

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 5, 2013

SESSION OF 2013

197TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 38

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

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

PRAYER

The SPEAKER. Today the prayer will be offered by Pastor Stuart Luce, St. James Lutheran Church, Limerick.

PASTOR STUART LUCE, Guest Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

As I was thinking about prayers to bless and challenge you in your work, I was drawn to some words by Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus is the savior in my faith tradition but in many faith traditions is respected for his wise teachings. Jesus' simple but profound words that inspired me and I hope you this day are "To whom much has been given, much will be required."

Let us pray:

Lord God, help the leaders of this House of Representatives remember the confidence voters have placed in them and let them live into that responsibility, for to whom much has been given, much will be required.

Lord, as many citizens feel they have less ability to change and mold our nation, empower these leaders, for to whom much has been given, much will be required.

Lord, as these leaders make decisions which will affect the powerful and the rich, those with influence and authority, let them not forget that to whom much has been given, much will be required.

Lord, as they also represent those with little voice or influence, those who are poor or needy, they dare not forget, to whom much has been given, much will be required.

Lord, as these leaders wrestle with significant issues and difficult challenges, give them wisdom and guidance, for to whom much has been given, much will be required.

Lord, give these leaders discerning hearts and minds that their decisions do not reflect their own interests, but rather the common good, for to whom much has been given, much will be required.

Lord God, these leaders have been given great responsibility, but at the same time they have been given great opportunity, so give them vision and courage that their actions are a blessing, for indeed to whom much has been given, much will be required.

These things we pray, Lord, for all things have been given into Your hands. 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, June 4, 2013, will be postponed until printed.

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

HB 612, PN 1959 (Amended) By Rep. HARHART

An Act relating to the right to practice naturopathic medicine; providing for the issuance of licenses and the suspension and revocation of licenses; providing for penalties; and making repeals.

PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE.

HB 776, PN 888 By Rep. HARHART

An Act amending the act of September 27, 1961 (P.L.1700, No.699), known as the Pharmacy Act, further providing for the authority to administer injectable medications, biologicals and immunizations.

PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE.

HB 942, PN 1957 (Amended) By Rep. ROSS

An Act amending the act of March 18, 1875 (P.L.32, No.36), entitled "An act requiring recorders of deeds to prepare and keep in their respective offices general, direct and ad sectum indexes of deeds and mortgages recorded therein, prescribing the duty of said recorders and declaring that the entries in said general indexes shall be notice to all persons," providing for requirements of certain instruments as a condition of recordation and for a fee for reprocessing.

COMMERCE.

HB 1177, PN 1958 (Amended) By Rep. HARPER

An Act amending Title 53 (Municipalities Generally) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for initiative of electors seeking consolidation or merger with new home rule charter.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

HB 1215, PN 1960 (Amended) By Rep. STERN

An Act establishing the Pennsylvania Tourism Commission; providing for powers and duties of the Pennsylvania Tourism Commission; establishing the Tourism Promotion Trust Fund; and repealing the Travel and Tourism Act.

TOURISM AND RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

HB 1216, PN 1530 By Rep. STERN

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, providing for the tourism marketing and promotion tax credit.

TOURISM AND RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

HB 1230, PN 1562 By Rep. HARPER

An Act amending the act of July 7, 1947 (P.L.1368, No.542), known as the Real Estate Tax Sale Law, in sale of property, providing for additional costs for rehabilitation and maintenance.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

HB 1348, PN 1742 By Rep. HARHART

An Act amending the act of December 20, 1985 (P.L.457, No.112), known as the Medical Practice Act of 1985, further providing for physician assistants.

PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE.

HB 1351, PN 1744 By Rep. HARHART

An Act amending the act of October 5, 1978 (P.L.1109, No.261), known as the Osteopathic Medical Practice Act, further providing for physician assistants.

PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE.

**BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES,
CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED****SB 304, PN 1172 (Amended)** By Rep. ROSS

An Act amending Titles 15 (Corporations and Unincorporated Associations) and 54 (Names) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Title 15, making extensive revisions, additions and deletions to preliminary material on general provisions; to corporation material on general provisions, on incorporation, on corporate powers, duties and safeguards, on officers, directors and shareholders, on fundamental changes, on registered corporations, on insurance corporations, on benefit corporations, on foreign business corporations, on incorporation and on foreign nonprofit corporations; to material on limited liability companies; to material on unincorporated associations; and to material on business trusts; in Title 54, further providing for general provisions and for corporate and other association names; and making related repeals.

COMMERCE.

SB 371, PN 427 By Rep. ROSS

An Act repealing the act of December 14, 1967 (P.L.746, No.345), known as the Savings Association Code of 1967, eliminating provisions for incorporation and organization, for names, for offices, for directors, officers, employees and attorneys, for members, for corporate powers, for savings operations, earnings, account insurance and reserves, for investment operations, for amendment of articles, for

mergers, consolidations, conversions and reorganizations, for voluntary and involuntary dissolution and distribution of assets upon insolvency, for foreign and Federal associations, for provisions applicable to Department of Banking and Securities and for penalties and criminal provisions.

COMMERCE.

SB 583, PN 1174 (Amended) By Rep. HARPER

An Act amending the act of August 23, 1967 (P.L.251, No.102), known as the Economic Development Financing Law, further providing for competition in award of contracts.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

SB 591, PN 565 By Rep. HARPER

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in Local Government Capital Project Loan Fund provisions, further providing for assistance to municipalities.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

BILL REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**SB 644, PN 1173 (Amended)** By Rep. CAUSER

An Act amending Titles 3 (Agriculture) and 34 (Game) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for swine hunting preserves; and further providing for the definition of "wild animals."

GAME AND FISHERIES.

**HOUSE RESOLUTION
INTRODUCED AND REFERRED**

No. 351 By Representatives COHEN, FLYNN, GINGRICH, KIRKLAND, KOTIK, MAHONEY, PAINTER and THOMAS

A Resolution designating the month of June 2013 as "Public School Religious Freedom Month" in Pennsylvania.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, June 5, 2013.

**HOUSE BILLS
INTRODUCED AND REFERRED**

No. 1438 By Representatives MAHER, BOBACK, HAHN, BLOOM, PICKETT, CUTLER, KNOWLES, MILLARD, ROCK, SWANGER, MAJOR, SAYLOR, BARRAR, HESS, R. MILLER, GINGRICH, HICKERNELL and EVERETT

An Act amending the act of May 22, 1933 (P.L.853, No.155), known as The General County Assessment Law, further providing for subjects of taxation enumerated.

Referred to Committee on AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS, June 5, 2013.

No. 1439 By Representatives HAHN, MAHER, BOBACK, BLOOM, PICKETT, CUTLER, KNOWLES, MILLARD, ROCK, SWANGER, SAYLOR, BARRAR, HESS, DENLINGER, R. MILLER, GINGRICH, HARHART, HICKERNELL, MAJOR and EVERETT

An Act amending Title 53 (Municipalities Generally) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for subjects of local taxation.

Referred to Committee on AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS, June 5, 2013.

No. 1440 By Representatives BOBACK, HAHN, BLOOM, PICKETT, CUTLER, KNOWLES, MILLARD, LONGIETTI, ROCK, SWANGER, MAJOR, SAYLOR, BARRAR, HESS, MAHER, R. MILLER, GINGRICH, HICKERNELL and EVERETT

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

Referred to Committee on AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS, June 5, 2013.

No. 1482 By Representatives MOUL, HANNA, MILLARD, READSHAW, TALLMAN, MCNEILL, C. HARRIS and EVERETT

An Act authorizing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Governor and the Department of Military and Veterans Affairs, to grant and convey to Gettysburg Foundation, or its successors or assigns, certain land situate in Gettysburg Borough, Adams County; to grant and convey to the Scranton School District, or its successors or assigns, certain lands situate in the City of Scranton, Lackawanna County; to grant and convey to Redevelopment Authority of the City of Bethlehem, or its successors or assigns, certain land situate in the City of Bethlehem, Lehigh County; and to grant and convey to La Salle University, or its successors or assigns, certain land and improvements situate in the 49th Ward, City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia County, known as the Ogontz Armory; authorizing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Governor, to grant and convey to ABO Haven, Inc., certain lands situate in the 29th Ward, City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia County; and authorizing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Governor and the Department of Transportation, to grant and convey to the City of Lock Haven certain lands situate in the City of Lock Haven, Clinton County.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, June 5, 2013.

No. 1487 By Representatives BAKER, PICKETT, O'BRIEN, CALTAGIRONE, MILLARD, LONGIETTI, DAVIS, CAUSER, SCHLOSSBERG, SCAVELLO, KULA, CUTLER, DENLINGER, V. BROWN, MOUL, COHEN, BARRAR, GODSHALL, C. HARRIS, JAMES, HESS, KAVULICH, CLYMER, GINGRICH, EVERETT, SWANGER, MAJOR, SCHLEGEL CULVER, WATSON, ROCK, FLECK, R. MILLER, GILLEN, ROEBUCK, FRANKEL and MURT

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, in personal income tax, further providing for operational provisions.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, June 5, 2013.

No. 1488 By Representatives BAKER, MILLARD, BIZZARRO, KORTZ, R. MILLER, DiGIROLAMO, GIBBONS, ROCK, GINGRICH, PETRI, V. BROWN, BROWNLEE, CALTAGIRONE, COHEN, MAHONEY,

MAJOR, DeLUCA, MARSICO, FARRY, HARHAI, READSHAW, BROOKS, NEILSON, MICOZZIE, HESS and GILLEN

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the United States Olympic plates.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, June 5, 2013.

No. 1489 By Representatives C. HARRIS, KORTZ, MILLARD, FLECK, O'NEILL, MULLERY, CUTLER, CALTAGIRONE, WHITE, MOUL, OBERLANDER, SCHLOSSBERG, F. KELLER, COHEN, BENNINGHOFF, CARROLL, GROVE, MILNE and MURT

An Act amending the act of August 26, 1971 (P.L.351, No.91), known as the State Lottery Law, providing for lottery winnings intercept.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, June 5, 2013.

No. 1491 By Representatives CHRISTIANA, SCHLOSSBERG, KILLION, DENLINGER, ELLIS, HACKETT, C. HARRIS, GINGRICH, MARSHALL, SANKEY, CORBIN, SIMMONS, GIBBONS, READSHAW and LAWRENCE

An Act amending the act of October 6, 1998 (P.L.705, No.92), known as the Keystone Opportunity Zone, Keystone Opportunity Expansion Zone and Keystone Opportunity Improvement Zone Act, providing for limited extensions and phaseout of the keystone opportunity zones.

Referred to Committee on COMMERCE, June 5, 2013.

SENATE BILLS FOR CONCURRENCE

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

SB 34, PN 930

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, June 5, 2013.

SB 46, PN 1056

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, June 5, 2013.

BILL SIGNED BY SPEAKER

Bill numbered and entitled as follows having been prepared for presentation to the Governor, and the same being correct, the title was publicly read as follows:

SB 333, PN 311

A Joint Resolution proposing integrated amendments to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, eliminating the Traffic Court of Philadelphia.

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

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Speaker turns to leaves of absence and recognizes the majority whip, who requests a leave of absence for the gentleman, Mr. KRIEGER, from Westmoreland County for the day; the gentleman, Mr. MICOZZIE, from Delaware County for the day; the gentleman, Mr. METCALFE, from Butler County for the day. Without objection, the leaves will be granted.

The Speaker recognizes the minority whip, who requests a leave of absence for the gentleman, Mr. GERGELY, from Allegheny County for the day, and the gentleman, Mr. FRANKEL, from Allegheny County for the day. Without objection, the leaves will be granted.

MASTER ROLL CALL

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

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—196

Adolph	Ellis	Kinsey	Pickett
Aument	Emrick	Kirkland	Pyle
Baker	English	Knowles	Quinn
Barbin	Evankovich	Kortz	Rapp
Barrar	Evans	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Everett	Kula	Readshaw
Bishop	Fabrizio	Lawrence	Reed
Bizzarro	Farina	Longietti	Reese
Bloom	Farry	Lucas	Regan
Boback	Fee	Mackenzie	Roae
Boyle, B.	Fleck	Maher	Rock
Boyle, K.	Flynn	Mahoney	Roebuck
Bradford	Freeman	Major	Ross
Briggs	Gabler	Maloney	Rozzi
Brooks	Gainey	Markosek	Sabatina
Brown, R.	Galloway	Marshall	Saccone
Brown, V.	Gibbons	Marsico	Sainato
Brownlee	Gillen	Masser	Samuelson
Burns	Gillespie	Matzie	Sankey
Caltagirone	Gingrich	McCarter	Santarsiero
Carroll	Goodman	McGeehan	Saylor
Causar	Greiner	McGinnis	Scavello
Christiana	Grell	McNeill	Schlossberg
Clay	Grove	Mentzer	Schreiber
Clymer	Hackett	Metzgar	Simmons
Cohen	Haggerty	Millard	Sims
Conklin	Hahn	Miller, D.	Smith
Corbin	Haluska	Miller, R.	Snyder
Costa, D.	Hanna	Milne	Sonney
Costa, P.	Harhai	Mirabito	Stephens
Cox	Harhart	Miranda	Stern
Cruz	Harkins	Molchany	Stevenson
Culver	Harper	Moul	Sturla
Cutler	Harris, A.	Mullery	Swanger
Daley, M.	Harris, J.	Mundy	Tallman
Daley, P.	Heffley	Murt	Taylor
Davidson	Helm	Mustio	Thomas
Davis	Hennessey	Neilson	Tobash
Day	Hess	Neuman	Toepel
Dean	Hickernell	O'Brien	Toohil
Deasy	James	O'Neill	Truitt
DeLissio	Kampf	Oberlander	Turzai
Delozier	Kauffman	Painter	Vereb
DeLuca	Kavulich	Parker	Vitali
Denlinger	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Waters
Dermody	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Watson
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Peifer	Wheatley

Donatucci	Killion	Petrarca	White
Dunbar	Kim	Petri	Youngblood

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Frankel	Godshall	Metcalfe	Micozzie
Gergely	Krieger	Miccarelli	

LEAVES ADDED—6

Barbin	Davidson	Stephens	Waters
Boyle, B.	Matzie		

LEAVES CANCELED—2

Frankel	Waters
---------	--------

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

If I could have the members' attention, I appreciate holding the conversations down. I would appreciate the members' attention. I want to introduce some of the guests that are with us today. I would appreciate your courtesy. Thank you.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. First, located to the left of the rostrum, we would like to welcome Cadee Wood from the Warrior Run School District. Cadee is the winner of Representative Culver's poster contest about State government, and she is here with her teacher, Amy Bowers. 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 Mikaela Brouse, who is the grand prize winner in Representative Masser's poster contest about State government. Mikaela is from the Southern Columbia School, and she is here with her mother, Melissa. 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 Representative Heffley's brother, Dean Heffley, and his wife, Pam, along with their son, Devon. Devon will be leaving later this month for Parris Island, South Carolina, where he will begin basic training in the United States Marines. Welcome to the hall of the House. I do not think they will applaud for you when you get to Parris Island like that, though. Thank you for your service and willingness to protect our country.

Also located to the left of the rostrum, we would like to welcome some guests of Representative Donatucci. Frank Perras and Grace Donatucci are here representing the organization Women Organized Against Rape. Along with them are Kristen Houser, Lou Ann Williams, and Diane Kuntz from the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape. Welcome to the hall of the House.

In the rear of the House, we would like to welcome guests of Representative Schlossberg, Dr. Bob Barraco. He is the chief of the Trauma Outreach at the Lehigh Valley Health Network in Allentown, and he is here with members of the trauma

prevention team to demonstrate their distracted driving simulator that they take to schools to educate students on the need to pay attention behind the wheel. Incidentally, the simulator will be located in the East Wing Rotunda until 1:30 p.m. today. Will our guests please rise. Welcome to the hall of the House.

Also located in the rear of the House, we would like to welcome Donna Lantz. She is shadowing Representative DeLissio for the day. Welcome to the hall of the House.

And we have a guest page with us today, Richard McCarthy. He is Representative DeLissio's nephew. Welcome to the hall of the House.

UNCONTESTED CALENDAR

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE

Ms. DONATUCCI called up **HR 147, PN 1136**, entitled:

A Resolution celebrating the 40th anniversary of the founding of America's first rape crisis center, Women Organized Against Rape.

* * *

Mr. KINSEY called up **HR 336, PN 1870**, entitled:

A Resolution honoring Pennsylvania's senior citizens by designating the month of June 2013 as "Older Americans: Making Choices for a Healthier Future Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. GOODMAN called up **HR 337, PN 1885**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of June 2013 as "Corrections Officers and Employees Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mrs. GINGRICH called up **HR 344, PN 1900**, entitled:

A Resolution commemorating the 13th anniversary of the NEW Leadership Pennsylvania Program.

* * *

Mr. SCAVELLO called up **HR 346, PN 1921**, entitled:

A Resolution honoring the 100th anniversary of the Department of Labor and Industry.

* * *

Mr. COHEN called up **HR 347, PN 1922**, entitled:

A Resolution congratulating the Julia Ward Howe Academics Plus Elementary School on its 100th anniversary.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolutions?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—196

Adolph	Ellis	Kinsey	Pickett
Aument	Emrick	Kirkland	Pyle
Baker	English	Knowles	Quinn
Barbin	Evankovich	Kortz	Rapp
Barrar	Evans	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Everett	Kula	Readshaw
Bishop	Fabrizio	Lawrence	Reed
Bizzarro	Farina	Longietti	Reese
Bloom	Farry	Lucas	Regan
Boback	Fee	Mackenzie	Roae
Boyle, B.	Fleck	Maher	Rock
Boyle, K.	Flynn	Mahoney	Roebuck
Bradford	Freeman	Major	Ross
Briggs	Gabler	Maloney	Rozzi
Brooks	Gainey	Markosek	Sabatina
Brown, R.	Galloway	Marshall	Saccone
Brown, V.	Gibbons	Marsico	Sainato
Brownlee	Gillen	Masser	Samuelson
Burns	Gillespie	Matzie	Sankey
Caltagirone	Gingrich	McCarter	Santarsiero
Carroll	Goodman	McGeehan	Saylor
Causer	Greiner	McGinnis	Scavello
Christiana	Grell	McNeill	Schlossberg
Clay	Grove	Mentzer	Schreiber
Clymer	Hackett	Metzgar	Simmons
Cohen	Haggerty	Millard	Sims
Conklin	Hahn	Miller, D.	Smith
Corbin	Haluska	Miller, R.	Snyder
Costa, D.	Hanna	Milne	Sonney
Costa, P.	Harhai	Mirabito	Stephens
Cox	Harhart	Miranda	Stern
Cruz	Harkins	Molchany	Stevenson
Culver	Harper	Moul	Sturla
Cutler	Harris, A.	Mullery	Swanger
Daley, M.	Harris, J.	Mundy	Tallman
Daley, P.	Heffley	Murt	Taylor
Davidson	Helm	Mustio	Thomas
Davis	Hennessey	Neilson	Tobash
Day	Hess	Neuman	Toepel
Dean	Hickernell	O'Brien	Toohil
Deasy	James	O'Neill	Truitt
DeLissio	Kampf	Oberlander	Turzai
Delozier	Kauffman	Painter	Vereb
DeLuca	Kavulich	Parker	Vitali
Denlinger	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Waters
Dermody	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Watson
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Peifer	Wheatley
Donatucci	Killion	Petrarca	White
Dunbar	Kim	Petri	Youngblood

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Frankel	Godshall	Metcalfe	Micozzie
Gergely	Krieger	Miccarelli	

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

STATEMENT BY MS. DONATUCCI

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the lady from Philadelphia County, Ms. Donatucci, under unanimous consent relative to one of the resolutions just adopted.

Ms. DONATUCCI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had the distinct pleasure of celebrating the 40th anniversary of WOAR (Women Organized Against Rape) at an event in Philadelphia a few months back, and it was at this celebration that I shared these sentiments.

Although each of us gathered here today are thrilled to know that WOAR has been in existence for 40 years, we would be equally thrilled to never have to celebrate another year of organizing women against rape in Pennsylvania.

We would completely forfeit our right to celebrate 50 years of this esteemed organization if it meant that women across this Commonwealth were finally safe in their homes and in their communities, if it meant that a third of the women in this country were no longer guaranteed to be raped at some point in their life, and if it meant that a quarter of those assaults would not occur before the victim's 18th birthday.

With HR 147 the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania formally and officially recognizes the Women Organized Against Rape organization not only as the founders of America's first rape crisis center some 40 years ago but also as an outstanding example of what can be accomplished when people mobilize for a cause.

The unfortunate truth is, every bit of the assistance WOAR provides is needed today, just as it was when the organization was established at the Philadelphia General Hospital back in 1973. For more than four decades, WOAR has been a leading nonprofit organization whose mission has been to eliminate all forms of sexual violence. WOAR has advocated for the rights of victims of sexual assault and abuse through direct services, education, and training programs for both children and adults.

In addition, WOAR has developed a direct service department that provides a 24-hour hotline, free individual and group counseling to children and adults, counseling in Spanish, hospital and court accompaniment, and Latino outreach services.

Finally, their most recent accomplishment is the creation and implementation of the Philadelphia Sexual Assault Response Center, which is the first of its kind rape trauma center.

Although we are celebrating its 40th birthday, it is important to note that WOAR actually operated underground a few years prior to its official capacity, because back then unless a woman was bruised, beaten, or worse, she was often blamed for her own rape, victimizing the victim yet again. Thank goodness we have come a long way, baby.

Now, without further ado, will you please join me in a round of applause to honor and celebrate WOAR's efforts to end sexual violence and abuse and its 40 years spent in the trenches combatting violence against women.

Thank you, WOAR, for all you do, and thank you, Mr. Speaker.

STATEMENT BY MR. SCAVELLO

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Monroe County, Mr. Scavello, under unanimous consent relative to one of the resolutions just adopted.

Mr. SCAVELLO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wanted to thank the members for their affirmative vote on the 100th anniversary of the Commonwealth's Department of Labor and Industry.

For the past century, the department has worked tirelessly to promote economic development and improve our business climate through various initiatives and programs, each aimed at helping Pennsylvania's workforce remain world-class and globally competitive. That is why myself along with Chairman Keller sponsored HR 346, which commemorates the special anniversary of the Commonwealth.

At the start of its existence, the department focused on ensuring workplace safety, enforcing child labor laws, and serving as the source for industrial statistics. Over the decades, however, the department has grown to include job training and placement services for workers, provide income security for unemployed and injured workers, secure and maintain employment and independence for individuals with disabilities, foster cooperation between labor and management, and ensure accurate and timely labor market information and economic analyses. To this day, the Department of Labor and Industry and its employees continue to improve the quality of life and economic security for workers and businesses of the Commonwealth.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

STATEMENT BY MR. KINSEY

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Kinsey, under unanimous consent relative to one of the resolutions just adopted.

Mr. KINSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to thank my colleagues for their affirmative vote on HR 336.

As many of you know, by the year 2030 the number of people reaching retirement age will double. Older adults have faithfully provided for current and future generations as pillars of our communities, of our families, and leaders in our communities, and defenders of our nation, yet seniors living in communities throughout our great Commonwealth face many health challenges as they begin to reach retirement age.

Mr. Speaker, communities can help improve the quality of life for older Americans by increasing their opportunities to remain active and engaged in community life, by providing individualized services and support systems to help maintain the dignity, independence, and self-determination of older Americans as they age. It is with these reasons and many more, Mr. Speaker, that I am honored to introduce this resolution.

I want to thank my cosponsors of this resolution, and I ask that all my colleagues get out and spread the virtues of healthy living among our senior population.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

STATEMENT BY MR. GOODMAN

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Schuylkill County, Mr. Goodman, under unanimous consent relative to one of the resolutions just adopted.

Mr. GOODMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to thank my colleagues for their support of HR 337, which declares June as "Corrections Officers and Employees Month" in Pennsylvania.

I have two State correctional prisons in my legislative district. I am always impressed with the dedication and professionalism I see from employees at the SCI (State Correctional Institution) Frackville and Mahanoy, as well as other correctional facilities across the Commonwealth.

Because their work is done behind forbidding walls and barbed wire, it is often overlooked by the public. Few understand the difficulties and challenges corrections employees face on a daily basis. They watch over those who are engaged in dangerous and addictive behavior, and most often reform and rehabilitation of them is difficult. They must treat those who lack medical care and are in poor health. They diagnose, treat, and protect the mentally ill. And most importantly, they keep our communities safe and secure.

Mr. Speaker, many of the people that work at Frackville and Mahanoy are not just my constituents or neighbors, they are also my friends, and I can tell you that it takes a very special individual to be able to work day to day, every day, in a corrections environment, and I commend my colleagues for their support of HR 337.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

STATEMENT BY MR. COHEN

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Cohen, under unanimous consent relative to one of the resolutions just adopted.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the House for the unanimous adoption of HR 347, which celebrates the 100th anniversary of the oldest school in my district, the Julia Ward Howe Academics Plus Elementary School.

I have learned from this celebration that there are people all over the country who once went to that school and there are people coming from Canada, Massachusetts, California, Florida, all over the Philadelphia area, parts of central Pennsylvania, parts of western Pennsylvania. The opportunity to celebrate a school's 100th anniversary is something that really brings out enthusiasm among alumni, among community residents, among the staff of the school. It is really a great experience for all involved, and I heartily recommend that other schools also celebrate important anniversaries.

Once again, thanks to the House for voting for this.

The SPEAKER. The House will be at ease for a minute or two.

The House will come to order.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Delaware County, Mr. Adolph, seeking recognition to make an announcement?

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

Mr. Speaker, there will be an Appropriations Committee meeting immediately in the House majority caucus room. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. There will be an Appropriations Committee meeting immediately in the House majority caucus room.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the lady from Susquehanna County, Ms. Major, for the purpose of a caucus announcement.

Ms. MAJOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to announce that Republicans will caucus at 12 noon. I would ask our Republican members to please report to our caucus at noon. We would be scheduled to come back on the floor at 2 p.m.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Dermody, for the purpose of a caucus announcement.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats will also caucus at 12 noon.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. This House stands in recess until 2 p.m., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

RECESS EXTENDED

The time of recess was extended until 2:30 p.m.; further extended until 3 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

**THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
(MATTHEW E. BAKER) PRESIDING****BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**

HB 26, PN 1944

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of December 5, 1936 (2nd Sp.Sess., 1937 P.L.2897, No.1), known as the Unemployment Compensation Law, further providing for contributions by employees; establishing the Service and Infrastructure Improvement Fund; and further providing for the Unemployment Compensation Fund.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1052, PN 1830

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of July 31, 1968 (P.L.805, No.247), known as the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, further providing for contents of subdivision and land development ordinance.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1122, PN 1831

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending Title 68 (Real and Personal Property) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in creation, alteration and termination of condominiums, further providing for contents of declaration and flexible condominiums and for amendment of declaration; and, in creation, alteration and termination of planned communities, further providing for contents of declaration for flexible planned communities and for amendment of declaration.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1223, PN 1555

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of June 24, 1931 (P.L.1206, No.331), known as The First Class Township Code, in general provisions relating to township officers, further providing for failure of officer to perform duties.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1225, PN 1832

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending Title 45 (Legal Notices) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in codification and publication of documents, providing for electronic publication of municipal codes; and making an inconsistent repeal.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1228, PN 1560

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of May 27, 1953 (P.L.249, No.35), entitled "An act providing that the town councils of incorporated towns shall have the right to declare vacant the seats of councilmen or presidents of town councils for failure to qualify and for failure to attend meetings or vote upon questions before the council," further providing for removal of town officers and for vacancies.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1229, PN 1561

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of May 1, 1933 (P.L.103, No.69), known as The Second Class Township Code, in township officers generally, further providing for removal for failure to perform duties.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1287, PN 1943

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Public Welfare Code, providing for electronic prior approval for Medicaid.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 196, PN 716

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of March 1, 1988 (P.L.82, No.16), known as the Pennsylvania Infrastructure Investment Authority Act, further providing for definitions, for financial assistance and for annual report.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 679, PN 654

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act designating a portion of State Route 3031 in Richland and Conemaugh Townships, Cambria County, as the Lieutenant Colonel B.D. "Buzz" Wagner Memorial Highway.

APPROPRIATIONS.

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

HB 1480, PN 1961 (Amended)

By Rep. MICOZZIE

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for availability of uninsured, underinsured, bodily injury liability and property damage coverages and mandatory deductibles.

INSURANCE.

HB 1481, PN 1933

By Rep. MICOZZIE

An Act amending the act of May 17, 1921 (P.L.682, No.284), known as The Insurance Company Law of 1921, providing for risk management and own risk solvency assessment.

INSURANCE.

HB 1483, PN 1934

By Rep. MICOZZIE

An Act amending the act of July 5, 2012 (P.L.995, No.112), known as the Portable Electronics Insurance Act, further providing for authority of vendors of portable electronics and for termination of portable electronics insurance.

INSURANCE.

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

SB 194, PN 135

By Rep. MICOZZIE

An Act amending the act of March 20, 2002 (P.L.154, No.13), known as the Medical Care Availability and Reduction of Error (McCare) Act, in regulation of medical professional liability insurance, repealing provisions relating to reports to commissioner and claims information.

INSURANCE.

CALENDAR

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1075, PN 1914**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Public Welfare Code, in kinship care, further providing for scope and for definitions; and providing for family finding.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1076, PN 1915**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Public Welfare Code, providing for family conferencing.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1325, PN 1706**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of January 24, 1966 (1965 P.L.1535, No.537), known as the Pennsylvania Sewage Facilities Act, further providing for definitions, for official plans and for permits.

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

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Located to the left of the rostrum, the Chair welcomes guests of Representative Turzai, Domenic Trimarchi and Nancy Pott Trimarchi. Please rise and be recognized. Welcome.

Located in the gallery, the Chair welcomes New Leadership 2013. This group is organized by the Pennsylvania Center for Women, Politics and Public Policy at Chatham University. There are 40 students here today from Pittsburgh city schools. They are the guests of Representative Frankel. Please rise and be recognized. Welcome.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 334, PN 1143**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in preliminary provisions, further providing for definitions; in organization, further providing for Chief Justice and president judges; in community and municipal courts, further providing for the Philadelphia Municipal Court and for jurisdiction and venue and providing for hearing officers; and, in traffic courts, further providing for jurisdiction and venue and for the Traffic Court of Philadelphia.

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 gentleman, Mr. McGeehan, is recognized.

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

Mr. Speaker, would the chairman of the Judiciary Committee stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the members kindly take their seats. Members, please clear the aisles, take your seats. We are about to begin debate. Members, please take your seats.

Does the gentleman, Mr. Marsico, agree to interrogation?

The gentleman has agreed. You may proceed, Mr. McGeehan.

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

Mr. Speaker, for my edification and the edification of the members, but particularly the citizens of Philadelphia, would the chairman give a brief explanation of this bill and its implications for the future of the Philadelphia Traffic Court?

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, I will try to be brief.

The bill amends Title 42 that would reorganize the Philadelphia Municipal Court to assume the functions of the current Philadelphia Traffic Court. However, because there are currently two sitting traffic court judges whose offices cannot be eliminated prior to a constitutional amendment abolishing the traffic court, the bill also provides for a transitional period where those two judges will continue to serve until the end of their terms as a member of the new traffic division of the municipal court. The transitional period will be in place for the period of time until a constitutional amendment is voted on at the polls.

During that transitional period, the bill establishes then a traffic division within the municipal court consisting of those judges elected to the Traffic Court of Philadelphia prior to the effective date of the legislation. Any vacancies occurring on the traffic court are not to be filled. The bill adds two municipal court judgeships to replace traffic court judgeships to be eliminated.

In addition, the president judge of the municipal court will be permitted to appoint an intermediate number of hearing examiners to hear cases concerning traffic infractions. The hearing officers to be added to the municipal court need not be lawyers, but in the event they are not lawyers, they must complete and pass a relevant course of training prior to assuming their positions. This would be consistent with the current requirements for traffic court judges.

At the end of the transitional period, the traffic division will expire, and instead, the Philadelphia Municipal Court will assume the current jurisdiction of the traffic court over prosecutions for summary offenses arising under the State Vehicle Code, Title 75, or any ordinance of a political subdivision enacted pursuant to the Vehicle Code.

That is the summary of the bill.

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

I may have missed, Mr. Speaker, because as a Philadelphian, I am louder at the microphone maybe than members of the Dauphin County delegation, but the number of hearing officers are not spelled out in the current bill; that leaves it to the discretion of the president judge?

Mr. MARSICO. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McGEEHAN. I heard a statistic yesterday, Mr. Speaker, from a member of the Philadelphia delegation about the extraordinary number of cases in which the current traffic court hears every year, and I think it was in the tune of 1.2 million cases, traffic citations they hear a year. And an amendment that I offered prior to this, the number that I had set was 10, which would – obviously with the arithmetic, 1.2 divided by 10 is about 120,000 cases. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, with their equal or should I say their commensurate partners, a district justice, is there – if you have the knowledge – the average number of cases a district judge hears as opposed to what currently an average traffic court judge hears. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, my question is, the adequacy of the number that is going to be applied to these hearing officers, when we have the extraordinary number of traffic cases that are heard every year in Philadelphia, is there any equal in this State and whether this bill should have spelled that number out given the extraordinarily high volume of traffic citations that the court has to hear?

Mr. MARSICO. Well, Mr. Speaker, the number that was given yesterday is wrong; that number is wrong. In fact, I have a report here from the Philadelphia Traffic Court itself, 2012 Annual Report, which says that actually the court "...actually adjudicated 205,098 citations," not a million-plus.

Mr. McGEEHAN. Thank you for the correction, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, is the salary enunciated in this bill as well?

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, the salary of the hearing officers is not spelled out.

Mr. McGEEHAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I had a question about the current lease of the traffic court building and the implications to the taxpayers of Philadelphia and to the Commonwealth. Currently Metro Development Company owns the building at 8th and Spring Garden and is 6 years into a 17-year lease from the First Judicial District. Are there plans under this bill to recoup the cost, or is the Commonwealth on the hook for the remaining 11 years of that lease?

Mr. MARSICO. Well, Mr. Speaker, that was a point of the hearing that we had in Philadelphia, as you remember. Those leases will not be affected. So that was obviously a concern of ours as well, and as you know, we pointed that out back then at the hearing. So it will not be affected.

Mr. McGEEHAN. I appreciate the period of interrogation.

I would like to be recognized to speak on the bill itself.

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

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

I will not repeat much of what I said yesterday about my feelings about Philadelphia being singled out as an example when there are plenty of examples around the Commonwealth of judicial misconduct. I do have an overarching, though, concern with SB 334, and it concerns the question of taking the public's right away from choosing judges and wresting that control away from the public and putting it into, essentially under this bill, one person, the president judge of the municipal court. I have a fundamental problem with taking the public's right away and wresting that control into someone who has, under this bill, no constraints on who is appointed to hear traffic citations in the city of Philadelphia.

Mr. Speaker, the debate has gone on, in the 20 years that I have been in this building, about merit selection and about the replacement of the public's ability to choose judges, taking the public's right to choose who represents them – whether it is in this body or whether it is in any level of the judiciary – and placing it into the hands of elites who really are not answerable to anybody. This, in my estimation, is essentially what SB 334 is doing. It is taking away the fundamental right of citizens of Philadelphia to choose their judges, to choose who hears their cases. And we may say, well, it is only traffic court; who cares about it. Well, as you and I know and the public watching and listening knows, that has a real effect on whether you can perform your job, whether you can go about your daily business – whether that is grocery shopping, whether that is making necessary medical appointments, whether that is picking your kids up from school. It has real consequences, probably more consequences than any other level of the judiciary in this Commonwealth. So it is vitally important that the public continues to exercise their ability to pick the judges who hear those cases.

The criticism has been, well, the public really is not engaged; they do not know who is running for office. And in many instances, I would agree with them on many levels of our judiciary, whether we are talking about the Supreme Court or whether we are talking about the traffic court or district justices. Many of us do not know who they are.

And if I can be honest, my own father, his long experience as a voter, I will tell you his parameters for choosing judges, if he is not familiar. He is a proud Irishman, and when he goes into the booth and is unfamiliar with the judges, he picks the Irish names first. And I am sure it is not unique to my father. We all are proud of our heritage. We are all proud of our region, so many people vote regionally. Many people vote according to gender. Many people vote according to their ethnic background. Many people vote according to their racial background. That is not unusual.

And I will tell you why that is important, because the reformers have left out an important point in discussion, a discussion about this bill and a discussion about merit selection, that kind of thinking when we vote for people we do not know. We choose people who reflect us, that reflect where we live, that reflect the values we share, to reflect our life experience. That is vitally important to the faith we have in democracy. That is vitally important to reflect our values in the courts and in public offices.

So when we take away the rights of citizens to choose and leave it to the hands of an unanswerable one individual, as it does under this bill, we should be very careful about where it goes from here, about whether we legitimize that wrongheaded approach to choosing who represents us in any level of government. Under this bill, the president judge of the municipal court does not have to take into effect the total makeup of the city of Philadelphia, does not have to take into consideration the racial makeup, the ethnic makeup, the gender makeup, the geographic makeup of the county. That is wrong in this case and it is wrong in any other case.

Mr. Speaker, of course there are problems. Of course there are problems in traffic court. Of course there are problems in every level of government. But taking away the people's right to choose is not the answer. It is not the answer to this problem and it is not the answer to any other problems in any other level of government, and I ask for a negative vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Vitali, from Delaware County.

Waives off? Thank you.

The gentleman, Mr. Carroll, from Luzerne County is recognized.

He waives off, Frank?

The gentleman, Mr. Thomas, is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, may I interrogate the – I want to say sponsor of the bill, but the advocate for the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has agreed to interrogation. You may proceed, Mr. Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as you and I heard during your hearing in Philadelphia County, there are 140-some employees who had nothing to do with the bad actions of several people at Philadelphia Traffic Court. In fact, it was said that these 140-some employees are good workers, have families, have responsibilities, and that some way or another, they should be taken into consideration.

And so my first question is, has SB 334 addressed the adverse impact this bill is going to have on those 140-some employees?

Mr. MARSICO. Well, Mr. Speaker, looking at the bill, the bill does not say anything about the employees. However, at the hearing Judge Glazer did mention that the employees would not be affected. There would not be any reduction. Do you recall that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. THOMAS. No. I did not hear the last part.

Mr. MARSICO. Judge Glazer—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman suspend.

Members, please clear the aisles, take your seats. The period of interrogation is impeded by their inability to hear each other.

You may proceed.

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, Judge Glazer at the hearing mentioned that those employees would not be affected – there would not be a reduction in the number of employees.

Mr. THOMAS. So, Mr. Speaker, and as you know and you are a very learned member of this body, unless we provide for something, then we cannot really guarantee anything. Is that correct? And—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman please suspend.

It is apparent that that is not a question relevant to the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, let me rephrase it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may rephrase.

Mr. THOMAS. Is there anything in SB 334 that memorializes Judge Glazer's advocacy for retaining these 140-some employees?

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, the answer is no. However, it is in the written testimony, the record of the Judiciary hearing held back in March.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, you mentioned earlier, through an earlier speaker, that there are long-term contracts in place, one regarding the utilization of the building at 8th and Spring Garden, and secondly, the computer contract. And I thought I heard you say that SB 334 will not impact either one of those long-term contracts.

So my question is, how will SB 334 avoid impacting those contracts, because they have conditions and circumstances that have to be satisfied. So how does SB 334 not impact those two long-term contracts?

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, the bill is solid on that issue. However, once again, Judge Glazer mentioned that those contracts would not be affected; they would continue.

Mr. THOMAS. So, Mr. Speaker, if that is correct then, it is arguable to conclude that SB 334 articulates how municipal court will function in the interim until SB 334 is fully vetted. So in other words, everything will be transferred over to municipal court.

And so my question is, if the functions of traffic court will be transferred over to municipal court as outlined in SB 334, how do we protect or how do we avoid a breach of contract with respect to the lease on the traffic court building?

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. THOMAS. Or will the county just have to pay for that until something happens?

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, response to the question is the operations of the court will continue to be administered by the courts. And so your question, there is nothing in the bill that addresses – the bill addresses, organizes the court but does not go into specific contracts, private contracts or things like that, or should not.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the question that I raised yesterday. As you know, we had a primary in Philadelphia County. There are two Republicans who made it through the primary. One of those Republicans represents the minority interest of the Republican Party in Philadelphia County. On the other side, there are two – three Democrats who came through the primary, one of which received almost 28,000 votes and who is a member of – a respected local in many of our communities.

How does SB 334, what does SB 334 say to the Republican candidates who came through the primary and the Democrats who came through the primary?

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, SB 334 would eliminate the judgeships.

Mr. THOMAS. So, Mr. Speaker, the labor leader and the representative of the minority component of the county Republican Party, they can just eat their losses and keep going. Is that what we are saying?

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, once again, the judgeships are eliminated, so there will be no elections for traffic court taking place because there will no longer be positions for someone to be elected to a judgeship.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, my last big question, and that is, I know that this is not a bill you authored, but as the majority chairman, in partnership with the minority chairman, have supported SB 334. And so my question is, is there anything that we can glean from SB 334 that will address the problems that currently face traffic court judges in Philadelphia? And I guess, I guess to clarify it a little bit further, one of the judges that is under indictment and possible prosecution is a magistrate out of Chester County who was brought into Philadelphia County to fill a vacancy.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to SB 334, is there anything from which we can glean as policymakers that would deal with that situation or that situation occurring in the future?

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, if I understand the question, well, my response would be, we are going to eliminate the traffic court in Philadelphia, so there would not be a problem then for traffic court in Philadelphia.

Mr. THOMAS. And I guess what I was asking, Mr. Speaker – SB 334 eliminates the institution, not the people, because bad actors can be found anywhere. But SB 334, if I understand it, would eliminate the institution or the established community court in Philadelphia County, and so to that end, how would that address the actions of people who are subjecting – who are facing Federal prosecution right now?

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, once again, it will eliminate the traffic court and it would be the Philadelphia Municipal Court, which has had a clean record.

Mr. THOMAS. And, Mr. Speaker, how does SB 334 line up with that constitutional prescription that calls for the existence of a community court?

Mr. MARSICO. If I understand the question, I will try to respond this way. There really is not an obligation to establish a community court. There would be the Philadelphia Municipal Court; that is what is in the legislation.

Mr. THOMAS. So that the Philadelphia Municipal Court will become the community court?

Mr. MARSICO. Once again, no, it would just be the municipal court, the Philadelphia Municipal Court.

Mr. THOMAS. So this will in effect eliminate the existence of this community court, unless we are empowering municipal court to become the community court.

Mr. MARSICO. I do not know if you understand. Mr. Speaker, I mean, there is no community court.

Mr. THOMAS. So, Mr. Speaker, your conclusion is that there is no and has never been a community court in Philadelphia County?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Thomas, I think the gentleman, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, has answered the question six or seven times with basically the same answer, so I am not sure—

Mr. THOMAS. So, Mr. Speaker, your instruction is to move on. So let me move on.

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

Mr. THOMAS. SB 334 provides that in the interim, hearing examiners will receive about – what is it, \$90,000 a year?

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, once again, the legislation does not specify a salary, does not.

Mr. THOMAS. So SB 334 has no mention of salaries?

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. Okay. Then, Mr. Speaker, under current arrangement, traffic court judges receive about \$90,000 a year.

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, approximately \$90,000; that is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, what is the annual salary for magistrates, an average?

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, I really do not know.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under current arrangements, municipal court judges receive about \$109,000 a year. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman kindly suspend.

The gentleman, Mr. Marsico, previously answered the question. He did not know the answer. But I might add that if you do know the answer, it really is an incorrect line of questioning if you know the answer to your own questions. The

purpose of interrogation is to ask questions in which you have no idea what the answer may be.

Mr. THOMAS. Trust me, Mr. Speaker, I stand for understanding. I do not stand here knowing the answers to the questions that I am raising.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Thomas, you may proceed with interrogation if you wish.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the speaker and I, and I guess the rest of us can learn now that municipal court judges are receiving about a hundred and seventy-some thousand dollars a year under the current arrangement – a little bit less than common pleas court judges. And so, Mr. Speaker, my question is, how does SB 334 transfer the responsibilities of traffic court to municipal court, require examiners who must be lawyers and members of the Pennsylvania bar, and how does 334 resolve the conflict between these interim hearing examiners who will be receiving \$90,000 a year working next to other people who are doing the same thing and receiving about a hundred and seventy-some thousand dollars? How do we resolve that natural conflict which exists in SB 334?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman suspend.

Is that a direct question in relation to—

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. —interrogation, or are you trying to make a summation point?

Mr. THOMAS. No. I am asking the question of how does SB 334 – since 334 talks about transferring the interim responsibilities of traffic court to municipal court and that the transferring of responsibilities will involve something new called traffic court hearing examiners who will handle the traffic matters which were normally with traffic court, and so recognizing that under municipal court rules, you have to be an attorney and a member of the bar in order to work. So my question is, how does SB 334 resolve the natural conflict that will exist between these proposed hearing examiners and municipal court judges on the issue of salary?

Mr. MARSICO. Well, Mr. Speaker, that was a very long question, but the bill— There is no conflict. The bill sets up the qualifications of a hearing officer. And, Mr. Speaker, if I can just mention that we have a fiscal note, a note that calls to your concerns. The fiscal note on SB 334 indicates there would be a \$311,000 saving to the General Fund if this bill is implemented.

Mr. THOMAS. Okay. So there is \$311,000 that will be available, because I do not want a situation, and I think you do not want a situation, where one lawyer who has been subjected to the same level of training is receiving a salary almost \$50,000 less than the person sitting next to them. There is an implied problem in SB 334.

And let me close out my interrogation with this last question. Is it true that SB 334 will be going back to the Senate?

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, yes, it will go back to the Senate. It has been amended, yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Okay, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, I conclude my interrogation, and let me just offer a few comments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has concluded his interrogation and may proceed with final remarks.

Mr. THOMAS. The majority chairman and the minority chairman have engaged in some heavy lifting, and the author of the bill should thank you in a special way for having to carry this big bear, because it is a bear that does not fit. Number one,

SB 334, if you look at the four corners of this prescription, it has nothing to do with the problems which currently face the Philadelphia Traffic Court, nor is there anything in SB 334 that will provide you and I and the people of Philadelphia County with some assurance that this same thing will not happen again, Mr. Speaker, unless SB 334 implies that because you are an attorney and a member of the bar that you cannot steal, and we all know that we cannot go that far.

So, Mr. Speaker, number one, SB 334 is going after a problem that is not there. There is a problem, but the solution to it or a path to resolving it is not caught up in SB 334. And on that particular reason, let me just kind of close that out with something most of us, if not all of us, just received a very good report from the Chief Justice of the Pennsylvania State Supreme Court, the Honorable Castille, and in his annual report, there are a number of cases in there that he has cited as problems that have occurred in the Pennsylvania judicial system. And he cited a couple things. We talked about Luzerne County. He mentioned some other things that I did not even know about. But the most important thing was his instructions on how important it is for us to work together to resolve problems in a real and smart way. The prescription in 334 is a quick fix that will not solve the problem.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, there are numerous counties in Pennsylvania where unemployment is well over 10 percent. I can run off, I could talk about Bedford. I could talk about York. I could talk about places in Delaware County. I could talk about other places where the unemployment is greater than the national average and is systematically, systemically, structurally problematic in at least 10 counties. And so, Mr. Speaker, we also know that there have been over 114,000 State workers, statewide, that are now out of work.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we have 140-some workers in the Philadelphia Traffic Court system who, according to Judge Glazer, had nothing to do with the madness that took place in Philadelphia Traffic Court. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in fact, Mr. Speaker, some of the light pointed on the problem in traffic court involved some of these 140 people who were whistleblowers. If they had not stepped up and said something about things that they saw and knew, we would not be where we are today. So we have some of these 140-some people who are whistleblowers. We have always said that whistleblowers should have some protection. SB 334 destroys the notion, destroys the notion that even these whistleblowers will be protected in this transformation period.

Thirdly, without provisions, without provisions for saying to the vendors of the two long-term contracts in Philadelphia County that you would be held harmless, there is nothing in SB 334 that shields the county from a claim of breach of contract by transferring responsibilities over to municipal court, and once you transfer those responsibilities over, there is no longer a need for a traffic court to hear these matters. So there are economic consequences arising out of the vagueness and the lack of clear instructions in SB 334 and the question of transformation.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. THOMAS. And so, Mr. Speaker, for the economic consequences, the decent, hardworking, some of whom might be whistleblowers, and because of the overburdening that this transformation will bring about, Mr. Speaker, I rise to send this bill back to the Judiciary Committee and work out those areas that have been raised by my comments and the absence of the majority person's inability to answer some of those questions.

And so I move to table this – send this bill back to Judiciary to get those issues worked out before we send it over to the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Moved by the gentleman, Mr. Thomas, that SB 334 be recommitted to the Judiciary Committee.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question and motion, the gentleman, Mr. Marsico, is recognized.

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, we had a hearing on this bill back in March. The Senate voted this bill out 50 to 0. I think it was 20 maybe to 1 or 2 voted out of our Judiciary Committee. The bill has been discussed, and so I oppose the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The minority leader, Mr. Dermody, is recognized on the motion to recommit to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear after the debate that we have had today on this bill that there are certainly significant problems with this bill. We have heard what it does to the voters of the city of Philadelphia; it takes away their right to select their traffic court judges. And among other things, it gives incredible powers, that ought to be reviewed, to the president judge of the municipal court. There are so many problems with this bill, it is hard to list them all, so it makes sense for us to send this back to the Judiciary Committee where it can be amended so that if there are problems with traffic court, we can address them properly and not with a bill that deprives the rights of the voters of the city of Philadelphia.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the presence on the floor of the gentleman, Mr. Frankel, and he will be added to the master roll.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair also recognizes the minority leader, who requests a leave of absence for the gentleman, Mr. WATERS, from Philadelphia County, and the gentleman, Mr. MATZIE, from Beaver County for the day. Without objection, the leaves will be so granted.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 334 CONTINUED

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—83

Barbin	Deasy	Kim	Parker
Bishop	DeLuca	Kinsey	Pashinski
Bizzarro	Dermody	Kirkland	Petrarca
Boyle, B.	Donatucci	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Boyle, K.	Evans	Kula	Readshaw
Bradford	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roebuck
Briggs	Farina	Mahoney	Rozzi
Brown, V.	Flynn	Markosek	Sabatina
Brownlee	Frankel	McCarter	Sainato
Burns	Freeman	McGeehan	Samuelson
Carroll	Gainey	McNeill	Santarsiero
Clay	Galloway	Miller, D.	Schlossberg
Cohen	Gibbons	Mirabito	Schreiber
Conklin	Goodman	Miranda	Snyder
Costa, D.	Haluska	Molchany	Sturla
Costa, P.	Hanna	Mullery	Thomas
Cruz	Harhai	Mundy	Vitali
Daley, P.	Harkins	Neilson	Wheatley
Davidson	Harris, J.	Neuman	White
Davis	Kavulich	O'Brien	Youngblood
Dean	Keller, W.	Painter	

NAYS—112

Adolph	Everett	Knowles	Rapp
Aument	Farry	Kotik	Reed
Baker	Fee	Lawrence	Reese
Barrar	Fleck	Lucas	Regan
Benninghoff	Gabler	Mackenzie	Roae
Bloom	Gillen	Maher	Rock
Boback	Gillespie	Major	Ross
Brooks	Gingrich	Maloney	Saccone
Brown, R.	Greiner	Marshall	Sankey
Caltagirone	Grell	Marsico	Saylor
Causser	Grove	Masser	Scavello
Christiana	Hackett	McGinnis	Simmons
Clymer	Haggerty	Mentzer	Sims
Corbin	Hahn	Metzgar	Smith
Cox	Harhart	Millard	Sonney
Culver	Harper	Miller, R.	Stephens
Cutler	Harris, A.	Milne	Stern
Daley, M.	Heffley	Moul	Stevenson
Day	Helm	Murt	Swanger
DeLissio	Hennessey	Mustio	Tallman
Delozier	Hess	O'Neill	Taylor
Denlinger	Hickernell	Oberlander	Tobash
DiGirolamo	James	Payne	Toepel
Dunbar	Kampf	Peifer	Toohil
Ellis	Kauffman	Petri	Truitt
Emrick	Keller, F.	Pickett	Turzai
English	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Vereb
Evankovich	Killion	Quinn	Watson

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Gergely	Krieger	Metcalf	Micozzie
Godshall	Matzie	Miccarelli	Waters

Less than the majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the motion was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the gentleman, Mr. Cohen, from Philadelphia is recognized.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, will the chairman of the Judiciary Committee consent to further interrogation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has agreed, and you may proceed, Mr. Cohen.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have read this bill over and over and over again, and I am frankly puzzled by what seems to me very confusing and very odd provisions of this bill.

Now, the current situation on the Philadelphia Traffic Court is that there is one elected judge actually functioning. I know her. It is Christine Solomon, a constituent of mine. Now, she is the only judge actually functioning because of indictments. Now, then we have three people who have won primaries and who are likely to win the election. And you add those people and the existing traffic court judge; that creates a total of four judges. And at first I read this, you talk about four judges on the municipal court in the traffic division, and it seemed to me, well, that is obvious. You take the one existing judge who is not accused of committing any crimes and you take the three new ones, and one plus three equals four. But then we are told, well, these elections of the people who are going to be nominated are not going to be held, and for the life of me, I cannot find anything in this bill canceling the existing elections, and I am not at all certain that it is constitutional to cancel existing elections where people have already filed nominating petitions and have been picked by the voters of the respective parties. And then suddenly there is a — on the last page of the bill, page 7, we talk about the establishment of the traffic court shall be "...two judges: who are serving on the court on the effective date of this subsection; and whose terms expire on December 31, 2017."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Cohen?

Mr. COHEN. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I apologize, but is there a question there?

Mr. COHEN. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Okay.

Mr. COHEN. Yes. I am asking, Mr. Speaker, that the chair of the Judiciary Committee explain the discrepancies. How do we have two courts— There is only one judge on the traffic court who meets the requirements in section 1321(b), and if we abolish the three people being elected this year, there is only going to be one judge who meets the traffic division qualifications for the municipal court. Will the gentleman explain how we actually fill the slots on both the traffic division of the municipal court and the two slots on the traffic court?

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, if I can understand the question, fairly long and complicated, but there is one active judge—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman please suspend.

The Chair can barely hear the gentleman, Mr. Marsico. I do not know how the rest of the members can hear.

Members, would you please take your seats. Thank you.

You may proceed.

Mr. MARSICO. Once again, Mr. Speaker, there is one active judge, three suspended without pay following their indictment, and three suspended – three resigned – and three that resigned.

Mr. COHEN. So you are counting – so, Mr. Speaker, you are counting the three suspended judges who are not now serving as being among the four judges assigned to the division of the municipal court?

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you.

Now, the Supreme Court has removed them from performing their duties. Is that not correct?

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, that is correct. They have been suspended without pay.

Mr. COHEN. So because they have been suspended without pay, they are not doing any work now? And the only—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman suspend.

It appears that the gentleman is asking a question that he knows the answer, and the gentleman knows that is not really appropriate.

Mr. COHEN. Okay. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we have arrived at an area of consensus, that there is only one—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may continue with interrogation, if he wishes.

Mr. COHEN. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have arrived at a consensus that there is only one actually performing judge because we start out with seven, there are three who were suspended and there are three who have resigned. So that is six removed, and we have one remaining.

Now, then how do we square that fact, which we both agree on now, with the language in 1121(2) which says "The Traffic Division..." of the Philadelphia Municipal Court "...shall consist of four judges elected to the Traffic Court of Philadelphia prior to the effective date of this paragraph. If a vacancy in the Traffic Division occurs, the vacancy shall not be filled." How do we deal – how does the court obey the law?

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. COHEN. They are not allowed to fill the vacancy.

Mr. MARSICO. These judges were suspended without pay.

Mr. COHEN. That is correct.

Mr. MARSICO. Okay. Yeah, I do not understand what your question is. They were suspended without pay.

Mr. COHEN. Right, and the law mandates there be four judges, and we have only got one eligible judge right now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman please suspend.

Will the gentleman kindly ask the question, allow the gentleman, Mr. Marsico, to then answer, and then you can ask another question.

Mr. COHEN. Okay. I did not think I was interrupting the gentleman, Mr. Marsico, but if I was, I apologize.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. COHEN. Does Mr. Marsico have a further answer?

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, they have not been removed from office; they have been suspended without pay. That is my answer; that is it.

Mr. COHEN. Okay. Okay. That is what I thought. I thought you had answered the question.

Okay. Mr. Speaker, where does this bill abolish the elections that are due to take place in November of 2013, in which the primaries have nominated candidates?

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, the bill eliminates the three positions, so it is not necessary then to have elections.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, would it not take an amendment to the Election Code to eliminate the elections?

Mr. MARSICO. No.

Mr. COHEN. No? No.

That concludes my interrogation, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman. You may proceed on final remarks.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is extremely difficult to read and extremely difficult to implement. It purports to set off a general division of the Philadelphia Municipal – traffic division, rather, of the Philadelphia Municipal Court, but it creates qualifications which there is only one person to serve on – my constituent who is going to be the hardest working judge in the whole State with the entire traffic division to herself. I have a high respect for her, but I really doubt she is going to be able to adequately deal with the vast caseload before her.

The bill somehow abolishes offices, but it is not clear that it is doing that. This is extremely vague. I understand the gentleman is dealing with a situation in which the facts are constantly changing, but I would think the best thing—

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. COHEN. My first choice would be to have the Judiciary Committee do more work on it, but since the House has already rejected that, I would move that this bill be recommitted to the Transportation Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Cohen, from Philadelphia makes the motion to recommit SB 334 to the Transportation Committee?

Mr. COHEN. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—86

Barbin	Deasy	Kim	Painter
Bishop	DeLuca	Kinsey	Parker
Bizzarro	Dermody	Kirkland	Pashinski
Boyle, B.	Donatucci	Kortz	Petrarca
Boyle, K.	Evans	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Bradford	Fabrizio	Kula	Readshaw
Briggs	Farina	Longietti	Roebuck
Brown, V.	Flynn	Mahoney	Rozzi
Brownlee	Frankel	Markosek	Sabatina
Burns	Freeman	McCarter	Sainato
Carroll	Gainey	McGeehan	Samuelson
Clay	Galloway	McNeill	Santarsiero
Cohen	Gibbons	Miller, D.	Schlossberg
Conklin	Goodman	Mirabito	Schreiber
Costa, D.	Haggerty	Miranda	Snyder
Costa, P.	Haluska	Molchany	Sturla
Cruz	Hanna	Mullery	Thomas
Daley, M.	Harhai	Mundy	Vitali
Daley, P.	Harkins	Neilson	Wheatley
Davidson	Harris, J.	Neuman	White
Davis	Kavulich	O'Brien	Youngblood
Dean	Keller, W.		

NAYS—109

Adolph	Farry	Lawrence	Reed
Aument	Fee	Lucas	Reese
Baker	Fleck	Mackenzie	Regan
Barrar	Gabler	Maher	Roae
Benninghoff	Gillen	Major	Rock
Bloom	Gillespie	Maloney	Ross
Boback	Gingrich	Marshall	Saccone
Brooks	Greiner	Marsico	Sankey
Brown, R.	Grell	Masser	Saylor
Caltagirone	Grove	McGinnis	Scavello
Causer	Hackett	Mentzer	Simmons
Christiana	Hahn	Metzgar	Sims
Clymer	Harhart	Millard	Smith
Corbin	Harper	Miller, R.	Sonney
Cox	Harris, A.	Milne	Stephens
Culver	Heffley	Moul	Stern
Cutler	Helm	Murt	Stevenson
Day	Hennessey	Mustio	Swanger
DeLissio	Hess	O'Neill	Tallman
DeLozier	Hickernell	Oberlander	Taylor
Denlinger	James	Payne	Tobash
DiGirolamo	Kampf	Peifer	Toepel
Dunbar	Kauffman	Petri	Toohil
Ellis	Keller, F.	Pickett	Truitt
Emrick	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Turzai
English	Killion	Quinn	Vereb
Evankovich	Knowles	Rapp	Watson
Everett			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Gergely	Krieger	Metcalfe	Micozzie
Godshall	Matzie	Miccarelli	Waters

Less than the majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the motion was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, Mr. Cohen is recognized.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the vote totals are slowly inching up in opposition to this bill on the subsidiary motions. I would urge that people in both parties vote against this bill on final passage. This is a bad bill. At best, it is a confused bill. At best, the inevitable litigation in the courts of Pennsylvania will uphold the constitutionality of this bill. At best, the courts will agree with the chairman of Judiciary's interpretation that it is possible to abolish elections in the middle of them without explicitly saying that that is what one is doing and without amending the Election Code.

I am very skeptical that this legislation will get through the Pennsylvania court system unscathed. I think we are somewhat abridging the Judiciary's power. We are certainly abridging the constitutional rights of Philadelphia voters. I believe this legislation is an overreaction to a terrible series of events. The long-term public interests of the city of Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania would be to have this bill defeated until

there is a comprehensive, sensible solution worked out. This solution is neither comprehensive nor sensible, nor comprehensible.

I would urge again a "no" vote on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlelady from Philadelphia, Ms. Bishop.

Ms. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, friends, Philadelphians, Pennsylvanians, lend me your ears. I come to remind all of you of three, all of you of three very important points. Number one, SB 334 tells us three things. Number one, it tells us we do not know how to select a traffic court judge. Number two, it tells us we do not have anyone in Philadelphia honorable or capable enough to be a traffic court judge in Philadelphia. And three, it tells us that other counties are more honorable and more capable of selecting a traffic court judge for Philadelphia. What a shame. What a putdown on those of us who live in the birthplace of our nation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. For all of us, this is one of the greatest putdowns you can give us.

So I am asking all of you, even though we do not have cash for kids, we have honor and we have integrity and we are as good as anybody else. So please vote "no" on SB 334. Thank you.

And there is an expression that says – may I have your attention for a moment – the wheels of the guards grind slowly but ever so finely. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Thomas, for the second time, from Philadelphia.

Mr. THOMAS. I am going to make this quick, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of my friends have said that you cannot vote against SB 334 because it is going to look bad for you in front of the media, and I am rising to say to you a "no" vote on SB 334 will not be a "yes" vote to the bad acts that took place in Philadelphia Traffic Court. Let me say that again. A "no" vote to SB 334 is not support or any condonement of the bad stuff that took place in Philadelphia County. Between the State prosecution and Federal prosecution, that is going to be dealt with. So what we are voting "no" on really is the inability of SB 334 to deal with some specificity.

Number one, what is going to happen to the 140-some employees who had nothing to do with this mess? Two, how do we ensure that vendors on the contracts on the building and on the computers, that they will not declare breach because there has been transformation of what is going on at 8th and Spring Garden? Three,

there were two Republican candidates, very good candidates, two Democratic candidates, who spent money – I know that a couple of them put their homes up, mortgages, to try and run citywide for this. If we wanted to go down this road as a way for solution, we should have done it last year, not this year, and we should have said something to these candidates before they filed papers, took out mortgages, and put their livelihood on risk. It is not Republican or Democrat; it is people. It is people who saw an opportunity and tried to do what we asked them to do in seeking that opportunity.

SB 334 should provide some clarification on the status of these decent candidates who put themselves at risk. Number four, SB 334 needs to address how a million-and-some cases are

going to be transferred over to another court that is hearing a million-and-some cases. Municipal court is overburdened today without the traffic court division. SB 334 provides some leeway, but not enough to deal with the transferring of the traffic division to municipal court.

And last but not least, Mr. Speaker, the people of Philadelphia, the people of Philadelphia need to be respected. If what you want in your county, if it is important for you to say something about what happens in your county, then, please, let the people of Philadelphia have something to say about what is going on in Philadelphia County. So do not just shut the door on 1.5 million people in Philadelphia County who need to be involved in this process. And for those five reasons, Mr. Speaker, vote "no" on SB 334 and continue to stand, stand with the majority leader, the minority leader, and all the people who have stood up and said that this mess in Philadelphia County needs to stop. But there is nothing in here that will change, add, or take away the State and/or the Federal prosecution that is under way for these people who have done bad acts in Philadelphia County.

So for those five reasons, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" on SB 334 and let us get it right with reforming the traffic court in Philadelphia County. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the minority leader, Mr. Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard over the last few days here debating the fate of the Philadelphia Traffic Court, we have talked about issues that you would not want to see have happen in any one of your districts. We have talked about two bills, and this SB 334 in particular that we are debating today is something you would never want to have happen, you would never let happen in any of your districts. This bill takes the rights of the Philadelphia voters away from selecting their traffic court judges, and what it does is, it places the ability, the power, to appoint those judges or hearing examiners, it gives that power to the president judge of the municipal court. It allows the president judge to set salaries. There are no salaries set. There are no requirements for the number of judges set. There is no accountability whatsoever. This is patronage run amok, this is patronage gone wild, without any accountability with the voters. This is something you would never let happen in any one of your districts, in any one of your counties, to let a president judge select without any qualifications whatsoever hearing examiners, the number of hearing examiners that will be involved, and what their salaries will be. One hearing examiner could make \$100,000. He could hire another hearing examiner who could make \$30,000.

Mr. Speaker, this bill makes no sense. It treats the citizens of Philadelphia as second-class citizens. We should vote "no" on this bill. If you want to reform traffic court, if there are problems with the traffic court in Philadelphia, we should craft a bill that solves the problem, has accountability, and does not punish the voters of Philadelphia.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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—114

Adolph	Everett	Lawrence	Reese
Aument	Farry	Lucas	Regan
Baker	Fee	Mackenzie	Roae
Barrar	Fleck	Maher	Rock
Benninghoff	Gabler	Major	Ross
Bloom	Gillen	Maloney	Sabatina
Boback	Gillespie	Marshall	Saccone
Brooks	Gingrich	Marsico	Sankey
Brown, R.	Greiner	Masser	Saylor
Caltagirone	Grell	McGinnis	Scavello
Causer	Grove	Mentzer	Simmons
Christiana	Hackett	Metzgar	Sims
Clymer	Hahn	Millard	Smith
Corbin	Harhart	Miller, R.	Sonney
Costa, D.	Harper	Milne	Stephens
Cox	Harris, A.	Moul	Stern
Culver	Heffley	Murt	Stevenson
Cutler	Helm	Mustio	Swanger
Day	Hennessey	O'Neill	Tallman
Dean	Hess	Oberlander	Taylor
DeLissio	Hickernell	Payne	Tobash
Delozier	James	Peifer	Toepel
Denlinger	Kampf	Petri	Toohil
DiGirolo	Kauffman	Pickett	Truitt
Dunbar	Keller, F.	Pyle	Turzai
Ellis	Keller, M.K.	Quinn	Vereb
Emrick	Keller, W.	Rapp	Vitali
English	Killion	Reed	Watson
Evankovich	Knowles		

NAYS—81

Barbin	DeLuca	Kim	O'Brien
Bishop	Dermody	Kinsey	Painter
Bizzarro	Donatucci	Kirkland	Parker
Boyle, B.	Evans	Kortz	Pashinski
Boyle, K.	Fabrizio	Kotik	Petrarca
Bradford	Farina	Kula	Ravenstahl
Briggs	Flynn	Longietti	Readshaw
Brown, V.	Frankel	Mahoney	Roebuck
Brownlee	Freeman	Markosek	Rozzi
Burns	Gainey	McCarter	Sainato
Carroll	Galloway	McGeehan	Samuelson
Clay	Gibbons	McNeill	Santarsiero
Cohen	Goodman	Miller, D.	Schlossberg
Conklin	Haggerty	Mirabito	Schreiber
Costa, P.	Haluska	Miranda	Snyder
Cruz	Hanna	Molchany	Sturla
Daley, M.	Harhai	Mullery	Thomas
Daley, P.	Harkins	Mundy	Wheatley
Davidson	Harris, J.	Neilson	White
Davis	Kavulich	Neuman	Youngblood
Deasy			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Gergely	Krieger	Metcalfe	Micozzie
Godshall	Matzie	Miccarelli	Waters

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.

RESOLUTION

Mrs. HARHART called up **HR 163, PN 1883**, entitled:

A Resolution directing the Joint State Government Commission to identify existing evidence-based child abuse and neglect prevention programs in this Commonwealth and nationwide, evaluate the effectiveness and relative cost of these programs and identify opportunities to integrate child abuse and neglect prevention methods and approaches into Commonwealth programs and policy.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—195

Adolph	Ellis	Kim	Pickett
Aument	Emrick	Kinsey	Pyle
Baker	English	Kirkland	Quinn
Barbin	Evankovich	Knowles	Rapp
Barrar	Evans	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Everett	Kotik	Readshaw
Bishop	Fabrizio	Kula	Reed
Bizzarro	Farina	Lawrence	Reese
Bloom	Farry	Longiotti	Regan
Boback	Fee	Lucas	Roae
Boyle, B.	Fleck	Mackenzie	Rock
Boyle, K.	Flynn	Maher	Roebuck
Bradford	Frankel	Mahoney	Ross
Briggs	Freeman	Major	Rozzi
Brooks	Gabler	Maloney	Sabatina
Brown, R.	Gainey	Markosek	Saccone
Brown, V.	Galloway	Marshall	Sainato
Brownlee	Gibbons	Marsico	Samuelson
Burns	Gillen	Masser	Sankey
Caltagirone	Gillespie	McCarter	Santarsiero
Carroll	Gingrich	McGeehan	Saylor
Causar	Goodman	McGinnis	Scavello
Christiana	Greiner	McNeill	Schlossberg
Clay	Grell	Mentzer	Schreiber
Clymer	Grove	Metzgar	Simmons
Cohen	Hackett	Millard	Sims
Conklin	Haggerty	Miller, D.	Smith
Corbin	Hahn	Miller, R.	Snyder
Costa, D.	Haluska	Milne	Sonney
Costa, P.	Hanna	Mirabito	Stephens
Cox	Harhai	Miranda	Stern
Cruz	Harhart	Molchany	Stevenson
Culver	Harkins	Moul	Sturla
Cutler	Harper	Mullery	Swanger
Daley, M.	Harris, A.	Mundy	Tallman
Daley, P.	Harris, J.	Murt	Taylor
Davidson	Heffley	Mustio	Thomas
Davis	Helm	Neilson	Tobash
Day	Hennessey	Neuman	Toepel
Dean	Hess	O'Brien	Toohil
Deasy	Hickernell	O'Neill	Truitt
DeLissio	James	Oberlander	Turzai
Delozier	Kampf	Painter	Vereb
DeLuca	Kauffman	Parker	Vitali
Denlinger	Kavulich	Pashinski	Watson

Dermody	Keller, F.	Payne	Wheatley
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	White
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Youngblood
Dunbar	Killion	Petri	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Gergely	Krieger	Metcalfe	Micozzie
Godshall	Matzie	Miccarelli	Waters

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

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized on unanimous consent.

Mr. MARSICO. I want to submit remarks for the record on SB 334. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, over the last year, nine elected judges of Philadelphia's Traffic Court have been implicated in a conspiracy that involved frequent and pervasive ticket-fixing at the Philadelphia Traffic Court. These judges participated in a widespread culture of giving breaks on traffic citations to friends, family, the politically connected, and business associates.

According to FBI reports, the politically connected regularly contacted these judges seeking preferential treatment on specific tickets. Additionally, the judges were regularly contacted by family, friends, and associates seeking a break on tickets. The judges accepted these requests and either gave the preferential treatment directly or communicated the request to another judge to whom the case was assigned.

Tickets were then fixed by either being dismissed, finding the ticketholder not guilty, or finding the ticketholder guilty of a lesser offense. In many cases, the ticketholder did not even appear in traffic court, yet his ticket was fixed. As a result, these ticketholders paid lesser or no fines and costs and evaded the assessment of points on their driver's records.

The result was a system of justice made for two categories of citizens: the elite, whose political connections let them evade responsibility for their actions; and everyone else.

Mr. Speaker, this bill ends the embarrassment of Philadelphia's Traffic Court.

This bill transfers the responsibilities of the Philadelphia Traffic Court to the Philadelphia Municipal Court. It eliminates the five traffic court judgeships that are currently vacant because of criminal activity by those judges. It moves the two remaining traffic court judges who have not been removed from office for corruption to new roles within the municipal court, effectively shuttering the traffic court immediately.

There is no good reason for taxpayers to continue footing the bill for a court that is unnecessary and has become an embarrassment to the State's judicial system. No other city or county in the State has an independent traffic court, and the historic problems of Philadelphia's Traffic Court demonstrate that it is not needed there either.

The citizens of Philadelphia, like the citizens of Pennsylvania everywhere, deserve a justice system that is fair and evenhanded. This bill was voted out of the Senate unanimously. The bill was also voted out of the House Judiciary Committee with broad bipartisan support. I urge you now to support SB 334 and to give Philadelphia's citizens the justice system they deserve.

I ask for your affirmative vote. Thank you.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentelady, Mrs. Harhart, rise? Unanimous consent? Without objection, the lady is recognized.

Mrs. HARHART. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to thank everybody for their support on HR 163, and I would like to submit my remarks for the record. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady. Please kindly submit your remarks to the clerk.

Mrs. HARHART submitted the following remarks for the Legislative Journal:

HR 163 is based on a recommendation by the Task Force on Child Protection.

The task force supported and recommended further consideration of evidence-based child abuse and neglect prevention programs.

HR 163 will direct the Joint State Government Commission, which prepared the task force's report, to:

- o Identify successful existing prevention programs;
- o Evaluate the effectiveness and relative cost of the programs;
- o Identify opportunities to incorporate child abuse and neglect prevention into existing programs and agency policies;
- o Identify existing funding streams for prevention; and
- o Make recommendations on how to incentivize the implementation of prevention programs.

A report would be issued to the majority and minority chairs of the Children and Youth and Judiciary Committees within 18 months.

The Joint State Government Commission was involved in the drafting of this resolution.

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1319, PN 1700**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 28, 1937 (P.L.955, No.265), referred to as the Housing Authorities Law, further providing for powers of an authority.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1363, PN 1761**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of November 26, 2008 (P.L.1672, No.135), known as the Abandoned and Blighted Property Conservatorship Act, further providing for definitions, for initiation of action, for appointment of conservator, for powers and duties of conservator and for sale of property.

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

Mr. **MASSER** offered the following amendment
No. **A01928**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 7, by inserting after "conservator"
, for incurring indebtedness

Amend Bill, page 4, line 19, by inserting a bracket before "The"

Amend Bill, page 4, lines 20 through 29, by striking out "[.] or has been" in line 20 and all of lines 21 through 29 and inserting
.] The owner fails to present compelling evidence that he has made a good faith effort, during the preceding 60-day period, to sell the property at a price which reflects the circumstances and market conditions.

Amend Bill, page 4, line 30, by inserting a bracket before
"building"

Amend Bill, page 4, line 30, by inserting after "building"

] property

Amend Bill, page 4, line 30, by inserting a bracket before "an"

Amend Bill, page 4, line 30, by inserting after "existing"

] a pending

Amend Bill, page 5, line 1, by inserting a bracket before the
period after "action"

Amend Bill, page 5, line 1, by inserting a bracket after "action."

Amend Bill, page 5, lines 1 through 5, by striking out "For the purposes of this paragraph" in line 1 and all of lines 2 through 5 and inserting

by an individual or nongovernmental entity.

Amend Bill, page 5, line 22, by striking out "if the property is zoned commercial."

Amend Bill, page 6, line 29, by inserting after "the " where it
occurs the first time

most

Amend Bill, page 6, line 29, by inserting after "senior "

nongovernmental

Amend Bill, page 8, lines 4 through 9, by striking out "After a petition is filed, if the court proceeds" in line 4 and all of lines 5 through 9 and inserting

A contract for sale entered into subsequent to the filing of a petition for conservatorship shall be subject to court approval and to reimbursement of costs incurred by the petitioner in preparing and filing the petition in accordance with the requirements of section 4.

Amend Bill, page 8, line 16, by striking out "(b)(4)" and inserting
(c)(1) and (5)

Amend Bill, page 8, line 17, by striking out "and the section is
amended by adding a subsection "

Amend Bill, page 9, lines 11 through 21, by striking out all of
said lines and inserting

(c) Hearing on conservator's final plan for abatement.—

(1) At the time the court appoints a conservator, the conservator may present and the court may approve the final plan for abatement. If no plan is presented at that hearing, a hearing date on the conservator's final plan for abatement shall be set within 120 days of the appointment.

* * *

(5) At the time of the hearing, all parties shall be allowed to comment on the plan, and the court shall take all comments into consideration when assessing the feasibility of the plan and the proposed financing. In making its assessment, the court shall give reasonable regard to the conservator's determination of the scope and necessity of work to be done for the rehabilitation or demolition of the building in approving the final plan and in approving the costs of conservatorship and sale of the property.

Amend Bill, page 9, line 23, by striking out "Section" where it occurs the second time and inserting Sections 8(b) and (c) and

Amend Bill, page 9, by inserting between lines 24 and 25 Section 8. Incurring indebtedness.

* * *

(b) Liens.—In order to facilitate the borrowing of funds for the costs of rehabilitation, the court may grant priority status to a lien [or security interest with priority over all other liens with the exception of municipal or other governmental liens, provided, however, that prior to granting a priority lien, the court has found that] given to secure payment on a debt incurred for purposes authorized under this chapter provided that:

(1) [The] the conservator sought to obtain the necessary financing from the senior, nongovernmental lienholder, but the lienholder declined to provide financing for reasonable improvements or other costs of rehabilitation on reasonable terms[.]; and

(2) [Lien] lien priority is necessary in order to induce another lender to provide financing on reasonable terms.

[(c) Lien status of rehabilitation expenses.—Should the senior lienholder agree to provide financing for the costs of rehabilitation, any funds lent to cover the costs shall be deemed to be added to the senior lienholder's preexisting first lien.]

* * *

Amend Bill, page 10, lines 9 through 12, by striking out "[Municipal] The principal on all State and municipal" in line 9 and all of lines 10 through 12 and inserting

[Municipal or other governmental liens.] Liens of the Commonwealth, liens for unpaid property taxes and properly recorded municipal liens.

Amend Bill, page 10, lines 17 and 18, by striking out "requesting the" in line 17 and all of line 18 and inserting preparing and filing the petition in accordance with the requirements of section 4.

Amend Bill, page 10, line 26, by inserting a bracket before "(8)"

Amend Bill, page 10, line 27, by inserting a bracket after "conservatorship."

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

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

Mr. MASSER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment makes no substantive changes. It is an agreed-upon amendment. It just clarifies provisions in the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is an agreed-to amendment, and I urge its adoption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—195

Adolph	Ellis	Kim	Pickett
Aument	Emrick	Kinsey	Pyle
Baker	English	Kirkland	Quinn
Barbin	Evankovich	Knowles	Rapp
Barrar	Evans	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Everett	Kotik	Readshaw
Bishop	Fabrizio	Kula	Reed
Bizzarro	Farina	Lawrence	Reese
Bloom	Farry	Longietti	Regan
Boback	Fee	Lucas	Roae
Boyle, B.	Fleck	Mackenzie	Rock
Boyle, K.	Flynn	Maher	Roebuck
Bradford	Frankel	Mahoney	Ross
Briggs	Freeman	Major	Rozzi
Brooks	Gabler	Maloney	Sabatina
Brown, R.	Gainey	Markosek	Saccone
Brown, V.	Galloway	Marshall	Sainato
Brownlee	Gibbons	Marsico	Samuelson
Burns	Gillen	Masser	Sankey
Caltagirone	Gillespie	McCarter	Santarsiero
Carroll	Gingrich	McGeehan	Saylor
Causer	Goodman	McGinnis	Scavello
Christiana	Greiner	McNeill	Schlossberg
Clay	Grell	Mentzer	Schreiber
Clymer	Grove	Metzgar	Simmons
Cohen	Hackett	Millard	Sims
Conklin	Haggerty	Miller, D.	Smith
Corbin	Hahn	Miller, R.	Snyder
Costa, D.	Haluska	Milne	Sonney
Costa, P.	Hanna	Mirabito	Stephens
Cox	Harhai	Miranda	Stern
Cruz	Harhart	Molchany	Stevenson
Culver	Harkins	Moul	Sturla
Cutler	Harper	Mullery	Swanger
Daley, M.	Harris, A.	Mundy	Tallman
Daley, P.	Harris, J.	Murt	Taylor
Davidson	Heffley	Mustio	Thomas
Davis	Helm	Neilson	Tobash
Day	Hennessey	Neuman	Toepel
Dean	Hess	O'Brien	Toohil
Deasy	Hickernell	O'Neill	Truitt
DeLissio	James	Oberlander	Turzai
Delozier	Kampf	Painter	Vereb
DeLuca	Kauffman	Parker	Vitali
Denlinger	Kavulich	Pashinski	Watson
Dermody	Keller, F.	Payne	Wheatley
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	White
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Youngblood
Dunbar	Killion	Petri	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Gergely	Krieger	Metcalfe	Micozzie
Godshall	Matzie	Miccarelli	Waters

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

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

(Bill as amended will be reprinted.)

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 196, PN 716**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 1, 1988 (P.L.82, No.16), known as the Pennsylvania Infrastructure Investment Authority Act, further providing for definitions, for financial assistance and for annual report.

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?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—195

Adolph	Ellis	Kim	Pickett
Aument	Emrick	Kinsey	Pyle
Baker	English	Kirkland	Quinn
Barbin	Evankovich	Knowles	Rapp
Barrar	Evans	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Everett	Kotik	Readshaw
Bishop	Fabrizio	Kula	Reed
Bizzarro	Farina	Lawrence	Reese
Bloom	Farry	Longietti	Regan
Boback	Fee	Lucas	Roae
Boyle, B.	Fleck	Mackenzie	Rock
Boyle, K.	Flynn	Maher	Roebuck
Bradford	Frankel	Mahoney	Ross
Briggs	Freeman	Major	Rozzi
Brooks	Gabler	Maloney	Sabatina
Brown, R.	Gainey	Markosek	Saccone
Brown, V.	Galloway	Marshall	Sainato
Brownlee	Gibbons	Marsico	Samuelson
Burns	Gillen	Masser	Sankey
Caltagirone	Gillespie	McCarter	Santarsiero
Carroll	Gingrich	McGeehan	Saylor
Causar	Goodman	McGinnis	Scavello
Christiana	Greiner	McNeill	Schlossberg
Clay	Grell	Mentzer	Schreiber
Clymer	Grove	Metzgar	Simmons
Cohen	Hackett	Millard	Sims
Conklin	Haggerty	Miller, D.	Smith
Corbin	Hahn	Miller, R.	Snyder
Costa, D.	Haluska	Milne	Sonney
Costa, P.	Hanna	Mirabito	Stephens
Cox	Harhai	Miranda	Stern
Cruz	Harhart	Molchany	Stevenson
Culver	Harkins	Moul	Sturla
Cutler	Harper	Mullery	Swanger
Daley, M.	Harris, A.	Mundy	Tallman

Daley, P.	Harris, J.	Murt	Taylor
Davidson	Heffley	Mustio	Thomas
Davis	Helm	Neilson	Tobash
Day	Hennessey	Neuman	Toepel
Dean	Hess	O'Brien	Toohil
Deasy	Hickernell	O'Neill	Truitt
DeLissio	James	Oberlander	Turzai
Delozier	Kampf	Painter	Vereb
DeLuca	Kauffman	Parker	Vitali
Denlinger	Kavulich	Pashinski	Watson
Dermody	Keller, F.	Payne	Wheatley
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	White
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Youngblood
Dunbar	Killion	Petri	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Gergely	Krieger	Metcalfe	Micozzie
Godshall	Matzie	Miccarelli	Waters

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 without amendment.

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1287, PN 1943**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Public Welfare Code, providing for electronic prior approval for Medicaid.

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 gentleman, Mr. Cutler, is recognized.
Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Very briefly, I just wanted to thank a couple people as we worked on this issue. The gentleman from the 19th District was the original champion of this issue. We had worked the last two terms on it, and I wanted to note his support and appreciation. Additionally, I want to just thank the gentlelady from the 194th District and her amendment yesterday that went in unanimously regarding the cost and fiscal impacts. I would certainly appreciate an affirmative vote to ensure that we can increase access to mental health drugs for those individuals currently enrolled in the programs. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully rise to oppose this bill. I certainly understand the sponsor's well-intended ideas relative to this bill, but HB 1287 includes language that weakens the Department of Public Welfare's ability to manage the medical assistance prescription drug benefit. Under HB 1287, preferred and nonpreferred drugs prescribed by psychiatrists would be exempt from prior authorization requirements. This exemption makes it easier for psychiatrists to prescribe drugs that are not on the department's preferred drug list.

Drugs included on the preferred drug list are determined by a committee, the Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee of DPW, which takes into account the efficacy, quality, and safety of the drugs. This committee includes psychiatrists, and its meetings are open to the public.

For any nonpreferred drugs prescribed by the psychiatrists, DPW would have to forgo the supplemental rebates that it currently receives for those drugs on the preferred drug list. This will likely result in the loss of supplemental rebates estimated at \$5 million annually and thereby increase costs in the MA program.

The preferred drug list, together with DPW's prior authorization process, has been an effective tool in managing prescription drug costs in the MA program while maintaining access to clinically effective drugs.

If we exempt psychiatrists from the prior authorization requirements, who will be the next group that seeks exemption?

If problems exist in getting the appropriate drugs to consumers, we should work to improve the current P&T Committee process for maintaining the preferred drug list and to improve the prior authorization requirements which enable consumers to use drugs that are not on this list.

So respectfully, I would say for really two main reasons, I would ask the members to vote "no." The first reason, of course, is costs, and now in the budget season where costs are such an issue, to lose up to \$5 million annually in the MA program is something we just simply cannot afford or should not do. And also there is a policy issue here too. If the psychiatrists are able to carve out their prescriptions, what about all the other groups? Everybody will want the same, and the next thing you know, we will perhaps lose even more money because we are not using the preferred drug list.

So for those two reasons and everything that I have mentioned here before, I would again, in all deference to the sponsor who is well-meaning, ask the members to please vote "no" on HB 1287. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the presence on the floor of the gentleman, Mr. Waters. He will be removed from the leave, added back to the master roll.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 1287 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Cutler, on his legislation.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to requalify some of the previous speaker's remarks. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that any changes in the proposed program could potentially impact up to \$5 million of rebates. That was certainly contained in the note. I would like to point out two additional facts, however. That is less than half of the proposed loss last year because of changes in the programs and changes in other associated costs. Last session many members might remember that there was opposition to the \$11 million in rebates lost.

However, Mr. Speaker, the fundamental piece that goes into the cost equation is still not being evaluated, in my opinion. While the Department of Public Welfare and many of the other areas, as they wrestle over the different sections of the budget, one of the things that happens, Mr. Speaker, when individuals who need mental health medications are not given access to them is that they in fact can decompensate, and they may end up in the emergency room; they may end up in a setting, in an alternate setting that provides care. Many times – and we heard a report this morning, the Judiciary Committee, regarding the status and the types of mental health patients that we have in our prison population – Mr. Speaker, if individuals do not have proper access to the medications that they are prescribed, there is a real increase or a real threat of an increase regarding how those individuals are cared for. And, Mr. Speaker, that is my concern, that has been the concern each of the last three sessions as we have worked on this piece of legislation. The real number does not take into account how those individuals are in fact accounted for, so to speak, in the Department of Public Welfare's budget.

Mr. Speaker, the answer for that is very simple, because corrections is corrections budget. You know, other costs associated with that would not show up in that budgetary silo. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think as policymakers, we should take a more holistic view. We need to ensure that individuals who need access to mental health care in fact can get it. And specific to the psychiatrists' exemption, Mr. Speaker, that was selected for a specific purpose. They have the highest rate of approval for that subset of pharmaceuticals that are being prescribed. So in essence, we are reverifying something that they have already prescribed and spinning our wheels, delaying treatment, and inadvertently increasing costs, in my opinion, to give them a medication that will likely be approved anyway.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would encourage us to take a look across the departmental budgets, understand the fiscal impact specific to the Department of Public Welfare budget, but also believe that we have to look at the impacts elsewhere, whether it be the Department of Corrections or other increased medical assistance costs related to the lack of access.

And for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully disagree and encourage an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Markosek, for the second time.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, again, my knowledgeable colleague has spelled out a very good reason for voting for this, but again, I think the reasons for voting "no" are not only just as good, but I think certainly, in my opinion, better. We have a cost factor here, and maybe we are not spending as much on this this year as in

previous years, but it is still roughly \$5 million, and in this tight budget season, when so many of us in this room want to see budget cuts, here is a situation where we can save \$5 million.

Also, the current system offers through the Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee a very substantial way that the correct drugs are selected to be on the preferred drug list. The committee is made up of many knowledgeable professionals of several different backgrounds, including psychiatrists, that put together this list, and those drugs have been deemed to be appropriate for the use. And again, if there is a psychiatrist out there or a psychiatrist group that wants to add drugs to that list, there is a process, it is a very good process that they can do that with, and to now just give a group the ability to say, we do not want to bother with that, I think is wrong on a policy basis because that opens up the door, it opens up the door to a lot of other situations and a lot of other professions that may choose to have their pharmaceuticals go beyond the preferred drug list for their pharmaceuticals.

So again, I think there are valid reasons that the gentleman has for sponsoring this bill, but it is a costly bill that policywise really does not make a lot of sense and we have in place a system that works, and I would suggest that we let that work and we vote "no" on HB 1287.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlelady, Ms. DeLissio.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to help clarify for the discussion today that the amendment that I had introduced yesterday will require a report 1 year after the effective date of the legislation to follow exactly what those costs are. I mean, I tend to be, historically and ideologically, pretty fiscally conservative, and even though \$5 million, when you look at it in the context of the budget of \$28 billion is not on a percentage basis an overwhelming amount of money, I do really understand that \$5 million can support a lot of programs and a lot of services for people in need. In this particular instance, in this particular instance, Mr. Speaker, it is important that psychiatrists who have made an educated and learned decision that a particular nonpreferred medication is best suited for their patient, that that psychiatrist be able to do that without prior approval, because when you are treating those in the mental health world, time, indeed, is of the essence. And I think because sometimes mental health issues are not as apparent or visible to us, we tend to sometimes forget that those are very, very, very fragile situations, and in the situations where – and I am not a psychiatrist, but in the situation where a psychiatrist is making that decision, I can assure you that the situation is urgent. So a delay of even 2 or 3 days is the difference between somebody decompensating, ending up back in perhaps an acute care setting, and then costing us thousands upon thousands of dollars.

So with that in mind, that amendment to 1287 looks at that cost a year from the effective date of legislation, it looks at it 2 years hence beyond that, and certainly the General Assembly would be free to get that first report and decide that the cost far outweighed the benefit and have another piece of legislation that repealed that or we can follow the costs and make a decision subsequently, weighing what those costs and benefits are.

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I will continue to be a "yes" vote for this piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker recognizes the minority leader, who asks for a leave of absence for the day for the gentleman, Mr. Brendan BOYLE, from Philadelphia. Without objection, the leave will be so granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 1287 CONTINUED

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—158

Adolph	Everett	Kinsey	Readshaw
Aument	Fabrizio	Knowles	Reed
Baker	Farina	Kortz	Reese
Barrar	Farry	Kotik	Regan
Benninghoff	Fee	Lawrence	Roae
Bizzarro	Fleck	Longietti	Rock
Bloom	Flynn	Lucas	Roebuck
Boback	Freeman	Mackenzie	Ross
Boyle, K.	Gabler	Maher	Rozzi
Brooks	Gainey	Major	Saccone
Brown, R.	Gibbons	Maloney	Sainato
Brown, V.	Gillen	Marshall	Samuelson
Burns	Gillespie	Marsico	Sankey
Caltagirone	Gingrich	Masser	Saylor
Carroll	Goodman	McGinnis	Scavello
Causer	Greiner	Mentzer	Schlossberg
Christiana	Grell	Metzgar	Schreiber
Clay	Grove	Millard	Simmons
Clymer	Hackett	Miller, R.	Sims
Corbin	Haggerty	Milne	Smith
Costa, D.	Hahn	Molchany	Snyder
Cox	Harhai	Moul	Sonney
Cruz	Harhart	Mullery	Stephens
Culver	Harkins	Murt	Stern
Cutler	Harper	Mustio	Stevenson
Daley, P.	Harris, A.	Neilson	Sturla
Davidson	Harris, J.	Neuman	Swanger
Davis	Heffley	O'Neill	Tallman
Day	Helm	Oberlander	Taylor
Deasy	Hennessey	Pashinski	Thomas
DeLissio	Hess	Payne	Tobash
Delozier	Hickernell	Peifer	Toepel
DeLuca	James	Petrarca	Toohil
Denlinger	Kampf	Petri	Truitt
DiGirolamo	Kauffman	Pickett	Turzai
Dunbar	Kavulich	Pyle	Vereb
Ellis	Keller, F.	Quinn	Watson
Emrick	Keller, M.K.	Rapp	White
English	Killion	Ravenstahl	Youngblood
Evankovich	Kim		

NAYS—37

Barbin	Dermody	Kula	Mundy
Bishop	Donatucci	Mahoney	O'Brien
Bradford	Evans	Markosek	Painter
Briggs	Frankel	McCarter	Parker

Brownlee	Galloway	McGeehan	Sabatina
Cohen	Haluska	McNeill	Santarsiero
Conklin	Hanna	Miller, D.	Vitali
Costa, P.	Keller, W.	Mirabito	Waters
Daley, M.	Kirkland	Miranda	Wheatley
Dean			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Boyle, B.	Godshall	Matzie	Miccarelli
Gergely	Krieger	Metcalfe	Micozzie

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 26, PN 1944**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 5, 1936 (2nd Sp.Sess., 1937 P.L.2897, No.1), known as the Unemployment Compensation Law, further providing for contributions by employees; establishing the Service and Infrastructure Improvement Fund; and further providing for the Unemployment Compensation Fund.

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 gentleman, Mr. Keller, is recognized.
Mr. W. KELLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is a bill that at one time we could get ahead of a problem. We are going to get ahead of a problem that is headed our way. The unemployment compensation administration fund was cut over the last 2 years \$60 million. It is no longer able to sustain itself. The only way— And we cannot get the money from Washington, they cut it, and sequestration is cutting into it. We are able to take the employee tax and put it into the administration, and we will no longer have the problem of our constituents not being able to get their unemployment compensation checks. So I want to thank the majority staff and the minority staff – they have done great work on this – and Chairman Scavello. And I think here is another bill that we worked together with and solved a problem in the Commonwealth.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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—195

Adolph	Emrick	Kinsey	Pyle
Aument	English	Kirkland	Quinn
Baker	Evankovich	Knowles	Rapp
Barbin	Evans	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Everett	Kotik	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Fabrizio	Kula	Reed
Bishop	Farina	Lawrence	Reese
Bizzarro	Farry	Longietti	Regan
Bloom	Fee	Lucas	Roae
Boback	Fleck	Mackenzie	Rock
Boyle, K.	Flynn	Maher	Roebuck
Bradford	Frankel	Mahoney	Ross
Briggs	Freeman	Major	Rozzi
Brooks	Gabler	Maloney	Sabatina
Brown, R.	Gainey	Markosek	Saccone
Brown, V.	Galloway	Marshall	Sainato
Brownlee	Gibbons	Marsico	Samuelson
Burns	Gillen	Masser	Sankey
Caltagirone	Gillespie	McCarter	Santarsiero
Carroll	Gingrich	McGeehan	Saylor
Causier	Goodman	McGinnis	Scavello
Christiana	Greiner	McNeill	Schlossberg
Clay	Grell	Mentzer	Schreiber
Clymer	Grove	Metzgar	Simmons
Cohen	Hackett	Millard	Sims
Conklin	Haggerty	Miller, D.	Smith
Corbin	Hahn	Miller, R.	Snyder
Costa, D.	Haluska	Milne	Sonney
Costa, P.	Hanna	Mirabito	Stephens
Cox	Harhai	Miranda	Stern
Cruz	Harhart	Molchany	Stevenson
Culver	Harkins	Moul	Sturla
Cutler	Harper	Mullery	Swanger
Daley, M.	Harris, A.	Mundy	Tallman
Daley, P.	Harris, J.	Murt	Taylor
Davidson	Heffley	Mustio	Thomas
Davis	Helm	Neilson	Tobash
Day	Hennessey	Neuman	Toepel
Dean	Hess	O'Brien	Toohil
Deasy	Hickernell	O'Neill	Truitt
DeLissio	James	Oberlander	Turzai
Delozier	Kampf	Painter	Vereb
DeLuca	Kauffman	Parker	Vitali
Denlinger	Kavulich	Pashinski	Waters
Dermody	Keller, F.	Payne	Watson
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Wheatley
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Petrarca	White
Dunbar	Killion	Petri	Youngblood
Ellis	Kim	Pickett	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Boyle, B.	Godshall	Matzie	Miccarelli
Gergely	Krieger	Metcalfe	Micozzie

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. SCAVELLO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Scavello, on unanimous consent, without objection.

Mr. SCAVELLO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to commend my Democratic counterpart, Chairman Keller, for all his hard work and applaud my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for voting in the affirmative on HB 26. A true bipartisan effort from the very beginning, HB 26 will replace a sizable Federal funding deficit for unemployment program administration without imposing any new taxes on employers or employees. This legislation will prevent the closure of at least one of the Commonwealth's UC service centers, provide meaningful upgrades to the department's information management and communication technologies, but most importantly, it will improve the quality, efficiency, and timeliness of UC-related services for our State's unemployed workers in their time of need.

The passage of HB 26 serves as a reminder of what great things can be accomplished when we both put political ideologies aside and work together to ensure top-notch program administration to help Pennsylvanians help themselves.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1052, PN 1830**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of July 31, 1968 (P.L.805, No.247), known as the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, further providing for contents of subdivision and land development ordinance.

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?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—195

Adolph	Emrick	Kinsey	Pyle
Aument	English	Kirkland	Quinn
Baker	Evankovich	Knowles	Rapp
Barbin	Evans	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Everett	Kotik	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Fabrizio	Kula	Reed
Bishop	Farina	Lawrence	Reese
Bizzarro	Farry	Longietti	Regan
Bloom	Fee	Lucas	Roae
Boback	Fleck	Mackenzie	Rock
Boyle, K.	Flynn	Maher	Roebuck
Bradford	Frankel	Mahoney	Ross

Briggs	Freeman	Major	Rozzi
Brooks	Gabler	Maloney	Sabatina
Brown, R.	Gainey	Markosek	Saccone
Brown, V.	Galloway	Marshall	Sainato
Brownlee	Gibbons	Marsico	Samuelson
Burns	Gillen	Masser	Sankey
Caltagirone	Gillespie	McCarter	Santarsiero
Carroll	Gingrich	McGeehan	Saylor
Causer	Goodman	McGinnis	Scavello
Christiana	Greiner	McNeill	Schlossberg
Clay	Grell	Mentzer	Schreiber
Clymer	Grove	Metzgar	Simmons
Cohen	Hackett	Millard	Sims
Conklin	Haggerty	Miller, D.	Smith
Corbin	Hahn	Miller, R.	Snyder
Costa, D.	Haluska	Milne	Sonney
Costa, P.	Hanna	Mirabito	Stephens
Cox	Harhai	Miranda	Stern
Cruz	Harhart	Molchany	Stevenson
Culver	Harkins	Moul	Sturla
Cutler	Harper	Mullery	Swanger
Daley, M.	Harris, A.	Mundy	Tallman
Daley, P.	Harris, J.	Murt	Taylor
Davidson	Heffley	Mustio	Thomas
Davis	Helm	Neilson	Tobash
Day	Hennessey	Neuman	Toepel
Dean	Hess	O'Brien	Toohil
Deasy	Hickernell	O'Neill	Truitt
DeLissio	James	Oberlander	Turzai
Delozier	Kampf	Painter	Vereb
DeLuca	Kauffman	Parker	Vitali
Denlinger	Kavulich	Pashinski	Waters
Dermody	Keller, F.	Payne	Watson
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Wheatley
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Petrarca	White
Dunbar	Killion	Petri	Youngblood
Ellis	Kim	Pickett	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Boyle, B.	Godshall	Matzie	Miccarelli
Gergely	Krieger	Metcalfe	Micozzie

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 1122, PN 1831**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 68 (Real and Personal Property) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in creation, alteration and termination of condominiums, further providing for contents of declaration and flexible condominiums and for amendment of declaration; and, in creation, alteration and termination of planned communities, further providing for contents of declaration for flexible planned communities and for amendment of declaration.

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?

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair returns to leaves of absence and recognizes the minority leader, who requests a leave of absence for the gentleman, Mr. BARBIN, from Cambria County, and the gentelady, Mrs. DAVIDSON, from Delaware County. Without objection, the leaves will be granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 1122 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

Adolph	Evankovich	Kirkland	Pyle
Aument	Evans	Knowles	Quinn
Baker	Everett	Kortz	Rapp
Barrar	Fabrizio	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Farina	Kula	Readshaw
Bishop	Farry	Lawrence	Reed
Bizzarro	Fee	Longietti	Reese
Bloom	Fleck	Lucas	Regan
Boback	Flynn	Mackenzie	Roae
Boyle, K.	Frankel	Maher	Rock
Bradford	Freeman	Mahoney	Roebuck
Briggs	Gabler	Major	Ross
Brooks	Gainey	Maloney	Rozzi
Brown, R.	Galloway	Markosek	Sabatina
Brown, V.	Gibbons	Marshall	Saccone
Brownlee	Gillen	Marsico	Sainato
Burns	Gillespie	Masser	Samuelson
Caltagirone	Gingrich	McCarter	Sankey
Carroll	Goodman	McGeehan	Santarsiero
Causar	Greiner	McGinnis	Saylor
Christiana	Grell	McNeill	Scavello
Clay	Grove	Mentzer	Schlossberg
Clymer	Hackett	Metzgar	Schreiber
Cohen	Haggerty	Millard	Simmons
Conklin	Hahn	Miller, D.	Sims
Corbin	Haluska	Miller, R.	Smith
Costa, D.	Hanna	Milne	Snyder
Costa, P.	Harhai	Mirabito	Sonney
Cox	Harhart	Miranda	Stephens
Cruz	Harkins	Molchany	Stern
Culver	Harper	Moul	Stevenson
Cutler	Harris, A.	Mullery	Sturla
Daley, M.	Harris, J.	Mundy	Swanger
Daley, P.	Heffley	Murt	Tallman
Davis	Helm	Mustio	Taylor
Day	Hennessey	Neilson	Thomas
Dean	Hess	Neuman	Tobash
Deasy	Hickernell	O'Brien	Toepel
DeLissio	James	O'Neill	Toohil
Delozier	Kampf	Oberlander	Truitt
DeLuca	Kauffman	Painter	Turzai
Denlinger	Kavulich	Parker	Vereb
Dermody	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Vitali
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Waters

Donatucci	Keller, W.	Peifer	Watson
Dunbar	Killion	Petrarca	Wheatley
Ellis	Kim	Petri	White
Emrick	Kinsey	Pickett	Youngblood
English			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Barbin	Gergely	Matzie	Miccarelli
Boyle, B.	Godshall	Metcalfe	Micozzie
Davidson	Krieger		

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 1223, PN 1555**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 24, 1931 (P.L.1206, No.331), known as The First Class Township Code, in general provisions relating to township officers, further providing for failure of officer to perform duties.

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?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

Adolph	Evankovich	Kirkland	Pyle
Aument	Evans	Knowles	Quinn
Baker	Everett	Kortz	Rapp
Barrar	Fabrizio	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Farina	Kula	Readshaw
Bishop	Farry	Lawrence	Reed
Bizzarro	Fee	Longietti	Reese
Bloom	Fleck	Lucas	Regan
Boback	Flynn	Mackenzie	Roae
Boyle, K.	Frankel	Maher	Rock
Bradford	Freeman	Mahoney	Roebuck
Briggs	Gabler	Major	Ross
Brooks	Gainey	Maloney	Rozzi
Brown, R.	Galloway	Markosek	Sabatina
Brown, V.	Gibbons	Marshall	Saccone
Brownlee	Gillen	Marsico	Sainato
Burns	Gillespie	Masser	Samuelson
Caltagirone	Gingrich	McCarter	Sankey
Carroll	Goodman	McGeehan	Santarsiero

Causer	Greiner	McGinnis	Saylor
Christiana	Grell	McNeill	Scavello
Clay	Grove	Mentzer	Schlossberg
Clymer	Hackett	Metzgar	Schreiber
Cohen	Haggerty	Millard	Simmons
Conklin	Hahn	Miller, D.	Sims
Corbin	Haluska	Miller, R.	Smith
Costa, D.	Hanna	Milne	Snyder
Costa, P.	Harhai	Mirabito	Sonney
Cox	Harhart	Miranda	Stephens
Cruz	Harkins	Molchany	Stern
Culver	Harper	Moul	Stevenson
Cutler	Harris, A.	Mullery	Sturla
Daley, M.	Harris, J.	Mundy	Swanger
Daley, P.	Heffley	Murt	Tallman
Davis	Helm	Mustio	Taylor
Day	Hennessey	Neilson	Thomas
Dean	Hess	Neuman	Tobash
Deasy	Hickernell	O'Brien	Toepel
DeLissio	James	O'Neill	Toohil
DeLozier	Kampf	Oberlander	Truitt
DeLuca	Kauffman	Painter	Turzai
Denlinger	Kavulich	Parker	Vereb
Dermody	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Vitali
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Waters
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Peifer	Watson
Dunbar	Killion	Petrarca	Wheatley
Ellis	Kim	Petri	White
Emrick	Kinsey	Pickett	Youngblood
English			

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-10

Barbin	Gergely	Matzie	Miccarelli
Boyle, B.	Godshall	Metcalfe	Micozzie
Davidson	Krieger		

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 1225, PN 1832**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 45 (Legal Notices) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in codification and publication of documents, providing for electronic publication of municipal codes; and making an inconsistent repeal.

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?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-193

Adolph	Evankovich	Kirkland	Pyle
Aument	Evans	Knowles	Quinn
Baker	Everett	Kortz	Rapp
Barrar	Fabrizio	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Farina	Kula	Readshaw
Bishop	Farry	Lawrence	Reed
Bizzarro	Fee	Longietti	Reese
Bloom	Fleck	Lucas	Regan
Boback	Flynn	Mackenzie	Roae
Boyle, K.	Frankel	Maher	Rock
Bradford	Freeman	Mahoney	Roebuck
Briggs	Gabler	Major	Ross
Brooks	Gainey	Maloney	Rozzi
Brown, R.	Galloway	Markosek	Sabatina
Brown, V.	Gibbons	Marshall	Saccone
Brownlee	Gillen	Marsico	Sainato
Burns	Gillespie	Masser	Samuelson
Caltagirone	Gingrich	McCarter	Sankey
Carroll	Goodman	McGeehan	Santarsiero
Causer	Greiner	McGinnis	Saylor
Christiana	Grell	McNeill	Scavello
Clay	Grove	Mentzer	Schlossberg
Clymer	Hackett	Metzgar	Schreiber
Cohen	Haggerty	Millard	Simmons
Conklin	Hahn	Miller, D.	Sims
Corbin	Haluska	Miller, R.	Smith
Costa, D.	Hanna	Milne	Snyder
Costa, P.	Harhai	Mirabito	Sonney
Cox	Harhart	Miranda	Stephens
Cruz	Harkins	Molchany	Stern
Culver	Harper	Moul	Stevenson
Cutler	Harris, A.	Mullery	Sturla
Daley, M.	Harris, J.	Mundy	Swanger
Daley, P.	Heffley	Murt	Tallman
Davis	Helm	Mustio	Taylor
Day	Hennessey	Neilson	Thomas
Dean	Hess	Neuman	Tobash
Deasy	Hickernell	O'Brien	Toepel
DeLissio	James	O'Neill	Toohil
DeLozier	Kampf	Oberlander	Truitt
DeLuca	Kauffman	Painter	Turzai
Denlinger	Kavulich	Parker	Vereb
Dermody	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Vitali
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Waters
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Peifer	Watson
Dunbar	Killion	Petrarca	Wheatley
Ellis	Kim	Petri	White
Emrick	Kinsey	Pickett	Youngblood
English			

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-10

Barbin	Gergely	Matzie	Miccarelli
Boyle, B.	Godshall	Metcalfe	Micozzie
Davidson	Krieger		

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 1228, PN 1560**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 27, 1953 (P.L.249, No.35), entitled "An act providing that the town councils of incorporated towns shall have the right to declare vacant the seats of councilmen or presidents of town councils for failure to qualify and for failure to attend meetings or vote upon questions before the council," further providing for removal of town officers and for vacancies.

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?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

Adolph	Evankovich	Kirkland	Pyle
Aument	Evans	Knowles	Quinn
Baker	Everett	Kortz	Rapp
Barrar	Fabrizio	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Farina	Kula	Readshaw
Bishop	Farry	Lawrence	Reed
Bizzarro	Fee	Longietti	Reese
Bloom	Fleck	Lucas	Regan
Boback	Flynn	Mackenzie	Roae
Boyle, K.	Frankel	Maher	Rock
Bradford	Freeman	Mahoney	Roebuck
Briggs	Gabler	Major	Ross
Brooks	Gainey	Maloney	Rozzi
Brown, R.	Galloway	Markosek	Sabatina
Brown, V.	Gibbons	Marshall	Saccone
Brownlee	Gillen	Marsico	Sainato
Burns	Gillespie	Masser	Samuelson
Caltagirone	Gingrich	McCarter	Sankey
Carroll	Goodman	McGeehan	Santarsiero
Causar	Greiner	McGinnis	Saylor
Christiana	Grell	McNeill	Scavello
Clay	Grove	Mentzer	Schlossberg
Clymer	Hackett	Metzgar	Schreiber
Cohen	Haggerty	Millard	Simmons
Conklin	Hahn	Miller, D.	Sims
Corbin	Haluska	Miller, R.	Smith
Costa, D.	Hanna	Milne	Snyder
Costa, P.	Harhai	Mirabito	Sonney
Cox	Harhart	Miranda	Stephens
Cruz	Harkins	Molchany	Stern
Culver	Harper	Moul	Stevenson
Cutler	Harris, A.	Mullery	Sturla
Daley, M.	Harris, J.	Mundy	Swanger
Daley, P.	Heffley	Murt	Tallman
Davis	Helm	Mustio	Taylor
Day	Hennessey	Neilson	Thomas
Dean	Hess	Neuman	Tobash
Deasy	Hickernell	O'Brien	Toepel
DeLissio	James	O'Neill	Toohil
Delozier	Kampf	Oberlander	Truitt
DeLuca	Kauffman	Painter	Turzai
Denlinger	Kavulich	Parker	Vereb
Dermody	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Vitali
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Waters
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Peifer	Watson

Dunbar	Killion	Petrarca	Wheatley
Ellis	Kim	Petri	White
Emrick	Kinsey	Pickett	Youngblood
English			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Barbin	Gergely	Matzie	Miccarelli
Boyle, B.	Godshall	Metcalfe	Micozzie
Davidson	Krieger		

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 1229, PN 1561**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 1, 1933 (P.L.103, No.69), known as The Second Class Township Code, in township officers generally, further providing for removal for failure to perform duties.

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 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	Evankovich	Kirkland	Pyle
Aument	Evans	Knowles	Quinn
Baker	Everett	Kortz	Rapp
Barrar	Fabrizio	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Farina	Kula	Readshaw
Bishop	Farry	Lawrence	Reed
Bizzarro	Fee	Longietti	Reese
Bloom	Fleck	Lucas	Regan
Boback	Flynn	Mackenzie	Roae
Boyle, K.	Frankel	Maher	Rock
Bradford	Freeman	Mahoney	Roebuck
Briggs	Gabler	Major	Ross
Brooks	Gainey	Maloney	Rozzi
Brown, R.	Galloway	Markosek	Sabatina
Brown, V.	Gibbons	Marshall	Saccone
Brownlee	Gillen	Marsico	Sainato
Burns	Gillespie	Masser	Samuelson
Caltagirone	Gingrich	McCarter	Sankey
Carroll	Goodman	McGeehan	Santarsiero
Causar	Greiner	McGinnis	Saylor
Christiana	Grell	McNeill	Scavello

Clay	Grove	Mentzer	Schlossberg
Clymer	Hackett	Metzgar	Schreiber
Cohen	Haggerty	Millard	Simmons
Conklin	Hahn	Miller, D.	Sims
Corbin	Haluska	Miller, R.	Smith
Costa, D.	Hanna	Milne	Snyder
Costa, P.	Harhai	Mirabito	Sonney
Cox	Harhart	Miranda	Stephens
Cruz	Harkins	Molchany	Stern
Culver	Harper	Moul	Stevenson
Cutler	Harris, A.	Mullery	Sturla
Daley, M.	Harris, J.	Mundy	Swanger
Daley, P.	Heffley	Murt	Tallman
Davis	Helm	Mustio	Taylor
Day	Hennessey	Neilson	Thomas
Dean	Hess	Neuman	Tobash
Deasy	Hickernell	O'Brien	Toepel
DeLissio	James	O'Neill	Toohil
Delozier	Kampf	Oberlander	Truitt
DeLuca	Kauffman	Painter	Turzai
Denlinger	Kavulich	Parker	Vereb
Dermody	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Vitali
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Waters
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Peifer	Watson
Dunbar	Killion	Petrarca	Wheatley
Ellis	Kim	Petri	White
Emrick	Kinsey	Pickett	Youngblood
English			

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-10

Barbin	Gergely	Matzie	Miccarelli
Boyle, B.	Godshall	Metcalfe	Micozzie
Davidson	Krieger		

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 **SB 679, PN 654**, entitled:

An Act designating a portion of State Route 3031 in Richland and Conemaugh Townships, Cambria County, as the Lieutenant Colonel B.D. "Buzz" Wagner Memorial Highway.

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?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-193

Adolph	Evankovich	Kirkland	Pyle
Aument	Evans	Knowles	Quinn
Baker	Everett	Kortz	Rapp
Barrar	Fabrizio	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Farina	Kula	Readshaw
Bishop	Farry	Lawrence	Reed
Bizzarro	Fee	Longietti	Reese
Bloom	Fleck	Lucas	Regan
Boback	Flynn	Mackenzie	Roae
Boyle, K.	Frankel	Maher	Rock
Bradford	Freeman	Mahoney	Roebuck
Briggs	Gabler	Major	Ross
Brooks	Gainey	Maloney	Rozzi
Brown, R.	Galloway	Markosek	Sabatina
Brown, V.	Gibbons	Marshall	Saccone
Brownlee	Gillen	Marsico	Sainato
Burns	Gillespie	Masser	Samuelson
Caltagirone	Gingrich	McCarter	Sankey
Carroll	Goodman	McGeehan	Santarsiero
Causar	Greiner	McGinnis	Saylor
Christiana	Grell	McNeill	Scavello
Clay	Grove	Mentzer	Schlossberg
Clymer	Hackett	Metzgar	Schreiber
Cohen	Haggerty	Millard	Simmons
Conklin	Hahn	Miller, D.	Sims
Corbin	Haluska	Miller, R.	Smith
Costa, D.	Hanna	Milne	Snyder
Costa, P.	Harhai	Mirabito	Sonney
Cox	Harhart	Miranda	Stephens
Cruz	Harkins	Molchany	Stern
Culver	Harper	Moul	Stevenson
Cutler	Harris, A.	Mullery	Sturla
Daley, M.	Harris, J.	Mundy	Swanger
Daley, P.	Heffley	Murt	Tallman
Davis	Helm	Mustio	Taylor
Day	Hennessey	Neilson	Thomas
Dean	Hess	Neuman	Tobash
Deasy	Hickernell	O'Brien	Toepel
DeLissio	James	O'Neill	Toohil
Delozier	Kampf	Oberlander	Truitt
DeLuca	Kauffman	Painter	Turzai
Denlinger	Kavulich	Parker	Vereb
Dermody	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Vitali
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Waters
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Peifer	Watson
Dunbar	Killion	Petrarca	Wheatley
Ellis	Kim	Petri	White
Emrick	Kinsey	Pickett	Youngblood
English			

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-10

Barbin	Gergely	Matzie	Miccarelli
Boyle, B.	Godshall	Metcalfe	Micozzie
Davidson	Krieger		

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 without amendment.

HB 1287 RECONSIDERED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is in receipt of a motion for reconsideration by the gentleman, Mr. Dermody, and the gentleman, Mr. Hanna: Pursuant to rule 26, we the undersigned move that the vote by which the House adopted HB 1287 on final passage on the 5th day of June be reconsidered.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

Adolph	Evankovich	Kirkland	Pyle
Aument	Evans	Knowles	Quinn
Baker	Everett	Kortz	Rapp
Barrar	Fabrizio	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Farina	Kula	Readshaw
Bishop	Farry	Lawrence	Reed
Bizzarro	Fee	Longietti	Reese
Bloom	Fleck	Lucas	Regan
Boback	Flynn	Mackenzie	Roae
Boyle, K.	Frankel	Maher	Rock
Bradford	Freeman	Mahoney	Roebuck
Briggs	Gabler	Major	Ross
Brooks	Gainey	Maloney	Rozzi
Brown, R.	Galloway	Markosek	Sabatina
Brown, V.	Gibbons	Marshall	Saccone
Brownlee	Gillen	Marsico	Sainato
Burns	Gillespie	Masser	Samuelson
Caltagirone	Gingrich	McCarter	Sankey
Carroll	Goodman	McGeehan	Santarsiero
Causer	Greiner	McGinnis	Saylor
Christiana	Grell	McNeill	Scavello
Clay	Grove	Mentzer	Schlossberg
Clymer	Hackett	Metzgar	Schreiber
Cohen	Haggerty	Millard	Simmons
Conklin	Hahn	Miller, D.	Sims
Corbin	Haluska	Miller, R.	Smith
Costa, D.	Hanna	Milne	Snyder
Costa, P.	Harhai	Mirabito	Sonney
Cox	Harhart	Miranda	Stephens
Cruz	Harkins	Molchany	Stern
Culver	Harper	Moul	Stevenson
Cutler	Harris, A.	Mullery	Sturla
Daley, M.	Harris, J.	Mundy	Swanger
Daley, P.	Heffley	Murt	Tallman
Davis	Helm	Mustio	Taylor
Day	Hennessey	Neilson	Thomas
Dean	Hess	Neuman	Tobash
Deasy	Hickernell	O'Brien	Toepel
DeLissio	James	O'Neill	Toohil
Delozier	Kampf	Oberlander	Truitt
DeLuca	Kauffman	Painter	Turzai
Denlinger	Kavulich	Parker	Vereb
Dermody	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Vitali
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Waters
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Peifer	Watson
Dunbar	Killion	Petrarca	Wheatley
Ellis	Kim	Petri	White
Emrick	Kinsey	Pickett	Youngblood
English			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Barbin	Gergely	Matzie	Miccarelli
Boyle, B.	Godshall	Metcalf	Micozzi
Davidson	Krieger		

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

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—156

Adolph	Fabrizio	Knowles	Rapp
Aument	Farina	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Baker	Farry	Kotik	Readshaw
Barrar	Fee	Lawrence	Reed
Benninghoff	Fleck	Longietti	Reese
Bizzarro	Flynn	Lucas	Regan
Bloom	Freeman	Mackenzie	Roae
Boback	Gabler	Maher	Rock
Boyle, K.	Galloway	Major	Ross
Brooks	Gibbons	Maloney	Saccone
Brown, R.	Gillen	Marshall	Sainato
Brown, V.	Gillespie	Marsico	Samuelson
Burns	Gingrich	Masser	Sankey
Carroll	Goodman	McCarter	Saylor
Causer	Greiner	McGinnis	Scavello
Christiana	Grell	Mentzer	Schlossberg
Clay	Grove	Metzgar	Schreiber
Clymer	Hackett	Millard	Simmons
Corbin	Haggerty	Miller, R.	Sims
Costa, D.	Hahn	Milne	Smith
Cox	Harhai	Mirabito	Snyder
Cruz	Harhart	Molchany	Sonney
Culver	Harkins	Moul	Stephens
Cutler	Harper	Mullery	Stern
Daley, P.	Harris, A.	Mundy	Stevenson
Davis	Harris, J.	Murt	Sturla
Day	Heffley	Mustio	Swanger
Deasy	Helm	Neilson	Tallman
DeLissio	Hennessey	Neuman	Taylor
Delozier	Hess	O'Neill	Tobash
DeLuca	Hickernell	Oberlander	Toepel
Denlinger	James	Pashinski	Toohil
DiGirolamo	Kampf	Payne	Truitt
Dunbar	Kauffman	Peifer	Turzai
Ellis	Kavulich	Petrarca	Vereb
Emrick	Keller, F.	Petri	Watson
English	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Wheatley
Evankovich	Killion	Pyle	White
Everett	Kim	Quinn	Youngblood

NAYS—37

Bishop	Dermody	Kirkland	Painter
Bradford	Donatucci	Kula	Parker
Briggs	Evans	Mahoney	Roebuck
Brownlee	Frankel	Markosek	Rozzi
Caltagirone	Gainey	McGeehan	Sabatina
Cohen	Haluska	McNeill	Santarsiero
Conklin	Hanna	Miller, D.	Thomas
Costa, P.	Keller, W.	Miranda	Vitali
Daley, M.	Kinsey	O'Brien	Waters
Dean			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Barbin	Gergely	Matzie	Miccarelli
Boyle, B.	Godshall	Metcalfe	Micozzie
Davidson	Krieger		

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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be at ease.

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

HEALTH COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The House will come to order.

The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Tioga County, Mr. Baker, for the purpose of an announcement.

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

There will be an immediate meeting of the Health Committee in the majority conference room of the Appropriations chairman, at the rear of the House; Appropriations chairman's conference room. That will not work.

On second thought, we will meet in the majority caucus room. We have one bill. I do believe it is agreed to. It will not take long. Immediately moving to the majority caucus room, the Health Committee, for the purpose of voting one bill.

The SPEAKER. There will be an immediate meeting of the Health Committee in the majority caucus room.

SENATE MESSAGE

**AMENDED HOUSE BILL RETURNED
FOR CONCURRENCE AND
REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES**

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 492, PN 1424**, 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 BILL
CONCURRED IN BY SENATE**

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 818, PN 928**, with information that the Senate has passed the same without amendment.

BILL SIGNED BY SPEAKER

Bill numbered and entitled as follows having been prepared for presentation to the Governor, and the same being correct, the title was publicly read as follows:

HB 818, PN 928

An Act amending Title 40 (Insurance) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for compliance with Federal health care legislation.

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

The SPEAKER. The House will be at ease.

The House will come to order.

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

HB 1472, PN 1963 (Amended)

By Rep. BAKER

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Public Welfare Code, in public assistance, further providing for medical assistance payments for institutional care; in intermediate care facilities assessments, further providing for time periods and making editorial changes; and, in hospital assessments, further providing for authorization and for time period.

HEALTH.

BILLS RECOMMITTED

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

HB 1075;
HB 1076;
HB 1319;
HB 1325; and
HB 1363.

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

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

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

HB 1437;
SB 155;
SB 470; and
SB 526.

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

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader.
Mr. TURZAI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
We would call HB 618 on second.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 618, PN 1917**, entitled:

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 agreements with institutions of higher education; in opportunities for educational excellence, further providing for definitions and for concurrent enrollment agreements; and extensively revising and adding charter school provisions.

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

MOTION TO ADJOURN

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

Mr. DERMODY. For the purpose of making a motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his motion.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker, I make a motion to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. May the Speaker presume that you were suggesting that we would adjourn until Monday, June 10, at 1 o'clock, like the normal week?

Mr. DERMODY. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

The gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Dermody, moves to adjourn until Monday, June 10, 2013, at 1 p.m.

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

The SPEAKER. On the motion to adjourn, the Speaker recognizes the majority leader, Mr. Turzai.

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

We have important work in front of us. We would ask that everybody please oppose the motion to adjourn. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The motion before the House is to adjourn.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—88

Bishop	DeLuca	Kinsey	Parker
Bizzarro	Dermody	Kirkland	Pashinski
Boyle, K.	Donatucci	Kortz	Petrarca
Bradford	Evans	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Briggs	Fabrizio	Kula	Readshaw
Brown, V.	Farina	Longietti	Roebuck

Brownlee	Flynn	Mahoney	Rozzi
Burns	Frankel	Markosek	Sabatina
Caltagirone	Freeman	McCarter	Sainato
Carroll	Gainey	McGeehan	Samuelson
Clay	Galloway	McNeill	Santarsiero
Cohen	Gibbons	Miller, D.	Schlossberg
Conklin	Goodman	Mirabito	Schreiber
Costa, D.	Haggerty	Miranda	Sims
Costa, P.	Haluska	Molchany	Snyder
Cruz	Hanna	Mullery	Sturla
Daley, M.	Harhai	Mundy	Thomas
Daley, P.	Harkins	Neilson	Vitali
Davis	Harris, J.	Neuman	Waters
Dean	Kavulich	O'Brien	Wheatley
Deasy	Keller, W.	O'Neill	White
DeLissio	Kim	Painter	Youngblood

NAYS—105

Adolph	Fee	Lawrence	Reed
Aument	Fleck	Lucas	Reese
Baker	Gabler	Mackenzie	Regan
Barrar	Gillen	Maher	Roae
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Major	Rock
Bloom	Gingrich	Maloney	Ross
Boback	Greiner	Marshall	Saccone
Brooks	Grell	Marsico	Sankey
Brown, R.	Grove	Masser	Saylor
Causer	Hackett	McGinnis	Scavello
Christiana	Hahn	Mentzer	Simmons
Clymer	Harhart	Metzgar	Smith
Corbin	Harper	Millard	Sonney
Cox	Harris, A.	Miller, R.	Stephens
Culver	Heffley	Milne	Stern
Cutler	Helm	Moul	Stevenson
Day	Hennessey	Murt	Swanger
Delozier	Hess	Mustio	Tallman
Denlinger	Hickernell	Oberlander	Taylor
DiGirolamo	James	Payne	Tobash
Dunbar	Kampf	Peifer	Toepel
Ellis	Kauffman	Petri	Toohil
Emrick	Keller, F.	Pickett	Truitt
English	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Turzai
Evankovich	Killion	Quinn	Vereb
Everett	Knowles	Rapp	Watson
Farry			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Barbin	Gergely	Matzie	Miccarelli
Boyle, B.	Godshall	Metcalfe	Micozzie
Davidson	Krieger		

Less than the majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the motion was not agreed to.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 618 CONTINUED

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

Mr. **CHRISTIANA** offered the following amendment
No. A01934:

Amend Bill, page 34, lines 28 and 29, by striking out "AND THROUGH AND INCLUDING THE 2014-2015 SCHOOL YEAR,"
Amend Bill, page 35, line 23, by inserting after "AND"
one-half of

Amend Bill, page 68, lines 24 and 25, by striking out all of said lines

Amend Bill, page 68, line 26, by striking out "22" and inserting 21

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Beaver County, Mr. Christiana.

Mr. CHRISTIANA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment would allow the home school, the traditional public school, to retain 50 percent of their per-pupil allocation for pensions. It would allow them to retain 50 percent of those dollars. Currently they send 100 percent of those dollars with the student to the cyber school that they attend. This will also allow 50 percent of the dollars to go to the cyber school for their pension costs, and the other 50 percent will make them whole as by the State reimbursement. So both the home school district that the student left will receive 100 percent of pension allocations, and the cyber school, which is currently getting more than 100 percent, would be reduced to 100 percent. I think this is a fair and equitable way to do this.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment. This amendment would also eliminate the 2-year sunset provision within the bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as we consider this amendment, it occurs to me, I do not know, I cannot envision a way that we can do less. This is about as little as we could possibly do to address an issue, address a problem that we are all aware of, we are all aware of. We have all talked to our local school boards. Time and again, they have talked to us about the pension double-dip, how school districts are paying over to charter schools, both brick-and-mortar and cyber charter schools, a payment that considers the pension of those employees at those schools, and at the same time, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is making a similar payment to those schools. They are getting paid twice. Our school districts are under great distress, and I am so concerned that this amendment is even less than window dressing. It is so minimally what we should be doing. You know, at a time we all know that school districts, their funding is thin. They have suffered the last couple years when it has come to the State appropriation under various line items. And now we have a chance to try to do something, and this amendment, it just does not even touch what we need to do.

When you think about it, it makes no sense. All of these schools are public schools. Whether we talk about traditional public schools and the school districts that we all know about, whether we talk about cyber charter schools, which use technology to deliver instruction, or whether we talk about brick-and-mortar charter schools, they are all public schools. And yet for some reason with this amendment, it tries to address the double-dip, and yet it does not do anything in regard to the brick-and-mortar charter schools. There are 157 brick-and-mortar charter schools. There are 16 cyber charter schools.

So we have an amendment before us that says, well, let us address the double-dip, but it does not touch the 157 brick-and-mortar charter schools. It does not change the way they get their money. It does not change the fact that they continue to get a double-dip. The only thing that it does is address 16 cyber charter schools, but it does not adequately address them either. It does not eliminate the double-dip. It takes half a bite. I do not know how less we can do. How can we face our school districts who are suffering and struggling and are begging us to take an honest approach to this problem?

And here we are, we are looking at amendment A01934, and they know that it does not address the problem. And so, I know there are lots of folks in this Assembly that want to do the right thing, that know that we do not have chances like this very often. We are in the middle of a budget period. We know that the agenda is going to be full. We know that HB 618 is going to come and go, and we do not have many opportunities to address the issues of funding that our school districts are suffering with. And I just urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment. This is so minimally, so small, that it misses the opportunity to do what is needed.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

CONSIDERATION OF HB 618 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. CARROLL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the prior speaker made excellent points that do not need to be rehashed. I would simply add, Mr. Speaker, that our public school districts, the 500, are in crisis mode, not just our urban districts but our suburban districts and our rural districts. Mr. Speaker, that crisis is being dealt with by virtue of HB 618 with this amendment, and this amendment is not even a life preserver. This amendment virtually does nothing in an effort to respond to the financial crisis that our districts face.

Nearly every district that I am familiar with in northeastern Pennsylvania has had an increase in class sizes, a reduction in staff, a drawdown of their fund balances. Many have no teacher contract. And yet our response is to offer them a paltry sum compared to what they should get if 618 without this amendment were to be passed. The fact of the matter is that we should go beyond what is embedded in 618 and include the brick-and-mortar charter schools so that they are all treated equally. Mr. Speaker, the cyber charter in the charter world always trades on the fact that they are public schools. Well, let us have those public schools on the same playing field as our 500 school districts and treat all equally. That is what needs to happen.

This amendment is simply not nearly enough to solve the financial crisis that our districts face. Anybody who thinks that supporting this amendment and passing this bill solves the financial problem for our districts is mistaken. It simply does not. The districts will know it. The business managers of the districts will know it. The school board members will know it, and the people that work in our districts and the parents of the children in these school districts will know that this amendment does not solve the problem and is not a solution to the 500 school districts' problems financially.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote to this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House adopt the amendment?

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

Mr. TURZAI. Thank you.

I rise in support of the Christiana amendment, amendment 1934 to HB 618, and I think there are some important points to make with respect to the amendment and its impact on our public schools. The fact of the matter is, the amendment 1934 will in fact save our school districts over \$65 million across the State based on rational and appropriate changes to the cyber charter school formula, and I must say, please take note, that it is happening not when our colleagues across the aisle had the majority, but while we are in the majority, and we ask you to come on board with our approach, because we want fairness. And in fact, and in fact, this is the first bill that has come to the floor to address cyber charter funding. When the other side was in charge, no such bill came to the floor, but it has come to the floor here.

Also, we are concerned with the education of each and every child. We want to make sure that each and every child in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania gets the most important educational opportunity for him or her that he can or she can get to succeed. And the fact of the matter is, this approach strikes an important balance. We know that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has great public schools. I am in a district that has two great public schools, and we want to make sure that each and every one of our public schools does its absolute best. We are also trying to preserve opportunities for kids that learn differently. Right now the cyber charter funding formula is not fair. This amendment addresses the pension issue, pejoratively referred to as a double-dip, and it also extends that permanently from the underlying bill, permanently.

We will be able to save at least \$65 million annually to school districts, promoting good public education in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and allowing some kids the opportunity to find an environment that is best for them. That is called responsible governing.

And let us talk about briefly funding for public schools. The fact of the matter is, this is consistent with the Republican House leadership in making sure that public schools across the State are truly and appropriately funded. And here is the thing, the budget that we will be voting on next week provides almost \$10 billion, \$10 billion—

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker?

Mr. TURZAI.—in terms of public education—

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

Mr. TURZAI.—in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker, I believe we have gone beyond—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Dermody, is seeking to make a point of order?

Mr. DERMODY. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DERMODY. I believe that the leader has gone beyond the scope of this amendment and the discussion here, way beyond that. I understand there is leeway allowed, but we are not talking about the budget. We are not talking about the bill. We are talking about this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

With the two leaders, it is always a little bit difficult for the Speaker to rein them in too much. As you know, we have tried to be fair to the leaders to expand slightly beyond the immediate subject before the House. With that recognition, I would agree that the overall general appropriations bill is not the subject and would ask the gentleman from Allegheny County to stay as close to the amendment as possible.

Mr. TURZAI. Yes, sir.

So I rise in support of amendment 1934, which in fact is addressing the cyber charter formula, making sure there is more money with respect to school districts, extending it permanently, and still making sure that there are great public schools, while at the same time letting some of our kids have other choices. It is consistent with what we have done as a House on public education, whereby we are spending the highest levels ever in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, while still making sure there are moneys available under EITC (educational improvement tax credit) and other options available to students. We know that there is a commitment to every child in our traditional public schools and in other venues, and we want that education to be the absolute best for each and every boy and girl.

I rise in support of amendment 1934 and ask for your support.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, Mr. Speaker, if we cared about educating every child in this Commonwealth, if we cared about treating every child in this Commonwealth fairly with regard to their public education, we would make sure every school district in this Commonwealth was treated fairly. We would make sure that every school district, cyber charter, charter school, or a regular bricks-and-mortar public school would be treated fairly.

Now, you have got an amendment here that does not do that. The other side knows it does not do that. It has nothing, not even close to the \$65 million savings. You are lucky if you get 13. Now, understanding full well that you are up here arguing for this amendment, you know there is a problem. You know there is a serious problem with funding with the double-dip that is going on right now. You know that, and you also know that if we did it for cyber charter schools, if we stopped the double-dip for cybers, we stopped the double-dip for bricks-and-mortar charter schools, we would save at least \$50 million a year, \$50 million that could go to help every single child in this Commonwealth receive a better education.

And believe me, every school district, every school board member, everybody who cares about K through 12 education in the Commonwealth knows full well that they have suffered tremendous cuts these last 2 years. They are not receiving record funding in this Commonwealth. They have been devastated, and you are contributing more to it today by trying to come up with this sham and suggesting \$13 1/2 million solves the problem that you know exists. It does not. It will not. And we should stand up here today and fix the problems we have with accountability and with funding with cyber charter schools and bricks-and-mortar charter schools so that all of our children are treated fairly. That is what we owe them. We will talk about the budget later and how this budget devastates education once again by etching in stone the billion dollars you cut for the K through 12 two years ago. That is what we will do. You brought it up; we will take care of it. And we will talk about that.

This amendment does not solve any problems. It creates more. It creates more inequality for our kids. You ought to be ashamed to put it up there. We ought to be voting on this bill. We ought to be saving \$50 million a year and onward.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Maher. The gentleman waives off.

The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, will the maker of the amendment rise for brief interrogation?

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

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Pennsylvania Association of School Business Officials said that HB 618 as it was originally drafted would save taxpayers about \$27 million. Do you agree with that?

Mr. CHRISTIANA. On the pension side, I believe it was \$27 million, plus the food service deduction would be another \$14 million, so you are looking roughly at a \$41 million savings.

Mr. STURLA. Okay. And your amendment cuts 50 percent of those savings. Is that correct?

Mr. CHRISTIANA. Yes, of the \$27 million. It would not touch the food service deduction. That will remain intact. And I will also add that it makes it permanent rather than for 2 years.

Mr. STURLA. Okay.

So, but the majority leader earlier had said it would save about \$65 million a year. In fact, it actually only saves about \$27 million a year. Would that be a fair assessment?

Mr. CHRISTIANA. The underlying bill does a lot of things, and I believe the majority leader was speaking about fund balances, Mr. Speaker. So I think it is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that he was not just talking about the one specific line item that the gentleman was asking about in his previous questions. He was looking at the bill more comprehensively and specifically the fund balances.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order on the amendment.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, this amendment costs the taxpayers of Pennsylvania. In addition to the fact that it does far less than the original bill did, the original bill only dealt with cyber charters, it did not deal with brick-and-mortar charters. Had we done that, we could have saved about \$360 million a year as opposed to this, which might save \$25 or \$30 million a year, 13 actually. Yes, given just the pension portion of it.

But beyond that, this amendment says that the school district will be reimbursed for their portion of pension costs, and then they have to give 50 percent of that on a per-pupil basis to a cyber charter school. It does not say that the cyber charter school actually has to incur any pension costs in order to receive that.

What we know is that those pension costs for those cyber charter schools in some cases either do not exist or do not equal the rates that are being paid in the public school, and so what we are really doing here, even if we are only paying 50 percent of the bill with part of what we are doing, is reimbursing something that does not exist. And so what you said to your school district is, go ahead, give away taxpayer dollars, and we do not care if it is actually buying anything, just give it away. That is what this amendment does. It just gives it away.

We do not require any accountability. We do not require any account balances. We do not require that there even be a pension cost in that cyber charter school, but we are just going to reimburse you for it anyway. That is not good fiscal policy. This amendment is not good fiscal policy. I would encourage a "no" vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. SANTARSIERO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am always astounded when the gentleman from Allegheny County, the majority leader, falls back on a rhetorical flourish and argues that when the Democrats were in the majority, they did not deal with this issue, and that becomes the logic to support a whole bunch of things that are not good for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and this is just the latest example of that. It is not good enough to say, hey, you did not deal with this issue when you were in the majority, so now we are going to actually deal with it and make the situation worse, and that is exactly what they are doing here. And why are they doing that? Why is it worse? Because by institutionalizing a giveaway to the cyber charter schools and doing nothing, doing absolutely nothing with respect to the brick-and-mortar charter schools, this Assembly is going to raise its hands and say, we have dealt with this issue now, but the reality is, we are locking in a bad deal for our schools across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania at a time that they can least afford it.

Now, listen, I know the majority leader wants to make this a partisan issue. He uses hyperpartisan rhetoric, but this is not a Democratic or Republican issue, because each and every one of us in this building represents school districts that are suffering right now, and each and every one of us in this room tonight represents school districts and property tax payers who could use the help by requiring that the double-dip end not just for

cyber charters but for brick-and-mortar charters as well and not half but 100 percent of that double-dip to be given back to our schools. We need this revenue. We need it everywhere in Pennsylvania.

This bill, this amendment would lock in a bad deal for our schools and our property tax payers, and if you want to do something for them, if you want to really do reform, then I ask you to vote "no" on this amendment, and hopefully tonight, although I guess tonight is still young so we will see what happens, my amendment, 1838, which would get rid of the double-dip for all charters, cyber and brick-and-mortar, and do it for an entire double-dip, not just this 50-percent scheme, is the way to go, and I would ask your support in that.

Vote "no" on this amendment, and let us do this right when we have the opportunity.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

BILL AND AMENDMENTS PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. Second of all, we have reconsidered the motion of the minority leader to adjourn, and the bill is going to be over, along with the amendments, for the day, and there will be no further votes.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the lady from Susquehanna County, Ms. Major, for the purpose of a caucus announcement.

Ms. MAJOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to announce – I ask my Republican colleagues to please report to our caucus room immediately. Again, Republican members, please report to caucus.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. Seeing no further business before the House, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Greiner, from Lancaster County, who moves that this House do adjourn until Monday, June 10, 2013, 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 6:22 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.