

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2013

SESSION OF 2013

197TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 82

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

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

PRAYER

The SPEAKER. The prayer this morning will be offered by Rabbi Ron Muroff of Chisuk Emuna Congregation, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

RABBI RON MUROFF, Guest Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Ribono Shel Olam – master of the universe. You are known by many names. You are addressed in many languages. You are regularly invoked in this grand hall of the people of Pennsylvania, yet what is the half-life of an invocation? What remains after we raise our heads and open our eyes? What lingers after the religious leader leaves this chamber?

I pray that when the men and women elected to serve the people of this great Commonwealth gather here to do their critical work, the awareness of Your presence will inform and inspire them. May they be mindful that all of us were created in Your image, that true power does not belong to the people that serve here, and that we are here in this world not to destroy but to build, not to engage in conflict but to pursue peace. Many religions call upon us to love our neighbors as ourselves. Many religions call upon us to love You, O God. Two hundred years ago Rabbi Levi Yitzhak taught that whether a person really loves God can be determined by the love with which a person bears towards others. When issues come before this body, whether seemingly mundane or profoundly important, may the Representatives take to heart that their actions or inactions affect the lives of others.

O Father, may elected officials always be focused on what is best for Your children, especially the weakest and most needy amongst us. We sometimes imagine that the world is created between us and them, yet the truth is that whatever we have in common – that what we have in common is so far greater than whatever divides us. Whatever our titles or our stations in life, we are, in the words of Wavy Gravy, "...all bozos on the bus...."

Elizabeth Lesser writes, "Every single person on this bus called Earth hurts; it's when we have shame..., we feel an outcast, as if there is another bus somewhere, rolling along on a smooth road. Its passengers are all thin, healthy, happy,

well-dressed and well-liked people who belong to harmonious families, hold jobs that..." do not "...bore or aggravate them, and never do mean things, or goofy things like forget where they parked their car" or "lose their wallet, or say something totally inappropriate. We long to be on that bus with the other normal people."

"But we are on the bus that says BOZO on the front, and we worry that we may be the only passenger on board.

"It is wonderful to take your place on the bus with the other bozos. It may be the first step to enlightenment to understand...that the other bus – that sleek bus with the cool people who know where they are going – is also filled with bozos – bozos in drag; bozos with a secret. When we see clearly that every single human being, regardless of fame or fortune or age or brains or beauty, shares the same ordinary foibles, a strange thing happens. We begin to cheer up,...and we become as buoyant as those people we imagined on the other bus. As we rumble along the potholed road, lost as ever, through the valleys and over the hills, we find ourselves among friends. We sit back, and enjoy the ride."

And so in this spirit, with great respect, I express a sincere wish: May God bless all the bozos of this chamber and Commonwealth.

And what is the half-life of an invocation? It depends entirely on the conscience of each individual Representative. If Representatives live and act with integrity, may they be blessed with contentment and peace. If they do not, may their consciences challenge and even unsettle them.

There is a traditional Jewish blessing, friends, to be recited when encountering those in positions of political power, and so I conclude this invocation with these words: Baruch shenatan m'kvodo l'vasar v'dam – blessed is the one who has given from His glory to humans of flesh and blood, and let us say, Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Monday, December 16, 2013, will be postponed until printed.

HOUSE RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 583 By Representatives MOLCHANY, BROWNLEE, KORTZ, CALTAGIRONE, LUCAS, KINSEY, HENNESSEY, MILLARD, READSHAW, FRANKEL, COHEN, HAGGERTY, SNYDER, VEREB, YOUNGBLOOD, WHEATLEY, DIGIROLAMO, GIBBONS, MCNEILL, ROEBUCK, W. KELLER, GINGRICH, PAINTER, ROSS, WHITE, DEASY and FARINA

A Resolution recognizing the week of January 13 through 19, 2013, as "Emerald View Park Trail Week" in this Commonwealth to honor Mount Washington Community Development Corporation's Emerald View Park Program for demonstrating how people in a community can work together to improve the quality of life in their neighborhoods.

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, December 17, 2013.

No. 589 By Representatives BOBACK, KORTZ, WHEATLEY, LONGIETTI, HELM, D. COSTA, DAVIS, MURT, MASSER, PARKER, GINGRICH, THOMAS, COHEN, ROCK, MAHONEY and CALTAGIRONE

A Resolution directing the Joint State Government Commission to study youth leadership and community involvement and to establish an advisory committee to conduct a comprehensive survey of existing youth development and leadership programs in this Commonwealth; identify ways in which these programs currently collaborate with and involve youth in community services and activities; and develop recommendations for successful collaborations between youth-serving organizations and local communities.

Referred to Committee on CHILDREN AND YOUTH, December 17, 2013.

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:

SB 731, PN 1649

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for burglary, for robbery, for grading of theft offenses and for the offense of retail theft.

SB 1040, PN 1277

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

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

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

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

The Speaker recognizes the minority whip, who requests a leave of absence for the gentleman, Mr. CRUZ, from Philadelphia County for the day. Without objection, the leave will be granted.

MASTER ROLL CALL

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

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—200

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
Culver	Harkins	Mirabito	Stern
Daley, M.	Harper	Miranda	Stevenson
Daley, P.	Harris, A.	Molchany	Sturla
Davidson	Harris, J.	Moul	Swanger
Davis	Heffley	Mullery	Tallman
Day	Helm	Mundy	Taylor
Dean	Hennessey	Murt	Thomas
Deasy	Hickernell	Mustio	Tobash
DeLissio	James	Neilson	Toepel
Delozier	Kampf	Neuman	Toohil
DeLuca	Kauffman	O'Brien	Truitt
Denlinger	Kavulich	O'Neill	Turzai
Dermody	Keller, F.	Oberlander	Vereb
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Painter	Vitali
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Parker	Waters
Dunbar	Killion	Pashinski	Watson
Ellis	Kim	Payne	Wheatley
Emrick	Kinsey	Peifer	White
English	Kirkland	Petrarca	Youngblood

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Cruz Cutler

LEAVES ADDED—2

Daley, P. Wheatley

The SPEAKER. Two hundred members having voted on the master roll call, a quorum is present.

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

The House will come to order.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. If I could have the members' attention, I would appreciate it if you would hold the conversations down. If the members could hold the conversations down, I would appreciate your courtesy. I would like to introduce some of the guests that are with us today. Thank you.

Located to the left of the rostrum, I would like to welcome Jocelyn and Charles Schlegel, Representative Culver's niece and nephew. Will our guests please rise. Welcome to the hall of the House.

In the rear of the House, we would like to welcome Yiannis Mallios, who is shadowing Representative Grell for the day. Yiannis is a senior at Cedar Cliff High School and is currently serving as an intern with the Harrisburg Regional Chamber. Will our guest please rise; over by the left door. Welcome to the hall of the House.

Also in the rear of the House, we would like to welcome Representative Kim's intern, Beverly Taylor. Will our guest please rise; over by the door on the right. Welcome to the hall of the House.

Also in the rear of the House, we would like to welcome Jack and Lois Hill and Richard and Ruth Plaugher. They are here today as guests of Representative Lawrence. Will our guests please rise.

And we would like to welcome, as a guest of Representative Kinsey, Sfc. Jeffrey Moore. He is with the National Guard. Will our guest please rise. Welcome to the hall of the House, and thank you for your service to our country.

Located in the well of the House, I would like to welcome guest page Malik Daniels, and he is a guest of Representative Kinsey. Will our guest please rise. Welcome to the hall of the House.

And as a special guest of Representative Moul and Representative Readshaw, we would like to welcome James Robert Kirby and his wife, Beth. They are seated to the left of the rostrum. Mr. Kirby is retiring as superintendent of Gettysburg National Military Park. He has been employed by the Federal government for 40 years. Will our guests please rise. Welcome to the hall of the House.

STATEMENT BY MR. MOUL

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Adams County, Mr. Moul, under unanimous consent.

Mr. MOUL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to thank Superintendent Kirby and his wife, Beth, for coming today so that I can publicly, along with Representative Readshaw, can publicly say thank you for the service that you have devoted to Pennsylvania, our country, to the Gettysburg National Military Park.

This is a gentleman that came to us a few years ago as a superintendent with the Gettysburg 150th, not only the 150th anniversary of the battle but also Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, which we just celebrated, staring him straight in the face, and this man took a hold of the reins and made sure that everything came off without a hitch, cutting through a lot of the Federal red tape, and making our community and the anniversary a total success in Gettysburg. And I wanted to publicly thank Bob Kirby and his wife, Beth, and certainly wish him many, many happy and joyous years on his retirement. Thank you, Mr. Kirby. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

STATEMENT BY MR. READSHAW

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

Mr. READSHAW. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to say a few words today for retiring Superintendent Kirby. He has been, obviously, a friend, a partner. He has collaborated with myself and the Pennsylvania Gettysburg Monument Project. He has been, in fact, an advocate and participated in so many events that we have had.

We wish him the best. Hopefully, we can see him in the future, and thank you for being the guardian of the Gettysburg National Park, sir. You are indeed a true friend, and best wishes to you.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

**LOWER DAUPHIN HIGH SCHOOL
GIRLS FIELD HOCKEY TEAM PRESENTED**

The SPEAKER. We would like to invite Representatives Payne, Marsico, and Hickernell to the rostrum for the purpose of presenting a citation to the Lower Dauphin Girls Field Hockey Team.

The gentleman from Dauphin County, Mr. Payne, may proceed.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Representative Marsico, Representative Hickernell, and myself, we are pleased to stand here today and recognize and congratulate a group of young women who recently demonstrated athletic excellence at the highest level.

With us today are members of the Lower Dauphin High School Girls Field Hockey Team. These young athletes demonstrated the utmost confidence and abilities in winning the State championship. They won the 2013 Field Hockey PIAA Class AAA State Championship title and not for the first time but for the second time consecutively in a row. They won last year and this year.

Under the guidance of head coach Linda Kreiser, the Falcons strived towards their sixth overall State championship title, and they completed the regular season with a 25-and-1 record, clinching the top prize with a great win, 2 to 1, over Emmaus High School.

Joining me at the front of the House is the head coach, Linda Kreiser, who has 36 years of coaching at Lower Dauphin, more than 600 wins and 6 State titles. The team captains are Devyn, Delani, Taylor, and Maggie.

As you know very well, championship seasons are never solo accomplishments. It takes a team effort. Several of the players who received special honors for their abilities are in the rear of the House. They had Morgan Bitting, who was named to the Mid Penn Conference Keystone Division All-Stars, National Field Hockey Coaches Association Regional 1st Team. Mid Penn Conference Keystone Division All-Stars – Gini, Devyn, Abby, Taylor, and Anna were all on that team. In addition, the girls were selected to the Pennsylvania High School Field Hockey Coaches Association 1st Team.

These young women are tremendous sources of pride for the school and their community. And the mayor from Hummelstown is to my left, Brad Miller, to be referenced and recognized by the entire Borough of Hummelstown. Their excellence is not to be outdone.

At this time I would like the entire 2013 Lower Dauphin High School Championship Field Hockey Team, who is in the rear of the House, to please stand for their due recognition.

Again, on behalf of myself, Representative Marsico, and Representative Hickernell, ladies, we wish you continued success in future seasons, and we would like to see you back next year.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The House will come to order.

UNCONTESTED CALENDAR

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. PAINTER called up **HR 504, PN 2481**, entitled:

A Resolution commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of Alfred Bester, renowned science fiction author, on December 18, 2013.

* * *

Mr. KORTZ called up **HR 580, PN 2769**, entitled:

A Resolution commemorating the 110th anniversary of Orville and Wilbur Wright's first controlled, powered and sustained heavier-than-air human flight.

* * *

Mr. PAINTER called up **HR 587, PN 2810**, entitled:

A Resolution commemorating the 270th anniversary of the Augustus Lutheran Church building.

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolutions?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—200

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
Causer	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
Culver	Harkins	Mirabito	Stern
Daley, M.	Harper	Miranda	Stevenson
Daley, P.	Harris, A.	Molchaney	Sturla
Davidson	Harris, J.	Moul	Swanger
Davis	Heffley	Mullery	Tallman
Day	Helm	Mundy	Taylor
Dean	Hennessey	Murt	Thomas
Deasy	Hickernell	Mustio	Tobash
DeLissio	James	Neilson	Toepel
Delozier	Kampf	Neuman	Toohil
DeLuca	Kauffman	O'Brien	Truitt
Denlinger	Kavulich	O'Neill	Turzai
Dermody	Keller, F.	Oberlander	Vereb
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Painter	Vitali
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Parker	Waters
Dunbar	Killion	Pashinski	Watson
Ellis	Kim	Payne	Wheatley
Emrick	Kinsey	Peifer	White
English	Kirkland	Petrarca	Youngblood

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Cruz

Cutler

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

STATEMENTS BY MR. PAINTER

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery County, Mr. Painter, under unanimous consent relative to two of the resolutions that were just adopted.

Mr. PAINTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I would like to thank the House for its unanimous support of HR 504 honoring the author, Alfred Bester.

Tomorrow is the 100th anniversary of Alfred Bester's birth. He was born in New York City. He attended the University of Pennsylvania, where he was a member of the Philomathean Society and played football for the Penn Quakers.

Alfred Bester was a writer, who made a name for himself in several media. He wrote for comic books, he wrote for magazines, he wrote novels, he wrote radio and television scripts, and for many years was the editor of Holiday magazine, but he is most noted for his work in the field of science fiction.

Mr. Speaker, 60 years ago this year in 1953, Alfred Bester published his first science fiction novel, "The Demolished Man." Later that year, also 60 years ago, at the World Science Fiction Convention held in Philadelphia, "The Demolished Man" was awarded the first-ever Hugo Award, which is the most prestigious award in science fiction. "The Demolished Man" is a science fiction detective story crossover set in the 24th century in a world where telepathy is commonplace and poses the question, how does a man get away with murder in a world where privacy is obsolete?

Bester retired to Ottsville, Pennsylvania, where he passed away in 1987. Shortly after his death, he was named a "Grand Master" of science fiction by the Science Fiction and Fantasy Writers of America, a prestigious lifetime achievement award.

I think the science fiction writer, Harry Harrison, put it best when he said that "...Bester was one of the handful of writers who invented modern science fiction." He brought to the field a wit and sophistication it had not known before and remains a major influence in the field today.

Again, I thank the House for its support of this resolution, and I thank the Speaker.

Thank you again, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the House for its unanimous support of HR 587, and I would particularly like to thank my good friend and neighbor from Montgomery County for cosponsoring it with me.

This resolution marks the 270th anniversary of the Augustus Lutheran Church building in Trappe in Montgomery County. This is the oldest Lutheran church building in the new world that continuously and still operates as a home for a Lutheran congregation.

It was built in 1743 for the price of 200 pounds. Everything in the building is made of native Pennsylvania materials except the pulpit, which was imported from England. It was designed by Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, the famous Lutheran pastor who served three churches in southeastern Pennsylvania at that time.

It is worth noting, Mr. Speaker, that it is not just the church building, it is not just the congregation, but these churches operated at the time as immigrant resettlement agencies. Thousands of German immigrant families, mine included, were assisted when they arrived in Pennsylvania back in Colonial times. Henry Melchior Muhlenberg was an outspoken advocate on behalf of German immigrants and a harsh critic of those who would exploit them. Hundreds of thousands of Pennsylvanians

and Americans today, and myself included, owe a debt of gratitude to the church and the congregation for their work, and in offering this resolution it will be my small way of saying thank you.

The anniversary of this church is not just a milestone for a congregation, it is not just a milestone for Lutheranism in America, but it is a milestone for Pennsylvania history. It is a living piece of the Commonwealth's heritage.

And again, I thank the House for their support for this resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

UNCONTESTED SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A**RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35**

Mr. WATERS called up **HR 591, PN 2825**, entitled:

A Resolution celebrating the National Guard on its 377th birthday.

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

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. Pete DALEY, from Washington County. Without objection, the leave will be granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HR 591 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—199

Adolph	Evans	Kortz	Pickett
Aument	Everett	Kotik	Pyle
Baker	Fabrizio	Krieger	Quinn
Barbin	Farina	Kula	Rapp
Barrar	Farry	Lawrence	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Fee	Longiatti	Readshaw
Bishop	Fleck	Lucas	Reed
Bizzarro	Flynn	Mackenzie	Reese
Bloom	Frankel	Maher	Regan
Boback	Freeman	Mahoney	Roae
Boyle, B.	Gabler	Major	Rock
Boyle, K.	Gainey	Maloney	Roebuck
Bradford	Galloway	Markosek	Ross
Briggs	Gergely	Marshall	Rozzi
Brooks	Gibbons	Marsico	Sabatina
Brown, R.	Gillen	Masser	Sacccone
Brown, V.	Gillespie	Matzie	Sainato
Brownlee	Gingrich	McCarter	Samuelson
Burns	Godshall	McGeehan	Sankey
Caltagirone	Goodman	McGinnis	Santarsiero
Carroll	Greiner	McNeill	Saylor
Causar	Grell	Mentzer	Scavello
Christiana	Grove	Metcalfe	Schlossberg
Clay	Hackett	Metzgar	Schreiber
Clymer	Haggerty	Miccarelli	Simmons

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Cruz Cutler Daley, P.

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

STATEMENT BY MR. WATERS

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Mr. Waters, seeking recognition under unanimous consent?

The gentleman, Mr. Waters, is recognized under unanimous consent relative to the resolution just adopted.

Mr. WATERS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday, December 13, we celebrated the 377th birthday of the National Guard. The National Guard, as the organized militia of the United States, was born in Boston, Massachusetts, on December 13, 1636.

The guard consists of citizen soldiers and airmen that provide protection from natural disasters and other hazards, and it is the only military force shared by the Federal and State governments. This status of the National Guard as a State military force is rooted in our Constitution.

Benjamin Franklin founded the Pennsylvania National Guard when he formed the Associators Militia in Philadelphia in 1747, and our guardsmen are essential to the Commonwealth today.

When they are not deployed overseas, they serve in readiness centers, armories, and Air National Guard bases across Pennsylvania.

The National Guard plays a crucial role in the security of our nation and our State. When there is a disaster, be it natural or manmade, the guard is the backbone of our ability to respond. While the Federal government provides the bulk of the resources for the guard in the form of equipment, weapons, and

funding, the State provides the young men and women who risk and sometimes give their lives in service.

For the sacrifices that have been made to date and for the future sacrifices to be made, I ask you all to join in congratulating the members of the National Guard and the guardsmen across the country as they celebrate 377 years of existence.

And, Mr. Speaker, we do have a young man who is here today that came in with the gentleman from Philadelphia, Representative Kinsey. He has already been recognized, but he is Sfc. Jeffrey Moore of the National Guard, who is here with us, and I would like to ask if he would please stand as a representative of the fine men and women who serve us every day ready to assist. Thank you, Sergeant First Class Moore, for your work.

And I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank the members of this House for unanimously voting in favor of this resolution. Thank you.

CALENDAR

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mrs. PARKER called up **HR 517, PN 2534**, entitled:

A Resolution expressing condolences on the passing of Augusta "Gussie" Clark, former councilwoman of the City of Philadelphia and exemplary public servant who died on October 13, 2013.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

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

Mrs. PARKER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on October 13, 2013, God, in his infinite wisdom, saw fit to call home one of his loyal and faithful servants, who was none other than Philadelphia's own, the Honorable Augusta Alexander Clark, affectionately known to us as Gussie.

By all accounts, she was, in essence, a tenacious, trailblazing trendsetter who relished in her most important roles in life, that of being a loving wife to her husband, Leroi. For those of you who are here from Philadelphia who remember Leroi, you remember him introducing himself to people as Clark from North Philly; a mother to Adrienne and Mark; a grandmother to Ayanna, Ahmad, Chloe, Michael, and Troy; daughter-in-law Tracy Carter-Clark; a sister, aunt, and a mentor to many.

She was a fierce debater, a phenomenal orator, and she was one of the best trash-talking, wolf-ticket-selling pinochle and scrabble players that I knew.

Gussie was raised in Fairmount, West Virginia, by parents with strong Christian and work values. They instilled in her this thirst for learning, and when the people in West Virginia referred to Gussie and her two sisters, they called them, and I quote, Mr. Speaker, "those smart Alexander girls," and Gussie definitely lived up to that moniker.

She graduated from high school with honors, obtained a bachelor of science degree in business administration from West Virginia State College, a master's degree in library sciences from Drexel University, and this is my favorite, Mr. Speaker, a

law degree from Temple University that she started at the age of 39. She was a wife, she was a mother, and she was working full-time. And Gussie is quoted in articles as saying, people will come up to her and say, "Gussie Clark, why are you going to start law school at the age of 39? You will be 43 when you finish. Why are you starting so late?" Quick-witted, Gus said, "In 4 years I'm going to be 43 no matter what I do. So getting a law degree now should clearly be okay."

Spiritually grounded, she was a 50-year member of Bright Hope Baptist Church, and I know that there are some of you in this audience who are saying, wait a minute; Bright Hope Baptist Church, I heard of that famous church in Philadelphia. It is true. William H. Gray, Jr., was a mentor of Gussie Clark's, and the late Congressman, Rev. Dr. William H. Gray III, whom this body had the great honor and distinction of honoring recently, was to Gussie, as Bill Gray often referred to her, as she was his big sister, because Gussie actually used to babysit for Bill Gray.

You know her because you are active in government because she made history in the city of Philadelphia. In 1979 Gussie was elected a city council person at large in the city of Philadelphia. Now, while, for the record, she was the second African-American woman who was elected to city council at large – Dr. Ethel Allen was the first – Gussie was the first Democratic African-American woman ever elected to the city council of Philadelphia, and for those of you who knew her, you know Gussie Clark did not wear second of anything well.

Mr. Speaker, she was quick-witted, and I quickly wanted to share this story with you. It is a real story. Many of you know that before I was elected to become a member of this chamber, I started at the tender age of 17 as a staffer in the city council of Philadelphia. Gus was quick-witted and a fierce debater. There was a major issue before council and it was the shipyard deal, and Keller will remember the Kvaerner shipyard deal in Philadelphia. Well, the city council members of that company, along with members of the administration, the Rendell administration at that time, came before council because they needed council's vote in order for the shipyard deal to get passed, and during the interrogation, Gussie was asking questions of this company and the administration about the role of women and minority participation and the overall economic impact that this deal was going to have on the city of Philadelphia. And the ladies will be pleased to note that in response to one of the representatives from the company saying, "We don't have all of the details regarding your issue etched in stone. You'll just have to trust us, trust us." Well, Mr. Speaker, in true Gussieism-like form, Gussie said, "Trust you? Trust you? Trust you is what a 16-year-old boy tells a 16-year-old girl on junior prom night, and I am elected to city council, and unless you get the details together, my vote is going to be a 'no' vote." The Rendell administration went back to their offices. They recessed the hearing. They came back and answered every question that Councilwoman Augusta Clark had on the record.

A staunch advocate for public education, she never, ever wavered. To walk with the Gray family, to walk with Presidents like Jimmy Carter, to be credentialed as an academic – a bachelor's, a master's, and a law degree – to be elected to public office as the second African-American woman, first Democratic African-American woman, it is possible that you can actually have your ego inflated and your brain can get big. But Gussie Clark was one of the very few in this business who had the ability to walk amongst the elite but stay in contact, in constant

contact with the people because she was about doing the people's business.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

Mrs. PARKER. I am proud today, Mr. Speaker, to recognize her family, who is here – Adrienne Mitchell, her daughter – and if you would please stand and remain standing until I finish introducing each of you – Mark Clark, her son; Tracy Carter-Clark, her daughter-in-law; her grandchildren, Ayanna, Ahmad, Chloe, Michael, and Troy; family friends, Emma Chappell; now she is Mark's mother-in-law, but some of you are saying, wait a minute; we heard that name, Emma Chappell. Yes, that is the Emma Chappell, the founder and former president of the only African-American-owned-and-operated African-American bank in the country and that was United Bank in Philadelphia; and Elton Andrews.

To the family, and I did not get a chance to say this to you during the funeral, thank you for sharing your mother with me. Thank you for sharing your mother with us. People do not know how tough it is to do the jobs that I, Gussie, and all of my colleagues do, but your family, your family suffers because time that you would be spending with them, you spend doing the people's business, and for that today I want to wholeheartedly say thank you.

To my colleagues, I want you to know that when we were focused on a bill during the budget process, we were talking about public education, and I had mentioned to you my humble beginnings. Well, one of the people who was actually responsible for making sure that I received a scholarship so that I could get an undergraduate educational opportunity was Councilwoman Augusta Clark. So to her grandchildren, I want you to remember this: You come from good stock. Your grandmother did not laugh if it was not funny, she did not scratch if it did not itch, and she did not dance if she did not like the song, and no matter where you go and what you do in life, you remember that you come from good stock.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask for a favorable vote.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—199

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

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Cruz Cutler Daley, P.

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

* * *

Ms. V. BROWN called up **HR 582, PN 2797**, entitled:

A Resolution honoring the life and expressing condolences upon the death of Nelson Mandela.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Speaker recognizes the lady from Philadelphia County, Ms. Vanessa Brown.

Ms. V. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and to my colleagues for your votes today to recognize the life of South African President Nelson Mandela.

Mr. Mandela was buried in his hometown of Qunu on Sunday, ending the official 10-day mourning period which began—

I am sorry; Mr. Speaker, could you ask for some silence in respect. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. I appreciate the members' attention.

The lady may proceed.

Ms. V. BROWN. Mr. Mandela was buried in his hometown, Qunu, on Sunday, ending the official 10-day mourning period which began when he died on the 5th of December.

Nelson Mandela has truly been an inspiration for all generations. He was courageous and a visionary, as well as a freedom fighter. Throughout his life he fostered racial reconciliation and taught us tolerance and forgiveness. He was an exceptional leader who was able to bring about transformative change by changing people's minds and hearts. He stepped forward after decades of imprisonment to help deliver democracy in a spirit of reconciliation working with his former captors without anger or emotion.

Following his release from prison in 1990, he continued his efforts to end Apartheid rule earning him his Nobel Peace Prize in 1993, which he shared with South Africa's last White President, F.W. de Klerk.

Last week nearly 100 world leaders, including Presidents Barack Obama, Bush, Clinton, and Carter, celebrated the life and legacy of Mr. Nelson Mandela. In his remarks President Obama described Mandela as the "last great liberator of the 20th century."

Madiba, the ancestral name Mr. Mandela was affectionately known by in his home country, like Dr. Martin Luther King, had made many sacrifices in order to gain equality for their people. Their lives are inspirational in the highest sense of the word.

I thank my colleagues again for supporting this resolution, and I encourage you to remember Mandela's life and the example he set while struggling to eradicate racism and inequality. I hope that Mandela's life will stand as a beacon for all of us who serve in this House. Mandela was this strong, he was this strong at a time when no one here that I can see with my eyes could have done what he had done. For 27 years of captivity, and not only him but his wife, Winnie, spent 400 days in solitary confinement for doing nothing but standing up for their rights, for doing nothing but standing up for equality for all of their people. They were willing to die for what they believed in, and I hope, I hope that today that by standing here in front of all of you, that you are inspired as you go through and you serve in this Commonwealth.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—199

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

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Cruz Cutler Daley, P.

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

STATEMENT BY MAJORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, Mr. Turzai.

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

I rise in support of the resolution sponsored by the good lady from Philadelphia, and I just wanted to say that for everybody who is for freedom, for equality, for the democratic process and recognizing how it can change individual lives, I salute this resolution for Nelson Mandela.

And I would just like to read a few lines. He was a South African antiapartheid revolutionary, politician, and philanthropist, who served as President of South Africa from 1994 to 1999. He was South Africa's first Black chief executive and the first elected in a fully representative democratic election. His government focused on dismantling the legacy of apartheid through tackling institutional racism, poverty, and inequality, and fostering racial reconciliation.

To be so noble after being imprisoned for 27 years, he was not vindictive, he did not seek reprisals. He sought to bring all people of all religions, race, ethnic origin together. He was a leader well beyond South Africa, a leader who was a true transformative figure, from revolutionary to unifying democratic leader. It is why the whole world mourns such a person who grew along the way and brought the rest of the world along with him.

Thank you for that great resolution, and I stood in support of it as did each and every one of the colleagues here today.

Thank you.

STATEMENT BY MR. MARKOSEK

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

Mr. MARKOSEK. On the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized under unanimous consent on the resolution just adopted.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Leader Dermody and our leadership team in the Democratic Caucus and all of the Democratic members, I first want to thank the gentlelady from Philadelphia for the wonderful tribute that she just made, and I would like to echo some of the comments also made by the majority leader about the great Nelson Mandela.

You know, when we talk about world figures, if we look in the last century or so, certainly since World War II, he stands as a shining star amongst the galaxy of folks who have actually made change, and I think the majority leader mentioned a transitional figure, a person who made significant change by what he did and what he stood for.

You know, about 20, 25 years ago there was a movie out. It was called "Gandhi." It was about the story of Mahatma Gandhi, and I cannot help but think in remembering the movie and the life of Gandhi and the things that he did and how similar the things that Nelson Mandela did in a very similar situation. He was ultimately fighting for freedom, something that we all here enjoy and often take for granted, and there are so many places in the world – South Africa was one of those places – where that simply was not the case.

So I think it is very appropriate that we stand here today and think about the life of Nelson Mandela, one of the great figures, world figures not only since World War II but perhaps in the last century, and he is a figure I think that we all can look up to and say we all would like to be like that, to ensure that freedom reigns for all people in all the world.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Delaware County, Mr. Adolph, for a committee announcement.

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

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

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

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

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

Ms. MAJOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to announce Republicans will caucus at 12:15. I would ask our Republican members to please report to our caucus room at 12:15. We would be prepared to come back on the floor at 1 p.m.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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 also caucus at 12:15. Democrats will caucus at 12:15. Thank you.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House stands in recess until 1 p.m., 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 452, PN 2823**

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the offense of criminal surveillance.

APPROPRIATIONS.**HB 490, PN 513**

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of August 5, 1941 (P.L.752, No.286), known as the Civil Service Act, further providing for powers and duties of director.

APPROPRIATIONS.**HB 587, PN 2773**

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in falsification and intimidation, further providing for the offense of impersonating a notary public or a holder of a professional or occupational license.

APPROPRIATIONS.**HB 1234, PN 1901**

By Rep. ADOLPH

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

APPROPRIATIONS.**HB 1271, PN 2774**

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act authorizing the release of all restrictions imposed by the Project 70 Act on a portion of certain lands situated in the Borough of Brentwood, Allegheny County, in exchange for the imposition of Project 70 restrictions on other lands owned by the Borough of Brentwood, Allegheny County.

APPROPRIATIONS.**HB 1411, PN 2824**

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act providing for the posting of annual financial reports for public school entities, for the convening of an advisory committee, for posting of final adopted budgets for public school entities and for the Department of Education's establishment of a searchable Internet website detailing certain information concerning receipts and expenditures by public school entities.

APPROPRIATIONS.**HB 1716, PN 2326**

By Rep. ADOLPH

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

APPROPRIATIONS.**HB 1725, PN 2822**

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act providing for school-to-work pilot programs; establishing the CareerBound Program; providing for a tax credit; and imposing powers and duties on the Department of Labor and Industry.

APPROPRIATIONS.**SB 1024, PN 1661**

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending Titles 18 (Crimes and Offenses) and 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in inchoate crimes, further providing for possession of firearm or other dangerous weapon in court facility; in arson, criminal mischief and other property destruction, further providing for arson and related offenses; in sentencing, further providing for sentences for second and subsequent offenses; and providing for sentencing for arson offenses and for sentences for arson of a historic resource.

APPROPRIATIONS.**CALENDAR CONTINUED****BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1816, PN 2615**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in certification of teachers, further providing for continuing professional development and for Pennsylvania School Leadership Standards.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 689, PN 677**, entitled:

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1878, PN 2777**, entitled:

An Act providing for Pennsylvania Workforce Investment Strategy Program, for Cooperative Workforce Investment Partnerships, for employee training programs and for Pennsylvania Workforce Investment Strategy Tax Credit; imposing duties on the Department of Community and Economic Development and the Department of Revenue; providing for carryover, carryback, refund and assignment, for pass-through entity, for administration, for limitation and for interim and annual reports.

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

RESOLUTIONS

Ms. V. BROWN called up **HR 57, PN 1919**, entitled:

A Resolution supporting youth tobacco prevention initiatives.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—199

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

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Cruz Cutler Daley, P.

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

* * *

Mr. SIMMONS called up **HR 571, PN 2726**, entitled:

A Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass and the President of the United States to sign the Marketplace Fairness Act of 2013 or a similar act to provide uniform measures for the collection of states' sales and use taxes.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—189

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

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

NAYS—10

Godshall	Metcalf	Petrarca	Roae
Keller, F.	Metzgar	Rapp	Saccone
McGinnis	Moul		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Cruz	Cutler	Daley, P.
------	--------	-----------

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

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (MATTHEW E. BAKER) PRESIDING

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1234, PN 1901**, entitled:

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

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the gentleman, Mr. Longiotti, is recognized. The gentleman may proceed when he is ready.

The members will please take your seats.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as we take up this very significant measure, I think it is appropriate that we discuss a few items. First of all, what is an appropriate size for our legislative body; secondly is the impact of this measure; thirdly is cost considerations; fourth is effectiveness; and fifth is public opinion.

Now, appropriate size. Let us talk about appropriate size. So when you look at Pennsylvania, there are 32 other States, 32 other States where State Representatives represent fewer constituents than we do, according to the National Conference of State Legislatures. We represent about 62,500 constituents each.

Now, we hear a lot in this chamber about run it like a business. Let us look at businesses. We would never say, for example, that Walmart should have the same number of customers as Joe's Department Store, or the same number of employees as Joe's Department Store, because Walmart has a lot more customers, right? We have 62,500 customers. It does not make any sense to compare the size of our legislature to Idaho, Rhode Island, Wyoming, and a bunch of other small States, and naturally they are going to have smaller bodies than we do. What is important to know is how many people we represent, and as I said, 32 other States' State Representatives represent fewer than we do. So the overall average, if you add up all the States together, divide it by 50, the overall average is 65,740, which is very close to our 62,500. If you eliminate the outliers, there are 5 States where State Representatives represent fewer than 10,000 people and there are 3 States where State Representatives represent more than 200,000 people. If you eliminate the outliers and average it out, it is 56,021, which is about 6,000 fewer than we represent.

What about the median point, the middle State? Massachusetts is at the median point. They are 25th. They represent 40,900 people, significantly less than we do in Pennsylvania. What about the modes? Statistics like to look at the mode. What is the most reoccurring number? Well, it happens to be that Pennsylvania is right around where the mode is. There are 5 States where State Representatives represent about from 62,500 to about 64,500. That is the mode. We are right there. Now, if we adopt this measure, we are going to shrink the legislature by 50 people. That is about a 25-percent cut, and that means with the current population of this State, we are going to increase our districts to 83,023 constituents. That puts us at a point where only 10 States have their State Representatives represent more people than we do, and of those 10 States, in 3 of those States – and I know this is a foreign concept to us, but in 3 of those 10, they have 2-member districts. In other words, in their legislative districts, there are two State Representatives that represent that district.

Now, according to Governing Magazine, in the last 100 years, the U.S. population has roughly tripled – no surprise to us – but the total number of legislative seats has remained the same. So as population grows, we are already representing more constituents than in past years.

So appropriate size? It looks like Pennsylvania is the appropriate size. No surprise that a couple years ago when the Speaker's Commission had a symposium and we all went over to the State Museum and we had a panel of experts, that panel of experts, who were not members of the legislature, mostly academicians, concluded that Pennsylvania was right-sized, that our legislature was the appropriate size. The numbers bear that out.

So let us talk about impact. What would the impact of this measure be? Tim Storey, who is a political analyst for the National Conference of State Legislatures, observed, "The legislature is the people's body, the branch where people are able to access policymakers at the highest level." We know that. We are the people's body.

Another group of analysts, Rosenthal, Loomis, and Hibbing, concluded in their analysis, "In districts under 50,000 or so, representatives can have personal contact with a sizable portion of" their "constituents." So we are the people that are closest to our constituents. We have regular contact with them. We understand what they think on important issues, and we serve their needs regularly. As our districts grow, we lose that contact.

Why do people say the United States Congress is out of touch? Why do they say that? I think in part because members of Congress represent 750,000 constituents. How can they – and we know this to be true – how often do you as a State legislator have contact with your member of Congress? How about the general public? They cannot touch people the way that we do. The average person has no contact with them. I do not think we want to emulate that model.

As we grow, we become more like Congress. It becomes too big to interact with our constituents, so it becomes about raising money and running ads on television, not about knocking on doors, talking to constituents, and learning what is important to them.

One of our colleagues from McKean County, his district already covers about 2500 square miles, 2500 square miles. That is larger than over half of the U.S. Congress districts. How much bigger do we want to make his district? How much more difficult do we want to make it for him to serve his constituents?

And what is the effect on small towns in rural Pennsylvania if we adopt this measure? Do they get further marginalized by these districts? Is it no wonder that groups like the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau oppose this legislation?

So what about cost? Well, the maker of the bill has himself said that it is really not about cost. He is not sure whether this measure would save much money, if any.

Yesterday we heard one of our colleagues talk about cost. The potential savings, and I say potential, the potential savings, as he stated, is 3 percent or less of the legislative budget, 3 percent. That is what we are talking about, not a whole lot. And I do not know about you, but I have no confidence that any of that money is going to get returned to the people of my district, and I think the same can be said to you about your districts, but we know that services will go down.

What about effectiveness? Does this make us a more effective body? You know, there have been a few State legislatures that have reduced their size, a few that have increased their size over the last couple decades. I have yet to see any study that indicates that this makes for an effective body, more effective body by reducing the legislature. The only thing that I can compare it to is our own bicameral system here. So we have 203 House members; we have 50 Senators. I have

checked the numbers. You probably have too. Year after year after year this chamber passes more legislation than the Senate. So they are 25 percent of our size. If that makes for a more effective body, they are not doing it legislatively.

And how about who takes care of constituents? We know that as House members, we are the ones that take care of constituents because they see us all the time. They come to House offices first. We serve them first. Senators do some constituent service, I will grant that, but by and large, the bulk of the people come to our offices. Does that make us more effective?

And who is more accessible? I would venture to say that most folks in this body are like me. If somebody calls my office and wants a meeting with me, they have that meeting usually within days, if not a week. When I get e-mails, I read those e-mails personally and I answer them personally. When I get phone calls, I answer those phone calls personally. When I get letters, I respond to those letters personally. Senators, a smaller body, they do not do that, I believe. They do not have the ability to do that. They have staff members. When average people come to meet in their office, a staff member meets with them. When e-mails come across, many of them go right to staff members who answer them, same with phone calls, same with letters. So who is more effective? Who is more accessible?

Now, do not get me wrong, my State Senator works very hard, but I can tell you, just as an example, this weekend I was at five events, not unusual. Usually I have more than that. It is the holiday season, so I was at five events. My State Senator was not at any of those events. Now, once again, I am not disparaging him. I know he has got a big district. He has got a lot of territory to cover. At each and every one of those events that I attended, I had more than one constituent come up to me to talk about where they were on an issue or what problem they had that they needed solved. So if we make this body larger, we cut down on our accessibility.

What about public opinion? I get it. If you conduct a poll today and ask, should we reduce the size of the legislature in Pennsylvania, the majority of Pennsylvanians will say yes. I understand that. I am a lawyer. They would say the same thing about lawyers. They say we have too many lawyers and we ought to get rid of lawyers, and I hear some applause there; I hear some applause there. But let me say this: When somebody needs help, they want a lawyer. When somebody needs help, they want a State Representative. I hear some applause there as well. We are not going to placate the appetite of the public to cut this legislature or the media that fuels that appetite, because guess what, Mr. Speaker? One hundred and fifty-three is not a cut enough. It will be 100, it will be 50, it will be 25, because that is public opinion, but when they need help, they come to us.

Now, my question to the body is, who is going to stand up for us, for our profession? If we do not have the courage to stand up for our own profession and say that we do hard work, that our work matters, that we have value, that we do not need to be reduced, who do you think is going to stand up and say that if we cannot stand up for ourselves?

Mr. Speaker, to me, this is a matter of self-respect. It is a matter of self-respect, and I refuse, I refuse to vote to cut the size of the legislature. I want to serve my people. I came here for a purpose. I know you came here for a purpose. Vote "no" on this measure. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Freeman, on final passage.

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for the prime sponsor of this proposal, the one that is before us today, but on this issue we have a difference of opinion. I know that in the eyes of many, reducing the size of the House is perceived as a reform measure. In reality, it will not achieve its hoped-for reforms and may very well result in a number of unintended negative consequences for our political process.

There are a number of very positive aspects to a House of 203 members that will be lost by reducing our number by 25 percent. With 203 members and small districts of roughly 62,000 people, we draw on a much more diverse group of people for our membership than do legislative bodies of a smaller size with larger districts. Oftentimes, being a State Representative is the first and only public office that any of us will hold. We come to this place fresh from our life experiences, not yet having attained the mantle of professional politician. I have served in this body for close to 28 years and I have had the pleasure of serving with steelworkers, educators, nurses, insurance salesmen, retail clerks, longshoremen, policemen, attorneys, social workers, farmers, and many, many other different occupations, people from all walks of life who bring to this place different perspectives and experiences that greatly enhance the legislative process and ensure broader outlooks and understandings of our society and of our Commonwealth. This is due in no small part to a large membership of 203 and to smaller districts. If we change that dynamic by creating a smaller House with larger districts, we lose that. A smaller membership with larger districts will inevitably result in career politicians winning out over the amateur candidate. It is the career politician with their name recognition, access to large campaign contributions, and big campaign war chests who will dominate the membership of this body. With a House of 203 with its smaller districts, money is less significant a factor. It is the personal door-to-door contact with the voter that matters the most in those races and can ensure the success of a less well-funded grassroots candidacy.

As legislators, small districts guarantee more face-to-face contact with constituents, which empowers the average citizen to have their concerns heard and to influence the votes of their Representative on policy matters. It is a simple but very real fact that a smaller legislative body with larger districts will diminish the possibilities of that direct contact with the public in those face-to-face encounters. One has only to look at the experience of our counterparts in the Senate who, try as they may, find it difficult to make every event in their larger districts. We have all been to meetings and events where our local Senator is forced to send a member of their staff to represent them because they have way too many commitments in larger districts. I am sure my experience as a legislator in this body is very similar to that of everyone here. I try to make every community event, every parade, every Eagle Scout Court of Honor. Constituents have easy access to me in my district office, and I encounter many of them as I go about my business in my hometown. That will change with larger districts. We will lose the accessibility that makes our position so important in State government. It is our easy accessibility to constituents that makes our role in the structure of State government so unique and so prized because we confer with the public directly, giving the public the best

avenue in State government to impact their feelings and thoughts, influence the process, and shape public policy through their contact with us.

A smaller House with bigger districts means more costly campaigns to get one's message out to the voters. More costly campaigns means more special interest money and influence in the legislative process, which narrows our perspective as a legislative body and diminishes the interest of the general public.

In many respects, we are the only element of State government that still practices what is known as retail politics. By that I mean door-to-door campaigning with direct voter contact. The other segments of State government – the Governor, statewide offices, and even the Senate – practice wholesale politics, where they connect with voters through advertising buys, direct mail, and media-driven events. We are the only branch of government that still connects with voters at the grassroots level in a one-on-one contact that is important to our democracy. That will be less and less likely with larger districts and an increased emphasis on wholesale politics.

The biggest argument that the proponents of this measure have made is that by reducing the size of our House by 50 members, we will save money. The reality is that the limited cost savings of 50 less members will be offset and lost by the need for more staff to serve its ever larger districts.

Larger districts will have unintended negative consequences on representation both in a geographic sense as rural districts will become overly large and difficult to service and in a policy context as our urban districts, made up largely of third-class cities and large boroughs, will see these constituencies swallowed up in bigger districts so that their special needs, their special concerns will get less attention as their influence in elections will be reduced. It is the rural and small-town citizens whose voice will be less likely to be heard in a smaller House with larger districts.

There needs to be one component of State government that is closest to the people and readily accessible. With 203 members, that is us. It is the small size of our districts, our 2-year terms of office, and the retail politics nature of our campaigns that ensures that. Let us not throw that away on a misguided notion of reform based on a smaller House.

I know that a 203 House has always been the bane of those in leadership. We are more deliberative in our process, our debates are more protracted, but our perspectives are broader as a result of it. It is often difficult for leaders to cobble together the 102 votes they need to pass a controversial measure. Leaders are frustrated by that factor, but that factor ensures that they have to work to make that happen. They have to earn those 102 votes by making the case for the policies they are promoting, and that, Mr. Speaker, is the way it should be in a legislative body.

Let us not alter the size of the one branch of State government that has the greatest contact with the people of Pennsylvania. Let us not cause the magical experience of the people's ability to access their Representatives to diminish in any way, shape, or form. Let us retain through the 203-member House the easy ability for constituents to personally express their view, their viewpoints, and have influence directly on the public policy process. If we reduce the size of the House by 50 members, we undercut that fact, and in so doing, we diminish the very essence of our role in State government and of effective representation in Pennsylvania State government.

I ask the House to please vote "no" on HB 1234.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Vitali, on final passage.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think the previous two speakers did an excellent job summarizing the arguments against this bill, and I also rise against this bill.

What I would like to do is perhaps augment some of those arguments with just a little bit more data. I think the first speaker mentioned that the Farm Bureau opposes this amendment, and in fact they do. There is an e-mail from Joel Rotz in September, which he says, and I will quote, he states the Farm Bureau's opposition and then he says, "Reduction in the number of legislative districts will have the practical effect of further eroding opportunities for access of rural constituents with their elected representative and for the representative to consider and advocate for the special needs of rural Pennsylvania. We urge a negative vote on HB 1234...." So the Farm Bureau opposes it, make no mistake about that.

And I think, you know, one of the issues particularly acute to rural areas is the geographic size of House districts and how this bill will change that. We have talked about how it will increase the number of people, but let us talk for a second about the size. Mr. Speaker, we took one district that looked particularly large on the map, House District 67, and we have discovered that that House district in its current form, representing, you know, one-two hundred third of the State, consists of 2,171 square miles. One legislative district right now is 2,171 square miles, and we did a little bit of a Google map search. It is about 80 miles to drive from one end to the other. So the problem with these rural areas is, if you think it is difficult to cover a district, to represent a district that takes 80 miles to cross, if you drop the legislature by a quarter, you are just exacerbating that problem. So there is really no mystery why the Farm Bureau and those who represent rural areas would have a problem with this.

We talked about cost savings. I mean, is this realistic? I just wanted to tighten up some figures I cited in yesterday's debate. There are approximately 80,000 State employees, 80,000 State employees. What cost savings really, in any realistic term, would there be for reducing that number by 50? We all know that is insignificant. We all know that is not the right approach to cost savings.

There are alternative approaches. I think it is very crucial, because of the arguments that the previous two members have mentioned, to have Representatives that people can actually interact with on a regular basis. My staff does a great job, as does the overwhelming majority of staffers here, and I do not mean this as a knock at them, but in the legislature right now, there are 2,600 legislative employees, 2,600 legislative employees. Now, no one should lose their job, but what I am suggesting is, if we had to do cutting, should the 50 people we cut be the front-line people in the legislature? I would suspect this is not the right approach.

Mr. Speaker, on the issue I think very well brought out by the first speaker, the size of each legislative district and the number of people we represent. I think the first speaker made the point that we are now around 32d or so as far as having the most population. If we enact this bill and it becomes law, the size of each of our legislative districts would expand to 83,000 people, 83,000 people, and there would only be, if that were the

case, 9 States in this union who represent more people, only 9 States. That is not what we want. It would be much better to represent fewer and fewer.

Mr. Speaker, it has been made mention that, yes, if you did a public-opinion poll, you know, the public may agree with this because they are sick of their legislators, they are sick of government, and I would suspect that the reason they are sick of government is because they are not responding to them. They are responding to the special interest groups. They are responding to the lobbyists in the hallways, they are responding to their campaign contributors, they are responding to all the people who give the big dollars, who give the million-dollar contributions, who shape this legislative process to their own benefit. You just look at the campaign contributions of the Marcellus Coalition or Students First PA PAC (political action committee) and how that shapes the legislative process. That's what people—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman please suspend.

For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Christiana, rise?

Mr. CHRISTIANA. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is far from the topic at hand, talking about campaign contributions, even naming some contributors. I think that is far from the substance of the bill, and I ask the Speaker to keep the gentleman on the topic of HB 1234. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Will the gentleman please focus on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. VITALI. Well, I clearly am on final passage, because one key point of this bill is how it will affect the influence of special interest group money, and I am certainly well within my rights to describe examples of how special interest group money is involved in this process. I do not get the gentleman's objection. There is no prohibition I know of in the House rules that prohibits me from citing examples—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman please suspend.

Mr. VITALI. —of the point I am trying to make.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman please suspend.

Please, let us get back to the debate on final passage of the bill in chief.

Mr. VITALI. Let me just summarize. If we really want to do right by the people we represent, we will direct our efforts to reducing the influence of special interest group money. If you pass this bill, you are increasing the influence of special interest group money.

Therefore, I ask for a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Thomas, on final passage.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, may I interrogate the author of the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Thomas, asks for a period of interrogation of the maker and he has agreed. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the appropriate question was to interrogate, but I am more interested in inquiry as opposed to interrogation.

First of all, let me thank you for stepping up to the plate and giving some real momentum to this conversation, because

I have been here long enough and have heard this conversation a couple times, but it has had no steam and no momentum. So I want to thank you for stepping up to the plate to move that conversation forward.

Let me also thank you for acknowledging up front that this is serious business. What is going to take place in HB 1234 is going to reshape the landscape of our understanding of a body politic in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. So to that end, I have a couple questions.

Number one, did you have a chance or the State Government Committee to hold public hearings around the State with respect to why this body politic should be comprised of 203 versus 153 members?

Mr. SMITH. The State Government Committee did not hold any hearings on this proposal this session. I know they did, because I remember testifying at least at one of them last session.

Mr. THOMAS. And, Mr. Speaker, were any one of those hearings or was that hearing in Philadelphia County?

Mr. SMITH. I do not recall exactly where any of the hearings were other than the one I attended, which was here in Harrisburg.

Mr. THOMAS. So, Mr. Speaker, to the best of your knowledge, other than what you have acknowledged, there have not been any hearings throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on this question.

In your proposal, and it might have changed, but I know the last time that I really took a look at it, you argued that the number of Representatives, House Representatives from Philadelphia County should be reduced from 25 to around 17 or 18. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH. The number of seats as a whole body would be reduced from 203 to 153 under this proposal, and the impact on any given county would be the same proportion across the State. So it is not that it would reduce the number of legislators from Philadelphia County any more than it would reduce proportionately the number from elsewhere around the State. It does not single out any one county by any stretch of the imagination.

Mr. THOMAS. So, Mr. Speaker, is it my understanding that reducing the legislature from 203 to 153 comes out to an average of losing 7 seats in 203 districts, or how is this going to occur?

Mr. SMITH. Essentially, because of the early 1960 Supreme Court ruling of one person, one vote, that every legislative seat, every Senate seat in the State governments, and every congressional seat at the national level should be approximately the same number of people, under that same premise, whether we were 100 members or 153 members or 500 members in Pennsylvania, each legislative district will still represent, more or less, the same number of people. So when you go from 203 to 153 under this proposal, it will be proportionately distributed. The loss of a legislator, if you will, will be proportionately divided across the State by virtue of the constitutional requirement of one person, one vote.

Mr. THOMAS. And so, Mr. Speaker, under that one person, one vote— Taking into consideration the basic requirements of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments, but let us talk about the 14th Amendment, for example. Right now there might be five to six legislative districts which have become or on their way to becoming minority-majority districts. So there are communities

that are completely underrepresented when you consider how legislative districts are drawn.

And so my question is, under your proposal how do you provide people of color and women assurances that they will be equally represented within this new scenario from 203 to 153?

Mr. SMITH. There is nothing about this proposal that undermines the constitutional requirements that currently exist. The ratio might change, but it does not undermine any – it in no way undermines their, you know, current status, their current rights to majority-minority districts. That will still be the same. The numbers will have changed, obviously, from 203 to 153, so there will be fewer people as legislators, but in terms of populations that would fall under that category, they would still have a proportionate representation within that 153 just as they have rights to that today.

Mr. THOMAS. And so, Mr. Speaker, it is your argument that if all legislative districts will grow from 63,000 to about 80,000, 90,000 people, is it arguable to conclude that if the responsibility to 62,000 people versus the responsibility to 83,000 or 85,000, it is going to be much different, correct?

Mr. SMITH. The responsibility would be the same, in my opinion.

Mr. THOMAS. But the capacity to adequately represent one population versus another. I mean, if the population now is 62,000 and we will be going to about 85,000, under your scenario does that not impact capacity?

Mr. SMITH. It may impact capacity, but I think when you look at Pennsylvania, the size of our legislature relative to our population, and when you do that comparison to many of the other States across this country, I do not think moving us to 153 legislators with roughly whatever it is, 85,000, 87,000 people per district, I do not think that puts us disproportionate to what other States have. And while it would say I guess you have a little more work to do, in a way of putting it, because you represent more people, but I do not think it changes that individual Representative's responsibilities to those people whether you represent 20,000, 50,000, or 100,000.

Mr. THOMAS. And so, Mr. Speaker, it is your feeling that if we take the legislative schedule for this year of which you presided over from January until December, we have spent a lot of time in session away from wives, away from children, and dealing with very tough issues. Now, in my case it would not apply because I am single. My twins' mother died when they were young, so I have had to raise my twin boys, but I know a lot of people here have wives, have little children, and have caretakers for other members of their families. And so I just wonder whether you think it is going to be possible to maintain those responsibilities by adding another 20,000 to 30,000 people to your district responsibility.

Mr. SMITH. It is my underlying contention and belief that we will do a better job if we are in the neighborhood of 153, and I sometimes said there is nothing magical about that per se other than it seemed doable, but it is my belief that one of the things that makes this body sometimes less productive than it could be is because we do not have the time to really understand the other person's perspective, the wide diversity of this State, the cultural differences that exist all across this State, just the nature of people in different communities who view the world a little differently. We may not always agree, but I believe that we will do a better job if there is a smaller number of us because we will have a better understanding of what the other person's problems

are or what their constituents' views are. And I believe that with a greater understanding, not necessarily agreement, but a greater level of understanding, that then the end product, in some cases the compromise, in some cases, you know, where you forge the majority in the House and the majority in the Senate, I believe that that product, the end product, which in our – you know, our primary job here is legislating – I believe the product will be of a higher quality. And as we understand the other legislators, we understand the other legislative districts better because we have a greater ability to communicate, to talk, to just get to know sometimes. I think we will be more efficient in that way and that the product of the law that we produce will be ultimately better and serve the people of Pennsylvania better, and that is the underlying reason I am standing here right now.

Mr. THOMAS. So, Mr. Speaker, it is your feeling that a smaller number, by getting rid of 50 members, that it will allow us to move closer to our strength, which is diversity. You are saying that a smaller number is able to better appreciate the 133 different languages in Philadelphia County or the agricultural spirit of Pennsylvania. So a smaller number would allow us to better understand those kinds of issues.

Mr. SMITH. I believe it will lead to a greater understanding, and with understanding, I believe we will find, you know, the unifying element that the majority will put forward as you go through the legislative process.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, Mr. Speaker, I just got a letter the other day from I think the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau opposing HB 1234, who believe that a smaller legislature would destroy the agricultural or the rural character of Pennsylvania. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH. That is their position. I think they are wrong. I believe when you look at the history of the legislature pre early sixties, at that point in time, before the one-person-one-vote ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court, every county in Pennsylvania had one legislator regardless of their population. The larger counties had some proportionate formula based on their population that said how many Representatives came from a Philadelphia County or a Westmoreland County or an Allegheny County, but every county in Pennsylvania had a legislator guaranteed. When the one-person-one-vote ruling came into place, that went away, and I would argue that it was at that point in time that, quote, "the rural voice" would have been somewhat diluted.

And I would also suggest that if you look at just population shifts over the last, you know, three or four decades, that the people of Pennsylvania have indirectly caused a shift away from how many rural legislators there are because of suburbia, and arguably, the move to suburbia has reduced the number of legislators from an urban area just because it is population-driven.

So the fact that there is— Hypothetically, if there are 203 of us elected here today and let us say, you know, 60 of those members come from, quote, "rural counties," so 60 as a ratio of 203. If you go to 153 members, that same ratio will still apply. But the idea that reducing the size somehow dilutes one group or another, I just do not think it is accurate because of the one person, one vote, which I believe changed the face of the legislature more than anything, especially in terms of rural versus urban representation in the legislature.

And secondly, the people of Pennsylvania have, like I said, indirectly changed the face of the legislature because now we have counties— Take like half of the counties in the southeast

were once quite rural, and now while they still have maybe a significant agricultural base in some of those southeast counties, they are more suburban by nature. Drive down the turnpike towards Philadelphia and you see, you know, what once were farm fields and now they are housing projects. A county like Westmoreland County still has a lot of agriculture but it is more and more suburban. Butler County would fall under that category. And I think anywhere you see the expansion of suburban populations, part of it is driven by people who have moved out of the urban area and part of it is just, you know, once rural areas that are now suburban. That has changed the ratio. If we are going to divide the votes in this place between the urban, suburban, and rural, that is what has changed that, not changing the number.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, we can agree that Pennsylvania – the top industry in Pennsylvania is still agriculture. In some places tourism might be number one, but for the most part, this is still an agricultural State.

So my question is, recognizing the seriousness of this and recognizing that it is going to alter the landscape of access to government – since we have this delegatory model in Pennsylvania – my question is, at any time have you or a State Government Committee or any other committee of the House sat down with the rural caucus of Pennsylvania? Have we talked to those farmers and the Farm Bureau and those people in rural Pennsylvania who feel as though they will be seriously impacted by this proposed change? Have we talked to them?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I think by most people's definition, the district I represent would be characterized as rural. And while I know some of my colleagues disagree – some of my colleagues from some of the rural areas disagree with this proposal, as far as I am concerned it has been discussed. Has there been a formal meeting? Perhaps no, but clearly I represent a rural district and I do not see this proposal as diluting the voice of rural Pennsylvania or diluting the voice of agriculture in this State government at all because of the proportionate nature of how the districts are developed, whether it is 203 or 153.

Mr. THOMAS. And I have faith in the fact that even in your own district, you have held electronic or direct town hall meetings around this issue?

Mr. SMITH. How I came to this was not a function of public opinion polling. I came to this as I observed how this place works, sometimes better, sometimes not so good. And as I identified earlier, my belief that is at the core of this proposal is that the product, the legislation that comes out of this body, will be of greater depth and understanding of the issues and the unique characteristics of Pennsylvania. It will be more respectful of that diverse nature of Pennsylvania by virtue of us having a better understanding. It is not driven by any kind of public opinion poll. That was not even a factor in this at all.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, again let me thank you for stepping up to the plate to move this conversation closer than history has permitted it in the past. And so I want to conclude my inquiry, I do not want to refer to it as interrogation, but I want to conclude my inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has concluded his inquiry and may proceed on final passage.

Mr. THOMAS. And let me speak on HB 1234.

If we believe that amending the Constitution, if we believe that it is time to get rid of 50 members of this lawmaking body,

if you believe that it is time to do that, without – and if you believe this is a serious process, then at a minimum we should have heard from the people that we represent. We should have, and with our growth in technology, we could have held electronic town hall meetings or we could have had direct town hall meetings. But if you agree that we need to do this without talking to the people who will be impacted by what we do, then you need to vote "yes."

But if you believe that the 62,000 people that you represent, that you represent them fairly, honestly, and with the best of what you have, then at a minimum you should talk to them before you engage in this redesign. And this is a redesign, numbers clearly indicate.

Montgomery County, which might be one of the most progressive counties in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and progressive because – not because of the titles and/or the salaries and/or the size of homes in Montgomery County, but Montgomery County is one of those counties where people talk to one another. And they are constantly engaging people on how can we make this experiment, democracy, the best that it can be? And in that context, Montgomery County is progressive. And this might be going on someplace else. This will interfere; this will interfere with the number of people representing Montgomery County.

In my own county, there are 133 different languages in Philadelphia County. We have a visible Latino, visible Asian, visible female, visible African-American community in Philadelphia County. We cannot walk around and act like they are not there and that we can only represent those that we can connect with. I would not advance a proposal without listening to those diverse communities of Philadelphia County.

We have a struggle right here in this legislature on the question of whether English should be the sole language of Pennsylvania. I mean, there are people who believe that regardless of where you came from, either you do what I want you to do or you cannot do anything. There is an attitudinal problem with HB 1234.

And I have had the luxury of watching the legislature from the executive side of the Commonwealth. I worked for the executive side of the Commonwealth and I did a good job, and part of my responsibility was to watch what was going on over here. And when I look back at those years, I am reminded of the situation where you did not have individual secretaries, you did not have research analysts, you did not have executive directors, you did not have attorneys. Everybody had to respond to a queue, a pool where they had to get their work done. And I remember the polls that were taken during that time. People were saying that we cannot get in touch with anybody. We cannot count on my Rep or my Senator to get back to me in a timely manner because you had to respond, when it came to the delivery of services, you had to respond to that pool that you were assigned to. You did not have any individualized support staff.

District offices, district offices, I believe when I came in here the minimum amount of money available for the operation of a district office was I think \$18,000, \$18,000. No medical benefits made available to district office staff. No real input in making that district office the best in the delivery of services. And I remember the cries that went out, and because of those cries, the responsibility – capacity was increased through additional staff, through district office staffing. Because like in my county, in Philadelphia County, I do not know how it is in

your county, but in my county nobody has district offices but State Reps and State Senators. There are no community-based council offices. There are no community-based Federal offices.

So when people walk into Curt Thomas's office, they have to come in my office to find out about city issues, about Federal issues, and about State issues. I am excited because I have a staff, I have staff that is able to connect with both local and Federal officials, and we work cooperatively in resolving many of our issues. And I could use some more support in expanding the capacity in the 181st Legislative District.

I was not satisfied with the outcome of the redistricting process, but I accepted it, primarily because my last 10 years I was the only member of this chamber that had to run in 10 wards or 10 different precincts, the only one. I literally had to service people from 500 to 5300, and in that 500 to 5300, part of my community involved folks who represented the highest level of people in poverty in America – not just in Pennsylvania, but in America. But also there was Northern Liberties, there was Yorktown, there was East Poplar, working communities, quality-of-life issues that people needed to deal with that had to deal with State government.

I mean, all of you know that on issues of motor vehicles, firearms, there are a number of issues, you have to come and get this legislature's approval before you can deal with some of those issues in your local communities. And so I know that because I have now gone down to 7 wards or precincts rather than 10, I know that my capacity to serve my constituents is going to be better, because I do not have to run from 500 to 5300 now, and I do not have to go through the structural changes in how that district was gerrymandered.

I got spanked in that last redistricting cycle, and I know I got spanked and I knew that I was spanked when it happened. But my position has always been, no matter where you put me, I am passionate about what I do and so I am always going to put forth my best.

But under HB 1234, this raises real questions about our capacity to serve eighty-three to eighty-five thousand people versus the 62,000 that we are representing today. HB 1234, the author argues that lesser means more, that we are more in touch with people if we are smaller than if we are larger.

And I argue and I say to the author, given the fact that our strongest, our strongest industry in Pennsylvania is our diversity. It is our diversity. And the beauty of it is, probably more than any other State in America, we are clearly the shining light of people who have come from many places across the world. We have all gotten here from different places, but now we are bound together. We are bound together. And we cannot afford to engage in any conduct that limits, interferes, or aggravates our capacity to be a voice and to represent the interests of the people that we represent. HB 1234 will not achieve that.

And at a minimum, at a minimum, at a minimum, we should not go down this road without talking to people, without talking to people. Communication is the sine qua non of progress. If people do not communicate, cooperate, willing to collaborate, and reach a consensus, we have no basis for conversation, and so we cannot go down this road without sitting down and talking to people.

And so I oppose HB 1234 and I ask you to join me in voting "no" on this until there has been a conversation with people that we represent on whether this is a road that we should go down and a conversation on how this is going to impact our capacity

to deliver services. I want to make Montgomery County duplicated all over the State and increased. We cannot afford to engage in conduct that would thwart the growth in places like Montgomery County, Bucks County, parts of Delaware County, and definitely Philadelphia County.

One of the things, I get a smile on my face on the weekends when I see all the traffic coming into Philadelphia. I mean, think about it for a moment. In the west, in the west this week Pittsburgh Steelers won. Last week Philadelphia Eagles won. The entertainment, the cultural entertainment, sports, the myriad of those assets in Philadelphia County makes Philadelphia County a great place. Let us do what we can do to support our commitment. It is almost a breach of trust to go down this road without having an honest conversation about where we are going. Thank you and God bless.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Saccone, on final passage.

Mr. SACCONI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is an issue of very high interest to my constituents, and in response to my good colleague from Philadelphia County, I would say I have had thousands and thousands of conversations with my constituents about this very topic, and that is one of the reasons why I took the time to try to find out for myself, you know, what is – it is an important issue in my area – what is it, what is the best way to deal with this? It is so important that we have to look at this topic objectively, look at the facts.

Pennsylvania labors under the second largest legislature in the country, behind New Hampshire's 424-seat, part-time legislature. So we have the largest full-time legislature in the United States, and we are certainly not the largest State, and our constituents know this. On that fact alone, they are suspicious and they think we should have a smaller legislature.

So I have spent the last almost 3 years now visiting some other State legislatures to see how they do it. I have visited 14 different State legislatures, a diverse set of them, to study our various systems, and talk to our colleagues in those legislatures and ask how it works in their State. And you have all had the chance to meet at least one of those colleagues because we had him here a couple weeks ago, Senator Sam McCann from the State of Illinois. He represents Abraham Lincoln's original district. We had him here as a guest to go over the 150th anniversary of the Gettysburg Address, but he was one of the colleagues I met when I visited the Illinois State legislature.

So I say we look at some of these neighbors of ours and compare ourselves to them. Let us start with Ohio.

Ohio is nearly equivalent to us in population. They are the seventh most populous State; we are the sixth most populous State. And they govern with a legislature – with a State House of 99 people in their State House. That is roughly, they represent roughly 120,000 people, residents per Representative. So a much smaller legislature, certainly not impossible for a State our size or near our size.

And when I visited that legislature, it was amazing just how it functioned. There was much less chaos, like we see on the floor here right now, much more sincere debate. Members listened quietly as other members spoke. They paid attention. They were polite. That was one of the first things I noticed when I came to this legislature. I was like, what is all the chaos going on? Is anybody even listening? Are we changing any minds when we come up here? But in their legislature of only

99, where there are so few people there, they actually listen to the debates. They actually listen to their colleagues.

You can also examine the State of Illinois, which is the fifth largest State by population, just ahead of us by about 100,000 people. Slightly larger than us in size – they are 55,000 square miles; we are 46,000 square miles. And yet they operate with 118 members in their State House, far fewer than us.

And then there is the State of New York, the third largest – third most populous State. Slightly larger than us in size also – New York has about 54,000 square miles as opposed to our 46,000 square miles. But they have 19 million people compared to our 12.7, yet they operate with 150 House members in a part-time legislature. So I ask you to compare those things.

For my rural colleagues who contend that a smaller legislature would hurt the rural districts, well, I represent a rural district too. I represent two counties; one is rural and one is suburban. And I would offer the example of the State of Montana.

I got to visit the Montana State legislature because my son was stationed out at Great Falls, Montana, so when I went out there to visit him, I made sure I made an appointment to go by the legislature and tour the legislature and talk to their Representatives. They are really an appropriate example of this rural-urban argument that we have. Montana is the fourth largest State by size, 147,000 square miles, but just under a million people in 56 counties. And a quarter of their population is concentrated in four cities, a very rural State. Yet they operate with 100 Representatives in their State House and 50 Senators. And I visited their legislature and I talked with their Senators and their Representatives, and they feel that rural Montana is well represented in that State – far bigger than ours, far bigger districts than ours, than ours would be, three times the size of our districts.

Now, other colleagues contend that Pennsylvania is a diverse State, they say. That is why, it is different. We are so diverse. Well, that is true. They are right. We are diverse. But it is interesting when you go to the other States and you talk to them, they say the same thing. They say, well, we are a diverse State too. We are very diverse; that is why we are so special. We are uniquely diverse.

Well, let us look at our neighbor again. Let us look at Ohio. They are a rural State, with concentrated populations in large areas such as Cleveland and Cincinnati. Or look at our neighbor Illinois, more populous than us, slightly bigger than ours. They are a rural State with a large concentration in Chicago and their surrounding counties. Yet both operate effectively with a smaller legislature, much smaller legislature than ours.

Now, some colleagues actually say, we should have a larger legislature. We are not just the right size, we should be bigger – the larger the better, voice of the people. But when you travel up to New Hampshire – remember I said the largest legislature in this country is New Hampshire's 424-seat legislature – when you travel up there, you learn that each legislator has a smaller voice. Imagine, there are 424 of us sitting here. They do not even have desks. They sit in what is like an auditorium, a school auditorium, all sitting there scrunched up with no desks. More people means you have a smaller voice. The leadership runs that legislature. Each individual legislator is almost neutered in such a large body as they have in New Hampshire.

Finally, my colleague from Delaware County, he touts the fact that the number we represent is small enough so that we can

each personally touch every constituent, and he is right. And he does that; I know that and I respect him for that. But I have done that too, because I have knocked on all those doors myself and that is how I talked to those people about why they are so concerned about the size of our legislature.

But under this bill, our districts would remain about the size, still reachable by a Representative that is willing to work at it. Some of us already represent districts nearly that size, in the 70,000s, because of the discombobulation of the redistricting. It is not much difference really, those few numbers, to represent a few more.

There is nothing magical about the number 203. As we learned last year when we had that symposium across the street, that number was arbitrary. What we can safely say is that an effective number lies, when you study this and you study all the other State legislatures, you can say an effective number for any State lies somewhere between 100 and 175.

Now, we can learn from Ohio and Illinois and New York and many other States, but we do not have to be them; I understand that. We are Pennsylvania. We want to have our own way. We can set our own standard within those guidelines. That is why I said this number 153 is pretty good; it is a pretty good number for our State, for the size of our State.

And still others argue that, well, it is not worth doing this because not much money will be saved, and that is not the biggest argument. I have heard it said, my good colleague from Northampton County, that people say that the most important argument. It is not. We all know that not much money will be saved, maybe in the tens of millions, certainly not in the hundreds of millions. It is not about how much money will be saved. It is like the Speaker said, the larger argument is about the effectiveness of the legislature, not just the cost savings.

You know, there is an old saying in government, "The difficulty lies not so much in developing new ideas as in escaping from old ones." That is a problem we always face, and keeping our current system is one idea we truly need to escape.

Now, the people, they want this, but they do not believe we can do it. They do not. And they are fed up with government, you have heard it said. You know it. When you go home, the people tell you that. They are fed up with government. Why? Because they are tired of telling us up here what they want and then we do not do it. That is what happens, that is what they say, over and over and over.

They say, we will never vote ourselves out of office. You people are all career politicians; you will never vote yourself out of a job. They say we are full of greed up here, this House is full of greed. They say we are full of avarice and selfishness, even pride. And in some sense they are right. But you know, remember just last session, we proved them wrong and we passed this bill, and we showed them that there are those among us that are willing to make that sacrifice and do what is right.

Look, we need to lead by example. We often ask our citizens to do more with less. We can do this too. We can do more with less. The people want it; we should do it. I ask you to vote "yes" on HB 1234.

And, Mr. Speaker, I also, from Yong and I, my wife and I, we wish you all, all my colleagues, a merry Christmas and happy new year. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Truitt, on the final passage.

Mr. TRUITT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of HB 1234.

If we are to be honest with ourselves, there are good arguments on both sides of this issue. There are good reasons to be in support of this bill; there are good reasons to be opposed to it. I am going to address a couple of the arguments that have been made so far.

One of them is about the cost. A couple of folks have said that we are really not going to save a whole lot of money. If you think about it logically, if we eliminate 50 State Representatives, we may not be able to eliminate any of their support staff. All that support staff would get redistributed over fewer offices, but we are at the very least going to eliminate 50 State Representatives. And if you add up the cost of the salary and benefits, we are talking about maybe \$6 million. And I have heard some people say, well, that is only 2 to 3 percent of the cost of the legislature. But you know, \$6 million here, \$4 million there, \$2 million over here, it starts to add up to real money over time. I think it is something that we should take seriously.

A lot of folks have raised the question about our ability to serve a larger number of constituents. Can we really serve eighty-two, eighty-three thousand constituents? I believe that we can. If you look at the way things work in the private sector, every year people in the private sector are expected to accomplish more with less by the benefit of technology. As we have greater technology, we can serve more people. We have social media and e-mail and other means of communication that we simply did not have when the size of this body was set to 203 members.

But most significantly, I think if we are honest with ourselves, we have to recognize that everybody in this room has a conflict of interest on this subject. We are talking about potentially eliminating our own job or making our own job harder. But the cool thing about this bill and the reason why I am in favor of it is because that we are not really voting here today on whether or not to reduce the size of the legislature. What we are voting on is whether or not we are going to let the people decide to reduce the size of the legislature. We have to pass this bill this session, and if we still think it is a good idea more than a year from now, we have to pass this bill again, and then the people get to decide, and I think that is a great thing, to draw people into the democratic process and find out what they think.

So in conclusion, it is a very simple thing. We are not here today to vote to decrease the size of the legislature. We are here today to vote that if in a year from now we still think it is a good idea to let the people decide, we are going to let the people decide. So let us let the people decide. Please vote in favor of HB 1234.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Sainato, on final passage.

Mr. SAINATO. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the debate. It started with an eloquent speech from my colleague from Mercer County who hit many of the strong points here today.

Mr. Speaker, I started my 20th year on December 1. This issue has been around for years, since I first got here, and I would hear people say, we have got to reduce the size of the legislature, and usually those who would say it, it was just

because it was an issue. And I have never in 20 years ever went along with that. I looked at the facts, Mr. Speaker. I am not doing it because it sounds good. You have got to look and see what is out there.

I believe we as a legislature in general sense have very hard, dedicated people that are here. There was talk yesterday with amendments. We want to go to 83,000 people under this proposal. That is a lot of people. Maybe in some districts, maybe legislators do not have to work as hard as other districts. In rural Pennsylvania, in rural Pennsylvania we do.

I am a full-time legislator. This is all I do, Mr. Speaker. I do not have any other sources of outside income. I said that 20 years ago, and I believe that is the way it should be. I do not have time. I work 7 days a week. I go to my events in my district. I believe my job is to represent 62,000 people, which I represent now. I believe that is what we are elected to do, to be there to service the needs of our constituents.

I believe that, you want to give me 83,000 people, my workload is not going to change, Mr. Speaker, because I always do what I can do now. I do it 7 days a week. That means I am going to have to send additional staff people to those events. I like to go to Eagle Scout awards. I think they are great. We should be honoring our children. I prefer to go myself. Very rarely do I send a staff person. You want to make my district a lot larger? They are not going to see the Representative. They are going to have to see a staff person.

Retail politics, that is what we are talking about, retail politics. One of my colleagues many years ago from the 3d District of Erie who has passed away, whom I had a lot of respect for, he used to go around and talk about retail politics. That is you being with the people that sent you here. Never lose track of those people, Mr. Speaker.

When I ran in 1994, I won a primary with seven people. I spent \$9200 out of my pocket. I won my Democratic primary by 46 votes. I did not have a whole lot of money when I started out, Mr. Speaker. I did it by knocking on doors, going to every event, and talking to the people. You want a district with 83,000 people? You cannot do that. That is not how you will get elected. It will be the political bosses. It will be those people with the money that are going to pick and choose who the Representative is. The average person will not have an opportunity to serve in this House. And I know many average people that I work with here that worked very hard to get here. That is not what is going to happen, Mr. Speaker.

As the gentleman from Delaware County said, if you have the money, you can go on television, you can run the ads, you can do the mailings, and you get elected. This is not about good government; this is about power, Mr. Speaker, power by the leaderships. Because you have less people, that is more power you can influence on the rank-and-file members. That is a fact. It is very disturbing when you see leaders trying to take that power.

I was never one sometimes not to go along with the leadership, but that is how it was, and I believe it is important that we represent the people who sent us here. We are not, we are not beholden to those who have the money, whether it is the leaders or the special interest groups out there that will control it.

Do our colleagues in the Senate work hard? Yes, they do. Yes, they do because they represent 250,000 people, and I will say my Senators actually are very visible in the community. They do the best they can, but they cannot do what I do. I do school programs with all the school districts in my district. I like it, I enjoy it, and I think it is important we get along and do things for our kids. I cannot do that with a bigger district. The Senators cannot do that, Mr. Speaker, but I can as a Representative.

I have never supported this proposal. I can defend it, and let me be frank, very few people in my district come up to me and talk about reducing the size of the legislature. They want to know about real issues and getting things done down in Harrisburg, not fluff. And unfortunately, we are doing more fluff any more than actual legislative business.

I am here, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that these people that are here do a good job, most people do, even when we disagree with each other. I work with some very hard, dedicated people. But we must have self-worth here.

As my colleague from Mercer said, if you cannot defend yourself, why are you here? If you do not want to work and you do not want to do it, then do not stay. Someone said, lead by example. That is true. We should lead by example. I am sure we are going to lose some of our members after this term, those who said they term-limited themselves 6 or 8 years ago. So I am sure none of them will go past what they said 6 or 8 years ago. So that will help reduce some of the members.

But, Mr. Speaker, I really believe that we need to be responsible for the people that sent us here. Each person is going to make their decision today. How are they going to vote on this? But I think about this, this is the first time I have ever seen a piece of legislation where we have separated the House and the Senate. We are going to run two bills. If this is such a great idea, why is it not all in one? So the Senate will say, oh, let us get rid of the House, but no, we cannot get rid of the Senate. That blows my mind how we can come up with this philosophy. Two bills – one for the House, one for the Senate – and I am sure the Senate is going to say, oh, we better run both of them. I am not naive, Mr. Speaker; I am not naive.

As I conclude, I urge my colleagues, I urge my colleagues to do the right thing. I would encourage them, I would encourage them to vote against this piece of legislation. Do the right thing for the people that you represent. If you cannot do it – when people want to see you, they do not want to see your staff. They want to see you as a Representative, and I feel very comfortable that in 19 years I have been as responsible as I could to the people that I represent, and I want to continue to do that one-on-one. As my late colleague from the 3d District said, retail politics, Mr. Speaker, that is what it is all about, retail politics.

A few weeks ago, a few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, we ran a bill that taxed rural Pennsylvania. Today we are just going to take their Representatives from them. What a great day. What a great day for rural Pennsylvania, less representation; some counties will have no Representative under this proposal. And this helps rural Pennsylvania? They have to drive, and when they drive, we know what is going to happen next year. Vote "no," Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is in receipt of a request for a leave of absence from the minority whip for the gentleman, Mr. WHEATLEY, from Allegheny County for the day. Without objection, the leave of absence will be granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 1234 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. CAUSER, on final passage.

Mr. CAUSER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer brief comments on HB 1234.

I have given this issue a great deal of thought, and I understand and respect the position of the Speaker and others on this issue. However, I feel compelled to share a few thoughts and concerns that I have with this proposal.

In analyzing the issue, I have struggled to figure out why exactly we would propose to amend the Constitution and make this change. What exactly is the main goal with this legislation? As some would cite, cost savings. But even the sponsor of the legislation acknowledges that it is not being done as a cost-savings measure. Is it efficiency or manageability? Is it easier to come to a consensus? That remains to be seen. What about the voice of the people, access to your Representative?

My concern centers around representation of the rural parts of the State. I am specifically concerned that this proposal diminishes the voice of rural Pennsylvania. I have heard previous speakers say that they represent a rural area, but I am here to tell you that from your district, if you can get to a large metropolitan area in less than a half an hour, you truly do not represent rural Pennsylvania.

I have heard previous speakers say that it will be only an additional 20,000 people. Can we represent districts with another 20,000 people? Of course we can. But keep in mind that in some rural parts of the State, like north-central Pennsylvania, an additional 20,000 people is a whole other county. When districts become larger and rural areas are drawn together with suburban or urban areas, I believe that the voice of rural Pennsylvania will be diminished.

This may have been stated earlier, but I want to restate it. We recently got a letter from the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau in opposition to this legislation, and I want to read one comment that they made.

The letter states, "Reduction in the number of legislative districts will have the practical effect of further eroding opportunities for access of rural constituents with their elected representative and for the representative to consider and advocate for the special needs of rural Pennsylvania. We urge a negative vote on HB 1234 and HB 1716."

Mr. Speaker, in the 11 years that I have served in this body, my goal has always been to be a strong voice for rural Pennsylvania, and I intend to continue being that strong voice, but I have some real concerns about this proposal in moving forward.

Mr. Speaker, I state my opposition to this bill. I think that we should vote "no" on this, and thank you for considering my position. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Barbin, on final passage.

Mr. BARBIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There is a real issue here because we are amending the Constitution. The people have spoken and they have said that there is an issue. There is a criticism that our legislature is unwieldy. There are a bunch of statements, and you can decide which side you are on, but it basically comes down to this: This constitutional provision is either a big idea of a reform with a little bit of noise or it is a big noise with a little idea of reform. That is the question that we have today. There are people on both sides of the issue.

But what we have to do – it is not about our job. This thing does not come into effect until 2021. So it is just a question of whether the people have the right to say that the legislature should be 150 people as opposed to 203. That is all it is, and it is the same thing in the Senate. And what we have to look at is not how many States have less or how many States represent less people; what we have to look at is, is the Pennsylvania legislature going to do a better job or a worse job if we decide to let the people vote on this particular constitutional amendment?

Now, to do that, we have to look at something. We are a full-time legislature. We are one of seven States that are. The closest parallel for us is Ohio. Ohio has a legislature that represents basically 89,000 people. So it is not impossible to represent 89,000 people. It is possible because Ohio does it. And Ohio has 12 million people and we have 12 million people. The question really is, if we do it, are we making the system better for Pennsylvanians? That is really just the question.

Now, the issue involved is not the best solution. The best solution is to go back to let the people decide what issues they want changed. This is a constitutional change. We do not have a bill in front of us that says we are going to have an open constitutional convention. We do not have a bill in front of us that is going to say, you know what the real thing that bothers people is? It is how much money influences the elections or maybe how gerrymandering influences elections or how whatever influences. We do not have that right. But we did do it before once.

In 1874 there was a national reform movement, and that movement hit Pennsylvania, and when it hit Pennsylvania, 50 percent of the delegates were Republican, 50 percent of the delegates were Democrat, and at the end of the open constitutional convention, they came up with a whole bunch of changes that we all take for granted right now. But they voted 70 percent to adopt those changes, and those changes are why we are here asking the question today.

In 1874 the Pennsylvania Railroad was the biggest corporation in the world, and that corporation had so much power that the public believed that the corporation had bought the whole House of Representatives. So what they did was they decided to double the number of Representatives to get us to where we are today. And they doubled the number of the Senate, but it was because there was a perception that money had bought all of the legislature.

Now, we are in a situation that is not that dissimilar now. We are deciding to take up one little part of whether this will make the situation better.

In 1874 it changed the Governor from 3 to 4 years. It provided that public education had mandated expenditures. It said special legislation would not be allowed in 26 areas. It said we doubled the legislature. It also said the provision on African-Americans voting was prohibited in our own

Constitution. And lastly, it said that corporate power could never overcome the State Police power.

Now we are here. We are not doing an open constitutional convention, but we have got an attempt, or we had one yesterday, to say, can 150 people do this? Can 38 Senators do this? Yes, they can. But they can only do that if we decide to make their terms appropriate. If you want to take money out of the elections, you make the terms 4 and 6 years. That amendment was voted down as untimely or out of order. That is what needs to be in this bill.

There was another amendment. It said that if you are going to knock out 50 seats in 2021, maybe you ought to have a nonpartisan reapportionment plan to do that so it is not gerrymandering 15 more seats. Those are good provisions that ought to be in the bill.

So again, you get to make your own decision. It is either a big idea of reform with little noise or it is big noise with little idea of reform. I believe this bill is somewhere in between. I believe the bill can be fixed in the Senate. I believe it is a first step that will allow a reasonable reform that will actually allow for more representation for the common good.

I am voting for this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlelady, Ms. Rapp, on final passage.

Ms. RAPP. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation with all due respect to the sponsor of the bill.

I do see this, as a rural legislator, as a step to consolidate power in the hands of a few. I believe that this piece of legislation does take away the voices of rural Pennsylvania, which is why the Farm Bureau opposes this bill.

One of my colleagues who shares part of my district, as has been said by a previous speaker, his district is over 2,000 square miles. The district that I represent is around 1800 square miles, Mr. Speaker. And as one of our colleagues from Philadelphia is concerned about his 10 precincts that he is going to be representing, my colleague and I represent three counties and more. I represent 33 townships, a third-class city, and 8 boroughs. And I am not complaining about representing the 65th Legislative District. I love the area where I live and serve, but I am concerned about the people in rural Pennsylvania losing their voice here in this body.

We have the number of legislators we have, we serve every 2 years, to keep us close to the people. We are the body that listens to the people, that tries to stay in touch with the people. Is it difficult for those of us who serve a large geographical area? Yes, it is. It is hard to be out there when you have to travel from one area of your district 2 hours to get to another area of your district when some of our members from Philadelphia serve a couple square blocks.

When I talk to my constituents about government, they are concerned about the cost of government. It has been said repeatedly that this bill is not a cost-saving measure. When you enter into conversations with constituents about cost of government, what they are really talking about is the growth of the administrative agencies. Due to the legislation that we pass many times for new initiatives by the administration, we are seeing an increase in the cost of government and many of our agencies, from the Department of Public Welfare, Department of Education, Corrections, Internal Revenue; go down the list. People are concerned about being overregulated in this State.

And I was making a comparison yesterday to my colleagues because I have been listening to some of the hearings in Washington, and one of the constitutional attorneys from one of the universities in Washington, DC, actually made the statement, Mr. Speaker, that his concern as a constitutional attorney is seeing these administrative agencies – and I am going to make the same comparison in the State of Pennsylvania – that in Washington the growth of those agencies is becoming so overwhelming that the constitutional attorney, who is not a conservative, talks about those agencies as becoming a fourth branch of government, a fourth branch of government that the people have no voice in. And we see the frustration of our Congress trying to combat this fourth branch of government, the administrative agencies. And I know that my staff and the district, if I wanted to talk about all of the issues that we try to help our constituents with, it is issues with those administrative agencies.

I am a fiscal conservative. I believe in, you know, smaller government. I am not opposing this bill because I want to spend more money in government. But I do not think that this bill is going to save the taxpayers money. As a matter of fact, I share my office space with my U.S. Senator and my Congressman so that they can both use the office for office hours without having to open up another office in the district that they serve in.

Yesterday one of my colleagues was talking about how we have technology now. We do not need to be out meeting people face-to-face. We can reach our constituents through e-mail. Well, last session when we had the hearings on this piece of legislation, I was asked to testify to the State Government Committee and our IT (information technology) Department said, well, instead of traveling the 4 hours to Harrisburg, I could testify by Skype, which we tried, and unsuccessfully, because we could not get the Skype to work from my district office to the majority caucus room. So I ended up testifying by phone conference because the Skype failed.

And if those of you who live in the urban areas think that all of rural Pennsylvania is connected to technology, I have news for you. We are not. As a matter of fact, on my way home or my way here, I drive about 45 miles through the Allegheny National Forest with very little cell phone coverage, let alone Internet or wireless.

I want to leave by asking a question to the legislators sitting here today. When we go through a census on all of those – every 10 years, Pennsylvania is always at the risk of losing a congressional seat because of our decline in population or because of no growth in the State of Pennsylvania regarding population. My question to you is, when we lose a congressional seat in Congress, do you believe that we lose a voice in Congress? Because I believe we do.

My Congressman serves 16 counties in this State. Yes, if we downsize, we will absorb those other areas. But I want you to compare, if we lose those rural voices – and this is why the Farm Bureau is so concerned – we are losing voices of the people in rural Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I would encourage a "no" vote on this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Cohen, on final passage.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we heard about representation as though representation is a zero-sum game, and as long as everybody has got the same percentage of people in the legislature, as they

would under this proposal, then it does not really matter. And the concept that is being advocated is that, you know, our job is sort of competing with each other, and as long as each geographic area has the same percentage, well, who cares? What is the difference? But representation is much more than counting seats and apportioning seats within a legislative body. Representation is about having energy to do something about problems.

There are, for better or for worse, only 24 hours in a day, and there are limits to the number of hours even the most dedicated of us can work in any given day. And the more work that has to be done to advocate before government agencies, to combine the elements of this local government to that local government, you know, they basically want the same things but they have slightly different ideas. which they feel very strongly about, it takes a lot of work to do the job of a State legislator and this is only a small portion of it.

Under this bill, we would have the same percentage of legislators from Philadelphia and Allegheny and Montgomery and rural counties, but you would not have the same amount of advocacy before governmental agencies. You would have 25 percent less advocacy before governmental agencies. You would have 25 percent less civic leadership. You would have 25 percent less people available to give interviews on radio, television. You would have 25 percent less people able to disseminate information.

People cannot do endless work. There has to be some recognition of the fact that time is limited, that there are numerous demands that are placed upon us. We cannot conceivably do everything that is demanded of us right now. And just giving us 25 – actually, 33 percent more constituents per member is only going to create more demands and a certain number of the demands we will not be able to meet, and there will be more frustration from people that we are unable to meet their demands and public opinion will actually go down.

Now, in my district the support for a smaller legislature is virtually nonexistent. I cannot remember five people in my whole legislative career who urged we had a smaller legislative district. There just is not any support for it. People do not understand that. But I know when other – Representative Saccone talked about it. He has had thousands of conversations in his district about it. I suspect there is a little hyperbole there, but my guess is, he has certainly had many more conversations than I have had.

So I commissioned a poll from June 3 to June 5, 2012. I sent you all a detailed summary of that poll. There are some things I would like to point out from that poll here. The pollster was all robo-polling. It asked the voters, a statewide sample, how much money they think will be saved if we reduce the size of the legislature. And none of the questions gave what seems to be the consensus answer here of \$6 or \$7 million. I figured, you know, we are going to do this in round numbers so it is easy to understand by the voters.

So the lowest number that the people had a choice of choosing in my poll was \$10 million savings, which is considerably more than even the advocates say is going to be saved. So only 9.4 percent, 9.48, 9 1/2 percent of the people believed we would save \$10 million. About the same number of people believed we would save \$1 billion if we reduce the size of the legislature. Eighteen and a half percent saw a savings of \$500 million. Seventeen percent saw a savings of \$100 million. A little over 10 percent saw a savings of \$50 million. So

55 percent of the people asked in the survey saw a savings of between \$50 million and \$1 billion.

Now, what does that mean? It means there is going to be a lot of disillusionment if this actually becomes law. People are going to expect there is going to be massive savings. They will have endless ideas for programs, they will have endless ideas for tax cuts, and whoever is in the legislature is going to have to deal with it. Well, you cut the size of the legislature. My community needs a lot of money. You saved so much money by cutting the size of the legislature. You are raising expectations that cannot possibly be met.

And then the poll asked the voters, what is a reasonable percentage of the State budget to spend on the legislature? The lowest percentage the poll gave was 1 percent, which is what we actually do spend on the State legislature. And 31 1/2 percent said that was a reasonable percentage. But 18 percent said that 2 percent was a reasonable percentage. Three percent thought – I am sorry. Nine and a half percent thought 3 percent of the whole budget was a reasonable percentage. Four percent thought 4 percent of the budget was a reasonable percentage. Six percent thought 5 percent of the budget was a reasonable percentage.

So you add those figures together of how many people supported spending 2 percent to 5 percent of the budget on the legislature and that is 38 percent compared to 31 percent who thought 1 percent was a reasonable percent of the budget. So the public, if you ask the question that way, the public thinks we are underspending. They are willing to spend considerably more money on the State legislature than we are actually spending.

I do not think this amendment does very much. Representative Barbin gave two categories. I think this is in the category of a lot of noise and not very much significance. You know, we can wax eloquently about the vast benefits of \$6 million or \$7 million in savings, but we did not try to fix the Pennsylvania highways on \$6 or \$7 million in savings. We set forth a series of taxes and fees that would raise \$2.4 billion in savings. We did not say, we are going to help the veterans clubs and the bars and the taverns and we are getting \$6 million back. We passed a piece of legislation which will generate, we are told, about \$200 million a year.

Pennsylvania is a big State. We have nearly 13 million people in Pennsylvania. Assuming that no new additional staff people are hired as a result of this – and the public, by the way, believes that if we do reduce the size of the legislature, we ought to hire additional staff people to deal with this – but assuming no additional staff people are hired, which I and others find an incredible projection, this saves Pennsylvanians about 50 cents per person, per year. They cannot even buy a newspaper nowadays with the money saved. They cannot buy a cup of coffee nowadays with the money saved. This is a lot of symbolism in search of any real public purpose.

We are not told anywhere that any State with a smaller legislature does a better job than we do. Nobody has said that. Nobody has said, Dr. So-and-So of Harvard or Slippery Rock or Princeton or Community College of Philadelphia, has said that there is some State that does a better job than Pennsylvania because they have a smaller size legislature. The studies just do not exist for that.

New York State is attacked regularly by the Governor and the media for its massive corruption problems which dwarf by far anything we have experienced in the Pennsylvania legislature. Illinois has problems with corruption and problems

with fiscal responsibility which dwarf anything we face in the Pennsylvania legislature. The fact that other States have reduced the size of the legislature does not mean they are doing a better job. The only thing you can say they are doing a better job of is reducing the size of the legislature, but it does not mean there is a better legislative product. It does not mean there is a better legislative process. It does not mean the people of that State are better served.

I am pleased that we have had two members of the Republican Party speaking out against this proposal. I would hope that that is symbolic of other people in the Republican Party opposing it as well.

If this amendment fails to pass, very few people are going to miss it. We are not besieged by lobbyists or citizens pleading with us to pass this legislation. I do not think I have had any mail in my inbox urging me to pass this legislation. I have not heard from any lobbyists. I am unaware there is any PAC that exists for smaller legislatures. Very few people are going to miss the passage of this legislation, but if this legislation is enacted, we are going to have many, many years of problems and headaches dealing with the negative results of it.

I urge a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Gainey, on final passage.

Mr. GAINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to interrogate the maker of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman, Mr. Smith, agree to interrogation on the bill? The gentleman has agreed. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. GAINNEY. Mr. Speaker, in southwest Pennsylvania, we have two minority Representatives. In this new bill, how would they be protected?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, the ratio of legislators, whether it is over minority members or rural communities or whatever demographic view you want to look at, would be proportionate to what it is today. If there are two of you out of 203 and we go down by 25 percent, roughly 25 percent, then statistically, you are going to be down by 25 percent. But it will still be the same ratio minority, rural, whatever, the demographic view will still be the same ratio that is sitting here today, at least from a statistical perspective. Obviously every election the voters of that individual district get to determine, you know, who their Representative is.

Mr. GAINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that. Statistically from a numeric-type situation, we could say different things. I am saying in regards to southwest Pennsylvania, we have two African-American representations. If we are really talking about being a diverse State, how will southwest African-American representation be protected in the bill?

Mr. SMITH. It is protected by the Constitution, plain and simple.

Mr. GAINNEY. Mr. Speaker, that concludes my interrogation. May I speak on the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has concluded his interrogation, and the Chair thanks the gentleman. You may proceed on final passage.

Mr. GAINNEY. First, I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to interrogate him.

In the west we only have two seats. We in a State where every day we know that diversity is needed, for us to remove a seat from the southwest, by saying that we are going to reduce

30 percent of the State House, meaning 50 percent of a majority-minority will be lost in this Commonwealth, meaning that in my part of the State, the southwest part of the State, we could end up with one African-American, one minority State Representative. That is not representation, but you want our taxation.

We cannot afford to go backwards in a State that has to be more progressive in going forward. Unless we can create something that says, here is how we protect the two African-American districts in the city of Pittsburgh, we should not even vote for this. This is not a situation where we are talking about moving forward.

I understand that there are many out there that are saying that they want a smaller legislature, but because you want a smaller legislature does not mean that we should have a smaller minority representation. We should not have a smaller minority representation.

In southwest Pennsylvania we have no State Senators that look like me. We only have two State Representatives and you want to take instead of give us and call this a good bill that does not empower anybody but self-interests. We have to be smarter when we talk about how do we grow as a State. To support something that takes away from a minority class is not the right direction, nor the message we want to send the State of Pennsylvania.

If we only want to look at it mathematically of how this is going to work without understanding how we are going to protect what we have, then we are playing a crap game and I am not into rolling dice anymore. We need something to make sure that the two State Reps in the west are protected.

We have an obligation, State. We have an obligation to make sure that we do this. We cannot continue to go backwards and call it progress.

If the southwest of Pennsylvania cannot have two or more African-Americans that look like me representing us, then we need to do something to form a different type of "how are we going to tax people?" Since you want to take something from us, give us something in return.

Vote this bill down. What is it? HB 1234, it is a bad bill because it does nothing to empower the people of this State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Gabler, on final passage.

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

Today we are here to debate HB 1234, a constitutional amendment that would reduce the size of this body from 203 members to 153 members. We spent a lot of time today talking about the policy that is contained in this measure, but I think it is important to stop for a moment and think about where we are in the constitutional amendment process. It is a long process.

After this vote happens today, and assuming it passes, this bill will have to go to the Senate, where it will have to be voted there. Then we have to have advertising across the State, an intervening general election, do that process again in another legislative session, and then submit this to the voters across the State for a referendum. So in order to go through that whole process, what today's vote represents is the beginning of a conversation.

I have asked for feedback in my legislative district pertaining to whether or not the citizens of this State believe that their legislature should be bigger or smaller, what it should look like, what size it should be. The response in my own legislative

district has been overwhelming. They believe that we could run the State more efficiently, more effectively, with a smaller legislature. So that is one reason why I think it is important to advance this bill forward today, to open this conversation.

Today's vote is not the end of a process; it is the beginning. I hope today's vote results in the opportunity for more feedback across the State so that people can actually hear from the citizens of Pennsylvania what they want their legislature to look like.

There has been a lot of discussion on the floor about what this might mean, if this might tilt the balance more in favor of urban or rural or one side or the other, and what this points out is that we do in fact have a diverse State. But no matter how many members we have in this chamber, whether it is 203, whether it is 153, the fact of the matter is, one person, one vote remains in effect. What that means is that the ratio remains unchanged. I find it actually very interesting there have been as many urban legislators as rural legislators who have spoken against this proposal, and I see similar ratios in favor of the proposal. In other words, the ratio of urban to rural will remain unchanged. There is no inherent benefit, there is no inherent detriment, to either urban or rural constituencies in this bill.

Now, personally, as a rural legislator, I will say that the job of a rural legislator can be challenging. In my own legislative district I represent an area that exceeds the size of the State of Rhode Island. This proposal may require us to work a little harder, may require us to drive a little bit more, but in my opinion, that is okay. That is okay because, frankly, this proposal is not about us; it is about the people of Pennsylvania. It is about what they want.

So I am here to say, let us give the citizens of Pennsylvania the opportunity to shape their government. Let us give them an opportunity to participate in the conversation. Let us give them a say by voting "yes," opening the conversation, and starting this process.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Sturla, on final passage.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the maker of this bill is sincere in his intent. I have known him for 23 years now, and I do not think he approaches this with any frivolity, but I believe that this legislation is misguided.

Mr. Speaker, it has been pointed out that there is little to no cost savings involved with this legislation, one of the reasons that people often cite as to why we should reduce the size of the legislature. But that issue is taken off the table. I believe the prime sponsor himself has said publicly that that is not the reason why he introduced this and he really did not think it would produce much cost savings, if any.

And, Mr. Speaker, it has been noted that, well, with the advance of technology, it is easier for us to serve our constituents. Well, I can tell you, having been here 23 years, when I first got here I did not even have a computer on my desk, and I used to receive a couple dozen handwritten letters a month from my constituents, who took the time to sit down and write me about an issue. Here 23 years later I still receive a couple dozen handwritten letters a month from constituents that take the time to sit down and write me a handwritten letter, but I also receive on some days as many as 200 e-mails from those constituents that I serve, even though the number has not

increased much in the last 23 years. My district is the exact same size as it was when I got here 23 years ago. I represent the exact same municipalities.

And what I saw was when we started getting desktop computers, my workload increased, and then when smartphones became available to everyone, I saw my workload increase even more because my constituents could contact me on a second's notice, not just a moment's notice or an hour's notice. People contact me watching us here on the floor of the House. Texts say, you know, what you said made sense or it did not. That does not decrease my workload; it increases my workload.

But, Mr. Speaker, what we are told by the prime sponsor is that 203 members is hard to get to agree on an issue because we do not know enough about each other's districts, and if we just had 153, we would be able to better understand what each other deals with on a daily basis and we would be much more productive. But following that logic, you would tend to believe that then the fact that there are only 50 Senators, they really know what each other's districts are like. They really must get stuff done over there in the Senate. They must rarely disagree with each other because they know what each other's districts are like. So why not go to 50 members of the House of Representatives, because after all, the Senate is a shining example of cooperation and getting things done. If you notice my tongue in my cheek, you are not mistaken.

It would also stand to reason that if 50 is not the right number and 153 is, then maybe we ought to increase the Senate to 153 members instead of 50, because if 153 is the right size, why not the right size for the Senate? But that is not a proposal here; we are proposing to cut the size of the Senate also.

But getting back to the issue of if we just knew more about each other, we would certainly be able to sit down and vote for things on a regular basis where we agreed. You would have to find two members that had exactly the same constituents in order to get that sort of nirvana to happen, I would think. Well, guess what? There are two districts in the State of Pennsylvania that are exactly the same, not just sort of the same, two members that represent exactly the same people. My two U.S. Senators represent exactly the same constituents. Their district is exactly the same. They represent exactly the same people. You would think they would vote together exactly the same 100 percent of the time, but they do not. So there goes that theory. This notion that if we just knew more about each other's districts, we would all agree on everything, that is not true.

And one of the great things about the diversity of this body is that we can become experts about our districts, and hopefully if we are good Representatives, we can convey that information to other members of the House. We may not always win, but that is not what this is about, because even if I have a more diverse district in terms of – instead of mostly urban, I have some rural and some suburban, it does not mean that it changes my vote.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that while I believe that the maker of this bill is sincere, I think that it is misguided, that it really does not do anything to help serve the people of Pennsylvania, but rather serves to try and sweep this issue under the carpet in terms of the fact that we have not gotten much done here in this House of Representatives, and blame it on the fact that there are too many members here.

There are a lot of issues we could be tackling instead of spending time doing this, and instead, we are spending time diverting attention from the issue that there are a lot of problems that have not been solved for the people of Pennsylvania, and

I will contend that it is not because of the number of members we have here, but rather that we have not taken the time to actually work on those issues.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlelady, Mrs. Dean, on final passage.

Mrs. DEAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will Rogers once said, "What this country needs is more working men and fewer politicians," and I agree. So while it may be true that this body does not require 203 members to adequately represent the people of Pennsylvania and while I would be happy to volunteer a few members to be the first to go, what we could do is make sure that we think about this important amendment to our Constitution and consider clearly what we are voting on and remember the history that got us here.

In 1968, in the spirit of reform, after repeatedly voting down proposals to reduce the size of the House, the result then was an increase to our current 203 membership. Thus, increasing the House was the face of reform. It was the measure of reform. And you have heard what the arguments would have been at that time. More Representatives would be a greater connection to the people we represent. Fewer Representatives, we become less connected, less responsive as legislators.

So while we vote on this important reform measure – and I want to note, I will be a "yes" because I am interested in reform – while we vote on this important reform measure, let us really look at reform. Let us vote in the spirit of progress, and let us commit ourselves to continuing the conversation about reform past today's vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentlelady.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Turzai, on final passage.

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

I rise in support of this historical constitutional amendment, HB 1234.

The current number of 203 House members is the result of the work of the delegates at the 1967-1968 Pennsylvania Constitutional Convention. With all due respect, the number 203 does not possess any intrinsic value in a legislative context, although given that it is an odd number, it does avoid a tie vote. The fact of the matter is, it was significantly debated in the '67-'68 Convention as to whether or not there should have been a different size for the House of Representatives, and in fact, many members did make the argument of that Constitutional Convention – the delegates, that is – that it should have been smaller.

On January 22 of 1968, Committee Proposal No. 1 was introduced and it contained the directive for 203 House districts upon introduction, but a number of amendments were offered and arguments made to change that number. In the end that Convention kept it, but the fact of the matter is, that does not mean that this constitutional issue should not be readdressed.

I want to read this one quote from Delegate Michael on February 5 of 1968, making several points in favor of reducing the size, quote:

"In 1873, when the Constitutional Convention last met, they set the House number at 200. In 1870, the population of Pennsylvania was about 3.5 million... Today, we are talking

about approximately 60,000 voters per Representative. Yet can you say with me today that our Representatives have less communication with the voters than they had back in 1873? Remember, Alexander Graham Bell did not invent the telephone until 1876. Henry Ford had not constructed his first automobile until well after 1900." – and remember this quote is in 1968 – "Today, we can call any place in the Commonwealth within a few minutes. There are over 100,000 miles of roads in Pennsylvania. Communication and transportation are completely different from the times as we look back to 1873.... In 25 more years what kind of communication and transportation are we going to have? In other words, this idea of numbers, a magic ratio, say, of 60,000 voters to one Representative, just is not significant today when we look at the changes that are coming about in transportation and communication. What we have to look at is how this legislature is going to work. Whether a smaller body would do the job or not."

I think that delegate was quite prescient. Here we are today with the vast improvements in transportation and communications, and the constitutional amendment, while historic, is also common sense. At 153 House districts and our current population of 12,700,000 people, we are talking about 83,000 people per district. With all due respect, this is not a significant change from the 62,500 given today's size of the legislature.

And the most important thing is that the ratio of representation between urban and suburban and rural areas will really remain equivalent. All areas would lose numbers of Representatives, but not proportional representation. Keep in mind there is one-person-one-vote constitutional requirement. The fact of the matter is, we can be a more representative body with 153 members, I believe, than with the total of 203.

This is a historic constitutional amendment. It deserves this type of debate. I applaud the Speaker, who runs the entire chamber, not just for one party or the other, but for the entire chamber, and is the person who would best be in the position to understand the need for this change, and I applaud the Speaker for moving this historical piece of legislation.

I would just say this: Over the last 3 years this body, in a bipartisan manner, has been nothing but effective and efficient and has in fact addressed significant issues across the board from privatization to property tax relief, to charter and cyber charter school reform, to transportation funding, to improving the lives for those with intellectual disabilities, to balancing budgets, to holding the line on taxes, to reducing debt. Week after week after week this body tackles important issues and we find bipartisan coalitions to pass that legislation and send it to the Senate. This is not about the effectiveness or the efficiency of the body or about each and every individual; it is about moving Pennsylvania and its representation into the 21st century given the changes in communication, technology, and transportation.

Again, I applaud the Speaker of the House and I think that this historical debate will continue. Remember that on any constitutional change, the voters of Pennsylvania, in a referendum, have the last say. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

And finally, we have the maker of the legislation, the gentleman, Mr. Smith, on final passage.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the debate. I appreciate the passion and the concerns that have been expressed here today.

I would suggest that members keep in mind that this is the first step of a rather long process that ultimately could end up with the people of Pennsylvania getting to make the decision that we have been debating, and something of a constitutional nature should require that level of debate.

I heard a dozen or more members reiterate their interpretation of some things that I have said rather consistently throughout the last session's consideration of this and this session and some I think maybe did not quite interpret it right, so I am going to restate just a couple quick points.

Number one, I introduced this constitutional amendment because I actually believe that this body will do a better job of legislating. I think the product we will produce will be better for the people of Pennsylvania.

And number two, for those that want to debate the cost savings or not, my statements have always been that it will probably save a little bit of money, but that is not the primary motivation for this, and that is because I do believe in this body. You know, I was accused by one constituent – I do not know, not actually one of my constituents; it was somebody else's that contacted me on this – of just putting this forth kind of as a grandstand reform piece, and I said, "Oh, really. You get elected by 203, 202 other people to be the Speaker of the House and the first thing you propose is that there probably should be 50 less of us here and you think I would do that for kicks and giggles or for public relation's purposes?" No, Mr. Speaker.

We can disagree about this and the vote will tell the story, and if the Senate takes it up, that will tell a different story, and if it gets to the vote of the general public as a referendum, that will ultimately tell the story. But I believe that a smaller size of the House, we will do a better job of representing the people and doing the primary function we are here for, and that is to pass laws that serve the people of Pennsylvania.

I would appreciate a "yes" vote on HB 1234. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—148

Adolph	Farina	Kotik	Petri
Aument	Farry	Krieger	Pickett
Baker	Fee	Lawrence	Pyle
Barbin	Flynn	Lucas	Quinn
Barrar	Frankel	Mackenzie	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Gabler	Maher	Readshaw
Bizzarro	Galloway	Mahoney	Reed
Bloom	Gergely	Major	Reese
Boback	Gibbons	Maloney	Regan
Boyle, B.	Gillen	Markosek	Roae
Boyle, K.	Gillespie	Marshall	Rock
Bradford	Gingrich	Marsico	Ross
Brown, R.	Godshall	Masser	Rozzi
Burns	Greiner	Matzie	Sabatina
Caltagirone	Grell	McGinnis	Saccone

Carroll	Grove	Mentzer	Sankey
Christiana	Hackett	Metcalfe	Santarsiero
Clymer	Haggerty	Metzgar	Saylor
Conklin	Hahn	Miccarelli	Scavella
Corbin	Harhai	Micozzie	Schreiber
Costa, D.	Harhart	Millard	Simmons
Cox	Harper	Miller, D.	Smith
Culver	Harris, A.	Miller, R.	Snyder
Davis	Heffley	Milne	Sonney
Day	Helm	Molchany	Stephens
Dean	Hennessey	Moul	Stevenson
Deasy	Hickernell	Mullery	Swanger
DeLozier	James	Mundy	Tallman
DeLuca	Kampf	Murt	Taylor
Denlinger	Kauffman	Mustio	Tobash
DiGirolamo	Kavulich	Neilson	Toepel
Dunbar	Keller, F.	Neuman	Toohil
Ellis	Keller, M.K.	O'Neill	Truitt
Emrick	Killion	Oberlander	Turzai
English	Kim	Payne	Vereb
Evankovich	Knowles	Peifer	Watson
Everett	Kortz	Petrarca	White

NAYS—50

Bishop	Donatucci	Kirkland	Rapp
Briggs	Evans	Kula	Roebuck
Brooks	Fabrizio	Longietti	Sainato
Brown, V.	Fleck	McCarter	Samuelson
Brownlee	Freeman	McGeehan	Schlossberg
Causar	Gainey	McNeill	Sims
Clay	Goodman	Mirabito	Stern
Cohen	Haluska	Miranda	Sturla
Costa, P.	Hanna	O'Brien	Thomas
Daley, M.	Harkins	Painter	Vitali
Davidson	Harris, J.	Parker	Waters
DeLissio	Keller, W.	Pashinski	Youngblood
Dermody	Kinsey		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Cruz	Cutler	Daley, P.	Wheatley
------	--------	-----------	----------

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.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Located in the gallery, as guests of Representative Gergely, we would like to welcome guests from the 35th District. Please rise and be recognized.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1716, PN 2326**, entitled:

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

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—150

Adolph	Farry	Lawrence	Pickett
Aument	Fee	Lucas	Pyle
Baker	Flynn	Mackenzie	Quinn
Barbin	Gabler	Maher	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Galloway	Mahoney	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Gergely	Major	Reed
Bizzarro	Gibbons	Maloney	Reese
Bloom	Gillen	Markosek	Regan
Boback	Gillespie	Marshall	Roae
Boyle, B.	Gingrich	Marsico	Rock
Boyle, K.	Godshall	Masser	Roebuck
Bradford	Greiner	Matzie	Ross
Brown, R.	Grell	McGinnis	Rozzi
Burns	Grove	Mentzer	Sabatina
Caltagirone	Hackett	Metcalfe	Saccone
Carroll	Haggerty	Metzgar	Sankey
Christiana	Hahn	Miccarelli	Santarsiero
Clymer	Harhai	Micozzie	Saylor
Conklin	Harhart	Millard	Scavello
Corbin	Harper	Miller, D.	Schreiber
Costa, D.	Harris, A.	Miller, R.	Simmons
Cox	Heffley	Milne	Smith
Culver	Helm	Molchany	Snyder
Davis	Hennessey	Moul	Sonney
Day	Hickernell	Mullery	Stephens
Dean	James	Mundy	Stevenson
Deasy	Kampf	Murt	Swanger
DeLozier	Kauffman	Mustio	Tallman
DeLuca	Kavulich	Neilson	Taylor
Denlinger	Keller, F.	Neuman	Tobash
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	O'Brien	Toepel
Dunbar	Killion	O'Neill	Toohil
Ellis	Kim	Oberlander	Truitt
Emrick	Kirkland	Payne	Turzai
English	Knowles	Peifer	Vereb
Evankovich	Kortz	Petrarca	Watson
Everett	Kotik	Petri	White
Farina	Krieger		

NAYS—48

Bishop	Dermody	Harris, J.	Pashinski
Briggs	Donatucci	Keller, W.	Rapp
Brooks	Evans	Kinsey	Sainato
Brown, V.	Fabrizio	Kula	Samuelson
Brownlee	Fleck	Longietti	Schlossberg
Causar	Frankel	McCarter	Sims
Clay	Freeman	McGeehan	Stern
Cohen	Gainey	McNeill	Sturla
Costa, P.	Goodman	Mirabito	Thomas
Daley, M.	Haluska	Miranda	Vitali
Davidson	Hanna	Painter	Waters
DeLissio	Harkins	Parker	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Cruz	Cutler	Daley, P.	Wheatley
------	--------	-----------	----------

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

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

THE SPEAKER (SAMUEL H. SMITH) PRESIDING

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 587, PN 2773**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in falsification and intimidation, further providing for the offense of impersonating a notary public or a holder of a professional or occupational license.

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?

Is the gentleman from Delaware County seeking recognition? On the question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Delaware County, Mr. Vitali.

Mr. VITALI. Would the maker of the bill just stand for brief interrogation?

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

Mr. VITALI. This, as I understand it, criminalizes impersonating a doctor of medicine, and I would think that is a crime already, is it not? I am just trying to get at what is happening with this bill, question mark. What is the penalty for falsely representing yourself to be a doctor right now, in the absence of this legislation?

Mr. BAKER. A second-degree misdemeanor.

Mr. VITALI. What just troubles me a little— Let me ask you this: Honestly, what troubles me about this bill is when I saw the support of the Pro-Life Federation. Do you have any idea why they would be weighing in on a bill that is seemingly out of their realm?

Mr. BAKER. Yes, sir. It is a direct result and recommendation out of the grand jury report of Philadelphia that transpired that led to the prosecution and conviction of Dr. Gosnell, the abortion clinic in Philadelphia. It was, actually, the number three recommendation by the grand jury to criminalize, make impersonating the doctor a crime. They were astounded that it was not a crime in Pennsylvania.

Mr. VITALI. Right.

Mr. BAKER. And by the way, not only does the Pro-Life Federation support this legislation and the other pro-life groups as well very strongly, but the medical profession as a whole and law enforcement as well are all in agreement.

Mr. VITALI. Okay; okay. I am sure this is fine. I mean, I am just concerned about the scenario where someone, a nondoctor

who is giving advice to someone that, let us say a Planned Parenthood facility, could be sort of caught up in this statute somehow. Could you maybe give me some assurances with regard to that scenario?

Mr. BAKER. This gets to the whole issue of impersonating a doctor.

Mr. VITALI. So to be clear, the legislative intent of this bill is not directed at Planned Parenthood personnel who give advice of a medical nature as would a nurse or a physician's assistant or a like similar. The legislative intent of this legislation is not directed at nondoctor personnel at Planned Parenthood-type facilities who do give aid of a medical nature?

Mr. BAKER. This is designed specifically to address the issue of impersonating a doctor.

Mr. VITALI. But is the intent— All right; okay. Thank you.

Mr. BAKER. You are welcome.

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

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

Mr. J. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the maker of the bill stand for brief interrogation?

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

Mr. J. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question revolves around naturopathic doctors. There are several universities in the country that have this program for folks to become doctors of naturopathic medicine. My question is, under our current law, if this was to become law, would those types of medical professionals be subject to this and could possibly find themselves incarcerated?

Mr. BAKER. Yes. A "doctor of medicine" is defined in the legislation: "An individual licensed under the laws of this Commonwealth to engage in the practice of medicine and surgery in all its branches," and that is what it says, sir.

Mr. J. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, a person who has this degree from a different State because our State does not currently recognize this degree would then be in fact not allowed to claim themselves to be a doctor in this Commonwealth or they could face criminal prosecution.

Mr. BAKER. They cannot pretend to be a licensed doctor in Pennsylvania if they are not.

Mr. J. HARRIS. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes my interrogation.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman seeking further recognition on the bill? The gentleman is in order.

Mr. J. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a great – I think this is a good piece of legislation, and I understand the maker's intent of the legislation. My only concern, Mr. Speaker, is that these medical professionals who actually do go to school, who are still in the process of trying to get licensure in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, they would be excluded from their practice currently, and it is my belief that many of them could face prosecution under this bill because they are not licensed under the medical board currently. So while I understand the maker's intent, Mr. Speaker, I believe, unless someone can tell me otherwise, I believe this may create a problem for all of those folks who currently practice holistic medicine who have gone to universities sanctioned in our country for this type of practice.

I would be open and happy to hear other members who may be able to provide clarification. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Mr. MUSTIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on the interrogation of the previous member and interrogate the maker of the bill, please.

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

Mr. MUSTIO. I rise with very similar concerns to the previous speaker and perhaps can ask a couple additional questions to provide some clarification to satisfy the concerns that I have. If the interpretation of the prior speaker is correct, I would have to rise in opposition to this legislation.

The intent of your legislation, as I initially understood it, would be to prohibit someone from – would be from prohibiting someone to impersonating a medical doctor as currently licensed under the medical board. Is that correct? Is that the only intent of this legislation?

Mr. BAKER. It applies to a person who pretends to be a doctor and treats patients.

Mr. MUSTIO. Then where we have the stumbling block then is your use of the term "doctor" as opposed to a medical doctor or a physician. That is a huge difference and will impact thousands of individuals in Pennsylvania.

Mr. BAKER. I respectfully disagree with the gentleman. Once again, it is defined clearly in the legislation, "An individual licensed under the laws of this Commonwealth to engage in the practice of medicine and surgery in all its branches," clear.

Mr. MUSTIO. It is clear when you use the term "medicine," but when you state that no one can use the term "doctor" in Pennsylvania, that is not clear.

Mr. BAKER. It is well defined and it is part of the construction— It is part of the Statutory Construction Act.

Mr. MUSTIO. I am not an attorney and I am lost on that, but what I can tell you right now is in Pennsylvania— If I might, Mr. Speaker, if I might, Mr. Speaker, just to kind of clarify what I am trying to get the answer to. I am not sure if that leads to an additional question or if that is talking on the legislation.

The SPEAKER. Do you intend to follow up with a question?

Mr. MUSTIO. I would, I believe.

The SPEAKER. We will give you a little leeway to explain your question.

Mr. MUSTIO. Thank you.

And the reason that I am asking this is we did pass legislation out of the House and it is currently sitting in the Senate Professional Licensure Committee, where currently in Pennsylvania – Mr. Speaker, if I could pass this information on to the maker of the legislation – currently in Pennsylvania individuals are able to use the term "naturopathic doctor." I can use the term "naturopathic doctor" in Pennsylvania and put myself out to the public as someone that knows what they are talking about as it relates to naturopathic remedies. These same individuals, naturopathic doctors, that spent thousands of hours in residency compared to somebody like Mark Mustio, who can just use that term, is the reason we pass legislation. These same naturopathic doctors are working in the cancer institutes in Philadelphia, they are working at UPMC's (University of

Pittsburgh Medical Center) integrated medical centers in Pittsburgh. So my concern is that if this legislation is not drafted correctly, I do not want to inadvertently eliminate those people from working at cancer institutes or at the University of Pittsburgh.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for perhaps transferring via ESP (extrasensory perception) to him to me and now we now have an answer, and I will support the legislation.

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

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

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, will the maker of the bill stand for a point of clarification, please?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Baker, will stand for interrogation. You may proceed.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a similar concern, similar to the gentleman from Allegheny County. There are any number of health-care practitioners in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. We have the good fortune to have many nurse practitioners, A.P.R.N.s (advanced practice registered nurses), certified nurse anesthetists, who in fact have earned Ph.D.s and therefore are referenced by the term "doctor."

I, too, want to be on the record and absolutely beyond clear that somehow there is not collateral damage created as a result of perhaps legislation that has been structured less than accurately, and in fact, personally, I feel that all health-care practitioners in Pennsylvania should be prevented from being impersonated. So I wish this were broader and not just limited to physicians, but this legislation deals with physicians, the use of the term "doctor," and I would like to have that clarification that somebody with a Ph.D. referenced as "doctor" is not going to get caught up in an unintended consequence here.

Mr. BAKER. That is correct. This is specifically referenced in statute and in legislation. This applies to D.O.s (doctors of osteopathic medicine) and medical doctors.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Mr. McCARTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, would the maker please stand for brief interrogation?

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

Mr. McCARTER. Thank you.

My quick question is, again in my constituency I have several organizations that actually practice acupuncture and teach acupuncture, and as part of their particular ceremony, they call themselves doctors following that particular program which they go through. Would this bill in fact touch them as impersonating doctors because they are probably not licensed under the State of Pennsylvania? Would they be considered to be impersonating a doctor?

Mr. BAKER. So long as they do not hold themselves out as a medical doctor or a D.O., they should be fine.

Mr. McCARTER. Again, the clarity. I know the intent of this particular bill, and I have no difficulty with it. However, the lack of clarity on this I think is confusing many of us, and I would hope that as this moves forward, that possibly we are able to see some change when it moves to the Senate to get that

clarity, and I hope the maker of the bill would agree with that. Thank you.

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

Agreeable to the provisions of the Constitution, the yeas and— Excuse me. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Harris, rise?

Mr. J. HARRIS. I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I was promised an explanation from the gentleman from Allegheny County, and he was never recognized, so my question was still—

The SPEAKER. Excuse me.

Mr. J. HARRIS. I am sorry.

The SPEAKER. Let me just keep this in order then.

Mr. J. HARRIS. I do not know how to do that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. How about this. I will recognize you for the second time on final passage of the bill, and you can ask your question if it has not been clarified.

Mr. J. HARRIS. Okay. Will the maker of the bill please stand for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Baker, indicates he will stand for interrogation.

Mr. J. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my ESP is not working with the other gentleman, so the message that was sent to that gentleman never made it to this side, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering if I could, on the record, get that clarification of an answer, please, about the naturopathic doctors.

Mr. BAKER. If he is good with it—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. BAKER. If he is good with it—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

I believe the majority leader feels that he can maybe adequately explain where we have a little bit of miscommunication taking place.

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

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

The bill is narrowly tailored. It is based on the grand jury recommendations in the Gosnell case, and the language is very specific, and because it is a criminal bill, it is very specific. You have to show intent of the defendant or of the actor to impersonate a doctor of medicine, and in so doing, the actor provides medical advice or treatment to another person as the patient. The fact of the matter is, this is very zeroed in. It is not designed in any way to take away from those who are licensed or otherwise recognized in their professions to provide the treatment or advice that they provide. This is very specific to the fact where someone impersonates a medical doctor, an M.D. or a D.O., as the good gentleman from Tioga County had indicated, and it would not encompass the fact patterns that I think you and others are raising from a hypothetical perspective, and it is a specific recommendation of the grand jury in the Gosnell case.

And what the bill specifically does is it increases the grading of the offense to a first-degree misdemeanor where someone impersonates a doctor of medicine and proceeds to, quote, "treat" patients, and the idea there is that if people believe that they are in fact being treated by a medical doctor or a D.O. and they are not in fact being treated by a medical doctor or a D.O., it is not designed with respect to other professionals who provide other professional services who are holding themselves out in the profession that they are actually in, not in a profession that they are not in.

And it is a very, very specific well-drafted piece of legislation, and I urge everybody to vote "yes."

Mr. J. HARRIS. On the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Harris, is in order on the bill.

Mr. J. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the bill, but I want to be clear on the record that there is a concern. I understand the intent from the maker, I understand the explanation, but as a member of the Professional Licensure Committee, I know that earlier this year we dealt with naturopathic medicine and the naturopathic doctors, and my hope would be that, you know, when this gets over to the Senate, that there may be some work for us to work with our colleagues in the Senate to maybe even closer define this legislation so that our intent of this legislation is solid and that many of the men and women across this Commonwealth who have gone to school to be holistic doctors, who have degrees from accredited universities, that they are not caught in this hole where they could be prosecuted for impersonating a doctor when the fact is they are and would have the credentials to do so.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will vote in support of this bill, but my goal is that in the Senate that there would be some clarification in the language so that many of the men and women across this Commonwealth who practice holistic medicine, that they are not caught in a bind.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for all the help with the clarification.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—198

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

Corbin	Hanna	Miller, D.	Smith
Costa, D.	Harhai	Miller, R.	Snyder
Costa, P.	Harhart	Milne	Sonney
Cox	Harkins	Mirabito	Stephens
Culver	Harper	Miranda	Stern
Daley, M.	Harris, A.	Molchany	Stevenson
Davidson	Harris, J.	Moul	Sturla
Davis	Heffley	Mullery	Swanger
Day	Helm	Mundy	Tallman
Dean	Hennessey	Murt	Taylor
Deasy	Hickernell	Mustio	Thomas
DeLissio	James	Neilson	Tobash
DeLozier	Kampf	Neuman	Toepel
DeLuca	Kauffman	O'Brien	Toohil
Denlinger	Kavulich	O'Neill	Truitt
Dermody	Keller, F.	Oberlander	Turzai
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Painter	Vereb
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Parker	Vitali
Dunbar	Killion	Pashinski	Waters
Ellis	Kim	Payne	Watson
Emrick	Kinsey	Peifer	White
English	Kirkland	Petrarca	Youngblood
Evankovich	Knowles		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Cruz	Cutler	Daley, P.	Wheatley
------	--------	-----------	----------

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 490, PN 513**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of August 5, 1941 (P.L.752, No.286), known as the Civil Service Act, further providing for powers and duties of director.

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—198

Adolph	Evans	Kortz	Petri
Aument	Everett	Kotik	Pickett
Baker	Fabrizio	Krieger	Pyle
Barbin	Farina	Kula	Quinn
Barrar	Farry	Lawrence	Rapp

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Cruz	Cutler	Daley, P.	Wheatley
------	--------	-----------	----------

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1271, PN 2774**, entitled:

An Act authorizing the release of all restrictions imposed by the Project 70 Act on a portion of certain lands situated in the Borough of Brentwood, Allegheny County, in exchange for the imposition of Project 70 restrictions on other lands owned by the Borough of Brentwood, Allegheny County.

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—198

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Cruz Cutler Daley, P. Wheatley

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

RULES SUSPENDED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker returns to today's regular House calendar and recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster County, Mr. Denlinger, who moves to suspend the rules for the immediate consideration of HR 584, PN 2807, on page 11 of today's House calendar.

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

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

Mr. DENLINGER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Given the hour of the day and the need to conform to our timing, I would ask for a suspension of the rules to move this time-sensitive issue along.

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 also urge the members to vote to suspend the rules for this resolution.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—180

Adolph	Evankovich	Knowles	Petri
Aument	Evans	Kortz	Pickett
Baker	Everett	Kotik	Pyle
Barbin	Fabrizio	Krieger	Quinn
Barrar	Farina	Kula	Rapp
Benninghoff	Farry	Longietti	Ravenstahl
Bishop	Fee	Lucas	Readshaw
Bizzarro	Fleck	Mackenzie	Reed
Bloom	Flynn	Maher	Reese
Boback	Freeman	Mahoney	Regan
Boyle, B.	Gabler	Major	Rock
Boyle, K.	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	Saylor
Causar	Greiner	McNeill	Scavello

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

NAYS—18

Bradford	Grell	Metzgar	Roae
Davidson	Harris, J.	Milne	Santarsiero
Dean	Keller, F.	Mullery	Thomas
DeLissio	Kim	Neilson	Vitali
Frankel	Lawrence		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Cruz Cutler Daley, P. Wheatley

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.

RESOLUTION

Mr. DENLINGER called up **HR 584, PN 2807**, entitled:

A Resolution urging the Congress of the United States to immediately consider and pass H.R. 3685, which exempts emergency services volunteers from being counted as full-time employees under the Federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster County, Mr. Denlinger.

Mr. DENLINGER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, citizens all across our Commonwealth are attempting to manage, as best they can, with the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. While our nation continues to have a debate over the broad impacts of ACA, one specific aspect should be of great concern to members on both sides of the aisle here today. As we know, Federal agencies are diligently working to promulgate regulations which will put the Affordable Care Act into force throughout society. One such agency, our nation's primary tax collection agency, the IRS (Internal Revenue Service), is preparing to issue a ruling which

classifies fire and emergency service volunteers as employees – volunteers classified as employees. What this means is that any volunteer company with 50 or more members will be required to purchase health insurance for all of its members.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, our volunteer responders give of themselves to provide very valuable services to our communities – saving lives and property. We further know that running these volunteer agencies gets more and more expensive every year. To meet the challenge, auxiliary groups work to solicit through holding bake sales, benefit dinners, and a range of other fundraising initiatives. Mr. Speaker, an IRS determination that volunteers are now to be considered employees, mandating that health insurance be purchased, would bring financial disaster to these companies.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to enter into a debate today on the Affordable Care Act. I simply ask that members on both sides of the aisle, all who appreciate what our volunteer responders do for our citizens, join me in sending a strong message to Washington that volunteers are in fact volunteers and that we request Federal action to prevent the placement of a crushing financial burden on our volunteer companies. I ask for an affirmative vote.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—198

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

DeLuca	Kauffman	O'Brien	Toohil
Denlinger	Kavulich	O'Neill	Truitt
Dermody	Keller, F.	Oberlander	Turzai
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Painter	Vereb
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Parker	Vitali
Dunbar	Killion	Pashinski	Waters
Ellis	Kim	Payne	Watson
Emrick	Kinsey	Peifer	White
English	Kirkland	Petrarca	Youngblood
Evankovich	Knowles		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Cruz	Cutler	Daley, P.	Wheatley
------	--------	-----------	----------

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

VOTE CORRECTIONS

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Roebuck, rise?

Mr. ROEBUCK. To correct the record, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may state his correction.

Mr. ROEBUCK. On the final passage of HB 1716, I was incorrectly recorded as voting in the affirmative. I wish to be recorded as voting in the negative.

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

For what purpose does the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Frankel, rise?

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To correct the record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may state his correction.

Mr. FRANKEL. On HB 1716 I was voted in the negative and want to be voted in the affirmative.

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

MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION UNDER RULE 24

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, Mr. Turzai.

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

As we near the Christmas holiday and this is our last voting date until we come back after the New Year, we have four bills that have been significantly vetted, voted upon second, hearings, and significant debate. HB 1725, SB 1024, HB 452, and HB 1411, they could not be voted on until 4:57, 4:55, 5:02, and 8:01, respectively. I would move that those four bills – a motion to proceed on those four bills, and that we would then get to the underlying votes on each of those bills. We had significant debate on second. We are here with an opportunity to close up and wish everybody Godspeed – HB 1725, SB 1024, HB 452, and HB 1411.

Thank you, and I would urge a "yes" vote.

The SPEAKER. The question before the House is the motion made by the gentleman, Mr. Turzai, for a motion to proceed for an immediate consideration of HB 1411, PN 2824, HB 452, PN 2823, on page 1 of House calendar supplemental B; for SB 1024, PN 1661, and HB 1725, PN 2822, on page 2 of House calendar supplemental B.

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

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

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Democratic members to vote "no" on this proposal as it is made right here containing these four pieces of legislation. Vote "no."

MOTION WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. On the motion, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Turzai.

Mr. TURZAI. Mr. Speaker, we will withdraw it. I would withdraw that motion, and we will do them individually, please, and we will start, if I might, after withdrawal, we will move on HB 1725, which would be passed at 4:57. We will do a motion to proceed on HB 1725.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Mr. Turzai, withdraws his previous motion.

MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION UNDER RULE 24

The SPEAKER. Mr. Turzai now makes a motion to proceed for the immediate consideration of HB 1725, PN 2822, on page 2 of today's House calendar supplemental B.

STATEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. If I could take a moment of a Speaker's prerogative while the floor leaders discuss the future action here in the next few minutes, I just wanted to take a moment to wish everyone a merry, merry Christmas and a happy New Year. I hope that everyone is safe and happy and enjoys the holiday season. We will look forward to getting back together as a body right after the first of the year.

MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION UNDER RULE 24 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman, Mr. Turzai, amending his motion to proceed?

Mr. TURZAI. Yes. HB 1725, SB 1024, HB 452, respectively, they need to be voted at 4:57, 4:55, and 5:02. We would ask for members to move to proceed to those three bills.

The SPEAKER. Therefore, the question before the House is, shall we pass the motion to proceed for the immediate consideration of HB 452 on page 1 of House calendar supplemental B, SB 1024 on page 2, and HB 1725 on page 2?

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

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

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would urge all members to support a motion to proceed on the bills that are listed on the board.

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the House move to proceed for immediate consideration of those three bills enumerated?

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

The following roll call was recorded.

YEAS—184

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

NAYS—14

Davidson	McGinnis	Milne	Samuelson
Kim	Metcalfe	Mullery	Thomas
Lawrence	Metzgar	Roae	Truitt
McCarter	Miller, D.		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Cruz Cutler Daley, P. Wheatley

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.

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 452, PN 2823**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the offense of criminal surveillance.

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—198

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

Davis	Heffley	Mullery	Swanger
Day	Helm	Mundy	Tallman
Dean	Hennessey	Murt	Taylor
Deasy	Hickernell	Mustio	Thomas
DeLissio	James	Neilson	Tobash
DeLozier	Kampf	Neuman	Toepel
DeLuca	Kauffman	O'Brien	Toohil
Denlinger	Kavulich	O'Neill	Truitt
Dermody	Keller, F.	Oberlander	Turzai
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Painter	Vereb
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Parker	Vitali
Dunbar	Killion	Pashinski	Waters
Ellis	Kim	Payne	Watson
Emrick	Kinsey	Peifer	White
English	Kirkland	Petrarca	Youngblood
Evankovich	Knowles		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Cruz Cutler Daley, P. Wheatley

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 1024, PN 1661**, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 18 (Crimes and Offenses) and 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in inchoate crimes, further providing for possession of firearm or other dangerous weapon in court facility; in arson, criminal mischief and other property destruction, further providing for arson and related offenses; in sentencing, further providing for sentences for second and subsequent offenses; and providing for sentencing for arson offenses and for sentences for arson of a historic resource.

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?

Is the gentleman seeking recognition?

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

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For the information of the members, some members are sensitive to the issue of mandatory minimum sentencing, and this bill does contain a mandatory minimum sentencing provision.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—188

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

NAYS—10

Brown, V.	Kinsey	Parker	Vitali
Brownlee	McCarter	Thomas	Waters
Evans	Mundy		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Cruz	Cutler	Daley, P.	Wheatley
------	--------	-----------	----------

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1725, PN 2822**, entitled:

An Act providing for school-to-work pilot programs; establishing the CareerBound Program; providing for a tax credit; and imposing powers and duties on the Department of Labor and Industry.

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 Lehigh County, Mr. Mackenzie.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to encourage my colleagues to support HB 1725, which establishes the program known as CareerBound. CareerBound is a workforce development initiative which brings together businesses, schools, and workforce development professionals across our Commonwealth to provide greater career exposure and awareness to middle school and high school students.

As a member of our House Labor and Industry Committee and Policy Committee, I have spoken with businesses and schools across our Commonwealth. When I speak to these individuals and these groups, they tell us that there is a disconnect between what is going on in education and in the business community that is taking place across our Commonwealth. Students are looking for greater career awareness and exposure, and businesses are seeking qualified, skilled employees for their businesses. As we move forward in this modern economy, bringing those two individuals and groups closer together is of significant importance for Pennsylvania's future. Specifically, an example of where this is taking place and this disconnect exists is in the manufacturing industry. Almost 7,000 annual manufacturing vacancies are existing right now that require no postsecondary education. Almost 1,000 jobs exist that require only a technical or 2-year degree. An additional 6500 jobs exist in manufacturing that require 4-year degrees.

HB 1725 and the CareerBound Program are designed to change this dynamic. The program is targeted to enhance our focus on the State's high-priority occupations. High-priority occupations exist where a skill is needed, the job pays a family-sustaining wage, and, and this is what is important, those students in those high-priority occupations will be set up for a successful career and life going forward. There are also going to be vacancies in those positions.

As this bill moves forward through our legislature, I want to thank a number of individuals who have helped us. Chairman Scavello has provided great leadership on workforce development initiatives. We also want to thank Representatives

Simmons, Evankovich, and Goodman for their help in moving this bill and this initiative forward, and also the individuals across this Commonwealth from the business, the education, and the workforce development communities who have provided significant input.

Now, the biggest challenge to providing a school-to-work pilot program like CareerBound is, of course, the funding. The funding that would be generated for CareerBound is generated through a model analogous to the EITC (earned income tax credit) program, which generates 75- to 90-percent tax credits for contributions which businesses provide.

This funding mechanism is important, and I ask for the support of all the members of the House. As I look forward to passing this bill, I want to thank the bipartisan support that I have received from across the aisle, and I look forward to working with the Senate as this bill moves forward.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Mrs. PARKER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just rise for the record to thank Rep. Mackenzie for offering this bill. As a member of the House Labor and Industry Committee, I am so proud that we worked in a bipartisan manner to get this accomplished.

As I just shared with my other colleagues, we have a lack of vocational education in Philadelphia, and I am hoping that Rep. Mackenzie's legislation will get us closer to that effort. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. I was afraid the supporters of the bill were going to talk everybody else out of it.

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—198

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

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Cruz	Cutler	Daley, P.	Wheatley
------	--------	-----------	----------

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

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

STATEMENT BY MAJORITY LEADER

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

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

I would like to wish each and every member of the House of Representatives a merry Christmas and a happy New Year. We look forward to working with you on very important issues for the citizens of Pennsylvania.

Godspeed to you and God bless. Thank you.

STATEMENT BY DEMOCRATIC LEADER

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

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as we draw this session to a close, this year anyway, I would like to congratulate Representative Markosek on his 31st year of perfect attendance.

And merry Christmas and happy New Year to everybody. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HEALTH COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Tioga County, Mr. Baker.

Mr. BAKER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just a friendly reminder, the Health Committee will have a hearing beginning tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. in the majority caucus room. Health Committee, majority caucus room at 9 a.m. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. There will be a Health Committee meeting tomorrow at 9 a.m. in the majority caucus room.

STATEMENT BY MR. THOMAS

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

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just to join you in extending merry Christmas, happy Kwanzaa, happy Hanukkah, and happy Three Kings' Day celebrations to all the members. Thank you.

BILLS RECOMMITTED

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

HB 1816;
HB 1878; and
SB 689.

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

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

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

HB 1567;
HB 1655;
HB 1753;
HB 1782;
HB 1794;
HB 1796;
SB 24;
SB 29; and
SB 33.

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

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 1205 and HB 1742 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

BILLS TABLED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 1205 and HB 1742 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 665, PN 1495**, entitled:

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

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 665 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 665 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 796, PN 1496**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of August 15, 1961 (P.L.987, No.442), known as the Pennsylvania Prevailing Wage Act, raising the threshold for applicability; further providing for specifications; and providing for protection of workmen.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 796 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 796 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. Seeing no further business before the House, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Mentzer, from Lancaster County, who moves that this House do adjourn until Wednesday, December 18, 2013, at 10 a.m., e.s.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the motion?
Motion was agreed to, and at 4:40 p.m., e.s.t., the House adjourned.