

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

THURSDAY, JANUARY 26, 1995

SESSION OF 1995

179TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 8

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 9:05 a.m., e.s.t.

THE SPEAKER (MATTHEW J. RYAN) PRESIDING

PRAYER

REV. CLYDE W. ROACH, pastor of Riverside United Methodist Church, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Gracious God our Father, we need You. Like our bodies need air and water, our hearts and our minds long for the indwelling of Your Holy Spirit.

Like the deer pants after the water brook, so our souls long for Your presence. As St. Augustine affirmed, "Our souls are restless until they rest in You."

Come, Holy Spirit, heavenly dove, with all Your quickening power, kindle the flame of sacred love in these cold hearts of ours.

Come into our presence even at this very moment. Rein in our wandering minds. Focus them on things eternal. Free us from the worries and anxieties that sap our strength and give us nothing in return, and speak to us what we might do better to serve Your people.

For it is in Your dear name we pray. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Wednesday, January 25, 1995, will be postponed until printed. The Chair hears no objection.

HOUSE SCHEDULE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, Mr. Perzel.

Mr. PERZEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the members, our intention today is to break for lunch at 1 o'clock, dinner will be at 6 o'clock, 6 to 7, and we will break again this evening at 10:30, if we go that long, and tomorrow morning we will be back at 9 o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman. It would be the hope of the Chair that it is not necessary to do this, and I would guess that it is the hope of many of the members.

Mr. PERZEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It was just a courtesy.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman for his courtesy.

CALENDAR

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 4, PN 148**, entitled:

An Act providing for a review process for filings with the Department of Environmental Resources.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, Mr. Perzel.

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that HB 4 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to.

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 7, PN 149**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of July 31, 1968 (P.L. 769, No. 240), referred to as the Commonwealth Documents Law, further defining "administrative regulation" in relation to the Department of Environmental Resources.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, Mr. Perzel.

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that HB 7 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair at this time turns to leaves of absence. The Chair recognizes the majority whip, Mr. Barley. Mr. BARLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have no leaves of absence for today. The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Itkin. Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, I request leave of absence for the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. EVANS. The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman. Without objection, leave of absence is granted.

MASTER ROLL CALL

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

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT-201

Adolph	Egolf	Lynch	Saylor
Allen	Fairchild	Maitland	Schroder
Argall	Fajt	Major	Schuler
Armstrong	Fargo	Manderino	Scrimenti
Baker	Farmer	Markosek	Semmel
Bard	Feese	Marsico	Serafini
Barley	Fichter	Masland	Shaner
Battisto	Fleagle	Mayermik	Sheehan
Bebko-Jones	Flick	McCall	Smith, B.
Belardi	Gamble	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Gannon	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Geist	Melio	Staback
Bishop	George	Merry	Stairs
Blaum	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Steelman
Boscola	Gladeck	Micozzie	Steil
Boyes	Godshall	Mihalich	Stern
Brown	Gordner	Miller	Stetler
Browne	Gruitza	Mundy	Stish
Bunt	Gruppo	Nailor	Strittmatter
Butkovitz	Habay	Nickol	Sturla
Buxton	Haluska	Nyce	Surra
Caitagirone	Hanna	Olasz	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Harhart	Oliver	Taylor, E. Z.
Cam	Hasay	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Carone	Hennessey	Pesci	Thomas
Cawley	Herman	Petrarca	Tigue
Chadwick	Hershey	Petrone	Travaglio
Civera	Hess	Pettit	Trello
Clark	Horsey	Phillips	Trich
Clymer	Hutchinson	Piccola	True
Cohen, L. I.	Itkin	Pistella	Tulli
Cohen, M.	Jadlowiec	Pitts	Vance
Colafella	James	Platts	Van Home
Colaizzo	Jarolin	Preston	Veon
Conti	Josephs	Ramos	Vitali
Cornell	Kaiser	Raymond	Walko
Corpora	Keller	Readshaw	Washington
Corrigan	Kenney	Reber	Waugh
Cowell	King	Reinard	Williams

Coy	Kirkland	Richardson	Wogan
Curry	Krebs	Rieger	Wozniak
Daley	Kukovich	Roberts	Wright, D. R.
DeLuca	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wright, M. N.
Dempsey	Laughlin	Roebuck	Yewcic
Dent	Lawless	Rohrer	Youngblood
Dermody	Lederer	Rooney	Zimmerman
DeWeese	Leh	Rubley	Zug
DiGirolamo	Lescovitz	Rudy	
Donatucci	Levdansky	Sainato	Ryan, Speaker
Druce	Lloyd	Santoni	
Durham	Lucyk	Sather	

ADDITIONS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-2

Evans O'Brien

LEAVES ADDED-1

Wright, D. R.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2, PN 193**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Public Welfare Code, providing for a job training program and establishing a timetable for implementation; further providing for a workfare program, for applications for assistance, for eligibility and for aid to families with dependent children; providing for an electronic benefit distribution system, for powers and duties of the Department of Public Welfare, for retesting and for protective custody of AFDC children for a publicly financed voucher program to provide access to privately delivered health insurance coverage.

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

Mr. **BLAUM** offered the following amendment No. **A0365**:

Amend Sec. 5 (Sec. 432.12), page 1, lines 3 through 7, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

(f) Elimination of benefits under subsection (d) shall not apply to any child conceived as a result of rape or incest if the department:

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

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws all of his amendments?

Mr. **BLAUM**. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair and the members thank the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. STURLA offered the following amendment No. A0187:

Amend Sec. 7 (Sec. 495.1), page 17, line 23, by inserting after "retarded."

All health care services shall, when available, be provided within the designated region.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What amendment 0187 does is amends the portion of the health services portion of this bill to say that "All health care services shall, when available, be provided within the designated region." I raise this point because I think it is important.

When we look at the health-care portion of this welfare reform bill, it looks very similar to something that is already going on in Philadelphia and that six-county region. For any of you who read the newspapers and followed what Mercy Healthcare Plan was doing in that region, at one point in time they were taking the mental-health-services portion of their HMO contract that they have with the Department of Welfare and they were subcontracting it out, and when they subcontracted it out, that subcontractor in turn turned around and subcontracted that subcontract out again.

What we had was a situation where those people that were eligible to receive mental health benefits in that region were having to travel about 50 miles to get those mental health services. Well, anybody who knows anything about mental health patients, you have a hard time getting them to go in and see their physician and to take advantage of those services that they need. Well, when you put a 50-mile travel on it, it gets even worse.

With this pilot, we are talking about doing an urban, suburban, and a rural area. My real concern is that in the rural areas where people have to travel 50 miles anyway, we are then going to say, guess what? We found a cheaper place. It is halfway across the State. We will provide the service. All you need to do is find a way to get across to the other side of the State and you can take advantage of it.

What this amendment does is says that when those services are available in that region, that is where they have to be provided. Obviously, if there is a heart surgery that is necessary and there is no place within a couple hundred miles, we will send them to Philadelphia or Pittsburgh or wherever the nearest place is that they can get that service. But when those services are available within the region that the pilot is set up for, I believe it is imperative that those services be provided to those people in that region. Thank you.

I urge a positive vote on this.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Snyder. Mr. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, these are pilot programs, and we would like to provide as much flexibility as possible in order to evaluate the programs effectively, and at this time we would not like to restrict the programs.

We ask for a negative vote on amendment 187.

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

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, in response to the previous speaker, I would contend that if we are going to simply have a pilot program that is looking to not provide services to people, I can guarantee you that we will cut costs. If I say to somebody in Erie, if there is a pilot program in Erie, and I say all your services are provided in Philadelphia, I can guarantee you those people will not access those services.

What this amendment says is that those services need to be provided in the areas where the people actually live. I do not think that is an unreasonable amendment. I do not think it is overly restrictive. It is common sense.

It also provides a level playing field for those people that are bidding on the contracts in these areas. If I am a legitimate, well-concerned insurance company or HMO (health maintenance organization) that wants to bid on this, then I will provide the services within that region, but if I want to try and make a sham out of this and I want to try and make a quick buck on a pilot program, I am not going to provide the services within the region. And so you end up with a situation where those insurance companies and HMO's that bid on this project with good intentions will be undercut by insurance companies and HMO's that do not have good intentions. So I think it provides a level playing field for those insurers also. Thank you.

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

Mr. ALLEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of the Sturla amendment.

Later on today we are going to be discussing the same ideas about pharmacists across the State. I think it is very important that the services be provided in the closest area possible.

I support the amendment and urge my members on this side of the aisle to do the same.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-120

Allen	DeWeese	Masland	Scrimanti
Argall	Donatucci	Mayermik	Semmel
Armstrong	Fajt	McCall	Shaner
Baker	George	Melio	Smith, S. H.
Battisto	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Staback
Bebko-Jones	Gordner	Mihalich	Steelman
Belardi	Gruitza	Mundy	Steil
Belfanti	Haluska	Nailor	Stetler
Bishop	Hanna	Nickol	Strittmatter
Blaum	Hennessey	Olasz	Sturla
Boscola	Herman	Oliver	Surra
Browne	Hershey	Pesci	Tangretti
Buxton	Hutchinson	Petrarca	Thomas
Caltagirone	Itkin	Petrone	Tigue
Cappabianca	Jadlowiec	Pistella	Travaglio
Carn	James	Platts	Trello
Carone	Jarolin	Preston	Trich
Cawley	Josephs	Readshaw	True
Cohen, M.	Kaiser	Richardson	Van Home
Colafella	King	Rieger	Veon
Colaizzo	Kirkland	Roberts	Vitali
Corpora	Krebs	Robinson	Walko
Corrigan	Kukovich	Roebuck	Washington

Cowell	LaGrotta	Rooney	Waugh
Coy	Laughlin	Rudy	Williams
Curry	Lescovitz	Sainato	Wozniak
Daley	Lloyd	Santoni	Wright, D. R.
DeLuca	Lucyk	Sather	Yewcic
Dent	Manderino	Schroder	Youngblood
Dermody	Markosek	Schuler	Zug

NAYS-76

Adolph	Fargo	Lynch	Rubley
Bard	Farmer	Maitland	Saylor
Barley	Feese	Major	Serafini
Birmelin	Fichter	Marsico	Sheehan
Boyes	Fleagle	McGeehan	Smith, B.
Brown	Gamble	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Bunt	Gannon	Merry	Stairs
Butkowitz	Geist	Micozzie	Stern
Chadwick	Gladeck	Miller	Stish
Civera	Godshall	Nyce	Taylor, E. Z.
Clark	Gruppo	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Clymer	Habay	Pettit	Tulli
Cohen, L. I.	Harhart	Phillips	Vance
Conti	Hasay	Piccola	Wogan
Cornell	Hess	Pitts	Wright, M. N.
Dempsey	Keller	Raymond	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	Kenney	Reber	
Druce	Lawless	Reinard	Ryan,
Egolf	Lederer	Rohrer	Speaker
Fairchild	Leh		

NOT VOTING-5

Durham	Horsley	Levdansky	Ramos
Flick			

EXCUSED-2

Evans	O'Brien
-------	---------

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. STURLA offered the following amendment No. A0271:

Amend Sec. 7, page 16, line 22, by striking out "Voucher" and inserting

Health Care

Amend Sec. 7 (Sec. 494), page 17, line 12, by striking out "voucher" and inserting

health care

Amend Sec. 7 (Sec. 494.1), page 17, line 15, by striking out "Voucher" and inserting

Health Care

Amend Sec. 7 (Sec. 494.1), page 17, line 17, by striking out "voucher" and inserting

health care

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

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Sturla, on amendment 271.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw that amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. TRICH offered the following amendment No. A0198:

Amend Sec. 5 (Sec. 432.12), page 10, line 24, by inserting after "(d)"
(1)

Amend Sec. 5 (Sec. 432.12), page 10, line 27, by inserting after "by"
first reducing the increment as provided in clause (2)
and then by

Amend Sec. 5 (Sec. 432.12), page 10, line 27, by striking out "in" and inserting

as provided in clause (3) of the

Amend Sec. 5 (Sec. 432.12), page 11, line 6, by striking out all of said line and inserting

adult recipient is again eligible for benefits.

(2) The reduction in benefits shall be made as follows:

(i) For the birth of the first additional child the increment shall be reduced by one-third.

(ii) For the birth of the second additional child the increment shall be reduced by an additional one-third.

(iii) For the birth of the third additional child the increment shall be reduced by an additional one-third.

For the birth of any additional children, the increment shall be eliminated and benefits calculated pursuant to clause (3).

(3) The department

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

The SPEAKER. On the question of the adoption of the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Trich. The gentleman has been recognized on the amendment and may proceed.

Mr. TRICH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am here today to offer an amendment that I am not necessarily proud of, but it is one that I believe goes in the right direction to correct a very flawed portion of HB 2.

Last evening we debated an issue that was raised by Representative Richardson concerning the \$87 a month that children who are born to mothers who are on welfare will be denied in the future. This, we were told, was actually to be not a penalty but a deterrent. If that is in fact the case, I would like to go along that same train of thought and merely soften that blow somewhat.

What I am suggesting by this amendment, which is amendment 0198, it would set into stages that same type of a concept. For example, a mother who delivers a child while on welfare would not be denied the total \$87 in funding but in fact would be denied one-third of that amount. Should a second child be born later also on welfare, then two-thirds of that allotment would be denied, and of course, on the third child, the entire allotment would be denied.

Again, I indicate to you I know it is not a beautiful amendment, but it is at least one with a little more compassion than the present bill is indicating, and I would hope that my colleagues would look at it favorably. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Ms. Manderino.

Ms. MANDERINO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this goes back to the area of the child exclusion or the child cap that we dealt with towards the end of or most of the early evening yesterday. I know that there were a lot of members in the chamber on both sides of the aisle that were looking for some area of compromise on the issue of the child cap. I would like to suggest that the Trich amendment offers a reasonable area of compromise.

What Representative Trich's amendment is doing is trying to while at the same time do what the makers of the original proposal intend, to change behavior, it is attempting to change behavior in a more gradual way that is a little bit more compassionate and takes into consideration the reality of should an extra child be born into the family. At the same time it does have a measure of penalty, if you want to call it that.

I think it is a very reasonable compromise. I would recommend that members on both sides of the aisle who are serious about changing behavior but concerned about negatively affecting innocent children would consider voting and vote "yes" on this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask for a "no" vote.

I think it is ludicrous that we set up a halfway deal here where we want to wean the welfare mothers off of having children that they cannot afford. You can have one and we will not give you as much, and number two we will not give you as much.

I think this is ludicrous, and we should defeat it and defeat it big-time. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. SURRA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this amendment by Representative Trich is very reasonable. If you believe that women have more children to get additional funds and have any concern about the child, this is a reasonable compromise. This gives them less money for the more children they have.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we heard testimony where the vast majority of pregnancies occur by accident. For all you pro-life members, I want you to understand that it is very possible that we will be encouraging abortions among poor people because they mistakenly become pregnant and then cannot afford the child. If that is your intent, Mr. Speaker, we are doing a heck of a job of going down that road.

I find it ironic, Mr. Speaker, that many of us here will collect \$109 to be here today but we have a problem with giving a poor woman \$87 a month to feed her child. Mr. Speaker, this is becoming a mean House. There is a mean cloud over the House of Representatives.

Now, we are all interested in doing the right thing on welfare reform. Let us not throw the children out the window with the bathwater.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question of the adoption of the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Snyder.

Mr. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this issue was debated yesterday to quite an extent. I think everybody understands what is being attempted here. But we have to realize that the child will also receive full medical assistance coverage, WIC (women, infants, and children) program benefits, food stamps, and if available, the mother will have day-care benefits.

So what we are asking you to do is to oppose this amendment and allow us to try to restore responsibility back into the welfare system. We are providing assistance for the care of children, but we are trying to restore responsibility into the system, and we ask you to oppose this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Ms. Manderino, for the second time on the issue.

Ms. MANDERINO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I just have to respond briefly to the comments made by the last speaker, and that is that we have never— And if you remember also in the debate yesterday, Mr. Blaum had a very reasonable amendment that said if you are sincere in the fact that those other benefits stay in place, let us make it clear in the language of the bill, because the interpretation that we have received is that the bill is not clear at all. And rather than get a legal opinion that that is how it was interpreted, we got a personal opinion of that was how it was going to be interpreted. The very fear of putting language to make clear what is claimed to be the intent but the failure to put that intent clearly in the language indicates to me that we all know that we want to remain unclear, that we do not want to specify for sure that these other benefits remain in place to protect and give a safety net to the child.

Given all of that, it seems to me that we should not accept the argument that we have protected the child and that we should make an attempt to do so. The Trich amendment is a reasonable attempt.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Trich, for the second time on the issue.

Mr. TRICH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I promise to make this brief.

I think it is important to clarify, however, my opening remarks when I stated that this was not an amendment that I was necessarily proud of. That is not to be misunderstood that I do not support my own amendment. It should be understood that it is embarrassing that we have to make such an amendment.

But I will indicate this to you: If in fact those of my colleagues who voted in the majority last night to deny the children that \$87 per month, if in fact you are being true to your convictions, this amendment still achieves that same goal. It does so with a little more compassion, however. It does so with not automatically cutting it off but rather cutting it off incrementally.

I would just remind my colleagues who stand up and so feverishly argue the points of the children, the unborn children, these are kids who are born, for God's sake, and people who need assistance right now. They are the youngest and the poorest of the poor, and for us to deny them, for us to deny them even what would be a reduced version of \$87, I think would be a sin.

Therefore, I would ask my colleagues to consider this amendment favorably.

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

Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a clarion clear call to every pro-life legislator on this floor. One of the major

inducements for a woman to terminate a pregnancy is an economic inducement. There is absolutely no doubt that anyone who cannot find it in his heart or her heart or his brain or her brain to not realize the pragmatism of that observation, they must also consider the fact that this vote - this vote - will have hypocritical ramifications. I do not see how any pro-life legislator can oppose the gentleman, Mr. Trich.

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

Mr. DRUCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, last night I stood on the floor of this House and supported an amendment offered by Mr. Richardson which would have deleted the one provision of this bill which I said I did not agree with. Mr. Trich's amendment is getting us halfway to the amendment last night that did not pass.

For those who are interested in saving money, and that is all this may be about, we do still save some money, just maybe not as much as if you eliminate it altogether. But let me point out what I think is the one fallacy in much of the comments that I have heard on the floor here about the focus on mothers.

This House is missing the point. As I understand the system as it works now, the focus is not on mothers; the focus is on children. Let me just walk you through a scenario that would highlight that.

I am new to the Committee on Health and Welfare, so I will stand corrected by any member if I am misunderstanding our system. But if you are a single mother with no children and you are on general assistance and you have a baby while you are collecting general assistance, you would receive AFDC (aid to families with dependent children) funding, which suggests to me that the system recognizes you have had a child and that child needs to be provided for. If you enter the system with two children, you get a certain amount. If you enter the system with three children, you get a different amount. If you enter the system with four children, you get a different amount. That suggests to me that the system recognizes that there are different units within that family, different children to provide for. The mother did not change. The mother has been the most constant thing in the scenarios I just outlined. The only thing that changed was the children. And what happens when there were more, there was an increment to help provide for those children. So for us to stand here and say, as one gentleman did, that we are trying to wean mothers off welfare, that is the wrong focus. It should not be on mothers. It is on children, and we are really missing the point if we cannot at least understand that one facet.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington County is taking us at least halfway. As I said, for those who want to save money, we will still do that, but at least we will provide some bridge for some of these families that need to provide for these children.

I would say in closing, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot for me to learn on this committee. But I would say one thing: I do know the difference between right and wrong, and I know the difference between helping and hurting, and this amendment today, Mr. Speaker, I believe would go a long way to help. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Columbia, Mr. Gordner.

Mr. GORDNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Very briefly, I was one of those individuals who voted against the amendment last evening to restore the funding. I stand before you as saying that I plan to support the Trich amendment because I believe that we do need some responsibility, but I believe that we also need

some compassion, as I believe Mr. Trich said, with that. And as I believe that we need to change the system somewhat, I believe Mr. Trich has offered us a good compromise, a good way of doing responsibility with compassion.

Again, although I voted last night against an amendment to totally restore the funding, I plan on voting for the Trich amendment and would urge my colleagues to do the same. Thank you.

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

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just a few comments regarding the pro-life issue that has been raised on the floor.

There is absolutely no conclusive proof that this provision of the bill that we are looking at is an incentive for abortions. That is totally untrue and there are absolutely no statistics to back that up. The comments and insinuations that were made are simply out of line.

Other members have said that some of the money that women on AFDC do receive is used for drugs, for other uses than for the welfare of the child. But the point that we are trying to provide in this bill, in this particular section— And I certainly appreciate the good efforts of Mr. Trich. I understand where you are coming from and what you are attempting to do, and I have a good understanding of your efforts in that respect. But at the same time, for over 30 years we have been dealing with a system that has shackled those on welfare from moving ahead, from providing accountability, from responsibility, and those are the issues that we are really looking at today.

I feel that we can provide through the nonprofits that we have, through churches, through the generosity of Pennsylvanians and Americans, we can help people who truly are in need. But we cannot, we cannot really deal effectively with the welfare issue until we begin to make some movement that is truly going to help people. From my perspective, the bill that we have in place will do just that.

As difficult as it was for Mr. Trich to say he is supporting the amendment, it is just as difficult for me to say I have to oppose it, and I do, and I would ask the members to consider this and to vote "no." Thank you.

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

Mr. TIGUE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for perhaps Mr. Clymer or someone else who is handling the bill on the other side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Clymer, will consent to interrogation. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. TIGUE. If I had one or two, well, say two children, and I was in the process of adopting a child and I ended up on welfare as the adoption came through, as an extra dependent, would the child I adopted be included in the— Would I not receive benefits for that child I adopted, because it would be beyond one dependent?

Mr. CLYMER. Just a moment, Mr. Speaker, and we will have a response.

You are talking about— Did you say a woman—

Mr. TIGUE. Let us say I applied, my wife and I or whoever it is—

Mr. CLYMER. Mr. Speaker, are you saying that if a person, a woman on AFDC wants to adopt a—

Mr. TIGUE. I am saying, what happens if I apply, some lady would, a woman, man; it does not matter, a couple, they apply for a—

Mr. CLYMER. Well, it does. Tell me, tell me whether or not, are they on welfare—

Mr. TIGUE. I am saying, if I adopt a child and I end up on welfare as the process is completed and somehow I end up on welfare

and now the approval comes, do I receive an additional- Am I entitled to an additional \$87 for that child?

Mr. CLYMER. Well, hypothetically, the question you are asking is certainly indeed a hypothetical, because what happens, you have to meet certain standards in order to have a child adopted. The work history, the availability of income, the availability you have to support that child - there are many factors that are considered before you are given adoption papers to properly adopt that child, so I am not sure. If you are saying that a woman on AFDC could adopt a child, I do not think that is going to occur.

Mr. TIGUE. That is not what I am talking about. I understand about the adoption question. Specifically, I may apply to adopt or I may have children. As an example, I apply to adopt a child and I am employed and I am approved, and as the process is moving on, somehow I lose my job; I am not eligible for unemployment; I now go on welfare. I already have two children, and the adoption is approved. Do I receive benefits for that adopted child?

Mr. CLYMER. Yes.

Mr. TIGUE. I do?

Mr. CLYMER. Sure.

Mr. TIGUE. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. On the question of the amendment, the Chair recognizes- Does the gentleman, Mr. Walko, seek recognition?

Mr. WALKO. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman seek recognition on the issue?

Mr. WALKO. Yes, sir, I do.

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

Mr. WALKO. I have heard Representatives mention that there is a lack of any evidence; there have been no statistics showing that this would grant an incentive to women to have abortions. At the same time, as a freshman of perhaps average intelligence, I have not heard one scintilla of evidence that this grand social-engineering experiment will lead to more solid families, and I would like for any member to rise with such a statistic that this bill will lead to stronger families, less illegitimate births. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Gamble, for the second time on the issue.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate what I said earlier, that this should be a "no" vote.

I thought the whole idea of welfare reform was to derail this old wagon that takes them from the cradle to the grave, and I thought the idea, too, was to discontinue subsidizing irresponsibility. The premise of this amendment is totally that the women on welfare are totally irresponsible; they have never heard of contraceptives; they cannot take any precautionary measures, and so they can have one, two, or three. I say it is a wrong message if we are serious about making some meaningful changes in the welfare system and truly talking about reform.

Again, I ask you to vote "no."

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Ms. Josephs.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had not intended to speak until I heard the last speaker.

Women on welfare may have heard of family planning services, but they cannot access them because we do not pay for them. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Jarolin.

Mr. JAROLIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As a comment on this particular amendment and the meaning of it.

Maybe we should have been doing the crime package first, because if I were one of the people that fell in the category with the children here, I would do anything to raise my children. If we turn around and we take money away from families, the possibility of increasing the crime in the State of Pennsylvania has increased at least 20 or 30 percent.

I know I would do anything to protect my children and raise them the right way. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. The gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Walko, asked if any member here had conclusive proof, some statistics. The gentleman, Mr. Clymer, indicated that there were no statistics that my statement that pro-life legislators should be ashamed of themselves if they voted against Mr. Trich were to be the case. He said that I did not have any statistics. Mr. Walko asked, anybody that has any statistics that can defend Mr. Clymer's position, please come to the microphone.

I want to interrogate Mr. Clymer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Clymer, indicates he will stand for interrogation. The gentleman, Mr. DeWeese, may proceed.

Mr. DeWEESE. The gentleman, Mr. Clymer, asserted that we did not have statistics, and we do not. It is common sense, Mr. Clymer; it is common sense. It is buttressed on any revocable assumption of common sense. The whole premise of what you are doing today, Mr. Speaker, the whole premise is that you will eliminate some pregnancies.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will yield.

Is the gentleman asking a question or making a statement at this point?

Mr. DeWEESE. Admittedly, sir, it is somewhat elliptical, but there is an interrogatory at the end.

The SPEAKER. Promise?

The gentleman may proceed with his questioning.

Mr. DeWEESE. Please give me some statistics, Mr. Speaker, that will substantiate your perspective.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Clymer, is recognized.

Mr. CLYMER. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We do have, after 1 year of the program working in the State of New Jersey, that the figures we had before show that there is no increase or decrease in the abortion rate because of this particular program, and I will be glad to share those- There is no significant increase.

So these figures are available. If the minority leader would like to come over here to take a look at them, we would be pleased to share those figures with you.

Mr. DeWEESE. Will the gentleman, Mr. Clymer, please read his comments into the record so that I am not the only one that is privy to them? I am told by my staff that there were 1,100 avoided, avoided births in the same time period in the State of New Jersey. All I know is, I am convinced, and it happens to do with common sense, that if you make disincentives for welfare mothers, especially for youngsters who are 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 whose educational levels are quite abbreviated, they are not going to have access to the information, they might not know the information, and if they did know it, they might not submit to it. So the pregnancy would probably occur, and in my rural constituency as well as some of the more urban areas of our

Commonwealth, I am convinced and I want it to go on the record that there will be more abortions, and I think 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 years from now statistics will bear me out. But I would like for you to read your data, at least for a moment or two, into the record. I think it is important. I think it is crucial. I think what Mr. Trich is trying to do is imperative.

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

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and that is reasonable for me to read the record of the medicaid-funded abortions that they have had in New Jersey.

Let us begin with the last 2 years. In 1993 there were 13,629 medicaid-funded abortions. In 1994, and this program now has been in effect for 1 year, the medicaid-funded abortions in New Jersey were 13,424, which shows a slight decrease, and I think that the record will bear testimony to me that this will continue to stay status quo or be reduced and not increase as the comments made by the minority leader.

He is certainly speaking off the cuff. He has no records. He has never taken time to investigate the situation. He has made statements that are totally out of the wind, and he cannot sustain those comments. So that is the information I provide this morning.

Mr. DeWEESE. Could the gentleman, Mr. Clymer, give me the amount of people that were on medicaid, women that were on medicaid in New Jersey last year as opposed to this year, and differentiate so we could do some mathematical extrapolation off the top of our head or otherwise?

Mr. CLYMER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot give those statistics at this present time. We will make them available.

Mr. DeWEESE. Those are paramount. The gentleman, Mr. Clymer, should be aware that there has been a general decline in population of childbearing women in the State of New Jersey. That could have some impact. The gentleman should probably put that into his calculations.

The gentleman also should be aware that there have been fewer abortions nationwide in the United States and in New Jersey. He should put those figures into his statistics.

One more question for the gentleman, Mr. Clymer: Could the gentleman, since he has averred that churches and charitable organizations will be forthcoming with help, can he give me some statistical data which countervails my own knowledge in *Time* magazine, *Newsweek*, *Forbes*, *INC.*, *Money*, et cetera, that there has been a decline, Mr. Speaker, a decline, a precipitous decline in the 1990's, into the late 1980's, in charitable giving? Give me some statistics that will refute your arguments, whether they are coming from the top of your head or from your bevy or phalanx of supporters there, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. CLYMER. Mr. Speaker, taken in light of what the minority leader has said, I think we can collectively say here this morning that the decrease that he has been talking about is the fact that there has been an emphasis on accountability and responsibility. I think over the last couple years Americans have said that people must be accountable and must be responsible. I mean, I think those are the issues, and I think that message is beginning to saturate the public and we are seeing those figures drop as a result of— And what we are trying to do is tie into that theme. This welfare bill in totality is trying to bring about that same theme - accountability and responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, can I recognize my colleague, Charles Dent? I am finished.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields to the gentleman, Mr. Dent.

Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker, I have no inclination—

Mr. CLYMER. Yes; I am finished with my comments.

Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is in error. The gentleman, Mr. DeWeese, had the floor.

Mr. DeWEESE. The gentleman, Mr. DeWeese, has no inclination to interrogate Mr. Dent. I have one final comment, and then I will relinquish the podium.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. DeWEESE. It seems to me that the whole purpose of this endeavor, primarily by the majority party but by some of my friends, some of my very good friends on this side of the aisle, is to discourage welfare mothers from having children, at least children that they cannot, obviously, support. Ipso facto, if this takes place, little girls in Greene County and little girls in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia and Bradford and McKean and Susquehanna and Union and Snyder are still going to get pregnant, and at 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 years of age, with very limited educational backgrounds and a social fabric that is not sewn together very tightly, they are going to seek the obvious alternative. In my opinion, we will be at these microphones 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 years from now, and our case at that time will be statistically supported. There will be more abortions. This is an abortion-incentive act.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Snyder.

Mr. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I do not stand here now as a leader trying to advocate a legislative program but as a member just like you who has struggled with concerns with this issue.

I think the debate has gone far astray of what the legislation is attempting to do. The previous speaker noted a 14-, 15-, 16-year-old young girl who, in his own words, makes a mistake, gets pregnant, and faces several choices. That choice to raise that child on her own or with the support of family is not deterred by this legislation today.

This program, Mr. Speaker, says that when you go onto the program of public assistance, you will receive full benefits available to you for you and your children. So that child will receive benefits at the time you go and qualify. What we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, is once you are on public assistance facing the struggles inherent with being in that situation, where you need to go out and reach for a helping hand from the taxpayers to envelop you in some form of safety and security so that you can raise that child, we are just saying that at that point we are asking you to be responsible, because once you have entered into the system, you are put on notice. Yes, we are willing to take care of your current situation, but we are asking you not to aggravate that situation any more, and we are trying to instill a notice. And as a previous speaker noted, it is behavior, and that is what we are looking for. This focus is on the children, everybody is trying to say, but no, it is on the mother, it is on the father, because if they are acting responsibly, there will not be a child and it will not be as a result of abortion.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the statistics as I understand them, 80 percent of the AFDC households are single-parent households. So therefore, in those households in which the average is already two or three children in that household, why are we looking like this is so draconian to say modify your behavior and do not have more children

if you want the taxpayers to support them? But furthermore we are saying, even if you have those children, we are going to support them with the basic necessities of life - food, medical care, and other benefits that are available for young children.

Also, look what we are doing. In this program we are saying that we are trying to instill job training and providing other incentives. When you have that young child, you are basically unable to participate in any of those other programs, so you are delaying for years even the entrancing under the mandatory aspect of this program into a job training or workfare program. Where are the values we are trying to instill?

The abortion issue is not one that is involved here. Certainly family planning and alternatives are available, but the question is, once you are on the benefits of the taxpayer-funded programs, all we are asking you to do is be responsible for not providing incentives to encourage you to stay in that system. It is the children. When we look at our urban areas and see the children coming into our schools from these households, and more and more children are coming, is that fair for the children as well? If you are looking at the interests of the children, then look at what we are trying to do. I do not think any one of us disagrees with the values that we are trying to instill, and we are not penalizing the children. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York County, Mr. Platts.

Mr. PLATTS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would Mr. Clymer stand for interrogation, please?

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

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, your previous comments and the comments of Mr. Gamble and Mr. Snyder about personal responsibility and accountability, the statistics show that for all women, including women on AFDC, perhaps approximately 60 percent of all pregnancies are unplanned, and that of those 60 percent, half or more are women using contraception. Do you accept those figures or statistics as somewhat accurate?

Mr. CLYMER. I just heard them for the first time the other day here on the floor of the House about the 60 percent that were unplanned. I do not go beyond-

Mr. PLATTS. Okay. Mr. Speaker, I have seen various studies that document those types of numbers, and if they are accurate, our emphasis on accountability and responsibility is not truly occurring here, because approximately 30 percent of AFDC women giving birth will have been responsible, will have been accountable by using contraception, but still became pregnant. So even though they were accountable and they were responsible, the way the bill is drafted without this amendment, you would still prohibit them from getting any additional AFDC grant.

Mr. CLYMER. Well, just two points. I cannot verify or not verify what you have said about the use of contraceptives. I do not know if that is a truly legitimate figure. But the other point is that there are as many taxpaying couples who work hard who, I am sure, have unplanned pregnancies, and they have got to deal with that issue. I mean, why have a double standard? We are trying to create the same standard for all the people that have children, regardless of their financial category, and we are trying to bring about accountability and responsibility.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, based on your last comment, are you suggesting then that women who are working, their husband or they are working, have an income, that we should not give them the tax

benefit of an additional exemption because they get a grant from the government by having another child?

Mr. CLYMER. No. What I am saying is that there are unplanned pregnancies, but I am saying that you have to cope with them, and the people who have to cope with them have to make those decisions, whether you are on AFDC or whether you are working parents. That is my point.

Mr. PLATTS. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

That concludes my interrogation. I would like to speak on the amendment.

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

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, the statistics do show that more than half of the women on AFDC who have unplanned pregnancies were using contraception, and as such, we are not going to hold them more accountable, more responsible. We are going to punish them even though they were responsible, even though they were accountable, and sought not to become pregnant.

One of the previous speakers, Ms. Josephs, talked about that we do not fund family planning. Not only do we not fund family planning as a State, for those women who get family planning despite that fact, we are still going to punish them and their children by this bill unless this amendment goes in.

So I encourage a "yes" vote on the amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. DENT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It was previously asked by the gentleman, Representative Walko, and also by the distinguished Democratic leader about if there is any statistical evidence supporting this so-called family cap. Let me relay to you one story—we could call this anecdotal evidence—from a woman, an ob-gyn (obstetrician gynecologist), a physician, who is in my legislative district, and I met her at her doorstep one day. Let me tell you what she told me. She said, "Why do you continue to pay for additional children for AFDC recipients?" And I asked her, "Why do you ask such a question?" And she said, "Well, I happen to be working in a Philadelphia hospital; I am working on my residency, and I just delivered the ninth child of a woman on AFDC, and I asked this woman"—this is what the doctor said—"and I asked this woman, why do you continue to have children if you cannot afford to support them?" And here was the answer: "Because they pay me more." Now, that is just one story. I am not saying that is representative of every woman who receives AFDC benefits. I am not suggesting that. I am just telling you that that is one story I have heard from a woman, an M.D. (doctor of medicine), a very progressive woman, I might add, who suggested that we impose this family cap.

I would also like to suggest to this body that if we do vote for the Trich amendment, we are in effect doing away with the family cap which this body wanted to keep in this legislation yesterday. So I would urge my colleagues to maintain the family cap and vote "no" on the Trich amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington, Mr. Daley.

Mr. DALEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think our friends on the right side of the room are doing something that we as Democrats have been accused of for the last several years, and that is social engineering. I know that the Republicans want to send a clear message to all of Pennsylvania that they mean business when it comes to welfare reform, but let us not throw out the baby with the bathwater.

Have you not learned the lesson from history that we all learned, that social engineering does not work? This debate reminds me, as a historian, of the debate in the Reichstag in 1930, and that scares me.

And I hear that this promotes irresponsibility, this legislation. That is absolutely ludicrous. That is like saying highway funding promotes speeding, and economic development funding promotes greed.

Like President Clinton said on Tuesday evening, we should not punish our children for the poor judgment of their parents. I rise for an affirmative vote on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Luzerne, Mr. Blaum. Mr. BLAUM. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Last night I voted against the amendment to remove the cap, and I will vote against the Trich amendment now. So why does a former chairman of Aging and Youth vote against these amendments? I do so because this current system is harmful to our children and it has to change, and gradually we are going to make these changes and we are going to tackle various amendments and we are going to try and decide whether they are right or not.

I believe it is time that we try something like this cap, but at the same time, everybody in this room has an obligation to vote with me when we are talking about other provisions for those kids and to vote with others who offer amendments for job training to help people and adults get off welfare and into the private sector, because I think we can all agree that the only true welfare reform is to get out of this system, for the adults and the kids to get out of this system, and that is how we begin to solve our problem.

But let us not think for one moment that the current system is not broke. It does not help kids, and it needs to change, because it does need changing. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Jefferson, Mr. Smith. Mr. S. H. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this amendment is basically saying to us that, well, the current system is not real great, but it is costing a little too much, so we better wean it back a little wee bit. The bottom line when you look at this amendment is that it is just going to temper this situation a little bit.

I heard some of the other speakers talking about social engineering and what the Republicans are trying to do in sending strong messages, but the fact is, the current welfare system that we have been living under in this country for the last 25 or 30 years, that is social engineering, and voting against this amendment will not be a pro-abortion inducement as has been suggested. The amendment is just watering down the system.

The current welfare system is what is an abortion in this country. It has trapped the poor people of this country, and if we in this legislature do not have the courage to make dramatic changes, then we may as well just keep tinkering along and creating more convoluted welfare reform bills like have been passed over the last several years.

I think it is time for the legislature to stand up and make a dramatic change. This has nothing to do with being cruel or mean-spirited; it has to do with facing the facts that the current welfare system has failed us. It is the abortion, and we need to make some changes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the lady from Luzerne, Ms. Mundy.

Ms. MUNDY. Mr. Speaker, people are looking for statistics. I have statistics for you. I have a report here called "The Jury Is Still Out." It is an analysis of the purported impact of New Jersey's AFDC child exclusion, otherwise known as the "Family Cap" law.

I think it is incumbent upon us to listen carefully to what this analysis has to say about the effect of the family cap in New Jersey:

"This analysis is intended to correct widespread misconceptions created by premature and inaccurate assertions about the purported impact of the child exclusion provisions of New Jersey's welfare reform demonstration - the Family Development Program (FDP) - in reducing births to women on Aid to Families With Dependent Children.... States considering the replication of the New Jersey model on the basis of these claims should first consider the more accurate and up-to-date information presented below."

And I will not read the entire report. I have it here for anyone who is sincerely interested in what it says, but I would like to read into the record a few paragraphs.

"General Population's Birth Rates Also Declining" in New Jersey is the heading: "Any assertions of reductions in AFDC birth rates must be considered in perspective of concomitant declines in the overall population's fecundity levels. New Jersey's births for the general population has been dropping over the last several years, reflecting national demographic trends. In 1990, there were 122,973 births to New Jersey residents, according to State Department of Health data. In 1991, the state recorded 121,415 births, a reduction of 1,558 births, or a drop of 1.3 percent from the previous year. The decline continued in 1992, with 120,352 births, another 0.9 percent drop. Thus, New Jersey had witnessed a decline in births of over 2.13 percent over two years."

"In order to achieve even this modest reduction of 94 births per month, an average of 458 newborns were excluded from their parents' grants during August and September. Consequently, for every birth that was allegedly avoided—for every birth that was allegedly avoided—the state penalized five infants who were born to AFDC families by refusing to provide them with any financial assistance. Annualized, that means that as many as 5,496 infants will be punished to produce the desired results of an estimated 1,122 avoided births."

The statistics do not bear out Mr. Clymer's assertions.

And finally, from the report, "States rushing to reform welfare by enacting child exclusion laws should exercise extreme caution in doing so based on the experience to date of New Jersey's Family Development Program. Contrary to the premature assertions of 'obvious' success by former Governor Florio and Assemblyman Bryant, the law's impact appears to be both modest and equivocal. Its desired outcomes are roughly half of what its proponents alleged last November and its adverse consequences may yet prove to be considerable. At the very least, states would be well-advised to await additional data from New Jersey's experiment. Aside from placating a public clamoring for welfare reform - any welfare reform - the child exclusion law remains a risky gamble with little demonstrated benefits."

Mr. Speaker, I offer this report and the excerpts from it maybe not as conclusive proof that the New Jersey program is not working but it should certainly give all of us pause in voting against this compromise amendment, which is designed to improve the outlook for children in this Commonwealth. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster, Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Quite a while ago, one of the speakers mentioned about incentives, and I would like to talk about that just for a brief moment here.

If we continue to proceed in giving these government handouts, we are again creating more disincentives for the family to come back together and to support one another. There is no incentive for the family to support the child itself. Mr. Speaker, you know that our family structure in Pennsylvania, in the United States, is going broke. It is bankrupt. We need to create a policy—and that is what we are trying to do today—that will allow the family structure to be once again rebuilt, and by voting “no” for this amendment and “yes” for what we are trying to do, we are trying to once again build that family support.

One other thing: The Center for Law and Social Policy is a liberal Washington think tank which opposed the family cap even before it was implemented. They went into their study with a preconceived notion that the program was bad. Mr. Speaker, anyone can cook the numbers in such a study, and I suggest that my colleagues consider the source. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tioga, Mr. Baker.

Mr. BAKER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is my understanding that if this bill would be signed into law, it would not go into effect until 10 months after the act is signed. That means that those individuals impacted by this legislation would be held harmless; those families, those children, would be held harmless that are currently in the household plus those mothers that may be pregnant at the time. So it is not punitive, and I stand because I believe that opposition to this amendment does not discourage mothers from having children but encourages positive, responsible behavior and to discourage dependency. We still have food and medical assistance being provided to these children.

Hypothetically, if a welfare mother went into the welfare agency and had four children to begin with, she could qualify for benefits, in my understanding, at this point. Under this amendment, she could have up to an additional four children or a total of eight children before there would be a total phaseout of any additional financial remuneration, assistance. Is that the message that we want to send, that it is okay to have eight children, without responding to our mandate from our constituents that we need to encourage responsible behavior and fiscal responsibility?

I think we need to think about this very, very thoroughly. We still have a safety net. We still have food and medical assistance being provided. Many of our families out there would be held harmless, as is currently the law, and after 10 months, then this would go into effect. If this goes into effect, then families could still have, hypothetically, up to eight children and still qualify for this assistance. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Argall.

Mr. ARGALL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to share a brief paragraph from an editorial in U.S. News and World Report from 2 weeks ago. It was written not by Newt Gingrich or Rush Limbaugh and certainly not by some old member of the Reichstag but it was written by their editor-in-chief, Mortimer Zuckerman, who has not hesitated to criticize Republicans over the years, sometimes when we are wrong and even sometimes when we are right.

He said, “A primary objective must surely be to reduce the number of babies born to unwed mothers. Present policy does the

opposite. Simply giving cash without strings to unmarried mothers does not give them an incentive to marry before having children or to forgo childbearing in the first place. It enables them to have babies, and the poorer the woman, the more the welfare stipend can be an inducement to pregnancy. The original AFDC program was designed to be a short-term bridge to help children by giving cash to their widowed mothers until they remarried, so that they would not be forced to go out to work. In practice, the program is standing on its head.

“The 1990s are not the 1930s. Today, most women on welfare have not been married but go on receiving benefits for years. The system has become a holding pen for the poor, not a helping hand for the dependent to become independent. It has been transformed from a remedy for poverty into a cause of it, from a stimulus to social cohesion into a destroyer of it.”

Mr. Speaker, I do not normally read a lot of things into the record, but I thought in this case he was much more eloquent than I could be. Thank you.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, may I interrogate Representative Flick or Representative Clymer?

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

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the prescription in the bill that provides no cash assistance to AFDC mothers who have additional children, does that apply to all AFDC recipients or does it apply to some?

Mr. CLYMER. Mr. Speaker, this is not my amendment, so I would refer to Mr. Trich, if he specifically asked for the maker of this amendment.

The SPEAKER. What the gentleman is saying, Mr. Thomas, is—and it was my mistake, I suppose, recognizing the gentleman, Mr. Clymer—the person who proposed the amendment is the gentleman, Mr. Trich, and you asked to interrogate the maker of the amendment.

The maker of the amendment, Mr. Trich, will you stand for interrogation?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, let me make a correction. I do not want to interrogate the maker of the amendment. I would like to interrogate the maker of the bill, and since Mr. Clymer seemed to have been the standard-bearer for this section of the bill, my interest is in interrogating him.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands and thanks the gentleman.

Mr. Clymer consents to interrogation, and the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. CLYMER. Mr. Speaker, we are still dealing with the amendment process. I will be glad to answer interrogation on the bill, if that is what he is interested in, when we get to that point in the debate.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, Mr. Speaker, in order to understand the amendment, I need clarification on that provision in the bill, and I will tell you what my problem is.

The bill itself provides for a pilot program, for a pilot job training, employment program, in 3 out of the 67 counties, so the program is designed to only impact on a very distinctive population of people. My concern is, these exclusionary provisions which talk about eliminating cash assistance to parents who have additional

children, is there any correlation between that exclusionary provision and the limited program prescription that is outlined in the bill? I need to understand that before I can understand the amendment.

Mr. CLYMER. Mr. Speaker, he really needs to address his comments to the maker of the amendment, and I defer to the maker of the amendment those comments, because as I said before, when we get to the passage of the final bill, I will be glad to take interrogation and speak specifically to those points which the speaker is concerned about.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, let me make my point.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. My point is this: The amendment, from what I understand, is designed to strike the language in the bill that provides for the elimination of cash assistance to AFDC mothers who have additional children. That is my understanding of the amendment.

It is also my understanding that there is a provision in the bill which says that all AFDC mothers who are currently receiving cash assistance, if this bill becomes law, will not receive additional assistance for additional children - very specific exclusionary rule.

My problem is that the bill provides for certain programs to help people who are subject to one or more of these exclusionary rules contained in the legislation. The reason that this amendment becomes so important is because there is no direct connection between these so-called incentives contained in the bill and the overall population of people who will be impacted by the exclusionary provisions in the bill. In other words, if this bill becomes law without the Trich or without some of the other progressive amendments that have been offered, then we will have a situation where we will be putting a total population of people, AFDC recipients, in a very adverse situation, because they will be faced with exclusionary provisions, and in application, they will not be able to take advantage of the so-called incentives that are contained in the bill itself.

If the pilot job training and employment program will only be limited to three counties, unless we are absolutely sure that all AFDC recipients are located in those three counties or that those counties where the incentives will be implemented represent those counties where we have our AFDC population, then I think, Mr. Speaker, impliedly, impliedly, we are creating a very discriminatory environment in which people will be affected by this legislation. We are saying that only in those counties where the incentives will apply will people who are subject to exclusionary provisions of the bill have some benefit and some opportunity to get out of the dependency state that they are in, but people who live outside of those counties that will not benefit from the incentives contained in the bill, they in effect will just have to suffer because they happen not to live in counties where the pilot programs will be implemented.

And to that end, Mr. Speaker, my point in final is this: In spirit, in spirit, we should not be providing assistance to anyone that creates additional dependency or creates a situation where people remain dependent as opposed to becoming independent. My problem is and why I rise in support of the Trich amendment is because until we come up with incentives that will apply to the entire affected population, I do not think that we can really be setting up exclusionary rules for everyone and benefits only for some, and to that end, we must remove the language contained in this bill by supporting the Trich amendment until such time that we reach a point in our deliberation where the incentives will apply to all persons who will be ultimately affected by the exclusionary and very negative provisions that are contained in the bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes, for the second time on the issue, the lady from Philadelphia, Ms. Josephs.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Here I am, Mr. Speaker. I just have a parliamentary inquiry.

I commend the lady from Luzerne, the Honorable Phyllis Mundy, for citing the study that she did, and I wonder if there is a way in which the entire study can be inserted in the record.

The SPEAKER. The study can be added as part of the Appendix to the Journal.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

REPORT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Ms. JOSEPHS submitted a report for the Legislative Journal.

(For report, see Appendix.)

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland County, Mr. Masland.

Mr. MASLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It was a long night last night. It is probably going to be a long day today. I have refrained as best I could for as long as I could from standing up here and saying anything, but there is a limit to my restraint. I will be brief, and I will tell you at the outset, because I am speaking now, I will spare you some time on final passage.

I am glad I had the opportunity to sleep on it last night. I hope I do not have the opportunity to sleep on it again tonight. But, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that you can only take so much, and I say that in a bipartisan spirit. From my side of the aisle, to be honest, I did not appreciate at times last night feeling as if I was just a drone, to be given marching orders. I did not appreciate that, and I thought the gentleman, Mr. Lloyd, had some cogent remarks in that respect.

On the other hand though, to the other side of the aisle, I do not appreciate all the inferences that we are just being hateful, hypocritical, shameful, senseless. It makes for some good headlines. I have to say that there are some very erudite and pedantic members amongst us who have been speaking not so much for statistics but for the headlines, and they will be great headlines all the way from Philadelphia to Greene County.

But the question ultimately comes down to this, and I think it is as Mr. Blaum had said earlier: If you think the current welfare system is not in need of change, then you can just vote "no." I really think it comes down to this amendment, because there have been a number of good amendments, and you might say, well, yes, Al, I think there is some need of change but not this change; no, some other kind of change, not this change; this is cruel change; let us have good change.

But most of the amendments are just tinkering around the edge of a bill which, I submit, is fairly cohesive. It is not perfect; it is not perfect at all. It may not be perfect when it finally comes out of the conference committee, because that is where it is ultimately going to end up, but we need to make this step today.

And on this amendment, this is a fateful type of tinkering for this type of bill. It could be fatal to the bill, and that is why I rise now as opposed to on final passage, because the welfare system is like the mythical beast that you have all heard of, the Chimera. The Chimera had the head of a lion, the body of a goat, and the tail of a serpent; a fire-breathing monster that ultimately was and ultimately had to be

killed. That is what our welfare system is. This amendment just says, well, we do not want it to have a lion's head; let us have a goat's head instead, or we do not want it to have a serpent's tail; you know, we will just switch those three parts around like a little puzzle. You still end up with a fire-breathing monster.

Mr. Speaker, the monster has to be killed. I urge a "no" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. DeLUCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I guess like my colleague who just spoke previous to me, I really was not going to speak on this issue.

I oppose the Trich amendment, and I think we need to address this situation, but listening to some of my other colleagues on the House floor, I guess what really made me get up to speak is some of the irresponsible statements that are being made. If we believe that every woman who gets pregnant, unfortunately a poor woman who gets pregnant, is irresponsible, that is totally ridiculous, and to make that type of inference on this floor is certainly not in the best interest of the people out there. Sure, there are irresponsible people, and sure, it is a small minority, and are we going to correct it even if this amendment went in there? No.

We talked about the family, building the family. This bill will probably play a little bit in building the family. I do not think it is going to make a very big difference. Until the Congress addresses that sex and violence is in America and on our TV's, then we can talk about building the family structure. Until we put decent wages out there for people to earn a living so that both parents do not have to go to work and leave their children home with nobody there to watch them, then we can rebuild the family.

You know, I came from a family, and certainly my mother-

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. TRICH. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Trich. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. TRICH. A request for a point of order.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman state his point.

Mr. TRICH. I am wondering if the debate is now straying off the amendment itself. This is my amendment, and we are beating it to death. Let us talk the amendment, Mr. Speaker, if possible, and cast a vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is exactly right. I think it has been beaten about pretty badly.

Mr. DeLUCA. All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman confine his remarks to the amendment of Mr. Trich.

Mr. DeLUCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I oppose the Trich amendment, and I think that we should put this in there, and I ask my colleagues to vote against it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Fleagle.

Mr. FLEAGLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus in on this amendment and why I am in opposition to it.

There was a wise old sage that told a story one time that I will never forget, and he was from Pennsylvania originally. His story was

told about how the battle against polio was waged, and he said that we could take two approaches to it. One approach would be to use our technology and our resources to develop a portable iron lung. That would be compassionate; that would be better for everyone. They would have more ease of going around; they would not be burdened. Of course, that is a Band-Aid approach. Or we could do as we did - use our resources, use our energy, use our strength to cure the problem. That way we will get rid of the problem.

Well, as many of you know, that wise old sage from Pennsylvania or with Pennsylvania roots was Newt Gingrich, and you may say, well, I do not agree with Newt Gingrich. He does not express my philosophy. But there is one thing that I believe everybody agrees with, and it is one thing that both Newt Gingrich and Louis Farrakhan agree with, that the present welfare system enslaves people. This bill is tough; you bet it is tough, but it takes that toughness to solve this problem. We cannot put a Band-Aid on this problem by waltzing around it, which is exactly what we are doing now. We have to be tough.

I say vote against this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question of the adoption of the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCALL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Trich amendment.

I was not going to speak on this bill, but I am kind of sick and tired of listening to all the remarks on the floor about personal responsibility and people taking responsibility for their own actions.

First of all, I firmly believe that the majority of the members in this hall advocate responsibility in our citizens, especially when it comes to providing public assistance. I also firmly believe we should not provide incentives to people to remain on public assistance.

However, I get the sense I had when I was a child when I would walk around the patio in the back of my house and I would see an ant or a bug walking around on that patio and I would step on it, and I would step on that bug without giving it any thought, no thought whatsoever. I did not feel any better; I did not feel any worse, and unfortunately, today I am getting that same sense, that we are just walking around stepping on people without any regard or without any care to their feelings.

I would ask that this House adopt the Trich amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-89

Battisto	George	Markosek	Santoni
Bebko-Jones	Gigliotti	McCall	Scrimenti
Belardi	Gordner	Melio	Serafini
Belfanti	Gruitza	Michlovic	Shaner
Bishop	Haluska	Mihalich	Staback
Buxton	Herman	Mundy	Steelman
Caltagirone	Horsey	Olasz	Stetler
Cappabianca	Itkin	Oliver	Sturia
Carn	James	Pesci	Surra
Carone	Jarolin	Petrarca	Tangretti
Cawley	Josephs	Petrone	Thomas
Cohen, M.	Kirkland	Pistella	Tigue
Colafella	Krebs	Platts	Travaglio

Colaizzo	Kukovich	Preston	Trello
Conti	LaGrotta	Ramos	Trich
Corpora	Laughlin	Rieger	Van Horne
Cowell	Lawless	Roberts	Veon
Curry	Lescovitz	Robinson	Walko
Daley	Levdansky	Roebuck	Washington
Dermody	Lloyd	Rooney	Williams
DeWeese	Lucyk	Rudy	Wright, D. R.
Druce	Manderino	Sainato	Youngblood
Fajt			

NAYS-112

Adolph	Egolf	Lynch	Schroder
Allen	Fairchild	Maitland	Schuler
Argall	Fargo	Major	Semmel
Armstrong	Farmer	Marsico	Sheehan
Baker	Feese	Masland	Smith, B.
Bard	Fichter	Mayernik	Smith, S. H.
Barley	Fleagle	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Flick	McGill	Stairs
Blaum	Gamble	Merry	Steil
Boscola	Gannon	Micozzie	Stern
Boyes	Geist	Miller	Stish
Brown	Gladeck	Nailor	Strittmatter
Browne	Godshall	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Burt	Gruppo	Nyce	Taylor, J.
Butkovitz	Habay	Perzel	True
Chadwick	Hanna	Pettit	Tulli
Civera	Harhart	Phillips	Vance
Clark	Hasay	Piccola	Vitali
Clymer	Hennessey	Pitts	Waugh
Cohen, L. I.	Hershey	Raymond	Wogan
Cornell	Hess	Readshaw	Wozniak
Corrigan	Hutchinson	Reber	Wright, M. N.
Coy	Jadlowiec	Reimard	Yewcic
DeLuca	Kaiser	Richardson	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Keller	Rohrer	Zug
Dent	Kenney	Rublely	
DiGirolamo	King	Sather	Ryan,
Donatucci	Lederer	Saylor	Speaker
Durham	Leh		

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-2

Evans O'Brien

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

On the question recurring,

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

Ms. JOSEPHS offered the following amendment No. A0248:

Amend Title, page 1, line 11, by striking out "and" and inserting a comma

Amend Title, page 1, line 13, by removing the period after "coverage" and inserting

and for the establishment of a joint task force between the Department of Health and the Department of Public Welfare to develop and implement on a pilot basis a health insurance continuation program for insured people with acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV); and making an appropriation.

Amend Sec. 7, page 12, line 23, by striking out "A SUBARTICLE" and inserting

subarticles

Amend Sec. 7, page 23, by inserting between lines 10 and 11

(o) Health Insurance Continuation

Section 495.1. Legislative Findings.—The General Assembly finds and declares that an insurance continuation program would lessen dependency on public assistance by forestalling or eliminating the need for individuals with acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS)/human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) from impoverishing themselves to become eligible for Medicaid due to the loss of private insurance coverage, thereby permitting individuals with AIDS/HIV to maintain rewarding part-time or full-time work. An insurance continuation program spreads the cost of health care among private insurance carriers, publicly supported Medicaid and Medicare programs and the patient. An insurance continuation program is a cost-effective means of assisting persons with AIDS and HIV who have private insurance by saving the Commonwealth nine dollars (\$9) in Medicaid costs for every one dollar (\$1) invested in an insurance continuation program.

Section 495.2. Definitions.—As used in this subarticle:

"Departments" means the Department of Health of the Commonwealth and/or the Department of Public Welfare of the Commonwealth.

"Task force" means the Health Insurance Continuation Joint Task Force of the Department of Health and the Department of Public Welfare created by this article.

Section 495.3. Establishment of Health Insurance Continuation Joint Task Force.—(a) The task force shall be comprised of the following eleven members:

- (1) The Secretary of the Department of Health or a designee.
- (2) The Secretary of the Department of Public Welfare or a designee.
- (3) Two representatives from nonprofit organizations providing services to individuals with AIDS/HIV, to be appointed by the President of the Senate.
- (4) Two representatives from the insurance industry to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate.
- (5) Two representatives from AIDS/HIV service organizations to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.
- (6) Two representatives of a nonprofit hospital plan corporation or a representative of a nonprofit professional health service plan to be appointed by the Governor.
- (7) The Insurance Commissioner of the Commonwealth or a designee.

Section 495.4. Purpose.—The purpose of the task force is to develop and implement on a pilot basis a health insurance continuation program to be administered by the Department of Health.

Section 495.5. Duties of Task Force.—The task force shall:

- (1) Identify persons with AIDS/HIV that may lose private health insurance coverage due to unemployment or inability to pay.
- (2) Determine financial eligibility criteria for participation in the program.
- (3) Determine for eligible participants appropriate procedures for prompt payment of the insurance premiums.
- (4) Designate appropriate departmental staff who are sensitive to the unique needs of the program's participants to manage the health insurance continuation program.
- (5) Report to the Committee on Public Health and Welfare in the Senate and the Committee on Health and Human Services in the House of Representatives at least once a year during the existence of the pilot program.
- (6) Promulgate regulations for the administration of the health insurance continuation program within six months after the effective date of this subarticle.

Section 495.6. Confidentiality Protection.—To ensure the confidentiality of eligible participants the task force shall establish guidelines for Commonwealth employees administering this subarticle.

Section 495.7. Appropriation. The sum of fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000), or as much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to the Health Insurance Continuation Joint Task Force for the fiscal year July 1, 1995, to June 30, 1996, for premiums. This appropriation shall be a three-year continuing appropriation and shall be allocated so that fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) is expended in each of the three fiscal years.

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

The SPEAKER. On the question of the adoption of amendment 0248, the Chair recognizes the lady, Ms. Josephs.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment establishes a joint task force between the Department of Health and the Department of Welfare, now the Department of Human Services, to set up a pilot project called the Health Insurance Continuation Program. This program would pay insurance premiums of low-income and limited-income HIV (human immunodeficiency virus) and AIDS (acquired immune deficiency syndrome) patients who are in danger of losing their private coverage because of their unemployment or another kind of inability to pay their health insurance premiums. I would appropriate \$50,000 annually to the department for 3 years in order to fund this task force; to the Department of Health, that is.

Today, Mr. Speaker, 17 States conduct such a program. These States have estimated that about 17,000 people with AIDS and HIV will be served this year by insurance buy-ins at the cost of about \$2.3 million or about \$1,400 a person per year. The reason I am suggesting that we spend money is the same rationale that was advanced by many of us only 2 days ago when we set up what we are calling the mini-Grace Commission. A small investment is going to reap a very large saving.

Health Insurance Continuation is a cost-effective way of helping those with AIDS or HIV. In fact, Michigan found that its cost-to-benefit ratio was 1 to 9 - that is, \$9 in services were provided for every dollar spent - and that the State saved \$517 in medicaid payments per client per month.

In addition, Health Insurance Continuation does not require that people impoverish themselves in order to receive medical coverage. It allows patients to maintain part- or full-time work, and it spreads the cost of care among private insurers and the public sector.

This is a scheme geared to the members of the party that I am not a member of and to some of ours also that unites the public and the private sectors and helps keep people independent; it helps keep them working; it saves money for State government, and I suppose that those people who will vote against it will vote against it because it does not deprive anybody of anything. It is not excluding any children; it is not punishing any mothers. It is a good program. It helps everybody.

I think I should have bipartisan support, and I ask for your support for this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Flick.

Mr. FLICK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is a bill that was introduced last year. It was referred to the Health and Welfare Committee. It did not receive consideration there last year.

We urge a "no" vote on this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-64

Bebko-Jones	Gigliotti	Miller	Shaner
Belardi	Gruitza	Mundy	Staback
Bishop	Horsey	Olasz	Steelman
Boscola	Itkin	Oliver	Stetler
Buxton	James	Pesci	Sturla
Caltagirone	Josephs	Petrarca	Tangretti
Carn	Kirkland	Petrone	Thomas
Cawley	Kukovich	Pistella	Travaglio
Colafella	Laughlin	Ramos	Trello
Colaizzo	Lescovitz	Readshaw	Trich
Corpora	Levdansky	Richardson	Veon
Cowell	Manderino	Rieger	Vitali
Curry	Markosek	Robinson	Walko
DeLuca	Meljo	Roebuck	Washington
DeWeese	Michlovic	Rudy	Williams
Donatucci	Mihalich	Scrimenti	Youngblood

NAYS-133

Adolph	Fairchild	Lederer	Saylor
Allen	Fargo	Leh	Schroder
Argall	Farmer	Lloyd	Schuler
Armstrong	Feese	Lucyk	Semmel
Baker	Fichter	Lynch	Serafini
Bard	Fleagle	Maitland	Sheehan
Barley	Flick	Major	Smith, B.
Battisto	Gamble	Marsico	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Gannon	Masland	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Geist	Mayernik	Stairs
Blaum	George	McCall	Steil
Boyes	Gladeck	McGeehan	Stern
Brown	Godshall	McGill	Stish
Browne	Gordner	Merry	Strittmatter
Bunt	Gruppo	Micozzie	Surra
Butkowitz	Habay	Nailor	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Haluska	Nickol	Taylor, J.
Carone	Hanna	Nyce	Tigue
Chadwick	Harhart	Perzel	True
Civera	Hasay	Pettit	Tulli
Clark	Hennessey	Phillips	Vance
Clymer	Herman	Piccola	Van Horne
Cohen, L. I.	Hershey	Pitts	Waugh
Conti	Hess	Platts	Wogan
Cornell	Hutchinson	Raymond	Wozniak
Corrigan	Jadlowiec	Reber	Wright, D. R.
Coy	Jarolin	Reinard	Wright, M. N.
Daley	Kaiser	Roberts	Yewcic
Dempsey	Keller	Rohrer	Zimmerman
Dent	Kenney	Rooney	Zug
DiGirolamo	King	Rubley	
Druce	Krebs	Sainato	Ryan,
Durham	LaGrotta	Santoni	Speaker
Egolf	Lawless	Sather	

NOT VOTING-4

Cohen, M.	Dermody	Fajt	Preston
-----------	---------	------	---------

EXCUSED-2

Evans O'Brien

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

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

Ms. JOSEPHS offered the following amendment No. A0249:

Amend Sec. 5 (Sec. 432.12), page 11, by inserting after line 30
(1) The department shall establish a review board to consider exceptions under this section.

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

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes the lady, Ms. Josephs.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is an amendment that I believe will take care of some of the problems that we debated earlier today and yesterday.

What it does is establish a board within the Department of Public Welfare to consider exceptions to the child-exclusion provision.

I wonder, in conjunction with this, if the maker of the bill, Mr. Flick, would stand for interrogation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Flick, indicates he will stand for interrogation. The lady may proceed.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, under the child-exclusion provision in your bill, if a woman on AFDC tries to access family planning services but cannot afford them and becomes pregnant, is there any way she can appeal to a body and preserve the payment for the child which is conceived and born?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. FLICK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think this is the perfect opportunity to stress an amendment which we accepted last night. Mr. Speaker, this was an amendment that the Representative from Philadelphia, Representative Josephs, proposed, and we accepted it.

Now, let us talk about this family cap. Government does not impregnate women-

Ms. JOSEPHS. Mr. Speaker, I am only asking a question, a simple question about his bill-

The SPEAKER. Will the lady yield.

Mr. FLICK. We accepted an amendment-I am going to be getting to the answer that she has-we accepted an amendment that would allow an individual who is receiving AFDC to go after the father of the child and receive child support, and, Mr. Speaker, that is what we ought to be doing.

In 1994 in our welfare reform piece, we allowed for two parents to be on welfare together, encouraging marriage.

Mr. Speaker, there is not an appeal process where an individual who becomes pregnant can go and ask for exception to this in my bill. What the young lady ought to be doing is working with those in

authority to get the young man who impregnated her to pay and to provide support. We provided in our 1994 reform that when mothers who were on medical assistance received hospital services to have a child, that that hospital would have to seek to determine who the father was. That is the area we ought to be going in, Mr. Speaker. That is the area. We need to have the individuals who are responsible for these pregnancies to be those who provide the financial support. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER. For the information of the House, the Chair has granted permission to Paul Vathis of the Associated Press to take still photography on the floor.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady, Ms. Josephs. Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I have another question.

The SPEAKER. A question of the gentleman, Mr. Flick?

Ms. JOSEPHS. He had consented to interrogation and unfortunately forgot he was being interrogated and took the floor and made a comment, but I will forgive him because he called me a young lady, and considering my seniority to him in years, I appreciate that compliment.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman, Mr. Flick, has any sense, he will not reply to that.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, who does have very much sense and has a lot of experience with women, I can tell.

The SPEAKER. Not as much as he would like.

Ms. JOSEPHS. I think, actually, I will not continue with the interrogation.

I think I will simply say that this is a board which will consider cases of individual hardship within the Department of Human Services. I think it is a way to help people who need help. It is a way not to micromanage, and I would appreciate bipartisan support for this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-45

Bebko-Jones	Horsey	Mundy	Rooney
Bishop	Itkin	Oliver	Shaner
Buxton	James	Pesci	Steelman
Caltagirone	Josephs	Petrone	Sturla
Carn	Kirkland	Pistella	Surra
Cohen, M.	Kukovich	Preston	Thomas
Corpora	Laughlin	Ramos	Trich
Curry	Manderino	Richardson	Veon
DeWeese	Melio	Rieger	Washington
George	Michlovic	Robinson	Williams
Gigliotti	Mihalich	Roebuck	Youngblood
Gruitza			

NAYS-155

Adolph	Druce	Lescovitz	Saylor
Allen	Durham	Levdansky	Schroder
Argall	Egolf	Lloyd	Schuler
Armstrong	Fairchild	Lucyk	Scrimenti
Baker	Fajt	Lynch	Semmel
Bard	Fargo	Maitland	Serafini
Barley	Farmer	Major	Sheehan
Battisto	Feese	Markosek	Smith, B.
Belardi	Fichter	Marsico	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Fleagle	Masland	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Flick	Mayernik	Staback
Blaum	Gamble	McCall	Stairs
Boscola	Gannon	McGeehan	Steil
Boyes	Geist	McGill	Stern
Brown	Gladeck	Merry	Stetler
Browne	Godshall	Micozzie	Stish
Bunt	Gordner	Miller	Strittmatter
Butkovitz	Gruppo	Nailor	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Habay	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Carone	Haluska	Nyce	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Hanna	Olasz	Tigue
Chadwick	Harhart	Perzel	Trello
Civera	Hasay	Petrarca	True
Clark	Hennessey	Pettit	Tulli
Clymer	Herman	Phillips	Vance
Cohen, L. I.	Hershey	Piccola	Van Horne
Colafella	Hess	Pitts	Vitali
Colaizzo	Hutchinson	Platts	Walko
Conti	Jadlowiec	Raymond	Waugh
Cornell	Jarolin	Readshaw	Wogan
Corrigan	Kaiser	Reber	Wozniak
Cowell	Keller	Reinard	Wright, D. R.
Coy	Kenney	Roberts	Wright, M. N.
Daley	King	Rohrer	Yewcic
DeLuca	Krebs	Rubley	Zimmerman
Dempsey	LaGrotta	Rudy	Zug
Dent	Lawless	Sainato	
Dermody	Lederer	Santoni	Ryan,
DiGirolamo	Leh	Sather	Speaker
Donatucci			

NOT VOTING-1

Travaglio

EXCUSED-2

Evans O'Brien

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

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

The SPEAKER. Did the lady, Ms. Josephs, have additional amendments or are they withdrawn? They are withdrawn. Thank you.

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

Mr. THOMAS offered the following amendment No. A0300:

Amend Title, page 1, line 5, by inserting after "implementation," providing for pension funds of recipients;

Amend Bill, page 23, by inserting between lines 19 and 20

Section 9. The Department of Public Welfare shall apply to the Federal Government for a waiver to ensure that persons who are unemployed are not forced to liquidate any pension funds which they may have already acquired and to which they are otherwise entitled before receiving benefits under this act, including, but not limited to, food stamps, welfare payments, Medicaid and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payments.

Amend Sec. 9, page 23, line 20, by striking out "9" and inserting 10

Amend Sec. 10, page 23, line 23, by striking out "10" and inserting 11

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The amendment is pretty straightforward. It would require the Department of Health and Human Services to apply to the Federal Government for a waiver, a waiver to insure that persons who are unemployed do not have to liquidate any pension funds which they may already have acquired for the purposes of receiving any benefits that might be available through the Federal Government, benefits like food stamps, medical assistance, or supplemental security income.

I ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question of the amendment, the Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. PERZEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We concur, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-201

Adolph	Egolf	Lynch	Saylor
Allen	Fairchild	Maitland	Schroder
Argall	Fajt	Major	Schuler
Armstrong	Fargo	Manderino	Scrimenti
Baker	Farmer	Markosek	Semmel
Bard	Feese	Marsico	Serafini
Barley	Fichter	Masland	Shaner
Battisto	Fleagle	Mayernik	Sheehan
Bebko-Jones	Flick	McCall	Smith, B.
Belardi	Gamble	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Gannon	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Geist	Melio	Staback
Bishop	George	Merry	Stairs
Blaum	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Steelman
Boscola	Gladeck	Micozzie	Steil
Boyes	Godshall	Mihalich	Stern
Brown	Gordner	Miller	Stetler
Browne	Gruitza	Mundy	Stish
Bunt	Gruppo	Nailor	Strittmatter
Butkovitz	Habay	Nickol	Sturla
Buxton	Haluska	Nyce	Surra

Caltagirone	Hanna	Olasz	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Harhart	Oliver	Taylor, E. Z.
Carn	Hasay	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Carone	Hennessey	Pesci	Thomas
Cawley	Herman	Petrarca	Tigue
Chadwick	Hershey	Petrone	Travaglio
Civera	Hess	Pettit	Trello
Clark	Horsey	Phillips	Trich
Clymer	Hutchinson	Piccola	True
Cohen, L. I.	Itkin	Pistella	Tulli
Cohen, M.	Jadlowiec	Pitts	Vance
Colafella	James	Platts	Van Horne
Colaizzo	Jarolin	Preston	Veon
Conti	Josephs	Ramos	Vitali
Cornell	Kaiser	Raymond	Walko
Corpora	Keller	Readshaw	Washington
Corrigan	Kenney	Reber	Waugh
Cowell	King	Reinard	Williams
Coy	Kirkland	Richardson	Wogan
Curry	Krebs	Rieger	Wozniak
Daley	Kukovich	Roberts	Wright, D. R.
DeLuca	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wright, M. N.
Dempsey	Laughlin	Roebuck	Yewcic
Dent	Lawless	Rohrer	Youngblood
Dermody	Lederer	Rooney	Zimmerman
DeWeese	Leh	Rublely	Zug
DiGirolamo	Lescovitz	Rudy	
Donatucci	Levdansky	Sainato	Ryan,
Druce	Lloyd	Santoni	Speaker
Durham	Lucyk	Sather	

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-2

Evans O'Brien

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

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair is advised that the lady, Ms. Josephs, has withdrawn her amendments.

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

Ms. WASHINGTON offered the following amendment No. A0225:

Amend Title, page 1, line 11, by striking out "and" and inserting a comma

Amend Title, page 1, line 13, by removing the period after "coverage" and inserting

and for an arbitration panel for medical care and prescription drugs.

Amend Bill, page 23, by inserting between lines 10 and 11

Section 495. Arbitration Panel for Medical Care and Prescription Drugs. (a) The department shall establish and maintain an arbitration panel

to hear claims made under this act regarding the denial of medical care or prescription drugs.

(b) The arbitration panel shall be composed of five members including:

(1) One member appointed by the Governor.

(2) One member appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate.

(3) One member appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(4) One member appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(5) One member appointed by Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

(c) The department shall promulgate rules and regulations to administer this board.

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

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

Ms. WASHINGTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many people on welfare that require medical care and prescription medicine that exceeds the limit allowed in HB 2. This amendment will allow these people a means to appeal for medical care and/or medication that might be life threatening.

I urge your support for this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. FLICK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We do not need more bureaucracy in our government. We urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-68

Belbeko-Jones	DeWeese	McCall	Rooney
Belardi	Fajt	Melio	Sainato
Belfanti	George	Michlovic	Scrimenti
Bishop	Gigliotti	Mihalich	Shaner
Buxton	Gruitza	Olasz	Staback
Caltagirone	Horsey	Oliver	Steelman
Cappabianca	Itkin	Pesci	Sturla
Carn	James	Petrarca	Surra
Cawley	Josephs	Petrone	Thomas
Cohen, M.	Kirkland	Pistella	Travaglio
Colafella	Kukovich	Preston	Trello
Colaizzo	LaGrotta	Ramos	Trich
Corpora	Laughlin	Readshaw	Walko
Cowell	Lescovitz	Richardson	Washington
Curry	Lloyd	Rieger	Williams
DeLuca	Lucyk	Robinson	Wozniak
Dermody	Manderino	Roebuck	Youngblood

NAYS-132

Adolph	Fairchild	Levdansky	Schroder
Allen	Fargo	Lynch	Schuler

Argall	Farmer	Maitland	Semmel
Armstrong	Feese	Major	Serafini
Baker	Fichter	Markosek	Sheehan
Bard	Fleagle	Marsico	Smith, B.
Barley	Flick	Masland	Smith, S. H.
Battisto	Gamble	Mayermik	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Gannon	McGeehan	Stairs
Blaum	Geist	McGill	Steil
Boscola	Gladeck	Merry	Stern
Boyes	Godshall	Micozzie	Stetler
Brown	Gordner	Miller	Stish
Browne	Gruppo	Mundy	Strittmatter
Bunt	Habay	Nailor	Taylor, E. Z.
Butkovitz	Haluska	Nickol	Taylor, J.
Carone	Hanna	Nyce	Tigue
Chadwick	Harhart	Perzel	True
Civera	Hasay	Pettit	Tulli
Clark	Hennessey	Phillips	Vance
Clymer	Herman	Piccola	Van Horne
Cohen, L. I.	Hershey	Pitts	Veon
Conti	Hess	Platts	Vitali
Cornell	Hutchinson	Raymond	Waugh
Corrigan	Jadlowiec	Reber	Wogan
Coy	Jarolin	Reinard	Wright, D. R.
Daley	Kaiser	Roberts	Wright, M. N.
Dempsey	Keller	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dent	Kenney	Rubley	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	King	Rudy	Zug
Donatucci	Krebs	Santoni	
Druce	Lawless	Sather	Ryan,
Durham	Lederer	Saylor	Speaker
Egolf	Leh		

NOT VOTING-1

Tangretti

EXCUSED-2

Evans O'Brien

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

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

Mr. **ARMSTRONG** offered the following amendment No. **A0368**:

Amend Sec. 7 (Sec. 494.4), page 20, by inserting after line 30
(4) Every effort shall be made to include the following benefits:

- (i) Visits to:
 - (A) A chiropractor's office.
 - (B) A podiatrist's office.
 - (C) An optometrist's office.
- (ii) Dental services, limited to surgical procedures and emergency services, including medically necessary palliative treatment, and diagnostics, restorations, or extractions related to the need for palliative treatment.
- (iii) Ambulance services, limited to medically necessary emergency transportation.

Amend Sec. 7 (Sec. 494.4), page 21, line 1, by striking out "(4)" and inserting

(5)

Amend Sec. 7 (Sec. 494.4), page 21, line 4, by striking out "(5)" and inserting

(6)

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Armstrong, on the amendment.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is not mandatory. It just states that the department shall take a look at and providers shall take a look at some other benefits that they may be able to provide within the policies. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair at this time asks the gentleman, Mr. Birmelin, to temporarily preside.

**THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
(JERRY BIRME LIN) PRESIDING**

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I urge your affirmative vote on this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes Mr. Flick from Chester County.

Mr. FLICK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We do support this amendment and ask your affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes Representative Manderino from Philadelphia County.

Ms. MANDERINO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the gentleman, the maker of the amendment, stand for a brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Armstrong, indicates he is willing to do so. You may proceed.

Ms. MANDERINO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Myself, personally, and I hear other members behind me who cannot find the amendment or have not received it, but it would do us great service if you could briefly explain the amendment and what it does.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Okay. It states that every effort shall be made to include the following benefits: visits to a chiropractor's office, a podiatrist's office, an optometrist's office, dental services, and ambulance services, most of which were taken out of the bill yesterday as mandatory benefits. We are just basically trying to include them as areas that will be at least taken a look at to see if they can be provided.

Ms. MANDERINO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-201

Adolph	Egolf	Lynch	Saylor
Allen	Fairchild	Maitland	Schroder
Argall	Fajt	Major	Schuler
Armstrong	Fargo	Manderino	Scrimenti
Baker	Farmer	Markosek	Semmel

Bard	Feese	Marsico	Serafini
Barley	Fichter	Masland	Shaner
Battisto	Fleagle	Mayernik	Sheehan
Bebko-Jones	Flick	McCall	Smith, B.
Belardi	Gamble	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Gannon	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Geist	Melio	Staback
Bishop	George	Merry	Stairs
Blaum	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Steelman
Boscola	Gladeck	Micozzie	Steil
Boyes	Godshall	Mihalich	Stern
Brown	Gordner	Miller	Stetler
Browne	Gruitza	Mundy	Stish
Bunt	Gruppo	Nailor	Strittmatter
Butkovitz	Habay	Nickol	Sturla
Buxton	Haluska	Nyce	Surra
Caltagirone	Hanna	Olasz	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Harhart	Oliver	Taylor, E. Z.
Carn	Hasay	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Carone	Hennessey	Pesci	Thomas
Cawley	Herman	Petrarca	Tigue
Chadwick	Hershey	Petrone	Travaglio
Civera	Hess	Pettit	Trello
Clark	Horsley	Phillips	Trich
Clymer	Hutchinson	Piccola	True
Cohen, L. I.	Itkin	Pistella	Tulli
Cohen, M.	Jadlowiec	Pitts	Vance
Colafrèlla	James	Platts	Van Horne
Colaizzo	Jarolin	Preston	Veon
Conti	Josephs	Ramos	Vitali
Cornell	Kaiser	Raymond	Walko
Corpora	Keller	Readshaw	Washington
Corrigan	Kenney	Reber	Waugh
Cowell	King	Reinard	Williams
Coy	Kirkland	Richardson	Wogan
Curry	Krebs	Rieger	Wozniak
Daley	Kukovich	Roberts	Wright, D. R.
DeLuca	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wright, M. N.
Dempsey	Laughlin	Roebuck	Yewcic
Dent	Lawless	Rohrer	Youngblood
Dermody	Lederer	Rooney	Zimmerman
DeWeese	Leh	Rubley	Zug
DiGirolamo	Lescovitz	Rudy	
Donatucci	Levdansky	Sainato	Ryan,
Druce	Lloyd	Santoni	Speaker
Durham	Lucyk	Sather	

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-2

Evans O'Brien

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

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

Mr. STURLA offered the following amendment No. A0221:

Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 414), page 6, line 23, by inserting after "department"

, or his designee within the department.

Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 414), page 6, line 26, by striking out the bracket before "(h)"

Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 414), page 6, line 27, by inserting after "year" two years and five years
Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 414), page 6, line 27, by inserting brackets before and after "The" and inserting immediately thereafter Each
Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 414), page 7, line 10, by striking out the bracket after "Program."
Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 414), page 7, lines 11 through 15, by striking out all of said lines

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes Representative Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment basically does two things. With regard to the fingerprinting program that there is available, the bill currently reads, on page 6, that "Absent a court order, only the department, the Pennsylvania State Police, the chief of a local municipal police department and the designated officials of neighboring states..." will have access to these fingerprints.

I think it is unrealistic to believe that, for instance, only the chief of police of the Philadelphia Police Department will be handling the fingerprinting portion of the records. So what my amendment does is says that the chief or a designee within the department. That is the first portion of it.

The other portion is to continue the evaluation of this program. I think it is important that we look at this not just on a 1-year basis but farther out to see whether in fact once we have started to clean up the fraud and once people know this is in place what kind of cost effectiveness it has out in future years.

That is the basis of the amendment, and I ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes Representative Saylor from York County.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I would agree with Mr. Sturla's amendment and ask for the Republican side and bipartisan support for his amendment.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-194

Adolph	Druce	Lescovitz	Santoni
Allen	Durham	Levdansky	Sather
Argall	Egolf	Lucyk	Saylor
Armstrong	Fairchild	Maitland	Schroder
Baker	Fajt	Major	Schuler
Bard	Fargo	Manderino	Semmel
Barley	Farmer	Markosek	Serafini
Battisto	Feese	Marsico	Shaner
Bebko-Jones	Fichter	Masland	Sheehan
Belardi	Fleagle	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Belfanti	Flick	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Birmelin	Gamble	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Bishop	Gannon	Melio	Staback
Blaum	Geist	Merry	Stairs
Boscola	George	Michlovic	Steelman

Boyes	Gigliotti	Micozzie	Steil
Brown	Gladeck	Mihalich	Stern
Browne	Godshall	Miller	Stetler
Bunt	Gordner	Mundy	Stish
Butkovitz	Gruitza	Nailor	Strittmatter
Buxton	Gruppo	Nickol	Sturla
Caltagirone	Habay	Olasz	Surra
Cappabianca	Haluska	Oliver	Tangretti
Carn	Hanna	Perzel	Taylor, E. Z.
Carone	Harhart	Pesci	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Hasay	Petrarca	Thomas
Chadwick	Hennessey	Petrone	Trello
Civera	Herman	Pettit	Trich
Clark	Hershey	Phillips	True
Clymer	Hess	Piccola	Tulli
Cohen, L. I.	Horsey	Pistella	Vance
Cohen, M.	Hutchinson	Pitts	Van Horne
Colafella	Itkin	Platts	Veon
Colaizzo	Jadlowiec	Preston	Vitali
Conti	James	Ramos	Walko
Cornell	Jarolin	Raymond	Washington
Corpora	Josephs	Readshaw	Waugh
Corrigan	Kaiser	Reber	Williams
Cowell	Keller	Reinard	Wogan
Coy	Kenney	Richardson	Wozniak
Curry	King	Rieger	Wright, D. R.
Daley	Kirkland	Roberts	Wright, M. N.
DeLuca	Krebs	Robinson	Yewcic
Dempsey	Kukovich	Roebuck	Youngblood
Dent	LaGrotta	Rohrer	Zimmerman
Dermody	Laughlin	Rooney	Zug
DeWeese	Lawless	Rubley	
DiGirolamo	Lederer	Rudy	Ryan,
Donatucci	Leh	Sainato	Speaker

NAYS-6

Lloyd	McGeehan	Scrimenti	Tigue
Lynch	Nyce		

NOT VOTING-1

Travaglio

EXCUSED-2

Evans O'Brien

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. STURLA offered the following amendment No. A0267:

Amend Sec. 6 (Sec. 438), page 12, by inserting between lines 19 and 20

(c) The department shall provide an annual report to the General Assembly which shall include, but not be limited to, the costs of implementing this section, a cost-effectiveness evaluation, the rate of fraud and any recommendations for improving the program.

Amend Sec. 6 (Sec. 438), page 12, line 20, by striking out "(c)" and inserting

(d)

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, what this does is says that we should have an analysis of the electronic benefit system and its cost benefits.

I believe that there has been a resolution in the House that has been entered into the House, HR 23, which begins to address some of the concerns that may surround the electronic welfare benefits transfer system, in that we know that with electronic banking cards and things like that, there are levels of fraud that exist. So what this amendment basically does is says that we want to have a look at whether fraud exists in this program once we get it up and running, what the cost is in implementing it and its cost effectiveness, and recommendations for improving the program in the future.

I ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes Mr. Waugh from York County.

Mr. WAUGH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sturla is correct. There are certain levels of fraud that we are all probably concerned with. It is our hope that the electronic benefits transfer system will eliminate fraud. We believe that it will.

Also, we believe that Mr. Sturla's amendment is a good amendment, and we ask for your support. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-200

Adolph	Egolf	Lynch	Saylor
Allen	Fairchild	Maitland	Schroder
Argall	Fajt	Major	Schuler
Armstrong	Fargo	Manderino	Scrimenti
Baker	Farmer	Markosek	Semmel
Bard	Feese	Marsico	Serafini
Barley	Fichter	Masland	Shaner
Battisto	Fleagle	Mayernik	Sheehan
Bebko-Jones	Flick	McCall	Smith, B.
Belardi	Gamble	McGill	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Gannon	Melio	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Geist	Merry	Staback
Bishop	George	Michlovic	Stairs
Blaum	Gigliotti	Micozzie	Steelman
Boscola	Gladeck	Mihalich	Steil
Boyes	Godshall	Miller	Stern
Brown	Gordner	Mundy	Stetler
Browne	Gruitza	Nailor	Stish
Bunt	Gruppo	Nickol	Strittmatter
Butkovitz	Habay	Nyce	Sturla
Buxton	Haluska	Olasz	Surra
Caltagirone	Hanna	Oliver	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Harhart	Perzel	Taylor, E. Z.
Carn	Hasay	Pesci	Taylor, J.
Carone	Hennessey	Petrarca	Thomas
Cawley	Herman	Petrone	Tigue
Chadwick	Hershey	Pettit	Travaglio
Civera	Hess	Phillips	Trello
Clark	Horsey	Piccola	Trich
Clymer	Hutchinson	Pistella	True
Cohen, L. I.	Itkin	Pitts	Tulli
Cohen, M.	Jadlowiec	Platts	Vance
Colafella	James	Preston	Van Horne
Colaizzo	Jarolin	Ramos	Veon

Conti	Josephs	Raymond	Vitali
Cornell	Kaiser	Readshaw	Walko
Corpora	Keller	Reber	Washington
Corrigan	Kenney	Reinard	Waugh
Cowell	King	Richardson	Williams
Coy	Kirkland	Rieger	Wogan
Curry	Krebs	Roberts	Wozniak
Daley	Kukovich	Robinson	Wright, D. R.
DeLuca	LaGrotta	Roebuck	Wright, M. N.
Dempsey	Laughlin	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dent	Lawless	Rooney	Youngblood
Dermody	Lederer	Rubley	Zimmerman
DeWeese	Leh	Rudy	Zug
DiGirolamo	Lescovitz	Sainato	
Donatucci	Levdansky	Santoni	Ryan,
Druce	Lloyd	Sather	Speaker
Durham	Lucyk		

NAYS-1

McGeehan

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-2

Evans O'Brien

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

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

Mr. STURLA offered the following amendment No. A0269:

Amend Sec. 7 (Sec. 494.6), page 22, line 7, by striking out "and access to" and inserting

access to and availability of

Amend Sec. 7 (Sec. 494.6), page 22, line 16, by inserting after "to" and availability of

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, what this amendment does is simply state, on page 22, in two separate places where we are talking about access, in the study portion, we are talking about studying the access that people have to these health-care services that will be provided.

I would simply hope that we would study the access to and availability of. We are simply trying to make sure that when we assess this program, we understand what levels of service are actually out there. This is sort of standard boilerplate language when you talk about health services. There are two components - access to and availability of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the lady, Representative Vance, from Cumberland County.

Mrs. VANCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We believe that this amendment is a good one. It helps to make the bill better, and we support the amendment. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-200

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

NAYS-1

McGeehan

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-2

Evans

O'Brien

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

On the question recurring,

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman, Mr. Sturla, have any further amendments?

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, at this point in time I will withdraw any further amendments.

I would like to make one final comment though, if that is appropriate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. You may proceed.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to thank the gentleman, Mr. Pitts, and his staff for supplying fiscal notes on obviously an abundant amount of amendments that I had to offer on this particular bill and thank the members for their patience in going through these. I think as a result of some of these amendments and amendments that other speakers have offered, we have actually been able to make this bill better, and I appreciate the support I have received in some of these amendments. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. **COHEN** offered the following amendment No. **A0281**:

Amend Sec. 4, page 7, line 16, by striking out "432(3)" and inserting 432

Amend Sec. 4, page 7, line 17, by striking out "is amended and the section"

Amend Sec. 4 (Sec. 432), page 7, lines 26 through 30; pages 8 and 9, lines 1 through 30, by striking out all of said lines on said pages

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Cohen from Philadelphia.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment removes the restriction of 18- to 25-year-olds from qualifying for transitionally needy welfare benefits.

Right now transitionally needy benefits, which originally were year-round unlimited benefits, have now been reduced to 2 months over any 2-year period. In an ideal world, all 18- to 25-year-old people would have a job or they would have a loving family which would support them and they would not need any governmental benefits. Unfortunately, this is not an ideal world and there are real people out there suffering real poverty, who are unable to get a job,

whose unemployment compensation benefits have run out, who do not have children or qualify for any other benefits.

Two-month benefits every 2 years for some very, very small amount of money, a few hundred dollars, is a very, very insignificant benefit, but it is a benefit that there is no decent, humane reason to take out.

I would urge that people here show some compassion, recognize tragedy in human life, recognize that people get in desperate economic circumstances—even if they are under 25 years old, they get in desperate economic circumstances—and give these people some minimal benefit.

I urge your support of this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes Representative King from Mercer County.

Mr. KING. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to ask the membership to consider the fact that we are talking about a real bonus here. This is not a type of funding mechanism that contributes in any meaningful way to those people who would be recipients. We are talking about 18- to 25-year-old able-bodied people who presently do not have any mental or physical incapacity to work, do not have any dependents depending on them for any livelihood, and we are simply saying to them, because you do not have the initiative to get up and go out and earn a job to separate yourself from the dependency of this entitlement, that we should give you this bonus of 400-and-some dollars every 2 years to stay in this capacity.

We ask for a "no" vote on this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes Representative Haluska from Cambria.

Mr. HALUSKA. The only thing I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, on this bill, if I could, this would allow us, with the workfare, these are able-bodied people, and these are the people whom we are trying to reach to teach them how to work. And I really think this 18- to 25-year-old, they are not going to be able to lay around the house and collect the money. They are going to have to work for their benefits. They will be able-bodied.

So I really would support this measure for the simple fact that we are trying to instill into these 18- to 25-year-old people the work ethic, and what a better way to do it than to put them to work for at least a couple weeks a year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Those in favor of the amendment will vote "aye"; those opposed, "no."

The Chair rescinds that statement and recognizes the Representative, Mr. Richardson, from Philadelphia.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think this is the crux of the whole bill. After we talk about children, now we are talking about those who fall between the ages of 18 to 25.

It seems to me that if we are going to take a major hit of going after those individuals who we believe are able-bodied and we believe that can work, then all we are asking and have asked from the very beginning is, where are the jobs? If you tell us that we in fact have the jobs, then produce them so that we are able to now go in and deal directly with giving people an opportunity to be able to in fact work. If the whole notion is work, and we agree that it is, and we have traveled over this Commonwealth on a number of occasions, then let us deal with work.

Eliminating general assistance eligibility for those 18 to 25 years old assumes that because these individuals are relatively healthy, that they also are employable. But rather than arbitrarily determining

employability based on age or health status, what we tried to do is establish a reality-based definition of "employability," and we have talked about this. It requires an independent county-by-county study to determine what actually constitutes the ability to work and determine if jobs for which this population qualifies are available in the local economy.

Mr. Cohen's attempt here is to try to let you know that we need to do something to be able to give some softening of a blow to a major hit and to something as major as this, and what I did was I looked up where we are in this country as it relates to joblessness, pennilessness, often homelessness. State general assistance cuts leave and talks about employables struggling for survival.

In this country, in Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, and in Pennsylvania, we have already restricted or time-limited GA recipient programs by excluding persons labeled as "employable." We have already seen that over 350,000 recipients were terminated from income support by those actions, and many lost health coverage as well. The definition of "employability" used by many of these States proved arbitrary, as they had little to do with individuals' actual ability to work or to locate a job in the local economy and did not reflect either labor market conditions or the numerous personal and structural barriers that GA recipients face to employment. It appears that the cuts were motivated principally by the cost savings predicted from these actions, nothing more.

A number of other States have enacted dramatic GA program reductions since 1991, including three that also eliminated aid to employables, and still others either stopped aiding the nondisabled during the eighties or do not provide any cash assistance to this population.

And quickly I want to share with you that we always have a tendency to label people in certain areas, and what I did was I looked at the Center on Social Welfare Policy and Law. It said that those who were terminated, did they find employment?

Impact studies conducted after GA termination uniformly show that the vast majority of "employable" persons whose cash assistance was discontinued did not enter jobs in the 1 or 2 years following, and as a result, for those who found work, it was typically low-wage, temporary, and part-time.

That people would not find jobs was totally predictable, from both economic information available at the time of the cuts as well as the characteristics of the GA population. None of this is taken into consideration at all. GA cuts often occurred in peak recessionary periods when securing a job was difficult for even the most qualified of candidates, meaning those who have Ph.D. (doctor of philosophy) degrees and M.S.W. (master of social welfare) degrees, et cetera.

As we have talked over and over again, I will make three final, quick points, and that is, in Michigan, according to the State statistics, over 80 percent of the former GA recipients, nearly 66,000 individuals, did not work for most of the year following GA termination. For those who did work, the work appears to have been sporadic.

Right here in our own State, nearly two-thirds, 64 percent, of a random sampling of "employable" former GA recipients surveyed lacked paid employment 2 full years after the cut during an entire 6-month period. An even greater number, a percentage of 74 percent, had no job covered by unemployment compensation in that period. Over the five quarters beginning with termination, 64 percent had no covered job at all, and less than 3 percent had covered employment in all five quarters.

Mr. Speaker, it continues to go on and on, but the reality of life is that it should be noted that what we are doing here is another attempt just to say we want to be tough, and being tough is okay, because I like to be tough, too, but one of the things that I know is you cannot be tough on your child and then say you still love them when you put them out in the cold if in fact he does not want to be put out in the cold. You can be tough, you can be tough, and you can be tough. You can determine that that individual needs to have and learn a lesson, but at the same time you do it in such a way that allows him an opportunity or her an opportunity of a way out to get back in.

What we are saying is that we do not want any chance or opportunity for them to get back in; we just want to do away with it. But as a result, and I know many of you do not even fear this, so it does not even matter whether we say it or not because it is not a major concern, but if we really wanted to be fair about this, let us talk about that 18- to 25-year-old. Let us talk about that individual that in fact needs to be at work, needs to find a job.

Give me a list—and I challenge anyone on the other side of the aisle—give me a list of the jobs that exist now so that we can send them to work, the ages of 18 to 25. Give me the list, and every time we ask for the list, all we get is rhetoric. We have never yet seen a list produced by those. And all of you who are making money off this deal, let us be clear: They are not talking about hiring welfare recipients as a result of them going to this automated system that they are talking about in terms of even the bank card. Hire some of them to work in that area. You will not do it.

The thing is that it is a basic contradiction to witness and watch over and over again to eliminate and cut young people off from even having an opportunity to be able to make it futuristically. We are saying that the Cohen amendment is a step in the right direction, so it is helping to try to make sure that we restore all of those youngsters to stay on, and that as we begin to find jobs, if they do not go to those jobs, then you are talking about another situation that we should deal with at that time. But you first have to offer them a job so we can determine whether or not they turned it down or not, but to arbitrarily take them off is sinful, shameful, and abominable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Before I recognize the gentleman, Mr. Sturla, let me just inform the members that we are getting near the tail end of the amendment process. We appear to have only seven more amendments after this one, and I would ask the members' indulgence. The noise level is getting a little higher and a little more difficult for members to be heard, and we would appreciate your cooperation in trying to keep your conversations to a minimum.

At this point, the Chair recognizes, on the amendment, Mr. Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman, Mr. King, stand for a brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. King, indicates he will. You may proceed.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of questions, and then I would like to make a brief comment.

Do you know, if someone is currently discharged from the Army, honorably discharged, and they come out, do they qualify for unemployment benefits if they cannot find a job immediately?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman yield for a moment, please?

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, was that—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman yield for a moment, please? Mr. King, please yield.

Members, please diminish the tone of your voice, if you would, please.

Mr. King, you may proceed.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, would you please reiterate your question to me again, sir, concerning the issue you are talking about?

Mr. STURLA. Yes. If someone is currently discharged from the Army with an honorable discharge, do they qualify for unemployment benefits when they are discharged from the Army?

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I can only say that certainly I am not qualified to speak to their eligibility at this time, but certainly if they have been discharged from the United States Army, United States Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force, I would submit to you that they are very employable.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, my question is not whether they are employable or not; it is whether they qualify for unemployment benefits.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I told you I do not have an answer to that question.

Mr. STURLA. Okay. Well, a followup question: If somebody is currently self-employed and they have exhausted their life savings trying to get their new business started up, and finally after 6 or 8 months of trying and seeing that it is just not quite working out they face bankruptcy and have no means of supporting themselves, do they qualify for unemployment benefits?

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, would you please refer your comments to the maker of the amendment for the answers that you are seeking? I will address this issue on final passage, if you like.

Mr. STURLA. Well, I guess what I am trying to do, if I can, Mr. Speaker, the maker of the amendment is saying we should restore some benefits, and I am trying to find out what is in the bill currently so that I know whether I want to restore these benefits or not.

Mr. KING. Well, why do you not address that to Mr. Speaker Cohen there at this time, and he can answer that question for you. I am sure he would like to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman, Mr. Sturla, requesting the interrogation of the maker of the amendment?

Mr. STURLA. I was not. I guess maybe I should interrogate the maker of the bill so that I can find out what is currently in the bill, whether the way the language is currently written those certain people would qualify.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Sturla, the Chair would advise you that if you had a question on the bill that does not pertain to this amendment, as yours appears not to, that you would do that in a sidebar and not from the floor of the House, if you would, please.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. STURLA. A point of inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. State your purpose, please.

Mr. STURLA. If the amendment is restoring something to the current language in the bill and I am trying to add a clarification on what the current language is, is that not pertinent to the amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. We are having a difficult time understanding your line of questioning as it applies to the amendment, and apparently Mr. King is also and would rather not answer those questions at this time.

Mr. KING. I think, Mr. Speaker, if I may assist you on this, that again I would direct you to the maker of the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes Mr. King.

Mr. KING. Thank you.

I would direct you again to the maker of the amendment. Obviously he had a reason for submitting this amendment to correct some language that he felt was deficient. If you have a problem with any language in the bill, then direct the question to Mr. Cohen, who put this amendment in, and he should be able to answer it for you.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, if I could—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes Mr. Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if I could, I am not sure that the maker of the amendment offered his amendment for the same purposes as what I am trying to discern here.

What I am trying to understand is, currently in the bill we are going to say that 18- to 25-year-olds do not qualify as transitionally needy. Now, if you are talking about someone who is habitually not working and not trying to make a contribution to society and simply trying to take advantage of society, I do not have a problem with not giving them assistance 2 months out of every 2 years, because I do not know that we have accomplished anything by doing that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentleman, Mr. King, care to respond?

Mr. STURLA. What I am trying to get at is whether the current language is punitive to members who are discharged from the military, one, and two, people who are self-employed, whose businesses fail, because it is my belief that if I am self-employed and my business fails, I would qualify under current law at least for 2 months' worth of benefits in a 2-year period while I got back on my feet and found a job.

I can understand, in most cases people who lose their job, they qualify for unemployment benefits; that gives them time to go hunt for a new job. I am not sure that somebody who is discharged from the military has time to go hunt for a new job. I am pretty sure that somebody whose business fails does not have time to go hunt for a new job, and if that is the case, then I would think that a 2-month period once every 2 years would give that person the opportunity.

Now, maybe Mr. Cohen's amendment does not address what I want to, but what I am trying to do is determine what is in that bill to find out whether in fact his amendment does address that or not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Can I assume that you are still interrogating Mr. King, Representative Sturla?

Representative Sturla, was your question put forth to Mr. King?

Mr. STURLA. Oh, I will put it in the form of a question.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to determine is the current language in the bill which cuts off 18- to 25-year-olds from transitionally needy. If I am a self-employed 18- to 25-year-old, if I have taken that entrepreneurial spirit, if I have done what everybody says I should do in America and start my own business and try and make things succeed and my business fails, would I then not qualify for 2 months' worth of assistance or unemployment benefits and be left out there in the cold on day 1?

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, if I may answer the question on final passage.

I would ask for a ruling from the Parliamentarian. Is his line of questioning germane to the amendment or is it not?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman, Mr. King, does not wish to answer that question, that is his prerogative. My only alternative suggestion to Mr. Sturla is the one that I gave him earlier,

and that is to talk to the prime sponsor of the bill, who may be in a better position to answer your question, and you can do that from the microphone or you can do that in a sidebar if you would prefer.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. You are recognized, Mr. King.

Mr. KING. At some point in time I will be happy to come back here and stand to any interrogation you have on final passage of this matter. At some point in time today I expect we will get to that point. But again, I decline the invitation to speak to this matter, because I do not think it is germane to this issue at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman, Mr. Sturla, have any further interrogation or comments?

Mr. STURLA. No further interrogation, but I do have one final comment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. STURLA. I believe that what I stated previously was in fact the case, and since I do not believe that the current language in the bill addresses those concerns, I will probably opt to vote for the Cohen amendment, even though he addresses more concerns than I am interested in addressing, but at least it addresses the concern that I am interested in.

I would think that there is better language that could be drafted, perhaps at a different date. I will move on at this point in time to keep the debate moving, but I think it is something that we should take into consideration as we look at what this bill actually does and consideration of this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would kindly ask the members again if they would keep the noise level down. I know that we are getting near the lunch hour, and I know that we are getting near the end of the amendment process, but please be patient, bear with us, and your quietness will help the process go much further.

On the amendment, the Chair recognizes Representative Haluska from Cambria County.

Mr. HALUSKA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If I could, I would like to comment on Mr. Cohen's amendment.

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

Mr. HALUSKA. What Mr. Cohen is doing I think answers Mr. Sturla's question. It is bringing the 18- to 25-year-old able-bodied person back onto this. They would then be eligible to work workfare and to get their benefits for 2 months a year for 2 years. So this would help Mr. Sturla's problem. Somebody that does go on hard times would be eligible, and also on this amendment, it would also help those people with summertime employment for the municipalities and everything.

So I really think it is a good amendment, and it really brings this age group back into compliance to work for benefits, even though it would only be 2 months a year for 2 years. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes Representative King.

Mr. KING. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When we are talking about money here, we are talking about an approximate savings to the Commonwealth of \$14 million, and certainly if we are in a position of plenty here, \$14 million may not seem like much to you on your side of the aisle. But what we are trying to address here is an issue where we need to put money in other places, and we think that there are better places to put this money than to hand it out to an able-bodied, mentally capacitated, independent person in the Commonwealth for this period of time.

I would remind you also, for those of you who have been here longer than this particular month, that back in May of 1993, as a result of HB 1341, which was an effort to include limited cutbacks to the general assistance program, primarily to the chronically needy category, that we had 165 "yeas" and 33 "nays," and on final passage of that, we had 141 "yeas," and Representative Sturla was a "yes" on both of those issues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes Representative Cohen.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the speeches made on behalf of this amendment by Representative Richardson, Representative Sturla, Representative Haluska.

I think the single most compelling point in all the speeches was Representative Haluska's pointing out that this is a test of our commitment to workfare. This is not a bonus. Under this bill, the people have to work to get this money. The 18- to 25-year-old people are the people who are most likely to commit crimes. We want people to have a productive life, a life of work, a life of being law-abiding.

For \$14 million, which is an infinitesimal percentage of the State budget, we are turning people away from crime. We are getting people involved in the workfare program so they will work and hopefully develop some attachment to the work ethic.

Mr. Sturla is correct that businessmen are ineligible for unemployment compensation, and if a business fails, the people are not eligible for any benefits other than welfare benefits, but they will have to work.

We want people to work. This is a prowork amendment for the people whom we want most to imbue with the work ethic. I strongly urge support of this amendment.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-55

Bebko-Jones	George	Melio	Staback
Belardi	Gordner	Mihalich	Steelman
Bishop	Gruitza	Oliver	Stetler
Butkovitz	Haluska	Pesci	Sturla
Buxton	Horsey	Petrarca	Surra
Caltagirone	Itkin	Pistella	Tangretti
Cappabianca	James	Preston	Travaglio
Carn	Josephs	Ramos	Veon
Cawley	Kirkland	Richardson	Washington
Cohen, M.	Kukovich	Rieger	Williams
Colaizzo	Laughlin	Robinson	Wozniak
Corpora	Lloyd	Roebuck	Yewcic
Curry	Lucyk	Rooney	Youngblood
DeWeese	Manderino	Scrimenti	

NAYS-145

Adolph	Egolf	Levdansky	Sather
Allen	Fairchild	Lynch	Saylor
Argall	Fajt	Maitland	Schroder
Armstrong	Fargo	Major	Schuler
Baker	Farmer	Markosek	Semmel
Bard	Feese	Marsico	Serafini
Barley	Fichter	Masland	Shaner

Battisto	Fleagle	Mayernik	Sheehan
Belfanti	Flick	McCall	Smith, B.
Birmelin	Gamble	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Blaum	Gannon	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Boscola	Geist	Merry	Stairs
Boyes	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Steil
Brown	Gladeck	Micozzie	Stern
Browne	Godshall	Miller	Stish
Bunt	Gruppo	Mundy	Strittmatter
Carone	Habay	Nailor	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Hanna	Nickol	Taylor, J.
Civera	Harhart	Nyce	Tigue
Clark	Hasay	Olasz	Trello
Clymer	Hennessey	Perzel	Trich
Cohen, L. I.	Herman	Petrone	True
Colafella	Hershey	Pettit	Tulli
Conti	Hess	Phillips	Vance
Cornell	Hutchinson	Piccola	Van Horne
Corrigan	Jadlowiec	Pitts	Vitali
Cowell	Jarolin	Platts	Walko
Coy	Kaiser	Raymond	Waugh
Daley	Keller	Readshaw	Wogan
DeLuca	Kenney	Reber	Wright, D. R.
Dempsey	King	Reinard	Wright, M. N.
Dent	Krebs	Roberts	Zimmerman
Dermody	LaGrotta	Rohrer	Zug
DiGirolamo	Lawless	Rubley	
Donatucci	Lederer	Rudy	Ryan,
Druce	Leh	Sainato	Speaker
Durham	Lescovitz	Santoni	

NOT VOTING-1

Thomas

EXCUSED-2

Evans O'Brien

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. COHEN offered the following amendment No. A0282:

Amend Sec. 4 (Sec. 432), page 9, line 21, by striking out "not"
 Amend Sec. 4 (Sec. 432), page 9, line 22, by inserting after "needy"
subject to repayment of benefits received upon
obtaining gainful employment

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes Representative Cohen.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment could informally be called the Leo-Trich-imitation amendment. We are offering here a compromise that I would rather not be offering, just as Mr. Trich did.

This is an alternative to the previous amendment. If we are not going to give 18- to 25-year-old people the chance to work for

2 months every 2 years, I am suggesting that we give them a chance to get a loan for the amount of money they would have gotten had they been working. They will have to repay the loan. The cost of this will be a small fraction of \$14 million. It will show some compassion, some concern, for these people. I think we ought to be doing that.

I would strongly urge support of the idea that people who are out of work, who need money, who are willing to sign legal papers committing themselves to pay the money back at some later date, should be able to get a loan from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for a very small amount of money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes Representative Flick from Chester County.

Mr. FLICK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We oppose this amendment and urge a negative vote.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-62

Bebko-Jones	DeLuca	McCall	Robinson
Belardi	DeWeese	Melio	Roebuck
Belfanti	George	Mihalich	Rooney
Bishop	Gigliotti	Olasz	Scrimenti
Butkowitz	Gordner	Oliver	Shaner
Buxton	Gruitza	Pesci	Sturla
Caltagirone	Haluska	Petrarca	Surra
Cappabianca	Horsey	Petrone	Tangretti
Carn	Itkin	Pistella	Thomas
Cawley	James	Preston	Travaglio
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Ramos	Trich
Colafella	Kirkland	Readshaw	Veon
Colaizzo	Kukovich	Richardson	Washington
Corpora	Laughlin	Rieger	Williams
Curry	Lloyd	Roberts	Youngblood
Daley	Manderino		

NAYS-139

Adolph	Fargo	Lynch	Semmel
Allen	Farmer	Maitland	Serafini
Argall	Feese	Major	Sheehan
Armstrong	Fichter	Markosek	Smith, B.
Baker	Fleagle	Marsico	Smith, S. H.
Bard	Flick	Masland	Snyder, D. W.
Barley	Gamble	Mayernik	Staback
Battisto	Gannon	McGeehan	Stairs
Birmelin	Geist	McGill	Steelman
Blaum	Gladeck	Merry	Steil
Boscola	Godshall	Michlovic	Stern
Boyes	Gruppo	Micozzie	Stetler
Brown	Habay	Miller	Stish
Browne	Hanna	Mundy	Strittmatter
Bunt	Harhart	Nailor	Taylor, E. Z.
Carone	Hasay	Nickol	Taylor, J.
Chadwick	Hennessey	Nyce	Tigue
Civera	Herman	Perzel	Trello
Clark	Hershey	Pettit	True
Clymer	Hess	Phillips	Tulli
Cohen, L. I.	Hutchinson	Piccola	Vance
Conti	Jadlowiec	Pitts	Van Horne
Cornell	Jarolin	Platts	Vitali
Corrigan	Kaiser	Raymond	Walko
Cowell	Keller	Reber	Waugh
Coy	Kenney	Reinard	Wogan

Dempsey	King	Rohrer	Wozniak
Dent	Krebs	Rubleby	Wright, D. R.
Dermody	LaGrotta	Rudy	Wright, M. N.
DiGirolamo	Lawless	Sainato	Yewcic
Donatucci	Lederer	Santoni	Zimmerman
Druce	Leh	Sather	Zug
Durham	Lescovitz	Saylor	
Egolf	Levdansky	Schroder	Ryan,
Fairchild	Lucyk	Schuler	Speaker
Fajt			

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-2

Evans O'Brien

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

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

Ms. STEELMAN offered the following amendment No. **A0286**:

Amend Sec. 4 (Sec. 432), page 9, line 4, by inserting a bracket before "(F)"

Amend Sec. 4 (Sec. 432), page 9, line 5, by inserting a bracket after "verified."

Amend Sec. 4 (Sec. 432), page 9, line 6, by insert brackets before and after "(G)" and inserting immediately thereafter

(F)

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

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes Representative Steelman.

Ms. STEELMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to request that instead of considering A0286 first, we consider my amendment 0287, because 286 and 374 fit together more logically.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the lady asking for the withdrawal of amendment 286 at this time?

Ms. STEELMAN. No. I am asking that you pass over that temporarily to consider 287 but then come back to 286 after we have done 287.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Amendment 286 is temporarily withdrawn.

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

Ms. STEELMAN offered the following amendment No. **A0287**:

Amend Sec. 4 (Sec. 432), page 9, line 7, by inserting a bracket before "No"

Amend Sec. 4 (Sec. 432), page 9, line 9, by inserting a bracket after "lifetime."

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the lady, Representative Steelman, from Indiana County.

Ms. STEELMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment eliminates the 9-month lifetime limitation on chronically needy benefits for survivors of domestic violence.

The women who are mostly the survivors of domestic violence are a diverse group. Some of them, when they finally have the courage to leave their abusive situations, need relatively little assistance in order to become self-supporting. Others have been wounded too deeply to recover quickly and easily. Some, because of a combination of age and life experience, are unlikely to be able to become self-supporting. For instance, a woman in her sixties who has never worked outside the home, and therefore has never contributed to Social Security as well as never having gained work experience, is unlikely to be able to qualify for gainful employment within a 9-month period.

Only a few days ago, we heard Governor Ridge announce his commitment to survivors of domestic violence and his willingness to back up that verbal commitment with increased funding for domestic violence centers. Most of you know already, even better than the Governor, the problems of domestic violence, particularly in your own districts. I am asking you to make a commitment today to enabling the survivors of domestic violence to escape to a more normal life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the lady, Mrs. Vance.

Mrs. VANCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a great deal of empathy for victims of domestic violence and think we have made some strides in this field. Before Act 49 of last year, victims of domestic violence would have gotten no benefits. Now we are 9 months. I think that it is unrealistic to say that they can have a lifetime of benefits because they at one time were a victim of domestic violence. I encourage their being able to overcome their concerns, but a lifetime of benefits, I think, is unwise in many ways. It may also emotionally cripple them as well as fiscally cripple the Commonwealth.

I urge your rejection of this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does Representative Sturla seek recognition? The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Steelman amendment.

Anybody who has been following the O.J. Simpson trial now knows about the realities of domestic violence, and there are many reasons, whether they be economic or psychological or whatever, that some women stay in abusive situations and become involved in abusive situations.

With the current cap that there is that says you can only be considered chronically needy 9 months in your lifetime as a result of being a victim of domestic violence, I think it sends the wrong message to women who are victims of domestic violence. We put them between a rock and a hard place. We say, maybe you can get involved in one domestic violence situation in your life that is abusive and we will help you out then, but that is it; if you get into an abusive

situation and are a victim of domestic violence later on in your life, that is too bad; you are not chronically needy anymore. I think that sends the wrong message about what we should be saying about domestic violence on the floor of this House and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The lady, Babette Josephs, the Representative from Philadelphia, you may proceed.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of the Steelman amendment.

I would like to point out to my friends on the other side of the aisle that their Governor went out of his way not very many days ago, when he addressed the joint session, to talk about domestic violence survivors. These are people who are victims of crime. Why do we treat them with less respect, why do we treat them with less compassion than we do other crime victims?

I do not think, really, in response to what one of the speakers said, that anybody is going to really stay on this meager benefit with which we are supporting people who are going through a very difficult time in their life.

I think if we care about victims, if we care about crime, if we care about women, we will support the Steelman amendment, and I hope that all of you will do that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes Representative Gordner from Columbia County.

Mr. GORDNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to be able to interrogate Representative Vance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Representative Vance, you are being asked to be interrogated. Do you consent to that? The lady indicates she is willing to stand for interrogation.

The lady reverses that decision and says that it is not her amendment and would ask you to redirect your interrogation to another member.

Mr. GORDNER. I would like to interrogate the maker of the bill, Representative Flick.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Representative Flick, you are being requested to stand for interrogation. He agrees to do so. Mr. Gordner, you may proceed.

Mr. GORDNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on page 9 of the bill, in regard to the section that we are dealing with now, there is a provision that says, "A person who is a victim of domestic violence and who is receiving protective services as defined by the department." Could you tell me what the phrase "who is receiving protective services as defined by the department" means? What are the protective services that are described?

Mr. FLICK. Mr. Speaker, that is part of the 1994 welfare reform law. That is not a part of our bill. That is a part of the amendment. The young lady is asking that a part of the Welfare Code be stricken. We are not dealing with that section of the code. I would direct your questions to the maker of the amendment.

Mr. GORDNER. Mr. Speaker, the question is involved in regard to what Representative Vance said. She indicated that there would be a lifetime of benefits, and I guess if there is no one from the other side that is going to answer the question, then I will go ahead and speak on the amendment.

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

Mr. GORDNER. It is sort of a shame because I am really not sure how I am going to vote on this amendment, and I was hoping for a little advice from the other side.

Representative Vance indicated that this would mean that a person would receive a lifetime of benefits, but the way I read this section, it says, "A person who is a victim of domestic violence and who is receiving protective services as defined by the department." To me, that does not seem like a person would receive a lifetime of benefits. It seems like there is that second qualifier there that says "...who is receiving protective services as defined by the department."

So I would disagree with the comments made by Representative Vance. I had hoped that she would be able to straighten me out, but she was not willing to do that, and so as a result of that, I would urge the support of this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the lady, Representative Bishop, from Philadelphia. The lady may proceed.

Ms. BISHOP. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Steelman amendment.

As a minister, there have been many opportunities I have had to counsel women who lived in domestic abusive situations. They already have very low self-esteem. They have already been abused physically and many times mentally. If they knew that there was that support there, perhaps just those little benefits would enable them to make the move sooner. Sometimes they stay there because they have no outside support and because there are no benefits, and if we are truly concerned about reforming welfare, it is these women many times who have children, and if they can get themselves together and get out and get a job and take their children with them, their children do not become victims of welfare.

I think it would behoove all of us in this House to give that large amount, a large segment of society, much larger than we even realize, the opportunity to have the strength to be able to rise up, get out of that situation, stand on their own feet, and raise their children, and knowing if they need that benefit, it is there. In most cases, once they are strong enough to make that move, they never look back, and they are able to get jobs and become independent and take care of themselves.

I am voting "yes," and I ask everyone in here, in the House, on both sides, to please vote "yes" and give those women who have been so abused an opportunity to know that there is something in place for them that will help them to make that important step. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the lady, Ms. Steelman, from Indiana County for the second time.

Ms. STEELMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think it is very important to keep in mind as you make your decision on your vote on this amendment the sentence with which I started my first statement; that is, the women who are survivors of domestic violence are a diverse population. I think that what we have in the Welfare Code now does not fully recognize that diversity, and I am asking you to respond to the fact that I think we have established a procrustean bed here in which some women are going to have their hands and feet cut off in order to enable them to fit into that 9-month structure. I think that that is a bad idea for a number of reasons.

In response to Representative Vance's comment that we have the possibility here of mandating lifetime benefits for all survivors of domestic violence, I do not think that that is true, and I would be more than happy to work with the framers of the bill and with the members of the Senate who will be involved in the conference committee that this bill is almost certainly going to go into to develop a set of guidelines for determining long-term eligibility for chronically needy status as a result of surviving domestic violence.

In fact, I have to say parenthetically that the fact that we were not able to work out that kind of more flexible and appropriate language is another reflection of how fast the bill is being run and how inappropriately, but in fact, there is still time to work on creating a system that is fair, that is responsible, and that is also responsive to the problems that are faced by women who are victims of crime who are trying to re-create their lives in a more normal pattern, and rather than subject them to an arbitrary 9-month limit, I would appreciate your assistance in removing that limit so that we can talk about a more rational system of providing benefits to victims of domestic violence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. At this time the Chair recognizes, for the second time, Representative Gordner from Columbia County. Mr. GORDNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again I bring up the same point. I have now had an opportunity to speak with someone who is familiar with this program and involved with the protective services and helping people with domestic violence, and they also agree that just because you are the victim of domestic violence once does not guarantee you to a lifetime benefit under this program. There is this qualifier in here. It says, "A person who is a victim of domestic violence and who is receiving protective services as defined by the department." What I have been advised is that the department considers protective services to be if you are within the confines of a shelter or receiving some sort of services through a shelter.

I just think it is not right, it is not fair in order to confine those benefits when you have that qualifier in there, and therefore, I would urge an affirmative vote on this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes, from Philadelphia County, the Representative, the lady, Ms. Manderino.

Ms. MANDERINO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just very briefly, I think that there was a response earlier that the amendment is good and the intention is good and we would like to do something but it is financially crippling. There was a fiscal note on this, and I just wanted to point out for the members that, yes, there is an additional cost. The cost is \$2.38 million, and for what we are talking about and the scope of the benefit versus the scope of the cost, I think it hardly qualifies, at least in my personal opinion, as fiscally crippling, and I would like you to keep that dollar amount and the small increase there in mind when you weigh it against the benefit received. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-86

Bebko-Jones	George	Michlovic	Shaner
Belardi	Gigliotti	Mihalich	Steelman
Belfanti	Gordner	Mundy	Stetler
Bishop	Gruitza	Olasz	Sturla
Buxton	Haluska	Oliver	Surra
Caltagirone	Hanna	Pesci	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Horsey	Petrarca	Thomas
Carn	Itkin	Petrone	Tigue
Cawley	James	Pistella	Travaglio
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Preston	Trello
Colafella	Kirkland	Ramos	Trich
Colaizzo	Kukovich	Readshaw	Van Horne

Corpora	LaGrotta	Richardson	Veon
Corrigan	Laughlin	Rieger	Vitali
Cowell	Lescovitz	Roberts	Walko
Coy	Levdansky	Robinson	Washington
Curry	Lloyd	Roebuck	Williams
Daley	Lucyk	Rooney	Wozniak
DeLuca	Manderino	Sainato	Wright, D. R.
Dermody	Markosek	Santoni	Yewcic
DeWeese	McCall	Scrimenti	Youngblood
Fajt	Melio		

NAYS-115

Adolph	Egolf	Lawless	Sather
Allen	Fairchild	Lederer	Saylor
Argall	Leh	Leder	Schroder
Armstrong	Farmer	Lynch	Schuler
Baker	Feese	Maitland	Semmel
Bard	Fichter	Major	Serafini
Barley	Fleagle	Marsico	Sheehan
Battisto	Flick	Masland	Smith, B.
Birmelin	Gamble	Mayermik	Smith, S. H.
Blaum	Gannon	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Boscola	Geist	McGill	Staback
Boyes	Gladeck	Merry	Stairs
Brown	Godshall	Micozzie	Steil
Browne	Gruppo	Miller	Stern
Bunt	Habay	Nailor	Stish
Butkowitz	Harhart	Nickol	Strittmatter
Carone	Hasay	Nyce	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Hennessey	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Civera	Herman	Pettit	True
Clark	Hershey	Phillips	Tulli
Clymer	Hess	Piccola	Vance
Cohen, L. I.	Hutchinson	Pitts	Waugh
Conti	Jadlowiec	Platts	Wogan
Cornell	Jarolin	Raymond	Wright, M. N.
Dempsey	Kaiser	Reber	Zimmerman
Dent	Keller	Reinard	Zug
DiGirolamo	Kenney	Rohrer	
Donatucci	King	Rubley	Ryan,
Druce	Krebs	Rudy	Speaker
Durham			

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-2

Evans	O'Brien
-------	---------

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

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

Ms. STEELMAN reoffered the following amendment
No. A0286:

- Amend Sec. 4 (Sec. 432), page 9, line 4, by inserting a bracket before "(F)"
- Amend Sec. 4 (Sec. 432), page 9, line 5, by inserting a bracket after "verified."
- Amend Sec. 4 (Sec. 432), page 9, line 6, by insert brackets before and after "(G)" and inserting immediately thereafter

(F)

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the lady, Ms. Steelman.

Ms. STEELMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have been talking a lot in the last 2 days about trying to reduce the incentives for women who are already on welfare to give birth to more children, and the House has reiterated over and over that the majority of members believe that a limitation on benefits to children is the appropriate way to achieve that goal. It seems to me that we are overlooking another issue that exists in the current Welfare Code, and that is in fact the change that was made in the Welfare Code, through Act 49, to define a pregnant woman—and this is a distinct change; it did not exist in the Welfare Code previously—but the definition of any pregnant woman as “chronically needy.” It seems to me that when the State starts to say pregnancy in and of itself is a qualifier for cash assistance benefits, that can only be interpreted as a direct incentive to pregnancy.

It is also the case that if you are looking at defining a pregnant woman as an automatic recipient of general assistance benefits under the “chronically needy” definition, you are particularly encouraging first pregnancies, because if we are looking at women who are already on AFDC, they are receiving benefits for their children, but the woman who would be most likely to benefit from this definition of “chronically needy” would be a woman who does not, at the initial point in time, have children. So not only do we have a direct incentive to pregnancy but we also have a direct incentive to first pregnancy, and obviously, that first pregnancy for many women is indeed the crucial event that traps them within the welfare system, and I do not think that we ought to be providing encouragement for them to do it.

Also, we have just had a vote in which we once again eliminated the classification of “transitionally needy” for 18- to 25-year-old young people, so we are taking away that transitionally needy eligibility for young women aged 18 to 25, although in our discussion we have tended to focus and think about, I believe, primarily young men aged 18 to 25. So we are saying to young women 18 to 25, with this bill, you cannot get even 2 months of transitionally needy assistance in 2 years, but if you become pregnant, a grateful Commonwealth will provide you with 6 months of general assistance and will then transfer you to AFDC so that you will continue to receive benefits now from AFDC for the next 3 months of your pregnancy and 18 years of your child’s life. Is this the message that we want to be sending to people? Essentially, is it not bizarre to send a message that we support pregnancies but, through the child-exclusion cap, that we reject support for children who are the normal result of pregnancy?

So it seems to me that if we are trying to send a message, if we are trying to make a statement about the need for personal responsibility, making the statement that pregnancy is an automatic qualifier for general assistance in Pennsylvania is probably a very serious mistake, and my amendment would eliminate pregnancy as an automatic qualifier for cash assistance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes Mr. Flick for the purpose of addressing the amendment.

Mr. FLICK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We support the amendment and urge an affirmative vote.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-182

Adolph	Druce	Lucyk	Sainato
Allen	Durham	Lynch	Santoni
Argall	Egolf	Major	Sather
Armstrong	Fairchild	Manderino	Saylor
Baker	Fajt	Markosek	Schroder
Bard	Fargo	Marsico	Schuler
Barley	Farmer	Masland	Semmel
Battisto	Feese	Mayermik	Serafini
Bebko-Jones	Fichter	McCall	Shaner
Belardi	Fleagle	McGeehan	Shechan
Belfanti	Flick	McGill	Smith, B.
Birmelin	Gamble	Melio	Smith, S. H.
Bishop	Gannon	Merry	Snyder, D. W.
Boscola	Geist	Michlovic	Staback
Boyes	George	Micozzie	Stairs
Brown	Gigliotti	Mihalich	Steelman
Browne	Gladeck	Miller	Steil
Bunt	Godshall	Mundy	Stern
Butkovitz	Gordner	Nailor	Stetler
Buxton	Gruitza	Nyce	Stish
Caltagirone	Gruppo	Olasz	Strittmatter
Cappabianca	Haluska	Oliver	Sturla
Cawley	Harhart	Perzel	Tangretti
Chadwick	Hasay	Pesci	Taylor, E. Z.
Civera	Hennessey	Petrarca	Taylor, J.
Clark	Herman	Petrone	Thomas
Clymer	Hershey	Pettit	Travaglio
Cohen, L. I.	Hess	Phillips	Trello
Cohen, M.	Horsey	Piccola	Trich
Colafella	Hutchinson	Pistella	True
Colaizzo	Itkin	Pitts	Vance
Conti	Jadlowiec	Platts	Van Horne
Cornell	Jarolin	Preston	Veon
Corpora	Kaiser	Ramos	Vitali
Corrigan	Keller	Raymond	Walko
Cowell	Kenney	Readshaw	Waugh
Coy	King	Reber	Wogan
Curry	Kirkland	Reinard	Wozniak
Daley	Kukovich	Richardson	Wright, D. R.
DeLuca	LaGrotta	Rieger	Wright, M. N.
Dempsey	Laughlin	Roberts	Yewcic
Dent	Lawless	Robinson	Zimmerman
Dermody	Lederer	Rohrer	Zug
DeWeese	Leh	Rooney	
DiGirolamo	Lescovitz	Rubley	Ryan,
Donatucci	Levdansky	Rudy	Speaker

NAYS-18

Blaum	James	Nickol	Tigue
Carr	Josephs	Roebuck	Tulli
Carone	Krebs	Scrimenti	Washington
Habay	Lloyd	Surra	Youngblood
Hanna	Maitland		

NOT VOTING-1

Williams

EXCUSED-2

Evans O'Brien

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the lady, Ms. Steelman, have any further amendments?

Ms. STEELMAN. I withdraw my next amendment since it was a backup to the one we just voted in favor of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady.

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

Mr. JAMES offered the following amendment No. A0292:

Amend Sec. 5 (Sec. 432.12), page 10, line 29, by inserting after "child"

except where the birth occurs as a result of rape, incest, failure of contraceptive methods or other cause beyond the control of the mother.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes Representative James.

Mr. JAMES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, from my understanding, the bill caps the cash benefits for mothers that have children after a certain time period. What my amendment does is take out and it makes an exception where the birth occurs as a result of a rape, incest, or failure of contraceptive methods, or other cause beyond the control of the mother.

I would ask for the adoption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes Representative Flick.

Mr. FLICK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We oppose this amendment and urge a negative vote.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-70

Bebko-Jones George Michlovic Scrimenti
Belardi Gigliotti Mihalich Shaner
Bishop Gruitza Mundy Stetler
Butkovitz Itkin Olasz Sturla

Buxton James Oliver Surra
Caltagirone Josephs Pesci Tangretti
Cappabianca Keller Petrarca Thomas
Carn Kirkland Petrone Travaglio
Cawley Kukovich Pistella Trello
Cohen, M. LaGrotta Preston Trich
Colafiglia Laughlin Ramos Van Horne
Colaizzo Lederer Richardson Veon
Corpora Lescovitz Rieger Waiko
Cowell Levdansky Robinson Washington
Curry Manderino Roebuck Williams
DeLuca Markosek Rooney Wozniak
DeWeese McGeehan Sainato Youngblood
Donatucci Melio

NAYS-130

Adolph Egolf Leh Saylor
Allen Fairchild Lloyd Schroder
Argall Fajt Lucyk Schuler
Armstrong Fargo Lynch Semmel
Baker Farmer Maitland Serafini
Bard Feese Major Sheehan
Barley Fichter Marsico Smith, B.
Battisto Fleagle Masland Smith, S. H.
Belfanti Flick Mayernik Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin Gamble McCall Staback
Blaum Gannon McGill Stairs
Boacola Geist Merry Steelman
Boyes Gladeck Micozzie Steil
Brown Godshall Miller Stern
Browne Gordner Nailor Stish
Bunt Gruppo Nickol Strittmatter
Carone Habay Nyce Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick Haluska Perzel Taylor, J.
Civera Hanna Pettit Tighe
Clark Harhart Phillips True
Clymer Hasay Piccola Tulli
Cohen, L. I. Hennessey Pitts Vance
Conti Herman Platts Vitali
Cornell Hershey Raymond Waugh
Corrigan Hess Readshaw Wogan
Coy Hutchinson Reber Wright, D. R.
Daley Jadowiec Reinard Wright, M. N.
Dempsey Jarolin Roberts Yewcic
Dent Kaiser Rohrer Zimmerman
Dermody Kenney Rubley Zug
DiGirolo King Rudy
Druce Krebs Santoni
Durham Lawless Sather

NOT VOTING-1

Horsley

EXCUSED-2

Evans O'Brien

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

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

Mr. JAMES offered the following amendment No. A0293:

Amend Sec. 5 (Sec. 432.12), page 11, by inserting after line 30

(f) A revision of the schedule of benefits under this section shall not affect the eligibility of a child born during the period described in subsection (d) for medical assistance or coverage under any health care policy or contract offered under this act.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes Representative James.

Mr. JAMES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, where this bill cuts off the cash benefit for any other children born, what this amendment does, it would allow that any children born, even though the cash benefit may be cut off, it would allow the children to continue to get medical assistance or coverage under any health-care policy or contract offered under this act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes Representative Flick.

Mr. FLICK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We believe this provision is in the bill. Therefore, we oppose this amendment and urge your negative support.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative James for a second time.

Mr. JAMES. I would just like to question Mr. Flick.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Representative James, you are in order, and you may proceed.

Representative Flick, you are being interrogated.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, are you saying that this is already in the bill, that children will be covered? Even though the cash payment would be off, they will be covered by other health-

Mr. FLICK. Mr. Speaker, present law provides that individuals receive medical assistance and food stamps under the AFDC program. The section that we refer to is cash assistance. So they would continue to receive the benefits they have and they would currently be eligible for, which would be the medical assistance and the food stamps.

Mr. JAMES. Now, this would be under this current HB 2. If so, could you tell me where the page and line number is?

Mr. FLICK. Could you repeat the question.

Mr. JAMES. My understanding is, you are saying that this is in the bill, and I am asking that if it is in the bill, where would it be in terms of page and line number?

Mr. FLICK. It is not in the bill. It is in present law. AFDC is a Federal program. We are not amending that section of the program. We are dealing with cash benefits only.

Mr. JAMES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would again ask- I just do not want to take any chances, Mr. Speaker, in terms of children's health and medical assistance, and I would just ask that we adopt this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Sturla from Lancaster County.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief.

I believe the only opposition to this is coming from people who say it would be redundant to say it twice in the bill. I would rather say it twice and make sure that those children are covered than risk it

being missed somewhere and those children not getting these benefits.

So I urge an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes Representative Richardson on the amendment.

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

Those are my sentiments exactly of the last speaker, that if in fact there is "belief," and that is the word that is used throughout this entire bill and this process, is believed that it is covered under law, then my position is that why would we not put it in just to make sure, and that if in fact it is already there, there will not be any problems in being able to take it out since we are not going to be able to see the bill in print before we vote on final passage anyway.

I urge an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair, on the amendment, recognizes Representative Flick.

Mr. FLICK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AFDC is a Federal program which the State shares in. The Federal Government funds 55 percent of the program; the State picks up 45 percent of the cost of the program. It is provided for by Federal law.

If there is Federal welfare reform and if they walk away from this portion of the program, if you accept this amendment, then you are saying that the State will pick up 100 percent of the cost of the medical assistance and food stamp program. We are not to that point yet, Mr. Speaker. Until the Federal Government changes their program, we need not tamper with this section of the law. It is mandated by the Federal Government. It is funded 55 percent by the Federal Government, 45 percent by the State. The cash assistance portion of the program, on the other hand, is 100 percent funded by the State, and that is what we are dealing with, Mr. Speaker.

I urge a negative vote.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-78

Bebko-Jones	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Shaner
Belardi	Gordner	Mihalich	Staback
Bishop	Gruitza	Mundy	Steelman
Blaum	Horsey	Olasz	Stetler
Buxton	Ikin	Oliver	Sturla
Caltagirone	James	Pesci	Surra
Cappabianca	Jarolin	Petrarca	Tangretti
Carn	Josephs	Petrone	Thomas
Cawley	Kirkland	Pistella	Tigue
Cohen, M.	Kukovich	Preston	Travaglio
Colafrilla	LaGrotta	Ramos	Trello
Colaizzo	Laughlin	Richardson	Trich
Corpora	Lescovitz	Rieger	Veon
Cowell	Levdansky	Roberts	Vitali
Curry	Lloyd	Robinson	Walko
Daley	Lucyk	Roebuck	Washington
DeLuca	Manderino	Rooney	Williams
Dermody	Markosek	Sainato	Wozniak
DeWeese	McCall	Scrimenti	Youngblood
George	Melio		

NAYS-123

Adolph	Egolf	Lawless	Sather
Allen	Fairchild	Lederer	Saylor
Argall	Fajt	Leh	Schroder
Armstrong	Fargo	Lynch	Schuler
Baker	Farmer	Maitland	Semmel
Bard	Feese	Major	Serafini
Barley	Fichter	Marsico	Sheehan
Battisto	Fleagle	Masland	Smith, B.
Belfanti	Flick	Mayernik	Smith, S. H.
Birmelin	Gamble	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Boscola	Gannon	McGill	Stairs
Boyes	Geist	Merry	Steil
Brown	Gladeck	Micozzie	Stern
Browne	Godshall	Miller	Stish
Bunt	Gruppo	Nailor	Strittmatter
Butkovitz	Habay	Nickol	Taylor, E. Z.
Carone	Haluska	Nyce	Taylor, J.
Chadwick	Hanna	Perzel	True
Civera	Harhart	Pettit	Tulli
Clark	Hasay	Phillips	Vance
Clymer	Hennessey	Piccola	Van Horne
Cohen, L. I.	Herman	Pitts	Waugh
Conti	Hershey	Platts	Wogan
Cornell	Hess	Raymond	Wright, D. R.
Corrigan	Hutchinson	Readshaw	Wright, M. N.
Coy	Jadlowiec	Reber	Yewcic
Dempsey	Kaiser	Reinard	Zimmerman
Dent	Keller	Rohrer	Zug
DiGirolamo	Kenney	Rublely	
Donatucci	King	Rudy	Ryan,
Druce	Krebs	Santoni	Speaker
Durham			

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-2

Evans O'Brien

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

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

Mr. COHEN offered the following amendment No. A0257:

Amend Sec. 7 (Sec. 494.4), page 21, by inserting between lines 12 and 13

(6) Nothing in this section shall alter the provisions or the payment of mental health, mental retardation and drug and alcohol services under sections 2334 and 2335 of the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.177, No.175), known as "The Administrative Code of 1929," under the act of October 20, 1966 (3rd Sp.Sess., P.L.96, No.6), known as the "Mental Health and Mental Retardation Act of 1966," and under the act of July 9, 1976 (P.L.817, No.143), known as the "Mental Health Procedures Act," including mental assistance reimbursements for services provided by licensed mental health, mental retardation and drug and alcohol agencies as authorized by the State Medicaid Plan and by Home and Community Based Waivers approved prior to 1995.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes Representative Cohen.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment conflicts with an amendment that Mrs. Vance had gotten through, amendment 285, earlier.

Would Mrs. Vance consent to interrogation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The lady indicates that she will, and as soon as she nears the microphone, the gentleman may proceed with his interrogation.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment was prepared by the Pennsylvania Community Providers Association, which believes that your amendment does not provide for any specific utilization of community provider services. The MH/MR (mental health and mental retardation) centers throughout the Commonwealth, in the opinion of the Community Providers Association, would no longer be eligible for reimbursement, under your amendment, in their view. Would you respond to that, please.

Mrs. VANCE. We believe that your amendment would carve out mental health.

In our amendment that we put in, we had the ability to substitute one mental health inpatient day for four outpatient days. We do not believe that this touches community mental health people at all. We have talked to not only our research staff here in the House but also to the Department of Welfare now, and they concur that our interpretation is correct, and this does not affect the act of 1966 at all or the Mental Health Procedures Act as well.

Mr. COHEN. Okay.

And you will be willing to talk further to try to persuade the community providers of this and be open to whatever material they have?

Mrs. VANCE. We feel very comfortable that their interests are protected. As I said, it has been agreed to also by the Department of Welfare, whom we just spoke to a few minutes ago.

Mr. COHEN. Okay.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Mr. COHEN. Based on that assurance and with the understanding of the community providers, I will be carefully watching this and monitoring it to make certain that that understanding, which differs from their understanding, is correct.

I withdraw this amendment.

Mrs. VANCE. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

HOUSE SCHEDULE

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

Mr. PERZEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I am requesting a recess for approximately 45 minutes, until 1 o'clock. We will come back on the floor and run the last of the amendments and do final passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes Mr. Itkin for the purpose of an announcement.

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, would it be an appropriate time to correct the record?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is appropriate. I thought you might perhaps have an announcement for your caucus first, but if not, go ahead.

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, it appears that I was not recorded on the Sturla amendment 0264 to HB 2 yesterday. I wish to be recorded in the affirmative.

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

For the benefit of the members, all corrections will be taken now if you would like to stay and take care of that.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

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

Mr. PERZEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We would like to ask all members just to come down to caucus for about 5 minutes, Mr. Speaker, before they go anywhere else for lunch.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Republican members, please go to the caucus room for a few minutes at this point. Thank you.

VOTE CORRECTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes Representative Sainato and apologizes if that is a mispronunciation.

Mr. SAINATO. Mr. Speaker, no, that is not a mispronunciation. You did well.

I just would like to correct the record from yesterday.

I was not recorded also on the Sturla amendment 0264, and I would like to be recorded in the affirmative, and also on the Blaum amendment 0362-1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's remarks will be spread upon the record. Thank you.

The Chair recognizes Representative Belardi from the great county of Lackawanna.

Mr. BELARDI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on HB 2, which we are currently considering, I would like to be recorded on amendment A0199. I am not recorded, and had I been at my desk, I would like the record to reflect my vote in the affirmative.

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

The Chair recognizes Representative DeLuca from Allegheny County.

Mr. DeLUCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On HB 2, amendment A0214, I was not recorded. I would like to be recorded in the affirmative, please.

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

The Chair recognizes Representative Levdansky.

Mr. LEVDANSKY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on HB 2, amendment A0181, amendment A0210, and amendment A0187, I would like to be recorded in the affirmative on all three.

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

The Chair recognizes Representative Richardson.

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

Mr. Speaker, on amendment A0286, my vote was recorded in the affirmative. I would like the record to reflect that my vote should have been in the negative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair regrets having forgotten about the lady, Ms. Bishop, but we have caught up to you and would ask that you make your correction at this time.

Ms. BISHOP. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday, January 25, I was not recorded. I would like to be recorded in the affirmative on the Piccola amendment 0228. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The lady's remarks will be spread upon the record.

The Chair recognizes Representative Hutchinson.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, to correct the record.

On amendment A0205, I was recorded in the affirmative. I would like to be recorded in the negative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Fajt, for a correction of record.

Mr. FAJT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday my switch malfunctioned on two votes to HB 2. On amendment 0265, I would like to be recorded in the affirmative, and on amendment 0214, I would like to be recorded in the negative. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a correction to the record.

On January 25 on amendment A0214, I would like to be recorded in the affirmative, and on amendment A0285, I would like for the record to reflect I be recorded in the negative.

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

The Chair recognizes Representative Walko from Allegheny County.

Mr. WALKO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On amendment A0275 to HB 2, my vote was not recorded. I would appreciate it being recorded in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Are there any other members that have corrections of the record to make at this time?

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This House stands in recess until 1 p.m. today.

AFTER RECESS

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

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

**HOUSE BILLS
INTRODUCED AND REFERRED**

No. 313 By Representatives READSHAW, GEORGE, FAIRCHILD, STABACK, COY, VAN HORNE, PRESTON, GIGLIOTTI, TIGUE, McCALL, BEBKO-JONES, GAMBLE, DeLUCA, WAUGH, TRELLO, COLAFELLA, JAROLIN, CIVERA, ARGALL, CAWLEY, BELFANTI, LAUGHLIN, STEELMAN and KAISER

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for authority to erect traffic-control devices.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, January 26, 1995.

No. 314 By Representatives READSHAW, GEORGE, FAIRCHILD, STABACK, COY, VAN HORNE, PRESTON, GIGLIOTTI, BEBKO-JONES, GAMBLE, DeLUCA, WAUGH, TRELLO, COLAFELLA, JAROLIN, CIVERA, CAWLEY, BELFANTI, LAUGHLIN, STEELMAN and KAISER

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for authority to erect traffic-control devices.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, January 26, 1995.

No. 315 By Representatives READSHAW, GEORGE, FAIRCHILD, STABACK, VAN HORNE, PRESTON, GIGLIOTTI, McCALL, BEBKO-JONES, GAMBLE, DeLUCA, WAUGH, TRELLO, COLAFELLA, JAROLIN, CIVERA, CAWLEY, BELFANTI, LAUGHLIN, STEELMAN and KAISER

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the erection of traffic-control signals on the basis of accident experience.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, January 26, 1995.

No. 316 By Representatives GIGLIOTTI, CALTAGIRONE, STABACK, D. R. WRIGHT, DeLUCA, CIVERA, BEBKO-JONES, PESCI, READSHAW, CORRIGAN, ROONEY, PRESTON, LAUGHLIN, TIGUE, TANGRETTI, COLAFELLA, DERMODY, MELIO, MIHALICH, WOZNIAK, SANTONI and M. COHEN

A Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, further providing for retirement of justices, judges and justices of the peace.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, January 26, 1995.

No. 317 By Representatives GIGLIOTTI, CIVERA, STABACK, STURLA, DALEY, D. R. WRIGHT, DeLUCA, TRELLO, MIHALICH, READSHAW, MILLER, DERMODY, LEDERER, BEBKO-JONES, KAISER, BELARDI, PESCI, E. Z. TAYLOR, CURRY, RUDY, CORRIGAN, ROONEY, PRESTON,

LAUGHLIN, TIGUE, COWELL, BELFANTI, YOUNGBLOOD, MELIO, TANGRETTI, HANNA, McGEEHAN, BUTKOVITZ, HERMAN, ROBINSON, COLAIZZO, NAILOR, TRICH, FARMER, MARKOSEK, PERZEL, KENNEY, LESCOVITZ, RICHARDSON, M. COHEN, ALLEN, CAWLEY, JAMES, BISHOP, PISTELLA, COLAFELLA, STEELMAN, LaGROTTA, MANDERINO and ROBERTS

An Act making an appropriation to the Department of Military Affairs for a grant to the Women in Military Service for America Memorial Foundation for the construction of a memorial.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, January 26, 1995.

No. 318 By Representatives GIGLIOTTI, ROBINSON, D. R. WRIGHT, TRELLO, WASHINGTON, PESCI, LAUGHLIN, MELIO, OLASZ, COLAFELLA, VEON, PISTELLA, RICHARDSON, MIHALICH and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending the act of August 1, 1975 (P.L.169, No.87), entitled "An act relating to pensions for employees of the City of Pittsburgh," further providing for the membership of the pension board.

Referred to Committee on URBAN AFFAIRS, January 26, 1995.

No. 319 By Representatives EVANS, WALKO, GEORGE, ROBINSON, HERMAN, STURLA, STABACK, COY, ROBERTS, BATTISTO, McCALL, DeLUCA, READSHAW, TANGRETTI, WOZNIAK, STETLER, JOSEPHS, JAROLIN, CALTAGIRONE, BOSCOLA, CARN, JAMES, KUKOVICH, D. R. WRIGHT, ROEBUCK, LAUGHLIN, MANDERINO, TRELLO, ITKIN and ROONEY

An Act amending the act of November 22, 1978 (P.L.1166, No.274), referred to as the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency Law, further providing for powers and duties of the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, January 26, 1995.

No. 320 By Representatives EVANS, WALKO, GEORGE, ROBINSON, HERMAN, STURLA, STABACK, COY, WOZNIAK, D. R. WRIGHT, ROEBUCK, LAUGHLIN, READSHAW, MANDERINO, TRELLO, BATTISTO, CARN, TANGRETTI, McCALL, FAJT, JOSEPHS and ROONEY

An Act amending the act of December 19, 1990 (P.L.1391, No.215), known as the Motivational Boot Camp Act, further defining "eligible inmate."

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, January 26, 1995.

No. 321 By Representatives EVANS, WALKO, STABACK, VAN HORNE, ROEBUCK, MANDERINO, TRELLO, ITKIN, BATTISTO, McCALL, JOSEPHS, ROONEY and STEELMAN

An Act amending the act of December 19, 1990 (P.L.799, No.193), known as the County Intermediate Punishment Act, further providing for the county intermediate punishment program, for boards and for the county intermediate punishment plan; and establishing the County Intermediate Punishment Account.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, January 26, 1995.

No. 322 By Representatives JOSEPHS, DEWEESE, ITKIN, EVANS, VEON, CALTAGIRONE, MANDERINO, FAJT, KUKOVICH, BEBKO-JONES, GORDNER, CLARK, DALEY, COY, PESCI, STETLER, LAUGHLIN, PLATTS, HERMAN, BATTISTO, TRELLO, SCRIMENTI, YOUNGBLOOD, RUBLEY, STABACK, CARN, PISTELLA, STURLA, L. I. COHEN, E. Z. TAYLOR, McCALL, BARD and STEELMAN

An Act amending Titles 18 (Crimes and Offenses), 23 (Domestic Relations) and 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for sexual offenses and the consequences of committing sexual offenses, for sentences for offenses against infant persons and for prostitution and related offenses; providing for the testimony of children; and imposing penalties.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, January 26, 1995.

No. 323 By Representatives MAITLAND, McCALL, JAROLIN, LYNCH, SCHULER, KING, PITTS, TIGUE, CAWLEY, WOZNIAK, WOGAN, STABACK, SAYLOR, B. SMITH, HUTCHINSON, TRELLO, BAKER, MILLER, NAILOR, SURRA, J. TAYLOR, STERN, WAUGH, PETRONE, E. Z. TAYLOR, LAUGHLIN, EGOLF, FARGO, BROWNE and BELFANTI

An Act exempting active duty members of the armed forces of the United States from any per capita or similar head tax and any occupational privilege tax.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, January 26, 1995.

No. 324 By Representatives MAITLAND, CLARK, FICHTER, TRUE, HERSHEY, NICKOL, SAYLOR, TRELLO, CIVERA, WAUGH, MELIO, PETRONE, MERRY and HALUSKA

An Act amending the act of April 14, 1972 (P.L.221, No.63), known as the Pennsylvania Drug and Alcohol Abuse Control Act, further providing for the disclosure of records.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, January 26, 1995.

No. 325 By Representatives MAITLAND, GEIST, McCALL, SATHER, SCHULER, WOGAN, PITTS, TIGUE, CAWLEY, PLATTS, WOZNIAK, DEMPSEY, STABACK, McGEEHAN, HERMAN, TRELLO, STISH, CIVERA, ROBERTS, READSHAW, WAUGH, BELFANTI, BARLEY, LaGROTTA, MELIO, RAYMOND, LAUGHLIN, BLAUM, YOUNGBLOOD and EGOLF

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the establishment of a Sex Offender Registry within the Criminal History Record Information Act, requiring the registration of certain sex offenders; imposing additional powers and duties on the Pennsylvania State Police and the Department of Corrections; providing for the dissemination of information within the Sex Offender Registry; and imposing penalties.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, January 26, 1995.

No. 326 By Representatives MANDERINO, FLICK, M. COHEN, WAUGH, STABACK, RUBLEY, KUKOVICH, MELIO, CARN, RICHARDSON, BELARDI, WASHINGTON, TRELLO, ROBINSON, HALUSKA, CURRY, NICKOL, MUNDY, ITKIN, READSHAW, WOZNIAK, E. Z. TAYLOR, BATTISTO, TIGUE, BISHOP, DeLUCA, YOUNGBLOOD, WALKO, BELFANTI, ROEBUCK, MERRY, STERN, STEIL and JOSEPHS

An Act amending Title 20 (Decedents, Estates and Fiduciaries) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the removal and replacement of a corporate or individual trustee.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, January 26, 1995.

No. 327 By Representatives M. N. WRIGHT and MELIO

An Act making an appropriation to the Office of Attorney General for the payment of certain moral claims against the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, January 26, 1995.

No. 328 By Representatives TRICH, RICHARDSON, KUKOVICH, TANGRETTI, PETTIT, PLATTS, STABACK, MELIO, BELARDI, PESCI, MUNDY, CURRY, STURLA, HERMAN, LAUGHLIN, McCALL, HENNESSEY, MICOZZIE, TIGUE, ROONEY, TRELLO, COWELL, SAYLOR, PRESTON, YOUNGBLOOD, BELFANTI, HALUSKA and JOSEPHS

An Act requiring police departments to adopt and follow a domestic violence response policy.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, January 26, 1995.

No. 329 By Representatives TRICH, CLARK, WAUGH, STABACK, FLICK, SANTONI, GORDNER, FLEAGLE, PESCI, MUNDY, LAUGHLIN, RUDY, OLASZ, BATTISTO, HENNESSEY, MICOZZIE, TIGUE, ROONEY, TRELLO, SAYLOR, PRESTON, KING, GEIST, TANGRETTI and MERRY

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the offense of damaging leasehold premises and for the offense of absconding without paying rent due.

Referred to Committee on CONSUMER AFFAIRS, January 26, 1995.

No. 330 By Representatives TRICH, WAUGH, SANTONI, KREBS, FLEAGLE, ROBERTS, PESCI, MUNDY, CURRY, LAUGHLIN, CLARK, FAIRCHILD, WOZNIAK, BATTISTO, BOYES, MICOZZIE, TIGUE, ROONEY, TRELLO, COWELL, SAYLOR, PRESTON, KING, DeLUCA, TANGRETTI, BELFANTI, FARGO, MERRY, STERN and STABACK

An Act amending the act of April 6, 1951 (P.L.69, No.20), known as The Landlord and Tenant Act of 1951, providing for an accelerated eviction remedy; and making a repeal.

Referred to Committee on CONSUMER AFFAIRS, January 26, 1995.

No. 331 By Representatives STRITTMATTER, STISH, SCHULER, TRELLO, FICHTER, WOZNIAK, FARMER, BATTISTO, FARGO, CONTI, BAKER, E. Z. TAYLOR, PHILLIPS, SATHER, GEIST, PETTIT, NAILOR, ARMSTRONG, BUNT, HUTCHINSON and HERMAN

An Act creating a suggestion system, to be known as Penn Search, to promote government efficiency and economy; and providing for the powers and duties of the Joint State Government Commission and the Office of Auditor General.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, January 26, 1995.

No. 332 By Representatives STRITTMATTER, STISH, SCHULER, TRELLO, SATHER, TRUE, ARMSTRONG, FICHTER, HERMAN, FLICK, BUNT, HUTCHINSON, LEH, PHILLIPS, CLARK, LYNCH, BAKER and E. Z. TAYLOR

An Act providing for the establishment of a Spending Affordability Committee.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, January 26, 1995.

No. 333 By Representatives STRITTMATTER, STERN, HUTCHINSON, SCHULER, MELIO, HANNA, LEH, FAIRCHILD, ARMSTRONG, TRELLO, YOUNGBLOOD, PESCI, E. Z. TAYLOR, SCHRODER and GODSHALL

An Act amending the act of June 25, 1982 (P.L.633, No.181), known as the Regulatory Review Act, providing for job analysis and employment possibilities by the Independent Regulatory Review Commission.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, January 26, 1995.

No. 334 By Representatives STRITTMATTER, STERN, SCHULER, YOUNGBLOOD, COLAFELLA, NAILOR, FAIRCHILD, GEIST, STISH, MELIO, FLICK, LEH, PESCI, TRELLO, HERSHEY, E. Z. TAYLOR, SCHRODER, B. SMITH and CLARK

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, providing for part-time election day employees.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, January 26, 1995.

No. 335 By Representatives STRITTMATTER, E. Z. TAYLOR, HERSHEY, BUNT, TRELLO, FARMER, BOYES, DRUCE, EGOLF and LEH

An Act amending the act of July 19, 1979 (P.L.130, No.48), known as the Health Care Facilities Act, terminating provisions relating to certificates of need.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, January 26, 1995.

No. 336 By Representatives STRITTMATTER, SCHULER, YOUNGBLOOD, STISH, E. Z. TAYLOR, MELIO, TRELLO, FICHTER, LEH, ARMSTRONG, SCHRODER, GEIST, FAIRCHILD, CLARK, HUTCHINSON, FARGO and WAUGH

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, requiring the Secretary of the Commonwealth to total debt service for referendum questions incurring indebtedness.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, January 26, 1995.

No. 337 By Representatives JAMES, BATTISTO, PRESTON, KING, SERAFINI, MELIO, WILLIAMS, JOSEPHS, CARN, STURLA, LAUGHLIN, PETRONE, RIEGER, DONATUCCI, OLIVER, THOMAS, BISHOP, M. COHEN, RICHARDSON, ROBINSON, McGEEHAN, COLAIZZO, TRELLO, BELFANTI, KIRKLAND, LEDERER, COY, CIVERA, BUXTON, STABACK, ROONEY, KUKOVICH, ITKIN, WASHINGTON, EVANS, J. TAYLOR, PESCI, TIGUE, CURRY, TRICH, YOUNGBLOOD, MIHALICH, RAMOS and HORSEY

An Act allocating a percentage of the net proceeds from all unclaimed funds from sheriffs' sales of residential real property to the Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency for the purpose of assisting potential home buyers with the financing and purchase of homes at sheriffs' sales.

Referred to Committee on URBAN AFFAIRS, January 26, 1995.

No. 338 By Representatives JAMES, REINARD, ROBINSON, COLAIZZO, ROEBUCK, JOSEPHS, WILLIAMS, BATTISTO, BELFANTI, McCALL, EVANS, RIEGER, DONATUCCI, CARN, D. R. WRIGHT, RICHARDSON, DEMPSEY, TRELLO, CAWLEY, STABACK, BISHOP, THOMAS, NICKOL, KIRKLAND, TIGUE, YEWIC, DALEY, PISTELLA, DURHAM, MELIO, PESCI, HASAY, LEDERER, GORDNER, CARONE, FLICK, MUNDY, ITKIN, WASHINGTON, DeLUCA, CIVERA, CURRY, MANDERINO, YOUNGBLOOD and MIHALICH

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the Assigned Risk Plan.

Referred to Committee on INSURANCE, January 26, 1995.

No. 339 By Representatives D. R. WRIGHT, SURRA and TRELLO

An Act amending the act of July 28, 1988 (P.L.556, No.101), known as the Municipal Waste Planning, Recycling and Waste Reduction Act, expanding the scope of the act; further providing for definitions, for powers and duties of municipalities other than counties, for submission and content of municipal waste management plans, for permit requirements, for site limitation, for completeness review; providing for disposal, processing and storage of municipal waste; further providing for planning grants, for information to host municipalities, for water supply testing and protection and for evaluation of permit applications; providing for cleanup; and further providing for host municipality benefit fees, for unlawful conduct and for public information.

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, January 26, 1995.

No. 340 By Representatives GEORGE, COY, KUKOVICH, TRELLO, PESCI, THOMAS, LUCYK, LAUGHLIN and STEELMAN

An Act placing a moratorium on the construction of contaminated soil incinerators; and directing the Conservation Committee of the House of Representatives to study the effects of contaminated soil incinerators on public health, the environment and the economy.

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, January 26, 1995.

No. 341 By Representatives GEORGE, COY, BELARDI, LAUGHLIN, STABACK, BUXTON, D. R. WRIGHT, LUCYK, GEIST, LEH, ROBERTS, HALUSKA, WAUGH, PESCI, TRAVAGLIO, RUDY and BELFANTI

An Act amending the act of November 26, 1978 (P.L. 1375, No. 325), known as the Dam Safety and Encroachments Act, further providing for general permits.

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, January 26, 1995.

No. 342 By Representatives GEORGE, COY, LAUGHLIN, STEELMAN, MICHLOVIC, TRELLO, PESCI, STABACK, FAIRCHILD, THOMAS and CLARK

An Act providing for hazardous and residual waste minimization; establishing the Office of Waste Minimization within the Department of Environmental Resources and providing for its powers and duties, the Small Business Technical and Financial Assistance Program and the Office of Small Business Ombudsman; providing for a program for research, development and implementation of methods to reduce the output of hazardous and residual waste at the source; and establishing the Waste Minimization Advisory Board within the Department of Environmental Resources.

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, January 26, 1995.

No. 343 By Representatives GEORGE, COY, TRELLO, STEELMAN, THOMAS, FAIRCHILD, STABACK, CORRIGAN, PESCI, FICHTER, L. I. COHEN, LAUGHLIN and READSHAW

An Act amending the act of July 28, 1988 (P.L. 556, No. 101), known as the Municipal Waste Planning, Recycling and Waste Reduction Act, providing for certain corporate tax credits for machinery and equipment utilizing recycled materials.

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, January 26, 1995.

No. 344 By Representatives GEORGE, LAUGHLIN, TRELLO, STEELMAN, HALUSKA, BATTISTO, TIGUE, PESCI, FAIRCHILD, OLASZ and THOMAS

An Act amending the act of July 13, 1988 (P.L. 530, No. 94), known as the Environmental Hearing Board Act, further providing for adjudication of the board.

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, January 26, 1995.

No. 345 By Representatives GEORGE, COY, TRELLO, OLASZ, THOMAS, FAIRCHILD, PESCI, TIGUE, PRESTON, BATTISTO, FICHTER and LAUGHLIN

An Act amending the act of July 7, 1980 (P.L. 380, No. 97), known as the Solid Waste Management Act, further providing for management of residual waste and for transportation of residual waste.

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, January 26, 1995.

No. 346 By Representatives GEORGE, TRELLO, LAUGHLIN, COY, OLASZ, THOMAS, STABACK, PESCI, TIGUE, PRESTON and BATTISTO

An Act amending the act of July 7, 1980 (P.L. 380, No. 97), known as the Solid Waste Management Act, further defining "person"; further providing for management of residual waste; and providing for municipal residual waste facilities.

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, January 26, 1995.

No. 347 By Representatives LaGROTTA, EVANS, ITKIN, COY, SCRIMENTI, FLICK, MUNDY, CAPPABIANCA, VAN HORNE, GORDNER, DALEY, LAUGHLIN, TIGUE, COLAFELLA, HERMAN, TRELLO, SANTONI, STABACK, LUCYK, ROONEY, VEON, STURLA, DeLUCA, CAWLEY, FAJT, TANGRETTI, McCALL, SURRA, JOSEPHS, STEELMAN, TRICH, BROWNE and BELFANTI

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L. 177, No. 175), known as The Administrative Code of 1929, further imposing additional budgetary duties and responsibilities on the Governor and the Secretary of the Budget; requiring the Auditor General and State Treasurer to furnish lists of employees and requiring monthly updates of employee lists to be furnished to the Legislative Data Processing Center; creating an independent advisory board to be known as the Independent Fiscal Review Board, providing for the appointment of its members, and defining its powers and duties; establishing an Economic Advisory Council; and providing for duties of the Governor, the Secretary of Public Welfare and the Secretary of Revenue.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, January 26, 1995.

No. 348 By Representatives CAPPABIANCA, WOZNIAK, BELARDI, HALUSKA, TIGUE, SCRIMENTI, WAUGH, DeLUCA, WOGAN, OLASZ, PETRONE, HORSEY and PRESTON

An Act amending Title 15 (Corporations and Unincorporated Associations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for accountability of domestic nonprofit corporations, for powers and duties of the Department of State and the Department of Revenue and for penalties.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, January 26, 1995.

No. 349 By Representatives CAPPABIANCA, DALEY, WOZNIAK, SAYLOR, BUNT, STURLA, HALUSKA, BELARDI, YOUNGBLOOD, MIHALICH and TIGUE

An Act amending the act of May 22, 1933 (P.L.853, No.155), known as The General County Assessment Law, further providing for exemptions from taxation.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, January 26, 1995.

No. 350 By Representatives CAPPABIANCA, MUNDY, DeLUCA, OLASZ, STABACK, SCRIMENTI, STERN, PETRONE, HORSEY and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending Title 1 (General Provisions) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for definitions.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, January 26, 1995.

No. 351 By Representatives CAPPABIANCA, DALEY, LAUGHLIN, WOZNIAK, OLASZ, PESCI, BELARDI, PETRONE, SCRIMENTI, HORSEY, YOUNGBLOOD, RICHARDSON and MIHALICH

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, further providing for corporate net income tax definitions.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, January 26, 1995.

No. 352 By Representatives CAPPABIANCA, DALEY, SCRIMENTI, BELARDI, GORDNER, TIGUE, STURLA, HALUSKA, NAILOR, PESCI, WOGAN, JOSEPHS, STETLER, YOUNGBLOOD, BATTISTO and CLARK

An Act authorizing the Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs to refuse to grant or renew licensure for failure to provide tax information, to file required State tax returns or reports, or to pay State taxes; and imposing duties on the Attorney General, the Department of Labor and Industry and the Department of Revenue.

Referred to Committee on PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE, January 26, 1995.

No. 353 By Representatives BROWN, MIHALICH, SATHER, BUNT, SAYLOR, TULLI, BAKER, VAN HORNE, ARGALL, TRELLO, COLAFELLA, PESCI, STURLA, ROBERTS, LAUGHLIN, TRICH, YOUNGBLOOD and BELFANTI

An Act amending the act of July 9, 1986 (P.L.1216, No.108), known as the Enterprise Zone Municipal Tax Exemption Reimbursement Act, making an appropriation to create additional enterprise zones.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, January 26, 1995.

No. 354 By Representatives BROWN, BARLEY, TRELLO, FICHTER, GORDNER, ADOLPH, GANNON, HERMAN, M. N. WRIGHT, SATHER, BUNT, SAYLOR, STABACK, MILLER, ARMSTRONG, CAPPABIANCA, E. Z. TAYLOR,

TRUE, BAKER, RUBLEY, PETTIT, CORNELL, BEBKO-JONES, CLARK, STISH, FARMER, MARSICO, HERSHEY, FAJT, COLAFELLA, DeLUCA, HUTCHINSON, GEIST, JAROLIN, PESCI, TIGUE, CIVERA, LAUGHLIN, STERN, RAYMOND, PETRONE, SCHULER, BELFANTI and MERRY

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, defining the offense of concealment of child from law enforcement authorities.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, January 26, 1995.

No. 355 By Representatives BROWN, DeLUCA, NYCE, MIHALICH, GANNON, M. N. WRIGHT, SATHER, SAYLOR, LAWLESS, RUBLEY, ROBINSON, BATTISTO, PESCI, ROBERTS, TRICH and STERN

An Act amending the act of May 2, 1945 (P.L.382, No.164), known as the Municipality Authorities Act of 1945, further providing for the removal of authority members.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, January 26, 1995.

No. 356 By Representatives GAMBLE, E. Z. TAYLOR, TRELLO, CIVERA, BELARDI, CLYMER, BELFANTI, MERRY, OLASZ, WOGAN, TIGUE, HERSHEY, McCALL, FARMER, JAROLIN, LEH, STABACK, CLARK, CORRIGAN, NYCE, MELIO, ARMSTRONG, BISHOP, KING, LAUGHLIN, BAKER, PESCI, LYNCH, THOMAS, PETTIT, GORDNER, STERN, YEWIC, WAUGH, BOSCOLA, WALKO, YOUNGBLOOD and CARONE

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, providing for psychiatric and psychological examinations and for education records.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, January 26, 1995.

No. 357 By Representatives GAMBLE, E. Z. TAYLOR, TRELLO, GEIST, BELARDI, CLYMER, MICHLOVIC, MERRY, BELFANTI, FAIRCHILD, OLASZ, LYNCH, TIGUE, BROWNE, BATTISTO, COY, JAROLIN, McCALL, PRESTON, STABACK, CORRIGAN, BISHOP, LAUGHLIN, PESCI, ROBINSON, KELLER and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending the act of August 9, 1955 (P.L.323, No.130), known as The County Code, providing for flags on the graves of recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Referred to Committee on VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, January 26, 1995.

No. 358 By Representatives GAMBLE, E. Z. TAYLOR, TRELLO, GEIST, BELARDI, FARGO, OLASZ, LEH, TIGUE, CLARK, VAN HORNE, KING, COY, HENNESSEY, JAROLIN, LYNCH, McCALL, SATHER, PRESTON, STERN, STABACK, WAUGH, CORRIGAN, BISHOP, LAUGHLIN, PESCI, HALUSKA, YOUNGBLOOD and CARONE

An Act amending the act of July 6, 1989 (P.L.169, No.32), known as the Storage Tank and Spill Prevention Act, providing for reimbursement for testing.

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, January 26, 1995.

No. 359 By Representatives GAMBLE, SCHULER, TRELLO, RAYMOND, BELARDI, BELFANTI, COLAFELLA, OLASZ, VAN HORNE, JAROLIN, McCALL, STABACK, LAUGHLIN, PESCI, ROBINSON, READSHAW and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending the act of July 12, 1972 (P.L.762, No.180), referred to as the Intergovernmental Cooperation Law, providing for agreements relating to consolidation of police forces.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, January 26, 1995.

No. 360 By Representatives GAMBLE, WOGAN, GEIST, MICOZZIE, FARGO, MELIO, BUNT, CLARK, FAIRCHILD, COLAIZZO, BROWN, KING and STERN

An Act prohibiting discrimination or preferential treatment of an individual or group in the operation of the Commonwealth's system of public employment, public education or public contracting.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, January 26, 1995.

No. 361 By Representatives HUTCHINSON, WAUGH, FICHTER, COY, HERSHEY, FLEAGLE, DEMPSEY, CARONE, L. I. COHEN, ROBERTS, PLATTS, BAKER, ZUG, TRELLO, GODSHALL, PHILLIPS, LYNCH, SCHRODER, RAYMOND, McCALL, BROWN, E. Z. TAYLOR, TIGUE, D. W. SNYDER, S. H. SMITH, CORRIGAN, CIVERA, GEIST, MARKOSEK, CLYMER, REBER, EGOLF, JADLOWIEC, FARGO, PETTIT, BELFANTI, ARMSTRONG, KING, LEH, STERN, DIGIROLAMO, SATHER and MARSICO

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, further providing for net loss carryover.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, January 26, 1995.

No. 362 By Representatives HUTCHINSON, WAUGH, FICHTER, TULLI, FLICK, FAIRCHILD, ROBERTS, MELIO, PLATTS, ZUG, TRELLO, MILLER, LYNCH, E. Z. TAYLOR, NAILOR, RAYMOND, BROWN, CORRIGAN, FARGO, BELFANTI, ARMSTRONG and LEH

A Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, providing for tax increase limitations.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, January 26, 1995.

No. 363 By Representatives TULLI, D. R. WRIGHT, PICCOLA, MARSICO, CORNELL, BATTISTO, NAILOR, VANCE, FARGO, KREBS, DENT, LEH, B. SMITH, BAKER, WOGAN, KELLER, FAIRCHILD, BLAUM, STABACK, GEIST, FLEAGLE, BARLEY, FLICK, NICKOL, TRUE, LYNCH, M. N. WRIGHT,

E. Z. TAYLOR, PESCI, ARMSTRONG, ARGALL, BROWN, MELIO, MASLAND, DALEY, BELFANTI, ADOLPH, MICOZZIE, HANNA, KING, DONATUCCI, MERRY, REINARD, NYCE, SCHULER, RUDY, KUKOVICH, SAYLOR, WAUGH, FICHTER, ZUG, HALUSKA, MILLER, TANGRETTI, COWELL, RUBLEY, SATHER, ITKIN, BEBKO-JONES, BUNT, HUTCHINSON, PHILLIPS, EGOLF, HENNESSEY, DIGIROLAMO, RAYMOND, ROBERTS, CIVERA, STEELMAN, YEWIC and HESS

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, further providing for the powers and duties of the Secretary of the Commonwealth; authorizing the filing of certain reports by facsimile; and making an appropriation.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, January 26, 1995.

No. 364 By Representatives TULLI, BUXTON, E. Z. TAYLOR, DALEY, HERMAN, RUBLEY, GRUPPO, BAKER, LEDERER, SEMMEL, BELFANTI, LYNCH, HALUSKA, STABACK, MILLER, PETTIT, CONTI, MARSICO, TRELLO, HENNESSEY, PETRONE and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, mandating that all school districts provide instruction for the safe driving of motor vehicles; further providing for payment for driver-education programs; and making an editorial change.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, January 26, 1995.

No. 365 By Representatives TULLI, BROWN, FARGO, VEON, KREBS, ITKIN, GEIST, COY, M. N. WRIGHT, SURRA, PETRONE, STABACK, JOSEPHS, MUNDY, STEELMAN, LUCYK, RUDY, FICHTER, NAILOR, HALUSKA, BUNT, HENNESSEY, LAUGHLIN and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending Title 30 (Fish) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, requiring fish bait dealer licensees to retail fish bait in biodegradable containers.

Referred to Committee on GAME AND FISHERIES, January 26, 1995.

No. 366 By Representatives TULLI, TRELLO, GEIST, S. H. SMITH, ZUG, LYNCH, CARN, MELIO, ARMSTRONG, BAKER, SATHER, HENNESSEY, SAYLOR, WAUGH, MAITLAND, HUTCHINSON and CIVERA

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the use of communication equipment.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, January 26, 1995.

No. 367 By Representatives GRUPPO, BLAUM, FARGO, PITTS, COLAIZZO, RUBLEY, STISH, BAKER, STERN, J. TAYLOR, EGOLF, McCALL, ARMSTRONG, FLEAGLE, YOUNGBLOOD, NYCE, BARD, KING, THOMAS, GODSHALL, BATTISTO, HERMAN, MICHLOVIC, CLARK, MELIO, FARMER, SATHER, HARHART, ROBERTS, ROONEY, HENNESSEY, KENNEY, E. Z. TAYLOR, VANCE,

DENT, STEELMAN, STURLA, STABACK, PETRARCA and LAUGHLIN

An Act requiring certain information relating to prospective home care employees.

Referred to Committee on AGING AND YOUTH, January 26, 1995.

No. 368 By Representatives FLICK, MERRY, LEH, FARGO, WAUGH, E. Z. TAYLOR, HENNESSEY and ARGALL

An Act repealing the act of May 16, 1951 (P.L.300, No.60), entitled, as amended, "An act authorizing certain counties to establish fire training schools for the paid and volunteer firemen of municipalities within the county."

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, January 26, 1995.

No. 369 By Representatives MCGEEHAN, WOZNIAK, WOGAN, YEWIC, STABACK, COY, PESCI, McCALL, TIGUE, ROONEY, BUNT, VAN HORNE, KELLER, TRELLO, LUCYK, GRUPPO, KING, JAROLIN, CIVERA, LEDERER, E. Z. TAYLOR, EGOLF, MELIO, GEIST, FARGO, TANGRETTI, BELFANTI, SCHULER, DONATUCCI, READSHAW, STISH, SATHER, CLARK, LEH, DIGIROLAMO and FLICK

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for use of deadly force by peace officers.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, January 26, 1995.

No. 370 By Representatives MCGEEHAN, WOZNIAK, BUXTON, YEWIC, STABACK, CORRIGAN, PESCI, GORDNER, McCALL, TIGUE, BATTISTO, PRESTON, HERMAN, ROONEY, BUNT, VAN HORNE, ROBINSON, KELLER, TRELLO, LUCYK, NAILOR, KING, CIVERA, LEDERER, E. Z. TAYLOR, EGOLF, MELIO, GODSHALL, FARGO, O'BRIEN, TANGRETTI, BELFANTI, DONATUCCI, READSHAW, STISH, CLARK, STERN, LEH, FLICK and MARSICO

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for forfeiture of bail under certain conditions.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, January 26, 1995.

No. 371 By Representatives KENNEY, WAUGH, PITTS, DURHAM, BELARDI, STABACK, HERSHEY, FARMER, HERMAN, PETRONE, LAUGHLIN, GRUPPO, LYNCH, McCALL, STETLER, MELIO, CLARK, COY, FAIRCHILD, RAYMOND, MICOZZIE, TIGUE, OLASZ, WOGAN, CONTI, ARGALL, BATTISTO, DeLUCA, KELLER, KING, E. Z. TAYLOR, BUNT, FLEAGLE, STURLA, DEMPSEY, SATHER, REINARD, YOUNGBLOOD, TRELLO, MCGILL, M. N. WRIGHT, CAWLEY, ZUG, MARKOSEK, PETTIT, BOYES, BLAUM, TRUE, FICHTER, GANNON, MAITLAND, EGOLF, FAJT, CIVERA, GEIST, BAKER, FARGO, SCHULER,

DALEY, BELFANTI, MARSICO, ARMSTRONG, SCHRODER, MERRY, STEIL and RUDY

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for sexually violent offenders.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, January 26, 1995.

No. 372 By Representatives MILLER, FARGO, BUNT, HERSHEY, RUDY, MAITLAND, KREBS, ARMSTRONG, HALUSKA, HESS, PETTIT, HARHART, STURLA, DEMPSEY, NYCE, BELARDI, LYNCH, HENNESSEY, HERMAN, MELIO, PETRONE, FAIRCHILD, RUBLEY, FLEAGLE, MASLAND, TRELLO, FICHTER, DeLUCA, YOUNGBLOOD, ARGALL, ZUG, EGOLF, BAKER, BARD, SCHULER, SCHRODER and JOSEPHS

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for an agricultural preservation registration plate.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, January 26, 1995.

No. 373 By Representatives EGOLF, JADLOWIEC, BROWN, CLARK, BATTISTO, STEIL, FARMER, LYNCH, FICHTER, STERN, CONTI, ALLEN, STISH, CHADWICK, BUNT, HUTCHINSON, NYCE, GRUPPO, TRUE, ARGALL, M. N. WRIGHT, HANNA, J. TAYLOR, HENNESSEY, ZUG, PHILLIPS, McCALL, ROBERTS, FAIRCHILD, SCHULER, KING, DRUCE, THOMAS, KENNEY, STAIRS, E. Z. TAYLOR, GEIST and WAUGH

An Act providing for the legal review of Federal mandates; and establishing the Constitutional Defense Council.

Referred to Committee on INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, January 26, 1995.

No. 374 By Representatives D. W. SNYDER, JADLOWIEC, FLICK, BROWN, CLARK, BATTISTO, STEIL, FARMER, LYNCH, FICHTER, STERN, CONTI, ALLEN, STISH, CHADWICK, BUNT, FARGO, NYCE, GRUPPO, ZUG, PHILLIPS, WAUGH, McCALL, ROBERTS, FAIRCHILD, SCHULER, KING, THOMAS, M. N. WRIGHT, HANNA, J. TAYLOR, GODSHALL, HENNESSEY, KENNEY, STAIRS, E. Z. TAYLOR, TRUE, ARGALL and GEIST

An Act providing for the review and coordination of Federal mandates; and establishing the Joint Legislative Committee on Federal Mandates.

Referred to Committee on INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, January 26, 1995.

No. 375 By Representatives ARMSTRONG, JADLOWIEC, BROWN, CLARK, BATTISTO, STEIL, FARMER, WOGAN, LYNCH, FICHTER, STERN, CONTI, ALLEN, STISH, CHADWICK, BUNT, NYCE, GRUPPO, ZUG, PHILLIPS, SATHER, McCALL, ROBERTS, FAIRCHILD, SCHULER, KING, THOMAS, M. N. WRIGHT, HANNA, J. TAYLOR, HENNESSEY, STAIRS, E. Z. TAYLOR, TRUE, ARGALL, GEIST, WAUGH and FLICK

An Act providing for the review of all Federal mandates; and creating the Office of Legislative Auditor.

Referred to Committee on INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, January 26, 1995.

HOUSE RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 28 By Representatives BROWN, JADLOWIEC, CLARK, FLICK, BATTISTO, STEIL, FARMER, LYNCH, FICHTER, STERN, CONTI, ALLEN, STISH, CHADWICK, BUNT, FARGO, HERSHEY, NYCE, GRUPPO, ZUG, PHILLIPS, SATHER, McCALL, ROBERTS, FAIRCHILD, SCHULER, KING, DRUCE, THOMAS, M. N. WRIGHT, HANNA, J. TAYLOR, HENNESSEY, KENNEY, STAIRS, E. Z. TAYLOR, TRUE, ARGALL, GEIST, WAUGH and HUTCHINSON

A Concurrent Resolution reasserting State sovereignty.

Referred to Committee on INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, January 26, 1995.

No. 29 By Representatives FLICK, JADLOWIEC, BROWN, CLARK, BATTISTO, STEIL, FARMER, WOGAN, LYNCH, FICHTER, STERN, CONTI, ALLEN, STISH, CHADWICK, BUNT, FARGO, NYCE, GRUPPO, ZUG, CARONE, PHILLIPS, SATHER, McCALL, ROBERTS, FAIRCHILD, SCHULER, KING, DRUCE, THOMAS, M. N. WRIGHT, HANNA, J. TAYLOR, HENNESSEY, KENNEY, STAIRS, E. Z. TAYLOR, TRUE, ARGALL, GEIST and WAUGH

A Resolution requesting the Intergovernmental Affairs Committee to review current Federal and State laws that place excessive burdens on families, businesses and local governments.

Referred to Committee on INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, January 26, 1995.

No. 30 By Representatives D. W. SNYDER, FLICK, JADLOWIEC, BROWN, CLARK, BATTISTO, STEIL, FARMER, WOGAN, LYNCH, FICHTER, STERN, CONTI, ALLEN, STAIRS, E. Z. TAYLOR, TRUE, ARGALL, GEIST, WAUGH, STISH, CHADWICK, BUNT, FARGO, NYCE, GRUPPO, ZUG, CARONE, PHILLIPS, SATHER, McCALL, ROBERTS, FAIRCHILD, SCHULER, KING, DRUCE, THOMAS, M. N. WRIGHT, HANNA, J. TAYLOR, HENNESSEY and KENNEY

A Concurrent Resolution appointing a delegation of the Pennsylvania General Assembly and the Governor and alternates to represent the Commonwealth at a Conference of the States to be convened under the auspices of the Council of State Governments in cooperation with the National Governors' Association and the National Conference of State Legislatures no later than 270 days after at least 26 legislatures adopt this resolution without amendment; and imposing duties on the Joint State Government Commission.

Referred to Committee on INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, January 26, 1995.

No. 31 By Representatives ARGALL, JADLOWIEC, BROWN, CLARK, BATTISTO, STEIL, FARMER, WOGAN, LYNCH, FICHTER, STERN, CONTI, ALLEN, STISH, CHADWICK, BUNT, NYCE, GRUPPO, ZUG, CARONE, PHILLIPS, McCALL, ROBERTS, FAIRCHILD, SCHULER, KING, DRUCE, THOMAS, M. N. WRIGHT, HANNA, J. TAYLOR, GODSHALL, HENNESSEY, KENNEY, STAIRS, E. Z. TAYLOR, TRUE, GEIST, WAUGH and HUTCHINSON

A Concurrent Resolution urging members of the Pennsylvania Congressional delegation to meet periodically with the General Assembly regarding unfunded Federal mandates.

Referred to Committee on INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, January 26, 1995.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. OLASZ offered the following amendment No. A0240:

Amend Sec. 7 (Sec. 494.1), page 17, line 23, by removing the period after "retarded" and inserting

and prescription drug benefits.

Amend Sec. 7 (Sec. 494.4), page 18, line 14, by removing the period after "eligibility" and inserting
for inpatient and outpatient care. Prescriptions would continue to be covered under the present fee-for-service rebate system.

Amend Sec. 7 (Sec. 494.4), page 19, lines 21 through 30; page 20, lines 1 through 28, by striking out all of lines 21 through 30, page 19, all of lines 1 through 27 and "(xiii)" in line 28, page 20 and inserting

(xii)

Amend Sec. 7 (Sec. 494.4), page 20, lines 29 and 30, by striking out all of said lines

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Olasz. Mr. OLASZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My amendment would still allow the pilot program for managed care in these regions but simply remove "pharmacy" from the managed care plans. Prescriptions would continue to be handled like they are now. Medicaid recipients could continue to go to whatever pharmacy they choose to get their prescriptions filled.

Currently pharmacists submit their bills to the Department of Public Welfare, which administers the medicaid program, and the department pays the bills. The department then has a record of each and every prescription that has been filled for medicaid recipients. Periodically the department tallies these purchases and notifies the drug manufacturers that the State is owed rebates on these drug purchases. Federal law requires the drug manufacturers to pay these rebates to the medicaid program. These rebates amount to approximately 22 cents on the dollar; I repeat, the rebates amount to approximately 22 cents on the dollar. For every \$1 the department

pays for prescriptions, an average of 22 cents is rebated back to the State by the drug manufacturers.

Since these rebates amount to 22 cents on the dollar, under HB 2 the State would be losing money. In 1993 these rebates amounted to \$80 million. In 1994 these rebates came to \$100 million, and it was just a week ago that the State Treasurer, Cathy Baker Knoll, sent out a release where she indicated that there is \$19 million lying out there in uncollected rebates.

My amendment would require the State to keep its current fee-for-service rebate system and allow the State to continue receiving these manufacturing rebates. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask for an affirmative vote on the amendment.

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

On the question of the adoption of the Olasz amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Schuylkill County, Mr. Allen.

Mr. ALLEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to support the Olasz amendment.

As before in the Sturla amendment that talked about regionalization, it is my concern that pharmacists living in rural Pennsylvania, whether it is a pilot project or not, especially independent pharmacists, would have a major problem if this amendment is not passed. If an HMO is in one area of one rural district and they are the provider of the pharmaceutical supplies and an independent pharmacist is 40 miles away and cannot participate, that means that a constituent who lives in the area of the independent pharmacist would have to travel 40 miles to get their prescription.

I ask for an affirmative vote on the Olasz amendment. It has been discussed several times in caucus. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady, Mrs. Vance.

Mrs. VANCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to discuss some of the facts with the Olasz amendment. I think there have been many misconceptions out there, deliberately or otherwise.

The purpose of a pilot program is to ascertain which is more economical, a fee for service with a rebate or private sector with a contract. First of all, in any of these pilot programs, there will be just not one; the RFP (request for proposal) says there must be at least three people.

I have heard a lot of concerns about rural areas. In many rural areas, number one, there is not even one HMO, let alone three. So I think it is almost impossible that you are going to have three HMO's who are going to be the providers for this. The Sturla amendment does make it more certain that everyone will have an equal chance.

As to the rebate, that is a really fallacious argument. The State will lose zero dollars on this, and I have asked again and again, show me proof how this will happen, and I have not been able to find that.

The whole idea of going out on a proposal is to give the medical assistance recipients a choice. They will have at least three choices. If in fact we pulled the pharmacists out of this program—and I support independent pharmacists, but I do not support making them a special tax-supported subsidy—the next thing we will hear is, well, let us pull out the nurse practitioners, or let us pull out the physicians. Once you start to make special exceptions for each group, the idea of putting it out on bid is lost.

I really believe that we are not going to hurt the independent pharmacists. They say that they are more cost effective; they deliver better services. I say fine; that is the idea of putting it out for a pilot project. And after a year checking, if they are more cost effective, this will show; there will be no problem, and I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. OLASZ. Mr. Speaker, would the prior speaker stand for interrogation, please?

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

Mr. OLASZ. Yes, sir. I would like to interrogate the prior speaker.

The SPEAKER. The lady consents to interrogation. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. OLASZ. Mr. Speaker, could you tell me how the State could continue to receive rebates under the pilot program?

Mrs. VANCE. There are two different ways that the State gets rebates now. Under the HealthPASS (Philadelphia Accessible Services System) program, there is a segregated accounting system, and the manufacturers contribute the money to the State. Under HMO's, the pharmacists contribute the money. It may be whose ox is getting gored, but it is not the State. The State will not lose money.

Mr. OLASZ. Mr. Speaker, can you tell me where that is contained in this bill, that particular provision you just referred to?

Mrs. VANCE. This bill does not impact on that at all.

Mr. OLASZ. That is correct; this bill does not impact on it at all. I think it does.

You also spoke to—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will yield.

Has the gentleman concluded his interrogation?

Mr. OLASZ. No, sir; no, sir.

Mr. Speaker, how can you refer to the local pharmacies as being tax-supported subsidies?

Mrs. VANCE. I am sorry. If you said something, I thought you were making a statement, not asking a question.

Mr. OLASZ. I am sorry; I did not hear that.

Mrs. VANCE. I thought you had concluded, and I thought you were making a statement. I did not know you were any longer asking questions.

Mr. OLASZ. I apologize for the misunderstanding, but you had made a statement, Mr. Speaker, that this would be, in effect, a tax-supported subsidy for the local pharmacists. Could you explain how that—

Mrs. VANCE. If you are going to pull them out and say we are going to protect the pharmacists, and it could be more cost effective if we had them in a pilot project, I think that we are protecting them in a special way that we are protecting no other group.

Mr. OLASZ. Mr. Speaker, that concludes my interrogation. I would just like to respond to some of the comments that were made.

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

Mr. OLASZ. Mr. Speaker, my desire is only to continue the program the way it currently exists. We are not giving them any special protection. On the contrary, the HMO's would be given preference, and I might add, these are the same HMO's that almost daily, in fact last week recorded record profits. They are awash in billions of dollars to the point they do not know what to do with the money. The same goes for the drug manufacturers. They are awash in money, and for the life of me I cannot understand how my amendment would be considered a money loser for the Commonwealth when all they are going to do is pump money into these already ridiculously profit-driven, gouged with the taxpayers' dollars, to give them private access to our health system.

I would appreciate an affirmative vote for it. And remember, that little guy on the corner who is the "mom and pop" drugstore and also the old moms and pops would have to travel great distances to get their scrip filled. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. Does the lady, Mrs. Rudy, seek recognition?

Mrs. RUDY. Yes; I do.

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

Mrs. RUDY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of the Olasz amendment. I come from one of those rural areas where people now have to travel great distances to get to a pharmacy. If we were to designate a pharmacy, only like one in the county, which I can visualize happening under this HMO plan, some people would have to drive many, many miles to get to that pharmacy, and as we are very well aware of, these people do not have transportation of any means to begin with, and there is no public transportation in a rural area.

So this is why I support the Olasz amendment. I see it as a great hardship in trying to get to a pharmacy in a rural area if you have a designated HMO. Thank you.

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

Mr. TRELLO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to interrogate the lady, Mrs. Vance, briefly.

The SPEAKER. The lady consents to interrogation. The gentleman may begin.

Mrs. VANCE. I would like to say that I am not the maker of the amendment, and I think it is misplaced. You should be interrogating the maker of the amendment.

Mr. TRELLO. I know, but everybody knows you are the most informed lady on this floor about this entire bill.

Mrs. VANCE. Flattery will get you nowhere, sir.

Mr. TRELLO. Just a very simple question.

If the independent pharmacies got together in a group and submitted a bid pricewise to be competitive, would this legislation allow them to do that?

Mrs. VANCE. They could have done this previously. They could have always grouped together because of the Sturla amendment, "within the designated area." If they were all within the same area, they could, yes. But there was nothing to ever prevent the pharmacists from getting together and bidding. They could have done it last year. In fact, many people talked about it, but they, at least their leaders to whom we spoke, did not want to talk about doing that.

Mr. TRELLO. In other words, your saying they "could have" means they cannot now?

Mrs. VANCE. Not unless they are all in the same area, because of the Sturla amendment which says "within the designated region."

Mr. TRELLO. Okay. Well, thank you. I think you have answered my question. Thank you.

I would like to make a comment, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. TRELLO. Mr. Speaker, I come from a very small community, and the Speaker was very elegant when he announced my guests last Tuesday and he pronounced "Coraopolis" correctly, and I commend him for that. But my community has about 52 percent senior citizens living in my wonderful hometown, and there are only two pharmacies there, where the pharmacist, in most cases, knows more about the patient than the doctor does. In fact, there are many cases where the pharmacist even corrected the doctor about a certain prescription that was given to one of my constituents.

This legislation will deny my senior citizens from having a convenient location to get their prescriptions. In some cases there is not bus transportation going to the next community or the next area where another drugstore is, and for the sake of the senior citizens in

my community and the senior citizens all over this great State of ours, I ask for an affirmative vote so that they will not be inconvenienced for their very, very vital needs and medication.

I would appreciate an affirmative vote on the amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-168

Adolph	Fajt	Maitland	Schroder
Allen	Farmer	Major	Schuler
Argall	Feese	Manderino	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Fleagle	Markosek	Semmel
Baker	Gamble	Marsico	Serafini
Bard	Gannon	Masland	Shaner
Battisto	Geist	Mayernik	Sheehan
Bebko-Jones	George	McCall	Smith, B.
Belardi	Gigliotti	McGill	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Godshall	Melio	Snyder, D. W.
Bishop	Gordner	Michlovic	Staback
Blaum	Gruitza	Micozzie	Stairs
Boscola	Gruppo	Mihalich	Steelman
Boyes	Habay	Miller	Steil
Brown	Haluska	Mundy	Stern
Browne	Harhart	Nailor	Stish
Buxton	Hasay	Nickol	Strittmatter
Caltagirone	Hennessey	Nyce	Sturla
Cappabianca	Herman	Olasz	Surra
Carn	Hershey	Oliver	Tangretti
Carone	Hess	Pesci	Taylor, E. Z.
Cawley	Hutchinson	Petrarca	Thomas
Chadwick	Itkin	Petrone	Tigue
Civera	Jadlowiec	Phillips	Travaglio
Clark	James	Piccola	Trello
Cohen, L. I.	Jarolin	Pistella	Trich
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Platts	True
Colafella	Keller	Preston	Van Horne
Colaizzo	Kenney	Ramos	Veon
Corpora	King	Raymond	Vitali
Cowell	Kirkland	Readshaw	Walko
Coy	Krebs	Richardson	Washington
Daley	Kukovich	Rieger	Waugh
DeLuca	LaGrotta	Roberts	Williams
Dempsey	Laughlin	Robinson	Wogan
Dent	Lawless	Roebuck	Wozniak
Dermody	Lederer	Rooney	Wright, D. R.
DeWeese	Lescovitz	Rublely	Wright, M. N.
Donatucci	Levdansky	Rudy	Yewcic
Durham	Lloyd	Sainato	Youngblood
Egolf	Lucyk	Santoni	Zimmerman
Fairchild	Lynch	Sather	Zug

NAYS-30

Barley	Druce	McGeehan	Saylor
Birmelin	Fargo	Merry	Stetler
Bunt	Fichter	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Butkovitz	Flick	Pettit	Tulli
Clymer	Gladeck	Pitts	Vance
Conti	Hanna	Reber	
Cornell	Kaiser	Reinard	Ryan,
DiGirolamo	Leh	Rohrer	Speaker

NOT VOTING-3

Corrigan Curry Horsey

EXCUSED-2

Evans O'Brien

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

On the question recurring,

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

AMENDMENT A0286 RECONSIDERED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Cohen, who moves that the vote by which amendment No. A0286 was passed to HB 2, PN 193, on the 26th day of January be reconsidered.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-193

Adolph Fairchild Major Schroder
Armstrong Fajt Manderino Schuler
Baker Fargo Markosek Scrimenti
Bard Farmer Marsico Semmel
Barley Feese Masland Serafini
Battisto Fichter Mayernik Shaner
Bebko-Jones Fleagle McCall Sheehan
Belardi Flick McGeehan Smith, B.
Belfanti Gamble McGill Smith, S. H.
Birmelin Gannon Melio Snyder, D. W.
Bishop Geist Merry Staback
Blaum George Michlovic Stairs
Boscola Gigliotti Micozzie Steelman
Boyes Gladeck Mihalich Steil
Brown Godshall Miller Stern
Browne Gordner Mundy Stetler
Bunt Gruitza Nailor Stish
Butkovitz Gruppo Nickol Strittmatter
Buxton Habay Olasz Sturla
Caltagirone Haluska Oliver Surra
Cappabianca Hanna Perzel Tangretti
Carn Harhart Pesci Taylor, E. Z.
Carone Hennessey Petrarca Taylor, J.
Cawley Herman Petrone Thomas
Chadwick Hershey Pettit Tighe
Civera Hess Phillips Travaglio
Clark Hutchinson Piccola Trello
Clymer Itkin Pistella Trich
Cohen, L. I. Jadlowiec Pitts True
Cohen, M. James Platts Tulli
Colafrella Jarolin Preston Vance
Colaizzo Kaiser Ramos Van Horne
Conti Keller Raymond Veon
Cornell Kenney Readshaw Vitali
Corpora King Reber Walko
Corrigan Kirkland Reinard Washington
Cowell Krebs Richardson Waugh

Coy Kukovich Rieger Williams
Curry LaGrotta Roberts Wogan
Daley Laughlin Robinson Wright, D. R.
DeLuca Lawless Roebuck Wright, M. N.
Dempsey Lederer Rohrer Yewcic
Dent Leh Rooney Youngblood
Dermody Lescovitz Rubley Zimmerman
DeWeese Levdansky Rudy Zug
DiGirolamo Lloyd Sainato
Donatucci Lucyk Santoni Ryan,
Druce Lynch Sather Speaker
Egolf Maitland Saylor

NAYS-5

Allen Durham Hasay Nyce
Argall

NOT VOTING-3

Horsey Josephs Wozniak

EXCUSED-2

Evans O'Brien

The question was determined in the affirmative, and the motion was agreed to.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The clerk read the following amendment No. A0286:

Amend Sec. 4 (Sec. 432), page 9, line 4, by inserting a bracket before "(F)"
Amend Sec. 4 (Sec. 432), page 9, line 5, by inserting a bracket after "verified."
Amend Sec. 4 (Sec. 432), page 9, line 6, by insert brackets before and after "(G)" and inserting immediately thereafter (F)

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On the question of the adoption of the amendment, the Chair recognizes the lady, Ms. Steelman.

Ms. STEELMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I understand that some of the members did not completely understand the amendment the first time that we voted on it, so they want to come back and reconsider it, and I am just going to reiterate what I said the last time.

I think it is a mistake to have language in the Welfare Code that provides an incentive for young women to get pregnant, particularly young women who have never been a part of the welfare system before and especially given that we have just cut out transitionally needy benefits for women in the 18- to 25-year age group. It seems to me that if we are going to say, well, we are completely doing away with transitionally needy benefits for people like you, but if you get pregnant, we are not going to limit you to 2 months of benefits in a

2-year period; we are going to put you on general assistance for several months, then we are going to transfer you to AFDC for the last trimester of your pregnancy, and then you are going to be on AFDC until your child reaches the age of 18. That actually does start to add up to be a financial incentive, and to paraphrase some comments made relative to another amendment earlier in the day, the poorer the woman, the more effective the economic incentive of the welfare stipend is.

So I think it is a mistake for us to send the message that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania wants to encourage this kind of behavior on the part of women if this welfare reform bill is supposed to be about personal responsibility.

The SPEAKER. Will the lady, Ms. Steelman, yield.

Ms. Steelman, my records indicate that your amendment passed 182 to 18. Is that accurate?

Ms. STEELMAN. I believe so.

The SPEAKER. Continue.

Ms. STEELMAN. I was finished when you asked me to suspend. If there is someone else who wants to speak on the amendment, that is fine.

The SPEAKER. No; no, go ahead. The lady may continue.

I frankly thought I misunderstood something. I did not understand why you were reconsidering this vote, that it passed so overwhelmingly.

Ms. STEELMAN. It is my understanding that some of the members want to reconsider their vote on the amendment, and I am willing to give them that opportunity.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady, Ms. Manderino.

Ms. MANDERINO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise, regretfully, to oppose my colleague on this amendment, and a number of people who asked before the break, this is the amendment that deals with removing pregnant women from the category of "chronically needy."

I think a lot of people cast a "yes" vote not understanding that that is what the amendment was, and this is an opportunity for those who wanted to vote "no" on this amendment to do so on reconsideration. Thank you.

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

Mr. BLAUM. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise to oppose the amendment. In the welfare bill that we passed last session, pregnant women were included under the category of "chronically needy." The bill as introduced by Mr. Flick did not change that. There is no motion except for this amendment to remove pregnant women from that category. I do not think there is any need for it.

I voted "no" the first time, will vote "no" again, and I urge the members of the House to vote "no." It seems an unnecessary amendment, something which the sponsors did not contemplate or favor when the bill was drafted, and, again, I think just something that goes a bit too far. So I would ask for a negative vote.

The SPEAKER. On the question of the adoption of the amendment A0286, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Flick.

Mr. FLICK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I again would like to ask your support of this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-123

Adolph	Fajt	Lynch	Schuler
Allen	Fargo	Maitland	Semmel
Argall	Farmer	Major	Shaner
Armstrong	Feece	Marsico	Sheehan
Baker	Fichter	Masland	Smith, B.
Bard	Fleagle	Mayernik	Smith, S. H.
Barley	Gamble	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Battisto	Gannon	McGill	Stairs
Birmelin	Geist	Melio	Steelman
Boscola	Gigliotti	Micozzie	Steil
Boyes	Gladeck	Miller	Stern
Brown	Godshall	Nailor	Stish
Browne	Gruppo	Nickol	Strittmatter
Bunt	Haluska	Nyce	Sturla
Butkovitz	Harhart	Olasz	Taylor, E. Z.
Carone	Hasay	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Chadwick	Hennessey	Petrone	Travaglio
Civera	Herman	Pettit	Trello
Clark	Hershey	Phillips	True
Clymer	Hess	Piccola	Tulli
Cohen, L. I.	Hutchinson	Pitts	Vance
Conti	Jadlowiec	Raymond	Vitali
Curry	Kaiser	Readshaw	Waugh
DeLuca	Keller	Reinard	Wogan
Dempsey	Kenney	Rieger	Wozniak
Dent	King	Rohrer	Wright, M. N.
DiGirolamo	Lawless	Rubley	Zimmerman
Donatucci	Lederer	Sather	Zug
Druce	Leh	Saylor	Ryan,
Durham	Levdansky	Schroder	Speaker
Egolf	Lucyk		
Fairchild			

NAYS-75

Bebko-Jones	George	McCall	Santoni
Belardi	Gordner	Merry	Scrimenti
Belfanti	Gruitza	Michlovic	Serafini
Bishop	Habay	Mihalich	Staback
Blaum	Hanna	Mundy	Stetler
Buxton	Horsey	Oliver	Surra
Caltagirone	Itkin	Pesci	Tangretti
Cappabianca	James	Petrarca	Thomas
Carn	Jarolin	Pistella	Tigue
Cawley	Josephs	Platts	Trich
Cohen, M.	Kirkland	Preston	Van Horne
Colafella	Krebs	Ramos	Veon
Colaizzo	Kukovich	Richardson	Walko
Corpora	LaGrotta	Roberts	Washington
Corrigan	Laughlin	Robinson	Williams
Cowell	Lescovitz	Roebuck	Wright, D. R.
Coy	Lloyd	Rooney	Yewcic
Daley	Manderino	Rudy	Youngblood
DeWeese	Markosek	Sainato	

NOT VOTING-3

Cornell	Dermody	Flick
---------	---------	-------

EXCUSED-2

Evans	O'Brien
-------	---------

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

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

AMENDMENT A0287 RECONSIDERED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady, Ms. Steelman, who moves that the vote by which amendment A0287 was defeated to HB 2, PN 193, on the 26th day of January be reconsidered.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-180

- | | | | |
|--------------|------------|-----------|---------------|
| Adolph | Fairchild | Lynch | Schuler |
| Allen | Fajt | Maitland | Scrimenti |
| Baker | Farmer | Major | Semmel |
| Bard | Feese | Manderino | Serafini |
| Barley | Fichter | Markosek | Shaner |
| Battisto | Fleagle | Marsico | Sheehan |
| Bebko-Jones | Flick | Masland | Smith, B. |
| Belardi | Gamble | Mayernik | Snyder, D. W. |
| Belfanti | Gannon | McCall | Staback |
| Birmelin | Geist | McGeehan | Stairs |
| Bishop | George | McGill | Steelman |
| Blaum | Gigliotti | Melio | Steil |
| Boscola | Gladeck | Merry | Stern |
| Brown | Godshall | Michlovic | Stetler |
| Browne | Gordner | Micozzie | Stish |
| Bunt | Gruitza | Mihalich | Strittmatter |
| Butkovitz | Gruppo | Miller | Sturla |
| Buxton | Habay | Mundy | Surra |
| Caltagirone | Haluska | Nailor | Tangretti |
| Cappabianca | Hanna | Olasz | Taylor, E. Z. |
| Carone | Hennessey | Perzel | Taylor, J. |
| Cawley | Herman | Pesci | Thomas |
| Civera | Hershey | Petrarca | Tigue |
| Clark | Hess | Petrone | Travaglio |
| Clymer | Hutchinson | Phillips | Trello |
| Cohen, L. I. | Itkin | Pistella | True |
| Cohen, M. | Jadlowiec | Pitts | Vance |
| Colafrilla | James | Platts | Van Horne |
| Colaizzo | Jarolin | Preston | Veon |
| Conti | Josephs | Ramos | Vitali |
| Cornell | Kaiser | Raymond | Walko |
| Corpora | Keller | Readshaw | Washington |
| Corrigan | Kenney | Reber | Waugh |
| Cowell | King | Reinard | Williams |
| Coy | Kirkland | Rieger | Wogan |
| Curry | Krebs | Roberts | Wozniak |
| Daley | Kukovich | Robinson | Wright, D. R. |
| DeLuca | LaGrotta | Roebuck | Wright, M. N. |
| Dempsey | Laughlin | Rooney | Yewcic |
| Dermody | Lawless | Rublely | Youngblood |
| DeWeese | Lederer | Rudy, | Zimmerman |
| DiGirolamo | Leh | Sainato | Zug |
| Donatucci | Lescovitz | Santoni | |
| Druce | Levdanský | Saylor | Ryan, |
| Durham | Lloyd | Schroder | Speaker |
| Egolf | Lucyk | | |

NAYS-15

- | | | | |
|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| Argall | Dent | Nyce | Sather |
| Armstrong | Fargo | Pettit | Smith, S. H. |
| Boyes | Hasay | Piccola | Tulli |
| Chadwick | Nickol | Rohrer | |

NOT VOTING-6

- | | | | |
|---------|---------|------------|-------|
| Carn | Horsley | Richardson | Trich |
| Harhart | Oliver | | |

EXCUSED-2

- | | |
|-------|---------|
| Evans | O'Brien |
|-------|---------|

The question was determined in the affirmative, and the motion was agreed to.

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

The clerk read the following amendment No. **A0287**:

Amend Sec. 4 (Sec. 432), page 9, line 7, by inserting a bracket before "No"

Amend Sec. 4 (Sec. 432), page 9, line 9, by inserting a bracket after "lifetime."

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady, Ms. Steelman. Ms. STEELMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Apparently there was also a certain amount of confusion over what this amendment does and does not do. I want to make it absolutely clear to all the members that my amendment does not create any lifetime entitlement to general assistance under the "chronically needy" definition. What it does do is eliminate the current cap on general assistance under the "chronically needy" definition at 9 months out of a survivor's lifetime.

The reason that I proposed this is because some women will never be recipients of general assistance even if they are survivors. Some women may need a month or two on general assistance as they are making the transition from an abusive situation to a different kind of life, and some women probably will need more than 9 months of protective services. A woman has to be receiving protective services in any case in order to qualify as chronically needy under the current definition, and if she needs more than 9 months of services, she may need more than 9 months of assistance. But if we do not lift this cap and if we do not work on developing some guidelines for determining when it is possible for women to be able to make the transition successfully from an abusive dependency relationship to self-supporting independence, we will continue to perpetuate a situation in which some women, because of their fears of being unable to support themselves, being unable to live away from their abuser, will remain in those abusive situations, and as the director of the battered women's shelter in my county said when I called her during the lunch break to discuss this, some of the women who stay in those abusive situations because of economic pressure will be killed. We are talking about an estimated cost to the State of \$2.38 million. That is about 25 cents per resident of Pennsylvania per year, and I think that if we saved even one woman's life through that expenditure, that that is not unreasonable.

We are not providing lifetime benefits for all survivors. What I am asking for is simply that we remove the arbitrary 9-month cap and that we work on developing qualifying guidelines that insure that the women who need help will continue to get help as long as they absolutely need it. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.
The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Flick.

Mr. FLICK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I again ask you to oppose this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Does the gentleman, Mr. Sturla, seek recognition?

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, very briefly.

I rise again in support of the Steelman amendment. Just not too long ago we heard the new Governor talk about wanting to help victims in how we deal with crime. Here we have a situation where we are talking about victims and the ability to assist them.

I would urge a positive vote in an attempt to help victims here, victims of domestic violence. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-96

Battisto	George	McCall	Santoni
Bebko-Jones	Gigliotti	McGeehan	Scrimenti
Belardi	Gordner	Melio	Shaner
Belfanti	Gruitza	Michlovic	Staback
Bishop	Haluska	Mihalich	Steelman
Blaum	Hanna	Miller	Stetler
Butkovitz	Horsey	Mundy	Sturla
Buxton	Itkin	Olasz	Surra
Caltagirone	James	Pesci	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Jarolin	Petrarca	Thomas
Cawley	Josephs	Petrone	Tigue
Cohen, M.	Kaiser	Pistella	Travaglio
Colafrilla	Keller	Platts	Trello
Colaizzo	Kirkland	Preston	Trich
Corpora	Kukovich	Ramos	Van Horne
Corrigan	LaGrotta	Readshaw	Veon
Cowell	Laughlin	Richardson	Vitali
Coy	Lederer	Rieger	Walko
Curry	Lescovitz	Roberts	Washington
DeLuca	Levdansky	Robinson	Williams
Dermody	Lloyd	Roebuck	Wozniak
DeWeese	Lucyk	Rooney	Wright, D. R.
Donatucci	Manderino	Rudy	Yewcic
Fajt	Markosek	Sainato	Youngblood

NAYS-99

Adolph	Egolf	Lawless	Schroder
Allen	Fairchild	Leh	Schuler
Argall	Fargo	Lynch	Semmel
Armstrong	Farmer	Maitland	Serafini
Baker	Feese	Major	Sheehan
Bard	Fichter	Marsico	Smith, B.
Barley	Fleagle	Masland	Smith, S. H.
Birmelin	Flick	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Boscola	Gamble	Merry	Stairs
Boyes	Gannon	Micozzie	Steil
Brown	Geist	Nailor	Stern
Browne	Gladeck	Nickol	Stish

Bunt	Godshall	Nyce	Strittmatter
Carone	Gruppo	Perzel	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Habay	Petit	Taylor, J.
Civera	Harhart	Phillips	True
Clark	Hasay	Piccola	Tulli
Clymer	Hennessey	Pitts	Vance
Cohen, L. I.	Herman	Raymond	Waugh
Conti	Hershey	Reber	Wright, M. N.
Cornell	Hess	Reinard	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Hutchinson	Rohrer	Zug
Dent	Jadlowiec	Rubley	
DiGirolamo	Kenney	Sather	Ryan,
Druce	King	Saylor	Speaker
Durham			

NOT VOTING-6

Carn	Krebs	Oliver	Wogan
Daley	Mayernik		

EXCUSED-2

Evans	O'Brien
-------	---------

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

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

AMENDMENT A0240 RECONSIDERED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Melio, who moves that the vote by which amendment A0240 was passed to HB 2, PN 193, on the 26th day of January be reconsidered.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-178

Adolph	Fajt	Lloyd	Scrimenti
Allen	Fargo	Lucyk	Semmel
Baker	Farmer	Manderino	Serafini
Bard	Feese	Markosek	Shaner
Battisto	Fichter	Marsico	Sheehan
Bebko-Jones	Fleagle	Masland	Smith, B.
Belardi	Flick	Mayernik	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Gamble	McCall	Snyder, D. W.
Bishop	Gannon	McGeehan	Staback
Blaum	Geist	McGill	Stairs
Boscola	George	Melio	Steelman
Brown	Gigliotti	Merry	Steil
Browne	Gladeck	Michlovic	Stern
Bunt	Godshall	Micozzie	Stetler
Butkovitz	Gordner	Mihalich	Strittmatter
Buxton	Gruitza	Mundy	Sturla
Caltagirone	Gruppo	Nailor	Surra
Cappabianca	Habay	Olasz	Tangretti
Carone	Haluska	Oliver	Taylor, E. Z.
Cawley	Hanna	Pesci	Taylor, J.

Chadwick	Harhart	Petrone	Thomas
Civera	Hennessey	Pettit	Tigue
Clymer	Herman	Phillips	Travaglio
Cohen, L. I.	Hershey	Piccola	Trich
Cohen, M.	Hess	Pistella	True
Colaafella	Horsley	Pitts	Tulli
Colaizzo	Hutchinson	Platts	Vance
Conti	Itkin	Preston	Van Horne
Cornell	Jadlowiec	Ramos	Veon
Corpora	James	Raymond	Vitali
Corrigan	Jarolin	Reber	Walko
Cowell	Josephs	Reinard	Washington
Coy	Kaiser	Richardson	Waugh
Curry	Keller	Rieger	Williams
Daley	Kenney	Roberts	Wogan
DeLuca	King	Robinson	Wozniak
Dempsey	Kirkland	Roebuck	Wright, D. R.
Dent	Krebs	Rooney	Wright, M. N.
DeWeese	Kukovich	Rubley	Yewcic
DiGirolamo	LaGrotta	Rudy	Youngblood
Donatucci	Laughlin	Sainato	Zimmerman
Druce	Lawless	Santoni	Zug
Durham	Lederer	Sather	
Egolf	Lescovitz	Saylor	Ryan,
Fairchild	Levdansky	Schuler	Speaker

NAYS-19

Argall	Clark	Major	Petrarca
Armstrong	Hasay	Miller	Rohrer
Barley	Leh	Nickol	Schroder
Birmelin	Lynch	Nyce	Stish
Boyes	Maitland	Perzel	

NOT VOTING-4

Carn	Dermody	Readshaw	Trello
------	---------	----------	--------

EXCUSED-2

Evans	O'Brien
-------	---------

The question was determined in the affirmative, and the motion was agreed to.

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

The clerk read the following amendment No. **A0240**:

Amend Sec. 7 (Sec. 494.1), page 17, line 23, by removing the period after "retarded" and inserting
and prescription drug benefits.

Amend Sec. 7 (Sec. 494.4), page 18, line 14, by removing the period after "eligibility" and inserting
for inpatient and outpatient care. Prescriptions would continue to be covered under the present fee-for-service rebate system.

Amend Sec. 7 (Sec. 494.4), page 19, lines 21 through 30; page 20, lines 1 through 28, by striking out all of lines 21 through 30, page 19, all of lines 1 through 27 and "(xiii)" in line 28, page 20 and inserting
(xii)

Amend Sec. 7 (Sec. 494.4), page 20, lines 29 and 30, by striking out all of said lines

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

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman, Mr. Melio, care to be recognized on this ?

Mr. MELIO. Mr. Speaker, I just would like a recall. The motion is to allow the amendment to be revoted on; that is all. I appreciate it. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. We understand.
This is the Olasz amendment that was voted a moment ago.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-180

Adolph	Egolf	Lucyk	Rudy
Allen	Fairchild	Lynch	Santoni
Argall	Fajt	Maitland	Sather
Armstrong	Farmer	Major	Schroder
Baker	Feese	Manderino	Schuler
Bard	Fleagle	Markosek	Scrimenti
Battisto	Gamble	Marsico	Semmel
Bebko-Jones	Gannon	Masland	Serafini
Belardi	Geist	Mayernik	Shaner
Belfanti	George	McCall	Sheehan
Bishop	Gigliotti	McGeehan	Smith, B.
Blaum	Gladeck	McGill	Smith, S. H.
Boscola	Godshall	Melio	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Gordner	Merry	Staback
Brown	Gruitza	Michlovic	Stairs
Browne	Gruppo	Micozzie	Steelman
Bunt	Habay	Mihalich	Steil
Butkovitz	Haluska	Miller	Stern
Buxton	Harhart	Mundy	Stish
Caltagirone	Hasay	Nailor	Strittmatter
Cappabianca	Hennessey	Nickol	Sturla
Carn	Herman	Nyce	Surra
Carone	Hershey	Olasz	Tangretti
Cawley	Hess	Oliver	Taylor, E. Z.
Chadwick	Horsley	Pesci	Taylor, J.
Civera	Hutchinson	Petrarca	Thomas
Clark	Itkin	Petrone	Tigue
Cohen, L. I.	Jadlowiec	Pettit	Trello
Cohen, M.	James	Phillips	Trich
Colaafella	Jarolin	Piccola	True
Colaizzo	Josephs	Pistella	Van Horne
Cornell	Keller	Platts	Veon
Corpora	Kenney	Preston	Vitali
Corrigan	King	Ramos	Walko
Cowell	Kirkland	Raymond	Washington
Coy	Krebs	Readshaw	Waugh
Curry	Kukovich	Reber	Williams
Daley	LaGrotta	Richardson	Wogan
DeLuca	Laughlin	Rieger	Wozniak
Dempsey	Lawless	Roberts	Wright, D. R.
Dent	Lederer	Robinson	Wright, M. N.
Dermody	Leh	Roebuck	Yewcic
DeWeese	Lescovitz	Rohrer	Youngblood
Donatucci	Levdansky	Rooney	Zimmerman
Durham	Lloyd	Rubley	Zug

NAYS-19

Barley	Fargo	Perzel	Tulli
Birmelin	Fichter	Pitts	Vance
Clymer	Flick	Reinard	

Conti DiGirolamo Druce	Hanna Kaiser	Saylor Stetler	Ryan, Speaker
------------------------------	-----------------	-------------------	------------------

NOT VOTING-2

Sainato Travaglio

EXCUSED-2

Evans O'Brien

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

On the question recurring,

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. PERZEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have been very open, very fair, and very bipartisan here. We have run over the last 16, 18 hours roughly 100 amendments. A number of those amendments have been passed and put into this bill in a bipartisan spirit of cooperation, and we feel that we have done an awful lot to move the process forward. I would like to thank the members for putting in this extra day.

A number of my members have approached me and asked if we could just voluntarily ask the members of the General Assembly to try to limit their remarks on final passage to 3 to 5 minutes. I say that because we have spent the extra day, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that we would not have to spend another day on top of that extra day, *but we will do whatever is necessary, Mr. Speaker, to pass this bill.*

So with that, I am asking for a spirit of cooperation in trying to keep the limit to 3 to 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

MOTION TO PLACE BILL ON FINAL PASSAGE POSTPONED CALENDAR

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

Mr. KUKOVICH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise because before we get into the debate on final passage, which I suggest could take anywhere from 2 to 4 hours, I would like to put a motion on the floor.

We have seen something in the area of 85, 90 amendments. Some have gone in; some have not; some have been reconsidered. There is not anybody, I think, on this floor who knows exactly what is in this

bill at this point. There are some areas, especially in the voucher health section, which I think are contradictory with HB 2, with the amendments, and with current law, which none of us understand. What I would like to do is make a motion to place this bill on the final passage postponed calendar. What that means is, it cannot be amended, so that will not drag on debate. It will give us time to have the bill reprinted so we can see what the bill actually does.

I am making this motion because, for members on both sides of this issue, I think it is important that they know exactly what is in this bill to protect themselves before they vote, whether they vote for it or against it. The practical effect is, this will not slow anything down, because the Senate is gone, the Senate has been gone, so even if the bill passes right now, nothing will happen to it. It can be up for a vote and reprinted, with a chance for us to read it over the weekend and vote either Monday or Tuesday or whenever the majority leader would like. I think it is imperative with all the changes that we have made, and the possibility and potential, if this bill ever becomes law, it is going to have an unbelievable impact on many of our constituents. I would just like us—because I made some mistakes on some amendments before the break; I voted wrong on a few things—I want the members to at least vote right on this bill, whether it is “yes” or “no.”

I think it is a reasonable request, considering we only had a few days to look at the bill. From the interrogation on the floor, quite frankly, *we did not get adequate responses to the issues that we asked about.* I am not going to stand here and run through a litany of things I do not understand, but I am still unclear about mental health outpatient, I am still unclear about a number of health-care provisions under the voucher system, and I genuinely do not know what impact it will have.

All I am asking is for the reasonable request to place this on the final passage postponed so we can at least tell our constituents, no matter how we vote, that at least we know what we voted for.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

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

Mr. GEORGE. I wanted to speak on final passage, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question before the floor is the motion of the gentleman, Mr. Kukovich, at this time.

Mr. GEORGE. Then I will yield until a pertinent time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Would the board kindly reflect the motion rather than final passage.

Now, on the question of a motion to postpone, as reflected on the board, on that question, the Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, most of the amendments—As a matter of fact, all of the amendments, Mr. Speaker, were pretty straightforward, and most of the members here in the General Assembly know what they were intended for. This is another effort to slow down the process. Status quo is not good enough. We are here, Mr. Speaker, to do the people's business.

Again, for 3 years we have put these proposals before the people of Pennsylvania and the Democrats in this General Assembly and the Republicans in this General Assembly. It is about time we act, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KUKOVICH. Mr. Speaker, if I could just respond briefly, and then I will shut up on the motion.

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. KUKOVICH. Thank you.

In response to that, anybody who understands the way the process works—and certainly the majority leader does—he knows this does not slow down anything. The Senate cannot take action anyway.

I wish that the debate was really on the level of the merits of this. What we are doing here is talking about people, and we are talking about legislation, not just about press releases and campaigns, Mr. Speaker, and that is the reason why we need to put this on the final passage postponed calendar. Neither you nor the sponsor of this bill has any idea of what the impact of this bill is. Some of us do care about that, and we cannot get the answers. Even if we read the bill, I am not sure we can get the answers, but the bare minimum we should get as elected officials who represent about 59,000 people is to understand what we are voting on, and that is certainly a reasonable request.

It does not slow the process down 1 minute, and I would ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. On the motion, does the gentleman seek recognition? The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Mihalich.

Mr. MIHALICH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to comment on the motion, because the motion is a reflection on the process that is used to try to pass this legislation.

Earlier today I heard one of my learned colleagues refer to some analogy in mythology, and I would like to take the same liberty, except the legend or myth, whatever you want to call it, is about somebody in Greek mythology called Sisyphus. The legislation we do not understand but which we allege is designed to help people less fortunate than ourselves get off the welfare level and into jobs reminds me of the Sisyphus story, or our process here does, and if you remember what that was, Sisyphus in some manner offended the gods on Mount Olympus, and they condemned him in perpetuity to roll a boulder up the mountain, and when he got it just about to the top, somebody would give it a little kick, and it would roll down the hill again, and he would have to start.

This reminds me of the process that we have had here, beginning with the first motions that we had on this process, which was to allow for public hearings. We denied the right for public hearings on this bill, and that, I think, was a mistake. It appears to me, on the basis of that, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of poor people - men, women, and children - in Pennsylvania angered the gods here in Harrisburg, and for that reason they are going to make it harder to push that boulder up this mountain of life, and I do not think that is fair.

I think the people should have been given input into this through extensive public hearings. For that reason and many other reasons - a lack of information - I agree with Mr. Kukovich that the least that can be done at this time, the very least that can be done, is to give those of us who must make these calls, make these votes, give us a full glimpse of the bill as it now stands. That is the very least we can do. The most we can do or a much better avenue, of course, would have been to allow public hearings and public input, but in lieu of that, I think we should be entitled to see the bill in its entirety in its reprinted form.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I urge a "yes" vote on Mr. Kukovich's motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Vitali, on the motion.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of the Kukovich motion. I agree with everything he said substantively, but I would rise in support of this motion for an additional reason.

What Mr. Kukovich is suggesting is enacted in one of the proposed rules which the Rules Reform Committee was suggesting. In other words, one of those rules would require that all these amendments be put into print, they be in print for 24 hours, and then we vote on them. I think we at least deserve to try that rule out. I know many of you just want to get this vote over with—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

The question before the House is not proposed rules or rules that failed. The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman, Mr. Kukovich. Kindly limit your remarks to that motion.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With regard to the substance, Mr. Perzel indicated that we have spent 18 hours and we have considered over 100 amendments, and I can tell you that I could probably tell you how I voted on most of those amendments, but I cannot tell you what amendments got in and what amendments did not get in.

I think it is only common sense, for those of you who actually will take the time to read the finished product, that we just take a look at it, give both ourselves a chance to take a look at it as well as give those whom we represent, the people we want to bring government back to. That is what we are trying to do with this new-wave government, bring government back to the people. Well, let us let them have something to say instead of rushing it through fast so they do not have a chance to talk with us over the weekend. Substantively, it is exactly correct.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you will indulge me for just a second, I do support him for a second reason, and that second reason is, when Mr. Perzel rejected rule reform, he said we have to take things slow. By supporting the Kukovich motion, we will be in effect allowing this rule, this proposed rule, to be in effect for one bill, to see if it works. We may not want to delay the bill for the purpose—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

Will the gentleman confine his remarks to the motion that is before the House. We are not going to redo the rules on the floor at 2 o'clock on a Thursday afternoon. Now, the motion is to postpone this particular bill, and I would appreciate it if you would restrict your remarks to that.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

That would conclude my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. WALKO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I come before this body again to speak as a freshman who has not had an opportunity to thoroughly review the bill ready for final passage with all the amendments. I think it is grossly unfair not only because of the importance of the subject matter to the many children who may be impacted but also procedurally for the constituents in my district to have an opportunity to tell me what they think about this.

I call upon my colleagues who are interested in opening the process for freshmen to support Mr. Kukovich as well. Because it is rug-cutting time, let us make this an open process. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Shaner, from Fayette County.

Mr. SHANER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As a member of the 52d District of Fayette County, I probably have one of the largest welfare-recipient areas in the Commonwealth. This is going to be a tough bill for me either way I vote in my district, because I am going to have to answer to all my people, both pro and con, so I rise to encourage an affirmative vote on Mr. Kukovich's motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Columbia County, Mr. Gordner.

Mr. GORDNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am one of the legislators who likes to keep track of the amendments that go in and not go in a bill and try to then make a decision on final passage based upon what is in. This particular bill has not had 5 amendments or 10 amendments or 15 amendments or 20 amendments or 25 amendments go in, but according to the calculations that I have kept, there have been 31 amendments that have gone into this bill. Since I have been a member, I cannot recall any other bill that has had that many amendments go into it - 31 amendments. I do not know how any of us can make a rational decision based upon the fact of 31 amendments going into a bill.

I think the request that has been made and the motion that has been made by Representative Kukovich is reasonable. He is not postponing it for 1 week or 2 weeks or 3 weeks. He is asking that we have the weekend to be able to go back and look at each one of those 31 amendments in order to make a final decision.

Again I would request that we be given that opportunity, and you have heard the comments of the first-term members that they be given that opportunity on one of the very first important votes that they will make as a legislator in this body. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Butler County, Mr. Travaglio.

Mr. TRAVAGLIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the vote on HB 2, A0240. My button must have malfunctioned, and I wanted to be in the affirmative.

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

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Sturla, on the question of postponement.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of the motion to put this off until Monday or whenever the majority leader decides. We are past the 2 o'clock witching hour here. The bill would have a new printer's number, we would not be offering any more amendments, and I think it would actually expedite the process.

I fully appreciate the fact that the Republican leader allowed every amendment to be heard on this. I think it made this a better bill. I think it is a better piece of legislation as a result of that. I think that discussion on the floor that we have had for the last day and a half was good, I think it benefited Pennsylvania, and I think it benefited all of us.

The times when I saw the debate digressing though was when members did not know the answer to something. That was when we spent hours trying to debate who was right about an issue when

nobody had any clue of what we were talking about. That was when the debate broke down; that was when it dragged on; that was when it went beyond the bounds of where it should have, because we were absent information.

If we get this bill reprinted and we come back at a time certain, with no amendments to vote up or down on this thing, and we know what is in that bill, the discussion will be limited to what is in that bill, not what we think might be in that bill, not what we thought passed but actually failed; no ancillary arguments. I think that then members will be able to limit themselves to brief arguments in favor of or against and discussions of this bill. If in fact we do not have that information, then I think members will have a tendency to ramble on about things they are not even sure exist in the bill.

So I think it is in everyone's best interest, and I do not know about anybody else, but after 13 hours on the floor yesterday and at this time, I guess, what, 5 hours today, I am sure there are a lot of people, particularly those from the western part of the State, that would like to get home before 10 or 11 o'clock tonight. They can come back refreshed, and we can make this brief.

I support the Kukovich motion and ask my colleagues to do so also. Thank you.

VOTE CORRECTION

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

Mr. SAINATO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to correct the record also on A0240. My machine must have malfunctioned. I voted in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. SAINATO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. On the question before the House, which is the motion of the gentleman, Mr. Kukovich, that the bill be placed on the final passage postponed calendar, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Richardson.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion of Representative Kukovich.

We have had an opportunity to witness what I believe is certainly not the best act of public policy on an issue as important as this. Everyone says that this is very important, but nobody wants to deal with what are the realities of the bill. We have no idea what now has been included, what has been excluded, who will be affected, how they will be affected, and to what degree the effectiveness of what you believe is in the bill will in fact pass. Everyone has said, I believe - I believe this; I believe that; I believe that people will not be hurt; I believe that women will not be hurt; I believe that children will not be hurt - but they do not know, and I think for that reason it would just be reasonable for each and every member just to think for a moment, just to think.

If you really want legislation that is going to impact on what you believe is tough government, then why would you not want to see it in print just for the purpose of being able to go over it to make sure that there are no mistakes being made? Oh, yes, I know you will say, we will send it over to the Senate and they will clean it up, and therefore, we have mandated ourselves to do what we said we would do, and that is to get through a welfare reform bill. I can indicate to

you that this certainly has stepped to the toes of those individuals who believe that this is welfare reform versus that which is not welfare reform, and I think that a postponement only gives us an opportunity to be able to see it all in print, to be able to see it all in front of us.

It is unconscionable that we will sit here and believe that the citizens of the Commonwealth will think that we really have been taking care of the people's business when in fact we have done a disservice to them. If we really want to correct the wrongs that have been written, then it would seem to me that we would give a favorable motion to the postponement of this legislation, to be able to come back on Monday and allow us the opportunity to vote up or down in a manner that is reasonable, and then everybody can see exactly where it was.

A delay would mean that you would open up the process again and try to do more amendments. At this particular time, there is no one that has suggested that we in fact have more amendments but in fact just postpone it for the sake of being able to see what we have put in the bill. No one yet, no one yet, either on this side of the aisle or the other side of the aisle, has been able to tell us what is really in this bill. As much as they claim that they understand it, there is no real understanding as to what is in the bill.

I would ask for a favorable vote on the motion to postpone.

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Corpora.

Mr. CORPORA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to address the motion that is on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, these are the documents that we have been poring over for the last numerous hours, and I want your cameras to focus on these documents. This is the present form of the bill, the amendments, and the fiscal notes which we are being asked to vote on right now. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. Final passage postponed, final passage postponed calendar - a parliamentary device that has come down through the years for just this moment. There will never be - apropos of the gentleman, Mr. Corpora's observations - there will never be, Mr. Speaker, a more poignant opportunity for us to invoke that parliamentary procedure.

Mr. Kukovich came to this microphone and politely requested that the final passage postponed calendar be invoked so that Monday the sheaf of papers that Mr. Corpora held in his hand would be consolidated, coordinated, and easily decipherable. None of us, not even our most gifted, even luminaries like the sage of Somerset County, the gentleman, Mr. Lloyd, himself, probably, probably, probably, Mr. Speaker, young Bill Lloyd could only adumbrate the essence of this measure. It is arcane, it is confusing, it is voluminous, and for Mr. Kukovich to ask for some reform -

I got a letter along with Mr. Itkin - relative to final passage postponed - I got a letter from 12 or 13 of my colleagues in the height of Indian summer, and the essence of that correspondence was there had been too much partisan bickering, too much straight-party-line voting, and there were a series of rules reforms in that terse epistle, and in that correspondence, this would have been an appropriate objective. In that correspondence, the reform of this chamber doing business in a more orthodox, traditional, numerical, and yes, parliamentary, parliamentary way seemed to be the essence of those well-meaning and idealistic members who crafted that letter to Bill DeWeese and Ivan Itkin and our leadership team.

Now, not all of those members still stand shoulder to shoulder on this side of the aisle, and not all of those members still embrace my perspective from time to time. That notwithstanding, Mr. Kukovich's proposal that an encyclopedic bill with multitudinous amendments be postponed until Monday, when the controlling party can very, very quickly bring it in for action, is not a big request. The request is de minimis, the request is basic, the request is parliamentary, and on the basis of parliamentary exactitude, parliamentary proficiency, to adhere to the fundamental principles which guide this institution and this chamber, I think the gentleman's request is worthy and a vote against it is contrary to the best interest of our institutional progress and to the eventual reform of the chamber which we all now find to be efficacious and on the horizon.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-97

Battisto	Donatucci	Markosek	Santoni
Bebko-Jones	Fajt	McCall	Scrimenti
Belardi	George	Melio	Shaner
Belfanti	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Staback
Bishop	Gordner	Mihalich	Steelman
Blaum	Gruitza	Mundy	Stetler
Boscola	Haluska	Olasz	Sturla
Buxton	Hanna	Oliver	Surra
Caltagirone	Horsey	Pesci	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Itkin	Petrarca	Thomas
Carn	James	Petrone	Tigue
Carone	Jarolin	Pistella	Travaglio
Cawley	Josephs	Platts	Trello
Cohen, M.	Kaiser	Preston	Trich
Colafella	Kirkland	Ramos	Van Horne
Colaizzo	Krebs	Readshaw	Veon
Corpora	Kukovich	Richardson	Vitali
Corrigan	LaGrotta	Rieger	Walko
Cowell	Laughlin	Roberts	Washington
Coy	Lescovitz	Robinson	Williams
Curry	Levdansky	Roebuck	Wozniak
Daley	Lloyd	Rooney	Wright, D. R.
DeLuca	Lucy	Rudy	Yewcic
Dermody	Manderino	Sainato	Youngblood
DeWeese			

NAYS-104

Adolph	Fargo	Lynch	Schroder
Allen	Farmer	Maitland	Schuler
Argall	Feese	Major	Semmel
Armstrong	Fichter	Marsico	Serafini
Baker	Fleagle	Masland	Sheehan
Bard	Flick	Mayermik	Smith, B.
Barley	Gamble	McGeehan	Smith, S. H.
Birmelin	Gannon	McGill	Snyder, D. W.
Boyes	Geist	Merry	Stairs
Brown	Gladeck	Micozzie	Steil
Brownc	Godshall	Miller	Stern
Bunt	Gruppo	Nailor	Stish
Butkovitz	Habay	Nickol	Strittmatter
Chadwick	Harhart	Nyce	Taylor, E. Z.
Civera	Hasay	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Clark	Hennessey	Pettit	True
Clymer	Herman	Phillips	Tulli
Cohen, L. I.	Hershey	Piccola	Vance
Conti	Hess	Pitts	Waugh

Cornell	Hutchinson	Raymond	Wogan
Dempsey	Jadlowiec	Reber	Wright, M. N.
Dent	Keller	Reinard	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	Kenney	Rohrer	Zug
Druce	King	Rubley	
Durham	Lawless	Sather	Ryan,
Egolf	Lederer	Saylor	Speaker
Fairchild	Leh		

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-2

Evans O'Brien

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

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to say that I want to commend our side of the aisle and our members, Representative Manderino, Representative Sturla, and Representative Babette Josephs, and others who have participated in trying to help shape the direction of this debate in an orderly fashion.

I want to say that I certainly believe that many of us have recognized that this issue of reform is something that different definitions mean different things to different people. While I am very concerned and very conscious of the fact that there are many people who are definitely going to be hurt, I think of an old African proverb, an African proverb that says, "Only a fool tests the depths of the water with both feet." I raise that as a point today to start my debate against HB 2.

I have talked to a number of people on the outside of this room who indicated that they thought that there was more evenness, there was more of a consciousness and a concern, really, about poor people, but what they have witnessed, Mr. Speaker, is that there has been a kind of wave of, I do not care, we want to do it anyway, and that it does not matter whether or not you bring logic to the table or not, notwithstanding the fact that you have heard over and over again that this has been a bipartisan effort. There has been some bipartisanship; there has not been a bipartisan effort. There have been individuals who have cut some deals in order to make sure that they are going to be satisfied and helped to get a few amendments in and make them look like they did something, but in reality we are hurting poor people in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. In fact, there are some people that have said, and I quote, Mr. Speaker, that this "Flickfare ain't fair" and that "Flickfare is sure 'nuff a nightmare," and that when we begin to look at where we are, we have to begin to start registering those protests and concerns as they have been raised.

One, before dealing with the specifics of this bill, I feel that it is important to again set the record straight. For at least the last 4 years, if not longer, we have been proposing a series of legislative initiatives that would have created jobs and saved the Commonwealth millions of dollars in the process. This three-bill package that we talked about then, amending the Employment Opportunities Act,

incorporated the Pennsylvania Job Creation Plan, establishing the Employment Training and Support Trust Fund, would have corrected the most blatant failure of the public assistance system, the failure to give public assistance recipients a fighting chance to get off welfare. You opposed that, Mr. Speaker.

The job training program outlined in HB 2 proposes to provide these opportunities by privatizing the training of those receiving assistance. When speaking about this move, the prime sponsor, Representative Flick, indicated that the Cleveland Works Project works. Well, it may have worked for the 1,300 or so people that it served, but what about those that could not get into the program? It seems to me that before allocating a huge chunk of our taxpayer dollars to privatization and putting money almost exclusively in the hands of the private industry councils, we should heed the words of Mr. Robert L. Woodson, Sr., president of the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise and well-respected conservative African-American, who urged the Federal Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources to evaluate the system, "evaluate the system itself in terms of outcome and its effectiveness in accomplishing its purpose which is the placement and retention of trainees in productive jobs."

In my estimation, Mr. Speaker, we are throwing the baby out with the bathwater. The New Directions program run by the Department of Public Welfare could be more effective if it were funded and staffed correctly, but the sponsors of this measure want to do a pilot program in three areas to see if they work. Let us first look at what we have and then try to make that work first as opposed to making sure our business friends profit while we experiment.

I say that we better be very careful, because what you have done here today is that you have cut a deal, cut a deal with some individuals who, on the private side of the market, that this is an economic venture for them. This is not about the Commonwealth's citizens who are poor. This is about business opportunities for those who see this as a way for them to make money on the backs of the poor, and I say to you, I dare anyone to defy that I am wrong. Why, they have already calculated who is going to get the bid on the fingerprinting; they have already calculated who is going to get the bid for the banks; they have already calculated who is going to get the bid for the cards. All those persons have already been selected. That is what this is all about. Let us not try to play mockery with the citizens of the Commonwealth, particularly when you can use the poor to take advantage of them.

The bill highlights the hypocrisy and the contradictory nature of the sponsors of this legislation for the political party that prides itself on being committed to the lives and welfare of children before birth. To call for the ending of additional assistance for a newborn just boggles one's mind. Why would you hold a mother in jeopardy just because you believe that that person lays down and has babies to receive \$87 a month. That is so ridiculous. I defy anybody here to say, those of you who have children, that when your wife deceives to have another child, and sometimes you say, I was not expecting to have another child, I certainly do not think you would beat up your wife because she had another child.

But in fact what we do today is that we want to punish those. So I did a little research and found out that all this crying out about all of these people having babies, that the vast majority of families that receive AFDC in this country have no more children than families that do not receive AFDC. I know you did not know that, and if you did know it, you still do not care about it because your posture has been diametrically opposed to what is fact. That is why we thought

the facts were important and that is why Representative Kukovich asked for a postponement so we could see the facts as they are really outlined in the bill.

The average number of children per family receiving AFDC in 1991 was approximately 1.9. The average number of children per family in the Nation as a whole was 1.84 that same year, not including families with no children. And by the way, for those who want to know what the vast majority of AFDC families have, one or two children, it indicates in this report that the United States national norm for one or two children is 72.7 percent. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is 72.1 percent. So you see already, Mr. Speaker, that we are living in a basic contradiction.

To categorize this assistance as a reward, when the sponsors know full well that \$87 or \$93 a month is what a mother will receive, defies all logical thinking.

This concept will only add pressure to women who find themselves pregnant and in need of assistance to seek alternative means of dealing with their pregnancy. To make the moral judgment that someone is or is not a responsible parent should not be the role of this legislative body. We are not God, jury, or executioner. The children should not be placed in jeopardy. It is punitive and mean to both the mother and the child.

A few other points to consider: Two-thirds of Pennsylvanians currently assisted by AFDC are children; benefit levels are already too low to provide economic security and family stability; most families in the Commonwealth receiving public assistance, again, only have one or two children.

What I would like to do, Mr. Speaker, is to raise the questions as I have to go through the context of the bill and then ask my questions.

With regard to the workfare program disclosed in this proposal, the approach of forcing someone to enter into these workfare projects has several serious implications. One, you are requiring an individual to participate in this project simply because they have not been able to secure employment. Note, we were under the impression that jobs were available. So because there is no employment available, you force them to participate in workfare?

Number two, you are requiring a person to work next to a person who presumably would be a member of a union, but you reward them with their assistance checks?

Has anyone ever thought what this could-

Ms. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the lady rise?

Ms. MANDERINO. I do not know what to call it, but I cannot hear the speaker, Mr. Speaker, and I would appreciate the House being asked to come to order.

The SPEAKER. I know what to call it.

Conferences on the floor, please break up.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

Mr. COY. Now that we are at a moment of ease, would you place the gentleman, Mr. WRIGHT, on leave for the balance of the day?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Wright, without objection, is placed on leave for the balance of the day.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Conferences on the floor, please break up.

The gentleman may proceed.

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

I thought this was a very important issue, and I thought that perhaps maybe, and I maybe could be wrong, but I want to thank the lady from Philadelphia for her intervention to try to seek a little order, because I thought everyone said this was so important, and I think a lot of us in a few minutes have tried to put together some remarks to respond to something that has been really a locomotive train that has come without an opportunity to even stop at the station to get on.

Therefore, it seems to me that as we are dealing with this issue, it seems that everyone and every thought for those individual persons' self-esteem, we are assuming that these folks have no self-esteem.

I think as anyone and every thought could be considered, that people do have self-esteem and they have self-pride. Programs included during this awkward transition are a major concern to many of us.

What are the legal ramifications of the practice of having an AFDC recipient working for nonprofit agencies? Mr. Speaker, I have outlined a few of my concerns regarding this section of this proposal, but there are others that should be noted for the record. Under the Family Support Act, which became effective in Pennsylvania on October 1, 1989, the Department of Public Welfare is supposed to place increased emphasis on encouraging recipients to find work. That was in fact done.

Most applicants and recipients over the age of 16 are required to cooperate with the welfare office in developing an individual employment plan. Any AFDC recipient who would willfully fail to cooperate with an approved employment development plan without good cause may be ineligible to receive assistance for themselves.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that, in my estimation, this section is redundant in that those receiving assistance are required to do part, if not all, of what is written in section 405.2 of this bill.

Regarding the assistance recipient identification program: In our committee meeting on Monday afternoon, Mr. Flick was quick to refer to Governor Casey's pronouncement that Pennsylvania was number one in the country in deterring fraud. There are certainly other reasons that I am vehemently opposed to this section of this bill, but just on the basis of being number one, I see no reason to begin fingerprinting, particularly in all other counties within the Commonwealth without first receiving the report on how it is going now, those who receive assistance and sharing that information with the Pennsylvania State Police, the chief of the local municipal police department, and the designated officials of neighboring States. Unless there is another motive that we are not aware of, I do not understand why we are pushing this.

This is purely the criminalization of poverty at the very least. We should never forget that nobody chooses to live in poverty, nobody, and some of us are one paycheck away from poverty ourselves. The vast majority are children, children who have no control over the economy and the circumstances that they are born into.

There certainly has to be a constitutional test for this section, but I have a suggestion. Why not fingerprint everybody? Since we believe so much in the theory that it will work, then those with student loans, those who are members of this body, the judges, everyone; then maybe we have a fair and equitable system.

With regard to eligibility: Once again, the mean-spiritedness of this legislation rears its ugly head. In this section, the bill specifies that "No individual shall qualify as chronically needy under this clause for more than nine months in a lifetime." If I interpret this correctly again, this means a person with a serious drug or alcohol problem or other serious problems or diseases must be aware of the days, weeks, or months that they have received treatment so as to not exceed their 9-month limit. This is truly absurd.

The full implementation of Act 152, December of 1988, still has not taken place and had the effect of needing more legislation, which are bills that we tried to introduce in this House that have failed in HB's 1516 and 1745 of last year, to insure that HMO's and their subcontractors are those who are disabled, that they no longer receive the 3 months of pittance that they were receiving. They get nothing. And what do the proponents of this assassination say? We will recommend nothing.

Well, I said Monday, yesterday, and I will say it again today, when a person's back is up against the wall, I think we all know what will happen. You may think you are saving money on the front end, but you will pay in the long run.

To further stipulate that even if a person is trying to repay society for violating the law until all fines, costs, and restitution have been paid, it is just nearsighted and mean not to think that you would give that person an opportunity to be able to pay off his or her fines, but what you have said is that we are going to take them off welfare until they pay their fines, costs, and restitution. How in the heck can they? It is impossible. But yet and still you believe that this is the proper way to proceed. They do their time, they return to society where there are no jobs, and then you tell them they cannot receive assistance until full restitution is made. That is ludicrous, and you are setting up the Commonwealth for a very expensive fall.

I can only indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that there are several individuals and persons who have in fact sent letters. In fact, we have received over 400 letters, and I brought them to the floor of the House today to let you see the abundance of letters that have in fact come in. They have come from Westmoreland County; they have come from Greene County; they have come from Dauphin County; they have come from New Florence; they have come from Champion; they have come from Smithton; they have come from Erie, and they have come from a number of other places in this Commonwealth where they are not urban people. These are rural areas where a number of persons are being hurt.

I have said on this floor and I will say it again that there are more white people on welfare than there are black people and Hispanic people, but for some reason there is a notion to believe that these are the individuals that we must go after, so we direct our attention towards going after what we believe is an answer to the problem when in fact I am saying to you that you are hurting your brothers and sisters, your cousins, your uncles, your aunts, your mothers and fathers, and friends who live in those counties and those areas where they have had serious problems in trying to find employment. Because they did work during their lifetime and because now they have been taken off welfare and then have to resort to going on welfare because they lost their job and the unemployment compensation has run out, there is no place else for them to go.

But you would have America and Pennsylvania believe that it is only black little children, black boys, black males, black females, and black mothers who are on welfare in this Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. That is a darn lie. It is not true at all, and the citizens of this Commonwealth need to hear it loud and clear, because what

is projected over the newspapers a lot of times and over the media is the wrong concept of what that is.

In receiving all of these letters— I point them out because all these letters came in in one day, since this bill has been on the fast track, to say that they oppose HB 2. Some from your own counties, some from those areas that you believe that there are poor people that do not exist because you may not hear from them.

But I say to you that I predict there will be a time when the poor will rise up in this State and they will come back out to give their voice and opinion about what has taken place. It is only because they do not have a voice that you are doing this to them today. Well, I want to let you know that we have received a number of letters, and I am going to let you know who the actual individuals are that have sent them and ask that they be submitted in its entirety so I do not have to read them into the record.

The Drug and Alcohol Service Providers Organization of Pennsylvania opposes HB 2. The Pennsylvania Jewish Coalition opposes HB 2. The Family Health Council of Central Pennsylvania opposes HB 2. The Pennsylvania Psychological Association opposes HB 2. The Pennsylvania Catholic Conference asked for a slowdown on HB 2 to give us an opportunity to see where these bills were. We have also received information from the Center for Independent Living that opposes HB 2. The Pennsylvania Healthy Mothers, Healthy Babies Coalition opposes HB 2. The Tressler Lutheran Services asked that there be a slowdown on this process of HB 2 and oppose HB 2. The president, Mr. Michael Neal, of the PCASO organization wrote to Mr. John Perzel, our majority leader, asking him to consider the Coalition of AIDS Service Organizations and that they oppose HB 2. The organization of the Coalition Against Domestic Violence asked that we oppose HB 2. The United Way of Pennsylvania asked that we oppose HB 2. The Pennsylvania Association of County Drug & Alcohol Administrators oppose HB 2. The Pennsylvania Pharmacists Association asked that we oppose HB 2 and that we consider the Olasz amendment, which was done, but they still believe that it was not the correct thing to do. The Mental Health Association of Southeastern Pennsylvania that raised the question over and over again and Mrs. Vance has responded by saying, I do not think that they are going to be affected by this, but everyone that I have talked to in the mental health community, they were here in wheelchairs the other day asking for our support, not to run this down our throats, and you violated against them as well. You did not even care about those who are in wheelchairs.

The Pennsylvania Community Providers Association opposes HB 2. The Lutheran Advocacy Ministry in Pennsylvania opposes HB 2. The ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union) opposes HB 2. The Pennsylvania National Organization for Women, better known as NOW, opposes HB 2. The Voucher Program Hazardous to Fiscal Health of County Government opposes HB 2. They are part of the Alliance for the Mentally Ill of Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania Partnerships for Children opposes HB 2. And a letter from the mayor of the city of Philadelphia, the Honorable Ed Rendell, wrote us a letter to the members of the Philadelphia delegation sent to the General Assembly opposing HB 2. I would like to have these letters submitted for the record so that they can be placed in the record.

I would like to read one of a series of letters that did come to the attention of my desk that I showed you a sample of. I would just like to read two of them to let you know what some citizens are saying. This is from Scottdale, Pennsylvania. It says, to "The Honorable Allen Kukovich.... I would like you to know what the welfare system has done for me. First the system has helped me start school as a full

time student. Because of the financial help I am receiving through welfare, I can afford baby-sitting for my two children, and for travel back and forth to college. Also, because I am getting help with child care and transportation, I can give all my free time to studying, which makes me a better student.

"Although being on welfare is not the life that I envisioned for myself, welfare is giving me an opportunity to become a nurse. The important factor here is that without the support of my welfare caseworker, and the system, I could never have attended college. I feel that welfare has helped me become a better person, and when I become a nurse, I will be a productive member of society, as well as a tax-paying citizen.

"If welfare benefits are cut off, it not only would adversely affect me, but many others like me. We need this support in order to go to school, which will eventually move us off welfare and into the role of productive citizen."

Another letter all the way from Penn, Pennsylvania: "I came from a well to do family who believed I would never need help or be without money. I did look down at those who were on the system.

"My husband had a great factory job and I didn't have to work. I had three children. Eventually he lost his job and at that point in my life we became one of 'those people.' Food stamps helped during the very bad months that we had no income. We both got jobs and did what we could to keep off the system. But when two people earn minimum wage and have no health insurance, there are times when you need help. My husband still works at a garage for 50 hours a week. By the grace of God I got a job at Head Start and we began rebuilding our lives."

Finally, I just want to say, "Yes we in the US need to change. So lets begin with change. Lets all work together to make a change. Lets change our attitudes. I truly think instead of cutting off services, government needs to encourage the services to work with government to solve our problems. I also truly believe that those making the decision to cut services have no idea what it is like to struggle. Everyone is a part of this country. We need to care for everyone - not just ourselves or not just those who 'have.'"

Mr. Speaker, I will submit the other two for the record. There is one letter to Governor Ridge and the other is to the members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I point this out because I believe that there was not a better reality check done by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Representative Evans, when we were allowed to point out the fact that there were several benefits that in fact have been done through the work effort of this past few years, the Democratic legislative accomplishments of the various acts in terms of what was done. Number one, Act 16 was a part of our true welfare reform package. HB 200 was to remove welfare liens. Act 49, which you all enacted last year, which was HB 41, the referral of all eligible GA and AFDC recipients to a conservation corps. Act 62 of 1993, child support and return of the establishment reforms. HR 68 adopted 5/3/93, Legislative Budget and Finance Committee report on teen pregnancy and prevention program submitted April of 1994. Act 49, again of 1994; another part of this bill of 1994, HB 1392, substantive changes to change GA eligibility, increase fraud deterrence, increase emphasis on work, encourage self-sufficiency, learnfare demonstration, and finger-photo ID's, ID demonstration tax cards.

I want to point out the fact that we have had our true welfare reform package, that in fact this true welfare reform package was in fact a part of the whole deal to deal with the problems that we have talked about. Well, members that keep saying we have never offered

any positive approaches to dealing with this problem are also lying, but we also brought the facts here today to indicate to you that that is very important.

Democratic budgetary and regulatory accomplishments which have been listed, and then containing costs, medical assistance cost-containment initiatives, maximizing of the Federal funds, generic drugs for adults, HealthPASS, HIO- (health insuring organization) and HMO-managed care, and the list goes on.

So anybody that keeps on saying that we do not have a record to deal specifically with what our accomplishments have been in the past does not know what they are talking about.

LETTERS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mr. RICHARDSON submitted letters for the Legislative Journal.

(For letters, see Appendix.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, as I conclude, I want to take this opportunity to ask to interrogate Mr. Flick.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman, Mr. Flick, stand for interrogation? The gentleman may proceed.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is your bill and you are the prime sponsor of this bill, and there were a couple of areas of concern that I thought may be important to some of the members of this General Assembly in terms of being able to determine where we are at this moment.

Has there been any thought given to requiring sensitivity training for the hired private contractors who will be ultimately servicing the indigent in this Commonwealth in your bill?

Mr. FLICK. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. Your transmission is coming across very staticky. I did not hear all of your question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. No problem.

Mr. Speaker, has there been any thought given to requiring sensitivity training sessions, that is, for the hired private contractors who would ultimately service the indigent in this Commonwealth?

Mr. FLICK. Mr. Speaker, the bill provides that the department will seek requests for proposals to implement a job training program for those who are receiving assistance. I would suspect that we would leave that up to the department.

The amendment was offered. At that time I indicated we in the General Assembly should not try to micromanage how the program is to be implemented. We are going to allow the Department of Public Welfare to draft the request for proposal and seek the submissions from the private sector.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Are there any safeguards in this bill to prevent program operators from simply keeping recipients on their employment records for the required 1 year to collect full payment on the contract and then terminating the participant?

Mr. FLICK. Mr. Speaker, it is beyond belief that a situation would exist where an individual was gainfully employed for a year solely for the purpose of the private-sector training organizations to collect their money. They are not the ones who are going to be paying the income to the welfare recipient. They are going to be training the individuals and helping them gain employment. The employer will be paying income to the individuals, and I would suspect that the employer is not going to pay the income if in fact that individual is not providing a service. It would not have anything to do with the training organization.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed that the Democratic leader has an urgent request, and I would like to yield the floor at this time to him for the purpose of his announcement.

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

Mr. DeWEESE. The gentleman thanks Chairman Richardson and Mr. Speaker for your indulgence.

I only have one quick observation to make and to put upon the record, and again, it is primarily a procedural observation, and that is that the committee system, the committee system has been ravaged and plundered and pillaged, and the face of battle has been transmogrified to the floor instead of its appropriate repository in the committee.

I cannot accept with grace the fact that 32 amendments were injected into the body of the bill, that committee work was not accomplished. I am convinced that Governor Thornburgh, if he were Governor, or Governor Ridge—*deja vu*, I guess—Governor Ridge and his very able and energized young team will go to the State Senate and arrange for a new proposal that will be substantially different from the proposal that we are working on today.

So I do not think that we needed to be as pell-mell. I do not think that we needed to abrogate the very essence of our committee structure, and it is primarily for that reason, the reason that our institution is being molested and that we are not behaving as a properly organized chamber - utilizing our committee members, committee staff, committee chairpersons, and the committee process. I do not think that that necessarily had to endure through the spring, but a couple of weeks of committee meetings and overviews and then to have a final passage vote February 10 or 15 would have been, I think, a better way to do business.

So, Mr. Richardson, thank you for yielding. Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to put my remarks on the record.

I think that although you will maintain a numerical majority, as this process winds down I think that essentially you will have a Pyrrhic victory at the end of the day. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the lady from Philadelphia—

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yielded the floor to Mr. DeWeese so he could ask his question. I asked to be recognized back, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Chair apologizes to the gentleman. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Richardson.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important matter, and I felt that the issues that we are dealing with require some answers. I was interrogating Mr. Flick, and I would like to now go back to that same interrogation, if it is possible.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Flick. The gentleman, Mr. Richardson, may proceed.

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

Mr. Speaker, we were getting to the question, and I am sorry that I did not hear the response, so I would like to repeat the question, and then maybe we can hear the response to my question.

Are there any safeguards in this bill to prevent program operators from simply keeping recipients on their employment records for the required 1 year to collect full payment on the contract and then terminating the participant of the program?

Mr. FLICK. Mr. Speaker, the way the bill is designed, the pilot job training program would evolve through a private-sector organization who would be contracted with by the Commonwealth for the purposes of counseling, training, and placing welfare

recipients into jobs, placing them in jobs with private organizations where the welfare recipient would be paid; the welfare recipient would be employed; the welfare recipient would be receiving money. The private placement organization would not be employing the welfare recipient. The proposal is patterned after the very successful programs known as Cleveland Works in Ohio and America Works, which is in New York and Connecticut.

Again, we, the Commonwealth, would be contracting with private-sector organizations for the purposes of training, counseling, and having welfare recipients placed in employment with private-sector organizations, and the welfare recipients would be the beneficiary, because they would become gainfully employed. And I do not believe there need be safeguards, because I do not think anyone would hire an individual and pay them for a year just so that the counseling organization would receive its full payment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, if the bill allows the contractors, who also can be employers, the question is, are there any safeguards built into that thought? I mean, the question is, we are talking about program operators that also could in fact be employers as well. What we want to know is, are there any safeguards if they are the employer?

Mr. FLICK. You know, I can only refer to the bill, Mr. Speaker, that on page 2, line 25, paragraph (4), it says, "Each program operator shall match trainees with existing job vacancies which pay wages and benefits sufficient to ensure the financial security of the trainee and any dependents to enable that trainee and dependents to remain free of any State assistance for at least one year."

Mr. Speaker, if the program operator accomplishes that, we will be successful. If the Department of Public Welfare does not enter into a contract that safeguards that the program operator employs the people, you know, that would be unfathomable for me to expect that the Department of Public Welfare would pay the program operator to hire the welfare recipient so that the net payment to the operator is more than what the welfare recipient gets. I mean, it would not be structured that way, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Well, Mr. Speaker, then what would be the per-participant cost to the State for this program?

Mr. FLICK. Mr. Speaker, that is why it is a pilot program. We do not know which counties it will be operated in. That is why we have provisions that we want reports back. All the requests for proposals on private programs are designed to save the Commonwealth money. This program is designed to save the Commonwealth money and to place individuals into employment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then how much money will that save?

Mr. FLICK. The fiscal note on this, we believe it will save the Commonwealth anywhere from \$32 million in the first year to \$46 million in subsequent years.

Mr. RICHARDSON. This is specifically on the job training program?

Mr. FLICK. No, sir, it is not.

I do not have the specific savings on that—

Mr. RICHARDSON. Okay. I am sorry; I did not hear your response, sir.

Mr. FLICK. I am sorry.

I do not have the specifics on the job training savings, because we do not really know what— It is a pilot program. We are not sure what part of the State, how many people, et cetera.

Mr. RICHARDSON. All right.

How will the costs of this program compare to the costs of the existing New Directions job training program?

Mr. FLICK. The New Directions program has been successful. The Governor indicated that over 300,000 individuals have been placed in employment over the past 8 years. We hope that we can be as efficient or more efficient than that program. That is why it is a pilot program.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not try new approaches, well, then we certainly will not know whether or not they would be successful. We are looking for private contracting with the public sector to provide training, counseling, and placement of individuals. It has worked in other States; we believe it can work in Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The real question was just dealing with costs, but I understand that there may not be any at this present moment. And we definitely support job training, and I will go on record to the supporter that we just wanted to see how it was going to work.

I am still concerned and I just raise with you, so after 1 year, people who are terminated from this particular program, then they go back on assistance, what do we do to prevent that from occurring?

Mr. FLICK. Mr. Speaker, if they have been gainfully employed for a period of 1 year, we hope they are well on their way to independence. The entire program of welfare reform should be based on providing individuals with opportunities to gain independence, to break out of this welfare dependency trap. If we are successful in placing them in employment for a period of 1 year, I suspect that they are well on their way to being successful.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, under the job-training section of this bill, there is a four-phase payment system that is to be forwarded to the contract operator by the department. Do you know who will monitor the job duration, after the four-phase payment system, 1 year later and the time is up?

Mr. FLICK. Mr. Speaker, the pilot program, we have asked—and I refer you to page 3, line 9, subparagraph (c), that there will be continual evaluation of the program—we ask that that report be submitted to the General Assembly no later than 2 years after the implementation of the program. Therefore, I am sure that the individuals who were placed will be tracked, and they will be tracked beyond a period of 1 year.

Mr. RICHARDSON. All right, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

Then—

Mr. FLICK. You are welcome, sir.

Mr. RICHARDSON.—what I would like to do is ask this question on child exclusion that we dealt with earlier, Mr. Speaker: What safeguard does your bill contain to prevent children from going hungry?

Mr. FLICK. I am sorry. I thought you were finished with interrogation.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That area.

Mr. FLICK. Oh; okay.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Now I am going to the child-exclusion area—

Mr. FLICK. Then I did not hear you; I am sorry.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Okay; no problem.

On my amendment that we were unable to have excluded and deleted from the bill, I would like to know, as it deals with the child exclusionary section on the family cap, what safeguard does your bill contain to prevent children from going hungry?

Mr. FLICK. Mr. Speaker, precluding cash payments does not exclude providing food stamps and medical assistance. The children

would receive that. We had debate on this for a sufficient period of time.

The program which provides assistance to those children is the AFDC program. That is a Federal mandate. The Federal Government pays 55 percent of the costs; the State pays 45 percent of the costs. We are talking about the cash assistance, which is 100 percent State funded. Children would receive medical assistance. They would receive food stamps. Actually, the mother would get the food stamps, not the—

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, on average, what is the monthly cost of providing food, shelter, clothing, and basic necessities for a family of three?

Mr. FLICK. I do not know.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, what is the AFDC grant level for a family of three? In other words, we know that there are specified amounts coming out of the department, and what I have been trying to do is ascertain what they are. Perhaps maybe because you have written the bill you could tell us, what is the AFDC grant level for a family of three?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

If the gentleman, Mr. Richardson, knows the answers to these questions, he should not be asking the—

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not know the answer, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You do not know the answers to those questions?

Mr. RICHARDSON. No; I do not know, not based on how the bill has been written, and I am asking that specifically for that reason, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FLICK. Mr. Speaker, allow me to try to work into an answer here backwards.

The portion of the bill which you are addressing is the portion which would restrict additional cash assistance being paid to an AFDC mother for the birth of an additional child. That would be \$87 a month, Mr. Speaker. We are talking about \$87 a month, but, Mr. Speaker, the bill is designed to provide opportunities for that AFDC mother by providing job training, counseling, skill development, and hopefully placing her into private employment. As I said, I referred to the Governor's comments earlier yesterday about the success of the programs we now operate.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Do you know how that is calculated, based on the fact that you went back first and came forward, with respect to that as it is going to impact directly on any of those new children that may be born? And I guess this would have to deal with how the term "Federal poverty level" is actualized.

Mr. FLICK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you have the same information which I have. You know, being the minority chairman of the Health and Welfare Committee, and certainly being the majority chairman for, I believe, at least the 12 years that I have been in the House, I would suspect that you know the answer. But, you know, for various counties it changes. It ranges from \$205 for a single individual up to \$316 for two, \$403 for three, \$497 for four, \$589 for five, \$670 for six, and then each additional person, \$83. That is for the counties of Adams, Allegheny, Berks, Blair, and I will not go on, but I will pass this to the, you are not court reporters, but the chamber reporters.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I guess that the other area of questioning I would leave to some of our more noted women who want to raise the question, but mine is really dealing with the medical area.

Medically, how soon after delivering a child can a woman return to work under your bill?

Mr. FLICK. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding most doctors recommend 6 weeks, but that is a medical decision. Our bill is silent.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The bill is silent on that, you said?

Mr. FLICK. Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Okay. Is postpartum recovery longer if there are complications with the pregnancy or with the delivery itself?

Mr. FLICK. Mr. Speaker, our bill does not address this area.

Mr. RICHARDSON. But it deals specifically with the work disregard that we are referring to, and I just want to make sure in terms of covering that, because everyone says they believe that the areas for families, particularly those of mothers, that it does not impact directly on them.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I will just conclude those remarks.

What I did, I was trying to get at a basis for determining how we in fact are going to deal with those individual mothers who are going to be going to work and how they will be perceived, so that at least on the record we will have an idea. But I will submit the questions for the floor to be able to be allowed to be submitted in the record, and therefore, it will mean that we have submitted these questions for the record and that perhaps at a later date, someone who may want to read this transcript will recognize that we tried to get the answers to what we believe are very important issues concerning this particular subject matter.

Mr. RICHARDSON submitted the following questions for the Legislative Journal:

QUESTIONS FOR FLOOR DEBATE

CHILD EXCLUSION

1. Medically, how soon after delivering a child can a woman return to work?
2. Is postpartum recovery longer if there are complications with the pregnancy or with the delivery?
3. How does the earned income disregard contained in your bill help postpartum women?
4. Do AFDC mothers qualify for subsidized day care?
(No - Subsidies are only provided for non-AFDC employed workers and education and training recipients.)
5. On average, how much does it cost to adequately cloth, feed and care for an infant through the first year of life?
6. On average, what is the monthly cost of providing food, shelter, clothing and basic necessities for a family of three?
7. What is the AFDC grant level for a family of three?
8. What does the term "federal poverty level" mean?
9. How is it calculated?

10. At what percentage of the federal poverty level are Pennsylvania's AFDC grants?

11. Does your bill provide that notice be given to AFDC recipients that their grants will not increase to support additional children?

12. How will women know that they will receive no additional help from the state if they give birth to another child while in need of assistance?

13. How many women do you estimate give birth to receive the incremental grant increase and what do you base your estimate on?

14. How many women in Pennsylvania living in poverty are at risk of unintended pregnancies?

15. What are some of the reasons for unintended pregnancy?

16. Under current law does the failure to adequately feed, cloth and shelter an infant constitute neglect?

17. How many infants do you estimate are currently at risk of neglect in Pennsylvania?

18. What safeguards does your bill contain to prevent children from going hungry?

Mr. RICHARDSON. In my conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I have attempted to try to deal with this issue as one who has been asked to try to follow the lead on this, but I want to let you know that I believe that a nightmare for poor people in Pennsylvania is taking place and that the other day when I asked about the process, I indicated very strongly that I was very upset that we were not afforded the opportunity to be able to be allowed to see the bill before it was in print and then the action that was taken after that. I have been here 23 years, and I have never seen anything that would not allow an opportunity for there to be fairness and an opportunity to deal with what I believe is very important as it relates to issues that impact on a large population and citizenry like those who are poor.

I can also remember that when I did chair the House Health and Welfare Committee as the majority chair, that we afforded everyone an opportunity to at least share their concerns and, in committee meetings, even went to counties that members asked us to go hold committee meetings in those particular counties because the issue was so vital to them that they felt it important to go there. Now that has changed.

Sometimes power corrupts and sometimes absolute power corrupts absolutely, that you give people a break and you do things fair, but then when it comes to the other side to ask for fairness, you cannot get it. And I can remember, every last one of you on the committee who asked for some support from myself, we gave that, and all we did today was ask for a little support, to say have a little heart about those out there who cannot fend for themselves, have a little heart for those individual persons who really need a chance. You brought this up; we did not. You said we have to rush this through; we did not, and all we said is if you give us a little time, maybe we can conceive that there can be an opportunity to really work out something.

I have never seen, since I have been here, the work of the whole committee done on the floor of the House for 2 straight days, not giving a chance for the members to really have a chance to rest - a straight 13 hours yesterday, back here this morning at 9 o'clock - and I just believe that this will come back to haunt you, that it will come

back in a way that you will not expect it, because a lot of times when you give out and dish out meanness to people, it does not always come back to you the same way that you gave it out. But I can guarantee you that those individual persons whom you are trying to take off welfare, that is going to impact on you and the lives of those individual constituents in your district, particularly those who have poor people.

Now, last year we put on the record every county and showed that every county does have some poor people, but the time is going to come when Pennsylvanians are going to rise up and they are going to deal with this issue. They are going to also have a voice and a say-so, and you will not be able to walk over them in the manner that you walked over them today.

I would hope that your conscience would be your guide, and I would hope that you would not allow politics as usual be allowed to be played in this game called welfare reform when in fact this is welfare, welfare, welfare slavery. This is not welfare reform. We should have an opportunity to go back, take it to the public, and allow the public an opportunity to voice their opinion.

I have put in the record those who have responded already, and it would seem to me that it would be most important for each and every one of you to recognize that all of you are going to one day have to deal with those individual persons who in fact have no place to go but wanted a chance to make it in society. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Ms. Manderino.

Ms. MANDERINO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to HB 2 on final passage, and I do so based on actually two purposes, and I cannot really determine which one upsets me more. One has to do with the process by which the bill has progressed through the committee structure in the House, and the other one has to do with the actual substance of the bill.

When we had this bill in committee in Health and Welfare on Tuesday, I believe it was, there were a lot of questions asked; there were a lot of questions answered with "I don't know" or "I don't know the impact." It did not seem to matter that we did not have the answers to the questions, because the objective was not to get to the substance of the bill; it was to get through the process and get the bill out in response to a particular type of time schedule. So process, sadly, took precedence over substance.

And then when we came on the floor of the House, we tried to raise a lot of those same questions around those substantive issues, and again, at least from my perspective, I believe there were a lot of questions that were not answered. There were a lot of "I don't know." There were a lot of ways that we were concerned about what the impact was, and it still could not be determined. And the process was asked to give 1 more day, one opportunity to view in final passage, and that was denied, because the process was more important than the substance.

So I am not sure if I am more sad because this chamber chose to choose process over substance than I am for the actual substance of the bill, because, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the substance of the bill, while on occasion actually having some really good components, even on the good stuff chose to be punitive in nature.

For example—and I said this in committee and on the floor of the House—just using one example of the fingerprinting to try to avoid fraud, quite frankly, that is something that I could have supported, but I cannot support the loss of privacy that was also instituted as part of that fingerprinting provision for somebody just because they are poor.

There are a lot of people who receive benefits from the State. Whether they are students, senior citizens, State employees, business people who get loans, there are a lot of people who get benefits from the State, and we do not fingerprint them and we do not pass their fingerprints on to the State Police or any other law enforcement officials and thus invade their privacy.

It is not a sin to be poor; it should not be a crime to be poor, and just because you are poor, you should not have different privacy rights than the rest of the citizenry. And so while I could have applauded an attempt at a program that potentially could reduce fraud where it was occurring, I cannot applaud a system that had to go further and be punitive in nature and invade people's privacy rights unnecessarily.

When we talked about the job training pilot project yesterday, I think it is a great idea. There were a lot of members that thought it was a great idea, and there were members that thought it was such a great idea that they asked, through the amendment process, can we expand the pilot areas a little further? And what we were told in response was, no, that is a bad amendment, quote, "we want to walk before we run."

On the one hand you might say that is an admirable approach, a reasonable approach, a thoughtful approach, a cost-effective approach, and I would have bought that if on the one hand when we were trying to provide opportunities for employment we were being thoughtful, but when it came to another area, such as the fingerprinting, we threw the thought process aside, we threw the reasonableness aside, we threw the cost effectiveness aside, because, Mr. Speaker, the reality of it is that we did last year in the Welfare Code put a pilot project in for the fingerprinting.

The SPEAKER. The lady will yield.

My records indicate that six more members desire recognition, so there is an end in sight. If we can keep the noise level down and allow the various speakers to go ahead, I think it will be to everyone's advantage.

The lady may proceed.

Ms. MANDERINO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I said, I could have accepted the thoughtfulness and reasonableness going into the pilot project on jobs if it was not for the statewide expansion of the fingerprinting project, that if you remember, just last spring when we did a welfare reform bill, we included fingerprinting as a pilot project. It is my understanding from the State Department that RFP's are in the process of being let and considered in that process. So we have not even seen the cost effectiveness, the quality, whether or not the fingerprinting has an ability to reduce fraud, and yet without that information from a pilot project, that I think 6 months ago we put in there trying to be thoughtful and deliberate, we have expanded it statewide. We have expanded it statewide when it is a punitive measure based on our assumptions or presumptions or stereotype that the vast majority of the people are out there committing fraud, and we want to be punitive and stop them from doing that awful thing that I am sure 95 percent of them are doing, but yet when it came to providing them opportunity, getting them into the work force, we wanted to walk before we ran, and with a punitive measure, we wanted to sprint as fast as we could before the starter's gun ever even went off. These are the notions that have been in this bill that have made it so punitive and so onerous that the good parts of the bill have gotten lost on the floor of the House and have gotten lost in the mire of confusion.

This afternoon at lunch break we tried to call down to HHS (Department of Health and Human Services) to try and get some clarification on questions that have arisen over and over again, both in committee and on the floor of the House, with regard to the child-exclusion provision and what happens to other benefits if we take this kind of action, and even then the response from them was not clear, that what we were given were absolute opinions that everything would be okay.

Mental health and mental retardation. Do we really know what we have done? Because if you know what we have done and you are comfortable that you understand how we have or have not affected people with mental health or mental retardation as it pertains to the medical assistance and the voucher program, I wish you would get up and explain it to me, because that, to me, is still a very unclear area of the law and very unfair to people in need to proceed without knowing the answers.

The substance had merit at certain points. The overall effect of the substance is punitive. It is a sad day, I think, for poor people and for the people of Pennsylvania if HB 2 passes, but more importantly, it is a sad day for our chamber that we put process over substance on an area that affects so many people's lives.

I urge a "no" vote on HB 2.

The SPEAKER. The 6 I mentioned a moment ago has gone to 11.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Clearfield, Mr. George. Does the gentleman desire recognition?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the Chair and this body, and I will not be very long.

I need a moment maybe to gather a few thoughts on what has transpired here in the last couple of days, and honestly, if you will excuse me, I liken this to the fact that it reminds me of an old saying that "the longer it went, the damner it got," and that is exactly what we have at this moment.

We started to purvey and insist that we were going to follow the lead of the masses, those back home who insist that we should reform our assistance and those we should help in regard to those that no longer should be able to demand our help. Yet when I read the synopsis and we talk, Mr. Speaker, about taking "able body" off the rolls, there is not anybody that I know that would disagree with that theory and would refuse to abide with that policy and concept, but by "able body," my people back home do not mean babies, infants, and those women who need our help.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but yesterday you and I were talking about your tenure and the fact that I am a junior with only 20 years, but I remember when you were just a young fella leading the fight for the Republican side along with Mr. Butera and Mr. Seltzer, and over on this side we had the likes of Manderino and Irvis and Fineman. You people came at each other like pugilists, yet never did you lose for one moment the sight of who you are and what you represent, and even though you, sir, may have represented the Grand Old Party and those on my side represented, it said, the working men and women, you never refused, either of you, to sit back and do the very best that you could for the men and women in our society.

For those who are a little bit concerned, and please believe me, I apologize for keeping you here any later, and I know not one will change their vote after listening to me, and I do not want to embarrass anyone when I say, I know darn well there are people on our side that are going to vote for this measure because they think the people back home will take it differently if that is not the case.

You know, this morning I read the paper, and I am not talking about the newspaper account of how many times the other side ate

yesterday. I am talking about the article about Governor Shapp and the fact that he did not try to cut the needy from help. He simply tried to remove those who did not deserve - those who defaulted and those who were not doing what is honest. Even though the people may have taken issue with that one argument, that Governor was elected the first time by 500,000 votes, and the second time, with all that had transpired, by 300,000 votes.

So for those of you that are going to go back home and say, yeah, I voted for it, then you ought to be honest enough and tell the people that you did hear from the small business people whose cash registers ring continually when these little people get these benefits, and they are the ones that contacted you and said, do not vote for this bill; postpone this bill; the pharmacists are getting hurt or the chiropractors are getting hurt, and we are not being treated right. So you see, when we pitch into their pockets, they do not like it either.

I could stand here and say a lot of things that I might even be sorry for, and I am not going to mention these things at this time. I am sure you are all very happy that I have laryngitis. But let me say this with an apology, Mr. Speaker: The majority leader insisted that we had 18 years and we went at this with such diligence, we went at this with such a frenzy, and we are going to be able to go home and tell the people what we have done. I am not worried about this bill, to be very honest with you, Mr. Speaker. It is not going anywhere. It is going over there and coming back, and it will be changed, so I am not worried about that. I am just going to go home and tell my people, things have changed since the Matt Ryan days. Oh, the people that come in are just as bright, and the people are just as loquacious, and they have such great elocution, but they forget one thing when they come here on the weekend. When they pack their bags and their car is overloaded, they must leave at home a little logic and a little compassion.

So I end by this, Mr. Speaker, by simply saying, again, what an old gentleman told me: "There's a difference between scratching your backside and tearing it to pieces," and some of you are going to have to look under your fingernails tonight. I am voting "no."

The SPEAKER. If that was not so funny, I would have it stricken from the record. On a reading of the Journal for today's date, that may not come out quite the same.

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

Mr. RAMOS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today in opposition to HB 2 on final passage.

You know, as a freshman, it has not been very easy for me. On Monday, as I arrived here, at the end of session I was informed that I was a member of the Health and Human Services Committee. At the same time, I was informed that that committee was meeting to consider HB 2. Two hours after that, that bill had come out of committee and onto the House floor, and I am here today in opposition to that bill, because unlike many other districts in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I represent a district that is one of the most if not the most impoverished districts in the entire Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

It is estimated that 48 percent of the people living in my district live under poverty. I represent the 180th District in Philadelphia, which is located in the northeastern part of this country. In the last 10 years, this part of the country lost an estimated 40 percent of all the industrial jobs. It is also in a city that lost a substantial amount of its industrial and commercial base, and as a result, you go down in my district and you see plenty of empty warehouses, industrial

buildings, empty lots that once used to house buildings which used to employ thousands of people.

Many of you remember that 3 or 4 years ago the Federal Government had to extend, a couple of times, the unemployment compensation benefits because of the amount of people that were looking for jobs and could not find them, and many of those people were also living in my district. In my district it is estimated that 40 percent of the residents in my district are 18 years or younger, 60 percent of them are between the ages of 18 and 35. So this bill which we are considering today, no doubt, affects so many people in my district, and that is why I am in opposition today.

I sat here on Monday to listen to the Governor talk about crime, but let me tell you that there is no greater need for us to talk about another thing more than jobs. I think that if there is a special session that we should be having, it should have been on jobs, because I think that most people in this country and our districts are concerned about jobs, and I will fully support such an effort, even on the Republican side. If we think about it, the major issue affecting everyone in this country is jobs, and some of the reasons or most of the reasons why people are on public assistance is because of the lack of opportunities and jobs. If you think that now because we have developed a pilot project on training and that we are going to privatize job training, the welfare recipients are going to run over to this job training program and at the end are going to be fully employed, enjoying basic benefits that many other people in this country and many of us enjoy, I do not think that is going to happen. It has not happened.

We have not been able to even hear in the last few days anyone talking about any current success of any job training program in the State of Pennsylvania. I have still to hear any success, any measure of success, on any of these programs. So thinking that now with this job training program, people are going to be employed, they are going to get off welfare, I think that we are wrong.

For the sake of time, obviously, I am going to be very short, for the sake of all of us, because I hope to get home and hope that my kids will recognize me when I get back.

I just finally want to say that I think this bill does a lot of injustices to a lot of people. In my opinion, we should have given an opportunity for public hearings, for public input, because this measure affects so many people - thousands of women and children in this Commonwealth. There was no need to hurry this legislation the way it is being done. Especially, I know for a fact that a lot of people in my district are going to suffer as a consequence, and I have to stand here and tell you that I cannot support it on those bases. I think that we should allow more time to consider the impact of this legislation on children, especially on women and families, and these are people who are the most unfortunate, who deserve our most consideration.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for the opportunity. I urge all my colleagues to vote "no" on HB 2. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. HORSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose HB 2.

I need to know, Mr. Speaker, what is the rush to judgment in this matter? I do not have a full printed-out copy of the legislation. I have got 1,000 amendments, not quite 1,000. For points of exaggeration, I have 1,000 amendments that I have got to go over, and I have to present back to my constituency tomorrow HB 2, and that is

improper. If I had a final copy of the legislation, I could give it to folks tomorrow when I get back to my district, hopefully, and show them what we have done in Harrisburg and actually show them, probably, the passed legislation. What is the rush to judgment, is the first question.

I am opposed to HB 2 also, Mr. Speaker, because it hurts children. The right-to-lifers, it does. It encourages women not to have kids. Kids are not the demons in this situation; the adults are. Kids should be allowed to live, and any legislation that we pass that stops birth or life is in opposition to the right to life, so we need to mull over that and think about that when we vote for this legislation.

There are issues of privacy. There are issues of confidentiality. There is the issue of family cap, and that is the issue I just addressed to the right-to-lifers. It is not right. It is not good legislation. Kids do not do it. The mission is and I believe the same way everyone else does that if you work, you should be paid. I believe in the work ethic. I believe that somehow we have to stop all these parents from having all these children, but I do not believe that the family cap is the methodology. We need to continue to provide the services to these kids somehow around the parents who are having the kids, and we did not succeed with this HB 2.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want it to be on record that Mike Horsey in the 190th opposes HB 2. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Ms. Josephs.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to urge a "no" vote for the child exclusion and abortion inducement act of 1995 for a number of reasons, the first one being that over the last 4 years, we have done a tremendous amount of work in this welfare area, and I would like to put that on record. This was a Democratic administration, a Democratic-dominated House, but certainly Republicans had part to do with this, and it was a bipartisan effort.

We contained costs by medical assistance cost-containment initiatives. We maximized Federal funds. We substituted generic drugs for brand drugs for adults. We set up and got into performance HealthPASS, health insurance organizations, HMO's, and many kinds of managed care. We strengthened child support enforcement.

We deferred fraud by front-end investigations, by starting a pilot project on electronic benefit transfers, by our pilot program on finger photo ID's, by a 60-day residency requirement, by increasing the fraud penalties, by adding a right of recovery from probate estates, and by strengthening proof of disability standards.

We promoted responsibility and self-sufficiency by strengthening child support, by setting up a procedure for voluntary acknowledgment of paternity at birth, by removing welfare liens, by agreements of mutual responsibility between clients and the department, and by setting up educational savings accounts.

We made work pay by setting up the New Directions and the Bridge to Employment programs and by referring welfare recipients to the Conservation Corps. We expanded workfare to nonprofit agencies. We established a job creation task force. We reauthorized the employment incentive tax credit program. We eliminated eligibility as "chronically needy" solely on basis of age, and we limited eligibility for those who voluntarily quit work.

We stopped the cycle of dependency by educational savings accounts, by expanding eligibility for 18- to 20-year-olds who completed school, by the Learnfare pilot project, by the New Directions program, and by expanded assistance for victims of domestic violence. We demanded accountability in performance by

agreement - that agreement, for mutual responsibility - by a biannual report to the General Assembly on caseloads and services and by an independent performance evaluation of the workfare program.

I think we have a fine record, and I think we have no need to rush into other things. That is one reason why I urge a "no" vote.

You know that I oppose this bill because I think it encourages abortion, because it is punitive, because it is cruel, because it punishes children, but the subjects of the bill are not the only people who are being punished. I believe the taxpayers are going to be punished also. I think this bill is a fraud on the taxpayers.

You heard Representative Manderino talk about how we are jumping into a statewide fingerprinting program, which we have no idea what it will cost or whether it will be effective. In some ways, that is the least of the problem.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have to tell you, and as my chairman has said many times on this floor, it is time to stop practicing avoidance behavior. We are facing a \$600- to \$800-million increase in welfare programs.

Now, the fiscal note that was prepared by the Republicans for HB 2 says that we—it is a very, very optimistic fiscal note—it says we may save up to \$32 million on this bill. Let me just, for sake of argument, say, let us double it; let us double it. We are going to save \$64 million by passing this bill. Does anybody have any idea what percentage of the welfare budget that is? I am not asking to interrogate. I will give you the answer. It is barely over 5 percent. This bill does not address the areas where the cost is really spiraling out of control, medical assistance, and the largest part of that is long-term care. This bill is a fraud on the taxpayer, and the taxpayer is a victim as much as the 12-year-old little girl who is a victim of incest.

Many people have talked about the process here. I also deplore it. I deplore it. We were forced on the House floor to act as if we were a committee. That is the reason. I do commend the majority leader for opening up the House floor the way he did, the Republican leader. I only wish that the Health and Human Services Committee had been opened up. If it had, we would not have spent 2 days on the House floor here. If we had run that committee the way we should have, we would not be suffering the way we are today. We did a disservice to ourselves and to the dignity of this institution on this bill, and I deplore that.

Finally, if I were really political, if I were not the fiscal conservative and the fiscally responsible person that I am, I would vote for this bill, because I think this bill is an embarrassment to the Republican, our new Governor. Everything that he has said in print and to us only a few days ago has been conciliatory and very cooperative in tone. I am sure people on the other side put their dollars and their energy and their time in getting him elected and were happy when he was elected. Now you have cut the ground out from under him. I do not understand why, but it is your party.

The other reason, if I were really political and not responsible, as I am, I would vote for it is because I think this bill goes a long way to breaking any kind of budget that the Republican administration now has to form. It is very, very expensive, but I am a fiscal conservative, and I am a fiscally responsible person.

I urge a "no" vote on this bill, and I hope that all of my colleagues will vote with me. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MOTION TO LIMIT DEBATE

The SPEAKER. On the question of HB 2 on final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Gladeck. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GLADECK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a motion, if I may.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman state his motion.

Mr. GLADECK. I would like to make a motion that we limit debate for the remainder of this debate on final passage to 3 minutes per speaker.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a moment.

The gentleman's motion is in order, and it is not debatable.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. On the question of the motion of the gentleman, Mr. Gladeck, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Itkin.

Although it is not debatable, as a matter of courtesy we have extended to the floor leaders the opportunity to speak briefly on matters such as this, and that courtesy will continue.

Mr. Itkin.

Mr. ITKIN. Could you advise the House how many members are seeking recognition from the floor?

The SPEAKER. To speak on the bill?

Mr. ITKIN. To speak on the issue.

The SPEAKER. Well, Mr. Itkin, I can say, at one point I had said there were 6; it grew to 11; the 11 turned into about 17; there are now 8 remaining that I am aware of.

MOTION WITHDRAWN

Mr. ITKIN. Okay. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the gentleman withdraw his motion temporarily, now that those people who are going to seek recognition will understand the timeframe and perhaps they will voluntarily agree to limit their remarks. I would prefer to do it that way than see the House come down on the membership.

We have been here for—I cannot remember what day it is this week, but we have been here for a long time, and we have been doing so well. Let us not get acrimonious right now in the final hours. I would appreciate it if Mr. Gladeck would withdraw his motion temporarily.

Mr. GLADECK. Yes, sir. I have no problem in doing that.

Mr. ITKIN. And the word to the remaining speakers, from my point of view, is, you heard the message; let us get on with the task.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Kukovich, rise?

Mr. KUKOVICH. For a point of information for the Chair.

In the spirit of Mr. Itkin's comments and to accommodate Representative Gladeck, I will withdraw my name as a speaker on final passage.

The SPEAKER. You saved a half hour. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Do we have any more such volunteers?

Would it help if I called out the names so that maybe peer pressure could be put to work?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster County, Mr. Sturla, for 30 seconds.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a couple of questions, and then I would like to make a few quick comments, and I will try and be brief.

Will the prime sponsor, Mr. Flick, rise for a brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman consents to interrogation. You may begin.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of questions. The job training that is in here, I think it actually looks like a pretty good program and, I believe, will do some good things. My question is, how does this job training program differ from the current job training program we have in existence in Pennsylvania, the New Directions program? Are there major differences, or is this to supplement it? How do we differentiate between the two? Is it similar? I mean, because I think it is, and I would just like to know that it is so that—

Mr. FLICK. Mr. Speaker, the bill provides for a pilot program where the State would request proposals from the private sector so that we could develop a system where the private sector is training, counseling, and placing individuals into employment. The payment plan is broken down in quarterly payments, which when the final payment is made, the individual would have been working 1 year. As I am sure you are aware, New Directions is a training program handled by the State.

We are looking to privatize. Rather than use government employees, we are looking to downsize government. The private sector is very successful. Many companies, I am sure, would be interested in bidding this program.

Mr. STURLA. Okay. Thank you.

To be quite truthful, I knew a lot of the provisions were the same, but I guess that was the one distinction that I had not made as a difference beforehand, and I appreciate that.

On the health voucher system, a similar question. Right now there is Healthy Choices in Pennsylvania, which is a program that is operated in Philadelphia and, I believe, the six surrounding counties. I believe it contracts with the Mercy Health Plan. Is that similar to the health plan that we are looking at here with the pilot programs in the various counties, because I think it has been a relatively successful program in terms of cutting costs?

Mr. FLICK. No. As a matter of fact, Healthy Choices has not even been given a contract yet. We are looking to establish a program whereby, again, the Commonwealth could contract for private health insurance for individuals. It would not necessarily be an HMO. It could be any provider group could gather together and submit a bid. Again, we are leaving this up to the department to structure the proposal.

Mr. STURLA. Okay. Thank you.

A couple of further questions, and then I will make comments.

The electronic benefits and fingerprinting, basically, they are expansions of pilot programs that are in existence now. Is that correct?

Mr. FLICK. That is correct.

Mr. STURLA. And the community work program, which the name has been changed to the workfare program, basically, that has existed for, I think, what is it, 12 years?

Mr. FLICK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It has existed since, I believe, 1982, when it was passed and signed into law.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have adopted about 10 or 12 of your amendments. You are probably one of the most familiar people with this bill. I cannot believe that you do not know the answers to these questions which you are asking now.

If you wish to make a statement, I would suggest you make a statement, but—

Mr. STURLA. Okay. Well, I just wanted to make sure that my interpretation was the same as yours, and I believe it is.

I would like to be recognized to make a few comments now, please.

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

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand to support this bill. While I believe that there are some concerns that I have, overall there are many portions of this bill that I believe move in the right direction.

Job training is something that I believe is necessary. We have tried to do that in the past, and my understanding is, we are looking at expanding those opportunities.

The health-care voucher system, I believe, expands on pilot programs that have been in existence and creates new opportunities in that area. Obviously, the electronic benefits and fingerprinting system was an expansion of those pilot programs.

The community work program, which I believe has some flaws and, as a result of that, has not been enforced for several years, obviously may be enforced again. I would hope that we would make some positive changes to that in the future.

There are, however, some concerns that I have - the two sections particularly, those that deal with transitionally needy and determination of need of additional children - and I would hope that the Senate would perhaps look at these further.

I know that the comment has been made by the Ridge administration that they want to work with the Senate. I know I have talked to many of my colleagues on both sides who have said, why are we debating this thing? The Senate is going to change it anyway; they will clean it up; they will change things; do not worry about it. I would hope that this is one of those sections where they in fact do some of that.

One of the things that we are doing is we are cutting off additional children to women who are on AFDC or who are currently eligible for AFDC. What we are not doing is limiting benefits to new first-time teen mothers, which is one of the things that Governor Ridge said he was most concerned about in his address, and at the same time we have cut the transitionally needy payments to 18- to 25-year-olds.

Now, I would like to talk about an example in my district. We have a teen parenting program in my high school. I visited that high school and the teen parenting program several months ago, and I asked them whether they were working with the teen fathers that were obviously getting these teenage girls pregnant, and they said where in fact the teenage father existed and they had access to the father, they were working with them, but in 70 percent of the cases, 70 percent of the teen mothers that they had in their program had given birth to a child fathered by someone between the ages of 20 and 40.

Now, what we have done here with this bill and where I have the problem with this bill, despite my support for it, is that we have taken those people, those men in that category, 18 to 25, taken away any benefit that they have, and we have said to teen girls, you do get benefits if you get pregnant, and that I believe makes a meal ticket out of a teenager. I believe what we will in fact see is higher rates of

teen pregnancy among girls who are having children to fathers between the ages of 20 and 40, and I think that is an alarming trend. I think that is something that members on both sides of the aisle would want to deal with, and I think that is what most people believe welfare reform should be about and we do not deal with it in this bill. So I would hope that either the Senate deals with it or we deal with it in the future, and so I wanted to get that point across.

I guess I have some concerns about the fiscal note that was issued on the bill itself in that the savings from job training, I believe, will occur but I do not believe they will occur as rapidly. We are going to have to spend some money up front, which I believe is necessary, but I do not know that we are going to have those quick-term savings, so I would hope that we would stick with this job training program even if the savings are not realized in the next year or two.

Workfare, I believe, has some long-term savings, but again, the gear-up costs that we had talked about earlier when we were doing amendments are going to cost money up front, and I hope we realize that and stick with it rather than giving up on it.

In closing, I would just say that I think we have done some harm with this bill, but I think we have expanded some things that are good about welfare reform. I would hope that, as I said before, the Governor works with the Senate to take care of some of these problems and that in fact when we revisit welfare reform in the future, that we would deal with some of these problems, because if what we are truly about in welfare reform is helping people, I think we have got quite a long way to go yet. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Ms. Bishop.

Ms. BISHOP. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to HB 2 in its current form.

It is inhumane and bordering on being criminal in nature. Its impact will be just as deadly as the Street Sweeper, the Uzi, the M-12, the M-6, or any of the other dangerous assault weapons in our community.

The chief beneficiaries of public assistance are women and children, and therefore, the victims of its destruction would be our children. As well as we are able, as well as I am able to assess, this bill will write off young people before they even have a chance.

However, because this bill was developed, because this bill was introduced, because this bill was moved out of committee, and because this bill was moved to the House floor without a public or any public input, we are not fully able to access its impact.

I am gravely disturbed by certain aspects of this measure. The provisions of the bill put the greatest responsibility and the greatest burden on women and children.

In one instance we wanted to at least allow for an appeal denial so that a woman who had been turned down assistance would have a chance to be heard and at least a possibility to receive assistance. That amendment failed. We wanted to insure that all needy children would receive assistance whether or not they were born while their mothers were on welfare. That amendment was killed, Mr. Speaker. We wanted to give victims of domestic violence more time to receive assistance, more than just the mere 9 months that was mentioned, and that amendment was killed, Mr. Speaker. The most devastating act that a woman can experience, the most humiliating act that a woman can experience is the act of rape and incest. Absolutely nothing is more devastating to any woman than having been violated, and we tried to see that she had some kind of help in this, and that went down the drain.

The chauvinism of the overwhelming male chamber of this House is coming through; it is coming through loud and clear, and it is being heard, and it is going to be heard back in our districts, Mr. Speaker, and it is going to be heard ringing louder than a tingling bell and a sounding cymbal.

This bill punishes women; it punishes children; it places the burden totally on the woman. As further evidence of this prejudice, the bill's cuts to the AFDC programs are said to be designed to deter single mothers from having children, but at the same time the bill wants to exclude contraceptives and prescription allowances.

I believe and many of the people in my community believe and other organizations agree that this will result in more abortions because the mother simply will not be able to afford to have children or to raise children. I am certain this is not the intent of those who created this legislation. All poor women—and I want this House to understand this—all poor women do not get pregnant just to receive a check. There are some who have planned and planned very carefully but they have accidents, like I am sure if it would be admitted, some of us planned but had accidents. I can tell you I had four.

All needy children should be covered. We cannot possibly understand all the extenuating circumstances of our constituents' lives that led them to being on welfare rolls. By setting harsher and harsher limits, we are turning away from the most vulnerable members of our Commonwealth. We are automatically sentencing these children to a life of failure, a life of poverty, a life of devastation, a life of crime, and a life of worthlessness.

The truth is that welfare is not responsible for the breakdown in the nuclear family, but public assistance does take care of the children who are the victims of the breakdown until we in this General Assembly can get around to fixing the real cause, which is joblessness, poverty, crime, addiction, which has contributed to the moral erosion and physical devastation of our entire society, our homes, our communities, our Commonwealth, and our Nation.

These poor children deserve to have an opportunity to live a better quality of life. They are our future. An investment in our future today determines how our dividends will return to us tomorrow.

So I beg you to vote "no" on HB 2. I am voting "no" for it. I cannot, in its present form, vote "yes" for it, and I am asking anyone who cares about children, anyone who still has compassion and sensitivity about children, to vote "no" on HB 2. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

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

Mr. JAMES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, may I question the maker of the bill? I have about four questions, and then I would like to make a brief comment.

The SPEAKER. I do not see the gentleman on the floor. The gentleman, Mr. Flick, is not on the floor at this time.

Mr. JAMES. Okay. If he returns before, can I then question him, unless there is someone else that maybe can answer questions as it relates to HB 2 in the area of the assistance recipient identification program. Can anyone do that?

Okay. What I can do, Mr. Speaker, you can go to the next person, and I will yield and wait until he comes back.

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

Mr. KIRKLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Flick is in the back if you need to see him.

Today I lend my voice to the chorus of voices that are denouncing the Republican drive for so-called welfare reform, HB 2.

The plan being put forward by the other side of the aisle is not an effort to address the needs of Pennsylvania's poorest citizens. Instead, it is a mean-spirited and flawed attempt to win political points.

I oppose HB 2 because it does not address many of the most fundamental factors involved in welfare dependency - education equity, substance treatment, and real job creation.

Two-thirds of all AFDC recipients that have been on the rolls for over 2 years have not graduated from high school. The average adult on welfare has eighth grade math and reading skills. Between 25 to 40 percent of AFDC recipients have learning disabilities. Thirty-four to 40 percent of all AFDC recipients tested at the "least proficient" reading level. These, Mr. Speaker, are the most extreme and most unfortunate cases, and my concern is, where are these people going to find jobs?

Mr. Speaker, could I have some order, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Could I have order in the House, please.

The conference in the vicinity of the gentleman, Mr. Kirkland, please cease.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. KIRKLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The reality is that we must educate welfare recipients in order to elevate them.

A soon-to-be-released study by economist Harry Holzer of employers in Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, and Los Angeles found that only 5 to 10 percent of low-skilled employment openings were available to individuals with few skills or little work experience.

In a recent U.S. News and World Report article, many employers were quoted as saying they "...wanted a [woman] who can type 70 words a minute with Lotus 1-2-3," for these kinds of entry level positions.

How are welfare recipients going to find a job in this environment without proper education and training, and how are our young people going to stay off welfare if the money for education is not distributed equally throughout our school districts?

Many companies that used to hire welfare mothers now insist that all applicants be over 21 and have a high school diploma.

If Republicans were serious about getting people off the dole, they would invest in education and training of our people.

Some of my Republican colleagues will probably say that welfare recipients should have learned or acquired these skills in school, and I agree. However, many welfare recipients live in our most impoverished and underfunded school districts; they live in districts with deteriorating buildings and outdated equipment; they live in districts with shortages of books and personnel; they live in districts that are drug-infested and have high rates of violence. So it should not be surprising that students from these areas are often poorly educated and have few skills. So it should not be surprising that individuals from these districts have difficulty securing and maintaining long-term employment.

I have a message for my Republican colleagues. If you are serious about reform, provide full funding for the PAVE (Pennsylvania Anti-Violence Education) Initiative program which attempts to deal with violence, drugs, and other ills that bring about welfare dependency.

If you are serious about reform, provide additional education equity funding for Pennsylvania's poorest schools within our Commonwealth. If you are serious, create real jobs for the people that you are attempting to throw out into the cold.

Today I challenge Republicans. If you are serious about reform, be consistent. If you are going to eliminate benefits for 18-

25-year-old able-bodied people because they are presumably the least needy, then let us also eliminate State funding for the least needy school districts in this Commonwealth. Let us change the Pennsylvania school funding formula and reduce State aid to our wealthiest school districts because they are presumably the least needy. If we undertook this course of action, I believe that Pennsylvania could win the battle against welfare dependency.

The problem is that there are people here who are not serious. I believe that their interest lies in reading political polls rather than helping the people on welfare.

If the Republicans are serious about welfare reform, where are the plans and funding for drug rehabilitation in HB 2?

A December 1994 study by the Department of Health and Human Services found that 16 percent, 16 percent of welfare mothers suffer from substance abuse problems that are likely to require treatment in order to succeed in job training programs. Some experts believe that the actual rates are higher.

The need for drug treatment as a part of welfare reform is not a Democratic or Republican position. Many States with Republican Governors recognize the merit of this kind of investment. Even Wisconsin, governed by the Republican poster boy for welfare reform, Tommy Thompson, now advocates required treatment for drug and alcohol users as the number one way to boost the impact of its jobs program for welfare recipients.

I find it ironic that Pennsylvania Republicans want to mandate testing but do not want to mandate drug treatment. To me, there is something wrong, something hypocritical about this position.

I am saddened by the fact that the House Republican leadership has chosen to single out and demonize the poor rather than work toward constructive and effective solutions to the problem of welfare dependency.

I want to close by emphasizing a few points. Point one, if Pennsylvania is going to become a police State for poor people, then it should be a police State for all people. Under the Republican plan, we are going to fingerprint and violate the privacy rights of millions of people who happen to be down on their luck. If the poor must be subjected to this unconstitutional and degrading process, so should any Pennsylvanian that receives public dollars or monetary benefits from the Commonwealth. Every person with a student loan, every person with a State contract, every person with a State grant or government salary should undergo this humiliating process.

No Pennsylvanian is better than another, and welfare benefits are no different than any other public expenditure. If you must undergo fingerprinting and a criminal background check to receive welfare, then a background check and fingerprinting should be a requirement to secure a State contract or a student loan. Fair is fair.

Supporters of these invasive measures would do well to remember one of the lessons that my parents taught me. Treat people how you want to be treated. If more people remembered this principle, drug testing and fingerprinting would not be so popular.

Point two, create real jobs and create them now, not Burger King, not McDonald's, but jobs that will allow a person an opportunity to provide for his or her family in a manner that will make them feel good about who they are, jobs that will allow them the opportunity to purchase a home, a car, and even pay for tuition for a child who wishes to attend college.

Point three, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have said they have developed a contract with America, where in fact what they have done is taken out a contract on America. They have taken out a contract on America's poor; they have taken out a contract on

America's physically challenged; they have taken out a contract on America's mentally ill; and worst of all, they have taken out a contract on our children. Shame on you.

Finally, to leave you without a quotation from the Bible would be very uncharacteristic of me. I believe it to be important because it lets each of you know what fate awaits those of you who would cause or allow harm to come to these children. The Book of Matthew tells us that "Whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea."

To deny a little one the financial help he or she needs to survive is offensive. And I hope those of you who vote for this offensive measure are able to hold your breath for a long time.

Earlier it was said that we should kill the monster. Vote "no" and kill this monster, HB 2.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. ROEBUCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There is about this discussion something that I find to be deeply disturbing, and it is the way in which we have managed to characterize those who are welfare recipients, those who are in distress, those who are being told that somehow they are inadequate because they lack character. It is suggested that somehow they are irresponsible, that somehow they are dishonest, somehow they manipulate a system, that somehow they are different, that they do not want to work. Indeed, last night, as we concluded our debate, it was suggested that those who wanted these benefits, those who are women, might even choose to be dishonest about whether they have been victims of incest or rape in order to get \$80 more a month, and that is what we said on this floor, and that is wrong.

Certainly those of us here apparently have never had any family members who have had to partake of welfare. Certainly no one here individually has ever done that; none of our fathers or our grandparents have done that; none of our brothers or our sisters have done that, or certainly we would not characterize those individuals in this way.

Those of us who say that we are public officials, it seems to me, ought to be very careful when we do this kind of thing, because we ought to remember that there are those who think of us in exactly these same terms, who say that we are dishonest, that we manipulate a system, that we do things that are basically wrong because we serve what we believe to be a public need.

There is about this something else though that is disturbing, and that is that we have captured again the rhetoric of the 1920's. It is clear to me that the other party still takes as a patron saint Herbert Clark Hoover, for we are reminded again it is the private sector that will solve our problems, that it is the nonprofits that will provide for those who are in distress, that it is the churches that we should look to to provide this aid, that it is other Americans who should provide this aid and not the government. And as we plunge then into increasing distress and chaos, we will continue to mouth those words that in itself will solve the problem.

It is suggested that there is a mean-spiritedness about this. Well, I suggest that it is not a mean spirit; it is basically just mean.

I would urge that we defeat HB 2. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Ms. Washington.

Ms. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the members of the House to vote "no" on HB 2 and to reject this cruel and unusual so-called welfare package.

As a mother and a former welfare recipient, I stand today to denounce this vicious attack on the women and children of this Commonwealth. It is an attack on women and children, because HB 2 fails to address the many problems of mothers on welfare.

The bottom line is that any welfare reform plan that does not address the issues like domestic violence and pregnancy prevention is doomed to fail.

I believe that the attempts to rush this legislation are another case of politics over policy.

In my view, HB 2 is nothing more than an attempt by some members of this House to copy inside-the-beltway Republicans. To paraphrase a famous Nike commercial, the members of the House are trying to be like Newt instead of like Michael Jordan. Instead of worrying about the inside-the-beltway crowd, the members of this chamber should be worrying about Pennsylvania's children and their families.

Mr. Speaker, HB 2 is a tragedy, and who is the loser in this tragedy? Our children, our future.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the members of this House for adopting my amendment that calls on mass transit authorities across the Commonwealth to establish a low-income ridership program so that people on assistance have a means of transportation to get to their place of employment; that is, if they have employment.

However, this provision does not address the total economic devastation that HB 2 has and that is going to wreck the status of the State's children and their families.

Shame on us for imposing a cap on family benefits to AFDC mothers. This uncaring and vicious proposal is based on political rhetoric instead of reality.

This plan is currently being attempted in New Jersey, and the results are inconclusive. It has never been proven that a relationship exists between supplemental welfare benefits and additional children.

What do we know about this cap? This cap will mean increased hunger. This cap will mean increased homelessness. This cap will mean increased child developmental problems. This cap will mean an increased number in the number of dysfunctional families in our State.

We know that the plan to cap benefits will further penalize the children of Pennsylvania's neediest families by forcing their families to stretch their already limited resources.

This proposed cap is even more cruel and mean-spirited when one considers that assistance would be denied to women for children that were conceived before they were on welfare. This means that if a woman is laid off from her job and becomes pregnant after the fact, that she would not receive additional benefits for her child. This means that if a woman's place of employment moves to another State and she becomes pregnant, that she would not receive additional assistance.

I guess some members believe that it is a woman's fault if she finds herself in these circumstances. Well, I do not buy that trash. Mr. Speaker, we are in essence placing a lien on children by adopting a cap on benefits. We are placing a lien on human life. Last session we removed welfare liens, and we should not now be in the business of placing liens on babies.

Mr. Speaker, the cruelty in this chamber knows no bounds. Not only are we going to cut cash assistance, but we are going to reduce

health care. We are telling people that they can only see a doctor 18 times a year and have 3 prescriptions a month.

There was a man that was at our press conference the other day who had several medical problems. He was a Republican, Mr. Speaker, and he asked us which one of his medical problems did we want him not to take care of. He asked us what medication did we want him not to have the prescription filled for, and, Mr. Speaker, we could not answer that question for him, so maybe you can, because he is a Republican, and I just hope that when the Republican members of this chamber vote "yes" on HB 2, that they will consider that gentleman.

Shame on us, Mr. Speaker, for rejecting fair play and due process for the poor. Our cruelty shows no bounds. Some members of this chamber would rather appear tough on welfare because it is good for newspaper headlines and television sound bites. Instead of being tough on welfare, we ought to be smart on welfare. How can we be smart on welfare without prevention and intervention? My mother always taught me an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Mr. Speaker, HB 2 must be rejected for numerous reasons. There are so many wrong things with the bill that we would be here for several more hours if I listed all of them. What we need in Pennsylvania is real welfare reform, and that does not mean HB 2.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that those in this chamber that vote "yes" on HB 2 will vote "yes" for family planning in the spring. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Mr. KENNEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I know everyone wants to go home, so I would like to submit my remarks for the record in writing. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Are you sure you would not prefer to give these remarks, Mr. Kenney?

Mr. KENNEY. I am sure, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support HB 2 regarding Pennsylvania's outdated welfare system. This legislation emphasizes personal responsibility, eliminating automatic cash grant increases for those who choose to have more children. It helps to reduce fraud by establishing a finger-imaging identification program which would eliminate duplication of benefits. It makes better use of taxpayer dollars by providing vouchers to welfare recipients to purchase health insurance, by privatizing job training and restoring the work ethic, by promoting public service in exchange for benefits. It also creates self-dependence and economic independence for young, able-bodied 18- to 25-year-olds who have no dependents. By eliminating the 60 days of cash assistance they receive every 2 years, the temptation will be gone to take the easy road.

These are only some of the changes in HB 2, and we must continue to look out for those Pennsylvanians who work hard, play by the rules, pay their taxes, and teach their children to obey the law while helping those on welfare become productive, independent citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to join me in creating positive change in Pennsylvania's welfare system by supporting "Pennsylvania's Personal Responsibility Law" - HB 2. Thank you.

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

Mr. JAMES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Mr. James will be the last speaker.

Mr. JAMES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I see that Mr. Flick has not returned yet, so I better go on with my comments.

Mr. Speaker, today the majority House leadership will attempt to ram through the House a vague, ill-conceived and hastily prepared, mean-spirited welfare reform package, and I urge all of us to vote "no" on HB 2.

In pursuing this course of action, those leaders are endangering the lives of Pennsylvania's children and poor people by placing HB 2 on the legislative fast track. They are microwaving this legislation, like Newt Gingrich, to poor people. There has been very little, if any, forethought into the writing of this legislation as it relates to poor people.

The House Health and Human Services Committee was formed Monday past, and I strenuously object to the consideration of such a punitive and draconian proposal as HB 2 without the benefit of public hearings. I strenuously object to the consideration of this important measure without the careful review of the Health and Human Services Committee. I strenuously object to the consideration of such a serious measure without calling for impact studies.

I call on the House to place this legislation on the right track instead of the fast track by voting "no" today, and if we cannot recommit it, if procedures do not allow us to recommit it, we should at least, at least, Mr. Speaker, let the House Health and Human Services Committee hold some hearings on this impact as it affects poor people in the Commonwealth.

There are a number of problems with this legislation. First and foremost is the criminalization of poverty.

Provisions such as fingerprinting and the elimination of the confidentiality of records are unacceptable. The confidentiality issue is particularly disturbing, because I believe it is unconstitutional to allow State Police access to the names of people on public assistance.

Essentially the majority leadership is saying, if you fall on hard times, you are going to be a criminal. Do we hold these same standards for State employees? Do we hold these same standards for those who have State contracts? The answer is no, because it is an invasion of privacy. Therefore, we should not violate the welfare recipients' rights to privacy.

These provisions, Mr. Speaker, are unacceptable in my view, because they single out poor people - poor people in my district, poor people throughout the Commonwealth. They are singling out people who are locked out of our political and economic systems. Even as we try to open up registration through motor-voter, that has been cut off and we have had to be sued by the Justice Department.

People on assistance do not hire lobbyists, Mr. Speaker, or they do not have huge PAC's (political action committees) to protect their interests like corporate welfare recipients. I believe that if we are going to impose these sanctions on people on assistance, then we should impose these same standards on any individual that receives any kind of monetary benefits from the Commonwealth.

I also, Mr. Speaker, have serious problems with two other sections of this package. They are the no-new-cash benefit and the elimination of the 18- to 25-year-old assistance category. The no-new-cash benefit is modeled after New Jersey law that refuses additional money to needy mothers for any new children. This proposal is based on the irrational notion that welfare mothers have

extra children to get extra money. I do not know of any mothers that get pregnant to get an \$87 increase in public assistance.

The jury is still out on the New Jersey law, and early claims of success in lowering the welfare birth rate are being challenged by social scientists. In addition, others claim that New Jersey's statistics are flawed, because there is evidence that many mothers are afraid to report that they have given birth to another child. So what do we really know about the New Jersey law? It has forced the Garden State's poorest families to further stretch already limited dollars.

The elimination of the 18- to 25-year-old general assistance category will have tragic consequences for our communities. Today it is estimated that 40 percent of African-American young people across the Commonwealth are unemployed. That is compared with 15 percent of the State's white population.

And what do you think will happen with this elimination of this safety net? Individuals in the 45-to-55 category were already removed from the rolls last year. We will have more crime, more drug abuse, more domestic abuse, more social devastation.

This reform, Mr. Speaker, may in the short run create some savings, but I am telling you, in the long run, it will rise like yeast in the oven in the long run.

Where are the plans, Mr. Speaker, for funding day-care centers in HB 2? Where are the plans for the real job training in HB 2? Where is the linkage between job creation and job placement for those receiving welfare benefits?

And finally, the GOP has not given us any indication of the costs of this program and how it is going to physically impact on us, and they are supposed to be the party of fiscal responsibility. The majority party has not dealt with the medical assistance issues, in my view, in detail, because this group, not the chronically needy, comprises the largest portion of the public assistance budget, and it appears that those on the other side have chosen to follow a politically popular, but costly and ineffective, policy. It seems as though the majority party has forgotten about the people of Pennsylvania in their rush to be like Newt Gingrich and other inside-the-beltway Republicans, pushing this mean-spirited proposal with not the consideration for poor people.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the correct path for Pennsylvania is to implement true welfare reform as proposed by my colleague, Representative David Richardson, Democratic chairman of the House Health and Human Services Committee. Representative Richardson's plan is welfare reform that supports children and families. It is welfare reform that is fiscally responsible. It is welfare reform that is effective and empowers people. Representative Richardson's plan is true welfare reform for Pennsylvania.

And like my colleague, Representative Ramos, said, I call on Governor Ridge to also have a special session on jobs, and I urge all my colleagues to vote "no" on HB 2. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Mr. Speaker, we in the legislature have a responsibility to improve and reform the present welfare system. Many of us have attempted to do so, with some success, over the past 2 years. Legislation passed in the last session was both corrective in nature while at the same time compassionate.

This measure, HB 2, goes even further to address some of the remaining problem areas. Certainly it is not without flaws. In fact, the majority party's desire and insistence that we do such a bill quickly - make that in haste - will no doubt create new problems in the future. Much of that concern could have been eliminated had the majority party permitted the committee structure the opportunity to do its work.

There are aspects of HB 2 that I do not agree with, and I, along with many others, have attempted to amend it from the floor. There are also aspects of this reform package that are acceptable.

It is for that reason and in an effort to show a spirit of compromise, rather than one of obstruction, that I cast a "yes" vote.

Ms. BEBKO-JONES submitted the following remarks for the Legislative Journal:

Republican welfare reform, if passed today by the State House, will set in motion cuts that will hurt women and children. I believe in welfare reform. I voted in favor of welfare reform in the past because the system as it now operates must be changed. But I do not support this legislation. This is reform on the backs of women and children.

One provision would eliminate assistance increases for additional children born to mothers receiving assistance for the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program.

This particular provision was designed to deter AFDC mothers—the vast majority of whom only have two children—from having more children. Proponents of this bill say, "Educate these women instead," but at the same time, this bill would eliminate the allowance for contraceptives after we have told these women, "You must use contraceptives." These women cannot afford the visits to clinics and the exam and the cash required to get reliable birth control.

Together, these two provisions are going to send desperate, poor, pregnant women over our State's borders for abortions. Is that what this so very anti-choice Commonwealth wants to do?

Why are we punishing these children, born and unborn, who are the innocent victims of poverty?

I voted for an amendment that would have eliminated the family-cap provision, which is my greatest but not only concern regarding HB 2.

We have not even been able to talk to the very people this reform will hurt. The bill was discussed in committee by Republicans before Democrats even knew which committees they were assigned to. Then the majority leadership denied our request for public hearings. This bill has been fast-tracked so that the Republicans can follow their 100-day plan. Our chamber is pushing through a significant welfare reform bill without one word from the people it affects. How is this a government of the people?

I do not want to talk to privileged legislators. I do not want to talk to lobbyists. I want to hear from welfare recipients.

HB 2 also injures victims of domestic violence, rape, and incest. Some members of the House tried to expand the window of assistance for victims of domestic violence from a meager 9 months but were defeated. They also tried to eliminate provisions requiring women to prove rape or incest and report the crime to police. If these women do not report the crime and keep the baby, they must identify their attacker or abuser on a signed affidavit under this measure.

I agree that these criminals should be prosecuted, but every woman who is raped or who is a victim of incest heals in her own way. We cannot possibly understand what is happening to these victims. For all we know, by making these women ID their attackers, we are setting them up for additional abuse from these same people.

Knowing that this measure will pass the House today despite its having problems too numerous to count, I hope my colleagues in the Senate will give the reform measure greater consideration and protect women and children from these hurtful cuts.

I support welfare reform. HB 2 is not reform. It is a mean-spirited attempt to save a couple of bucks at the expense of poor women and children.

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

Mr. Speaker, 20 years of the "Great Society" brought us big government and poor results; no longer can excess State and Federal spending be justified by good intentions. Citizens have grown to resent the intrusion of government in their lives. They recognize the inability of a bureaucracy to respond effectively to the needs of local communities and the people residing in them. It is not so much that our objectives have changed. As a State and a Nation we still strive to secure for our citizens a productive and meaningful way of life. What we have recognized is that our policies have failed. The time has come to rethink basic assumptions about the problems we face and how best to meet future challenges.

Poverty has become a way of life among many, with welfare dependency passed down through generations of families. This dependency has fostered a complacency and an otherwise destructive lifestyle among some receiving aid, while allowing government and the bureaucracy to often stand in the way of individual initiative and prosperity.

As President Bush said on November 28, 1990, "A cornerstone of our effort to reduce the heavy hand of government is this idea of empowering people, not bureaucracies. And giving people - working people, poor people, everyone - control over their own lives and access to property and jobs so that all Americans can have a life of dignity, responsibility, and economic opportunity."

The time has come to rethink our strategy for opportunity - paternalistic policies hamper growth and cripple individual initiative. Government interference has limited access to a prosperous future, frustrated individual motivation, and denied many the chance to achieve a better way of life. In the words of Governor Tommy Thompson of Michigan, "Welfare has become the enemy of the American Dream. For many, welfare has become a trap that encourages dependency by providing little, if any, incentive to work. It is a system that destroys hope."

Allow me for a moment to share with you a story which Governor John Engler of Michigan recounted at the ALEC New Member Orientation meeting last December in Washington, DC.

Consider the success story of Charles Jones of Saginaw, Michigan. In the '60's, he served his country in Vietnam. After the war, Charles came home and went to work at a local factory. But soon, he discovered that he could make more money selling drugs, so he quit. Even worse, he neglected his family and it began falling apart. His family got on AFDC and would have stayed on for good.

But now, Charles is a part of Michigan's welfare reform initiative.

We call it: To strengthen Michigan families.

Today, Charles has a job and volunteers at his local DSS office, teaching other welfare parents how to break the cycle of dependence and poverty.

As he says with pride, "I'm getting my family back. I want my teens to remember me as a father who goes to church, a father who works two jobs, a father who gets in the news for accomplishing something. I didn't know I had it in me. I just needed a push."

There are thousands of men and women across our Commonwealth and across the Nation just like Charles. People who need a push. People who need us to believe they can solve their own problems and turn their lives around if given the opportunity to learn a skill, find work, and be productive.

Twenty years from now we all would like to look back with pride and tell our children and grandchildren that our Commonwealth and our great Nation are leading the world in the 21st century because we got back on course at the end of the 20th century.

We need to take bold steps. We need to be leaders. And most important, we need to give people a hand and stop giving them just a handout.

Disraeli once said that every successful politician must know two things: he must know himself, and he must know his times. Extending that wisdom to the parties, we can say that the challenge to both parties today is vision and adaptation in the face of circumstances and challenges.

Mr. Speaker, I urge each and every member of this House to support this strategy for opportunity.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

YEAS-157

Adolph	Durham	Lucyk	Schroder
Allen	Egolf	Lynch	Schuler
Argall	Fairchild	Maitland	Scrimenti
Armstrong	Fajt	Major	Semmel
Baker	Fargo	Markosek	Serafini
Bard	Farmer	Marsico	Shaner
Barley	Feese	Masland	Sheehan
Battisto	Fichter	Mayernik	Smith, B.
Belardi	Fleagle	McCall	Smith, S. H.
Belfanti	Flick	McGeehan	Snyder, D. W.
Birmelin	Gamble	McGill	Staback
Blaum	Gannon	Melio	Stairs
Boscola	Geist	Merry	Steelman
Boyes	Gladeck	Micozzie	Steil
Brown	Godshall	Miller	Stern
Browne	Gruppo	Mundy	Stetler
Bunt	Habay	Nailor	Stish
Butkovitz	Haluska	Nickol	Strittmatter
Caltagirone	Hanna	Nyce	Sturla
Carone	Harhart	Olasz	Taylor, E. Z.
Cawley	Hasay	Perzel	Taylor, J.
Chadwick	Hennessey	Pesci	Tigue
Civera	Herman	Petrone	Travaglio
Clark	Hershey	Pettit	Trich
Clymer	Hess	Phillips	True
Cohen, L. I.	Hutchinson	Piccola	Tulli
Colafella	Jadlowiec	Pitts	Vance
Colaizzo	Jarolin	Platts	Van Home
Conti	Kaiser	Raymond	Vitali
Cornell	Keller	Readshaw	Waugh
Corrigan	Kenney	Reber	Wogan
Coy	King	Reinard	Wozniak
Daley	Krebs	Roberts	Wright, M. N.
DeLuca	LaGrotta	Rohrer	Yewcic
Dempsey	Laughlin	Rubley	Zimmerman
Dent	Lawless	Rudy	Zug
Dermody	Lederer	Sainato	
DiGirolo	Leh	Santoni	Ryan,
Donatucci	Lescovitz	Sather	Speaker
Druce	Levdansky	Saylor	

NAYS-42

Bebko-Jones	Gordner	Mihalich	Rooney
Bishop	Gruitza	Oliver	Surra
Buxton	Horsey	Petrarca	Tangretti
Cappabianca	Itkin	Pistella	Thomas
Carr	James	Preston	Trello
Cohen, M.	Josephs	Ramos	Veon
Corpora	Kirkland	Richardson	Walko
Cowell	Kukovich	Rieger	Washington
Curry	Lloyd	Robinson	Williams
DeWeese	Manderino	Roebuck	Youngblood
George	Michlovic		

NOT VOTING-1

Gigliotti

EXCUSED-3

Evans O'Brien Wright, D. R.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

RESOLUTION
PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mrs. COHEN called up **HR 32, PN 311**, entitled:

A Resolution commemorating the liberation of Auschwitz fifty years ago today, January 26.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Montgomery County, Mrs. Cohen.

Mrs. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate, after the vote on this resolution, if the book could remain open so that we could get additional sponsors. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be held for additional sponsors here for a short period of time.

Mrs. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-200

Adolph	Egolf	Lynch	Sather
Allen	Fairchild	Maitland	Saylor
Argall	Fajt	Major	Schroder
Armstrong	Fargo	Manderino	Schuler
Baker	Farmer	Markosek	Scrimenti
Bard	Feese	Marsico	Semmel
Barley	Fichter	Masland	Serafini
Battisto	Fleagle	Mayernik	Shaner
Bebko-Jones	Flick	McCall	Sheehan
Belardi	Gamble	McGeehan	Smith, B.
Belfanti	Gannon	McGill	Smith, S. H.
Birmelin	Geist	Melio	Snyder, D. W.
Bishop	George	Merry	Staback
Blaum	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Stairs
Boscola	Gladeck	Micozzie	Steelman
Boyes	Godshall	Mihalich	Steil
Brown	Gordner	Miller	Stern
Browne	Gruitza	Mundy	Stetler
Bunt	Gruppo	Nailor	Stish
Butkovitz	Habay	Nickol	Strittmatter
Buxton	Haluska	Nyce	Sturla
Caltagirone	Hanna	Olasz	Surra

Cappabianca	Harhart	Oliver	Tangretti
Carn	Hasay	Perzel	Taylor, E. Z.
Carone	Hennessey	Pesci	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Herman	Petrarca	Thomas
Chadwick	Hershey	Petrone	Tigue
Civera	Hess	Pettit	Travaglio
Clark	Horsey	Phillips	Trello
Clymer	Hutchinson	Piccola	Trich
Cohen, L. I.	Itkin	Pistella	True
Cohen, M.	Jadlowiec	Pitts	Tulli
Colafella	James	Platts	Vance
Colaizzo	Jarolin	Preston	Van Horne
Corti	Josephs	Ramos	Veon
Cornell	Kaiser	Raymond	Vitali
Corpora	Keller	Readshaw	Walko
Corrigan	Kenney	Reber	Washington
Cowell	King	Reinard	Waugh
Coy	Kirkland	Richardson	Williams
Curry	Krebs	Rieger	Wogan
Daley	Kukovich	Roberts	Wozniak
DeLuca	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wright, M. N.
Dempsey	Laughlin	Roebuck	Yewcic
Dent	Lawless	Rohrer	Youngblood
Dermody	Lederer	Rooney	Zimmerman
DeWeese	Leh	Rublely	Zug
DiGirolamo	Lescovitz	Rudy	
Donatucci	Levdansky	Sainato	Ryan,
Druce	Lloyd	Santoni	Speaker
Durham	Lucyk		

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-3

Evans O'Brien Wright, D. R.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

RESOLUTION
PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. STERN called up **HR 33, PN 379**, entitled:

A Resolution declaring January 1995 as "School Director Recognition Month" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-200

Adolph	Egolf	Lynch	Sather
Allen	Fairchild	Maitland	Saylor
Argall	Fajt	Major	Schroder
Armstrong	Fargo	Manderino	Schuler
Baker	Farmer	Markosek	Scrimenti
Bard	Feese	Marsico	Semmel
Barley	Fichter	Masland	Serafini
Battisto	Fleagle	Mayernik	Shaner

Bebko-Jones	Flick	McCall	Sheehan
Belardi	Gamble	McGeehan	Smith, B.
Belfanti	Gannon	McGill	Smith, S. H.
Birmelin	Geist	Melio	Snyder, D. W.
Bishop	George	Merry	Staback
Blaum	Gigliotti	Michlovic	Stairs
Boscola	Gladeck	Micozzie	Steelman
Boyes	Godshall	Mihalich	Steil
Brown	Gordner	Miller	Stern
Browne	Gruitza	Mundy	Stetler
Bunt	Gruppo	Nailor	Stish
Butkovitz	Habay	Nickol	Strittmatter
Buxton	Haluska	Nyce	Sturla
Caltagirone	Hanna	Olasz	Surra
Cappabianca	Harhart	Oliver	Tangretti
Carn	Hasay	Perzel	Taylor, E. Z.
Carone	Hennessey	Pesci	Taylor, J.
Cawley	Herman	Petrarca	Thomas
Chadwick	Hershey	Petrone	Tigue
Civera	Hess	Pettit	Travaglio
Clark	Horsely	Phillips	Trello
Clymer	Hutchinson	Piccola	Trich
Cohen, L. I.	Itkin	Pistella	True
Cohen, M.	Jadlowiec	Pitts	Tulli
Colafella	James	Platts	Vance
Colaizzo	Jarolin	Preston	Van Horne
Conti	Josephs	Ramos	Veon
Cornell	Kaiser	Raymond	Vitali
Corpora	Keller	Readshaw	Walko
Corrigan	Kenney	Reber	Washington
Cowell	King	Reinard	Waugh
Coy	Kirkland	Richardson	Williams
Curry	Krebs	Rieger	Wogan
Daley	Kukovich	Roberts	Wozniak
DeLuca	LaGrotta	Robinson	Wright, M. N.
Dempsey	Laughlin	Roebuck	Yewcic
Dent	Lawless	Rohrer	Youngblood
Dermody	Lederer	Rooney	Zimmerman
DeWeese	Leh	Rubley	Zug
DiGirolamo	Lescovitz	Rudy	
Donatucci	Levdansky	Sainato	Ryan,
Druce	Lloyd	Santoni	Speaker
Durham	Lucyk		

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-3

Evans O'Brien Wright, D. R.

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

The SPEAKER. This resolution will also be held in the front of the Speaker's rostrum for additional sponsors for a short period of time.

ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS OF SPONSORS

The SPEAKER. The Chair acknowledges receipt of additions and deletions for sponsorships of bills, which the clerk will file.

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

STATEMENT BY MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. PERZEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the members for their indulgence over the last 2 days. I think the fact that 32 amendments went into this piece of legislation goes to show that we, in a bipartisan fashion, tried to allow the minority to have as much input into this piece of legislation as possible.

This has been a very open process. We heard everybody out. There were no moves to cut any debate off. There were one or two motions- Well, one or two times we asked if we could try to limit what we were saying, but nobody was cut off from anything they had to say.

We are going to try to run the General Assembly here like a business. You will be given time schedules. You already know what we are doing next week, so there are no surprises. That has already been mailed to each and every one of you. We will be here every day to implement the agenda that we feel is fit for the people of Pennsylvania.

We will give you every opportunity to have your voice again heard. If there is something that you feel is necessary, if you bring amendments down here, we will hear what you have to say. If there are bills-we have already talked to over 20 of you-if there are bills that you feel that are important for your district, if they make common sense, we are willing to bring them out and give them a hearing.

But I want to thank you very much for the time and attention that you put forth the last 2 days.

VOTE CORRECTIONS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Jarolin. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. JAROLIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to correct the record.

On amendment A0264 which was voted on yesterday, A0285 yesterday, A0244, and A0145, I would like to be recorded in the negative.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Belfanti.

Mr. BELFANTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on yesterday's Blaum amendment A0362, I was not recorded. I wish the record to reflect that I voted in the affirmative.

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

STATEMENT BY MR. MIHALICH

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Mihalich.

Mr. MIHALICH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to comment on the proceedings and offer my congratulations to the majority leader for the open process he had in the House today, but I sort of feel like when I offer that congratulations if somebody would have offered congratulations to Lindbergh if he only flew one-third of the Atlantic.

There were two other important aspects of this deliberative process that were avoided deliberately, and that was public hearings

and, from what I am told and from what I have heard here, due deliberation in the committee process.

So along with the compliments on an open process here in the House, I want it to be pointed out before we leave this floor today that we did ignore the public-input process and we did circumvent to some sense the committee process. Thank you.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. James. Mr. JAMES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the questions I had for HB 2, can I have them submitted for the record?

The SPEAKER. *You may indeed submit them for the record.*

The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. JAMES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Section 414 Assistance Recipient Identification Program

Summary of Provision:

Act 49 of 1994 established a pilot program in three areas of the State to implement finger-imaging. This provision deletes the pilot provision and establishes it on a Statewide basis.

Provision also expands designated officials having access to Identification Program to the Pennsylvania State Police and chiefs of local municipal police departments.

Provision deletes requirement of DPW to report on pilot results. Requires DPW to provide annual reports to the General Assembly on instances of multiple enrollment.

Analysis

This provision takes effect immediately without regard to time required to submit and obtain a Federal waiver and the time delays inherent in the competitive procurement process.

This provision presumes that there is a widespread multiple enrollment problem. There is no evidence to corroborate this hypothesis. There is no appropriation to fund this initiative.

The following questions must be addressed:

1. What is the cost of this program?
What is the source of funding?
What are estimated savings? *Initially and in out years?*
2. In the absence of any data supporting the notion of multiple enrollments, is this sound public policy and a valid use of limited State funds?
3. Is any other State seeking to do this Statewide? (Answer is no; only California has approval for LA County; NY is doing GA only - not requiring Federal waiver.)
4. Does this apply to adults only? All recipients, including children?
5. What will police do with information?

VOTE CORRECTIONS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Cohen. Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I missed amendments A0214 and A0216 introduced by Representative Kukovich. I would like the record to show that had I been voting on those amendments, I would have voted in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Gigliotti, who advises the Chair that his machine malfunctioned. Had it been working, his vote would have been in the negative on HB 2.

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

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman, Mr. Richardson, requesting recognition?

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

Mr. Speaker, I have some remarks for the record on HB 2 to submit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may submit his remarks.

The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

“A NIGHTMARE FOR POOR PEOPLE IN PENNSYLVANIA”

Good afternoon. I want to thank each of you for joining us today. Please hold your questions until all concerned citizens and members have spoken.

I am State Representative David P. Richardson, Jr., of Philadelphia, Democratic chairman of the House Health and Human Services Committee.

Today, I am joined by: (List members present)

This press conference has been called to sound the alarm and alert Pennsylvania's families and children that their lives are in grave danger.

Yesterday, the House Republican leadership and their members of the House Health and Human Services Committee arbitrarily passed HB 2 out of committee. This bill was not in print properly, the sunshine law was violated, and the House Health and Human Services Committee was not properly reorganized. These actions contradict every principle of fair play.

Tomorrow on the House floor, Republican House leadership will ram through a vague, ill-conceived, and hastily prepared “so-called” welfare reform package.

In pursuing this course of action, GOP leaders are endangering the lives of Pennsylvania's children and defenseless by placing HB 2 on the legislative “fast” track.

There has been very little opportunity, if any, to share in meaningful dialogue in a proper and open forum, even though the Governor and the House Speaker indicated that there would be *bipartisanship participation* in the legislative process.

The House Health and Human Services Committee was formed only yesterday, but never officially reorganized.

We strenuously object to the consideration of such a punitive and draconian proposal without the benefit of public notice and hearings. In fact, my motion to call for public hearing was defeated along party lines.

We strenuously object to the consideration of this important measure without the careful review of the Health and Human Services Committee.

We strenuously object to the consideration of such a serious measure without calling for impact studies. In paraphrasing Governor Ridge, no problem affects Pennsylvania families more profoundly than crime. But I believe that there is no problem that affects Pennsylvanians more profoundly than poverty! Pennsylvanians have the right to live without fear. I truly believe that, but Pennsylvania's poor families will not, if this legislation becomes law. People with nothing will do whatever is necessary in order to survive.

Therefore, I call on the members of the House of Representatives to vote to recommit HB 2 for the purpose of holding public hearings.

We call on the House to place this legislation on the "right" track instead of the "fast" track.

First and foremost, this bill places great danger to the health and welfare of our newborn babies. A number of provisions can be characterized as the criminalization of poverty. Provisions such as fingerprinting and the elimination of the confidentiality of records are other examples. This is clearly unacceptable!

The confidentiality issue is particularly disturbing. It is unconstitutional to allow State Police access to the names of people on public assistance.

Essentially, the Republican leadership is saying, "If you fall on hard times, you are a criminal."

Do we hold the same standard for those who have contracts with the State? Do we hold elected officials, State legislators, members of the judiciary and others to the same standard?

The answer is "no" because it is an invasion of privacy. Therefore, we should not violate welfare recipients' rights to privacy either.

These provisions are unacceptable in our view because they single out poor people. They single out people who are locked out of the system.

Individuals, families, and children affected by this bill do not hire lobbyists or have huge PAC's to protect their interests like corporate welfare recipients.

Fingerprinting would not be considered if we also fingerprinted all people who received student loans.

Better yet, let us fingerprint all individuals that receive State contracts.

As I have mentioned, we have serious problems with two other sections of this package. They are the "no new cash benefit" provision and the elimination of 18- to 25-year-old assistance category.

The "no new cash benefit" is modeled after the New Jersey law that refuses additional money to needy mothers for any new children.

This proposal is based on the irrational notion that women have extra children to get extra money.

I do not know of any woman that got pregnant to get the small increase in public assistance for a new child. However, I do know women who have had unintended pregnancies due to rape, incest, or failed and ineffective contraception.

The jury is still out on the New Jersey law. Early claims of success in lowering the welfare birth rate are being challenged by social scientists.

First, New Jersey's statistics do not account for the overall decrease of births in the State.

In addition, others claim that New Jersey's statistics are flawed because there is evidence that many mothers are afraid to report that they have given birth to another child. This circumstance may indicate that we are forcing mothers to have children in unsafe environments.

What do we know about the New Jersey law? It has forced the Garden State's poorest families to further stretch already limited dollars.

I also have serious problems with the elimination of the 18- to 25-year-old assistance category which will have tragic consequences for all communities.

Today it is estimated that 40 percent of African-American young people across the Commonwealth are unemployed. By the way, a study by the Department of Public Welfare found that contrary to popular opinion, the majority of recipients are white.

What do you think will happen with the elimination of this safety net? Individuals in 45-64 category were already removed from the rolls last year.

Where are the jobs? Where are the jobs? Where is the linkage between job creation and job placement for those receiving assistance? Where are the plans and funding for day care in HB 2? The GOP has not given indication of the cost of this program and it is going to cost.

We believe that the correct path for Pennsylvania is to implement "true welfare" reform as I proposed last session. As I said in my introduction, we can achieve true welfare reform and we can save tax dollars. If you remember, the Senate Republicans gutted my job creation bill in order to cut general assistance to older unemployed workers. My true welfare reform plan supports children and families. If attempted to establish guidelines and a peer review procedure for oversight of publicly funded cesarean sections, the

number of unnecessary cesarean sections performed in Pennsylvania can be reduced. Not only would that have saved money, it could improve health care.

It is true welfare reform that is fiscally responsible.

It is true welfare reform that is effective and empowers people.

My plan is true welfare reform for Pennsylvania.

In closing, I believe that if we are fashioning reform of the welfare system, we must take into account that there simply is not enough jobs, not even menial, low-wage jobs. And since the new administration seems so determined to do this, I call on the Governor to be the first to offer jobs to those who will be cut off welfare.

The SPEAKER. Are there any further remarks or business in connection with the regular session?

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, all remaining bills and resolutions on today's calendar will be passed over. The Chair hears no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks County, Mr. DiGirolamo.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until Monday, January 30, 1995, at 1:05 p.m., e.s.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to, and at 4:45 p.m., e.s.t., the House adjourned.