

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

SATURDAY, JUNE 27, 2015

SESSION OF 2015

199TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 53

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

**THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI)
PRESIDING**

PRAYER

HON. SID MICHAELS KAVULICH, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Holy and everlasting Father, You are compassionate and Your mercy is beyond all bounds. Open up the ears of we, Your servants, and speak to our hearts that we may listen.

We come before You today with a great responsibility and burden to the people of this Commonwealth. They rely on us to make the right decisions, as we rely on You to guide us through our every action. As You do not grow faint or weary, strengthen us so that we may also be strong and persevere. As You understand us as no human person can, let us understand what are the needs of the people we serve.

Those who wait upon You shall renew their strength. They shall mount up with wings like eagles. They shall run and not be weary. They shall walk and not be faint. Give us the courage to see clearly, to look forward with hope, and rest in You.

Sustain us, comfort us, unite us in a fellowship of solidarity, and always remind us that what we do to the least of us, we do unto Thee. Lord, make us instruments of Your peace. Where there is hatred, bring Your love; where there is injury, Your pardon, Lord; and where there is doubt, true faith in You. We, Your humble servants, ask that You hear our prayer, and no matter by what name we invoke You, may we always remember that You are the one true Father God who truly hears us and always answers us. 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 Friday, June 26, 2015, will be postponed until printed.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

SB 329, PN 220

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, establishing the Ready to Succeed Scholarship Program; and conferring powers and imposing duties on the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency and the Department of Education.

EDUCATION.

SB 487, PN 1133 (Amended)

By Rep. PICKETT

An Act amending the act of May 17, 1921 (P.L.682, No.284), known as The Insurance Company Law of 1921, providing for limits on copayments for insured medical services provided by a physical therapist, chiropractor and occupational therapist.

INSURANCE.

SB 861, PN 978

By Rep. PICKETT

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in miscellaneous provisions, providing for coverage obligations of loaner vehicles.

INSURANCE.

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HB 1192, PN 1959 (Amended)

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act to provide from the General Fund for the expenses of the Executive and Judicial Departments, the State Government Support Agencies and the General Assembly of the Commonwealth, the public debt and the public schools for the fiscal year July 1, 2015, to June 30, 2016, for certain institutions and organizations, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015; to provide appropriations from the State Lottery Fund, the Tobacco Settlement Fund, the Aviation Restricted Account, the Hazardous Material Response Fund, The State Stores Fund, the Milk Marketing Fund, the Home Investment Trust Fund, the Emergency Medical Services Operating Fund, the Tuition Account Guaranteed Savings Program Fund, the Banking Fund, the Firearm Records Check Fund, the Ben Franklin Technology Development Authority Fund, the Oil and Gas Lease Fund, the Home Improvement Account, the Cigarette Fire Safety and Firefighter Protection Act Enforcement Fund, the Insurance Regulation and Oversight Fund, the Pennsylvania Racehorse Development Restricted Receipt Account, the Justice Reinvestment Fund and the Multimodal Transportation Fund to the Executive Department; to provide appropriations from the Judicial Computer System Augmentation Account to the Judicial Department for the fiscal year July 1, 2015, to June 30, 2016; to provide appropriations from the Motor License Fund for the fiscal year July 1, 2015, to June 30, 2016, for the proper operation of several departments of the Commonwealth and the Pennsylvania State Police authorized to

spend Motor License Fund money; to provide for the appropriation of Federal funds to the Executive Department of the Commonwealth and for the payment of bills remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015; and to provide for the additional appropriation of Federal and State funds from the General Fund and the State Lottery Fund for the Executive Department of the Commonwealth for the fiscal year July 1, 2014, to June 30, 2015, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1385, PN 1960 (Amended) By Rep. ADOLPH

A Supplement to the act of April 1, 1863 (P.L.213, No.227), entitled "An act to accept the grant of Public Lands, by the United States, to the several states, for the endowment of Agricultural Colleges," making appropriations for carrying the same into effect; providing for a basis for payments of such appropriations, for a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure; and making an appropriation from a restricted account within the Agricultural College Land Scrip Fund.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1386, PN 1961 (Amended) By Rep. ADOLPH

A Supplement to the act of July 28, 1966 (3rd Sp.Sess., P.L.87, No.3), entitled "An act providing for the establishment and operation of the University of Pittsburgh as an instrumentality of the Commonwealth to serve as a State-related university in the higher education system of the Commonwealth; providing for change of name; providing for the composition of the board of trustees; terms of trustees, and the power and duties of such trustees; authorizing appropriations in amounts to be fixed annually by the General Assembly; providing for the auditing of accounts of expenditures from said appropriations; providing for public support and capital improvements; authorizing the issuance of bonds exempt from taxation within the Commonwealth; requiring the chancellor to make an annual report of the operations of the University of Pittsburgh," making appropriations for carrying the same into effect; and providing for a basis for payments of such appropriations, for a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1387, PN 1962 (Amended) By Rep. ADOLPH

A Supplement to the act of November 30, 1965 (P.L.843, No.355), entitled "An act providing for the establishment and operation of Temple University as an instrumentality of the Commonwealth to serve as a State-related university in the higher education system of the Commonwealth; providing for change of name; providing for the composition of the board of trustees; terms of trustees, and the power and duties of such trustees; providing for preference to Pennsylvania residents in tuition; providing for public support and capital improvements; authorizing appropriations in amounts to be fixed annually by the General Assembly; providing for the auditing of accounts of expenditures from said appropriations; authorizing the issuance of bonds exempt from taxation within the Commonwealth; requiring the President to make an annual report of the operations of Temple University," making an appropriation for carrying the same into effect; providing for a basis for payments of such appropriation; and providing a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1388, PN 1963 (Amended) By Rep. ADOLPH

A Supplement to the act of July 7, 1972 (P.L.743, No.176), entitled "An act providing for the establishment and operation of Lincoln University as an instrumentality of the Commonwealth to serve as a State-related institution in the higher education system of the Commonwealth; providing for change of name; providing for the composition of the board of trustees; terms of trustees, and the power and duties of such trustees; providing for preference to Pennsylvania residents in tuition; authorizing appropriations in amounts to be fixed annually by the General Assembly; providing for the auditing of accounts of expenditures from said appropriations; providing for public support and capital improvements; authorizing the issuance of bonds exempt from taxation within the Commonwealth; requiring the President to make an annual report of the operations of Lincoln University," making an appropriation for carrying the same into effect; providing for a basis for payments of the appropriation; and providing a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1389, PN 1964 (Amended) By Rep. ADOLPH

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

APPROPRIATIONS.

SENATE BILL FOR CONCURRENCE

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

SB 813, PN 1119

Referred to the Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, June 26, 2015.

**REPORT OF
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

The SPEAKER. The clerk will read the following supplemental report from the Committee on Committees.

The following report was read:

Committee on Committees
Supplemental Report

In the House of Representatives
June 27, 2015

RESOLVED, That

Representative Warren Kampf, Chester and Montgomery Counties, is elected as a member of the Insurance Committee.

Respectfully submitted,
Robert Godshall, Chairman
Committee on Committees

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?
Resolution was adopted.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The majority whip requests a leave of absence for Representative REESE of Westmoreland County for the day. That request is granted.

The minority whip requests leaves of absence for Paul COSTA of Allegheny County for the day, Jordan HARRIS of Philadelphia County for the day, Bryan BARBIN of Cambria County for the day, and Anthony DeLUCA of Allegheny County for the day. Those requests for leaves of absence will be granted.

MASTER ROLL CALL

The SPEAKER. Turning to the master roll, members will proceed to vote.

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—191

Acosta	Everett	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Adolph	Fabrizio	Krieger	Readshaw
Baker	Farina	Lawrence	Reed
Barrar	Farry	Lewis	Regan
Benninghoff	Fee	Longietti	Roae
Bishop	Flynn	Mackenzie	Roebuck
Bizzarro	Frankel	Maher	Ross
Bloom	Freeman	Mahoney	Rozzi
Boback	Gainey	Major	Saccone
Boyle	Galloway	Maloney	Sainato
Bradford	Gergely	Markosek	Samuelson
Briggs	Gibbons	Marshall	Sankey
Brown, R.	Gillen	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brown, V.	Gillespie	Masser	Santora
Burns	Gingrich	Matzie	Saylor
Caltagirone	Godshall	McCarter	Schemel
Carroll	Goodman	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Causar	Greiner	McNeill	Schreiber
Christiana	Grove	Mentzer	Schweyer
Cohen	Hahn	Metcalfe	Simmons
Conklin	Hanna	Metzgar	Sims
Corbin	Harhai	Miccarelli	Snyder
Costa, D.	Harhart	Millard	Sonney
Cox	Harkins	Miller, B.	Staats
Cruz	Harper	Miller, D.	Stephens
Culver	Harris, A.	Milne	Sturla
Cutler	Heffley	Moul	Tallman
Daley, M.	Helm	Mullery	Taylor
Daley, P.	Hennessey	Murt	Thomas
Davidson	Hickernell	Mustio	Tobash
Davis	Hill	Nesbit	Toepel
Dawkins	Irvin	Neuman	Toohil
Day	James	O'Brien	Topper
Dean	Jozwiak	O'Neill	Truitt
Deasy	Kampf	Oberlander	Vereb
DeLissio	Kaufner	Ortitay	Vitali
Delozier	Kauffman	Parker, C.	Ward
Dermody	Kavulich	Parker, D.	Warner
Diamond	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Watson
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Wentling
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Peifer	Wheatley
Driscoll	Killion	Petrarca	Wheeland
Dunbar	Kim	Petri	White
Dush	Kinsey	Pickett	Youngblood
Ellis	Kirkland	Quigley	Zimmerman
Emrick	Klunk	Quinn	
English	Knowles	Rader	Turzai,
Evankovich	Kortz	Rapp	Speaker
Evans			

ADDITIONS—0**NOT VOTING—0****EXCUSED—7**

Barbin	DeLuca	Harris, J.	Reese
Costa, P.	Gabler	Pyle	

LEAVES ADDED—2

Baker	Wheatley
-------	----------

LEAVES CANCELED—1

Wheatley

The SPEAKER. One hundred and ninety-one members having voted on the master roll, a quorum is present.

CALENDAR**RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35**

Ms. HAHN called up **HR 408, PN 1923**, entitled:

A Resolution honoring Moore Township, Northampton County, on its 250th anniversary.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. On the resolution, Representative Marcia Hahn.

Please suspend.

Members, Representative Hahn has the floor. If we could please take our seats.

Ms. HAHN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to ask for support of HR 408, which recognizes Moore Township in Northampton County on its 250th anniversary. The Eastern and Point Phillips districts of Moore Township are in the 138th District, which I represent; the Beersville and Klecknersville portions sit in the 183d District, which Representative Harhart serves.

Moore Township came into being in 1765, 37 years after the county's first settlement near Horner's Cemetery, which is just west of the Catasaquua Creek and north of what is now Nor-Bath Boulevard. The township draws its name from John Moore, a member of the Pennsylvania Provincial Assembly, an earlier version of the General Assembly, in the early 1760s. Moore Township began with a population of 50 and grew to 500 within 15 years, with three gristmills and two sawmills as its earlier businesses. Today that population numbers nearly 9600. The township encompasses 38 square miles, which is part of the Northampton Area School District, and is kept safe by the Moore Township Police Department and Klecknersville Rangers Volunteer Fire Company.

Moore Township has it all, with beautiful farmlands nestled against the Blue Mountains. It has great recreational opportunities, including access to the Appalachian Trail, which runs through the township.

Its official 250th anniversary celebration will take place in late August with a lot of ceremonial things happening, so I would invite all the members to come to Moore Township for the celebration. And a big thank-you goes out to the historical commission under the guidance of township supervisors Dick Gable and Dave Tashner for all their hard work in coordinating activities as part of the celebration.

Please join Representative Harhart and me in recognizing this great occasion and supporting HR 408.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative.

Representative Julie Harhart.

Mrs. HARHART. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am proud to join Representative Hahn in honoring Moore Township with HR 408, celebrating the occasion of their 250th anniversary.

I have long represented communities surrounding Moore Township and know the area well; however, it was not until the most recent reapportionment that I have had the honor of representing the Klecknersville and Beersville portion of the township.

Although many people think of the Lehigh Valley as an industrial area, we also boast many beautiful rural areas, such as Moore Township, with its beautiful mountain views, farmland, and many creeks and trails. The people of Moore Township represent the very best of the Lehigh Valley and the Commonwealth.

Along with them, I am very proud and excited to celebrate this momentous milestone in the township's history. Again, my heartfelt congratulations to Moore Township on its 250th anniversary.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—191

Acosta	Everett	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Adolph	Fabrizio	Krieger	Readshaw
Baker	Farina	Lawrence	Reed
Barrar	Farry	Lewis	Regan
Benninghoff	Fee	Longiotti	Roae
Bishop	Flynn	Mackenzie	Roebuck
Bizzarro	Frankel	Maher	Ross
Bloom	Freeman	Mahoney	Rozzi
Boback	Gainey	Major	Saccone
Boyle	Galloway	Maloney	Sainato
Bradford	Gergely	Markosek	Samuelson
Briggs	Gibbons	Marshall	Sankey
Brown, R.	Gillen	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brown, V.	Gillespie	Masser	Santora
Burns	Gingrich	Matzie	Saylor
Caltagirone	Godshall	McCarter	Schemel
Carroll	Goodman	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Causar	Greiner	McNeill	Schreiber
Christiana	Grove	Mentzer	Schweyer
Cohen	Hahn	Metcalfe	Simmons
Conklin	Hanna	Metzgar	Sims
Corbin	Harhai	Miccarelli	Snyder
Costa, D.	Harhart	Millard	Sonney
Cox	Harkins	Miller, B.	Staats
Cruz	Harper	Miller, D.	Stephens

Culver	Harris, A.	Milne	Sturla
Cutler	Heffley	Moul	Tallman
Daley, M.	Helm	Mullery	Taylor
Daley, P.	Hennessey	Murt	Thomas
Davidson	Hickernell	Mustio	Tobash
Davis	Hill	Nesbit	Toepel
Dawkins	Irvin	Neuman	Toohil
Day	James	O'Brien	Topper
Dean	Jozwiak	O'Neill	Truitt
Deasy	Kampf	Oberlander	Vereb
DeLissio	Kaufner	Ortitay	Vitali
DeLozier	Kauffman	Parker, C.	Ward
Dermody	Kavulich	Parker, D.	Warner
Diamond	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Watson
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Wentling
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Peifer	Wheatley
Driscoll	Killion	Petrarca	Whealand
Dunbar	Kim	Petri	White
Dush	Kinsey	Pickett	Youngblood
Ellis	Kirkland	Quigley	Zimmerman
Emrick	Klunk	Quinn	
English	Knowles	Rader	Turzai,
Evankovich	Kortz	Rapp	Speaker
Evans			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Barbin	DeLuca	Harris, J.	Reese
Costa, P.	Gabler	Pyle	

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

* * *

Mr. SANTARSIERO called up **HR 413, PN 1950**, entitled:

A Resolution honoring the life of Frank Capcino, known as "Frank Cappuccino," and the contributions he made to professional boxing and extending condolences to his family.

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. On that resolution, the Chair recognizes Representative Santarsiero.

Members, if you will please give the floor to Representative Santarsiero. Sir.

Mr. SANTARSIERO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in remembrance of Mr. Cappuccino, a resident of Lower Makefield Township, whose career is well noted in the field of boxing as a referee. His time in the sport and his contributions will long be remembered.

And on behalf of this General Assembly and this House and the people of Lower Makefield and Bucks County, it is with heartfelt sympathy and condolences that we share and extend to his family, and in recognition of a life well lived and a tremendous impact on the sport of boxing that we offer this resolution.

Therefore, I ask the members to vote in favor of HR 413.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—191

Acosta	Everett	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Adolph	Fabrizio	Krieger	Readshaw
Baker	Farina	Lawrence	Reed
Barrar	Farry	Lewis	Regan
Benninghoff	Fee	Longietti	Roae
Bishop	Flynn	Mackenzie	Roebuck
Bizzarro	Frankel	Maher	Ross
Bloom	Freeman	Mahoney	Rozzi
Boback	Gainey	Major	Saccone
Boyle	Galloway	Maloney	Sainato
Bradford	Gergely	Markosek	Samuelson
Briggs	Gibbons	Marshall	Sankey
Brown, R.	Gillen	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brown, V.	Gillespie	Masser	Santora
Burns	Gingrich	Matzie	Saylor
Caltagirone	Godshall	McCarter	Schemel
Carroll	Goodman	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Causser	Greiner	McNeill	Schreiber
Christiana	Grove	Mentzer	Schweyer
Cohen	Hahn	Metcalfe	Simmons
Conklin	Hanna	Metzgar	Sims
Corbin	Harhai	Miccarelli	Snyder
Costa, D.	Harhart	Millard	Sonney
Cox	Harkins	Miller, B.	Staats
Cruz	Harper	Miller, D.	Stephens
Culver	Harris, A.	Milne	Sturla
Cutler	Heffley	Moul	Tallman
Daley, M.	Helm	Mullery	Taylor
Daley, P.	Hennessey	Murt	Thomas
Davidson	Hickernell	Mustio	Tobash
Davis	Hill	Nesbit	Toepel
Dawkins	Irvin	Neuman	Toohil
Day	James	O'Brien	Topper
Dean	Jozwiak	O'Neill	Truitt
Deasy	Kampf	Oberlander	Verab
DeLissio	Kaufner	Ortitay	Vitali
Delozier	Kauffman	Parker, C.	Ward
Dermody	Kavulich	Parker, D.	Warner
Diamond	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Watson
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Wentling
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Peifer	Wheatley
Driscoll	Killion	Petrarca	Wheeland
Dunbar	Kim	Petri	White
Dush	Kinsey	Pickett	Youngblood
Ellis	Kirkland	Quigley	Zimmerman
Emrick	Klunk	Quinn	
English	Knowles	Rader	Turzai, Speaker
Evangovich	Kortz	Rapp	
Evans			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Barbin	DeLuca	Harris, J.	Reese
Costa, P.	Gabler	Pyle	

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

STATEMENT BY MR. MURT

The SPEAKER. Representative Tom Murt, on unanimous consent.

Mr. MURT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask for everyone's attention.

Mr. Speaker, every single day, on the average, 22 veterans take their lives from the effects of post-traumatic stress disorder. And this is a good segue because Governor Wolf has declared today as "Post-traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day" in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Of those 22 veterans that commit suicide every day, a fair portion of them are females, and most of these veterans have served in combat in the war on terror in Iraq and Afghanistan. And I think it is a good idea for us to just pause today to recognize these veterans. By anyone's definition, 22 veterans every day that take their lives is truly an epidemic.

But, Mr. Speaker, post-traumatic stress is not unique to just our veterans. Post-traumatic stress can result from exposure to combat, child sexual or physical abuse, a terrorist attack, a sexual or a physical assault, a serious accident like a car wreck, even a natural disaster like a fire, a tornado, a hurricane, a flood, or an earthquake.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, tragically, there is no cure for post-traumatic stress disorder. There are various therapies that have been effective, whether it is psychological counseling or medication. The VA (Veterans' Administration) is starting to recognize dog therapy and even therapy through the arts. Many of our veterans who suffer from post-traumatic stress have found relief and solace through painting and drawing and so forth.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a great idea today for us to join with the Governor in recognizing that post-traumatic stress is truly debilitating and that we have lost many veterans, not in combat, but veterans who take their own lives because of post-traumatic stress. Also, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for us to recognize the fact that many of our brothers and sisters and constituents suffer from post-traumatic stress, not through exposure to combat, but through other traumatic events in their life.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you very much, Representative Murt.

Members, we are going to turn to announcements at this time.

RULES AND APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE MEETINGS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the Appropriations chair, Bill Adolph, for an announcement.

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

Mr. Speaker, there will be an immediate Rules Committee meeting in the House Republican conference room, and then in 15 minutes, at 11:35, there will be an Appropriations meeting in the majority caucus room. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. There will be an immediate Rules Committee meeting in the House Republican conference room, and then in 15 minutes, at 11:35, there will be an Appropriations meeting in the majority caucus room.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. Representative Major, the majority caucus chair, for an announcement.

Ms. MAJOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to announce Republicans will caucus this morning at 11:45. I would ask our Republican members to please report to our caucus room at 11:45. We would be prepared to come back on the floor, Mr. Speaker, at 12:15. Thank you.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. The minority caucus chair, Representative Dan Frankel, for an announcement.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Democrats will also caucus at 11:45. Democrats will caucus at 11:45. Please attend caucus this morning. Thank you.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 12:15.

AFTER RECESS

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

**BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES,
CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED**

SB 812, PN 1078 By Rep. ADOLPH

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

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 813, PN 1119 By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act making appropriations from the Workmen's Compensation Administration Fund to the Department of Labor and Industry and the Department of Community and Economic Development to provide for the expenses of administering the Workers' Compensation Act, The Pennsylvania Occupational Disease Act and the Office of Small Business Advocate for the fiscal year July 1, 2015, to June 30, 2016, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015; and making an interfund transfer.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 814, PN 1080 By Rep. ADOLPH

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

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 815, PN 874

By Rep. ADOLPH

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

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 816, PN 1081

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act making an appropriation from the Public School Employees' Retirement Fund to provide for expenses of the Public School Employees' Retirement Board for the fiscal year July 1, 2015, to June 30, 2016, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 817, PN 1082

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act making an appropriation from the State Employees' Retirement Fund to provide for expenses of the State Employees' Retirement Board for the fiscal year July 1, 2015, to June 30, 2016, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 818, PN 877

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act making appropriations from the Philadelphia Taxicab and Limousine Regulatory Fund and the Philadelphia Taxicab Medallion Fund to the Philadelphia Parking Authority for fiscal year July 1, 2015, to June 30, 2016.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 819, PN 1083

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act making appropriations from a restricted revenue account within the General Fund and from Federal augmentation funds to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission for the fiscal year July 1, 2015, to June 30, 2016.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 820, PN 1084

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act making appropriations from the restricted revenue accounts within the State Gaming Fund and from the State Gaming Fund to the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board, the Department of Revenue, the Pennsylvania State Police and the Attorney General for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2015, to June 30, 2016, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE,
CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND
RECOMMITTED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES**

HB 1118, PN 1965 (Amended)

By Rep. MARSICO

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for independent counsel; and making an editorial change; and amending the act of October 15, 1980 (P.L.950, No.164), entitled "A supplement to the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.177, No.175), entitled "An act providing for and reorganizing the conduct of the executive and administrative work of

the Commonwealth by the Executive Department thereof and the administrative departments, boards, commissions, and officers thereof, including the boards of trustees of State Normal Schools, or Teachers Colleges; abolishing, creating, reorganizing or authorizing the reorganization of certain administrative departments, boards, and commissions; defining the powers and duties of the Governor and other executive and administrative officers, and of the several administrative departments, boards, commissions, and officers; fixing the salaries of the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and certain other executive and administrative officers; providing for the appointment of certain administrative officers, and of all deputies and other assistants and employes in certain departments, boards, and commissions; and prescribing the manner in which the number and compensation of the deputies and all other assistants and employes of certain departments, boards and commissions shall be determined," implementing the addition of section 4.1 to Article IV of the Constitution of Pennsylvania; establishing the Office of Attorney General elected by the citizens and setting forth powers and duties of the Attorney General; creating an Office of General Counsel and providing for legal services for Commonwealth agencies; transferring, reorganizing or reconstituting certain boards, commissions and agencies; placing certain duties upon the courts and district attorneys; repealing certain acts and parts of acts and making appropriations," in Office of Attorney General, further providing for criminal prosecutions; and, in Office of General Counsel, providing for investigations involving the Attorney General.

JUDICIARY.

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEES

HB 561, PN 634

By Rep. REED

An Act amending the act of December 31, 1965 (P.L.1257, No.511), known as The Local Tax Enabling Act, in consolidated collection of local income taxes, further providing for definitions.

RULES.

HB 1154, PN 1835

By Rep. REED

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in registration of vehicles, further providing for registration and certificate of title required and for display of registration plate.

RULES.

HB 1278, PN 1836

By Rep. REED

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in other required equipment, further providing for television equipment.

RULES.

HB 1279, PN 1710

By Rep. REED

An Act designating a section of Christopher Columbus Boulevard between Oregon Avenue and Washington Avenue in the City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia County, as the William J. Guarnere and Edward "Babe" Heffron Memorial Boulevard.

RULES.

SB 620, PN 1130

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act authorizing the release of Project 70 restrictions on certain land owned by the Borough of Carlisle, Cumberland County, in return for the development of park and open-space lands within North Middleton Township, Cumberland County.

APPROPRIATIONS.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 438, PN 389**, entitled:

An Act designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 982 over the Loyalhanna Creek, Westmoreland County, as the Lance Corporal Joseph E. Roble Memorial Bridge.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 538, PN 1108**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of July 2, 1993 (P.L.345, No.48), entitled "An act empowering the General Counsel or his designee to issue subpoenas for certain licensing board activities; providing for hearing examiners in the Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs; providing additional powers to the Commissioner of Professional and Occupational Affairs; and further providing for civil penalties and license suspension," further providing for definitions; providing for reporting of sanctions and criminal proceedings and for temporary and automatic suspension; and further providing for civil penalties.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Ms. **HARPER** offered the following amendment No. **A02569**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 21, by striking out "A DEFINITION" and inserting
definitions

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 5 and 6
"Expunge" or "expungement." Removal of a disciplinary record, accomplished by:

(1) permanently sealing the affected record from public access;

(2) deeming the proceedings to which the affected record refers as not having occurred; and

(3) except with respect to any subsequent application for expungement, affording the affected party the right to represent that no record exists regarding the subject matter of the affected record.

* * *

Amend Bill, page 5, line 20, by striking out "5(B)" and inserting 5(a), (b)

Amend Bill, page 5, line 21, by inserting after "ADDED"

July 17, 2009 (P.L.95, No.25) and

Amend Bill, page 5, line 24, by striking out all of said line and inserting

(a) Authorization.—

(1) The Commissioner of Professional and Occupational Affairs, after consultation with the licensing boards and commissions, shall have the power to adopt a schedule of civil penalties for operating without a current, registered, unsuspended and unrevoked license, registration, certificate or permit and for violating any provision of their respective acts or regulations relating to the conduct or operation of a business or facility

licensed by such licensing boards and commissions. The schedule of penalties shall not be applicable to disciplinary matters under the jurisdiction of a licensing board or commission unless that licensing board or commission has approved the schedule. The schedule of penalties, guidelines for their imposition and procedures for appeal shall be published in the Pennsylvania Bulletin, provided that the commissioner shall, within two years of such publication, promulgate a regulation setting forth the schedule of penalties, guidelines and procedures. Any such penalty shall not exceed the sum of \$1,000 per violation. Duly authorized agents of the bureau shall have the power and authority to issue citations and impose penalties for any such violations. Any such penalty imposed may be appealed to a hearing examiner or the licensing board or commission pursuant to the regulations promulgated under section 3(b). If the appeal is initially to a hearing examiner, the relevant licensing board or commission shall render a decision on any exceptions to the decision of the hearing examiner or on any applications for review in accordance with section 3(d). All proceedings shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of 2 Pa.C.S. (relating to administrative law and procedure).

(2) The Commissioner of Professional and Occupational Affairs shall expunge the disciplinary record of a licensee, registrant, certificate holder or permit holder subject to the following conditions:

(i) The licensee, registrant, certificate holder or permit holder must make written application to the commissioner for expungement not earlier than four years from the final disposition of the disciplinary record.

(ii) The disciplinary record must be the only disciplinary record that the licensee, registrant, certificate holder or permit holder has with either the commissioner or a licensing board or commission under the commissioner's jurisdiction.

(iii) The licensee, registrant, certificate holder or permit holder must not be the subject of an active investigation related to professional or occupational conduct.

(iv) The licensee, registrant, certificate holder or permit holder must not be in a current disciplinary status, and any fees or fines assessed must be paid in full.

(v) The licensee, registrant, certificate holder or permit holder must not have had a disciplinary record previously expunged by the commissioner.

(vi) The imposition of discipline must have been for a violation involving:

(A) Failure to complete continuing education requirements or practicing for six months or less on a lapsed license, registration, certificate or permit. At least four years must have elapsed since the final disposition of the disciplinary record at the time of application for expungement.

(B) Any violation, except those which resulted in license suspension or revocation, in which at least ten years have elapsed since the final disposition of the disciplinary record at the time of application for expungement.

Disciplinary records involving imposition of discipline for violations other than those identified in clauses (A) and (B) shall not be eligible for expungement.

(vii) The licensee, registrant, certificate holder or permit holder shall pay all costs associated with the expungement as established by the commissioner by regulation.

(3) Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit a licensing board or commission from using a previous discipline for any regulatory purpose or from releasing records of a previous

discipline upon request from law enforcement or other governmental body as permitted by law.

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

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, Representative Harper, just to explain the amendment, please.

Ms. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment simply keeps the status quo with regard to where the fines from an inspection sticker go.

Sorry, wrong bill. I am a busy girl today. I apologize, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment is a bill that the House has passed unanimously several times, simply adds the ability for minor license offenses for occupational licenses to be expunged.

The SPEAKER. Thank you very much.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—191

Acosta	Everett	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Adolph	Fabrizio	Krieger	Readshaw
Baker	Farina	Lawrence	Reed
Barrar	Farry	Lewis	Regan
Benninghoff	Fee	Longietti	Roae
Bishop	Flynn	Mackenzie	Roebuck
Bizzarro	Frankel	Maher	Ross
Bloom	Freeman	Mahoney	Rozzi
Boback	Gainey	Major	Saccone
Boyle	Galloway	Maloney	Sainato
Bradford	Gergely	Markosek	Samuelson
Briggs	Gibbons	Marshall	Sankey
Brown, R.	Gillen	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brown, V.	Gillespie	Masser	Santora
Burns	Gingrich	Matzie	Saylor
Caltagirone	Godshall	McCarter	Schemel
Carroll	Goodman	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Causer	Greiner	McNeill	Schreiber
Christiana	Grove	Mentzer	Schweyer
Cohen	Hahn	Metcalfe	Simmons
Conklin	Hanna	Metzgar	Sims
Corbin	Harhai	Miccarelli	Snyder
Costa, D.	Harhart	Millard	Sonney
Cox	Harkins	Miller, B.	Staats
Cruz	Harper	Miller, D.	Stephens
Culver	Harris, A.	Milne	Sturla
Cutler	Heffley	Moul	Tallman
Daley, M.	Helm	Mullery	Taylor
Daley, P.	Hennessey	Murt	Thomas
Davidson	Hickernell	Mustio	Tobash
Davis	Hill	Nesbit	Toepel
Dawkins	Irvin	Neuman	Toohil
Day	James	O'Brien	Topper
Dean	Jozwiak	O'Neill	Truitt
Deasy	Kampf	Oberlander	Vereb
DeLissio	Kaufner	Ortity	Vitali
Delozier	Kauffman	Parker, C.	Ward
Dermody	Kavulich	Parker, D.	Warner
Diamond	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Watson
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Wentling
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Peifer	Wheatley
Driscoll	Killion	Petrarca	Wheeland
Dunbar	Kim	Petri	White
Dush	Kinsey	Pickett	Youngblood
Ellis	Kirkland	Quigley	Zimmerman
Emrick	Klunk	Quinn	

English Evankovich Evans	Knowles Kortz	Rader Rapp	Turzai, Speaker
--------------------------------	------------------	---------------	--------------------

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Barbin Costa, P.	DeLuca Gabler	Harris, J. Pyle	Reese
---------------------	------------------	--------------------	-------

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

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

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 561**, **PN 634**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 31, 1965 (P.L.1257, No.511), known as The Local Tax Enabling Act, in consolidated collection of local income taxes, further providing for definitions.

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

The SPEAKER. It is my understanding that any amendments to that bill have been withdrawn. It is my understanding that all amendments to the bill have been withdrawn.

If anybody wishes to correct me on that, please do so now. Okay.

On the question recurring,
Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?
Bill was agreed to.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The majority whip has indicated that Representative Matt BAKER wishes to be placed on leave of absence. That request will be granted.

The minority whip has requested that Representative Jake WHEATLEY be placed on leave of absence for the day. That request will be granted.

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1154**, **PN 1835**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in registration of vehicles, further providing for registration and certificate of title required and for display of registration plate.

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

Ms. **HARPER** offered the following amendment
No. **A02251**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 3, by striking out all of said line
Amend Bill, page 1, lines 9 through 16; page 2, lines 1 through 13; by striking out all of said lines on said pages and inserting
Section 1. Section 1332(d) of Title 75 of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes is repealed:
Amend Bill, page 2, line 19, by striking out "3" and inserting
2

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Harper for a brief explanation of the amendment.

Ms. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is the amendment that would keep the status quo with respect to traffic tickets. For this offense, the portion going to local governments would still go to local government under my amendment.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

On that question, Representative Bill Keller.

Mr. W. KELLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the maker of the amendment stand for brief interrogation, please?

The SPEAKER. The gentlelady has indicated she will stand for interrogation. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. W. KELLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I know you are a big proponent of Act 89, and in committee we were given a report from PENNDOT that said that this bill would cost \$4.4 million – a hit to the Motor License Fund of \$4.4 million. I know you know the number, but I was wondering, do you agree with that number?

Ms. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to answer the question for my colleague from Philadelphia, with whom I worked very hard to get a transportation funding bill passed that included this.

I am not sure of the exact amount of revenue that this brings in to PENNDOT. I am sure that the portion of the traffic tickets that go to local governments are important to each and every one of the local governments who depend on that for payment of their expenses for enforcing these traffic tickets.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, people pay for these stickers and the cost of producing the stickers should come out of what people are paying for.

Mr. W. KELLER. Thank you. That ends my interrogation, Mr. Speaker.

On the amendment, please?

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, sir. You have the floor.

Mr. W. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, this is the second time within 2 weeks that I had to stand on this floor and bring to the attention of this body that we are, week by week, chipping away at Act 89. Act 89 took 4 years of hard work, and it really was 16 years in the making. And as you can see what Act 89 has done to the economy of Pennsylvania, I believe it is the one thing that sparked the economy of Pennsylvania and got us back on the right road again.

I agree with the gentelady from Montgomery County that this does take the money that was going to municipalities and it sends it to the Motor License Fund, but the cost of this amendment is \$4.4 million. What we have recaptured in the bill by working with the maker of the bill, we captured \$2.2 million back to the Motor License Fund. It costs municipalities across this State anywhere between \$200 a year or \$6,000 a year, depending on what municipality it is and what county it is from.

I believe this was a fair compromise. It would send half of the money that it took out of the Motor License Fund back to the Motor License Fund. Each municipality, I am sure, receives a much bigger benefit than \$200 a year or \$6,000 a year from the Motor License Fund.

I want to commend the maker of the amendment. He worked with us and he thought this was a fair agreement that we could recapture half of what it costs. We agreed that the law enforcement wants this for probable cause, and I believe this is a fair way to handle it.

We need to stop chipping away at the Motor License Fund. I will stand here all the time when we keep taking money out, and here is my prediction: The next time I stand at this microphone, it will not be \$2 million or \$4 million; it will be a \$100 million hit to the Motor License Fund.

I just want to make this body aware what is going on. We have to be cognizant. We have to take care of the fund. It took us a long time to get Act 89 and to get our bridges and highways under way in getting fixed.

I would ask all members to please vote "no" on the Harper amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek, on the amendment, please.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we just went through a couple years ago essentially a generational Herculean task in getting Act 89 passed so that we could replenish the Motor License Fund. We, in a bipartisan way, raised some significant taxes to do that, and many of us in this room at the time – almost all of us, whether they voted for it or not – agreed that that had to be done. And I would certainly hate to wonder what would be going through now had we not done that then with our other issues that we have before us today.

The Motor License Fund currently funds about \$700 million for State Police coverage. Much of that State Police coverage is for local municipalities that do not have their own police force. Act 89, a good portion of that— The local government folks were very much involved in the negotiations of Act 89 and have done pretty well under Act 89 because of the strength of the Motor License Fund since we passed Act 89.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker – and I know the gentelady from Montgomery believes very strongly in transportation. She was on the committee, I know, for many years. But I would respectfully say that I would ask all of the members here to vote "no" on this.

Echoing the words of the chairman from Philadelphia whom we just heard, we have done so much and paid such a high price to make the Motor License Fund viable in Pennsylvania. Now is not the time, so soon after we have passed it, to start nipping away at it, start taking things out of it, just because it is a fund of money sitting there. The local governments have done very well under Act 89 and do not need this additional money. Sure, they would like it, but they do not need it.

I would ask all the members to please vote "no" on the Harper amendment.

The SPEAKER. Representative Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

While I oppose the gentelady's amendment, please be clear that it is not her amendment that is costing money, it is the bill. And what we did in committee is to try to rectify that argument by making sure that not only will PENNDOT be made whole, but it will actually benefit because all the money will go to the Motor License Fund.

We are at a time of the year when people are not going to get exactly what they want. This was a compromise within the committee to move this bill for our members that are concerned about law enforcement.

Chairman Keller's amendment was adopted in committee. We had this amendment in committee; it was defeated. But I understand, particularly her position on the Local Government Committee, why this is being offered, but I would ask that we oppose it so we can move this bill on and put it through to the Senate. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Vereb.

Mr. VEREB. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of the gentelady's amendment.

We are really talking about \$12.50 a ticket that would go to the municipality, unless, of course, the expiration of registration goes beyond the 60- or perhaps 90-day period, where the fine escalates. I think our local municipalities certainly need the help.

I understand and respect both gentlemen. In fact, I voted for the bill, the transportation bill, that eliminated these stickers. But after seeing what has been going on and hearing from the street what is needed, that is why I not only support the amendment, but will be supporting the underlying bill as well.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Any other members wish to be recognized? Representative Jozwiak.

Mr. JOZWIAK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of Representative Harper's amendment, because in this bill, the fines that go to local municipalities are important to their budgets. Also in this bill, the total bill, EMS (emergency medical services) gets \$10 per citation and so does the CAT Fund (Catastrophic Loss Benefits Continuation Fund).

So we are just talking on the amendment. Is that correct? That is just on the amendment, so I am in favor of the amendment. I would ask everybody to support the amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Bill Keller, for the second time on the amendment.

Mr. W. KELLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just a point of clarification. The bill as it stands now does not take away surcharges, so EMS and all other surcharges still remain with the counties. I would like to point out again, the cost to each municipality ranges between \$200 a year to \$6,000 a year. That would be the cost, the minimum cost to the municipalities. And once again, I would like to reiterate that they receive much more benefit than that small amount of money through Act 89.

And again, I ask us not to constantly chip away at it, because we will be back pretty soon with bigger numbers than \$4.4 million.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Heffley, and then I will come to the maker of the amendment.

Mr. HEFFLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would disagree. This is not taking any money away from the fund. It is currently, the status quo is you pay for the sticker when you pay for the registration, so I do not believe that it is going to take any money away, and it will take money away from your local police departments – \$4 million statewide.

A lot of our police departments or local governments are struggling with the costs, a lot of them are laying off officers, going to part-time, and I think this is going to be a hit for your local governments and it is not a hit for PENNDOT.

So I would agree with the amendment and ask for a positive vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Harper.

Ms. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask the members to vote with their local governments on this issue.

Right now the local governments are getting a share of the tickets that are generated from enforcing this process. We are taking money from them unless we pass the Harper amendment and keep the money where it is today.

It is really not fair to suggest that the \$12.50 per ticket that the local governments are currently getting, and would continue to get under my amendment, would imperil the historic transportation funding act that a majority of us passed last session. The numbers do not match up that way. It is unfair to suggest that they do. And the Harper amendment would just continue letting local governments get that small amount of each traffic ticket that they get for enforcing the laws. Thank you.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—106

Adolph	Greiner	Maloney	Roae
Barrar	Grove	Marsico	Saccone
Benninghoff	Hahn	Masser	Sankey
Bloom	Harhart	McGinnis	Santora
Boback	Harper	Mentzer	Saylor
Brown, R.	Heffley	Metcalfe	Schemel
Caltagirone	Helm	Metzgar	Schreiber
Causser	Hennessey	Miccarelli	Simmons
Christiana	Hickernell	Millard	Sonney
Corbin	Hill	Miller, B.	Staats
Cox	Irvin	Milne	Stephens
Culver	James	Moul	Tallman

Cutler	Jozwiak	Murt	Tobash
Day	Kampf	Mustio	Toepel
Delozier	Kaufer	Nesbit	Toohil
DiGirolamo	Kauffman	O'Neill	Topper
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Oberlander	Vereb
Ellis	Killion	Ortitay	Vitali
Emrick	Kim	Parker, D.	Ward
English	Klunk	Petri	Warner
Everett	Knowles	Pickett	Watson
Farry	Krieger	Quigley	Wentling
Fee	Lawrence	Quinn	Wheeland
Freeman	Lewis	Rader	Zimmerman
Gillen	Mackenzie	Rapp	
Gillespie	Maher	Reed	Turzai,
Gingrich	Major	Regan	Speaker

NAYS—83

Acosta	Dermody	Kavulich	Peifer
Bishop	Diamond	Keller, F.	Petrarca
Bizzarro	Donatucci	Keller, W.	Ravenstahl
Boyle	Driscoll	Kinsey	Readshaw
Bradford	Dunbar	Kirkland	Roebuck
Briggs	Evankovich	Kortz	Ross
Brown, V.	Evans	Kotik	Rozzi
Burns	Fabrizio	Longietti	Sainato
Carroll	Farina	Mahoney	Samuelson
Cohen	Flynn	Markosek	Santarsiero
Conklin	Frankel	Marshall	Schlossberg
Costa, D.	Gainey	Matzie	Schweyer
Cruz	Galloway	McCarter	Sims
Daley, M.	Gergely	McNeill	Snyder
Daley, P.	Gibbons	Miller, D.	Sturla
Davidson	Godshall	Mullery	Taylor
Davis	Goodman	Neuman	Thomas
Dawkins	Hanna	O'Brien	Truitt
Dean	Harhai	Parker, C.	White
Deasy	Harkins	Pashinski	Youngblood
DeLissio	Harris, A.	Payne	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Baker	DeLuca	Harris, J.	Reese
Barbin	Gabler	Pyle	Wheatley
Costa, P.			

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

On the question,

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

Mr. STURLA offered the following amendment No. A02636:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 4, by striking out the period after "plate" and inserting
 ; and, in enforcement, providing for municipal patrol services and for regional police force grants; conferring powers and imposing duties on the Center for Local Government Services in the Department of Community and Economic Development and the Pennsylvania State Police; and making an appropriation.
 Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 18 and 19 Section 3. Chapter 63 of Title 75 is amended by adding subchapters to read:

SUBCHAPTER D
MUNICIPAL PATROL SERVICES

Sec.

6351. Scope of subchapter.

6352. Definitions.

6353. Pennsylvania State Police full-time patrol services fee.

6354. Pennsylvania State Police part-time patrol services fee.

6355. Reduction or elimination.

6356. Allocation.

6357. Distressed municipalities.

6358. Annual reports by Pennsylvania State Police.

6359. Intermunicipal police response.

6360. Penalties.

6361. Prohibition.

6362. Applicability.

§ 6351. Scope of subchapter.

This subchapter relates to municipal patrol services.

§ 6352. Definitions.

The following words and phrases when used in this subchapter shall have the meanings given to them in this section unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

"Commissioner." The Commissioner of Pennsylvania State Police.

"Local full-time patrol services." Patrol services provided by a municipality for a period of 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

"Local part-time patrol services." Patrol services provided by a municipality for a period of less than 24 hours a day and less than seven days a week.

"Patrol services." Police services provided to protect public safety by maintaining order, protecting people and property and enforcing motor vehicle and criminal laws, by routine visits through a municipality.

"Pennsylvania State Police full-time patrol services." Patrol services provided by the Pennsylvania State Police which are the primary police services for a municipality.

"Pennsylvania State Police part-time patrol services." Patrol services provided by the Pennsylvania State Police which supplement the local part-time patrol services provided in the municipality.

§ 6353. Pennsylvania State Police full-time patrol services fee.

(a) Requirement.—Each municipality that receives Pennsylvania State Police full-time patrol services shall pay the fee for service under subsection (b) for the Pennsylvania State Police full-time patrol services provided in the previous calendar year if it meets the following criteria:

(1) Does not provide its own local full-time patrol services.

(2) Does not participate in a regional police force for local full-time patrol services.

(3) Does not contract with another municipality for local full-time patrol services.

(b) Amount.—A fee for service shall be paid by a municipality under subsection (a) as follows:

(1) For the first year of service, the fee for service shall be \$52 per resident per year.

(2) For the second year of service, the fee for service shall be \$104 per resident per year.

(3) For the third year of service, the fee for service shall be \$156 per resident per year.

(4) For the fourth and subsequent year of service, the fee for service shall be \$208 per resident per year.

(c) Elimination.—A municipality that provides local full-time patrol services and subsequently eliminates the services shall be assessed at a fee for service of \$208 per resident per year.

(d) Determination and payment.—

(1) The commissioner shall determine whether a municipality provides local full-time patrol services and shall maintain a list of those municipalities, which shall be made available to municipal officials.

(2) The commissioner shall submit an invoice by February 1 to each municipality determined under paragraph (1) for Pennsylvania State Police full-time patrol services provided in the preceding calendar year. The fee for service shall be paid on a quarterly basis in equal installments to the Commonwealth. The population figures for each municipality used by the commissioner shall be based upon the most recent Federal decennial census but shall not include any individual who is incarcerated or confined in an institution operated by the Federal Bureau of Prisons, a State correctional facility, a county correctional facility or a juvenile detention center.

(3) If the commissioner determines that the cost for providing Pennsylvania State Police patrol services is less than the fees due by a municipality in the next calendar year, the commissioner may adjust the fees for service accordingly.

(4) If the commissioner determines that the cost for providing Pennsylvania State Police patrol services is more than the fees due by a municipality in a calendar year, the commissioner may adjust the fees for service for the next calendar year accordingly, but may not increase the fee more than 2% for the next calendar year.

§ 6354. Pennsylvania State Police part-time patrol services fee.

(a) Requirement.—

(1) Except as set forth in paragraph (2), each municipality that receives Pennsylvania State Police part-time patrol services shall pay the fee for service under subsection (b) for Pennsylvania State Police part-time patrol services provided in the previous calendar year if the municipality meets the following criteria:

(i) Provides its own local part-time patrol services.

(ii) Participates in a regional police force for local part-time patrol services.

(iii) Contracts with another municipality for local part-time patrol services.

(2) Exemptions.—

(i) The following municipalities shall be exempt from paying a fee for service under paragraph (1):

(A) Municipalities with a population of 1,000 or less that provide or contract for patrol services for at least 40 hours per week.

(B) Municipalities with a population of more than 1,000 but less than 3,500 that provide or contract for patrol services for at least 80 hours per week.

(C) Municipalities that provide or contract for patrol services of an additional 40 hours per week over 80 hours per week for each 2,500 in population the municipality has a population of equal to or greater than 3,500.

(ii) A municipality that qualifies for an exemption under subparagraph (i)(C) shall not be considered to provide local full-time patrol services.

(b) Amount.—A fee for service shall be paid by a municipality under subsection (a) as follows:

(1) For the first year of service, the fee for service shall be \$17 per resident per year.

(2) For the second year of service, the fee for service shall be \$34 per resident per year.

(3) For the third and subsequent years of service, the fee for service shall be \$52 per resident per year.

(c) Elimination.—A municipality that provides local part-time patrol services and subsequently eliminates the services shall be assessed a fee for service of \$52 per resident per year for Pennsylvania State Police part-time services.

(d) Determination and payment.—

(1) The commissioner shall determine whether a municipality meets the necessary criteria to be considered as

having local part-time patrol services and shall maintain a list of those municipalities, which shall be made available to municipal officials.

(2) The commissioner shall submit an invoice by February 1 to each municipality determined under paragraph (1) for Pennsylvania State Police part-time patrol services provided in the preceding calendar year. The fee for service shall be paid on a quarterly basis to the Commonwealth. The population figures for each municipality used by the commissioner shall be based upon the most recent Federal decennial census, but shall not include any individual who is incarcerated or confined in an institution operated by the Federal Bureau of Prisons, a State correctional facility, a county correctional facility or a juvenile detention center.

(3) If the commissioner determines that the cost for providing Pennsylvania State Police patrol services is less than the fees due by a municipality in the next calendar year, the commissioner may adjust the fees for service accordingly.

(4) If the commissioner determines that the cost for providing Pennsylvania State Police patrol services is more than the fees due by a municipality in a calendar year, the commissioner may adjust the fees for service for the next calendar year accordingly, but may not increase the fee more than 2% for the next calendar year.

§ 6355. Reduction or elimination.

If a municipality that is paying a fee for service under section 6353 (relating to Pennsylvania State Police full-time patrol services fee) or 6354 (relating to Pennsylvania State Police part-time patrol services fee) institutes police patrol services sufficient to cause a reduction or elimination in the fee for service being paid, the municipality shall not be required to pay the fee for service for the portion of the year during which the local patrol service is provided.

§ 6356. Allocation.

Funds collected annually under this subchapter shall be deposited into the General Fund for the cost of Pennsylvania State Police operations.

§ 6357. Distressed municipalities.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this subchapter, a municipality that is determined to be distressed under the act of July 10, 1987 (P.L.246, No.47), known as the Municipalities Financial Recovery Act, shall not be required to pay the fee for service under this subchapter unless the municipality eliminates local full-time or part-time patrol services after it has been determined to be distressed under the Municipalities Financial Recovery Act or within three years prior to its request for distressed status under the Municipalities Financial Recovery Act. A municipality that was once classified as distressed under the Municipalities Financial Recovery Act, but is not currently deemed distressed by the Department of Community and Economic Development, shall pay the fees for service under this subchapter.

§ 6358. Annual reports by Pennsylvania State Police.

The commissioner shall prepare and disseminate an annual report to each municipality paying a fee for service under this subchapter. The report shall include:

(1) Total hours patrolled.

(2) Dates and times patrolled.

(3) Number of incidents to which the Pennsylvania State Police responded.

§ 6359. Intermunicipal police response.

A municipality or regional police force providing local full-time or part-time patrol services may levy a per incident or hourly fee for service on another municipality which does not have patrol services if the municipality or regional police force is requested by the Pennsylvania State Police to respond to an incident within the municipality which does not have local patrol services.

§ 6360. Penalties.

The following shall apply:

(1) Any municipality failing to make a payment required under this subchapter shall forfeit all payments to be received

from the Commonwealth until the outstanding balance owed is paid in full.

(2) Upon declaration of a local emergency, as defined in 35 Pa.C.S. § 7102 (relating to definitions), a municipality may request from the commissioner an extension of time for payment.

§ 6361. Prohibition.

The fee for service shall be calculated on a per capita basis as a method to determine total municipal fees assessed, except that no tax, fee or other assessment may be levied by a municipality on a per capita basis for the purpose of funding the fees under this subchapter.

§ 6362. Applicability.

This subchapter shall apply to the Pennsylvania State Police patrol services provided in the calendar year beginning after the year in which this section takes effect.

SUBCHAPTER E

GRANTS TO REGIONAL POLICE

FORCES

Sec.

6371. Regional police force grants.

§ 6371. Regional police force grants.

(a) Grant program.—The Center for Local Government Services in the Department of Community and Economic Development shall establish a grant program to assist municipalities in regionalizing their police operations.

(b) Fund.—The Regional Police Assistance Fund is established in the State Treasury. All money deposited in the fund and interest which accrues from those funds are appropriated on a continuing basis to the Center for Local Government Services in the Department of Community and Economic Development to be used exclusively for the purposes of providing grants to municipalities under subsection (a).

(c) Regulations.—The Center for Local Government Services shall adopt rules and regulations necessary to implement and administer this section.

Section 4. Appropriations are as follows:

The sum of \$20,000,000, or as much thereof as may be necessary, is appropriated to the Regional Police Assistance Fund for the fiscal year July 1, 2015, to June 30, 2016, to carry out the purposes of 75 Pa.C.S. § 6371.

Amend Bill, page 2, line 19, by striking out "3" and inserting

5

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Sturla for a brief description of the amendment. Sir.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, and I understand this may be ruled out of order and I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

This amendment would address the issue of the 700-plus million dollars a year that get taken off the top of the Motor License Fund to help pay for State Police that patrol 21 percent of the State's population – \$700 million for 21 percent of the State's population. The rest of the State pays for their own police protection through local taxes.

While this may not happen in this bill today, I would suggest that at some point in time as we continue to run out of funds, with transportation dollars, that this amendment will be absolutely necessary in order to continue to fund transportation projects in the State of Pennsylvania – \$700 million every year.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Sturla, I just want to understand, you are not withdrawing that amendment?

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. It is my understanding that the amendment 2636 has been withdrawn.

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

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1278, PN 1836**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in other required equipment, further providing for television equipment.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1279, PN 1710**, entitled:

An Act designating a section of Christopher Columbus Boulevard between Oregon Avenue and Washington Avenue in the City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia County, as the William J. Guarnere and Edward James Heffron Memorial Boulevard.

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

Mr. **W. KELLER** offered the following amendment No. **A02243**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 4, by striking out "James" and inserting "Babe"

Amend Bill, page 1, line 7, by striking out "James" and inserting "Babe"

Amend Bill, page 2, line 25, by striking out "James" and inserting "Babe"

Amend Bill, page 3, line 25, by striking out "James" and inserting "Babe"

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Keller for a brief description of the amendment.

Mr. **W. KELLER**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment straightens out a mistake I made in the bill. We are naming part of Columbus Boulevard for the two members of the Band of Brothers who were from my neighborhood. And when I read the bill I saw the mistake, that

I had it as "Edward Heffron." No one in the neighborhood would know whom I am talking about. His nickname was Babe, and I have to make sure I put Edward "Babe" Heffron in the bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
The SPEAKER. Yes, sir.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—189

Acosta	Everett	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Adolph	Fabrizio	Krieger	Readshaw
Barrar	Farina	Lawrence	Reed
Benninghoff	Farry	Lewis	Regan
Bishop	Fee	Longietti	Roae
Bizzarro	Flynn	Mackenzie	Roebuck
Bloom	Frankel	Maher	Ross
Boback	Freeman	Mahoney	Rozzi
Boyle	Gainey	Major	Saccone
Bradford	Galloway	Maloney	Sainato
Briggs	Gergely	Markosek	Samuelson
Brown, R.	Gibbons	Marshall	Sankey
Brown, V.	Gillen	Marsico	Santarsiero
Burns	Gillespie	Masser	Santora
Caltagirone	Gingrich	Matzie	Saylor
Carroll	Godshall	McCarter	Schemel
Causer	Goodman	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Christiana	Greiner	McNeill	Schreiber
Cohen	Grove	Mentzer	Schweyer
Conklin	Hahn	Metcalfe	Simmons
Corbin	Hanna	Metzgar	Sims
Costa, D.	Harhai	Miccarelli	Snyder
Cox	Harhart	Millard	Sonney
Cruz	Harkins	Miller, B.	Staats
Culver	Harper	Miller, D.	Stephens
Cutler	Harris, A.	Milne	Sturla
Daley, M.	Heffley	Moul	Tallman
Daley, P.	Helm	Mullery	Taylor
Davidson	Hennessey	Murt	Thomas
Davis	Hickernell	Mustio	Tobash
Dawkins	Hill	Nesbit	Toepel
Day	Irvin	Neuman	Toohil
Dean	James	O'Brien	Topper
Deasy	Jozwiak	O'Neill	Truitt
DeLissio	Kampf	Oberlander	Vereb
Delozier	Kaufer	Ortitay	Vitali
Dermody	Kauffman	Parker, C.	Ward
Diamond	Kavulich	Parker, D.	Warner
DiGirolamo	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Watson
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Wentling
Driscoll	Keller, W.	Peifer	Wheeland
Dunbar	Killion	Petrarca	White
Dush	Kim	Petri	Youngblood
Ellis	Kinsey	Pickett	Zimmerman
Emrick	Kirkland	Quigley	
English	Klunk	Quinn	Turzai,
Evankovich	Knowles	Rader	Speaker
Evans	Kortz	Rapp	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Baker	DeLuca	Harris, J.	Reese
Barbin	Gabler	Pyle	Wheatley
Costa, P.			

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

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

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR C

The SPEAKER. We are going to go over SB 620. I apologize. It has not been 24 hours. We would need a motion to proceed on this particular bill.

MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION UNDER RULE 24

The SPEAKER. Representative Cutler.
Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. Speaker, I would make the motion that we can immediately consider SB 620.
The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

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

The SPEAKER. Leader Dermody, on the motion to proceed with respect to SB 620.
Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
I would urge the members to vote in favor of the motion to proceed.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—173

Acosta	Evans	Kirkland	Ravenstahl
Adolph	Everett	Klunk	Readshaw
Barrar	Fabrizio	Knowles	Reed
Benninghoff	Farina	Kortz	Regan
Bishop	Farry	Lawrence	Roebuck
Bizzarro	Fee	Lewis	Ross
Bloom	Flynn	Longietti	Rozzi
Boback	Frankel	Mackenzie	Saccone
Boyle	Freeman	Maher	Sainato
Bradford	Gainey	Mahoney	Sankey
Briggs	Galloway	Major	Santarsiero
Brown, R.	Gergely	Maloney	Santora
Brown, V.	Gibbons	Markosek	Saylor
Burns	Gillespie	Marshall	Schemel
Caltagirone	Gingrich	Marsico	Schlossberg
Carroll	Godshall	Masser	Schreiber
Causser	Goodman	Matzie	Schweyer
Christiana	Greiner	McGinnis	Simmons
Cohen	Grove	McNeill	Sims
Conklin	Hahn	Mentzer	Snyder

Corbin	Hanna	Metcalf	Sonney
Costa, D.	Harhai	Miccarelli	Staats
Cox	Harhart	Millard	Stephens
Cruz	Harkins	Miller, B.	Sturla
Culver	Harper	Moul	Taylor
Cutler	Harris, A.	Murt	Thomas
Daley, M.	Heffley	Mustio	Tobash
Daley, P.	Helm	Nesbit	Toepel
Davis	Hennessey	O'Brien	Toohil
Dawkins	Hickernell	O'Neill	Topper
Day	Hill	Oberlander	Vereb
Dean	Irvin	Ortitay	Vitali
Deasy	James	Parker, C.	Ward
DeLissio	Jozwiak	Parker, D.	Warner
DeLozier	Kampf	Pashinski	Watson
Dermody	Kaufner	Payne	Wentling
DiGirolamo	Kauffman	Peifer	Whealand
Donatucci	Kavulich	Petrarca	White
Driscoll	Keller, F.	Petri	Youngblood
Dunbar	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Zimmerman
Dush	Keller, W.	Quigley	
Ellis	Killion	Quinn	Turzai,
Emrick	Kim	Rader	Speaker
Evankovich	Kinsey	Rapp	

NAYS—16

Davidson	Kotik	Miller, D.	Roae
Diamond	Krieger	Milne	Samuelson
English	McCarter	Mullery	Tallman
Gillen	Metzgar	Neuman	Truitt

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Baker	DeLuca	Harris, J.	Reese
Barbin	Gabler	Pyle	Wheatley
Costa, P.			

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

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 620, PN 1130**, entitled:

An Act authorizing the release of Project 70 restrictions on certain land owned by the Borough of Carlisle, Cumberland County, in return for the development of park and open-space lands within North Middleton Township, Cumberland County.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—189

Acosta	Everett	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Adolph	Fabrizio	Krieger	Readshaw
Barrar	Farina	Lawrence	Reed
Benninghoff	Farry	Lewis	Regan
Bishop	Fee	Longiotti	Roac
Bizzarro	Flynn	Mackenzie	Roebuck
Bloom	Frankel	Maher	Ross
Boback	Freeman	Mahoney	Rozzi
Boyle	Gainey	Major	Saccone
Bradford	Galloway	Maloney	Sainato
Briggs	Gergely	Markosek	Samuelson
Brown, R.	Gibbons	Marshall	Sankey
Brown, V.	Gillen	Marsico	Santarsiero
Burns	Gillespie	Masser	Santora
Caltagirone	Gingrich	Matzie	Saylor
Carroll	Godshall	McCarter	Schemel
Causar	Goodman	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Christiana	Greiner	McNeill	Schreiber
Cohen	Grove	Mentzer	Schweyer
Conklin	Hahn	Metcalfe	Simmons
Corbin	Hanna	Metzgar	Sims
Costa, D.	Harhai	Miccarelli	Snyder
Cox	Harhart	Millard	Sonney
Cruz	Harkins	Miller, B.	Staats
Culver	Harper	Miller, D.	Stephens
Cutler	Harris, A.	Milne	Sturla
Daley, M.	Heffley	Moul	Tallman
Daley, P.	Helm	Mullery	Taylor
Davidson	Hennessey	Murt	Thomas
Davis	Hickernell	Mustio	Tobash
Dawkins	Hill	Nesbit	Toepel
Day	Irvin	Neuman	Toohil
Dean	James	O'Brien	Topper
Deasy	Jozwiak	O'Neill	Truitt
DeLissio	Kampf	Oberlander	Verb
DeLozier	Kaufner	Ortitay	Vitali
Dermody	Kauffman	Parker, C.	Ward
Diamond	Kavulich	Parker, D.	Warner
DiGirolamo	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Watson
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Wentling
Driscoll	Keller, W.	Peifer	Wheeland
Dunbar	Killion	Petrarca	White
Dush	Kim	Petri	Youngblood
Ellis	Kinsey	Pickett	Zimmerman
Emrick	Kirkland	Quigley	
English	Klunk	Quinn	Turzai,
Evankovich	Knowles	Rader	Speaker
Evans	Kortz	Rapp	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Baker	DeLuca	Harris, J.	Reese
Barbin	Gabler	Pyle	Wheatley
Costa, P.			

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 return the same to the Senate with the information that the House has passed the same with amendment in which the concurrence of the Senate is requested.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1192, PN 1959**, entitled:

An Act to provide from the General Fund for the expenses of the Executive and Judicial Departments, the State Government Support Agencies and the General Assembly of the Commonwealth, the public debt and the public schools for the fiscal year July 1, 2015, to June 30, 2016, for certain institutions and organizations, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015; to provide appropriations from the State Lottery Fund, the Tobacco Settlement Fund, the Aviation Restricted Account, the Hazardous Material Response Fund, The State Stores Fund, the Milk Marketing Fund, the Home Investment Trust Fund, the Emergency Medical Services Operating Fund, the Tuition Account Guaranteed Savings Program Fund, the Banking Fund, the Firearm Records Check Fund, the Ben Franklin Technology Development Authority Fund, the Oil and Gas Lease Fund, the Home Improvement Account, the Cigarette Fire Safety and Firefighter Protection Act Enforcement Fund, the Insurance Regulation and Oversight Fund, the Pennsylvania Racehorse Development Restricted Receipt Account, the Justice Reinvestment Fund and the Multimodal Transportation Fund to the Executive Department; to provide appropriations from the Judicial Computer System Augmentation Account to the Judicial Department for the fiscal year July 1, 2015, to June 30, 2016; to provide appropriations from the Motor License Fund for the fiscal year July 1, 2015, to June 30, 2016, for the proper operation of several departments of the Commonwealth and the Pennsylvania State Police authorized to spend Motor License Fund money; to provide for the appropriation of Federal funds to the Executive Department of the Commonwealth and for the payment of bills remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015; and to provide for the additional appropriation of Federal and State funds from the General Fund and the State Lottery Fund for the Executive Department of the Commonwealth for the fiscal year July 1, 2014, to June 30, 2015, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

(Bill analysis was read.)

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?

Chairman Bill Adolph is recognized on HB 1192.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask you to support HB 1192, the general appropriations bill for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for the fiscal year 2015-16.

For your information, this budget proposal spends \$30.18 billion. This proposal contains a year-over-year increase of \$1 billion, or 3.6 percent, to support the increased investments in our State's top priorities, such as education, human services, agriculture, public safety – and, Mr. Speaker, all without a tax increase.

As we embark on this process of drafting this budget, we were presented with two options.

The Governor proposed one option. That option represented increasing spending by 16 percent, supported by massive tax increases to our residents – our residents that use nursing

homes, day-care services, professional services; an expansion of sales tax that this Commonwealth had never heard of. As a chamber, as a chamber, Republicans and Democrats unanimously rejected that option when each and every one of us voted against those massive tax increases required to support the Governor's \$33.8 billion spending plan.

HB 1192 as amended is another option you can choose. This spending plan provides sustainable increases for State government priorities, like a \$100 million increase for basic education, \$25 million for pre-K, accelerates school construction payments, \$41 million for our higher education institutions, an additional \$10 million for our Pennsylvania residents that are going to Pennsylvania schools through the PHEAA (Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency) State grant program, and, Mr. Speaker, something that we are all interested in, \$332 million for more human services. And, Mr. Speaker, we did all that without raising taxes.

This is a responsible approach that ensures that we will be able to deliver our promises and help the working people of this fine Commonwealth – your neighbors, your friends, your families. Please join me in voting for this responsible no-tax increase.

And, Mr. Speaker, remember, June 30 does mean something. We do have a constitutional requirement to pass an on-time budget. Please take that into your consideration in voting for this budget. Thank you so much.

The SPEAKER. Representative Joe Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, clearly this spending plan does not reflect the priorities of House Democrats, the Governor, or Pennsylvanians in general. It does not reflect any sort of compromise, which is what we do here at budget time. Instead, it reflects a unilateral take-it-or-leave-it approach. This budget is just more of the same, the same old approach to budgeting that we painfully have experienced over the past 4 years.

It fails to solve the structural budget deficit, a \$1.3 billion gap for next year, growing – growing because of all the cost drivers that we already know exist – growing to a more than \$2.1 billion gap the following year, and that is if we do not add any money to anything. That is if we just hold harmless on our current budget. Instead, it continues to follow the blueprint of using one-time fixes, gimmicks, and other maneuvers – which, by the way, our credit rating agencies have clearly, clearly warned us about.

This budget flat-out ignores what Pennsylvanians have said they want from their State government: real investments in education and property tax relief.

Under the budget, education will continue to suffer. Basic and early childhood education receive about 25 cents on the dollar compared to the Governor's proposal, which means school districts will have no choice but to raise local property taxes again, reduce staffing again, and eliminate programs again. This budget only provides a \$20 million increase for special education, which is not even a quarter of the Governor's proposed increase.

The Governor's plan would have fully, fully restored the Corbett-era education cuts. Total education funding under this plan would still be less than the 2008-2009 budget year, the year before, the year before Federal stimulus.

Under this budget, higher education would continue to suffer. Institutions of higher education, including community colleges, State-related universities, the State System of Higher

Education, and the Thaddeus Stevens School only receive a 3-percent increase. That is less than half, less than half of the Governor's proposal. We cannot expect our institutions of higher education to hold the line on tuition increases with only a 3-percent increase after years, after years of financial neglect.

The bottom line is, this budget is inadequate. It simply does not cut it. It will unravel just as quickly as the last four Republican budgets did, which led to the current structural deficit.

This budget relies on more than \$1 1/2 billion dollars from unsustainable, one-time sources and gimmicks, such as transfers from special funds; the revenue surplus, which we all know contains several nonrecurring sources; and shifting payments to future years, such as school employees' Social Security payments and child welfare payments.

Pennsylvanians want, and we have seen recent polling to indicate this, that the top two things that are on the minds of Pennsylvanians relative to this budget are an increased investment in our children – and the way we do that here in the General Assembly and State government is through sufficiently funding basic ed and special ed and all of the education lines – and the other thing that is high on their list is property tax reform. That is something that all of us here, recently many of us voted for a bill that went over to the Senate that we all supported. What they do not want is a gimmick-filled, missed opportunity, one-time fix, nonrecurrent revenue, take-it-or-leave-it budget that throws Pennsylvania under the bus. That is what they do not want.

Mr. Speaker, this budget brings to mind the title of a song from years ago by a song artist by the name of Nat King Cole. He had a song that was titled "Unforgettable." This budget brings to mind that song, but if he were singing a song about this budget, the name of the song would be "Unsustainable."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask all members to please vote "no" on HB 1192.

The SPEAKER. Representative Greg Vitali.

Members, please know that with respect to floor remarks, members are limited to 5 minutes, with the exception of the leaders. There is a 5-minute clock with respect to remarks on the general appropriations bill.

Representative Vitali.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to HB 1192, and I would like to analyze this budget from an environmental perspective.

This budget woefully underfunds environmental protection in Pennsylvania. Probably the best environmental proposal out there this term was Governor Wolf's energy investment initiative. This was part of a larger economic development package funded by his severance tax, which would have provided \$140 million and more to things like wind energy, solar energy, energy conservation, and green agriculture. This budget would not fund that program, and it is regrettable because we as a State have an ethical responsibility to move away from fossil fuels and deal with climate change. Pope Francis recently called climate change the principal, one of the principal challenges facing humanity today, and we are not dealing with that in this budget.

Second point, this budget cuts funding to the Department of Environmental Protection. It cuts funding from the Wolf proposal of \$147 million in State funding to the department to \$143 million. But worse than that, it continues to institutionalize the underfunding of the chief State environmental regulatory

agency. This agency was funded at a level of \$200 million in 2006-2007 – \$200 million. This proposal is down to \$143 million. There has been a 10-percent reduction in staffing of this important regulatory agency since 2006, from about 3,000 positions to 2,700 positions. We really cannot— The environment really is at risk, especially given the challenges of gas drilling, when we continue to cut and cut our regulatory agencies.

Third point, this budget continues to use the Oil and Gas Lease Fund as a cash cow. This is one of those gimmicks that has been previously referred to. The Oil and Gas Lease Fund was established to fund important conservation projects in Pennsylvania. Those conservation projects need that funding. There is an acute infrastructure need. This budget takes \$67 million from that fund this year in addition to the \$50 million automatically deducted, so \$117 million will be deducted from the Oil and Gas Lease Fund and not used for conservation projects but used for general government operations.

And finally, this budget maintains the punitive Ridge, the punitive Corbett cut to the Delaware River Basin Commission. It is a small appropriation that was funded at \$934 million in fiscal year '13-'14, but Governor Corbett cut that by \$500,000 because they would not enact regulations relating to oil and gas development. That was just punitive, a slap at this, a slap at this commission. Governor Wolf's budget would have restored most of that funding to the Delaware River Basin Commission, but this current budget takes it right back down to the Corbett levels.

So for these and other reasons, I would ask for a "no" vote on this budget. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Seth Grove.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Last time I was at this microphone talking about a budget-related topic, we unanimously gave a vote of no confidence to the Governor's budget – a \$12.7 billion dollar tax increase, which raised taxes on every single Pennsylvania resident and ended up with a \$318 million deficit. That is right: \$12.7 billion in tax increases with a \$318 million deficit. At best it was irresponsible; at worst it was incompetent.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have one and only one budget, legitimate budget, which is before us, HB 1192, one which spends under TABOR (Taxpayer's Bill of Rights) without tax increases, which after the June 1 vote of no confidence should be acceptable to this House. This budget is a huge win for education: \$100 million in basic education funding distributed through the new fair and equitable funding formula, \$20 million for special education, \$25 million for early education, and \$5 million for EITC (educational improvement tax credit).

Mr. Speaker, some of us are a little worried about line 161, or the authority rentals and sinking fund reimbursements line, which has been zeroed out. I know my colleagues across the aisle offered an amendment to increase this line item by \$90 million. During debate, we asked to hold off, hold off on that amendment until we get to budget time, when we can actually appropriate funds for PlanCon (Planning and Construction Workbook) reimbursements. We will take care of our trapped construction reimbursements for our school districts.

According to the last data available from the Department of Education, we owe school districts \$5.3 billion in reimbursements – \$3.6 billion for Part H and \$1.7 billion in Part

G. We are making good on those debts to our school districts this year. Through the Accelerated School Construction Investment program, we will authorize the State School Building Authority to fully reimburse all owed school districts trapped in PlanCon.

Some may say that is cash money. I say it is taking care of business. Five point three billion dollars is going to our school districts, guaranteed. You wanted \$90 million; we offer \$5.3 billion. Even the charter lease funds will be funded this year through that line item. Next year line 161 will be approximately \$250 million to take care of the bond payments to the State Public Building Authority, charter leases, and to take care of the new reimbursements moving through the PlanCon process. If we leave this program alone, without changes, we will see school districts go 30 years or longer without being reimbursed, or we can take care of it this fiscal year and reimburse school districts what is owed to them.

Mr. Speaker, this is a huge, all-around win for education – no tax increases, billions for education funding, a new bipartisan fair funding formula. Let us get this to the Governor so he can sign it and fund our schools. After all, this budget is schools that teach, government that is working, and jobs that will pay, without massive tax increases on behalf of the taxpayers across this Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, let us vote in the affirmative for HB 1192 and show responsible fiscal management that our taxpayers expect from us, while funding the priorities they demand from us.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Mary Jo Daley.

Ms. DALEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The June 30 deadline for passing a budget approaches, and I just cannot stop thinking about my understanding of a budget as a plan, a plan that clearly states priorities. Gov. Tom Wolf has made his priorities clear: address Pennsylvania's structural deficit, provide equitable and sufficient funding of education, and get middle-class Pennsylvanians back to work in good jobs that pay a living wage.

I wholeheartedly agree with Governor Wolf and his plan for government that works for Pennsylvanians. I receive e-mails every day from people who live in my district urging me to support the Governor's plan. The budget before us is a sham. It prioritizes gimmicks over governing, and is a repeat of the last 4 years under Corbett. This budget assumes that we will have more than \$200 million from some kind of liquor privatization, yet there is no indication of where it is coming from or what the exact plan is. That means that this \$200 million is just a wild assumption about how much money it will generate between now and next June. This is just one of the gimmicks in a budget filled with them.

This Republican budget prioritizes booze over kids. The Republican budget is not balanced, and it actually adds to the structural deficit. And it also prioritizes drillers over our kids.

Despite these objections, I think that we have an opportunity to work together, to negotiate a budget that makes education a priority, makes gas drillers pay their fair share, provides historic statewide property tax relief for homeowners, returns Pennsylvania to a sound financial footing, and boosts jobs and the economy. I think Pennsylvanians want us to work together to achieve that kind of budget.

So I close with agreeing that Governor Wolf has a plan for Pennsylvania. It is a plan that is good for the people in my district and the rest of the State. So let us leave the theatrics

behind and work together to develop a budget that is good for Pennsylvania and that we can all be proud of. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Fred Keller.

Mr. F. KELLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today in support of HB 1192. As we approach the June 30 deadline, we have to look at our finances, much like the taxpayers of the Commonwealth. How much revenue do we have, and how are we going to spend it? What are our priorities, and what is our income?

I think most households across this Commonwealth would be very happy with a 3.6-percent increase in their revenue, a 3.6-percent increase in their pay. That is what the Commonwealth is going to do in this upcoming budget. It is going to spend 3.6 percent more on the priorities of this Commonwealth: an increase in education of 3.5 percent, a priority; an increase in the Department of Health, 5.6 percent; increase in Human Services, 3 percent; Military and Veterans Affairs, 6.9-percent increase; and within the Education Department, Pre-K Counts, a 25-percent increase; Head Start Supplemental Assistance, a 12.8-percent increase.

This budget does exactly what Pennsylvanians would expect us to do. It handles the finances of this Commonwealth the same way they would handle the finances of their home. It looks at the revenue, and it prioritizes that money. It looks at a 3.6-percent increase.

We look at how we did this. You know, our revenue last year came in \$400 million more than expected. I do not call that a gimmick. I call that increased revenue, because we allowed over the last 4 years Pennsylvanians to keep more of their own money. We allowed them to spend it as they saw fit, not as Harrisburg sees fit, and that has generated us additional revenue in this past fiscal year. And if we continue the policies of letting people invest their money that they have earned as they see fit, our economy will continue to grow. So when I look at this whole package and I hear about gimmicks and I hear about cuts, I just look at what the Pennsylvania people have done for the last 5 years. We had Appropriations hearings, and the administration was in and the Secretary of the Budget was there, and he was asked a question. He was asked, "Do you plan on writing the Obama administration and asking them to replace the \$1 billion worth of cuts they made to the Commonwealth?" And he answered, "No."

Why do we not expect Washington to hold up their end of the bargain, but we expect the hardworking taxpayers of this Commonwealth to continually send us more money. People of Pennsylvania demand that we live within the money they send us, that we prioritize things. That is what this budget does. This is not a budget that is on gimmicks. This is a budget that is done with the resources that we have here in Harrisburg, resources that we get from the people that work.

This money does not just come out of thin air. It comes from people's paychecks. And if we increase the budget more than 3.6 percent and we have to increase taxes, we are cutting income to the hardworking Pennsylvanians that send us money. I do not think we should vote to cut anybody's paycheck, but that is what you are doing when you advocate to increase spending that would require us to raise taxes.

So I ask that the members of this General Assembly vote not, vote not to increase spending and decrease people's paychecks, but vote in support of this bill that will allow our families to keep more of their own hard-earned dollars.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kinsey.

Mr. KINSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by giving credit where credit is due; therefore, I want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for piecing together a budget, piecing together a budget so that they can go home and tell their constituents that they got the budget done on time.

As I stand here, Mr. Speaker, today is a gloomy day. I am not saying it is gloomy just because it is cloudy and raining outside, but it is a gloomy day because when I think about individuals who really depend upon us, individuals with intellectual disabilities who receive supports and services through the Department of Human Services, there is no real new funding for county-run human services programs. And let us not forget that just a few years ago that department was cut by \$84 million, cut by \$84 million under the previous Governor.

I do not want to digress, but when I think about individuals who put their lives on the line to serve our country, you know, it is great when we have individuals come here and we applaud them for serving our country, but when we go back to our communities and we see what is really taking place with our veterans and we see so many of them homeless, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but wonder why this budget, proposed by my Republican colleagues, does not include any new real funding to reduce homelessness for our veterans.

I can go on, and I can mention that this budget does not include any new real funding to combat our ever-growing heroin epidemic that this Commonwealth is facing.

Mr. Speaker, Governor Wolf is proposing to include additional money to help people with intellectual disabilities. Governor Wolf is proposing to include new and additional money to combat veterans' homelessness. Governor Wolf is proposing to include new additional money to deal with the heroin epidemic. But, Mr. Speaker, it appears as though it is falling on deaf ears in some cases.

Mr. Speaker, yes, today is a gloomy day all across our Commonwealth. We here in this chamber have nothing to be proud of today. So let us stop the gimmicks, let us get serious, and let us make sure that we present a budget to the people of Pennsylvania – and I mean all of the people of Pennsylvania – a real budget that we can build upon.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with what we have in front of us, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on HB 1192.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Harper.

Ms. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You cannot spend what you do not have. You cannot spend what you do not have. We have a constitutional requirement in Pennsylvania to balance the budget by June 30.

A couple of weeks ago this House voted unanimously to reject the Governor's budget and the Democratic spending priorities in it. I know a lot of people have asked us to increase spending, and I know we would like to, many of us, increase spending in various areas, but you cannot spend what you do not have.

The Governor's proposal did not get a single vote because it required us to be willing to levy new taxes and increase taxes that we were not willing to do. We would be taxing things we have never taxed before: toddlers in day care; kids in college, for room and board. Just to raise the revenues that the Governor's budget requires, we would have had to vote to tax those things.

Worst of all, we would have had to vote to tax families struggling to keep a senior in nursing home care or caring for them at home with home health care. That is what that budget required. The Governor's proposed 6.6-percent tax on services is a staggering expense on the families we represent. I could not bring myself to do that, and none of us could. But you still cannot spend what you do not have. So if we are unwilling to levy those taxes on the families that we represent and who trusted us to send us here, we cannot spend the money the Governor has proposed we spend, because you cannot spend what you do not have.

Even the Independent Fiscal Office calculated that whether you are a household with less than \$25,000 in annual income or one with more than \$100,000 in annual income, you would be paying more under the Governor's budget. No wonder nobody wanted to vote for that budget, and no one back home would have wanted us to vote for it either.

Now, some have said we are like Washington, DC, and we are gridlocked, but we are not. Pennsylvania is not gridlocked. Although we have a Democratic Governor and a Republican legislature, our Governor signed three pieces of legislation just this past week. One was a real estate disclosure law amendment, one creates navigators to help people with health insurance exchanges, and another allows pharmacists to give vaccines. None of these had a problem getting through. We did them in a bipartisan fashion, so the issue is not partisanship. The issue is that our Governor has asked us to vote for the largest tax increase in the history of the Commonwealth, and we were unwilling to do that. You cannot spend what you do not have. To spend an extra \$4 billion, you have to be willing to raise taxes \$4 billion, and we are not willing to do that.

I did not get a single call asking me to raise people's taxes or to tax day care or to tax nursing home care – not a single call. When I questioned people who wanted more spending, a couple of them reluctantly said that I could raise income taxes a little bit. A couple said I might raise sales taxes a little bit. A couple of them said I might raise taxes on the shale but not the Governor's plan for the shale. That would give us the largest tax increase in the history of Pennsylvania and the largest tax increase on shale in America.

So we cannot spend money that we do not have, and we have got a balanced budget before us today that balances and does not spend money that we do not have. It is the responsible thing to do.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (KATHARINE M. WATSON) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The conditions of the people will not change until the people change the conditions within themselves. We cannot continue to ask children to do their best if we are not prepared to support them. We cannot continue to ask children to give us Cadillac performance and you only give them Volkswagen dollars to work with.

We are in the 21st century. The only way our young people will be able to participate in the 21st century is if we are willing to provide the support that they need.

We, the Pennsylvania General Assembly, have the constitutional duty and obligation to provide for a system of public education that is both efficient and proficient. Now, no matter how many times you want to say that I cannot spend what I do not have, we cannot continue to ask without providing the capacity that allows young people to soar.

I am speaking today not for me, but I am speaking today for the children, the members of the Unitarian community, the Presbyterian community, the Protestant community, the Islamic community, all of those people who came here last Saturday, and every day have fasted from 8 a.m. until 8 p.m. in the evening, and all they are asking is that we fund public education at an adequate level.

If we can continue to spend \$40,000 to keep people in prison, should we not spend at least \$20,000 to make sure that our children are able to go to Yale? They have been out here since Saturday. They are going to be here. They are going to be here until we do the right thing. We cannot keep ducking, dodging, and making excuses and then ask people to do their best.

I challenge anybody from my side or the other side to show me a budget that is balanced. This budget proposal is not balanced. It is not balanced. Stevie Wonder, Ray Charles could see that it is not balanced.

Mr. CUTLER. Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman please suspend.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Lancaster rise?

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order, Madam Speaker.

I do not believe it is appropriate to denigrate those who are blind.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I am not denigrating them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend, please.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not denigrating them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. THOMAS. I am actually elevating them, because they can see—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman— Sir, would you please suspend.

Thank you. One moment, please.

Thank you to the gentleman from Philadelphia and to the gentleman from Lancaster.

Might I remind all the members that these are impassioned times, and indeed that the people of Pennsylvania have sent passionate legislators to Harrisburg to represent them. If we could indeed perhaps tone down the rhetoric a little bit and still make the important points we have to make, it would be much appreciated from the Chair.

Thank you very much. Please continue.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Madam Speaker pro tem.

And let me apologize if it was interpreted that I was denigrating folks with physical disabilities. I was actually elevating, elevating Ray Charles and the other member. And I was actually elevating them because what I was saying was they can see what we are unable to see, and that is we have a budget in front of us that is not balanced. We have a budget in front of us that has not invested what we need to invest in public education to ensure that all children, all children, have access to an equal education. We have a budget in front of us that does not take the progressive steps that need to be taken to provide a public and a safe and progressive environment for our communities. That is not reflected.

As chairman of the Commerce Committee, Democratic chair, jobs. Pennsylvania has gone from 10th in job creation to almost 45th. We have counties in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 10 counties that have structural underemployment and unemployment, where people have not benefited from the growth that other communities in Pennsylvania have witnessed.

This is the time now to step up, stand up, and be firm, be firm in putting forth a budget that puts Pennsylvanians back to work, that gives our kids access to a quality education, and do not use voodoo numbers to try and make sure that we have a budget.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, sir.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland County, Representative Bloom.

Mr. BLOOM. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the citizens who send us here, the people we speak for and vote on behalf of expect us to be stewards of their hard-earned tax dollars. To me that means we watch every dollar like it was theirs, which it is. It means we spend only what needs to be spent and not a dollar more. And it means we only ask for a tax increase if it is absolutely, unquestionably necessary. We should never, ever demand more of the hard-earned dollars from the pockets of our hardworking taxpayers unless we have first exhausted every other option. It is our job to solve problems for our taxpayers, not create new, unnecessary problems for them.

Madam Speaker, Governor Wolf has claimed that we now face problems in Pennsylvania that only \$4.7 billion in new taxes can solve. He is demanding a package of painful new income taxes, sales taxes, energy taxes, banking taxes, and more. The Governor asserts that State government needs to spend 16 percent more than last year and that our Pennsylvania taxpayers must pay for this. But with this responsible budget plan now before us, HB 1192, we now have the opportunity to solve the problems of balancing our Pennsylvania State budget without a dollar of new taxes on anyone. Not one taxpayer needs to suffer one higher tax.

Madam Speaker, this responsible budget increases educational funding and critical services without Governor Wolf's job-crushing tax-hike scheme. Madam Speaker, this responsible budget holds the line for our hardworking taxpayers without subjecting them to Governor Wolf's convoluted and misguided shell game of higher income and sales taxes cloaked in the illusion of pretend property tax relief.

Madam Speaker, this responsible budget will be delivered to the Governor's desk by June 30, on time, on balance, and on behalf of the hardworking taxpayers of Pennsylvania, and I implore Governor Wolf to do the right thing and sign it into law.

In recent days Governor Wolf and his team have taken to hurling insults at those of us who would have the audacity to put the taxpayers we serve before the unnecessary growth of State government and higher taxes. According to his comments, the Governor seems to think that protecting the hardworking taxpayers we serve is a cheap political stunt, a gimmick, or bogus theatrics. Governor Wolf, I respectfully ask, let us stop with the gratuitous insults and start getting responsible. And members, I respectfully urge a vote in favor of HB 1192, the responsible Pennsylvania State budget.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, sir.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Representative Frankel.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I also rise in opposition to this budget. One of my earlier colleagues, my colleague from Snyder and Union Counties, talked about how this Republican budget is crafted the way Pennsylvanians craft their household budgets. Well, Madam Speaker, I do not know any Pennsylvania household that does not pay their Social Security taxes on time, and that is exactly one of the irresponsible maneuvers that this budget uses to balance the budget; irresponsible, deferring paying Social Security taxes as a technique to pass this budget.

Now, my colleague just now from Cumberland County talked about education priorities. Let me tell you something about this budget. Three cents. Three pennies. That is how much our kids' education is worth in the Republican budget before us. A net increase of \$8 million in education funding split between 1.8 million students over the course of 180 days – three cents per student per day. Shameful. We know that a budget is a reflection of priorities, and that means this budget must have its priorities set on something other than our children and their education. Unfortunately, misplaced priorities are nothing new in our General Assembly.

For the fifth year in a row, we are voting on a budget crafted exclusively by Republican members in the House and Senate that continues to put the interests of big money and big business ahead of working men and women and children in Pennsylvania. For the fifth year in a row, we are voting on a budget that fails to even consider revenue that could be reasonably, fairly, and consistently generated by common sense and strongly supported proposals to tax smokeless tobacco products, close the Delaware loophole – for real this time – and hold gas drillers accountable for their fair share.

For the fifth year in a row, we are voting on a budget proposal that is unbalanced, unfair, and unacceptable. For the fifth year in a row, I will be voting "no."

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you.

Next, please, the lady, the gentledady from Monroe County, Representative Rosemary Brown.

The gentledady may begin.

Mrs. R. BROWN. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise today to speak on HB 1192. Madam Speaker, it is no secret that Pennsylvania has dealt with significant financial

stressors over the last several years, and this year is no different, as we work diligently as a team to come up with a budget that supports core government services while protecting our taxpayers. And as a district that is highly, highly overtaxed, it is a priority to me to protect my constituents. And as my colleague, Representative Harper, stated, "You cannot spend what you do not have."

My constituents absolutely do not have any more in taxes to give. Households are barely making it as it is. And as State legislators, we need to work with what we have. As we look at this budget, I would like to point out that there are no new taxes to our households. We also have notable increases— As was mentioned before, it is stated that we do not support education. There are notable increases in education in this budget. We have added \$100 million to basic education, utilizing, finally utilizing, a new, fairer funding formula for all new moneys, treating our schools and children more fairly across Pennsylvania. We are moving in the right direction. We still have some work to do, but we are moving in the right direction with the distribution of the school funding formula.

We have also added an additional \$25 million increase for Pre-K Counts, a \$5 million increase for Head Start, and a \$20 million increase for special education.

On top of that, we increased funding by \$41 million for the higher education system, really working to keep our tuition rates manageable and affordable for our students. So I beg to differ that we do not support education. All of these moneys are very focused on the key area of importance, which is education.

Madam Speaker, we have an obligation to best support our government functions without jumping immediately to our taxpayers for new moneys. Our taxpayers are looking for us to be focused and responsible, and I truly believe that this budget does that, and I ask my colleagues to support HB 1192.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you.

The Chair now recognizes the minority secretary from Philadelphia County, Representative Rosita Youngblood.

Ms. YOUNGBLOOD. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise in opposition to the Republican budget bill, which is the fifth, the fifth consecutive budget that fails to put the people of this great Commonwealth first, fails to move the Commonwealth forward.

Madam Speaker, the definition of "insanity" is doing the same thing over and over and over and expecting different results that will never happen, so by definition, this budget is insane.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Ms. YOUNGBLOOD. And I am submitting the rest of my remarks for the record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you.

Ms. YOUNGBLOOD submitted the following remarks for the Legislative Journal:

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise in opposition to the Republican budget bill, which is the fifth consecutive budget that fails to put people first and fails to move this Commonwealth forward.

Madam Speaker, the definition of "insanity" is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results. So by definition, this budget is insane. For the fifth year in a row, we are trying the Republican approach, an approach that has resulted in devastating consequences for the people of this Commonwealth.

Pennsylvania has gone from a leader in job growth to dead last; 90 percent of local property tax payers saw increases in their tax bills; school districts were forced to lay off teachers and counselors; and our credit rating has been downgraded. And yet here we are again with the same approach to a budget using gimmicks above governing – and again we are expecting different results, and with a budget that is out of balance.

It is especially insane when you consider that for a fifth straight year we are once again failing to make education a priority and failing to make gas drillers pay their fair share. That is like looking through your seat cushions for change while not charging rent to a person living in your basement.

Madam Speaker, the people of Pennsylvania made it clear that they wanted a new direction for this Commonwealth. They understood that doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results is the definition of "insanity."

Yet here we are – again – focusing on a budget that is the same old status quo. This budget does not put people first. It keeps the status quo front and center. It is truly the definition of "insanity."

I encourage all members to vote "no" on this insane Republican budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Lackawanna County, Representative Everett.

Mr. EVERETT. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise today to support the balanced budget, no-tax budget put forth by our wonderful Appropriations Committee chairman, Bill Adolph, and his excellent staff, with the help of our colleagues across the aisle and on the other end of the Capitol. During this budget we overcame a \$1.25 billion structural deficit and were able to spend \$1 billion more, or 3.6 percent, to increase revenue and spending on education, our primary concern here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. A \$370 million increase in education spending; a \$25 million increase in Pre-K Counts, which is a 25.7-percent increase; a \$5 million increase in a program that is very important to rural Pennsylvania, Mobile Science and Math, 13-percent increase; and at the same time fully fulfilling our Act 120 obligations to pay down our pension deficit by increasing our pension payments for our school districts by \$573 million, a 49.5-percent increase, increasing our total payments this year against our pension deficit of \$1.7 billion – which, I will add, decreases property taxes in every school district in Pennsylvania.

We were able to restore spending in agriculture and increase spending in agriculture \$23 million, an 18.2-percent increase in the most important and largest industry in Pennsylvania that feeds families across our Commonwealth. We were able to restore funding cuts to agriculture research – Hardwoods Council and many other agricultural research programs that benefit our industries and benefit Pennsylvania State University.

We increased spending in DCED (Department of Community and Economic Development) by \$11 million, a 5.6-percent increase; DCNR (Department of Conservation and Natural Resources), \$21.7 million; corrections, \$116 million; probation and parole, \$12 million; drug and alcohol, \$2.7 million; health and human services, more than \$15 million.

My point in all this, Madam Speaker, is that this is a budget that serves the needs of Pennsylvania without increasing taxes on the backs of our working families. Five years ago when we regained the majority, we inherited a \$4 billion deficit, which through prudent spending and cuts in unnecessary government services, we have erased.

I encourage everybody to take a close look at this budget, on both sides of the aisle, and see what it does for Pennsylvania without increasing taxes. This is a real budget that works for Pennsylvania without increasing taxes, without placing burdens on our working families, and without increasing spending by the proposed 16 percent, increasing sales taxes by 40 percent, increasing personal income taxes by 21 percent, and increasing spending by an unsustainable \$4.7 billion.

Now, it would be wonderful to spend that much money if we were willing to pay the price. As my colleague pointed out earlier, and I will repeat it, you cannot spend what you do not have, and you cannot spend what you are not willing to put a vote up for. I am not willing to put a vote up for those kinds of tax increases, and not one other member of this House was.

So I would ask you to support this budget on both sides of the aisle, put it on the Governor's desk, and ask him to sign it so we can keep Pennsylvania open for business and moving forward. If there are other issues we need to deal with, we can do that later in the session.

I thank you for your time, Madam Speaker, and encourage a "yes" vote. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER. Representative Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the proposed budget here, 1192. Five or six years ago this State was seventh in job creation in the nation. We were the only State in the nation with improved test scores in math and reading at all levels. We had actually passed a Marcellus Shale tax here in the House, with an agreement by the Republicans over in the Senate to pass it as soon as they came back. They did not.

Four years of mismanagement and budgets like this budget, with full cooperation and votes of majority Republicans in the House and the Senate, we are now fiftieth in job creation – dead last. We have declining test scores. We have higher local property taxes. We have 20,000-plus teachers that are laid off. We have had multiple bond downgrades.

Mr. Speaker, last year the electorate spoke. They elected Tom Wolf. He proposed to restore education funding cuts, the billion dollars that had been cut under the previous administration. He proposed a modest shale tax as a way to pay for that. He proposed a transparent government with no structural deficits, and he proposed property tax relief. And you know what? When I watched the ads on TV last fall, the Republicans agreed with it too. I saw your ads. You were all for a Marcellus Shale tax. You were all for funding education. You were all for property tax relief. You are on the record.

But here we go. This budget, it has a built-in structural deficit. It increases the structural deficit for next year. It is not balanced. It has no reasonable shale tax to fund education. It claims that there is additional funding for education, but when you look at it, the basic ed increase of \$100 million and the

special ed increase of \$20 million is offset by an \$87 million school employee Social Security payment that has shifted, and \$25 million of underfunding of PSERS (Public School Employees' Retirement System) for \$112 million. So the net increase, \$8 million, less than one-tenth of 1-percent increase for funding for education – not even pennies on the dollar; tenths of pennies on the dollar.

Mr. Speaker, there are no claims in this budget of pension savings, even though we heard that without that Republicans would not agree to a budget with the Governor. Mr. Speaker, this is another budget that runs the State into the ground, like has been going on for the last 4 years. It puts off payments for months and even years. It overprojects revenues, it underprojects cost savings, and it is not balanced.

The numbers tell the story. There is \$800 million worth of adjustments in this budget. You know, I heard we need to act like the people at home. When their budget does not balance, they do not just go back and change the numbers. That is what this budget does.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford another year of these abysmal policies. I am reminded of the old Popeye cartoon, where Wimpy used to say, "I'd gladly pay you Tuesday for a hamburger today." This budget is the hamburger today. It creates a \$2 billion structural deficit for next year. Mr. Speaker, it does not fund education. Mr. Speaker, it is not responsible. Mr. Speaker, we were told you cannot spend money you do not have, but this budget does and attempts to call it a balanced budget.

I urge a "no" vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Christiana.

Mr. CHRISTIANA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of HB 1192. Mr. Speaker, since March 3, the Governor, his administration, and those in the General Assembly shackled with carrying his massive spending plan, they have all started this conversation about what they would like to spend, making promises to hundreds of interest groups of significant increases, yet they do not want to talk about the revenue side of their proposal. Why? Because they all voted against their revenue side of their proposal.

The Democrats, while they support the spending plan, they did not even have someone author the revenue plan. It had to be introduced by a Republican. And we started the budget month by giving that revenue plan a vote, and not one of them voted for it.

But the Republicans, for the fifth straight year we have started the conversation with what we can realistically afford – real investments, real leadership. We have reduced or eliminated programs that are antiquated or maybe are no longer a wise investment. We have made changes to programs that were noble but not maximized because of bureaucratic hurdles, like the KEYS (Keystone Education Yields Success) program that helped take people from Pennsylvania's welfare rolls and put them on the employment rolls.

And in this budget we make real investments that we can afford: higher education, the State System, \$12.3 million increase; community colleges, \$6.5 million increase; the State-relateds, \$17 million increase; pre-K, \$25 million increase; and the public education system in Pennsylvania is going to get a real \$100 million increase. One hundred million dollars, I have heard that number recently. That is the same amount that our public schools in Pennsylvania placed in their reserves last year. In the last 4 years they have put over

\$500 million in their reserve accounts, yet we hear that it is raining and pouring outside. They are sitting on \$4 billion of reserves, yet the other side of the aisle wants to talk about the fact that they are underfunded.

Just last year they added \$100 million to their reserves, yet the House Republicans are increasing investment by another \$100 million, another \$100 million. It is safe to say that if they are saving that amount of money, then we are doing our job in Harrisburg and we are being responsible to the taxpayers. Therefore, we should allow the campaign rhetoric to cease. Yes, you elected a Democratic Governor, but you also elected Republican majorities in the House and the Senate, and the people of Pennsylvania understand that. It is time that we all understand that in Harrisburg.

Now, it is true we have not seen rapid revenue growth, but we have seen reasonable revenue growth. It is true that we still have to scrutinize every single line item so that we can balance a realistic budget. We have met our pension obligation for the fifth straight year, but the reality is, it took a \$573 million increase to do it. We had to spend \$1.7 billion on the schools' retirement plan. We cannot afford the status quo for our pension system.

And the idea that raising taxes is the only way that we can raise revenue in the General Fund is ridiculous. The Republicans have increased revenues while fending off every tax increase known to man. We have increased revenue in a responsible and commonsense way. When you have more people employed in Pennsylvania, you have more people paying the personal income tax rate, and the revenue goes up.

When more companies start up in Pennsylvania and move into Pennsylvania, you have more paying the second highest corporate net income tax in the country, and revenue goes up. When our economy is allowed to grow, workers earn a higher wage – more money to spend, more sales tax revenue.

What the Governor says is he is for increased revenue, but his first action when he got the keys to the office was to sign an Executive order stopping non-surface impact leasing, cost us \$90 million in the current year – \$90 million that I will add and say stopped us from having a \$90 million higher surplus. And yes, we have a surplus in Pennsylvania. You can call this year's budget a gimmick, but last year we spent \$29.1 billion, but we brought in \$29.4 billion. That is a \$370 million surplus. Enough with the gimmicks and the sham discussion. A property tax gimmick is when the Governor says he is going to give property taxes, but in 2015-16 not a dime of his plan would go to property taxes. A sham budget is when you say you are increasing spending by \$700 million—

The SPEAKER. Sir?

Mr. CHRISTIANA. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. I apologize; you do have to conclude.

Mr. CHRISTIANA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I urge a "yes" vote.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Margo Davidson.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I predicted in my interview with my local paper, the Delco Times, last week, the Republican-controlled legislature would present a totally unacceptable budget to the Governor, which he would have no choice but to veto. That process is happening now in real time.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that both school districts in the 164th Legislative District, as well as many school districts across the Commonwealth need additional funding to begin to do the job that they are called to do: educate our children. This unreasonable, unbalanced budget only nets a paltry \$8 million to increase education spending. There is still \$500 million that needs to be restored. That \$8 million is minus the gimmicks, the so-called adjustments, and the PlanCon loan scheme.

Upper Darby School District and the William Penn School District, along with many other school districts, submitted plans to the Governor on how they would spend the money proposed in the Wolf budget that people overwhelmingly support. Those plans include restoration of programs that helped kids succeed. Those programs will not be funded with the GOP Corbett 5 budget.

This budget is not balanced. It is not reasonable. It has wild assumptions in liquor privatizations; one-time gimmicks, including not paying our Social Security bills; and unreasonable borrowing and less-than-responsible borrowing to fund PlanCon. It does not provide for property tax relief, as we voted for, or a reasonable tax on gas drillers. For these reasons and so many others, so many gimmicks, so many wild assumptions, I will be voting "no" on this Republican budget that continues the policies of Tom Corbett.

I am glad, though, that we have a Governor that is willing to stand up for the Pennsylvania children and families that I support by vetoing this unfair, unbalanced, unreasonable budget that does not restore the massive cuts to public education that Republicans made.

I urge members who support fair education funding in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to join me and my like-minded colleagues by voting "no" on this unfair, unreasonable, Corbett 5 budget.

The SPEAKER. Representative Marguerite Quinn.

Ms. QUINN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you are enjoying this Saturday.

I rise today to support HB 1192. After 3 weeks, after 3 weeks of budget hearings through the month of March, after having the privilege and the opportunity to speak and to question the different secretaries-elect, the various agency heads, we learned a lot about this budget. From then, in March, to now, today, June 27, I continue to hear from my constituents about their concerns with the budget proposal that was presented to us back on March 3.

HB 1192 in front of us right now has no new taxes on our most vulnerable populations: those in nursing homes, those receiving in-home health-care services, those who rely on ambulatory services just to leave their home. HB 1192 has no new taxes for families who need in-home help to take care of a disabled child or parent; no new taxes on durable equipment like a wheelchair or diapers or Depends; no new taxes for families who struggle to pay day care, either for a child or a parent; no new taxes for our students who are seeking higher education on their school fees, their textbooks, their meal plans. I could go on and on and I could read that list of new taxes that have been proposed to you, but you all know it. You all know that list so well that on June 1 you voted against that proposal. Every one of us in this room voted against increasing taxes – not a vote, not a blooming vote. It was a reality check, collectively, not just one side of the aisle or the other. Collectively, we decided and we showed with our vote that we do not want to raise taxes on the people we serve. We did not

want to raise the personal income tax by 21 percent. We did not want to increase and expand our sales tax on hundreds of items. So where does that leave us? We need to look at what we can afford, just like when I have that reality-check conversation with my kids, "Honey, you can't spend what you don't have." This budget proposal is reflective of our fiscal reality as well as our collective will that we do not want to raise historic \$4 billion in taxes this year, \$8 billion the following year. We do not want to be part of that dramatic increase in spending.

This budget provides additional support for our top priorities. I hear education, 100 million new dollars for education, for basic ed. You all have their spreadsheets. Five hundred school districts, every one of them gets an increase. Special education gets an increase, higher education, early education, community education. It is in there. It is also within our means.

The reality is that we have in front of us a sustainable budget that is sustainable with the available revenue that we have. This is how I run my household, this is how I teach my kids to run theirs, and this is how we should run our government.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Madeleine Dean.

Mrs. DEAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in grateful appreciation to the majority party for this proposal. I am very thankful. I thank you because you made it easy; you made it clear. I thank you for this inadequate, anemic, artifice of a budget. It is a budget that looks in the rearview mirror, a budget that repeats gimmicks of the past. It makes our job easier because I know what my neighbors and my constituents want. They want, Pennsylvanians want a budget that invests in our children, invests in education, and reverses the cuts, the billion-dollar cuts of the past, whether it is pre-K or higher education or basic education. My neighbors, my constituents want a reasonable severance tax on shale gas, not a giveaway. You are absolutely right. We cannot spend what we do not have, and over the course of the past 4 years, we do not have more than \$1 billion in revenues to go to our children.

On the reverse side of that, very harmful in this budget is the proposal that goes so far as to cut more than \$1 million from the Governor's proposal for health, health spending, which will effectively eliminate the health registry for those who live in the area of the drilling, eliminate that small amount of money that we were trying to invest to protect the health of those living in that area.

Finally, what my constituents want is a balanced budget, and of course, this is not. It uses, again, hoaxes.

I thank the majority party for this poorly crafted budget that we know does not serve the needs of our constituents. This budget looks in the rearview mirror and says, let us do it again, whereas, I believe our obligation is to look forward to spend and invest in our children, to balance our budget.

On behalf of all Pennsylvanians who know better, I will be a "no" vote, and I am grateful that our Governor will be too. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative DiGirolamo.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

One of my favorite stories from Scripture is the story about the rich landowner who calls three of his servants in, and he tells them, "I'm going away for a long time." And he gives each of them the same exact amount of money and gold, and he says, "When I come back I want you to invest that and I want an account of what you do with that money." And when he comes

back he calls the first servant in, and the servant says, "I have invested your money, and here, I've doubled it." And the master says, "You've done a good job." The second servant comes in and says, "I've invested your money and I've made half as much," and the master said, "Well done." And the third servant comes in and say, "Master, I buried the money that you have given me in the ground. I wanted to play it safe, and I am returning it back to you."

As I look at this budget – and I understand that nobody ever gets everything they want, and most of the time you do not get half of what you want – I want to commend our Appropriations chairman, the gentleman from Delaware County. I really think he did a terrific job, he and the staff, in putting this budget together. It is a good budget.

And as I look at this from my perspective, the red flags that come up are that I see money in here from the privatization of the State stores, which I am absolutely against. I see no revenue in this budget from a reasonable and responsible tax on Marcellus Shale. On the human services side, they have done some good things. There is no money in there for the 10-percent cut that our counties have taken in human services. The waiting list, there is a little bit more money in the waiting list, but I think we could do a whole lot better. I had inserted an amendment in the budget when we did it a few weeks ago that would have added \$20 million into an Emergency Addiction Treatment Fund, which I think we so desperately, desperately need. That is not in there. The gentleman from Bucks County, my good colleague, has been talking about changes in the way special education is funded, which could potentially save our school districts \$300 to \$350 million, and I see that not reflected in this budget.

Now, again, when I look at this budget, it really is a safe vote. It is a safe vote. There are no tax increases in this budget. They have put additional revenue in most of our priorities – education and some of the other things, you know, special ed, pre-K, early childhood education, although I think that should really be a priority.

But, Mr. Speaker, my constituents elected me to come here to Harrisburg – and I am just speaking for myself – and not to play it safe, Mr. Speaker. I think that there is a whole lot more that we can do with this budget. And my good friend from Washington County, on occasion he has stood up in here – and I love it when he gets up, and rightfully so – and he says, "What about the taxpayers? What about the taxpayers?"

And we seem to be stuck at times into not raising taxes for no reason at all. How about a no-tax pledge like, "I promise not to raise taxes except when the health and the safety and the welfare of the constituents that I represent are in danger or jeopardy?"

And again, Mr. Speaker, they did a great job in putting this budget together. I think we can do better. I am going to be a "no" vote today on the budget. I do not know if the Governor is going to veto it. I know no more than what I read in the paper, and he said he is going to veto it. So we are going to come back here again, I guess, next week and the week after and work on a budget. But if the Governor vetoes it, I want to work together with the members of my caucus and the other caucus to try to come up— I am not in favor of what the Governor proposed. I think it is way too far, but I think there is a place in the middle that we can meet so we can have a responsible budget, and I am going to come up with a plan in the next week or two—

The SPEAKER. Sir, you will have to conclude. Thank you.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Next speaker, Representative Saccone.

Mr. SACCONI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Every year we agonize over passing a budget, trying to make a balance between how much services to provide and how much the taxpayers can afford, a budget that will spur economic growth and create jobs and propel our economy into prosperity.

Now, I have heard the other side comparing our budget with the Governor's proposal, and it reminds me of the words of Abraham Lincoln, who said, "What kills a skunk is the publicity it gives itself," because the Governor's proposal just did not pass the smell test – soaring tax increases, rewards to special interests. Nobody back home wanted that, and we could not even get a single vote in this chamber for that proposal. That is quite a feat, that is quite a feat, yet he is still out advocating that.

And I have heard it said today, oh, structural deficit, \$1.2 billion, \$1.6 billion, or whatever it is. Just remember, it was only 5 years ago that we came in here with a \$4 billion deficit. Since then five times we have brought forth a balanced no-tax increase, on-time, responsible budget after 8 years of disorganized and dysfunctional budgets under the Rendell administration.

Our budget respects the taxpayer. The Governor's budget proposal insulted them. Our budget eliminates the \$5 billion tax increase the Governor proposed, and that was just the first year; \$8 billion after that. A total of \$12 billion, \$13 billion of tax increases. No, Mr. Speaker, we will not continue to press down this crown of thorns on the head of the taxpayers like this Governor wants to do. The taxpayers are already weary from the heavy yoke of taxes. They are crying out for relief.

Now, I have said it before on this floor, but the stories keep repeating themselves every time I go back home. It is the same. It has not changed. Little old ladies tugging my elbow in the grocery store and at the bank and in the Post Office saying, "Rick, I just can't make it. I can't pay my bills. I'm living on less than \$1,000 a month, and yet I've got to pay all my bills and I've got to pay these crazy taxes and all these spending programs. I can't make it. Don't raise my taxes." Story after story, people asking me, please do not raise my taxes, and through their pain we can see the injustice of it all. What is the Governor's answer? Now make me bricks without straw. That is what the Governor wants. He does not care what the taxpayers – whether they can afford it or not. Just do it. Give me the spending – give me the money I need. That is his answer. But at the bottom of the heap is the taxpayer struggling to make ends meet while paying for those who insist that they have a right to the working man's money. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, beware of neglecting the taxpayer lest your favor will dwindle perilously lower than it is now.

Well, we have heard the call of the taxpayer, and they answer with a very responsible budget that provides the services we can afford without raising taxes. It has already been said, \$100 million increase for basic education, \$20 million increase for special ed, \$25 million for Pre-K Counts, \$127 million for intellectual disabilities, \$8 million for our veterans homes – and it goes on and on and on – \$1 million for the food banks. The Governor's proposal is built on sinking sand. Ours is built on the rock of fairness to those who bear the burden of paying it.

We are governing. I am proud to support this budget, and I encourage all the members to join me in voting "yes" on HB 1192. And I ask the Governor to sign it immediately and give the taxpayers the relief they need.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Mark Mustio.

Mr. MUSTIO. I think this is the second time I followed him.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Probably one of the nicest men, probably one of the nicest men in the history of this body is Representative Joe Markosek, the minority Appropriations chair – oh; it is going to get a little worse – but he has said repeatedly over the last 5 years, "one-time gimmick," "robbing Peter to pay Paul." I am a little bit confused how it can be a one-time gimmick for 5 years.

But I would like to take a moment to read an e-mail that came out yesterday. "To: Interested Parties" from the Governor's communications director, and it asks that we implement the following, and I want to let the Governor know when my constituents hear these words what they are hearing: "A commonsense severance tax to help fund our schools," tax the middle-class shale jobs out of PA; "Provide property tax relief to middle-class families and seniors," take \$30 million from the Quaker Valley School District, the Moon Area School District, the West Allegheny School District, and the Avonworth School District and send it to Philadelphia; "Fix Pennsylvania's structural...deficit without gimmicks," without gimmicks. We have heard that, without, without gimmicks.

Okay. Let us go to one of those without gimmicks. Here is a calculation of the proposed sales tax on fees, meals, textbooks, and this is for the private colleges and universities that have 178,058 students in Pennsylvania that do not get any taxpayer assistance out of this budget. Tax on meal plan costs, tax on books, the sales tax increase costs \$466, which generated \$83 million from families, hardworking families, many of whom, parents are working at these evil gas companies – right? – making middle-class wages so that they can afford to pay for their mortgage, which has property taxes to help fund our schools; so that they can pay their local wage tax to help pay the teachers in our schools; so that they can live in our communities and volunteer at our ballfields, volunteer at our churches, volunteer—

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

Mr. MUSTIO. This is what this budget—

Mr. DERMODY. I think he should be speaking on the bill that is before us, which is HB 1192.

The SPEAKER. Leader Dermody.

Mr. Mustio may proceed. We have not interrupted a single speaker here today. Everybody has had an opportunity to speak. There was a lot of latitude. There was a lot of latitude.

Mr. Mustio may proceed.

Mr. MUSTIO. I appreciate the comments of the minority leader.

My point is that this budget protects many millions of Pennsylvanians. Right now the cost of shale gas is very low, roughly – what? – between a buck 20, buck 50. Sixty cents it takes to move that gas through the lines. There is very little money there. So there is a lot of— My constituents have been laid off. Now we want from the Governor to tax them.

This budget protects, protects middle-class makers that are making taxes that we have seen an increase in PIT (personal income tax), in sales tax over this past year. This protects makers, not companies, people, people that take time to e-mail you, heartfelt e-mails, not boilerplate e-mails that are mass-produced by some special interest group. These are individual heartfelt stories on the impact if we get this wrong, if we get this wrong with this industry. If we get it right, all of you on that side of the aisle will be standing there taking claim at every ribbon-cutting there is in your community. All those that spoke against this budget and for shale tax, I invite all of you, all of you to a quarterly meeting of the companies in my district and meet real people, real people that volunteer in our communities, real people that go to church and tithe.

The SPEAKER. Sir.

Mr. MUSTIO. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. We are going to move towards the leaders at this time, unless anybody else wishes to speak. It will go Leader Dermody, Leader Reed, Appropriations Chair Markosek, and Appropriations Chair Adolph.

At this time Leader Dermody is invited to speak.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let us be clear: You started this budget discussion with a political stunt and not much has changed. This budget does not protect people. It punishes. It punishes children. It punishes Pennsylvania citizens with disabilities. It punishes Pennsylvania homeowners.

I heard this talk today that we ought to be responsible, and you are darn right, and the responsible thing to do is to adequately fund education for our children.

And you are right, we elected a Governor. Tom Wolf won the race, and he won because he committed to fund education adequately and he committed to do that with a fair and reasonable shale tax. That is the responsible thing to do. The responsible thing to do is to make sure Pennsylvania homeowners get the property tax they deserve, and the responsible thing to do is to tell Pennsylvanians the truth.

Finally, we have got an agreement that we have a structural budget deficit. That budget deficit was, you know, built up over the last 5 years. So now we do not have a surplus. We have got almost a \$2 billion problem that we have to address and we ought to be truthful with the citizens of Pennsylvania how we fix that, and it is not going to be with the five budgets, this being the fifth, that tries to solve our problems with, yes, gimmicks, smoke and mirrors, and one-time revenue sources. We need to be truthful with the people of the Commonwealth and tell them we do not solve our problem unless we have recurring sources of revenue so we can invest responsibly, we can invest in our children, we can invest in jobs and economic development, we can make sure that your property taxes do not continue to skyrocket because we do not adequately fund our schools, we let our test scores go down, and we turn our backs on our children. That is the end of those days.

Now, it is time we get serious. It is time we get serious to talk about how we want to invest in our children, in our citizens, and invest in jobs and economic development in this Commonwealth, and we will be here with you to talk about that when and if you ever want to get serious about solving Pennsylvania's problems. Governor Wolf wants to get serious. We want to get serious. It is time we get down to business and solve the problems of Pennsylvania with a responsible budget

that invests in the things, that invests in our future to make Pennsylvania move forward.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Majority Leader Dave Reed.

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

Here we are, June 27, attempting to move a budget forward to keep government working while we continue to negotiate a number of items in the weeks and months ahead.

I agree with my colleague, the minority leader, that it is time to get serious about some very serious decisions. When this body was sworn in the first Tuesday in January, I talked a little bit about a concept that I learned in graduate school at Penn, the difference between a political scientist and a political actor, and I talked about how "political scientists," generally defined, were not just academics but were folks who liked to banter back and forth about public policy. They like to talk about how the world should be, how the world could be if we lived in a utopian society and everybody agreed on the same definition of "perfect," what and how things should operate.

And then I talked a little bit about the political actor, the folks who debate public policy and talk about how the world could be, how the world should be, particularly if we could get everybody to agree on the same definition of "perfect." But the main difference between the two was very simple: The political scientist had no responsibility for actually making decisions, whereas, the political actor had to not just talk about how the world could be and should be, but had to actually make the decisions to make the world what it be. They had to make tough decisions, they had to make easy decisions, but they had to make decisions on public policy.

Sometimes I feel like over the last several months only one side of the aisle has stepped up to be political actors while the other side has become complacent over the last 5 years in being political scientists. They have sat out the budget process for 5 years now. It is time for both sides to come to the table and be willing to make the tough decisions.

It is always easy to find a reason to be no, particularly when somebody else will take the responsibility for governing. Our party and our side of the aisle has taken that responsibility. The closest we have gotten from the minority party to taking that responsibility is when, several weeks ago, they introduced for the first time the Governor's spending proposal. They were not willing to introduce the Governor's tax package, so we had to actually do that ourselves for them. And when they attempted to bring the spending package to the floor, we reminded them that we are not Washington, DC. We will not produce spending packages without the taxes to go with it, and required a vote on a tax package first. And lo and behold, when it came time to make a decision, when it came time to tell us how they were going to pay for their Governor's spending package, each and every one of them voted "no." So to stand up here today and act like we can have this utopian society where we can pay for every single thing of which we would like to spend but somehow we do not have to have the taxes to go along with it, it is absurd. It is living in a fantasy world. It gets back to this philosophy that some people believe that somehow this Capitol is connected to a rainbow, and at the end of that rainbow there is a pot of gold with a little leprechaun that is just chucking gold coins into that pot and will pay for these programs. That is just not true. That is how Washington, DC, got into record deficits. That is how our country became a mess. That will not be how we operate Harrisburg under our watch.

As I have said before, we want to have a discussion on education. We are spending \$27 billion on education in Pennsylvania; basic public education, \$27 billion. That is the sixth highest per-pupil spending in the entire country. This budget, though, adds to that total. We add \$200 million in educational investments, \$100 million for basic education K through 12, and we distributed through the new basic education funding formula from the commission's work over the last year. We add \$30 million, a record amount, to early childhood education. We add \$45 million to higher education as well.

Look, as I said at the beginning, it is June 27. This is not where I had hoped to be today. I had hoped to have a universal agreement with the Governor, our colleagues across the aisle, and both parties in the Senate, but we are not there. The Governor has alluded to progress being made. When we talk about public pension reform, I think it is accurate to say significant progress has been made in negotiations with the administration on public pension reform. The problem, though, outside of public pension reform, is that not a single item that the Governor proposed in March has been taken off the table, not a single one of the \$5 billion in new taxes this year and \$12 billion worth of new taxes next year, not a single spending item has been taken off the table from the administration. Give and take is required in all facets of the budget process. We need to get about the business of having that discussion sooner rather than later.

In the meantime, this government, this budget, while it may not be perfect and perhaps we would all write it just a little bit differently – I probably would do so, and probably each of you as well – this budget gives us an opportunity to indeed keep government working while we continue negotiations. Our children, our human services agencies, our State and school district employees do not need to be held hostage to the budget process while we continue to wrangle over on some very difficult public policy issues that have been bantered about for decades. There is only one person who will be shutting down government in the weeks ahead, and that decision lies with the Governor. He can very easily choose a couple lines to veto and continue the discussion forward. He can very easily choose not to interrupt the lives of everyday citizens while we get about the business of negotiating the next round of these budget discussions. We met our responsibility. We did so in a timely fashion. We are committed to a broad public policy debate going forward, but today, on this date, it is time to keep government working while those discussions continue.

I would ask the members to support HB 1192. Thank you.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. Mr. Murt, for what purpose do you rise?

Mr. MURT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit some remarks in favor of the budget document before us.

The SPEAKER. Yes; we will accept those. Thank you.

Mr. MURT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

No budget is a perfect document, and neither is the one before us, but this budget plan we have before us is not devoid of positive attributes either.

When this process started back in February, I told Chairman Adolph I would not be able to support this or any budget unless we increased the investment we make in our brothers and sisters who suffer from intellectual and developmental disabilities and autism.

For a moment I want to call our attention to this component of the budget. Mr. Speaker, a waiver for a family who cares for an adult child with special needs affords such a family with the funds they need to care for their son or daughter. These funds pay for transportation, housing, health care, and all other items needed to care for an adult with an intellectual or developmental disability or autism.

In the budget that is before us, under the intellectual disability waiver program, we add \$4.967 million in State funds to serve 600 new special education graduates. These are young men and women who have been trained to a high degree of preparedness in their high schools and will be entering the work world. As a result of this budget, they will not be going on the waiting list.

In this budget, we also add \$4.637 million to serve an additional 400 consumers who have intellectual and developmental disabilities who are on the emergency waiting list; \$396,000 to serve 75 individuals who currently live in our 5 State centers in Hamburg, Polk, Ebensburg, White Haven, and Selinsgrove; \$372,000 to serve an additional 50 adult consumers with autism; and \$10.372 million in additional State funds.

The SPEAKER. The Appropriations chair, beginning with the minority Appropriations chair, Representative Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the members have heard my previous remarks, and I was just listening to the majority leader in his remarks about negotiating a budget. What we have in front of us here right now is a budget negotiated by his caucus and the Republican Caucus in the Senate. The Democratic Caucus in the House and the Democratic Caucus in the Senate have not been a part of this. We have reached out, in spite of what he says. There have been meetings, there have been plenty of meetings with the Governor, with the Appropriations chairman, with the Republican leadership of the House, with the Democratic leadership of the House, with all four leadership teams and the Governor.

And the Governor, keep in mind, 7 months ago ran on what he thought Pennsylvanians wanted the most: basic funding for education to be paid for, the additional funding to be paid for by a reasonable Marcellus severance tax. He ran and won on that. The polls show, the polls show that that is where the people of Pennsylvania still are, and we have been talking about this. And do you know the answer that we got when the Governor threw those things out and said, "Come on, let's talk"? We basically got a feeling from the other side that their interest was liquor privatization. That is what we got back. That was their priority, liquor privatization, instead of educating kids, instead of solving the property tax issue. Now, I will give the majority leader and all of the members in this chamber a lot of credit, because we did here in the House deal with a property tax issue, and we have now sent it over to the Senate, but they obviously – so far at least – have ignored it. It is not part of this.

Two nights ago we got this sent to us. I had to have my staff working there all night trying to go through line by line, and that is not unusual. That is what they do, and God love them, that is what, you know, they know they do and they do a good

job with it, but this is what we have now here at the eleventh hour. We could have negotiated a budget by now, just as he says, and we are going to have to do that now past the deadline, and to blame us for that when what we heard loud and clear from the other side was the most important thing in Pennsylvania right now is liquor privatization instead of educating kids.

And then we come up with this particular plan that we have in front of us that has a whole host of ideas of funding sources that are unsustainable, unsustainable. For example, you look at just the revenue, that additional revenue that has come in, the unexpected little higher revenue this year. A lot of that is from unsustainable sources, the so-called escheat situation. That is a one-time, for the most part, source of funding. That is what got us into this situation that we have here 5 years ago. Yes, gimmicks. I will say it again. It is not that I am saying the same thing over and over again, it is that the other side is doing the same thing over and over and over and over again.

Now, the fifth straight time that we have had a budget like this where we have just basically had unsustainable sources of funding, and you wonder why, and you wonder why we have a structural budget deficit. And when you look at that, and we all know – and I have said it before – we all know what the cost drivers are in Pennsylvania, and they are not going away and they are significant, and a lot of them are not our fault. There are things that we do not necessarily have in plan, but they are Federal matches for Medicaid and things like that, and then, of course, we throw in the pension payments that we all know about and we have to address that situation. So we have all these cost drivers, but what are we doing to solve it? We come up with this budget that basically breaks us even for 1 year, scares the heck out of me for what is down the road because of all the future cost drivers.

And you talk about Washington. Well, one thing I know that people do not like about Washington is because they keep kicking the can down the road. What do we call this? What do we call this? This is the biggest kick the can down the road that Pennsylvania has done in many years. That is exactly what we are doing. We are not coming up with good reasons and suggestions for funding. We are kicking the can down the road with all of these one-time gimmicks, if you will, these gimmicks that will not solve our problem and will just create a bigger problem next year and the years after. This Governor has taken the steps and he has said, look, no more of that; no more of that. Let us get some good, honest projects and sources of funding on the table. Let us negotiate them. He is willing to negotiate. He understands that he is not going to get everything he wants. We all know that, but we have not even started that process. I look forward to starting that process after this particular effort is no longer with us.

And again, I would just remind everybody again because I think it fits, you know the Nat King Cole song when he said, "Unforgettable, that's what you are"? If he was singing about this budget, he would say, "Unsustainable, that's what it is."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Chairman Bill Adolph.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I thank the ladies and gentlemen of the House for giving us the opportunity to put in front of you today what I believe, and many of you believe, is a very sustainable, workable budget for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I appreciate the opportunity to work with Chairman Markosek and his members of Appropriations, but at this time I would be very remiss if I did not thank our staff for the hours of hard work that they put in.

I would just like to remind the minority leader regarding the structural deficit that we were faced with 4 years ago of over \$4 billion. The Governor, Chairman Markosek, Chairman Browne, Chairman Hughes, and Governor Wolf all agreed several weeks ago that the structural deficit as of June 1 was \$1.2 billion. That is a decrease in the structural deficit. Last year, to the taxpayers' credit of Pennsylvania, we will have close to a half a billion dollars more revenue brought into this State than what was projected by this House of Representatives. That is not gimmicks. That is actual tax money, actual cash that has come in to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. No gimmicks; actual tax revenue. You take that \$500 million in cash plus the \$1 billion in structural deficit that did not exist, all of a sudden you are up to \$1.5 billion in real money. Once again, doing what the taxpayers of Pennsylvania have asked us to do – be responsible, be bright, be inventive. We have looked around the entire Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and we were able once again to bring together a sustainable, responsible budget in balance with no new taxes to our hardworking people and families of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, for the fifth year in a row my good friend, Chairman Markosek, and the members of the House Democratic Party once again have not introduced a budget. If you are not willing to pay for Governor Wolf's budget, you should have been responsible in preparing your own budget. This is the only option that is going to pass this House because you did not have an option. When you had an opportunity to pay for Governor Wolf's budget, you did not vote for it.

I urge you to please vote for HB 1192 and keep this Commonwealth of Pennsylvania moving forward. Thank you very much.

MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION UNDER RULE 24

The SPEAKER. For a motion, the majority leader is recognized.

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

We would ask the members, now that the debate has concluded on HB 1192, for a motion to proceed for immediate consideration of HB 1192. Thank you.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. Representative Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would also urge the members to support a motion to proceed.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—169

Adolph	Fabrizio	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Farina	Kotik	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Farry	Krieger	Reed
Bishop	Fee	Lawrence	Regan
Bizzarro	Flynn	Lewis	Roebuck
Bloom	Frankel	Longietti	Ross
Boback	Gainey	Mackenzie	Rozzi
Boyle	Galloway	Maher	Saccone
Bradford	Gergely	Mahoney	Sainato
Briggs	Gillespie	Major	Sankey
Brown, R.	Gingrich	Maloney	Santarsiero
Brown, V.	Godshall	Markosek	Santora
Caltagirone	Goodman	Marshall	Saylor
Carroll	Greiner	Marsico	Schemel
Causar	Grove	Masser	Schlossberg
Christiana	Hahn	McCarter	Schreiber
Cohen	Hanna	McGinnis	Schweyer
Corbin	Harhai	McNeill	Simmons
Costa, D.	Harhart	Mentzer	Sims
Cox	Harkins	Metcalfe	Sonney
Cruz	Harper	Miccarelli	Staats
Culver	Harris, A.	Millard	Stephens
Cutler	Heffley	Miller, B.	Sturla
Daley, M.	Helm	Moul	Taylor
Daley, P.	Hennessey	Murt	Thomas
Davis	Hickernell	Mustio	Tobash
Dawkins	Hill	Nesbit	Toepel
Day	Irvin	O'Brien	Toohil
Dean	James	O'Neill	Topper
Deasy	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Vereb
DeLissio	Kampf	Ortitay	Vitali
Delozier	Kaufar	Parker, C.	Ward
Dermody	Kauffman	Parker, D.	Warner
DiGirolamo	Kavulich	Pashinski	Watson
Donatucci	Keller, F.	Payne	Wentling
Driscoll	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Wheeland
Dunbar	Keller, W.	Petrarca	White
Dush	Killion	Petri	Youngblood
Ellis	Kim	Pickett	Zimmerman
Emrick	Kinsey	Quigley	
Evankovich	Kirkland	Quinn	Turzai,
Evans	Klunk	Rader	Speaker
Everett	Knowles	Rapp	

NAYS—20

Acosta	English	Metzgar	Roae
Burns	Freeman	Miller, D.	Samuelson
Conklin	Gibbons	Milne	Snyder
Davidson	Gillen	Mullery	Tallman
Diamond	Matzie	Neuman	Truitt

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Baker	DeLuca	Harris, J.	Reese
Barbin	Gabler	Pyle	Wheatley
Costa, P.			

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

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—112

Adolph	Grove	Marsico	Ross
Barrar	Hahn	Masser	Saccone
Benninghoff	Harhart	Mentzer	Sankey
Bloom	Harper	Metcalfe	Santora
Boback	Harris, A.	Metzgar	Saylor
Brown, R.	Heffley	Miccarelli	Schemel
Causar	Helm	Millard	Simmons
Christiana	Hennessey	Miller, B.	Sonney
Corbin	Hickernell	Milne	Staats
Cox	Hill	Moul	Stephens
Culver	Irvin	Murt	Tallman
Cutler	James	Mustio	Taylor
Day	Jozwiak	Nesbit	Tobash
Delozier	Kampf	O'Neill	Toepel
Diamond	Kaufar	Oberlander	Toohil
Dunbar	Kauffman	Ortitay	Topper
Dush	Keller, F.	Parker, D.	Truitt
Ellis	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Vereb
Emrick	Killion	Peifer	Ward
English	Klunk	Petri	Warner
Evankovich	Knowles	Pickett	Watson
Everett	Krieger	Quigley	Wentling
Farry	Lawrence	Quinn	Wheeland
Fee	Lewis	Rader	White
Gillen	Mackenzie	Rapp	Zimmerman
Gillespie	Maher	Reed	
Gingrich	Major	Regan	Turzai,
Godshall	Maloney	Roae	Speaker
Greiner	Marshall		

NAYS—77

Acosta	Deasy	Harkins	Parker, C.
Bishop	DeLissio	Kavulich	Pashinski
Bizzarro	Dermody	Keller, W.	Petrarca
Boyle	DiGirolamo	Kim	Ravenstahl
Bradford	Donatucci	Kinsey	Readshaw
Briggs	Driscoll	Kirkland	Roebuck
Brown, V.	Evans	Kortz	Rozzi
Burns	Fabrizio	Kotik	Sainato
Caltagirone	Farina	Longietti	Samuelson
Carroll	Flynn	Mahoney	Santarsiero
Cohen	Frankel	Markosek	Schlossberg
Conklin	Freeman	Matzie	Schreiber
Costa, D.	Gainey	McCarter	Schweyer
Cruz	Galloway	McGinnis	Sims
Daley, M.	Gergely	McNeill	Snyder
Daley, P.	Gibbons	Miller, D.	Sturla
Davidson	Goodman	Mullery	Thomas
Davis	Hanna	Neuman	Vitali
Dawkins	Harhai	O'Brien	Youngblood
Dean			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Baker	DeLuca	Harris, J.	Reese
Barbin	Gabler	Pyle	Wheatley
Costa, P.			

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.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does Mr. Hanna rise?

Mr. HANNA. To submit some remarks for the record.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. Those will be accepted.

Mr. HANNA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to HB 1192 offered by the gentleman from Delaware County.

Throughout this entire budget process, Governor Wolf and House Democrats have consistently focused on restoring cuts and boosting investment in education, providing statewide property tax relief for the middle class and senior citizens, and closing the structural budget deficit without gimmicks. These are the items the people of Pennsylvania told us they need and still stand by those same priorities today. Another status quo Republican budget will not accomplish any of these goals.

Yesterday members on the other side of the aisle turned to the same old gimmicks they used in their previous four budgets. In response, Governor Wolf was very adamant when he stated that if this language shows up on his desk, he will veto the entire budget.

Narrow-minded interests and status quo proposals will not improve our current system, and neither will marginal increases in education funding. Might I remind you, Mr. Speaker, the State System of Higher Education's 14 universities are the only 4-year universities with a statutory mandate to provide high-quality education at the lowest cost possible to students. Under the Governor's proposal, institutions of higher education, including community colleges, State-related universities, and the State System of Higher Education, would see increases between 7 and 11 percent. Yet this Republican budget proposal falls short by only proposing a 3-percent increase in funding, which will undoubtedly lead to tuition increases.

Budgeting is all about priorities, and it is clear that the GOP's priorities are out of whack. House Democrats and the Governor value an adequately funded educational system, property tax relief, and a better Pennsylvania for everyone.

Once more, it is extremely disappointing to see the Republicans push for more of the same. We cannot and will not give up on the people of Pennsylvania. We have an obligation to have real conversations about how to move Pennsylvania forward, and this is not productive by any means. These gimmicks prove that Republicans are not interested in a real commitment to education funding, fixing our structural deficit, or addressing property tax relief for the people of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, we all want a responsible, structurally balanced budget passed on time, but offering a budget proposal 4 days before the deadline, while shortchanging the people of Pennsylvania just to advance a political agenda, is not in the best interest of the people of Pennsylvania.

As I have said before, we need the votes, you need the Governor. Period.

Vote "no" on HB 1192.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Chairman Marsico.

Mr. MARSICO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a committee announcement.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. Please, members.

Chairman Marsico.

Mr. MARSICO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Tomorrow, Sunday, the Judiciary Committee will meet in 205 Ryan Building at 2:30 to consider SB 166, SB 210, SB 663, and SB 747. That is tomorrow, 2:30, 205 Ryan.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. There will be a Judiciary Committee meeting tomorrow at 2:30 in room 205, Ryan Office Building.

BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

SB 1, PN 1132 (Amended)

By Rep. METCALFE

An Act amending Titles 24 (Education), 51 (Military Affairs) and 71 (State Government) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, extensively revising pension provisions: for the Public School Employees' Retirement System, in the areas of preliminary provisions, of membership, contributions and benefits, of School Employee's Defined Contribution Plan and of administration and miscellaneous provisions; for health insurance for retired school employees, in the area of preliminary provisions; for military pensions, in the area of military leave of absence; for boards and offices, in the area of Independent Fiscal Office; for the State Employees' Retirement System, in the areas of preliminary provisions, of membership, credited service, classes of service and eligibility for benefits, of State Employees' Defined Contribution Plan, of contributions, of benefits and of administration, funds, accounts, general provisions; and providing, as to the revisions, for construction and administration, for applicability, for funding, for liability, for State Employee member statements and for State Employees Retirement Board obligations.

STATE GOVERNMENT.

OBJECTION TO COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader, Frank Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to object to the report of the State Government Committee containing SB 1.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has raised an objection to the report of the committee on SB 1. Pursuant to the provisions of section 676 of Mason's Manual, the House shall decide whether a committee report is properly reported.

On the question,

Shall the House accept the report of the State Government Committee?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Dermody.

Members are only permitted to speak once on this question.

Representative Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this morning at approximately 9:30 a motion to move the previous question was made in the State Government Committee to cut off debate on SB 1. Mr. Speaker, any motion to cut off debate in committee is explicitly prohibited by Mason's Manual, and as such, violates our House rules.

Mr. Speaker, Mason's Manual, section 632, provides that, and I quote, "...no motions to close or limit debate are allowed" in committee. It says, "...no motions to close or limit debate are allowed" in committee. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, in clear violation of this rule, a motion to cut off debate was made in committee, and SB 1, a bill that makes massive changes to our

State's public pension system and impacts one out of every six households in Pennsylvania, was railroaded through committee.

Mr. Speaker, Democratic members of the committee were not handed the amendments to be considered until they were walking into the room, and the chairman moved to cut off debate after only a half hour, even though members were not scheduled to go back into session for another hour and a half. It is clear that Democratic members of the committee and the public were intentionally left in the dark in what is in SB 1 before today's committee vote was taken. Democratic members of the committee were intentionally denied the opportunity to speak and cast an informed vote. Worse yet, this was done in clear violation of our House rules.

I move to object to the report of the State Government Committee and send SB 1 back to committee so that we can, one, enforce our rules, and so that we could undo a wrong and all the members of the State Government Committee can have a full, transparent, and informed vote on SB 1.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Cutler, on the question of the objection to the committee report, sir.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, when reviewing the State Government Committee actions earlier today, I happened to be in the back of the room. I would like to point out a couple of additional facts that I believe are necessary for this debate so that the House can make an appropriate decision on it.

During the consideration of the first amendment, after some debate and some dilatory motions, a member moved the previous question on that amendment. I think it is worth noting that while a time was scheduled for 2 hours of debate, the gentleman, who was the chairman, was attempting to preserve additional time for consideration of the additional five Democratic amendments as well as the remaining three Republican amendments.

Mr. Speaker, to clarify this action as inappropriate under our House rules actually is an inaccurate representation of our rules. Our rules clearly state, "RULE 78 Parliamentary Authority," that "Mason's Manual supplemented by Jefferson's Manual of Legislative Procedure shall be the parliamentary authority of the House, if applicable and not inconsistent with the Constitution of Pennsylvania, the laws of Pennsylvania applicable to the General Assembly, the Rules of the House, the established precedents of the House and the established customs and usages of the House."

Mr. Speaker, in this particular debate, we never arrived in Mason's Manual, because when you review the past practice of the House for several sessions now, we have recognized the use of the motion for previous question during a standing committee meeting, particularly as noted, to preserve time so that additional amendments, which the Democrats had filed, could in fact be considered. Mason's Manual therefore is only supplement to the past rules and procedures of the House, and they take precedence.

Mr. Speaker, the minority members of the committee left the room and did not return. And furthermore, I would point out that their amendments were called up for consideration. The remaining 15 committee members were in place; 14 committee members are a quorum requirement, and they dutifully continued the meeting.

Mr. Speaker, under House rule 49, once bills are reported out of the committee, the votes are posted on the Internet, and under House rule 52, the member assigned to report the bill to the House must take the report on the same day, which is the process that we are now entered in, and failure to comply shall be reported to the House.

Under House rule 45, a committee report must be "...acted upon by a majority vote of the members of a standing committee present at a committee..." meeting with a quorum present. The majority vote must be "...at least 12 members..."

Mr. Speaker, all of these criteria were met, and we should accept the report and oppose this motion. Thank you.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Leader Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I just heard, I think the argument is that because we broke the rules in the past, we can break them now. I mean, the rule is that you cannot cut off debate in the committee, and there is a reason to have that rule. It is the time that the bill can be vetted properly, and the Democratic members left because they were not allowed to speak, and that is what we should do. And we should protect for the future the ability of our committees to have an open and honest debate on bills. That is what this is about.

Mr. CUTLER. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Mr. Speaker, the only point that I would highlight is the fact that our prior rules take precedence over Mason's Manual, which the gentleman is relying on, and all of the rules were appropriately followed.

I would urge a defeat of this motion. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Samuelson.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

May I interrogate the majority whip? He is talking about the rules being followed. I have the rules in my hands. Does he wish to be interrogated on his previous statement or does he wish not to be interrogated on his previous statement?

The SPEAKER. Representative Samuelson, sir, typically on a motion – this is not a bill in front of us. If you want to speak, given your perspective on the rules, you are more than free to do so, and please feel free to do so and at your leisure, but to interrogate somebody on their perspective on the rules and how they outline it is not a standard, it is just not the standard way of operating on the floor.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Is the majority whip declining to be interrogated?

The SPEAKER. Sir, it is my ruling that, really, you can proceed in telling us your perspective on the rules—

Mr. SAMUELSON. Okay.

The SPEAKER. —which is perfectly legitimate, by the way; completely appropriate. Interrogation is when you want to find out about what a bill says or something about a particular bill or an amendment.

Mr. SAMUELSON. I would like to speak on this motion.

The SPEAKER. You certainly may, sir.

Representative Samuelson, on the objection to the committee report. Sir.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you.

The majority whip, the gentleman from Lancaster, just said that Mason's Manual and Jefferson's Manual are not applicable in this situation because they are superseded by the rules of the

House. Well, we all have a copy of the rules of the House in our desks, and if you turn to rule 61, it is all about moving the previous question: "A motion for the previous question, seconded by 20 members...." Wait a second. How many members in the State Government Committee seconded the motion this morning? The rules clearly say that 20 members are necessary to second the motion. Only 5 seconded the motion this morning, so that is in violation of rule 61, which requires 20 members, which, actually, rule 61 talks about moving the previous question on the floor of the House. Rule 61 is silent on the question of moving the previous question in a committee. You can look at all the rules from 1 to 78, and there is nothing in here, nothing in here about moving the previous question in a committee. So the will of the House adopted on swearing-in day 2015 – all of us voted for these rules of the House – does not provide for a procedure where debate can be cut off in a committee and debate can be shut down in a committee. It is not provided for.

In rule 61 there is a procedure if 20 members of the House, sustained by a majority vote, want to cut off debate in the House of Representatives. I think that has happened four times in the 16 – I am sorry; it happened four times in the first 12 years I was here. It happened quite a bit in the last 4 years, where debate was shut off on the floor of this House. But the procedure is clearly spelled out that, yes, if you want to cut off debate and not allow people to talk, not allow an issue to be discussed, you can do it by rule 61, but you need 20 members of the House to stand up. There were only five members of the House to stand up in the State Government Committee this morning. So how could the State Government Committee debate be cut off if the rules do not provide for it?

Let me venture to say, with what the majority whip said, if the rules do not spell it out, then you go back to Jefferson's Manual and Mason's Manual. And the minority leader clearly said that Mason's Manual is explicit on this point that debate cannot be shut off in a committee, and since our rules are silent on it, we have to go with what is in Mason's Manual. Shutting off debate in a committee is not permitted.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative John Maher.

Members, if we might, please. Representative Maher has the floor, and then after this, Representative DeLissio has also asked to speak on the motion to object to the report.

Representative Maher, the floor is yours.

Mr. MAHER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The prior speaker is quite correct that rule 61 specifically provides that if a motion to move the previous question occurs on the House floor, it requires 20 members to second. The rules also provide that a motion to move the previous question is a privileged motion, meaning that it rises to the top of order compared to some other questions that might be before the chamber.

What the House rule does is that if this happens on the House floor, it is the only motion that requires 20 to second on the House floor. A motion to reconsider a vote requires two people to make that motion, but otherwise, our rules do not require anyone to second any motion. So what is unusual in our rules is that if this motion is made on the House floor, it requires 20 people to second it. The rules do not burden the committees with a similar standard of requiring any extra members to make the motion to move the previous question.

The rules as to the privilege of motions do carry to the committees, and the motion to move the previous question, as is the other sequence of privileged motions, does apply at a committee level, but rule 61 clearly only applies with the superseconding requirement on the House floor.

So on this arcane question of whether or not a motion to move the previous question, if I had been at this meeting, which I was not because I am not on that committee, my view would have been that the motion to move the previous question in committee as a privileged motion provided for under our House rules would require no additional seconds other than what would ordinarily be required in committee, and by tradition in most committees, that is a motion and a second.

So as characterized in the debate to this point, I think it is entirely appropriate that the motion to move the previous question, which is provided for in our rules as a privileged motion, was undertaken at a committee meeting, and the fashion it was done probably was belts and suspenders by having five individuals second when one should have been sufficient.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative DeLissio.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wish I were very, very, very familiar with the rules and understand and understood a lot of this procedural back and forth, and then there are other times that I wonder, why bother, because I think our rules might as well start out with the phrase "once upon a time." We seem to make this up as it fits the situation, and I am not sure I could keep up with that.

But what I can and would like to share on the record today, because I was indeed at that committee meeting this morning, was that my motion to ask for a recess to review that 11-page amendment was voted down along party lines. That was procedurally correct, rather straightforward, although somewhat not in line with our representative democracy. So when we talk about allowing ample time for the other amendments, which I believe do not even total five pages total and are not full pages, three or four of those, which were Democratic amendments which we actually had, so it was the 11-page amendment that was described to have made major changes to the legislation, that is what started the discussion. So, Mr. Speaker, I need to go on the record here today to say that that allowance to ensure sufficient time for those additional very small, inconsequential types of amendments is not a meaningful argument.

I want to go on the record to say that the constituents of the 194th did not have their voices heard today in that State Government Committee meeting because somebody started invoking rules that clearly start with "once upon a time."

The SPEAKER. Representative Thomas, Representative Curtis Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, an earlier speaker made it very clear that there are no provisions in the rules for moving the previous question in a committee setting. Mr. Speaker, you know and we know that the motion to move the previous question is a nuclear weapon. It is a nuclear weapon to silence an equal member, and so it should never have any application to a committee meeting, and that is why it is not mentioned.

And it is unfortunate that— I have been here 20-plus years. In the last 2 years we have seen the motion to move the previous question on the floor more than we have in the history

of this institution, because, Mr. Speaker, more often than not, instead of respecting the dignity of one another, we are using the rules to be mean-spirited to one another, and, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is why we came here. And so the reason that this should go back to the committee is because it was out of order, out of time, and it disrespected the dignity of the members of that committee, Republicans and Democrats.

On this moving the previous question, it is not a D or R issue that we have ownership of. We know when we use it, we know why we use it, and we know that it is wrong to use it in a committee setting. And to that end, Mr. Speaker, I ask you to exercise your stewardship. I ask the majority leader, the Democratic – let me stop.

Let me ask the chairman, the majority chairman of the committee to do the right thing and take this back and do it right.

And I ask all committee chairmen, minority and majority, do not exercise a motion to move the previous question in a committee setting, because that in and of itself will promote divisiveness, meanness, and an assault on the integrity of every member in that committee.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask, I ask each and every member, especially committee leadership, to not exercise that weapon in a committee setting, and I ask the majority chairman of the State Government Committee to take that back and do it the right way and respect the dignity of his members, both Republican and Democrat.

The SPEAKER. Representative Bob Freeman.

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Dermody motion to object to the report of SB 1 from the State Government Committee.

I was not going to speak on this, but after hearing the comments of the gentleman from Allegheny County that somehow since moving the previous question is a privileged motion, therefore, it applies in the case of committees – do not get me wrong, I enjoy great works of fiction as much as the next person.

However, the reality is that the only reference to using the motion for the previous question is covered in House rule 61, and House rule 61 is very specific, as the gentleman, Mr. Samuelson, has pointed out. It requires 20 seconds from members of this body, and it brings debate to a close and the House to an immediate vote – the House to an immediate vote, not a committee of the House, but the House to an immediate vote.

As was pointed out by the gentleman, Mr. Samuelson, in the absence of anything specific on the use of the motion to move the previous question for committees, we are then compelled under our own rules of this House to rely on Mason's Manual, which clearly prohibits that kind of motion being used within committee.

We need to stand in favor of the integrity of our rules. If we lose this, if we lose the integrity of our rules, we lose the integrity of this place. I urge a "yes" vote for the motion to object to the report.

The SPEAKER. Representative McCarter.

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

I also want to note my objection to the reporting of State Government Committee reporting of SB 1 as amended.

As already noted, the members of the committee on the minority side were presented with a series of amendments 3 minutes before the committee met today at 9 a.m. Mr. Speaker, we know that the committee chair, however, had several of these amendments yesterday because of the dating on the forms themselves, but never forwarded these amendments to the Democratic committee members or our staff, while Republican members were given those amendments with an analysis.

As noted by the committee chair and committee counsel, the amendments contained significant changes to SB 1, and yet we were given a scant 3 minutes to deal with the issue, even though they had far-reaching fiscal impact, and at the same time never gave us the opportunity, even under points of order, to be able to ferret out exactly where the rationale was for moving the process in the way that the committee chairman was moving.

Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable. This is the People's House. It is a bastion of democracy in Pennsylvania. This nondemocratic behavior, however, by the majority chairman of the committee surely cannot reflect the majority of the members on the majority side of the floor, because no other chairman on any other committee that I serve, and I believe everybody else in here serves, acts in this fashion. This is an embarrassment to every member of this chamber.

The SPEAKER. Those who believe the committee report is properly reported will be voting "aye"; those who do not believe it is properly reported will be voting "nay."

On the question recurring,

Shall the House accept the report of the State Government Committee?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Also, Representative Wheatley has been put back on the master roll for the day.

OBJECTION TO COMMITTEE REPORT CONTINUED

On the question recurring,

Shall the House accept the report of the State Government Committee?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—114

Adolph	Greiner	Marshall	Roae
Barrar	Grove	Marsico	Ross
Benninghoff	Hahn	Masser	Saccone
Bloom	Harhart	McGinnis	Sankey
Boback	Harper	Mentzer	Santora
Brown, R.	Harris, A.	Metcalfe	Saylor
Causar	Heffley	Metzgar	Schemel
Christiana	Helm	Miccarelli	Simmons
Corbin	Hennessey	Millard	Sonney
Cox	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Staats
Culver	Hill	Milne	Stephens
Cutler	Irvin	Moul	Tallman

Day	James	Murt	Taylor
DeLozier	Jozwiak	Mustio	Tobash
Diamond	Kampf	Nesbit	Toepel
DiGirolamo	Kaufer	O'Neill	Toohil
Dunbar	Kauffman	Oberlander	Topper
Dush	Keller, F.	Ortitay	Truitt
Ellis	Keller, M.K.	Parker, D.	Vereb
Emrick	Killion	Payne	Ward
English	Klunk	Peifer	Warner
Evankovich	Knowles	Petri	Watson
Everett	Krieger	Pickett	Wentling
Farry	Lawrence	Quigley	Wheeland
Fee	Lewis	Quinn	White
Gillen	Mackenzie	Rader	Zimmerman
Gillespie	Maher	Rapp	
Gingrich	Major	Reed	Turzai,
Godshall	Maloney	Regan	Speaker

NAYS—76

Acosta	Dean	Harkins	Pashinski
Bishop	Deasy	Kavulich	Petrarca
Bizzarro	DeLissio	Keller, W.	Ravenstahl
Boyle	Dermody	Kim	Readshaw
Bradford	Donatucci	Kinsey	Roebuck
Briggs	Driscoll	Kirkland	Rozzi
Brown, V.	Evans	Kortz	Sainato
Burns	Fabrizio	Kotik	Samuelson
Caltagirone	Farina	Longiotti	Santarsiero
Carroll	Flynn	Mahoney	Schlossberg
Cohen	Frankel	Markosek	Schreiber
Conklin	Freeman	Matzie	Schweyer
Costa, D.	Gainey	McCarter	Sims
Cruz	Galloway	McNeill	Snyder
Daley, M.	Gergely	Miller, D.	Sturla
Daley, P.	Gibbons	Mullery	Thomas
Davidson	Goodman	Neuman	Vitali
Davis	Hanna	O'Brien	Wheatley
Dawkins	Harhai	Parker, C.	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Baker	Costa, P.	Gabler	Pyle
Barbin	DeLuca	Harris, J.	Reese

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the report of the State Government Committee was accepted by the House.

The SPEAKER. The clerk will read the report.

BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

SB 1, PN 1132 (Amended)

By Rep. METCALFE

An Act amending Titles 24 (Education), 51 (Military Affairs) and 71 (State Government) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, extensively revising pension provisions: for the Public School Employees' Retirement System, in the areas of preliminary provisions, of membership, contributions and benefits, of School Employee's Defined Contribution Plan and of administration and miscellaneous provisions; for health insurance for retired school employees, in the area of preliminary provisions; for military pensions, in the area of military leave of absence; for boards and offices, in the area of Independent Fiscal Office; for the State Employees' Retirement System, in the areas of preliminary provisions, of membership, credited service, classes of service and eligibility for benefits, of State Employees' Defined Contribution Plan, of contributions, of benefits and of administration, funds, accounts, general provisions; and

providing, as to the revisions, for construction and administration, for applicability, for funding, for liability, for State Employee member statements and for State Employees Retirement Board obligations.

STATE GOVERNMENT.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER. The clerk will read the following supplemental reports from the Committee on Committees.

The following reports were read:

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

In the House of Representatives,
June 27, 2015

Resolved that,

Representative Rozzi, Berks County, is elected a member of the Human Services Committee.

Respectfully submitted,
Rep. Mike O'Brien
Chairman
Committee on Committees

* * *

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

In the House of Representatives,
June 27, 2015

Resolved that,

Representative Youngblood, Philadelphia County, is elected a member of the Human Services Committee.

Respectfully submitted,
Rep. Mike O'Brien
Chairman
Committee on Committees

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolutions?
Resolutions were adopted.

LABOR AND INDUSTRY COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Representative Mauree Gingrich, the chair of Labor and Industry, is called for an announcement.

Mrs. GINGRICH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to issue a reminder, please, to the members of the Labor and Industry Committee. At the call of the Chair, we will have a meeting tomorrow in room G-50 to consider one bill, and thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Labor and Industry Committee will meet at the call of the Chair tomorrow to consider one bill in room G-50.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Representative John Maher is called upon.

Mr. MAHER. An announcement, Mr. Speaker.

The Environmental Resources and Energy Committee will meet Monday at 11 a.m. in room G-50, Irvis Office Building.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Environmental Resources and Energy Committee will meet Monday at 11 a.m. in room G-50, Irvis Office Building

BILLS RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that the following bills be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations:

HB 561;
HB 1154;
HB 1278;
HB 1279;
SB 438; and
SB 538.

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

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that the following bills be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar:

SB 330;
SB 655;
SB 687; and
SB 688.

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

CALENDAR CONTINUED

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 824**, **PN 1565**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 35 (Health and Safety) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in miscellaneous provisions, providing for confidentiality of personal information of public safety officials.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 824 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 824 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

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. Members, we are adjourning at the motion of Representative Kathy Watson to tomorrow, Sunday, June 28, 2015, at 3 p.m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the motion?
Motion was agreed to, and at 3:34 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.