

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 4, 2012

SESSION OF 2012

196TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 23

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

**THE SPEAKER (SAMUEL H. SMITH)
PRESIDING**

PRAYER

HON. JOHN A. LAWRENCE, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Father, we are grateful for Your hand of mercy upon each of us who is here in this chamber today. We thank You for the opportunity to serve the people of this great Commonwealth, a land that You have blessed with Your mighty hand.

Father, we ask Your special blessing this day on the family of the late Senator John Heinz, remembering that it was 21 years ago today that he lost his life in a tragic plane crash. He served the people of this State with honor and distinction, and his death left a void that we feel to this day. We also ask Your blessing upon the families of the others who lost their lives in that accident. Comfort them, Father, on what must certainly be a difficult day.

May it be a reminder to us that no man knows the day nor the hour that his soul will be required of him. May it be an inspiration to us to lay aside the partisan differences that so often entangle us, and may it spur us to truly work toward what is best for the people of Pennsylvania. Lead us even this day as we consider legislation, as we meet in caucus, and as we speak with one another on the issues of our time.

We humbly ask this in the name of Jesus the Christ. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Tuesday, April 3, 2012, will be postponed until printed.

SENATE MESSAGE

HOUSE BILLS
CONCURRED IN BY SENATE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 469, PN 2756, and HB 470, PN 2757**, with information that the Senate has passed the same without amendment.

SENATE MESSAGE

AMENDED HOUSE BILLS RETURNED
FOR CONCURRENCE AND
REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 823, PN 3335, and HB 1500, PN 3336**, with information that the Senate has passed the same with amendment in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives is requested.

SENATE MESSAGE

HOUSE AMENDMENTS
CONCURRED IN BY SENATE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, informed that the Senate has concurred in the amendments made by the House of Representatives to **SB 110, PN 2051; SB 730, PN 2034; SB 743, PN 1843; SB 815, PN 2033; and SB 1167, PN 1947**.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Turn to leaves of absence.

The majority whip has no leave requests for today.

The Speaker recognizes the minority whip, who requests a leave of absence for the gentleman, Mr. HORNAMAN, from Erie County for the day, and the lady, Ms. BISHOP, from Philadelphia County for the day. Without objection, the leaves will be granted.

**BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE,
CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED**

SB 342, PN 549

By Rep. HARHART

An Act amending the act of June 15, 1982 (P.L.502, No.140), known as the Occupational Therapy Practice Act, further providing for definitions, for creation of board, for requirements for licensure, for practice and referral, for renewal of licenses and for refusal, suspension or revocation of license; and providing for impaired professionals program.

PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE.

MASTER ROLL CALL

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

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—195

Adolph	Dunbar	Kirkland	Quigley
Aument	Ellis	Knowles	Quinn
Baker	Emrick	Kortz	Rapp
Barbin	Evankovich	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Evans, D.	Krieger	Readshaw
Bear	Evans, J.	Kula	Reed
Benninghoff	Everett	Lawrence	Reese
Bloom	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roae
Boback	Farry	Maher	Rock
Boyd	Fleck	Mahoney	Roebuck
Boyle, B.	Frankel	Major	Ross
Boyle, K.	Freeman	Maloney	Sabatina
Bradford	Gabler	Mann	Saccone
Brennan	Galloway	Markosek	Sainato
Briggs	Geist	Marshall	Samuelson
Brooks	George	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brown, R.	Gerber	Masser	Santoni
Brown, V.	Gergely	Matzie	Saylor
Brownlee	Gibbons	McGeehan	Scavello
Burns	Gillen	Metcalfe	Schroder
Buxton	Gillespie	Metzgar	Simmons
Caltagirone	Gingrich	Miccarelli	Smith, K.
Carroll	Godshall	Micozzie	Smith, M.
Causar	Goodman	Millard	Sonney
Christiana	Grell	Miller	Staback
Clymer	Grove	Milne	Stephens
Cohen	Hackett	Mirabito	Stern
Conklin	Hahn	Moul	Stevenson
Costa, D.	Haluska	Mullery	Sturla
Costa, P.	Hanna	Mundy	Swanger
Cox	Harhai	Murphy	Tallman
Creighton	Harhart	Murt	Taylor
Cruz	Harkins	Mustio	Thomas
Culver	Harper	Myers	Tobash
Curry	Harris	Neuman	Toepel
Cutler	Heffley	O'Brien, M.	Toohil
Daley	Helm	O'Neill	Truitt
Davidson	Hennessey	Oberlander	Turzai
Davis	Hess	Parker	Vereb
Day	Hickernell	Pashinski	Vitali
Deasy	Hutchinson	Payne	Vulakovich
DeLissio	Josephs	Payton	Waters
Delozier	Kampf	Peifer	Watson
DeLuca	Kauffman	Perry	Wheatley

Denlinger	Kavulich	Petrarca	White
DePasquale	Keller, F.	Petri	Youngblood
Dermody	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	
DeWeese	Keller, W.	Preston	Smith, S.,
DiGirolamo	Killion	Pyle	Speaker
Donatucci			

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Bishop Hornaman

LEAVES ADDED—7

Boyd Gerber Micozzie Roebuck
Briggs McGeehan Murt

LEAVES CANCELED—1

Briggs

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

**HOUSE BILLS
INTRODUCED AND REFERRED**

No. 2202 By Representatives KAMPF, BEAR, BLOOM, CLYMER, CUTLER, DAY, DUNBAR, EVANKOVICH, GABLER, GINGRICH, GRELL, GROVE, HENNESSEY, LAWRENCE, MURT, PERRY, ROSS, SAYLOR, SIMMONS, STEPHENS, TOEPEL, TRUITT and VEREB

An Act amending the act of June 1, 1945 (P.L.1242, No.428), known as the State Highway Law, providing for commemorative designations; and making editorial changes.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, April 4, 2012.

No. 2301 By Representatives DALEY, HESS, BOYD, V. BROWN, CALTAGIRONE, CLYMER, COHEN, D. COSTA, DAVIS, DAVIDSON, DeLUCA, FRANKEL, GEIST, GIBBONS, HORNAMAN, JOSEPHS, KOTIK, KULA, MAHONEY, MANN, McGEEHAN, PRESTON, REED, WATERS, WATSON and WHEATLEY

An Act providing for the Homeowner Assistance Settlement Act; establishing a fund for the purpose of funding the Homeowner's Emergency Mortgage Assistance Program; and providing for an appropriation.

Referred to Committee on URBAN AFFAIRS, April 4, 2012.

No. 2302 By Representatives PETRI, MARSICO, CLYMER, COHEN, CREIGHTON, DALEY, DAVIDSON, DeLUCA, DONATUCCI, J. EVANS, GEIST, GINGRICH, HACKETT,

HARHART, MILLARD, MURT, QUINN, RAPP, READSHAW, SCAVELLO, STEPHENS, THOMAS, TOOHL, VEREB, VULAKOVICH, WATSON and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in child protective services, further providing for definitions; and providing for a Children's Advocate and remedial powers, for response to complaints, for cooperation of agencies and providers, for confidentiality of investigations and records, for findings and recommendations, for protection from retaliation and for nonexclusivity of remedy.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, April 4, 2012.

No. 2303 By Representatives TRUITT, CREIGHTON, DAVIDSON, GEIST, KAUFFMAN, KNOWLES, MOUL, PAYTON, ROCK and ROSS

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in background checks for employment in schools, further providing for definitions, for requirement relating to administrators and for fee.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, April 4, 2012.

No. 2304 By Representatives TRUITT, CREIGHTON, DAVIDSON, GEIST, KAUFFMAN, KNOWLES, MOUL, PAYTON, ROCK and ROSS

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in preliminary provisions, further providing for background checks of prospective employees and conviction of employees of certain offenses.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, April 4, 2012.

SENATE BILLS FOR CONCURRENCE

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

SB 341, PN 2036

Referred to Committee on AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS, April 4, 2012.

SB 1150, PN 2037

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, April 4, 2012.

SB 1395, PN 1925

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, April 4, 2012.

The SPEAKER. The House will come to order, please. If members could kindly hold the conversations down.

UNCONTESTED CALENDAR

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. READSHAW called up HR 589, PN 3137, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of May 2012 as "Motorcycle Safety and Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. STURLA called up HR 604, PN 3171, entitled:

A Resolution designating April 4, 2012, as "Thaddeus Stevens Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. CALTAGIRONE called up HR 609, PN 3176, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing May 3, 2012, as the "National Day of Prayer" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. MATZIE called up HR 638, PN 3276, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing May 1, 2012, as "World Asthma Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. HICKERNELL called up HR 645, PN 3305, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of May 2012 as "Foster Care Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. EMRICK called up HR 646, PN 3306, entitled:

A Resolution observing the month of May 2012 as "Preeclampsia Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

On the question, Will the House adopt the resolutions?

YEAS—195

Table with 4 columns of names: Adolph, Aument, Baker, Barbin, Barrar, Bear, Benninghoff, Bloom, Boback, Boyd, Boyle, B., Boyle, K., Bradford, Brennan, Dunbar, Ellis, Emrick, Evankovich, Evans, D., Evans, J., Everett, Fabrizio, Farry, Fleck, Frankel, Freeman, Gabler, Galloway, Kirkland, Knowles, Kortz, Kotik, Krieger, Kula, Lawrence, Longietti, Maher, Mahoney, Major, Maloney, Mann, Markosek, Quigley, Quinn, Rapp, Ravenstahl, Readshaw, Reed, Reese, Roae, Rock, Roebuck, Ross, Sabatina, Saccone, Sainato

Briggs	Geist	Marshall	Samuelson
Brooks	George	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brown, R.	Gerber	Masser	Santoni
Brown, V.	Gergely	Matzie	Saylor
Brownlee	Gibbons	McGeehan	Scavello
Burns	Gillen	Metcalfe	Schroder
Buxton	Gillespie	Metzgar	Simmons
Caltagirone	Gingrich	Miccarelli	Smith, K.
Carroll	Godshall	Micozzie	Smith, M.
Causser	Goodman	Millard	Sonney
Christiana	Grell	Miller	Staback
Clymer	Grove	Milne	Stephens
Cohen	Hackett	Mirabito	Stern
Conklin	Hahn	Moul	Stevenson
Costa, D.	Haluska	Mullery	Sturla
Costa, P.	Hanna	Mundy	Swanger
Cox	Harhai	Murphy	Tallman
Creighton	Harhart	Murt	Taylor
Cruz	Harkins	Mustio	Thomas
Culver	Harper	Myers	Tobash
Curry	Harris	Neuman	Toepel
Cutler	Heffley	O'Brien, M.	Toohil
Daley	Helm	O'Neill	Truitt
Davidson	Hennessey	Oberlander	Turzai
Davis	Hess	Parker	Vereb
Day	Hickernell	Pashinski	Vitali
Deasy	Hutchinson	Payne	Vulakovich
DeLissio	Josephs	Payton	Waters
Delozier	Kampf	Peifer	Watson
DeLuca	Kauffman	Perry	Wheatley
Denlinger	Kavulich	Petrarca	White
DePasquale	Keller, F.	Petri	Youngblood
Dermody	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	
DeWeese	Keller, W.	Preston	Smith, S.,
DiGirolamo	Killion	Pyle	Speaker
Donatucci			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Bishop Hornaman

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

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. If I could have the members' attention, please. Kindly clear the aisles and take the conversations to the rear of the House, if necessary. I would like to introduce some of the guests that are with us today.

Located to the left of the rostrum, we would like to welcome Bart and Connie Howard. They are here today as guests of Representative Mirabito. Will our guests please rise. Welcome to the hall of the House.

Also located to the left of the rostrum, we would like to welcome Nadine Druschel and her children, Grace and Liz; Kim Pizella and her children, Trey, Caroline, and Julia; and Nancy Heberling, and they are here today as the guests of Representative Christiana. Will our guests please rise. Welcome to the hall of the House.

In the rear of the House, we would like to welcome senior political science students from West Chester University. They are accompanied by their professors, John Kennedy and Peter

Loedel, and they are the guests of Representative Tim Briggs, who occasionally teaches these students in his capacity as West Chester's Legislative Fellow. Will our guests please rise. Welcome to the hall of the House.

Also in the rear of the House, we would like to welcome Morgan Driggs from Berks Catholic High School, and she is shadowing Representative Caltagirone for the day. Will our guest please rise. Over here by the door to the right.

FORMER MEMBER WELCOMED

The SPEAKER. And at this point in time, I would like to invite Representative Boyd and Representative Harris to the dais for the purpose of presenting a citation to Debbie Acor. And along with that I wanted to welcome one other guest who is with us. Former Representative Jere Schuler is with us, and he is here kind of to be a part of this citation presentation. Jere, welcome back to the hall of the House.

Will the gentleman suspend for a second. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Geist, rise?

Mr. GEIST. Would the gentleman, Mr. Schuler, submit to interrogation?

The SPEAKER. You will get a short answer.

DEBBIE ACOR PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Lancaster, Mr. Boyd, is recognized for the purpose of presenting a citation. If we could have the members' attention, please.

Mr. BOYD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have been kind of looking forward to this day, and then a part of me has been apprehensive about this day. Today on the House floor, Representative Harris and I are going to present a citation to my secretary and his constituent, Debbie Acor.

I would like, if possible – if Deb would stand – Debbie actually has worked for the House for over 35 years, and if you look over, you will note that she started working in the House when she was 12. And she has had a long and distinguished career, and again I refer to the speech on the floor yesterday from the gentleman from Greene County that talked about how important our staff is, and I do not think anybody appreciates what it is like to have a tremendous staff as we members. Particularly when you are a freshman and you arrive here in this whole new world, to have somebody with the experience of Debbie was just a tremendous blessing to me.

My predecessor, Jere Schuler, who Speaker Smith introduced, Deb worked for Jere for 20 years before she started working for me, and I am now in my 10th year. So Deb Acor has been the legislative secretary, support staff, for the people of Lancaster County in the 43d District for 30 years. That is the entire time the 43d has existed in Lancaster County from the time it was actually moved back in 1980.

And the folks in Lancaster County have been blessed to have somebody who responds immediately, gets answers to the questions, and actually has the tact and the grace to give them the truth and make them feel good that they got the truth, and we all know what that is like. Sometimes while the truth will set us free, as the plaque in the ceiling of the House says, sometimes the truth hurts. And Deb is one of those people that has the ability to deliver the truth in a gracious and a kind way,

and it has always been a blessing to me. I say that because when I got here, she told me the truth about a few things as a young legislator and taught me the ropes, and I am so grateful that she was able to do that.

So on behalf of Representative Harris – Deb lives in Representative Harris's district – and myself, the folks from Lancaster County, and I am sure Representative Schuler would say this, she is a terrific person. We wish her well in her retirement. She and her husband, Don, I just hope you guys have the greatest time in the next coming years and many, many, many more of them.

FAMILY INTRODUCED

Mr. BOYD. With Deb today is her husband, Don. So, Don, if you would stand and be recognized. And Deb's mom is here, Ann Sierer. Ann, would you rise, please? You know, you can tell a lot about a person by their offspring. You must be a terrific mom, because Deb is just awesome.

Would everybody please give them a warm welcome.

UNCONTESTED SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. FRANKEL called up **HR 662, PN 3348**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the week of April 2 through 6, 2012, as "Graduate and Professional Student Appreciation Week" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. VITALI called up **HR 664, PN 3349**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of April 2012 as "Distracted Driving Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. McGEEHAN called up **HR 667, PN 3350**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing President Franklin Delano Roosevelt for his strength, courage and determination through a time of national crisis and war in remembrance of the occasion of his death.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolutions?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—195

Adolph	Dunbar	Kirkland	Quigley
Aument	Ellis	Knowles	Quinn
Baker	Emrick	Kortz	Rapp
Barbin	Evankovich	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Evans, D.	Krieger	Readshaw
Bear	Evans, J.	Kula	Reed
Benninghoff	Everett	Lawrence	Reese
Bloom	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roae
Boback	Farry	Maher	Rock
Boyd	Fleck	Mahoney	Roebuck
Boyle, B.	Frankel	Major	Ross

Boyle, K.	Freeman	Maloney	Sabatina
Bradford	Gabler	Mann	Saccone
Brennan	Galloway	Markosek	Sainato
Briggs	Geist	Marshall	Samuelson
Brooks	George	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brown, R.	Gerber	Masser	Santoni
Brown, V.	Gergely	Matzie	Saylor
Brownlee	Gibbons	McGeehan	Scavello
Burns	Gillen	Metcalfe	Schroder
Buxton	Gillespie	Metzgar	Simmons
Caltagirone	Gingrich	Miccarelli	Smith, K.
Carroll	Godshall	Micozzie	Smith, M.
Causer	Goodman	Millard	Sonney
Christiana	Grell	Miller	Staback
Clymer	Grove	Milne	Stephens
Cohen	Hackett	Mirabito	Stern
Conklin	Hahn	Moul	Stevenson
Costa, D.	Haluska	Mullery	Sturla
Costa, P.	Hanna	Mundy	Swanger
Cox	Harhai	Murphy	Tallman
Creighton	Harhart	Murt	Taylor
Cruz	Harkins	Mustio	Thomas
Culver	Harper	Myers	Tobash
Curry	Harris	Neuman	Toepel
Cutler	Heffley	O'Brien, M.	Toohil
Daley	Helm	O'Neill	Truitt
Davidson	Hennessey	Oberlander	Turzai
Davis	Hess	Parker	Vereb
Day	Hickernell	Pashinski	Vitali
Deasy	Hutchinson	Payne	Vulakovich
DeLissio	Josephs	Payton	Waters
DeLozier	Kampf	Peifer	Watson
DeLuca	Kauffman	Perry	Wheatley
Denlinger	Kavulich	Petrarca	White
DePasquale	Keller, F.	Petri	Youngblood
Dermody	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	
DeWeese	Keller, W.	Preston	Smith, S.,
DiGirolamo	Killion	Pyle	Speaker
Donatucci			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Bishop Hornaman

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

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. I would like to welcome a couple other guests that are with us.

Up in the balcony, as guests of Representative Major, we would like to welcome Susquehanna County commissioner Maryann Warren and Susquehanna County conservation director Jim Gardner. Will our guests please rise. Welcome to the hall of the House, up in the top right of the balcony.

And in the rear of the House, we would like to welcome Maggie Quinn, Representative Quinn's daughter, and friends Gina Feghali and D.J. Ryan, and they are here visiting from Penn State, and most surprisingly they are the guests of Representative Marguerite Quinn. Will our guests please rise. Oh, back here in the center. Sorry. Welcome to the hall of the House.

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

HB 2168, PN 3041 By Rep. BARRAR

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for the pay of officers and enlisted personnel in active State service.

VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY
PREPAREDNESS.

HB 2199, PN 3358 (Amended) By Rep. BARRAR

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for duty of driver in emergency response areas.

VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY
PREPAREDNESS.

**RESOLUTION REPORTED
FROM COMMITTEE**

HR 542, PN 3008 By Rep. BARRAR

A Resolution supporting the efforts of Vietnam Veteran's Memorial Fund to construct an underground learning facility at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial to inform future generations of the honor and sacrifices made by those who served their country.

VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY
PREPAREDNESS.

**RULES AND APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. The lady, Ms. Major, from Susquehanna County is recognized for the purpose of an announcement.

Ms. MAJOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to announce that there will be an immediate Rules Committee meeting. That meeting will be held in the Appropriations conference room.

There will be an Appropriations Committee meeting at 11:45, and that meeting will be held in the majority caucus room.

And at 12 noon, Republicans will caucus, and we would be prepared to come back on the floor at 12:30.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Rules will meet immediately in the Appropriations conference room, and Appropriations will meet at 11:45 in the majority caucus room.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Frankel, is recognized for the purpose of a caucus announcement.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There will be a Democratic caucus at 12 noon; Democratic caucus at 12 noon. Thank you very much.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Seeing no further business at this moment, this House stands in recess until 12:30, unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

RECESS EXTENDED

The time of recess was extended until 12:45 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

**BILLS ON CONCURRENCE
REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**

HB 823, PN 3335

An Act amending the act of July 31, 1968 (P.L.805, No.247), known as the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, in subdivision and land development, providing for notice to school district; in planned residential development, further providing for application for final approval; and providing for wastewater processing cooperative planning.

RULES.

HB 1500, PN 3336

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, consolidating the Long-Term Care Patient Access to Pharmaceuticals Act; further providing for declaration of policy, for definitions and for third-party drugs in long-term care facilities; and making a related repeal.

RULES.

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HB 3, PN 3114 By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending Title 74 (Transportation) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for public-private transportation partnerships; and making a related repeal.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 153, PN 3347 By Rep. ADOLPH

A Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, reducing the size of the General Assembly.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1478, PN 1785 By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of August 9, 1955 (P.L.323, No.130), known as The County Code, in alternative provision for third class county convention center authorities, further providing for hotel room rental tax.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1588, PN 3346

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of August 9, 1955 (P.L.323, No.130), known as The County Code, in fiscal affairs, further providing for authorization of five per centum hotel tax in certain counties of the fifth class.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1749, PN 2238

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of August 9, 1955 (P.L.323, No.130), known as The County Code, in fiscal affairs, further providing for authorization of hotel tax.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1839, PN 2356

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act redesignating Duboistown Bridge, connecting Williamsport and Duboistown over the Susquehanna River, Lycoming County, as the Lance Corporal Abram Howard Memorial Bridge.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2136, PN 2981

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for prevention of abduction of children.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2137, PN 2989

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act providing for a temporary moratorium of court-ordered countywide reassessments and for reforms based upon study.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2244, PN 3297

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act providing for watershed disaster reconstruction.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 375, PN 2093

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending Title 53 (Municipalities Generally) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in municipal authorities, further providing for money.

APPROPRIATIONS.

CALENDAR

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1916, PN 3298**, entitled:

An Act itemizing public improvement projects for flood protection and flood damage repair to be constructed by the Department of General Services, together with their estimated financial costs; providing for the adoption of specific disaster mitigation or assistance projects or flood assistance projects, together with their estimated financial costs; authorizing the use of interest earnings held by the Commonwealth Financing Authority for funding the projects; and making appropriations.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

Adolph	Donatucci	Killion	Quigley
Aument	Dunbar	Kirkland	Quinn
Baker	Ellis	Knowles	Rapp
Barbin	Emrick	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Evankovich	Kotik	Readshaw
Bear	Evans, D.	Krieger	Reed
Benninghoff	Evans, J.	Kula	Reese
Bloom	Everett	Longietti	Roae
Boback	Fabrizio	Maher	Rock
Boyd	Farry	Mahoney	Roebuck
Boyle, B.	Fleck	Major	Ross
Boyle, K.	Frankel	Maloney	Sabatina
Bradford	Freeman	Mann	Saccone
Brennan	Gabler	Markosek	Sainato
Briggs	Galloway	Marshall	Samuelson
Brooks	Geist	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brown, R.	George	Masser	Santoni
Brown, V.	Gerber	Matzie	Saylor
Brownlee	Gergely	McGeehan	Scavello
Burns	Gibbons	Metcalfe	Schroder
Buxton	Gillen	Metzgar	Simmons
Caltagirone	Gillespie	Miccarelli	Smith, K.
Carroll	Gingrich	Micozzie	Smith, M.
Causer	Godshall	Millard	Sonney
Christiana	Goodman	Miller	Staback
Clymer	Grell	Milne	Stephens
Cohen	Grove	Mirabito	Stern
Conklin	Hackett	Moul	Stevenson
Costa, D.	Hahn	Mullery	Sturla
Costa, P.	Haluska	Mundy	Swanger
Cox	Hanna	Murphy	Tallman
Creighton	Harhai	Murt	Taylor
Cruz	Harhart	Mustio	Thomas
Culver	Harkins	Myers	Tobash
Curry	Harper	Neuman	Toepel
Cutler	Harris	O'Brien, M.	Toohil
Daley	Heffley	O'Neill	Turzai
Davidson	Helm	Oberlander	Vereb
Davis	Hennessey	Parker	Vitali
Day	Hess	Pashinski	Vulakovich
Deasy	Hickernell	Payne	Waters
DeLissio	Hutchinson	Payton	Watson
Delozier	Josephs	Peifer	Wheatley
DeLuca	Kampf	Perry	White
Denlinger	Kauffman	Petrarca	Youngblood
DePasquale	Kavulich	Petri	
Dermody	Keller, F.	Pickett	Smith, S.,
DeWeese	Keller, M.K.	Preston	Speaker
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Pyle	

NAYS—2

Lawrence Truitt

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Bishop Hornaman

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.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Speaker returns to leaves of absence and recognizes the minority whip, who requests a leave of absence for the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. McGEEHAN, for the remainder of the day. Without objection, the leave will be granted.

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of HB 2077, PN 3266, entitled:

An Act providing for a Small Business Flood Relief Supplementation Program; making an appropriation; and providing for termination of the program.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

- Adolph Donatucci Killion Quigley
Aument Dunbar Kirkland Quinn
Baker Ellis Knowles Rapp
Barbin Emrick Kortz Ravenstahl
Barrar Evankovich Kotik Readshaw
Bear Evans, D. Krieger Reed
Benninghoff Evans, J. Kula Reese
Bloom Everett Lawrence Roae
Boback Fabrizio Longietti Rock
Boyd Farry Maher Roebuck
Boyle, B. Fleck Mahoney Ross
Boyle, K. Frankel Major Sabatina
Bradford Freeman Maloney Saccone
Brennan Gabler Mann Sainato
Briggs Galloway Markosek Samuelson
Brooks Geist Marshall Santarsiero
Brown, R. George Marsico Santoni
Brown, V. Gerber Masser Saylor
Brownlee Gergely Matzie Scavello

- Burns Gibbons Metcalfe Schroder
Buxton Gillen Metzgar Simmons
Caltagirone Gillespie Miccarelli Smith, K.
Carroll Gingrich Micozzie Smith, M.
Causer Godshall Millard Sonney
Christiana Goodman Miller Staback
Clymer Grell Milne Stephens
Cohen Grove Mirabito Stern
Conklin Hackett Moul Stevenson
Costa, D. Hahn Mullery Sturla
Costa, P. Haluska Mundy Swanger
Cox Hanna Murphy Tallman
Creighton Harhai Murt Taylor
Cruz Harhart Mustio Thomas
Culver Harkins Myers Tobash
Curry Harper Neuman Toepel
Cutler Harris O'Brien, M. Toohil
Daley Heffley O'Neill Truitt
Davidson Helm Oberlander Turzai
Davis Hennessey Parker Vereb
Day Hess Pashinski Vitali
Deasy Hickernell Payne Vulakovich
DeLissio Hutchinson Payton Waters
DeLozier Josephs Peifer Watson
DeLuca Kampf Perry Wheatley
Denlinger Kauffman Petrarca White
DePasquale Kavulich Petri Youngblood
Dermody Keller, F. Pickett
DeWeese Keller, M.K. Preston Smith, S.,
DiGirolamo Keller, W. Pyle Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Bishop Hornaman McGeehan

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 2245, PN 3301, entitled:

An Act providing for the adoption of capital projects related to flood disaster railroad assistance projects.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—190

Adolph	Dunbar	Killion	Quigley
Aument	Ellis	Kirkland	Quinn
Baker	Emrick	Knowles	Rapp
Barbin	Evankovich	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Evans, D.	Kotik	Readshaw
Bear	Evans, J.	Krieger	Reed
Benninghoff	Everett	Kula	Reese
Boback	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roae
Boyd	Farry	Maher	Rock
Boyle, B.	Fleck	Mahoney	Roebuck
Boyle, K.	Frankel	Major	Ross
Bradford	Freeman	Maloney	Sabatina
Brennan	Gabler	Mann	Saccone
Briggs	Galloway	Markosek	Sainato
Brooks	Geist	Marshall	Samuelson
Brown, R.	George	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brownlee	Gerber	Masser	Santoni
Burns	Gergely	Matzie	Saylor
Buxton	Gibbons	Metcalfe	Scavello
Caltagirone	Gillen	Metzgar	Schroder
Carroll	Gillespie	Miccarelli	Simmons
Causier	Gingrich	Micozzie	Smith, K.
Christiana	Godshall	Millard	Smith, M.
Clymer	Goodman	Miller	Sonney
Cohen	Grell	Milne	Staback
Conklin	Grove	Mirabito	Stephens
Costa, D.	Hackett	Moul	Stern
Costa, P.	Hahn	Mullery	Stevenson
Cox	Haluska	Mundy	Sturla
Creighton	Hanna	Murphy	Swanger
Cruz	Harhai	Murt	Tallman
Culver	Harhart	Mustio	Taylor
Curry	Harkins	Myers	Thomas
Cutler	Harper	Neuman	Tobash
Daley	Harris	O'Brien, M.	Toepel
Davidson	Heffley	O'Neill	Toohil
Davis	Helm	Oberlander	Turzai
Day	Hennessey	Parker	Vereb
Deasy	Hess	Pashinski	Vitali
DeLissio	Hickernell	Payne	Vulakovich
Delozier	Hutchinson	Payton	Waters
DeLuca	Josephs	Peifer	Watson
Denlinger	Kampf	Perry	Wheatley
DePasquale	Kauffman	Petrarca	White
Dermody	Kavulich	Petri	Youngblood
DeWeese	Keller, F.	Pickett	
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Preston	Smith, S.,
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Pyle	Speaker

NAYS—4

Bloom	Brown, V.	Lawrence	Truitt
-------	-----------	----------	--------

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Bishop	Hornaman	McGeehan
--------	----------	----------

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the bill passed finally.

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1839, PN 2356**, entitled:

An Act redesignating Duboistown Bridge, connecting Williamsport and Duboistown over the Susquehanna River, Lycoming County, as the Lance Corporal Abram Howard Memorial Bridge.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

If the House would please come to order. I would appreciate it if the members would take their seats, clear the aisles.

This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Mirabito.

Mr. MIRABITO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to my colleagues for your attention.

I rise today to speak with you about HB 1839 and to tell you a story about a young man named LCpl. Abram Howard.

FAMILY INTRODUCED

Mr. MIRABITO. I am joined today by his parents, Bart and Connie Howard. Please give them a warm welcome.

Let me take you back to when Lance Corporal Howard was a small boy, a small boy who loved to hunt at his grandfather's cabin. Abe and his brother, Alex, traveled with their family to their grandfather's cabin on Jacks Hollow Road in Lycoming County. Jacks Hollow is a winding mountain road. It is very wooded, with a lot of deer and a lot of game. The area is filled with good, friendly people who have lived there a long time. It is a beautiful place to run and play as a small boy, and what made the trip memorable was driving with their grandfather.

The road to Jacks Hollow crosses the west branch of the Susquehanna River from Williamsport to Duboistown. The bridge is being rebuilt now, but at that time it was a narrow steel bridge, the kind of bridge that makes your tires swerve and rumble as you cross it. Abe and Alex drove across that bridge many times on the way to their grandfather's cabin.

Like many young boys, Abe wanted to drive, so much so that when he was about 11 years old, Abe often argued with his grandfather that he should be allowed to drive across the bridge. Of course, his grandfather pointed out that Abe was much too young to do anything of that kind, but Abe persisted. It became an epic debate between grandfather and grandson. Eventually, Abe's persuasive nature swayed his grandfather, who allowed him to drive across the narrow steel bridge. Abe and Alex never knew at that time the significance of driving across that bridge.

As they grew up, Abe's determination led him to become LCpl. Abram Howard of the United States Marines. His commitment took him to a land far away from his family, far from the narrow bridge and the drives with his grandfather. LCpl. Abram Howard became a third-generation Marine and the 12th member of his family to enlist and serve.

In December of 2009, Lance Corporal Howard volunteered for deployment to Afghanistan, where he served bravely until his death in July 2010 at the age of 21. For his bravery, Lance Corporal Howard was awarded a number of citations, including the Purple Heart, the Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal with distinguished "V" device, the Combat Action Ribbon, the National Defense Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Medal, the Sea Service Deployment Ribbon, the Armed Forces Service Medal, and the NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) Medal.

With the redesignation of the Duboistown Bridge as the "Lance Corporal Abram Howard Memorial Bridge," we create a permanent reminder of one young man's patriotism, courage, and commitment to service to our country. With this bridge naming, we say thank you to LCpl. Abram Howard and his family.

Since his death, Abram's family has twice hosted members of Lance Corporal Howard's unit at his grandfather's cabin. The family plans on doing so again this summer. His family has grown by about 50 members, Marines and their families. Not surprisingly, they all seem to know about grandfather's cabin and the narrow steel bridge.

I ask for your support for HB 1839. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Speaker returns to leaves of absence and recognizes the minority whip, who requests a leave of absence for the gentleman, Mr. BRIGGS, from Montgomery County for the day. Without objection, leave will be granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 1839 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Members and all guests will please rise out of a sign of respect for the fallen Marine and then a moment of silent prayer for the family and friends.

(Whereupon, the members of the House and all visitors stood in a moment of silence in solemn respect to the memory of Marine Corps LCpl. Abram L. Howard.)

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—193

Adolph	Dunbar	Kirkland	Quinn
Aument	Ellis	Knowles	Rapp
Baker	Emrick	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Barbin	Evankovich	Kotik	Readshaw
Barrar	Evans, D.	Krieger	Reed
Bear	Evans, J.	Kula	Reese
Benninghoff	Everett	Lawrence	Roae

Bloom	Fabrizio	Longietti	Rock
Boback	Farry	Maher	Roebuck
Boyd	Fleck	Mahoney	Ross
Boyle, B.	Frankel	Major	Sabatina
Boyle, K.	Freeman	Maloney	Saccone
Bradford	Gabler	Mann	Sainato
Brennan	Galloway	Markosek	Samuelson
Brooks	Geist	Marshall	Santarsiero
Brown, R.	George	Marsico	Santoni
Brown, V.	Gerber	Masser	Saylor
Brownlee	Gergely	Matzie	Scavello
Burns	Gibbons	Metcalfe	Schroder
Buxton	Gillen	Metzgar	Simmons
Caltagirone	Gillespie	Miccarelli	Smith, K.
Carroll	Gingrich	Micozzie	Smith, M.
Causer	Godshall	Millard	Sonney
Christiana	Goodman	Miller	Staback
Clymer	Grell	Milne	Stephens
Cohen	Grove	Mirabito	Stern
Conklin	Hackett	Moul	Stevenson
Costa, D.	Hahn	Mullery	Sturla
Costa, P.	Haluska	Mundy	Swanger
Cox	Hanna	Murphy	Tallman
Creighton	Harhai	Murt	Taylor
Cruz	Harhart	Mustio	Thomas
Culver	Harkins	Myers	Tobash
Curry	Harper	Neuman	Toepel
Cutler	Harris	O'Brien, M.	Toohil
Daley	Heffley	O'Neill	Truitt
Davidson	Helm	Oberlander	Turzai
Davis	Hennessey	Parker	Vereb
Day	Hess	Pashinski	Vitali
Deasy	Hickernell	Payne	Vulakovich
DeLissio	Hutchinson	Payton	Waters
Delozier	Josephs	Peifer	Watson
DeLuca	Kampf	Perry	Wheatley
Denlinger	Kauffman	Petrarca	White
DePasquale	Kavulich	Petri	Youngblood
Dermody	Keller, F.	Pickett	
DeWeese	Keller, M.K.	Preston	Smith, S., Speaker
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Pyle	
Donatucci	Killion	Quigley	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Bishop	Briggs	Hornaman	McGeehan
--------	--------	----------	----------

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 2244, PN 3297**, entitled:

An Act providing for watershed disaster reconstruction.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

Adolph	Dunbar	Kirkland	Quinn
Aument	Ellis	Knowles	Rapp
Baker	Emrick	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Barbin	Evankovich	Kotik	Readshaw
Barrar	Evans, D.	Krieger	Reed
Bear	Evans, J.	Kula	Reese
Benninghoff	Everett	Lawrence	Roae
Bloom	Fabrizio	Longietti	Rock
Boback	Farry	Maher	Roebuck
Boyd	Fleck	Mahoney	Ross
Boyle, B.	Frankel	Major	Sabatina
Boyle, K.	Freeman	Maloney	Saccone
Bradford	Gabler	Mann	Sainato
Brennan	Galloway	Markosek	Samuelson
Brooks	Geist	Marshall	Santarsiero
Brown, R.	George	Marsico	Santoni
Brown, V.	Gerber	Masser	Saylor
Brownlee	Gergely	Matzie	Scavello
Burns	Gibbons	Metcalfe	Schroder
Buxton	Gillen	Metzgar	Simmons
Caltagirone	Gillespie	Miccarelli	Smith, K.
Carroll	Gingrich	Micozzie	Smith, M.
Causar	Godshall	Millard	Sonney
Christiana	Goodman	Miller	Staback
Clymer	Grell	Milne	Stephens
Cohen	Grove	Mirabito	Stern
Conklin	Hackett	Moul	Stevenson
Costa, D.	Hahn	Mullery	Sturla
Costa, P.	Haluska	Mundy	Swanger
Cox	Hanna	Murphy	Tallman
Creighton	Harhai	Murt	Taylor
Cruz	Harhart	Mustio	Thomas
Culver	Harkins	Myers	Tobash
Curry	Harper	Neuman	Toepel
Cutler	Harris	O'Brien, M.	Toohil
Daley	Heffley	O'Neill	Truitt
Davidson	Helm	Oberlander	Turzai
Davis	Hennessey	Parker	Vereb
Day	Hess	Pashinski	Vitali
Deasy	Hickernell	Payne	Vulakovich
DeLissio	Hutchinson	Payton	Waters
Delozier	Josephs	Peifer	Watson
DeLuca	Kampf	Perry	Wheatley
Denlinger	Kauffman	Petrarca	White
DePasquale	Kavulich	Petri	Youngblood
Dermody	Keller, F.	Pickett	
DeWeese	Keller, M.K.	Preston	Smith, S.,
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Pyle	Speaker
Donatucci	Killion	Quigley	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Bishop	Briggs	Hornaman	McGeehan
--------	--------	----------	----------

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 2136, PN 2981**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for prevention of abduction of children.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

Adolph	Dunbar	Kirkland	Quinn
Aument	Ellis	Knowles	Rapp
Baker	Emrick	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Barbin	Evankovich	Kotik	Readshaw
Barrar	Evans, D.	Krieger	Reed
Bear	Evans, J.	Kula	Reese
Benninghoff	Everett	Lawrence	Roae
Bloom	Fabrizio	Longietti	Rock
Boback	Farry	Maher	Roebuck
Boyd	Fleck	Mahoney	Ross
Boyle, B.	Frankel	Major	Sabatina
Boyle, K.	Freeman	Maloney	Saccone
Bradford	Gabler	Mann	Sainato
Brennan	Galloway	Markosek	Samuelson
Brooks	Geist	Marshall	Santarsiero
Brown, R.	George	Marsico	Santoni
Brown, V.	Gerber	Masser	Saylor
Brownlee	Gergely	Matzie	Scavello
Burns	Gibbons	Metcalfe	Schroder
Buxton	Gillen	Metzgar	Simmons
Caltagirone	Gillespie	Miccarelli	Smith, K.
Carroll	Gingrich	Micozzie	Smith, M.
Causar	Godshall	Millard	Sonney
Christiana	Goodman	Miller	Staback
Clymer	Grell	Milne	Stephens
Cohen	Grove	Mirabito	Stern
Conklin	Hackett	Moul	Stevenson
Costa, D.	Hahn	Mullery	Sturla
Costa, P.	Haluska	Mundy	Swanger
Cox	Hanna	Murphy	Tallman
Creighton	Harhai	Murt	Taylor
Cruz	Harhart	Mustio	Thomas
Culver	Harkins	Myers	Tobash
Curry	Harper	Neuman	Toepel
Cutler	Harris	O'Brien, M.	Toohil
Daley	Heffley	O'Neill	Truitt
Davidson	Helm	Oberlander	Turzai
Davis	Hennessey	Parker	Vereb
Day	Hess	Pashinski	Vitali
Deasy	Hickernell	Payne	Vulakovich
DeLissio	Hutchinson	Payton	Waters
Delozier	Josephs	Peifer	Watson
DeLuca	Kampf	Perry	Wheatley

Denlinger	Kauffman	Petrarca	White
DePasquale	Kavulich	Petri	Youngblood
Dermody	Keller, F.	Pickett	
DeWeese	Keller, M.K.	Preston	Smith, S.,
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Pyle	Speaker
Donatucci	Killion	Quigley	

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-4

Bishop	Briggs	Hornaman	McGeehan
--------	--------	----------	----------

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.

STATEMENT BY MRS. KULA

The SPEAKER. Is the lady from Fayette, Mrs. Kula, seeking recognition under unanimous consent?

Mrs. KULA. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The lady may proceed.

Mrs. KULA. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to take this opportunity to thank the members for their vote on HB 2136. This bill amends Title 23 of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes to enact the Uniform Child Abduction Prevention Act. The act would allow the courts to order abduction prevention measures when children, typically during custody proceedings, are at a risk of being kidnapped.

I am extremely pleased with the bipartisan support that this bill has received. If this bill prevents the heartache and trauma of so much as one child abduction, our work here will have been for the good of Pennsylvania's children.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the lady.

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1478, PN 1785**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of August 9, 1955 (P.L.323, No.130), known as The County Code, in alternative provision for third class county convention center authorities, further providing for hotel room rental tax.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-142

Adolph	DePasquale	Kavulich	Quinn
Aument	Dermody	Keller, W.	Ravenstahl
Barbin	DeWeese	Killion	Readshaw
Bear	DiGirolamo	Kirkland	Roebuck
Boback	Donatucci	Kotik	Ross
Boyd	Ellis	Kula	Sabatina
Boyle, B.	Evans, D.	Longietti	Saccone
Boyle, K.	Evans, J.	Mahoney	Sainato
Bradford	Everett	Major	Samuelson
Brennan	Fabrizio	Mann	Santarsiero
Brooks	Farry	Markosek	Santoni
Brown, R.	Fleck	Marsico	Saylor
Brown, V.	Frankel	Masser	Scavello
Brownlee	Freeman	Matzie	Smith, K.
Burns	Galloway	Miccarelli	Smith, M.
Buxton	Geist	Micozzie	Sonney
Caltagirone	George	Millard	Staback
Carroll	Gerber	Miller	Stephens
Christiana	Gergely	Mirabito	Stern
Clymer	Gibbons	Moul	Stevenson
Cohen	Gillespie	Mundy	Sturla
Conklin	Godshall	Murphy	Tallman
Costa, D.	Goodman	Murt	Taylor
Costa, P.	Grove	Myers	Thomas
Creighton	Hackett	Neuman	Toepel
Cruz	Haluska	O'Brien, M.	Turzai
Curry	Hanna	O'Neill	Vereb
Cutler	Harhai	Oberlander	Vitali
Daley	Harkins	Parker	Vulakovich
Davis	Harper	Pashinski	Waters
Day	Harris	Payton	Watson
Deasy	Hennessey	Peifer	Wheatley
DeLissio	Hess	Perry	Youngblood
Delozier	Hickernell	Petri	
DeLuca	Josephs	Preston	Smith, S.,
Denlinger	Kampf	Pyle	Speaker

NAYS-51

Baker	Gingrich	Lawrence	Rapp
Barrar	Grell	Maher	Reed
Benninghoff	Hahn	Maloney	Reese
Bloom	Harhart	Marshall	Roae
Causar	Heffley	Metcalfe	Rock
Cox	Helm	Metzgar	Schroder
Culver	Hutchinson	Milne	Simmons
Davidson	Kauffman	Mullery	Swanger
Dunbar	Keller, F.	Mustio	Tobash
Emrick	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Toohil
Evankovich	Knowles	Petrarca	Truitt
Gabler	Kortz	Pickett	White
Gillen	Krieger	Quigley	

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-4

Bishop	Briggs	Hornaman	McGeehan
--------	--------	----------	----------

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 1749, PN 2238**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of August 9, 1955 (P.L.323, No.130), known as The County Code, in fiscal affairs, further providing for authorization of hotel tax.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—136

Adolph	DiGirolamo	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Aument	Donatucci	Kula	Readshaw
Barbin	Ellis	Longietti	Roebuck
Bear	Evans, D.	Maher	Ross
Boback	Evans, J.	Mahoney	Sabatina
Boyd	Everett	Major	Sainato
Boyle, B.	Fabrizio	Mann	Samuelson
Boyle, K.	Farry	Markosek	Santarsiero
Bradford	Fleck	Marsico	Santoni
Brennan	Frankel	Masser	Saylor
Brown, R.	Freeman	Matzie	Scavello
Brown, V.	Galloway	Miccarelli	Smith, K.
Brownlee	Geist	Micozzie	Smith, M.
Burns	George	Millard	Sonney
Buxton	Gerber	Miller	Staback
Caltagirone	Gergely	Mirabito	Stephens
Carroll	Gibbons	Moul	Stern
Cohen	Gillespie	Mundy	Stevenson
Conklin	Godshall	Murphy	Sturla
Costa, D.	Grove	Murt	Tallman
Costa, P.	Hackett	Mustio	Taylor
Cruz	Haluska	Myers	Toepel
Curry	Hanna	Neuman	Turzai
Cutler	Harhai	O'Brien, M.	Vereb
Daley	Harkins	O'Neill	Vitali
Davis	Harper	Oberlander	Vulakovich
Day	Harris	Parker	Waters
Deasy	Hennessey	Pashinski	Watson
DeLissio	Hess	Payton	Wheatley
DeLozier	Hickernell	Peifer	White
DeLuca	Josephs	Perry	Youngblood
Denlinger	Kavulich	Petri	
DePasquale	Keller, W.	Preston	Smith, S., Speaker
Dermody	Killion	Quinn	
DeWeese	Kirkland		

NAYS—57

Baker	Gabler	Knowles	Quigley
Barrar	Gillen	Kortz	Rapp
Benninghoff	Gingrich	Krieger	Reed
Bloom	Goodman	Lawrence	Reese
Brooks	Grell	Maloney	Roae
Causar	Hahn	Marshall	Rock
Christiana	Harhart	Metcalfe	Saccone
Clymer	Heffley	Metzgar	Schroder
Cox	Helm	Milne	Simmons
Creighton	Hutchinson	Mullery	Swanger
Culver	Kampf	Payne	Thomas

Davidson	Kauffman	Petrarca	Tobash
Dunbar	Keller, F.	Pickett	Toohil
Emrick	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Truitt
Evankovich			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Bishop	Briggs	Hornaman	McGeehan
--------	--------	----------	----------

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 3, PN 3114**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 74 (Transportation) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for public-private transportation partnerships; and making a related repeal.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Delaware County, Mr. Vitali.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I salute the maker of the bill for attempting to tackle a problem that desperately needs to be attacked, which is the intense transportation needs of this Commonwealth. Our roads, our bridges, all need additional, additional support, additional funding. But I cannot support this bill because I think this is the wrong way to deal with our transportation needs. In fact, I think this is an abdication of our legislative authority over such basic things as roads, bridges, parking garages, and other basic transportation infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, my main concern with this bill is, and it has a wide application, and I am just looking at roads, bridges, tunnels, overpasses, parking garages – a wide application. We right now own many of these structures and have the right to determine if and when they are tolled and by how much. If we pass this bill, we are giving our authority to make those decisions to an authority not responsive to the people of Pennsylvania. If we pass this bill, we will essentially, with a minor exception I will talk about, give up the right to an authority to do things like toll Interstate 76, perhaps toll 95, toll State roads, toll, if I am getting this correctly, even determine fees on parking, certain municipal parking garages. Many basic pieces of transportation infrastructure we will be losing our authority over.

And you might say, well, you know, what is wrong with that? This is what I fear, and I have talked with some financial people on this. And I am not an expert on this issue and I do not know all the ins and outs, and if I am incorrect, then I will accept those corrections, but I want to bring this up for discussion.

I think the way this dynamic works, why, when we get a piece of our infrastructure and lease it 99 years to a commercial entity and give them the right to toll it, why that works financially for that private entity is that they make a substantial profit in tolling for the next 99 years. And you say, well, what is wrong with that? I mean, nothing is wrong with— That is profit; that is the way business works. My problem is this: We get a lump sum of money to fix roads and bridges now and the benefits are limited, but people 25 years from now, 50 years from now, 75 years from now, they are still paying this elevated toll. They are the losers in this. Our children and our children's children are losers in this transaction. Even though it might benefit most people of voting age today, even though it might benefit the businesses who are making the profits, even though it may benefit the unions who might be getting some construction jobs, even though it might benefit road users today who are getting better roads, the people who lose are the people who, once these improvements are used up, once the money is spent, keep paying and paying and paying. That is just shortsighted.

You know, I hear this ideology bandied about in political circles – we should not be spending on a credit card; we should not be mortgaging our future. That is a very common political mantra on both sides of the aisle: Let us not mortgage our political future. Well, this is a mortgage. This is making our children pay for the very real benefits we are getting today, and I think that is the wrong approach.

Yes, there is this limited ability from the part of the legislature to veto, but that requires us to act, both chambers to act, either within 9 session days or 20 calendar days. And we all know how that works out. We all know the speed at which we work and the probabilities of us being able to stop something like that. So essentially we are giving up our authority.

I think also voting for this legislation evidences on the part of this legislature a lack of political courage, because we know, we know how these bridges and roads and highways should be paid for. They should be paid for the people who are using them right now, the people who burn the gas, the people who use the roads.

Now, the Governor, Governor Corbett, created a transportation commission, the full name escapes me, but one of the recommendations he made, that commission made, was uncapping the oil company franchise tax, and that would, that would glean huge sums of money. I am looking at this chart: \$270 million in year 1; \$544 million in year 2; year 5, \$1.3 billion. If we are being honest with ourselves and we want to do the right thing, we need to have the political guts to impose a tax. That is very fair: You impose a tax. That is not the gutless way to do this. The gutful way to do this, the courageous way to do this, is to impose a tax on the people who are going to be using it now. The gutless way to do it is to make the people who are not of voting age today and perhaps not even born today pay for it. That is what gutless politicians do. They make people who do not interfere with their reelection prospects pay for things. You get the benefits now for the people who can vote

for you, and then in the future, other people who are not going to affect your political career, they pay for it.

That is not the way to go here, Mr. Speaker. We need to start doing the right thing. We need to pay for our transportation needs—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Payne, rise?

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I just would ask that you caution the gentleman not to use disparaging remarks against any elected official. To say that politicians are gutless would refer to this entire chamber. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

We encourage the gentleman from Delaware County to focus on the substance of HB 3 and combine the debate to that material that is before us, please.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think a tax, some sort of tax on petroleum products is better than this for a number of reasons. We talked about the user paying: The more you drive, the more you use the roads, the more you wear out the roads; therefore, the more you should pay. So this oil franchise tax is very fair. Plus, it has very good other consequences such as, by reducing the use of fuel, which happens sometimes with an increase in price, you are decreasing our dependency on foreign oil and giving moneys to those foreign nations who mean us harm.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe we should reconsider this. We should do the right thing. We should maintain our own legislative control, and we should pursue other options in dealing with our basic infrastructure repair needs.

Thank you very much. I urge a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Mercer County, Mr. Longietti.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose HB 3. I do not do so because I am opposed to the concept of public-private partnerships to deal with transportation needs. Unfortunately, this bill is fatally flawed. It is a flaw that could lead to the tolling of our interstates without our vote or our support in this body. I attempted to fix that flaw several weeks ago through the amendment process and offered amendments that would specifically require the House and the Senate to approve P3 (public-private partnership) projects that involve the tolling of interstates. Unfortunately, on a slim margin, those amendments were rejected, so they are not part of this bill.

I think it is important that we understand what we are voting for here, and I went back to the language of the bill to specifically see that, and I want to review certain sections of the bill. When you look at pages 5 and 6 of this bill, it specifically states that we would transfer the rights for the use or control of a transportation facility to a private entity and allow that private entity to collect a user fee. A user fee is another word for a toll.

And on page 24 of the bill, how can they use those user fees? Broad authority is given for those user fees to be used for the transportation needs of the Commonwealth. It does not specify that a toll or a user fee would have to be used to rehabilitate or

reconstruct the road that is being tolled; it could be used for any transportation need. It could be used in other parts of the Commonwealth. It could be used for other modes of transportation, including mass transit. So the tolls that would be paid, if this P3 bill is passed and if a project is approved that is a P3 project that tolls, for example, Interstate 80 or any of the other interstates, those revenues could be used for any transportation need in any part of the Commonwealth.

It is important to note that a transportation facility, on pages 6 through 8 of the bill, specifically include an existing road. Our interstates are existing roads, so the bill clearly allows them to be subject to P3s and tolled possibly.

It is important as we look at page 7 of the bill, which would establish the Public-Private Transportation Partnership Board, what is the composition of this board? It is a seven-member board. The Secretary of Transportation would share it, the Secretary of the Budget or his or her designee would be a member, and the other five members are appointed by either the legislature or the Governor. The language of the bill specifically states those appointed members cannot be elected officials. So we know as we stand here that that Public-Private Transportation Partnership Board, none of those members face voters. None of them are accountable to the electorate like we are. And this unelected board would have the unilateral power to approve any particular public-private partnership project.

Now, I attended the budget hearings that were held recently by the Appropriations Committee. I attended the hearing where the Secretary of Transportation testified, and he testified about the transportation needs of the Commonwealth. And we obviously all agree that those needs are great, and I think we all agree that even this bill, if it were passed, would not come anywhere close to addressing the needs that our Commonwealth faces. But at that hearing, the Secretary specifically stated that he would like to toll all of the interstates in Pennsylvania and that he is pushing the Federal government for the ability to toll all of the interstates in Pennsylvania. Those were his words at the hearing. So this bill opens the door. The Secretary of Transportation shares the public-private partnership commission or board.

And we also know, if we read the newspapers, that the Federal government has had a hard time on their end dealing with transportation, and we know that there are some members of Congress who have proposed specifically to turn the interstates over to the States, to give them to the States, ostensibly to allow the States, without any Federal approval or requirement of Federal approval, to toll the interstates. And so if that happens, if those members of Congress prevail, then we will have, with this bill, an unelected seven-member board who will have the sole power to decide to toll any of the interstates in our Commonwealth, including interstates that run through my district; namely, Interstate 79 and Interstate 80.

And what will be our ability in the legislature to have a voice on that? We will not have a voice. We cede our voice away to an unelected board. And what has been our experience when we have done that in the past, even in the recent past when we have done that? Last year when we adopted the budget bills, Act 22 of 2011 was enacted. It was a Welfare Code, omnibus Welfare Code bill. It provided unilateral and unprecedented power to the Secretary of the Department of Public Welfare to make decisions. And now many of us – and I did not support that bill; I voted against it, but it passed; it became law – and now many of us are hearing from hospitals, from pharmacists, from social

service agencies, because changes are being made without our voice because we ceded that power away. And so here we are again, we are looking at a bill that will take away our voice in the legislature. I think that is foolhardy for us to cede that power.

Now, the bill does give some illusion – and I say the word "illusion" – some illusion of some ability of this legislature to stop a P3 project, but it is only an illusion, and we know as a practical matter that it is not something that we will actually be able to stop, because all that it does is it provides the legislature with a very short window – namely, 20 calendar days or 9 legislative days – for the General Assembly to pass a concurrent resolution to disapprove a project. If we fail to do that, the project becomes final because an unelected board decided it. And I have been around here 5 years, not a long time, but I know this much: It is very rare, very rare for legislation to move that quickly. In fact, the very bill that we are debating today was introduced months ago – months ago – and we are finally getting to a point where we are at final passage. How in the world can we expect any ability to stop a P3 project in 20 calendar days or 9 legislative days? It is an illusion that will not happen.

And yet when we look at the bill, there is an exception for the Turnpike Commission. On page 37 of the bill, the Turnpike Commission could not enter into a P3 project in regard to granting any substantial oversight and control over the turnpike mainline without a direct vote of this General Assembly, without our approval. So why do we make that exception for the Turnpike Commission? And why do we not apply that same rule to interstates, interstates like Interstate 80, Interstate 79, Interstate 78, Interstate 81, Interstate 95, across our Commonwealth? We should be following that same rule. We should be doing the job that we are elected to do and not ceding our authority to an unelected seven-member commission.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, although the concept of public-private partnerships is a good and worthy concept of consideration, and although this bill will not come close, will not come close to addressing our transportation needs in this Commonwealth, it is fatally flawed. It takes away the voice of the legislature, and particularly my concern is that it allows a seven-member unelected commission, unaccountable to the taxpayers, to decide to toll an interstate in our Commonwealth without any real ability for us to stop it.

I cannot give up my voice. I cannot give up my vote. I will not give up my voice or my vote. I urge my members, my fellow colleagues, to vote against this bill. Preserve your voice. Do not let them toll the interstates without your ability to stop it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from York County, Mr. Saylor.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to support this bill. Now, in these difficult times that we all know each of our districts are facing across this Commonwealth, we need government to look at ways to use limited resources that we have more efficiently and to ensure that the taxpayers of this Commonwealth are getting the most for every dollar that we spend.

Public-private partnerships, P3s as a lot of us call them, use the financial resources and the efficiency of the private sector for public benefit while taking the burden off of the State. HB 3 will unleash billions of dollars in the private sector,

dollars as upfront capital to accelerate the maintenance, the improvement, and expansion of Pennsylvania's roads, bridges, and other infrastructure.

HB 3 is a good jobs bill. Let me repeat that: It is a good jobs bill. Private investment combined with government investment will stimulate the construction industry and lead to direct job creation here in Pennsylvania. Additionally, the resulting infrastructure improvements will create an environment for job growth across the board, across this Commonwealth.

Chairman Geist has been tireless in his effort and has been a great advocate for this necessary tool for this Commonwealth. To be exact, he has been at the forefront of this issue for over 9 years, and I applaud the efforts he has made and the time he has put in and dedication to bring about improvements to Pennsylvania's roadway into the 21st century. HB 3 represents a smart government, because it represents less government. It lets the private sector invest in the people of this Commonwealth.

Please vote "yes" on HB 3. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the lady from Philadelphia County, Ms. Josephs.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, rise in opposition to this bill, to HB 3, for all the reasons that were enumerated by the two speakers who were before me who called for a "no" vote. But I want to add another one to this.

This morning my committee had a briefing, very thorough, very interesting, very detailed, from the two pension systems. There is an enormous, billions and billions of dollars of unfunded liability in the pension system. I asked what effect on this unfunded liability would the rush towards privatization have, and I could get no answer at this point. But I caution us, not only are we putting off to our children and grandchildren a debt that we ourselves owe, which was said already, but we may be hastening the augmentation of the unfunded liability, in this case in our SERS (State Employees' Retirement System) pension system and in other privatizations, in both PSERS (Public School Employees' Retirement System) and SERS, and I think this is a significant problem that all of us should pay attention to.

I expect this bill would come back. By that time, I hope I have an answer from the pension system how much this may hurt and in what way it may hurt. I do not think we can absolutely say, and I will characterize myself, I cannot say with any sincerity that I am looking to save the pension systems and do something about this billions and billions of dollars of unfunded liability and at the same time vote to privatize everything when we do not know that effect.

So there is another reason, Mr. Speaker. Let us vote "no." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would be remiss in not giving some accolade to my colleague from Blair County, who I know has worked a very long time on this particular issue. He has been a great supporter of transportation, and he has been a very great supporter of public-private partnerships for Pennsylvania, and I want to make sure I publicly offer accolades to him for getting this far with this bill.

I am going to vote "yes" on this bill, but I will also repeat what I said in the Appropriations Committee meeting today, and that was that anyone out there who votes for this and goes home and thinks that you have solved the transportation problem in Pennsylvania, forget it. This would be a very relatively small part of the overall transportation funding needs that we have here in our Commonwealth.

And keep in mind, keep in mind, what we call these projects are public-private partnerships – public-private partnerships. There is a public part of this. It requires public finances, which we all know we have very little of, particularly in transportation where we not only have very little of but we are really lacking anywhere near significant transportation dollars for our overall transportation needs in the Commonwealth, our massive infrastructure problem as well as our mass transit problem in Pennsylvania.

This bill does not really go all that far in solving it. I am going to vote "yes" because it does add a little bit to it. But I would also suggest and submit to you and to anybody else listening to me here today that this, I think, is another reason and indicates why we need an overall transportation plan in Pennsylvania, and I would call on the Governor to quit ignoring the transportation issues that we have here in Pennsylvania.

We have a crumbling, crumbling infrastructure, a massive and vast crumbling infrastructure. We do not have anywhere near the funds that we need, and it is going to take a lot of new funding to solve our transportation problems, both in infrastructure and mass transit. And we are going to have to put up some tough votes, and the Governor is going to have to show and be part of some very difficult leadership decisions to make this all possible. And we are willing to work, I think, in a bipartisan way with both sides of the aisle, at least I know I am and I think our leadership is committed to do that, but we need a plan and we need the Governor to get behind that plan as soon as possible.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker returns to leaves of absence and recognizes the presence of the gentleman, Mr. Briggs, from Montgomery County on the floor of the House. His name will be added back to the master roll call.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 3 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Bucks County, Mr. Petri.

Mr. PETRI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of this legislation. I think it is long overdue, and I want to commend the maker for working so hard on this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, a previous speaker mentioned "petroleum tax," and I think "petroleum tax" is an interesting term, because it tends to mean to some people some sort of thought that we are just going to tax the petroleum companies, Mr. Speaker. Well, do we not think that they are going to pass that through? Guess who is going to pay that tax. That is called a tax at the pump, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think that is the solution. I do not think our solution should be solely on the middle class, on the

commuters. The taxpayers have paid enough, and they cannot pay more at this time.

So I want to commend the maker. You know, too often, Mr. Speaker, around here, especially recently, it seems like every bill, it is not enough or it is too much, it is too soon, it is too late, it is the wrong time, it is the wrong solution. I want to commend this maker for having a solution, for having the guts to stand up and fight for his convictions. This is a gentleman who has been working on this matter for 8 years. When he started this, it was a new and novel idea. Now many other States have adopted it. And I hear them being lauded, Mr. Speaker, and I hear us being criticized, and yet here is a gentleman who was willing 8 years ago to stand for his convictions and try a new solution.

I think we ought to pass this and pass it overwhelmingly so that we can tell people we are thinking outside the box and we are coming up with other solutions. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Bucks County, Mr. Santarsiero.

Mr. SANTARSIERO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as have previous members commented today, I want to first start by commending the gentleman from Blair County, the majority chair of the Transportation Committee, for his efforts on this bill. While I am not going to vote for it today, I do believe that he has made a sincere effort to try to move an important issue forward. And I do believe ultimately that the concept of public-private partnerships has a place to play in addressing our overall transportation needs here in Pennsylvania, and so for that reason, as I said, I commend the gentleman for moving legislation forward.

The problems that I have with this bill are the issues that I raised 2 months ago now when we considered this bill on second consideration, specifically that this bill vests in a new unelected seven-member commission the power to enter into these agreements and ultimately to toll our vital infrastructure – roads and bridges throughout Pennsylvania.

We have heard in hearings and meetings on this bill that there will not be that many projects that will be amenable to public-private partnerships; in fact, only about 10 to 15 percent of our annual transportation needs. And most of those projects are going to be centered in the southeastern part of the State, because that is where the volume of transportation is such that there would actually be a return on investment for these private investors. And that is relevant to this because there will be so few projects, and they will be centered primarily in the area of the State that I represent, that this General Assembly should be able to address each of those projects on a case-by-case basis and make a thorough and fair decision on each of those applications as they come forward.

I think it is a big mistake to cede that responsibility to an unelected commission, and I say to all of the members here today who are prepared to vote in favor of this bill that when your constituents come to you and say, "Why can't you stop Route 95 from being tolled? Why can't you stop Route 202 from being tolled?" and your response is, "Well, because a seven-member commission made the decision," I am not sure that your constituents are going to find that to be a satisfactory answer. So that is point one and a major, I think, defect in this legislation.

Point two, Mr. Speaker, is that there is absolutely no restriction in this bill on who can enter into these public-private partnerships, what companies can do it. I tried to amend the bill back in February to require that majority American companies be the sole entities that would be considered for these projects. Regrettably, that amendment was defeated. But I still believe that that is in fact the best course here, to enable us to be sure that our vital infrastructure will be operated and maintained by American companies, not companies who are overseas. And it is not simply a security issue, but it is also an issue of access, and when there are problems, as surely there will be over the course of a lease that could run for many, many years, many decades in fact, if citizens do not have quick redress if there are problems, that, Mr. Speaker, is a major problem, and yet that is exactly the potential problem that this bill sets up.

So, Mr. Speaker, while I again commend the gentleman for attempting to address this piece of our transportation problem, at the end of the day I must vote "no," and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, for the reasons that I just stated, to do likewise. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the lady from Philadelphia County, Ms. DeLissio.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I find it interesting that the House thinks it is okay for a private entity to toll versus a public entity to tax. For the constituents of the 194th, the outcome is the same, it is dollars out of their pocket, the difference being, with HB 3, my constituents have no recourse.

I am very clear that my new job description here comes with tremendous responsibility, and I have never shirked that responsibility in a 30-year career. I refuse to shirk that responsibility here today. I urge my colleagues to think about the outcomes of this particular measure as it pertains to tolling infrastructure, and I will be a "no" vote on this piece of legislation. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Luzerne County, Mr. Carroll.

Mr. CARROLL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And like others, Mr. Speaker, I will start by commending the gentleman from Blair for his advocacy for transportation. The chairman's advocacy and desire to solve this problem is legendary.

Mr. Speaker, HB 3, which is widely known as the public-private partnership bill, the P3 bill, is misnamed. "P3" is a misnomer, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this bill is the "TB" bill, the transportation board bill, because the transportation board is the essence of this bill.

And there is some level of irony, Mr. Speaker. At the very moment in time when the Governor is about shrinking boards and commissions, at the very moment in time that we are going to shrink the General Assembly with a later vote, we are about to create a brand-new commission out of thin air. It seems to me we already have a State transportation commission, Mr. Speaker. We have a House Transportation Committee, a Senate Transportation Committee, and we have a whole slew of folks who work at PENNDOT, yet for some reason we need to create another board.

Mr. Speaker, this board, as has been noted by others, has the direct capacity to toll our interstates and toll our bridges. Mr. Speaker, this General Assembly has the capacity and makes the decision related to raising taxes. Mr. Speaker, we raise or not gasoline taxes. We have the capacity to raise or not the oil company franchise tax. We can raise driver's license and vehicle registration fees, Mr. Speaker, without the need for a transportation board. But when it comes to tolls, Mr. Speaker, for some reason it seems we need insulation from that decision, so we will create a board who will decide whether or not we will toll an interstate or a bridge.

Mr. Speaker, I know this General Assembly contemplated and ultimately made a decision to toll Interstate 80 a few years ago, admittedly a complicated vote. But, Mr. Speaker, that is the job. That is what we were sent here to do, to contemplate those sorts of decisions and then answer to our constituents back home. Mr. Speaker, I was elected by the folks in Luzerne and Monroe Counties to contemplate those decisions and cast a vote and then defend that vote, not to pawn that decision off on a transportation board.

Mr. Speaker, for the reason being that this created board will have the capacity to make what I think is a legislative decision, I cannot support and will oppose HB 3. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Delaware County, Mr. Killion.

Mr. KILLION. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of HB 3, and I would like to address some of the concerns I am hearing from some of the members on the other side of the aisle. They are concerned about us having a commission instead of this elected body making the decision on what projects would go forward, but think about it. Think about it for a minute. You are a union pension fund and you have \$800 million to invest, and you want to invest it in infrastructure so you can put your men and women back to work who desperately need these jobs. So you look at Pennsylvania. They have a bill now. If we listen to them on the other side of the aisle, you can get your project done and approved and put that money, get it invested, if you convince 102 House members, 26 Senators, and the Governor, or you can go to a State like Virginia that is currently doing this and putting people to work and go before a commission, make your case, a commission that was appointed by elected officials, like we are looking to do here. Where are you going to put your \$500 million? You want to invest it now.

I heard from the other side how long it takes to pass a bill in the House and the Senate. There it is. I would not put a dime in Pennsylvania when I can go to States where I can get my money invested right away and put my men and women, union, especially union, because they have the money, these pension funds, back to work.

Vote "yes" on HB 3. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let us please be clear, this bill is one of those tiny round Band-Aids on a gaping wound. We have transportation issues in the Commonwealth. The Governor's commission reported back with a plan to solve a problem that

would take around \$3 billion. There is a bipartisan effort to try to put that plan in effect so we can solve our road, bridge, and transit problems.

Now, this Band-Aid, if you call it that, may create a few jobs. It is not going to solve our major issue that we have across this State on solving the transit problems, making sure the public safety is protected. We have bridges right now that are being closed in western Pennsylvania because they are in such a state of disrepair.

So while this bill can be touted as a couple of jobs, this bill will not solve our problem. The Governor needs to stand up. He needs to lead us on this transportation issue. We need to have a jobs bill, a public safety bill, and solve the problems we face in the Commonwealth with roads, bridges, and transit.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Frankel.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me just follow up with the minority leader's comments. I am prepared to support this bill, but as he said, this is really a tiny little piece of the puzzle. The fact of the matter is that we do have legislation that will address this on a bipartisan basis in the Senate, here in the House. A number of us have introduced the pieces of the puzzle that will fix this that were the fundamental recommendations of the Governor's commission to address transportation reform in this State.

Legislation is here. It has not been discussed, it has not been considered, and it has got to be part of the answer. To go home and think that we have addressed our comprehensive transportation problem in this State by passing this bill is not a reasonable way to describe what we are doing here. This may create some jobs; it may repair some of the infrastructure. It may do none of those things, because it may take years to do. We need to do something now, immediately, to address the public safety problem that we have, the economic development problem that we have, as we cannibalize our roads and bridges and our mass transit agencies in this State.

In fact, just yesterday in Lawrence County, a State highway was being shut down because of a crack in a bridge that creates a public safety hazard. There is no money to repair that. We are going to see this take place, this pattern of failing infrastructure, failing across the State, preventing people from getting from one place to another, preventing goods and services from moving around, preventing people from getting to their jobs, if we do not act and act decisively. This is a very small start.

I support it. It is part of the puzzle, but it does not even go an inch in terms of addressing the comprehensive nature of the crisis that we are facing today in mass and public transportation and in infrastructure. We have to be courageous enough to deal with it. We need the Governor to act to provide the leadership to do that. Many of us in the legislature have already put up the bills. Why are we not discussing it? Why are we not debating those pieces of legislation that truly will go to address and fix the crisis that we are facing today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster County, Mr. Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I first want to praise the maker of this bill for his advocacy for transportation for longer than many members

have even been in this House, and my sense is that if there was more he felt he could do at this point in time, he certainly would, and I understand that he is shackled by members that will not do anything other than this to improve education in Pennsylvania. Transportation; I am sorry. What did I say?

The SPEAKER. We are used to you getting off the subject, so—

Mr. STURLA. My apologies, Mr. Speaker. That was an earlier issue today.

But I will also contend that this bill, like so much of what has been done in this session, is an abdication of responsibility. This bill says we here in the legislature will not vote to toll roads; we will let somebody else do it for us. Earlier this year we said we will not tax shale in this State; we will let somebody else do it for us and we will try and collect the money after they do it for us. Earlier this week we said we would not vote to immediately eliminate 50 seats in this House; we will let somebody else do it 10 years from now. We would not vote to cut \$400 million in DPW (Department of Public Welfare); we said we would let the Secretary of Public Welfare do that.

I imagine, if you wanted to, we could put up a bill that said you abdicated your responsibility as a State Representative and you will let somebody else make that decision. Maybe that is unnecessary; maybe you have already done that. The reality is that while there are merits to this bill, it is an abdication of your responsibility as a State Representative, plain and simple. You want to have the benefits of what this bill might bring and be able to distance yourself from any of the realities that might bring those benefits, because you will claim you never were for a toll, you were just for the road that the toll brought.

I would suggest that at some point in time we get down to the real business here in this State and look at the transportation bills that have been introduced, both in the House and Senate, that actually deal with the transportation issues in this State as opposed to just abdicating that responsibility to someone else.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Clinton County, Mr. Hanna.

Mr. HANNA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to HB 3. I oppose the bill because it delegates to a seven-member unelected board the ability to toll our highways. I cannot support that, Mr. Speaker. That responsibility lies with this House.

Mr. Speaker, what I could support is a comprehensive solution to our number one public safety problem in this Commonwealth, and of course, that is our decaying infrastructure. This bill does not address that. This bill does not even come close to addressing the number one public safety problem in the Commonwealth. And of course, the other part that addressing that number one public safety problem would do is create jobs across this Commonwealth, but because we are not addressing the number one public safety problem, we are not getting the benefit of job creation that would come with addressing that problem.

This bill fails to do what the Governor's commission recommended. This Governor's commission and a former Governor's commission both recommended the same thing, a comprehensive solution to our transportation infrastructure problem, and this bill in no way addresses that. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there are bills that will address that, bipartisan bills that will address that. In the Senate, the majority

Appropriations chairman has introduced bills that would address that. This bill, HB 3, does not do that. Here in the House, Representative Frankel and myself have introduced a comprehensive solution to our number one public safety problem, but this bill does not do that, and we have not moved that bill that would do it.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, this bill fails to address the number one public safety problem and it also fails to create jobs, and finally, Mr. Speaker, I will submit the balance of my remarks for the record.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, during second consideration of HB 3 the gentleman from Bucks County (Santarsiero) offered an amendment that would have prevented the nonelected board created in this bill from granting private capital investors the authority to impose tolls on Pennsylvania's taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, during that debate the gentleman from Delaware County rose in opposition and he plainly stated the intent of this bill is to "attract private capital investors" to invest in rebuilding Pennsylvania's deficient infrastructure. He said that if we adopted the Santarsiero amendment, then we would prevent these private capital investors from imposing tolls on Pennsylvanians for the privilege of using Pennsylvania roads and crossing its bridges.

He said adopting the Santarsiero amendment would force them to take their money to other States that allowed them to impose tolls.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing of which I am certain; it is that private capital investors invested their money for the sole purpose of realizing a return on their investment – to make more money.

Under HB 3, there is no doubt where that money will come from. It will come from the tolling of our roads and bridges. That is the return on investment.

There is no accountability in the bill. There is no limit on tolling authority and the toll money collected will go to private capital investors handpicked by a nonelected board which the public cannot hold accountable.

This bill is going to make many private capital investors extremely wealthy. That is the real intent of this bill – to line the deep pockets of private capital investors with billions of dollars in toll money collected from toll-paying Pennsylvania taxpayers.

This so-called public-private partnership bill is a farce.

The only partnership in this bill is the effort between the Governor and the Republican majority to "pick winners and losers" and to line the pockets of their big-business campaign donors, all under the veil of privatization.

The tolls on our State highways, roads, and bridges that this bill encourages will increase the cost of every piece of commerce that passes a toll. These costs will be passed down to Pennsylvania consumers. This bill will increase the price of milk, eggs, and bread for every one of our constituents.

With many Pennsylvanians struggling to make ends meet, I cannot support a bill that will line the pockets of the superwealthy on the backs of the middle class.

I ask my antitolling colleagues to join me in opposing HB 3. Please vote "no."

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. DeLuca.

Mr. DeLUCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was not going to speak on it, but let me just say this: I am in favor of HB 3, but some of the comments I hear from the other side certainly make me wonder if they represent 60,000 people. My good friend from Delaware mentions the other side. Well, you know what, we are all individuals. We represent 60,000 people. We have our own minds. If some people are against this, then you should say "some people." You should not say "the other side." There are people on this side who are in favor of HB 3. That is ridiculous. It is about time that some on the other side there do not have all red and maybe they use their mind to vote on some of the bills that they might disagree with. And when I hear the gentleman from York saying the private sector can do it better, this is a public-private partnership, and I hope that they do a good job because the private sector has got this country in the worst shape that I have ever seen it. It has bankrupted some of the people out there. And we talk about the private sector; let us not think that the private sector does everything right. The public sector does a lot of things right that we want to criticize them for, and it is not right. When you make a statement about the other side, why do you not just say, some members on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this HB 3.

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Turzai.

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

I rise in support of HB 3, and just to follow my good friend from Allegheny County, the title of this particular legislation is public-private partnerships, and you are right, there is excellent public-sector infrastructure work, and it helps to have excellent relationships with the private sector. It is public-private partnerships, and it is a legitimate point. This is a point where we are talking about infrastructure to be developed in a relationship between government and the private sector, to help deliver the best infrastructure that is possible. And I applaud the chairman for his efforts in making this innovative approach, which has been adopted in other jurisdictions, to help as a tool to develop the needed infrastructure to continue to grow this State in a positive direction.

The other points that I wanted to make, look, with the tolling legislation, there was considerable debate, particularly with respect to I-80. Ultimately, I-80 was found, its tolling, not to meet the Federal standards. That was essentially under two administrations – one Republican, one Democrat. What is being addressed in this particular legislation is not that same approach. It is in fact an innovative approach that is not akin in any way to what had been previously done with respect to the I-80 tolling and the rejection of that by the Federal government under two administrations.

Third, I do understand that Federal legislation requires Davis-Bacon application with respect to this legislation. There are Federal dollars that are significantly used in transportation costs, and that is a requirement with respect to the use of those Federal dollars. This is a bill that has been vetted significantly to take into account the many considerations brought to the floor by the members on both our side and the other side of the aisle, and it is a bill that has had significant bipartisan support. I would applaud this particular chairman of the Transportation Committee, the minority chairman of the Transportation

Committee, with respect to their hard work and trying to take into account the varying perspectives to make this public-private partnership work.

In the end, it is about jobs in Pennsylvania and it is about improved infrastructure in Pennsylvania, and this is an important tool to be able to move forward. I would ask for a "yes" vote from all members of this body, on both the Republican and Democratic sides. I think it is a good, bipartisan piece of legislation, and it will continue to move us forward here in Pennsylvania to make it better for our kids and grandkids. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Centre County, Mr. Conklin.

Mr. CONKLIN. I would like to thank the Speaker.

Most of all, I would like to thank the maker of the bill, and I would like to thank the members for standing up and speaking today. See, early on today, before a vote, I had asked some questions about the bill to some folks, and whether they just did not understand the dynamics of the bill or whether I did not ask the questions appropriately, the answers pertaining to this bill did not match the reality of it. It is only through this open discussion, this open forum that we have been given today, this open discussion from hearing both members of this wonderful House explain the dynamics of this bill, I have to ask the members to vote "no," and I will tell you why. First off, I hear a lot about the public-private partnership, that this is the only way it would exist. I did not realize that most of the members did not realize that we put road construction out to bid, that PENNDOT really does not build highways; it is done by private contractors. Nor did I realize that when I would ask about the tolling, it would be done by the seven-member board versus this House. I was told today that that was not true, but again today, I would like to thank the members on both sides of the aisle for pointing that out. Just as Interstate 80 was tolled through this House, perhaps it would be done again through this House, but I would much rather have this House do it than appointees doing it without any repercussions to the public.

So, Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank you for indulging me. I want to thank the members on both sides for having this open dialogue and allowing us to realize more in depth what is in this bill. So for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am asking my colleagues to vote "no." I think we, as an elected body, need to keep control of this, and I think we have to remember that we do do public-private partnerships, that we do work with the private companies.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Armstrong County, Mr. Pyle.

Mr. PYLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It has been an illuminating conversation. We are talking about something that the gentleman from Centre quite correctly assessed. PENNDOT already subcontracts out most of its construction. In a way, we are 3P to a lesser extent. If you look at DEP (Department of Environmental Protection), they are doing it as well. They are bringing people in to review permits and whatnot from outside the government, a private entity.

Now, what is in it for me? Mr. Speaker, a quick story. I drove out Sunday night, the same as I always do, 208.4 miles, and at not a single tenth of any of those miles did anybody

really ask if I was Republican or Democrat. I was just another guy on the road. Similarly, I have seen many of my colleagues here in my part of the woods, out in the west, and they have seen me in their part of the woods, out in the east. The roads are a common denominator, Mr. Speaker.

Now, we have heard said that we need a bigger solution, and I agree with that. We do, but this is part of the solution. It is a tool in the toolbox. It is not the whole puzzle, Mr. Speaker. It is maybe just a corner of it, but nonetheless, if we are going to get that puzzle done, we have to have that corner done. This is a tool, Mr. Speaker, that has been used very successfully. In the Commonwealth of Virginia, on I-95, south of Roanoke, the Pocahontas Expressway, it has been used successfully; in San Diego, California, cutting 4 hours' drive time around the bay by a private company building a tunnel under the bay. It has been used successfully in Tampa, Florida, and many, many other places throughout the States.

Mr. Speaker, as my good friend from Delaware County alluded to earlier, who are these private entities that are looking to come here and do these projects? Oftentimes, they are pension funds, flush with cash of our retirees. They are looking for stable investments that will return on their outlay of money. Mr. Speaker, this model has been deployed successfully in 38 States. We would be number 39. Mr. Speaker, as much as I appreciate the calls for bipartisanship and the accolades for Chairman Geist, who deserves every one of them – in the parlance, he has done the legwork; he has walked the mile and spoken to every possible factor involved in a 3P structure – Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that gentility, coming back on a Wednesday when we get to go home for a couple of weeks, kind of puts your mind in the right place. But, Mr. Speaker, another part of putting us in the right place is having bridges that are not falling down, having roads that have enough capacity to handle the flow of traffic in and out of the city of the first class, the city of the first class. Even down to the smallest, and yes, Mr. Speaker, I still do have hamlets in Armstrong County up on the road signs. This covers all of them.

Now, does Armstrong County have a place that is probably going to be eligible for a 3P? No, we are not big enough. We do not have that kind of vehicle traffic, but what we do have, Mr. Speaker, is the Allegheny River, with a lock and dam system the Army Corps can no longer fund to keep open. Why am I going to be supporting 3P? I believe I need to get that river back open. A hundred miles from the border of Armstrong and Allegheny Counties, the whole way to New York, it is a dead river. You cannot move on it. Mr. Speaker, 3P, again, is just a portion of what we need to do to get out of this pickle. It is not a cure-all. It is not an end-all, be-all, but it is most certainly a vital tool in the toolbox we need.

I would urge a vote on HB 3 positively. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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—128

Adolph	Emrick	Kirkland	Pyle
Aument	Evankovich	Knowles	Quinn
Baker	Evans, J.	Kortz	Rapp
Barbin	Everett	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Farry	Krieger	Readshaw
Bear	Fleck	Lawrence	Reed
Benninghoff	Frankel	Maher	Reese
Boback	Galloway	Major	Roae
Boyd	Geist	Markosek	Ross
Boyle, K.	Gerber	Marshall	Saccone
Brooks	Gergely	Marsico	Saylor
Burns	Gibbons	Matzie	Schroder
Caltagirone	Gillespie	Metcalfe	Simmons
Causer	Gingrich	Metzgar	Smith, M.
Christiana	Godshall	Miccarelli	Sonney
Clymer	Goodman	Micozzie	Stephens
Costa, D.	Grell	Miller	Stern
Costa, P.	Grove	Milne	Stevenson
Cox	Hackett	Moul	Sturla
Creighton	Hahn	Murt	Swanger
Cutler	Harhart	Mustio	Tallman
Daley	Harper	Myers	Taylor
Day	Harris	O'Brien, M.	Thomas
Deasy	Heffley	O'Neill	Tobash
Delozier	Helm	Oberlander	Toohil
DeLuca	Hennessey	Payne	Truitt
Denlinger	Hess	Payton	Turzai
DePasquale	Hickernell	Peifer	Vulakovich
Dermody	Hutchinson	Perry	Watson
DiGirolamo	Kauffman	Petri	
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Smith, S.,
Dunbar	Keller, W.	Preston	Speaker
Ellis	Killion		

NAYS—66

Bloom	DeLissio	Longietti	Roebuck
Boyle, B.	DeWeese	Mahoney	Sabatina
Bradford	Evans, D.	Maloney	Sainato
Brennan	Fabrizio	Mann	Samuelson
Briggs	Freeman	Masser	Santarsiero
Brown, R.	Gabler	Millard	Santoni
Brown, V.	George	Mirabito	Scavello
Brownlee	Gillen	Mullery	Smith, K.
Buxton	Haluska	Mundy	Staback
Carroll	Hanna	Murphy	Toepel
Cohen	Harhai	Neuman	Vereb
Conklin	Harkins	Parker	Vitali
Cruz	Josephs	Pashinski	Waters
Culver	Kampf	Petrarca	Wheatley
Curry	Kavulich	Quigley	White
Davidson	Keller, F.	Rock	Youngblood
Davis	Kula		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Bishop	Hornaman	McGeehan
--------	----------	----------

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.

STATEMENT BY MR. GEIST

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Blair County, Mr. Geist, is recognized under unanimous consent relative to the legislation just passed.

Mr. GEIST. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to thank the House for this passage. I totally agree with my friends, Frank Dermody and Joe Markosek, whom I have traveled the State with, promoting transportation projects. This is another tool to go into the toolbox. How effective will it be? There are many projects across the State of Pennsylvania that will qualify for this style of project. The comment that was made about it creating a couple jobs, I would just like to say, if you ask Dale High at High Industries in Lancaster how many jobs were created for all of the steel that went into the 495 HOT (high occupancy toll) lanes, every inch, every foot, every yard came out of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, on a project, a single project, that was bigger than the whole total construction budget of the State of Pennsylvania. How many laborers went to work? Hundreds and hundreds and hundreds – the materials industry, the engineering industry – and everybody benefits from it, and it becomes true economic development.

Whether it is Port Authority Transit in Pittsburgh that has a P3 on converting all of their buses and the fueling station that goes with it to save them millions and millions and millions of dollars of fuel costs, or whether it is a project on the Allegheny River to reconstruct the locks north of Pittsburgh, this bill will become a valuable tool for the Department of Transportation to use, and the moneys that will be freed up from the investment of pension fund money and other moneys can then be moved to do maintenance on other roads in the State. This bill took a long time to ever mature and get to the point where we passed it. The State of New York just passed a bill that will bring in billions of dollars to the State of New York, called New York Works.

When we first started on this, I had no idea what it would do for the State of Pennsylvania in real jobs, but after all the time we have worked and all the experts who have vetted this legislation, I will tell you if it is the Schuylkill Expressway or the I-95 capacity project, that project alone is eight times the total construction budget of the State of Pennsylvania. This is a very, very good piece of legislation. I want to thank those who voted for it. Those who thought we were tolling Interstate 80 again, it will not happen. It has timed out to three tries; you are out.

One more comment, Mr. Speaker. Pennsylvania is going to have to control our own fate when it comes to funding transportation. The 3-month extension at the Federal level – we are taking it out for a 2-year bill – means that the State of Pennsylvania is going to be challenged to fix our own broken system. There were wonderful comments made by leaders on the other side. I served on that commission under Governor Rendell. The Transportation Advisory Commission Report was excellently done at PENNDOT. We need \$3.7 billion of new money a year, every year, to solve our State road problem, our State bridge problem, add capacity, and fix broken municipal roads. This is just a tool, and I thank everyone for voting for it.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 375, PN 2093**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 53 (Municipalities Generally) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in municipal authorities, further providing for money.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

Adolph	Donatucci	Killion	Quigley
Aument	Dunbar	Kirkland	Quinn
Baker	Ellis	Knowles	Rapp
Barbin	Emrick	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Evankovich	Kotik	Readshaw
Bear	Evans, D.	Krieger	Reed
Benninghoff	Evans, J.	Kula	Reese
Bloom	Everett	Lawrence	Roae
Boback	Fabrizio	Longietti	Rock
Boyd	Farry	Maher	Roebuck
Boyle, B.	Fleck	Mahoney	Ross
Boyle, K.	Frankel	Major	Sabatina
Bradford	Freeman	Maloney	Saccone
Brennan	Gabler	Mann	Sainato
Briggs	Galloway	Markosek	Samuelson
Brooks	Geist	Marshall	Santarsiero
Brown, R.	George	Marsico	Santoni
Brown, V.	Gerber	Masser	Saylor
Brownlee	Gergely	Matzie	Scavello
Burns	Gibbons	Metcalfe	Schroder
Buxton	Gillen	Metzgar	Simmons
Caltagirone	Gillespie	Miccarelli	Smith, K.
Carroll	Gingrich	Micozzie	Smith, M.
Causer	Godshall	Millard	Sonney
Christiana	Goodman	Miller	Staback
Clymer	Grell	Milne	Stephens
Cohen	Grove	Mirabito	Stern
Conklin	Hackett	Moul	Stevenson
Costa, D.	Hahn	Mullery	Sturla
Costa, P.	Haluska	Mundy	Swanger
Cox	Hanna	Murphy	Tallman
Creighton	Harhai	Murt	Taylor
Cruz	Harhart	Mustio	Thomas
Culver	Harkins	Myers	Tobash
Curry	Harper	Neuman	Toepel
Cutler	Harris	O'Brien, M.	Toohil
Daley	Heffley	O'Neill	Truitt
Davidson	Helm	Oberlander	Turzai
Davis	Hennessey	Parker	Vereb
Day	Hess	Pashinski	Vitali
Deasy	Hickernell	Payne	Vulakovich
DeLissio	Hutchinson	Payton	Waters

DeLozier	Josephs	Peifer	Watson
DeLuca	Kampf	Perry	Wheatley
Denlinger	Kauffman	Petrarca	White
DePasquale	Kavulich	Petri	Youngblood
Dermody	Keller, F.	Pickett	
DeWeese	Keller, M.K.	Preston	Smith, S.,
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Pyle	Speaker

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-3

Bishop	Hornaman	McGeehan
--------	----------	----------

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.

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1588, PN 3346**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of August 9, 1955 (P.L.323, No.130), known as The County Code, in fiscal affairs, further providing for authorization of five per centum hotel tax in certain counties of the fifth class.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-140

Adolph	DiGirolamo	Kotik	Readshaw
Aument	Donatucci	Kula	Roebuck
Barbin	Ellis	Longietti	Ross
Bear	Evans, D.	Mahoney	Sabatina
Boback	Evans, J.	Major	Sainato
Boyd	Everett	Mann	Samuelson
Boyle, B.	Fabrizio	Markosek	Santarsiero
Boyle, K.	Farry	Marsico	Santoni
Bradford	Fleck	Masser	Saylor
Brennan	Frankel	Matzie	Scavello
Briggs	Freeman	Miccarelli	Smith, K.
Brown, R.	Galloway	Micozzie	Smith, M.
Brown, V.	George	Millard	Sonney
Brownlee	Gerber	Miller	Staback
Burns	Gergely	Mirabito	Stephens
Buxton	Gibbons	Moul	Stern
Caltagirone	Gillespie	Mundy	Stevenson
Carroll	Gingrich	Murphy	Sturla
Cohen	Godshall	Murt	Tallman

Conklin	Goodman	Myers	Taylor
Costa, D.	Grove	Neuman	Thomas
Costa, P.	Hackett	O'Brien, M.	Tobash
Creighton	Haluska	O'Neill	Toepel
Cruz	Hanna	Oberlander	Turzai
Curry	Harhai	Parker	Vereb
Cutler	Harkins	Pashinski	Vitali
Daley	Harper	Payne	Vulakovich
Davidson	Harris	Payton	Waters
Davis	Hennessey	Peifer	Watson
Deasy	Hickernell	Perry	Wheatley
DeLissio	Josephs	Petri	White
DeLozier	Kampf	Preston	Youngblood
DeLuca	Kavulich	Pyle	
Denlinger	Keller, W.	Quinn	Smith, S.,
Dermody	Killion	Ravenstahl	Speaker
DeWeese	Kirkland		

NAYS-54

Baker	Evankovich	Knowles	Pickett
Barrar	Gabler	Kortz	Quigley
Benninghoff	Geist	Krieger	Rapp
Bloom	Gillen	Lawrence	Reed
Brooks	Grell	Maher	Reese
Causer	Hahn	Maloney	Roae
Christiana	Harhart	Marshall	Rock
Clymer	Heffley	Metcalfe	Saccone
Cox	Helm	Metzgar	Schroder
Culver	Hess	Milne	Simmons
Day	Hutchinson	Mullery	Swanger
DePasquale	Kauffman	Mustio	Toohil
Dunbar	Keller, F.	Petrarca	Truitt
Emrick	Keller, M.K.		

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-3

Bishop	Hornaman	McGeehan
--------	----------	----------

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the bill passed finally.

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR C

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS**

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to the following **HB 1500, PN 3336**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, consolidating the Long-Term Care Patient Access to Pharmaceuticals Act; further providing for declaration of policy, for definitions and for third-party drugs in long-term care facilities; and making a related repeal.

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

The SPEAKER. Moved by the gentleman, Mr. Bear, that the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate.

The Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Bear, for a brief description of Senate amendments.

Mr. BEAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Senate made one amendment, based on the Pharmacy Board, as far as oversight of the pharmacists. So that was a very minor change. It was an oversight in the House.

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

Adolph	Donatucci	Killion	Quigley
Aument	Dunbar	Kirkland	Quinn
Baker	Ellis	Knowles	Rapp
Barbin	Emrick	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Evankovich	Kotik	Readshaw
Bear	Evans, D.	Krieger	Reed
Benninghoff	Evans, J.	Kula	Reese
Bloom	Everett	Lawrence	Roae
Boback	Fabrizio	Longietti	Rock
Boyd	Farry	Maher	Roebuck
Boyle, B.	Fleck	Mahoney	Ross
Boyle, K.	Frankel	Major	Sabatina
Bradford	Freeman	Maloney	Saccone
Brennan	Gabler	Mann	Sainato
Briggs	Galloway	Markosek	Samuelson
Brooks	Geist	Marshall	Santarsiero
Brown, R.	George	Marsico	Santoni
Brown, V.	Gerber	Masser	Saylor
Brownlee	Gergely	Matzie	Scavello
Burns	Gibbons	Metcalfe	Schroder
Buxton	Gillen	Metzgar	Simmons
Caltagirone	Gillespie	Miccarelli	Smith, K.
Carroll	Gingrich	Micozzie	Smith, M.
Causar	Godshall	Millard	Sonney
Christiana	Goodman	Miller	Staback
Clymer	Grell	Milne	Stephens
Cohen	Grove	Mirabito	Stern
Conklin	Hackett	Moul	Stevenson
Costa, D.	Hahn	Mullery	Sturla
Costa, P.	Haluska	Mundy	Swanger
Cox	Hanna	Murphy	Tallman
Creighton	Harhai	Murt	Taylor
Cruz	Harhart	Mustio	Thomas
Culver	Harkins	Myers	Tobash
Curry	Harper	Neuman	Toepel
Cutler	Harris	O'Brien, M.	Toohil
Daley	Heffley	O'Neill	Truitt
Davidson	Helm	Oberlander	Turzai
Davis	Hennessey	Parker	Vereb
Day	Hess	Pashinski	Vitali
Deasy	Hickernell	Payne	Vulakovich
DeLissio	Hutchinson	Payton	Waters
Delozier	Josephs	Peifer	Watson
DeLuca	Kampf	Perry	Wheatley
Denlinger	Kauffman	Petrarca	White
DePasquale	Kavulich	Petri	Youngblood
Dermody	Keller, F.	Pickett	
DeWeese	Keller, M.K.	Preston	Smith, S.,
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Pyle	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Bishop	Hornaman	McGeehan
--------	----------	----------

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

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

BILLS SIGNED BY SPEAKER

Bills numbered and entitled as follows having been prepared for presentation to the Governor, and the same being correct, the titles were publicly read as follows:

HB 469, PN 2756

An Act amending the act of March 2, 1956 (1955 P.L.1211, No.376), known as the Practical Nurse Law, further providing for violations.

HB 470, PN 2757

An Act amending the act of May 22, 1951 (P.L.317, No.69), known as The Professional Nursing Law, further providing for use of title.

HB 1500, PN 3336

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, consolidating the Long-Term Care Patient Access to Pharmaceuticals Act; further providing for declaration of policy, for definitions and for third-party drugs in long-term care facilities; and making a related repeal.

SB 110, PN 2051

An Act amending Title 74 (Transportation) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for the authority of the department; and providing for logging of certain aircraft flights.

SB 730, PN 2034

An Act amending the act of May 1, 1933 (P.L.103, No.69), known as The Second Class Township Code, in corporate powers, further providing for real property and for personal property; and, in contracts, further providing for letting contracts.

SB 743, PN 1843

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, further providing for teaching safe driving of motor vehicles.

SB 815, PN 2033

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for right to counsel; and providing for right to counsel in dependency and delinquency proceedings.

SB 1167, PN 1947

An Act amending Titles 23 (Domestic Relations) and 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for consideration of criminal conviction, for modification of existing orders and for child custody proceeding during military deployment; and providing for expedited or electronic hearing.

Whereupon, the Speaker, in the presence of the House, signed the same.

STATEMENT BY MR. BEAR

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Bear, from Lancaster County, seeking recognition under unanimous consent relative to the legislation just passed?

Mr. BEAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to speak on HB 1500. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank a lot of people who were involved with the passage of HB 1500. With the passage of HB 1500, veterans who are now in long-term care, who receive their pharmacy prescriptions from the Veterans' Administration, now can get these prescriptions and not lose the benefit when they go to long-term care, and they can get it for the \$8 a month that they have been paying since they have been getting the pharmaceuticals.

I want to thank some people who have really been working on this. Starting back home, Al Siegfried, back in Lancaster County, who was one of the folks that started this initiative; Representative Scott Boyd, who started working with Al to get this done, as well as my Senior Advisory Council and the Pennsylvania Pharmacy Board, the Pennsylvania Pharmacists, the past administration as well as the current administration. We spent a lot of time to get this simple fix done, and this will now benefit all Pennsylvania veterans who are in long-term care. So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Franklin County, Mr. Kauffman, seeking recognition?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just to correct the record on HB 3. I was recorded in the affirmative and should have been recorded in the negative.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's remarks will be noted for the record.

STATEMENT BY MR. STURLA

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Lancaster County, Mr. Sturla.

The gentleman from Lancaster County, Mr. Sturla, were you seeking recognition under unanimous consent relative to a resolution we had passed earlier in the day?

Mr. STURLA. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I was not able to make these comments earlier. I will try and be brief.

With regard to HR 604, "Thaddeus Stevens Day," today we recognize the 220th anniversary of the birth of Thaddeus Stevens. Thaddeus Stevens had a lengthy and distinguished career as a teacher, lawyer, and statesman, serving in both this great body and in Congress. Most notably, he fought for the preservation of public education in this Commonwealth, the emancipation of slaves, the passage of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and reconstruction of the South after the Civil War. Thaddeus Stevens directed that upon his death, he be buried in an integrated cemetery in the city of Lancaster with this self-composed epitaph on his grave marker, quote: "I repose in this quiet and secluded spot, not from any

natural preference for solitude. But finding other cemeteries limited as to race, by Charter rules, I have chosen this that I might illustrate in my death the principles which I advocated through a long life: Equality of man before his Creator," unquote.

Thaddeus Stevens College of Technology stands as a monument to his leadership and foresight, providing solid industrial education to all citizens of this Commonwealth, regardless of race or color.

Again, I just want to thank the members for that opportunity to point out some of the aspects of the life of Thaddeus Stevens. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the lady from Delaware County, Mrs. Davidson, rise?

Mrs. DAVIDSON. To correct the record, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The lady may state her correction.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. I was recorded in the positive on HB 1588. I wish to be recorded in the negative.

The SPEAKER. The lady's remarks will be noted for the record.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Thank you.

**THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
(JOHN MAHER) PRESIDING****REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Staback, seek recognition?

Mr. STABACK. I would like to submit some comments for the record on HB 1749.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Those comments will be well received. Thank you.

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

Mr. Speaker, HB 1749 is much like the earlier two bills considered by the House.

My legislation affects Lackawanna County and its hotel tax, raising it from its current 4 percent to 7 percent, and the distribution of the collected revenues. It is the product of negotiations with county officials and members of the Lackawanna County Tourism Promotional Agency.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will increase the dollars available to the TPA to do their important work, work that results in more tourism to the northeast. It also allows Lackawanna County to help municipal authorities with their incurred debt due to tourism and recreation.

The division of the revenues generated by the hotel tax will go from an 80-20 split with the county getting the most money to a much fairer 60-40 split. These ratios and tax rates have been agreed to locally.

HB 1749 is a much-needed measure and includes the solutions to problems facing the tourism industry in Lackawanna County.

It is with that in mind that I ask for support for HB 1749.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B CONTINUED

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 153, PN 3347**, entitled:

A Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, reducing the size of the General Assembly.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Representative Saccone.

Mr. SACCONI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just a few comments. Pennsylvania has the largest full-time legislature in the United States, second only to New Hampshire, which as the largest legislature, but they are part-time. We have the largest full-time legislature in the United States. When you look around the country, I think it helps this debate to compare Pennsylvania to some other States.

Now, Texas is a good inspiration for us to take a look at. Texas is nearly six times the physical size of Pennsylvania, and it is about 2.2 times the population of Pennsylvania. Yet Texas has a 150-member State House, and by the way, they have a part-time legislature, too. In Texas, 160,000 people are served by one legislator, and if we were to match that ratio in Pennsylvania, we would reduce the House down to about 78 legislators. Now, of course people would complain that that number would be too small and they would probably be right. So reducing it to 153 seems to be much more reasonable, and it would still be on par with a State like — much better representation than a State like Texas.

Our neighbor to the west, Ohio, is also maybe even a better comparison because they are roughly the same size as Pennsylvania by square miles. Pennsylvania is the 33d largest State and Ohio is the 34th. We have 46,000 square miles; they have roughly 45,000 square miles. And roughly the same in population, Pennsylvania is the sixth most populous State and Ohio is the seventh most populous State, and they have roughly the same rural-to-urban ratio that we do, and yet Ohio has a 99-seat State House. I had the chance to visit the Ohio State Legislature and talk with some of their Representatives and watch them in action, and it was amazing, as the Speaker had referenced in some of his previous comments, it was amazing how much more civil the debate was and how much more people paid attention and how much more deliberative their debate was. So again, there is another great example for us to take a look at.

One more I will offer is the State of Montana. Now, Montana is one of those States that you can really look at; it has a real rural-to-urban split. Montana is the fourth largest State by square miles in the United States, 147,000 square miles, but it has just under 1 million people in 56 counties, and a quarter of their population is in just 4 cities. And yet Montana has 100 State Representatives in their House. And I had a chance to visit Montana recently and visit their State legislature and talk to their Senators and their Representatives, and they had no problem covering the very large geographic areas that they represent. They serve some very large rural areas.

Now, yesterday my colleague from Montgomery County mentioned that the State Rep is the level of government that is closest to the people, and he is correct. In many town halls, when I present the argument to the people that with our enlarged districts, we might go from roughly 62,000 to a little over 80,000 and the citizens might not see their Representatives as much, they might not be getting the kind of representation that they are used to, really, I usually get a lot of laughter, because as my close friend from Westmoreland County has pointed out to me, with the advanced technology that we have today, we can certainly represent more people with the same amount of staff. So the argument that because we enlarge our districts a little bit, that we would need to increase the staff, I think is not borne out.

And one of the main arguments for reducing the size of the legislature, which again, my close friend from Westmoreland County has pointed out to me, and I agree with him, is that we ask the people of Pennsylvania, especially in hard times, to lead by example, and we should, too. I think the State legislature should be reduced. We should start the reductions right here and lead by example and show that we can do more with less as we ask our citizens to do more with less.

So we can do this. Everywhere I go in my district, the people want this. On all the doors that I knocked on, the people told me that they think the legislature should be reduced. I think there is no magic in 203. I think 153 is a good compromise, and I support this bill. I ask you to vote "yes" on HB 153. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh County. Representative Day is recognized on the question.

Mr. DAY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before our chamber here today to talk about HB 153, make comments on 153. I listened to all the debate from all of my colleagues here on this side of the aisle and that side of the aisle as well. It is one of the decisions that we have to make, no more gravity in this decision. So I sit here and I try to listen to what everyone says, and actually, in our caucus, you need some skills to be able to question and interrogate your leader. It is his bill. And I asked him certain questions, and he actually gave responses that made me think differently about this piece of legislation. I stand here and I think as I look up at the clock, it is a quarter of 3 today, and I think about all the decisions I have made in my lifetime. What has been a better decision or a more grave decision than this one? And I can only think of one. About 10 minutes from now, I was standing in a church and three bells started to ring, and I turned and looked up the aisle. And it was 20 years ago today that I actually made the best decision that I have ever made, and that decision was to marry my wife, and it was the day we were married.

GUEST INTRODUCED

Mr. DAY. Susan, would you please stand. Would you welcome my wife to the House.

As my colleagues in the front row ask my wife, what about your decision, it was certainly the best decision that I made.

I do not want to take any more of your time. I appreciate your indulgence.

On 153, it is a grave decision to make, changing our Constitution. Overall, I had reservations. I wanted to reduce the size of government. I wanted to reduce the size of government. This is a reduce-the-size-of-government vote, and I said, my first question when the Speaker first brought this up, I said, what about the Senate? What about staff? What about our subdivisions, school districts, counties, municipalities? How do we do that? And the Speaker, with his experience, realizes that sometimes all we can do is what we can do here in the House. So this bill that he crafted, I support and I will be voting in favor of today, and I urge all of my colleagues to consider the same. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and notes for the benefit of the members that ordinarily it is not in order for a member to be pointing out those in attendance, but the Parliamentarian did advise me of the 20th wedding anniversary exception to that rule.

On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware County, Representative Vitali.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I regretfully will not be supporting this bill, because while on the surface it appears to be a good-government bill and, clearly, very politically popular, I think the effect will be just the opposite. It is an easy bill to vote for because I think the feeling of most people is, I hate politicians; this means less politicians; therefore, I like this bill. And that is why I think it is easy to support and it is hard to vote against, but I think vote against it, we should.

Mr. Speaker, rather than focusing in on the size of our legislature as a measure of good government, I really think we need to be focusing in on the number of people we are representing, especially when you compare us to other States. Pennsylvania obviously has a large legislature because it has a huge number of people. I mean, we have about the fourth or fifth largest number of people in the country, and that in itself will drive a large legislature, but we represent 60,000 people, and that is a lot of people. In fact, I think right now, only about 19 States have legislators who represent more people. I think we ought to be representing less people, we ought to be representing less people if we want to have better government.

One of the problems I have seen in this legislature, and I know that the gentleman, the prime sponsor, yesterday talked about his gut reactions to a lot of things and how his gut reaction is that this might make it better, but my gut reaction is, the problem we have in this legislature is the dominance of special interests, special interest group money, lobbyists, the way lobbyists wine and dine us with meals, the way special interests give hundreds of thousands of dollars to campaigns. That is the problem, and that is something, in my view, we ought to be dealing with. Now, the problem with a large number of people we represent is the more people we represent, the more dependent we are on special interest groups, the more dependent we are on money to get elected. I am proud to say

that I have never called anyone for money, but I have been able, by pure shoe leather, to visit everybody in my district. I have that contact with my district; therefore, I do not need special interest group money. That gives a legislator an enormous amount of independence. I do not need union money. I do not need teacher money. I do not need doctor money. I do not need lawyer money because their money is only an indirect way to influence my people. There is a direct way to influence your people if you have a small enough district, and that is to visit their doors, to knock on their door, to say hello, to shake their hand one at a time, day after day, week after week. If you can do that, you can thumb your nose at special interest group money. You can even thumb your nose, frankly, at the money of your own party. That gives you independence. And the problem is, the larger the number of people you represent, and this will take us from 60,000 to 80,000, the more dependent you are on special interest group money. And it is the special interest group money, not the fact that there are 203 of us as opposed to 153 of us, it is the special interest group money that skews the legislative process.

On the previous vote – I am not going to mention names – I was just chatting with a colleague who went and checked with a special interest group in the back and talked about a vote and all of that. That is what is screwing up the process. It is the special interest group money that we are not dealing with that is screwing up the process. You go to any high-quality midstate restaurant on a Tuesday or Monday night and you are going to see those moneyed interests, moneyed interests buying us high-quality wine that we would not pay for ourselves, prime rib, and all the other things, because we have become dependent on those people. We have become dependent on those people—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman suspend. You are entitled to characterize your own motives and behaviors. You are not entitled to characterize the behavior or motives of other members. You may proceed with that clarification.

Mr. VITALI. It is the dependence on special interest group money that erodes the legislative process, and I believe that by decreasing the size of this legislature, you are increasing that dependence. The first speaker who spoke cited Texas as a prime example. Now, we represent 64,000 people. According to NCSL (National Conference of State Legislatures), Texas, his model with a small legislature, each legislator represents 167,000 people. Could you imagine what it is like to try to be independent of special interest group money if you represented 167,000 people? The other example he cited was Ohio, 116,000 people. You just cannot do it. You cannot do it. I like the fact that I can go to a parade or go to an event and people know me by my first name. They know me by my first name; they know something about me; they trust me because they have met me. They are not cynical about me. They are not cynical about the process, and that is because it is a small enough legislative district that I can go to the supermarket and meet people I know and talk to them. You lose that. You lose that intimacy, you lose that independence, and you increase dominance on special interest group money the bigger you make this place.

Mr. Speaker, some people talk about, well, cost savings. Mr. Speaker, cutting us by 50 people, that will not be a real cost savings, and if it is, it is not the way to go about doing it. The experience of other States when they have cut costs, Illinois is one example, what happens is staff increases so costs do not go

down. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to mention individual legislators, but I have a district office staff of three people and I know other legislators in Delaware County who have staffs of six people, seven people, and more. Mr. Speaker, that tells me, if I can do my job with three district office staffers and other people similarly situated in suburban Philadelphia who have six and seven and more staffers, they can do their job—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

I think we have already had the conversation. You are certainly within your rights to characterize your own behavior, your own decisions, your own motives, but it is against the behavior of this House to be doing it about others.

Mr. VITALI. My point is that we can cut, we can cut staffing without cutting function, without cutting efficiency, responsiveness. So if the stated reason for this legislation is cost-cutting, the people of this State should know there are ways you can cut costs without making your legislator more dependent on special interest group money, without suffering responsiveness, without suffering with regard to specific – without suffering service cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I do have some concerns about the way this legislation is gone about. It is an existential question we are dealing with of the ultimate importance, yet we have undertaken those studies as to whether the optimal size should be 203 or 210 or 153 or 170. It is just a kind of a gut and a feel. I mean, that is not the way to do such important questions like this. The evidence I have heard with regard to, yes, this will make us more responsive, it is not based on any – I have not heard any studies, any other States. It is just like, yeah, my gut feeling is it is going to make it more responsive. You know, costs, yeah, I mean, it is going to cut costs. I have heard no – I have seen no balance sheets as to how this is all going to work out.

Mr. Speaker, I think that if we are real about this, if this is just window dressing, that is fine, but if we are real about this, we need to really seriously study things like what is the optimal size, what will the cost savings be, what are the results of other States with regard to responsiveness? I know that many of us, not myself, represent rural areas, and you know, 60,000 people where I live, I can get across one end of my district in 20 minutes, so it is not a big deal to me, but if you are in some rural areas, the geographic area that is required to get 60,000 people, and with this bill, 80,000 people, will be quite enormous, and that is why, I believe, the Farm Bureau, or at least one agricultural group, voiced opposition to this.

I also am very concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the opportunity for gerrymandering this bill will present. We have seen what happened under the current system, keeping the same number of districts, mischief reeked by the Reapportionment Commission. Given the opportunities for such drastic line drawing, I fear what they will do given such an opportunity.

So I am going to vote "no," and I just want my voice heard because I have worked on governmental process issues for 20 years and I want my voice to be heard, saying I do not believe this is going to make Pennsylvania's government better. I think we ought to do the courageous things like campaign finance reform, limiting lobbying expenses, and so forth. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

GUEST INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is privileged today to recognize one of his 60,000 bosses who is in the gallery. Here today, advocating for Pennsylvania State University, Brendan McNally. Brendan, welcome to the hall of the House. Brendan, incidentally, is the son of our former member, Chris McNally.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 153 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware County, the Appropriations chairman, Representative Adolph.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to take this opportunity to inform the members that the State of Illinois did reduce their legislature back in 1980, and that number was from 177 to 118. There was a study done about 10 years after that, and they did not see significant increase or decrease in the spending of the administrative expenses. That same journal did a study 10 years later, in the year 2000, and they did start to see some significant decreases in the costs and operation of the General Assembly. So as the gentleman from Delaware County spoke, originally there was not a significant amount of decrease in expenses and costs to the General Assembly of Illinois, but the following 10 years, there was significant difference. As recent as 2001, the University of Illinois did a study, and they saw a decrease of a whole 1 percent as relevant to the spending of the total State government.

As far as individual members and their district office staff, I have a district very similar to the Representative from Delaware County, and for over two decades, I have operated that district office with two full-time folks and on occasion a part-time person. So it can be done no matter where you reside. Others need more; others needs less. So I understand where he is coming from, but other districts demand more constituent services. I am fortunate that most of my folks do not put the demand on their district office as some other urban areas may do. Okay. And obviously in the more rural areas, they need additional district offices. But the cost of the legislature is what we are talking about. If you just take \$80,000 and times it by 50, plus benefits, that is a savings of over \$5 million a year. In a single term of the House of Representatives, that is a savings of over \$10 million. So that is a significant savings, and that is not the reason the bill is being run. It is just for the management, the management of this legislature. I believe that those folks would be able to better represent their district because we would be able to run this House more efficiently as a result of this bill.

I urge a "yes" vote on this. Thank you very much.

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

Mr. SAINATO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Five years ago I had the opportunity to serve on the Speaker's Commission on Reform, the Speaker's Commission on Reform. This is one issue which we dealt with on that commission. We had hearings. We had experts come in from across the country. We had members from rural areas and urban

areas come before us and give their testimony. This was a very deliberative process. Our commission rejected this idea. This proposal has had no hearings. This proposal is just, let us just do it. We thought this process out, and we had a very diverse group who served on the Commission on Reform, a very diverse group, and we did a lot of good stuff, a lot of good rules we have changed. We have helped make this legislature a better, a better institution because of the reforms which we did on that commission. But this legislation, Mr. Speaker, it is something that feels good, something that sounds good. But, Mr. Speaker, this will have a direct effect, especially on rural Pennsylvania. Do not let that fool you. Many of us, especially in western Pennsylvania, do a lot of constituent service. Our people rely on our district offices. They rely on knowing their legislature. How many of you have gone out and you ask that question to constituents, have you ever met your State Senator? Have you ever met your Congressman? Most people do not even know who they are, and many of them who do have never met them. Ask that same question, how many people have met your legislator?

Mr. Speaker, I am a full-time legislator. This is all I do. Every weekend I am out in the community, talking to the people that I represent. Last Saturday I started at 8 a.m. in the morning. I went to a breakfast. At 10 a.m. I went to an Easterfest, Mary, Mother of Hope. At 12 o'clock I bowled for Big Brothers and Big Sisters, for a charity event to help them raise money. At 5 o'clock I went to the Friends of the NRA (National Rifle Association) banquet. At 7:30, Mr. Speaker, I was at a softball festive night to raise money for a local charity. That is what I did on Saturday, and I am sure many people in this building did what I did if you are a full-time working legislator who is out there with the people you represent. If you do not do that, your people are not going to know you.

I enjoy what I do, Mr. Speaker. I go out in the community. I know most people that I represent. As the gentleman from Delaware said, he knocks on doors all the time and he knows his people in another way. There is nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker. We are a representative government. Those are the people that send me here, and I listen to their needs and concerns, and I think that is what my job is.

I believe that we as a legislature should stand up for representation. That is what this is about, Mr. Speaker. Think of a Senator representing 250,000 people. We represent 60,000 people right now. After reapportionment, we are going up to 63,000 people. My area is going to get bigger, and I will work just as hard.

Mr. Speaker, I go into the schools in my district. I have nine school districts. I think it is important that we talk to young people. It is important that they know who we are and it is important that we show and lead by example to make them get interested in government. If you are going to increase my district that much bigger and give me three or four or five more school districts, I cannot do what I am doing now, Mr. Speaker. Here is what it is going to come down to. Whom do your constituents want to see? Do they want to see you, or under this proposal, do they want to see that newly hired staff person that you are going to have to have to go out and represent you? I think most people want to see their Representative. They do not want to see their staff person, especially at some of those types of events. I have a great staff. They work very hard in my district office. I have a very busy office, one of the busiest offices in western Pennsylvania, but I believe it is right.

Let us talk numbers, Mr. Speaker. Let us talk numbers. The median legislature in this country represents 41,000 people; 41,000 people is what they represent. Under the new reapportionment, we will represent 63,000 people, and it is manageable, in my opinion. If you work hard and you work, you will be able to represent your people. You want to give me 80,000 people, you will not have the same representation that you have now.

I studied this issue, as I said earlier, on the Commission on Reform. And, Mr. Speaker, I am in my 18th year. I am in my 18th year. When this takes effect, if the good people send me back, I would be here 28 years. I would be toward the end, Mr. Speaker. So I have nothing at all to lose by this bill being passed, but we also have many hardworking younger members who want to work for their people. They are the ones we have to remember. Those are the people that like what they are doing. They want to be out there helping people. That is what this job is all about, the legislative process, going to your committee meetings, being a chair, that you can do something to help the people that you represent. Under this proposal, Mr. Speaker, you will be taking a valuable process away, especially the one-on-one contact. The cost of running for office, as we all know, keeps going up, year after year. Who will your new Representatives be? You will no longer be able to do door-to-door. You will no longer be able. You are going to have to raise substantial amounts of money or you are going to have to be self-funded, so the only people that will be left will be very wealthy individuals. When I look across this House floor, many people in this chamber are average, working people. Whether you are a conservative, a moderate, a liberal, whatever you want to call yourself, most people – and I respect each and every one of my colleagues – they are average people. You will not have that with a smaller legislature.

As far as the legislative process, Mr. Speaker, I have been under five Speakers, and they never had any problem managing this House. I think we have done a good job many times working together and accomplishing goals to do what is best for the people of Pennsylvania, the people of Pennsylvania. Rural Pennsylvania, I guess that is where I am from in Lawrence County, and I feel bad for some of my colleagues that are going to have to have, if this bill actually becomes law in 10 years, three and four and five counties. You are going to have counties with no representation of a person who actually lives in that municipality. I do not think that is fair, I do not think that is right, and I strongly would encourage my colleagues to seriously think about this today. Think about what you are doing. Without hearings, you have never vented this issue. I have. I have seen it. The easy vote is "yes." The easy vote is "yes." The difficult vote is "no," but that is what we are here to do, to put up the difficult votes and do what you think is right for the people that you represent. Each and every one of you is going to have to make that decision today. And for many of you, it is not going to affect you. You will be gone before this 10-year process is out. And for those senior members, remember something, if you have been here that long and you have worked very hard at what you have done, you will never give that opportunity to some of your colleagues that are here today because they will not have that opportunity. And through no fault of their own, they are very good, hardworking people, who in 10 years will not be here. And their county will probably lose their Representative who they may all like and is doing a

good job. And if they are not, the people will tell them they do not want them there anymore.

So I conclude, Mr. Speaker. I thank you for your attention today, and I strongly believe, and I would encourage my colleagues, do the right thing, vote "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

GUEST INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For the information of the members, we have another son of a former member with us today. Ben Clark is the son of former Representative Dan Clark. Ben is also a student at Pennsylvania State University and here advocating on their behalf and had interned previously with Representative Geist. Ben, welcome to the hall of the House.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 153 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mercer County, Representative Longietti.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal would decrease the representation of the people of Pennsylvania and their government by giving them fewer Representatives. Our tradition at the Federal level has been the few times that we have amended the Federal Constitution in this regard have always been to increase and not decrease the representation of the people. In the United States Congress, we started out at our beginning with about 50 Representatives. Today we have about 435. The size and population of the country has increased and representation was increased. When our country was founded, United States Senators were not elected by the people. They were selected by State legislatures. We amended our Federal Constitution to provide for direct election of U.S. Senators to increase and not decrease the representation of the people. At one time women and minorities did not have the right to vote in this country. We amended our Constitution to allow them the right to vote, to increase and not decrease the people's representation and their democracy.

So when a proposal like this comes along that would diminish the representation of the people, it is against the American tradition. And when it is proposed to amend our Constitution to diminish or reduce the representation, the proponents offering that proposal have a heavy burden. They have a heavy burden to show why the American tradition should be departed from, why we should decrease representation. For when it comes to altering the very constitutional foundation of our government, this is not a matter for playful experimentation. It is not a matter for whimsical tinkering or even bending to the popular will of the people at that particular time. It is serious business with serious consequences.

So we must ask ourselves certain questions as we prepare to vote on this bill: Have the proponents of this legislation met their heavy burden of changing the constitutional foundation of our government? Have the authors of this bill justified the diminishment of the people's representation? Have the reformers offered any hard evidence that reducing representation will improve our effectiveness or improve the cost benefit to the taxpayers or improve our structure in

comparison to other States? I answer each of these questions affirmatively, no. They have offered no evidence. They have only provided empty assertions that it would be so. They have utterly failed to meet their high burden that we should amend our Constitution to diminish the representation of the people.

Yet I offer evidence that refutes each of their empty assertions. So we have heard a lot about the size of legislatures in other States and how we compare. As has been said, each of us represents about 63,000 people. Did you know, did you know that the Representatives in 32 other States represent fewer people than we represent here in Pennsylvania? Listening to the debate, you would think that we are the oddity, yet 32 other States, their State Representatives represent fewer people than we do. The median State is Massachusetts. They are the middle. They represent approximately 41,000 constituents, which is about 22,000 fewer people than we represent.

You know, you cannot compare the bank around the corner to Bank of America. Bank of America has a lot more employees than your local bank. That is because they have a lot more customers than the local bank around the corner. We have 63,000 customers. Do not compare me to Wyoming and Idaho. We have heard that shrinking the legislature will somehow make us more effective and more efficient. Once again, empty assertions with no facts. Our State Senate is about a quarter of our size. They have 50 Senators. We have 203 Representatives. They are a much smaller body than us, so how effective have they been? How do they compare to this House of Representatives? Did you know, during each of the last three legislative sessions, we passed more bills out of the House and more of our bills became law than the State Senate? So how is a smaller body more effective?

We have heard a lot about Ohio, the Ohio Legislature. I know something about Ohio. Actually, I live at the border of Ohio. It is actually a lot closer for me to go to the State Capitol of Ohio than it is to come here to Harrisburg. It takes me about 4 hours to get to Harrisburg. I can get to the Ohio capital, Columbus, in about 2 1/2 hours. So how is Ohio doing? They have a smaller legislature. Are they more effective than us? Are they more efficient than us? Let us look at the stats. Did you know that the unemployment rate in Ohio has been significantly higher than the unemployment rate in Pennsylvania for each of the last 3 years running? Did you know that? Did you know that Ohio has scored below Pennsylvania in the fourth grade and eighth grade reading and math assessments for each recorded year from 2007 through 2011? Did you know that Pennsylvania was rated one of the best States in the country to retire in, but Ohio did not even make the top 10? Did you know that Pennsylvania offers programs like the property tax rebate for seniors, prescription drug assistance for seniors, reduced registration fees for seniors, but Ohio offers none of these types of programs for senior citizens? So much for trying to emulate Ohio. I do not want to become like Ohio. I do not think that is a model of where our representation should be.

Now, the proponents of this legislation say that passing it would somehow save taxpayer dollars, although they are not sure how much would be saved and they are not offering that as a reason to support this bill, but really, eliminating 50 State Representatives might save, might save, the people of Pennsylvania about 50 cents apiece a year; 50 cents apiece per year. Now, when you add 20,000 constituents to each representation, which is a 25-percent increase, there are tradeoffs and consequences for that 50 cents a year. As has been

mentioned, constituents will see us less. We will have more territory to serve and more places to be. And by the way, by the way, what is one of the most often heard criticisms of members of the United States Congress? You know it, and I know it. We hear arguments that they are disconnected. They do not understand what it is like to be an average constituent. And why is that? In part, because they represent 720,000 people. We have made them so big that they do not move around their district and talk to people and understand what their problems are. So why in the world would we want to emulate that problem and go to a larger legislature or more constituents?

Constituents will have less opportunities to communicate with us. If you are like me, you read your e-mails, you read your letters, you take your phone calls, and you respond to them directly. You meet directly with constituents. Increase our constituency base by 25 percent and we will need to delegate that function to staff in many cases. I do not think that the people will get their 50 cents' worth out of that. We will be less in touch with the pulse of our communities and more removed from the views of our constituents. Is it really worth a savings of 50 cents a person to have a disconnected and inaccessible government? What will happen to our rural areas and smaller towns? As each of us has to represent 80,000 people, our districts will have to reach into the more densely populated areas to pick up that necessary population. Is it no wonder, is it no wonder that the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau, the Pennsylvania State Grange, and the Pennsylvania Association of Township Supervisors have all announced their opposition to this bill because it would diminish, it would reduce the representation of rural Pennsylvania and the small towns in Pennsylvania?

Currently in Mercer County, where I come from, we have three State Representatives that live in Mercer County. If this proposal becomes law, we may have one, maybe no Representatives that live in Mercer County. I do not think that is a good deal for the people of Mercer County. Our colleague from McKean County has a district that already covers almost 2500 square miles; 2500 square miles. His district is larger than over one-half of the United States Congress districts. I ask the question, how much larger do we want to make his district? How much more difficult do we want to make it for his constituents to see him? We must remember that Pennsylvania is the most rural State in the country and the legislature needs to reflect that diversity.

So where is the hard evidence that this proposal will produce any significant benefits to the people of Pennsylvania? I submit that it will not benefit the people of Pennsylvania. So while I certainly respect my colleagues who have offered this bill, they simply have failed to meet their high burden to demonstrate how this bill, to diminish the representation of the people, will somehow benefit the people. And when it comes to altering the foundations of our constitutional government, it is imperative that we produce strong evidence for such a change. This is not the time to conduct an experiment upon conjecture. Our constitutional fathers made it difficult to amend the Constitution to avoid such a cavalier approach. We must remember that if this experiment fails, it will be equally difficult to amend the Constitution and undo what we have done. So let us not look to opinion polls, which change like the wind, when establishing the constitutional foundations of our government. Let us do what is right by our fellow citizens. Let us reject this

effort to diminish the representations of our citizens by rejecting this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority whip, who asks that the gentleman from Lancaster County, Mr. BOYD, be placed on leave for the balance of the day. Without objection, leave is granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 153 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Venango County, Representative Hutchinson.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose HB 153, and I ask my colleagues to join me in opposition. Many of us, myself included, who have been around here for a while are extremely wary when we hear legislative leaders talk about being better able to quote, unquote, "manage the process." Each individual member, every one of us, is sent here by their constituents, not to be managed by others, but instead to represent the constituents and to make their own decisions on which way to vote on the issues.

This brings me to the crux of the issue, in my opinion. Mr. Speaker, this is a time when more and more citizens feel alienated from their government. By definition, larger and larger representative districts make it much less likely that citizens will have personal contact with their elected Representatives. I believe it is that personal contact, that daily ear to the ground, that makes us better legislators and helps to reduce public cynicism. As districts become bigger, it is just physically impossible for individuals to be personally accessible when their districts are getting larger and include tens of thousands of additional citizens.

Our forefathers never viewed the House as an elitist body. They envisioned the people's House as a rough-and-tumble body that was filled with citizens who came to Harrisburg to vote, but who also live in and actively participate in the fabric of their communities back home; legislators who are not only involved in civic, charitable, and church organizations and functions, but who also may be seen informally chatting over coffee at their local diner or who may be seen going for an evening stroll down the street with their wife on a warm summer evening; legislators who are in a better position to informally hear and embody the viewpoints and values of their neighbors.

It is no surprise that over the years polls have consistently shown that people like their individual legislator, but they do not approve of Harrisburg or they do not like the legislature as a whole. It is this personal contact that makes the difference. As a sidenote, I also believe that the larger we make legislative districts, the less likely that nonwealthy, unconnected citizens will be able to run competitively for the House. Today there are many members sitting here who got here not with mass media, but with shoe leather. Unfortunately, as we go forward, if this legislation is enacted, the bigger the districts will become, the more impossible it will become in the future for individuals to

get known and get elected without purchasing expensive television and other expensive mass media. I believe the importance of ballot access is critical.

Mr. Speaker, the House plays a very important role in the lawmaking process because we immediately reflect the hopes and passions of our constituents. This connection with the people will become more diluted as we reduce the number of House members. This downsizing will only save money marginally, if at all, as the prime sponsor himself has admitted. I might add that the true way, if you wish to save money, is to spend less money on the operations of the legislature. But more importantly, the loss of a close connection between the people and their elected Representatives will be detrimental to our democracy and will also block many individuals from any opportunity to ever competitively run for the State House of Representatives.

So please join me in opposing HB 153. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and, on the question, recognizes the gentlelady from Warren County, Representative Rapp.

Ms. RAPP. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the sponsor of this bill, I cannot as a Representative of the second largest geographical district in Pennsylvania support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I currently serve the 65th District, which consists of 3 counties, 33 townships, 8 boroughs, and 1 third-class city. Obviously, under this proposed legislation, the 65th Legislative District only expands further geographically. And certainly I can attest to everything that the other rural legislators have spoken of regarding campaigns, meeting people in our district, staying close to our constituents.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, when our Founding Fathers in the Constitution designated the House of Representatives as being the body of the people and in that Constitution they said that the House of Representatives would run and would serve every 2 years in the House, the reason for the 2-year term, in their minds, was so that the House of Representatives, the legislators in the House of Representatives would stay close to the people that they represent, stay close to those constituents, go out and meet those constituents so that we can best represent them, whether we agree or disagree with them or not.

And quite frankly, I was astounded to hear the Representative from Delaware County stating that some of the members in Delaware County have six or seven staff members. When I have the second largest geographic district and do not have that many staff members, if we want to look at savings, maybe we should look at the number of staff members people have in their districts. That certainly is one way to cut down the expenses of this House.

As the Representative from Lawrence or Mercer stated – I am not sure; forgive me – there was a hearing under the former Speaker's reform group. I testified at that State Government meeting at that time basically stating what I am stating now. I testified again this session. The chairman of the State Government Committee invited me to testify because he knew that I had concerns regarding this proposal.

It is very interesting when I hear legislators in more urban areas talk about we can downsize because we have technology today. People can contact us by e-mail. We can contact them by

e-mail. Technology is a wonderful thing, Mr. Speaker, when it works. But that particular day, as the members of the State Government Committee will recall, because I live 4 hours away from this Capitol Building, I was invited to testify by Skype, a wonderful idea. The IT (information technology) people sent me the technology for the computer, got it all set up, ready to go. Guess what? When I was supposed to testify by Skype, it did not work. So we had to wait and the State Government Committee was waiting down here in Harrisburg. I was waiting back in my office, Mr. Speaker, and eventually I had the opportunity to testify by speakerphone. All well and good, but what I am saying to you is in rural Pennsylvania not everybody has access to the Internet. Indeed, some of my senior folks do not even have a computer, which is why they need to come to my office and hear about all the programs that previous legislators have talked about that we have passed legislation for in this House to help our senior citizens and others in this great State. They need direct access to their legislators, Mr. Speaker, and it is very difficult to do. It is difficult for my constituents to drive sometimes 50 miles or 30 miles to come to my office, especially, Mr. Speaker, with the price of gasoline these days at the pump.

So, Mr. Speaker, some believe that fewer legislators, fewer days give more power to the executive branch. Certainly that does take away the voice of rural constituents, and that is some of the concern of our Farm Bureau and some of our township supervisors. When we are not here in this body serving the people of Pennsylvania, we have to be very cautious about what we are doing concerning the balance of power between the executive and the legislative branches of government.

I certainly am one, Mr. Speaker, who stands today for government reform, but whether you have 203 members in this body or whether you have 153, integrity of government is reflected in the integrity of the legislators and not by how many legislators serve in this House. This proposal will have a negative impact on rural Pennsylvania in having access to their legislator, the legislator who is their voice in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives.

I am a "no" vote on this legislation and ask you to carefully consider the impact of your vote and what it will have not just in rural PA but all across this State.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady and, on the question, recognizes the gentleman from McKean County, Representative Causer.

Mr. CAUSER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to HB 153 for many of the same reasons that have been expressed by my colleagues from rural Pennsylvania. I have numerous concerns with HB 153, and as I look at the legislation, the first thing that comes to mind is, what are we really trying to accomplish? When we look at this legislation and you look at the details and I listen to the debate, I hear the words "increased efficiency," "increased effectiveness," "management," and from some people "cost savings."

Well, I will tell you that I certainly have some very deep concerns about some of the comments that have been made. I have some deep concerns about the legislation itself. I can tell you, speaking on the issue of cost savings, reducing the size of the legislature certainly I do not believe saves the State any

money. I know firsthand that if you reduce the number of legislators, make the districts larger, the first thing that will happen is legislators covering larger districts will add more staff and add more district offices, and there really will not be any cost savings.

I am very concerned about the impact on rural representation, as the Representative from Warren County just spoke about. Right now I have the largest legislative district in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. I use every outreach tool available to communicate with my constituents, whether it is e-mails, Facebook, every tool that we have for communications, and as the Representative from Warren County stated, we still have constituents who do not even have computers. So in rural Pennsylvania we still have some issues, and I am very concerned about the impact that this legislation could have on rural representation in communicating with our constituents. I will say that I support reduced government spending, but I do not think by cutting representation in the State House of Representatives is the way to accomplish that.

I respect my good friend, the Speaker's position on this particular legislation. I just respectfully disagree with him. I think that we need to be focused on representation. We need to maintain representation across this Commonwealth, and I think that in order to do that we should reject HB 153. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the minority whip, who asks that the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. ROEBUCK, be placed on leave for the balance of the day and that the gentleman from Montgomery County, Mr. GERBER, be placed on leave. Without objection, those leaves are granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 153 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Northampton County, Representative Freeman.

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose HB 153. I know that in the eyes of some, this measure is perceived as a reform measure, but in reality, it will not achieve the hoped-for reforms that its supporters are professing and, in fact, may very well result in a number of unintended negative consequences that will run counter to the goal of reform.

In his opening remarks on the debate on this bill, the prime sponsor, our Speaker, made some comments to the effect, and I want to do his comments justice, but comments to the effect that when he first came down here, he more or less accepted the notion that we would have a House of 203 and saw nothing wrong with it but that over time his thinking on the subject changed and he came, in his own words, to feel that a smaller House would be more beneficial. Ironically, I had almost the opposite effect. I remember when I first came here, my notions were that perhaps at 203 we are too big, that maybe a figure like 153 might be a more appropriate figure, but over time in the course of my service, I came to realize the many benefits that

having a chamber of 203 members brings. One that has not really been widely discussed here today in the course of our debate but I think is very important is the divergence of perspective that we gain. At 203 members, being elected in small districts, we have seen many people come into the political system. Oftentimes this is their first and sometimes only public office that they will hold. I have served with people who were steelworkers, longshoremen, insurance salesmen, farmers, educators, policemen, social workers, attorneys, nurses, people from all walks of life, and they brought with them those perspectives from their own personal experiences, something more readily achievable in a chamber of 203 than in a smaller House where, chances are, you will probably draw on people who are career politicians to run in districts that will be tougher to gain a seat in.

At 203 our districts are just about the right size. We represent 60,000 people. That is a manageable size, and it is still a challenge for many of our colleagues in the more rural parts of this State, given the vast distances that they have to service, but at least 60,000 is better than the 80,000 envisioned in this legislation.

With this legislation we increase the population of our districts by a third, and one should not discount the impact that will have on being able to provide good constituent service and to hear the concerns of our district constituents in face-to-face conversations. Smaller districts mean more face-to-face contact with our constituents. It empowers the people of our district – our voters, our constituents, our employers – it empowers them to have access to those who will be voting on decisions that will affect them.

I am sure my experience as a legislator is very similar to many of the members of this chamber. I am sure just like almost each and every one of you, I try and get to as many Eagle Courts of Honor as I can, I try to participate in the civic parades of the communities of my district as much as they do. I am sure they try and get as often as they can to the volunteer fire company banquets, to the flag-raising ceremonies, to the Memorial Day services that occur every May in their districts. They are accessible. They are available to talk with their constituents because our districts are small in size. That is one of the key and most important benefits of a House of 203 members, that voter contact, which in so many respects is at the very heart of a well-functioning democracy; the ability of voters to confer with their elected Representatives and to impart to them their feelings on how the policy decisions of the day should be dealt with.

All we have to do is look to our colleagues in the Senate to realize that because of the size of their districts, the larger number of people they have to represent, that they are not able to get to the kind of functions that we are. Too often I am sure each and every one of us has had the experience when we go to a community event and there is a representative from the Senator's office at that event because they have to service a larger district. They cannot be everywhere, something which we get pretty close to achieving because of the size of our districts.

Bigger districts also mean more costly campaigns, and that problem should not be looked upon as something minor. It is a serious problem. If campaigns are more costly, that means that more special interest money will be driven into the process, and there is no way that that will not affect the policymaking process down here. It will take away from the power of the people to be the true influence on this process as it gets blurred

with special interest money that gets infused in the campaigns out of the necessity to be able to have to have the funds to communicate with voters in a bigger district.

Today you can run the kind of shoe-leather campaign, the kind of door-to-door campaign that many of us ran to get down here and that many of us continue to run in our reelections to remain as the Representatives for our district. Those kinds of campaigns are the best kind of campaigns. They are grassroots. They require face-to-face contact with the voter to convince them of the merits of your candidacy and why you should be elected to this office.

A smaller House with larger districts means a greater distance from the people. If we diminish the size of this chamber and we create larger districts to service, we are going to have less and less contact with people. It will be tougher to get to everything that we should try and get to. We will need more staff to service the needs of our constituents in those districts, which negates the intent of saving money by doing away with 50 seats in this House.

And as has been mentioned by my friends and colleagues from rural Pennsylvania, it will pose a particular hardship on the rural people of Pennsylvania in being able to access their legislator and the services they can provide because of the expanded district in the sparsely populated part of the State. Other municipal entities will also find themselves more inclined to be underrepresented. Currently we have about 50 members in this chamber who represent districts of the third class, small cities that have real needs and need to have their voice heard in the debate on public policy here in Harrisburg. If we reduce the size of this chamber by 50 members to 153, their needs are going to get submerged in a larger district, and one has to question whether or not that will impact their ability to have their needs addressed and heard in the policy discussions of this legislature. That small borough that you might represent today, which you pay a lot of attention to because it is a part of your district, might have its voice diminished in a greater district where it does not have that same leverage in the electoral process and in the ability to catch your ear because of its diminutive size.

At 203 members we are the only branch, the only branch of State government where politics is still done at the retail level. Think about it. Every other aspect of State government, politics is conducted at the wholesale level, and by wholesale level, I mean it is done through expensive campaign advertising on TV, in newspapers, through radio, through mailers. We are the only level where it is real retail politics, where we still go out and run the door-to-door campaigns to meet the voters and to make the case for our candidacy and to hear their concerns.

There needs to be at least one branch of State government that is closest to the people. With small districts and a 2-year term, we guarantee that this House, this House of Representatives, remains that branch of government that has the pulse of the people, that can hear their concerns, and can respond quickly to their needs and to their direction.

Our Speaker noted in his remarks on Monday that we would be more deliberative if we were a smaller body. In reality, in my opinion, just the opposite would occur. If anything, we may be a little too deliberative at times in our tendencies, but compare our debates to the debates that go on in the Senate, a much smaller body. There is more discussion in this chamber, and I realize at times that frustrates each and every one of us, but it is a healthy thing to have that debate, to have that discussion, to

hear different perspectives, to allow every one of these members in this chamber to come up to the microphone and to give their viewpoint and perspective that might not otherwise be represented in a chamber with less Representatives.

When you reduce the membership of a body from 203 to 153, you lose the perspective of 50 people, you lose the perspective of 50 people, and that means we do not get the broad representation of thought on the kind of issues we are asked to vote upon.

Our Speaker also noted the frustration he felt as a past floor leader in trying to get the House to function properly, to address the work that is before it, and to pass legislation, and yes, at 203 members it can at times be difficult and downright cumbersome to move items on the legislative agenda, but you know, in many respects that is a virtue, because it requires our leaders to consult with a broader range of people to get the necessary 102 votes to be able to gain the kind of consensus that ensures that all the perspectives have been brought into play. So it is not necessarily a bad thing that it is sometimes tough for the leaders to be able move what they want to move through this process.

We are a more independent body than our Senate colleagues, and that is attributable to our size. A smaller House with fewer members, larger districts, will mean fewer people will need to be on board with any idea for it to become law, and that runs counter to the broad notion of a democratic process.

In his remarks the Speaker noted that there is no magical number, there is no magic, I guess is what he said, about the number 203, and that is true, but that may also be said about 153. There is no magical number in that regard either. What is magical is the relationship of the people to their Representatives, their ability to access their elected Representatives, to talk to them one on one, to get their viewpoint across, to have the opportunity to influence the public policy process through that direct voter contact, that direct contact with their elected official in their district or with candidates on the hustings.

Let us not alter the one branch of State government that permits greater one-on-one contact with the people of this Commonwealth. Let us not cause that magical experience of the people's ability to access their Representative, to express personally to them their point of view, and to influence the public policy process. If we adopt this bill today, we undercut the ability for our people, our constituents, to have that ready access. Let us not diminish representation. Let us vote "no" on HB 153.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and, on the question, recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Representative Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I started to waive off primarily because in listening to the last speaker and the gentelady before the last speaker, both of them kind of hit the nail on the head. They made it clear that reducing the size of the House or the General Assembly is not tantamount to greater success or better performance. The quality is not in the number. The quality is really in how we operate.

Yes, there is a cry out there for reducing the size of the General Assembly, but that is only after people look at the cost associated with the operation of the General Assembly. It is not the size; it is the cost. And if we are going to take this step towards amending the Constitution, why not advance a

proposition that leads to the General Assembly coming in session in February and leaving in June? Statutorily we work as a part-time body, but you and I know that we are actually working 12 months out of the year. So if you want to save money, let us follow the path of many other States and stop coming in and out for 12 months and come in in February, take care of our business, which is the budget and a few more issues, and go home so you can be with your family – your wives, your husbands – and the community. That will save money.

If we consolidate some of the delivery of our services, we can save money. And, Mr. Speaker, when you look at how much it costs to become a State Rep or Senator, when I came in 23 years ago versus what people have to spend today, any reduction in the House is going to not intentionally, but it is going to result in disenfranchisement of a whole bunch of people who are not able to raise the money that is required or necessary in order to run for office today. So there are communities out there, both rural and urban, that are going to be locked out of significant participation in this process.

And my last concern to complement the last two speakers is on this issue of technology. Someone said that because of the progress that we have made in technology, that we can better manage our business. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is correct for those communities that are either wired or beneficiaries of broadband technology or wireless technology, but, Mr. Speaker, there are growing communities in rural and urban Pennsylvania that are not wired and have not been the beneficiaries of wireless communication. And, Mr. Speaker, we all know that in order for technology to work, you need infrastructure, you need instruction on how to use the infrastructure, and you need quality equipment to go with the infrastructure and the instruction. Those are the three basic tenets of accessing technology. Without that, you cannot really benefit from it. And so, Mr. Speaker, if you look at many of our communities in rural Pennsylvania and in urban Pennsylvania, I mean, I can tell you right now that within the last 12 months, Pennsylvania has been the beneficiary of a ton of money in broadband communications, but, Mr. Speaker, when you look at where that broadband money is invested, it is not in a lot of our rural communities. There are some that benefit, but for the most part, it has not reached those communities and has not reached some urban communities.

So, Mr. Speaker, the last data I saw shows that over 30 percent of people who have computers do not have access to the Internet. So they have equipment, but they do not have access to the industry. And so, Mr. Speaker, until we resolve that, until we resolve a broader conversation about the management of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, and until we have taken some meaningful reform steps to reduce the cost of what is viewed as excessive cost associated with the operation of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, we have no other choice but to vote "no" on HB 153.

And I applaud the Speaker in stepping up, because for some years a lot of people have been talking about this, but he was the only one that I know of in my time that has stepped up and said, I want to have a conversation about it. And so I think this conversation has to be a part of some other conversations to get a handle on our business and maximize the delivery of services that we can provide to the people of Pennsylvania.

But in closing, you know that unless HB 153 is talking about jobs in my district and other districts, if HB 153 is not talking about health care for the hundreds of thousands of uninsured children in Pennsylvania, and if HB 153 is not talking about making access to a quality education available to all children, whether they come from Philadelphia County, Delaware County, or Northumberland County, so unless we are talking about legislative prescriptions with that kind of nexus, then I am not going to be in favor of it anyway. So vote "no" on HB 153.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority whip, who asks that the gentleman from Delaware County, Representative MICOZZIE, be placed on leave for the balance of the day. Without objection, that leave is granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 153 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Representative Cohen.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I join many of my colleagues in urging a "no" vote on this legislation.

I have experience with larger legislative bodies in terms of the number of people they represent. I started as an intern in the U.S. House of Representatives, which then, as now, had 435 members. With 435 members, there were many members who were not known to each other, and I remember coming here with 203 members and being impressed how what a small body this was compared to the 435 members of the U.S. House of Representatives. And then after I worked in the U.S. House of Representatives, I worked in the U.S. Senate, and that was smaller than the U.S. House of Representatives with 100 members, and the people knew each other a lot better in the U.S. Senate, but in the U.S. Senate they had even less connection with their constituents than the members of the U.S. House, which the Senate had about 500,000 people per congressional district. And I learned how disconnected the Federal government can be with its very large constituencies, and the Congressmen and Senators in the Federal government basically limited their contacts with their constituents to symbolic exercises. They would carefully look at their constituents and see, well, if I go here, what broader message am I sending to larger numbers of people? And if it was not a good symbolic reason to go to some location, members of the U.S. House and members of the U.S. Senate tended not to go there.

And even into the State Senate, which is much smaller in terms of the size of a district than the U.S. Senate, it is hard for the members of the State Senate to get around like we do. One of my constituents is a guy named Bob McGowan, who worked as a staff aide for many years for Senator Shirley Kitchen, and he told me how frustrated he was over and over again listening to the complaints of people. How come Senator Kitchen does not go here? Representative Cohen goes here; this Representative goes there. And he would patiently explain how the State House districts were much smaller than the State

Senate districts and it was a lot easier for us to go around, but he was very frustrated by the number of times he had to give that kind of explanation.

We are fortunate indeed that we represent small numbers of people, relatively speaking. We represent smaller size districts than the Philadelphia City Council, which represents 150,000 people at a district level and some of them represent the entire city of 1.5 million people. We represent smaller districts than many county commissioners do. The fact that we represent a smaller number of people makes us closer to the people and enables us to do a better job. We ought not to be ashamed of that fact.

These are not our seats. There is no Mark Cohen seat; there is no Sam Smith seat; there is no Mike Turzai seat or Frank Dermody seat. These are the people's seats, and when we talk about eliminating seats, we are not eliminating our own personal property. These seats are not our personal properties. These seats are the property of the people of Pennsylvania, and what we are doing is we are voting to give the people of Pennsylvania less representation than they now have.

One argument for this legislation is that, well, we are making massive cuts in the executive branch. We are cutting all sorts of social services. We are cutting all sorts of educational services. Should we not be consistent and cut ourselves? I think, Mr. Speaker, we ought not to be making all these cuts and we certainly ought not to be seeking justifications for making unwise cuts, and we ought to realize that when we are cutting, we are hurting adversely the same people we are hurting by the other cuts. Somebody who is affluent and does not need State government for anything or believes that that is his or her perspective, that he has no need or she has no need for State government, is not going to be affected by the number of State legislators, but somebody who needs social services, who needs a better education, who needs help for a parent or an uncle or an aunt who is getting up in years, by adding a cut in the number of State legislators to all the other cuts that are being inflicted upon persons like that, we are only adding the harm we are doing to people who need our help.

This bill has been advocated for a long, long time. It has been advocated before some of us have been alive. Past legislators and past legislative bodies have had the wisdom to reject this legislation. I would hope that we here today would also have such wisdom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, the majority leader, Representative Turzai.

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

I rise today in support of HB 153. This constitutional amendment by our Speaker is a historical approach and today's vote is a historical vote as well.

For many of us on both sides of the aisle, we are putting forth an issue that has been often discussed or not ever put forth for significant floor debate and an actual vote. For many it is following through on a pledge to change how State government operates and in fact says that we are not interested merely in ourselves but that we stand for smaller government, including a smaller legislature. It is an opportunity for us to rightsize Pennsylvania government and to be able to deal in a more efficient and effective manner with respect to the major issues facing the State.

To change the size of the legislature requires this amendment to the State Constitution, but keep in mind that the constitutional amendment process requires both chambers to pass it, and we will give the Senate that opportunity shortly, and then it must be passed in two consecutive sessions and subsequently approved by a referendum vote of the people of Pennsylvania.

For me and I believe for many others, we welcome the opportunity to make sure that this constitutional amendment passes in the 2011-2012 session. We can get input and readdress it in the 2013-2014 session before ultimately letting the people of Pennsylvania speak on the legislation themselves in a referendum vote.

I repeat, I believe that the Speaker's measure and the fact that we have taken the time to have had a serious, rational, thoughtful approach and debate over the last days on this House floor represents a transformational break from the past for this body and for this Capitol. I truly believe that our matter-of-fact-but-serious approach or serious discussion already has marked a break in the past and means that we are willing to continue to tackle tough issues, historical issues, as we are today. This debate and this vote, designed to make State government smaller, is a historic step and a step in a positive direction.

I would urge the members to please vote "yes."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority whip, who asks that the gentleman from Montgomery County, Representative MURT, be placed on leave for the balance of the day. Without objection, that leave is granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 153 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question, the gentlelady from Philadelphia, Representative Josephs, is recognized.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to this bill. I am going to try not to repeat many of the very good arguments made by people on both sides of the aisle who are against this bill, but I must say that I am very pleased to be able to agree with the lady from Warren. She has the second largest district, she told us, in area. I have the smallest district in area, but I am very concerned about those rural districts because Philadelphia is a place where we cannot grow our own food. We have to depend on the farmers, the people who have been standing up and complaining about this bill, and the Farm Bureau, who came before the State Government Committee and expressed this disapproval of this bill for the same reason as many of the Representatives from the rural areas did.

I also have to say that like the gentleman from Delaware County, I talk to my constituents maybe not directly about once a week but certainly once removed. I cannot get to all the doors, but I meet my constituents on the bus, on the subway, on the street, in the grocery store and the cleaners, in the gardens. I see them all, and the ones that I do not see, I go to their buildings, their big apartment houses, and I do reports from Harrisburg. They all know me. I could not do that if we had a bigger district. I think it is important that my constituents know me.

In addition, I am going to tell you what my constituents will think of this bill. Now, I am not impugning anybody's motive on the other side or my side who is voting for this bill, but I want to tell you what my constituents think of it. They think this bill is reform light. They know this bill is not real reform. It is being sold that way, but they are not stupid. They understand perfectly well that what they want is not happening in this bill. What they want is a legislature that is not so expensive.

I had two amendments. They suffered mass extinction when as a group the Chair declared them not germane or not appropriate, and when I offered them in amendment in the committee, the State Government Committee, they were voted down. These two amendments, one after another, would require, would put into law that if we reduce the size of this legislature, we need to reduce, one amendment said, 25 percent our budget, the other amendment said 20 percent our budget. If we do not do that, my constituents are going to know very well this is a game, this is a sham, and I cannot believe that my constituents are any smarter or more aware than anybody else's constituents here. The voting public in Pennsylvania is not fooled by this stuff, not fooled, Mr. Speaker. They are a lot smarter than you think they are, than I think they are sometimes, too.

Reform has to do with making this legislature less expensive. Nobody wanted to vote on that. I do not understand why. I truly do not understand why the majority party – and they control all the parliamentary skulduggery that happens here. It rolls off the Speaker's tongue much better than it rolls off mine when he says it, but I am working on it. Parliamentary skulduggery made it impossible for me to offer these amendments on the floor, and I am very sorry about that, because there would have been a very interesting vote, I can tell you.

Eliminating 50 legislative districts without eliminating some of our budget is a sham; it is a sham. I do not think anybody in the public is fooled. It is very hard to see how any people would benefit when their legislator is not going to be available, finds it harder to be responsive, and is spending more money to get to his or her constituents. I do not get it. I do not really get it. Pennsylvanians want real reform, not sound bites. Pennsylvanians might want a limited government, but they do not want a smaller one that spends more money. I have no idea what happened in Illinois where they spent less. Maybe part of the bill was my amendment. What do I know? I do not know.

I think people who vote for this bill are not going to be fooling at least the people in my district. They are smarter than that. I am not voting for this bill, and I urge everybody who has some respect for his voters or her voters not to vote for this either.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westmoreland County, Representative Evankovich.

Mr. EVANKOVICH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the comments of the majority leader that our vote today is transformative and our vote today is historic.

I stand in support of HB 153. For decades our State has wrestled with the question of whether or not our legislature is right, appropriately sized. On one hand, I certainly understand the concerns of many members that reducing the size of our legislature may, in many ways, change the role of the legislator. On the other hand, I also hear the call from the taxpayer, from the voter, for us to do more with less and for us to lead by

example. I understand those concerns brought up by many of the more senior, more rural colleagues, and I respect those concerns deeply, but I believe that this proposal very well may change the role of the legislator, and I think that might be a good thing.

All HB 153 does, very simply, is it starts the process to ultimately give the people of Pennsylvania the opportunity to vote up or down on reducing the size of our legislature. It does nothing more. It is not hasty, it is not speeding the process along, and I think that the people of Pennsylvania deserve the opportunity to vote whether or not they want to reduce the size of their legislature, and today I will vote to give the voters of Pennsylvania that opportunity. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and, on the question, recognizes the Representative from Lancaster County, Representative Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard several members talk about this as being a historic vote, and I guess in one sense it is. I do not know of any other time in the history of the House where we have had amendments ruled out of order that applied to the same sentence as the original bill. I cannot remember the last time I voted on legislation that did not take effect for 10 years. We have on occasion, although to many members' protestations, voted on legislation that has not had a single public hearing. So I guess in that sense it might be historic. I am not sure that we have grappled with this issue for decades, maybe a few hours here in the last few days, but I think maybe the Constitutional Convention in '68 was a little more historic than this, and I do not know many members that can tell me the details of that historic occasion.

You know, earlier some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that represent districts in the northern tier spoke, and while there are few occasions where we agree on issues, I do not believe it is because they are not doing a good job of representing their district or I am not doing a good job of representing mine. I think it is because they actually are quite in tune with their district and I am in tune with mine and we have divergent populations and we represent different interests, and that is what this legislature is about. And when those interests of our constituents get diluted and spread out in a way that you now have to represent a little bit of everything and a lot of nothing, I do not think it serves those constituents well at all.

And so I agree with my colleagues that are concerned about their large rural districts. I, like the Representative from Philadelphia who spoke earlier, who has the smallest district, I have a relatively small district. About 55,000 of my constituents live in 4 square miles. I knock on doors without ever leaving a porch. I just step over the rail.

And if I was looking at this from a political perspective, I might think this was a good idea, because in Lancaster County we have about 500,000 people. There are 8 Representatives there that each represent a little over 60,000 people, 7 Republicans and 1 Democrat. My guess is, if this bill is implemented, we will have 500,000 people, 6 Representatives representing a little more than 80,000 each, and my guess is, there will be 5 Republicans and 1 Democrat. So I should be for this if politically I think it is going to be to our advantage, but it does not make us better Representatives.

It has been said that we might be better educated if there were only 153 of us, that we could learn the issues better. I am not exactly sure how that works, because quite frankly, having

been here for more than 20 years, when I first got here, it was pretty hard to communicate with some of my constituents. I remember getting a computer and sort of looking at it like it was some sort of paperweight and finally getting an e-mail address so that some people could communicate with me, and I would get a couple of e-mails a week, and now there are times I get a couple hundred a day, sometimes at 2 and 3 and 4 o'clock in the morning from constituents that are expressing a concern about an issue that they have learned about on the Internet. And so my job of communicating with my constituents has not gotten easier just because I have a quicker means of communicating with them. It has gotten harder because I am communicating with more and more and more of them every single day. It used to be that somebody had to take the time to sit down and write a handwritten letter or call during office hours if they wanted to communicate, and now it is instantaneous. And so take that and multiply it by another 25 percent. I do not know what your days are like, but I often spend 12 and 14 hours a day trying to get caught up. Try 16 or 18 hours a day now or just getting to the point where you say, you know, I will just send out a mass e-mail saying, sorry, I would like to respond to everybody, but there is just not time to do it. That is what we are talking about here.

If this were going to save money, I would say, well, at least that is a noble cause. I do not agree that it is necessarily worth it if you are going to cut representation, but the reality is that this is not going to save money. It is going to replace an elected Representative with an unelected staff person in order to get the job done, and I do not think that is good for our constituents, whether you are Republican or Democrat.

From a reform standpoint, it is probably going to make it harder to defeat an incumbent, because particularly in those more rural districts, you will not be able to get into a few towns and talk to the majority of the people. It is going to require that you spend tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars on media in order to try and have a chance in an election. That is not going to serve the public any better.

And finally, we have been told that it will be more efficient and more effective and better representation if there were just fewer of us here in the House and over in the Senate. But you all know how this body operates and how the Senate operates, and I do not think I am telling tales out of school to know that there are 20 Democrats over in the Senate and 30 Republicans, and if what I am told is true, if the majority of members in the majority party decides they do not want something, 16 out of the 30 members in the majority party over in the Senate do not want something, the leadership has agreed not to bring it up as an issue. And so you can have a situation where there are 20 members that are Democrats and 14 members that are Republicans that want to have something happen but 16 members have put a stop to it; two-thirds of the members want something to happen and one-third has the ability to stop it. The more you shrink your numbers, the easier it is for a few to thwart ideas and legislation, for a few to thwart what the majority of Pennsylvanians want, for a few to control what happens, and I do not think that works for any of our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, earlier in this debate when we were trying to offer amendments, I offered an amendment that would have this take effect immediately, and this is the part that I do not understand most about this legislation, because the maker of this bill said, you know, if we do it in 2022, this will give the public

time to digest this. But assuming that we vote on this and it passes in this session and that we scurry back to it because members will have campaigned on it in this coming election and we get it done right away at the beginning of this next session, by the primary in 2013 the voters could be voting on this. And if they say yes, they will have taken a couple months to digest this, and then we will tell them, now wait 9 years. You voted "yes," you want us to reduce the size of the legislature, now wait 9 years before we are willing to implement that. Why? Why would you wait 9 years to implement the will of the voters? What makes sense about that other than that gives you plenty of time to make sure you qualify for the pension and the lifetime health-care benefits? The public can see that. If they vote to approve this, why would they want to wait 9 years?

So, Mr. Speaker, I think there are political reasons why this should not be done. I think there are reasons that impact our constituents as to why this should not be done, but I also think that if you truly want to represent the people that you were elected and sent here by, you want to vote "no" on this legislation. If you want to do reform in some other form, there may be 50 other things we can talk about. This is not the bill to do it. This does not accomplish reform. This delays reform, does not save money, and does not represent the wishes of your constituents. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Representative Wheatley, on the question.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to interrogate the maker of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker of the House indicates he will receive your questions.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. And I will remind the gentleman – we have not had the occasion yet today; this is not directed towards you – but the object of interrogation is to elicit information in order to gain an understanding of the bill before us.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, Mr. Wheatley.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to know if in any of your deliberations in developing this legislation or any of the hearings that covered the legislation, has there been any conversation around the implications or impact to minority districts in any reduction?

Mr. S. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, we evaluated that impact, and the analogy that I would use to respond, if in this current map that is under development for this next 10-year cycle, if hypothetically there were 4 majority-minority Hispanic districts that statistically should be provided for in this new map because of growing population centers of Hispanic voters – and I am just using that as an example – if there were 4 with 203 members, then with 153 members proportionately, there would be 3 majority-minority districts that would be established at 153 members. So much like the argument of rural versus urban representation as it makes up the face of this legislature, I do not believe that it diminishes a minority sector any more than it diminishes a rural sector because it will still be proportionate of 203; it will be the same proportion of 153.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Mr. Speaker, so am I, just for clarity, am I clear to understand that you have analysis that shows that in any reduction, any increasing of population from our current population allocation to 80,000 or more, that your analysis

shows you proportionately the representation of minority voting groups would proportionately diminish as any other group proportionately would diminish? Is that what I am hearing you say?

Mr. S. SMITH. Correct. Mr. Speaker, we did not draw a map partly because the people working on reapportionment are a little busy right now. So we did not draw a map literally with 153 districts, and quite frankly, I thought that was a bad thing to do because it might suggest some things that would not necessarily be true, but we did evaluate the numbers and we looked at it specifically with the example I gave with the majority-minority districts as it relates to Hispanic, because that is one that is more easily identifiable and comparable to this current reapportionment process that we are engaged in.

So I do not want to overstate it. It was not like a complete statistical analysis of every minority population, but the question you are asking, yes, it was evaluated. We did look at that and are comfortable that the minority representation, the districts that would be majority-minority would be proportionately the same with 153 as it is with 203.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I have been trying to ascertain and maybe in your deliberations you have done this and so it would be good if you have some analysis that if you wanted to share with me, I would love to see it, but I am curious to know if, as you were analyzing the implications to minority-majority districts, one, if you looked at geographic representation of what happens to minority-majority districts geographically as well as if you looked at what happens from different minority-majority, some increasing, like you made reference to Hispanic and Latino populations, some may be stagnant communities. In any of that analysis, have you also compared that to what the Voting Rights Act, section 2, states as it relates to disenfranchisement or disproportional impacts to minority districts in any reapportionment process?

Mr. S. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, yes. The bottom line is that it is still a proportion based on a minority population as a ratio to the population of the whole Commonwealth, and if that represented 4 legislative seats out of 203, it would roughly represent 3 out of 253, and with all minority populations, there would still be the ability to constitutionally and under the Federal Voting Rights Act apportion the statistically fair number of districts for any given minority population.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Thank you.

And I am not trying to interrogate you. I just want to understand what process that helped you develop into 153 and what that 153 might do to minority-majority districts, and if in fact there is going to be a diminishing of minority-majority districts, if there is some analysis that showed you what that diminishing will be. Me, personally, I have not seen it, but I would like to see it, because that would help me understand if I should support this or not support this. And from what I think I hear you saying is, in your analysis that you did do, your thinking is it will stay proportional, and if that is the case, I am curious of how your numbers get you there when our populations are what they are and they are really geographically compact. So I am not sure if you can share that information or if that information is available by some documentation, but that would be important for me to understand how that impacts minority-majority districts from your analysis.

Mr. S. SMITH. Like I said, I was not really at liberty to have the people that are working on the current reapportionment map do a complete in-depth mapping to verify it, but we did check that out. We were conscientious of that fact, and I did send one of the folks that works for us that has been part of that over to share with you some information that I believe will answer your question satisfactorily that this proposal to reduce the size of the House from 203 to 153 will not disenfranchise anybody. There may be one less of this minority group or that group, but there will be one less of nonminority legislators as well, and by and large, the proportionate representation will still be able to absolutely comply with the constitutional and voter rights requirements specifically as it relates to minority rights.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If I can, because the maker of the bill just shared some information with me, if I can ask for a moment to just hear the information before I come back and make my statement to know if my statement is necessary or not?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That would be appropriate. You are entitled to speak twice on the question. So we will put you back on the list—

Mr. WHEATLEY. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. —and hope you reach a sound conclusion.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Clearfield County, Representative Gabler.

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

I rise to make a few observations about HB 153 and more specifically about the constitutional amendment process. I have to say that as I wrestle with this issue, I do consider the fact that I am from a rural district. I can leave my home, drive an hour north without leaving my district, and I am not talking traffic. I am talking rural highways at 55 miles an hour. So the idea of covering a large area of geography is a concern to me.

However, it does come to mind that one of the less pleasant parts of the experience of being a Representative is when we make a decision, return to our districts, and then have feedback come to us from our constituents, and they say, if I had only known before you voted, I could have told you how I felt as things move along. Well, the great thing about the constitutional amendment process is we can do this now, and this is the first step in the process. But then we have to have an intervening election and then come back in another term and have this whole discussion again. And so what that means is, what we are doing today is we are opening a conversation with our constituents. Certainly the media is going to take note. Certainly our constituents are going to have the opportunity to see what we do here today and we are going to get feedback on it, and that is what it is.

So I have got to say I certainly have my concerns about what the implications of this could be, and I think that as this conversation continues, we will continue to get good feedback and a good sense from our constituents about what this constitutional amendment will really mean to our districts. But I have got to say in the interest of opening the conversation with my constituents, giving them the opportunity to truly focus on this, I think that it is in the best interest of the people of Pennsylvania to bring them into this conversation by moving this bill forward now.

So I am going to vote "yes" today with the note that I certainly have concerns about what this could mean if this was certainly— If this was the final vote on this, I would have to say that I would need a bit more information, but that is why we need to open this conversation with our constituents now. Once we send this to— If we pass this bill today, the Senate is going to have to consider it. If they pass it, then the Governor is going to have to sign it and we can come back in another session and do this all over again, and even after that is all done, the citizens of Pennsylvania still get the opportunity to have a referendum on this.

So there is a lot of opportunity for citizen input, and today that is what this vote is about. A "yes" vote today is to allow the citizens of Pennsylvania the opportunity to join the conversation, have their input on this bill, and tell us what they want their legislature to be.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlelady from Philadelphia, Representative DeLissio, on the question.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When I first got here in December of 2011, I ran into a former colleague of mine in the rotunda, and as it turns out, unbeknownst to me he had served in the House back in the 1960s, the late 1960s, and he proceeded to share with me how life was back then. And at the time there were 203 Representatives, but he was very, very clear that the infrastructure that supported the body was very, very different and very, very small.

And as a result of the debate on this piece of legislation, and I have been following the debate very carefully, I have a couple of thoughts that I would like to share as it pertains to this piece of legislation. One, I think that if we were to look at each of the last four decades since the late 1960s when my colleague described what the legislature was like back then, we would probably see a per-Representative increase in cost that has increased at an alarming rate. Again, the size of the legislature had not increased, but the cost per legislator had increased. These are things that we indeed can manage. So the body has performed for all of those years and the costs were different.

And that also brings me to believe that— You know, I am in touch with my constituents. We do town hall meetings on a quarterly basis. Our constituents, my constituents at least, are frustrated with the quality of what comes out of the legislature, meaning the product, and the process and what it takes to produce anything that comes out of the legislature. They are frustrated with the cost of that producing it. I have not heard anybody say that it is the 203 Representatives that frustrate them. I think what people are doing in their busy lives is responding in a very – responding very quickly to the idea of how do we reduce the cost of the legislature, and they do not follow what the details of that means, and the devil is in the details. So in 2 weeks when I hold my next set of three town hall meetings, we will be discussing this at some length, whether it passes tonight or not.

I came up here, I have watched the legislature for the past 20 years, and I definitely came up here with ideas about reform. There are no ifs, ands, or buts about it. I do not think this is a reform measure that makes any sense when you start to look at the details of it, whether that detail is, it is not going to take place for 9 years if and when it passes a referendum vote, and none of those details are about any type of meaningful reform

that is happening to deal with the frustration that is out there today. Less is not necessarily more, and this is one instance of that. Less representation does not mean more service or a better body as a result of that.

I am also concerned, currently 16.8 percent of the body is represented by women, and that statistic has been very static for the last 20 years that I am aware of. I am also concerned that with that diminished size of the body, the opportunity for a body that represents the demographics of this State will also be diminished, and that is a very serious concern. I know myself and a few others have been putting a lot of effort into trying to encourage more women to run and to just raise the awareness of that issue within our Commonwealth.

And lastly, there have been two reports that have been published lately that I hope everybody is aware of. One is the Civic Health Index of the State of Pennsylvania. Nonpartisan groups of folks have put together this Civic Health Index, and Pennsylvania ranks 50 out of 50 States in terms of civic health, and that measure is how engaged our citizens are. So in my own district I have been working very hard to actively engage the citizens via town hall meetings and pretty continuous contact in order to reengage them, because I think most citizens are very, very frustrated. So our Civic Health Index is 50. Our Pennsylvania integrity index is a C-minus; no States got an A; a handful of States got a B; the majority probably got a C or C-minus, and then there were two handfuls that got an F. Again, these are measures of where Pennsylvania stands in terms of transparency, our ability to engage our citizens, etc. These are not points of pride, Mr. Speaker, and I think that a smaller legislature will do nothing, absolutely nothing, to increase those benchmarks. People will be even more frustrated that they cannot civically engage. I would be concerned as a voter and taxpayer, and my concern has been for the past 20 years.

I heard when I first started to consider whether or not I wanted to run for office, well, gee, Pam, do you not know that there are five guys up there who run Harrisburg? How do you think you are going to make a difference, or depending on whom you talk to, 11 folks who run Harrisburg. Well, I am determined that everybody in the body will have a role in participating in this government and representing the 60,000-plus constituents that we represent. If the body is smaller, that group becomes tighter, and I do not think any good can come of that, and we will be revisiting 20 and 30 years ago when deals were made in that infamous back room and no good came of it.

So, Mr. Speaker, for all of those reasons I will be a "no" vote tonight. I think my constituents will be very glad that I am a "no" vote and encourage me to continue to work for meaningful reform. This is not that. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentlelady and recognizes, on the question, the gentleman from Philadelphia, Representative Waters.

Mr. WATERS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to HB 153. I guess you are not surprised to hear that, but I have good reasons for why I am not in support of shrinking the size of the legislature.

There was a saying years ago, one that we are all aware of, about taxation without representation, and this is not necessarily taxation without representation, but it is less representation. And I just cannot help but to notice that in certain districts this will impact communities differently. This will not be shared across the Commonwealth equally when we start reducing the amount

of members who will be able to serve and represent the people and the wishes of the people throughout the districts.

I know that one of the thoughts behind this is that it will be a cost savings and save taxpayers money, but a lot of people who do pay taxes pay taxes because they believe in return for their taxes, they get service. This will mean not less taxes being paid by the taxpayers, but it is going to definitely mean less services that they are going to receive as a result of having less people available to help them out.

Now, in certain areas where we have people who depend on government more than in other areas, for instance, people in poverty and people who are low-income, the working poor, people who have other issues related to crime, unemployment, people who have other issues in terms of the social issues in their communities, they do not need less help, they need additional help, and what we are talking about doing today is reducing the help that will be available to them sometime in the future.

Now, I do not know about you, Mr. Speaker, but I know as far as in Philadelphia, if we start increasing the amount of people that have to come to an elected official's office, then that only means that, and if you start increasing the geographical area that a person is now responsible for and the complaints and the problems that are also, I will just say, germane to the area where we are in certain urban communities, then that would mean that we will probably have to include more staff in order to accommodate those complaints.

More than likely, especially in some of the rural areas, that will mean you will definitely have to open up, in order to capture that population, more offices, more satellite offices. That means more staff. Those are more benefits that staff people, who are entitled to get, are going to now be added to the fiscal part of the legislator. So you are going to have to have more staff getting additional benefits. That does not, to me, sound like you are shrinking the size of government at all. It seems like the only target that you are looking at right now, how do you shrink the size of the legislators up here?

And the population of Pennsylvania is not going down. We are hoping that the population of Pennsylvania increases, and it will increase if we have an effective government, not less government, an effective government, and lessening and lowering the amount of people who are going to be available and capable of serving the constituents of the great Commonwealth, it does not sound to me like we are talking about a more effective government.

In the areas where we have large minority populations, the overall count or percentage of minorities in this Commonwealth is about 14 percent, but when you look at the General Assembly in both chambers, you do not see that kind of representation in our General Assembly. You do not see 14 percent minority participation in terms of people of color when you look inside both chambers here in the General Assembly; you do not see that, and if you are talking about reducing the numbers, knowing that the population outside it is not going to be reduced, then more than likely our representation here will be even less than what it is right now.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will just say that if we want to have true representation that reflects the voters' rights, that reflects human rights, that reflects civil rights, then reducing the size of the legislature will not help that at all. If anything, it is only going to have a negative impact on that kind of representation. HB 153 does not work to serve anyone's interest except for

some people who have their own personal agenda, and it is another attack on our Assembly.

I would say that we should vote this bill down and send a strong message to the other chamber, who I hope will agree that we want to have more service for the taxpayers who are not going to be given a reduction in their taxes as a result of this. People want service and this does not represent service. This represents a lack of service. And in the areas that we represent, we need to have additional staff already just to accommodate the needs of the 62,000 people that we have, and now you want to increase the number to 80,000. We see that across the board that is not going to give us a more effective government or representation in our areas unless you also increase the staff, and increasing the staff will neutralize any cost savings that you are talking about having. Let us leave well enough alone.

Let us vote down HB 153. It is not necessary, and I will say no to HB 153. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and, on the question, recognizes the gentleman from Crawford County, Representative Roae.

Mr. ROAE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am speaking in support of HB 153. With these tough budget times that we have, we are asking all State agencies, all different departments of the State, to do more with less.

Mr. Speaker, we need to look at ourselves. We are going to be asking schools to do more with less, maybe bigger class sizes, no automatic increases every year like they used to get. We are going to be asking State agencies to do more work or the same amount of work with fewer employees. We may even need to ask full-time PASSHE (Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education) professors to teach 15 hours a week rather than 12. If we are doing all these things and probably dozens of others that I could think of, we should be asking ourselves to do the same thing. I think it is perfectly reasonable that we would have to represent 80,000 people rather than 60,000. If we expect everybody else that gets paid with tax money to do more, we should do more as well, Mr. Speaker.

I think this legislation would save money. Even if we kept all the district offices open, even if we kept the entire staff in place, not having 50 Representatives, that would absolutely save money. And I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that we have to hire more staff. I do not think we have to open up more offices. We could absolutely make do with what we have now, and this legislation could definitely save money.

As far as interaction with our constituents, I think we can easily interact with 20,000 people more. When you look at the technology we have today, things like Facebook, Twitter, when you look at cell phones, e-mail, fax machines, it is much easier now for us to interact with our constituents than it was for Representatives 30 or 40 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, if you think about the different types of events that we attend, I was at a Farm Bureau banquet a couple days ago, and probably half the people there were not in my district, but I would have been at that banquet anyway, whether they were all in my district or half of them. I recently went to an Eagle Scout ceremony. It was a joint citation presentation with another member. I would be there anyway if all those people were mine or half of them were mine. A lot of things we go to, whether it is chamber of commerce functions or meetings with the school board association or all the different things we do, it is not going to add, you know, 20 or 25 percent more work.

As far as actual one-on-one interactions, I am completely confident that all of us can make as much time as necessary possible to have those individual meetings with constituents. I do not see, Mr. Speaker, I mean, I appreciate the concerns that some members have, but I just do not see where going from about 60,000 to 80,000 is going to have a big catastrophic effect.

So one last thing, Mr. Speaker. It may be a little bit harder for somebody like me to get reelected, because I did my campaigning knocking on doors. It is harder to knock on doors when you have more doors to knock on, but I think I am here to serve my constituents. I am here to serve the people back in the district. I am not here to run for reelection, and if it is tougher to get reelected without raising a lot of money, that is just how it goes, Mr. Speaker.

So I would urge everybody to support the bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and, on the question, recognizes for the second time the gentleman from Allegheny County, Representative Wheatley.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the maker of the bill for sharing the information with me to help me understand exactly their process and how they have come to their understanding of the implications to majority and minority districts.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make a few comments. First, in fact this reduction of the size— I am sorry. Are you pointing, asking for me, Mr. Speaker? Oh, I am sorry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No; I am sorry. You may proceed.

Mr. WHEATLEY. If in fact the reduction of the size of the General Assembly does go into effect and HB 153 becomes the vehicle, I understand that in the year 2020 or after the reapportionment process in 2020, this will be the basis for that reduction. One of the things that I would want to make sure we do before enactment of that process would be to make sure we have a clear understanding of what it is this will do as it relates to not only rule representation but minority representation and the effectiveness of voters being able to send individuals here to represent their interests. And from the conversation that I previously had with staff from the maker of the bill, I believe there is a commitment to understanding that implication. So with that, I feel comfortable enough to at least be able to be clear on a process by which to come to a determination on how that would impact my residents.

My overarching comment is, my philosophy is, I do not believe that reducing the size of the General Assembly gets us to where we want to be as an efficient, effective government. But if we do reduce the size of the General Assembly, I think it is utmost critical and important that we do it with an eye towards making sure underserved areas, be they rural, or underserved populations, be they Hispanic, African-American, or others, have their true abilities to be represented in this House. Because in order for us to be able to be effective, we have to make sure that individuals that are different than ourselves are all at the table helping to make and shape policy in a way that it does not diminish their influence but strengthens their influence.

So with that being said, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for giving me the time to speak on this, and I look forward to working with the maker of the bill to make sure we clearly

understand the implications of what this will do and impacts what this would do with minority and majority districts. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the understanding of the Chair that the gentleman from Clearfield County, Representative Gabler, has remarks he would like to submit for the record. Is that correct?

Mr. GABLER. Yes, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Please submit those to the clerk. Thank you very much, Mr. Gabler.

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to correct a misstatement I made in my prior remarks. I mistakenly referred to the signature of the Governor as a part of the constitutional amendment process. However, I would like to clarify that constitutional amendment bills only must be passed by both chambers of the General Assembly in two consecutive sessions before a referendum is submitted to the voters. I would like the record to reflect this correction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. And our final speaker on the list, before the maker of the bill, is recognized on the question. That is the gentleman from Philadelphia, Representative O'Brien.

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

Vox populi – the voice of the people. Hush. Hear it on the playgrounds. Vox populi – the voice of the people. Hear it on the streets. Vox populi – the voice of the people. Discordant, loud, a cacophony of sound. Vox populi – the voice of the people. And here in this chamber – loud, discordant, a beautiful cacophony. Vox populi – the voice of the people.

In a democratic republic, Mr. Speaker, in a democratic republic, it is incumbent upon us to hear the voice of the people and to reflect the voice of the people, the passion of the people, the desires of the people here in this chamber. If we are serious, if we are serious about reducing the size of government, if we are serious about saving money, we come together and we consider a plan to create a unicameral form of legislative government. But we chose not to. But we chose not to. So we are left with vox populi – the voice of the people. The cacophony known as the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, this we must preserve. This is honorable. This is the voice of the people.

I urge a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Jefferson County, the Speaker of the House, Representative Smith.

Mr. S. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time the House has afforded this issue, and certainly being a constitutional amendment, it is significant in that regard. It is a fairly simple concept, and yet with it, obviously, comes some real questions about the impact of a fairly simple change.

I, in talking to members and people around and listening to the comments this afternoon, I found it a little bit interesting that a lot of the debate was focused on cost. And while I believe that this certainly has the ability to reduce the costs of the legislature over the long haul, at the end of the day, that is really incumbent on the membership as a whole to determine how much you can cut the expenses, cut the overhead costs of running a legislature, and yet not deprive constituents of their access to you, their ability to communicate their views, their ability or their need for maybe you running interference with an administrative agency. And certainly I think we all have our own recognition of what that level of service is, what that level of communication is, what is necessary. But I believe, I believe it will save some money in the long haul.

But as I said in my opening remarks before we started the legislation on Monday, my real interest in this legislation – and some tried to twist this, some tried to twist this thought, and I want to be very clear about it. For this body to be effective, it requires the ability to communicate and to understand, and what I have seen as a legislative leader – mind you, while the media sometimes portrays this place as the leaders control it and you are going to do what I say, and perhaps there are times when that has been more the case, my belief in how this place runs best is when the leaders are listening to the members, the members, all of us, are listening to our constituents, and then it is our job to try to mold together what the members want to do, find that consensus, find that middle ground on the issue perhaps, the compromise, find a way to resolve the problem I am trying to fix that does not create a problem for you or your constituency. The leader's job is to, in essence, follow the members.

Now, there are times when you get to the end of the day on a budget where you have to push, because there is no perfect solution. Like, we could debate these numbers forever: Is 153 right? Is 172 right? Is 203 the right number? We could debate those numbers forever if we wanted to, but at some point you have to settle and say, this achieves the concept, it achieves the goal that we are trying to get to, and then at that point the leader's job is to help push it through. But there is nothing about this proposal that is any more significant than the ability of each of us to have a better understanding of what the others' problems are, what the others' concerns are, and what your solution to the problem is.

One of the examples I have used in talking to people is, in the Senate a leader could sit down and talk to every member in the caucus in a matter of a day or two. In the House, until you start talking to every member in the caucus, until you get to the end, it is a week and a half or so later – to have a substantive conversation, to have a conversation with real exchange of ideas, and things have changed by then. Somebody has run around behind your back because you are at the Z end of the alphabet when you started at the A. So there is an element of efficiency, and I do not mean efficiency in the sense of speed; I mean efficiency in the sense of building that collective wisdom, and that is a term I have used before on the floor of this House in a swearing-in day speech, perhaps a couple of years ago.

The process is not that I am right or that guy is right or this lady is right. The process really of legislating in the form of government we have is about taking the collective wisdom. Our constituents share some of their wisdom with us, we share it with each other, and that collective wisdom is what leads us to the best solution – not the perfect solution, the best solution.

So I just wanted to restate that, amplify it a little bit, that in my view, and given some of my experiences previously at this podium, previously at the seat beside the leader's, and somewhat in my short period of time in the Speaker's chair, that we will be more efficient in that sense, and that is what I see as the value of this change in the Constitution. Maybe it will save a little money – I think it can – but that is really incumbent upon who the members are to do that.

The timeline that we thought through and settled on is, one, because of the significance of this change, you need to be able to do it right. The gentleman from Allegheny County raised questions about minority rights and what would these numbers look like. Certainly to do this right, to allow the people of Pennsylvania the opportunity to vote on a constitutional amendment in a couple of years and then to establish the accurate statistics to go through that whole process, I think is one that the timeline allows for that change to be somewhat gradual but at least defined.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot of arguments – you know, on any bill you can always find an argument for, you can always find an argument against, and I understand that. I have been around here for a while. We have all made those choices. This legislation is about us doing a better job.

To those that say it is not enough reform, it is not real reform, well, it was not proposed as the end-all to reforming the legislative world. It is not a suggestion that this is all there is to do. There are many other things that we need to do. In my view, if this legislation passes, if the Senate takes it up – and it would appear that it would be prime to go through the second session of the legislative process a year and a half from now or whenever it would be – there may be other things that we need to deal with, whether it is how the reapportionment process works when you go from 203 to 153, because that would be a dynamic reapportionment process. We do not need to argue over that today until we see if there is support to make this change.

So I appreciate the time and the interest, the comments of the members. I urge you to support this legislation. It is not the end of the day. This is arguably the first step. And certainly we are not going to make the final decision. For everybody that was talking about representation and what our constituents want and what is their view, the one thing about constitutional amendments is, we do not make the final decision. The people of Pennsylvania in a statewide referendum vote will make the decision of something of this magnitude.

I think it is worthy of their consideration, and I would urge you to afford the people of Pennsylvania the opportunity to cast that vote "yea" or "nay." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—140

Adolph	Emrick	Krieger	Readshaw
Aument	Evankovich	Lawrence	Reed
Baker	Evans, J.	Maher	Reese
Barbin	Everett	Mahoney	Roae
Barrar	Farry	Major	Rock

Bear	Frankel	Maloney	Ross
Benninghoff	Gabler	Markosek	Sabatina
Bloom	Galloway	Marshall	Saccone
Boyle, B.	Geist	Marsico	Santarsiero
Boyle, K.	Gergely	Masser	Santoni
Bradford	Gibbons	Matzie	Saylor
Brennan	Gillen	Metcalfe	Scavello
Brown, R.	Gillespie	Metzgar	Schroder
Burns	Gingrich	Miccarelli	Simmons
Caltagirone	Godshall	Millard	Smith, K.
Carroll	Goodman	Miller	Smith, M.
Christiana	Grell	Milne	Sonney
Clymer	Grove	Moul	Staback
Conklin	Hackett	Mullery	Stephens
Costa, D.	Hahn	Mundy	Stevenson
Cox	Harhart	Murphy	Swanger
Creighton	Harper	Mustio	Tallman
Culver	Harris	Neuman	Taylor
Curry	Heffley	O'Neill	Tobash
Cutler	Helm	Pashinski	Toepel
Daley	Hennessey	Payne	Toohil
Davis	Hickernell	Peifer	Truitt
Day	Kampf	Perry	Turzai
Deasy	Kauffman	Petrarca	Vereb
Delozier	Kavulich	Petri	Vulakovich
DeLuca	Keller, F.	Pickett	Watson
Denlinger	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	White
DePasquale	Killion	Quigley	
DiGirolamo	Knowles	Quinn	Smith, S., Speaker
Dunbar	Kortz	Ravenstahl	
Ellis	Kotik		

NAYS—49

Boback	DeWeese	Hutchinson	Payton
Briggs	Donatucci	Josephs	Preston
Brooks	Evans, D.	Keller, W.	Rapp
Brown, V.	Fabrizio	Kirkland	Sainato
Brownlee	Fleck	Kula	Samuelson
Buxton	Freeman	Longietti	Stern
Causar	George	Mann	Sturla
Cohen	Haluska	Mirabito	Thomas
Costa, P.	Hanna	Myers	Vitali
Cruz	Harhai	O'Brien, M.	Waters
Davidson	Harkins	Oberlander	Wheatley
DeLissio	Hess	Parker	Youngblood
Dermody			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Bishop	Gerber	McGeehan	Murt
Boyd	Hornaman	Micozzie	Roebuck

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.

SENATE BILL FOR CONCURRENCE

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

SB 1169, PN 2038

Referred to Committee on AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS, April 4, 2012.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2137, PN 2989**, entitled:

An Act providing for a temporary moratorium of court-ordered countywide reassessments and for reforms based upon study.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington County, Representative White.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of HB 2137. This is a bill that we had considered previously in this chamber. It was sent over to the Senate and amended and then vetoed by the Governor. We have restored the language to language that will make this constitutionally passable. This will provide real relief to deal with the issue of property tax reassessments when they are court ordered. We are not taking away the ability of a county to do one if they want to. But since we have been here last dealing with this in June, we have commissioned a task force to deal with the issues with reassessment reform, which will be released next week, those findings, and I think will make it abundantly clear that there are serious problems with the process, loopholes that need to be closed, and this is a commonsense, targeted approach that will allow our taxpayers to avoid having to face property tax increases under the guise of a reassessment.

This is a good bipartisan compromise. I want to thank my colleague, Representative Saccone – we have worked together on this – and I would urge all members to vote "yes" on HB 2137. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington County, Representative Neuman.

Mr. NEUMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is imperative that we pass this bill today. It is a bill that will allow us as a chamber to take a look at the task force recommendation to change the reassessment process. If we are going to have property taxes in the State of Pennsylvania, we need to have reassessments, and this reassessment process needs to be fair and equitable. So this moratorium is temporary to give our chamber time to discuss and debate changes to the reassessment process so that we can make that process fair and equitable to property tax payers.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Representative Saccone.

Mr. SACCONI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This has truly been a bipartisan effort, both sides working together. It is good to see this, because the people of

Pennsylvania really want this, and I just encourage your positive vote on this.

Thank you very much.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—189

Adolph	Donatucci	Killion	Quinn
Aument	Dunbar	Kirkland	Rapp
Baker	Ellis	Knowles	Ravenstahl
Barbin	Emrick	Kortz	Readshaw
Barrar	Evankovich	Kotik	Reed
Bear	Evans, D.	Krieger	Reese
Benninghoff	Evans, J.	Kula	Roae
Bloom	Everett	Lawrence	Rock
Boback	Fabrizio	Longietti	Ross
Boyle, B.	Farry	Maher	Sabatina
Boyle, K.	Fleck	Mahoney	Saccone
Bradford	Frankel	Major	Sainato
Brennan	Freeman	Maloney	Samuelson
Briggs	Gabler	Mann	Santarsiero
Brooks	Galloway	Markosek	Santoni
Brown, R.	Geist	Marshall	Saylor
Brown, V.	George	Marsico	Scavello
Brownlee	Gergely	Masser	Schroder
Burns	Gibbons	Matzie	Simmons
Buxton	Gillen	Metcalfe	Smith, K.
Caltagirone	Gillespie	Metzgar	Smith, M.
Carroll	Gingrich	Miccarelli	Sonney
Causar	Godshall	Millard	Staback
Christiana	Goodman	Miller	Stephens
Clymer	Grell	Milne	Stern
Cohen	Grove	Mirabito	Stevenson
Conklin	Hackett	Moul	Sturla
Costa, D.	Hahn	Mullery	Swanger
Costa, P.	Haluska	Mundy	Tallman
Cox	Hanna	Murphy	Taylor
Creighton	Harhai	Mustio	Thomas
Cruz	Harhart	Myers	Tobash
Culver	Harkins	Neuman	Toepel
Curry	Harper	O'Brien, M.	Toohil
Cutler	Harris	O'Neill	Truitt
Daley	Heffley	Oberlander	Turzai
Davidson	Helm	Parker	Vereb
Davis	Hennessey	Pashinski	Vitali
Day	Hess	Payne	Vulakovich
Deasy	Hickernell	Payton	Waters
DeLissio	Hutchinson	Peifer	Watson
Delozier	Josephs	Perry	Wheatley
DeLuca	Kampf	Petrarca	White
Denlinger	Kauffman	Petri	Youngblood
DePasquale	Kavulich	Pickett	
Dermody	Keller, F.	Preston	Smith, S., Speaker
DeWeese	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Quigley	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Bishop	Gerber	McGeehan	Murt
Boyd	Hornaman	Micozzie	Roebuck

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.

STATEMENT BY MR. SACCONI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Allegheny, Representative Sacconi, seek recognition?

Mr. SACCONI. Unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. You may proceed.

Mr. SACCONI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Once again, I just want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, our leadership, and the staff. It took a lot of work to bring this to the floor and get this done, and there were a lot of people running around trying to make things happen at the last minute. And I really appreciate all the work, and I hope the people back home see and understand how much it took to get this through. And I encourage my colleagues in the Senate to take it up as quickly as possible when they come back.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For the information of the members, we do not expect any more recorded votes.

Are there any announcements?

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

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

- HB 527;
- HB 2300; and
- SB 1141.

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

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 1780 and HB 2000 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

BILLS TABLED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 1780 and HB 2000 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

CALENDAR CONTINUED

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1685, PN 2469**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of August 15, 1961 (P.L.987, No.442), known as the Pennsylvania Prevailing Wage Act, further providing for definitions; and providing for duties of department.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 1685 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 1685 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1976, PN 2863**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for original jurisdiction and venue in courts of common pleas; and providing for venue in personal injury actions against corporations and similar entities.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 1976 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 1976 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. TURZAI called up **HR 423, PN 2446**, entitled:

A Resolution directing the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee to study existing State aid funding formulas.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HR 423 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

RESOLUTION REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HR 423 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

* * *

Mr. TURZAI called up **HR 438, PN 2507**, entitled:

A Resolution urging the City of Philadelphia to establish a year-round program providing for the safe removal and adequate disposal of illegally discarded waste tires.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HR 438 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

RESOLUTION REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HR 438 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Carbon County, Representative Heffley, who moves that this House now adjourn until Monday, April 30, 2012, at 1 p.m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the motion?
Motion was agreed to, and at 5:30 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.