

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

MONDAY, JULY 1, 2013

SESSION OF 2013

197TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 53

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 10:15 a.m., e.d.t.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (MATTHEW E. BAKER) PRESIDING

PRAYER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE DISPENSED WITH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the prayer and Pledge will be dispensed with for today.

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Sunday, June 30, 2013, will be postponed until printed.

SENATE MESSAGE

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

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 465, PN 2202; HB 1075, PN 2201; and HB 1141, PN 2200**, with information that the Senate has passed the same with amendment in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives is requested.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Who is that shadow in the well of the House?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is just a friendly reminder for the benefit of the members that we will be reconvening on the floor of the House today at 2 p.m. in voting session; 2 p.m., voting session today.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Freeman, from Northampton County, who moves that this House do now adjourn until Monday, July 1, 2013, at 2 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 10:16 a.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

MONDAY, JULY 1, 2013

SESSION OF 2013

197TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 54

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (MATTHEW E. BAKER) PRESIDING

PRAYER

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

Glorious God, here we stand before You this day in solemn prayer. Guide our efforts as we proceed in our quest to govern and provide for the welfare of this great Commonwealth.

May our hearts and minds be open to ideas that will lead to the betterment of those we represent.

Protect those who fight to protect our freedoms. Bring our mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, children, friends, who serve in the Armed Forces safely home.

And as we approach the Fourth of July, commonly referred to as the birth of America, may we be ever mindful of what makes us a great nation: that we were, we are, and will remain one nation, under You, O God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

In gratitude we glorify You for shedding Your grace on us.
In Your name we say, Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the approval of the first Journal of the first session of Monday, July 1, 2013, will be postponed until printed.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 1598 By Representatives HANNA and FRANKEL

An Act amending Titles 58 (Oil and Gas), 74 (Transportation) and 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Title 58, repealing expiration; in Title 74, providing for organization; further providing for minority and women-owned business participation; in sustainable mobility options, further providing for definitions; further providing for the Public Transportation Trust Fund, for application and

approval process, for report to Governor and General Assembly, for coordination and consolidation; for asset improvement program, for programs of Statewide significance and for capital improvements program; establishing the Alternative Energy Capital Investment Program; providing for multimodal transportation funding and for airport operation and zoning, providing for first class city consolidated car rental facility; providing for traffic signals, for the bridge bundling program; in Title 75, in financial responsibility, further providing for required financial responsibility; in fees, further providing for collection and disposition of fees and moneys, for driver's license and learner's permit, for certificate of title, for security interest, for information concerning drivers and vehicles, for certified copies of records and for certificate of inspection; in general provisions, further providing for obedience to traffic-control devices; in Pennsylvania Turnpike, further providing for definitions; repealing deposit and distribution of funds; in liquid fuels and fuels tax, further providing for definitions; in State highway maintenance, further providing for dirt and gravel road maintenance; in supplemental funding for municipal highway maintenance, further providing for supplemental funding for municipal highway maintenance; and in taxes for highway maintenance and construction, providing for imposition of tax and for allocation of proceeds.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, July 1, 2013.

No. 1603 By Representatives CHRISTIANA, CUTLER, HELM, AUMENT, MUSTIO, KILLION, BURNS, D. COSTA, HARKINS, KOTIK, RAVENSTAHL, GIBBONS, BENNINGHOFF, R. MILLER, SWANGER, O'BRIEN, HICKERNELL, MAHER, HARHAI, GODSHALL, GILLEN, COHEN, MARSHALL, HACKETT, SABATINA, BRIGGS, WATERS, MATZIE, DeLUCA, MULLERY, MENTZER, SCAVELLO, SONNEY, SIMMONS, KORTZ, O'NEILL, GILLESPIE, GINGRICH, DERMODY, TURZAI, HANNA, P. DALEY, ADOLPH, GROVE, STURLA, J. HARRIS, KIRKLAND, BISHOP, KULA, M. DALEY, QUINN, MICOZZIE, MILLARD, STEVENSON and SCHLOSSBERG

An Act amending the act of December 20, 1985 (P.L.457, No.112), known as the Medical Practice Act of 1985, providing for the provision of anesthesia care in certain settings; and conferring powers and imposing duties on the Department of Health.

Referred to Committee on PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE, July 1, 2013.

No. 1604 By Representative MILNE

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in preliminary provisions, further providing for method of payment.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, July 1, 2013.

No. 1605 By Representative MILNE

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in preliminary provisions, further providing for method of filing.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, July 1, 2013.

No. 1606 By Representatives R. BROWN, BAKER, BOBACK, COHEN, GINGRICH, C. HARRIS, HEFFLEY, MILLARD and PASHINSKI

An Act amending the act of July 19, 1979 (P.L.130, No.48), known as the Health Care Facilities Act, in licensing of health care facilities, further providing for definitions, for licensure and for application for license.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, July 1, 2013.

No. 1608 By Representatives KAMPF, ELLIS, BARBIN, MILLARD, EVERETT, CUTLER, MICOZZIE, EVANKOVICH, KAUFFMAN, BAKER, O'BRIEN, F. KELLER, SACCONI, HEFFLEY, P. COSTA, KILLION, FEE, QUINN, C. HARRIS, FARRY, REESE, STERN, SONNEY, CLYMER, HENNESSEY, MAJOR, TOOHIL, RAPP, TALLMAN, GINGRICH, COX, VEREB, PAYNE, ADOLPH, AUMENT, M. K. KELLER, BLOOM, METCALFE, MARSHALL, D. COSTA, PICKETT, MUNDY, HICKERNELL, DENLINGER, BENNINGHOFF, CORBIN, HARHART, COHEN, GILLESPIE, MUSTIO, STEVENSON, KNOWLES, HESS and SWANGER

An Act amending Title 66 (Public Utilities) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in alternative form of regulation of telecommunications services, further providing for definitions, for continuation of commission-approved alternative regulation and network modernization plans, for alternative forms of regulation, for competitive services, for access charges, for interexchange telecommunications carriers and for additional powers and duties.

Referred to Committee on CONSUMER AFFAIRS, July 1, 2013.

SENATE BILL FOR CONCURRENCE

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

SB 1043, PN 1321

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, July 1, 2013.

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**HB 913, PN 1054**

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in judicial computer system, further providing for deposits into account.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 725, PN 1295

By Rep. ADOLPH

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

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 726, PN 1296

By Rep. ADOLPH

A Supplement to the act of July 28, 1966 (3rd Sp.Sess., P.L.87, No.3), known as the University of Pittsburgh—Commonwealth Act, making appropriations for carrying the same into effect; and providing for a basis for payments of such appropriations, for a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 727, PN 748

By Rep. ADOLPH

A Supplement to the act of November 30, 1965 (P.L.843, No.355), known as the Temple University—Commonwealth Act, making an appropriation for carrying the same into effect; providing for a basis for payments of such appropriation; and providing a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 728, PN 1297

By Rep. ADOLPH

A Supplement to the act of July 7, 1972 (P.L.743, No.176), known as the Lincoln University—Commonwealth Act, making an appropriation for carrying the same into effect; providing for a basis for payments of the appropriation; and providing a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 729, PN 1298

By Rep. ADOLPH

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

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 1002, PN 1178

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act providing for the capital budget for the fiscal year 2013-2014.

APPROPRIATIONS.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Located to the left of the Speaker, as guests of Representative Barrar, the Chair welcomes Stephanie, Ethan, and Caden Toth. Stephanie is the daughter of Representative Barrar, and Ethan and Caden are two of his three grandchildren. Please rise and be recognized.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Are there any leaves of absence?

Seeing none, the Chair thanks the gentlemen.

MASTER ROLL CALL

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

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—203

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

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

LEAVES ADDED—2

Day Sims

LEAVES CANCELED—1

Sims

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two hundred and three members having voted on the master roll, a quorum is present.

STATEMENT BY MR. CLYMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair at this time recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Clymer, upon unanimous consent.

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to make a few remarks about the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg.

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

Members, please take your seats. This marks the occasion of a momentous moment in the time of history for Pennsylvania and our nation.

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, good morning, everybody. We are glad to see everyone here this morning.

One hundred and fifty years ago today, at approximately 7:30 a.m., Lt. Marcellus Jones of the 8th Illinois Cavalry aimed a carbine down the Chambersburg Pike and fired the first shot of the Battle of Gettysburg. As the morning progressed, Confederate troops under Gen. Henry Heth fought the Union cavalymen under Gen. John Buford. At 10 a.m. reinforcements for both sides arrived. Eventually, as the heat of the battle continued and the afternoon wore on, the Confederates drove the Union troops back through the town of Gettysburg to positions on Cemetery Ridge.

By the morning 85,000 Union troops, under the command of Gen. George Meade, faced approximately 75,000 Confederate troops under the command of Gen. Robert E. Lee. The Union line ran from Culp's and Cemetery Hills south to the Little Round Top, taking the shape of a fishhook. The Confederate lines ran along Seminary Ridge, back through Gettysburg to Culp's Hill. The second day's battle was slow to start, but when it was finally through, it instantly became some of the most horrendous fighting of the entire war. The fighting, sometimes hand-to-hand, raged from Little Round Top to Devil's Den, to places known simply as the Peach Orchard and the Wheatfield. The second day's casualties amounted to 15,000 men.

Early in the morning on Friday, July 3, Robert E. Lee's Confederates launched an attack on Culp's Hill in an attempt to dislodge the entrenched Union troops. The attack failed, and as a result, Lee decided that the center of the Union line was the weakest. Around 1 p.m. a single Confederate cannon on Seminary Ridge signaled the start of a massive cannonade that at the time was the loudest sound ever heard in the Western Hemisphere. The cannons were heard as far away as Baltimore, some 75 miles away. Around 3 p.m. Pickett's Charge began and 12,000 Confederate troops attacked the Union lines. By 4 p.m. the attack had been repulsed and a cheer went up from the Union lines. The next day it rained, and on July 5 the Confederates began their retreat southward, carrying a wagon train of wounded that stretched 17 miles.

The Battle of Gettysburg was the largest ever fought on American soil, and it is appropriate that we commemorate its 150th anniversary today. It remains the turning point of the American Civil War. Over 150,000 men participated, and one-third of all troops, that is one-third of all troops engaged became casualties. Pennsylvanians at Gettysburg numbered almost 35,000 men, of which 1,182 were killed, 3,177 were wounded, and 880 were captured.

We need to remember this historic event in our nation's history and the sacrifices of all Americans, both Blue and Gray. And in the words of Abraham Lincoln, "...from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion – that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain – that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom – and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Mr. Speaker, if I can add just one more note to this, to the events that took place. We have in the State Museum and over in the Ryan Building Peter Frederick Rothermel's picture, a print, of Pickett's Charge. It was the Pennsylvania General Assembly that in 1866 commissioned him – who was a Pennsylvania artist, by the way – to do this work. He spent 4 years talking to those who participated at that particular battle and designing that print in such a way – well, it is an oil painting, but we have the print in the Ryan Building – so that it recaptured the authentic uniforms, the rifles that were used, the flags, and the environment that the attack took place on.

So again, Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate this time as we stand here today and we remember 150 years ago that the Union troops and the Confederate troops were engaged in one of the most horrific wars that our country has known, and yet it was the turning point of the Civil War that kept us united. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman very much.

UNCONTESTED CALENDAR

RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. BARRAR called up **HR 400, PN 2170**, entitled:

A Resolution designating October 1, 2013, as "College Radio Day" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—203

Adolph	English	Kirkland	Petri
Aument	Evankovich	Knowles	Pickett
Baker	Evans	Kortz	Pyle
Barbin	Everett	Kotik	Quinn
Barrar	Fabrizio	Krieger	Rapp
Benninghoff	Farina	Kula	Ravenstahl
Bishop	Farry	Lawrence	Readshaw
Bizzarro	Fee	Longietti	Reed
Bloom	Fleck	Lucas	Reese

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

STATEMENT BY MR. PAINTER

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Painter, is recognized on unanimous consent.

Mr. PAINTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to thank my good friend from Delaware County for sponsoring HR 400 and the House for adopting it, and I have additional written remarks I would like to submit for the record. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman, and he may submit his remarks to the clerk to be spread upon the record.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representative Barrar for sponsoring HR 400, which designates October 1 as "College Radio Day" in Pennsylvania, and to thank my fellow members for their unanimous support of this resolution.

I wanted to say a few words about West Chester University's radio station, WCUR, which one of my district office interns, Maria Reyes, is a part of, given that West Chester is the closest State school to my district. WCUR has been in operation since the 1960s, and over 100 students at West Chester are a part of the station. Besides Maria, I wanted to give special recognition to a few other people at the station, specifically, general manager Justin Sochovka, music director Dillon Sweigart, events and promotions director Christina Gates, sports director Kenny Ayers, programming director Jessica Micchelli, and the first Spotlight Member, Kait Convery.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 1002, PN 1178**, entitled:

An Act providing for the capital budget for the fiscal year 2013-2014.

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—189

Adolph	Emrick	Kim	Petrarca
Aument	English	Kinsey	Petri
Baker	Evans	Kirkland	Pickett
Barbin	Everett	Knowles	Pyle
Barrar	Fabrizio	Kortz	Quinn
Benninghoff	Farina	Kotik	Rapp
Bishop	Farry	Kula	Ravenstahl
Bizzarro	Fee	Longietti	Readshaw
Boback	Fleck	Lucas	Reed
Boyle, B.	Flynn	Maher	Regan
Boyle, K.	Frankel	Mahoney	Rock
Bradford	Freeman	Major	Roebuck
Briggs	Gabler	Maloney	Ross
Brooks	Gainey	Markosek	Rozzi
Brown, R.	Galloway	Marshall	Sabatina
Brown, V.	Gergely	Marsico	Saccone
Brownlee	Gibbons	Masser	Sainato
Burns	Gillespie	Matzie	Samuelson
Caltagirone	Gingrich	McCarter	Sankey
Carroll	Godshall	McGeehan	Santarsiero
Causar	Goodman	McGinnis	Saylor
Christiana	Greiner	McNeill	Scavello

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

NAYS—14

Bloom	Keller, F.	Metcalfe	Roae
Dunbar	Krieger	Metzgar	Simmons
Evankovich	Lawrence	Reese	Truitt
Gillen	Mackenzie		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

Ordered, That the clerk 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 **SB 725, PN 1295**, entitled:

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

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—199

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

NAYS—4

Haluska	McGinnis	Metcalfe	Metzgar
---------	----------	----------	---------

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

The two-thirds 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 **SB 726, PN 1296**, entitled:

A Supplement to the act of July 28, 1966 (3rd Sp.Sess., P.L.87, No.3), known as the University of Pittsburgh—Commonwealth Act, making appropriations for carrying the same into effect; and providing for a basis for payments of such appropriations, for a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure.

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—199

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

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

NAYS—4

Haluska	McGinnis	Metcalfe	Metzgar
---------	----------	----------	---------

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

The two-thirds 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 **SB 727, PN 748**, entitled:

A Supplement to the act of November 30, 1965 (P.L.843, No.355), known as the Temple University—Commonwealth Act, making an appropriation for carrying the same into effect; providing for a basis for payments of such appropriation; and providing a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure.

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—199

Adolph	Emrick	Kinsey	Pickett
Aument	English	Kirkland	Pyle
Baker	Evankovich	Knowles	Quinn
Barbin	Evans	Kortz	Rapp
Barrar	Everett	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Fabrizio	Krieger	Readshaw
Bishop	Farina	Kula	Reed
Bizzarro	Farry	Lawrence	Reese
Bloom	Fee	Longietti	Regan
Boback	Fleck	Lucas	Roae

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

NAYS—4

Haluska	McGinnis	Metcalfe	Metzgar
---------	----------	----------	---------

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

The two-thirds 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 **SB 728, PN 1297**, entitled:

A Supplement to the act of July 7, 1972 (P.L.743, No.176), known as the Lincoln University—Commonwealth Act, making an appropriation for carrying the same into effect; providing for a basis for payments of the appropriation; and providing a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure.

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. Lawrence, is recognized.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe I have a potential conflict of interest on this vote, and thus, I will be abstaining from voting.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is excused from voting.

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—198

Adolph	Emrick	Kinsey	Pickett
Aument	English	Kirkland	Pyle
Baker	Evankovich	Knowles	Quinn
Barbin	Evans	Kortz	Rapp
Barrar	Everett	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Fabrizio	Krieger	Readshaw
Bishop	Farina	Kula	Reed
Bizzarro	Farry	Longietti	Reese
Bloom	Fee	Lucas	Regan
Boback	Fleck	Mackenzie	Roae
Boyle, B.	Flynn	Maher	Rock
Boyle, K.	Frankel	Mahoney	Roebuck
Bradford	Freeman	Major	Ross
Briggs	Gabler	Maloney	Rozzi
Brooks	Gainey	Markosek	Sabatina
Brown, R.	Galloway	Marshall	Saccone
Brown, V.	Gergely	Marsico	Sainato
Brownlee	Gibbons	Masser	Samuelson
Burns	Gillen	Matzie	Sankey
Caltagirone	Gillespie	McCarter	Santarsiero
Carroll	Gingrich	McGeehan	Saylor
Causar	Godshall	McNeill	Scavello
Christiana	Goodman	Mentzer	Schlossberg
Clay	Greiner	Miccarelli	Schreiber
Clymer	Grell	Micozzie	Simmons
Cohen	Grove	Millard	Sims
Conklin	Hackett	Miller, D.	Smith
Corbin	Haggerty	Miller, R.	Snyder
Costa, D.	Hahn	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		

NAYS—4

Haluska	McGinnis	Metcalfe	Metzgar
---------	----------	----------	---------

NOT VOTING—1

Lawrence

EXCUSED—0

The two-thirds 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 **SB 729, PN 1298**, entitled:

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

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. Longietti, is recognized. Apologies; the gentleman, Mr. Petrarca, is recognized.

Mr. PETRARCA. Thank you, Speaker Smith.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is what happens with long days and long nights. You are in order and may proceed.

Mr. PETRARCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to speak on the \$28 million appropriation to the University of Pennsylvania. I have paid attention to the University of Pennsylvania and their budgets since being elected, and certainly, as a chairman of Agriculture on my side of the aisle. I also serve on their board of overseers for their veterinary school. And the University of Pennsylvania, they do many things very well. We all get e-mails from them, I believe, on a daily basis. They have good schools there – their business school, their school of veterinary medicine – run by good people and do good things. They are also very good at raising money at the University of Pennsylvania. They are right now in the midst, or they just finished a capital budget plan where they have raised, I believe, in the area of \$4 billion. Their endowment, they have one of the larger endowments, I believe, in the country, probably the world, at nearly \$7 billion.

However, unlike our State-related schools and unlike our State System schools, the University of Pennsylvania does something that I think that they do not do that well. They do not, unlike these other schools, they do not educate sufficient numbers of Pennsylvania students. In fact, as I see it, I think they educate more foreign students than they do residents of Pennsylvania, and I personally have a problem with that. As we talk about a \$28 million appropriation to this University, even in terms of agriculture, we could certainly, certainly spend those dollars on our cooperative system that we have that has been decimated in recent years in terms of the budget. We also, in western Pennsylvania, do not have an animal diagnostic lab that we have been talking about for many years.

So as we talk about dollars and we talk about appropriations going to the University of Pennsylvania, as I see it, until this university cares about and educates the students of Pennsylvania, I cannot in good conscience vote for this appropriation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. MICCARELLI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As one of the students that was a Pennsylvania-born-and-bred student and educated at the University of Pennsylvania, I stand in support of this bill. There are many members on both sides of the aisle who have been educated at the university of Pennsylvania who are from here, who live here, who work here, who continue to support the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The only veterinary school in the entire Commonwealth is at the University of Pennsylvania. It is vital, it is critical that we maintain that school, and that is what we are doing with this appropriation.

I encourage a "yes" vote from all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. ROSS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

One thing I need to correct so that there is no misunderstanding: The University of Pennsylvania's veterinary school has its own budget; in fact, it has to contribute overhead expenses to the university as a whole. The university's endowment is not available to the veterinary school. Each of the schools has to raise and support themselves independently.

Secondly, the comment about the foreign students probably does apply to other sections of the university; it certainly does not apply to the veterinary medicine school. As a matter of fact, the moneys that we send on are specifically targeted to make sure that more Pennsylvania students go to the veterinary medicine school so that they will in turn be available to support agriculture here in the Commonwealth. So this is very well thought out. This has been dealt with over many years to try and target these dollars most specifically where they will do the most good for Pennsylvania students.

And I would point out that the other veterinary medicine schools elsewhere in the country wind up being very heavily subsidized as part of their State's budgets. So to compete and to make sure that we do not allow Pennsylvania students to go elsewhere for veterinary medicine training and possibly wind up leaving the State and making a shortage of veterinarians here in Pennsylvania, I urge the members to continue to support the line item that we are considering today, SB 729, and vote favorably on it. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Roebuck.

Mr. ROEBUCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, rise in support of this appropriation. The Matthew Ryan Veterinarian School is in fact in my legislative district. And although it is in the city of Philadelphia, I would point out that in fact Philadelphia not only has the only veterinary school in the Commonwealth, we also have the only agricultural high school in the Commonwealth, and it is an important link between our community of Philadelphia and the rest of the State.

The school does an outstanding job. It gives opportunity to those who want to study veterinary medicine. It does provide incentives for Pennsylvanians who study there. It is a quality institution, and it deserves support of this legislative body.

I would urge all my colleagues to support this legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlelady from Bucks, Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. WATSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to echo the remarks of the gentleman from Chester County.

I am a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania. I have a very fine education, and I am very quick to tell everybody, my family did not pay for it. I went on almost a full scholarship. I would have never, my parents did not come from anything that I could have ever afforded an opportunity like that.

At the same time, Penn knows that from their standpoint financially, I guess I am their least successful graduate. I never made the kind of money that a lot of people did. I send them a little bit, but believe me, it is not in an endowment fund.

But the veterinary school has always been, I have never understood the whys, but everyone who has ever been there knows the veterinary school is off on its own. Now, Penn claims the veterinary school and is very prideful when they talk about the panorama of the University of Pennsylvania, but they do not help them. They raise the money on their own. And if you know many veterinarians, a lot of them are not – I think of one I used to sit next to here in the hall of the House – and he would tell you that especially for large animal veterinarians, these are not wealthy people, either, to give donations.

This is where the money goes: It goes to Penn students. I cannot speak to whether or not they have students more outside of Pennsylvania. They have very high standards. Everybody applies, like most universities – period – anywhere in this country. They are very – they will say they do not, but they do – they want a wide-ranging student body. They want people from all kinds of walks of life who meet that basic criteria. And I have always said, I look and I think they figure, who is going to really make it in life and send me a big donation back?

I am here to say, I think I made it because I got to this Pennsylvania House and I am very proud of that fact. I do not send them a lot of donations, but I am very happy at least to vote for this and help out the veterinary school. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentlelady from Philadelphia, Ms. DeLissio. No? Waives off? Thank you very much.

The Chair recognizes the gentlelady, Ms. Daley.

Ms. DALEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to add my voice in support of the appropriation for the veterinary school at the University of Pennsylvania. I worked at the university for 20 years before coming here and can attest to the fact that the funds and dollars in each department and each school are handled completely separately. Endowments are not available across the board; they are used for special purposes. It is incredibly important, I think, to support the school of vet medicine. They do amazing work, not only at the Ryan Vet Hospital in Philadelphia, but also at the New Bolton Center out in Chester County. They are working programs, training rescue dogs to go into situations that are really – this is a big deal for situations like earthquakes and fires and whatnot.

And I would urge support for, a "yes" vote for this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the lady, Ms. Boback.

Ms. BOBACK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, am a proud alum of the University of Pennsylvania, and I rise to ask for support of this line item.

When I served on the Ag Committee, I had the opportunity to visit New Bolton. In my estimation, this school is second to none, and I consider it a jewel in this Commonwealth. Please support this line item for the University of Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady.

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—197

Adolph	Emrick	Kim	Petri
Aument	English	Kinsey	Pickett
Baker	Evankovich	Kirkland	Pyle
Barbin	Evans	Knowles	Quinn
Barrar	Everett	Kortz	Rapp
Benninghoff	Fabrizio	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Bishop	Farina	Kula	Readshaw
Bizzarro	Farry	Lawrence	Reed
Bloom	Fee	Longietti	Regan
Boback	Fleck	Lucas	Roae
Boyle, B.	Flynn	Mackenzie	Rock
Boyle, K.	Frankel	Maher	Roebuck
Bradford	Freeman	Mahoney	Ross
Briggs	Gabler	Major	Rozzi
Brooks	Gainey	Maloney	Sabatina
Brown, R.	Galloway	Markosek	Saccone
Brown, V.	Gergely	Marshall	Sainato
Brownlee	Gibbons	Marsico	Samuelson
Burns	Gillen	Masser	Sankey
Caltagirone	Gillespie	Matzie	Santarsiero
Carroll	Gingrich	McCarter	Saylor
Causar	Godshall	McGeehan	Scavello
Christiana	Goodman	McNeill	Schlossberg
Clay	Greiner	Mentzer	Schreiber
Clymer	Grell	Metzgar	Simmons
Cohen	Grove	Miccarelli	Sims
Conklin	Hackett	Micozzie	Smith
Corbin	Haggerty	Millard	Snyder
Costa, D.	Hahn	Miller, D.	Sonney

Costa, P.	Hanna	Miller, R.	Stephens
Cox	Harhai	Milne	Stern
Cruz	Harhart	Mirabito	Stevenson
Culver	Harkins	Miranda	Sturla
Cutler	Harper	Molchany	Swanger
Daley, M.	Harris, A.	Moul	Tallman
Daley, P.	Harris, J.	Mullery	Taylor
Davidson	Heffley	Mundy	Thomas
Davis	Helm	Murt	Tobash
Day	Hennessey	Mustio	Toepel
Dean	Hess	Neilson	Toohil
Deasy	Hickernell	Neuman	Trutt
DeLissio	James	O'Brien	Turzai
Delozier	Kampf	O'Neill	Vereb
DeLuca	Kauffman	Oberlander	Vitali
Denlinger	Kavulich	Painter	Waters
Dermody	Keller, F.	Parker	Watson
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Pashinski	Wheatley
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Payne	White
Dunbar	Killion	Peifer	Youngblood
Ellis			

NAYS—6

Haluska	McGinnis	Petrarca	Reese
Krieger	Metcalfe		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

The two-thirds 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.

CALENDAR

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 198, PN 1924**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, providing for Dyslexia Screening Pilot Program.

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

Mr. **TALLMAN** offered the following amendment
No. **A02938**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 19, by striking out "The" and inserting
To the extent funding is available, the

Amend Bill, page 2, line 26, by inserting after "that"
demonstrates that the school district has funding available
for the program and that

Amend Bill, page 3, line 5, by striking out "The" and inserting
To the extent funding is available, the

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

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

Mr. TALLMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Basically, this amendment just clarifies what the prime sponsor said in committee under my questioning, so it just puts that in writing so we have it. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the amendment, the gentleman, Mr. Neilson, is recognized.

Mr. NEILSON. I would encourage all members to vote for this amendment. This is an agreed-to amendment, and I thank the Representative for introducing it.

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—203

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

Ellis Kim Peifer Youngblood
Emrick Kinsey Petrarca

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

Mr. O'NEILL offered the following amendment
No. A03016:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 14, by inserting after "language."
Other difficulties may include problems in reading comprehension and reduced reading experience that can impede the growth of vocabulary and background knowledge.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. O'Neill.

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

Mr. Speaker, all this amendment does is brings the definition in line with the national definition for "dyslexia." Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the amendment, the gentleman, Mr. Neilson, is recognized.

Mr. NEILSON. I thank the gentleman for introducing the amendment and clarifying the definition. This is a supported amendment. I encourage all members to vote "yes" on the amendment.

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—203

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

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

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-0

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

On the question recurring,

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the understanding of the Chair that the gentleman, Mr. Truitt, has withdrawn his amendment.

The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

(Bill as amended will be reprinted.)

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1559, PN 2110**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, providing for youth suicide awareness and prevention training.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is my understanding the gentleman, Mr. Truitt, has withdrawn his amendment to this bill.

The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 155, PN 1211**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 15, 1986 (P.L.1610, No.181), known as the Rabies Prevention and Control in Domestic Animals and Wildlife Act, further providing for findings, for legislative intent, for definitions, for Statewide system for rabies control, for powers and duties of department, for vaccination required and certificate and tag, for veterinarians participating in low-cost rabies clinics and for powers and duties of department relating to wildlife.

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-203

Adolph	English	Kirkland	Petri
Aument	Evankovich	Knowles	Pickett
Baker	Evans	Kortz	Pyle
Barbin	Everett	Kotik	Quinn
Barrar	Fabrizio	Krieger	Rapp
Benninghoff	Farina	Kula	Ravenstahl
Bishop	Farry	Lawrence	Readshaw
Bizzarro	Fee	Longietti	Reed
Bloom	Fleck	Lucas	Reese
Boback	Flynn	Mackenzie	Regan
Boyle, B.	Frankel	Maher	Roae
Boyle, K.	Freeman	Mahoney	Rock
Bradford	Gabler	Major	Roebuck
Briggs	Gainey	Maloney	Ross
Brooks	Galloway	Markosek	Rozzi

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

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-0

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 700, PN 1320**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 6, 1956 (1955 P.L.1414, No.465), known as the Second Class County Port Authority Act, further providing for membership of the authority; and providing for Department of Transportation Regionalization and Privatization Study.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-203

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

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-0

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Turning to supplemental calendar B of today's calendar.

Will the kind gentleman, Mr. DiGirolamo, please come to the rostrum.

BILLS ON CONCURRENCE REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HB 82, PN 2154 By Rep. TURZAI

An Act providing for actions for costs of care of seized animals.

RULES.

HB 163, PN 2175 By Rep. TURZAI

An Act amending the act of August 9, 1955 (P.L.323, No.130), known as The County Code, in prothonotary, clerks of courts, clerk of orphans' court, register of wills, recorder of deeds, further providing for how offices to be held.

RULES.

HB 1141, PN 2200 By Rep. TURZAI

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in preliminary provisions, further providing for the Special Education Funding Commission; in school finances, providing for reopening of school district annual budget and further providing for annual budget, additional or increased appropriations and transfer of funds; in grounds and buildings, further providing for limitation on new applications for Department of Education approval of public school building projects; in certification of teachers, further providing for disqualification and providing for professional educator discipline fee; in community colleges, further providing for financial program and reimbursement of payments; in community education councils, further providing for State funding; in school districts of the first class, providing for budget reports; and in reimbursements by Commonwealth and between school districts, providing for basic education funding for 2012-2013 school year and for payment on account of equipment purchased for area vocational-technical schools and school districts, further providing for payments to intermediate units and for special education payments to school districts; providing for assistance to school districts in financial recovery or financial watch status; further providing for Pennsylvania Accountability Grants; and providing for Distance Education Program.

RULES.

HB 1190, PN 2090 By Rep. TURZAI

An Act amending the act of July 19, 1979 (P.L.130, No.48), known as the Health Care Facilities Act, in licensing of health care facilities, further providing for definitions, for administration, for licensure, for term and content of license and for reliance on accrediting agencies and Federal Government; and providing for reliance on national accreditation organizations for hospitals.

RULES.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

BILLS ON CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 82, PN 2154**, entitled:

An Act providing for actions for costs of care of seized animals.

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

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Ellis for a brief description of the Senate amendments.

Mr. ELLIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, after working on this bill for over a year now, the Senate met with all the interested parties and made a few changes.

One, instead of sending the initial request to the district judges, it will be going to the common pleas court in the county. Also, if a court orders the defendant to pay reasonable costs of care, the cost order shall include filing fees. And the Senate added a provision that prohibits the petitioner from reproductively sterilizing a seized animal unless the owner surrenders the right for that operation to be performed.

And finally, they added a provision for the case of indigency, so if the person cannot afford to pay the \$15 because they are indigent, then they would not have to. And then also, a measure that was brought up whenever this was debated before the House was the matter of, what if the person is found innocent? The Senate inserted language that would include a provision to allow innocent, people that are eventually found innocent of animal cruelty to recoup the cost of the cost of care.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

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	English	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Aument	Evankovich	Kula	Readshaw
Barrar	Evans	Longietti	Reed
Bishop	Fabrizio	Lucas	Reese
Bizzarro	Farina	Mackenzie	Regan
Bloom	Farry	Maher	Roae
Boback	Flynn	Mahoney	Rock
Boyle, B.	Frankel	Maloney	Roebuck
Boyle, K.	Freeman	Markosek	Ross
Bradford	Gabler	Marshall	Sabatina

Briggs	Gainey	Marsico	Saccone
Brooks	Galloway	Masser	Sainato
Brown, R.	Gergely	Matzie	Samuelson
Brown, V.	Gibbons	McCarter	Sankey
Brownlee	Gillen	McGeehan	Santarsiero
Burns	Gillespie	McNeill	Saylor
Caltagirone	Gingrich	Mentzer	Scavello
Carroll	Goodman	Metzgar	Schlossberg
Christiana	Grell	Miccarelli	Schreiber
Clay	Grove	Micozzie	Simmons
Clymer	Hackett	Miller, D.	Sims
Cohen	Haggerty	Miller, R.	Snyder
Conklin	Hanna	Milne	Sonney
Costa, D.	Harhai	Miranda	Stephens
Costa, P.	Harhart	Molchany	Stevenson
Cox	Harkins	Mullery	Sturla
Cruz	Harper	Mundy	Swanger
Daley, P.	Harris, J.	Murt	Taylor
Davidson	Heffley	Mustio	Thomas
Davis	Hennessey	Neilson	Toepel
Day	James	Neuman	Truitt
Dean	Kampf	O'Brien	Turzai
Deasy	Kauffman	O'Neill	Vereb
Delozier	Kavulich	Painter	Vitali
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Parker	Waters
Dermody	Killion	Pashinski	Watson
DiGirolamo	Kim	Petrarca	Wheatley
Donatucci	Kinsey	Petri	White
Dunbar	Kirkland	Rapp	Youngblood
Ellis	Kortz		

NAYS—45

Baker	Fee	Keller, M.K.	Payne
Barbin	Fleck	Knowles	Peifer
Benninghoff	Godshall	Krieger	Pickett
Causar	Greiner	Lawrence	Pyle
Corbin	Hahn	Major	Quinn
Culver	Haluska	McGinnis	Rozzi
Cutler	Harris, A.	Metcalfe	Smith
Daley, M.	Helm	Millard	Stern
DeLissio	Hess	Mirabito	Tallman
Denlinger	Hickernell	Moul	Tobash
Emrick	Keller, F.	Oberlander	Toohil
Everett			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

* * *

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 163, PN 2175**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of August 9, 1955 (P.L.323, No.130), known as The County Code, in prothonotary, clerks of courts, clerk of orphans' court, register of wills, recorder of deeds, further providing for how offices to be held.

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

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Benninghoff for a brief description of the Senate amendments.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Briefly, this helps our county commissioners. Currently, as you know, the prothonotary laws for counties who may progress into another level of counties as ours, from fifth to fourth class, are required to split their offices and develop a whole other office. This bill will make it from a "shall" bill to a "may" bill. The Senate introduced an amendment to it that would also do this with consultation to the president judge, which I support, and I appreciate the members' support. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—203

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

Dunbar	Killion	Payne	White
Ellis	Kim	Peifer	Youngblood
Emrick	Kinsey	Petrarca	

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-0

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

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

* * *

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 1190, PN 2090**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of July 19, 1979 (P.L.130, No.48), known as the Health Care Facilities Act, in licensing of health care facilities, further providing for definitions, for administration, for licensure, for term and content of license and for reliance on accrediting agencies and Federal Government; and providing for reliance on national accreditation organizations for hospitals.

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

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Cutler for a brief description of the Senate amendments.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Very briefly, the Senate made a couple changes to make the bill internally consistent. When HB 1190 originally left this chamber, there were two conflicting terms, being the "accreditation organization" and the "accrediting agency," as well as the "licensure survey" versus "inspection." They made that all internally consistent and generally improved the bill.

And while I am here, I would also like to briefly take this time to thank everyone's assistance in moving this bill, particularly the gentlelady from Philadelphia. She was very helpful as we moved it, and I appreciated having her as a second prime sponsor.

Additionally, I would like to briefly thank the staff, both of the Department of Health as well as the House and the Senate Health Committees, as they were fabulous to work with as we moved it through the process. And I think it was evidenced by the previous unanimous votes, and I would certainly appreciate an affirmative vote here this afternoon. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-203

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

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-0

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

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

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

The House will come to order.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlelady, Ms. Major.

Ms. MAJOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to call an immediate Republican caucus. I would ask our Republican members to please report to our caucus room.

And then, Mr. Speaker, I believe you will call that we will be at recess at the call of the Chair? Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

The Chair thanks the lady.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Frankel, for a caucus announcement.

Mr. FRANKEL. Democrats will caucus immediately as well. Democrats will caucus immediately.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

For the information of the members, we will be giving 15 minutes' notice before we reconvene.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This House now stands in recess until the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

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

THE SPEAKER (SAMUEL H. SMITH) PRESIDING

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, Mr. DAY, from Lehigh County for the day. Without objection, the leave will be granted.

BILL ON CONCURRENCE REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HB 1075, PN 2203 (Amended)

By Rep. TURZAI

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 and for medical assistance benefit packages, coverage, copayments, premiums and rates; in children and youth, further providing for payments to counties for services to children and providing for provider submissions; in intermediate care facilities assessments, further providing for time periods and making editorial changes; in hospital assessments, further providing for authorization and for time period; in Statewide quality care assessment, reenacting and further defining "net inpatient revenue," providing for implementation, for administration, for

limitations and for expiration; in Pennsylvania Trauma Systems Stabilization, further providing for funding; in kinship care, further providing for scope and for definitions; providing for family finding; and, in human services block grant pilot program, further providing for establishment of human services block grant pilot program, for powers and duties of the department, for powers and duties of counties, for allocation and for use of block grant funds.

RULES.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR C

BILL ON CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS AS AMENDED

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to the following **HB 1075, PN 2203**, as further amended by the House Rules Committee:

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 and for medical assistance benefit packages, coverage, copayments, premiums and rates; in children and youth, further providing for payments to counties for services to children and providing for provider submissions; in intermediate care facilities assessments, further providing for time periods and making editorial changes; in hospital assessments, further providing for authorization and for time period; in Statewide quality care assessment, reenacting and further defining "net inpatient revenue," providing for implementation, for administration, for limitations and for expiration; in Pennsylvania Trauma Systems Stabilization, further providing for funding; in kinship care, further providing for scope and for definitions; providing for family finding; and, in human services block grant pilot program, further providing for establishment of human services block grant pilot program, for powers and duties of the department, for powers and duties of counties, for allocation and for use of block grant funds.

On the question,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

MOTION TO REJECT RULES COMMITTEE REPORT

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Bucks County, Mr. DiGirolamo.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may state his motion.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule 30, I move that the House reject the report of the Rules Committee containing HB 1075 as amended and return the bill to the Rules Committee as last passed by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Bucks County, Mr. DiGirolamo, has moved that under rule 30, HB 1075 be – that under rule 30, the gentleman, Mr. DiGirolamo, has moved to reject the report of the Rules Committee.

The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. William Keller.

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

I rise to second the motion from the gentleman from Bucks.

The SPEAKER. Under rule 30, the motion has been properly seconded; therefore, the question before the House is, shall the House accept the report of the Rules Committee on HB 1075?

On the question,
Shall the House accept the report of the Rules Committee?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Bucks County, Mr. DiGirolamo. And for the information of the members, a motion of this sort is debatable by the members one time.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Mr. Speaker, for clarification, would you clarify for the members what a "yes" vote and a "no" vote will mean on this motion?

The SPEAKER. It will be stated, those in favor of accepting the report – meaning it would come on before the House – those in favor of accepting the report will vote "aye"; those opposed to accepting the report shall vote "no."

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Further parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that for this motion to pass, it does not require a suspension of the rules but only a constitutional majority of 102. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, a constitutional majority sustains the day.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the motion?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you.

Last night in the Senate, the Senate passed this identical bill, 1075, with language in it to expand Medicaid in Pennsylvania. Earlier today in the Rules Committee that language was taken out and the bill before us we have today, it was out the language that would expand Medicaid here in Pennsylvania. The language that was stripped out and that the Senate passed 40-10 – and I want to remind the members on my side of the aisle that 17 members of our party voted for this expansion. Two-thirds of the members on my side of the aisle, Senators, voted to expand Medicaid in Pennsylvania.

They had in that bill a number of protections for the State of Pennsylvania, many of the protections. The protections that were in that bill would allow Pennsylvania to opt out if the Federal government did not live up to their end of the bargain, would make sure that Pennsylvania would continue to collect the gross receipts tax, and most importantly, in the fourth year – the first 3 years of this program, the Federal government pays for 100 percent of the costs – in the fourth year, when Pennsylvania has to start picking up a percentage of the cost, they would allow us to charge these expanded patients a copay or a premium to recoup the cost to Pennsylvania. There were a number of protections in there.

Now, I have been looking at this issue for a long time. I think from the bottom of my heart that this is absolutely the right thing to do for the State of Pennsylvania. Many Governors in States across the country who are no fans of the Affordable Health Care Act have decided that expanding in the Medicaid is the best thing to do for their State. And just a few reasons why, and I will only be a minute, Mr. Speaker, on this. Just a few reasons why: The first 3 years are absolutely free – \$3.5 to

\$4 billion of Federal money coming into Pennsylvania. The three independent studies that have looked at this – from the Economy League, from the Independent Fiscal Office, and from the RAND foundation – they all said the same thing, that Medicaid expansion in Pennsylvania will create thirty-five to forty thousand new jobs here in the State of Pennsylvania. I am going to say that again: thirty-five to forty thousand new jobs in the State of Pennsylvania.

And the population that this is going to insure is our working poor, the working poor in every one of our districts. These are people that are making \$150, \$200, \$300 a week that have no health insurance at their place of employment. And if I might add, the demographics of whom this is going to cover is heavily tilted towards women – working women in day cares, in nursing homes, in beauty salons.

And on top of that, Mr. Speaker, our veteran population, Medicaid expansion will cover half of the uninsured veterans that live in the State of Pennsylvania. I am going to say that again: Our veterans, many of them who have been in Iraq and Afghanistan, they do not get free health-care coverage for the rest of their lives. This will cover half of the veteran population in the State of Pennsylvania.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have this motion before us. I am going to ask the members to vote "no." I know this is an issue that a lot of the members on my side of the aisle do not like. I believe from the bottom of my heart this is absolutely the right thing to do for the State of Pennsylvania, and I ask a "no" on the motion to recommit.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

I rise to ask the members to vote "yes" with respect to this particular motion. That vote means that you are accepting the report from Rules Committee, so I am asking the members to vote "yes" on this particular motion.

Medicaid expansion is an issue that has been raised by the passage of the Federal Obamacare legislation, and in front of us is the issue whether we should be doing it legislatively or if it remains in the proper hands of the executive branch, where that issue is being negotiated through our Department of Public Welfare Secretary, Bev Mackereth, our former colleague; with the Federal government, the Department of Health and Human Services. That is an ongoing negotiation about the terms under which Medicaid expansion might in fact work in our Commonwealth, and if there was an opportunity to reform many of the programs under the Department of Public Welfare with respect to Medicaid. Our program is in fact already one of the most generous in the entire country, and many people in the administration, particularly our Secretary, Bev Mackereth, believe there is an opportunity for reform. This is not a matter that should be in legislation. This is a matter that the Governor and his department Secretary and their staff, the executive branch, should be able to negotiate with Washington, DC.

Second, it is not a provision that should be in this particular legislation, HB 1075, for which it was not connected by subject and which also contains nursing home and hospital assessments that are necessary to the functioning of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's budget for the fiscal year 2013-2014.

Many of our members do not believe that Medicaid expansion is the right decision. Other members, even those who are open to the issue, believe that this should not be in this

legislation, the administration should be allowed to negotiate the terms. And if anybody read any comments with respect to the intent of the legislation as it came over to the House, the maker of that particular provision intimated that she believed that it tied the administration's hands and that they had to accept Medicaid expansion no matter what the Governor and the administration negotiated. That is certainly not appropriate, and the Rules Committee did the right job in removing that language from the underlying bill, HB 1075. In addition, what was also removed was the changing of the name of the Department of Public Welfare to the Department of Human Services. HB 993, a stand-alone bill, will be run on third because we think that should be a separate vote and should also not be included in this 1075, which is necessary for the implementation of the 2013-2014 budget.

No matter where one stands on the issue of Medicaid expansion, whether one believes that it is necessary pursuant to the Obamacare legislation, or if you believe that it disincents folks, and that also it will not be affordable for the taxpayers of the citizens over the long term, those issues are aside. That is a debate that is occurring throughout the Commonwealth and its citizens, but it is not the debate in front of us now. This is solely a procedural vote designed to either accept or not accept the report of the Rules Committee. And the Rules Committee voted with the majority that said, this is an issue that should not be in the underlying bill, HB 1075. It is inappropriate to be in HB 1075. This is a budget vehicle to complete the implementation of the budget for 2013-14 and is not a vehicle where it should be debated, such an outstanding issue which should be in a freestanding piece of legislation, and that there needs to be deference to the administration, the executive branch, to continue to have its reign. It was a duly elected office by the citizens of Pennsylvania to fulfill their duties in determining what terms they might be able to negotiate with respect to Medicaid or Medicaid expansion.

I would urge all of the members to please vote "yes" to accept the report of the Rules Committee. Thank you.

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

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my colleague from Bucks and ask the members to vote not to accept the report from Rules.

I must disagree with majority leader most vehemently that this is a procedural vote, because if this is a procedural vote, it has extraordinary consequences for hundreds of thousands of citizens in our State. Today in the Rules meeting, the majority leader implied that we are not on a deadline when it comes to the decision to expand Medicaid. I could not disagree with that statement more, and that is why I support the DiGirolamo motion.

We need to recommit this bill to Rules because even if the majority leader believes that we have all the time in the world, there are countless thousands of Pennsylvanians who feel that we most certainly are on a deadline. We need to recommit this bill because there are 33 hospitals in serious financial peril, and they would most certainly argue that we are on a deadline, because if we do not expand Medicaid, these hospitals will not be able to take on any new patients that cannot pay for care. We also have 13 critical access hospitals in communities like Tyrone, Meyersdale, Coudersport, Corry, and Muncy who need the added influx of people with insurance in order to balance

their books and remain financially stable. Trying to tell these 13 critical access hospitals that we are not on a deadline is another reason why we need to support the DiGirolamo motion to send this bill back to Rules by voting not to accept the report from the committee.

And of course, we have our community health centers providing incredible care to a large number of low-income adults without health insurance, and for whom getting some payment through Medicaid for these same individuals could be a lifeline to keeping their doors open. These facilities know we are on a deadline. So there are hospitals, administrators, doctors, nurses, all watching anxiously to see if we will do the right thing and make sure that their patients have insurance and have it soon.

Mr. Speaker, we need to support the DiGirolamo motion because the Federal health-care law works under the assumption that most Americans will have health insurance starting in 2014. The Federal government has adjusted its budget to reflect that. Those budget decisions will impact our hospitals and our economy significantly if we refuse to accept the funds that will cut the number of uninsured in Pennsylvania by more than half. We cannot do that unless we support the DiGirolamo motion and reject this report.

In addition to our hospitals, our businesses in Pennsylvania also are on a very, very tight deadline. Large businesses employing low-wage workers will soon be asked to purchase health insurance for Medicaid-eligible employees. All those employees just above the poverty level will be forced to purchase health insurance on the exchange if they do not receive Medicaid. And when they do, and when they do, Mr. Speaker, their employer will be expected to help pay for it. These businesses are all on a deadline, and unless we send this bill back to Rules, a Medicaid expansion vote will not see the light of day in this House and we will not have a chance to help our businesses pay for health insurance.

Jackson Hewitt found that the fines for employers whose Medicaid-eligible workers enroll in the exchange could be over \$1 billion nationally and up to \$85 million in Pennsylvania alone. The fiscal watchdogs that are nervously watching the months go by, contrary to the majority leader's statements, they know we are on a deadline. To offer to pay for the complete, total, 100-percent cost of Medicaid for these low-income working adults does not last forever. I may be a supporter of health-care access and equity, but I am no fiscal fool.

We should be encouraging the people who have delayed seeking health care for too long to go to the doctor now when the Federal government is paying every single cent. It is a generous offer. It is a great offer and other States are taking advantage of it, those around us, and our, our taxpayers will be paying for those benefits in those other States if we do not act on this now.

Ultimately, the people facing the harshest and most pressing deadline, the ones counting off the days until January 1, 2014, are those hundreds of thousands of Pennsylvanians who lack health insurance and who would qualify for it if we only would accept the Federal offer of funds. Some of them are working men and women who were enrolled in adultBasic before we eliminated it. Others are working in restaurants and coffee shops, day-care centers and senior centers, who cannot afford insurance and have simply gone without. They have survived by visiting free clinics, the emergency room, and most often by simply forgoing care. They need us now to support the

DiGirolamo motion so that Medicaid expansion has a chance to pass in Pennsylvania, so that by July 2014 we will be in motion to offer health-care access to those who most desperately need it.

You know, the head of my local community health center described the day the Affordable Care Act was declared constitutional as an extraordinary moment. She said an older, low-income working woman, who needed more care for her chronic condition than the health center could provide itself, started crying in her waiting room that now she was going to have access. There are thousands, hundreds of thousands of Pennsylvanians in the same exact position, and delaying this decision when others are moving forward to do it is irresponsible. These are the people – and contrary to the majority leader's belief – who cannot tolerate waiting another day. They are on a deadline.

We need to support the DiGirolamo motion to give this language a fighting chance. Our constituents need care as soon as they can get it. They deserve care as soon as they can get it, and they do not have all the time in the world, and that means neither do we. We must act now.

This vote, this procedural vote to support our colleague from Bucks in his motion may be the only vote, the only vote that you get for Medicaid expansion. This is not simply a procedural vote, Mr. Speaker. This is a vote on the substance of Medicaid expansion, make no mistake, as we have an urgent need to move on this. We need to recommit this back to Rules and put this back in. The Senate, on a bipartisan basis, a supermajority including the majority of Republican Senators, recognize the importance of this. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle should recognize the importance as well and rise over the partisanship that seems to characterize this debate all the time.

We need to act on behalf of hundreds of thousands of Pennsylvanians, recommit this bill to Rules. Support the DiGirolamo amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Just to be clear, it is a distinction without a difference in net effect. The board says recommit, which is the effect of the motion, but technically, for our purposes, it is a motion to reject the committee report. So I just want to be clear for the record and for the members, although it says recommit, technically our board is unable to put those words up. So I just wanted to make the record clear.

On the question, the Speaker recognizes the lady from Luzerne County, Ms. Toohil.

Ms. TOOHL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This bill, HB 1075, has been run clean out of the Rules Committee, and that is the way that it should be. This is a bill for the foster children, the neediest children in Pennsylvania; children without parents, children without homes, children who get put in homes and are not getting adequate reimbursement. This bill, 1075, must be run with its sister bill, a Children and Youth bill. This is something that has been so hard-fought in the Children and Youth Committee and should be run together.

And the fact that we are coming to this, that it is becoming a vehicle for DPW (Department of Public Welfare) for \$2 million worth of taxpayer money for DPW to change signs that are going into disrepair is incorrect, so the Rules Committee is correct in taking that off of there.

And Medicaid expansion, all of us in this room – if you would hear me out quickly for a moment – all of us in this room as legislators, Pennsylvania legislators, we should feel empowered to grapple with a very complex Medicaid issue. The

expansion of Medicaid is a choice that we as Pennsylvanians have. We have one of the most broken systems. We have children in foster care, children in the welfare system that cannot get a doctor to take them in our Medicaid system. They are denied quality; they are denied access. So we need to grapple with this huge problem. We can take the money. The money looks good. The money is going to come free for a little bit, but we should be empowered to fix a broken system. You can get health insurance for the working poor. You could bring back adultBasic. We could expand CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program), but these are not items that should be run on this bill.

So I would ask you to please accept the recommendation of the Rules Committee and have an affirmative vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question before the House is, shall the House accept the report of the Rules Committee on HB 1075? Those in favor of accepting the report will vote "aye"—

For what purpose does the gentleman from Bucks County, Mr. DiGirolamo, rise?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

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

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Mr. Speaker, as the maker of the amendment, I would like one more opportunity to speak, and I was wondering, out of the goodness of your heart, if you might give me that opportunity. I promise not to take more than 2 or 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. I am sorry. I had stated at the beginning of the debate that members were only allowed to be recognized once, and I am unable to do that.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question before the House is, shall the House accept the report of the Rules Committee on HB 1075?

Those in favor of accepting the report shall vote "aye"; those opposed to accepting the report shall vote "no."

On the question recurring,

Shall the House accept the report of the Rules Committee?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—108

Adolph	Gabler	Lucas	Quinn
Aument	Gillen	Mackenzie	Rapp
Baker	Gillespie	Maher	Reed
Barrar	Gingrich	Major	Reese
Benninghoff	Godshall	Maloney	Regan
Bloom	Greiner	Marshall	Roae
Boback	Grell	Marsico	Rock
Brooks	Grove	Masser	Ross
Brown, R.	Hackett	McCinnis	Saccone
Causar	Hahn	Mentzer	Sankey
Christiana	Harhart	Metcalfe	Saylor
Clymer	Harper	Metzgar	Scavello
Corbin	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Simmons
Cox	Heffley	Micozzie	Smith
Culver	Helm	Millard	Sonney
Cutler	Hennessey	Miller, R.	Stephens
Delozier	Hess	Milne	Stern
Denlinger	Hickernell	Moul	Stevenson
Dunbar	James	Murt	Swanger

Ellis	Kampf	Mustio	Tallman
Emrick	Kauffman	O'Neill	Tobash
English	Keller, F.	Oberlander	Toepel
Evankovich	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Toohil
Everett	Killion	Peifer	Truitt
Farry	Knowles	Petri	Turzai
Fee	Krieger	Pickett	Verb
Fleck	Lawrence	Pyle	Watson

NAYS—94

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Day

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

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

CONSIDERATION OF HB 1075 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. The House will be at ease for a moment.

The House will come to order.

Although we cannot vote this bill at this point in time, short of a motion to proceed, is there anyone seeking to debate this bill?

The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Turzai.

Mr. TURZAI. Mr. Speaker, I would move—

BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. HB 1075 is over temporarily.

The House will come to order.

RULES AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETINGS

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Turzai, for announcements of committee meetings.

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

We will have an immediate meeting of the Rules Committee in the Appropriations conference room, followed by an Appropriations Committee meeting in the majority caucus room.

So we will have an immediate meeting of the Rules Committee in the Appropriations conference room, followed by the Appropriations Committee meeting in the majority caucus room.

We will return to the floor at 6:30.

The SPEAKER. There will be an immediate meeting of the Rules Committee in the Appropriations conference room, followed by an Appropriations Committee meeting in the majority caucus room.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

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

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Democrats will caucus at 6 o'clock; Democrats will caucus at 6 o'clock, and my understanding is that we will be back on the floor about 6:30.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. This House stands in recess until 6:30, unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

AFTER RECESS

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

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**HB 993, PN 1157**

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Public Welfare Code, changing the name of the Department of Public Welfare to the Department of Human Services; and providing for a transition period.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 591, PN 1326 (Amended)

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in preliminary provisions, further providing for method of payment and method of filing; in Department of Revenue, further providing for transmission of money; in agents for collection, further providing for corporate treasurers; in bonus and tax records, further providing for corporate loans and tax, for municipal loans and tax and for monthly statements by registers of wills; in collections other than by settlement, further providing for driver's license fees and for amounts payable to State institutions; in procedure for disbursement of money from State Treasury, providing for reimbursement for administrative costs; in Local Government Capital Project Loan Fund, further providing for assistance to municipalities; in special funds, further providing for funding and for transfer and providing for other grants; providing for additional special funds; in general budget implementation, providing for the Motor License Fund; in 2012-2013 budget implementation, further providing for the Department of Public Welfare; in 2012-2013 restrictions on appropriations, further providing for Veterans' Trust Fund; providing for 2013-2014 budget implementation; providing for 2013-2014 restrictions on appropriations for funds and accounts; in audits, further providing for Race Horse Development Funds; making an appropriation; and making related repeals.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE
REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE****HB 465, PN 2211 (Amended)**

By Rep. TURZAI

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, in tax for education, further providing for definitions, for exclusions from tax, for credit against tax, for licenses and for local receivers of use tax; providing for remote sales reports; providing for special taxing authority; in personal income tax, further providing for definitions, for classes of income and for taxability of partners; providing for tax treatment determined at partnership level and for tax imposed at partnership level; further providing for income of a Pennsylvania S Corporation, for income taxes imposed by other states and for operational provisions; providing for contributions for the Children's Trust Fund and for contributions for American Red Cross; further providing for general rule, for return of Pennsylvania S Corporation, for requirements concerning returns, notices, records and statements and for additions, penalties and fees; providing for citation authority; in corporate net income tax, further providing for definitions and for reports and payment of tax; in corporate stock and franchise tax, further providing for imposition and for expiration; in bank and trust company shares tax, further providing for imposition of tax, ascertainment of taxable amount and exclusion of United States obligations, for apportionment and for definitions; in realty transfer tax, further providing for definitions, for excluded transactions, for imposition of tax and for acquired company; providing for nonlicensed corporation pari-mutuel wagering tax; in film production tax credit, further providing for definitions, and for credit for qualified film production expenses; in educational opportunity scholarship tax credit, further providing for scholarships; repealing provisions relating to coal waste removal and ultraclean fuels tax credit; making an editorial change; in job creation tax credit, further providing for tax credits; providing for city revitalization and improvement zones, for mobile telecommunications broadband

investment tax credit, for the Innovate in PA Program, for neighborhood improvement zones and for Keystone Special Development Zone program; in inheritance tax, further providing for transfers not subject to tax and for exemption for poverty; in inheritance tax, further providing for liabilities and for deductions not allowed; in procedure and administration, further providing for definitions and for petition for reassessment; providing for the Board of Finance and Revenue; further providing for review by the Board of Finance and Revenue; providing for a report concerning the significant changes in the structure and regulatory environment within the banking industry; and making related repeals.

RULES.

STATEMENT BY MR. MILLER

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Dan Miller, under unanimous consent.

Mr. D. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the night is getting long. Our day is almost complete. But I wanted to take a quick moment, obviously we know of the national tragedy that happened yesterday in relation to 19 heroes who gave their lives in Arizona fighting a fire. I think it is important to note that those people did not fight that fire that was in their hometown, but went to the neighboring town to go lend a hand.

So I would just ask, Mr. Speaker, and I know we have a busy evening, if we could have a moment of silence for those 19 who gave their lives and for the families who are suffering their loss tonight.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

If it is okay with the gentleman, I will do that when the members are back, when we have more members back in their seats, when it would be more appropriate, I think.

Mr. D. MILLER. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B CONTINUED**BILL ON CONCURRENCE
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS**

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 1141, PN 2200**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in preliminary provisions, further providing for the Special Education Funding Commission; in school finances, providing for reopening of school district annual budget and further providing for annual budget, additional or increased appropriations and transfer of funds; in grounds and buildings, further providing for limitation on new applications for Department of Education approval of public school building projects; in certification of teachers, further providing for disqualification and providing for professional educator discipline fee; in community colleges, further providing for financial program and reimbursement of payments; in community education councils, further providing for State funding; in school districts of the first class, providing for budget reports; and in reimbursements by Commonwealth and between school districts, providing for basic education funding for 2012-2013 school year and for payment on account of equipment purchased for area vocational-technical schools and school districts, further providing for payments to intermediate units and for special education payments to school districts; providing for assistance to school districts in financial recovery or financial watch status; further providing for Pennsylvania Accountability Grants; and providing for Distance Education Program.

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

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

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

Mr. TURZAI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The underlying bill allows the school district to reopen its annual budget for a period of 30 days after enactment of the annual State General Appropriation Act to reflect Federal and State allocations provided for the current fiscal year by the annual State General Appropriation Act.

Pursuant to the amendment adopted in the Senate, the legislative intent language was corrected and changed to indicate budget implementation. As many of you know, the budget bill sets forth the \$10 billion that is going to education in the State of Pennsylvania, but how that money is distributed is actually done in the Education Code, so the legislative intent reflects that. The Special Education Funding Commission, the report date was changed. It establishes a permanent School Code provision to allow school districts to reopen their annual budgets. There is a provision that allows – or requires, actually – school districts to file budgets electronically with the House and Senate Education Committees. It continues the moratorium on the Pennsylvania Department of Education's acceptance of applications for reimbursement for new school construction projects through the 2013-2014 fiscal year. It requires the Pennsylvania Department of Education to conduct a statewide analysis of school facilities and future capital needs, a preliminary report by May 1, 2014; elimination of duplicate health exams for teachers; new professional educator discipline fee; community college funding formula; community education councils and its funding formula; the basic education funding formula; the CTC (career and technology center) vocational program equipment grants; the intermediate unit payments for special education; school district payments for special education; assistance to financial recovery and financial watch school districts; the accountability block grants; the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency's distance education program.

The following sections of the code have been added or amended as a result of those provisions. It is a lean bill and allows for the distribution of all education moneys. As I said, it is over \$10 billion. Special education funding, reopening of school district annual budgets, annual budget, limitation on new applications for Department of Education approval of public school building projects, professional educator discipline, financial programs, State funding, budget reports, basic education funding, payment on account of equipment purchased for area vocational technical schools, payments to intermediate units, special education payments to school districts, assistance to school districts declared to be in financial recovery status, Pennsylvania accountability block grants, and distance education program. That is the sum and substance of the amendments, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery County, Mr. Stephens.

Mr. STEPHENS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose HB 1141. I know it is a little unusual this late in the day, this late in the budget process, but I do want to just place some remarks on the record here for exactly why. Yesterday I was pleased to support HB 1437, the Commonwealth's budget bill. As I mentioned yesterday during the debate on the bill, education and quality public schools are important to my constituents. The budget bill we passed yesterday invested \$10.8 billion, or over 19 percent of the State's total expenditures, into education. It increased the basic education line item by \$122.5 million to an all-time high of \$5.5 billion. That is the largest amount of State funding in basic ed ever. It is also the largest line item in our Commonwealth's budget.

For these reasons I spoke in support of the bill and noted the significance of the educational line items. Unfortunately, while I do strongly support this level of an investment into public education, I cannot support the method through which the funds are distributed to our local schools in this bill. The school funding formula in general and the hold-harmless provision dramatically shortchange my school districts and many other school districts throughout the State. Many of my colleagues and I have raised these issues about the fundamental unfairness of the school funding formula and the hold-harmless provisions. And for that reason I rise and I will be voting against this bill.

By way of example, just so the members understand, the top 11 school districts in our Commonwealth in terms of per-pupil expenditures— So the Commonwealth spends per pupil in each of these districts, the following amounts: \$12,102 is the highest level that the Commonwealth spends per pupil in basic education funding. Going down, the 10 after that are: \$9,124; \$8,697; \$8,581; \$8,381; \$8,231; \$8,144; \$8,085; \$8,061; \$7,948; \$7,920.

So you see, that is the amount of money that the State spends per pupil in basic education at each of those districts; all above \$7,920. Here is what the State spends per pupil in my school districts. The highest of my four school districts receives \$918 per pupil. Let me say that again: The highest in the State receives \$12,000 per pupil; the highest in my district receives \$900 per pupil. Going down: \$769 per pupil, \$726 per pupil, \$612 per pupil, \$531 per pupil. The five school districts in my legislative district, none of them receive more than \$1,000 per pupil, yet this bill, HB 1141, is going to drive these basic education funds, the largest line item in our budget and the largest amount we have ever invested in State education, through a formula that will give some districts between seven and twelve thousand dollars per child.

Mr. Speaker, I know many of my colleagues are concerned about property taxes. When you take a look at the share of State revenue and local revenue funding the schools across our Commonwealth, you will see that the 11 districts I started off with, with the \$7900 to \$12,000 per pupil, all receive between 64 and 78 percent of their total funding from the State. They only have to rely on local property taxes for anywhere between 13 and 30 percent. My districts, on the other hand, only receive 14, 15, 16, and 17 percent from the State. What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? That 81, 82, 82, 85, and 85 percent of my schools' funds have to come from the local property tax payers. Mr. Speaker, that is what is driving the property tax issue in my district. I would encourage the members to look at their own

numbers. When you look at the Berks County numbers, the hotbed of property tax issues in this Commonwealth, you will find most of those districts are only funded by the State to the tune of about 25 percent. As I mentioned before, Mr. Speaker, the top districts that I listed are receiving in the 70 percents when it comes to funding their district.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am going to have to oppose this bill. I find this formula to be unjust. I think it is inequitable. This is the worst wealth redistribution scheme I think I have seen. Frankly, I think all of our kids ought to be valued equally. I think my kids in the 151st District are worth the same amount in State dollars as the rest of the kids across this Commonwealth, and for that reason I will be opposing the bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate?

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

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Education Code bill is a bill that distributes the money to our local school districts, so how would that money be distributed under this bill? Twenty-three percent of the increased funding, or about \$30 million, goes to just 21 school districts located in just 14 counties. This is a special carveout for a few handpicked districts. The remaining 479 school districts are left out in the cold, and the remaining 53 counties do not get to participate.

If you represent one of these 21 school districts, you should vote for this bill because they will be getting a healthy benefit. But if your district is comprised of school districts that are part of the 479 who are left out, you should vote against this bill since your citizens' tax dollars are being designated for just 21 school districts. As was mentioned just a moment ago, we used to have a funding formula to prevent this sort of thing from happening. It may not have been perfect, but it ensured that rational and established criteria were used to distribute school funding. After Governor Corbett took office, that funding formula was scuttled. Now we do not have a funding formula, but we have \$30 million worth of earmarks for 21 school districts. We are distributing school funding by earmark. This is the most blatantly arbitrary distribution of school funding in my tenure in the legislature.

Let us look at the specifics. Twelve categories were created and rules were written so only 21 handpicked school districts could meet the criteria. For example, there is a rural school district category, but only one school district qualifies as a rural school district. Pennsylvania is the most rural State in the nation, but we only have one rural school district under this formula. There is a small school district category, but there is only one school district that meets the definition of a "small school district" in this bill. Pennsylvania has 500 school districts, but we only have one small school district. There is a category entitled "personal income supplement," and five separate criteria are applied so that only two school districts qualify for those funds.

So there it is. We are down to picking a select group of school districts and writing language to ensure that those districts get additional money while the remaining school districts are left out. I cannot support that arbitrary approach, and I urge my colleagues, particularly those who represent the vast stretch of Pennsylvania left out of this scheme, to also vote "no." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the lady from Monroe County, Mrs. Rosemary Brown.

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

I would like to submit my comments for the record on HB 1141.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the lady.

Mrs. R. BROWN submitted the following remarks for the Legislative Journal:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I fully support the increase in our basic education funding included in our fiscal year 2013-14 budget, and I thank this legislature for dedicating more State education dollars than ever before to support our children. However, Mr. Speaker, I am extremely concerned about the funding formula utilized to distribute these funds to our schools throughout Pennsylvania and the districts located within Monroe and Pike Counties. A hold-harmless provision does not best utilize these funds, and I also question the distribution of additional funds that were utilized in this formula. As a component and piece of the puzzle for our school tax situation in Monroe/Pike Counties, it is crucial that I ensure that the distribution of education funds is fairly distributed throughout the State, and even more so throughout the local districts within Monroe the Pike Counties.

For this reason I cannot support the Education Code/HB 1141. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Adams County, Mr. Tallman.

Mr. TALLMAN. Mr. Speaker, just real quickly.

The gentleman from Mercer County and the previous gentleman both made legitimate comments. Having been on a school board in 1991 when we changed the school funding formula, it really went bad. However, in 1141, we are actually addressing some of those inequities by taking student population and aid ratio, which are very important to my school districts.

So I urge a positive vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate?

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

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in past years I have stood and talked about the fact that we do not have a funding formula in Pennsylvania, and school district after school district has been shortchanged. In most cases, rural school districts in this State – and I have cited them numerous times – cut \$25,000 per classroom in the last 2 years and again this year. And in some cases, the wealthiest school districts in this State cut less than \$1,000 per classroom, and the same applies again this year.

Now, the ironic thing is that my school district actually fares pretty well in this year's distribution, not because there is a fair formula, but by the luck of the draw. That still does not make this legislation right, because they can just as easily next year have the rug pulled out from under them.

Mr. Speaker, until we reestablish a sane, rational funding formula that takes into consideration the factors that we took into consideration for years in this State – the relative wealth of a district; the number of students in poverty; the number of kids on free and reduced lunch; the number of kids with English as a

second language; the small rural districts that had excessive overhead costs, not because they chose to have a lot of overhead, but because they were a tiny school district – until we have a formula that truly reflects that, we say to our school districts, you know what? You are at our will, and it is just willy-nilly as to whether or not you are going to get funded this year.

The other day in the debates we were told that nothing in the budget would affect anybody's school budget because they had already passed theirs, and that is correct in one sense. The lack of funding did not affect any school budgets this year, because they budgeted in the tax increases at the local level. They budgeted in the cuts to teachers. They budgeted in the costs for parents to have their kids participate in programs. They budgeted in the fact that there was not going to be an art class or a music class because they did not expect anything from the State. And so, if there happens to be a windfall, well, they will figure out how to restore one program or rehire one teacher, but that does not make it right.

And, Mr. Speaker, whether your district is getting \$12,000 or whether it is getting \$900, whether you are in a district that has extreme wealth where you can have low tax rates and generate millions and millions of dollars or whether you are in an impoverished district that has 30 or 40 or 50 percent of your properties tax-exempt that generate zero dollars toward school funding, is not taken into account in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is wrong. Whether you are getting a lot or whether you are getting a little, the reality is, it is wrong. I urge a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate?

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

Mr. KORTZ. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I promise to be brief.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to HB 1141. Last night we heard a lot of verbiage back and forth about cuts, no cuts, increases. Mr. Speaker, the fact is, when Governor Corbett came to office, this budget was cut nearly a billion dollars. It was cut out of education, and it hurt our children. It has hurt our school districts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do give credit to the majority Appropriations chair. He has added some money back over the last couple of years, and I thank you for that, sir. But, Mr. Speaker, there are still ramifications that have happened. We have had school buildings that have closed. We have had impacts to teachers being laid off. We have had property taxes increased. We have had programs cut to various schools. To back up my claims about the cuts, I am going to submit this spreadsheet for the record, sir, that details not only my school but all the schools in the State compared to the high-water mark of when Governor Rendell was here in his last budget as opposed to where we are at now. And also, the follow-up document, as far as a property tax increase, this was gleaned from Allegheny County Treasurer John Weinstein. We have had property tax increases in West Mifflin, McKeesport, South Allegheny and West Jefferson Hills, just last week, on Thursday, which I share with the gentleman from the 39th District. They raised their millage. We have also had some layoffs; none at TJ (West Jefferson Hills), though.

I also have the information for other schools in the 39th, Elizabeth Forward and Clairton. They have both had property tax increases and layoffs. And the schools in the 40th District, Bethel Park and Upper St. Clair, have likewise had millage increases in their property taxes. I will submit this for the record.

I would urge a "no" vote. Thank you, sir.

GRAPHS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mr. KORTZ submitted graphs for the Legislative Journal.

(For graphs, see Appendix.)

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to try and keep this short, especially in light of the fact that we have lost a real champion for education, and that was the Honorable William Herbert Gray III, who was celebrated by this House but dedicated his life to giving kids an opportunity. And so, Mr. Speaker, within the context of this Public School Code, and in the interest of time, I am just going to take a few minutes to kind of zero in on a real glaring part of this proposal.

In 2002 Governor Schweiker took over the Philadelphia School District. When the Governor took over the school district, they put in place a five-member commission that is commonly referred to as the "School Reform Commission." Of the five people that make up the School Reform Commission, three of those people are appointed by the Governor, talk directly with the Governor. In fact, one of the three members that Governor Corbett has placed on the School Reform Commission is a former Secretary of Public Welfare for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. All three of his people are very good people. I have the utmost faith and confidence in their skills and their abilities.

But, Mr. Speaker, the House is being asked, the House is being asked to empower, empower this body to negotiate agreements between the School Reform Commission and the School District of Philadelphia. The School Reform Commission has the legal authority to identify and secure cost savings, identify and secure good talent for managing the day-to-day affairs of the school district, and make the kinds of decisions that are necessary to put the Philadelphia School District on the right footing. And, Mr. Speaker, the School Reform Commission has failed to do that, so now the General Assembly is being asked to do that through this proposal that has been articulated as a \$140 million bailout for Philadelphia County.

Once again we are putting Philadelphia against other school districts as though Philadelphia is isolated from 24 other school districts in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. They are facing major problems, and the major problems can be articulated very simply. If you want kids to provide Cadillac performance in their academics, in their attendance, in their growth and development, then you cannot do it with Volkswagen dollars. You cannot spend a couple dollars and get excellence in the end. There is not enough money in the Public School Code and

in the budget to deal with the academic attendance, infrastructure, and material needs of kids in Philadelphia.

There is not one person that I know of in this body that can tell me how the School Code and the budget are going to give the city of Philadelphia \$140 million. The numbers in the budget and as articulated in the Public School Code are speculative, unsustainable, and tantamount to voodoo, when you try to put the numbers together. Stevie Wonder could see what is going on in this Public School Code. If Ray Charles was living, he would see what is going on in this Public School Code. It gives you the hope of tomorrow without the tools to make tomorrow a reality for kids.

There is nothing in the \$140 million that says that the 3700 workers of the school district that have received pink slips, that their jobs will be restored. There is nothing in the \$140 million that provides any guarantees that the kids that are without books, that are without infrastructure to take advantage of technology, kids that are attending schools with deteriorating buildings, there is nothing in this \$140 million that is going to guarantee that.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is not whether or not we still have stimulus money. The question is whether or not we still have enough compassion to give kids at least a running start that each and every one of us received at some point. We would not be here today, and I heard some people earlier talk about the excellent education that they received from the University of Pennsylvania. I received an excellent education from Temple University and David A. Clarke School of Law. I have heard people talk about the excellent education they have received from Lincoln University, but each and every one of the people that acknowledges that they received an excellent education, there are two facts that would stand out. Number one, your mom and your daddy did not have all the money that you needed. Somebody had to struggle and sacrifice in order for you to make it, and they could not sacrifice and make it possible for you and me to stand on the foundation that we stand on today if somebody did not come step up and help.

This beautiful State, this beautiful country that we live in, one of the reasons that makes democracy the best science in the world is because people have reached out to help one another. That is not articulated in HB 1141. Mr. Speaker, we cannot go back to Philadelphia, we cannot go back to York, we cannot go back to Erie – yes, we can go back to Erie and say to Erie, "We got you some more money." But, Mr. Speaker, more money is not what is needed, needed – let me underline – needed for the kids of Erie, Pennsylvania. We are still using outdated money to try to deal with modern-day needs, and I am kind of fed up. We keep talking about what people want without dealing with what they need. The kids need the best. They can only become a real global participating partner in this dream called life by making the right kind of investment, and you make the investments on the front end so that you do not have to spend on the end. We should not be debating on whether or not Head Start, early child care, K through 12, we should not be debating on whether we should spend \$5, \$10. We should talk about that being a priority for all of us.

Now, the Governor says that the city will go out and borrow money. Well, by the time they borrow money, they are going to end up having to come up with more money to pay off that debt. The \$120 million that is supposed to be available from part of the sales tax, it would not happen until 2014-15, not '13-'14. The district says that they need \$304 million today – today – in order

to guarantee a halfway decent education for this year. So that \$120 million is speculative, prospective, and not sustainable, because the mayor has been spending that \$120 million of the sales tax. What is he going to do now? Now that we redirected, how is he going to make up the shortfall? This bill, HB 1141, represents as an unfunded, unattainable mandate that is going to leave local municipalities, local school districts, having to rob from Peter to pay for Paul, and at the end of the day, our kids get left out.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to close with, the game is lame. The game is lame. We cannot go back and guarantee anything. We cannot guarantee anything. We cannot take these numbers and articulate it in a way that it makes sense, and because we cannot express it in a way that gives these kids hope, real hope about tomorrow— Yes, yes, Philadelphia does have the most money, but Philadelphia County is still the only number one county in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. There are 133 different languages in the Philadelphia School District. There are 180-some thousand kids, 70 percent of them on fixed incomes. Should we say no because they are poor? Should we say no because they come from urban Pennsylvania? Should we say no because they might not have the background that we have? No. I think that that is an opportunity for us to step up to the plate.

And HB 1141 and its subsequent bills, because the Fiscal Code, the Tax Code, they are all out of line and without any real, real, real opportunity. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate?

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

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

I know the hour is getting late and people are interested in getting out of here, but they are also very interested in hearing some facts and figures. I would like to first speak to the point the gentleman from Montgomery County – and I would like everybody to listen to this, because I remember when I came up here about 20 years ago, the number one issue in my district was distribution of State money for public education. And I remember standing at a mike somewhere in here and complaining about how much money Springfield School District, Marple Newtown School District, and at that time I represented a section in Upper Darby. And there was a gentleman who was the chairman of the Appropriations Committee at that time, was from Philadelphia, and we would go back and forth a little bit, and I would show him how little these school districts received and he would explain to me that the distribution of State funds is based upon the wealth of the district, the per capita of the district, the market value of the homes.

Now, there is no way that I can complain about the amount of money that my school districts are complaining when I take a ride around the entire Commonwealth and see the poverty that exists in some of our rural areas and some of our urban areas. I agree with the gentleman from Montgomery County that this hold-harmless issue needs to be dealt with. We need to deal with this issue, but this hold-harmless issue has been around for decades. I do not want anyone who has been new to this General Assembly to think that this is a new issue. This issue has been around for decades. There are many school districts in the Commonwealth that benefit tremendously by the hold-harmless, and it is normally the poorer school districts.

Now, if you think the problem exists now with this formula, if we take away that hold-harmless or we just eliminate it and distribute per pupil, we would have to come up with some other supplement to balance it out.

Now, I just took a look at my own school districts, and I think Marple Newtown gets about \$700 per pupil, Radnor gets 500-some dollars per pupil, Springfield gets about \$800 per pupil. And there are school districts in my own county, and Delaware County is a very small geographic county, very populated but very small. And the poorer school districts in our own county receive as much as \$8,000 per pupil. But there is no question when you drive down the Blue Route in Delaware County that there is a big difference between Radnor School District and Chester Upland School District in the per capita and the market value of the homes. So the hold-harmless is a problem, but the distribution of those funds would have to be balanced out in some other way, because I truly believe that the poorer school districts should receive more State funding than the richer school districts.

Now, the gentleman from Philadelphia that spoke before me, the School District of Philadelphia is receiving \$1.3 billion this year. They receive an additional \$30 million on this bill, \$30 million more in this bill. They have about 18 percent of the total school population of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. They receive about 20 percent of the State funding. Now, we have a couple other bills tonight, and they are going to receive about \$45 million in the Fiscal Code. And that is money – and I explained that a little bit last night – that was money that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was going to send to Washington, DC, for errors that were made in the Department of Welfare over the last 20 years. That is money that we would not have had. That is money that would have gone to Washington, DC. A good Congressman from Philadelphia was able to negotiate that. We understand the immediate problem that the School District of Philadelphia has, a \$300 million hole, and we are asked to fill half of it. So they are getting \$30 million in this bill, \$45 million in the Fiscal Code. Then in the Tax Code, they are going to receive a 1-percent sales tax, and it is just a conversion from where the money is going now. I do not like the word "voodoo." This was something that was agreed to by folks in Philadelphia and folks in Harrisburg, trying to help out the School District of Philadelphia, trying to help out the 3500 people that just received their pink slips. Not voodoo, a negotiated settlement.

So please, Mr. Speaker, I know it is late and we have been here for 9, 10 straight days, but there is no voodoo mathematics going on here. We are trying to distribute the money to the poorest school districts and then to every school district, but we have to have accountability when we distribute this money, and I understand the administration put some accountability that will make sure that the School District of Philadelphia will be able to sustain the revenue that we are sending them.

And please remember, the amount that we are distributing in public education funds this year is the highest amount that has ever been distributed in the history of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Please, I urge you to vote for HB 1141. Thank you so much.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate?

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

Mr. D. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill for several reasons, but I will be brief on two. First, Mr. Speaker, is that the moratorium in PlanCon (planning and construction) is having major problems in my district in particular. I do not believe that it made sense to freeze projects that were in the middle of completion, that were designed with the understanding there would be State assistance, and now when millions of dollars have been spent to further that goal and further construction, for the State to renege on its promises for assistance at this time.

The second reason I object to this now is because of what I believe to be the inadequacy in the special education funding. While I am pleased to know that there is a commission currently reviewing this formula, I know that this current formula leads to unjust and leads to inequities throughout the State. The reality of it is, Mr. Speaker, you could take a child today who has a diagnosis for special education services, bring that child to different districts separated by not that far, and you will have the inability to give services that would match and would help that child. So the inequities exist that cause big problems throughout, and I do not believe that this formula in place will deal with that problem. The reality of it is that too many school districts in relation to special education are being forced and stuck in a situation where they are making decisions based on financial reasonings and not the needs of the children.

And the reality is that whether we are talking education cuts or funding that is flat for special education services, as well as those approved private schools who also are doing a lot of our special education work, the reality of it is that those children who are stuck in those situations without a better funding stream, a stronger special education commitment, are not just having a tough time moving forward; in many cases, they are moving back.

I urge a "no" on 1141. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate?

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

Mr. WHEATLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I apologize because I was originally not going to stand up and say anything. I was going to let this process roll. But I was listening to a prior speaker, the majority Appropriations chairman, and I wanted to bring up something that I know my good friends from Philadelphia probably want to say but cannot because they are trying to be nice with the majority party to help their children and their school district. But let us be clear: What is in this additional support for the city of Philadelphia and the School District of Philadelphia, from what I can see, the \$45 million that the State owed back to the Federal government, that is Federal money, right? That was money that we were going to pay to the Federal government, that the Congressman from Philadelphia worked to get. The ability for Philadelphians to loan themselves from a sales tax of their own citizenry or to aggressively go after delinquent taxes for their own citizenry, that is Philadelphians being able to save themselves. But the reality is, they came to the State looking for additional State revenues to help them.

Now, originally we talked about a phasing-out of some corporate taxes that some on the majority side said they would never stop that tax, but it has been stopped. And a part of that money is being used, but none of that money is being used to help save these children in this situation or other children across

the Commonwealth. So we need to be real with the citizenry and those residents in Philadelphia, and do not try to fool them as if the State is kicking in any real additional supports for them.

If we are going to really talk about the ways by which our educational system is suffering and wanting to save other districts from getting to the point that Philadelphia is in, then we really would talk about other emergency funding mechanisms that we have available, not new taxes. We can just ask some of our corporate friends to help pay for some emergency needs of our future, but if we are not willing to do that, then I guess we should be at least willing to help those citizens who want to help themselves.

So let us not act like we have come to their aid and their rescue as if the State has kicked in any real, meaningful support. We are basically allowing Philadelphians, who are already overtaxed, to basically help themselves. And I, for one, think it is a BS plan that should not go forward, and we should really go back to the drawing board and really provide additional, real supports for not only the children of Philadelphia, but all the children of the Commonwealth, so that we can actually help them meet our State standards.

So I am going to join with others who have said tonight, we should not be for this. We should vote "no," and we should really sit back down and really figure out how we save, help save not only the city of Philadelphia's school system, but many other school systems across this Commonwealth that are going to be and are currently faced with these financial challenges.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Dauphin County, Mr. Payne.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I sat here yesterday, and I sat here all day today like my colleagues, and I continually hear the cries that we need more money, need more money for the Philadelphia school system. Mr. Speaker, I represent a great district, and one of the schools in my district is the Derry Township School District, Hershey. They get \$605 per student. Let me repeat that: \$605 per student. That equates to .0415 percent of the basic education funding. You have to get out the microscope to find that percent. The Philadelphia school system gets \$4,889 per student, or 20 percent of the basic education funding, and I am supposed to sit here tonight and hear that Philadelphia needs more money, that I should put a vote up to give Philadelphia school systems more money.

In addition, the Appropriations chairman correctly said, there is \$45 million more in the Fiscal Code, \$30 million more in this bill than previously, and 1 percent in the Tax Code. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, more money is not going to solve the problem, but fairness in distribution to our children across the Commonwealth would go a long way in helping to solve my problem in my district.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker returns to leaves of absence and recognizes the minority whip, who— I apologize; the Speaker notes the presence of the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Sims, on the floor of the House. His name has been added back to the master roll call.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 1141 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—113

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

NAYS—89

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Day

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

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR F

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 993, PN 1157**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Public Welfare Code, changing the name of the Department of Public Welfare to the Department of Human Services; and providing for a transition period.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—137

Adolph	DiGirolamo	Killion	Parker
Aument	Donatucci	Kim	Pashinski
Barbin	English	Kinsey	Petrarca
Bishop	Evans	Kirkland	Petri
Bizzarro	Fabrizio	Kortz	Quinn
Boback	Farina	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Boyle, B.	Farry	Kula	Readshaw
Boyle, K.	Fee	Longietti	Reed
Bradford	Fleck	Maher	Reese
Briggs	Flynn	Mahoney	Roebuck
Brooks	Frankel	Markosek	Ross
Brown, V.	Freeman	Marshall	Rozzi
Brownlee	Gainey	Masser	Sabatina
Burns	Galloway	Matzie	Sainato
Caltagirone	Gergely	McCarter	Samuelson
Carroll	Gibbons	McGeehan	Santarsiero
Christiana	Godshall	McNeill	Scavello
Clay	Goodman	Mentzer	Schlossberg
Cohen	Greiner	Miccarelli	Schreiber
Conklin	Grell	Micozzie	Sims
Costa, D.	Hackett	Miller, D.	Snyder
Costa, P.	Haggerty	Milne	Stephens
Cruz	Haluska	Mirabito	Stevenson
Culver	Hanna	Miranda	Sturla
Cutler	Harhai	Molchany	Taylor
Daley, M.	Harkins	Mullery	Thomas
Daley, P.	Harper	Mundy	Turzai
Davidson	Harris, J.	Murt	Vereb
Davis	Hennessey	Mustio	Vitali

Dean	Hickernell	Neilson	Waters
Deasy	James	Neuman	Watson
DeLissio	Kampf	O'Brien	Wheatley
DeLuca	Kavulich	O'Neill	White
Denlinger	Keller, W.	Painter	Youngblood
Dermody			

NAYS—65

Baker	Gillespie	Mackenzie	Regan
Barrar	Gingrich	Major	Roae
Benninghoff	Grove	Maloney	Rock
Bloom	Hahn	Marsico	Saccone
Brown, R.	Harhart	McGinnis	Sankey
Causar	Harris, A.	Metcalfe	Saylor
Clymer	Heffley	Metzgar	Simmons
Corbin	Helm	Millard	Smith
Cox	Hess	Miller, R.	Sonney
Delozier	Kauffman	Moul	Stern
Dunbar	Keller, F.	Oberlander	Swanger
Ellis	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Tallman
Emrick	Knowles	Peifer	Tobash
Evankovich	Krieger	Pickett	Toepel
Everett	Lawrence	Pyle	Toohil
Gabler	Lucas	Rapp	Truitt
Gillen			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Day

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.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 10, PN 1322**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in safe schools, further providing for Office for Safe Schools and providing for allocation of certain appropriated funds.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

Mr. REGAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I support SB 10. I want to thank the chairman and the members of the House Appropriations Committee for adopting an amendment I authored to SB 10 to encourage more

utilization of appropriately trained officers within the context of the grant program provided for in this bill. I support SB 10 and the increase in grant funding connected to it in the general appropriations bill, which will provide our schools with the ability to hire additional officers and invest in appropriate training, security equipment, and violence prevention programs. This amendment is going to allow the Office for Safe Schools to stretch the grant funding further by encouraging, but not mandating, schools to utilize retired officers.

Mr. Speaker, shortly after being sworn into office, following the tragedy at Sandy Hook, I introduced legislation to provide for the hiring of appropriately trained retired officers in schools across the Commonwealth. I am pleased we have taken a small step in this direction with the adoption of my concept into the parameters of SB 10. I thank Senator Scarnati and his staff for working with me and the members of the Education Committee, and I encourage my fellow members to support the passage of SB 10, which I am sure will go a long way toward protecting our schools, our teachers, and our children.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—202

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

Deasy	Hickernell	Neilson	Toepel
DeLissio	James	Neuman	Toohil
DeLozier	Kampf	O'Brien	Truitt
DeLuca	Kauffman	O'Neill	Turzai
Denlinger	Kavulich	Oberlander	Vereb
Dermody	Keller, F.	Painter	Vitali
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Parker	Waters
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Pashinski	Watson
Dunbar	Killion	Payne	Wheatley
Ellis	Kim	Peifer	White
Emrick	Kinsey	Petrarca	Youngblood
English	Kirkland		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Day

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.

BILLS SIGNED BY SPEAKER

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

HB 82, PN 2154

An Act providing for actions for costs of care of seized animals.

HB 163, PN 2175

An Act amending the act of August 9, 1955 (P.L.323, No.130), known as The County Code, in prothonotary, clerks of courts, clerk of orphans' court, register of wills, recorder of deeds, further providing for how offices to be held.

HB 1141, PN 2200

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in preliminary provisions, further providing for the Special Education Funding Commission; in school finances, providing for reopening of school district annual budget and further providing for annual budget, additional or increased appropriations and transfer of funds; in grounds and buildings, further providing for limitation on new applications for Department of Education approval of public school building projects; in certification of teachers, further providing for disqualification and providing for professional educator discipline fee; in community colleges, further providing for financial program and reimbursement of payments; in community education councils, further providing for State funding; in school districts of the first class, providing for budget reports; and in reimbursements by Commonwealth and between school districts, providing for basic education funding for 2012-2013 school year and for payment on account of equipment purchased for area vocational-technical schools and school districts, further providing for payments to intermediate units and for special education payments to school districts; providing for assistance to school districts in financial recovery or financial watch status; further providing for Pennsylvania Accountability Grants; and providing for Distance Education Program.

HB 1190, PN 2090

An Act amending the act of July 19, 1979 (P.L.130, No.48), known as the Health Care Facilities Act, in licensing of health care facilities, further providing for definitions, for administration, for licensure, for term and content of license and for reliance on accrediting agencies and Federal Government; and providing for reliance on national accreditation organizations for hospitals.

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

**MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR
HOT SHOT FIREFIGHTING CREW**

The SPEAKER. If I could have the members' attention. I would appreciate if you would take your seats. There have been two requests to make note of some tragedies and losses, a little bit ago. It was under unanimous consent, noting the loss of the Hot Shot firefighting crew out in Arizona and the loss of some brave and very talented firefighters. And it was the nation's biggest loss of firefighters in a wildfire in 80 years, and the deadliest single day for U.S. firefighters since September 11, 2001.

So at this moment I would like to ask each of us to rise in a moment of silence in prayer for the families and respect for these fallen firefighters. Members and all guests will please rise.

(A moment of silence was observed.)

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

**MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR
WILLIAM HERBERT GRAY III**

The SPEAKER. Additionally, as has been mentioned a couple of times on the floor today, a gentleman who was with us not more than a year ago, happened to be visiting the Capitol, and we had him here at the dais and allowed him to say hello, former Congressman William Herbert Gray III passed away.

He was born on August 20, 1941, and while I think a lot of us are familiar with some of his history, I just wanted to note – we did not have time to get to a formal resolution, given the timing and our time and schedule – he was born in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and he graduated from Simon Gratz High School in Philadelphia back in 1959. In 1972 he became the senior minister at Bright Hope Baptist Church in Philadelphia. In 1978 he was elected as a Democrat to represent Philadelphia in the United States House of Representatives. He represented Pennsylvania's 2d Congressional District until he resigned in 1991. He was also the first African-American to chair the House Budget Committee, and the first to serve as majority whip. From 1991 to 2004 Mr. Gray served as president of the United Negro College Fund.

He leaves behind a wife and three sons, and I am sure a lot of great memories for some of you who knew him very well personally, and a great leader in this country. Again, I would like members and all guests to please rise in a moment of silence in prayer for the family and in respect for Congressman Gray. Members and all guests will please rise.

(Whereupon, the members of the House and all visitors stood in a moment of silence in solemn respect to the memory of the Honorable William Herbert Gray III.)

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

STATEMENT BY MR. THOMAS

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Thomas, seeking recognition under unanimous consent relative to the passing of Congressman Gray?

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of time, I just wanted to kind of add something to a couple of things that you mentioned. Number one, the Honorable William Herbert Gray III was the first member of Congress to help bring an end to apartheid in South Africa. Number two, it was Bill Gray that President Bill Clinton called upon to bring an end to the conflict in Rwanda. And it was really a treat to watch Bill Gray, Congressman Gray, move groups to bring an end to that conflict in Washington, DC. I had the privilege of witnessing that. And I could just go on and on and on. The 30th Street Train Station in Philadelphia County was able to be brought into the 21st century because of William H. Gray III.

Just last year, 1 month away from celebrating a number of young people in my district, who against difficult odds in the face of crime, violence, drugs, domestic violence, all of it, shootings, they were able to achieve excellence in their education. It was last year this time that we were able to call on Congressman Gray to provide 35 of those young people with laptop computers to go on to college and continue their excellence in education. Education was changed completely; both public education, private education, and college education was changed by Congressman Gray.

And in closing, since we are dealing with this budget, there was not one year that Congressman Gray was head of the Budget Committee that they did not deliver a budget on time, and one that addressed the needs of all Americans rather than the wants of a few. That is one thing that stands out very brightly about Congressman Gray.

Without question, without question, he was my friend and my 21st-century giant. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

STATEMENT BY MR. EVANS

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Evans, under unanimous consent.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, also very appropriate, the President was just in Africa, and in terms of an individual who raised the consciousness of the wrongs that were taking place in South Africa, the Congressman was in the forefront of fighting against apartheid. He was someone who, in my view, was ahead of his time in terms of explaining to all America why it was important that apartheid was something that we as a country should not be supporting that government. And the Congressman was someone who would always bring that message home. I was someone who grew up – when the Congressman got elected in 1978, I got elected in 1980. And he

was someone who always taught a number of us: Dave Richardson, who used to be a member of this House; John F. White, Jr., who was a member of this House; Marian Tasco, who was not a member of this House, who worked for him. All of us were individuals who worked closely with him.

So he did not just set a tone for the 2d Congressional District, but he set a tone for the entire Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and this nation, and he will be missed. But if you knew anything about him, he lived life. He did not apologize about anything. He would speak his mind, and although he was a minister, you knew where Bill Gray stood, no matter if you agreed or disagreed with him.

So I thank the Speaker and my colleague, also, in the comments that he made. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

STATEMENT BY MS. BISHOP

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the lady from Philadelphia County, Ms. Bishop, under unanimous consent.

Ms. BISHOP. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would be remiss after all that has been said if I did not say that he was a supporter of women in politics, any number of women: Marian Tasco, Louise Williams Bishop, Shirley Kitchen, and a host of others. We knew that whenever we talked to Bill Gray – Congressman Bill Gray, Rev. Bill Gray – that if our perspective was right, he would be there for us. I would not be here today if it had not been for him. And when I felt a calling to come and get in politics, my idea was really the city of Philadelphia. I did not dream that I would ever be serving in the House of Representatives. It was he who directed me, and I feel, as most of us feel, that there is a void because a man like Bill Gray has been called to another assignment and to rest.

My last conversation, in trying to figure out why he resigned, we had only one conversation about that. He said, I have done most of what I have wanted to do. I have come to where I am, the second man from the President of the United States of America. I have served in Congress and helped to change laws there. I have worked with people like you and Marian Tasco and others to see to it that your dreams were being fulfilled. I have a family who needs me now, and I would like to spend the rest of my days with them.

Thank you for allowing me to make these comments.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the lady.

STATEMENT BY MS. YOUNGBLOOD

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the lady from Philadelphia County, Ms. Youngblood, under unanimous consent.

Ms. YOUNGBLOOD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When we had Bill Gray here last year, he stated to me that was one of the happiest days of his life, that he was honored and allowed to sit at the rostrum with the Speaker and have a conversation with him.

Bill Gray was not only a friend to me, but he was also a mentor. I always felt free to call him by cell phone if something was troubling me and ask him for advice in health. With him, you had to be straightforward with your questions, and he would give you sometimes an answer you did not want to hear.

I will miss him deeply as a friend and as a mentor, and I think this nation will mourn a very great man that has accomplished so many things that we hope our future generations can accomplish as well.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the lady.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR D

BILL ON CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS AS AMENDED

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to the following **HB 465, PN 2211**, as further amended by the House Rules Committee:

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, in tax for education, further providing for definitions, for exclusions from tax, for credit against tax, for licenses and for local receivers of use tax; providing for remote sales reports; providing for special taxing authority; in personal income tax, further providing for definitions, for classes of income and for taxability of partners; providing for tax treatment determined at partnership level and for tax imposed at partnership level; further providing for income of a Pennsylvania S Corporation, for income taxes imposed by other states and for operational provisions; providing for contributions for the Children's Trust Fund and for contributions for American Red Cross; further providing for general rule, for return of Pennsylvania S Corporation, for requirements concerning returns, notices, records and statements and for additions, penalties and fees; providing for citation authority; in corporate net income tax, further providing for definitions and for reports and payment of tax; in corporate stock and franchise tax, further providing for imposition and for expiration; in bank and trust company shares tax, further providing for imposition of tax, ascertainment of taxable amount and exclusion of United States obligations, for apportionment and for definitions; in realty transfer tax, further providing for definitions, for excluded transactions, for imposition of tax and for acquired company; providing for nonlicensed corporation pari-mutuel wagering tax; in film production tax credit, further providing for definitions, and for credit for qualified film production expenses; in educational opportunity scholarship tax credit, further providing for scholarships; repealing provisions relating to coal waste removal and ultraclean fuels tax credit; making an editorial change; in job creation tax credit, further providing for tax credits; providing for city revitalization and improvement zones, for mobile telecommunications broadband investment tax credit, for the Innovate in PA Program, for neighborhood improvement zones and for Keystone Special Development Zone program; in inheritance tax, further providing for transfers not subject to tax and for exemption for poverty; in inheritance tax, further providing for liabilities and for deductions not allowed; in procedure and administration, further providing for definitions and for petition for reassessment; providing for the Board of Finance and Revenue; further providing for review by the Board of Finance and Revenue; providing for a report concerning the significant changes in the structure and regulatory environment within the banking industry; and making related repeals.

On the question,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER. Moved by the gentleman, Mr. Turzai, that the House concur in the amendments.

The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate as amended by the House?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Mrs. Parker.

Mrs. PARKER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to comment on the portion of this Tax Code that relates to the School District of Philadelphia. Let me first note for the record that we are all aware of the fiscal crisis in the amount of the \$304 million structural deficit currently facing the School District of Philadelphia. So the sales tax enabling legislation contained in this Tax Code, which will eventually translate into \$120 million annually for the School District of Philadelphia, is desperately needed. There is no denying that fact. Our children, their future, and 3700 jobs depend on it.

However, I also want the record to reflect the math associated with the request for funding from the School District of Philadelphia, which, I might add, is governed by and the responsibility of the State via the School Reform Commission established by this body in 2001 in what is often referred to as the official "State takeover" of the Philadelphia public schools.

Now, as a matter of history, we should be reminded that in 1998 the General Assembly began preparing for an increased State role in the School District of Philadelphia by approving Act 46. The School Reform Commission was established in December 2001 via Act 83 of 2001, and it was passed October 2001 when the oversight of the school district shifted to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It replaced what was our school board. This was in response to the school district's financial difficulties. At the same time as the takeover, the General Assembly approved a new school funding package, and on December 21, 2001, then Secretary Charles Zogby of the Pennsylvania Department of Education signed a declaration of distress for the Philadelphia School District. This triggered the State takeover of the school district from the city of Philadelphia. The State of Pennsylvania formed the School Reform Commission to oversee the troubled public school system. For the record, the SRC is made up of five members; three of them are appointed by the Governor, two are appointed by the mayor, and the State Senate must confirm the nominees.

When we, along with the public, learned this year of the School District of Philadelphia's funding crisis, it asked for three different allocations of funding from government and labor to address its fiscal crisis. The amounts were \$120 million from the State, which governs the district; \$60 million from the local government, whose children are served by the system; and \$133 million from the teachers union in concessions, who work to teach the students, and those concessions should be negotiated through collective bargaining.

Now, working in partnership with local, State, and Federal elected officials, along with the business community, many people worked together to craft a plan that they believed would have addressed the school district's needs, and it was as follows: local government would create a \$2-per-pack cigarette tax in Philadelphia, generating immediately \$45 million, and in the '14-'15 fiscal year, the estimated amount of revenue to be generated was \$87 million. Now, this has already been passed by the city council of Philadelphia.

Next, we were to enhance the collection of delinquent property taxes in Philadelphia, which, I might add, was included in the tax fairness package that this chamber had the wisdom to already pass, and we passed those bills and we have sent them to the Senate where they await consideration, and they would generate \$28 million.

And then the 1-percent sales tax that is set to expire next year, that we as a city are attempting to do what many of us in this body do not ever think the city of Philadelphia has the

ability to do, and that is take care and make sure that our own fiscal house is in order. We had hoped to use that 1-percent sales tax to address the pension crisis that is draining, currently, \$613 million annually from the city's budget, but eventually, that \$120 million annually that would be generated for the school district and the balance of that would be dedicated to pensions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we do the math and we add up those numbers, that would have been a total of \$193 million in revenue for the school district – listen – generated solely on the back of local government, which also just attempted to fix a broken property tax assessment system known as AVI (Actual Value Initiative), where many of our residents have already seen their property assessments, in many instances, quadruple as a result of Philadelphia taking the responsibility of attempting to get its own fiscal house in order.

Now, from the State, Mr. Speaker, this is what we needed. We needed to simply give enabling authority to the city of Philadelphia to enact this cigarette tax. Now, for those of you who were reading the newspapers like I was early last week, early press accounts noted that this cigarette tax appeared to be on track. All of a sudden – and I do not want you all to laugh at me – a man by the name of Grover Norquist or Norquist or Norquise, whatever he is called, the last time – I just heard about him so please do not laugh at me. It is total ignorance. I just learned it – well, whomever he is, I do not believe that he is a taxpaying resident of the city of Philadelphia, but nevertheless, last week in the press when the cigarette tax was once on track, all of a sudden this Norquist, Norquise guy sends out a letter saying that the cigarette tax is a bad idea, and all of a sudden, the cigarette tax does not move. The next thing I know, it was dead. One person with that much power.

The next thing we needed was to pass the bills, as I mentioned, enabling Philadelphia to strengthen its delinquent property tax collections. Again, those bills await approval.

And then, Mr. Speaker, this is something that we have not said and we have read accounts of it in the newspaper from the Federal government, from the Obama administration, from the Obama administration and his Department of Health and Human Services, we needed them to forgive debt that Pennsylvania has owed to the Federal government for many years, and after lengthy negotiations eventually they did, and this resulted in the freeing up of \$45 mil—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentle lady suspend a minute.

I apologize, but I am not sure where the items that you are talking about are directly related to the subject of this Tax Code that is before us, and I would encourage you to focus your comments on the pros and cons of the bill before us, please.

Mrs. PARKER. Yes, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, I am doing my best to stay focused on the Philadelphia School District portion of the sales tax language that is included in the Tax Code, HB 465. And, Mr. Speaker, I am being as disciplined as I possibly can, and I thank you for the leeway you have just provided.

May I proceed, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The lady may proceed.

Mrs. PARKER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

After freeing up the \$45 million in one-time State funding, we must give credit where credit is due.

The SPEAKER. Well, I said you could proceed. I did not mean you could just keep going on into left field.

Mrs. PARKER. Oh, Well, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Seriously, I am teasing a little bit. Just try to get it to focus, keep it as tightly to that portion of the bill. I respect, you know, that that is important, and ask you to stay as focused on it as possible, please.

Mrs. PARKER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There are some people that we need to give credit to, Mr. Speaker. I note for the record that any and everything we accomplish in this body has to be done in a bipartisan manner, and in order to get this done and working with the Federal government to get the State money, we had to have our administration to work with Washington, and I am always one who always believed that we have to work in a bipartisan manner to accomplish success in this body. And with that in mind, I need to give kudos to two members of the Governor's staff: Zogby – not Zogby – Schultz and Aichele. Schultz and Aichele; I am sorry. Mr. Speaker, I am staying close, but Schultz and Aichele, Mr. Speaker, and I want to tell the truth. They worked extremely hard in negotiating the \$45 million in State funding that was freed up to be involved in this deal, and I want to say thank you to them for the record. In addition to that, it is David L. Cohen, Congressman Bob Brady, and Rob Wonderling of the chamber. They worked behind the scenes, and you would have thought they were elected and members of this body who could cast a vote, but they cannot.

With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the sales tax enabling legislation connected to funding for the School District of Philadelphia contained in HB 465, I do not personally believe that we did the best deal for Philly schools. We could have done and we should have done better to assist in this manner. I want to state for the record that there is not one elected official in this General Assembly in either chamber who can claim victory for Philly schools. We put a Band-Aid on a gunshot wound and are fostering a sense of dependency by not giving Philadelphia the authority to enact a recurring revenue source that the district can use, so when the \$45 million of new State money, when it runs out, we do not want them to have to come back to us, because we have heard your calls for Philadelphia to be self-sufficient, and we wanted you to give us the power to do such, and unfortunately, that did not occur.

So for the record, in my calculations I want to share my math as it relates to the language contained in HB 465: \$15.8 million from the State, \$45 million in one-time State funds. That is \$60.8 million in State funds, and \$45 million is going to disappear next year. In this bill, the sales tax language will – and do not be upset when I say this – the first year it is going to generate \$50 million in debt for the city of Philadelphia, but eventually we are going to get to the \$120 million that it will generate for the school district on an annual basis, and the \$28 million in delinquent tax collection, again, that is because this body had the wisdom to pass it and to give Philadelphia the tools it needed to collect that money. Mr. Speaker, that is \$138.8 million in local revenue.

Now, public education across the Commonwealth and the School District of Philadelphia, I believe they deserve a better deal and I think we can do better. The burden of funding public education in Philadelphia just got shifted to local government. I need to thank Mayor Nutter, Council President Darrell Clarke, State Senator Shirley Kitchen, Senator Williams, and Senator Hughes, because no one can say that all of us did not work around the clock.

To my members in this chamber from the Philly delegation, I need to say this to you, and I want you to listen to me and be clear: I need to thank you for holding firm and for your willingness to stay united in agreeing to cast whatever vote was necessary to generate the revenue that we needed to assist the School District of Philadelphia. Now, you all know I am not rich. I am the worst fundraiser in this building, so I do not have any money to sort of compete with what is going to be written in the press. But you know where you were and you know you held solid, and whatever tough vote we had to put up, you knew that we were ready to do it, and for that, all 26 of you and our 2 Republican friends – they know who they are – they are to be commended.

I need to say this, and it is in regards to the sales tax enabling legislation that is included in the Tax Code, which is HB 465. It is the future of children that we were talking about, children like Cherelle Parker, born to a single teenage mother, raised by her grandparents. Grandmother, domestic worker; for those of you in here who are too young to know what that means, that means my grandmother cleaned the houses of extremely wealthy people to take care of me. My grandfather was a Navy veteran, who was physically disabled and had a speech impediment, but both of them full of pride. I am a first-generation college graduate. Every statistic in this nation that relates to Black women right now says that I am supposed to be barefoot and pregnant with 100 kids by 100 different men, but my grandmother, she was a proud woman. She walked with her shoulders back, her head up; study hard, work hard, use education. That is the great equalizer.

To those rich nonprofits funding the effort to privatize public education in Philadelphia, I cannot raise enough money to beat you. I am the poorest fundraiser in this building. We are right on the issue. I have got Nikes, solid pure souls, will walk door by door and block by block, but you will not beat us, because every child born in the circumstances like Cherelle Parker, they are going to have a choice, and I am not going to stop until they do. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate as amended by the House?

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

Mr. VITALI. Do I have to be the next speaker?

The SPEAKER. It was a special spot just for you.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My staff brought to my attention a portion of this bill that first appeared in the Appropriations Committee yesterday that troubles me greatly. It is a provision that deals with the treatment of intangible drilling costs, and it is a tax break for drillers who are not paying the corporate net income tax. And if I can just find that; give me just a second. This is on page 16, line 4 through line 14, and this has been called by the PA Budget and Policy Center a pointless giveaway to the gas industry.

This amendment, it is a little technical, but it basically involves almost all drilling expenses and how they are amortized. Under current law, drilling expenses are amortized over the life of the well, which is about a 30-year period. This provision, if allowed to go into law, would allow a full third to be written off in year 1, with the rest written off over the next 10 years. It is a little arcane, but it, I am told, is a fairly

significant tax break for the drilling industry. It only deals with a write-off for personal income tax purposes, but as it turns out, according to the PA Budget and Policy Center with regard to 70 percent of wells drilled in Pennsylvania, they basically pay taxes through the personal income tax by setting up limited liability corporations, specialized partnerships, and so forth. So what this does, it really amounts to a tax break for drillers who are already evading the corporate net income tax.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of those last-minute things that seems to slip into budget after budget, and it is the type of thing that I think many of us came up here to stop – tax breaks slipped in for a special interest group at the last minute. This is the exact same thing, exact thing we have been charged with trying to stop by the constituents we represent.

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

Mr. VITALI. Therefore, I have introduced – I have prepared an amendment, amendment 3264, which cleanly excises that section of this bill. So at this point I would move to suspend the House rules for the immediate consideration of amendment 3264, which would delete this provision, and I ask you to support me in this motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Delaware County, Mr. Vitali, moves to suspend the rules for immediate consideration of amendment A03264.

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

The SPEAKER. On that motion, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Vitali.

Mr. VITALI. I am not going to argue the policy – I think I just did – but why would you suspend? What justification is there to suspend the rules? Well, that is the only way this amendment could actually succeed. This bill literally just came off the presses. At the start of this debate this bill was in print for mere minutes. This amendment was just completed during the impassioned speech of the previous speaker. This language was just approved yesterday in Appropriations. The justification for suspending the rules is that is the only way possible for us to really deal with this amendment and deal with this issue.

So I think we are fully justified in suspending the rules so we can get to the merits of the issue itself. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On the motion to suspend the rules, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask all the members to support the suspension of the rules.

The SPEAKER. On the motion, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Indiana County, Mr. Reed.

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

We would ask the members to oppose the motion to suspend the rules. The language that the suspension for the amendment would actually take out of the bill, all it merely does is puts small drilling companies in the same category of the benefits that large drilling companies already have in Pennsylvania, putting them in line with the Federal tax benefits by changing the amortization schedule for the drilling costs. It does not

actually create a difference in the amount that a company can amortize, costwise, and benefit from that amortization. It merely changes the amortization schedule.

We would ask the members to oppose the motion to suspend.

The SPEAKER. On the motion to suspend the rules, the only people, the members that are allowed to debate this are the floor leaders. I recognized the gentleman, Mr. Reed, in lieu of the majority leader, and of course the maker of the motion has had his opportunity to debate it.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—85

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

NAYS—117

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Day

Less than a majority of the members required by the rules having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the motion was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Northampton County, Mr. Freeman.

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, a section of HB 465 provides for a city revitalization and improvement zone or improvement zones. This, by and large, is a good concept and provides a tool to struggling communities in need of help. However, I am disappointed with the provisions of this concept, how it is structured. It is structured in such a way that some of Pennsylvania's neediest cities will not qualify to participate in this new city revitalization and improvement zone program. For instance, Act 47 communities, those distressed communities in our Commonwealth who are most in need, will not qualify to participate in this program, unless, of course, they happen to be in a home-rule county. Otherwise, those who are not are disqualified. Those who will qualify for this program, by and large, are deserving to participate, but those who are being excluded from this program, the neediest of our communities, should also have access to it in order to address their fiscal needs and their desire to rebuild their city economies.

There is also an additional provision in this section which causes me some concern. I do not believe we should be artificially setting a cutoff on the population of those third-class cities that could participate in this program, at least not those third-class cities that have somewhat of a substantial population. Yet in this legislation, any city that does not have 30,000 or more would, again, not be able to participate in this new program. There are many cities of some size of significance, such as my hometown of Easton which has 28,000 people, that would be able to utilize this program with great effect to help rebuild its own tax base and to spur economic development, and yet by this cutoff of population are excluded from this program.

Ironically, there is a pilot provision within the section which would allow a township or a borough of 7,000 or more to participate, yet cities of substantial populations that fall below the 30,000 threshold would be excluded.

We need to revisit this program at some point in the very near future to establish a more objective criterion as to which communities can participate in it and why they should. Such a criterion should include and recognize that communities with high percentages of tax-exempt property are the most at risk, the most vulnerable in our Commonwealth, and need this tool to help revitalize them. If one examines those municipalities that have slipped into Act 47 distressed status and looks at the percentage of tax-exempt properties within those municipal boundaries, one finds that they have a very high percentage of tax-exempt properties – cities like Harrisburg, where nearly

50 percent of the total assessed value of property is tax-exempt; Johnstown, Scranton, places like my hometown of Easton, where 27 percent of the total assessed value of property is tax-exempt, in large part due to the location of institutions that provide a very important purpose to the local economy and as a place of jobs, but because of their status do not pay real estate taxes, the lifeblood of any municipality's revenue stream.

In the case of Easton, we have Lafayette College, an outstanding institution of higher learning. We have the Northampton County Government Center. And we have numerous churches and nonprofit organizations – all good, good institutions that provide a lot in terms of the quality of life, but again, they do not provide anything in the form of real estate taxes to the city, and this is a problem in all of our Act 47 and high tax-exempt property municipalities.

So we need to refashion this section of this proposal at some point in the near future in order that we craft it in such a way that we can get this tool to those municipalities most in need. Through this process we have not done that, and it is a grave disappointment. But I am hoping in the near future we can reexamine this section, and in doing so, make sure that it reaches far more communities that are in need and can utilize this tool to help rebuild their economic base and their tax base as well.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate as amended by the House?

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

Mr. SCHREIBER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today just to speak very briefly in support of the city revitalization and improvement zone enabling legislation as part of this bill.

I represent the 95th District, which includes the city of York. York is one of the cities that will benefit tremendously from this legislation, and as seen in Allentown, where similar legislation has helped boast to date over \$500 million in new development, this is an excellent tool for Pennsylvania communities.

I would like to thank both Senators Smucker and Waugh and Representatives on both sides of the aisle in both chambers of this government who initiated this legislation in a bipartisan effort to support several cities in Pennsylvania, with York and Lancaster at the epicenter.

I am proud to say that today is the culmination of over a year of effort bringing this to fruition. As York city's economic and community development director, I worked alongside these Senators and Lancaster's mayor, Rick Gray, and my former boss, York's mayor, Kim Bracey, to support and move this forward, and its passage today will move our cities forward.

While our Pennsylvania cities cannot develop their way out of longtime systemic structural financial deficiencies, this is an excellent tool in the toolkit of local government. It will improve investor confidence in our city. It will lead to job creation and enhancement of the tax base. It will improve the quality of life and place of our city. It is an excellent economic development mechanism that will benefit several older communities and PA and should be extended to other cities throughout the Commonwealth in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you again to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both chambers of government, as well as the mayors of York and Lancaster and

several other cities for their participation in the development of this legislation. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate as amended by the House?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh County, Mr. Mackenzie.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As the prime sponsor of HB 465, I rise to support this important piece of legislation. It has two objectives. The first is to reform our Tax Code and make it more hospitable to job creators. The second is to provide the much-needed revenue for core functions of government, such as public safety and education. Oftentimes, these two things are talked about as being mutually exclusive; however, this bill accomplishes those two objectives.

When you look at the different elements of the bill that have been worked on by both the House and the Senate, we see that it does some important changes to the Tax Code. First off, it closes loopholes so that revenue that was being drained from our State is maintained here in Pennsylvania. With that revenue, we are allowed to make changes to the Tax Code such as eliminating the inheritance tax on small businesses. We also allow for a startup business deduction of \$5,000 in the first year a new business is established.

There are many other positive changes in the Tax Code that, again, make our State more hospitable to job creators, but it also makes that important investment in the future. In education, the bill increases the investment of dollars for our most struggling schools, and it also ensures that students will continue to be able to receive the educational opportunity scholarship credits even if the student's school or residence is removed from the low-achieving schools list.

Lastly, I want to talk about one of the things that is most important to me, and that is public safety and providing what is needed most for our volunteer responders. This bill will help volunteer fire companies and volunteer rescue companies across this State who are merging, consolidating, or selling assets by exempting them from the realty transfer tax. This is particularly important to me because a volunteer fire organization in my district was hit with a tax bill for \$15,000. That money could have gone towards public safety and it should have gone towards public safety. This bill will make sure that that type of tax grab does not happen in the future.

In short, this bill provides, again, for a more hospitable tax climate in Pennsylvania which will help job creators and it invests in the future. Those are two things that we can all get behind. And the Senate has already voted by a vote of 46 to 4, an overwhelming bipartisan majority, to support this bill, and I ask all members of our chamber on both sides of the aisle to get behind and support this important piece of legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. The bill will be over temporarily.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR E

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 591, PN 1326**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in preliminary provisions, further providing for method of payment and method of filing; in Department of Revenue, further providing for transmission of money; in agents for collection, further providing for corporate treasurers; in bonus and tax records, further providing for corporate loans and tax, for municipal loans and tax and for monthly statements by registers of wills; in collections other than by settlement, further providing for driver's license fees and for amounts payable to State institutions; in procedure for disbursement of money from State Treasury, providing for reimbursement for administrative costs; in Local Government Capital Project Loan Fund, further providing for assistance to municipalities; in special funds, further providing for funding and for transfer and providing for other grants; providing for additional special funds; in general budget implementation, providing for the Motor License Fund; in 2012-2013 budget implementation, further providing for the Department of Public Welfare; in 2012-2013 restrictions on appropriations, further providing for Veterans' Trust Fund; providing for 2013-2014 budget implementation; providing for 2013-2014 restrictions on appropriations for funds and accounts; in audits, further providing for Race Horse Development Funds; making an appropriation; and making related repeals.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the majority chairman of the Appropriations Committee just stand for brief interrogation?

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

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is not the biggest deal in the world, but there is an appropriation here. It is in section 1723-H, sub (2). It is a \$150,000 appropriation to be used for "independent research regarding natural gas drilling." It is to be diverted from the Department of Environmental Protection. It came in under your amendment today; it was your amendment today, amendment 3261. We have been trying to find out who this appropriation is to and what is it for, and we just cannot do it. We have asked staff, and I am just trying to figure out what this \$150,000 appropriation, who is getting it, and what is it for?

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is an appropriation that will be used by various universities across the Commonwealth to do research on the safety of drilling.

Mr. VITALI. So the \$150,000 figure, how was that arrived at? That seems very— Excuse me; that seems very vague. This amount is not targeted to a specific entity. Is that correct?

Mr. ADOLPH. The name of the organization is Pennsylvania SAFER (Shale Alliance for Energy Research).

Mr. VITALI. I am sorry; Pennsylvania—

Mr. ADOLPH. Pennsylvania SAFER.

Mr. VITALI. Got it. Okay. That concludes my interrogation. Thank you.

Mr. ADOLPH. You are more than welcome.

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

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Lawrence County, Mr. Sainato.

Mr. SAINATO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I look at this legislation and I have concern over this legislation. Fifty million dollars, \$50 million in this legislation is being taken, taken out of the Property Tax Relief Fund. That \$50 million is coming from Lawrence County in the form of the casino license. Another \$50 million will come from Philadelphia County. That money is supposed to be put in for property tax relief, property tax relief for all residents in all 500 school districts in Lawrence County. Now we are taking \$50 million from the application in Lawrence County, and 21 school districts are going to get \$30 million in special earmarks, as was pointed out earlier tonight. It is bad enough we are taking the \$50 million out of the casino money to go to cut everybody's property taxes. What makes it worse is the other 479 districts do not see any of that money. That, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, really is not fair. It is not fair because when we legalized casino slot revenue 9 years ago come July 4 – we are only 3 days from that – that money was supposed to be used for property tax relief for our residents. Now this year we find a way to use the money for the General Fund. That is why it needs to be in statute. It just disturbs me to see that money – we have waited a long time to get it there, now it is being used for earmarks, earmarks in the State for 21 school districts that just got lucky and hit the jackpot this year. For the other 479, unfortunately, you come up a loser on the machine.

So I will be voting "no" on this piece of legislation.

BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. SB 591 is over temporarily.

MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION UNDER RULES 21 AND 24

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves to proceed for the immediate consideration of HB 1075, PN 2203; HB 465, PN 2211; and SB 591, PN 1326.

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

The SPEAKER. On the motion to proceed, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all members to support the motion to proceed.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—189

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

NAYS—13

Cutler	Harhai	Metzgar	Sainato
Davidson	Longietti	Mullery	Samuelson
DeLuca	McCarter	Petrarca	Thomas
Grell			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Day

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

CONSIDERATION OF SB 591 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—104

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

NAYS—98

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Day

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

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR C CONTINUED

CONSIDERATION OF HB 1075 CONTINUED

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

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—108

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

NAYS—94

Barbin	DeLissio	Kim	Painter
Bishop	DeLuca	Kinsey	Parker
Bizzarro	Dermody	Kirkland	Pashinski
Boyle, B.	DiGirolamo	Kortz	Petrarca
Boyle, K.	Donatucci	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Bradford	Evans	Kula	Readshaw
Briggs	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roebuck
Brown, V.	Farina	Mahoney	Rozzi
Brownlee	Flynn	Markosek	Sabatina
Burns	Frankel	Matzie	Sainato
Caltagirone	Freeman	McCarter	Samuelson
Carroll	Gainey	McGeehan	Santarsiero
Clay	Galloway	McNeill	Schlossberg
Cohen	Gergely	Miller, D.	Schreiber
Conklin	Gibbons	Mirabito	Sims
Costa, D.	Goodman	Miranda	Snyder
Costa, P.	Haggerty	Molchany	Sturla
Cruz	Haluska	Mullery	Thomas
Daley, M.	Hanna	Mundy	Vitali

Daley, P.	Harhai	Neilson	Waters
Davidson	Harkins	Neuman	Wheatley
Davis	Harris, J.	O'Brien	White
Dean	Kavulich	O'Neill	Youngblood
Deasy	Keller, W.		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Day

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

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR D CONTINUED

CONSIDERATION OF HB 465 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—119

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

NAYS—83

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Day

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. If I could have the members' attention. Do not hold me to this, but I believe we are about finished. I do not think there are any more recorded votes, but do not run off just yet.

I have to make a housekeeping announcement. Through the summer they are going to be doing maintenance on the floor desks, and they will be cleaning them out and doing stuff, so take your personal things out of your desks on your way out. And when you take that cowbell out, do not bring it back. Well, go ahead and leave the cowbells in the desks. We will take care of that this summer, too.

STATEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. I guess if the Speaker is allowed a moment of unanimous consent, which I will never concede I have to do that, I did want to say something to you folks beyond I know everybody heads back to their districts, and while some people in the media and the public like to think that we are on vacation for the next couple months, I know that we all do a lot of work through the summer. And while we may take a day or two off here and there and go on a family vacation, there is a lot of hard work to be done and a lot of discussion among ourselves through the committees, as well as with constituents.

I did want to just say thank you to the members. We are a body of very diverse – we come here with a lot of diverse backgrounds and a lot of diversity within our districts, and in many respects, that is what makes Pennsylvania great. And we have had our moments in this place when we have gotten a little owly with each other and we have our, kind of, days that maybe were not our proudest moments, but I as Speaker and one who is charged with trying to maintain order, I just wanted to sincerely thank you all for your cooperation in terms of how we go through the process of debating issues that we hold deeply but differently. And you have made my job a lot easier through this cycle as we come to the end of the budget cycle, and I sincerely, sincerely want to thank you all for your cooperation in that regard.

God bless you all.

STATEMENT BY MAJORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Turzai.

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

I wish each and every one of the members a safe trip home, and thank you for your professionalism and your friendship. God bless.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. The lady from Philadelphia County, Ms. DeLissio, is recognized for remarks on the record. The lady may state her comment.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have remarks for the record for HB 1075.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the lady.

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

After we adjourn and over the next few days and weeks, you may go to the doctor, perhaps for an annual checkup or for a nagging pain or a summer cold. Perhaps on the way home from your district office you will stop at the pharmacy to pick up a prescription, or visit the dentist for one of the twice-yearly recommended dental cleanings. Or maybe, like me, you will schedule a long-overdue visit with your eye doctor.

If you engage in any of these activities over the summer, I hope you will reflect on the fact that we are adequately insured and that we voted earlier this evening to not extend health insurance to many of our constituents who are uninsured.

I will leave you with two thoughts: There but for the grace of God go I, and shame on us.

BILLS RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 198 and HB 1559 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Petri, from Bucks County, who moves that this House do now adjourn until Monday, September 23, 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 8:58 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.