

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

TUESDAY, JULY 1, 2008

SESSION OF 2008

192D OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 52

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 2 p.m., e.d.t.

THE SPEAKER (DENNIS M. O'BRIEN) PRESIDING

PRAYER

The SPEAKER. The prayer will be offered by Representative Grucela.

HON. RICHARD GRUCELA, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we thank You for the gift of this new day. We thank You for the sleep which has refreshed us and for the chance to begin life anew today.

We welcome this new day as Your gift to us and ask Your guidance as we accept the challenges and burdens of this day – its joys, its sorrows, its responsibilities, and its rewards.

This day is full of promise and opportunity; may we waste none of it. This day is full of mystery of the unknown; please help us to face it without fear or anxiety. This day is full of beauty and adventure; help us to be fully alive to it all.

Bless this day with good health for our members and especially their families, those we love, and all Your children. When night comes, may we look back upon this day without regrets, and may no one be unhappy because of anything we may have done or anything we failed to do.

To us all, grant Your provisions for our needs today and the grace to see this day in the light of eternity. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, approval of the Journal of Monday, June 30, 2008, will be postponed until printed. The Chair hears no objection.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair turns to requests for leaves of absence.

The majority and minority leaders indicate there are no requests.

Members will report to the floor.

MASTER ROLL CALL

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

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—203

Adolph	Gabig	Markosek	Rohrer
Argall	Galloway	Marshall	Ross
Baker	Geist	Marsico	Rubley
Barrar	George	McCall	Sabatina
Bastian	Gerber	McGeehan	Sainato
Bear	Gergely	McI. Smith	Samuelson
Belfanti	Gibbons	McIlhattan	Santoni
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Melio	Saylor
Bennington	Gingrich	Mensch	Scavello
Beyer	Godshall	Metcalfe	Schroder
Bianucci	Goodman	Micozzie	Seip
Bishop	Grell	Millard	Shapiro
Blackwell	Grucela	Miller	Shimkus
Boback	Haluska	Milne	Siptroth
Boyd	Hanna	Moul	Smith, K.
Brennan	Harhai	Moyer	Smith, M.
Brooks	Harhart	Mundy	Smith, S.
Buxton	Harkins	Murt	Solobay
Caltagirone	Harper	Mustio	Sonney
Cappelli	Harris	Myers	Staback
Carroll	Helm	Nailor	Stairs
Casorio	Hennessey	Nickol	Steil
Causer	Hershey	O'Brien, M.	Stern
Civera	Hess	O'Neill	Stevenson
Clymer	Hickernell	Oliver	Sturla
Cohen	Hornaman	Pallone	Surra
Conklin	Hutchinson	Parker	Swanger
Costa	James	Pashinski	Tangretti
Cox	Josephs	Payne	Taylor, J.
Creighton	Kauffman	Payton	Taylor, R.
Cruz	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Thomas
Curry	Keller, W.	Perry	True
Cutler	Kenney	Perzel	Turzai
Daley	Kessler	Petrarca	Vereb
Dally	Killion	Petri	Vitali
DeLuca	King	Petrone	Vulakovich
Denlinger	Kirkland	Phillips	Wagner
DePasquale	Kortz	Pickett	Walko
Dermody	Kotik	Preston	Wansacz
DeWeese	Kula	Pyle	Waters
DiGirolamo	Leach	Quigley	Watson
Donatucci	Lentz	Quinn	Wheatley
Eachus	Levdansky	Ramaley	White
Ellis	Longietti	Rapp	Williams
Evans, D.	Mackereth	Raymond	Wojnaroski

Evans, J.	Maher	Readshaw	Yewcic
Everett	Mahoney	Reed	Youngblood
Fabrizio	Major	Reichley	Yudichak
Fairchild	Manderino	Roae	
Fleck	Mann	Rock	O'Brien, D.,
Frankel	Mantz	Roebuck	Speaker
Freeman			

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

The SPEAKER. A quorum being present, the House will proceed to conduct business.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. For the information of the members, Corrie Sullivan is here today serving as a guest page. She is the constituent and guest of Representative Denlinger. Corrie has recently been accepted as a student and will be attending Linden Hall this fall. Corrie is located in the well of the House. Also here today is her mother, Leslie Sullivan. She is seated to the left of the Speaker. Please welcome them to the floor.

I would like to introduce Breanne Tomi and Shane Gannon, who are the guests of Representative Deberah Kula. Both Breanne and Shane are interns in the 52d Legislative District and attend Waynesburg University. Would you please stand and be recognized.

The Chair would like to welcome, as the guests of Representatives Siptroth, Scavello, and Carroll, Carla LaBar, Anna LaBar, and Guy LaBar from East Stroudsburg. Guy LaBar is working his way up the ranks in becoming an Eagle Scout. Also, the Chair would like to welcome Richard and Barbara Cornish from Chestnuthill Township, as well as their children and friends. They are seated in the gallery. Would you please stand and be recognized.

FINNEGAN INTERNS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to recognize the minority whip, Representative Argall, for an introduction.

Mr. ARGALL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, every year at this time it is our honor to introduce the Finnegan Interns. As a 1979 intern, I turn the job over to a much more recent intern, Representative Gibbons.

Mr. GIBBONS. Thank you, Representative Argall.

Yes, I was also a Finnegan Intern. I did it about two decades later than Representative Argall, in the year 2001.

But we have with us today four Finnegan Interns who are out here doing 10-week internships with various executive agencies, learning about government and politics, and it is a good start for a future career. So I would like to ask them to stand up as I introduce them.

First, we have Susan Law, a resident of Murrysville, Pennsylvania. She is a student at Shippensburg University and serving with the PA Department of Public Welfare.

Then we have Kelly Rogers, a resident of Stroudsburg, PA, is a student at Dickinson College, and is serving with the Pennsylvania Department of State.

Timothy Brea is a resident of McClure, Pennsylvania, is a student at Juniata College, and is serving with the Pennsylvania Department of General Services.

And lastly, Brian Rengert is a resident of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, and a student at St. Joe's University, and he is serving with the Pennsylvania Securities Commission this summer.

I just want to congratulate them all. They had to write an essay and do a lot of work to get these internships, and I hope they enjoy their time here in Harrisburg and learn a lot this summer.

MISS CHESTER PAGEANTS WINNERS AND CONTESTANTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Thaddeus Kirkland for an introduction.

Mr. KIRKLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of introducing some of the most finest, brightest, and intelligent young ladies in the land, and I am grateful to have them coming from my hometown of Chester, Pennsylvania. They are the 2008 Miss Chester Pageants winners and contestants: Miss Chester Sweetheart winner, Rai Zhana Allen-Holmes; Miss Chester Sweetheart third place, JaLissa Baxter; Miss Chester Princess winner, Anna-Maria Tokarczyk; Miss Chester Junior Teen winner, Amari Stewart; Miss Chester Junior Teen second-place winner, Damyra Birens; Miss Chester Junior Teen third place, Ja'Leaha Kirksey; Miss Chester Teen winner, Brea Morgan. And they are joined by a former beauty queen, who is still a beauty queen, their pageant trainer, Tracey Johnson; and two beautiful parents, Ms. Kirksey and Mrs. Richardson. They are seated here in the back, and I would like the members just to welcome them.

There is a certain way you have to welcome them, with their little hand wave.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to recognize, as the special guests of Representative Mike Sturla, his son, Pete, and his friend, Anthony Perez. They are guest pages. Would you please stand to be recognized, gentlemen. Welcome to the House.

HOUSE BILL INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 2692 By Representatives JOSEPHS, KORTZ, BENNINGTON, COHEN, DePASQUALE, FRANKEL, FREEMAN, GIBBONS, GODSHALL, GOODMAN, HANNA, HENNESSEY, HORNAMAN, JAMES, KING, KIRKLAND, McILVAINE SMITH, NICKOL, PERZEL, RAMALEY, SIPTROTH, SWANGER, THOMAS and YOUNGBLOOD

A Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, further providing for absentee voting.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, July 1, 2008.

CALENDAR

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2231, PN 4088**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of February 9, 1999 (P.L.1, No.1), known as the Capital Facilities Debt Enabling Act, further providing for appropriation for and limitation on redevelopment assistance capital projects.

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

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the bill pass finally? Agreeable to the provisions of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

(Members proceeded to vote.)

VOTE STRICKEN

The SPEAKER. The clerk will strike the vote.

BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. This bill will be over temporarily.

The House will come to order.

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 838, PN 2247**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 26, 1947 (P.L.318, No.140), known as the CPA Law, further providing for definitions, for State Board of Accountancy, for general powers of the board, for examination and issuance of certificate, for education requirements, for experience requirements; providing for requirements for issuance of certificate; further providing for certificates issued by domestic reciprocity and for certificates issued by foreign reciprocity; providing for practice in this Commonwealth by individuals under substantial equivalency, for practice outside this Commonwealth under substantial equivalency; further providing for licenses to practice, for licensing of firms, for peer review, for grounds for discipline, for reinstatement, for ownership of working papers, for unlawful acts and for acts not unlawful.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Maher. Mr. MAHER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to alert the Chair that I am withdrawing my amendments to this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair is informed there are no other amendments. Is there any member wishing to offer an amendment?

Does Representative Adolph seek recognition?

Mr. ADOLPH. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend.

The Chair would request that members take their seats. Be respectful of the members wishing to debate the issues before us.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. Representative Adolph.

Mr. ADOLPH. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you.

I would like to disclose to the members of the House as well as the Speaker, and I would like to have an answer to it, that this bill that is running is a change to the C.P.A. (certified public accountant) act. I am licensed by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as a public accountant. My partner is licensed as a C.P.A. I just want to make sure that it is okay to vote on this bill before we start voting on it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is a member of a class. The bill affects the class. The gentleman has no conflict in this matter.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

The SPEAKER. The House will be at ease.

The House will come to order.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2113, PN 4125**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 11, 1972 (P.L.286, No.70), known as the Industrialized Housing Act, further providing for definitions and for regulations, insignia of certification required.

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

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

The SPEAKER. 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—203

Adolph	Gabig	Markosek	Rohrer
Argall	Galloway	Marshall	Ross
Baker	Geist	Marsico	Rubley
Barrar	George	McCall	Sabatina
Bastian	Gerber	McGeehan	Sainato
Bear	Gergely	McI. Smith	Samuelson
Belfanti	Gibbons	McIlhattan	Santoni
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Melio	Saylor
Bennington	Gingrich	Mensch	Scavello
Beyer	Godshall	Metcalfe	Schroder
Biancucci	Goodman	Micozzie	Seip
Bishop	Grell	Millard	Shapiro
Blackwell	Grucela	Miller	Shimkus
Boback	Haluska	Milne	Siptroth
Boyd	Hanna	Moul	Smith, K.
Brennan	Harhai	Moyer	Smith, M.
Brooks	Harhart	Mundy	Smith, S.
Buxton	Harkins	Murt	Solobay
Caltagirone	Harper	Mustio	Sonney
Cappelli	Harris	Myers	Staback
Carroll	Helm	Nailor	Stairs
Casorio	Hennessey	Nickol	Steil
Causer	Hershey	O'Brien, M.	Stern
Civera	Hess	O'Neill	Stevenson
Clymer	Hickernell	Oliver	Sturla
Cohen	Hornaman	Pallone	Surra
Conklin	Hutchinson	Parker	Swanger
Costa	James	Pashinski	Tangretti
Cox	Josephs	Payne	Taylor, J.
Creighton	Kauffman	Payton	Taylor, R.
Cruz	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Thomas
Curry	Keller, W.	Perry	True
Cutler	Kenney	Perzel	Turzai
Daley	Kessler	Petrarca	Vereb
Dally	Killion	Petri	Vitali
DeLuca	King	Petrone	Vulakovich
Denlinger	Kirkland	Phillips	Wagner
DePasquale	Kortz	Pickett	Walko
Dermody	Kotik	Preston	Wansacz
DeWeese	Kula	Pyle	Waters
DiGirolamo	Leach	Quigley	Watson
Donatucci	Lentz	Quinn	Wheatley
Eachus	Levdansky	Ramaley	White
Ellis	Longietti	Rapp	Williams
Evans, D.	Mackereth	Raymond	Wojnaroski
Evans, J.	Maher	Readshaw	Yewcic
Everett	Mahoney	Reed	Youngblood
Fabrizio	Major	Reichley	Yudichak
Fairchild	Manderino	Roae	
Fleck	Mann	Rock	O'Brien, D.,
Frankel	Mantz	Roebuck	Speaker
Freeman			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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.

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. HANNA called up **HR 836, PN 4120**, entitled:

A Resolution designating August 2008 as "Pennsylvania Produce
Month" in this Commonwealth.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—203

Adolph	Gabig	Markosek	Rohrer
Argall	Galloway	Marshall	Ross
Baker	Geist	Marsico	Rubley
Barrar	George	McCall	Sabatina
Bastian	Gerber	McGeehan	Sainato
Bear	Gergely	McI. Smith	Samuelson
Belfanti	Gibbons	McIlhattan	Santoni
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Melio	Saylor
Bennington	Gingrich	Mensch	Scavello
Beyer	Godshall	Metcalfe	Schroder
Biancucci	Goodman	Micozzie	Seip
Bishop	Grell	Millard	Shapiro
Blackwell	Grucela	Miller	Shimkus
Boback	Haluska	Milne	Siptroth
Boyd	Hanna	Moul	Smith, K.
Brennan	Harhai	Moyer	Smith, M.
Brooks	Harhart	Mundy	Smith, S.
Buxton	Harkins	Murt	Solobay
Caltagirone	Harper	Mustio	Sonney
Cappelli	Harris	Myers	Staback
Carroll	Helm	Nailor	Stairs
Casorio	Hennessey	Nickol	Steil
Causer	Hershey	O'Brien, M.	Stern
Civera	Hess	O'Neill	Stevenson
Clymer	Hickernell	Oliver	Sturla
Cohen	Hornaman	Pallone	Surra
Conklin	Hutchinson	Parker	Swanger
Costa	James	Pashinski	Tangretti
Cox	Josephs	Payne	Taylor, J.
Creighton	Kauffman	Payton	Taylor, R.
Cruz	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Thomas
Curry	Keller, W.	Perry	True
Cutler	Kenney	Perzel	Turzai
Daley	Kessler	Petrarca	Vereb
Dally	Killion	Petri	Vitali
DeLuca	King	Petrone	Vulakovich
Denlinger	Kirkland	Phillips	Wagner
DePasquale	Kortz	Pickett	Walko
Dermody	Kotik	Preston	Wansacz
DeWeese	Kula	Pyle	Waters
DiGirolamo	Leach	Quigley	Watson
Donatucci	Lentz	Quinn	Wheatley
Eachus	Levdansky	Ramaley	White
Ellis	Longietti	Rapp	Williams
Evans, D.	Mackereth	Raymond	Wojnaroski
Evans, J.	Maher	Readshaw	Yewcic
Everett	Mahoney	Reed	Youngblood
Fabrizio	Major	Reichley	Yudichak
Fairchild	Manderino	Roae	
Fleck	Mann	Rock	O'Brien, D.,
Frankel	Mantz	Roebuck	Speaker
Freeman			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

* * *

Mr. CURRY called up **HR 837, PN 4121**, entitled:

A Resolution reiterating the importance of the Revolutionary War, observing September 3, 2008, as the 225th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Paris that ended the Revolutionary War, reaffirming our friendship with France, Spain and Great Britain and recognizing the civic endeavors of the Pennsylvania Society of the Sons of the American Revolution.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—203

Adolph	Gabig	Markosek	Rohrer
Argall	Galloway	Marshall	Ross
Baker	Geist	Marsico	Rubley
Barrar	George	McCall	Sabatina
Bastian	Gerber	McGeehan	Sainato
Bear	Gergely	McI. Smith	Samuelson
Belfanti	Gibbons	McIlhattan	Santoni
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Melio	Saylor
Bennington	Gingrich	Mensch	Scavello
Beyer	Godshall	Metcalfe	Schroder
Biancucci	Goodman	Micozzie	Seip
Bishop	Grell	Millard	Shapiro
Blackwell	Grucela	Miller	Shimkus
Boback	Haluska	Milne	Siptroth
Boyd	Hanna	Moul	Smith, K.
Brennan	Harhai	Moyer	Smith, M.
Brooks	Harhart	Mundy	Smith, S.
Buxton	Harkins	Murt	Solobay
Caltagirone	Harper	Mustio	Sonney
Cappelli	Harris	Myers	Staback
Carroll	Helm	Nailor	Stairs
Casorio	Hennessey	Nickol	Steil
Causer	Hershey	O'Brien, M.	Stern
Civera	Hess	O'Neill	Stevenson
Clymer	Hickernell	Oliver	Sturla
Cohen	Hornaman	Pallone	Surra
Conklin	Hutchinson	Parker	Swanger
Costa	James	Pashinski	Tangretti
Cox	Josephs	Payne	Taylor, J.
Creighton	Kauffman	Payton	Taylor, R.
Cruz	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Thomas
Curry	Keller, W.	Perry	True
Cutler	Kenney	Perzel	Turzai
Daley	Kessler	Petrarca	Vereb
Dally	Killion	Petri	Vitali
DeLuca	King	Petrone	Vulakovich
Denlinger	Kirkland	Phillips	Wagner
DePasquale	Kortz	Pickett	Walko
Dermody	Kotik	Preston	Wansacz
DeWeese	Kula	Pyle	Waters
DiGiroalamo	Leach	Quigley	Watson
Donatucci	Lentz	Quinn	Wheatley
Eachus	Levdansky	Ramaley	White
Ellis	Longiatti	Rapp	Williams
Evans, D.	Mackereth	Raymond	Wojnaroski
Evans, J.	Maher	Readshaw	Yewcic
Everett	Mahoney	Reed	Youngblood
Fabrizio	Major	Reichley	Yudichak
Fairchild	Manderino	Roae	

Fleck	Mann	Rock	O'Brien, D.,
Frankel	Mantz	Roebuck	Speaker
Freeman			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

CONDOLENCE RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER. Members will take their seats. We are about to take up a condolence resolution for a former member. The Sergeants at Arms will close the doors of the House.

The clerk will read the resolution.

The following resolution was read:

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
The House of Representatives

Condolence Resolution

WHEREAS, The House of Representatives of Pennsylvania notes with deepest regret that the Honorable Edgar A. Carlson, a former member of the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania who served the 68th Legislative District, passed away on June 24, 2008, at the age of seventy-eight; and

WHEREAS, Born on September 2, 1929, in Harwick, Mr. Carlson served as a member of the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania from 1984 to 1992. He was a dedicated professional, serving as Justice of the Peace in Blossburg, Blossburg Republican Committeeman, Tioga County Republican Party Chairman, Tioga County Treasurer and Delegate to the Republican National Convention; and

WHEREAS, An avowed community steward, Mr. Carlson was a fifty-year member of Lodge No. 350, Free and Accepted Masons, and he also served the Hillside Rod and Gun Club, the Arnot Sportsmen's Club, the Blossburg Firemen's Association and the Siloa Lutheran Church, where he served on the council for numerous years. Mr. Carlson was a revered and respected member of his community, and his loss will be felt by the many individuals who knew, admired and loved him. His inspiring presence will live long in the hearts and memories of those whose lives he touched; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pay tribute to the Honorable Edgar A. Carlson, who served his community and this Commonwealth in a way most beneficial to the highest ideals of public service; and extend heartfelt condolences to his wife, Margaret J. Jenkins Carlson; son, James; daughters, Ann Lee Strong and Janis Glenn; six grandchildren; and one great-grandchild; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution, sponsored by the Honorable Dennis M. O'Brien on June 30, 2008, be transmitted to Margaret J. Jenkins Carlson.

Dennis M. O'Brien, Speaker of the House

ATTEST:
Roger Nick, Chief Clerk of the House

(SEAL)

The SPEAKER. Members and guests will rise as a sign of respect for our former member.

(Whereupon, the members of the House and all visitors stood in a moment of silence in solemn respect to the memory of the Honorable Edgar A. Carlson.)

The SPEAKER. Members and guests may be seated.
The Sergeants at Arms will open the doors of the House.

Mr. S. SMITH. Mr. Speaker?
The SPEAKER. The House will be at ease.

The House will come to order.

REMARKS BY MINORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader for some remarks.

Mr. S. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to reflect a second on the memorial citation that we just did.

Edgar Carlson was one of those guys that when I first came to the House, he was one of those kind of good-old-boy characters, and he said something one day that embodies the dilemma that all of us face quite often in the course of the legislative process. I do not remember what the issue was, but Edgar said, "Some of my people are for it, some of my people are against it, and I am for my people." I just thought I would throw that back as we deal with these tough issues, because we all face that from time to time, and I have always remembered Edgar kind of putting the dilemma in perspective.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The House will be at ease.

The House will come to order.

REMARKS BY MR. COHEN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Cohen.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to add a few words about Ed Carlson.

Pete Daley and I were reminiscing a couple of minutes ago about what a very wonderful, humorous, relaxed, friendly, decent person he was. I served with him for 7 years on the House Labor Relations Committee. We agreed on virtually nothing that was controversial, but he was always very relaxed, always very helpful. He was just a model human being, and I think we have lost a very, very good person.

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

The House will come to order.

REMARKS BY MR. PETRONE

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman, Representative Petrone, rise?

Mr. PETRONE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just to say a few words about Mr. Carlson.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. PETRONE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, had the pleasure of serving with Ed Carlson for 12 years, and I can tell you, he was one of the finest gentlemen I ever met in the House of Representatives, through all the years I have been here.

Faithfully, every year, I got a Christmas card from him with a note about some trip we had gone on in the Game and Fish Committee or some other little remembrance of an occurrence that happened here. He truly was an honorable man, and he deserves to be remembered as such.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

REMARKS BY MR. ROEBUCK

The SPEAKER. Representative Roebuck.

Mr. ROEBUCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just also would like to just add a few remarks as we think about Ed Carlson.

Ed was one of those people that I got to know early in my career and oftentimes had the opportunity to eat breakfast with him and get to know him. I always remember the story he told about his home area and how, when you go through the process of elections, you want to know what is happening, and that he was indeed in an area where you had to drive, he told me you had to drive to the south part of his county to pick up radio reception and television reception. I really did not believe him. I thought he was playing on my urban roots.

About 5 years ago or so I had to drive through his area, and as I am driving along, first I lost my cell phone and then I lost my radio. So I understand what he was saying was exactly true. But I remember that sense he had, that spirit he had, and he was a great guy and was a person that emulated the very best in what it is to be a member of this legislature and to serve the people of this Commonwealth.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2231 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. The Chair returns to final consideration of HB 2231, PN 4088.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Turzai.
Mr. TURZAI. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to HB 2231, and I think it is important to make a few points for the record in asking the members of this legislature to vote against the authorization of \$800 million in borrowing under the RCAP program (Redevelopment Assistance Capital Program).

Borrowing is just spending but with delayed payment. Tax dollars for fees and interest as well as for the principal must be paid back. For every dollar borrowed and spent, the taxpayers must typically put up a dollar and a half to pay back that dollar that was borrowed. Authorizing this \$800 million in borrowing means we will be spending \$800 million and more, because under RCAP, it is a revolving line of credit and the taxpayers will have to pay that back.

For just that initial \$800 million that is authorized, borrowed, and spent, the taxpayers will have to pay close to \$1.2 billion in taxes. That is not to mention the money that has to be paid back in taxes when that money gets respent. Borrowing puts off tax increases until tomorrow, and it allows politicians to spend today without facing the fiscal consequences today.

A mortgage on a home for a family is not analogous. This State has a huge budget. We will be spending approximately \$62 billion in this fiscal year of State and Federal dollars through various funds, and we are going to then, on top of that, borrow, given all the borrowing plans that will be running through the legislature, close to \$3 billion that we will be spending during the rest of the Rendell administration.

Let me make it clear to the public, and I am pleased to press the import to my colleagues here, you will never see tax cuts with this type of spending and borrowing. Not only that, you will see tax increases in the future years. Of the \$2.9 billion that is being borrowed, this \$800 million shows that of that entire \$2.9 billion, 90 percent of those bonds, including this \$800 million, will be spent during the remainder of Gov. Ed Rendell's second term. He will have the advantage of taking that money across the State and currying political favor, and this is a program, the RCAP program, which is designed to do exactly that, curry political favor with the walkaround checks.

Now, one of the things that we stressed yesterday and that I want to stress again today with respect to the RCAP is that, as a revolving line of credit, it is taking an increase on your State credit card. At the end of the Schweiker administration, that line of credit, that debt limit on our State credit card was \$1.5 billion. In the first 5 years, the Governor has already increased his limit on that credit card twice by \$640 million and by \$500 million, and now wants to seek a fourth credit card, increasing it by another \$800 million, which will take the credit card limit of \$2.65 billion, as it stands today, and increase it to \$3.4 billion – with a "b." As your tax dollars, Mr. Speaker, pay that off, the Governor is able to respend that money, regift that money for political purposes, while your tax dollars, \$1.50 for every dollar, continue to pay that back.

In '08-'09 it is projected that taxpayers will pay back \$70 million of the existing RCAP dollars, which means that the Governor right now, through the course of the year, will be able to gift out that \$70 million as it gets paid off. In addition, given the existing \$2.65 billion limit, \$46 million right now has not been committed and can be gifted right now for these pet projects. One point three billion has already been committed by this Governor of that \$2.65 billion, but the bonds have not been issued, but shortly will be issued. How does this size up into the macro picture of Pennsylvania's debt status? What people must understand is that Pennsylvania's debt status needs to take into account local debt and State debt, because in comparison, many fellow States only do debt on a State level. Our total State debt – local, municipal authority, and school district debt – is \$110 billion, \$110 billion.

Our ranking, according to a Washington, DC, think tank, debt service as a percentage of total tax revenue at 11.4 percent ranks us 45th out of 50 States – 45th out of 50 States. Quoting a local think tank, "Governor Rendell has done an effective job of masking the taxpayers' true debt-burden by not recognizing the debt in off-budget agencies, school districts, and other levels of government.... But it is the same taxpayer who is on the hook for this more than \$110 billion in debt" – of which we are, under this bill, adding \$800 million that is revolving line of credit. "And when we look at the true costs of this borrowed money, Pennsylvania taxpayers owe almost \$9,000 per person in state and local debt – or \$36,000 for the typical family of four."

All the while, while we are spending this borrowed money – \$3.1 billion in the first 4 years that we have to pay back to the tune of \$4.8 billion – the Governor wants us to take out another \$3 billion that will cost us somewhere close to \$4.6 billion. And we have been spending on an annual basis of about 7-percent increase per year or a total in the first 5 years of about 34-percent increase when the rate of inflation was 15 1/2 percent. Mr. Speaker, if we are serious about focusing on middle-class families and expanding Pennsylvania's economy for small and large businesses to have family-sustaining jobs, we cannot keep up this pace of borrowing and spending. We need it to be focused on tax cuts for middle-class families, small businesses, large businesses, so that we can promote family-sustaining jobs.

With all due respect, I am dismayed. I think of all of the borrowing programs; many might have decent ends that we could be doing on a pay-as-you-go basis, but this increase in the RCAP limit, taking out the fourth credit card as well as the hedge fund under alternative energy, I think are completely mistaken. I would ask that all the members think long and hard about leveraging their kids' and grandkids' futures.

Do they really want their kids to stay in Pennsylvania to pick up the debt so that the Governor gets political advantage of spending that money today, while they are paying throughout their longevity, trying to decide where to raise their families to pay for this debt that we are taking out or not? Look, Governor Corzine in New Jersey said, given their fiscal issues, we have got to tighten our belts and make the tough cuts. We should be doing that here today. I would urge a "no" vote on this RCAP authorization of \$800 million to take it up to \$3.4 billion in this revolving line of credit.

Thank you very, very much.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, Representative DeWeese.

Conversations on the floor will cease. Members will take their seats.

Representative DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. I just wish that the previous speaker were so inspired about debt when it comes to the national administration and the national executive.

On the scale of 10, the Republican President, which my honorable colleague embraces like a sick kitten around a hot brick—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will—

Mr. DeWEESE. Come on, even he is smiling at that.

The SPEAKER. The House will come to order. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair will remind all members to try to bring their conversations back to the issue at hand. This day is going to be long enough as it is.

Mr. DeWEESE. If it will make my honorable colleague feel better, I will apologize for that extravagant metaphor, but he does adhere tenaciously to Bush administration objectives and methodologies. And the Honorable Edward G. Rendell's administration would be a 1 on a 10 scale of borrowing and the Bush administration would be a 10 on the 10 scale of borrowing, but nevertheless, most of us, and I know the honorable gentleman might have some intellectual repartee back and forth on apples and oranges, but most of us have to go to the bank if we are going to buy a house and get a mortgage.

And his good friends and my good friends at United States Steel have to go to Wall Street to borrow so that they can invest, and I would only think that if the gentleman's perspective was turned around, people at the Pittsburgh Symphony and the Pittsburgh Zoo and the University of Pittsburgh and a variety of other worthy goals in Allegheny County, including the Hillman cancer institute and our overall objectives on the horizon with the Salk program would all be enhanced and benefited by an investor, and Edward G. Rendell's administration is an investing administration.

Many of my GOP colleagues on both sides of the aisle, or both sides of the building, I should say – Republicans in the Senate, Republicans in the House – realize the efficacy of HB 2231. And as I leave the microphone and ask for a favorable vote, I would only politely suggest that a negative vote on this proposal should also accompany a feeling that it would not be appropriate to ask the Rendell administration over the next 2 1/2 years to come into your legislative district and invest, because by this vote, you would be trying to deny, you would be trying to cuff and pinion the Rendell administration's opportunities to come into your hometown, your home county, your home precincts and invest.

I believe this will pass with substantial numbers, Democrats and Republicans alike, and I look forward to the pro-business vote from my Republican friends that this indeed is. There are two different perspectives, the one enunciated by the honorable gentleman from Allegheny, and the one that is embraced by the House Democrats and many of the House Republicans. But I believe, sir, Mr. Speaker, this is a pro-business vote. This is a chance to invest.

The SPEAKER. Representative Clymer.

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I must respond to the majority leader's comments about the Federal Congress. The Democrats who control the House—

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman will suspend. The Chair reminded members earlier to keep the comments – bring them around to the issue at hand, and the Chair will remind the members—

Mr. CLYMER. Yes, and I am responding directly to the comments that he made at the—

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman will suspend.

Leaders have more latitude than rank-and-file members. The Chair did remind the gentleman, and he brought his remarks around. If the gentleman wants to speak on the issue at hand, he is invited to do so.

Mr. CLYMER. Okay.

Well, Mr. Speaker, my comments are directly to bring out the debate with what the majority leader has said. And I have

heard the majority leader, on several occasions on the floor of the House, say we need this energized debate; it is good to get the policy issues in the air and to have members hear both sides of an issue. And my issues and my remarks deal directly with what the majority leader had said with the National Congress. I think there should be equal time for our side over here to make comments as to what he had said about the—

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes that the leaders may be exuberant at times, but the members' debate is limited to the issue at hand. The Chair will ask the gentleman to restrict his remarks in that form.

The gentleman's objection is noted for the record.

Mr. CLYMER. Okay; thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Metcalfe.

Mr. METCALFE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to allowing the debt to be increased for the State of Pennsylvania and really take exception to this being framed as a pro-business vote, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if this was the way that the majority of businesses ran their businesses, they would be broke and bankrupt and out of business, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, only because the State can use the power and the force to come in and exact from the taxpayers the payments for this debt that will be increased, are we able to still remain in the black.

Mr. Speaker, there are very few businesspeople out there that would agree with the majority leader's statement that this is a pro-business vote, unless they are feeding at the trough from this bill, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we should vote this down to protect the jobs of this State and to protect the citizens of this State from having to pay higher taxes in the future. They will have to pay off this debt, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does Representative Stevenson seek recognition?

The gentleman is in order.

Mr. STEVENSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I also rise in opposition to HB 2231. This is a substantial increase in raising the debt limit on RCAP. When Governor Rendell took office in 2003, the debt limit on RCAP was \$1.51 billion. Since then, the General Assembly and the Governor have increased that debt limit twice. The limit was increased by \$640 million in 2004, again by \$500 million in 2005. Those two increases represent an increase of \$1.14 billion. The debt limit on RCAP is now \$2.65 billion. It raises the obvious question, when is enough, enough? If we are going to take money from the taxpayer consistently year after year to try and fund businesses in this State, I think we are definitely going in the wrong direction.

And for that matter, many of the businesses I talked to feel this is an anti-business vote, certainly not a pro-business vote. Their thinking is, why does the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania not reduce business tax rates all across the Commonwealth and give every business operating in Pennsylvania the same advantage, rather than by using this type of a program, which picks obvious winners and losers and gives money directly to businesses? Some win, some get the grants, some get the loans; others do not. This, obviously, is an unfair approach to economic development, and I think by changing our tax structure, we could be much more successful. For those reasons I oppose this legislation and ask for a negative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Ellis.

Mr. ELLIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the maker of the bill rise for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Representative Evans indicates he will stand for interrogation. Representative Ellis is in order and may proceed.

Mr. ELLIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just have a couple of questions in regards to the way that we are going to do it this year, the manner in which we are going to do these bond issuances. Now, in 2004 when we raised the cap by \$640 million, and in 2005 when we raised it an additional \$500 million, were either of those ones, were the bond issuances done in the same manner, where we would basically guarantee borrowing would continue for 4 years, or were those done individually?

Mr. D. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, the only thing we are doing is raising the limit. Those decisions are made by the administration.

Mr. ELLIS. Okay. Mr. Speaker, can you explain to me, from what I am to understand, we are going to issue \$200 million worth of borrowing this year, \$200 million in 2009, \$200 million in 2010, and \$200 million in 2011. What is the mentality? Do you have inside knowledge as to what the mentality to do it in that manner was?

Mr. D. EVANS. No, Mr. Speaker. As I said, the only thing we are doing as the legislature is just raising the limit.

Mr. ELLIS. Final question, Mr. Speaker; what year, again, will these issuances actually be paid off by the working families of Pennsylvania?

Mr. D. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, it is generally spread over 20 years.

Mr. ELLIS. So 2028 will be the year that they are paid off.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On the bill.

The SPEAKER. Representative Ellis is in order and may proceed.

Mr. ELLIS. You know what, Mr. Speaker? Having come from a business background – as many people know, I am a third-generation small businessman – obviously, there are times where borrowing is appropriate. No one will disagree with that statement. We cannot forward ourselves without a bit of borrowing, but at some point, we have to draw the lines. When we continue to borrow at a rate that we have seen under this current administration, then what happens is, I am not going to be so much worried about paying it off in the future, but my children are. You know, the reality is, every dollar that we borrow now, we are going to pay back \$1.50. So we have to be very mindful of what we do. I think to increase the cap this far, at this time, is a bad idea.

We had an opportunity in the last few years to actually do some good and reduce some taxes on the businesses. You hear people actually saying that this is a pro-business vote. Well, I will tell you what, Mr. Speaker, if we were very serious about helping business, we would lower the taxes here in Pennsylvania and make it a little bit more competitive, instead of letting this administration go around and hand out big checks.

You say it is pro-business, Mr. Speaker; I say this kind of borrowing is giving them the business. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Quigley.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, rise to oppose HB 2231. And I just want to read a quote from Standard & Poor's, which is a financial rating industry. This is a report that came in May of 2007, and they

say that "Pennsylvania's debt profile is currently favorable, but over the next five years commonwealth management intends to issue substantially more general obligation debt than it retires.... In addition, commonwealth officials intend to issue roughly half of the \$2 billion of economic stimulus debt proposed by the governor.

"Over the next five years, these additional issuances, exclusive of economic stimulus debt, would boost the commonwealth's tax-supported debt by more than 39%...over...fiscal year-end 2006 levels, moving it to an above-average debt burden from below average when compared with other states...."

So again, Standard & Poor's, one of the premier rating industries and financial institutions, is issuing a warning that if we continue on this trend that what we are hearing about now and what he heard from the finance director of the Governor – how great things are in Pennsylvania – that we are headed on a course that could cause us problem. And I would submit to you, metaphorically, for my good friend in Greene County's benefit, that this debt will hang like a sword of Damocles over the Commonwealth taxpayers in Pennsylvania.

Again, vote down this RCAP budget. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Perry.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, rise to ask for a "no" vote on this bill. As you know, I had two amendments yesterday based on the premise that it is not fair, that the way that the money is distributed is unequal. I can tell you that there have been no projects in the 92d District, the district that I represent, yet, my taxpayers, the taxpayers I represent, get the honor and privilege of paying for all these projects all around the State. The threshold is simply too high in many cases for rural districts to qualify, to begin with, and then of course they have to match it. So it effectively cuts rural districts out.

Now, these are typically "want" projects, not "need" projects. We need infrastructure. We need our roads and bridges to bring business and keep our standard of living. We want stadiums and other things that we do not need. Now, to my honorable colleague from Greene County, we cannot help the Federal situation. We cannot do anything about that, but if do you not want to join the current administration being a 10 on the level of borrowing, I would say you have an opportunity to vote right now, to vote right here today and not join that level of borrowing.

So I would ask that we all vote "no." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of final passage. I have heard speakers talk about the fact that we are spending money that our children will have to pay back and why should we burden them with that debt? You know, over the years, when I first purchased a house, I went and borrowed money and took on some debt. As I made improvements to that house with home improvement loans, then I rolled them into a mortgage, and I took on a little more debt. Then I bought a rental property and I took on a little more debt, and I improved my neighborhood as well as other neighborhoods also by incurring some of that debt. I think it is a wise investment, or was a wise investment, and still is a wise investment for my family.

The debt that we incur for capital budget projects invests in projects in our community. I know some members say, well, not in my community. But in my community, and I will just give you a few examples where we have matched RCAP money in some cases two to one, three to one, four to one: We have a \$9 million Fulton Opera House renovation project; we have a \$3 million Heritage Center project; we have a \$2 million Puerto Rican Cultural Center; we have a \$20 million Life Sciences building, actually, it was \$40 million, we only did \$10 million from the State; we have \$175 million hotel and convention center; we have a \$30 million Pennsylvania Academy of Music; a \$25 million minor league baseball stadium. And we will have, with this, money for the Thaddeus Stevens, Lydia Smith houses, the Lancaster Museum, rail yard relocation – hundreds of millions of dollars worth of investment that is not just for me and the taxpayers today, but is for my children. And but for those dollars being spent, my children would not be able to go watch a ball game in the stadium. They might not be able to use the facilities at the museum or the "Y," or when they mature, be able to use the hotel and convention center for meetings and civic events, and so this is an investment in our children's future, and it is an investment in projects that will be here for 20 or 30 or 40 or 50 years in our communities. This is not about buying something that we are just going to spend this week, and then it is gone; this is about investing in our future in Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Rohrer.

Mr. ROHRER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my comments will just be brief because there have been very many good comments made already, but as I sit and listen, my mind is just drawn to the fact that our debate on this issue here and on the budget to come is really one that just goes right to the heart of philosophy. And whether one is a Republican in Washington or a Democrat in Washington Congress or here on the floor or whatever, it really sometimes does not make a difference, depending on your philosophy of what the role of government is.

In my mind, as I sit and I think of this, it comes down to just a couple of core values, and they are these: There is a clear difference in my mind between investment, what we term to be investment, and what one would term to be largesse. There is a clear distinction, Mr. Speaker, between what is in the interest of the general welfare and what would be considered a special interest benevolence. There is a clear division between pay-as-you-go discipline and burden-your-children-with-debt discipline.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of what some have said, this is not pro-business. This is not borrowing. It is not legitimate growth economics. It is certainly not fiscally prudent. It is by no means taxpayer-friendly.

Mr. Speaker, from all perspectives, it is simply not wise, and for that reason, I will be voting "no," and I think it would be appropriate to vote "no" on this bill. Thank you.

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

The Chair, again, will ask members to reduce the level of their conversations so the gentleman can be heard.

Representative Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support HB 2231, and the reason that I support HB 2231 is because some, if not all of you, know that

from February up through April, the Intergovernmental Affairs Committee held public hearings throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. We had a hearing in Harrisburg. We had one in Erie, one in Pittsburgh, one in Scranton, and one in Philadelphia.

Mr. Speaker, other than from a Philadelphia perspective, I had not had an opportunity to witness firsthand the impact of RCAP investments. But, Mr. Speaker, in Erie, Pennsylvania, I visited probably a 22d- century hotel and convention center that probably represents the best of our architectural design and engineering and development. But it is the hotel and convention center, yes, with beautiful physical edifices, but what was more important to me were the jobs associated with the hotel, with the jobs associated arising out of the convention center development, and with the long-term procurement and contractual opportunities arising out of the operation of the convention center.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Erie, Pennsylvania and surrounding counties have been facing major hardships with their employment and entrepreneurial opportunities. This convention center, this hotel represented a major shot in the arm for Erie County. When we were in Scranton, we had an opportunity to meet at Scranton University, and one of the conversations that we had was about how RCAP has represented significant investment in the economy of Scranton, Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we talked about the jobs, the entrepreneurial, the contractual, and the other opportunities arising out of the RCAP investment in Scranton, Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in Pittsburgh, at the University of Pittsburgh and around Pittsburgh, it had been a couple of years since I visited Pittsburgh, but RCAP is literally transforming not only the face of the city of Pittsburgh, but the quality of lives of the people in the great city of Pittsburgh.

Mr. Speaker, my momma used to say that what is good for the gander is good for the goose. If investments were okay and lifting the debt ceiling was okay under Ridge and Schweiker, it should be okay under Rendell. Mr. Speaker, I have been here long enough; this is not the first time the RCAP ceiling has been lifted to allow for more capital investments. This is not the first time that we have confronted the issue of debt as it relates to investments in this great State. Mr. Speaker, this is the Keystone State.

When Rendell became Governor, we were 27th in the nation in many areas around jobs, education, and a number of other issues. We are no longer 27, Mr. Speaker, in the nation. Mr. Speaker, we are either above average, if not close to the top, partly due because of our RCAP investments, and not just investments, but prudent, prudent well-thought-out investments. So we are not just throwing money here and there. I was really surprised; as I witnessed these RCAP investments all around Pennsylvania, I kind of said to myself, I know why the 181 has been doing so bad. It is all going to Scranton, Erie, and all over the State.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see some of it come to the 181 so that we can begin to thrive with jobs, new business development, entrepreneurial opportunities, capital investments in our schools, capital investments in our neighborhoods. I would love to see it come to the 181, but I am not driven by selfish motives as much as I am driven by selflessness as it relates to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and people all across Pennsylvania.

I do not hate because Jake Wheatley gets an RCAP in Pittsburgh. I am not going to hate because somebody else gets an RCAP in Scranton, because at the end of the day, it equals jobs; it equals economic development; it equals improvement. If the investment leaves a community better off than it was before the investment was made, I am not going to hate. I am going to jump up and down and find out how we can duplicate it somewhere else in Pennsylvania.

Vote "yes" on HB 2231.

The SPEAKER. Representative Clymer.

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly applaud the Representative from Lancaster County who got all those projects. He got many projects that many of us would be very envious of, as we have submitted those projects in RCAP but we have not gotten them. In Bucks County, which is the fourth largest county in population in the Commonwealth, we have gotten very few since this administration has come in and, yet, we have put many projects on the list. I am just saying that as others—Zero, I just heard from one of my colleagues, we have gotten zero. The fourth largest county, that is Bucks County, has gotten nothing from this administration. That is what my colleagues are telling me.

So all I am saying is that it would be nice if we would get a fair share of some of this money. Certainly, our taxpayers are putting money into the State Treasury to make all of this possible. So it is nice to hear others get up, and I applaud them, they certainly have the connections, I presume, to get these projects. That is wonderful, but let us be more generous. Let us show equity. Let us show a fairness with the dollars.

I am not going to vote for this bill simply because there is no guarantee that Bucks County, the fourth largest county in the Commonwealth, will get any of these projects. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Hutchinson.

The Chair will ask members, again, to reduce the noise level on the floor so the gentleman can be heard. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to oppose HB 2231 because, once again, we are as a State with this bill, demonstrating that we are trying to live beyond our means. I think every person in this room knows that there is such a thing as too much debt. Otherwise, why would we have a cap at all? Why would we not just say there is no limit on borrowing? If borrowing is so great, let us do away with the cap. But quite frankly, everyone knows that we cannot, we cannot borrow our way to prosperity. It just will not work. Too many in this country have shown the folly of trying to borrow beyond your means, and that is why we have this subprime mortgage crisis. And as an aside, Mr. Speaker, I have a constituent who likes to refer to our Governor as the subprime Governor, because he feels that we are borrowing too much money in this bad economic time.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to address a couple of comments that were made earlier. Number one, for those who do feel that they have projects that they want, that they support and want released, quite frankly, there is room for more projects under the existing caps. Each and every year approximately \$60 million is paid off and that frees up money to reauthorize new projects. So if you have a project that is on the cusp of being approved, you do not need this bill in order to get that project funded. As bonds get paid off and we move down below the cap again, then other projects can be reauthorized. And

number two, Mr. Speaker, a statement was made about saying that members who do not support this should not ask for projects. Well, quite frankly, I think the reverse is true; members who vote against this, their taxpayers should not have to pay any taxes to pay off the debt that is associated with this bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise against this bill. I ask my colleagues to support me on this and put Pennsylvania back on the road to fiscal sanity with lower debt.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative George.

Mr. GEORGE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you want us to be relevant and stay on the subject matter. Possibly, if we were unified to save money, we would cut the camera system out of this place and we would not have so many appearances for stardom, if you would appreciate it. Did I do something wrong again, Mr. Speaker?

May I continue, please? Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order – so far.

Mr. GEORGE. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would hate to disappoint you.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have listened for 3 or 4 days and I have heard the Governor's name come up, and it is just too bad that we have to act this way, because I served under Milton Shapp, and I served under Thornburgh, and I served under Bob Casey, and I served under the gentleman, Mr. Ridge, and now I serve under Governor Rendell. And I want to tell you something, I wish I knew what Ed Rendell has forgotten, because the truth of the matter is, why would you not expect Philadelphia, with almost a quarter of the population, to get some credit?

But little Clearfield County, I am glad to say – and it will help Clinton County, it will help Centre County, it will help Mifflin County, it will help Elk County, it will help Cambria County – we got a \$270 million ethanol plant, and we are at the task of getting a \$480 million coal waste plant in Karthaus. Why do we not get at the task, because you know what I always say? Talk is cheap, but it takes money to buy whiskey. Let us vote this bill.

The SPEAKER. Does Representative Turzai wish to be recognized for the second time?

The gentleman is in order.

Mr. TURZAI. Yes, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

As an initial matter, I just want to briefly respond to the majority leader's calling me a sick kitten. No, no, no; I take it in the jest that the majority leader offered it. But I do want to say that he was talking about the past, real briefly, just moving forward, I have to say, I do think that Republican nominee John McCain and his focus on controlled spending and less borrowing and no earmarks – I am wrapped around that, too, just like I must have been the warm brick in the past. So I want to stay on that focused fiscal message.

What I would like to say though is, I heard a number of the individuals get up and speak in favor of this \$800 million authorization. The fiscal note indicates that for every \$100 million of that borrowed, \$160 million has to be paid back. That takes it up to well over, close to \$1.3 billion and, again, as my colleague from Oil City indicated, it is a revolving line of credit. But a number of them talked about how this money is going to go to great hotels and convention centers. I was looking in here, and one of the projects I see noted in HB 1859, which I voted against, was for the Port Authority of

Allegheny County, one of the most inefficient operations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, where people are able to collect their pensions in a DROP (Deferred Retirement Option Plan) account at the same time that they are able to collect salaries.

I see in here for the Port Authority, \$2 million, \$5 million, another \$17 million, \$5 million, \$4 million, \$7 million, \$7 million, and \$4 million, and they got that on top of the drink tax and the car rental tax and the money out of the Act 44, I-80 boondoggle tax and borrowing of \$12 million – \$12 billion, with a "b" – and I do not know; here is, I think, the difference. It is a question, I think if you are for it, how you view growth in the economy, and if you are against it, how you view growth in the economy. If you are for it, you view government as the solution to growing the economy and not the market. You think that a hotel and convention center cannot get financed on their own, cannot go to bankers, cannot go to venture capitalists, cannot go to individual investors to find private-sector money to build a hotel and convention center in their respective communities.

If you believe, and you are against this, you believe that the private sector works quite well in growing the economy. I think also that those people that want to put up a hotel and a convention center can actually go out, make their case to investors as to why it is a good investment and how they are going to make a profit over the long term, and do not need a government subsidy that is being paid by taxpayers, because ultimately, this is middle-class-family money and small business money and large employer money that is paying for the great hotel and convention center. That is who is paying for it. They are just paying for it through a bunch of politicians and bureaucrats who think they know better about how to grow an economy.

That is the difference, how you view the private sector. Is it done through government, bureaucrats, politicians, or is it done in the private-sector market? And guess what? If we were not doing this RCAP, not only this \$800 million authorization, but the \$2.6 billion line of credit that is already out there, if we were not doing that, guess what we might be able to do? We might be able to cut taxes for everybody – for middle-class families, for small businesses, for large employers. And guess what? Across the board, no winners or losers. I think it also defines, if you are for this RCAP authorization or if you are against it, how you view your role as a legislator. If you are in favor of this RCAP, you view your role as a legislator as being able to go and get pockets of taxpayer dollars, hardworking people trying to meet gas prices, trying to meet college education costs, trying to meet health-care costs.

You are saying to them, I can better decide how to spend your money, and I want to be the big shot to take that money back home and put that big project up. I want to be standing there along with Governor Rendell and making this happen, but if you are opposing it and you do not see the need for the capital projects overall, you are saying that I think the best credit I can get with respect to the electorate and with respect to the middle-class families is to say to them, I want you to keep more of your hard-earned dollars in your pocket. You, employer, who I want to stay here and expand here, to locate here, or to start up here, I want you to have the capital to invest in your own infrastructure. I want you to have the capital to invest in your own personnel. You make those decisions. You are the entrepreneur.

In the end, it is those individuals that are making cities and towns across this State happening. They are the people that are taking care of the YMCA and the schools and the little leagues and the churches. It is those entrepreneurs. Let us just look at where we are in terms of our taxes. If we did not have this RCAP program and we could do those tax cuts, we would not be, we would not have the second highest corporate tax rate in the developed world, Pennsylvania, at 9.99 percent. We would not have to be a State that increased the personal income tax, which essentially, has very few deductions, from 2.8 percent to 3.07 percent, taking away \$900 million annually from middle-class families and small businesses. We might not have these ridiculously bad rankings in terms of our growth in comparison to other States.

From 1970 through today, our rankings in job growth were 49th; our population growth, 47th; our personal income growth, 45th out of 50 States. We could be cutting taxes and be part of the 10 States who have the lowest taxes and have decreased their taxes. Their personal income growth for their citizens was 1600 percent. Those, like Pennsylvania, that had the largest tax burden increases, the personal income growth was almost half less than that at 970 percent. States that reduced taxes, 88-percent growth in their population. Pennsylvania, or the highest tax-burdened States, only an 18-percent population growth. For goodness' sake, we continue to lose congressional districts every time we redistrict, and we are going to lose at least one if not two in the next go-around, you all know that. I would take the 193-percent job growth for the 10 States with the lowest tax burden over the 53-percent job growth for the 10 States with the largest tax burden. We have lost, with all these great economic development convention centers and hotels, why did it not stem the loss of 80,000 manufacturing jobs since this Governor came into the administration?

I think, and I think the colleagues who are opposed to this RCAP stand on the notion that the private-sector entrepreneurs will grow the economy. You cannot grow the economy and grow the government at the same time. This grows the government, and it stops growing the private sector in Pennsylvania. That is what it does. In addition, I think those that oppose it recognize the best message they can take back to Pennsylvanians is, I cut your taxes. I want you to take responsibility for your life. I want you to be able to afford a college education. I want you to be able to afford prices and make your own decisions with your hard-earned money as opposed to us being the big shots, accumulating billions and billions and billions of taxpayers' dollars, acting like big shots.

Vote against this RCAP \$800 million boondoggle. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Stern.

Mr. STERN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is a beautiful chamber that we get a chance to work in every day. We come down here and sometimes we think that we are in the Emerald City almost, but this is not Oz. We have a bill before us today that proposes to spend \$200 million, or borrow \$200 million, for the next 4 years that has to be paid back by the citizens and taxpayers of Pennsylvania. The first 3 years that these moneys will be paid back, I just think it needs to be sent out so that those that are listening to this debate understand how much they will be paying back in the moneys that we are borrowing here today. But in the first 3 years, beginning in 2010, we will be paying approximately \$92 million back of what we are borrowing here today.

For 17 years in a row, we will be spending almost \$63 million. Sixty-three million for 17 years to pay back this debt that we are incurring on the taxpayers of Pennsylvania today. The final 3 years incurs another expenditure of about \$93 million. So we are borrowing \$200 million the first year, \$200 million the second year, \$200 million the third year, \$200 million the fourth year, and we are borrowing \$800 million.

I spoke to— I heard one of the previous speakers mention about, this has something to do with economic benefits and businesses. I have talked to my business community. I have talked to sole proprietors that are struggling just to pay their taxes, struggling to pay their rising fuel costs, struggling to pay their food costs and everything else that it takes to run their business, but yet, here in Harrisburg, we are going above and beyond, spending \$800, or borrowing \$800 more million and somebody has to pay it back. Yes, our children and our grandchildren are going to be the ones that have to pay this debt back over a period of about 20-some years. We need to keep that in mind as we move forward with this vote, and I plan on voting against 2231.

I would ask my colleagues to think about the future of their children and their grandchildren as well and tighten our buckles down here in Pennsylvania just like our constituents back in our districts are trying to tighten their belts right now and cut their spending habits.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (MATTHEW E. BAKER) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the majority leader, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. Just one last minute on HB 2231's final passage.

Take a convention center in the city of Philadelphia or a convention center in Pittsburgh or a convention center in Blair County, Altoona, or any other RCAP proposal that we are going to work together on in Democratic and Republican districts; the amount of State investment in one of those facilities so far supersedes the ability of the private sector to engage in that it is exponential, but small businesses and medium-sized free enterprise efforts in the area of that convention center or that new construction benefit, and benefit immeasurably.

There is no use subscribing to some of the favorable comparisons relative to our Tax Code if we are not going to make substantial Commonwealth investments in big-ticket items. The RCAP was last raised in 2005, and there were Republican majorities in the House and Republican majorities in the Senate. Throughout history both parties have been involved in elevating the debt ceiling or allowing more flexibility for State financing. This is not a partisan issue at all. We have a sturdy handshake from our brethren in the Republican Senate leadership team, and many of our senior Republican members here in the House have a favorable perspective. I just want to make sure that everybody knows, in our view – and it has been contested at the microphone – this is a pro-business vote. This is an investment opportunity in bigger ticket items than the private sector could normally, and almost in all occasions, contemplate.

So I would ask for a favorable vote. Not only do we have the chance to enhance our urban settings and our rural and suburban projects, but we will also give impetus and momentum to small and medium businesses three blocks away, 3 miles away, or 30 miles away. This will have a cumulatively positive effect for business in our State, and I would respectfully request an affirmative vote on HB 2231, final passage.

THE SPEAKER (DENNIS M. O'BRIEN) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER. Representative Preston.

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

I heard an awful lot of talk, people talking about small business, and I will just start in my own environment in dealing in Allegheny County about helping small business and what this bill will be able to do.

I have heard some people talk about, well, if we care about middle-class families and the small business, again, now, I am not saying anything about it because I have and want to encourage small business, and it is the same thing, I am not pointing a finger if someone says they have been in small business for 30 or 40 years, and maybe if they have not expanded, does that mean that possibly they have problems?

Well, let us look at what happens. Small companies and major companies work together in developing a site – engineering firms, architectural firms. There is aerial photography; there are GIS (geographic information system) programs, an awful lot of small engineering and computer systems or analysis that really look at the major projects and lay that out. Then let us just even look at the small trucking companies that bring in the concrete, that ship in an awful lot of the materials to the businesses. Now, I know in western Pennsylvania, when we were building the convention center or even the stadiums, for an example, we could not find enough small businesses that we actually had to go outside the State and bring people in, but they paid taxes and they paid off an awful lot of the debt.

I am trying to understand when the gentleman is talking about taxpayers' dollars. Well, if you float something and they wind up having people contribute and they are selling tickets, i.e., whether it is a stadium, whether they sell and bring in a million or a couple million dollars of hotel rooms, but who does the catering? How about that small businessperson, the new entrepreneur for the bottled water? What about the doorknobs that are sold? What about the glass, the window glass? What about the hinges and what about all the other different parts that go in with the infrastructure of laying that building? That sounds like small businesses to me. So do not say that we are not trying to help someone.

And even in the small towns that develop a theater that may not even have the wherewithal within their own contributions to be able to build those theaters, between the doors, the windows, the tickets, the employment, the janitors, the air conditioning, the HVAC (heating, ventilating, and air conditioning), dealing with the heating systems, dealing with the electrical workers, the small electrical contractor, the small plumbing contractor that does all of the hard work, those small businesses. And if you are saying that we do not care about them but yet we are providing jobs and an awful lot of jobs and wages and taxes for those individuals that line up for that and even the vendors that

come in to play, and we could go on all the way from the glassware and all the way from the lightbulbs, all the way from the light fixtures, to the painters, the small painting contractor that does an awful lot of that work and it provides wages, it provides businesses, and it does provide an awful lot of jobs, and it keeps an awful lot of people surviving in a lot of the rural areas just as well.

So let us really look at what this bill does. I am not trying to say that we are selling away. I did not ask the gentleman what our debt ratio was, and that makes a difference. It is about the debt ratio. It is not about how much the debt is. It is about the debt ratio versus, i.e., how much is actually coming in, but he does not mention about what the debt ratio of the State is, and it is good. So we need to be accountable for what we are trying to do, and this is a very good bill to be able to adequately look at for the people of Pennsylvania.

Then there is another thing, about the people who use the facilities. Now, all I know is that when we have— Whether it is a sports event, whether it is baseball, football, or soccer, they do not come from inside the city of Pittsburgh; they do not come from inside the city of Pittsburgh. They come from Butler County, Beaver County, Westmoreland County, all around, all of the other different suburbs. They come in, and if you do not believe me, how about the traffic jams that everybody is trying to do.

And it does, yes, it helps an awful lot of small businesses, and the people are coming in for some form of entertainment, i.e., even with the convention center. People come from Cambria County, people come from Westmoreland County, people come all the way from Maryland and Delaware. They are coming into Pittsburgh or Philadelphia or Scranton and coming in from the State of New York. So let us not try to paint this picture where everybody wants to say about tax and spend. This generates an awful lot of jobs for an awful lot of middle-class families, lower-income families, and also provides a way for people from upper income to be able to buy a ticket to be able to enjoy some of the entertainment that an awful lot of these facilities are doing. And if you do not believe me, then you ask some people that when they are looking for an area that is usually high-end – they have a higher source of income – they want to know about the cultural accoutrements, and they do not mind traveling 20 or 30 miles, because we know that the rural areas sometimes cannot support that, but it still gives you a class community to be able to deal with.

Let us support this bill. It is a good action. It helps an awful lot of middle-class families and an awful lot of small businesses.

GUEST INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to recognize, as the guest of the Speaker and perhaps many members of the House, someone that we are very proud of, David Krall. Would you please stand and be recognized.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2231 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Representative Frankel.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of HB 2231, and I think we really need to recognize where Pennsylvania is positioned here. Some would

portray us, as we have heard, as spendthrifts, that we are running ourselves into debt, but the fact is, borrowing money and leveraging bonds, making investments in our State has been and will be a key economic development tool, and when you compare us to the rest of the States, we are right in the middle of the pack. We are 25th in terms of borrowing in terms of our debt, and Wall Street, Wall Street believes that we are behaving responsibly. We have a AA bond rating, one of the best in the country, and in fact, when they came here to talk to our Finance Committee and we had folks coming in— In fact, maybe we are underleveraged; we are not using our resources enough.

When I talk to the business community in Pittsburgh in Allegheny County, many of them are strong believers that we ought to be making these investments. If you take a look back at the past and look at what we have been able to do with redevelopment assistance in southwestern Pennsylvania, it is hard to imagine what we would be like if we did not make those investments. We would not have sports teams; we would not have a convention center. We would not have many of the amenities that are important that bring people to the city, keep people there, and make it a place that people want to invest in and move to and have a sense of vitality.

We have a sense of hope today in southwestern Pennsylvania, and this bill will help continue the momentum that I think we are poised to do to make our city and our region vibrant. This bill is extremely important. It is not irresponsible. It is not mortgaging the future. It is responsible by every standard that you take a look at when you are evaluating whether you are in the position to borrow money.

We have a AA bond rating, middle of the pack in terms of 50 States in where we are with our debt load at this point. This is a responsible bill. It is a modest proposal. We ought to make these investments. I urge its approval.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Levdansky.

Mr. LEVDANSKY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Representative Frankel cited some of the statistics that I think are important in this debate. A couple of months ago the House Finance Committee had Budget Secretary Masch appear before the committee, and he gave a presentation, a comprehensive presentation on all of the State debt. And one thing I think you have got to keep in mind is that every year the State is retiring bonds that were issued 15, 20, or other years ago. So we are retiring debt as well as accruing debt. So on balance, what this bill does is increase the RCAP by about \$800 million.

Now, my legislative district, I live – my district is 15 to 20 miles outside of Pittsburgh, but I view my legislative district in the context of a region. My district has not benefited yet from RCAP assistance, because there is an important requirement that you have to have a 50-percent local match. So it is not like you or the Governor are walking around giving out free money. The reality is that it has to be a good project. It goes on a list. You get on the capital budget and you compete with all the other requests, and there are far more requests than we have funds available to fund projects. But all of these RCAP projects require a local match; in most cases at least of 50 percent. So it is not like it is free money.

Just understand that a lot of us do not view this as our ability to bring bacon back to our district or pork back to our district. I view this as a critically important program to partner with the

private sector who needs, at times, some State support to leverage their investment to make projects happen not so much because they are important in a legislator's district but, more importantly, because they are good for our region in southwestern Pennsylvania. So to the extent that organizations and companies and private-sector entities in the Pittsburgh area benefit from that, while it does not directly impact my district, certainly it does indirectly. We are all part of a region.

One final thing, and I say this not because I think the Governor needs to be defended on this, but the reality is, I think the Governor clearly understands, too. He views this legislation as an opportunity to leverage private-sector investment. And one of the previous speakers alluded to the Governor going around giving out checks; the last time I read in the newspapers, Governor Rendell seemingly has no interest in running for public office. His term ends here in another couple of years, but that does not mean he does not have an interest in helping to spur economic growth in Pennsylvania.

This bill and some of the other bills that we are going to consider this week are really important to help leverage private-sector investment in Pennsylvania's economy, and for that reason alone we should all support this legislation. Thank you.

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—151

Adolph	Galloway	McCall	Samuelson
Baker	Geist	McGeehan	Santoni
Barrar	George	McI. Smith	Scavello
Bastian	Gerber	Melio	Schroder
Belfanti	Gergely	Mensch	Seip
Bennington	Gibbons	Micozzie	Shapiro
Beyer	Godshall	Milne	Shimkus
Biancucci	Goodman	Moyer	Siptroth
Bishop	Grucela	Mundy	Smith, K.
Blackwell	Haluska	Murt	Smith, M.
Brennan	Hanna	Mustio	Smith, S.
Buxton	Harhai	Myers	Solobay
Caltagirone	Harkins	Nailor	Sonney
Cappelli	Harper	O'Brien, M.	Staback
Carroll	Hess	O'Neill	Stairs
Casorio	James	Oliver	Steil
Causar	Josephs	Pallone	Sturla
Civera	Keller, W.	Parker	Surra
Cohen	Kenney	Pashinski	Tangretti
Conklin	Kessler	Payne	Taylor, J.
Costa	Killion	Payton	Taylor, R.
Cruz	King	Perzel	Thomas
Curry	Kirkland	Petrarca	Vereb
Daley	Kortz	Petri	Vitali
Dally	Kotik	Petrone	Wagner
DeLuca	Kula	Phillips	Walko
DePasquale	Leach	Pickett	Wansacz
Dermody	Lentz	Preston	Waters
DeWeese	Levdansky	Quinn	Watson
DiGirolamo	Longietti	Ramaley	Wheatley
Donatucci	Maher	Raymond	White
Eachus	Mahoney	Readshaw	Williams
Evans, D.	Major	Reichley	Wojnaroski
Evans, J.	Manderino	Roebuck	Youngblood
Everett	Mann	Ross	Yudichak
Fabrizio	Markosek	Rubley	

Fairchild	Marshall	Sabatina	O'Brien, D.,
Frankel	Marsico	Sainato	Speaker
Freeman			

NAYS—52

Argall	Gabig	Keller, M.K.	Rapp
Bear	Gillespie	Mackereth	Reed
Benninghoff	Gingrich	Mantz	Roae
Boback	Grell	McIlhattan	Rock
Boyd	Harhart	Metcalfe	Rohrer
Brooks	Harris	Millard	Saylor
Clymer	Helm	Miller	Stern
Cox	Hennessey	Moul	Stevenson
Creighton	Hershey	Nickol	Swanger
Cutler	Hickernell	Peifer	True
Denlinger	Hornaman	Perry	Turzai
Ellis	Hutchinson	Pyle	Vulakovich
Fleck	Kauffman	Quigley	Yewcic

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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.

RULE 19(B) SUSPENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Evans, who moves to suspend that portion of House rule 19(b) as it relates to notice requirements and amendment filing deadlines for purposes of immediately considering the general appropriations bill, SB 1389.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Evans on the motion.

The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. D. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, this is a motion for suspending that part of rule 19(b) so that we can move this process along and get this budget issue resolved by this Thursday. I would ask that members join with us so that we could get out of here before the Fourth of July, so we can move this bill through the process.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority chair, Representative Civera.

Mr. CIVERA. Mr. Speaker, if I understand correctly, the majority Appropriations chairman is making a motion to suspend the rules so we could take up HB 1389. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. It is SB 1389.

Mr. CIVERA. I meant to say Senate bill.

May I speak on the motion, Mr. Speaker?

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

Mr. CIVERA. Mr. Speaker, what I would like to do today is to speak on the motion to suspend, but before I do that on the motion, we are here today because this motion is what we had to agree, as leaders and the Governor, on Sunday and early

Monday morning, but I think these remarks will be apropos in what I am about to say.

In one respect, I am kind of glad that we resolved what we had to do to do the people's business. On the other hand, I am saddened that we have to come – because the rules that are before us today and the rule that is being asked to be suspended is a rule that was set up by the Rules Committee that was taken very seriously when this House was organized in January of '07, because the people of Pennsylvania had believed that the General Assembly should be tighter as far as legislation that is passed and what we do with the budget of Pennsylvania and the dollars that we spend.

If you remember this year when we did— After the Governor came before us, he spoke to us and presented his budget in February, and in February, at that point, is when the wheels started to roll of when this appropriations bill should be passed and when we should start to do the people's business of Pennsylvania as far as the dollars and the budget for the school districts and everything and the appropriation issues that are faced with the Commonwealth.

On February 19 of 2008, I wrote a letter to the Governor, and the letter was a similar letter that we have followed in previous years when we adopted a budget in Pennsylvania and the procedure of how that should take place. The letter was sent to the Governor, and a response from the Governor came back, and it had dates of when we should be doing what we should be doing as the chairman of the Appropriations, the minority chairman, and the leaders of the four caucuses. These dates would not have brought us to the point of where we are today, asking for the suspension, had we had agreed to the letter that I had sent out, copies to the majority of the Appropriations, the majority leader, and then the same in the House, as well as in the Senate this letter was copied.

My point today is this: We have agreed to do a budget on Monday night, or Monday morning, and we have agreed to come to the dollars that are going to be evenly appropriated through the Commonwealth. However, this practice cannot continue to go on as years before us. It is our constitutional obligation to get a budget done on the date that the Constitution tells us to.

My other point of this is to bring out that the General Assembly – this House, 203 members – was not a participant in what we participated in on Sunday evening, and I think that is wrong, Mr. Speaker. I think that is incorrect. I think that our forefathers, when they wrote the State Constitution and they drew what the membership of what this General Assembly was, was to have participation by each and every member of the General Assembly.

Now, I realize what goes on and the politics that are played on both sides of the aisle. After the Appropriations hearings were put before us, we came before this chamber right before the Easter holiday, and I had asked a schedule of when that budget was going to be brought up. Not once did I ask; at least seven or eight times, I stood at this podium and asked the majority chairman of the Appropriations Committee to give us a schedule so we could have amendments. My point in arguing this, my point in bringing this to the floor is that we would not be doing what this rule asks us to do; we would not have to come here and request a suspension of the rules to move this document forward.

This practice, at this point in time and in the years to come, has to stop, has to stop. These rules cannot be made for one day

and then talk to a different group the next day. The practice has to begin that each and every member that represents a district has to have a say in the \$28 billion spending number through this Commonwealth.

We have a budget that we are going to vote on that I am going to ask the Republicans not to vote on because it is not in balance, and the majority chairman is going to ask his side to vote on because we need to get a vehicle over to the Senate, and that vehicle is the Senate bill, so we could get what we compromised on, and I compromised, too, but I am not going to be a hypocrite and stand here and say that I am all in full agreement.

What I want you to understand is that this practice can no longer be the way it was this year. We need to participate. That is why we have Appropriations Committees. That is why we have the members of those Appropriations Committees ask the direct questions to our different departments throughout the Commonwealth to get answers, and if we continue to do a practice like this, this is wrong. Then we are going to put a rule in to monitor the rule, and if you understand what I am saying, that sounds— What is he saying? That does not make any sense at all. So when we adopt rules, why go in and ask another way? But we are into July. We are into July 1. The Senate bill was noted last week. That means the first day that it could be acted on would be July 7.

So what I am saying to you is that we need to stop doing this practice. Whether you agree or whether you disagree, we need to take this Commonwealth in a different direction, a direction that when you cast a vote, you mean it.

Now, we are going to move to suspend the rules today because, like I just said to you a minute ago, we need to get this document to the Senate, but I ask the members of the General Assembly as well as both the Republicans and the Democrats, that they back what I am saying here. And we have talked to our leadership that in the coming years these late dates cannot prevail any longer, that they cannot prevail any longer; that we have a say, we have an active say in that budget.

Some people believe that what I tried to do a couple weeks ago or a couple of months ago when I asked for the amendment process, I heard remarks, it does not mean anything; it is hypocritical. You know something? If that is the case, lock the doors and do not let anybody in. I make this point because I believe in what I am saying. I believe it is the right thing to do. Send the letter with the different dates on it, have letters written to the editorial boards saying we need an open process. We need to start— What we think up here and what we say, we need to follow through, Mr. Speaker, because it is not going to mean anything and the public is going to laugh at us.

Yes, we have agreed on a balanced budget. Yes, we have agreed on a budget that can carry Pennsylvania in the next year or so, and, yes, we have agreed on an education dollar amount, but we all could agree, we all could have gotten up and said whether we believe in it or we do not believe in it, and that is my point.

I am going to rise to ask you to suspend the rules, but at this point, I am reluctant. I am reluctant because I believe that we need to change the practice of how we do business in the General Assembly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—179

Adolph	Galloway	Marshall	Sabatina
Argall	George	Marsico	Samuelson
Baker	Gerber	McCall	Santoni
Barrar	Gergely	McGeehan	Saylor
Bastian	Gibbons	McI. Smith	Scavello
Bear	Gillespie	Melio	Seip
Belfanti	Gingrich	Mensch	Shapiro
Bennington	Godshall	Micozzie	Shimkus
Beyer	Goodman	Millard	Siptroth
Biancucci	Grucela	Miller	Smith, K.
Bishop	Haluska	Milne	Smith, M.
Blackwell	Hanna	Moyer	Smith, S.
Boback	Harhai	Mundy	Solobay
Boyd	Harhart	Murt	Sonney
Brennan	Harkins	Mustio	Staback
Brooks	Harris	Myers	Stairs
Buxton	Helm	Nailor	Steil
Caltagirone	Hennessey	Nickol	Stern
Cappelli	Hershey	O'Brien, M.	Stevenson
Carroll	Hess	O'Neill	Sturla
Casorio	Hickernell	Oliver	Surra
Causer	Hornaman	Pallone	Tangretti
Civera	James	Parker	Taylor, J.
Clymer	Josephs	Pashinski	Taylor, R.
Cohen	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Thomas
Conklin	Keller, W.	Payton	True
Costa	Kenney	Peifer	Turzai
Cruz	Kessler	Perzel	Vereb
Curry	Killion	Petrarca	Vitali
Daley	King	Petri	Vulakovich
Dally	Kirkland	Petrone	Wagner
DeLuca	Kortz	Pickett	Walko
Denlinger	Kotik	Preston	Wansacz
DePasquale	Kula	Pyle	Waters
Dermody	Leach	Quigley	Watson
DeWeese	Lentz	Quinn	Wheatley
DiGirolamo	Levdansky	Ramaley	White
Donatucci	Longietti	Rapp	Williams
Eachus	Mackereth	Raymond	Wojnaroski
Evans, D.	Mahoney	Readshaw	Yewcic
Evans, J.	Major	Reed	Youngblood
Fabrizio	Manderino	Reichley	Yudichak
Fleck	Mann	Roebuck	
Frankel	Mantz	Ross	O'Brien, D.,
Freeman	Markosek	Rubley	Speaker
Gabig			

NAYS—24

Benninghoff	Fairchild	Maher	Roae
Cox	Geist	McIlhattan	Rock
Creighton	Grell	Metcalfe	Rohrer
Cutler	Harper	Moul	Sainato
Ellis	Hutchinson	Perry	Schroder
Everett	Kauffman	Phillips	Swanger

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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 SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 1389, PN 2283**, entitled:

An Act to provide from the General Fund for the expenses of the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Departments of the Commonwealth, the public debt and the public schools for the fiscal year July 1, 2008, to June 30, 2009, 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, 2008; to provide appropriations from the State Lottery Fund, the Energy Conservation and Assistance Fund, 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 Payment Fund, the Banking Department Fund, the Firearm Records Check Fund, the Ben Franklin Technology Development Authority Fund and the Tobacco Settlement 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, 2008, to June 30, 2009; to provide appropriations from the Motor License Fund for the fiscal year July 1, 2008, to June 30, 2009, for the proper operation of the several departments of the Commonwealth and the Pennsylvania State Police authorized to spend Motor License Fund moneys; 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, 2008; to provide for the additional appropriation of Federal and State funds from the General Fund for the Executive and Judicial Departments of the Commonwealth for the fiscal year July 1, 2007, to June 30, 2008, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2007.

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

Mr. **SCHRODER** offered the following amendment No. **A11354**:

Amend Sec. 212, page 256, line 8, by striking out all of said line and inserting

State appropriation46,156,000

Amend Sec. 212, page 259, lines 15 and 16, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

units. Of the amount appropriated, \$3,900,000 shall be set aside for an intermediate unit providing administrative services for an institution providing residential treatment services under section 1306 of the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, to students who are residents of a school district of the first class. The intermediate unit and institution must also be owed back payment for these services from a school district of the first class as reviewed by the Pennsylvania Department of Education pursuant to sections 1308 and 1309 of the Public School Code of 1949.

State appropriation 10,211,000

Amend Sec. 212, page 263, lines 17 through 19, by striking out all of said lines

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Schroder on the amendment.

Mr. SCHRODER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to start out by saying how disappointed I am and just add on to the remarks of Chairman Civera just a few moments ago that all the members of this House were not afforded the right and the opportunity to offer amendments to this budget.

Mr. Speaker, it seems clear that the process this year was designed by the majority party to hold the budget until the very last moment; if we go into overtime, and then members, just so as not to cause a furlough situation, are forced under pressure to withdraw their amendments. Mr. Speaker, we should not be operating like this, and I think it is a sad day in the House in moving the exact opposite way of which we should be taking our deliberations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this amendment that I have drafted, the purpose of this amendment is to solve a long-simmering dispute with regards to a large sum of money that is owed to a number of school districts in Chester County. What has been happening is that the Philadelphia School District has, in essence, been dumping many of their hard-to-educate, most seriously educationally impaired special education students to our school districts in our county. Our county has dutifully educated them, and when it is time for the Philadelphia School District to pay the bill, they act like a deadbeat parent, and they have refused to pay \$5 million owed to several school districts in Chester County. Now, Mr. Speaker, there have been a few payments recently, and that number, \$5 million, has come down to about \$3.9 million. But, Mr. Speaker, this money has been owed for a long period of time, and the Philadelphia School District is not living up to its obligation. Heaven knows, in this budget that we are about to pass, they will be treated very, very well by the taxpayers of this Commonwealth and by the hardworking taxpayers in Chester County, and, Mr. Speaker, those taxpayers deserve to have the bill paid by the Philadelphia school system for the educational services being provided to their special education students.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Mr. SCHRODER. So, Mr. Speaker, with that on the record and with the fact that we have gone into overtime, as we have every year under the Rendell administration for this budget, and just recognizing the reality that we are faced with that even if this amendment passes, its likelihood of survival through the process, in light of the fact that we already have an agreement, is very slim, Mr. Speaker, I will be withdrawing the amendment.

And, Mr. Speaker, I did want to put this serious situation on the record, though, because the city of Philadelphia needs to live up to its obligations, or the Philadelphia school system; excuse me, needs to live up to its obligations to those neighboring school districts and surrounding school districts that are providing educational services to their students.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

It is the information of the Chair there are no other amendments pending to this bill.

Representative Fairchild.

The House will be at ease.

The House will come to order.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Mr. FAIRCHILD offered the following amendment No. **A11356:**

Amend Sec. 214, page 270, line 16, by striking out all of said line and inserting

State appropriation76,867,000

Amend Sec. 225, page 319, line 9, by striking out all of said line and inserting

State appropriation1,000,000

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Fairchild on the amendment.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment provides for an increase of \$500,000 for the Red Cross Extended Care Program. The Red Cross has served a very valuable service in Pennsylvania, and essentially, what we would like to do is restore the amount of money that was in the budget in 2006. So what I would like to do is to urge the colleagues here on the House floor to urge leadership, who is negotiating the budget, as we all know, to consider this in their request.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Mr. FAIRCHILD. At this time I would like to withdraw this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Mr. FAIRCHILD offered the following amendment No. **A11357:**

Amend Sec. 218, page 288, line 29, by striking out all of said line and inserting

State appropriation75,000

Amend Sec. 220, page 312, line 12, by striking out all of said line and inserting

State appropriation145,671,000

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Fairchild.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment provides for an increase of a mere \$25,000 for Pennsylvania's share of preservation costs of the American Battle Monuments Commission, and their mission is to preserve these American war monuments around the world. The line item is currently only \$50,000, and my \$25,000 increase would help to maintain these monuments to our veterans who served very ably and very nobly in,

principally, our world wars, .i.e., World War I and World War II.

If you or any of your family members or friends have ever been to some of these war shrines or monuments in Europe, you will realize just how valuable they are, and Pennsylvania, itself, has a presence there with their own monuments that pay tribute to our soldiers who fought and died there.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Mr. FAIRCHILD. I withdraw this amendment.
The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. FAIRCHILD offered the following amendment No. **A11358:**

Amend Sec. 218, page 290, line 30, by striking out all of said line and inserting

State appropriation 600,000

Amend Sec. 220, page 312, line 12, by striking out all of said line and inserting

State appropriation 145,596,000

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Fairchild.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is an extremely important amendment. It restores the funding for— Actually, the amendment was intended to give a \$100,000 increase to the Civil Air Patrol in Pennsylvania. However, as I understand the budgetary process, it will revert back to the Governor's budget, which that line item was zeroed out.

So, essentially, what this amendment boils down to is we would like to see \$600,000 allocated to the Civil Air Patrol in Pennsylvania. The mission of the Civil Air Patrol is vitally important. They go on search-and-rescue missions. They monitor and assist with our emergencies and our emergency disaster teams, and they are, indeed, a very good mentor of our youth in Pennsylvania.

So again, Mr. Speaker, please consider this request.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Mr. FAIRCHILD. And again, Mr. Speaker, at the request of the respective Appropriations chair and leaders, who have assured me that they will take a look at these items, I withdraw this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. FAIRCHILD offered the following amendment No. **A11359:**

Amend Sec. 210, page 245, lines 28 through 30, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

For the PAMAP Program.
State appropriation 2,400,000

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Fairchild on the amendment.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The next two amendments have to do with Pennsylvania's PAMAP. We call it the PAMAP Program. This amendment adds an appropriation of \$2,400,000 for the PAMAP Program in the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and reduces the appropriations for infrastructure and initiative mapping in the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources from \$2,400,000.

In all that gobbledygook, what we are simply doing with this is transferring the money from one account in the State budget to another account. The PAMAP Program project has been eliminated from the Governor's proposed budget, but what we need this money for is to, essentially, finish out the aerial mapping and data source recovery for the State of Pennsylvania. The mapping, the aerial part of that, has essentially been done, but there is an awful lot of work to do, and we want to make sure that that work, indeed, does get done. The County Commissioners Association and many other organizations that are interested in geology and data and using that data for different projects including GIS projects, et cetera, are very interested in this, and they are very concerned that they have enough money, the State has enough money to complete the project.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Mr. FAIRCHILD. So with that said, Mr. Speaker, I also withdraw this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. FAIRCHILD offered the following amendment No. **A11360:**

Amend Sec. 202, page 215, line 13, by striking out all of said line and inserting

State appropriation 60,851,000

Amend Sec. 210, page 245, lines 28 through 30, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

For the PAMAP Program.
State appropriation 4,600,000

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Fairchild on the amendment.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is the last amendment, and this, again, has to do with the PAMAP Program. And what this does, in addition to the previous amendment I described, this money will be used – this additional money would designate the funds for PAMAP as a permanent program rather than a project and would simply change the administrative label given to the data task the funds would support. The tasks themselves, infrastructure mapping, would remain the same. The additional \$2.2 million would provide the resources necessary to continue collecting aerial imagery of one-third of the Commonwealth according to the established 3-year cycle to continue integration and distribution of State and county data layers to serve all levels of government.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Mr. FAIRCHILD. This amendment will also be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed there are no further amendments to this bill. Are there any members offering amendments? The Chair sees no member rise.

Will the House agree to the bill?

The Chair recognizes Representative Perzel. The gentleman waives off.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. D. EVANS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Evans for an announcement.

Mr. D. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, prior to making that announcement, I would like to make one comment about the budget process.

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

Mr. D. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, one, I want to thank the Republican leader and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee on the other side for their cooperation in moving this process.

I just announced to them and I want to give a little sense on the update. I spoke to the Senate today, the Senate leadership today. This is just the first step. If everything goes right, if everything goes right, we should be able to finish by Thursday, if everything goes right in terms of moving these through the process. Your leader, and your chair of Appropriations, as well as our side speaking to the Senate along with the Governor's Office, we just need to get these vehicles in place, and then by Thursday, again, you know, anything could happen, but obviously, we are hoping to have everything done by Thursday. That is what we are hoping, and we are trying to get that done. So I wanted to just make that announcement.

APPROPRIATIONS AND RULES COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Mr. D. EVANS. Immediately there will be an Appropriations meeting in the majority caucus room, in the majority caucus room.

And then after that, the Appropriations Committee meeting, there will be a Rules Committee meeting, also in the majority caucus room.

I would like to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to make those announcements.

The SPEAKER. There will be an immediate meeting of the Appropriations Committee in the majority caucus room. After the Appropriations Committee meeting, there will be a Rules Committee meeting in the majority caucus room.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman, Representative Caltagirone, rise?

Mr. CALTAGIRONE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At the call of the break, there will be a meeting of the House Judiciary Committee in room G-50. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Judiciary Committee will meet in room G-50 at the break.

Does the gentleman, Representative Evans, have an estimated time he would like to return to the floor?

Mr. D. EVANS. I would say 5:15, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

LABOR RELATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Representative Casorio is recognized for an announcement.

Mr. CASORIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A Labor Relations Committee announcement. The Labor Relations Committee will hold an immediate meeting in room 39, East Wing. It will be a very brief meeting, and we encourage the members to attend; 39 East Wing, a Labor Committee meeting.

The SPEAKER. The Labor Relations Committee will meet immediately in room 39, East Wing.

The Chair would ask Representative Caltagirone again to clarify his announcement as to what building that meeting is in.

Mr. CALTAGIRONE. That is in the Irvis Office Building, room G-50. It will be a very brief meeting.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Are there any other announcements?

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess to the call of the Chair.

The Chair estimates, as reflected in Representative Evans' comments, we hope to be back at 5:15.

AFTER RECESS

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

BILL REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

SB 1424, PN 2209 By Rep. D. EVANS

An Act amending the act of December 22, 1983 (P.L.306, No.84), known as the Board of Vehicles Act, providing for licensing cost.

APPROPRIATIONS.

The SPEAKER. This bill will be placed on the supplemental calendar.

BILL REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HB 2289, PN 3307 By Rep. D. EVANS

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for desecration or sale of venerated objects.

APPROPRIATIONS.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be placed on the active calendar.

BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

SB 1158, PN 2145 By Rep. D. EVANS

An Act amending Title 74 (Transportation) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for transportation infrastructure partnership and development.

APPROPRIATIONS.**BILL REREFERRED**

The SPEAKER. The Chair moves, at the request of the majority leader, that SB 1158, PN 2145, be rereferred to the Committee on Transportation.

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

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HB 44, PN 3953 By Rep. DeWEESE

An Act prohibiting the sale, installation and disposal of mercury thermostats; and prescribing penalties.

RULES.

HB 2670, PN 4056 By Rep. DeWEESE

An Act authorizing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Governor, to convey a certain easement in the City of Philadelphia.

RULES.

The SPEAKER. These bills will be placed on the active calendar.

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE
REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**

HB 239, PN 4106 By Rep. DeWEESE

An Act amending the act of May 1, 1933 (P.L.103, No.69), known as The Second Class Township Code, further providing for liens for assessments and for connection to water system.

RULES.

The SPEAKER. This bill will be placed on the active calendar.

**BILLS ON CONCURRENCE
REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**

HB 1150, PN 4115 By Rep. DeWEESE

An Act amending the act of May 17, 1921 (P.L.682, No.284), known as The Insurance Company Law of 1921, in preliminary provisions, further providing for effect of act on existing laws; in life insurance, further providing for additional investment authority for subsidiaries; in casualty insurance, providing for autism spectrum disorders coverage and for colorectal cancer screenings coverage; in insurance holding companies, further providing for definitions, for acquisition of control of or merger with domestic insurer, for acquisitions involving insurers not otherwise covered and for standards and management of an insurer within a holding company system; providing for committee review; establishing the Insurance Restructuring Restricted Receipt Account; providing for community health reinvestment; and making a related repeal.

RULES.

HB 1329, PN 3192 By Rep. DeWEESE

An Act amending the act of July 31, 1968 (P.L.805, No.247), known as the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, providing for optional notice of ordinance or decision and procedural validity challenges; further providing for ordinance provisions and for jurisdiction of the zoning hearing board and the court of common pleas in challenges to the validity of an ordinance for procedural defects in the process of enactment; and providing for time for appeal and procedural defects of decisions.

RULES.

HB 1330, PN 3193 By Rep. DeWEESE

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for appeals generally and for appeals from ordinances, resolutions, maps, etc.

RULES.

HB 1612, PN 4084 By Rep. DeWEESE

An Act providing for testing standards for cigarette fire safety, for certification of compliance by manufacturers, for package markings and for enforcement and penalties; establishing special funds; and providing for sale of existing inventory, for manufacturers' sale to other states or foreign countries and for regulations and preemptions.

RULES.

HB 2295, PN 3999

By Rep. DeWEESE

An Act amending Title 68 (Real and Personal Property) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in management of condominiums, further providing for application of subpart relating to condominiums created by prior statutory law and for lien for assessments.

RULES.

SB 949, PN 2275

By Rep. DeWEESE

An Act providing for bituminous coal mines; and making a repeal.

RULES.

The SPEAKER. These bills will be placed on the supplemental calendar.

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

HB 973, PN 1137

By Rep. CALTAGIRONE

An Act amending the act of November 22, 1978 (P.L.1166, No.274), referred to as the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency Law, adding a definition; and establishing the Center for Evidence-based Crime Prevention Research and its powers and duties.

JUDICIARY.

HB 2218, PN 3333

By Rep. CALTAGIRONE

An Act amending the act of November 22, 1978 (P.L.1166, No.274), referred to as the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency Law, providing for a task force on drug-endangered children.

JUDICIARY.

**HOUSE BILL
INTRODUCED AND REFERRED**

No. 2695 By Representatives HELM, BUXTON, ADOLPH, BASTIAN, BLACKWELL, BOBACK, CAPPELLI, CLYMER, ELLIS, GEORGE, GOODMAN, HARHAI, HERSHEY, HESS, KAUFFMAN, KILLION, KORTZ, KOTIK, KULA, MAJOR, MANN, MARSHALL, MARSICO, MENSCH, NICKOL, PETRI, PHILLIPS, PICKETT, QUINN, REICHLEY, ROCK, SIPTROTH, K. SMITH, STABACK, STERN, SWANGER, WATSON, WOJNAROSKI, YOUNGBLOOD, HORNAMAN and DENLINGER

An Act amending the act of June 28, 1995 (P.L.89, No.18), known as the Conservation and Natural Resources Act, providing for certified lifeguards in State parks with public beaches.

Referred to Committee on TOURISM AND RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, July 1, 2008.

SENATE BILL FOR CONCURRENCE

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

SB 1247, PN 1690

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, July 1, 2008.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 1424, PN 2209**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 22, 1983 (P.L.306, No.84), known as the Board of Vehicles Act, providing for licensing cost.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS
TO HOUSE AMENDMENTS**

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to House amendments to **SB 949, PN 2275**, entitled:

An Act providing for bituminous coal mines; and making a repeal.

On the question,
Will the House concur in Senate amendments to House amendments?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Coal mining is one of the most dangerous jobs in the United States. It is certainly one of the most dangerous jobs worldwide. We have a magnificent track record in Pennsylvania on mine safety, and the mine safety law of 1961 has given us good service, but it is, obviously, time for renewal and refocus.

Our friends at the Department of Environmental Protection and our friends at the United Mine Workers and the Pennsylvania Coal Association have worked diligently with the General Assembly over the past several years to generate a new statute, and obviously, since a statute had not been generated since 1961, its time had come.

The essence of this measure, SB 949, that I will ask for a favorable vote tonight in, creates a Mine Safety Board to deal with ongoing safety problems and challenges as new technologies are developed in the years ahead. It focuses on emergency shelters in the mine so that disasters at Crandall Creek, Utah, or Sago, West Virginia, or the Quecreek dynamics here in Pennsylvania will not necessarily be repeated. And along that line, relative to Quecreek, updated and available

mine maps and transfer maps will be a part of this law. Walkaround rights within the mine for all mining operations and all coal miners, both those that serve under collective-bargaining agreements and those who do not, are also a part of this statute.

This proposal had been debated again and again and would not have been realized successfully if, in my view, last week Governor Rendell had not brought the United Mine Workers, the inimitable Cecil Roberts, the president of the UMWA (United Mine Workers of America) of the United States and Canada, into the room with our business friends from the Pennsylvania Coal Association and Scott Roberts and Joe Scaffoni of DEP (Department of Environmental Protection) and the Governor, who I jokily said the other night, Mr. Speaker, at a press conference, knows going into the meeting as much about the technical aspects of coal mining as the rest of us did about the Soviet submarine system. But notwithstanding that, he rolled up his sleeves and for 5 consecutive hours pushed, cajoled, wheedled, inspired, supplicated, pounded, and within 96 hours, due to a great deal of focus by Senators Mary Jo White, Rich Kasunic, and their colleagues, and especially, especially Scott Roberts of DEP, one of Secretary McGinty's lead team members, and our friends at the UMWA – Danny Kane, Dennis O'Dell, Eddie Yankovich, Ronnie Bowersox, and Jim Lamont, Floyd Campbell, Bud Abbott, Tony Brnusak – these are folks that work in the mines. These are people that have an intimate knowledge of mine safety, along with their counterparts at CONSOL and Foundation, and George Ellis and his team at the Pennsylvania Coal Association.

So I would just like to ask for an affirmative vote tonight and make a very, very special nod to Tara Smith, one of the bright young lawyers on the House Democratic team, who helped shepherd this measure into position for a vote tonight.

There is no doubt that as the evening goes toward the midnight hour and this bill makes its way toward the Governor's reception room and the Governor's inner office that Pennsylvania will have the strongest mine safety statutes among the 50 States. Of course, only 10 or 15 may have coal in them, so that statement needs to be focused on in that regard, but we are a leader nationally. Pennsylvania's Bureau of Deep Mine Safety within DEP has a sterling reputation. Now we will have an enhanced law that will mean safer mines for the men and women who go 300, 500, 800 feet into the earth. We are, as the saying goes, the Saudi Arabia of coal or we have the most abundant resources of deep coal, and it is about time. But we did it; we did it with compromise, and we did it by virtue of aggressive negotiations last week.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. Representative George.

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

Mr. Speaker, as we sit here, no matter how long we have been honored by representing those back home, I think there are times when we might be judged badly in that we are not of the type that would turn our backs in regard to helping our fellow man.

The fact remains that there has been nothing that has been accomplished toward saving these lives of our miners since 1961, and yet we continue to see not only in Pennsylvania but all over, where our miners go into that deep chasm under the ground and do not come back. The end result is a husband,

a wife, who live orphaned, who leave orphans all over, and that is wrong.

So as we mentioned all of those fine people – the Governor, the United Mine Workers, the operators, George Ellis, the Senate – there is one entity yet that it will take to close this thing off. So hopefully the next individual who would have left his life and dinner bucket in that mine site instead will be able to return home at the end of that shift, and it will be done because of you and me. Whether you have a coal mine, as many of us do in our area, you are involved and you are concerned and you will not neglect and not leave down; you will make sure that as little as possible of these people that go into the mines and do not come out will be stopped simply because you are going to take your place and show these people, these miners, that you do, indeed, want to protect them from the time they get out of their cars into that mine and get back home. I know you are going to join with Bill DeWeese and Bud George and the rest of us in doing the best you can so that what has been experienced over the years will not continue to be the rule of thumb.

Let us save these people. They are our people. They believe in us. Let us show them that we have every bit of concern as we should. Let us vote "yes" on this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Hutchinson.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this grandson of a Clearfield County coal miner also rises in support of this bill and wants to personally thank the many parties involved that made this happen.

I think it is important that Pennsylvania remain at the forefront of safe mines and be able to adapt to the new and changing methodologies and technologies that are employed in the underground mines. And with that in mind, it is important that we put this new mine safety regulation board in place, which will be done under this bill, in order to further change and adapt and help make our mines what we owe to the men and women who go down there, make them the very safest and the very best that we possibly can.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you to everyone who has been involved in making this historic legislation happen, and I ask for your affirmative vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Pyle.

Mr. PYLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania sits advantageously positioned over the largest treasure chest of coal, gas, and oil found in the continental United States. Roughly 6 years ago, following the Quecreek disaster, representatives of the Pennsylvania Coal Association, the United Mine Workers, the DEP, the Mine Safety Administration, got together to craft a document that would protect our men and women underground more so than they had been in over 50 years.

It has been a rough and bumpy road, but with sides willing to compromise, and that is what SB 949 is: neither side got everything they wanted out of this bill. Each side gave a little to each other's perspective, and we came up with a document that does protect our coal miners better than any other State in this Union.

Mr. Speaker, it is a rare day that I can stand up and say I agree wholeheartedly with the majority leader and Chairman George, but today I do. I think the strength of this document is that every side gave a little bit to get much, much more back, and that more we are getting back is the safety of our coal miners, Mr. Speaker.

I would encourage all the members of my caucus to support this measure and reach across the aisle to my friends over there and encourage them to support it, too. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Solobay.

Mr. SOLOBAY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As the prime sponsor of the House version of this same exact bill that we are voting on now from the Senate, I, too, rise in complete support of the bill and complete support of the process that made it get to where we are today.

As some of the speakers already have said, not everyone got exactly every piece that they wanted through this bill, but it is still a piece that is going to be very, very important for the men and women that we depend on who go down those deep, dark shafts every day to mine the coal, to keep the lights on, to do the other things that the coal has been able to provide for our Commonwealth as well as for the nation.

And although we do this especially for those people that are down there in that area and doing that work, we also, if for no other reason, do it for their children and for their spouses so that the pictures and the images we saw of many of the disasters that have occurred over recent years are not something that we have to deal with any longer in Pennsylvania.

Please vote for SB 949.

The SPEAKER. Representative Reed.

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

To be brief, I rise in support of concurrence on SB 949. I think today is a monumental day for this body as we move forward with bringing our mine safety laws into the 21st century to ensure that those who work so hard and so willingly to produce the power that lights up our State and our nation are able to come home to their families at the end of the evening.

And I would also like to thank all the parties involved, both from the industry, the union, the DEP, the House and the Senate, in bringing forth today's agreement and would ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments to House amendments?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—203

Adolph	Gabig	Markosek	Rohrer
Argall	Galloway	Marshall	Ross
Baker	Geist	Marsico	Rubley
Barrar	George	McCall	Sabatina
Bastian	Gerber	McGeehan	Sainato
Bear	Gergely	McI. Smith	Samuelson
Belfanti	Gibbons	McIlhattan	Santoni
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Melio	Saylor
Bennington	Gingrich	Mensch	Scavello
Beyer	Godshall	Metcalfe	Schroder
Biancucci	Goodman	Micozzie	Seip
Bishop	Grell	Millard	Shapiro
Blackwell	Grucela	Miller	Shimkus
Boback	Haluska	Milne	Siptroth
Boyd	Hanna	Moul	Smith, K.
Brennan	Harhai	Moyer	Smith, M.
Brooks	Harhart	Mundy	Smith, S.
Buxton	Harkins	Murt	Solobay
Caltagirone	Harper	Mustio	Sonney
Cappelli	Harris	Myers	Staback

Carroll	Helm	Nailor	Stairs
Casorio	Hennessey	Nickol	Steil
Causser	Hershey	O'Brien, M.	Stern
Civera	Hess	O'Neill	Stevenson
Clymer	Hickernell	Oliver	Sturla
Cohen	Hornaman	Pallone	Surra
Conklin	Hutchinson	Parker	Swanger
Costa	James	Pashinski	Tangretti
Cox	Josephs	Payne	Taylor, J.
Creighton	Kauffman	Payton	Taylor, R.
Cruz	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Thomas
Curry	Keller, W.	Perry	True
Cutler	Kenney	Perzel	Turzai
Daley	Kessler	Petrarca	Vereb
Dally	Killion	Petri	Vitali
DeLuca	King	Petrone	Vulakovich
Denlinger	Kirkland	Phillips	Wagner
DePasquale	Kortz	Pickett	Walko
Dermody	Kotik	Preston	Wansacz
DeWeese	Kula	Pyle	Waters
DiGirolamo	Leach	Quigley	Watson
Donatucci	Lentz	Quinn	Wheatley
Eachus	Levdansky	Ramaley	White
Ellis	Longiatti	Rapp	Williams
Evans, D.	Mackereth	Raymond	Wojnaroski
Evans, J.	Maher	Readshaw	Yewcic
Everett	Mahoney	Reed	Youngblood
Fabrizio	Major	Reichley	Yudichak
Fairchild	Manderino	Roae	
Fleck	Mann	Rock	O'Brien, D., Speaker
Frankel	Mantz	Roebuck	
Freeman			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments to House amendments were concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

The SPEAKER. The House will be at ease.

**THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
(JENNIFER L. MANN) PRESIDING**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will come to order.

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS**

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 1150, PN 4115**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 17, 1921 (P.L.682, No.284), known as The Insurance Company Law of 1921, in preliminary provisions, further providing for effect of act on existing laws; in life insurance, further providing for additional investment authority for subsidiaries; in casualty insurance, providing for autism spectrum disorders coverage and for colorectal cancer screenings coverage; in insurance holding companies, further providing for definitions, for acquisition of control of or merger with domestic insurer, for acquisitions involving insurers not otherwise covered and for standards and management of an insurer within a holding company system; providing for committee review; establishing the Insurance Restructuring Restricted Receipt Account; providing for community health reinvestment; and making a related repeal.

On the question,
Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

RULES SUSPENDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Speaker for the purpose of offering a motion to suspend the rules to offer amendment A08401.

On the motion—

Mr. D. O'BRIEN. Madam Speaker? The amendment that I wish to offer is A08556.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair stands corrected.

The Speaker is recognized on a motion to suspend the rules to offer amendment A08556.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. D. O'BRIEN. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The purpose of the suspension is to offer an amendment that encompasses an agreement with Senator Pileggi, Senator Scarnati, Senator Orie, and Senator White.

The purpose of the suspension is so that we can vote to improve what has been called the best autism reform bill in the country. The purpose of the suspension is so that we can make a few small but fundamental improvements in the bill as amended in the Senate. The purpose of suspension is to support the 60-plus Pennsylvania autism advocacy groups who spoke out to insist on these improvements. The purpose of the suspension is so that we can put into the bill the essential definitions of care that will ensure the level of care and the continuity of care that families affected by autism deserve.

I thank you all for your vote in support of this motion to suspend, and I thank the Senate, particularly Senator Pileggi, Senator Scarnati, Senator Orie, Senator White, on their leadership in crafting the agreement that has led to this vote on suspension of the rules.

I ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Turzai, rise?

Mr. TURZAI. Are we able, on this motion, on the motion, able to, or do I have to wait until the amendment to question the maker of the motion, just a few questions on the underlying agreement?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate is limited on the motion. You would be in order on the amendment.

Mr. TURZAI. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. S. SMITH. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the motion to suspend the rules for the consideration of amendment 8556. I know that this issue has created a lot of interest around this place and am thankful and appreciative of the work that went on between both bodies in the House and the Senate to bring us to this moment.

So I would urge members to support the suspension of the rules. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—203

Adolph	Gabig	Markosek	Rohrer
Argall	Galloway	Marshall	Ross
Baker	Geist	Marsico	Rubley
Barrar	George	McCall	Sabatina
Bastian	Gerber	McGeehan	Sainato
Bear	Gergely	McI. Smith	Samuelson
Belfanti	Gibbons	McIlhattan	Santoni
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Melio	Saylor
Bennington	Gingrich	Mensch	Scavello
Beyer	Godshall	Metcalfe	Schroder
Bianucci	Goodman	Micozzie	Seip
Bishop	Grell	Millard	Shapiro
Blackwell	Grucela	Miller	Shimkus
Boback	Haluska	Milne	Siptroth
Boyd	Hanna	Moul	Smith, K.
Brennan	Harhai	Moyer	Smith, M.
Brooks	Harhart	Mundy	Smith, S.
Buxton	Harkins	Murt	Solobay
Caltagirone	Harper	Mustio	Sonney
Cappelli	Harris	Myers	Staback
Carroll	Helm	Nailor	Stairs
Casorio	Hennessey	Nickol	Steil
Causer	Hershey	O'Brien, M.	Stern
Civera	Hess	O'Neill	Stevenson
Clymer	Hickernell	Oliver	Sturla
Cohen	Hornaman	Pallone	Surra
Conklin	Hutchinson	Parker	Swanger
Costa	James	Pashinski	Tangretti
Cox	Josephs	Payne	Taylor, J.
Creighton	Kauffman	Payton	Taylor, R.
Cruz	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Thomas
Curry	Keller, W.	Perry	True
Cutler	Kenney	Perzel	Turzai
Daley	Kessler	Petrarca	Vereb
Dally	Killion	Petri	Vitali
DeLuca	King	Petrone	Vulakovich
Denlinger	Kirkland	Phillips	Wagner
DePasquale	Kortz	Pickett	Walko
Dermody	Kotik	Preston	Wansacz
DeWeese	Kula	Pyle	Waters
DiGirolamo	Leach	Quigley	Watson
Donatucci	Lentz	Quinn	Wheatley
Eachus	Levdansky	Ramaley	White
Ellis	Longiatti	Rapp	Williams
Evans, D.	Mackereth	Raymond	Wojnaroski
Evans, J.	Maher	Readshaw	Yewcic
Everett	Mahoney	Reed	Youngblood
Fabrizio	Major	Reichley	Yudichak
Fairchild	Manderino	Roae	
Fleck	Mann	Rock	O'Brien, D., Speaker
Frankel	Mantz	Roebuck	
Freeman			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

On the question recurring,
Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

Mr. D. O'BRIEN offered the following amendment No. A08556:

Amend Sec. 2 (Sec. 405.2), page 13, line 11, by inserting brackets before and after "CLAUSE (1)" and inserting immediately thereafter

clauses (1) and (1.1)

Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 635.2), page 17, line 10, by striking out "MODIFICATION" and inserting

modifications

Amend Sec. 2 (Sec. 405.2), page 17, line 18, by inserting a comma after "DISORDERS"

Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 635.2), page 17, line 18, by inserting a comma after "PLAN"

Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 635.2), page 17, line 21, by inserting a comma after "DISORDERS"

Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 635.2), page 17, line 21, by inserting a comma after "PLAN"

Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 635.2), page 18, line 5, by inserting a comma after "FUNCTION"

Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 635.2), page 19, line 16, by inserting after "PROVIDER"

to produce socially significant improvements in human behavior or to prevent loss of attained skill or function

Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 635.2), page 19, line 20, by striking out "DISORDER" and inserting

disorders

Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 635.2), page 22, line 13, by striking out "THE" and inserting

For purposes of this section, the

Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 635.2), page 22, line 14, by inserting after "OF"

not less than

Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 635.2), page 22, line 30, by inserting after "AUTHORIZED"

or ordered.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes Speaker O'Brien.

Mr. D. O'BRIEN. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I will submit my remarks for the record and thank all the members for their support.

Mr. D. O'BRIEN submitted the following remarks for the Legislative Journal:

For years, private health insurers in Pennsylvania have systematically excluded coverage for treatment and support services to those with an autism spectrum disorder (ASD). This is outrageous and discriminatory. HB 1150 will finally give families in Pennsylvania who are affected by autism some relief from this discrimination.

With the help of Pennsylvania's top autism experts, and with input from families affected by autism, I wrote HB 1150 to address the challenges these families face that are unique to living in Pennsylvania.

Some context is necessary to fully explain the role of the Medical Assistance Program in covering essential autism treatments in Pennsylvania, and the consequent burden on the Commonwealth's budget. Coverage of services for individuals with autism is currently provided through a Federal Medicaid waiver category, known as "Category PH-95." This waiver authorizes the Department of

Public Welfare (DPW) to establish a program to provide Medicaid coverage to Pennsylvania special-needs children, including those with autism, regardless of income eligibility levels. Families that use services for their kids under the PH-95 program are often referred to as "loophole families."

I must digress here to express my absolute disdain for this term "loophole families." This PH-95 program was established in part to address the discriminatory practices of the insurance industry. The program was properly developed and implemented to ensure that families, many of whom are paying health insurance premiums to private insurers despite the exclusion of medically necessary services, are able to receive health-care services for their loved ones. The pejorative term "loophole," however, suggests that these needy families, desperate to care for their loved ones, are receiving some government benefit through less-than-honest means. I view this term as further compounding the discrimination to which these families and their loved ones living with autism are subjected to on a daily basis. I will therefore refer to the program by its proper name, PH-95.

The PH-95 program has met many needs for families in Pennsylvania who have children with autism. However, access to autism services under this program is by no means guaranteed to continue into the future. In fact, the State or Federal government could at any time impose barriers to access, such as participation premiums or income-eligibility requirements. The expectation is very real that the service levels and coverage currently offered through the PH-95 program may be dramatically altered or even eliminated in these perilous times for government budgets. The uncertainty over whether this coverage will continue causes an additional burden that individuals with autism and their families should not have to bear. Those families must care for their loved ones always with the sword of Damocles hanging over their heads.

We must acknowledge that, without coverage under PH-95 or under private insurance, a great many families affected by autism would go into immediate and potentially irreversible crisis. We cannot wait until this crisis arrives to respond. HB 1150 is an immediate and appropriate response to this inevitable crisis. While mandating private insurance coverage of autism treatment, it also statutorily commits DPW to providing a safety net for families affected by autism even if the PH-95 program was altered or eliminated.

Those who claim the PH-95 program should continue as the sole means of covering autism treatment in Pennsylvania are ignoring history. In August 2005 the Rendell administration gave notice that, due to budgetary concerns, it would seek permission from the Federal government to limit access to the PH-95 program based on family income. Under this plan, families would have been assessed a premium in order to enroll in the Medical Assistance Program, regardless of a prior eligibility determination. The plan included the annual adjustment of premiums based on any changes in the household's circumstances or changes in the DPW's Medical Assistance Program costs.

I was among the many who actively opposed this plan. My response included the introduction of a bill during the 2004-05 legislative session to address the administration's budgetary concerns. The bill was designed to reduce the Commonwealth's financial burden for covering autism services by forbidding Pennsylvania health insurers from systematically excluding insurance coverage for persons living with autism. A companion bill was introduced by Senator Jane Orie, who cochairs with me the Joint Legislative Autism Caucus. I also filed this proposal as an amendment to legislation I believed likely to reach the Governor's desk.

Due to these efforts, and the advocacy of the autism community, we obtained a temporary political concession from the Rendell administration whereby the administration agreed to suspend the plan to alter the PH-95 program, allowing time for the introduction of separate legislation intended to accomplish the same goal. HB 1150 encapsulates and honors that agreement and thus eliminates the possibility that the plan to impose medical assistance premiums would be reinstated.

On the Federal level, another movement is afoot which, if successful, will have a negative impact on the services and coverage provided to families through the PH-95 program. Pennsylvania is the only State that has a program like this, and, as a result, the Federal government has questioned whether Pennsylvania's program should be allowed to continue.

The utility of the Medicaid program for persons with autism is likewise in danger nationally. The Federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) is proposing current cost-cutting measures that would limit the services covered by PH-95. They are proposing to amend the definition of "rehabilitative care" to prevent the use of Federal Medicaid dollars for any services unless those services are intended to restore a person to a former level of functioning. This would have devastating effects on individuals with autism, who need services to acquire an appropriate level of functioning and also to prevent regression (the loss of acquired skills or functions). This latest assault upon existing Medicaid coverage is the most serious threat to the funding of effective treatment for children with autism and other developmental disabilities that I have ever seen.

While there is now in place temporary moratorium on changes to the definition of "rehabilitative care," that moratorium is subject to changing political whims. Other means of ensuring coverage of services for individuals with autism is absolutely necessary. HB 1150 is the means to that end.

HB 1150 has rightfully received national attention as the model for addressing insurance discrimination against autism. Last July the House gave unanimous approval to HB 1150, and I thank you again for that. After referral to the Senate Banking and Insurance Committee, the bill was referred to the Pennsylvania Health Cost Containment Council (PHC4). The independent panel of experts that PHC4 hired to review HB 1150 has finally weighed in.

Let me quote the conclusion of the experts' report:

"In summary, the evidence submitted to the Pennsylvania Health Care Cost Containment Commission is sufficient to evaluate the impact of the HB 1150 mandate. The analyses and research papers support a finding of marginal premium increase costs of approximately \$1 PM/PM attributable to the ASD benefit. These cost increases are modest relative to: ongoing insurance cost increases; estimated cost offsets for families and the Commonwealth; and better results for children and youth with ASD. The clinical and cost effectiveness research studies provided indicate that improvements in clinical and role functioning and quality of life can be anticipated for those children and youth with ASD who use evidence based behavioral therapies, including Applied Behavioral Analysis."

Such an outstanding review from PHC4's independent experts validated what I already knew: that HB 1150 was a cost-effective way to address the challenges Pennsylvania's families affected by autism are facing. Besides giving families access to insurance coverage for autism services, the Governor's budget office estimates it will provide tens of millions of dollars in savings to the Commonwealth's budget.

I would like to say that it has been smooth sailing for HB 1150 since then, but, as you may have heard, we hit a few bumps along the way. With good intentions, I believe, the Senate made certain amendments to the bill that I simply could not accept. My concern with the Senate's amendments to HB 1150 centers on the need for an essential quality and continuity of care for individuals with autism.

I will elaborate on my reasons for that in a moment, but let me say how pleased I am that we were able to come to an agreement with Senate leaders that resulted in the amendment that the House has adopted here today. I have assurances that the Senate will concur in this amendment, and that Governor Rendell will then sign this historic legislation. I thank you for your vote to suspend the rules so that I could offer this amendment, and for your vote to adopt this amendment. I also want to thank Senators Pileggi, Scarnati, Ori, Stack, and White for their willingness to engage and to achieve a commonsense solution to this issue.

Of course, I also need to again thank Representatives DeLuca and Micozzie, the chairs of the House Insurance Committee, for their efforts – without their unyielding support, HB 1150 would not be on the threshold of passage.

As I said, HB 1150 must provide both a quality of care and a continuity of care that our families affected by autism expect and deserve. Quality of care is achieved by requiring that covered autism services are provided within the context of a comprehensive treatment plan developed and implemented by licensed professionals. A crucial aspect of autism treatment involves behavior specialists who help individuals with autism achieve new levels of skill and function, and also to help prevent the loss of skill or function (known as regression). For the first in Pennsylvania, behavior specialists will become licensed under HB 1150.

In order to understand why continuity of care is so important, we must realize that HB 1150 creates a private-public partnership for covering autism services. HB 1150 requires that insurance companies shoulder a fair share of covering autism treatments that medical assistance currently covers, and caps the insurance companies' obligation at \$36,000. Under HB 1150, we guarantee that medical assistance will continue to serve as a safety net and will cover treatment once that \$36,000 cap is met.

Here is the heart of the issue. Families may well be involved in both systems, private insurance and medical assistance. For this reason, this bill must provide for continuity of care between the two systems. Without that continuity, there would be some families who will be left with less care than they are currently receiving under the Medical Assistance Program. By involving some families in these two distinct systems, we must address the consequences of their two competing standards of determining level of coverage of care. This is the "medical necessity" issue.

The Medical Assistance Program uses a time-proven and federally approved medical necessity standard to determine coverage of autism services. There have been serious concerns that insurance companies will use their own medical necessity standards to deny coverage to families, leaving them with less care than they would have received under medical assistance. This bill must contain provisions that ensure that any standard used by the insurance companies is consistent with the minimum standard currently used by medical assistance.

I am happy to say that the amendment adopted by the House today does just that. Pennsylvania's State and local autism advocates identified for us the area of greatest concern in regards to this issue of competing medical necessity standards. The House amendment adopted today solves this concern by including carefully crafted definitions of mandated care under the bill. Sixty-two autism advocacy groups and thousands of individual advocates have united to support HB 1150 with this essential House amendment.

To be clear, this amendment to HB 1150 does not impose a uniform definition of medical necessity. Health insurance companies and DPW will be permitted to retain their own definitions of medical necessity. However, the consequences of the medical necessity issue are being addressed in a clear and meaningful way by this amendment. It creates more precise definitions of mandated care that insurance companies and DPW will be required to cover. These definitions of mandated care will ensure continuity of services when families move between the two systems, medical assistance and a private insurance coverage, regardless of what standard of medical necessity is applied.

And even apart from those continuity of service situations, these precise definitions create clear standards of mandated coverage for autism services across both systems. They will prevent the use of medical necessity standards to deny coverage of the mandated care they define. These definitions of mandated care will ensure that kids with autism will continue to receive the services they need not only to move their progress forward, but also to prevent them from slipping back.

These definitions of mandated care will provide essential protections against inappropriate denials on the front end, while a new expedited review process for denied claims will provide those protections on the back end.

Let me summarize: The version of HB 1150 that I expect the House to pass today, and that the Senate has pledged to also pass, defines its mandated services in a way that requires coverage for young persons with autism to advance their functions and skills, as well as to maintain the functions and skill they have already obtained. This version of the bill will indeed allow health insurers and DPW to apply their own medical necessity criteria during utilization reviews. But, they must do so in a manner consistent with the General Assembly's intention that the result of those reviews never cause a person with autism to lose a service or program that person would otherwise have received under the Medical Assistance Program had HB 1150 never been passed. Any other result would belie the clear purpose of both the House and the Senate and, I believe, the Governor. The General Assembly intends HB 1150 to benefit young persons with autism, to end insurance discrimination against them, and to relieve the Commonwealth's budget from expenses that should have been covered by private insurers. Presuming that HB 1150 becomes law, it must be construed in light of these plain intentions.

This final amendment has made HB 1150 a better bill, and one I am proud to support. I thank the members for their support, and I ask for their affirmative vote on the bill on concurrence as amended by the House.

* * *

Periodically, as members of this House, we are called upon to listen and to lead...to stand and to speak with a voice that attends to the interests of the body as a whole: Our Great Commonwealth. This, my friends, is one of those moments. This historic legislation will further three important goals.

First, this bill will help end insurance discrimination against autism and will open doors to service.

HB 1150 will open the doors to medical care, accurate diagnosis, and intervention and support services for Pennsylvanians with autism. The human toll brought by the refusal of insurers to provide coverage is immense. Families are under stress, finances are under attack, and futures are slipping away and fractured because early diagnosis and intervention are not occurring.

Now is the time to act and require insurance coverage for the medical care that can bring about a new day. HB 1150 will open doors of hope and development for those with autism. It will redefine the future through access to medical care and accurate diagnosis and intervention services. It will pierce the darkness of the autism avalanche, and bring the dawn of a new day for those with autism: A New Day emblematic of a people bound as Pennsylvanians in "Commonwealth."

Second, this bill will grow the Commonwealth's network of medical research and clinical expertise.

Pennsylvania's medical and research communities are poised to be leaders in the response to autism not only in the United States, but also in the world. By voting for HB 1150, we celebrate Pennsylvania's first-rate autism research and enhance the position of our finest researchers as they work to unlock the mysteries of autism.

Pennsylvania educates twenty percent of the nation's physicians and is a leader in medical education, research, and health care. HB 1150 unties the hands of our outstanding physicians and scientists so that they can use their hands to solve the autism puzzle.

Third, this bill ensures medical assistance is the safety net intended...not the sole provider.

HB 1150 is the responsible thing to do on behalf of taxpayers and for good government. The closed door to insurance coverage for those with autism is straining the medical assistance network, depriving the most vulnerable among us of the medical safety net which medical assistance is intended to provide.

You may remember my promising to take kids with autism from 3 by 5s to 8 by 10s – and here it is! (Photo held up from rally.)

On April 18 many of you stood with me in the Capitol Rotunda as we proclaimed April "Autism Awareness Month." This is a photo of Gabriel Craig, who sat on my lap when I signed the proclamation.

Gabriel is the son of Philip and Dawn Craig, and brother to Thomas, Allison, and Josiah of Wilson Boro, Easton, Pennsylvania. Gabriel has autism, but with extensive early intervention, Gabriel is making unbelievable progress.

"Gabriel!" How wonderfully appropriate – and encouraging! – that a child named "Gabriel" would help me proclaim the good news of a new day dawning for Pennsylvanians with autism.

Stand with me and vote "yes" on HB 1150. Once we do, this photo will accompany HB 1150 and trumpet its arrival in the Senate.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—203

Adolph	Gabig	Markosek	Rohrer
Argall	Galloway	Marshall	Ross
Baker	Geist	Marsico	Rubley
Barrar	George	McCall	Sabatina
Bastian	Gerber	McGeehan	Sainato
Bear	Gergely	McI. Smith	Samuelson
Belfanti	Gibbons	McIlhattan	Santoni
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Melio	Saylor
Bennington	Gingrich	Mensch	Scavello
Beyer	Godshall	Metcalfe	Schroder
Biancucci	Goodman	Micozzie	Seip
Bishop	Grell	Millard	Shapiro
Blackwell	Grucela	Miller	Shimkus
Boback	Haluska	Milne	Sipthoth
Boyd	Hanna	Moul	Smith, K.
Brennan	Harhai	Moyer	Smith, M.
Brooks	Harhart	Mundy	Smith, S.
Buxton	Harkins	Murt	Solobay
Caltagirone	Harper	Mustio	Sonney
Cappelli	Harris	Myers	Staback
Carroll	Helm	Nailor	Stairs
Casorio	Hennessey	Nickol	Steil
Causer	Hershey	O'Brien, M.	Stern
Civera	Hess	O'Neill	Stevenson
Clymer	Hickernell	Oliver	Sturla
Cohen	Hornaman	Pallone	Surra
Conklin	Hutchinson	Parker	Swanger
Costa	James	Pashinski	Tangretti
Cox	Josephs	Payne	Taylor, J.
Creighton	Kauffman	Payton	Taylor, R.
Cruz	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Thomas
Curry	Keller, W.	Perry	True
Cutler	Kenney	Perzel	Turzai
Daley	Kessler	Petrarca	Vereb
Dally	Killion	Petri	Vitali
DeLuca	King	Petrone	Vitulakovich
Denlinger	Kirkland	Phillips	Wagner
DePasquale	Kortz	Pickett	Walko
Dermody	Kotik	Preston	Wansacz
DeWeese	Kula	Pyle	Waters
DiGirolamo	Leach	Quigley	Watson
Donatucci	Lentz	Quinn	Wheatley

Eachus	Levdansky	Ramaley	White
Ellis	Longietti	Rapp	Williams
Evans, D.	Mackereth	Raymond	Wojnaroski
Evans, J.	Maher	Readshaw	Yewcic
Everett	Mahoney	Reed	Youngblood
Fabrizio	Major	Reichley	Yudichak
Fairchild	Manderino	Roae	
Fleck	Mann	Rock	O'Brien, D.,
Frankel	Mantz	Roebuck	Speaker
Freeman			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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 concur in Senate amendments as amended?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question, will the House concur in the amendments made by the Senate as amended by the House?

On the question recurring,
Will the House concur in Senate amendments as amended?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—203

Adolph	Gabig	Markosek	Rohrer
Argall	Galloway	Marshall	Ross
Baker	Geist	Marsico	Rubley
Barrar	George	McCall	Sabatina
Bastian	Gerber	McGeehan	Sainato
Bear	Gergely	McI. Smith	Samuelson
Belfanti	Gibbons	McIlhattan	Santoni
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Melio	Saylor
Bennington	Gingrich	Mensch	Scavello
Beyer	Godshall	Metcalfe	Schroder
Biancucci	Goodman	Micozzie	Seip
Bishop	Grell	Millard	Shapiro
Blackwell	Grucela	Miller	Shimkus
Boback	Haluska	Milne	Siptroth
Boyd	Hanna	Moul	Smith, K.
Brennan	Harhai	Moyer	Smith, M.
Brooks	Harhart	Mundy	Smith, S.
Buxton	Harkins	Murt	Solobay
Caltagirone	Harper	Mustio	Sonney
Cappelli	Harris	Myers	Staback
Carroll	Helm	Nailor	Stairs
Casorio	Hennessey	Nickol	Steil
Causar	Hershey	O'Brien, M.	Stern
Civera	Hess	O'Neill	Stevenson
Clymer	Hickernell	Oliver	Sturla
Cohen	Hornaman	Pallone	Surra
Conklin	Hutchinson	Parker	Swanger
Costa	James	Pashinski	Tangretti
Cox	Josephs	Payne	Taylor, J.
Creighton	Kauffman	Payton	Taylor, R.
Cruz	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Thomas
Curry	Keller, W.	Perry	True
Cutler	Kenney	Perzel	Turzai

Daley	Kessler	Petrarca	Vereb
Dally	Killion	Petri	Vitali
DeLuca	King	Petron	Vulakovich
Denlinger	Kirkland	Phillips	Wagner
DePasquale	Kortz	Pickett	Walko
Dermody	Kotik	Preston	Wansacz
DeWeese	Kula	Pyle	Waters
DiGirolamo	Leach	Quigley	Watson
Donatucci	Lentz	Quinn	Wheatley
Eachus	Levdansky	Ramaley	White
Ellis	Longietti	Rapp	Williams
Evans, D.	Mackereth	Raymond	Wojnaroski
Evans, J.	Maher	Readshaw	Yewcic
Everett	Mahoney	Reed	Youngblood
Fabrizio	Major	Reichley	Yudichak
Fairchild	Manderino	Roae	
Fleck	Mann	Rock	O'Brien, D.,
Frankel	Mantz	Roebuck	Speaker
Freeman			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments as amended were concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR C

RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. HANNA called up **HR 839, PN 4130**, entitled:

A Resolution congratulating the State System of Higher Education on its 25th anniversary and for 25 years of significant work in this Commonwealth.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—203

Adolph	Gabig	Markosek	Rohrer
Argall	Galloway	Marshall	Ross
Baker	Geist	Marsico	Rubley
Barrar	George	McCall	Sabatina
Bastian	Gerber	McGeehan	Sainato
Bear	Gergely	McI. Smith	Samuelson
Belfanti	Gibbons	McIlhattan	Santoni
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Melio	Saylor
Bennington	Gingrich	Mensch	Scavello
Beyer	Godshall	Metcalfe	Schroder
Biancucci	Goodman	Micozzie	Seip
Bishop	Grell	Millard	Shapiro
Blackwell	Grucela	Miller	Shimkus
Boback	Haluska	Milne	Siptroth
Boyd	Hanna	Moul	Smith, K.
Brennan	Harhai	Moyer	Smith, M.
Brooks	Harhart	Mundy	Smith, S.
Buxton	Harkins	Murt	Solobay
Caltagirone	Harper	Mustio	Sonney
Cappelli	Harris	Myers	Staback
Carroll	Helm	Nailor	Stairs

Casorio	Hennessey	Nickol	Steil
Causer	Hershey	O'Brien, M.	Stern
Civera	Hess	O'Neill	Stevenson
Clymer	Hickernell	Oliver	Sturla
Cohen	Hornaman	Pallone	Surra
Conklin	Hutchinson	Parker	Swanger
Costa	James	Pashinski	Tangretti
Cox	Josephs	Payne	Taylor, J.
Creighton	Kauffman	Payton	Taylor, R.
Cruz	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Thomas
Curry	Keller, W.	Perry	True
Cutler	Kenney	Perzel	Turzai
Daley	Kessler	Petrarca	Vereb
Dally	Killion	Petri	Vitali
DeLuca	King	Petrone	Vulakovich
Denlinger	Kirkland	Phillips	Wagner
DePasquale	Kortz	Pickett	Walko
Dermody	Kotik	Preston	Wansacz
DeWeese	Kula	Pyle	Waters
DiGirolamo	Leach	Quigley	Watson
Donatucci	Lentz	Quinn	Wheatley
Eachus	Levdansky	Ramaley	White
Ellis	Longietti	Rapp	Williams
Evans, D.	Mackereth	Raymond	Wojnaroski
Evans, J.	Maher	Readshaw	Yewic
Everett	Mahoney	Reed	Youngblood
Fabrizio	Major	Reichley	Yudichak
Fairchild	Manderino	Roae	
Fleck	Mann	Rock	O'Brien, D.,
Frankel	Mantz	Roebuck	Speaker
Freeman			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

CALENDAR CONTINUED

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. DeWEESE called up **HR 169, PN 3863**, entitled:

A Resolution directing the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee to study the feasibility of a local property tax freeze and the gradual elimination of local property taxes for senior citizens; to perform a cost analysis of such a freeze and reduction; to determine the consequences of such a freeze and reduction on local taxing bodies and on the Commonwealth; and to make recommendations on alternative financing methods for school districts.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HR 169 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled bill calendar.

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

RESOLUTION REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HR 169 be removed from the tabled bill calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

* * *

Mr. DeWEESE called up **HR 281, PN 3457**, entitled:

A Concurrent Resolution directing the Joint State Government Commission to study the issue of workplace pay disparity, to reexamine existing Federal and State laws relating to that issue and to make recommendations to the General Assembly.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HR 281 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled bill calendar.

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

RESOLUTION REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HR 281 be removed from the tabled bill calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

* * *

Mr. DeWEESE called up **HR 408, PN 2501**, entitled:

A Resolution directing the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee to conduct a study of the State Lottery relating to its ability to continue to support programs and services for older Pennsylvanians.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HR 408 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled bill calendar.

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

RESOLUTION REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HR 408 be removed from the tabled bill calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

* * *

Mr. DeWEESE called up **HR 459, PN 3864**, entitled:

A Resolution directing the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee to study the fiscal impact of tax-exempt properties on the finances of municipalities and school districts; to review the policies of other states in addressing the burden of limited tax bases as a result of tax-exempt properties; and to make recommendations on ways to assist tax authorities with a high concentration of tax-exempt properties.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HR 459 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled bill calendar.

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

RESOLUTION REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HR 459 be removed from the tabled bill calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

* * *

Mr. DeWEESE called up **HR 627, PN 3329**, entitled:

A Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to budget and appropriate certain funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HR 627 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled bill calendar.

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

RESOLUTION REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HR 627 be removed from the tabled bill calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be at ease.

The House will come to order.

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that the following bills be removed from the tabled bill calendar:

SB 2;
SB 266;
SB 1103;
SB 1146; and
SB 1341.

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

BILLS RECOMMITTED

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

SB 2;
SB 266;
SB 1103;
SB 1146; and
SB 1341.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be at ease.

The House will come to order.

COMMUNICATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker acknowledges receiving the following communications, which the clerk will read.

The following communications were read:

A communication dated June 26, 2008, from the Public Employee Retirement Commission providing an actuarial cost impact of amendment Nos. 06997 and 06998 to HB 2084, PN 3689.

A communication dated June 26, 2008, from the Public Employee Retirement Commission providing an actuarial cost impact of amendment No. 07099 to HB 2084, PN 3689.

A communication dated June 26, 2008, from the Public Employee Retirement Commission providing an actuarial cost impact of HB 1737, PN 2315.

A communication dated June 26, 2008, from the Public Employee Retirement Commission providing an actuarial cost impact of amendment No. 07040 to HB 2084, PN 3689.

A communication dated June 26, 2008, from the Public Employee Retirement Commission providing an actuarial cost impact of amendment No. 07098 to HB 2084, PN 3689.

A communication dated June 30, 2008, from the Department of Revenue providing a list of scholarship organizations, educational improvement organizations, and prekindergarten scholarship organizations receiving contributions from business firms granted a tax credit.

(Copies of communications are on file with the Journal clerk.)

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the intention of the Chair to recess the House and enter into special session at 6:20 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be at ease.

HOUSE SCHEDULE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader for the purpose of an announcement and an update.

The House will come to order.

Mr. DeWEESE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

As a focus on tomorrow's schedule, we had a sidebar with the Republican leadership team, and we are collectively convinced that the schedule will take a little bit more time than we might have speculated earlier in the afternoon.

We were going to come in midafternoon and go into the evening, again, allowing the mechanisms that are in place relative to the various codes and bills that need to be worked on in both chambers by substantial members of the staff. We were thinking about coming in at 2 and working throughout the rest of the afternoon into the evening so that the morning hours could be devoted to a variety of those other efforts.

However, the KOZ (keystone opportunity zone) bill could potentially take a substantial amount of time as we are debating

it. We are going to pull back, come in at 12, and do our formal moments with the prayer and the Pledge, then report to our respective caucuses and come back on the floor at 1 and start with our legislative calendar at that time.

So report to the floor at high noon and then report to caucus, then report back at 1, after grabbing a sandwich, and being prepared. Again, depending on the nuances of the afternoon and the good work that our hard-charging staff is producing, we will continue on Wednesday and Thursday. And as Chairman Dwight Evans said earlier in the day, after some conversations we had this afternoon with Senator Pileggi, the majority leader of the Senate, it is our goal to leave for our summer work in our home precincts and our home offices late, late on Thursday night prior to the commencement of the Fourth of July weekend. That is a goal, and we still have high confidence that we can achieve that goal.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Preston, for the purpose of an announcement.

Mr. PRESTON. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Consumer Affairs Committee will meet tomorrow, 205 Ryan Building, at 10 a.m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Consumer Affairs will meet tomorrow at 10 a.m. in room 205, Ryan Office Building.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Godshall.

Mr. GODSHALL. Thank you.

I have just gone around the room telling my members that Consumer Affairs would be at 12:30. Apparently that was just changed back to 10 a.m., and I apologize for the inconvenience. But it is 10 a.m., at this point, again, rather than 12:30.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Are there any other announcements? Any further announcements?

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, any remaining bills and resolutions on today's calendar will be passed over. The Chair hears no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Conklin of Centre County, who moves that this House do now adjourn until Wednesday, July 2, 2008, at 12 m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the motion?
Motion was agreed to, and at 6:34 p.m., e.d.t., the House
adjourned.