and to get control. All we are asking for, very simply, is no special agendas, no special projects, no looking for anything funny, no tax increase, no higher than inflation, and no secret fees. You say, can that be accomplished? Well, you have during those past 10 years.

You know what is interesting, we look at the General Appropriations Act going back 20 years, and in those 20 years when you look at the bottom 4 years that took the latest to pass, aside from the 1991 budget with Governor Casey, which was passed on August 4, and remember, we were \$3 billion in the hole, there were some major tax increases. All of them were passed in another year, and out of the bottom 4 years, 3 of those 4 years have been during this administration and with us in place. I am saying something is wrong here. Enough is enough, let us get this right. Let us not hold the people of Pennsylvania, 25,000 workers, and casino workers hostage because we want to spend more money, go \$10 billion in the hole, and have that obligation rolled out.

The other thing is, we are going to borrow \$800 million to \$850 million and we are going to spend that. When, this year, next year, in 3 years or 4 years? We all know if we borrow, we are going to spend it quickly, and then for the next 30 years, we are going to pay for it.

There are 14 cogeneration plants in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I have five of them in my home county and another one in adjacent Carbon County that used to be my district, so, in my immediate area, I have six cogeneration plants. I have one proposed coal-to-gas liquification plant, and if the big oil companies would stop holding this up by using the banks because they do not want this to come out, it is a very environmentally safe and competitive fuel, that would come in place. This energy bill that we have is not going to put it in place, folks, so do not say that is the excuse, although it may be part of it.

Recently, I received 13 wind tunnels that were built on top of my mountain. I think you all have them across the Commonwealth, and none of them held up the budget. None of them were there saying it was so important for these things at that time that it held up the budget. The appropriations actually say, the Governor has his priorities, but so did these governors, and it got done within a quick time line. It was not always late, dragged out, and with high spending levels.

All we are saying is that we can handle all these things, get the State budget done, and let us do it without a tax increase, within inflation, and without any fees that are going to obligate us. Get that done, and then come back.

I say this, I hate this idea that we always have to spend money. It is like money is the answer to everything we do, but it is not. It is using your head, and I think there are a lot of things we can do. There are a lot of good ideas that have come from both sides of the aisle, from both Chambers, and from outside of this Capitol that can make these things flow, but it does not have to cost us a great amount of money. You do not have to prime the pump when you already have, in an energy case, a lot of that energy already flowing.

What I am saying is, we are here, let us do the budget, get it done to keep the 22,000 to 25,000 people working, to keep the casinos going, and all it is going to take is a simple action of saying, we concur with no tax increase, within the inflationary rate, and also without any funny fees. That all being done, we can be done and this Commonwealth can function again.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery, Senator Wonderling.

Senator WONDERLING. Madam President, I will be very brief and just offer some observations. I have been sitting here listening to a first in the Senate, and I have served here for about 5 years. This is the first time over an extended period of time, for almost an hour, that in a respectful manner, in a calm manner, and in a manner rooted in substance and not in emotion, colleagues of mine on both sides of the aisle have debated, discussed, and offered their perspective on the issues of the day. I think in this day and age where we seek to find the killer sound bite to grab the media's and the public's attention, it is refreshing that we can have an honest discussion about these ideas.

I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in absolutely applauding the Governor, and I think the agenda perhaps is not even ambitious enough to lay out goals related to transportation, health care, or energy independence, precisely what he is doing, and he is doing his job, I think as we all do each and every day as we listen to our constituents and draft legislation and offer ideas and concepts for a new Pennsylvania for this new century, because that is what it is all about.

Madam President, we are public servants. We love vigorous debate and we love to engage in the arena of ideas. I think it is important to remember though, and particularly as I listened to the comments from my respected colleague from the city of Pittsburgh, that we are co-equal branches of government. The Constitution does not necessarily give one branch of government more power or authority over the other, and so indeed His Excellency can ascend to the bully pulpit from time to time. That bully pulpit may be in the media room, or in his office, or at a local Wawa to trumpet and pronounce his vision and future of programs for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I think what you have seen in this Chamber, on a bipartisan basis for the last 6 months, is a collegial body that has taken matters into its own hands to get things done for the citizens of this Commonwealth.

Madam President, I remember, as if it were only yesterday, a vote of 50 to 0 to adopt rules in this Chamber that would make the business of the Pennsylvania Senate more transparent for the

citizens of this Commonwealth. The last time I checked my watch, the Democratic majority in the House is still having reform commissions, what I call reform by rope-a-dope instead of actually agreeing and getting the hard work done so we can bring more transparent government, at least here in the Senate, to the citizens of this Commonwealth. That hard work occurred last November and December, so that when we and our leadership all took the oath of office for a new term, we adopted rules by a vote of 50 to 0, on a bipartisan basis, to be more transparent. By my last count, we have sent over 80 pieces of legislation to the House. Many of those passed by a vote of 50 to 0, or 49 to 1, including a budget bill that passed this Chamber over 10 days ago by a vote of 49 to 1 that met the criteria on a bipartisan basis, as was outlined by my fine colleague, Senator Rhoades, living within inflation, basically applying the same rules to school district spending upon ourselves as a State government with no gimmickry, financial tricks, or budgetary magic.

Why is this so important that we are talking about the budget in the context of another ambitious agenda? I think it is important to remind everybody, not just our colleagues, that these are not just numbers on a piece of paper. We are talking billions and billions of dollars that are in play that is the people's money. Where does this budget come from? It comes from the wallets and pocketbooks of hardworking men and women in this Commonwealth, so we should be ever mindful as public servants that it is the money of the citizens of this Commonwealth. The power that we have, either to deal with it at a temperate or perhaps not so temperate level, and to respect the fact that we have this authority to take what is earned from a citizen and use it for a broader purpose to the level of almost \$22 billion, is something that we need to always be mindful of.

Madam President, in this day and age, when you consider that the average Pennsylvanian makes about \$35,000 a year, and that if you total up the taxes paid to the Federal government, to this Commonwealth, local school districts, and to their local municipality, almost 50 percent of the earnings of the average Pennsylvanian today goes to government. Now, at a point in time in which we are dealing with a potential government shutdown where well-meaning public servants who never have to face the electorate, who work at PennDOT or in our State Park system, are facing a furlough, we are now going to those folks who make \$35,000 a year, and they are already taxed 50 percent of their income, and say, we want to tax you some more.

My colleagues have noted as of late that I am growing a bit of a scraggly beard, Madam President, and I am calling this my budget beard. It looks awful, and my wife will not kiss me in the morning, at night, or in between any longer until I shave off this beard. To me this budget beard represents perhaps the amount of time we have already spent to meet our constitutionally required budget deadline, and trust me, I cannot grow a long ZZ Top looking beard. It is going to be short and scraggly for days to come. Madam President, the point is not my facial hair, nor budget gimmicks, press conferences rallying around a cup of coffee at a convenience store in southeastern Pennsylvania, barbs, rhetoric, or emotional speeches to try to rally a special interest group, or a robocall here or a highly contrived multimedia campaign by a partisan organization over there. The point is that we are public servants, and I think the number one responsibility we have as

servants of the people is to listen. When I listen to the folks whom I represent in the 24th Senatorial District, the message is loud and clear: No new taxes, no new taxes.

So I think that we are moving towards a productive conclusion. I think, as my colleague, Senator Tomlinson, has outlined, that we are making good progress and that cooler heads will prevail. I also think, and I have been giving this quite a bit of thought, that history will prove that this potentially long, hot summer of 2007, where we seem to be at a stalemate over a philosophical direction of this Commonwealth, will be remembered as the end of the age of arrogance. It will be remembered in which hardworking men and women of this Commonwealth who struggle to make ends meet, work more than one job, drop their kids off early at day care in the morning and do not get home until late at night, who understand that it is very hard to make a living in this day and age, will be buoyed and at least given some hope that, in an age in which a cold, faceless, bureaucratic government that likes to gobble up earnings and use them for some broader purpose that my constituents ask, how does that benefit me and where do I get the benefit from that, they will see that arrogance coming to an end.

That is my hope and my promise. We have to bring our government back to the people, and we do that by limiting government and by understanding that the hardworking men and women of this Commonwealth cannot afford to pay any more taxes. That is what I am hearing loud and clear from my constituents, and that is why I am prepared to remain here as long as it takes to uphold a budget that meets a no-new tax threshold.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Anthony Williams.

Senator A.H. WILLIAMS. Madam President, I actually think that we are making progress because traditionally, Petitions and Remonstrances are pretty boring moments full of platitudes, placating, and pandering. We actually have rank-and-file Members beginning to file up to these microphones and state their case publicly, but I want to go one step farther.

I do not necessarily think budgets have ever been reconciled by cooler heads unless there were boatloads of money that influenced the way you voted so your district gets more than mine, and this budget is not going to be any different. I want to say for the record, now for the third day, that robocalls can stop in the Senate. Let us have a meeting of COMO, our management process in the Senate, and let us make a rule, no more robocalls by Republicans or Democrats. It is always, and I said this to my dear friend today, it is always from a different vantage point when you decide you have been picked on.

When you smack somebody first with a robocall, you say it is not partisan and you are trying to provide information. It is always partisan, and it is always to gain political advantage. That is the way we do things. I do not necessarily agree with it, but that is the way we do things here. We always talk about the other side of the aisle, my dear friend, a bipartisan activity, even though it is by one vote. There was nothing bipartisan about that budget which passed, and I was the one vote who voted against it because I do not think we should deny kids pre-kindergarten, I do not think we should strip Misericordia Hospital in Delaware County of its ability to provide emergency relief services. I can

go through the whole budget and tell you all the things I believe should not have been passed in that budget.

I will also tell you that those Democrats on my side of the aisle who voted for that budget described it as a vehicle to create conversation, and I will tell you, these Democrats are disappointed with the fact that we have not made more progress. I listed all the things the Governor conceded - a cigarette tax, Jonas Salk, the gross profits tax - and I can go down the list of things that he has compromised on, and so these Democrats said, you know what, we have gone this far, we will go even farther and will engage in a dialogue with Republicans on that side of the aisle. That has not happened. All we keep getting is, we do not want taxes, and this, \$1, \$2, \$3, \$4, \$5 is what we are talking about.

Rhetoric is not the substance of \$5. Let us not call it a tax, let us call it a fee, because that is what happened the last time when they raised taxes on gas, but it was a gas tax. This is not about the substance, \$27 billion is not anything about this \$5. It is about who is in charge and politics. It is about, we are going to dictate the terms to this Governor regardless. That is what this conversation is about, and we are getting ready to sacrifice over 20,000 employees to make that point. I do not care how you dress it up or what anybody says, it is about who is in charge. There is nobody speaking logically. From my grandmother to my daughter, my wife to my mother, they do not understand why we are arguing over \$5 a year to generate savings for the future in terms of energy.

For those people who want to say, you know what, there are a lot of great ideas out there, there are. We have talked about those ideas. We are at war right now in Iraq because we have not developed an energy strategy that no longer makes us dependent on oil. We have a Governor who has said, let us take a first step, but because his ideas are not perfect, because we have not talked long enough, we have not delayed the process long enough, and we have not compromised long enough, I say, baloney. It is time to get past the rhetoric, and it is our moment of truth for Pennsylvania to move past all of this, and \$5 is not a lot to ask of anyone to do that.

I do not represent the most affluent people of Pennsylvania, and for those who want to talk about the openness of how we do the budget, this is not an open conversation. If people want to do the budget in an open fashion, let us do it on the Senate floor and not in a conference committee. Let us do it on the Senate floor and let taxpayers know everything that you put in. There are some fiscal hawks who were talking about getting a convention center or minor league baseball stadiums in their districts, and they are the fiscal hawks. I do not have a minor league baseball team in my Eighth Senatorial District. My taxpayers do not get anything out of it. They do not get anything out of a convention center that is not in my district. That is in somebody's district who is talking about not raising taxes. Let us stop the hypocrisy.

Do you want to face the challenge of fiscal constraint? I will take that challenge. I will pass a no-frills budget, and I will make sure whatever you do not get, I do not get. Whatever you get, I get. We can do that. I can take that challenge, but I am not going to play these games. This is about who is in charge, not what we are arguing about or the substance that we are taking about. It is not about \$5. If anybody wants to take that challenge, I am here.

Let us remove the robocalls. I have said that for 3 days, and I have not yet received a letter saying we want to remove the robocalls from the Senate. I have not heard from one person on that side of the aisle, from my dear friends, saying, you know what, he is right. If you want to tell the Governor, do not send a robocall to my district and do not make this partisan, then take up that challenge. I guarantee you the Governor will no longer do it, but as long as you do it, he is going to do it. That is the bottom line and the way this works. This is not a heavyweight fight with both of my arms tied behind my back when I am fighting for children, adults, and seniors, and you decide I am going to go in the ring unarmed and you can take all the shots you want and I cannot take a shot back. Who does that? That is disingenuous and, as my grandmother used to say, that is a big fib. It is just not the truth.

Let us focus on what this is about. This is about who is in charge and who wants to influence the outcome. It is not about \$5 in an energy policy, but about who is going to dictate the terms of this, and by the way, cooler heads should prevail, because I can ratchet it up just as high as the next guy. Threats can go all day across this place. I will stand the test of time, I will stand up to that heat and I will tell people the truth. Do not come on this floor and say, I do not want to spend any more and I want to cut taxes. And by the way, I want to make it very clear, it is by none of the people who have spoken thus far. We are rank-and-file guys and do not get that kind of cache.

There are other people who will be at that table talking about fiscal considerations and fiscal constraints while their district benefits. I do not think that is what we should be about, and for those who are concerned for the people who are going to be laid off, they should be, but they need to return to their bodies and explain to them that if you have something, I get something. I am not asking for anything for my specific district, but I am asking for an opportunity for my children to live in an energy-friendly Pennsylvania. I am asking for an opportunity for my mother, who will be replacing her air conditioning system this year, to be able to do it with a credit. I am asking for the thousands of people who already have smart meters in their homes to be able to use them in an appropriate and effective way.

This is not about rhetoric, but about reality and what happens in everybody's lives. I hope that the gotcha politics of Pennsylvania could go away. I do not care how you dress it up again, you do not make a pig with lipstick into a beauty queen. That is just not what you do. Face the reality. This argument is, and I will describe it the best way I can describe it, it is like an argument in my household. When I do not have the money, I tell my wife, you cannot spend the money. Honey, we cannot afford the new furniture, or that dress, or that hairdo has to go on the sideline. I tell her that and she understands, but when I do have the money, I do not go home and say that the children cannot get new shoes. I do not do that. I do not say we should not replace the sofa. I say we should save money and spend appropriately when we have the money to spend.

For those people in Pennsylvania who say we do not want taxes and want to cut spending, I agree with that, but then do not spend in your district, because I am going to go through line by line and explain to the taxpayers what we are spending money on. Do not act like you are holier than thou on this, because you

are not. You have been doing it for decades and just changed the version. The checkers on the board never change. You are going to spend \$27 billion and are actually trying to sell that as being responsible and that you are fiscal hawks? No, you are not, because you are going to pay for education, you are going to pay for State Troopers, you are going to pay for prisons, and you are going to pay for health care. That is what we are supposed to do, and when you have the money, you are supposed to improve on the bottom line so you can deliver better quality for taxpayers.

Talking about wanting to cut taxes and not having the substance of what we are going to spend the money on is a hollow argument. You are going to spend money, and you are going to spend billions of dollars, and there are not many people on this floor who can tell me that they never voted for a budget, and by voting for that budget you spent taxpayer money in the billions of dollars. This \$5 does not represent a hoot in that conversation. This is about something serious in the context of how you affect Pennsylvanians' everyday lives.

I want to tell you that I am not in an office where I am used to getting a lot of e-mails and letters. Most people stop in or call, because that is the way they communicate. I have received letters from people in parts of Pennsylvania that I know I will never represent, but those people are not registered in my party. They understand \$5, and when I tell them about \$27 billion, they cannot reconcile this with the guy who is telling them, I am cutting your taxes, and they should not. They want to know what it is going to do for their district, and they should.

For those of us who want to move this process along, I would suggest we do just that. Let us move this process along and not make it something it has never been before. It is about initiatives, and this Governor is articulating his vision of Pennsylvania just as other governors before him have, during budget time. This \$5 expenditure is nothing lavish, and we are not asking for luxuries, a Mercedes Benz, or testing this concept on something that has not been applied before. These initiatives relate to real outcomes for Pennsylvania, and for those of us who want to stop this robocalling, let us start here first with the Senate of Pennsylvania. Let us say, we are not going to do it, and go to COMO next week to take them out.

For anybody who does not want to spend a taxpayer's penny, let them be the first person to say, I will take out any initiative that I have in this budget and agree not to spend any taxpayer's money in my district because I am so thoroughly disgusted with doing it.

Madam President, I do not think anybody is going to take that challenge. I think that at the end of the day they will claim victory and spend the taxpayers' money. It will be hidden in a budget yea thick, layered under words they have agreed to in some hollow, dark office building in the back because it will be a deal that they cut. Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative, black, white, senior, rookie, all of them have done it.

For those 20,000-plus employees who will be laid off on Monday, blame all of us. I am not looking or asking for exemption on this. Blame all of us, but be clear it is the Senate of Pennsylvania that holds the fate of these employees in their hands.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Senator Tomlinson.

Senator TOMLINSON. Madam President, the next time my friend, the Senator from Philadelphia, wants to count out \$5, he can count it out on this desk over here. I think the demonstration of counting out \$5 or talking about the \$5 problem shows some of the problems we had in the hearings we held on the energy independence policy. The \$5 was to go toward helping people buy new refrigerators and air conditioners, which a lot of us like that idea, and a lot of it went towards renewable energy, wind, solar, and that kind of thing, which I think is a good idea. The problem is that wind and solar only gives you about 2 percent of your generation power or demand. My question was, since we are the Saudi Arabia of coal, why are we not investing any of that \$800 million in coal? Why are we not investing it in industries that are already here and helping our own industries and generating plants?

That was one of the questions, and it was not answered. Actually, just the other day I received a letter from Secretary McGinty who gave me a pretty succinct answer, but it is not like the process has not been going on and we have not been looking at energy or trying to examine the policy of the Governor or Secretary McGinty. One of the biggest questions I had is when I heard from Senator White, Senator Rhoades, and Senators in rural Pennsylvania who are sitting on mountains and mountains of coal and yet we could potentially not have enough generation for our demand, I want to know why we are not even looking at working with coal generation. The clean coal technology, as I am told by the PUC and the Secretary, is excellent technology, very clean, and would meet all Federal standards. I do not know why we are not trying to retire some of those older plants that do not meet the standards, because 10 percent of our generation is supposed to be shut down because of Federal regulation. Why are we not working on that?

I like the idea of solar and wind energy, but it can only ever generate 2 percent. We need more generation, but all we are asking for is that for \$800 million I want to see the bang for the buck. We want to see the best dollars spent, particularly when we are sitting on, and you talk about an independence in energy, mountains and mountains of coal. All you have to do is listen to Senator Rhoades and Senator Don White and those who have districts where all they have is coal, and I do not understand. That is part of the problem, and it is almost 5 o'clock on a Friday afternoon and we still do not know why we are not investing in coal. Can we get that solved before the weekend? Probably not. Have we been trying to? Yes, we have, but it is a very long and complicated process.

On the point of the \$5, a lot of people would think about the \$5, but it is the question of the \$800 million that we are going to spend in about 3 years, and a lot of us want to make sure that money is spent back in Pennsylvania in those industries. I like the idea of renewable energy and applaud Secretary McGinty for trying to move solar and wind energy ahead. We need renewable energy, but we are going to spend \$800 million and we should be looking at how we are going to spend it here. That is a monumental question and task to resolve, and it is not because we have not been trying to, because we have.

Madam President, I just wanted to point out that we have been trying to resolve and investigate those issues, and we have Senators who have good points who are trying to get those points

through. I am not sure that we can do that before the end of the weekend, but we could probably solve the budget by the end of the weekend. Let us move forward with an independent energy policy and with incentives for people to buy new products. I just went out and bought a new washer and dryer, and it is amazing how much energy they save. Although it was pointed out when you buy a new refrigerator, the old refrigerator gets put in the basement to hold the beer, so you do not necessarily save money because very few people get rid of their old one.

My point is that I agree with Senator Anthony Williams and am on his side regarding the early childhood education and the block grants, but if we are going to hold up this budget process, all the State employees, and the casino industry because we have not come to a resolution on the energy policy, that is a false promise because I do not think we can do that. These are legitimate questions, legitimate concerns, and things that we have to move forward on, but we are not going to solve them this weekend or, as I said earlier, in 45 days.

It was a very ambitious agenda the Governor gave us and I think we did a lot of work on it. He certainly conceded on many issues, as we did, but we must all realize there are a lot of big issues that we still have to resolve, and they are honest issues. The \$5 does not sound like much, but frankly, the small businesses are going to spend a lot more than \$5, but if they know they are going to get a good return, if they know they are going to get energy independence, if they know it will lower the demand and we will have enough generation in the future, then I am for that, but I do not have those questions answered. We have not gone through the entire process and solved all that.

I am prepared to have more meetings and hearings, anything it takes, but we are not going to have these legitimate concerns solved by Monday. I say, let us get this budget solved and get long-term energy contracts and some of the other things on energy where there is some common ground, but there are things we are not going to resolve by Monday. There is no reason to put any State employee out of work because we cannot get to that big question of what we are going to do with clean coal technology, renewable energy, and incentives for people to buy energy-efficient appliances. These are all great and wonderful things, but given all the other tasks we were asked to do, I still think this one remains open, and nobody should be held hostage to that, particularly State employees and a new industry.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Anthony Williams.

Senator A.H. WILLIAMS. Madam President, it is always difficult for me to debate Senator Tomlinson because I consider him a friend, and when we talk about bipartisan activities, he has actually engaged in a variety of those issues, so he comes with credibility when he says that he believes in the initiatives we are talking about today. Unfortunately, I do not believe that a majority of his Caucus has that same kind of perspective. I also do not believe that when we talk about deferred dreams, we should take it as payment in full on anything in life, and certainly not this particular consideration. The dream of Pennsylvania being an energy-independent State is just that, a dream, and frankly, in certain areas, a nightmare.

I want it to be very clear that I am a person who spends a great deal of time with Senator Ray Musto and Senator Mary Jo White, and we all serve with great distinction and honor on the Committee on Environmental Resources and Energy. They have educated me over the years on the concerns that people in western Pennsylvania have on protecting coal and its growth. I do not think that it is beyond the pale of understanding of myself, Secretary McGinty, or the Governor. I do not believe there is anything that we are proposing which counters that or negates its ability to prosper in Pennsylvania. I would also draw attention to the fact that \$800 million is a lot of money, but it still does not equal \$27 billion, and \$800 million in 3 years does not equal \$27 billion in 1 year. Even 3 years with this initiative does not get close to the amount of money we are going to spend in this budget, and that is without this initiative. Although \$800 million is a lot of money, it is not \$27 billion.

To have a proposal that begins the process of energy independence does not counter our ability to support the coal industry. It never has and never will. We are from Pennsylvania, and I understand what it means to support our total economy. I have done those votes in the committee. When Senator Musto came to me and said I have to have this, this, and this, he will tell you that I have been there, even though I come from Philadelphia and Delaware Counties, because it is an integrated economy. If they fail in the west, we sink in the east. I understand that, and I think this Governor understands that. But to suggest that this bill and this initiative has to be a perfect initiative and incorporate all the ills, then we will be sitting here until our grandchildren represent us in this Chamber. They know that, and we also know that when we have public hearings on initiatives, they never get off the ground. The reality is that we have been talking about this long enough, so this Governor said, here is the moment and now is the time to take a shot at it. I think he is taking a full, hearty shot at it with an appropriate and balanced perspective. He is not proposing ideas which have not been thought out and tried, but is applying ideas which have been thought out and tried. Frankly, he is on the up part of the curve.

While people keep talking about solar and wind energy as X-percentage of the total generation process, they are right today, but there is a whole category of alternative energy which, hopefully, is going to increase over time, because when you talk about it only being 10 or 15 percent, which is generous, you are talking about oil being the other dominant portion of that. We have to create alternative energy so that oil is not so dominant, and we cannot wait for that any longer. Anyone who understands why we are so vested in the Middle East understands it is about protecting our interests as it relates to oil. That is why we are there. I would like to say that it is because we believe in humanitarian issues, do not like tyranny, and want to take arms away from all those dictators, but that is not, unfortunately, reality. We all know that, and the reality is that we are there because we have to protect our interests when it comes to oil.

Pennsylvania should be in front of that curve. I do not agree that this struggle we are having has anything to do with us agreeing on these ideas, because if it did, we would have passed these initiatives today. Clearly, there are those who stand at these microphones--and it is not just Senator Tomlinson--who agree with this stuff but think we should wait. If we all agree, then we

should not wait. If we all agree with this, we should just move forward and get it done. That is what we should do, and \$800 million as compared to \$27 billion is still not anywhere close to that number.

I also want to hear a response to us making a decision as a Chamber, I want to hear from the other side of the aisle that they agree that robocalls should stop. If the next person stands up in response to my comments, I want that person to respond to my question, are they prepared to stop robocalls in the Senate? We can resolve that, and it does not take hearings, legislation, or years. If we think being partisan is a part of the robocall process, then let us stop it and let the Senate take the challenge. We do not have to wait for the Governor or the House to change those rules. Let us stand up and take that on and stop robocalls, and we will get the Governor to stop his robocalls. If we are going to be having a conversation, then let us have a conversation. Let us take the time to clean up the total environment in Harrisburg, or at least about that process.

While I appreciate the gentleman's comments about being supportive of these initiatives but the timing tends to be of a concern, I think the time is now. I daresay the 20,000 people whom we are going to lay off on Monday would be willing to put down that \$5 toward keeping their jobs and going forward, especially when you say that at the end of the rainbow, there is a return for your \$5.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Senator Tomlinson.

Senator TOMLINSON. Madam President, there is no way that I could ever spend more time than Senator Anthony Williams at the microphone, and I have never seen anybody wind down a speech longer than he can.

In reference to robocalls, my complaint today in committee was not about the calls, but to point out that this was just another political tool in using the casinos as a wedge, and I think we all agree with that, but I am beyond that. I am here in Harrisburg and there was a lot of misinformation, but there was proof that we do not need to furlough the 7 or 8 employees at the Department of Revenue. We had a legal opinion that said we did not have to do that. The point was that this is just another political ploy. It is a leverage issue, and I am beyond that and want to put that to bed.

To briefly get back to energy, and I promise you, I will end with this and sit down after this, but being the Saudi Arabia of coal, we have companies in Pennsylvania that turn coal into gasoline. Secretary McGinty and I have been very much for that, but I do not want to hold up a budget because we cannot get that done. With the price of gas today at \$3 a gallon, we should be able to market coal into gas. We should be able to do that and be independent on that, and let us move that forward, but I do not want to hold this budget up because we cannot get that accomplished or because we cannot get the details worked out on how we spend the \$800 million.

I am not opposed to alternative energy and, in fact, I am very much for it. It comes down to the fact that we sell more energy in Pennsylvania than we take in. We are not an energy debtor. We sell our excess capacity, so it is not a matter that we will run out of generation, which I was worried about, but it is a matter that we should be investing our dollars in something that will

return more than 2 percent of the generation capacity in Pennsylvania, and that could be coal. Turning coal into gas is a great argument, debate, and something to pursue, but none of this should stop us from settling a budget or cause the furloughing of Pennsylvania employees or shutting down of the casino industry in Pennsylvania. With that, I yield to my good friend, Senator Anthony Williams, who I know could talk me back down into my chair at any time.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Anthony Williams.

Senator A.H. WILLIAMS. Madam President, the gentleman does not do too badly either at winding down his comments.

I would again suggest that if we are going to save taxpayers money, then we should start with robocalls. I do not know what the cost is to the Senate, but by the time I come back to the Senate floor I will find out how much it cost to have these robocalls, and we can start by saving taxpayers money with that and no longer have to worry about this issue.

I agree that turning coal into gas is available to us now. I simply disagree that we should be waiting to figure out when we do that, because if we want to argue about how to spend \$800 million and that should be part of the initiative, I think that can be worked out. Because guess what? I do not believe anybody who pulls up to a gas pump in Pennsylvania today and pays \$3 or \$4 per gallon, or whatever outrageous amount they pay, will say, wait a minute, you mean we have a way to study this and figure out a way to reduce the cost? I do not think anyone at home today is looking forward to winter and thinking about how much their gas or electricity bill is going to be. I do not think there is anyone at home today who, when told there is a way to solve that problem today and all we have to do is invest in Pennsylvania and it will only cost you \$5, will think we should wait. I do not think there are any Pennsylvanians who will say we should wait, and I think they would also say, I do not care if it is budget time or if it should have been in May, February, or 2006, we should have done that. They do not disagree with the fact that this Governor is saying we should do it now. All I can tell you is that when you look at the editorials across Pennsylvania, and not just from Philadelphia or Delaware County, they just do not get it. They say, we just do not get it, \$5 to figure out a way for us not to do all the things the Senator alluded to, to reduce that cost, is something they think we should do with urgency, not with more deliberation and conversation.

There are two things we can do today, and I am again going to ask that we stop the robocalls in the Senate, and begin the process of being energy independent in Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Allegheny, Senator Orie.

Senator ORIE. Madam President, when my colleague from Philadelphia keeps quoting \$5 and pulling out \$1 bills, and yesterday a \$5 bill, he is using an average of what the cost is in Pennsylvania to consumers. The one issue that he is not looking at that I am hearing from my senior citizens and some of the poorer people in Allegheny County is the fact that it is based on the kilowatt usage and how much you use. So, if you are a poor person or a senior citizen and you have an oven, stove, washer, dryer, and most of the individuals have air conditioners in their

windows, not an air conditioner that accommodates the whole home, the older your appliances are, the more money you are going to be paying. The ones who can afford to buy these energy-efficient refrigerators, stoves, or ovens are the ones who are going to get the rebates back, and they will be the ones who are going to spend \$5 a year.

One aspect that is being totally lost in this mix are the poor citizens of Pennsylvania who cannot afford to modernize their equipment or appliances, who live day-to-day to make ends meet in their homes. That is what I am concerned about, and those are answers we have not received

For senior citizens, when the caps are coming off these rates and rates are going to go up, I would concede that \$10, \$20, \$30 is going to be a lot to a family on their electricity bill that is going to go up automatically, and I ask the Senator from Philadelphia, when he mentions \$5, that is the average.

I think the younger families who are more well-to-do are the ones who will benefit from this. Are senior citizens going to be able to put solar panels on their homes, or is a poor family going to be able to benefit from solar panels? They are not going to be able to afford that, so what about those people? That is what I say is getting lost in this mix and dialogue that we are having, getting lost in this misconception of what it is about, and we all have to take a break and step back and realize the ramifications of this energy bill. The gentleman was not here when I spoke earlier, but it is not just about that, it is also about \$850 million worth of debt on top of that. Maybe they will not pay for it now, but we all as taxpayers will pay it in the future. Let us vet that out and see the impact in Pennsylvania. I certainly applaud the vision, but do not punish the State or the workers of Pennsylvania because we are really looking at this issue the way the public would want us to. We are scrutinizing it. It is not to stop it, it is to vet out the issues and see where we can reach agreement and move forward.

I just ask that you consider that, because I believe in my heart of hearts the ones who are going to suffer from this, when you look at that average, are senior citizens and the poor in Pennsylvania, and it is just not right.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Anthony Williams.

Senator A.H. WILLIAMS. Madam President, I agree caps are going to come off, and I would think that would make us want to stay here even longer to resolve it now. I am glad somebody brought up poor people, because with all due respect, most of the people I represent are considered poor people. I know exactly what they are going to get out of this process. They are getting attention drawn to something that people have looked past. Those caps that are coming off are going to drive up the cost for all of Pennsylvania, but particularly that population.

With all due respect to the prior speaker, when she talks about those utility bills, most of this talks about a kilowatt hour. A kilowatt hour relates to electricity, and most of the stuff you just mentioned does not relate to this category. Frankly, most poor people do not use the amount of energy that people who do have a lot of money use. That is not opinion, that is a fact. So, to talk about who is going to use those kilowatt hours, most of the people who are going to use those kilowatt hours have a lot of

money, because they have many more appliances in their home, such as home computers and lights in every room that are turned on. They have electric appliances that most of these people do not have.

One thing that they are beginning to have are these smart meters, which is a part of this conversation and a part of this initiative. It will allow them to negotiate the terms of when and where they spend their money, and they will learn how to be energy efficient within their homes. There is a lot that relates to people who do not have money in this initiative. That is not something that the Governor or Secretary McGinty glazed over in pursuit of supporting those who cannot. That is just not true. For those who want to talk about debt in the future, I do not need to go down the boatloads of things that we bonded in this State that, frankly, seniors will be paying for generations to come, and my children will be seniors by the time we are finished paying for them. Stadiums under a Republican Governor and a Republican legislative body were bonded, and the last time I checked, they are not in everybody's district, but for some reason we thought that was an appropriate thing to bond, but we do not think protecting the Commonwealth in terms of being energy efficient is an important thing to do for seniors and poor people? That is just being inconsistent.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognize the gentlewoman from Allegheny, Senator Orie.

Senator ORIE. Madam President, I would like to briefly respond to Senator Williams. When he mentions the smart meters, if you are an older senior citizen and have an older refrigerator, because the new modern versions are the ones that are energy efficient and your smart meter shows you how many kilowatts you are using, what do you do, unplug the refrigerator? That is the point behind this. The smart meter just tells them that their appliances are using more kilowatts. I believe that their kilowatts are going to be more because newer appliances are more modern and more energy efficient. It is an issue that needs to be vetted out, and to say that I am bringing that up without considering the poor or the impact on them, that is the whole point behind this. A smart meter does not do anything other than tell you you are using a lot of kilowatts, you are going to be charged for this. What is the solution for those individuals, for seniors, for poor people? What is their solution, unplugging? I do not get it. That is something that is not answered.

You are right, the wealthy are going to be the ones who will benefit from this. They can put a solar panel on without thinking twice, and get rebates and money back from the State. What happens to those two classes of people? I do not know, and that is all I am saying. It is an issue that we need to address.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Anthony Williams.

Senator A.H. WILLIAMS. Madam President, for one thing, a smart meter tells you that you are not only using kilowatt hours, but also the best and most optimal time to use them. For example, if you have a dishwasher in your house that runs on electricity and you run it at 6 o'clock when everyone else is running their dishwashers, it will cost you more money. It tells you not to run

it now, run it later. That is what it does and that is why they call it a smart meter, but everybody knows that.

We can go through these arguments point by point. The question is, do you pay it now or later? Do you feel that we are in an energy crisis now? If I am driving up to a gas pump, I think so. If I am going to pay when those caps come off, I think so. If I am one of those folks who are poor, living in their houses trying to figure out how to pay their utility bill, I think so. It is time well-spent in this crisis to figure this problem out now.

If people have different ideas, then say, I am willing to take the challenge. Let us not pass the budget, let us stay here a few extra weeks and get this thing cleared up in terms of this energy initiative, so that all these concerns can be a part of it; not passing a budget and then going home and talking about the house being on fire and we will get water later. And if people are concerned about poor people, great, I am glad we all are. That is great. Where have we been for the last 30 years? We have not done anything for them then. We did not do anything in the last budget or during the course of several years to deal with this issue as it relates to people who are poor. The last time I checked was when I was on this floor arguing for LIHEAP, and not to say that some people on the other side of the aisle were not a part of that consideration, because they certainly were, but I was very aggressive in terms of pushing that initiative uphill by myself.

On weatherization, let us go down the list of things that relate to people who do not have money and cannot afford to pay these bills. Where are we? We are not here. Do not start throwing them up against the wall and see if they stick. Do it now. If you are really concerned and think it is an important issue, then do it now. Go back to your Caucus and say, take a couple of weeks off. Do not lay people off because we are going to come back with an answer. We are going to get this thing done because we are committed to doing it now. I do not want to hear that we are going to do it sometime down the road, because that means you are selling hollow promises to people who can no longer afford those hollow promises come September, November, and December. They cannot.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Senator Browne.

Senator BROWNE. Madam President, there was an observation made by my colleagues that the remaining Members on the floor are former House Members. It might be the reason why this debate is going on so long today.

I want to take an opportunity to respond to some of the things that Senator Williams had asked for. First of all, he had requested that, as a matter of policy, the Senate stop the robocalls, and I stand ready with him in requesting COMO that we do that, but I also want to make sure we realize that there is a line in advocacy that we should not cross, robocall or not. My reason for getting up yesterday was to state my opinion on the fact that the line was crossed, even if it was through a robocall or mail piece, or whatever, and that we should never be exploiting our veterans. Those are men and women in service in our advocacy, so even if we get rid of the robocalls and go to something else, that is a topic we should never cross, and that was the main reason why I wanted to get up and speak in regard to the calls I received.

In regard to dealing with alternative energy as a matter of public policy, we should do that now. I think there is room within our current General Fund Budget that we pass and still remain below the CPI to invest in alternative energy, but it is just the way we are doing it. I basically disagree with the method in which we are getting the State involved, and I think it comes down to basically economics and history. History dictates that, at least from my standpoint, whenever government gets headlong into energy policy, it is not a good thing, so I think we should consider an alternative.

As we all know, energy sources are basic commodities, and as basic commodities they are very sensitive to the rudiments of supply and demand. People will make choices for energy based on price and availability. It does not matter how many windmills or dams we build, or whether we strap solar panels to our back. Whatever we do, people are going to purchase energy sources within a range based on supply, cost, price, and availability. What is the least sensitive aspect of society to the dictates of supply and demand? That is government. The reason why is because we are not spending our own money, we do not put our own money at risk, and we are not subject to the pressures of competition because we are the only 60-million pound green dome in town. We do not have other governments competing against us, other jurisdictions of our power competing against us. What is the Governor's plan proposing to do? It is getting government headlong in the supply business of energy.

We are proposing to spend \$800 million, and that is the debate here. Again, it is not the \$5 a year, but the \$800 million and the \$2 billion in debt service over the course of the bond on energy supply. We are dictating the supply, and we constantly hear we are leveraging private dollars, but we are not leveraging anything, we are just dictating where the private dollars will go because we are the first line of finance. The rest of the money is going to follow the public money, which means we are distorting the basic elements of supply and demand that are the best and most efficient way to dictate energy supply.

The thing we should do is look for an alternative. We should not be putting more impediments in the supply and demand equation but releasing them, and the way to do that is not through government-controlled policy but through incentives and tax credits, rewarding those businesses which receive the private money and get the demand by lowering the cost of government and lowering taxes on those who are profitable and those who are successful.

That is the model in energy that has worked. We looked back to the 1970s when government tried to control energy, and what did we have? We had lines at gas stations. We looked at California when government tried to cap prices and what did we have? We had blackouts. Government's role in the energy supply should be as a partner and not as a leader.

Madam President, this alternative energy train is coming through town and it is important for government to be part of the crew, maybe one of the conductors, but we cannot be the engineer. If we are driving this locomotive and we are the engineer, I can guarantee that this is one train that will derail.

Thank you very much.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Senator Tomlinson.

Senator TOMLINSON. Madam President, the other point about the alternative energy is that the 2 percent it will produce is going to be some of the most expensive energy you can purchase. Senator Browne is right in that we must be careful. This is important and something we have to do. It is coming and something we should be encouraging and even be investing in, but we are also almost contradicting that we are trying to lower the cost of energy, but we are making people buy an expensive form of energy because it is good for the environment. So these things have to be balanced out.

I actually stood up to talk a little bit about the smart meter. The smart meter is a nice idea and already in Pennsylvania. The problem with the smart meter is that it is going to tell you at 3 o'clock in the afternoon you have to turn off your air conditioner because the cost of energy at 3 o'clock is extremely high. Are you going to ask the elderly in their homes to turn their air conditioner off because it is going to save the peak power? What we are trying to do is make sure that the cost of peak power is lower, and I understand that, and we should be working toward that, but we do not have it resolved yet. We all know you should set your dishwasher on a 3-hour delay at 12 o'clock at night so that the dishwasher goes on at 3 o'clock in the morning. I know that. I do not need a smart meter to do that. And I know that I should not be running my air conditioner at 3 o'clock in the afternoon in July when it is 100 degrees out, I know that, because that is peak demand, but unfortunately, we have to do that. You cannot tell those people that because a smart meter says it is too high, they have to shut that off. You cannot do that. The smart meter is good and is in the mix, but I think what is demonstrated here in these debates is that this issue still needs a lot of resolution. These things are all good, but they have to be resolved. I will go back again to my point that we are not going to resolve these by Monday. We still should not hold the State employees or the State budget hostage for energy.

My good friend, Senator Anthony Williams, makes a lot of good points and I agree with a lot of them, but so do other Senators. The conflicting points of interest have to be resolved, and we have to get about the business of doing that. I am happy to continue to do that and was ready to do some of that today, but it got pushed off. I think we will do other things on the budget and they will get pushed off. I was hoping we could talk a little bit more about the budget, and maybe we could have a few meetings with Secretary McGinty and with our leaders, but I do not think that is going to happen because I do not think we will be able to resolve some of these very, very important issues.

The smart meter is a great idea, we are already using it, it is going to tell you some things that you do not want to hear or be able to live by, and common sense will tell you that your energy costs will be a lot less at 3 o'clock in the morning than they are at 3 o'clock on a hot July afternoon.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Anthony Williams.

Senator A.H. WILLIAMS. Madam President, I listened intently to Senator Browne's comments, and I am sorry he left because I thought his remarks were very cogent and brought a perspective to this conversation that is substantive, and that is, do you invest in the marketplace or allow the marketplace to dictate

the process? With all due respect to all of us, the time is long past where we allow utility companies to dictate the process because the old robber barons were all drawn up around rich individuals controlling precious resources and dictating to us what the price would be. That is the way it came about, and while I understand when he says, we do not want to have the government go headlong in creating an industry, and I agree with him that we do not, I do not think he remembers when President Kennedy wanted to go to the moon. At that time, there were many people who said it was a waste of time, energy, and public resources, and the only entities that were investing in space technology was the government. We spent billions of dollars on going to the moon and developing technology around it. Today, or maybe not today, I do not know what day it was on, the iPod phone by Apple that came out and is the hottest thing that my kid keeps talking about because I am not buying one, is a direct relative of when we flew to the moon. Cell phones, iPods, home computers, and all this technology that we cannot seem to get enough of came from the government investing in what was visionary and what many people thought was controversial at the time.

We talk about 2 and 3 percent, and yes, alternative energy is very expensive, but if we wait for the marketplace or those people who want to be most profitable to invest in this process, they will never do so. Their responsibility is to return as much money to their bottom line as possible. Right now, that is not possible in this activity. We have lived through a generation where, as a matter of fact, our economy is for a large part affected by technology which came directly from government investing in something that people thought was mythical and impossible, and that was landing a man on the moon.

At the time, all the tentacles of the economy were not defined with a blueprint that said, if we do this, you are going to get millions and billions and create Bill Gates and Apple computers. Nobody knew that at the time, and while I respect the fact that the Senator explained it in terms that many of us could finally understand it, I just disagree that government should not be as heavily invested as they can be in this process, because private investors will not do it. We know that, and this issue as it relates to a crisis is real, it is now, and we should not defer it any longer. This Governor is doing the responsible thing by saying we have to confront this situation right now. We cannot defer it any longer, and we have to take on the challenge not only for Pennsylvanians today, but also for generations beyond.

I respect the arguments from the other side of the aisle, and I am glad somebody finally stood up and said that they are willing to deal with the robocalls, as such. I understand what the gentleman said about not crossing the line, and think that is appropriate. I think that is fair and balanced. But I think we should finally take up the issue. I also think we should take up the issue of the energy crisis as it is today. If we believe that costs are going to be what they are in the fall and caps are going to come off and there is going to be a problem, then we should confront the problem today.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Senator Browne.

Senator BROWNE. Madam President, it is my opinion that we are not talking about things like putting a man on the moon.

We are not talking about a value-added product but about a basic commodity, regardless of the technology. So, regardless of what we are building, wind is wind, solar energy is solar energy, coal is coal, oil is oil, and in the end it supplies the same thing. It supplies a basic need to our constituents, which does the same thing, turns on the lights and air conditioner, heats the water, and runs the car.

In the end, people are not going to be making purchases based on anything but price and availability. We are not talking about advanced technology that has value outside of its basic purpose. I think, just as a matter of comparison in terms of what we are doing, energy is a commodity which is sensitive to supply and demand, and the more government gets involved in it, based on the history of this type of product and service, I think the worse we are. I am simply proposing another strategy.

I compliment the Governor for his leadership in this regard, and Pennsylvania should be more active in developing alternative energy. However, I believe the strategy of using a government-controlled model to make this happen will lead to bad results. Let us look for another strategy and work together to get this done. I think we can do that within the current budget cycle and resources, and I look forward to working with Senator Williams and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to make sure Pennsylvania is a leader in investment in alternative energy.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Montgomery, Senator Connie Williams.

Senator C. WILLIAMS. Madam President, since I started this, I hope to make the final comments. I think we all have to remember that this is incredible. First of all, it is an incredible investment in our future that cannot be quantified. While we are talking about a commodity of energy, we are also talking about issues that really relate to international peace in the world, making us energy independent. So I am delighted and happy that we have had this conversation. I am proud to have started it, and I hope to have some action very quickly on this subject.

Thank you, and good evening.

HOUSE MESSAGE

SENATE BILL RETURNED WITH AMENDMENTS

The Clerk of the House of Representatives returned to the Senate **SB 704**, with the information the House has passed the same with amendments in which the concurrence of the Senate is requested.

The PRESIDENT. Pursuant to Senate Rule XIV, section 6, this bill will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Executive Nominations.

COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE APPOINTED ON HB 1286

The PRESIDENT. The Chair announces, on behalf of the President pro tempore, the appointment of Senators PILEGGI, ARMSTRONG and LaVALLE as a Committee of Conference on the part of the Senate to confer with a similar committee of the House, if the House shall appoint such committee, to consider the differences existing between the two Houses in relation to House Bill No. 1286.

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

BILL SIGNED

The PRESIDENT (Lieutenant Governor Catherine Baker Knoll) in the presence of the Senate signed the following bill:

SB 86.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MINORITY CAUCUS CHAIRMAN

The PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Senator Costa.

Senator COSTA. Madam President, I would like to make an announcement for the benefit of the Democratic Senators and remind them that we will be convening a caucus probably within the hour. We will be doing that in our Democratic Caucus room.

The PRESIDENT. There will be a Democratic caucus within the hour. It is 5:30, so by 6:30 there will be a Democratic caucus.

RECESS

The PRESIDENT, The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York, Senator Waugh.

Senator WAUGH. Madam President, I move that the Senate do now recess until Saturday, July 7, 2007, at 12 o'clock noon, Eastern Daylight Saving Time.

The motion was agreed to by voice vote.

The Senate recessed at 5:26 p.m., Eastern Daylight Saving Time.