

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2009

SESSION OF 2009

193D OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 118

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

THE SPEAKER (KEITH R. McCALL)
PRESIDING

PRAYER

HON. KAREN BOBACK, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we come to You today during this glorious time of year to sing Your praise and proclaim Your majesty here on earth. In Your goodness and mercy, hear our prayer and let our cry come unto You. Bless our families. Remind us that their love enhances our persona and gives us the strength to do Your will. Bless our communities. Help us to recognize those in need and be generous in thought, in word, and in deed.

Here, on this House floor, encourage us to put aside our differences in order to develop consensus for the common good. Help us to share our talents to build bridges between and among ourselves in the decisions we will make in the name of Pennsylvania. Help us to remain stalwart in our quest to do what is right for this great Commonwealth. And as representatives of others, constantly remind us of the power of our voice and of our vote. In our decisionmaking, may we always represent You first and then those who sent us to this great place.

Bless our State, our nation, our world. Keep all who defend us safe. And in Your omnipotent goodness and mercy, have us lead by example so that our prayer will resonate with all mankind, that for once and for all we will realize peace on earth, good will toward men. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNALS APPROVED

The SPEAKER. The Journals of Friday, September 18; Monday, September 28; Wednesday, September 30; and Thursday, October 1, 2009, are now in print. Will the House approve the Journals?

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, approval of the Journal of Monday, December 14, 2009, will be postponed until printed. The Chair hears no objection.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Turning to leaves of absence, the Chair recognizes the majority whip, the gentleman from Greene County, Representative DeWeese, who requests leaves of absence for: Representative DONATUCCI from Philadelphia County for the day; Representative LENTZ from Delaware County for the day. Without objection, the leaves will be granted.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Representative Turzai, the minority whip, who requests leaves of absence for: Representative HELM from Dauphin County for the day; Representative TRUE from Lancaster County for the day. Without objection, the leaves will be granted.

MASTER ROLL CALL

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Turning to leaves of absence, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Representative Turzai, the minority whip, who requests a leave for the gentleman from Delaware County, Representative CIVERA, for the day. Without objection, the leave will be granted.

MASTER ROLL CALL CONTINUED

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—195

Adolph	Everett	Longietti	Reese
Baker	Fabrizio	Maher	Reichley
Barbin	Fairchild	Mahoney	Roae
Barrar	Farry	Major	Rock
Bear	Fleck	Manderino	Roebuck
Belfanti	Frankel	Mann	Rohrer
Benninghoff	Freeman	Markosek	Ross

Beyer	Gabig	Marshall	Sabatina
Bishop	Gabler	Marsico	Sainato
Boback	Galloway	Matzie	Samuelson
Boyd	Geist	McGeehan	Santarsiero
Boyle	George	McI. Smith	Santoni
Bradford	Gerber	Melio	Saylor
Brennan	Gergely	Metcalfe	Scavello
Briggs	Gibbons	Metzgar	Schroder
Brooks	Gillespie	Micozzie	Seip
Brown	Gingrich	Millard	Shapiro
Burns	Godshall	Miller	Siptroth
Buxton	Goodman	Milne	Smith, K.
Caltagirone	Grell	Mirabito	Smith, M.
Carroll	Grove	Moul	Smith, S.
Casorio	Grucela	Mundy	Solobay
Causar	Haluska	Murphy	Sonney
Christiana	Hanna	Murt	Staback
Clymer	Harhai	Mustio	Stern
Cohen	Harhart	Myers	Stevenson
Conklin	Harkins	O'Brien, D.	Sturla
Costa, D.	Harper	O'Brien, M.	Swanger
Costa, P.	Harris	O'Neill	Tallman
Cox	Hennessey	Oberlander	Taylor, J.
Creighton	Hess	Oliver	Taylor, R.
Cruz	Hickernell	Pallone	Thomas
Curry	Hornaman	Parker	Turzai
Cutler	Houghton	Pashinski	Verbe
Daley	Hutchinson	Payne	Vitali
Dally	Johnson	Payton	Vulakovich
Day	Josephs	Peifer	Wagner
Deasy	Kauffman	Perzel	Walko
Delozier	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Wansacz
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Petri	Waters
Denlinger	Kessler	Phillips	Watson
DePasquale	Killion	Pickett	Wheatley
Dermody	Kirkland	Preston	White
DeWeese	Knowles	Pyle	Williams
DiGirolamo	Kortz	Quigley	Youngblood
Drucker	Kotik	Quinn	Yudichak
Eachus	Krieger	Rapp	
Ellis	Kula	Readshaw	McCall,
Evans, D.	Levdansky	Reed	Speaker
Evans, J.			

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Civera	Helm	Miccarelli	True
Donatucci	Lentz	Perry	

LEAVES ADDED—5

DeWeese	Harper	Hennessey	McGeehan
Godshall			

LEAVES CANCELED—5

DeWeese	Godshall	McGeehan	True
Donatucci			

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

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

HB 1390, PN 3014 (Amended) By Rep. FREEMAN

An Act updating and expanding the storm water planning requirements to be undertaken by counties; authorizing counties to regulate storm water within a watershed-based planning area; authorizing the formation of water resources management authorities; enabling counties, municipalities and water resources management authorities to develop integrated water resources management plans; imposing duties and conferring powers on the Department of Environmental Protection, the Environmental Quality Board, counties, municipalities and water resources management authorities; providing for financing and for waiver of use for certain grant or loan funds; and making related repeals.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

HB 1772, PN 3015 (Amended) By Rep. FREEMAN

An Act amending the act of January 19, 1968 (1967 P.L.992, No.442), entitled "An act authorizing the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the local government units thereof to preserve, acquire or hold land for open space uses," further providing for acquisition of interests in real property, for local taxing options and for exercise of eminent domain.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

CALENDAR

RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. STABACK called up **HR 559, PN 2987**, entitled:

A Resolution remembering Christmas Eve 1944 in northwest Europe.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The House will come to order. Members will please take their seats. The Sergeants at Arms will clear the aisles. Member will please take their seats.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lackawanna County, Representative Staback.

Mr. STABACK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my resolution recognizes the patriotic heroism and steadfast bravery displayed by soldiers and civilians from the United States in northwest Europe during December 1944 and honors the many lives that were lost in that last winter of World War II.

During what is now known as the Battle of the Bulge, a strong German force sought to override and destroy groups of Allied armies in Belgium, Luxembourg, and France, resulting in one of the largest and deadliest land battles of the entire war. Taking advantage of the foggy weather and of the total surprise of the Allies, the Germans penetrated deep into Belgium, creating a dent, or a bulge, in the Allied lines. An American

force held out at Bastogne, even though surrounded and outnumbered. Over 600,000 American soldiers fought in this battle, resulting in more than 81,000 casualties, including 19,000 American lives lost.

My resolution makes special notice of the eventful Christmas Eve of 1944. On December 24 in what soon was called Black Christmas, the Germans began a devastating campaign which launched air strikes on multiple Allied air fields and rail yards in Bastogne, Belgium, and ships along the English Channel.

One American soldier, Capt. John Prior, was the battalion surgeon in charge of the 10th Armored Division field hospital located in Bastogne, Belgium, when it came under heavy attack that Christmas Eve. With no electricity, limited water, food, and medical supplies, the field hospital under his supervision operated around the clock as an aid station for those wounded soldiers and civilians unable to flee the city.

This resolution also pays special tribute to a registered nurse from the Bastogne area, Ms. Renee LeMaire, who gave her life helping wounded American soldiers at that aid station. Known as the Angel of Bastogne, Ms. LeMaire was a courageous volunteer who worked relentlessly without adequate food and rest in the hope of healing and inspiring the Allied troops.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, this resolution remembers and honors the 763 soldiers of the 66th Infantry Division who died in the frigid waters of the English Channel when the troop ship carrier, the SS Leopoldville, full of reinforcements to push back the German advance, was torpedoed and sunk by a Nazi submarine that same Christmas Eve night.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

Mr. STABACK. Mr. Speaker, today with us are four veterans of the Battle of the Bulge and the fighting at Bastogne, Belgium. To me, these men are American heroes whose service to America during this pivotal moment in World War II is to be rightly honored and never forgotten. It is my distinct pleasure to present these men to the House. They are seated to the left of the Speaker at the rostrum. I would ask that upon the calling of their name that they would rise and remain standing: Cpl. George Waters from Waymart, Pennsylvania, along with his wife, Betty; S. Sgt. Frank Lojewski from Duryea, Pennsylvania; Cpl. Robert Wecker from York, Pennsylvania; and Cpl. John Kunkle of York, Pennsylvania, all survivors of the Battle of the Bulge.

On behalf of the entire membership of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, I want to thank all of you and all the veterans who fought at the Battle of the Bulge for all the sacrifices you made on our behalf to preserve the freedoms that we certainly enjoy today in this, the greatest country in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the members to join me in honoring these distinguished individuals and their brothers-in-arms by voting in favor of HR 559.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, ladies and gentlemen of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Turning to leaves of absence, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Greene County, Representative DeWeese, who requests a leave of absence for the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Representative McGEEHAN. Without objection, the leave will be granted.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Representative Turzai, the minority whip, who requests a leave of absence for the gentleman from Montgomery County, Representative GODSHALL. Without objection, the leave will be granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HR 559 CONTINUED

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

Adolph	Evans, J.	Longiatti	Reichley
Baker	Everett	Maher	Roae
Barbin	Fabrizio	Mahoney	Rock
Barrar	Fairchild	Major	Roebuck
Bear	Farry	Manderino	Rohrer
Belfanti	Fleck	Mann	Ross
Benninghoff	Frankel	Markosek	Sabatina
Beyer	Freeman	Marshall	Sainato
Bishop	Gabig	Marsico	Samuelson
Boback	Gabler	Matzie	Santarsiero
Boyd	Galloway	McI. Smith	Santoni
Boyle	Geist	Melio	Saylor
Bradford	George	Metcalfe	Scavello
Brennan	Gerber	Metzgar	Schroder
Briggs	Gergely	Micozzie	Seip
Brooks	Gibbons	Millard	Shapiro
Brown	Gillespie	Miller	Siptroth
Burns	Gingrich	Milne	Smith, K.
Buxton	Goodman	Mirabito	Smith, M.
Caltagirone	Grell	Moul	Smith, S.
Carroll	Grove	Mundy	Solobay
Casorio	Grucela	Murphy	Sonney
Causar	Haluska	Murt	Staback
Christiana	Hanna	Mustio	Stern
Clymer	Harhai	Myers	Stevenson
Cohen	Harhart	O'Brien, D.	Sturla
Conklin	Harkins	O'Brien, M.	Swanger
Costa, D.	Harper	O'Neill	Tallman
Costa, P.	Harris	Oberlander	Taylor, J.
Cox	Hennessey	Oliver	Taylor, R.
Creighton	Hess	Pallone	Thomas
Cruz	Hickernell	Parker	Turzai
Curry	Hornaman	Pashinski	Vereb
Cutler	Houghton	Payne	Vitali
Daley	Hutchinson	Payton	Vulakovich
Dally	Johnson	Peifer	Wagner
Day	Josephs	Perzel	Walko
Deasy	Kauffman	Petrarca	Wansacz
Delozier	Keller, M.K.	Petri	Waters
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Phillips	Watson
Denlinger	Kessler	Pickett	Wheatley
DePasquale	Killion	Preston	White
Dermody	Kirkland	Pyle	Williams
DeWeese	Knowles	Quigley	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Kortz	Quinn	Yudichak
Drucker	Kotik	Rapp	
Eachus	Krieger	Readshaw	McCall,
Ellis	Kula	Reed	Speaker
Evans, D.	Levdansky	Reese	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Civera	Helm	McGeehan	Perry
Donatucci	Lentz	Miccarelli	True
Godshall			

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

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. In the back of the hall of the House, the Chair welcomes the 2009 American Indoor Football Association National Champions, the Reading Express. They are also four-time Northern Division Champions; two-time Eastern Conference Champions, and have put together an impressive 56-14 record in their short four seasons of play. They are led by coach and general manager Bernie Nowotarski and owners Ted and Lisa Lavender.

The Reading Express hopes to battle for the 2010 championship this upcoming season. We wish them much success and ask that you please join me in thanking them for their dedication and service to the community and families of Reading and Berks Counties, but also to congratulate the Reading Express for bringing home a national championship to the Commonwealth. The Reading Express, will they please rise, as the guests of Tom Caltagirone and the entire Berks County delegation.

Congratulations on your achievement.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair turns to leaves of absence and recognizes the majority leader, who requests a leave of absence for the gentleman from Greene County, Representative DeWEESE, for the remainder of the day. Without objection, the leave will be granted.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. May I have the attention of the members. We have two special guests that I would like to introduce to the membership.

We have some special guests coming from two different parts of the world. The first guest I would like to recognize is Andrew Kao. This year he became the Ambassador and Director General of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office in New York. Prior to assuming his new duties, Ambassador Kao served as the Director General of the Department of Treaty and Legal Affairs in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the Republic of China. He also has served as a representative for the Taipei Economic and Cultural Center in New Delhi, India; Secretary General to the Coordination Council for North American

Affairs in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Office in the Republic of China; and as Director General of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office in Atlanta, Georgia.

He is accompanied today by Winston Hu, who serves as director of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office in New York, and Bochia Ni, senior trade officer with Taipei Economic and Cultural Office. They are guests today of the Speaker of the House. Will you please give a warm welcome to our friends and guests.

Our second group is in Harrisburg as guests of our colleague, the Honorable Greg Vitali. Visiting us today is the consul general of Italy in Philadelphia, Luigi Scotto. The consul general began his service in January of this year. In his position, he has worked to reinforce the positive image of Italy in the world. He has forged stronger ties between the United States and Italy and is working with the Italian community in Philadelphia to access information on news, events, and various consular services.

He is joined today by Joseph Auteri, who is the president of the Italy-America Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia, and Tanya Tecci, a board member of the Italy-America Chamber of Commerce. Also joined with the ambassador is Peter Alois, who is the founder and president of Alois Global Trading Strategies. The purpose of their visit is to meet with the Deputy Secretary for International Business Development to discuss the facilitation of trade between Italy and Pennsylvania. Please join me in welcoming our friends from Italy.

The Chair would also like to note that former Representative, Marie Lederer, has joined the delegation. She probably could be our translator if need be. Marie, welcome back to the floor of the House. It is great to see you. You look wonderful.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. The Chair notes the presence of the gentleman from Montgomery County, Representative Godshall, on the House floor. His name will be added to the master roll.

STATEMENT BY MR. VITALI

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to recognize, under unanimous consent, the gentleman from Delaware County, Representative Vitali, who would like to say a few words to our Italian guests. The members will please come to order.

(Remarks by Mr. Vitali in Italian.)

Mr. VITALI. I was told that if I messed that up, it really would not matter because no one really could understand it anyway, but also, I would also like to introduce:

(Remarks by Mr. Vitali in Italian.)

The SPEAKER. Welcome to the hall of the House.

(Remarks by Mr. Vitali in Italian.)

Mr. VITALI. Basically, what we are here doing today is really trying to attract Italian businesses into the State of Pennsylvania to help all our economies, so it has been a

productive visit so far. I would also like to mention that at 12 noon today, schedule permitting, the president of our Italian-American Caucus, Tony DeLuca, will be hosting a luncheon in his room, 115 Irvis, today, and Italians and non-Italians alike are welcome. So thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. We have additional guests to welcome on the House floor. In the well of the House, Ben Griner, who attends Mechanicsburg Area High School, is here today serving as a guest page. He is the guest of Representative Sheryl Delozier. Welcome to House, Ben.

Also in the well of the House are Matthew Miller, Austin Winters, and Ben Lehman. They are here today serving as guest pages. All three boys attend the Chambersburg Area Middle School. Matthew and Ben reside in Representative Todd Rock's district and Austin resides in Representative Mark Keller's district. They are here today as the guests of Representative Rob Kauffman. Welcome to the hall, gentlemen.

Also in the well of the House, Krystyna Perkins is a senior at West Perry High School. She is shadowing our roll call clerks, Lori Hoffman and Zach Bauer, for the day. She resides in Representative Mark Keller's district. Krystyna plans to further her education at Harrisburg Area Community College and then to the University of Pitt and will major in criminal and family law. Welcome to the hall of the House.

In the back of the hall of the House, the Chair welcomes an advanced criminal law class from the University of Pennsylvania Law School and their professor. They are Paul H. Robinson, Colin S. Diver Professor of Law. The students: Thomas Gaeta, Matthew Majarian, Megan Schultz, Phontip Tanompongphandh, Douglas Weck. This class did a grading study of the Pennsylvania Crime Code and presented their findings at a joint hearing with the House and Senate Judiciary Committees this morning. We would like to thank them for their semester-long project. They are the guests of Representative Tom Caltagirone. Welcome to the House, gentlemen.

CONDOLENCE RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER. Members will please take their seats. We are about to take up a condolence resolution on the death of a former member. The Sergeants at Arms will close the doors of the House. Members will please take their seats. 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 regrets that the Honorable John Fallon Pressmann, a former member of the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania who served the 132nd Legislative District, passed away on July 24, 2009, at the age of fifty-six; and

WHEREAS, Born in Salisbury, Maryland, on September 6, 1952, Mr. Pressmann was a graduate of Allentown Central Catholic High School, Lehigh County Community College and Cedar Crest College. A former Democratic Committeeman and Constable, he served as a Lehigh County Commissioner from 1982 to 1984 and was a State Representative from 1985 to 1990. A teacher at Allentown Central Catholic High School since 2005, Mr. Pressmann had served as the head cross country coach since 1997 and the head track and field coach since 1998. He was also an adjunct professor at Lehigh Carbon Community College and Northampton Community College. A member of the Lehigh County Democratic Committee and the Allentown Democratic Committee, he was Chairman of the Allentown Redevelopment Authority and a member of the Lehigh County General Practice Authority. A former President of the 10th Ward Civic Association, Mr. Pressmann was a former Vice President of the Allentown Sertoma Club, former State Vice President of the Young Democrats and former Secretary of the Lehigh Valley Democratic Association; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pays tribute to the Honorable John Fallon Pressmann, who served his community and this Commonwealth in a way most befitting the highest ideals of public service; and extend heartfelt condolences to his wife, Deborah Couto Pressmann; sons, Sean and Daniel; daughter, Laura; mother, Patricia; and numerous other family members, friends and colleagues; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution, sponsored by the Honorable Jennifer L. Mann, be transmitted to Deborah Couto Pressmann.

Jennifer L. Mann, Sponsor

Keith R. McCall, Speaker of the House

ATTEST:

Anthony Frank Barbush, Chief Clerk of the House

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of the resolution will rise as a sign of respect for the deceased former member. All guests will please rise.

(Whereupon, the members of the House and all visitors stood in a moment of silence in solemn respect to the memory of the Honorable John Fallon Pressmann.)

The SPEAKER. The resolution has been unanimously adopted.

REMARKS BY MISS MANN

The SPEAKER. On the question of the resolution, the Chair recognizes the gentlelady from Lehigh County, Representative Mann.

Miss MANN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I know the clerk just read the resolution, but I did want to add just a few comments. And we are fortunate enough to have Jack's family here with us today and I will introduce them to all of you in just a moment.

Jack Pressmann served this body from 1985 to 1990 and was the last Democrat to hold my House seat prior to my election in 1998. But to me, he was much more. He was a mentor, adviser, and trusted friend. His untimely death occurred while he was

hiking in the Sierra Mountains in California – on a hike to raise funds for inner-city youth. See, Jack was always thinking of others. He gave of his time, his talent, and his heart to all he did and to those he served and those he worked so hard to help. It was the students he taught and coached, the organizations whose boards on which he served, those aspiring elected officials, and those serving elected officials that he advised, and above all to his highest priority, his wonderful family.

As I said, we are fortunate to have some members of Jack's family here today, and they are seated in the rear of the House. I will introduce them to you: wife, Deborah; sons, Sean and Daniel; daughter, Laura; mother, Patricia; sister, Anne Lauderschlager, and her husband, Todd; and sister, Ellen McWhorter. If we could, please, welcome them.

Jack's death was a great loss to his family and our entire community. He impacted so many lives in such a positive way. To carry on his legacy, his family and friends started a foundation in his name dedicated to providing scholarships to students who attend his alma mater, Allentown Central Catholic High School, and to providing financial assistance to vital nonprofits in our community. The first "I Run for Jack" 5k took place on November 28th, and amazingly, over 500 participants attended, raising over \$30,000. I think that outpouring of support says it all.

Jack's legacy may not be for me to determine, but I think he set an example of what was important by how he lived his life. His service to others and dedication to his family and his hometown are inspiring to us all. And based on all those he touched and all that he accomplished in his shortened time on earth, it is a wonderful example we would all do well to follow.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentlelady.

REMARKS BY MR. FREEMAN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Northampton County, Representative Freeman.

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And my thanks to Representative Mann for sponsoring the condolence resolution for former Representative Jack Pressmann.

I know oftentimes the members of this chamber, many of them rather new in service to the legislature always show due reverence and respect when we take up a condolence resolution on the death of a former member, but for many of them, that oftentimes seems abstract, as they may not have served with that member, may not have come to know them or to work with them.

I am very privileged to have served with Jack. Jack was one of my closest friends in the legislature when we served together 1985 to 1990. And I think, unfortunately, the media and the public never fully appreciate the importance of friendship in this body, the camaraderie that we can develop over time. Those friendships mean a lot and can truly last a lifetime. They mean a lot because it is your friends you turn to for advice in this body, who help you as you fight your legislative battles as you try and advance that legislative agenda to improve the lives of your constituents and the citizens of this Commonwealth. That was the kind of friend that Jack was. He was always there, always there for his friends.

There is no denying that my good friend Jack could sometimes be kind of gruff and a little blunt at times; I think his family would be the first to admit that. But there is also no denying that he possessed tremendous empathy for others and a tremendous sense of compassion, particularly for those who did not have someone to speak up for them, who were less fortunate. He also possessed a marvelous sense of humor, which I think carried him well throughout his life and made him a great guy to hang out with as you worked on legislation together.

Jack hated bullies. He hated those who were pompous and put on airs. He stood up for the underdog and was always there to stand by and promote the well-being of the little guy. Of all his characteristics, I think one that really stands out with Jack is his tremendous sense of loyalty – loyalty to his friends, loyalty to his family, and loyalty to the institution here in which he served, a place that he relished serving in and was always loyal to throughout his career.

Jack was a loving and devoted husband and father, a loving and devoted son and brother. He also loved his hometown. He cared deeply about Allentown. He wanted to make sure that Allentown could be a success and he strived throughout his public service and even after he left office to try and make Allentown a better place in which to live. He was a public servant, a teacher, a coach, and a community leader. He proved in fact that there is life after the legislature, as he devoted countless hours both to his profession as a teacher and a coach, but also to the betterment of his community of Allentown.

I wish that all of us could have been in attendance at his funeral – and I know that is not possible; we all have demands on our time. But had you been there, I think each and every member of this chamber would have been touched by the outpouring of mourning on his loss, but also of how he had touched so many lives in such a dynamic and wonderful way. I think the most poignant moment came as so many of the girls who had been on his track team showed up in appropriate attire for a funeral, but they wore their track shoes in honor to Jack. That was truly a magnificent tribute to him and how he had so marvelously touched their lives.

My friend Jack Pressmann made the world a better place because he was in it and because he always tried to make a positive difference through his life. He was a good man and he will be missed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Sergeants at Arms will open the doors of the House.

RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. DeLUCA called up **HR 570, PN 3013**, entitled:

A Resolution expressing sorrow upon the death of Police Officer Michael Crawshaw, and extending condolences to his family.

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Representative DeLuca.

Mr. DeLUCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If I could, I would like to have Randy Vulakovich, Representative Vulakovich— Is he on the floor? Come on up, Randy. Representative Dom Costa and Representative Mike Turzai.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

We are about to close the doors of the House. We are waiting for the picture to be taken in the back of the hall.

The Sergeants at Arms will close the doors of the House.

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

Mr. DeLUCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we come before you today with a heavy heart. As many of you know, either personally or through the news media, this past Friday a Penn Hills police officer was laid to his final rest. He was shot dead earlier in the week in an ambush, just doing his job.

Thirty-two-year-old Michael Crawshaw was a patrolman in Penn Hills, the community which I not only represent here in Harrisburg but also where I live. He protected the town in which, for over 35 years, I have made my home and raised my family. A felon is accused of gunning down Officer Crawshaw, while he sat in his police car waiting for backup to arrive, after allegedly killing another man over a mere \$500 dispute, and even while wearing an electronic ankle monitor. Officer Crawshaw never had a chance to get out of his vehicle.

If nothing else, this absolutely senseless, horrific crime drives home the dangers police officers on every level encounter every day. Gone are the days when the bad guys only seemed to be in big cities. Crime has infiltrated every community and could be taking place right next door to where you greet your neighbors and your children and grandchildren play. Thankfully, we have people like Michael Crawshaw who are willing to put themselves in harm's way. Whatever would we do without police officers? The sad story today is people have no regard for human life – not even their own.

In Penn Hills last week, two people lost their lives over \$500. Hopefully, the killer will never again see the light of day to inflict more harm. Now, while we cannot legislate morals or values, we can support those who deal with the sinister side of humanity every day. The death of Officer Crawshaw hangs like a dark cloud over all of Penn Hills. Without a doubt, this policeman was a credit to his family, his municipality, and this Commonwealth. And before I read the resolution, I would like to recognize the individuals who are up here: Representative Vulakovich, who knew the family from Shaler; Representative Costa, who was the public safety director of Penn Hills; and Representative Mike Turzai, who represents Officer Crawshaw's brother who is on the Northern Regional Police Department. Randy, would you like to say a few words?

Mr. VULAKOVICH. I do not think there are any words we could really say – we have gone through this so many times with other officers – that could ever really do justice to the sacrifice made. I can tell you that every police officer who puts on the badge has thoughts that go through his head every time he goes to his locker in the morning, puts on his gear, walks out to the car. I know one of the things that I always thought about was I never wanted my family to have to go through a funeral where I was the person that was being honored. It is a terrible thing the family has to go through. If you look in the eyes of his

mom and dad and his brother – his brother is a police officer, so you can just imagine now his brother's wife, his mom and dad, thinking, I lost one child, their baby boy – because no matter how old you are, our kids are always our babies.

I went to the mass; Bishop Zubik had it. His friends were there. Tony, you were there and you saw the outpouring from his friends. They were devastated. One of them got up and gave a little talk about their feelings about Michael – quiet guy, stood in the background, not a grandstander, but willing to do his job. It is something that we know can happen to us every day that we go out there, but we accept that fate that that could happen someday.

To his mom, dad, other family, his brother, Matt, who will go to that locker – he is probably there today putting on his gear – my deepest sorrow. And to Michael, you are in Heaven, let God lead you and God bless you.

Mr. DeLUCA. I would like to read the resolution, if you would bear with me. It is resolution 570.

Expressing sorrow upon the death of Police Officer Michael Crawshaw, and extending condolences to his family.

WHEREAS, Police Officer Michael Crawshaw valiantly gave his life in the line of duty at the age of 32 on December 6, 2009; and

WHEREAS, Officer Crawshaw was the first officer on the scene of a home invasion and murder and was himself fatally shot by the suspect as the suspect fled the scene; and

WHEREAS, The suspect was apprehended a short time later and awaits prosecution; and

WHEREAS, A graduate of Shaler Area High School, Officer Crawshaw joined the Penn Hills Police Department after serving as a campus police officer for the University of Pittsburgh; and

WHEREAS, For the past four years, Officer Crawshaw faithfully displayed great loyalty, commitment and professionalism in the performance of his duties as a member of the Penn Hills Police Department; and

WHEREAS, He served with consummate skill, upheld the laws of this Commonwealth and was a role model for those who aspire to a career in law enforcement; and

WHEREAS, A beloved family member and active community steward, Officer Crawshaw exemplified the best qualities of human service, and generously gave of his heart and time to enhance the quality of life of his family and community; and

WHEREAS, A great public servant of this Commonwealth, his loss will be felt by the many individuals who knew, admired and loved him; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the House of Representatives express sorrow upon the death of Police Officer Michael Crawshaw, and extend heartfelt condolences to his parents, Linda and James Crawshaw III; brother, Matt; and other family members.

I would ask this body to vote to affirm this resolution.

Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Members and guests will rise as a sign of respect for the fallen police officer. Guests will also rise.

(Whereupon, the members of the House and all visitors stood in a moment of silence in solemn respect to the memory of Police Officer Michael Crawshaw.)

The SPEAKER. Members and guests may please be seated.

The Sergeants at Arms will open the doors of the House.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

Adolph	Everett	Longiotti	Reichley
Baker	Fabrizio	Maher	Roae
Barbin	Fairchild	Mahoney	Rock
Barrar	Farry	Major	Roebuck
Bear	Fleck	Manderino	Rohrer
Belfanti	Frankel	Mann	Ross
Benninghoff	Freeman	Markosek	Sabatina
Beyer	Gabig	Marshall	Sainato
Bishop	Gabler	Marsico	Samuelson
Boback	Galloway	Matzie	Santarsiero
Boyd	Geist	McI. Smith	Santoni
Boyle	George	Melio	Saylor
Bradford	Gerber	Metcalfe	Scavello
Brennan	Gergely	Metzgar	Schroder
Briggs	Gibbons	Micozzie	Seip
Brooks	Gillespie	Millard	Shapiro
Brown	Gingrich	Miller	Siptroth
Burns	Godshall	Milne	Smith, K.
Buxton	Goodman	Mirabito	Smith, M.
Caltagirone	Grell	Moul	Smith, S.
Carroll	Grove	Mundy	Solobay
Casorio	Grucela	Murphy	Sonney
Causar	Haluska	Murt	Staback
Christiana	Hanna	Mustio	Stern
Clymer	Harhai	Myers	Stevenson
Cohen	Harhart	O'Brien, D.	Sturla
Conklin	Harkins	O'Brien, M.	Swanger
Costa, D.	Harper	O'Neill	Tallman
Costa, P.	Harris	Oberlander	Taylor, J.
Cox	Hennessey	Oliver	Taylor, R.
Creighton	Hess	Pallone	Thomas
Cruz	Hickernell	Parker	Turzai
Curry	Hornaman	Pashinski	Vereb
Cutler	Houghton	Payne	Vitali
Daley	Hutchinson	Payton	Vulakovich
Dally	Johnson	Peifer	Wagner
Day	Josephs	Perzel	Walko
Deasy	Kauffman	Petrarca	Wansacz
Delozier	Keller, M.K.	Petri	Waters
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Phillips	Watson
Denlinger	Kessler	Pickett	Wheatley
DePasquale	Killion	Preston	White
Dermody	Kirkland	Pyle	Williams
DiGirolando	Knowles	Quigley	Youngblood
Drucker	Kortz	Quinn	Yudichak
Eachus	Kotik	Rapp	
Ellis	Krieger	Readshaw	McCall,
Evans, D.	Kula	Reed	Speaker
Evans, J.	Levdansky	Reese	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Civera	Helm	McGeehan	Perry
DeWeese	Lentz	Miccarelli	True
Donatucci			

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

The SPEAKER. If the members will bear with the Speaker for another 10 or 15 minutes, we have to say farewell to a couple of our colleagues.

I am sure you all know one of the famous statesmen, Pericles, once said that "What you leave behind is not what is engraved in stone monuments, but what is woven into the lives of others." Those words seem fitting as we prepare to say farewell to two of our colleagues, who through their words and actions have sought to better the lives of all Pennsylvanians and to strengthen the Commonwealth. Each will be remembered, and their legislative endeavors written about, in different ways. Collectively, however, their individual efforts have helped to write the history of Pennsylvania.

Each of us who has had the privilege to take the oath of office and the opportunity to support and defend the Constitution of this great Commonwealth as a member of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives brings to the office our own ideals, our own beliefs, and our own agendas. And once we begin serving in Harrisburg, our personal agendas are tempered by the awesome responsibility invested in each of us to protect, defend, and ensure the peace, safety, and happiness of the people of this great Commonwealth. That responsibility unites all of us under a common yoke and becomes the foundation upon which we weigh and debate legislation and conduct the people's business. Our actions in this hall of the House touch people's lives, and although few of our floor debates will likely be quoted by future statesmen, we are creating a legacy that will remain alive long after we leave this chamber.

Today is a bittersweet day for two of our members. It marks the journey for two of our colleagues, which I am certain will be memorable for both of them. The Honorable Don Walko will be taking a new challenge in his role as judge of the court of common pleas for Allegheny County, and the Honorable Craig Dally will be the newest judge on the court of common pleas of Northampton County. Both gentlemen will be missed in this chamber, and I can only imagine how it will feel for them when they walk out of this chamber, knowing that the next time that they come into this chamber and return, someone new will be sitting in their seat.

Their work, like all of our work, will not be engraved in stone monuments but will be woven into the fabric of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the lives of all Pennsylvanians. Today I am going ask Representative Walko and Representative Dally to come up to the rostrum. I will introduce each of them separately, but I want them both to come up and take a seat to the right of the Speaker – or left, however you so desire.

Our colleague and friend, Don Walko, is well known for a lot of things, but most especially for his efforts to address blight and his work to establish problem solving in the courts. He was elected to the Pennsylvania House of Representatives on November 8, 1994, and began his service to the 20th Legislative District in 1995. The one thing that I remember the most about Don – that took some guts, but it was an issue that was a big issue – is when he loaded up a couple of bus loads of senior citizens and took them to Canada to show that he could purchase pharmaceuticals at a much cheaper price in Canada than he could here in Pennsylvania.

He certainly made an impact and an impression on a lot of our members when he did in fact do that. But I know that in his

new role as judge, I do not know if the hours are certainly going to be any better than the hours that we all put in here on this floor and in this job, but I do know one thing for certain, that his commute will be a lot shorter and I know he will appreciate that. Representative Walko, you have the microphone.

FAREWELL ADDRESS BY MR. WALKO

Mr. WALKO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you, friends and colleagues, Allegheny County. Thank you. Bittersweet, indeed.

First of all, thank you so much. You are a tremendous Speaker, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to start off by thanking all of the wonderful staff persons who work here and make this such a wonderful place to work: Wally Macon and his crew; Jack and all the Sergeants at Arms; Alli Fisher, Ed Haines, Laura Kuller, Dawn Reese, and all of the leadership staff persons; Appropriations staff persons, including Miriam Fox, Erik Randolph, Renee Fuller, Rebecca May Cole; Christina Zarek and everybody at the Legislative Communications Office, including Ben Turner and Stephany Dugan; Clayton Dressler and everyone at the Publications Office; Dave Spizzirri and Lynn Bias for helping keep us sane in some hectic times; Vince DeLiberato and the whole crew at the Legislative Reference Bureau; C.C. Kraber and everyone at the Research Office; Pat Brady and the PENNDOT team; Paul Cunningham and his DIT (Democratic Information Technologies) team; and my anchor here in Harrisburg, my trusted and hardworking legislative assistants, Louise Koppenheffer – stand up, Louise. Thank you. Back home I would like to extend a special thanks to my 15-year assistant, Lawrenceville zone, Art Nese. You know Tom Forrester, the once powerful Allegheny County Commissioner, held my seat for 10 years. Shortly after I was sworn in, he said that those 10 years were the greatest years of his political life. Fifteen years later, I fully understand how he felt. I love being part of this great institution. I do.

It has been hard for me to summarize exactly why I enjoyed being part of the House. I love being part of a team quarterbacked by Todd Eachus for the expansion of our prescription drug programs for older Pennsylvanians. I thoroughly enjoyed being chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts and working closely with Chairman Caltagirone, Chairman Marsico, Tom Creighton, and the many fine members of the committee over the years like Sean Ramaley, Joe Petrarca, and others.

But I guess it really comes down to one thing that made this such a great experience: It is the great group of colleagues I have from Allegheny County. Our House members from that county are a fantastic group of dedicated and caring individuals: Dom Costa, the former chief of police in Penn Hills in Pittsburgh. He understands deeply the human experience. He embodies toughness, compassion, and fairness. Yeah, you do, Dom. Frank Dermody, former prosecutor, who has a calming influence in the storms that blow through this General Assembly. Before he was a prosecutor, he was a public defender. If you have not heard stories from those days, you are missing a lot. Really, when it comes down to it, Frank Dermody personifies justice. Joe Markosek, the go-to guy on

transportation issues who cares deeply about our Commonwealth's infrastructure needs. Dave Levdansky, an expert on government financing and a straight shooter who will speak the truth without regard to consequences. Before I met David, we had a common political teacher, the great Victor Willam. Tony DeLuca, who always thinks about the impact of what we do on families in Pennsylvania. He is our leader on health-care issues. Harry Readshaw, more than anyone else I know, understands the big picture of government, community, and family. He is the best at keeping things in perspective and doing it with a wonderfully dry sense of humor for the 15 years he sat behind me on this House floor. Paul Costa, a great Representative who does more than any other member to promote cooperation and civility in the midst of turmoil. Rob Matzie, always upbeat and positive with a deep understanding of the legislative process and how it can help people. Dan Deasy reflects dedication to his position and to the district year round. And we all know he showed us his quiet courage during the torturous budget process back in October. Dan Frankel personifies pure dedication to the city of Pittsburgh and commitment to the civil rights of all Pennsylvanians. Joe Preston, my fellow Young Democrat of Allegheny County – former Young Democrat. I have known him for 30 years and his insights and experience have been invaluable to me. Bill Kortz – happy birthday, Bill. He is a sincere and caring person who has not forgotten where he comes from. He is relentless in reaching for his goal. Best of luck, my dear friend.

Chelsa Wagner, Matt Smith, Marc Gergely, Jake Wheatley – exuberant folks with lots of ideas. They are young but well seasoned. They are great advocates for important causes. John Maher, Mike Turzai, Randy Vulakovich, and Mark Mustio, my Allegheny County friends from the other side of the aisle. We have often disagreed on issues here on this floor, but you have always treated me with dignity and respect and I will never forget that. Nick Kotik, experienced in local government. Nick brings a deep understanding of the impact of our actions here on the people back home, especially in local government. It has been a pleasure sitting next to you on the House floor for the past 7 years. And my wife thanks you, Nick, for never letting up on your insistence that I run for judge. As I leave this House, I want you to know how I appreciate your friendship and your dedication to the people of Allegheny County and all of Pennsylvania.

Now, I have been blessed with a wonderful family. My mother, Eleanor, and my father, Don Sr., have been more than supportive as I pursued this career in law, politics, and government. My children have been firm pillars of support for me. Jessica and Nicholas are at college taking final exams today. Nathaniel is here as a page, and Gabriella Grace is over in the corner with her mother. Stand up, Gabriella. Gabriella, stay out of politics.

Like all children of elected officials, they have sacrificed to let me serve – missed basketball games, plays, and basketball performances, needing to leave the house on Saturdays or Sunday afternoons to attend charitable or political events. You all know the story. Well, kids, that is going to change. And finally, the glue that holds our family together, my wife, Julie. Stand up, Julie. I love you.

So long, my dear colleagues. I hope you will let me visit you from time to time. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Our colleague and friend, Craig Dally, was first elected to the House of Representatives in 1996, representing the 138th Legislative District. He supports numerous reform measures and initiatives. His legislative priorities have centered around local tax reform, health care, and transportation. His experience and his convictions will serve him well as he takes on his new role as judge in the court of common pleas of Northampton County. Given Representative Dally's courage of conviction, there is little doubt that he will handle his duties justly and fairly. The only thing that I can say to you, Craig, is the next time I see you, I want strokes.

Representative Dally.

FAREWELL ADDRESS BY MR. DALLY

Mr. DALLY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Congratulations, Representative Walko.

One thing that I realized in sitting here listening to Representative Walko's remarks, I never realized there were that many Democrats in Allegheny County. No wonder we cannot win any votes in this place. But anyway, good luck to you.

Mr. Speaker, Majority Leader Eachus, Republican Leader Smith, fellow members, House staff, and honored guests:

I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to address the House during this, the final days of my tenure, as a member of this exceptional and historic body. It is hard to believe that it has been over 13 years since the fine voters – and I must say, smart voters – of the 138th Legislative District bestowed upon me the honor of representing them in the House of Representatives. It seems but a few short months ago that I walked on this floor for the festive swearing-in ceremony in January of 1997, and was in awe of the beauty of this chamber and thinking that I had the privilege of serving with 202 other men and women from throughout Pennsylvania and from a variety of different walks of life in the oldest democratic body in the Western Hemisphere, to serve my constituents and the people of this great Commonwealth.

Today as I prepare to leave, 13 years later, I must say that my feelings are mixed, and as the Speaker said earlier, bittersweet. While I am proud of what this House has accomplished during my tenure and the assistance that my staff and I have provided to the people we represent, I am leaving behind many great memories, many great friends, and an institution that I cherish. But as the old adage goes, nothing lasts forever. And it is now my time to leave to serve the people of Northampton County as a member of the court of common pleas, and just as importantly, to give another individual the opportunity to experience what I have and to serve the residents of the 138th Legislative District.

All of us in political life know a person is not successful in this line of work without the help and assistance from family and friends, many of whom have honored me with their presence today, and they are seated in the rear of the House. If you could just rise, please. Thank you.

And several who began this journey with me 13 years ago and who are no longer with us. I am thankful that my father, John Dally, was able to share in the joy of my first election, but saddened that his death in April of 1988 did not allow him to witness the success achieved during my tenure nor share in this day as I prepare to depart. The same is true for my wife's

parents, Marge and Al Capobianco, who were two of my biggest supporters and who died within 15 months of each other in 2006 and 2008. For it was my mother-in-law's persistence that caused me to become a Republican in 1994, little knowing that less than 2 years later I would be elected to the House of Representatives as a Republican. And finally, I remember today my beloved grandmother, Catherine Dally, who immigrated to this country from Italy in 1910 at the tender age of 5, married at 16, widowed at age 50, and was the most giving and selfless grandmother until her final days in 2001, when she died at the age of 96. Her incredible influence on my life remains with me each and every day. Thankfully, I have been blessed with my mother, Marge Dally, being with me every step of the way. She is with us today. I would like to recognize her. Mom, if you could stand up, please.

She is a strong Norwegian from the South Dakota farm country, so she has been a great volunteer and an ardent supporter and has even been good for a few campaign contributions along the way. So thanks, Mom. I would also like to recognize my sister, Karin Curcio; and my brother, John Dally, his wife, Susan, and their son, Anthony, my nephew, who are in the rear of the House; and my aunt and uncle, Don and Norma Abbott, who are here to my left. If you could also stand to be recognized. I would like to thank them for their assistance and support over the years.

As Representative Walko mentioned in his remarks, all of us know, all of us who serve here know that our work here and at home takes a tremendous toll on our families, who are both the beneficiaries of our work but also the victims of our crazy schedules, and they never truly get the recognition nor are they shown the appreciation that they deserve. I would like to recognize my wife, Ann, who is here today. I would like to publicly thank her for all she has done for me and for being the great mother that she has been to our children. Thank you. Our two daughters, Sarah and Alison, could not be here today due to college exams at Lafayette College, where they are both students, but because of my work here in the General Assembly, they have shared in experiences that will last a lifetime. My one bit of advice to the younger members is to engage your family in your work, for it will be something that you will be most thankful for when your children enter adulthood.

While I am extending thanks to those who have been instrumental in my success, I want to recognize my loyal and devoted staff, many of whom have been with me during my entire tenure, and I ask that you stand as I mention your names. Gail Pakosky has been my Harrisburg secretary since the day I arrived here, and she will be moving on to greener pastures with the Appropriations Committee – or perhaps what used to be greener pastures. Valerie Kane was a recent addition and she is now working for Representative Harris. Marcia Hahn, who has not only run my district office operations but has basically run my life for the last 13 years. And also from my district office, I want to recognize Sandra Schaadt, Ruth O'Connor, and Gina Costello. Together with Marcia, these ladies have been my public face in the district and have consistently demonstrated the empathy and professionalism required to help the thousands of constituents who we have served during my tenure. Thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Finally – and she is probably going to be surprised by this – but I do want to recognize my legal secretary, Linda Curry, who is here. She is hiding in the back row. She has been my legal

secretary for the last 20 years and has had the unenviable task of working with the demands of my legislative schedule while still trying to practice law. So, Linda, if you could please stand to be recognized.

Saying goodbye to so many dear friends in this chamber is very hard because you have meant so much to me personally and professionally. I will be taking much more than a collection of lessons that you have taught me; I will be taking with me many great memories that will last for my remaining years.

I want to especially thank my Lehigh Valley colleagues from both sides of the aisle and those members who sit in our corner of the chamber, up there in the corner, for their support and camaraderie over the years. I do want to make special mention of three colleagues. When I arrived on this floor 13 years ago, I was given the seat next to Representative Harhart, who was seated as she is today on the center aisle. So I was sitting where Representative Stevenson is sitting. So every time I had to leave my seat for whatever reason, I had to ask her permission. I soon came to realize that I was put in that spot for a reason. Since my mother was not able to come to Harrisburg with me on session days, I needed someone who would keep me in my place and Julie never missed an opportunity to do so. So thank you, Julie, for keeping me grounded and focused, and most of all, for your friendship.

And then there is my longtime friend and colleague, Representative Rich Grucela. How about a round of applause for Rich, whom I have known over my entire adult life. Over the years, Rich and I have worked together on scores of outreach events in our respective districts to the great benefit of the people we serve. This bipartisan approach to serving the public has been most successful and noticed by our constituents, and it is a model that should be utilized more often by the members of this House.

And finally, Representative Scott Hutchinson, with whom I have shared so many funny stories that I am sure we will continue to laugh about long after my departure. I was going to mention Representative Turzai, but at the beginning of this session he made a conscious decision to move from our area of the floor up to the front to sit with the other members of leadership. So we thought, well, he soon forgot about us so I soon forgot about him.

It has been great, the well-wishes from the members that I have gotten over the last few weeks. They congratulate you, they wish you well, and then pretty soon the focus turns to who is going to get your position on Professional Licensure. How about that parking spot in the garage? Did anybody put in for your floor seat on the House? You have an aisle seat? Just the other day I was going in my office and Daryl Metcalfe walks in with his tape measure. I thought, if he is a mortician, I am in big trouble, but he was just there to measure the curtains. I will say that my office is prime office space. It is in great condition. Just give me about 45 minutes to move out. But anyway, such is life in an institution where voids are filled very quickly. And I wanted to be conscious to give everyone my forwarding information. I am not so sure it is going to be used, but I will do so anyway.

Continuing with my long list of thank-yous, I want to recognize the exceptional staff of this institution, and in particular, the staff of the Republican Caucus. Never in my professional life have I been associated with a better group of competent and dedicated public servants, who make our jobs as members so much easier. I would also be remiss if I did not

make special mention of my longtime writer, Len Bennett, and my buddies, Lynn and Spiz, back in the lounge. I see Spiz back there. Thank you for your friendship.

So I am often asked, so do you have any regrets? Sure, I have a few, but as Frank Sinatra once crooned, "too few to mention." I am excited by the prospect of moving to a new place and starting something I have worked toward for a long time. But it is like leaving your family – something you have to do but something that is not any easier for having to do it.

I wish each and every one of you much success in your endeavors. As we all know, this institution has taken its share of knocks in the recent years, but I am confident that through the guidance of your leaders and the hard work of the members, this institution will once again achieve the prominence and respect that it truly deserves. Legislating is tough, but incredibly important work. And it is often work that is better done by striving for consensus rather than self-importance. On that note, I will leave you with a quote from Benjamin Franklin, who was the first Speaker of this House, who stated quite poignantly, "A man wrapped up in himself makes a very small bundle."

I am confident that the best days of our Commonwealth lie ahead of us, and we will achieve that success with your continued leadership. God bless, Godspeed, and farewell.

REMARKS BY MR. GRUCELA

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Northampton County, Representative Grucela, for some remarks.

Mr. GRUCELA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, once again, Craig beat me to the punch. He said pretty much everything I was going to say.

But if I might, Mr. Speaker, just a few moments to kind of reiterate what Craig said. First of all, Craig's father was a mentor of mine when I was a young guy just getting into politics, and the one thing Jack Dally taught me was, it does not matter what the letter behind your name is; what matters is what you do right and what you do for the people and especially for the district.

Craig and I have neighboring districts, and for the 11 years that I have been pleased to work with him, as he already mentioned, we have always worked in a bipartisan manner back home, and I would hope that in some cases that would be a model for what can be done and what can be accomplished when we keep in mind it is really our districts and especially the people of Pennsylvania that we want to help and we want to work for.

Jack Dally was a real true mentor of mine, and I knew Craig when he was probably in high school, even though he looks older than me. But seriously, when he was first elected, I know how proud his father was of him then and I know how proud his father would have been when he was not only elected to the House but certainly looking down on him today as he is about to become a member of the Northampton County bench.

And I want to only leave you with this one humorous story that we tell all the time back home in the district, that he is well aware of, especially those of us in politics. There is a nice little restaurant that we frequent together, although it is in Craig's district, and I cannot tell you how many times that people have come up to either myself or Craig and say, we really like you two guys, what you have been doing for the Slate Belt. We vote

for both of you, which of course we know is impossible. So every time that people tell Craig and me that they have voted for both of us, we know they are not registered voters.

But seriously, it has been a pleasure to work with him. I am going to miss him in this chamber and back home because of the good relationship we have had and the many friends that we share, including his lovely wife and his daughters and his family.

So, Craig, I wish you well. We are going to miss you. Thanks for mentioning my name, and you stole a little bit of what I was going to say. But God bless you and be well, take care, you and Judge Walko, whom I share some baseball affinity with. So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

REMARKS BY MINORITY WHIP

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Representative Turzai.

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

I rise to just say that for many of us on this side of the aisle and for, I am sure, everybody in the House, I am losing one of my best friends in Craig Dally. This gentleman has outstanding character, true intellect, real integrity, one of the most humorous, erudite individuals I have had the encounter of meeting my entire life.

He and Ann have become good friends of Lidia and myself, and he is going to be an outstanding judge. And, Craig, I hope at some point I get to vote for you when you run for the Supreme Court or that you get appointed to a higher court, because what you will do in Northampton will shine, I am sure, across the judiciary. We are going to miss you, and it is going to be difficult serving here without you.

Craig did nominate me for my position as whip, which forced me down to the front. I got him back.

Also, just with respect to my colleague, Don Walko, just a gentleman of real class, and I am sure he is going to serve my home county of Allegheny County with real dignity and distinction. A lovely family; we often talked about our kids being at Catholic schools in the community.

And, Don, I did not get a chance to vote for Craig because he is all across the State, but I, with honor, cast a vote for you in this past election, and I am honored that you are going to serve and I know you will do great.

Thank you very, very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

REMARKS BY MR. SCAVELLO

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Monroe County, Representative Scavello.

Mr. SCAVELLO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to say that Craig and Don, if there are two people in this body that are absolute perfect gentlemen, it is you two, and both of you are going to be missed. And I am just so proud to see both of you out there as common court judges, and just remember my marriage ceremony – you both are going to do a lot of weddings.

Craig, I just want you to know everybody back here was a little offended because you just mentioned the guys in the back, but they are all going to miss you, especially when they are combing their hair – not me – but they are going to miss you. They do not have a mirror any longer.

The SPEAKER. Again, our sincere thank-you for your service and dedication to the House of Representatives. And on behalf of all of the membership, we wish you much success in your future endeavors. Congratulations.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

HB 1944, PN 2598

By Rep. ROEBUCK

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, providing for confidentiality of home addresses of school employees.

EDUCATION.

HB 2026, PN 2766

By Rep. ROEBUCK

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in terms and courses of study, providing for dating violence education.

EDUCATION.

SB 441, PN 1075

By Rep. ROEBUCK

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, further providing for disqualifications relating to teacher's certificate.

EDUCATION.

RESOLUTION REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HR 565, PN 3001

By Rep. ROEBUCK

A Resolution ratifying the designation of Valley Forge Military College as the Official Military College of Pennsylvania and endorsing and encouraging participation in the Valley Forge Military College Legislative Appointment Initiative Program.

EDUCATION.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will go to the House supplemental calendar.

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. TURZAI called up **HR 561, PN 3004**, entitled:

A Resolution honoring the members of the Statewide Water Resources Committee for their outstanding work in developing the State Water Plan.

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

Adolph	Everett	Longiotti	Reichley
Baker	Fabrizio	Maher	Roae
Barbin	Fairchild	Mahoney	Rock
Barrar	Farry	Major	Roebuck
Bear	Fleck	Manderino	Rohrer
Belfanti	Frankel	Mann	Ross
Benninghoff	Freeman	Markosek	Sabatina
Beyer	Gabig	Marshall	Sainato
Bishop	Gabler	Marsico	Samuelson
Boback	Galloway	Matzie	Santarsiero
Boyd	Geist	McI. Smith	Santoni
Boyle	George	Melio	Saylor
Bradford	Gerber	Metcalfe	Scavello
Brennan	Gergely	Metzgar	Schroder
Briggs	Gibbons	Micozzie	Seip
Brooks	Gillespie	Millard	Shapiro
Brown	Gingrich	Miller	Siptroth
Burns	Godshall	Milne	Smith, K.
Buxton	Goodman	Mirabito	Smith, M.
Caltagirone	Grell	Moul	Smith, S.
Carroll	Grove	Mundy	Solobay
Casorio	Grucela	Murphy	Sonney
Causar	Haluska	Murt	Staback
Christiana	Hanna	Mustio	Stern
Clymer	Harhai	Myers	Stevenson
Cohen	Harhart	O'Brien, D.	Sturla
Conklin	Harkins	O'Brien, M.	Swanger
Costa, D.	Harper	O'Neill	Tallman
Costa, P.	Harris	Oberlander	Taylor, J.
Cox	Hennessey	Oliver	Taylor, R.
Creighton	Hess	Pallone	Thomas
Cruz	Hickernell	Parker	Turzai
Curry	Hornaman	Pashinski	Vereb
Cutler	Houghton	Payne	Vitali
Daley	Hutchinson	Payton	Vulakovich
Dally	Johnson	Peifer	Wagner
Day	Josephs	Perzel	Walko
Deasy	Kauffman	Petrarca	Wansacz
DeLozier	Keller, M.K.	Petri	Waters
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Phillips	Watson
Denlinger	Kessler	Pickett	Wheatley
DePasquale	Killion	Preston	White
Dermody	Kirkland	Pyle	Williams
DiGirolamo	Knowles	Quigley	Youngblood
Drucker	Kortz	Quinn	Yudichak
Eachus	Kotik	Rapp	
Ellis	Krieger	Readshaw	McCall,
Evans, D.	Kula	Reed	Speaker
Evans, J.	Levdansky	Reese	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Civera	Helm	McGeehan	Perry
DeWeese	Lentz	Miccarelli	True
Donatucci			

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

* * *

Ms. MAJOR called up **HR 569, PN 3005**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of January 2010 as "Learn a Snow Sport Month" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

Adolph	Everett	Longiotti	Reichley
Baker	Fabrizio	Maher	Roae
Barbin	Fairchild	Mahoney	Rock
Barrar	Farry	Major	Roebuck
Bear	Fleck	Manderino	Rohrer
Belfanti	Frankel	Mann	Ross
Benninghoff	Freeman	Markosek	Sabatina
Beyer	Gabig	Marshall	Sainato
Bishop	Gabler	Marsico	Samuelson
Boback	Galloway	Matzie	Santarsiero
Boyd	Geist	McI. Smith	Santoni
Boyle	George	Melio	Saylor
Bradford	Gerber	Metcalfe	Scavello
Brennan	Gergely	Metzgar	Schroder
Briggs	Gibbons	Micozzie	Seip
Brooks	Gillespie	Millard	Shapiro
Brown	Gingrich	Miller	Siptroth
Burns	Godshall	Milne	Smith, K.
Buxton	Goodman	Mirabito	Smith, M.
Caltagirone	Grell	Moul	Smith, S.
Carroll	Grove	Mundy	Solobay
Casorio	Grucela	Murphy	Sonney
Causar	Haluska	Murt	Staback
Christiana	Hanna	Mustio	Stern
Clymer	Harhai	Myers	Stevenson
Cohen	Harhart	O'Brien, D.	Sturla
Conklin	Harkins	O'Brien, M.	Swanger
Costa, D.	Harper	O'Neill	Tallman
Costa, P.	Harris	Oberlander	Taylor, J.
Cox	Hennessey	Oliver	Taylor, R.
Creighton	Hess	Pallone	Thomas
Cruz	Hickernell	Parker	Turzai
Curry	Hornaman	Pashinski	Vereb
Cutler	Houghton	Payne	Vitali
Daley	Hutchinson	Payton	Vulakovich
Dally	Johnson	Peifer	Wagner
Day	Josephs	Perzel	Walko
Deasy	Kauffman	Petrarca	Wansacz
DeLozier	Keller, M.K.	Petri	Waters
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Phillips	Watson
Denlinger	Kessler	Pickett	Wheatley
DePasquale	Killion	Preston	White
Dermody	Kirkland	Pyle	Williams
DiGirolamo	Knowles	Quigley	Youngblood
Drucker	Kortz	Quinn	Yudichak
Eachus	Kotik	Rapp	
Ellis	Krieger	Readshaw	McCall,
Evans, D.	Kula	Reed	Speaker
Evans, J.	Levdansky	Reese	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Civera	Helm	McGeehan	Perry
DeWeese	Lentz	Miccarelli	True
Donatucci			

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

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1196, PN 2984**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of November 10, 1999 (P.L.491, No.45), known as the Pennsylvania Construction Code Act, further providing for definitions and for administration and enforcement; and providing for applicability.

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—193

Adolph	Everett	Longiotti	Reichley
Baker	Fabrizio	Maher	Roae
Barbin	Fairchild	Mahoney	Rock
Barrar	Farry	Major	Roebuck
Bear	Fleck	Manderino	Rohrer
Belfanti	Frankel	Mann	Ross
Benninghoff	Freeman	Markosek	Sabatina
Beyer	Gabig	Marshall	Sainato
Bishop	Gabler	Marsico	Samuelson
Boback	Galloway	Matzie	Santarsiero
Boyd	Geist	McI. Smith	Santoni
Boyle	George	Melio	Saylor
Bradford	Gerber	Metcalf	Scavello
Brennan	Gergely	Metzgar	Schroder
Briggs	Gibbons	Micozzie	Seip
Brooks	Gillespie	Millard	Shapiro
Brown	Gingrich	Miller	Siptroth
Burns	Godshall	Milne	Smith, K.
Buxton	Goodman	Mirabito	Smith, M.
Caltagirone	Grell	Moul	Smith, S.
Carroll	Grove	Mundy	Solobay
Casorio	Grucela	Murphy	Sonney
Causar	Haluska	Murt	Staback
Christiana	Hanna	Mustio	Stern
Clymer	Harhai	Myers	Stevenson
Cohen	Harhart	O'Brien, D.	Sturla
Conklin	Harkins	O'Brien, M.	Swanger
Costa, D.	Harper	O'Neill	Tallman
Costa, P.	Harris	Oberlander	Taylor, J.
Cox	Hennessey	Oliver	Taylor, R.
Creighton	Hess	Pallone	Thomas
Cruz	Hickernell	Parker	Turzai
Curry	Hornaman	Pashinski	Vereb
Cutler	Houghton	Payne	Vitali
Daley	Hutchinson	Payton	Vulakovich
Dally	Johnson	Peifer	Wagner
Day	Josephs	Perzel	Walko
Deasy	Kauffman	Petrarca	Wansacz
Delozier	Keller, M.K.	Petri	Waters

DeLuca	Keller, W.	Phillips	Watson
Denlinger	Kessler	Pickett	Wheatley
DePasquale	Killion	Preston	White
Dermody	Kirkland	Pyle	Williams
DiGirolamo	Knowles	Quigley	Youngblood
Drucker	Kortz	Quinn	Yudichak
Eachus	Kotik	Rapp	
Ellis	Krieger	Readshaw	McCall,
Evans, D.	Kula	Reed	Speaker
Evans, J.	Levdansky	Reese	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Civera	Helm	McGeehan	Perry
DeWeese	Lentz	Miccarelli	True
Donatucci			

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.

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1281, PN 2182**, entitled:

An Act providing for notice and a public hearing relating to privately operated community corrections facilities.

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—193

Adolph	Everett	Longiotti	Reichley
Baker	Fabrizio	Maher	Roae
Barbin	Fairchild	Mahoney	Rock
Barrar	Farry	Major	Roebuck
Bear	Fleck	Manderino	Rohrer
Belfanti	Frankel	Mann	Ross
Benninghoff	Freeman	Markosek	Sabatina
Beyer	Gabig	Marshall	Sainato
Bishop	Gabler	Marsico	Samuelson
Boback	Galloway	Matzie	Santarsiero
Boyd	Geist	McI. Smith	Santoni
Boyle	George	Melio	Saylor
Bradford	Gerber	Metcalf	Scavello
Brennan	Gergely	Metzgar	Schroder
Briggs	Gibbons	Micozzie	Seip

Brooks	Gillespie	Millard	Shapiro
Brown	Gingrich	Miller	Siptroth
Burns	Godshall	Milne	Smith, K.
Buxton	Goodman	Mirabito	Smith, M.
Caltagirone	Grell	Moul	Smith, S.
Carroll	Grove	Mundy	Solobay
Casorio	Grucela	Murphy	Sonney
Causer	Haluska	Murt	Staback
Christiana	Hanna	Mustio	Stern
Clymer	Harhai	Myers	Stevenson
Cohen	Harhart	O'Brien, D.	Sturla
Conklin	Harkins	O'Brien, M.	Swanger
Costa, D.	Harper	O'Neill	Tallman
Costa, P.	Harris	Oberlander	Taylor, J.
Cox	Hennessey	Oliver	Taylor, R.
Creighton	Hess	Pallone	Thomas
Cruz	Hickernell	Parker	Turzai
Curry	Hornaman	Pashinski	Vereb
Cutler	Houghton	Payne	Vitali
Daley	Hutchinson	Payton	Vulakovich
Dally	Johnson	Peifer	Wagner
Day	Josephs	Perzel	Walko
Deasy	Kauffman	Petrarca	Wansacz
Delozier	Keller, M.K.	Petri	Waters
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Phillips	Watson
Denlinger	Kessler	Pickett	Wheatley
DePasquale	Killion	Preston	White
Dermody	Kirkland	Pyle	Williams
DiGirolamo	Knowles	Quigley	Youngblood
Drucker	Kortz	Quinn	Yudichak
Eachus	Kotik	Rapp	
Ellis	Krieger	Readshaw	McCall,
Evans, D.	Kula	Reed	Speaker
Evans, J.	Levdansky	Reese	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Civera	Helm	McGeehan	Perry
DeWeese	Lentz	Miccarelli	True
Donatucci			

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.

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2047, PN 2815**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 25, 1945 (P.L.1050, No.394), known as the Local Tax Collection Law, further providing for compensation of treasurers in first class townships.

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—193

Adolph	Everett	Longietti	Reichley
Baker	Fabrizio	Maher	Roae
Barbin	Fairchild	Mahoney	Rock
Barrar	Farry	Major	Roebuck
Bear	Fleck	Manderino	Rohrer
Belfanti	Frankel	Mann	Ross
Benninghoff	Freeman	Markosek	Sabatina
Beyer	Gabig	Marshall	Sainato
Bishop	Gabler	Marsico	Samuelson
Boback	Galloway	Matzie	Santarsiero
Boyd	Geist	McI. Smith	Santoni
Boyle	George	Melio	Saylor
Bradford	Gerber	Metcalfe	Scavello
Brennan	Gergely	Metzgar	Schroder
Briggs	Gibbons	Micozzie	Seip
Brooks	Gillespie	Millard	Shapiro
Brown	Gingrich	Miller	Siptroth
Burns	Godshall	Milne	Smith, K.
Buxton	Goodman	Mirabito	Smith, M.
Caltagirone	Grell	Moul	Smith, S.
Carroll	Grove	Mundy	Solobay
Casorio	Grucela	Murphy	Sonney
Causer	Haluska	Murt	Staback
Christiana	Hanna	Mustio	Stern
Clymer	Harhai	Myers	Stevenson
Cohen	Harhart	O'Brien, D.	Sturla
Conklin	Harkins	O'Brien, M.	Swanger
Costa, D.	Harper	O'Neill	Tallman
Costa, P.	Harris	Oberlander	Taylor, J.
Cox	Hennessey	Oliver	Taylor, R.
Creighton	Hess	Pallone	Thomas
Cruz	Hickernell	Parker	Turzai
Curry	Hornaman	Pashinski	Vereb
Cutler	Houghton	Payne	Vitali
Daley	Hutchinson	Payton	Vulakovich
Dally	Johnson	Peifer	Wagner
Day	Josephs	Perzel	Walko
Deasy	Kauffman	Petrarca	Wansacz
Delozier	Keller, M.K.	Petri	Waters
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Phillips	Watson
Denlinger	Kessler	Pickett	Wheatley
DePasquale	Killion	Preston	White
Dermody	Kirkland	Pyle	Williams
DiGirolamo	Knowles	Quigley	Youngblood
Drucker	Kortz	Quinn	Yudichak
Eachus	Kotik	Rapp	
Ellis	Krieger	Readshaw	McCall,
Evans, D.	Kula	Reed	Speaker
Evans, J.	Levdansky	Reese	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Civera	Helm	McGeehan	Perry
DeWeese	Lentz	Miccarelli	True
Donatucci			

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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MAJORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Luzerne County, the majority leader, Representative Eachus.

Mr. EACHUS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We are going to take a brief lunch break from 1 to 2 o'clock. We will be back on the floor at 2 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Any announcements?

RECESS

The SPEAKER. This House stands in recess to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

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

The SPEAKER. The members will please report to the floor of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Turning to leaves of absence, the Chair notes the presence of the gentlelady from Lancaster County, Representative True. Her name will be added to the master roll.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Representative Turzai, who requests a leave of absence for Representative HENNESSEY from Chester County for the day. Without objection, the leave will be granted.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 711, PN 1544, [corrective reprint, PN 1545]**, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 4 (Amusements) and 64 (Public Authorities and Quasi-Public Corporations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, making extensive revisions to provisions on gaming, in the areas of legislative intent, definitions, the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board, applicability of other statutes, powers of the board, code of conduct, expenses of regulatory agencies, licensed gaming entity application appeals from board, license or permit application hearing process and public hearings, board minutes and records, regulatory authority, collection of fees and fines, slot machine license fee, number of slot machines, reports of board, diversity goals of board, license or permit prohibition, specific authority to suspend slot machine license, Category 2 slot machine license, Category 3 slot machine license, number of slot machine licenses, applications for license or permit, slot machine license application, slot machine license application character requirements, supplier licenses, manufacturer licenses, gaming service provider, occupation permit application,

alternative manufacturer licensing standards, alternative supplier licensing standards, additional licenses and permits and approval of agreements, license renewals, change in ownership or control of slot machine licensee, nonportability of slot machine license, appointment of trustee, table games, slot machine licensee deposits, gross terminal revenue deductions, itemized budget reporting, establishment of State Gaming Fund and net slot machine revenue distribution, distributions from Pennsylvania Race Horse Development Fund, Pennsylvania Gaming Economic Development and Tourism Fund, transfers from State Gaming Fund, responsibility and authority of Department of Revenue, wagering on credit, eminent domain authority, compulsive and problem gambling program, drug and alcohol treatment, labor hiring preferences, declaration of exemption from Federal laws prohibiting slot machines, financial and employment interests, additional restrictions, political influence, regulation requiring exclusion of certain persons, prosecutorial and adjudicative functions, investigations and enforcement, conduct of public officials and employees, prohibited acts and penalties, report of suspicious transactions, additional authority, applicability of Clean Indoor Air Act, liquor licenses at licensed facilities, interception of oral communications, electronic funds transfer terminals, junkets, gaming schools and appropriations; further providing for powers and duties of the Commonwealth Financing Authority; and making related repeals.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Representative Maher.

Mr. MAHER. Mr. Speaker, I was seeking recognition on third consideration. Can you rescind your announcement? I do not intend to ask for a vote recorded on third consideration, Mr. Speaker, but for clarity I was seeking to suspend the rules.

Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw that. Please feel free to proceed with the final consideration.

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?

For the information of the members, we would like to start the debate on SB 711. It is not appropriate to vote the bill until 7:42 p.m. this evening. Therefore, if there is no debate—

The House will be at ease.

The House will come to order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks County, Representative Clymer. The gentleman, Mr. Clymer, is recognized on final passage.

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if we could get the attention of the members.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

The House will come to order.

The gentleman, Mr. Clymer, is requesting the attention of the members. The House will come to order.

The gentleman, Mr. Clymer, is recognized.

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to SB 711 on final passage. Mr. Speaker, I was very disappointed and, I will admit, somewhat frustrated yesterday when the motion was made whereby cutting off all future amendments. I had a number of amendments that I wanted to offer, and I was not able to offer

those amendments. Mr. Speaker, it reminded me of 5 years ago when those of us who wanted to amend the casino gambling bill at that time could not do so because we had to suspend the rules, because situations were in place whereby we could not get the two-thirds majority for the suspension of those amendments. And when you are dealing with a casino gambling bill, whether it is the slots or the table games, it is major legislation because it is going to harm the people of Pennsylvania. So it was important for us 5 years ago to offer our amendments, and they were good amendments and they were amendments that would have made a very bad bill improved.

So, Mr. Speaker, I come here and tell you that I am disappointed that I see what was happening yesterday occurred 5 years ago, that the casino lobbyists have their tentacles truly involved in the halls of government, and that does lead to my frustration.

Having said that, having witnessed what occurred and participated in what occurred 5 years ago, I thought when this General Assembly came to do reform that finally we were on the right track – openness, debate, transparency. We were going to do away with what occurred in the past, but those reform measures really did not have an effect as we debated this bill on Monday. I am disappointed that we did not have more support from the members and from leadership— Well, from members, questioning why we should close off debate when we just signed off on reform measures a few years ago. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the sign that was out there 5 years ago, crime and corruption is still standing.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you an example of some of the bills that we wanted to offer 5 years ago in—

The SPEAKER. Mr. Clymer.

Mr. CLYMER. —concept.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Clymer, the gentleman is out of order.

Mr. CLYMER. In what respect?

The SPEAKER. Mr. Clymer, Mr. Clymer, you need to keep your remarks focused on final passage of SB 711 and the confines of that legislation. No personal attacks on the floor of the House.

Mr. CLYMER. Mr. Speaker, I did not know I was leveraging any personal attacks, but I am trying to point out why this bill, SB 711, is not a good piece of legislation, and I have to use examples in order to make my point. So let me continue, and I hope that together we can agree that my remarks are in context with this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I had amendments, amendments that would change the price of the casino license that I was unable to offer – \$25 million was one, \$50 million, up to \$75 million, to increase the tax on the table games from 20 percent to 25 percent to 28 percent. And, Mr. Speaker, this is important because I have heard in the past some members saying that we do not have enough money in this General Assembly. We are always short. That is why we are doing this bill. Had we asked a fair market value for these licenses 5 years ago and today, we would have that money, but we are not going to have it because we have listened to those influenced by the casino operatives, and that is my point.

Mr. Speaker, if 5 years ago we would have increased the licenses for classes 1 and 2 to \$225 million, which was a fair amount, we would have raised \$2.7 billion. That would have been \$2.1 billion over and above what we got. The \$60 million

that we got, we could have had \$2.1 billion. Can you imagine what we could have done with that money and the reason we would probably not be in the financial bind we are today?

Mr. Speaker, we did not have in this bill— In SB 711, we have in there a provision that allows for credit, and, Mr. Speaker, that is damaging to the poor, to the disadvantaged, and to the less fortunate in our society. Why in the world we would allow that to stay in the bill is beyond me, but that was an amendment that we should have addressed yesterday, but we could not, and it only makes sense to the casinos, not to the working people of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, the table games that we are considering, brings a new group of gamblers into the arena. These are going to be the younger people, people who love to do the poker, the roulette, the blackjack, and the other 37 games – I made mention of the number, not specifically the games – more addiction, more problems to our society.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not include, in law enforcement, the Attorney General and the State Police. The BIE, the Bureau of Investigations and Enforcement, while it is credible to some degree, cannot secure the protected information which is absolutely necessary if we are going to do a job in doing background investigations on those who are seeking a casino license or a table license.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me again tell you that this is not economic development. There will be proponents that will be standing up telling us that this is economic development. Maybe in the construction of the casino itself – there is obviously some construction; the trade unions are put to work – but the gambling itself, the actual gambling is not economic development.

And as I mentioned in the past, I will mention it again that Paul Samuelson, the Nobel Prize-winning economist, who is considered one of greatest economists of all times, said this about gambling, about SB 711 as I make reference to it. He says, "[Gambling] involves simply sterile transfers of money or goods between individuals, creating no new money or goods. Although it creates no output, gambling does nevertheless absorb time and resources. When pursued beyond the limits of recreation, where the main purpose...is to 'kill' time, gambling subtracts from the national income." So there we have a well-known economist telling us that gambling is not economic development. In fact, we know that there is a downside, as we know from Professor John Kindt and Professor Bill Thompson, that the social costs create a problem for all of us.

And, Mr. Speaker, SB 711 will create those social costs – the dysfunctional families, the bankruptcies, the lost time at the workplace. Mr. Speaker, these are things that we should be concerned about. We should be concerned about how we are addressing the issue of families. And, Mr. Speaker, this bill does not include the monthly statement, which was voted down, but the monthly statement would have been really a godsend to those family members who have a loved one who is becoming addicted to the gambling craze.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not do anything about restricting the free alcohol in the gambling casinos. And, Mr. Speaker, that was another amendment that I had prepared to debate, to present to the body, but unfortunately, I could not present it. And very briefly, we should not allow free drinks in the casinos. Do I have to remind you that Norm Braman, the former owner of

the Eagles, lost his Eagles franchise in the casinos of Atlantic City? And just recently reported in the CBS News, there was a gambler there who lost \$127 million, and this 52-year-old Omaha man made this statement. He said that "...he has filed a civil suit, claiming casino staff regularly plied him with alcohol and painkillers in order to keep him gambling...." "According to the Journal, several former and current..." members "...of Harrah's said they were told by their managers to let..." this individual "...keep betting even while he was visibly drunk, and were afraid they would be fired if they tried to prevent him from gambling."

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that is an issue that we need to look at. How many people have lost \$500 or \$5,000 or \$10,000 because they were intoxicated and they did not have control of their senses? So I am sorry that we could not move forward on that issue because that is a very important issue. Alcohol and gambling is a horrific mixture, and we should not allow that to occur in our gambling casinos.

And then, Mr. Speaker, as I have read in the news, there was a possible grand jury investigation as to how the casino licenses were awarded in 2004, I guess 2005, and that is another dark cloud that is getting darker over this General Assembly, another reason to defeat SB 711.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that we force nonsmoking rules on many mom-and-pop businesses and other industries throughout Pennsylvania, but on the gambling floor, 50 percent of the floor can be used for smoking. Now, you know and I know that there are probably few checks that are made to determine whether it is 50 percent or 60 percent. I would think that it is more than 50 percent where they can smoke, maybe 60, 70 percent, although I will tell you I do not have that verification. But the very fact that we have treated them differently than we do our other companies here in Pennsylvania, the ones that create wealth, the ones that hire and pay the taxes, those are the ones that we should be more concerned about, but of course, the powerful influence of gambling and the casinos overrides.

Mr. Speaker, as I wrap up my debate here, I want the members to think about this. We have this gambling industry here in Pennsylvania. We have spent hundreds of hours trying to fix it, from 2004. We have regulations in place trying to keep people from doing wrong. What other industry do we have in Pennsylvania where we have to spend so much time and so much energy trying to keep it from spilling over the banks and creating harm to people?

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, 1,000 people on the exclusion list. These are people who have been addicted. What are we doing to our families and to our fellow men? Mr. Speaker, we have hundreds of people who are using the Pennsylvania hotline, and that is all going to increase if we pass this bill, if we create these table games. Is this what we want for our citizens? I trust not.

Mr. Speaker, this is something that we do not need, and I trust that there are enough votes here today to defeat this unneeded, and from my perspective, this unwanted legislation. It does not do anything to help the people of Pennsylvania. And as we look in the future and we see that Atlantic City and Las Vegas are all fumbling around because their revenues have dropped significantly, we are putting ourselves into a very serious economic bind come the future, not counting the human carnage that this gambling creates.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the members for their attention.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster County, Representative Denlinger.

Mr. DENLINGER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to SB 711, and I join my esteemed colleague, Representative Clymer, in pointing out just a few things that I think members here should consider before we cast this vote of extreme importance. Three major points I would like to share with my fellow colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that SB 711 should be opposed because of the corrosive effect that the promotion of gambling has on the work ethic of the citizens of the Commonwealth. Mr. Speaker, historically we have looked to that ethic, that idea that through industry and personal initiative, families and individuals build wealth and provide for their own needs. That day's pay for a day's work, if you will, has really been the cornerstone of our financial success, but we are exchanging that, Mr. Speaker, through this legislative initiative with the idea of rolling the dice and hitting it lucky. We are exchanging the idea that people should save, that they should invest for their future, and they are going to cast that over onto the roll of the dice.

Mr. Speaker, some years ago when I was in the private sector, I met with employees in my company who were at the lower pay scales to talk with them about the rollout of a 401(k) plan, a savings plan for retirement, and I was quite horrified to learn that for those at a certain income level, their plan for retirement essentially was, I am going to hit the lottery. Well, Mr. Speaker, if through these initiatives we are building that concept into people's psyche, if you will, then we have done them a great disservice.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I believe that SB 711 will have a corrosive effect on our communities, and people can be cynical about these kinds of directions. They can say, well, gambling is just really a direct tax on stupidity, and if people want to be stupid and walk into establishments where the house always wins, then let them do it. We collect the taxes and so much the better for us. But, Mr. Speaker, I abhor that cynical view. I would really challenge each one here to step back and say, are we doing the good thing, that truly good thing for the people of our Commonwealth? I think not, in promoting SB 711.

As my colleague from Bucks mentioned, we need to think about the corrosive effect that this bill will have on families, on children, and we tried through the amendment process to highlight the plight of children who are not receiving the funds through divorce settlements – the deadbeat dads, if you will. We were unable to get that into this bill, but there is a huge effect in human lives through the promotion of gambling, and for those who are at the far edges of this challenge, sometimes even suicide is their only last result. And so, Mr. Speaker, I challenge my colleagues here to set aside that cynical attitude, that idea that we can build our State government through the corrosive effects of gambling and reach for a better society, a better-idea society.

And third, Mr. Speaker, I recommend a "no" vote on SB 711 because of the corrosive effect that gambling has on State government. In 2004 as I stood at this podium, I made a comment that I had a fear of the effects of money on Harrisburg, on the General Assembly, and in insidious ways, money always finds a path to power; it always does. We put prohibitions in place, we put up obstacles, but money always finds a path to power, and I fear, Mr. Speaker, that through this

expansion of gambling, we open the gate wider to the pervasive influence of gambling interests on the Senate and on the House and in the Governor's Mansion. Mr. Speaker, we need to be careful that we do not turn this State government over to those interests, those gambling interests that are money-oriented and that reach for power.

And one last thought, if I may, Mr. Speaker. I am particularly troubled today by the aspect that is woven into this legislation that allows for casinos to loan people money, the bet-on-credit aspect, if you will. Mr. Speaker, this is financial ruin on steroids. For that person who is sinking downward, the casino comes to them and says, hey, we can help you out a little bit here. We are just going to arrange a loan. We are going to let you just continue to gamble even though you have run out of cash; you can borrow. You can borrow against your house, against your other assets. Mr. Speaker, this is an insidious aspect to this particular piece of legislation.

And as we look out over our government and look out in a time when people are calling into question activities in the banking industry, the mortgage industry, up on Wall Street, what is it we see that gets people into trouble? Mr. Speaker, I would say it is the reach – reaching a little too far, greed getting hold. And with this bet-on-credit aspect in this piece of legislation, I see the gambling industry doing the reach, and the toll in human lives will be staggering.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to SB 711 in the hope that some colleagues will hear this, they will think better of the direction, and they will oppose SB 711 for the good of our State government, for the good of our communities, and for the good of our work ethic as a people.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks County, Representative Petri.

Mr. PETRI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today in support of SB 711.

For the record, there has been a lot of debate about what the real tax rates are and whether they are too high or too low, and I just could not allow that debate to continue without looking at the actual facts. If you look at the blended rate, that is the rate with regard to the slot machines where we are really high as compared to other States, and you blend that high rate on slot machines with the proposed rate under this bill, you will find that we will still be one of the highest-tax States in the country, and that is important for our taxpayers. It is important that there be revenue. That was the whole idea of adding table games to the assortment of entertainment that was available to casinos, and that was to create revenue.

There is also a study which was done, and this independent study – and by the way, this study was done by the same group that originally successfully, successfully predicted what kind of revenue the State would have from slot machines. This study suggests that there could be up to 10,000 new jobs created in Pennsylvania. In this economy, that cannot be underscored enough. In our own community in Bucks County, the unemployment rate with regard to trade organizations and those that are involved in commercial construction is staggering. I do not know that anyone knows what the real unemployment rate is, but I hear day after day that workers are working part-time and they are job sharing, and they get to work 3 days so that their colleague gets to work 3 days. And so one of the things that becomes key in this process is that we do create jobs, and

this bill is taxed at a rate where it will encourage casinos to actually put table games in their facilities.

Now, why would this be important? If you take just one example in Bethlehem, the Sands location—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

The House will come to order. The gentleman has a right to be heard.

Mr. Petri may proceed.

Mr. PETRI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just take the Bethlehem Sands work. I saw an early proposal of what this casino proposes, and what they have built so far is a small fraction of what is supposed to be on the site. Now, nobody ever predicted that the cash flow and the moneys available for construction would be as tight as they are, but without table games, the opportunity for a hotel at that site, the opportunity for retail, the opportunity for additional housing all goes away. So while we have been talking about table games and the addictions – and there certainly are addictions – we are talking about all the harm and we have to focus our attention on job creation and development on these sites that will create jobs, particularly at this time. We have really nothing else in our stimulus package from a Federal government point of view that will have as much of an impact for Pennsylvania in jump-starting our economy. Now, I am fairly confident that when we do that in the next 6 months and there are additional construction jobs available that we will see a turn in this economy, and when we get to next year and, Mr. Speaker, when we are on this floor June 30, let us hope that we all are looking at this decision that we are going to make today and tomorrow and saying, you know what? We did the right thing because where would we be without this revenue?

Do not assume it is going to solve every problem, because it is not. Do not assume there will not be other social problems, because Representative Clymer and others are correct about those issues and we cannot be unmindful, but let us look at the big picture of what is happening throughout. We already have slot machines. This is not that much of a reach to say we ought to have table games.

And I just want to make one other point and then I will wrap up, Mr. Speaker, and that point is this: Many, many constituents come to me and say, I do not like slot machines. I just do not want to participate, but I do like to play occasional table games, and when they talk to me about it, they are very deliberate. They go to the casino with the idea that they are either going to win X dollars or lose X dollars and they stay within that time parameter. Now, I am not trying to say that is everybody, but that is the kind of person who is currently not coming to Pennsylvania because they are not going to play slot machines. They are going to New Jersey or they are going to Las Vegas.

So, Mr. Speaker, gambling exists, Mr. Speaker, and it will continue to exist and it has existed probably from the first caveman. Who knows what they traded or what they did to beat each other up on table games and rocks and marbles and whatever else. But let us face it, it is part of our culture, it is part of our behavior, and yes, you can regulate it, but you will not have it go away.

We need the revenue. I encourage the members to vote in favor of SB 711 when it comes back over amended from the Senate. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster County, Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I certainly have great respect for the prior speaker, but however, I must disagree with him. Recognizing that gambling is part of the culture now, I was not here when the original vote was cast; however, I have watched with some interest some of the problems that have arisen since that time period.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke extensively throughout the debate regarding some of the process that got us here, and I would like to once again bring these same complaints and concerns up for debate before the General Assembly.

There was a time when what occurred here was given some deference through the court system. Prior to the pay raise case of 2005 that reached the Supreme Court and known as *Stilp v. Commonwealth*, there was an assumption of constitutionality for everything that we did here. After that court case, however, the court said that they are the final arbiter of what is constitutional and what is not.

Mr. Speaker, my concerns arise by the process by which this bill was amended, moved through the House, and is now heading back to the Senate. The reasons for these concerns I had listed previously. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is in fact a nonpreferred appropriation that required a two-thirds vote. Therefore, the amendment did not successfully pass and will likely be challenged in the court system. Mr. Speaker, if it is found unconstitutional, we will find ourselves right back where we are today debating whether or not we should have table games here and debating whether or not what we tried to do during this session was appropriate. The courts will strike down whatever portion of the law they find inconsistent or perhaps strike down the entire law. In either case, we face months, perhaps years of court battles tying this legislation up that will not let the money come to the State coffers. If that is the case and if it is the will of the General Assembly, Mr. Speaker, to advance table games, I would advocate that we should at least do it properly.

Mr. Speaker, if I may quote briefly from the bill. On page 39, it clearly says, "Funds in the account are hereby appropriated to the department on a continuing basis for..." a multitude of different occurrences. But one of gravest concern, Mr. Speaker, is found on page 76, line 23, where it says, "A county of the second class A: 50% of the licensed facility's local share assessment shall be distributed to the county...in a first class township that is contiguous to the municipality in which the licensed facility is located. If the nonprofit hospital ceases to exist..." there are other ways to move the money.

Mr. Speaker, it became apparent through debate and suggestion by some other members that this is probably the Lower Bucks Hospital. Some research probably indicates that it is the only hospital that would qualify. This hospital, Mr. Speaker, is not under the direct control of the Commonwealth. Therefore, it is a direct violation of Article III, section 30.

Now, I will not challenge the constitutionality of the underlying bill. I have already fought that and received the votes. I respect that I lost that motion. However, I do want to point out that I am fearful that this will again be raised when we get to the courts and it will be outside of our control to fix it at that point, and at that point, we will have given any of our opportunity to fix this bill over to the court system to handle how they deem appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, there are other references in here. A college is referenced on page 79, lines 46 through 51, and over onto page 80, line 1. The medical school, Mr. Speaker – there can only be one in the State that qualifies. It was, again, referenced by name on the House floor. Mr. Speaker, if these were not nonpreferred appropriations which violate Article III, section 30, then they are most definitely violations of section 7, where it says, "Notice of local and special bills," must be advertised in those areas 30 days prior to legislation being advanced that would impact those areas.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on. There are specific appropriations in this bill: page 76, lines 23 through 50; page 78, lines 10 through 51; page 79, 46 through line 51; and page 80, line 49 through line 4. Mr. Speaker, all of these cause concerns regarding the process by which we got here.

Additionally, we had this bizarre movement of the bill from second consideration to third consideration back to second, where some amendments were considered and others were cut off through the motion to proceed and call the previous question, Mr. Speaker. All of this I believe is inappropriate use of the legislative process, and I have grave concern about whether or not this bill will withstand judicial scrutiny.

I respect my colleagues here on the floor. We have debated vigorously about the underlying issues. I share the concerns and the reasons to vote against this bill that my colleagues previously have expressed – the gentleman from Lancaster County, the gentleman from Bucks County. But, Mr. Speaker, if we do not have the integrity of the process behind this bill regardless of the outcome, it will be challenged in court, and unfortunately, I do not believe that we will win.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote this bill as amended down. Let us return to the proper legislative process and let us not give our authority to the judicial branch to exercise as they see fit. We have a job to do, and I encourage us to do it here this afternoon.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. In the balcony, the Chair would like to welcome a bus tour of residents from Washington County. They are the guests of Representative Tim Solobay. Will the guests please rise. Welcome to the hall of the House.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 711 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westmoreland County, Representative Reese.

Mr. REESE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose SB 711. I have three main reasons for opposing this legislation. The first reason: When the residents of this Commonwealth were sold the concept of casinos, it was under the guise of property tax relief. Yet under SB 711, there will be a massive expansion in gambling but none of that money will find its way to property tax relief. Rather, it will prop up the out-of-control spending that has occurred here in Harrisburg over the last 7 years.

Secondly, there is no real oversight in SB 711. This is a classic case of the fox watching the henhouse. Proper oversight is necessary to ensure the residents of this Commonwealth are

not being cheated by an industry that is questionable at best. Mr. Speaker, I personally believe that this body failed the residents of the Commonwealth when we did not include Representative Vereb's bill that would provide oversight by the Attorney General's Office.

Third and finally, SB 711 allows for the casinos to extend credit to gamblers. Now, perhaps many of us are okay with a concept that a husband and a wife will get a babysitter and go and budget a couple hundred dollars to gamble in a casino, but it also allows for a gambler who is addicted to gambling to take out lines of credit, and this is very dangerous, Mr. Speaker. It is very dangerous because someone who is addicted to gambling does not want to step away from that table, does not want to step away from that slot machine because they believe that when they do, that table, that dice, that slot machine will hit. So they are willing to borrow money from the casino even if it would cost their home or their cars, and I think this would have a terrible effect on families in Pennsylvania.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request a "no" vote on SB 711. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery County, Representative Vereb.

Mr. VEREB. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the maker please stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Santoni, indicates he will stand for interrogation. The gentleman, Mr. Vereb, is in order and may proceed.

Mr. VEREB. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to go back to some interrogation from yesterday regarding the 15-mile and 30-mile clauses in the piece of legislation, going from 15 to 30.

Currently there is one more unawarded category 3 license under the original statute. Am I correct?

Mr. SANTONI. Under the original statute, one has been awarded and one is pending.

Mr. VEREB. There are two applicants for the second category 3, which has not been awarded. The information I have, is there a Fernwood and Wyomissing? Do you agree with that or do you at least agree there are two applicants out there publicly applying for that second license?

Mr. SANTONI. That is my understanding; those two. That is correct; yes.

Mr. VEREB. Okay. With the 15-mile radius now, when we move it to 30, if the Gaming Control Board awards either Wyomissing or Fernwood a license, would this 30-mile radius bump the other one out?

Mr. SANTONI. The 30-mile radius does not affect those two potential licenses that you are talking about. They are under the old rules, 15 miles.

Mr. VEREB. Okay. But you will agree that only one of the two is going to get the second category 3 license under the original statute. Correct?

Mr. SANTONI. That is a decision by the board, but I would suspect that to be the case, but I cannot say yes. That is up to the board.

Mr. VEREB. Okay. Going with the understanding that the application period for that second category 3 is closed and there are two applicants, the common denominator will say one of those two will get it. Now, while the Gaming Board in the past has done some things that discomfited me, they certainly have

worked to better themselves. I mean, short of some egregious behavior, there is really only one of those two that can get that license, as it stands now. Correct?

Mr. SANTONI. As it stands now, yes.

Mr. VEREB. So the bottom line is, whoever does not get that third license will be banned from the new category 3 that we are creating under this law. Correct?

Mr. SANTONI. I do not know that to be the case, Mr. Speaker.

I think we are talking about something – we are speculating on something, and I do not really want to get into that. I do not want to predict what the future will be. I do not have a crystal ball, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. VEREB. Respectfully, Mr. Speaker, there is no crystal ball needed here. The bottom line is Wyomissing and Fernwood, Mr. Speaker – see, and maybe not yourself, but I know I have not been at any meetings. I challenge the members of this General Assembly, the members of the legislature, to even come up with two or three names of future applicants. I am sure they could not. So I am familiar that Wyomissing and Fernwood are in proximity of each other and are both competing for the existing category 3 license. And you would agree that at least those two licenses, you understood, are going for the current category 3?

Where I think my interrogation is relative and needs an answer is one of those two are going to get that category 3 under existing law. Correct?

Mr. SANTONI. You are asking me to speculate, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to do that. It is up to the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board. They could say neither is getting the license. If they both do not meet the criteria necessary to get that license, the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board could not give a license to both.

Mr. VEREB. Okay. I agree with that assessment. Now, let us just say they do give to one of these two. Your 30-mile radius would wipe them out for competing for the new category 3. Any of these two gets the license under the existing act, would not your language wipe that entity out from competing for the new category 3?

Mr. SANTONI. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be evasive. I cannot give you the answer because we are speculating, and there are a lot of things that have to be worked out with regards to those two facilities and the potential for a license given to them.

Mr. VEREB. Mr. Speaker, I believe Wyomissing is in your district, so I do not think there is a geographical challenge. I am putting a scenario because I think the members of this legislature need to understand the need to go from 15 to 30 miles. I am just trying to put a scenario that while it may not be guaranteed, it is sure more likely to happen than not in that one of these two licensees is going to get that license, short of there being a financial issue or some other local zoning issue, whatever the issues might be. I understand that there is no guarantee that either of those two will get it. I am asking you, in the scenario that one of those two gets it, just say for sake of conversation Wyomissing gets the category 3 that is under the current statute. Under the new act, under your new legislation, would Fernwood, with the 30-mile radius, be wiped out from being able to compete for the added category 3 in your legislation, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SANTONI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in the scenario discussed, the Gaming Control Board does have the discretion to give two additional ones to both the ones you said, the one in Monroe and the one in Reading. They could both get it under the new legislation. One would be eligible with the 15-mile radius and the other with the 30-mile-radius provision.

Mr. VEREB. Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the area. Wyomissing and Fernwood, are they not, say, within 15, 20 miles of each other?

Mr. SANTONI. No, sir; no. Fernwood in Monroe County and Wyomissing gaming in Berks County are more than 30 miles away from each other.

Mr. VEREB. So they would not have a conflict under this expansion of time?

Mr. SANTONI. No.

Mr. VEREB. Is there another licensee— See, again, I am not in the crowd here, Mr. Speaker. Is there another licensee that would be bumped if Fernwood or Wyomissing were to receive a license, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SANTONI. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to be nice here and to answer all the gentleman's questions because I have worked with the gentleman on this issue. I have reached out to him, and we have been trying to work with him throughout the months and months that we have debated this issue. I have answered his question. He is asking me to speculate on what the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board could do and what they are able to do, et cetera, and I have answered his question, and I do not want to be evasive, but I think I have answered his questions appropriately.

Mr. VEREB. I will rephrase, Mr. Speaker, on a different—

The SPEAKER. Well, the gentleman is correct. You cannot just keep on asking the same question over and over and eliciting the same answer, Mr. Vereb.

Mr. VEREB. Mr. Speaker, I respect your suggestion, and I will take care of that in my line of questioning.

I am just trying to figure out where we got the 30 miles, what makes logical sense.

Now, just say Wyomissing received a license. Would Fernwood then be banned because of their proximity to Mount Airy if they were within 30 miles?

Mr. SANTONI. Mr. Speaker, I do not know the mileage from the facilities in Monroe County, so I am not going to speculate that.

Mr. VEREB. All right. Mr. Speaker, you are the author of the amendment. Can you again explain to me why we went from 15 to 30 miles?

Mr. SANTONI. As I said yesterday in the negotiations with the Pennsylvania State Senate, those mileage restrictions were put into effect.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. VEREB. I have a question of the Chair, a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VEREB. I think it is important to find out, with all the speculations that are going on, with all due respect, I think it is important to find out where we came up with the 30 miles. Is

there such a thing as interrogating a representative of the Senate in the House chamber or the Chair?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. VEREB. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just figured I would ask.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Santoni, has answered the question, where I will rule any more questions on that subject out of order. He has answered the question about five or six different ways and different times, Mr. Vereb.

Mr. VEREB. I understand he tried to answer, Mr. Speaker. I respectfully disagree. The question was not answered, but I will move on from that topic, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, at any point were there drawings? Papers that had circles on them indicating where future licenses would be with your—

Mr. SANTONI. I saw no drawings, Mr. Speaker. Your question was, were there any drawings related to where the facilities would go, prospective facilities?

Mr. VEREB. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SANTONI. I have not seen that. I answered that question yesterday in debate and I will answer it again today. The answer, Mr. Speaker, is no.

Mr. VEREB. Okay. I actually asked if there was a map; I am just asking drawings, and we are pretty technical here, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, am I correct in this amendment that the felony ban is in effect with passage of your legislation? I know we ran it yesterday. I know you clarified it with me that it was in a previous amendment, but is it out of order or is it part of your amendment that there is a felony ban for anyone to acquire or participate in a license application?

Mr. SANTONI. Yes.

Mr. VEREB. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Is the property tax relief language of Representative Bradford a tax or was it gutted and replaced with your amendment?

Mr. SANTONI. The property tax language in the bill is a trigger mechanism that when the Rainy Day Fund reaches \$750 million, when the economy starts to rebound – whenever that is; hopefully it will be soon – that money, the table games money, goes directly into the Property Tax Relief Fund.

I might note, and there was a lot of discussion yesterday about this, that there is no property tax relief from gaming, and that is false. We are still getting the property tax relief from the slots revenue. The table games revenue will go into the Property Tax Relief Fund after the Rainy Day Fund reaches \$750 million. That is the language in the bill that is related to property tax relief.

Mr. VEREB. Okay. Just to understand you correctly, the language in this amendment fulfills the money that was taken from the Rainy Day Fund for the passage of this budget. It replaces up to the amount taken out in this last budget and then would go into the Relief Fund?

Mr. SANTONI. When the Rainy Day Fund reaches \$750 million, whenever that is – sometime, hopefully, in the near future – when that reaches that, then the money from the table games will go into the Property Tax Relief Fund.

Mr. VEREB. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am through interrogating the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Would the gentleman like to debate the bill on final passage?

Mr. VEREB. I just have one question of interrogation of the majority leader, if he would rise for interrogation, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates he will stand for interrogation. The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. VEREB. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

One question: I obviously have a concern over how we got from 15 to 30 miles, and I feel from members of the area that in fact this language will ban a current applicant from applying for that new license if they do not get it under the current act. So I am pretty hung up on that, Mr. Speaker. So I just ask this question: Do you have any idea, respectfully, how the Senate or the body that worked on this language, do you have any idea how or why they expanded from 15 to 30? That is my question.

Mr. EACHUS. Sure. And I heard the interaction yesterday and today between you and the gentleman, so let me give you my view of this.

In the bipartisan, bicameral discussion we had with the Senate, there was much concern from State Senators, and I think generally from members at the table, that by allowing for category 3s, these two licenses under the old act and the new one that is envisioned in the Santoni amendment, for those to be colocated in regions next to already existing casino platforms, that it could negatively impact a number of things. First, we want to make sure that we maintain the integrity of the Property Tax Relief Fund. We do not want to see the property tax relief under the former slots bill that we passed originally impacted by willy-nilly competition.

Second, the Santoni amendment does not choose winners and losers in any category. What we allowed for is the existing license under the old act – and I believe Valley Forge is the applicant – to stand as the board approved it. There was another round that they were in the middle of when we started this discussion which they have not awarded. There were a number of applicants beyond the two that you mentioned earlier in that round. We do not impact or make any choice as it relates to the board's decisionmaking on that round. It is very instructive, what the gentleman did in his amendment.

And third, the third applicant we open up, as you say, with a geographic boundary that is 30 miles instead of 15 because of the concern from the Senate, mostly, about the impact to the Property Tax Relief Fund and competition in marketplaces that currently exist in counties that currently have category 1 and category 2 facilities. That is the way this process came forward, and I think the way the gentleman crafted the language was extremely artful in that it does not impact the current round, it is not instructive of the board as it relates to decisionmaking and picking winners and losers, and it is careful about how we currently impact the decisionmaking of that board as it relates to competition so that we do not negatively impact those who have made a significant investment in gaming currently in Pennsylvania.

I hope that was thorough for you.

Mr. VEREB. Actually, it was very thorough. And I guess market saturation and the concern of market saturation is some of the reason for it, and it is explanatory.

Mr. Speaker, I will not ask you the question because it is a hypothetical, but the other concern of my 30-mile radius is currently the court's challenge of Valley Forge, and if they were to somehow be considered not a resort by the Supreme Court, Montgomery County would lose any chance ever of having that

category 3 license in Montgomery County. So that is the other reason why I was asking it, because it is even more of a hypothetical what the Supreme Court would say for Valley Forge.

So thank you for standing for interrogation, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. On the bill, the gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. VEREB. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For the last 2 3/4 years I have worked with the Senate and in the House on several reforms, and I will say this: The gentleman from Reading is correct, the chairman, in that he did work with me on reforms as well as staff. And when it came time for voting SB 711 before the first time it was under second consideration, I very patiently lauded the efforts and supported SB 711 under the original second consideration.

I still stand by the efforts of reform that are in this bill including the felony conviction. You know, there is no reason that a convicted felon that was elected into office, convicted while in office or out of office, goes into prison and comes out, there is no reason they should have access to a license that they may very well have helped craft the legislation for. So I do applaud that language.

I would have loved to have seen BIE moved into the Attorney General's Office, but I think one thing this chamber needs to understand is that the Republican Caucus obviously supports that and fights for that. I think the other chamber had some issues with it as well as some members of the other side of the aisle. So I will not hold you, Mr. Speaker – publicly challenge you on the BIE issue, because you are right. We did work together on that issue.

But I am going to rise in opposition to the bill. And I am rising in opposition not because of the lack of cooperation on the original second consideration of SB 711; I am rising in opposition to the bill because of the way it went back to second consideration, the way it then went with the debate cut off although we are sunshined all week, the way it went back to third consideration and to final consideration within a 24-hour period.

Mr. Speaker, arriving here in Harrisburg and participating – and we all hear it and we all turn our heads at this point – but participating in the Speaker's Reform Commission was one of the greatest experiences of my lawmaking life, because it got to educate me on the amendment processes, the bill processes such as this gaming bill, such as SB 711. And it helps me understand that, you know, a day or two not only takes that debate off the table that you did not get a chance to read it, but it does also give you that time overnight to think about some questions you did not ask. And I happen to think, Mr. Speaker, not standing again and not asking questions and getting some answers to them will be irresponsible of myself, after all the work that I have worked with my colleagues in our caucus as well as the Democratic Caucus. I think it would be irresponsible for me not to stand up and ask pointed questions.

You see, Mr. Speaker, I made a comment yesterday that there are more members in the lobbying industry and the special interest groups that participated in the craft of this law than we here did. So I think these questions are important, Mr. Speaker, so we all understand what happened in 2004.

For the sophomores and the freshmen here in the House, where were you in 2004? Well, the House was passing the current gaming law in the middle of the night, Mr. Speaker,

with changes done literally overnight. It did not get to a publicly reported grand jury investigation, Mr. Speaker, by accident. It did not get to a grand jury investigation for clarification. There are publicly reported issues that I want to avoid with SB 711, and I just think the way we got here, being that this whole week has been sunshined until Saturday to where we could have taken just one more day, two more days to have all our amendments have their day in court, to have their day reviewed by this fine group of people, both Republican and Democratic amendments, but instead, Mr. Speaker, we chose the nuclear option. The nuclear option cut off debate.

There are some things you do in this room, Mr. Speaker, and this SB 711 is an inference, it is a certain amount of respect for people and the institution, and I think what bothers most members that have retired, members that are here, and members that will come here is that lack of opportunity and respect in this institution to debate bills.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, what is the hurry for SB 711? We are sending it to the Senate, they are changing it, and it is going to come back to this chamber. That is not speculation, Mr. Speaker. I suggest that is a wise investment to be sure that it is coming back. So we will go through this round of debates again, and I hope then that the Senate and our House colleagues will work to make sure that their efforts are transparent to everyone in Pennsylvania, not just those drawing the circles on papers, on licensees with lobbyists and other special interest groups, Mr. Speaker.

So I urge you to vote "no" on SB 711, which hopefully will bring us to a new level of debate, a new level of reforms, and a new level of transparency on an act that is clearly in question from 2004.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lackawanna County, Representative Wansacz.

Mr. WANSACZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the gentleman rise for interrogation, please?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Santoni, indicates he will stand for interrogation. The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. WANSACZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, can you tell me, what is the licensing fee that we are going to be charging?

Mr. SANTONI. The licensing fee for category 1s and category 2s is \$16.5 million and for the category 3 resort licenses is \$7.5 million.

Mr. WANSACZ. And can you correct my memory, what was the licensing fee of the slots when we appropriated that? The slot machine, what would the licensing—

Mr. SANTONI. \$50 million for the slot license and \$5 million for categories 1 and 2 and \$5 million for category 3.

Mr. WANSACZ. Can you tell me, what is the tax rate that we are going to be charging on the category 1 and the category 3?

Mr. SANTONI. The tax rate on the table games?

Mr. WANSACZ. I am sorry; on the table games, on SB 711.

Mr. SANTONI. The tax rate on the table games initially would be 14 percent plus the 2 percent local share, and on July 1 of 2011, that rate would be 12 percent plus the 2 percent local share.

Mr. WANSACZ. Can you tell me what the tax rate is on the slot machine revenue?

Mr. SANTONI. On the slots, it is 55 percent.

Mr. WANSACZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, do you know of any other business in Pennsylvania that we charge – let us use the lowest rate – 12 percent, 14 percent, 16 percent, 55 percent taxes? Do you know of any businesses that we currently charge right now?

Mr. SANTONI. I am not aware of any, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WANSACZ. Do you know of any other businesses that we currently charge \$50 million or \$16.5 million a year just to come into Pennsylvania so we can tax them with these exuberant taxes?

Mr. SANTONI. No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WANSACZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

No further questions.

If I could speak on the bill, please?

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

Mr. WANSACZ. Mr. Speaker, as you heard, and I can tell you, in my 9 years here, I have never, ever, ever voted for a perfect bill, and I am sure many of you can look in the mirror and say the same thing, because this General Assembly is about the art of compromise, not only here in this House chamber but in the Senate and with the Governor's Office.

Now, there are things that I do not like about this bill that if I were God, I would do it my way, but I am not, and neither is anybody here. But this legislation is about creating jobs. We are not giving this away like so many people say. You just heard the gentleman speak. Look at any other business and ask them what their tax rate is. Is it 55 percent? I do not think so. Are they getting charged a \$50 million fee or a \$16.5 million fee? I do not think so.

And also what is happening, we are in the middle of a recession – we, right here – and there are not many times that I can say we vote on a bill that we directly have a shot to create jobs. Your vote will create jobs today.

You can argue all you want against it, it is going to create jobs. It is going to create 10,000-plus jobs. Now, you can vote "no" and choose not to create jobs and you can run around and say everything else, but this is about creating jobs. This is about putting people to work.

Out in Luzerne County alone, you are talking about a thousand new jobs being created at \$40,000 each. You can look at any of these other places, and to put that in contrast, I believe the Governor just gave Harley-Davidson \$15 million to stay in Pennsylvania, and they have 1,300 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we can do something good here today. We can create jobs. We can have economic benefit. We can solve a lot of the problems that were in the original gaming act. Unlike the previous speaker, Mr. Speaker, I was here in 2004 and I remember that vote, and that vote did not come across as so many people talk about that were not here.

We have an opportunity, that we made some mistakes like we do on many other bills, to correct those problems, and I think we really did fix the majority of the problems in this bill. Again, it is not perfect, but is it a good bill? Yes, it is.

And so what I would urge you today is to look out and say, I can put people to work. I can get, I can get 50 percent-plus taxes off of a business. And guess what, guys? We are not putting them in a KOZ (keystone opportunity zone). We are not saying, here, here is \$15 million to come into Pennsylvania and to create a thousand jobs. No, we are saying, I am going to take \$16.5 million off you, hit you with a 16-percent tax, and I want you to create those jobs. That is what we are doing.

So let us come together. Let us do what is best for Pennsylvania's economy. Let us put people to work in a recession. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Northumberland County, Representative Phillips.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to SB 711.

SB 711 and its expansion of gambling to table games will only worsen conditions for numerous families across our Pennsylvania. There is no denying that gambling leads to many social ills – addiction, crime, not to mention the devastating effects gambling has on families across Pennsylvania. The most addictive part of gambling, as I see it, is the get-rich-quick mentality that gamblers often rely on to feed their addiction.

We all know that our current gaming industry has problems. We have pointed them out and the Governor has acknowledged them. We need to ensure that we fix those problems before expanding an industry that could create even more problems. It is not fair, it is not fair at all to prey upon the weakness of addiction in order to fund State government, and that is exactly what we would be doing if we pass this legislation to allow table games.

It is morally wrong to encourage gambling. It is morally wrong to bank on the weaknesses of others to balance budgets.

It is ironic that State government has the power to expand gambling, and yet we are often the ones asked to intercede when there are problems. What will our State government do to help curb the effects of gambling? Will we have the money to put more police in our communities? Will we be able to provide counseling to the addicted gamblers? Will we have enough resources to help families in need after the gambling addiction has taken away the very dollars used to house, feed, and clothe them?

Is expanded gambling a risky venture for the State government? You bet it is. Gambling is essentially a tax. It has been proven that the majority of people who gamble are the ones who are least able to afford it. The bottom line: We are taxing the poor. A few rich get richer and many who are poor get really poor.

Some States that have both table games and slots have warned us that we need to see what the slots industry has produced before we allow table games. We have been waiting on an independent report telling us how the slots industry has impacted our people, but that report has not yet been released, and here we are, rushing through the legislation.

How have slots casinos impacted society? I have heard many stories from constituents and others around Pennsylvania who have been referred to problem gamblers' hotlines and programs. They are gambling away money that should be used for mortgages, rent payments, utilities, and food for their children.

More often we are reading of good people getting caught up in gambling, then resorting to embezzlement – and we have seen many cases lately – at their place of employment as a way to feed their habit or recoup their losses. Nothing beneficial comes from gambling, and I truly believe you can be assured that eventually more money will be paid by the State for social problems created by addiction to gambling than we will be generating by this gambling tax.

As I said in 2004, slot machines are not good for public policy, and I agree that adding table games to this problem-plagued industry further erodes that policy.

Mr. Speaker, I will be joining my colleagues in voting "no" on this legislation and encourage others to do the same.

In an e-mail received concerning the 400,000 members of 2400 United Methodist congregations of Pennsylvania who urge us to oppose final approval of SB 711, there is one sentence in that e-mail statement at the end: "If you support this ill-advised legislation, you will be sending the message to every Pennsylvania citizen that money solves all our problems and that greed [is] good."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Lawrence County, Representative Sainato.

Mr. SAINATO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to support SB 711. As a member of the House Gaming Oversight Committee, this is an issue we have dealt with for a long time. I know Chairman Santoni has worked very hard and diligently to promote this legislation. We have had input, we have had hearings, and the time has come.

We are in a recession. We just went through a terrible budget battle where severe cuts had to be made, programs not funded to the extent which many of us would like to see. But we are at a point. Part of that budget agreement was table games.

Table games is something the time has come in Pennsylvania. Five years ago we legalized slot machines and created facilities throughout Pennsylvania. Most of them are up and running. There are still two that are not, and hopefully, within this year both of them will be under construction to be resolved, because we do need that revenue.

I have heard some of my colleagues today talk about property tax relief. We need to do something about property taxes. Maybe the gaming was not the greatest thing in the world, but it has helped a lot of our seniors receive help on their property taxes. And as new facilities come online, there will be more property tax relief for our residents of Pennsylvania.

And I think that is important; it is very important. Is gaming the answer to solving all the world's problems? No, it is not, Mr. Speaker, but there are not a whole lot of options out there.

Many in this General Assembly do not support raising taxes – do not support raising taxes. There is \$200 million that is part of this budget that is not there right now. And I have seen over the last few days when we were doing the nonpreferreds and everyone supported them and they wanted them, but money has to come from somewhere, Mr. Speaker. And if 90 percent of this chamber does not want to raise taxes, you have got to find that money somewhere, and, Mr. Speaker, this is the answer. This was part of what was agreed to. It will enhance the ability of Pennsylvania's casinos to compete with States such as West Virginia. Ohio legalized it last election, a few months ago. We compete with Atlantic City. We compete with the Indian reservations in New York.

Whether you support gaming or you do not, the figures do not lie, Mr. Speaker. We need this revenue to help us balance our budget, because I got news: Unless the economy turns and turns quickly, we are going to have another problem next year. We need to get these facilities online. We need these facilities to start generating revenue for Pennsylvania so we can provide vital services, which we need to do. We cannot just keep relying on taxing people.

This is a solution. It has helped other States. Is it the cure-all? No, it is not. There are problems associated with gaming. We have to make sure that those who have problems

are helped. But there are a lot of people that use it for recreational facilities. This is their evening out; they want to spend money. This is what it is about, Mr. Speaker. This is about SB 711. We have reforms in this proposal to change some of the problems we have had in the past.

We have done a lot. I looked back when we legalized slot machines 5 years ago on July 4. And some speakers have made reference that it was done in the middle of the night. I recall that day, July 4, 2004. The question always comes up, why was it done in the middle of the night? I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that debate started at 10 a.m. – 10 a.m. – and it went about 18 hours. So the members that were in here at the time will recall there were many speeches that day and everyone was given that opportunity, but it was done in the middle of the night because there was 18 hours of debate. And today there are a lot of people working in the industry. They have jobs they would not have had if we would not have done that on July 4, 2004.

In western Pennsylvania, we are still recovering from the devastation when the plants shut 20 years ago. Many communities in western Pennsylvania have not fully recovered. We need the revenue generated from these facilities. Lawrence County does have the license for the harness racing and they are still looking to get their finances. I believe this package and the table games would help seal the deal for them and get them up and running, get approval so tax revenues can generate into this State, which would cut the property taxes of every 66 counties, plus the wage tax in Philly, in Pennsylvania. So we need to encourage them to get up and running and give them every opportunity they have possible.

I will be voting for this bill today. I know the hard work that went into getting this bill passed, and I believe that we need this for Pennsylvania. I urge my colleagues to support SB 711.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Venango County, Representative Hutchinson.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose, strenuously, SB 711. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we stand poised to perpetuate a bad deal for the people of Pennsylvania, which I feel that SB 711 is. And why is it a bad deal? Let me give you three quick reasons why I feel that SB 711 is a bad deal.

Reason number one: Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed already over these past several years since the original gambling bill the many social ills which are extremely magnified by a gambling culture in Pennsylvania – the broken families, the bankruptcies, and the ruined lives.

Mr. Speaker, just monitor the number of calls to our Pennsylvania gambling helpline, and remember, no matter how high that number is, that is only a tip of the iceberg for the many, many problems which have been caused for families and citizens across Pennsylvania.

And remember, too, as a previous speaker pointed out, that over time those numbers of people who are entrapped and ruined by gambling, those numbers are families that for the most part are those who can least afford to be caught up and spend money on gambling. Gambling truly does prey on the lower socioeconomic classes much more than those who can afford it, and that is truly unfortunate.

The second reason why this is a bad deal for Pennsylvania: Mr. Speaker, we have nowhere near the promised property tax relief that brought gambling to Pennsylvania in the first place. Those who brought gambling sold it as a way to relieve the onerous property tax burden for the taxpayers of Pennsylvania.

But the people are still waiting, waiting for that \$1 billion annual property tax relief that we have nowhere near approached yet. And, Mr. Speaker, SB 711 is a way not to provide property tax relief. Unfortunately, it is a way for the fat cats in Harrisburg to spend more money again without giving tax relief.

And a third reason, my third reason that I will share with you today, Mr. Speaker, that this is a bad deal for Pennsylvania, and I think this may be the most important reason of all, and that is that we never got it right the first time. Let me repeat that: We never got it right the first time, so why, why would we even think of expanding gambling today if we did not get it right the first time?

The original gambling implementation was a mismanaged affair, and it was an embarrassing process from day 1. That bill, just like this bill, was crafted in the back rooms of the gambling industry, by the gambling industry, and for the gambling industry. Why else would it turn out as bad as it has?

Mr. Speaker, from that first expansion of gambling in Pennsylvania, the two flagship casinos in Philadelphia from that first bill are still not yet built. We have seen indictments of Gaming Board-approved casino owners. We have had gambling employees hired without thorough background checks. We have had casino ownership granted to a problem gambler who did not have nearly enough money or financial backing to construct, let alone run, the casino that was licensed to him. And, Mr. Speaker, we have had a very weak enforcement regime that unfortunately limits the ability of an independent Attorney General or the State Police to act as the necessary check and balance on the gaming industry that we truly need here in Pennsylvania. I think those are compelling reasons in and of themselves to vote against this bill.

And, Mr. Speaker, as I conclude, let me remind the folks in the General Assembly that many of these problems with the current implementation of slots gambling in Pennsylvania have already been acknowledged by the penultimate supporter of gambling in Pennsylvania. That would be Governor Rendell, our Governor whose historical legacy will largely rest on this dubious achievement of bringing gambling to Pennsylvania.

Our Governor earlier this year said two things. One thing he said, we should first pass a separate gambling reform bill – a separate bill. And what is the other thing he said? Earlier this year the Governor said that we should not think about expanding gambling in Pennsylvania by bringing in table games until all of our previous slot parlors are up and running.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is wise advice. Please join me in opposing SB 711, a bad deal for Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Crawford County, Representative Roae.

Mr. ROAE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For me, the one overriding determining factor involves property tax relief. Gambling in Pennsylvania at the casinos was supposed to bring us massive property tax reductions. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is outrageous that money from table games would not go to hardworking families to pay their property taxes but would go to the General Fund.

Property taxes have increased by several hundred dollars a year per family on average since the first slot machine bill was passed. The typical homeowner is only receiving about \$100 or \$200 a year property tax relief from the slot machines. Table games tax revenue should also go for property tax relief. The relief people are getting is not even close to what was promised,

and I feel that any future tax revenue from gambling should go to property taxes.

There are a lot of different points of view about slot machine gambling. Some people feel it is a fun form of recreation. Other people have serious moral objections. There are a lot of different points of view, but I think nearly everybody would agree that taxpayers were promised property tax relief and they are not getting property tax relief.

There are some other issues with the bill as well. When you look at the local share of how the local communities would get the money from the table games, it is basically earmarks. There is a lot of concern in Washington about earmarks: Who gets what? Why does this group get money, this group does not? That is what they are doing with the local share in this bill. Why cannot the local share of the table games tax be used for property tax relief in those communities?

Then there are other issues other people already spoke about. The Attorney General's Office, it is being widely reported in the media that there is a grand jury going on to investigate gambling.

There is a lack of oversight with gambling in Pennsylvania, some of the things we talked about yesterday, basic commonsense things like winnings being intercepted from deadbeat parents to help them catch up with their child support obligations that are past due. Why should you be \$1,000 behind in child support? You win \$1,000 at a casino and that money does not go to the kids; it goes to the person who won it. That is wrong, Mr. Speaker. But what is more wrong is that this chamber is going to give budget relief to the Commonwealth and not budget relief to the hardworking families in Pennsylvania.

This bill is wrong, Mr. Speaker. If we do these table games, the tax money needs to go to property taxes, not to the bloated State government. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Adams County, Representative Tallman.

Mr. TALLMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just one piece of information for the General Assembly here. I am running a survey, and I have 500 responses back so far from the 193d District, and one of those questions in my survey was table games. Now, the interesting thing is, it is running approximately 50-50 for and against table games. The one piece that I find to be very, very interesting is that those people that are supporting table games in my survey, 50 percent of those, or 125 of the 250, want property tax relief attached to the table games bill.

Let me start off, I have in my hands the Senate bill – 460 pages, 460 horrible pages. We had lots of good amendments to the bill, both on that side and this side. As a matter of fact, I would have supported some of those amendments, but we had a procedural maneuver done last night that denied the people of Pennsylvania their representation and input on this bill.

Lastly, you probably cannot name a State – I am going to name a couple – that currently has table games that is in some kind of economic utopia, because it does not exist. Funding State government on the back of gambling is economic nonsense. Take, for example, both New Jersey and Florida. They are in dire economic straits.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tioga County, Representative Baker.

Mr. BAKER. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for my voice.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose SB 7-come-11. I have always been morally opposed to the expansion of gambling and vigorously opposed the initial legislation that was passed at about 4 a.m. in 2004, and I cannot support table games legislation expansion either. And I think it is pretty remarkable that even though we have some systemic problems with the current gaming law, we are here at it again, expanding gaming to include table games when we have not had an opportunity to remedy the problems that were created in the first place and that have been evolving since 2004.

Evidence does prove that there is a nexus with families that suffer as a result of expanded gambling in bankruptcy filings, domestic violence, and increases in crime, just to name a few. Many ethical issues surrounding Harrisburg today suggest numerous reasons to oppose expanded gambling.

In 2004, at around 4 a.m., many of us stood for long periods of time to oppose the creation of gambling. We warned of some of the problems that would be forthcoming. We made the fight and the argument, but obviously, there were powerful forces here in play in the Capitol to make sure that this passed. Regrettably, it was supported by the Governor very strenuously and individuals on both sides of the aisle in both chambers.

In 2004, again at 4 a.m., this passed, regrettably. And the licenses themselves are particularly egregious in that they could have been auctioned for up to \$200 million to \$250 million apiece, could have generated between \$2 billion and \$3 billion in revenue. It is just a pittance in terms of what we were able to generate. Again, powerful forces at play here at the Capitol in the General Assembly. Special interest lobbying prevailed to help billionaire owners, some of whom do not even live in America. I find that egregious.

It is clear to me that significant law enforcement oversight was and continues to be lacking. Law enforcement responsibilities should be placed under the Attorney General and the State Police and not fall under the auspices or aegis of the Pennsylvania Gaming Board.

It has been widely reported in some newspapers that there is currently a grand jury investigation going on regarding these casino licenses. For crying out loud, what in the world are we doing expanding gaming when there is already a very dark cloud over this industry? We have no business in doing anything but reforming gaming, let alone expanding it. It just does not make sense.

Also, for those that voted for gambling, the carrot or defense they were offered was that legalizing gambling would significantly if not substantially reduce property taxes. First we heard it could eliminate property taxes. Then we heard it would significantly reduce them. On average, in my district, it is only \$100 to \$150 per home.

When many of us debated against passage of the legislation, we warned that the pittance of tax relief that would be realized is a very, very poor bargain for the social costs it would create upon our society. We need to make substantive reforms to improve and clean up the problems currently under investigation, as well as give our law enforcement greater oversight and independence from the Gaming Board.

You know, I have heard many conflicting justifications and apologetics for the gambling industry and for expanding gaming. First I heard it was all about saving the equine industry. Then it was about saving jobs. Then it was about creating jobs.

Then it was about property tax elimination. Then it was about some property tax elimination. And recently they tried to say it was imperative to fund some of our universities. My goodness, I have heard a lot of different attempted rationale, justifications, and apologetics for this, and they just keep coming for some reason. Now we want to expand the bill, the gaming law, before we have corrected some of the very significant problems that exist with it.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to conclude with three significant quotes from our Founding Fathers about gambling and I think that pretty much sum up the substance and the concerns that I have regarding this industry.

Thomas Jefferson said, "In a world which furnishes so many employments which are useful, so many which are amusing, it is our own fault if we ever know what...[weariness; heaviness] is, or if we are ever driven to the miserable resources of gaming, which corrupts our dispositions, and teaches us a habit of hostility against all mankind."

Benjamin Rush: "This disorder seizes gentlemen in some instances before breakfast in the morning, and continues with only short intervals for meals, till 11 o'clock at night. It affects some people in the night as well as the day, and on Sundays as well as week days.... This madness is of a destructive tendency, and often conducts persons afflicted with it to poverty, imprisonment, and an ignominious death."

My last quote, and in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, our first President of the United States, our revered George Washington, said perhaps the best quote of all regarding this industry. He said, "...avoid gaming. This is a vice which is productive of every possible evil, equally injurious to the morals and health of its votaries. It is the child of avarice, the brother of inequity, and father of mischief. It has been the ruin of many worthy families; the loss of many a man's honor; and the cause of suicide. To all those who enter the list, it is equally fascinating; the successful gamester pushes his good fortune till it is overtaken by a reverse; the losing gamester, in hopes of retrieving past misfortunes, goes on from bad to worse; till grown desperate, he pushes at everything; and loses his all. In a word, few gain by this abominable practice (the profit, if any, being diffused) while thousands are injured." That is a quote from our first President of the United States, George Washington.

Mr. Speaker, for moral reasons and many others, I oppose SB 711. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Northumberland County, Representative Belfanti.

Mr. BELFANTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and just discuss what occurred on this floor about 30 years ago, and that issue was the legalization of the Pennsylvania Lottery. And we heard from the other side of the aisle, or at least those of us who were here, from the other side of the aisle how passing or adopting the lottery would lead to the downfall of this State and impoverish the poorest families and the oldest senior citizens quicker than lickety-split. And these righteous Republicans used that argument for about 2 days, just like we are doing with table games today, but what was the net effect of the lottery program?

First, it was only supposed to be about property tax and rent rebate. That was all it was designed to do, was to give a decent property tax and rent rebate. And the gentleman earlier that

talked about his school district residents only getting \$20 or \$30, I think mine got about \$15. But guess what? For as much as I hear about property tax reductions that are needed, I find that a great many people in my district get their real property tax reduction and rate relief from that terrible lottery bill that we passed. It was just incredible that we could stoop so low as a General Assembly as to put out there this damning gambling device that would just eat us away, eat away the fabric of our democracy.

Well, a few short years after that, the lottery program had such a surplus that all of a sudden we had a shared-ride program. Oh, my goodness, all of the righteous people that voted against the property tax relief and the lottery could not wait to put in their newsletters the shared-ride program, a new program funded by our wonderful State lottery.

Then a year or two after that it was, oh, my God, we still have a surplus; how about if we build some senior action centers? Build as many as you want in your county – I think I have 11 in Northumberland County, which is a fifth-class county – and be damned where the money comes from. But let us build senior action centers with that bloody, dirty money coming from the lottery.

And how about the trips to the doctors, not shared-ride but personal rides to the doctors, to the mall, to Wally World? Oh, it must be terrible to lean on the poor people of this State for buying lottery tickets, and here is this same debate 30 years later.

Now, Mr. Speaker, not one lottery proponent or lobbyist spoke to me about this issue for as long as it is out there – not one. But, Mr. Speaker, the property tax that you talk about, about the original gaming bill, was not laid out that it was going to be paid back in 1 year, that the benefits would be flowing in 1 year. I heard speaker after speaker from this side of the aisle say that when all of the racinos are up and running, when all of them are up and running, there will be a significant reduction in the property tax, in one's property tax and/or rent rebate. But the fact is, the licensing process took much longer than expected.

But still after we put that \$500 million reserve in, which also was known to every person in this chamber that there would have to be a \$500 million fallback and enough money to pay employees before any of the tax reductions would go out, we still managed a paltry \$600 million. Six hundred million dollars went out to help people pay their property taxes, and that is on top of the property tax and rent rebate program that that other sinister, that other sinister program laid at our feet 30 years ago.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we can sing a song or two from the Righteous Brothers, but let us do what is right here. We are in the midst of the worst recession since the Great Depression. We should leave no stone unturned to try and get revenues so that 900 State employees have been given permanent furlough notices – already 900, and they are talking about more. Is that what that budget was all about? Is that what that budget was all about? I think if I would have known 900 State employees were going to be permanently furloughed, that would have been a tough pill for me to swallow to vote for this budget.

But here is an escape hatch where we can wait a year or two, and when the benefits start rolling in, like they did with the lottery, we can make sure that they all get in our newsletters when people forget that we voted "no." Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Representative Maher.

Mr. MAHER. And just to provide a little relief for the members, I assure you I will not be making any motion just now.

You know, gambling is about the hope of winning and the certainty of losing – winners and losers. SB 711, though, is a rigged game. The winners, the big winners, are already determined, and the losers are the people of Pennsylvania.

Who are the winners? Well, it is Christmas for casinos. With the provisions put in in the Santoni amendment, the prospect exists that over \$600 million will be needed to be refunded by Pennsylvania to the existing casino licensees. Oh, they get to keep their license, though; it just winds up that they did not actually have to pay for them.

Now, last night we heard that this bill is going to add something that says that if we have to refund the money in accordance with law, then we will just seize it right back, and my guess is that that would be considered a bill of attainder and not be deemed constitutional, either by our courts or by the Federal courts. You cannot simply legislate the confiscation of someone's property. It cannot be done. It cannot be enforced; I suppose it can be done.

So as a result, the casinos, who had to put up \$600 million, can now expect that money to be refunded, and I am sure they are going to have quite a holiday celebration. They will have to remember who to thank, I suppose, because the campaign limitations that were sought by this side of the aisle are not in this bill either. So I imagine their Thanksgiving will be soon.

It is also Christmas for casinos because instead of having to pay a market price for a table games license, they are going to have a price that was picked out of thin air. When the slots casino licenses were issued for \$50 million each, we were told, oh, that is a lot of money. But again, allowing the marketplace to establish the value was rejected by the very people who were trying to pick a number now. And what happened? Well, as soon as an entity got a slots license, many of them were then sold, and what we saw was an increase in the value of these licensees, these companies, in the range of a quarter billion dollars each.

So what that tells us is that the free market attaches a value of about a quarter billion dollars to the slots licenses that were given away for \$50 million, and the \$50 million is about to be given back. So why is it that this body, that the Santoni amendment rejects the notion and the maneuvers yesterday rejected the opportunities for this body to enforce auctioning off these licenses? Well, somebody is a winner there, and that winner is predetermined.

The other winners, big winners, of the Santoni amendment are out-of-State horse owners – horses. The Santoni amendment guarantees that 100 percent of all purse funds that are funded by tax collections can be paid to out-of-State horse owners. That does not help Pennsylvania agriculture. This body had unanimously adopted a provision that would have guaranteed that at least 30 percent of this money would have to stay in Pennsylvania, but the Santoni amendment stripped that out, and the maneuver last night to prevent amendments that were timely filed and in order from being heard deprived Pennsylvania agriculture of the opportunity to get this right.

The Pennsylvania Farm Bureau supported it. PennAg Industries supported standing up for Pennsylvania agriculture, because what the Santoni amendment does is creates a circumstance where you can go to Kentucky or you can go to Delaware, you can go to New York, you can go to West Virginia, you can go to any number of other States and bring a big cardboard check with you, because you voted that each and every year \$60 million of Pennsylvania taxpayer dollars is going out of State, going to the benefit of horse owners out of State.

So we have got the casinos as big winners and we have got out-of-State horse owners, who cannot vote here; they cannot possibly be your constituents. The in-State horse owners, of course, would be delighted to have this money stay in Pennsylvania. It is Pennsylvania agriculture. So why would it be, do you suppose, that someone would vote to create these moments where you could go proudly with your cardboard check to Kentucky and say you have just delivered \$60 million into that State? Why do you suppose? It is a rigged game.

Now, of course there are losers too. Homeowners in Pennsylvania particularly are losers because not only are you gambling with \$600 million that will probably be refunded, which means that is \$600 million that will not be delivered as property tax that has to come out of the Property Tax Relief Fund, you are gambling that the property tax bills for every Pennsylvania homeowner will be increased next year. Plus, you are guaranteeing that they will be increased, because to the extent that moneys that would have been gambled on slots are now going to be gambled on table games, the slots money had to go to property tax relief; the table games money does not. But we are told, someday, someday maybe it will. It is a rigged game. It is like that pea thing where the guy on the street suckers people in and goes "there's the pea" and he keeps moving it around. Someday you will win. Well, Pennsylvanians are never going to win this game. Homeowners are always going to lose this game.

Well, there are some other winners. There are some special interests who have exactly-tailored language, exactly-tailored language to deliver an endless windfall of Pennsylvania taxes to this chosen outfit, that chosen outfit, that chosen outfit. And as Mr. Cutler said earlier, I think that violates the Constitution, unless this passes by a two-thirds vote. So there are other certain winners. But again, who are the losers? Homeowners and the public.

With respect to the public, think about the integrity provisions. This is supposed to be about reform. The law enforcement provisions here actually help prevent appropriate oversight. Why? Why pass a bill that says that Morris the Cat should be guarding a tuna sandwich? Why? The obvious and correct course of action was before you stripped out.

The process by which this proceeded we all understand was extraordinary and extraordinarily wrong. When this bill was returned to the second consideration that affected what amendments were in order and which could be heard, we heard that all amendments filed by 2 p.m. would be in order and would be considered. And in fact, that promise then was broken, and amendments that had been timely filed were just skipped over. The people of Pennsylvania were deprived of the ability to find out where you stand on a lot of questions, a lot of important questions. This whole business of the way the rules were played is like a game of Three-card Monte. Again, just like that pea game, the public can never win.

So I ask you, regardless if you think that having gaming is desirable or not in Pennsylvania, what we do know is that rigged legislation that rewards the casinos, rewards selected special interests, rewards out-of-State horse owners, deprives Pennsylvania farmers, restricts law enforcement, makes sure – guarantees – that the homeowners in your district will have an increase in their property tax next year because you are moving the money around and so quick they will never be able to figure it out, you suppose, but they will.

Please, do not support the legislation in this form.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Luzerne County, Representative Pashinski.

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

I stand in support of SB 711 for many reasons, but before I share them with you I want to express my true respect for those that are opposed to the gaming industry in any sense. Their position is admirable and certainly worthy of being heard.

In our quest to protect our citizens, we are constantly creating laws to do just that. Whether it is a stop sign or a signal light, a fire alarm or a safety belt, this legislature is always trying to help and protect our constituents, and that is certainly what we need to do. But the reality is that no matter what safeguards we devise, people will still experience loss, sorrow, and pain of some degree, because each one of us bears our own responsibility in determining our destiny.

Throughout our lives we are constantly faced with making choices, and in each case we take an educated position to determine what best suits our needs. When it comes to the gaming industry and the actual operation itself, there are some people that choose not to play a game, that choose not to attend a casino or a racino, a horse race or a bingo. There are some people that choose to play bingo at a fireman's bazaar or in a church basement. Some people buy a lottery ticket every week. Some people just buy one. Others buy 5, 10, or 20 or more. Others only buy when the jackpot reaches a multimillion-dollar pot. The fact of the matter is, the gaming operation is a part of our lives. All of us have the choice, and the best we can do is to provide safeguards to create a fair and just operation.

SB 711 does just that. It has increased regulations and provided more transparency and accountability in many areas. The fact of the matter, as many other States have also implemented gaming operations, the purpose has been to create jobs, to create economic development, and to also provide valuable dollars to fill the budgetary gaps of the States that are using these facilities.

How soon we forget. In August of 2008 Pennsylvania was projecting a \$300 million surplus. At that point, Mr. Speaker, there would have been no layoffs, no furloughs, no loss of services, and we would all be debating who was going to get more of the \$300 million pie. But in September of 2008 we experienced a global financial collapse, which then forced our country into a financial collapse and forced 45 out of our 50 States into massive deficits, so great that the decline rivaled the historic 1929 disaster.

To me, the gaming industry has provided a new source of desperately needed dollars that provide jobs and economic development that I have personally seen in Luzerne County with Mohegan Sun, the very first casino that was up and operating. I have seen the new infrastructure, the roads, the light standards, the improved law enforcement operations, new

equipment, buildings, security lighting cameras, electronic equipment, and many more, to help our constituents keep them safe and well-served. SB 711 is going to continue to keep the economic development moving in a positive direction by creating thousands of jobs, both directly and indirectly, as many as 16,000.

We all know that our middle class is being squeezed to the point of collapse. We are all trying desperately to take care of those needs for our constituents without raising taxes. The gaming operation is one of those ways to garner new dollars without raising taxes.

Is this a perfect bill? Our former Representative, or rather our former speaker, a Representative from Lackawanna, Luzerne, Wyoming, and Monroe Counties, stated he has never seen a perfect bill. In the short time that I have been here, I have seen anything but perfect. But in our quest to achieve perfection, the phrase is, "don't lose the good." SB 711 is good. There is more money and more services to help those with a potential addiction than ever before. Millions of dollars and additional people qualified to help folks that have this addiction to overcome it has been available by part of this law.

There is a tremendous potential of development besides the 16,000 new jobs, many life-sustaining jobs that will help continue with the economic growth. That is good; it is not perfect. SB 711 is good; it is not perfect, but it does play a major role in helping to close the gap.

When it comes to tax relief, let us not be disingenuous. In my community, the folks have received over \$200 in tax rebates. That was only with six, seven, and eight casinos. The potential of \$400 to \$600 in rebates when all of these are up and running is certainly a reality.

The experience that I have witnessed in Luzerne County has been nothing but positive. Mohegan Sun is a shining example of how a gaming operation should be run. They have been a very active community partner, taking a direct role in helping various parts of our community. They have supported our local United Way, our community service organizations, and they have set the standard for sharing one success with others.

We all should know that our financial stability is still uncertain; the dollars from the gaming industry it desperately needed. This may not be a perfect bill, but for sure, SB 711 is good. I urge my colleagues to support it. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Westmoreland County, Representative Krieger.

Mr. KRIEGER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I agree with some of the comments made previously and in fact with some of the comments made by both Democrats and Republicans yesterday in connection with the process by which we are now considering this bill on third consideration. It has clearly been a flawed process. It was designed to jam this through. I have to wonder what is wrong with a bill whenever we have to resort to these types of tactics.

I think the people of Pennsylvania looking at this today and yesterday at best look at this as political nonsense and business as usual in Harrisburg; at its worst, at its worst look at it as having all the marks of a backroom deal. The people of Pennsylvania deserve better, Mr. Speaker.

Previous speakers also touted this gambling bill as an economic development proposal, and I think it is a sorry state of

affairs when we have come to the place in this Commonwealth where we think gambling is economic development. For economic development, we need to create wealth. To create wealth, we need to make things; we need to save; we need to invest. This bill does not encourage that. In fact, it discourages it.

It is undeniable that the money spent by a gambler on table games will not be spent on other goods or services. It will not be invested and will not be saved. So the private businesses where these gambling dollars would otherwise have been spent will suffer a dollar-for-dollar loss.

Some are pushing table games as a painless solution, a way for State government to continue to spend recklessly without consequence. It is not painless, however. It is our obligation in this House to weigh the costs, both economic and social, with the projected benefits. The result of this debate tonight, the expansion of gambling and table games, is perhaps a foregone conclusion, but the people of Pennsylvania deserve to hear the truth, and the truth is that the expansion of gambling is an act of desperation.

A vote for this bill is a vote for the destruction of millions of dollars of our people's wealth. It will not bring prosperity. Indeed, it will bring nothing but pain and despair. I believe the people of Pennsylvania deserve better, and I would urge a "no" vote on SB 711.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Does the gentleman from Washington County, Representative Solobay, wish to be recognized? The gentleman waives off.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, may I interrogate Representative Santoni?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Santoni, indicates he will stand for interrogation. The gentleman, Mr. Thomas, is in order and may proceed.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the board reads "SB 711," but I read it as "Santoni 711," because it now has your amendment and it has your support. But I have a couple of questions that I would like to ask you.

As was mentioned yesterday, you agreed that between October 2 and yesterday you introduced the same amendment nine times. Is that correct?

Mr. SANTONI. No, I did not introduce this same amendment nine times. No, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. Okay. Between October 2 and yesterday, the record shows nine amendments that were introduced to SB 711 which carry your name, and in those nine amendments there were a number of changes, and just a couple of questions about those changes.

On the tax abatement, do we have an agreement with the Senate to support the tax abatement provision of SB 711?

Mr. SANTONI. Mr. Speaker, is he talking about the LERTA (Local Economic Revitalization Tax Assistance Act) issue?

Mr. THOMAS. Pardon me?

Mr. SANTONI. The issue that we spoke about yesterday related to the LERTA. Is that what you are speaking to?

Mr. THOMAS. No, we are talking about the abatement of real estate taxes, where the land has deteriorated and a building permit has not been pulled.

Mr. SANTONI. I do not know if there is an agreement with the Senate on that particular language, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, do we have an agreement with the Senate on the agreement in lieu of taxes?

Mr. SANTONI. I am not aware of it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, are you familiar with a court case, June 8 of 2009, where the Eagles and the city of Philadelphia were involved in a legal dispute of whether or not the Eagles should have paid X amount of dollars pursuant to an agreement as opposed to paying property taxes?

Mr. SANTONI. I am sorry; you asked me if I was aware of that case?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. SANTONI. Being a big Eagles fan, I am. Yes, I was aware of that case.

Mr. THOMAS. And, Mr. Speaker, you know that the case was resolved with the Eagles paying the city of Philadelphia \$8 million?

Mr. SANTONI. I do not remember the particular details of the settlement, but I am saying that I am sure you are correct.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, Mr. Speaker, do you know what percentage the \$8 million was of the overall amount that the Eagles would have paid if they had paid property taxes in lieu of the agreement?

Mr. SANTONI. I do not know the answer to that; I am sorry.

Mr. THOMAS. But, Mr. Speaker, do we have an agreement with the Senate on this agreement in lieu of property taxes?

Mr. SANTONI. The answer to that question is, I do not know and I do not believe that we do.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, is it true that we redefine what would constitute a felony within the gaming statute in the House?

Mr. SANTONI. We changed that language in my amendment that was passed yesterday; yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Do we have an agreement with the Senate on that change in the language?

Mr. SANTONI. Again, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I know the answer to that. I do not want to say for sure because I do not know. I do not believe that we have an agreement with the Senate on that particular language that was put in my amendment last night.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, do we—

Mr. SANTONI. That does not mean they are opposed to it. I just do not know that we have reached out to them and gotten an agreement with them on that particular language in the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, do we have an agreement with the Senate on the extension provision of SB 711, extending the period in which you get a license and start operating?

Mr. SANTONI. Again, Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that the Senate, in its wisdom, will agree with our amendment and what we put in and worked so hard to accomplish. I think, as I said yesterday, that most of the language in the bill will be agreed to, but I do not know that everything that we passed yesterday has been run by the Pennsylvania State Senate and that they have agreed to everything. But I do believe that they will agree to most, and again, hopefully they will concur, but if they decide to make some changes, we will act appropriately at that time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the credit provisions of SB 711, where casinos are able to extend credit.

Was it your legal staff that drafted that section of the bill, or is that something that came from the Senate to the House?

Mr. SANTONI. Mr. Speaker, most of the language of what you are speaking to came from the Senate, and then it was also helped to make some changes to that by the Republicans, the House Republicans, with regard to that language.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, are you familiar with the Pennsylvania check cashing licensing law and the subsequent amendments to the licensing law?

Mr. SANTONI. Not the details of it; no, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, there are some who believe that the credit authorization that is provided for in SB 711 flies in the face of the check cashing licensing law in this respect.

Pennsylvania has differed from most other States, and why it is clearly the Keystone State, has refused to permit payday lending, permit loans financed by banks outside of Pennsylvania that do not carry the same rules and the same regulations as Pennsylvania banks do. That is specifically prohibited in not only the check licensing law but in several other statutes. And so to that end, are you concerned about whether or not the credit provisions that are provided for in SB 711 will withstand legal review?

Mr. SANTONI. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the attorneys and the legal team that worked together on the amendment to SB 711 made sure that we would be able to meet the criteria of the law, and I do think that we will with the language that we have in the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, let us assume that SB 711 passes and goes to the Senate, and of the five areas of concern that I just mentioned, let us say that the Senate changes three out of five of those areas, or maybe changes all five areas. Is your interest in this bill becoming law such that you will accept those changes and move this to the Governor's desk?

Mr. SANTONI. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to speculate with what the Senate will do and how we will respond to it. We are looking at getting a piece of legislation that will help create jobs, spur economic development, help fill our budget hole. That is what we are looking to do. We want to help our constituents and help our taxpayers, and if the bill that comes back from the Senate does that, I certainly cannot speak for our leadership, but that is what I believe our priorities are and priorities will be as we move forward.

So if the bill meets that on its way back from the Senate, I would support it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, do you acknowledge that four of the items or concerns that I mentioned relate only to Philadelphia County, and so to that end, if there are changes made, it would not destroy your passion for the creation of jobs and economic development within the context of table games. And so my question is, why could you not support changes that would only impact 1 out of 66 counties?

Mr. SANTONI. Mr. Speaker, while we are parochial sometimes in our view, I believe as chairman of the Gaming Committee it is my duty to make sure that all the concerns of the 67 counties are met to the best of our ability, and hopefully we can address the concerns of the city of Philadelphia. I love the city of Philadelphia and will do everything I can to enhance their gaming life, if you will.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, God knows that is praiseworthy, and I appreciate that, your love for the city. But, Mr. Speaker, let me ask, if all that is real, why did not those five changes that have

been made, changes in SB 711, come before the Gaming Oversight Committee and your members allowed to respond to them?

Mr. SANTONI. We worked this issue very hard, very long. Input – I know that you say you did not have much input, but many members of this General Assembly had input on this legislation. We caucused it and discussed it. I think we did a terrific job in putting out a product that the majority of the members could support, and that bill, hopefully, will be sent over to the Senate. When changes are made by the Senate, if changes are made by the Senate, we will see and take a look at what they look like and act appropriately or act accordingly.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am now confused. Are you saying that the issue of tax abatement was before the Gaming Oversight Committee and the committee responded to it?

Mr. SANTONI. I do not believe we ever— That issue was not directly in front of the Gaming Oversight Committee. But, Mr. Speaker, as happens a lot of times around here, when a bill comes out of committee, it is amended and worked on and dealt with in different ways, and changes are made in the process that we have been going through now for the past 2 months.

So while each particular interest that you are talking about might not have been dealt with directly in committee, I do not think that we are setting any kind of precedent by dealing with the issue through the amendment process that we have gone through, not just yesterday and today but I guess it was back in the beginning of October when we first started talking about table games.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, Mr. Speaker, can you tell me why the three members of the Gaming Oversight Committee from Philadelphia County offered amendments that were ruled out of order because of multiple changes in the amendment numbers?

Mr. SANTONI. Mr. Speaker, could you repeat that question? I believe that might be better asked of the Speaker, but he was in a sidebar. Would you please repeat the question?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. Mr. Speaker—

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman stating a point of parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. THOMAS. My parliamentary inquiry is, why were there nine changes to SB 711 between October 2 and December 14, which adversely, or which precluded the three members of the Gaming Oversight Committee from Philadelphia County from being able to offer amendments to those proposed changes?

The SPEAKER. It is not a question that the Chair could respond to. It was out of the purview of the Chair and in response to the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, just so I will be clear – and I have a lot of faith in your judgment – are you saying that the nine amendments between October 2 and December 14, which precluded all three members of the Philadelphia delegation on the Gaming Oversight Committee, were not done to preclude? Well, let me put it this way: Are you saying that the five concerns which are reflected in the nine changes to SB 711 between October 2 and December 14 were brought to the

attention of the three members of the Gaming Oversight Committee from Philadelphia County?

Mr. SANTONI. Mr. Speaker, the Gaming Oversight Committee and we that were dealing with this issue dealt with all appropriate amendments that were properly filed. So I think to say that we tried to cut anybody out is disingenuous; we did not. I am sure that the other members of the Gaming Oversight Committee would tell you, I think we have been very inclusive. We have been very open. We have had hearings about the issue and you have had every opportunity to offer amendments, and if they were properly filed, we dealt with them.

Mr. THOMAS. Okay. Mr. Speaker, am I addressing—

The SPEAKER. Would you be—

Mr. THOMAS. —Representative—

The SPEAKER. —further interrogating or do you want to—

Mr. THOMAS. I cannot win with both of you.

The SPEAKER. Do you want further interrogation or would the gentleman like to—

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, I would like further interrogation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may continue.

Mr. THOMAS. I will lose anyway, but I know I will lose if I have to go from one to the other.

Mr. Speaker, on October 2, by a vote of 14-11, a table gaming bill came out of the Gaming Oversight Committee. Is that correct?

Mr. SANTONI. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. That bill was supported by all three members of the Philadelphia delegation. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will yield. The gentleman will yield. The interrogation is not proper, Mr. Thomas. The debate before the House is final passage of SB 711. The bill is on final passage. The gentleman does not have to answer for what happened in previous committee meetings or committee actions. The question before the House is final passage, SB 711 in the confines of SB 711, not what happened in committee.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am going to conclude my interrogation, and I hope that Representative Santoni did not take my interrogation the wrong way. He has been a member of this House for over 15 years and I do not think I have ever seen a time when he has offered nine different amendments to the same issue in less than 30 days, but I have a lot of respect for him and I know that he is trying to move the ball forward.

And so to that end, Mr. Speaker, let me just kind of set the record straight.

The SPEAKER. On the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. W. Curtis Thomas supports table games. W. Curtis Thomas, like Representative Wansacz, believes that table games will create 10,000-plus jobs, will represent an economic investment in Pennsylvania, will help clear up a debt, will help keep Pennsylvania dollars in Pennsylvania. Like my colleague, I believe all of that. And, Mr. Speaker, it was that commitment which led to an affirmative vote for table games on October 2, 2009, from W. Curtis Thomas. But, Mr. Speaker, what is on the board today, it is not what was voted on October 2.

Mr. Speaker, I have a problem with a tax reduction for casino operators while property owners will be witnessing a tax increase in 2011 in Philadelphia County. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I have a problem with— On October 2, I did not vote for an agreement in lieu of the payment of taxes when table games came out of committee. Mr. Speaker, what is on the board, SB 711, on October 2, I did not vote for extending the time in which a licensee had to get their license and get up and

going. I did not do that. And, Mr. Speaker, I would not have done that, because I know that when it comes to Philadelphia County there were a number of prospective operators, many of whom are prepared to go forward in building a casino in Philadelphia County if they had an opportunity. So I think that it is fundamentally unfair to give one operator an advantage over other people who responded to the process and played fairly in addressing the regulations. That is just fundamentally unfair.

Mr. Speaker, I think what the Senate did in its efforts, in its reform efforts, to make sure that certain people did not become casino operators, directors, and what have you – I am talking about the felony punishment rule. I think what the Senate did was correct. My momma used to say, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." We started tinkering around with that rule and now we have a situation that carries a loophole that could be problematic later on. Mr. Speaker, I think that the credit provisions of SB 711 fly in the face of good public policy, because when you and I are able to walk into Get Happy Casino and use a credit card or write a check to borrow money from the casino, in my opinion, that is tantamount to payday lending. That is tantamount to an unfair circumstance, because the interest that will run with that day-to-day loan or day-to-day credit or week-to-week credit is going to be triple, double, and is going to squeeze, if not aggravate, an already bad situation for the person that is trying to get credit. It is my opinion, it is my legal opinion that we outlawed that practice in earlier statutes, and for us to include that in SB 711 makes SB 711 real problematic. I would like for us to rethink that.

So, Mr. Speaker, without taking up a whole lot of time, because I am not interested in filibustering; I am interested in making it very clear that I am not going to help move this to the Senate. I am going to let the Senate respond to what comes over there, and I am convinced that when it comes back it will not reflect what we send over. At that point, my interest, my commitment to table games, will be honored.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Butler County, Representative Metcalfe.

Mr. METCALFE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Machiavellian, double-dealing gambling expansion legislation. Mr. Speaker, Machiavellian is defined as "a political doctrine which holds that craft and deceit are justified in pursuing and maintaining political power." This slick legislation is extremely flawed in favor of the powerful gambling and political special interests, promising to cause destruction in the lives of Pennsylvanians and to cause many tears in the eyes of Pennsylvania's men, women, and children.

The legislation provides for funding for gambling addictions before it even starts. Once again, Mr. Speaker, we provided for that 5 years ago in the original legislation for slots and now we are upping the ante, so to speak, understanding that this expansion of gambling will cause even more addictions, even more tears, and in so doing, are increasing the funding for the gambling addiction provisions of the legislation. Evidence that the crafters of this destructive policy do not have compassion is what we are seeing. They do not care, have no heart for the human cost of this Machiavellian, double-dealing gambling expansion. Gambling interests will strip the wealth out of Pennsylvania, and some parents will be enticed to literally take the food off the table and the clothes off the backs of their own

children to satisfy their own appetites for gambling. Gambling expansion will result in increased crime; organized crime; political corruption, as we have seen over the last 5 years; and more welfare dependency. It will hurt families by increasing bankruptcies, suicide rates, poverty, gambling addictions, divorce, child abuse, and neglect.

Mr. Speaker, we should truly consider the economic cost of this legislation. So many from the other side of this issue have advocated that this legislation will create jobs. Well, that is not where the impact of expanded gambling ends, in creating more gambling-associated jobs, Mr. Speaker. There is a cost and benefit side to this equation; there are dollars and cents; there is right and wrong, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in the "Conclusion" section of the National Gambling Impact Study Commission Report from June 18, 1999, we read that "No reasonable person would argue that gambling is cost free." There is definitely a cost side to gambling expansion that needs to be considered, but it is much harder to ascertain than that revenue side that so many are bragging about, Mr. Speaker, and the job creation that they are trying to brag about. There are direct economic costs and indirect social costs that make it difficult to evaluate the total costs associated with expanded gambling. In 2004 I referenced Professor John Kindt from the Business Department of the University of Illinois, who had calculated that the cost to taxpayers of a State for gambling – the costs when you expand gambling, when you create gambling in a State – are at least \$3 for each dollar collected; \$3 cost for each dollar collected. So all of you that think that this is the great solution to your spending appetite, this will do nothing but create additional expenses to add onto your already insatiable appetite to spend. Just because you see some hundreds of millions of dollars come in, you have to recognize the additional cost that it is creating.

In the business community, Mr. Speaker, other than being one of those individuals actually benefiting from this, if you reviewed a policy that would tell you that it is going to cost you \$3 for every dollar you are going to collect, Mr. Speaker, you would not be in business very long, approving such a thing. But in the legislature, where so many decisions are made with a very shortsighted view, very shortsighted view of policy ramifications, Mr. Speaker, without that long-term vision for what it is actually going to do, we will see many tonight embrace this illogical solution to a very compounding problem of budget deficits and hard economic times.

Mr. Speaker, to talk about crime a little bit. As a result of expanded gambling, in the first 3 years of casino gambling in Atlantic City, they went from 50th in the nation per capita crime to number one; from 50th to number one in per capita crime, Mr. Speaker. Again, back in the 2004 debate I referenced that in January of '99, the Family News from Dr. James Dobson cited Nevada, and in the Family News had stated "When compared with the other 49 states, Nevada ranks first in the nation in suicide, first in divorce, first in high school dropouts, first in homicide against women, at the top in gambling addictions, third in bankruptcies, third in abortion, fourth in rape, fourth in out-of-wedlock births, fourth in alcohol-related deaths, fifth in crime, and sixth in the number of prisoners locked up. It ranks in the top one-third of the nation in child abuse, and dead-last in voter participation," Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very clear from past studies, and even from our own experience here since 2004, that expanded gambling results in more crime against the citizens of the State in which it is expanded.

The new revenue from gambling expansion will not equate to painless new taxes but will levy pain across the State in the lives of many citizens that will never see it coming. Mr. Speaker, as you consider the revenue, job creation that has been argued from the other side, I think it is important to understand the cannibalizing impact that expanded gambling has on an economy. Previous speakers had mentioned that some of those gaming/gambling expansion interests were not even from our country, and those that are from our country many times are not even from our State, certainly are not from the local communities in which the gambling is expanded, Mr. Speaker. So as they strip the profits out of the local regional economies in which this gambling is expanded, we will see a loss of wealth in those communities. A loss of that wealth in those communities will mean a loss in the ability to create more jobs.

I think it is a very clear contrast tonight. I think for anybody watching the extended debate on PCN (Pennsylvania Cable Network) or reporting on it, anybody watching it has seen both sides rise this afternoon and into this evening and argue for some of the same exact aspects of the legislation but in oppositely contrasted positions – for one side to argue job creation who is advocating for this, but for our side to argue a long-term vision of what job creation will result from this and that is a negative impact on job creation, a loss of job creation, because of the cannibalizing effect and long-term negative economic impact of this policy decision. Both sides cannot be right. The side that is advocating job creation tonight advocated major property tax relief 5 years ago, Mr. Speaker, this property tax relief that has been touted by so many over the years, including the Governor.

As I have talked to citizens over the last 5 years about the supposed property tax relief, the body language, the facial expressions, the answers from my taxpayers are ones of being insulted, of having their intelligence insulted by those who argue that they have actually delivered some substantive property tax relief through the expansion of gambling 5 years ago as they promised. And with this promise of job creation tonight, those who are listening, who have seen the false promises of property tax relief understand that this once again is just another false promise, Mr. Speaker. Property tax relief that was touted under the slots legislation that still will not be evident under this expansion of gambling with the table games in the full-blown casinos across the State is once again another political answer for a very real problem that is costing citizens their homes and the property that they had bought that they thought they owned but found that it was, when they finished paying the bank mortgage, it was still mortgaged to the government through property taxes. So this will not deliver any property tax relief, of course. It will not deliver any real job creation for anybody with a long-term vision for the State, for anybody that wants to see their children and grandchildren remain in Pennsylvania and see Pennsylvania operate as an economic powerhouse. Those who are advocating this are advocating a policy that will have serious, harmful effects on our economy, and I believe that we have seen that in Pennsylvania already, the negative economic side, over the last 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I was really alarmed as we read through some of the projects that were being proposed to be funded by this legislation. I would like to read a few of those to give the audience of PCN a taste of that and hopefully any members that

might not have heard of some of these, a further enlightenment to the very special and political interests that are being served, being served up on a silver platter to these individuals through this vote tonight.

The summary that I have is the local share summary. It says it sets the local share tax rate at 2 percent to be distributed as follows: Harrah's in Chester County, 1 percent to the county; Chester City, 1 percent to the city for becoming a sponsor of the community college; Mohegan Sun, Luzerne County, 1 percent distributed the same as the slots; Plains Township, 1 percent to the township until budgetary cap is reached, excess over cap to be distributed to the county; The Meadows in Washington County, 1 percent to the DCED – The Department of Community and Economic Development is the organization, the State entity that it is talking about – for grand to economic authorities and redevelopment authorities. For grants to economic, there was a typo there; excuse me. North Strabane Township, 1 percent to the township until budgetary cap is reached, excess over cap to be distributed to the county; Unknown Harness Track – we are making an appropriation for an unknown harness track. Host county, 1 percent distributed the same as slots; host township, 1 percent to the township until budgetary cap is reached, excess over cap to be distributed to the county; Philadelphia Park, Bucks County, 1 percent to the Lower Bucks Hospital; Bensalem Township, 1 percent to the recreation department of Bensalem. A recreation department? How do we send money to a recreation department? Well, I guess some perceive gambling as recreation even though it does harm those. Penn National, Dauphin and Lebanon Counties, 1 percent to the county for a violent crime task force; East Hanover (Dauphin County), East Hanover (Lebanon County), \$120,000 to each township, excess to the county for the violent crimes task force. Obviously, we think there is going to be some additional crime here that needs to be funded, enforcement for. Presque Isle Downs, Erie County, 2 percent (entire local share) for a new community college. Mr. Speaker, we are providing funding for a community college that does not yet exist in tonight's legislation; 2 percent for a community college that does not yet exist. Summit Township, from the Presque Isle Downs, distributed per county share; SugarHouse/Foxwoods, Philadelphia, distributed pursuant to slots formula; The Rivers, Allegheny County, 85 percent of the 1 percent – and get this – 85 percent of the 1 percent to county libraries – so libraries are picking up some funding here – 15 percent of the 1 percent to a tourist promotion agency in Monroeville. How do you arrive at those numbers – 85 percent to county libraries and then it just so happens 15 percent to a tourist promotion agency in Monroeville? I guess there were not any other tourist promotion agencies in Allegheny County that would have liked that funding. Pittsburgh, 1 percent to the county library system; Mount Airy, Monroe County, 50 percent of the 1 percent to DCED, Department of Community and Economic Development once again, a State agency, for grants in Monroe County, for roads and economic development; 50 percent of the 1 percent for grants from PHEAA (Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency) to a school of medicine; Paradise Township, 1 percent to the township until budgetary cap is reached, excess over cap to be distributed to the county; Sands Bethworks, Northampton County, 60 percent of the 1 percent for county economic development; 20 percent of 1 percent to Easton; 20 percent of the 1 percent to Lehigh County with 50 percent of the 20 percent to contiguous

municipalities for economic development. Can you follow the numbers? Somebody is following the numbers, but most likely they are just looking for the dollars. Bethlehem City, 50 percent of the 1 percent to Bethlehem; 20 percent of 1 percent to Allentown; and 30 percent to Easton; Valley Forge, host county, 1 percent to the Commonwealth Financing Authority for Business in our Sites, tax increment financing and water and wastewater projects; host township, 1 percent to the township until budgetary cap is reached, excess over cap to be distributed to the county.

Mr. Speaker, I know some of the members who are talking may not want to hear what I have to say, but their noise is starting to get into my ears. I almost cannot hear myself speak. If I might have a little attention, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. The House will come to order.

The gentleman, Mr. Metcalfe, is in order and may proceed.

Mr. METCALFE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And finally, the Unknown Class 3 resort, the host county, 1 percent distributed the same as slots, and the host township, 50 percent of the 1 percent to host township; 50 percent of the 1 percent to contiguous city.

Mr. Speaker, we see things that are being funded through this list – a community college that does not exist yet, community colleges, libraries, a hospital, various programs at the DCED for grants, various municipalities, and even a recreation department, Mr. Speaker, just amazing the distribution of these funds that is so blatantly driven by the special interests and political interests of this body and the special interests outside this body, which leads me back to the Machiavellian comment that I started off with, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think a very good point was raised through the one appropriation, I believe it was to a veterinarian school, by one of the gentlemen from Lancaster County last night, that this should have been voted by two-thirds as a nonpreferred appropriation. I know that this body ruled that to be constitutional, but I am sure, Mr. Speaker, there will be a lawsuit if this is passed and that somebody will prevail if the courts are just in recognizing that the Constitution does not allow for this type of appropriation without a two-thirds approval by this General Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think that everybody in this State should be concerned about the lack of transparency that has occurred through this process with this gaming expansion, this gambling expansion. Mr. Speaker, even to the point that when I was here in 2004 debating this, and I think one of my last speeches was at 1:30, 2 o'clock in the morning, and I remember being interviewed by CNN around 6 in the morning while we were still on the floor that morning afterwards. We stayed here all night, through the night, through the dark, and we are not able to stay here that late any longer without suspensions and the membership approving of that like we were in the past from a leadership-driven decision, but we still, last night, in the dark of night, when the sun had set and people were probably either having dinner or doing homework or trying to follow up from their tiring day of work that they were out working, paying a significant share of that labor to taxes, that we in the dark of night had the majority of this body from the other side of the aisle shut down debate and shut down further amendments to this legislation, Mr. Speaker. I think when you terminate debate so blatantly on a piece of legislation that is so controversial that there is no straight-faced person in this State that can argue that

you are not pulling the wool over the eyes of the people in trying to see through what is going on here and avoiding the ultimate transparency that comes through us vetting this out during debate, Mr. Speaker.

I am glad that we are having the opportunity today to debate this as fully as we have, although I think many of us would expect another motion as we approach that deadline tonight of when we hit the 24-hour mark, that there might be another move to the previous question to shut down debate, to avoid transparency in the dark of night, pass a piece of legislation that is very dark in its impact on the State and on the lives of the people of this State. Mr. Speaker, I have heard members from the other side of this argument tonight trying to argue that good is bad and bad is good; that good is evil and evil is good. Well, we who are advocating against this are standing to correct the record, that this policy will have nothing but a negative impact on this State and the lives of the people of here, and that this is a bad policy. This is not a good policy for the future of this State, and it is not a good policy for the future of the children of this State or for anyone in this State.

Mr. Speaker, I think what is even more unbelievable are the grand jury investigations of the prior gaming/gambling expansion legislation and what has been associated with that over the last 5 years, that there is currently a grand jury investigation and instead of this body working with the Senate to advance reforms in the law that will correct corruption and weed out the problems that have been inherent and created through this legislation, as much as we can do with reform legislation, and instead of having it as a separate vote, it has been melded into this legislation to try and give people political cover as they vote for this, when their constituents rise up and ask, why did you vote for such a policy that is going to have such a horrific impact on the lives of Pennsylvanians? And they can claim that they voted for reform, that was the real reason they voted. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that for any individual to not take notice of the grand jury investigation and indictments that have already been issued through other grand juries recently, that we should hold off on this legislation and make sure that we actually advance the reforms without the expansion of gambling, they are really turning a blind eye to what is going on in this body, across the hall, upstairs in the other body, and throughout the hallways of this Capitol and across the State from either political and special interests that have been benefiting from the past 5 years of gambling expansion and will serve to benefit in the future at the cost to Pennsylvanians lives.

Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues that we heard from that is leaving this General Assembly from Northampton County gave me this little pin to have as a token, a memory of him serving here in this legislature, that I can hang up in his office that I have been down measuring and looking forward to occupying when he does leave, but he gave me this little button that says, "No place for hate." No place for hate, and I agree fully with that, that this body should be no place for hate. And I appreciate the future judge giving me that button to use tonight as a prop for my speech, because this legislation is going to hurt people. It is going to hurt people. You do not take an action that is going to harm somebody without some type of hate being exercised. You are not doing it out of love. You are not executing a new policy, putting a new policy in place that you know is going to hurt people because you love them. You are actually providing

in this legislation, according to the summary, for more money for the gambling addictions that will be created by this legislation, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask everyone to show the gentleman from Northampton County that we are going to miss him and that we agree with him that this is no place for hate. We should vote this legislation down tonight. This legislation needs to be defeated if you actually love your neighbor.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Schuylkill County, Representative Seip.

Mr. SEIP. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support SB 711. I have heard some of the remarks of the previous speakers, particularly the gentleman from Northumberland County and the gentleman from Bucks. I have a lot of respect for you and I appreciate all the energy that you put into your arguments. I want to attempt to try and allay your fears about the potential for harm to those susceptible to addictions.

Currently there are many people across this Commonwealth who are playing illegal card games and engaging in illegal gaming activities. These folks would be better served by a professional venue with a professional staff who is trained to oversee the gaming activities. Just as we do not want alcohol to be served or sold by those without proper training, we know we would be much better served by those in the casinos overseeing their customers, having them trained, being trained professionals overseeing these games in sanctioned venues. Mr. Speaker, those engaging in illegal games are not being served by trained professionals. These games have no standard of fairness or legitimacy, and certainly there is no Web site for help if there is a sense that the gaming is reaching a problem level.

Mr. Speaker, mental health treatment funding is not adequate in Pennsylvania; substance abuse treatment funding is incredibly underfunded; and funding for gaming addictions, before legalized gaming, was all but nonexistent. SB 711 will ultimately fund treatment better in Pennsylvania. Addiction issues in Pennsylvania were present long before casinos and long before SB 711 was put forth, but this bill will greatly enhance treatment and provide resources to combat addictions.

Instead of sending money outside of our Commonwealth, literally by the busloads to other States, we have an opportunity to the keep those dollars here in Pennsylvania and in our economy. A minimum, a minimum of \$1.5 million is put aside for treatment, treatment of problem and compulsive gambling. To date, \$4.7 million has been placed into a treatment fund that just continues to grow because of a lack of use. Currently \$380,000 has been put aside for gaming treatment; \$119,000 for training for those who are professionally overseeing the games; \$65,000 has been dedicated to a hotline that those who feel like their gaming is getting to a problem level can use. All of this investment in treatment and prevention would not be possible without the carefully regulated gaming industry that SB 711 will only improve.

Mr. Speaker, during the budget debate I advocated for human services. I advocated for treatment funding for providers, funding for those trying to combat addictions. SB 711 is an important piece of our budget, and I am willing to vote "yes" to

fund the budget, the budget that I advocated for – "yes" to jobs, "yes" to treatment funding, "yes" to combating addictions, "yes" to collecting more LST (local service tax) dollars for our local governments, "yes" to SB 711.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to provide an affirmative vote. That concludes my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland County, Representative Grell.

Mr. GRELL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the interest of advancing the debate, I just want to offer written remarks for the record. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and so do the members.

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

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I was speaking with my daughter, who is a student at Cumberland Valley High School – which by the way, along with another school in my legislative district (Camp Hill School District), was just named one of the outstanding schools in Pennsylvania and the nation by U.S. News & World Report.

In any event, my daughter was impressing me with her newfound knowledge of the legislative process and she said, "So dad, are you going to drop any bills in the hopper today? Are you going to do any pigeon-holing? How about log-rolling?" It led to a pretty interesting conversation and hopefully gave her a better understanding of what her dad does for a living.

If I had only known what was going to occur in recent days and weeks in connection with SB 711, the bill to expand legalized gambling in Pennsylvania. This would have been a real lesson to every student in her class on the government process.

What could they learn?

As the gentleman from Philadelphia learned, you have to be literally standing by the legislative "hopper" – specifically the amendment desk – at all times or someone will slip in nine different amendments, right up until the filing deadline, never knowing which amendment will be offered.

You would have learned about the gut and replace amendment tactic, rendering your ability to offer reasonable amendments ineffective.

They would have learned that a ruling of the Speaker can actually reverse time itself in another curious means of causing legitimate amendments to be deemed out of order.

Not the kind of thing you learn in high school civics class.

But that is not all, Mr. Speaker. They could learn how the body can overwhelmingly vote in favor of an amendment to ensure some property tax relief and minutes later watch it disappear and be ripped from the waiting hands of Pennsylvania property owners.

They would have seen a way to pigeon-hole dozens of meritorious amendments through something called a "Motion to call the previous question," under which 20 members, supported by a complicit majority party, can scrap all amendments and bring an immediate end to all debate, silencing the voices of opponents and the citizens they represent. That is the worst kind of old-school, Philadelphia-style bully politics.

And to be sure the students would have learned about log-rolling. It is pretty clear even from the truncated floor debate yesterday that several whopper logs were rolled into this bill. The chairman from Berks County was lacking in details, but it is clear that there is a log in this bill that establishes a perpetual WAM (walking-around money) for a certain favored medical school in the Northeast. Another log provides

similar public largesse to one community college, and yet another log provides great advantage to a certain hospital.

Mr. Speaker, putting aside all of the societal concerns about expanded gambling as so well enunciated by Chairman Clymer and others, there is ample basis to oppose SB 711 on the basis of the journey we have taken to get there.

Finally, our students of civics will also get a lesson in the fact that we have two legislative chambers. We will see what comes back from the Pennsylvania Senate – hopefully it will be a far cry better than the product we are sending over to them today. I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation today, allow us to improve it through the variety of amendments still pending, and give all Pennsylvanians a reason to take pride in what comes out of this legislature.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Adams County, Representative Moul. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. MOUL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have heard on this House floor today that we were going to tax these casino interests, but coming from 25 years of being in business for myself, I do not look at this as taxing a business; I look at this as we are in partnership with these people, in a roundabout sense. We have what they want, they cannot operate without it; that makes us technically their partner. But in the 25 years of business, the one thing that I never wanted to hear, I never wanted to win a contract and find out that there were aeons between myself and the next closest bidder. That would mean that I left a lot of money lay on the table. And in this case, I think we left a tremendous amount of money on the table.

I truly believe that we are selling Pennsylvania short. The taxpayers of Pennsylvania could make a whole lot more money with this deal than what we are about to. Twelve to fourteen percent is not a good deal for Pennsylvania. When it comes to property tax relief, I think that we were sold the premise in 2004 that gaming is going to be a huge chunk of the answer to our property tax problems in Pennsylvania. As we have heard here many times today, it really has not done anything for us. What is worse is this bill does not put one dime into property tax relief. As a matter of fact, when the gamblers or people who play the slots in casinos walk away from those slots to go in and play their table games, that is going to be less revenue for the Property Tax Relief Fund. Therefore, the property owners who are expecting money from the Property Tax Relief Fund in Pennsylvania will actually wind up with less to work with. They will actually get less property tax relief when those people go to play these table games. With no safety net built in, I find it repugnant that we tell people that we are going to help them in their property tax in order to get the camel's nose under the tent, and now we are bringing the camel all the way into the tent, and guess what? Well, now we have what we want, but you property owners, you get no tax relief or very little.

But let us go to agriculture and what this bill does for the equine industry in Pennsylvania. When slots came about in Pennsylvania, the equine industry, the horse racing industry, standardbreds and thoroughbreds, at that particular time was hurting, but after slots came into being, Pennsylvania went to becoming one of the top States in the country for horse racing. The equine business overall flourished. People were coming into the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and buying farms, starting breeding farms, starting racing stables. And some of you might think, what do I care about the horse racing industry? Well, let me just tell you about a few of the people that work in

that industry, because this is not just a few horses racing for a prize on the track. It is much deeper than that. The tentacles go out much further than that.

On all these farms, you have farmhands; you have farmers that grow crops to feed these horses; you have fence companies that border these farms; you have grain mills and all the people that work within the grain mills that turn the grain into feed for these horses; you have truckers that drive the trucks, that haul the grain; you have mushroom growers and that industry that is affected; you have trainers; tack shops; farriers; sulky manufacturers. You have one of the country's largest and most prosperous horse trailer manufacturing companies in the country right in Lancaster County, Eby Trailers, which employs hundreds of employees here in Pennsylvania. I cannot imagine laying some of those off because our equine industry is left shorthanded by this bill. You have horse transport businesses, veterinarians, DNA labs, auction houses, and many more industries related to horse racing than what I have suggested already.

The bottom line is, the horse racing business and agriculture is tens of thousands of jobs here in Pennsylvania. So when I hear somebody take a microphone on this floor and tell me that we are going to create thousands of jobs by having table games in Pennsylvania, I have to ask myself, but how many thousands of jobs are we going to lose in the equine industry once this bill goes through? When you take 34 percent of the Race Horse Development Fund this coming year, 17 percent the year after that, and 17 more percent the year after that, you are striking a hard blow to that industry. Personally, I hate to see it happen.

I think this is a sad day for agriculture in Pennsylvania. I really wish that those of you that have made up your mind to vote for this, I wish you would reconsider for all the farmers and the agriculture business in your community. I am sure they will be watching.

Mr. Speaker, I promised you I would keep it under 5 minutes, so thank you for your time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lackawanna County, Representative Staback.

Mr. STABACK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of SB 711, and I do so because I support what the bill makes possible. SB 711 has the potential, indeed, to create 16,000 new jobs; surely I support the creation of those kinds of jobs. SB 711 can provide \$1 billion in economic stimulus yearly; I support that kind of shot in the arm for Pennsylvania's economy. SB 711 fills holes in the budget while it avoids raising taxes; I support funding this year's budget and future budgets with a revenue source that offers dependable new money without ever overburdening the citizens of our Commonwealth.

And, Mr. Speaker, contrary to what many believe, this bill does not offer a blank check to the gaming industry. Instead, it includes improvements to the regulations that have been in effect since the year 2004, it closes loopholes and opens the books on gaming revenues and practices, and wisely, SB 711 recognizes the stresses and the opportunities that will await local municipalities by providing for economic development in host municipalities and surrounding areas. Mr. Speaker, this legislation allows our State to face its current fiscal problems while it plans for future investment into the Rainy Day Fund and then the Property Tax Relief Fund.

This is a good bill for today. It is going to be a good bill for tomorrow. With all this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I ask for an affirmative vote on the measure. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berks County, Representative Rohrer.

Mr. ROHRER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as we continue our comments on this bill today, I have listened with rapt attention to the debate on both sides, and I want to compliment many of the speeches by the gentlemen on our side of the aisle: the gentleman, Mr. Baker, for his history and his emphasis on the moral aspect – or the lack of that – of this bill; the gentleman, Mr. Maher, and his exquisite layout of the inconsistency and the problems in the process that have led up to this bill being before us; the gentleman, Mr. Krieger, and others, who have made very, very excellent points here tonight. But, Mr. Speaker, as I have listened, it does remind me of 5 years ago when we stood and we voted through the first implementation of gambling in this Commonwealth. I remember I stood up there slightly, just a bit before midnight that night, and said that it was a woeful day in this Commonwealth when this House would usher in a practice, which then was on Independence Day, if we all remember. It was on the Fourth of July and it was also on a Sunday, of all things, and that rather than giving independence to our people, we were going to give them dependence.

I have listened tonight carefully and in the days preceding relative to what the benefits of the passage of this legislation would be. I have listened real hard. I have heard only two: one, we will get more money; and number two, some figment of an imagination of jobs created. But, Mr. Speaker, I ask this very clear question here tonight: Is that all that we need to consider? Is the only reason we come here to vote is to consider if something creates some fictitious amount of jobs, that it is therefore justifiable? Or that we need money so badly that we will, at any cost, pass legislation that will generate some elusive amount of funds? Is that all that we are here to consider?

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that in many respects, the House has deteriorated when we believe that a job created by this industry, the gambling industry, is in any way equal to— Let us look around the ceiling here. I see natural gas, I see bridge building, I see electricity, I see petroleum, I see commerce – the kinds of things that made Pennsylvania what it is. And to have folks stand and say, well, we have lost steel jobs – and those are real jobs – we are going to replace them with some jobs created in the gambling industry, with a product that does not generate wealth but steals wealth from those who lose their money. What are we here for, Mr. Speaker? I submit that we have a much higher responsibility and duty in this House, to make determinations on the basis of what is good for people, not what is good for the moment, good for some revenue that comes up here when in fact the cost that is created by the passage of this legislation, the cost in human misery – and yes, it is real – the cost in loss of jobs by those who become addicted and lose their jobs, the cost of homes where families are broken up because of this practice.

And, Mr. Speaker, if anyone stands up and says you do not know that those exist, then you have not done homework. Just a couple of weeks ago I was with a group of men at a graduation at Teen Challenge in Rehrersburg, Pennsylvania, in Berks County. And in that graduation, there were several men who were there whom I talked with directly who became addicted to table games and gambling, and then because they lost their

money, they became addicted to drugs and they lost their families and they ended up in need of restoration. Now, is that the kind of job that we want? Is that the kind of industry that we want to pass our vote upon and say it is legitimate? Where is the consideration of the cost of lives? I have not heard that today. I submit that being concerned about people's lives – about husbands, about mothers, and fathers, and children – is not a Republican or Democrat issue, but it is something that should be shared by all of us because in our districts are all of these people. I have heard nothing really talked about that today, only that this is good because we will make a little bit of money, and that this is good because we may create some jobs.

You know, I agree we need jobs, but if we would have spent half of the amount of energy that has been expended to pass this legislation and have it spent on determining how we could lower taxes for business in this State or something else that would create real jobs, we could have made a real statement for the people of this Commonwealth and for the real creation of jobs. This does neither, Mr. Speaker. This generates maybe some money. How much? I do not know, but certainly nothing that is worth the cost of lives. And maybe it creates some jobs, Mr. Speaker, but not the kind of jobs that each of us want in our districts and what this State needs.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard tonight a very clear case why this legislation before us is not right for Pennsylvania. It is not in the best interest of Pennsylvanians and it is not good for this Commonwealth. Mr. Speaker, I submit that this piece of legislation is not worthy of being passed in this House and ought to be voted "no." Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Blair County, Representative Stern.

Mr. STERN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have listened to my colleagues tonight suggest that gambling is good policy for Pennsylvania. Some have mentioned jobs and economic development. I could mention many of the same things that other members have suggested in their remarks here this evening, but I will not continue to repeat what has so clearly been articulated by many of those that have risen to the microphone this evening and clearly stated, as their valid points and issues, being opposed to this legislation.

This gambling bill and the expansion of table games reminds me of someone that is trying to build on an unsecure foundation. Any buildsman, tradesman, or contractor knows and understands, you cannot build a secure foundation on shifting sand. Once you begin to mix gambling legislation to a budget where Pennsylvania families depend on constant and dependable funding for schools, prisons, welfare, education, crime prevention, and all the other things that we look for in a budget, there will be cracks develop and the foundation of our budget will crumble. Gambling is not economic development, as we have been told this evening; it is about attracting people into a casino with the promise and the allure of cheap food and free liquor and taking their money.

Of course, I have heard my friends also say that they do it anyway, they are going to go to another State, they are going to do it someplace else so they might as well do it here, and it is an entertainment for them. When individuals and families lose their hard-earned money and rich casino operators win, then it is the wrong policy to adopt in this Commonwealth. This legislation is not beneficial for Pennsylvania's foundational future. It creates holes. It does not fix anything.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mr. STERN. For the remainder, I would like to, in the interest of time and for the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to submit the rest of my remarks for the record.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit these remarks for the record. Even since the enactment of gambling in Pennsylvania on July 4, 2004, in the middle of the night, the Commonwealth has dealt with a host of issues that point to the fact this legislation was flawed from its inception.

The original purpose according to the Governor was to provide property tax relief to Pennsylvania taxpayers. While millions of dollars have been returned to the citizens, it has been far from the promised relief that was highly publicized. Over \$1 billion was originally promised but the slot revenues never reached its golden promise to the Pennsylvania property owners. This legislation that passed then was a golden goose for casino operators as they reaped the rewards of those individuals that lost money at the casinos. It was stressed in the beginning that our equine industry needed help. They needed slots at the casinos to survive. The horse racing industry would move out of State and our farmers would suffer. All these concerns were saddled to the whole gambling debate and pointed to Pennsylvania agriculture to expand gambling in Pennsylvania.

Well, now casinos are here and once again the rich casino lobbyists are running roughshod over any type of good public policy to the benefit of the gambling industry.

Many of the issues for table games concern the way the original gambling legislation passed in the first place. It was baked in such a fashion from ingredients that garnered support of the chef – the chef being former Senator Vince Fumo.

When gambling first passed in 2004, the General Assembly never auctioned licenses that could have potentially generated millions of additional dollars in property tax relief. This was one of the reasons to consider gambling in the first place.

Now we fast-forward to December 15, 2009. The proposal before us is another backroom attempt to gain the required vote to support special interests that are connected to the gambling cartel. Good policy initiatives have been voted down by the Democrat majority.

This whole legislation has held children and students hostage. The Santoni omnibus amendment does not allow those individuals that win money on table game legislation to have their winnings intercepted for the payment of child support on arrearages owed by them to their children. This is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. I brought up the issue on the House floor that Pennsylvania law requires fathers in back support to their families to lose their hunting and fishing licenses. Pennsylvania law also requires professionals with licenses issued by the Commonwealth to forfeit their professional license if they are in arrears of child support.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, last session we made it a crime if someone moved their address across State lines to avoid payment of child support. Yet, with this table game legislation, we welcome them to the casino to lose their money that should be going to meet their financial obligations to their children and then, if they win, they can take it home and never pay a dime to their wife and children.

This is a travesty of any type of good public policy. Now we are voting on table game legislation because the Governor wants it to plug his budget hole. We could not vote for appropriations for Penn State, Pitt, Temple, and Lincoln because the gambling vote had to come first. It had to come first because students and children once again were held hostage by Governor Rendell and the House Democrat leaders to generate revenue and pass a bill that enacts bad public policy for Pennsylvania and will hurt Pennsylvania families.

The Commonwealth could have met our responsibilities to college students but the Governor wanted table games. The House Democrat majority should enact legislation on its merit and not because of the special interests of the casino and mega gambling cartel with connections to Atlantic City and Las Vegas. If table games were so beneficial, then why did the majority leader hold college students hostage and allow them to face higher tuition fees?

SB 711, with the Santoni amendment, is focused solely on the owners of licenses and not about fixing the problems inherent with the current gambling industry. To hold the future of college students and potential tuition tax increases hostage is again wrong.

This gambling legislation is another backroom agreement between the gambling lobbyists and the casino operators and a small group of legislators that are attempting to offer a carrot approach to members to gain support for this ill-fated and poorly-thought-out legislation.

We cannot expect to support future budgets on the shortfalls and pitfalls of gambling. Years ago the Maryland Attorney General issued a study and report entitled "The House Never Loses and Maryland Cannot Win: Why Casino Gaming Is A Bad Idea." In the report was a detailed study backed with facts that gamblers lose but the house always wins. It also detailed stories of the hidden costs of gambling to taxpayers and families. As we move forward, we cannot continue to support get-rich-type schemes with the false allure of one-time revenues and uncertain stable revenue for the Commonwealth.

We should also be moving two separate bills on gambling, one to reform the original legislation of casino gambling of 2004 to provide oversight by qualified law enforcement officials. The original legislation was enforced by a gambling oversight board called Bureau of Investigations and Enforcement, or BIE. The problem with this board is it does not have the authority or jurisdiction to gain information from legitimate law enforcement groups such as the Attorney General's Office or the State Police. This lends itself to the fox guarding the proverbial henhouse.

Now, if I understand gambling in Pennsylvania as the proponents have fashioned it, the following seems to be an accurate description of the current state of gambling in Pennsylvania. We have a select group of well-financed casino operators that have given their support to a crafted bill that benefits them. It does not help property owners in Pennsylvania one bit. As a matter of fact, not one cent in this new table game legislation will go back to property tax owners in Pennsylvania. It will be sent to areas impacted by gambling to give them a cut of the pie to gain passage of this ill-conceived legislation. Medical facilities, hockey arenas, community colleges, local shares to municipalities with certain groups getting special consideration. I could go on and on, but, Mr. Speaker, you get the point. This bill is setting back Pennsylvania and setting bad public policy that we will never recover from for many years to come.

I will be voting "no" on the final passage of SB 711.

This bill is not good for Pennsylvania or good for Pennsylvania taxpayers or students or children. It does not help Pennsylvania families and continues to erode the foundation of a solid budget for future generations. We are literally gambling with our future if this bill is passed.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh County, Representative Day.

Mr. DAY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a couple quick points about why Pennsylvania does not need this bill. First of all, government does not create jobs. Technically, we can create jobs with other people's money. At best, gambling is a recreational activity that has a higher asset consumption rate than traditional recreation activities, so in effect, legalizing it transfers money from one business to another since disposable

income is limited. Now, I understand that some would say that businesses with higher tax rates mean more to tax and spenders. That is easy math.

However, this bill would allow an activity which consumes more financial assets. It consumes more financial assets faster than traditional recreational activities. If a recreational consumer goes into a gaming facility and sets a limit of, say, \$400 to spend, that can be utilized and consumed in 1 to 2 hours. If that recreational consumer would spend that \$400 in your community, how many days would it take, how many jobs would that support in your neighborhoods in your districts? A waitress job in a casino could seem like job creation, but it could actually mean a job loss in another place to eat or at a local recreational or food establishment.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think Pennsylvania needs this bill and I would like to define my use of "asset consumption," not in a traditional economic or financial sense; however, as a way to measure the use of economic assets of consumers. I would like my fellow colleagues to picture a water hose, a regular garden hose, that has water traveling through this hose. This water traveling through the hose is measured in volume and speed. Current law allows consumers to consume, hopefully disposable assets, at a volume and speed of a garden hose. This bill would create a situation where consumers will be consuming assets at a rate, volume, and speed of a fire hose. And I urge my colleagues not to do this to your people.

If a person with that \$400 of disposable income decides to visit a casino, that \$400 would be consumed very quickly at a blackjack table. And again, if you take that \$400 and use it on other things in your community, that would be much better for all of our districts.

Mr. Speaker, my second point is, I have heard arguments tonight that the Commonwealth needs more revenue. We all know that. We went through over a hundred days trying to balance our budget. Some members are portraying an urgent need for money and despite less revenue coming in, they still want to spend more and thus profess a need to increase revenue. And that is okay. I appreciate other people's viewpoints. As a matter of fact, the Representative from Philadelphia made the best arguments for why to support this bill. I will share that with him later if he is so inclined. These people who profess a need to increase revenue also want to legalize activities that they probably would not dare advise their family and friends to do. I am afraid that certain people want to exercise their control of the process to push through this expansion of gaming so that they can take more tax dollars and control which districts receive funding rather than allow all Pennsylvanians an equal chance at that funding.

Again, I hold firm that I do not believe government creates jobs; it taxes economic activity. This bill taxes an activity. As was stated earlier, it taxes an activity more than any other business. I have never even thought about that, but the speaker that said that is right. This may be the largest tax increase on a business in the history of our legislature. What other businesses have been taxed at these rates? Unfortunately, at this time, I do not know.

More money, more money; we need more of the people's money, and we can get it by legalizing gaming. We can get their money quicker than any other taxing activity that has been thought of in the past. That is why this bill is an expansion of

gambling, and that is why people believe that this bill is the panacea that would get more of the people's money faster because of the consumption rate, and therefore, the taxing rate.

We need to live within our means and not look for additional ways to tax the people of the Commonwealth of their hard-earned dollars. Mr. Speaker, we must resist the urge to gamble away our future and the future of small businesses competing for the very limited resources people have. Mr. Speaker, I could go on: leadership, property tax promises, asset consumption rate, false job creation, the need to tax and spend. For all these reasons, I am opposed to this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Representative Keller.

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

I would like to commend the gentleman from Berks, the chairman of the Gaming Committee. I know he has been asked a lot of questions tonight, and a lot of tough questions. But it is amazing to me. He has been criticized for not helping and not doing anything, but last night I had an amendment that would fix one of the things that the other side has been complaining about in the bill. The gentleman was very gracious and tried to help as much as he could. I find it amazing that the people who are out there complaining about the problems with the bill would not vote to suspend the rules to fix that problem. So I do not understand what is going on. It was good enough for the other side to come into the district and have a press conference in front of the proposed site for Foxwoods. They went there and called everybody names and said we should not do the extension, but last night when we had a chance to fix that problem in the bill, and the gentleman from Berks was gracious enough to help me with, again, a parochial issue, no help from the other side. In fact, the opposite. The opposite from leaders saying do not do it, do not fix the bill, do not help. I do not understand it. I think it is wrong.

I do not know why we are here again playing games when you had a chance to fix the thing that you said was wrong with the bill, but would not put the votes up, but yet you could come into the district and have press conferences in the district in front of the site. That is hypocritical, and unfortunately, I am going to have to vote against the gentleman Mr. Santoni's amendment, but I think the other side should stop the games, stop being hypocritical. And if you want to fix the bill, stand up. You stood up outside the place. You came into my district. You came there and said it was wrong, but when you have a chance to fix it, you do not fix it.

So I, again, would like to thank the gentleman from Berks. Stop being hypocrites. If you want to fix bills, get down to fixing it and stop playing games.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Representative O'Brien, Michael O'Brien.

Mr. M. O'BRIEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As we begin to bring this to a close, the past 2 days of high emotion and high intrigue, the end is near and we can return to our families and enjoy the holiday season. And certainly, and certainly, it is worth being noted that throughout the Northern Hemisphere, this time of year is noted for the return of the sun. It is noted for the end of encroaching darkness. Be it the ancient Romans with Saturnalia, be it our Jewish brothers and sisters with the Festival of Lights, or be it Christians with Christmas, light is the essential theme. But it should be noted that our

Buddhist brothers and sisters celebrate, in December, Bodhi; Bodhi, where the Buddha comes to the understanding that suffers due to ignorance. And with that, the Buddha came to enlightenment, and there establishes the basic dialectic – ignorance versus enlightenment. Sadly, sadly, over the course of the past 36 hours, we have curtailed debate, we have taken issues such as lobbyist reforms in regards to gaming, tax abatements offered to gaming facilities, and the issue of dealing with the extending of licenses for casinos who have no possibility to get up within the time that is allowed to them under the current statute. Ignorance versus enlightenment, and this is where we are left.

I would like to close – and hopefully this is the last comment I ever have to make on gaming – but I would like to close and share the words that our brothers and sisters in the United Methodist Witness shared with us this morning when they wrote, "We believe this legislation will add to the public's low regard of members of the General Assembly. You will create the appearance that special interests – namely the casino industry and their lobbyists – have undue influence over your actions. If you support this ill-advised legislation, you will be sending the message to every Pennsylvania citizen that money solves all our problems and that greed [is] good."

I implore each and every one of you to vote "no." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington County, Representative Daley.

Mr. DALEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, in the 28 years that I have sat on the floor of this House, in the 28 years I have sat on the floor of this House, I have never seen an issue that when I have seen everyone at the microphone, what you said was right. Every Republican and Democrat on this issue has articulated their feelings, and you are right. What you said is absolutely right about SB 711. You know, woe be it to you and me as leaders that we have to predicate our budget on gaming. That is a sad state of affairs that me as a public official and you as a public official, that we have to base our future and the future of Pennsylvania on gambling. Woe be it to the country of America, in which we see so many States that are stuck in the same predicament that we are, that now we have to base our budget on something like gambling. That is not what our Founding Fathers wanted us to do. They did not want us to base our budgets and everything that we do in the name of the public based upon gambling.

But here we are today with a budget that is tremendously short, and what everyone has said is absolutely right, on either side of the aisle. There are many things that are very bad about this issue. There are a lot of people that are going to be affected by this issue in a very adverse way, and many families and individuals will suffer from what we do here tonight. Families will be ruined. Lives will be changed. Home economies will be destroyed. But here we are as leaders, we have to do the balancing test. Is this good public policy or do we have some other way of making the problem go away? Well, guess what? Tonight here is where we are. We are voting on an issue that many of us find reprehensible and actually against our moral and personal beliefs, but we have to vote for it. I am going to vote "yes." Do I want to vote "yes"? No. Because I believe like you believe, caveat emptor, and you know what all that means. That means maybe what you are buying is not worth the cost of what we are going to pay.

I pray that the future of Pennsylvania and that future Pennsylvania legislatures will wean themselves away from programs such as this so that we create real jobs, so we can really make Pennsylvania run, Mr. Speaker. I will reluctantly vote "yes" on SB 711. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Chester County, Representative Schroder.

Mr. SCHRODER. Will the maker of the amendment stand for interrogation? Will the maker of the amendment stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Santoni, indicates he will stand for interrogation. The gentleman, Mr. Schroder, is in order and may proceed.

Mr. SCHRODER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of definitions that are in this bill that I would like to start there by asking a few questions on. On page 243, we have the definition of "Electronic gaming table," and it says that "The term shall not include a slot machine." Now, my question to you is, how is this electronic gaming table different from what we currently have in the slot machine casinos that has been called virtual blackjack and that sort of thing?

Mr. SANTONI. The electronic table games, you are competing against another person. The other definition you talked about, you are competing against the machine.

Mr. SCHRODER. So are you saying that under "Electronic gaming table," this definition, that you are competing against other players, but there is no dealer per se or no individual involved? It is totally automated and computerized. Is that the idea?

Mr. SANTONI. The electronic table game is what the definition — exactly what it says. It is an electronic table game. You are playing against not a person, but the computer, if you will.

Mr. SCHRODER. Then how does that differ from the "Fully automated electronic gaming table" that is defined on the next page of the bill? Are there some electronic gaming tables that are not fully automated?

Mr. SANTONI. There are; yes.

Mr. SCHRODER. Can you give an example of the differences of those?

Mr. SANTONI. A fully automated table game is one that does not require a casino employee to operate.

Mr. SCHRODER. So are you saying that the tables that are contemplated under the previous definition of "electronic gaming table" do require an employee, a live person, to operate? Because I do not see that in that definition.

Mr. SANTONI. Could you repeat the question again, please, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SCHRODER. It would appear from the definition of "fully automated electronic gaming table," that I would assume that no live person is needed to run that game, but yet, I do not see where a live person is needed under the previous definition of "electronic gaming table" either, and I was just wondering, if there is a live person involved there, what is their role since they are playing against each other, but I believe it is somehow computerized?

Mr. SANTONI. A dealer could possibly be required.

Mr. SCHRODER. A dealer could possibly be required. Would a dealer probably be required?

Mr. SANTONI. For instance, let me just give you an example of—

Mr. SCHRODER. Definitely be required or—

Mr. SANTONI. I am sorry. I spoke over you, Mr. Speaker. Could you repeat that?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will yield. The gentleman will yield. The House will come to order. Members are trying to interrogate each other and they cannot hear the questions nor the answers.

Mr. SCHRODER. Let me preface my, let me preface—

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

Mr. SCHRODER. Let me preface my—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will yield.

Mr. SCHRODER. I am sorry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Schroder, may proceed with the questioning.

Mr. SCHRODER. Thank you.

Let me preface my question by saying this: When we passed the original slots law, I do not believe any of us contemplated the so-called slot machine where you are playing a virtual blackjack dealer such as, you know, that are set up at the various casinos across the State. So I am trying to understand the definitions of these "electronic gaming tables" and the "fully automated electronic gaming table" so that we can have a clear understanding before we vote on this bill exactly what we are allowing to be introduced into the casinos. And so I guess I do not understand how a person is possibly involved in an electronic gaming table or it would not be electronic, I would think.

Mr. SANTONI. Let me try and answer it this way: The difference between— I think what you are talking about, the games that you see that are there now that are considered slot machines and the ones that could be utilized when we vote for the table games legislation. The slot machine legislation is based on a predetermined amount of winners and you are not playing against anybody else, you are playing, essentially, by yourself. Whereas the table games, you are playing against other people, you are playing against the dealers, the electronic dealer, if you will. It is not predetermined as a slot machine would be.

Mr. SCHRODER. Sure. And I do understand that and I appreciate that. I guess I am just still fuzzy on the difference between fully automated electronic gaming table and electronic gaming table.

I would ask this. Let us just take the definition of "fully automated gaming table." Are there limits to the number of those such tables that a casino can have on their floor?

Mr. SANTONI. Well, for category 1s and 2s, their maximum is 250, and for category 3s, the maximum is 50.

Mr. SCHRODER. So a category 2 could have 250 fully automated electronic gaming tables on its floor and would have no employees operating those tables?

Mr. SANTONI. Yes.

Mr. SCHRODER. So, Mr. Speaker, all of the claims that we have heard about job creation and good jobs and well-paying jobs and how wonderful this bill is because we are going to put Pennsylvanians to work could all be for naught if the casinos would decide that 250 of their table games would be fully automated as opposed to having a live individual running the table game?

Mr. SANTONI. Mr. Speaker, just to be clear: Yes, they are allowed to have the maximum amount of fully automated machines at 250, but the tax rate is different. The tax rate is

34 percent if the casino chooses to use those types of machines; 16 percent initially, 14 percent after July 1 if they do not and use the standard tables that will require a dealer or a person, an employee.

Mr. SCHRODER. All right. I appreciate that. I appreciate that distinction. I am glad to hear there is a difference in the tax rate. I do not know if that will be of much consequence to dealers and other workers who are anticipating employment through this bill, though, if in fact these electronic table games are used instead.

Okay. Moving on, under the definitions there is the definition of "gaming junket" and later in the bill there is a rather extensive section governing so-called gaming junkets. My question to you, is there anything in the bill that prohibits or excludes compulsive gamblers from participating in these so-called gaming junkets?

Mr. SANTONI. There is no particular language on that; no, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SCHRODER. Mr. Speaker, later on there is a definition of "licensed facility," and I would like to just ask about one particular part of this definition of "licensed facility," because I think it ties into a section that comes later in the bill. Under "Licensed facility" it authorizes the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board to conduct table games, and the term would include any "area of a hotel which the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board determines is suitable to conduct table games."

So my first question is, what criteria will be used by the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board to determine which areas of a hotel are suitable for table games?

Mr. SANTONI. Things like appropriate security and appropriate surveillance would be utilized in their decisionmaking process.

Mr. SCHRODER. So as long as there is appropriate security and surveillance. I understand— The one thing I did see was that the area cannot be blocked, I guess, from camera view—

Mr. SANTONI. Right.

Mr. SCHRODER. —and that sort of thing.

Mr. SANTONI. That is correct.

Mr. SCHRODER. That is what you are talking about? Okay.

Mr. SANTONI. Yes.

Mr. SCHRODER. But let us be clear, we are talking about an area that is beyond the floor of the casino here, correct?

Mr. SANTONI. Yes; it could be.

Mr. SCHRODER. Well, the hotel itself, as I read this bill, is separate from the casino floor. Is that correct?

Mr. SANTONI. Yes.

Mr. SCHRODER. Okay. Under the definition of "slot machine," it appears that one word is added and that is "computerized." Why was "computerized" added into this definition?

Mr. SANTONI. I understand that it was a request by the House Republicans. Your staff requested it, and we said we would agree with it.

Mr. SCHRODER. That might be, but that does not answer my question. My question is this: Were not previous slot machines in use already computerized?

Mr. SANTONI. Yes.

Mr. SCHRODER. So would you say then that technically under the previous statutory definition of "slot machine" that did not contemplate "computerized," were all of the slot machines therefore in violation of our existing law?

Mr. SANTONI. No; I would not concur with that assessment.

Mr. SCHRODER. What under the old definition— Well, I guess my point is there is a reason why "computerized" had to be added here, because I do not see any other changes to that definition. All right. I will let it go at that.

Mr. Speaker, there is a definition of "table games" and a number of terms used here that some of them are familiar, but frankly, I have never heard of. And I think it is important that before we pass this bill, the people of Pennsylvania understand exactly what games are going to be offered. So under the definition of "table game," I would ask, what is the game red dog?

Mr. SANTONI. Mr. Speaker, it is a variation of poker, but let me just try to maybe intercept some of your future questions. The list that you are going to read is a standard list that other jurisdictions use to get into the particulars of each table game. They are a table game by what the standards call them. So that is why we put them in the bill, to allow the facilities the options of picking the table games that they choose and that they think would best serve their customers.

Mr. SCHRODER. Well, I agree that many of the games enumerated here – blackjack, poker, craps, mini-baccarat – are certainly familiar games, but some of these are just not familiar to me, someone who is generally not a gambler.

What about pai gow, p-a-i g-o-w?

Mr. SANTONI. It is a form of poker. It is an old poker game.

Mr. SCHRODER. Sic bo?

Mr. SANTONI. Poker.

Mr. SCHRODER. Fan-tail?

Mr. SANTONI. Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I am an amateur gambler, and the games that you are saying are standard games played at other jurisdictions, and the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board will ultimately make the call as to what games get approved. But I believe it is in our best interest to include all of the table games that other jurisdictions use and that meet the standard of table games to give the casino operators the option of picking and choosing their games with the oversight of the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board.

Mr. SCHRODER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate that, but I believe it is incumbent upon the members of the General Assembly who will vote for this legislation to at least have answers to the questions about exactly which kind of games we are approving for table use in the Commonwealth, and the only other two I was going to mention are panguingui and chemin de fer or something like that.

Mr. SANTONI. They are all related to poker, I am being told by my poker expert, the gentleman from Westmoreland.

Mr. SCHRODER. Mr. Speaker, there is a section in the bill regarding budgetary impasse. I guess we are all familiar with that concept. It probably does not need to be defined in the bill for any of us, but it says, "...if, in the event of a budgetary or other fiscal crisis, the Governor orders the furlough of Commonwealth employees," among others, it says, "the board and its employees and...the Pennsylvania State Police whose duties involve the regulation and oversight of gaming...shall not be subject to furlough and shall continue to perform their duties of employment."

So I guess my question to you is this: Can in fact other State Police employees be furloughed during such an impasse and are

we giving a special protection here, if you will, to State Police employees who are involved in the regulation and oversight of gaming?

Mr. SANTONI. Mr. Speaker, I answered this particular – not exact question, but I dealt with this yesterday when you were on leave. We think the importance and the integrity of the gaming industry is paramount, and that is why that information is put in the bill. We do not want to cripple our casinos and we do not want to, certainly, open it up without having any kind of law enforcement available. So that is what I said yesterday, and I will say it again today.

Mr. SCHRODER. So if that is the answer, then I take it State Police that patrol our highways, the turnpike, respond to crimes – they can be furloughed but gaming State Police cannot?

Mr. SANTONI. Mr. Speaker, I am answering the questions related to the gaming bill. That question might be better directed elsewhere.

Mr. SCHRODER. Well, I believe it is directly related to the gaming bill as far as the protections that we are giving here.

Mr. SANTONI. I answered the question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SCHRODER. I am done with that question.

Mr. Speaker, under provision, section 1206(f) regarding "Confidentiality of information," certain things are to be withheld from public disclosure, and one of those includes "history of criminal activity." Mr. Speaker, I believe this information would be public anyway, so what is the public policy of shielding it from public disclosure when someone submits this information to the Gaming Board?

Mr. SANTONI. Currently the provisions related to the confidentiality are very, very broad, and we tried to narrow that in this legislation.

Mr. SCHRODER. I understand they are very broad. I am still wondering why someone's history of criminal activity, which I presume would be a public record, would all of a sudden be shielded and cloaked in confidentiality once it is in the hands of the Gaming Control Board?

Mr. SANTONI. History of criminal activity could include both charged and uncharged, and we do not think it is appropriate to publish uncharged criminal activities. So that is why that language is there.

Mr. SCHRODER. Mr. Speaker, authority is given in this bill to "Enforce prescribed hours for the operation of table games so that a certificate holder may conduct table games on any day during the year in order to meet the needs of patrons or to meet competition." Does that language, as I believe it appears to read, contemplate that casinos will be open 365 days a year?

Mr. SANTONI. That is what current law is and we would leave that up to the jurisdiction of the private enterprise, when they want to be open and when they want to be closed.

Mr. SCHRODER. So there will be no closing for Christmas, Yom Kippur, Ramadan, or any other important holiday?

Mr. SANTONI. At the discretion of the private enterprise, the casino would make that decision.

Mr. SCHRODER. Well, what if the employee seeks time off to recognize and celebrate their religious convictions under one of those holidays. Are they permitted to have that time off or how will that be handled?

Mr. SANTONI. That is an employee and employer decision that needs to be made between them, not a decision that the government should make.

Mr. SCHRODER. Mr. Speaker, what is the purpose for allowing the board to determine a reduction and decrease in the

number of slot machines at these facilities? There are a couple of provisions in there allowing a 2-percent decrease and then there is a floor, I guess, saying that they cannot be decreased to less than 1500. First of all, do not most of our casinos have more than 1500?

Mr. SANTONI. There are reasons that we put those in – to keep certain numbers of slot machines, not to replace slot machines with table games and change machines here willy-nilly, those kinds of things. So those provisions were put in to protect the casino operator from doing that.

Mr. SCHRODER. Could we not just have prohibited the reduction in slot machines?

Mr. SANTONI. We could. It is not realistic, but we think that the language that is in there is appropriate.

Mr. SCHRODER. Mr. Speaker, there is a section in the bill that deals with a determination of a slot machine licensee being entitled to the return of any portion of the license fee. We know that that has been an issue. It appears that a scheme is set up that if a court would order and determine that a reimbursement of any portion of a fee is due and owed to the licensee, the board could immediately turn around and assess a one-time slot machine renewal fee for the equivalent amount, thereby, in essence, avoiding the order of the court in that regard. Was that put in there to deter or prevent the current category 2 casinos from suing for any additional category 3 casinos that might be approved?

Mr. SANTONI. Mr. Speaker, as a deterrent to sue for anything in this act. And I would just add that you might call it a scheme, but I think that we would call it taxpayer protection.

Mr. SCHRODER. Well, Mr. Speaker, do you agree that this would eliminate any incentive for a casino to seek reimbursement of their license fee pursuant to the original law?

Mr. SANTONI. That is not for me to determine, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SCHRODER. Well, there must have been an intent and a reason this was put in there. Can you explain to me what that reason is?

Mr. SANTONI. As I said earlier, I think it is an attempt to protect the taxpayer, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SCHRODER. Mr. Speaker, there is language in here about felony convictions that I just had a question about. It says, "FOR PURPOSES OF THIS SECTION, A FELONY OFFENSE IS ANY OF THE FOLLOWING," and it says, "AN OFFENSE PUNISHABLE UNDER THE LAWS OF THIS COMMONWEALTH BY IMPRISONMENT FOR MORE THAN FIVE YEARS." Mr. Speaker, are there felonies that are punishable by imprisonment of less than 5 years in this Commonwealth?

Mr. SANTONI. No, I do not believe so.

Mr. SCHRODER. So are you stating for the record that in fact we are excluding no felonies under this language?

Mr. SANTONI. That is my belief.

Mr. SCHRODER. If we were not limiting it then or excluding it to only felonies of more than 5 years, what is the purpose of putting the 5-year language in if it in fact applies to all felonies?

Mr. SANTONI. People in other States might want to move here and work and find out what our law is.

Mr. SCHRODER. But there are other provisions dealing with other jurisdictions in other States and convictions in those other States right below that section.

Mr. SANTONI. That is correct.

Mr. SCHRODER. So I would ask again, what is the purpose of limiting our felonies or putting this language in to more than 5 years if in fact your statement is true that there are no felonies punishable by less than 5 years?

Mr. SANTONI. The language is put in so when people read our law, they know what the language is and what the law says.

Mr. SCHRODER. Mr. Speaker, was Mr. DeNaples's felony punished by less than 5 years or more than 5 years?

Mr. SANTONI. Mr. Speaker, I do not know.

Mr. SCHRODER. How about former Senator Fumo's?

Mr. SANTONI. I do not know.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's questions are out of order. The gentleman will yield. The questions are out of order.

Mr. SCHRODER. Could I ask under which rule that they would be out of order, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. We, during our debate — avoid all personalities during our debate.

Mr. SCHRODER. I guess I thought that was limited to members of the body. I apologize if I overstepped the rules.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. SCHRODER. Mr. Speaker, in section 1332, there are extensive provisions for the appointment of a trustee. They are new provisions, yet prior to this the Gaming Control Board has appointed a trustee in the well-known case of the Mount Airy situation. My question to you is, if they already had the authority to appoint a trustee, why are we including this language and does this change any other law of Pennsylvania with regards to appointing trustees?

Mr. SANTONI. We wanted to provide a statutory framework, and we do not believe it changes anything.

Mr. SCHRODER. So there was no statutory framework in place previously when the Gaming Control Board appointed the trustee in the Mount Airy situation, correct?

Mr. SANTONI. There was general regulatory authority over the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board.

Mr. SCHRODER. General regulatory authority under the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board?

Mr. SANTONI. That is correct.

Mr. SCHRODER. Did they enact, through their regulations, a trusteeship provision?

Mr. SANTONI. I believe that they did.

Mr. SCHRODER. And I should probably know this, and I apologize for not, but did those regulations come before the gaming control committee for our review and approval?

Mr. SANTONI. I do not recall getting that information, but I do not recall every piece of mail or correspondence that I got on the whole gaming issue because we get so much, as you know.

Mr. SCHRODER. Mr. Speaker, there are provisions in the bill dealing with tournaments and contests, and I have several questions on those. I am not sure what version you have or how yours is printed out, but I am looking at page 334. It looks like it might be section 1302 because it comes right before section 1303. Anyway, I guess my question is this: These tournaments that are contemplated, is there any duration on these tournaments established in the law?

Mr. SANTONI. One moment, please.

Each tournament would need the approval of the board as to the duration and the other circumstances related to that tournament.

Mr. SCHRODER. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry; I did not hear your response.

Mr. SANTONI. The duration with regards to that tournament, other characteristics of the tournament would be determined by the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board.

Mr. SCHRODER. Your response, I believe, was that the Gaming Control Board would determine the duration of the tournament, when it begins and when it ends—

Mr. SANTONI. Correct.

Mr. SCHRODER. —or what they are allowed, how many days? But there is no limitation in law that would apply to this. It would be the discretion of the Gaming Control Board. Is that the case?

Mr. SANTONI. Yes; that is true.

Mr. SCHRODER. Okay. Now, a little further down there is a very interesting part that says, "The number of gaming tables used during a contest or tournament shall not be counted toward the maximum number of gaming tables authorized by the certificate holder's table game operation certificate." So these games that will be used in a tournament under this are above and beyond the table games that they are authorized on their casino floor.

Mr. SANTONI. Yes.

Mr. SCHRODER. Is that correct?

Mr. SANTONI. Yes.

Mr. SCHRODER. Yet there are no limitations on the time period in the law that the Gaming Control Board could allow these tournaments with all of these extra tables to run.

Mr. SANTONI. As I said, that decision rests with the Gaming Control Board.

Mr. SCHRODER. So under this provision of the law, there is nothing to prevent these extra tournament table games from becoming permanent table games if the Gaming Control Board, in its infinite wisdom, justifies it as so?

Mr. SANTONI. I do not believe that is true, Mr. Speaker, because a "tournament" by definition has an ultimate winner, and when that winner is determined, that tournament has concluded. I do not know that there is a game out there that could last forever. There is a winner.

Mr. SCHRODER. Could there not be various games and contests within a tournament? I mean, it might not be one group of people sitting down to play Texas hold 'em or something like that. It could be any number of players continuously coming in and out. I mean, is there anything to prevent that?

Mr. SANTONI. There is a winner to a tournament, and when that winner is established, the tournament is concluded.

Mr. SCHRODER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am much less than satisfied with that answer, and I just believe that this area— One more question. I also believe that these tournaments can be— I asked you about the definition of "hotel" earlier. I also believe these tournaments can take place off the casino floor in various areas of the hotel if deemed appropriate by the Gaming Control Board, correct?

Mr. SANTONI. That is actually preferred. Those tournaments will be making money for the Commonwealth, so we want them to have adequate space. So they will probably be in ballrooms, if you will, and in other areas of the hotel to make it a better atmosphere to have a tournament.

Mr. SCHRODER. So we very well might have created here additional table games above and beyond the legal limit that will actually be used throughout different areas of the hotels that are contemplated under this law, off the casino floor?

Mr. SANTONI. You said something, a number of additional illegal machines? Is that what you said? I do not agree with that. I think that the legislation speaks to what tournaments are, and I spoke to that and answered your question. It speaks to the number of table games that will be on the regular casino floor.

Mr. SCHRODER. Is there a definition of "tournament" that you can point me to that says that in the law, in the bill?

Mr. SANTONI. There is a definition of "tournament" in the bill. You can certainly look it up as fast as I could.

Mr. SCHRODER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am tempted to respond to that comment, but I will hold off.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman concluded his interrogation?

Mr. SCHRODER. No.

Mr. Speaker, under subsection 1327A, "OTHER FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS," it speaks to credit and the process by which the casinos will offer credit to gaming patrons. Mr. Speaker, it says, among other things, that "...THE CERTIFICATE HOLDER," which is the casino, "WILL VERIFY IDENTITY AND INDEBTEDNESS INFORMATION THROUGH A CREDIT BUREAU OR CASINO CREDIT BUREAU...." Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know, is there a difference and what would the difference be between a standard credit bureau or a casino credit bureau?

Mr. SANTONI. The standard credit bureau is exactly what it says, a typical credit bureau, and a casino is one that deals with casinos, established by the casino.

Mr. SCHRODER. Are they regulated and subjected to the same State and Federal laws and regulations as the standard credit bureau?

Mr. SANTONI. Yes, I believe they are.

Mr. SCHRODER. Now, Mr. Speaker, under the "TAX LIABILITY" section, the term "unsecured credit" is used. It says, "DRAWS AGAINST UNSECURED CREDIT EXTENDED TO PATRONS....," but I am not asking a question on the tax ramifications of that. My question is this: The way I read this, not only unsecured credit can be extended by the casinos but secured credit can also be extended by the casinos. Would that be correct?

Mr. SANTONI. The answer to your question is that it could be secured.

Mr. SCHRODER. It could be secured.

Mr. SANTONI. Yes.

Mr. SCHRODER. And what items could the casino credit bureau be required to hold as collateral for security?

Mr. SANTONI. That is a private contract between the person applying for credit and the creditor.

Mr. SCHRODER. Well, would they be able to require that a home be put up for credit?

Mr. SANTONI. They cannot require anything.

Mr. SCHRODER. In order to get the credit, if it is a secured credit line, I believe they can require that.

Mr. SANTONI. Again, that is a private operation between the credit agency, the creditor, and the person applying for the credit. That would be their decision.

Mr. SCHRODER. Are there any protections in this law or any Pennsylvania consumer protection law, for that matter, that would prohibit a casino offering and issuing credit that would prevent them from requiring someone to put their house up or their car or their Rolex watch, for that matter?

Mr. SANTONI. They would be subject to all State and Federal credit protections.

Mr. SCHRODER. Indeed, I assume they would be, which is why I am asking if there is anything in this bill specifically that would prohibit them from requiring, say, a home to be put up as collateral?

Mr. SANTONI. I answered the question and I will answer it again: It is a private transaction, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SCHRODER. That is a statement. I am not so sure that is an answer, but I will move on.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman answered the question.

Mr. SCHRODER. Mr. Speaker, one of the previous speakers did an excellent job of running down the various funds that are doled out to certain selected institutions and whatever in this legislation in the form of WAMs, earmarks, whatever you want to call them. But I am interested in a particular one where a local share assessment goes to a nonprofit hospital in a first-class township. Do we know, are there any members of the General Assembly or House who sit on that hospital's board?

Mr. SANTONI. I am not aware of that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SCHRODER. Is that a no?

Mr. SANTONI. I am not aware of that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SCHRODER. Is that a do not know?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman answered the question.

Mr. SCHRODER. I am just seeking clarification.

The SPEAKER. He answered the question.

Mr. SCHRODER. Mr. Speaker, there is a community college slated to get 100 percent of a licensed facility's local share assessment. What is the name of that college?

Mr. SANTONI. Mr. Speaker, a lot of this, again, we went through this yesterday when you were not here, and I do not know the answer to that, but the local share issues were negotiated amongst the respective areas of the State, and that is where that language came from, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SCHRODER. Can that college be visited today?

Mr. SANTONI. When you were not here yesterday, Mr. Speaker, when we were here for 12 hours and you went home – I do not know where you went, but we were here and we answered a lot of the questions related to the local share. I do not know the particular place you are talking about, but as I said, the negotiations were done by the respective communities, and that is where the language came from that was put in the amendment.

Mr. SCHRODER. Well, Mr. Speaker, you can talk about my absence last night all you want, but the fact is, had the Speaker not put the screws to us and allowed us to read the appropriate bill, I would not be—

Do we know if any members of the General Assembly are on the board of this community college?

Mr. SANTONI. I am sorry; could you repeat the question?

Mr. SCHRODER. Do we know if any members of the General Assembly are on the board of this community college?

Mr. SANTONI. I do not.

Mr. SCHRODER. Okay. Mr. Speaker, there is a school of medicine located in a city of the second class within a county of the third class that gets 50 percent of the local share, I believe. Is that the medical school that the former license holder of the Mount Airy Lodge also sits on that board?

Mr. SANTONI. I do not know that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SCHRODER. I am sorry?

Mr. SANTONI. I do not know the answer to that, Mr. Speaker. I do not know who sits on the board of that.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Schroder, we do have other speakers waiting.

Mr. SCHRODER. I think I just have a couple more questions, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it appears in subsection 1521 that we set up a situation where the licensees that also hold a liquor license get different treatment than other such holders of a liquor license insofar as it says, they "...SHALL NOT BE SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 471(C) OF THE LIQUOR CODE." Is that the so-called three strikes—

Mr. SANTONI. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHRODER. —provision?

Mr. SANTONI. Yes, it is.

Mr. SCHRODER. What is the rationale for treating the casinos differently from, say, the corner tavern in this regard?

Mr. SANTONI. Well, the rationale is that we have taken away the opportunity for the license to be removed, because if they lose their license, there is potential for lost revenues and tax dollars. But I would also like to point out that the penalties, the fines, are substantially higher, significantly higher than anybody else would be subject to if they violate the provisions of the Liquor Code.

Mr. SCHRODER. Mr. Speaker, on the bill.

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

Mr. SCHRODER. I do thank the chair of the gaming control committee, Chairman Santoni, for his patience and attempting to answer the questions to the best that he could.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that what we have here is a piece of legislation, once again, that was cobbled together in secret meetings, most of the time while members of the General Assembly were home for Thanksgiving, mainly staff shuttling back and forth between House and Senate and one caucus and the other, with the rank-and-file members being largely left out of the drafting process. And that is unfortunate, because it seems that whenever that happens, we run into a whole host of problems, just like we did when the original gaming legislation was passed.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of problems that I see in the bill. The possible reduction in slot machines is only going to accomplish one thing. It is going to hurt revenue and reduce revenue coming into property tax reduction since it is only slot machine revenue that goes to reducing property taxes.

This return of the license fee to the Gaming Board as a one-time assessment to in essence negate a court's decision which I believe, as the previous speaker spoke out, will not withstand muster. I would point out, though, that if it does, that certainly, I believe, allows us to pursue other reforms that many of us have wanted to see for a long time such as changing the composition of the Gaming Control Board, changing who appoints the members of the Gaming Control Board, none of which we were really going to touch because of the fear that the slots casinos would get their license or a portion of their license fees back. However, if that is no longer at issue, I would suggest that that opens up a whole lot of other avenues that we can look at.

Mr. Speaker, I also have serious questions, and it seems very undefined in here about this concept of tournaments and their ability to take place off the casino floor in hotels and the fact that the table games used for tournaments are not subject to the cap in the law on table games for each facility. I do believe under interpretation — and when you see the way they interpreted slot machines under the original law, it is not hard to

fathom that they will take the broadest possible interpretation of many of these provisions. So what we could very well end up having are permanent tournament tables above and beyond the limit of tables established under this law, which would be placed in various areas of hotels or boardrooms or anything like that, and just completely negate any cap that was established and intended by the General Assembly. I hope the Gaming Control Board does not interpret it that way, but I see nothing in the bill that would preclude them from interpreting it that way.

Finally, I just want to talk about one issue and clarify something that was said earlier in the debate with regards to the *DePaul* decision, which was the decision that struck down the campaign contribution prohibition that was in the previous version of the law. An earlier speaker implied that the current version of SB 711 does not address the problem created by the *DePaul* court, but in fact, I believe the bill does address the problem.

Language on page 239 of the bill amends the intent provisions of Title 4 of our slots law to clarify that "BANNING ALL TYPES OF POLITICAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS BY CERTAIN PERSONS SUBJECT TO THIS PART IS NECESSARY TO PREVENT CORRUPTION." Two months ago when we were looking at this issue, the Pennsylvania Legislative Reference Bureau, our bipartisan, bicameral legislative agency, issued a brief or a memorandum which explained that a statutory provision which has been declared unconstitutional due to a substantive problem as opposed to procedural may be reinstated simply by curing the substantive defect without reenactment or citation to the court decision, and in fact recommended that we handle it that way. So the current version of SB 711 fixes the substantive defect and reinstates the campaign contribution limits originally intended by the General Assembly.

MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mr. SCHRODER. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to submit for the record the memorandum from the Reference Bureau so that if anyone is looking at our debate today in the future, this issue will be clarified, and I would like to submit that for the record.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and he may submit his remarks to the clerk.

Mr. SCHRODER submitted a memorandum for the Legislative Journal.

(For memorandum, see Appendix.)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. If the Speaker can digress for 1 minute, I just would like to make an announcement on behalf of Representative Pete Daley. He is finally a grandfather. His first grandchild was born, Gianna Nicole Jericho. She was born October 29, 2009, 4 pounds 15 ounces. Born to Delia Ann Daley Jericho and James Jericho. All are doing well — Mom, Dad, and child. Congratulations, Pete.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Turning to leaves of absence, the Chair notes the presence of the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Representative Donatucci, on the floor; the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Representative McGeehan, on the floor. Their names will be added to the master roll.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority whip, Representative Turzai, who requests a leave of absence for the gentlelady from Montgomery County, Representative HARPER.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 711 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. We are down to two speakers and one that is on second and the whip and the prime sponsor of the legislation.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Representative Levdansky.

Mr. LEVDANSKY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are three points I want to make regarding final passage of SB 711. First, I want to talk a little bit about how and why this bill is important in the context of the budget that we adopted a couple of months ago. Secondly, I want to talk a little bit about how the revenue from this interfaces with our effort to promote meaningful property tax reform, and finally, I want to talk about some of the – briefly – about what I consider to be the false morality that I have heard some remarks about this evening.

This piece of legislation is important because, as you all remember, we had a very difficult time reaching closure on the budget this year. There was not a willingness in either chamber in any of the caucuses to raise the personal income tax or other taxes. So the revenue that will be provided by legalizing table games will generate about \$250 million this year to close the revenue shortfall that we need to bridge in order, in order to fully fund the budget that we voted for and that we adopted. Two hundred of the \$250 million will come from the fees and the assessments and the license fees relative to table games and the tax revenue that it will generate, and \$50 million is from a transfer from the horsemen's fund. So it is important, it is important that this is passed, understanding that it may not have been the first preference for revenue for some people, but the Senate Republicans put this on the table as a source of revenue in order to generate what we needed to bridge the budget that we passed, the revenue shortfall.

In the House, the Democratic Caucus, we had a different idea. We talked about, we were not in favor of raising the personal income tax, but we thought that we could get \$200 million by putting in place a gas severance tax and taxing smokeless tobacco. We passed a Tax Code bill with those revenue sources in it. That Tax Code bill went to the Senate. Those two options were taken off the table by the Senate Republicans. Thus, we are not going to tax Marcellus Shale gas extraction, we are not going to put a tax on smokeless tobacco, so the only thing left is to adopt this legislation with table games. So that is where we are and how we got here.

Now, I have heard a lot of comments about property tax relief. Let us be clear about what this bill does. This bill as amended says that when the State Rainy Day Fund has a surplus of \$750 million, then the revenue, then the revenue derived from the tax on table games will be used to augment the slot revenue already in place to reduce school property taxes. Understand that: It works to augment once we get to the trigger of \$750 million.

And in terms of what kind of property tax relief we have already done with the slots in Act 71, it has generated in the '08-'09 fiscal year; I am sorry, '07-'08 fiscal year, \$786 million. Seven hundred and eighty-six million dollars went out to homesteads and farmsteads across the State for property tax reduction, and in this past fiscal year, \$770 million has been allocated for property tax relief. So in the last two fiscal years, slots revenue has generated \$1,556 million in school property tax reductions for homesteads and farmsteads across Pennsylvania.

Now, let us put this in perspective. Nobody ever claimed that slots revenue was going to cause the elimination of property taxes – not the Governor, not anybody that advocated the slots at the racetracks said that it would eliminate. But in fact, but in fact, it has resulted in about 124,000 Pennsylvania property tax payers who have had their school property taxes eliminated by the slot revenue, but there is a lot more that needs to be done on property tax reform.

I and a lot of you have been involved in that effort to find meaningful, meaningful revenue to supplant property taxes to fund our schools and our public education. To put this in perspective, school property taxes in this State, this bill will provide \$200 million in revenue, but school property taxes paid in this State by all property owners is \$10.8 billion; \$10.8 billion. Of that, approximately \$5.8 billion is paid by residential properties and farmsteads, and we have a provision in our State Constitution that says, through the homestead exemption, we could reduce property taxes up to 50 percent of the median assessed value. That means we can cut school property taxes \$2.9 billion. Now, we have allocated about \$770 million for that. That still means we need a little more than \$2 billion to fund the maximum amount of school property taxes allowed presently by the Constitution. Does anybody have any simple ideas on how to come up with \$2 billion of replacement revenue? If they have a politically and legislatively painless way to do that, let me know; I am all ears. But the reality is that there is not an easy way to come up with \$2 billion to replace school property tax revenues if you want to cut property taxes to the maximum amount allowed by the State Constitution. So you need more than \$2 billion to get there plus the slot revenue. This bill would only generate \$200 million. This would be a literal drop in the bucket; \$200 million is a literal drop in the bucket, but again, the Senate Republicans decided they did not want to put a couple drops in the bucket on property tax reform. They decided that they wanted to bridge the revenue shortfall and the revenue necessary to fund this year's budget by us adopting this, but if those on the other side of the aisle can persuade the Senate Republican leadership to find \$200 million some other way, then we could use this revenue for property tax reductions. But absent finding another way to fund property tax reductions, this amendment will allow, in the future, after we get to that trigger of \$750 million in the Rainy Day Fund, for that in fact to happen.

So please understand, please understand, there is a long way to go and very difficult choices need to be made if we want to achieve meaningful property tax reductions in this State, and I welcome everybody, Democrat and Republican, your ideas and your thoughts about how to do that. But bring along your pencils and your thinking caps and bring along your political courage as well, because it is going to be about making hard choices to come up with \$2 billion of replacement revenue, notwithstanding what you hear from time to time.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say a little bit about the morality of this issue because that factors in for a lot of members, and I respect that. The next dollar that I spend at the racetrack or the casino will be my first. Frankly, personally, I do not gamble. I do not understand the fascination that a lot of people have with it, but do you know what? Probably a lot of people that I represent do not understand my passion for chasing white-tailed deer during deer season either, but I respect the fact that so many Pennsylvanians, including those in western Pennsylvania and in my district, believe that this is a legitimate form of entertainment or whatever. They spend their discretionary dollars doing this. I do not understand it, but I do not think I should impose my value judgments about the morality of this upon them.

Mr. Speaker, I also just want to point out that the debate over this yesterday and all the days before was tied in the context of the nonpreferreds, of the nonpreferreds, and I do not understand how some members can say that gambling and this legislation is morally wrong and at the same time, same time support appropriating public dollars to colleges and universities, including my alma mater of Penn State that has a major, a whole curriculum in hotel and casino management. We are using public dollars to fund our nonpreferreds who train and educate our kids in hotel and casino management. If you have a little problem about the morality of table games, you certainly ought to have a real moral problem about spending tax dollars on colleges and universities and even our community colleges that are very engaged and active in trying to train workers for this emerging and growing gambling industry that we have in the State. So if we are going to be moral about this, at least we ought to be consistent.

One final thing, Mr. Speaker, again, I do not gamble. I do not really understand the fascination that a lot of people have with it, but I do know this. I do know that for far too many decades and years people in my district in western Pennsylvania traveled out of State to spend their gambling dollars. They traveled to New Jersey, they traveled to Delaware, they traveled next door to West Virginia, and so we put slots in place to capture that revenue and keep it home here in Pennsylvania and use it for our needs here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Well, those States are now moving down the line, and they have a competitive advantage because they have allowed table games. This legislation would simply put us back on a par, back on a par with our adjoining States.

Notwithstanding what you believe relative to the morality of the issue, I think the reality is, people do not have to gamble in Pennsylvania. They do not have to go to the casino. They can go out of State or they could even stay at home and gamble on the Internet. So if we are going to be antigambling, then there are a whole lot of things that you ought to focus on.

Mr. Speaker, for all those reasons and more, we need to finalize the budget. We need to put the casinos in Pennsylvania. Whether you like them or not, whether you have problems with

them or not, they need and deserve to be put on a competitive, level playing field with the casinos and racetracks outside of Pennsylvania, and the revenue that will be generated by this legislation is certainly necessary to close the budget once and for all.

I urge an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks County, Representative Clymer, for the second time.

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will try to be brief, but I had to make some corrections on some of the remarks that were made by some of the other legislators. There was this question that this \$50 million price tag for the slots license was a bonus for us. Let me tell you this: The casinos are a monopoly. There are only so many out there. It is not like a Walmart or a Target or other industries that have to compete against each other. They are a monopoly. We have created a monopoly, and when they have, within their walls, video poker, which is the crack cocaine of gambling, and they can gamble from 5 cents to \$1,000, they are going to make money. So they are very profitable. The licenses are very valuable, and to prove that I am going to say it again for the third time: The Republican Caucus has invited an investment banker – I will not mention his name; I did before – from Chevy Chase, Maryland, to come in here, and he gave testimony before the Senate and House Republican Finance Committees on the issue, and he said that those – let me repeat it again – those licenses are worth – that is in class 1 and class 2 – between \$250 million to \$500 million.

And as I said before, to be repetitious, when Harrah's bought 50 percent of the Chester Downs license, they paid \$250 million. So, Mr. Speaker, how would you like to be in that situation where you are an owner of a casino that you got \$250 million for a half ownership and you still own part of the casino? I mean, that is a pretty good deal. Where else in private industry do we allow such lucrative financial transactions to take place?

The other speaker had mentioned just a few moments ago, give me some suggestions as to how we can raise money. Mr. Speaker, I tried to make those suggestions in amendments that I could not offer. One of the suggestions is that we have the table licenses at \$50 million apiece because they are still a bargain at that price. That would raise \$600 million, \$600 million. That is \$400 million more than the \$16.5 million that we are asking. Did you hear me? Four hundred million dollars. There is a solution. So unfortunately, I could not offer those amendments because of the parliamentary procedure that took place.

I want to make one more comment, and, Mr. Speaker, this goes back to 2004. It was July 3; it was late in the afternoon. Once again we were looking at the slots bill and we felt that through the same procedures that happened with this legislation being introduced at a date when most of us could not have had an opportunity to examine it, that late afternoon on July 3, there were three of us that were looking at a bill, this casino bill that we were going to vote later that morning but we were going to caucus on, and we were trying to figure out, what did they do to change it? And maybe the bill went through the Rules Committee; I am not certain how it took place, but there was a different printer's number on, and we were told that the changes were made. So there were three of us – myself; it was my staff person on the State Government Committee; and it was, I am

going to mention the name, Representative John Maher. We were back in the vicinity of his desk trying to figure out, after spending hours and hours and days trying to work on this issue, what did they do to change it? What were they doing to create a problem? And one of the issues – and you need to understand this – one of the issues that Representative Maher and myself and my staff person were looking at, what did they do? Because one of the changes we were looking at, did they take out the State Police? The State Police, we understood, were going to do the primary investigations of all the casino applicants. Well, as it turned out, that was not to be the case. The way the bill was passed and constructed, it was the BIE, the Bureau of Investigations and Enforcement.

So you know why some of us get a little frustrated when we are not able to read the bill in its entirety, that we are put at the eleventh hour to try to understand a 135-page bill, or whatever the numbers of pages were, because that is repetitious. That is not what the Speaker's Commission said we would be all about. There would be transparency; there would be openness.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I needed to make those comments, because if we are going to do this right, if we are going to bring honesty and integrity into this system, then let us not do these underhanded games. Let us play it straight. Let us be right with the members of the House if we are going to pass this very difficult piece of legislation, one that does more harm to the people of Pennsylvania than good. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Allegheny, Representative Maher, wish to be recognized for the second time? The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. MAHER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For the benefit of the members, the Pennsylvania State University does not have a major in casino management. It does, however, have a school of agricultural science, and with the way this bill is crafted, tens of millions of dollars, you are voting to send tens of millions of dollars of Pennsylvania taxes to other States. Those States will have a need to have farmers on their equine agriculture. They will have the need, as Dan Moul explained so well, for all the sundry industry associated with agriculture. And maybe some of the kids in Kentucky or Delaware or West Virginia, maybe a couple of them will attend the Pennsylvania State University School of Agricultural Sciences because there will certainly be less of a demand, less of a need here in Pennsylvania when you vote to send Pennsylvania taxpayers' money out of State.

Now, this document is 420 pages long. It has been in print for about 8 hours. I know, through the magic of rule interpretations, those 8 hours will be 24, but I wonder, has anybody in this chamber actually gotten through each and every one of those 420 pages? I know many people have been working on it on our side. Now, I cannot confess that I have read it all, but I will say I have read enough to know that the right vote on this proposal is a "no" vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery County, Representative Murt.

Mr. MURT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to concur with the previous speaker. Penn State does not offer any major or any college that has to do with casino gambling, and I believe it was very inappropriate to drag Penn State University into this debate.

Just for the record, the name of the major, I believe, to which the gentleman was referring is hospitality, restaurant, and institutional management.

And, Mr. Speaker, just for the record, I think it is important to note that that major and the course content of that academic program focuses on tourism and the hospitality industry. It has nothing to do with gaming, nothing to do with the gambling industry. And again, Mr. Speaker, it was inappropriate to bring Penn State into this debate. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Representative Turzai.

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

There is no compelling reason to be voting on a bill to expand gaming in Pennsylvania. And if I might, and it is rhetorical, of all the things that we could be doing, what kind of an agenda item is this? Do we not have better things to be discussing and voting upon for the good of the order of Pennsylvania citizens? And how did expanded gambling become the centerpiece of economic development? What does that say about the State?

I am not reflexively against gambling. My dad and mom went, on occasion, to the tracks to gamble and enjoy their evenings. They were watchful of their dollars and responsible. Evidence does suggest that some families, however, do suffer as a result of significant expanded gaming. Many people could have supported a position to expand gaming back in 2004 that was limited to the existing racetracks. They were destination locations, not in the middle of the neighborhoods, and gambling already was occurring in these locales. Certainly, that proposal could have been credible with respect to the assertion to save the horse racing industry.

But back in 2004, under this Governor's administration, the original slots legislation was passed, and at its best it was tainted. The mere fact that those licenses were not auctioned for public bidding spoke volumes. Monopoly licenses were to be handed out by a handpicked board.

Sir, if I might have order.

The SPEAKER. The House will come to order.

The conference on the side aisle will please break up. The conferences on both side aisles will please break up.

Mr. TURZAI. The fact that monopoly middlemen—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield. Will the gentleman yield.

The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. TURZAI. The fact that monopoly middlemen were established in that 2004 bill to sell equipment to end users was really reprehensible. Why would we add or enhance a piece of legislation that did not pass the smell test in the first instance?

Secondly, as a former prosecutor, it has been clear to me and to others that there were significant concerns with law enforcement aspects of that initial bill. The Attorney General publicly testified in front of a House committee on January 31, 2007, that the gambling legislation had it wrong from a law enforcement perspective. It should have been placed under the Attorney General and the State Police, as that is how it was done in New Jersey.

While it is true we did some minor law enforcement reforms, those reforms, everyone knows, are still far from complete. This bill certainly does not have any teeth in it. No bill has yet been

passed which completely transfers law enforcement powers from the Gaming Board to the Attorney General and the State Police. And until this fundamental reform is undertaken, why would we be expanding gambling?

I know many members have made mention of this, but it is true, and it is a fact that none of us should ignore. Newspaper sources have reported that there is a State grand jury investigation into the issuing of the casino licenses under the 2004 legislation. It was reported in the Post-Gazette, the Tribune-Review, and the Morning Call, quote, "A statewide grand jury in Pittsburgh is investigating whether casino licenses in 2006 were steered to some applicants...." Why would we be addressing the expansion of licenses when a grand jury investigation is ongoing?

Fourth and related to that above ongoing investigation, there are many that feel that there was a rush to issue licenses from the Gaming Board, and keep in mind, this is a board where members make about \$150,000 each plus hold private-sector positions, and keep in mind, they are supposedly board members who have never had ex parte discussions.

But I have to give you some facts about one of the licenses back in my hometown of Pittsburgh. There a license was granted to a company which had zero equity investment in the gambling facility but had secured shaky leverage financing that had to be changed in midstream. Weeks before the gaming board voted on that license, all the ratings agencies had issued negative outlooks for the sister company and had actually reduced that sister company's credit rating from a B-minus to a CCC-plus. They also gave the licensee itself a B-minus and said, quote, unquote, it "suggests that the project is highly vulnerable." The awardee, the sister company, had reported losses of \$26.1 million in '07, \$14.3 million in '06, and \$5.3 million in '05. Those other casinos had amassed over \$550 million in debt, and the principal himself had over \$11 million in personal gambling losses. It went to construction on a \$200 million bridge loan, and I just want you to know that this facility is already losing revenues and may not be sustainable. And we are going to expand gambling?

I will say this about the property tax issue. I do not want to belabor the point, but of the close to \$10.5 billion paid annually in property taxes, the original bill delivers less than \$1 billion, and as has been stated, this particular bill puts nothing directly toward property tax relief. The original bill came in under this grandstanding notion and people did expect – I talk to people back home – that property tax bills were going to be eliminated. In my own school district, homesteads received \$154 – some relief.

More than anything, more than anything, there are two points that I find disconcerting. One, this lack of law enforcement aspect, the fact that it was placed under the Gaming Board and not under the Attorney General and the State Police, which are the historical places of law enforcement in our State: inspecting and auditing casinos; enforcing both the criminal and regulatory provisions of the law; monitoring casinos for compliance; ensuring that adequate security measures are in place; investigating and reviewing all license applicants, investigating and reviewing all employees; prosecuting violations of the slots casino law; filing recommendations and objections to license applications – all of that should have been placed under the Attorney General and the State Police, period, and this bill does not do it.

Secondly, the way of doing business over the past 7 years has been tax more, borrow more, get your hands on someone else's money any way you can, and it is no different in this bill and in the original slots legislation. It has been about accumulating pots of other people's money and controlling it for people's political favor. We need a new way of doing business in Pennsylvania, and I am shocked, in many ways, dismayed, disappointed that in this era, in this era with the deficit, with the convictions, with the investigation, that we would be compelled to go back to that same paradigm and not initiate a new way of doing business. It is not good.

To the people of Pennsylvania, if this bill in fact passes, I apologize. We do not need this additional projected revenue for the budget. Out of nearly a \$28 billion budget, we can find \$200 million to reduce in spending; trust me. And in fact, this budget was never predicated on expanded gaming. It is a disingenuous proposition. Anybody who thinks that expanded gaming is about anything other than expanded gaming and the gaming industry is kidding themselves and not telling the citizens of Pennsylvania the truth.

With all due respect, I would ask my colleagues to think about this bill, to think about it, particularly in this climate, and I wish we were down here talking about improving the business environment to create more jobs or if we were talking about new ways to bring fiscal responsibility to Pennsylvania and to reduce the size of government. That is what Pennsylvanians are looking for us to discuss. No one believes, no one believes that this bill is going to somehow make Pennsylvania better. Nobody, nobody is under that disillusion.

I would urge you to please vote "no." Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. The Chair notes the presence of the gentleman from Greene County, Representative DeWeese, on the House floor. His name will be added to the master roll.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 711 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berks County, Representative Santoni, on the question.

Mr. SANTONI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a long 2 days – a lot of debate, a lot of discussion, some emotion. I apologize to anyone that I offended, if I got a little heated throughout the last couple of days, but it has been a long 2 days and a good debate that we had. Coupled with the 2 days back in October, I think we have debated this bill pretty thoroughly.

But I do want to make some comments as we conclude the debate on SB 711 and give you some clarifications and then why I believe SB 711 is a good bill to pass for the people of Pennsylvania.

I think it is important to note and to respond, first of all, to the gentleman from Allegheny about this being the centerpiece of our economic development. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the Senate Republicans, not our leadership, made this the centerpiece of the budget and economic development package. They came to the budget table and brought this idea forward, not our leadership. So because of that, we thought it

was in the best interest of all of us and the people of Pennsylvania to do it right. So the Senate Republicans made it the centerpiece; we just want to do the right thing in making it a good bill, as I said, for the people of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, Act 71, the original legislation to introduce gaming to Pennsylvania, has been referenced throughout the last couple of days, and I just want to talk a little bit about it.

First of all, I have a list of the vote from back in 2004, and I am not going to embarrass anybody, but just for the record, a lot of the members that got up and said how evil it was actually voted for it. But you should not be ashamed of voting for it; you should be proud of it, you should be happy, because Act 71 from 2004 did a lot of good things, and I am going to point out a few. So if you voted for it, take credit for it.

Mr. Speaker, there are currently 8,346 family-sustaining jobs that have been created at the 9 casinos opened thus far, along with an approximate 8,000 additional construction jobs. That is a lot of jobs in an economy that we have been suffering through in the last few years.

Mr. Speaker, to date, over \$3 billion – that is with a "b," billion – has been generated, with two-thirds of that being returned to the citizens of the Commonwealth in the form of property tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, \$500 million has been distributed to our horse racing industry, an industry that was dying back in 2004 and it has been resurrected with the gaming industry, allowing this important industry to retain and create thousands of jobs and expand its valuable partnership with Pennsylvania's number one industry – agriculture.

And, Mr. Speaker, if the casino gets built in Berks County, Penn State Berks will introduce a gaming and tourism major to their curriculum. Build it and they will come.

Mr. Speaker, slots play has provided \$220 million to local governments that host or are near casinos for hundreds of projects, including road and public safety improvements, economic development and tourism projects, and community recreation.

And also, Mr. Speaker, local fire companies – local fire companies, the people that protect our families – have also received \$75 million in funding from the taxes generated by slots play. So take credit for that vote. You should be proud of it.

So now we move on to the transition to table games and the addition of table games.

Mr. Speaker, as we have seen over the past couple of months on the floor of this House, not everyone thinks that legalizing table games is the right thing to do, and I understand and appreciate that. But a majority of Pennsylvanians do; they believe that we should have table games, a large percentage, up to 70 percent. And I suspect and hope that a majority of the members of the General Assembly who represent them agree also.

Mr. Speaker, for months this summer and into the fall, we negotiated a budget that makes smart investments in the people of Pennsylvania. We did that because the 203 men and women in this room know that the past year has been a struggle for millions of Pennsylvanians. We see it in our communities, we hear it in our district offices, and we read it in our newspapers and in the hundreds of e-mails that we receive. People are hurting. We feel it when we talk to those who have lost their jobs, who cannot afford health care, and whose children attend underfunded schools.

Tax revenues are coming up short just when we need it to help real Pennsylvanians get back on their feet. But, Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to improve people's lives. Today we can take a huge step toward raising revenue without raising taxes on those people who cannot afford it.

Mr. Speaker, today we can help start the creation of thousands and thousands of new jobs and help to stimulate the State's economy. Mr. Speaker, today we can say yes to moving forward on this very important issue.

During this year's budget impasse, we heard time and time again that the budget cannot increase taxes. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that this legislation allows us to raise revenue without forcing anyone to pay an extra dime of taxes. Let me repeat that: Mr. Speaker, the passage of this legislation allows us to raise revenues without forcing anyone to pay an extra dime of taxes. We are promoting a sound free-market business model that gives companies the chance to expand, to hire new employees, and to strengthen their bottom line.

We are opening up new options for patrons who can choose where to spend their money. We are making investments in the infrastructure and economy of our communities. And just as this body has supported efforts to combat alcoholism, drug abuse, and other addictive behaviors, we are strengthening our commitment to assisting those few men and women who struggle with a compulsive gambling problem.

Mr. Speaker, keep in mind, this is not just a table games bill; it is a reform bill as well. We are strengthening our efforts to ensure that the gaming industry is a positive contributor to our Commonwealth. The hundreds of millions of dollars of revenue we realize from authorizing table games with the passage of SB 711 will allow us to make vital investments in our future. With the money the State will earn from table games, we can uphold our commitment to our children by fully funding the Governor's education initiatives this year and for years to come, and we can do this all without taking anything from those who need our help.

Mr. Speaker, it has been also mentioned many times on the floor of this House of the person that frequents the casinos. It has been characterized that that person is the gambling degenerate that is spending the kids' milk money. Well, I am not doubting that that occurs, Mr. Speaker, and it is a sad aspect of gaming and I am not doubting it for one second, but, Mr. Speaker, it is a small, small minority.

The large percentage of people who frequent our casinos are people like my dad, a 78-year-old retiree. Every once in a while he decides he wants to go down to Penn National or the Sands and spend a couple bucks. He will take my mom; he will take a couple of his buddies. He will enjoy himself. He will spend a few dollars. Sometimes he wins; most of the time he loses. He will go out to dinner and spend a few bucks there and go home happy, if he won, but happy because he had a good time. There are millions and millions of Pennsylvanians just like him who we are accommodating by having gaming, the slot machines, and also the expansion of table games, because he is always yelling at me why there are not table games at the casinos because he likes to play poker and blackjack.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the majority of the people just like him that enjoy the experience of going to the casinos. Let us make sure that they are viable businesses here in this Commonwealth, and let us vote for SB 711. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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—103

Barbin	Drucker	Longietti	Roebuck
Belfanti	Eachus	Mahoney	Sabatina
Beyer	Evans, D.	Manderino	Sainato
Bishop	Fabrizio	Mann	Samuelson
Boyle	Farry	Markosek	Santoni
Bradford	Frankel	Matzie	Seip
Brennan	Freeman	McGeehan	Siptroth
Briggs	Galloway	McI. Smith	Smith, K.
Brown	George	Melio	Smith, M.
Burns	Gerber	Micozzie	Solobay
Buxton	Gergely	Mirabito	Sonney
Caltagirone	Gibbons	Mundy	Staback
Carroll	Goodman	Murphy	Sturla
Casorio	Grucela	Myers	Taylor, J.
Cohen	Haluska	O'Brien, D.	Taylor, R.
Conklin	Hanna	O'Neill	Wagner
Costa, D.	Harhai	Oliver	Walko
Costa, P.	Harkins	Pallone	Wansacz
Curry	Hornaman	Parker	Waters
Daley	Johnson	Pashinski	Wheatley
Deasy	Josephs	Payton	White
DeLuca	Kirkland	Perzel	Williams
DePasquale	Kortz	Petrarca	Yudichak
Dermody	Kotik	Petri	
DeWeese	Kula	Preston	McCall,
DiGirolamo	Levdansky	Readshaw	Speaker
Donatucci			

NAYS—92

Adolph	Fleck	Major	Reichley
Baker	Gabig	Marshall	Roae
Barrar	Gabler	Marsico	Rock
Bear	Geist	Metcalfe	Rohrer
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Metzgar	Ross
Boback	Gingrich	Millard	Santarsiero
Boyd	Godshall	Miller	Saylor
Brooks	Grell	Milne	Scavello
Causar	Grove	Moul	Schroder
Christiana	Harhart	Murt	Shapiro
Clymer	Harris	Mustio	Smith, S.
Cox	Hess	O'Brien, M.	Stern
Creighton	Hickernell	Oberlander	Stevenson
Cruz	Houghton	Payne	Swanger
Cutler	Hutchinson	Peifer	Tallman
Dally	Kauffman	Phillips	Thomas
Day	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	True
DeLozier	Keller, W.	Pyle	Turzai
Denlinger	Kessler	Quigley	Vereb
Ellis	Killion	Quinn	Vitali
Evans, J.	Knowles	Rapp	Vulakovich
Everett	Krieger	Reed	Watson
Fairchild	Maher	Reese	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Civera	Helm	Lentz	Perry
Harper	Hennessey	Miccarelli	

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the bill passed finally.

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

COMMITTEE MEETING CANCELED

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

Mr. DALEY. To announce a committee meeting tomorrow.

The Commerce Committee is not going to be meeting tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

STATEMENT BY MR. DeWEESE

The SPEAKER. Can we have the attention of the members? Members, clear the aisle and the well.

The Chair would like to recognize the gentleman, Representative DeWeese, under unanimous consent. Without objection, the Speaker will grant him unanimous consent.

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

I would like to congratulate the bipartisan vote that advanced the ball just a few moments ago and congratulate my colleague, Mr. Santoni, for his enthusiasms, his focus, his unyielding efforts on behalf of an issue that will surely garner revenues for our State.

I will be brief. I have had a tough day, but I have had a lot of you e-mail me and text me and call me and stop by my office, and that is rewarding in the extreme.

At the conclusion of my remarks, I will tender my resignation as the Democratic whip. But I want to say to one and all that I have enjoyed being the Democratic whip, and God only knows what will be forthcoming on the future.

But my final sentence to you right now is that for all of you who have shown me a special moment in recent days, and possibly in the days ahead, I am fundamentally – and I could not do it without being Bill DeWeese – irrevocably grateful. Thank you.

HOUSE SCHEDULE

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

Mr. EACHUS. Thank you.

For the information of the members, just some procedural issues going forward into the next couple of days.

We have heard from the Senate. They have said that they may act as early as tonight on this legislation, perhaps other pieces that need to come back over to us. I am asking members to be patient on that interaction, because I do not know how long it will take them. We will be reaching out to the Senate leadership tonight.

My guess is that we will have a very light schedule tomorrow. If that comes back, we will try and get back to the House floor to continue our business. If not, we will focus on Thursday and try and get the business done as it comes forward. But I do not have much more than that.

Mr. Speaker, if there is really no objection, I think an 11 o'clock start? Would that work for you? An 11 o'clock start tomorrow for all the members. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

HB 830, PN 937

By Rep. MELIO

An Act amending the act of December 15, 1982 (P.L.1266, No.287), entitled, as amended, "An act conferring limited residency status on military personnel, their dependents and civilian personnel assigned to an active duty station in Pennsylvania," further providing that once eligibility for in-State tuition rates is established, rates shall continue until program completion.

VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY
PREPAREDNESS.

HB 1838, PN 2410

By Rep. MELIO

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for duty of board.

VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY
PREPAREDNESS.

HB 1985, PN 2673

By Rep. MELIO

An Act amending the act of June 24, 1976 (P.L.424, No.101), referred to as the Emergency and Law Enforcement Personnel Death Benefits Act, further providing for the payment of death benefits to members of the Pennsylvania Civil Air Patrol.

VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY
PREPAREDNESS.

RESOLUTION REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HR 403, PN 2421

By Rep. MELIO

A Concurrent Resolution relating to the presumption of a service connection for Agent Orange exposure for certain Navy and Air Force veterans and calling on the Congressional Delegation of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to fully support and fund passage of the Agent Orange Equity Act of 2009.

VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY
PREPAREDNESS.

The SPEAKER. That resolution will go to the House calendar.

BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HB 163, PN 159

By Rep. MELIO

An Act amending the act of June 23, 1931 (P.L.932, No.317), known as The Third Class City Code, further providing for tax levies.

VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY
PREPAREDNESS.

BILL REREFERRED

The SPEAKER. The Chair moves, at the request of the majority leader, that HB 163, PN 159, be rereferred to the Urban Affairs Committee.

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

HOUSE RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 567 By Representatives LENTZ, BELFANTI, CLYMER, GEORGE, HARKINS, MUNDY, SIPTROTH, MAHONEY, SOLOBAY, PARKER, D. COSTA, HORNAMAN, MURT, J. TAYLOR, YOUNGBLOOD and K. SMITH

A Resolution urging the Congress of the United States to enact meaningful financial reforms and not preempt states in passing legislation creating the Consumer Financial Protection Agency.

Referred to Committee on COMMERCE, December 15, 2009.

No. 571 By Representatives SIPTROTH, BRADFORD, BRENNAN, BRIGGS, CALTAGIRONE, CONKLIN, D. COSTA, CUTLER, DEASY, DeLUCA, DRUCKER, FAIRCHILD, GIBBONS, GOODMAN, GROVE, HARHAI, HENNESSEY, HORNAMAN, KORTZ, KOTIK, LENTZ, MAHONEY, MAJOR, MARKOSEK, MATZIE, METZGAR, MILNE, MURT, READSHAW, REICHLEY, SCAVELLO, K. SMITH, SOLOBAY, STABACK, SWANGER, TALLMAN, VULAKOVICH, WAGNER, WANSACZ, WATERS, YUDICHAK, ROAE and BEAR

A Resolution directing the Joint State Government Commission to conduct a comprehensive study of the current number of legislative districts within this Commonwealth, proposals to amend the Constitution of Pennsylvania to reduce the size of the General Assembly and the potential impact of the proposed reduction on cost, constituent services, work performed by members and staff, legislative effectiveness and efficiency and representation of constituent interests.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, December 15, 2009.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 2107 By Representatives DeWEESE, SOLOBAY, PETRARCA, PALLONE, HALUSKA, SAINATO, MARKOSEK, LONGIETTI, CASORIO, MATZIE, GIBBONS, DALEY, MAHONEY, WHITE and KULA

An Act authorizing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Governor and the Department of Military and Veterans Affairs, to grant and convey to Waynesburg University certain lands situate in the Borough of Waynesburg, Greene County.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, December 15, 2009.

No. 2167 By Representatives REICHLEY, BEAR, BENNINGHOFF, BOBACK, BOYD, BROOKS, CAUSER, CHRISTIANA, CIVERA, CLYMER, COX, CREIGHTON, CUTLER, DALLY, DELOZIER, DENLINGER, ELLIS, EVERETT, FAIRCHILD, GEIST, GILLESPIE, GINGRICH, GRELL, GROVE, HARRIS, HENNESSEY, HICKERNELL, HUTCHINSON, KAUFFMAN, M. KELLER, KILLION, KNOWLES, MAJOR, MARSICO, METZGAR, MILLER, MILNE, MOUL, MURT, MUSTIO, OBERLANDER, PICKETT, PYLE, RAPP, REED, REESE, ROAE, ROCK, ROHRER, ROSS, SAYLOR, S. H. SMITH, STERN, STEVENSON, SWANGER, TALLMAN, J. TAYLOR, TURZAI, VULAKOVICH and WATSON

An Act amending Title 62 (Procurement) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for application of part and for the definitions of "Commonwealth agency," "contracting officer," "executive agency," "independent agency," "purchasing agency," "State-affiliated entity" and "supplies"; providing for the definitions of "competitive procurement," "contracting agency," "judicial agency" and "legislative agency" and for public access to procurement information and prohibited contracts; further providing for procurement responsibility, for powers and duties, for Board of Commissioners of Public Grounds and Buildings, for methods of source selection, for competitive sealed bidding, for competitive electronic auction bidding, for competitive sealed proposals, for small procurements, for sole source procurement, for emergency procurement, for multiple awards, for competitive selection procedures for certain services and for selection procedure for insurance and notary bonds; and making a repeal.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, December 15, 2009.

No. 2168 By Representatives BENNINGHOFF, BEAR, BOBACK, BOYD, CAUSER, CHRISTIANA, CIVERA, CLYMER, COX, CREIGHTON, CUTLER, DALLY, DELOZIER, DENLINGER, ELLIS, EVERETT, FAIRCHILD, GEIST, GILLESPIE, GINGRICH, GRELL, GROVE, HARRIS, HENNESSEY, HICKERNELL, HUTCHINSON, KAUFFMAN, M. KELLER, KILLION, KNOWLES, MAJOR, MARSICO, METZGAR, MILLER, MILNE, MOUL, MURT, MUSTIO, OBERLANDER, PICKETT, PYLE, RAPP, REED, REESE, REICHLEY, ROAE, ROCK, ROHRER, ROSS, SAYLOR, S. H. SMITH, STERN, STEVENSON, SWANGER, TALLMAN, J. TAYLOR, TURZAI, VULAKOVICH and WATSON

An Act amending Title 62 (Procurement) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for application of part and for the definitions of "Commonwealth agency," "contracting officer," "executive agency," "independent agency," "purchasing agency," "State-affiliated entity" and "supplies"; providing for the definitions of "competitive procurement," "contracting agency," "judicial agency" and "legislative agency"; further providing for procurement responsibility, for powers and duties, for Board of Commissioners of Public Grounds and Buildings, for methods of source selection, for competitive sealed bidding, for competitive electronic auction bidding, for competitive sealed proposals, for small procurements, for sole source procurement, for emergency procurement, for multiple awards, for competitive selection procedures for certain services and for selection procedure for insurance and notary bonds; and making a repeal.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, December 15, 2009.

No. 2169 By Representatives GRELL, BEAR, BENNINGHOFF, BOBACK, BOYD, BROOKS, CAUSER, CHRISTIANA, CIVERA, CLYMER, COX, CREIGHTON, CUTLER, DALLY, DELOZIER, DENLINGER, ELLIS, EVERETT, FAIRCHILD, GEIST, GILLESPIE, GINGRICH, GROVE, HARRIS, HENNESSEY, HICKERNELL, HUTCHINSON, KAUFFMAN, M. KELLER, KILLION, KNOWLES, MAJOR, MARSICO, METZGAR, MILLER, MILNE, MOUL, MURT, MUSTIO, OBERLANDER, PICKETT, PYLE, RAPP, REED, REESE, REICHLEY, ROAE, ROCK, ROHRER, ROSS, SAYLOR, S. H. SMITH, STERN, STEVENSON, SWANGER, TALLMAN, J. TAYLOR, TURZAI, VULAKOVICH and WATSON

An Act amending Title 62 (Procurement) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for public access to procurement information.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, December 15, 2009.

No. 2170 By Representatives CHRISTIANA, BEAR, BENNINGHOFF, BOBACK, BOYD, CAUSER, CIVERA, CLYMER, COX, CREIGHTON, CUTLER, DALLY, DELOZIER, DENLINGER, ELLIS, EVERETT, FAIRCHILD, GEIST, GILLESPIE, GINGRICH, GRELL, GROVE, HARRIS, HENNESSEY, HICKERNELL, HUTCHINSON, KAUFFMAN, M. KELLER, KILLION, KNOWLES, MAJOR, MARSICO, METZGAR, MILLER, MILNE, MOUL, MURT, MUSTIO, OBERLANDER, PICKETT, PYLE, RAPP, REED, REESE, REICHLEY, ROAE, ROCK, ROHRER, ROSS, SAYLOR, S. H. SMITH, STERN, STEVENSON, SWANGER, TALLMAN, J. TAYLOR, TURZAI, VULAKOVICH and WATSON

An Act amending Title 62 (Procurement) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for competitive sealed proposals.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, December 15, 2009.

No. 2171 By Representatives DELOZIER, BEAR, BENNINGHOFF, BOBACK, BOYD, BROOKS, CAUSER, CHRISTIANA, CIVERA, CLYMER, COX, CREIGHTON, CUTLER, DALLY, DENLINGER, ELLIS, EVERETT, FAIRCHILD, GEIST, GILLESPIE, GINGRICH, GRELL, GROVE, HARRIS, HENNESSEY, HICKERNELL, HUTCHINSON, KAUFFMAN, M. KELLER, KILLION, KNOWLES, MAJOR, MARSICO, METZGAR, MILLER, MILNE, MOUL, MURT, MUSTIO, OBERLANDER, PICKETT, PYLE, RAPP, REED, REESE, REICHLEY, ROAE, ROCK, ROHRER, ROSS, SAYLOR, S. H. SMITH, STERN, STEVENSON, SWANGER, TALLMAN, J. TAYLOR, TURZAI, VULAKOVICH and WATSON

An Act amending Title 62 (Procurement) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for prohibited contracts.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, December 15, 2009.

No. 2172 By Representatives CALTAGIRONE, MANN, HORNAMAN, SCAVELLO, BELFANTI, BEYER, BRENNAN, CARROLL, CASORIO, D. COSTA, CREIGHTON, CUTLER, DALLY, DEASY, DRUCKER, J. EVANS, EVERETT, FAIRCHILD, FRANKEL, GEIST, HALUSKA, HARKINS, HARRIS, HESS, HICKERNELL, KORTZ, MAHONEY, MILLER, MOUL, MUNDY, MURT, O'NEILL, PRESTON, READSHAW, REICHLEY, SANTONI, SIPTROTH, K. SMITH, SOLOBAY, SONNEY, STERN, STEVENSON, SWANGER, WANSACZ, WATERS, WATSON, WHITE and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for jurisdiction and venue.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, December 15, 2009.

No. 2173 By Representatives CALTAGIRONE, SIPTROTH, MANN, SOLOBAY, CARROLL, D. COSTA, DeLUCA, HARKINS, MAHONEY, PYLE, REICHLEY, THOMAS, VULAKOVICH and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending Title 71 (State Government) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for the definition of "superannuation age."

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, December 15, 2009.

No. 2174 By Representatives CALTAGIRONE, WATERS, STABACK, DERMODY, BELFANTI, CARROLL, COHEN, GOODMAN, HALUSKA, HARKINS, JOHNSON, MURT, MYERS, M. O'BRIEN, PAYTON, PRESTON, REICHLEY, ROSS, SIPTROTH, SWANGER, THOMAS and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act establishing the Community-Based Health Care (CHC) Program in the Department of Health; providing for hospital health clinics and for a tax credit; and making an appropriation.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, December 15, 2009.

No. 2175 By Representatives CALTAGIRONE, BISHOP, SANTARSIERO, QUINN, BEYER, CARROLL, D. COSTA, GINGRICH, GODSHALL, GROVE, HARKINS, HENNESSEY, JOHNSON, KORTZ, MAHONEY, MUNDY, MURT, O'NEILL, PRESTON, REICHLEY, SANTONI, SIPTROTH, K. SMITH, SOLOBAY, THOMAS, WHEATLEY and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, further providing for suspension of operating privilege.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, December 15, 2009.

No. 2176 By Representatives READSHAW, GERGELY, WAGNER, KORTZ, BELFANTI, BRENNAN, CARROLL, DEASY, J. EVANS, FABRIZIO, HANNA, HORNAMAN, SIPTROTH, K. SMITH and STABACK

An Act amending the act of October 5, 1978 (P.L.1109, No.261), known as the Osteopathic Medical Practice Act, further providing for definitions and for athletic trainers.

Referred to Committee on PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE, December 15, 2009.

No. 2177 By Representatives READSHAW, GERGELY, WAGNER, KORTZ, BELFANTI, BRENNAN, CARROLL, DEASY, J. EVANS, FABRIZIO, HANNA, HORNAMAN, SIPTROTH, K. SMITH and STABACK

An Act amending the act of December 20, 1985 (P.L.457, No.112), known as the Medical Practice Act of 1985, further providing for definitions and for athletic trainers.

Referred to Committee on PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE, December 15, 2009.

No. 2178 By Representatives GALLOWAY, BELFANTI, MUSTIO, DiGIROLAMO, CASORIO, BEAR, BOYD, CALTAGIRONE, CIVERA, DERMODY, GIBBONS, GRUCELA, HENNESSEY, HORNAMAN, MURT, OBERLANDER, PRESTON, SANTARSIERO, SIPTROTH, K. SMITH, SOLOBAY, THOMAS, WANSACZ and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending the act of November 29, 2004 (P.L.1282, No.158), known as the Manufactured Housing Improvement Act, expanding the coverage of the act to relocated housing.

Referred to Committee on LABOR RELATIONS, December 15, 2009.

No. 2179 By Representatives SCHRODER, BAKER, BOYD, CUTLER, GINGRICH, GROVE, HUTCHINSON, KILLION, MARSICO, METCALFE, MOUL, PICKETT, PYLE, REICHLEY, ROAE, SAYLOR, STERN, SWANGER, TALLMAN, TRUE, VULAKOVICH and WATSON

A Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, providing for health care services.

Referred to Committee on INSURANCE, December 15, 2009.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY COMMITTEE MEETING

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

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that we will in fact be holding the public hearing of the energy conservation committee tomorrow. We are going to attempt to start at 9:30. I wanted the members to be aware of that, and we will hopefully be done by the start of session. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Environmental Resources and Energy will meet at 9:30 tomorrow morning.

SENATE MESSAGE**RECESS RESOLUTION
FOR CONCURRENCE**

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, presented the following extract from the Journal of the Senate, which was read as follows:

In the Senate,
December 15, 2009

RESOLVED, (the House of Representatives concurring), Pursuant to Article II, Section 14 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, that when the Senate recesses this week, it reconvene on Tuesday, January 5, 2010, unless sooner recalled by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate; and be it further

RESOLVED, Pursuant to Article II, Section 14 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, that when the Senate recesses the week of January 5th, it reconvene on Monday, January 25, 2010, unless sooner recalled by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate; and be it further

RESOLVED, Pursuant to Article II, Section 14 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, that when the House of Representatives recesses this week, it reconvene on Tuesday, January 5, 2010, unless sooner recalled by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and be it further

RESOLVED, Pursuant to Article II, Section 14 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, that when the House of Representatives recesses the week of January 5th, it reconvene on Monday, January 25, 2010, unless sooner recalled by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the House of Representatives for its concurrence.

On the question,
Will the House concur in the resolution of the Senate?
Resolution was concurred in.
Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

**CONSUMER AFFAIRS
COMMITTEE MEETING**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Representative Preston, for the purpose of an announcement.

Mr. PRESTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to bring to the attention of the members of the Consumer Affairs Committee, to the members of the Consumer Affairs Committee, we will be having a voting meeting of the full committee tomorrow at 10 o'clock in 205 of the Matt Ryan Building. That is Consumer Affairs, room 205 of the Matt Ryan Building. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Consumer Affairs will meet tomorrow at 10 a.m. in room 205 of the Ryan Building.

Are there any further announcements?

RECESS

The SPEAKER. This House stands in recess until the call of the Chair, unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.