

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

SUNDAY, JUNE 29, 2014

SESSION OF 2014

198TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 47

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 5 p.m., e.d.t.

THE SPEAKER (SAMUEL H. SMITH) PRESIDING

PRAYER

HON. JERRY STERN, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Let us bow our heads:

Today is a day of worship for many, a day of rest for others, a day that was full of recreation and picnics for some as they spent quality time with family and friends. Today is also a workday for many, and we find ourselves this afternoon beginning a final stretch that will have us review many bills, and eventually a budget, that will serve the multiple needs of this Commonwealth.

It was on a day similar to this that William Wilberforce confronted his ambition one Sunday, and he wrote these words: "Blessed be to God for the day of rest and religious occupation wherein earthly things assume their true size. Ambition is stunted."

We remain thankful, dear Lord, for the travel mercies that You have extended to the members of the General Assembly to allow us to be present again. We thank you for our leaders on both sides of the aisle and their staffs, because we know that they work extremely long and tenuous hours to bring us the bills that we vote on, and to explain the complicated details of some of the legislation before us.

Thank You for our Speaker and his constitutional duties to this chamber. We pray a special blessing upon him and his family. We ask also a special blessing on the Senate and the Governor's Office as we work together for the good of Pennsylvania. Grant us wisdom and discernment as members to determine what is in the best interests of those who have elected us to be their Representatives.

Thank You, dear Lord, also for our soldiers, Lord. Returning here today, I passed a convoy of military personnel that were returning back to their base from a weekend of duty serving our Commonwealth, serving our nation. Thank You for our families, dear Lord. And we need to say a special thank you also to the staff that is always here, faithful in their duties to keep the House functioning properly.

And finally, we ask You, Lord, to give us the quiet time to reflect on what is truly important in life. We pray for those in authority so that we may live our lives in a peaceful manner, and we especially thank You for the beauty of this day, God. Bless those assembled and the remainder of this evening.

I pray these things in the name of Jesus. 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 Saturday, June 28, 2014, will be postponed until printed.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

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

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Democrats will caucus immediately. Democrats will caucus immediately. Thank you.

RECESS

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

RECESS EXTENDED

The time of recess was extended until 6:45 p.m.; further extended until 7:15 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

ACTUARIAL NOTES

The SPEAKER. The Speaker acknowledges receipt of actuarial notes for amendment No. 7160 to HB 1353, PN 2152, as amended by amendment Nos. 6917, 7089, and 7096;

amendment Nos. 8590 and 8561 to HB 1353, PN 2152, as amended by amendment No. A8109; amendment Nos. 8273 and 8274 to HB 1353, PN 2152, as amended by A6917.

(Copies of actuarial notes are on file with the Journal clerk.)

SENATE BILLS FOR CONCURRENCE

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

SB 819, PN 2156

Referred to Committee on PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE, June 29, 2014.

SB 1078, PN 2187

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, June 29, 2014.

SB 1188, PN 2216

Referred to Committee on AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS, June 29, 2014.

SENATE MESSAGE

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

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 272, PN 3542; HB 927, PN 2100; HB 1972, PN 3865; and HB 2242, PN 3869**, with information that the Senate has passed the same with amendment in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives is requested.

SENATE MESSAGE

HOUSE BILL CONCURRED IN BY SENATE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 2275, PN 3723**, with information that the Senate has passed the same without amendment.

BILLS SIGNED BY SPEAKER

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

HB 2275, PN 3723

An Act amending Title 35 (Health and Safety) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in emergency telephone service, further providing for termination.

SB 1096, PN 1846

An Act amending Title 26 (Eminent Domain) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for limited reimbursement of appraisal, attorney and engineering fees.

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. PETRI, from Bucks County for the day; the gentleman, Mr. MASSER, from Northumberland County for the day; and the lady, Ms. QUINN, from Bucks County for the day. Without objection, the leaves will be granted.

The minority whip indicates there are no requests for leaves of absence.

MASTER ROLL CALL

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

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—200

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

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

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Masser	Petri	Quinn
--------	-------	-------

LEAVES ADDED—2

Adolph	Evans
--------	-------

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

UNCONTESTED CALENDAR

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. FABRIZIO called up **HR 927, PN 3867**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing July 2014 as "National Sarcoma Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Ms. HAHN called up **HR 930, PN 3875**, entitled:

A Resolution designating August 2014 as "Pennsylvania Produce Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. PAYNE called up **HR 931, PN 3876**, entitled:

A Resolution honoring the United States Coast Guard on the occasion of its 214th anniversary.

* * *

Mr. COHEN called up **HR 932, PN 3885**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the 15th anniversary of the Law and Government Institute of Widener University School of Law.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolutions?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—200

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Masser	Petri	Quinn
--------	-------	-------

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

CALENDAR

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 145, PN 2208**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of August 24, 1963 (P.L.1175, No.497), known as the Mechanics' Lien Law of 1963, providing for the definition of "costs of construction"; and further providing for right to lien and amount, for priority of lien and for discharge or reduction of lien on payment into court or entry of security.

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 1185, PN 2194**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of July 28, 1953 (P.L.723, No.230), known as the Second Class County Code, further providing for requests for examinations and reports of coroners.

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 1436, PN 1867**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 20, 1996 (P.L.1492, No.191), known as the Medical Foods Insurance Coverage Act, amending the title of the act; and further providing for declaration of policy, for medical foods insurance coverage, for cost-sharing provisions and for exemption.

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

Mr. **TRUITT** offered the following amendment No. **A08373**:

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 5 and 6, by striking out "for declaration of policy,"

Amend Bill, page 1, line 6, by striking out the comma after "coverage" and inserting
and

Amend Bill, page 1, line 7, by striking out "and for exemption"

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 10 through 12, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

Section 1. The title and sections 4 and 6 of the act of December 20, 1996 (P.L.1492, No.191), known as the Medical Foods Insurance Coverage Act, are amended to read:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 16, by inserting a bracket before "related"

Amend Bill, page 1, line 16, by inserting after "related"

] other

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 16 through 20; page 2, lines 1 through 30; page 3, lines 1 through 4, by striking out "and food-related" in line 16, all of lines 17 through 20 on page 1, all of lines 1 through 30 on page 2 and all of lines 1 through 4 on page 3

Amend Bill, page 3, line 6, by inserting before "Except"

(a) Nutritional supplements.—

Amend Bill, page 3, line 13, by striking out the bracket before "and"

Amend Bill, page 3, line 13, by striking out "]"

Amend Bill, page 3, lines 13 through 15, by striking out ", IgE and Non-IgE mediated food protein" in line 13, all of line 14 and "eosinophilic disorders and short-bowel syndrome" in line 15

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 16 and 17

(b) Amino acid-based elemental medical formula.—Except as provided in section 7, any health insurance policy which is delivered, issued for delivery, renewed, extended or modified in this Commonwealth by any health care insurer shall provide that the health insurance benefits applicable under the policy include coverage for infants and children for the cost of amino acid-based elemental medical formula prescribed by a physician and administered orally or enterally for IgE and non-IgE mediated food protein allergies, food protein-induced enterocolitis syndrome, eosinophilic disorders and short-bowel syndrome.

Amend Bill, page 3, line 21, by striking out the bracket before "and"

Amend Bill, page 3, line 21, by striking out "]"

Amend Bill, page 3, line 21, by striking out "and food-related allergic disorders"

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 25 and 26

(a.1) Amino acid-based elemental medical formula.—Benefits for amino acid-based elemental medical formula prescribed by a physician for IgE and non-IgE mediated food protein allergies, food protein-induced enterocolitis syndrome, eosinophilic disorders and short-bowel syndrome shall be subject to copayment and coinsurance provisions of a health insurance policy to the extent that other medical services covered by the policy are subject to those provisions.

Amend Bill, page 4, lines 3 through 15, by striking out all of said lines

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Chester County, Mr. Truitt.

Mr. TRUITT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is an agreed-to amendment, and given that it is my bill and my amendment, you would probably question my sanity if I said anything otherwise. But generally, this amendment represents the ongoing negotiations and cooperation with the insurance industry representatives. What we are trying to do is, there is already an existing law in Pennsylvania that requires insurance companies to cover amino acid-based elemental formulas for children with certain diseases or disorders, and what we are trying to do is tweak that bill to make sure that some kids that have some diseases that are not listed there will have their elemental formulas covered by insurance.

So what the amendment does is it simply makes it clear that off-the-shelf foods available at a grocery store are not covered by this amendment, or this change to the bill. We are making it clear that oral formulas are covered.

So whether a kid takes the elemental formulas, whether they consume them orally or by feeding tube, it is still going to be covered. And then finally, we are just trying to make some structural changes – it is really technical in nature – to avoid unintended consequences for sufferers of the disorders that were already listed in the act.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "yes," and I appreciate your support. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—197

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

NAYS—3

Carroll	Miller, D.	Rozzi
---------	------------	-------

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Masser	Petri	Quinn
--------	-------	-------

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

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

(Bill as amended will be reprinted.)

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 1422, PN 2141**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in particular rights and immunities, providing for successor business entity liability.

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, it is the Speaker's understanding that the amendments have been withdrawn.

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

STATEMENT BY MS. HAHN

The SPEAKER. Does the lady from Northampton County, Ms. Hahn, seek recognition under unanimous consent relative to one of the uncontested resolutions that were adopted earlier this evening?

The lady is in order and may proceed.

Ms. HAHN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to thank the members for their support of HR 930, which would designate the month of August 2014 as "Pennsylvania Produce Month." The Commonwealth's vegetable growers continue to be a national leader in the production and processing of many fruits and vegetables that feed our families. The positive impact fruits and vegetables have on our health is well-known, and the positive impact fruits and vegetable growers have on our economy is worth considering. There are approximately 50,000 acres producing 280,000 tons of vegetables a year in Pennsylvania, pumping close to \$155 million of revenue into the Commonwealth's economy.

Produce grown in Pennsylvania is available in abundant supply at community farmers markets, roadside stands, and supermarkets throughout the Commonwealth during the month of August.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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 meeting of the House Appropriations Committee in the majority caucus room. Thank you.

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

RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Turzai, from Allegheny County for a committee announcement.

Mr. TURZAI. We will have a Rules Committee meeting at 8 o'clock in the Appropriations Committee conference room; at 8 o'clock. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The House will be at ease for a few minutes for the duration of those two committee meetings.

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HB 402, PN 3881 By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act imposing duties on lessees of oil and natural gas leases; and providing for the recording of surrender documents from oil and natural gas leases and of affidavits of termination, expiration or cancellation.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1013, PN 3883 By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in pupils and attendance, further providing for home education program.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1543, PN 3829 By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of October 17, 2008 (P.L.1645, No.132), known as the Home Improvement Consumer Protection Act, providing for the definition of "time and materials"; and further providing for application fees and for home improvement contracts.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2194, PN 3399 By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending Title 53 (Municipalities Generally) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for investment of authority funds.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2345, PN 3730 By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending Titles 13 (Commercial Code) and 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in general provision, providing for construction; and in particular rights and immunities, further providing for required disclosures in connection with rental-purchase agreement and for lessee's right to acquire ownership.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2353, PN 3854 By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of May 17, 1921 (P.L.789, No.285), known as The Insurance Department Act of 1921, in suspension of business - involuntary dissolutions, further providing for definitions, for injunctions and orders, for fraudulent transfers prior to petition and for voidable preferences and liens.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 622, PN 2222

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act providing for the licensure of persons providing debt settlement services, for powers and duties of the Department of Banking and Securities and for enforcement; imposing civil penalties; and making a related repeal.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**BILLS ON CONCURRENCE
REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**

HB 118, PN 3864

By Rep. TURZAI

An Act amending the act of December 12, 1986 (P.L.1559, No.169), known as the Whistleblower Law, further providing for the definitions of "appropriate authority," "employee," "employer" and "good faith report," for protection of employees, for enforcement and for penalties.

RULES.

HB 185, PN 3863

By Rep. TURZAI

An Act amending the act of December 12, 1986 (P.L.1559, No.169), known as the Whistleblower Law, further providing for the definitions of "appropriate authority," "good faith report" and "public body," for protection of employees and for penalties.

RULES.

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 2354, PN 3843**, entitled:

An Act requiring the Department of Environmental Protection to receive approval from the General Assembly for a State plan to regulate carbon dioxide emissions for existing stationary sources prior to submitting the State plan to the United States Environmental Protection Agency for approval.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Mrs. **SNYDER** offered the following amendment No. **A08738**:

Amend Bill, page 6, lines 16 through 24, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

(b) Consideration by General Assembly.—Upon transmission under subsection (a), the State plan shall be:

(1) proposed as a resolution in each chamber;

(2) placed on the calendar of each chamber for the next legislative day following transmission; and

(3) considered by each chamber within 20 days after transmission.

Amend Bill, page 6, line 25, by striking out "both chambers" and inserting

each chamber

Amend Bill, page 6, line 26, by striking out "adopt the concurrent" and inserting

adopts the

Amend Bill, page 6, line 30, by striking out "concurrent"

Amend Bill, page 7, line 30, by striking out "CONCURRENT"

Amend Bill, page 8, line 1, by inserting after "RESOLUTION"

under subsection (b)

Amend Bill, page 8, line 1, by striking out "15 DAYS OF THE"
Amend Bill, page 8, line 1, by striking out "30" and inserting
15

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

The SPEAKER. For the information of the members, that amendment had been filed under the Speaker's name; however, the lady, Mrs. Snyder is offering it.

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

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the lady from Greene County, Mrs. Snyder.

Mrs. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Amendment 08738 is a technical amendment drafted in conjunction with the Speaker's Office. The amendment would clarify the process by which the General Assembly would approve the State plan. Under this amendment, the State plan would be proposed as a resolution in each chamber and considered within 20 days. If both chambers adopt their respective resolutions, the State plan would be approved by the General Assembly.

This amendment strengthens the safety net that was put in place in committee and establishes consistency of what has occurred in this House previously.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

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

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

NAYS—7

Bishop	Kinsey	Parker	Youngblood
Brown, V.	Miranda	Thomas	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Masser	Petri	Quinn
--------	-------	-------

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

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

Mr. ROSS offered the following amendment No. A08732:

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 11 through 18; page 2, lines 1 through 30; page 3, lines 1 through 28, by striking out all of said lines on said pages

Amend Bill, page 3, line 29, by striking out "3" and inserting
2

Amend Bill, page 4, line 10, by striking out "4" and inserting
3

Amend Bill, page 6, line 9, by striking out "5" and inserting
4

Amend Bill, page 8, line 8, by striking out "6" and inserting
5

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Chester County, Mr. Ross.

Mr. ROSS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As a matter of general policy, I believe bills should be as short as possible. I believe they should focus on action items so that there is no confusion. Adding additional language, particularly language that does not require action, tends to create unnecessary controversy and confuses the issue.

And for that reason I am offering this amendment, which takes out the sections of legislative intent. They do not add to the bill. They do detract, in my opinion, from the bill. I urge a positive vote on the amendment to simplify and focus this legislation where it belongs.

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

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the lady from Greene County, Mrs. Snyder.

Mrs. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is an agreed-to amendment, and I would ask the members to vote in the affirmative.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—198

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

NAYS—2

Metzgar	Mullery
---------	---------

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Masser	Petri	Quinn
--------	-------	-------

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

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

Mr. GIBBONS offered the following amendment No. **A08784**:

Amend Bill, page 8, by inserting between lines 7 and 8 Section 6. Suspension of alternative energy portfolio standards. Until a State plan under this act is approved by the EPA, the requirements under the act of November 30, 2004 (P.L. 1672, No.213), known as the Alternative Energy Portfolio Standards Act, are suspended at the levels mandated for the June 1, 2014, through May 31, 2015, compliance year.

Amend Bill, page 8, line 8, by striking out "6" and inserting
7

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Lawrence County, Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. GIBBONS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to offer amendment A08784, which would temporarily suspend the current alternative energy portfolio standards of Pennsylvania. As many of you know, Pennsylvania has a law which requires electric utilities to purchase power or equivalent credits from government-preferred sources of electricity, like wind and solar power.

We have had this law since 2004. And by 2021, 18 percent of all of Pennsylvania's electricity that is sold to retail customers, our constituents, will have to come from these sources, which tend to be the highest cost, least reliable of all electric generation sources.

At the same time, over the past number of years we have seen continued decline of other industries, including the coal manufacturing and coal-electric generation. In this instance, government has decided that it wanted to pass the strictest environmental regulations, from the mercury and air toxics rule, to the subject of today's discussion, the new greenhouse gas rule.

According to DEP's (Department of Environmental Protection's) recent testimony delivered to the Senate Environmental Resources and Energy Committee, in order to meet the 2030 target that the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) has established for Pennsylvania, the capacity level at a coal plant will be at 17 percent. In 2005 capacity levels at coal plants were 73 percent. Mr. Speaker, I question whether any business in this Commonwealth can survive running 17 percent of the time. Worse yet, consider the magnitude of that on the electric grid.

We have shed over 20,000 megawatts of coal generation over the past number of years, and I am concerned what could develop if Pennsylvania's State plan is not written properly. That is why I am strongly supporting HB 2354.

However, I am equally concerned with how renewables are managed in this State, especially because the new Federal greenhouse gas rule now contemplates pushing even more renewables into the system as an option for compliance.

I believe we cannot continue to have government-driven outcomes in energy; whether it is driving coal plants out of service by excessive regulation or pushing other forms of energy into the system, the result could be terrible for the economy and for all consumers of electricity.

The House Consumer Affairs Committee recently held hearings on the spike in electricity costs in January.

We all heard from our constituents the outrage of the spike in electricity prices. With coal leaving and more renewables becoming mandated into the system, I am concerned about the increased costs that are coming. I think we, like our neighbors in Ohio who passed something similar to what is in this amendment, should take a time-out and suspend our AEPS (Alternative Energy Portfolio Standard) mandates until the State greenhouse gas plan is written and we can properly coordinate our energy policy with what is left of our electric fleet. We will not know until after the State plan is completed what role renewables will play, and just as importantly, how they will be funded.

More practicably, if renewables are going to take a place in our State greenhouse gas plan, then we should suspend the mandates today so we can get credit for the role that renewables play under the plan once it is adopted. One of the complaints I know was aired at the Senate hearing on the greenhouse gas rule was that the EPA is not giving us credit for what we are already doing. Between 2005 and 2012 we have already seen a 17-percent reduction in our greenhouse gases that we are not getting credit for. Why not wait and kick-start the renewables program that could meet those needs, get credit for what we are already doing, and reflect the current marketplace?

The President says renewables will save us money. Let us suspend the program today to make sure that we have time to make a full evaluation of the role they play now and will play in the future in the State greenhouse gas plan. Then we can either restart the program or decide whether to enhance or modify it, depending upon the needs of our State.

I urge a favorable vote for this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Mr. SANTARSIERO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my experience in the 6 years that I have been in the House now that very often there are bills or amendments brought up in the waning days and hours of the fiscal year that have broad implications for the future – broad implications for the future from a policy standpoint and broad implications for the future politically. Mr. Speaker, this is one of those situations.

Back in 2004 this General Assembly, which at the time had Republican majorities in both the House and the Senate, did something amazing. It came together in a bipartisan way to pass the AEPS standards. And it was then signed by then Governor Rendell. Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania became the leader in alternative energy when it did that. Now tonight we are being asked to roll that back with this amendment. And, Mr. Speaker, everyone in this Assembly should pay very close attention to this vote, because the people outside of this building will be paying very close attention. The people outside of this building, our constituents, ordinary Pennsylvanians who care about making sure that we use more and more alternative energy,

ordinary Pennsylvanians who are concerned about climate change and the impacts to our environment in the long run by the continual use of fossil fuels, they will be watching this vote very carefully.

So before you think that this is just an amendment on a bill in late June that will get lost in the cacophony of all the other things that we are doing in the next day or so, stop and think, because it is not so. You are about to cast a very important vote, and it is a vote that many people outside of this chamber are going to be watching. And I can tell you, if you vote for this amendment and against the Alternative Energy Portfolio Standard, it will not be forgotten.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Chester County, Mr. Ross.

Mr. ROSS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am afraid I have to strongly disagree with the maker of this amendment on a number of points. First of all, it is not true that the benefits that come from the alternative energy will not be counted. The measurement is from 2005 forward. Any changes that we get for the portfolios are going to be part of, easily, something that could be considered in the State implementation plan, and we cannot speak of what the State implementation plan is yet because it has not been offered or created.

Secondly, there are many organizations and businesses that count on us to be consistent. When we institute a program and they make business plans on that program, they rely on us maintaining those programs. When we choose, on a program that has been successful like the AEPS has been, to suspend it suddenly without notice, their investments are put at risk, and that damages our credibility and it damages the businesses in Pennsylvania. So from a business point of view, this is a bad idea.

And finally, there is the discussion about cost. We have been a very open and very broad-based alternative energy portfolio compared to other States, and the benefit of that has been to the ratepayers. The cost of the program has been very modest, much more so in Pennsylvania than in many of the other States. The provisions, for example, that were recently suspended in Ohio were much more expensive, and they were very narrowly tailored in such a way so that they drove up costs and had a limited range of applicants.

So on all fronts, the fact that we have included waste coal, the fact that we have included a broad range of biomass and a number of other elements in the program, we are very reasonable. To take this reasonable program and suspend it would be a very bad choice.

So I urge a "no" vote. This amendment, if it does go in, from my point of view, would destroy the effectiveness of this bill.

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

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Clearfield County, Mr. Sankey.

Mr. SANKEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand with the good gentleman from Lawrence County on this amendment. I think it is a fantastic idea. And as the earlier speaker alluded to, people are paying attention. They are going to be paying attention July 1 when their power bills in Clearfield County go up 15 percent. They are going to be paying attention.

I stand with the gentleman from Lawrence County because he has shown the foresight to care about the well-being of all Pennsylvanians. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we owe it to the hardworking, struggling families of Pennsylvania, and I believe that we must prove to them that we do more than just tax and spend, and regulate.

I stand with the good gentleman from Lawrence County, and I hope my colleagues will do the same. Thank you.

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

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Chester County, Mr. Truitt.

Mr. TRUITT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to let you know that I intend to abstain from this vote because I have a conflict of interest.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman seeking an opinion as to whether he has a conflict, or are you—

Mr. TRUITT. No, Mr. Speaker, I was requesting—

The SPEAKER. —stating unilaterally that you have a conflict and you want to be excused?

Mr. TRUITT. I am requesting permission to be excused because I have a conflict of interest.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Truitt's vote, will be excused from voting on this amendment.

Mr. TRUITT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to this amendment. Our Alternative Energy Portfolio Standard is relatively low compared to other States. Right now it simply is around 4 percent to up to 8 percent by 2020. Contrast that to our 8 percent, New Jersey, their AEPS is 17 percent. All of the surrounding States have significantly higher alternative energy portfolio standards than Pennsylvania.

This legislation was passed back in 1995 with the main sponsor, Senator Erickson, a Republican from Delaware County, and Representative Ross from Chester County.

This makes sense from a business perspective. As you drive across the Pennsylvania countryside, you will see—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. The sponsor of the amendment has just indicated to the Speaker that he is intending to withdraw this amendment. I did not want you to belabor your debate, if that is okay with the gentleman.

The Speaker thanks the gentleman. The amendment is withdrawn.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. VITALI offered the following amendment No. **A08356**:

Amend Bill, page 6, lines 10 and 11, by striking out "No less than 100 days prior" and inserting
Prior

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

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

Mr. VITALI. I am going to be withdrawing this amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Delaware County, Mr. Vitali, who calls up amendment A08365. Do you intend to introduce this amendment?

The gentleman, Mr. Vitali, is it your intention to introduce, offer amendment 8365?

Mr. VITALI. Let me just take a look at that.

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Yes, you want to offer it?

Mr. VITALI. I will.

The SPEAKER. Okay.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. VITALI offered the following amendment No. **A08365**:

Amend Bill, page 6, by inserting between lines 8 and 9
(7) Consult at least monthly with the State Plan Implementation Advisory Committee.
Section 5. State Plan Implementation Advisory Committee.
(a) Establishment.—There is established within the department the State Plan Implementation Advisory Committee. The purpose of the committee shall be to advise the department during the development of the provisions for the implementation of the State plan.
(b) Membership.—The membership of the committee shall consist of eight members of the General Assembly who shall be appointed as follows:
(1) Two members appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate.
(2) Two members appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate.
(3) Two members appointed by the Majority Leader of the House of Representatives.
(4) Two members appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.
(c) Appointment.—Members of the committee shall be appointed within 30 days of the effective date of this act.

(d) Terms of service.—Members of the committee shall serve until final approval of the State plan by the EPA.

(e) Chairperson.—The chairperson of the committee shall be elected from among and by a majority vote of the members appointed under subsection (b).

(f) Meetings.—Within 60 days of the effective date of this act, the department shall call the first meeting of the committee and shall establish a schedule for monthly meetings of the committee to assist the department in crafting the State plan.

(g) Expenses.—Members of the committee shall serve without compensation.

(h) Facilitator.—The department shall retain the services of a third-party facilitator to conduct the activities of the committee.

Amend Bill, page 6, line 9, by striking out "5" and inserting

6 Amend Bill, page 8, line 8, by striking out "6" and inserting
7

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

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

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is a relatively simple amendment that creates a legislative advisory committee consisting of eight members of the General Assembly, two by each of the caucuses, the purpose of which would be to advise the DEP in the crafting of their State implementation plan.

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

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

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the proposed amendment because I believe that all of our citizens deserve to be heard. And I think it will be much easier for our citizens to contact each of us as elected Representatives so that we can approve a plan here just as the gentlelady has proposed in her proposal, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, I do not believe a commission, another level of government, is necessary to create additional confusion so that our citizens can talk to us.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are adequately situated to debate these issues. I believe that we are in the position to best hear from our folks. And rather than erect additional barriers, I believe we should oppose this amendment and allow our body to take action, because I believe that is what our citizens would want.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the lady from Greene County, Mrs. Snyder.

Mrs. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

While I appreciate the maker of the amendment's intention, I do believe the bill clearly outlines for the process and that that is addressed in there. I do not really think there is a need for this amendment, so I would ask for a "no" vote. Thank you.

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

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Vitali, for the second time.

Mr. VITALI. Just to be clear, I wanted to— This simply would authorize a commission composed of eight members of the General Assembly to advise the Department of Environmental Protection on the crafting of the plan.

I think what we are trying to do here is to make sure that the DEP hears what we have to say, and these members would be appointed by the majority leader, the minority leader of the House and Senate, so they would be our spokesmen, as it were.

I am sensing this may be simply a knee-jerk reaction to something I am proposing, but I think if you really think about this, I have much worse amendments behind this. So this actually is really benign. I am sort of puzzled why anyone would oppose this because it is kind of the whole point of the bill to make sure that the DEP is listening to the legislature. So I might just, you know, take a minute and actually read this yourself and think, is there really anything wrong with this?

So I would ask for an affirmative vote.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—37

Bishop	Conklin	Kinsey	Roebuck
Boback	Daley, M.	Kirkland	Sabatina
Boyle, B.	Davidson	McCarter	Samuelson
Boyle, K.	DeLissio	McGeehan	Scavello
Brown, R.	Dermody	Miller, D.	Sims
Brown, V.	Evans	Miranda	Sturla
Brownlee	Freeman	O'Brien	Thomas
Caltagirone	Hanna	Painter	Vitali
Clay	Kim	Parker	Wheatley
Cohen			

NAYS—163

Adolph	Farry	Kortz	Pickett
Aument	Fee	Kotik	Pyle
Baker	Fleck	Krieger	Rapp
Barbin	Flynn	Kula	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Frankel	Lawrence	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Gabler	Longietti	Reed
Bizzarro	Gainey	Lucas	Reese
Bloom	Galloway	Mackenzie	Regan
Bradford	Gergely	Maher	Roae
Briggs	Gibbons	Mahoney	Rock
Brooks	Gillen	Major	Ross
Burns	Gillespie	Maloney	Rozzi
Carroll	Gingrich	Markosek	Saccone
Causer	Godshall	Marshall	Sainato
Christiana	Goodman	Marsico	Sankey
Clymer	Greiner	Matzie	Santarsiero
Corbin	Grell	McGinnis	Saylor
Costa, D.	Grove	McNeill	Schlossberg
Costa, P.	Hackett	Mentzer	Schreiber
Cox	Haggerty	Metcalfe	Simmons
Cruz	Hahn	Metzgar	Smith
Culver	Haluska	Miccarelli	Snyder
Cutler	Harhai	Micozzie	Sonney
Daley, P.	Harhart	Millard	Stephens
Davis	Harkins	Miller, R.	Stern
Day	Harper	Milne	Stevenson
Dean	Harris, A.	Mirabito	Swanger
Deasy	Harris, J.	Molchany	Tallman
Delozier	Heffley	Moul	Taylor
DeLuca	Helm	Mullery	Tobash

Denlinger	Hennessey	Mundy	Toepel
DiGirolamo	Hickernell	Murt	Toohil
Donatucci	James	Mustio	Topper
Dunbar	Kampf	Neilson	Truitt
Ellis	Kauffman	Neuman	Turzai
Emrick	Kavulich	O'Neill	Vereb
English	Keller, F.	Oberlander	Waters
Evankovich	Keller, M.K.	Pashinski	Watson
Everett	Keller, W.	Payne	White
Fabrizio	Killion	Peifer	Youngblood
Farina	Knowles	Petrarca	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Masser	Petri	Quinn
--------	-------	-------

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. VITALI offered the following amendment No. **A08366**:

Amend Bill, page 6, line 5, by inserting after "electricity" and take into consideration health care and physical damage costs that result from climate change

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What this amendment does, it adds to the provisions of the bill. The bill itself requires the DEP, in constructing their State implementation plan, to look for a least-cost approach to complying, and while I agree with that concept, what this amendment does is suggests or directs that other costs, such as the costs to human health, the costs with regard to damage related to climate change, also be factored in the cost equation.

Mr. Speaker, there is a significant health cost with regard to conventional pollutants – SOx (sulfur oxide) and NOx (nitrogen oxide) and mercury – and this needs to be factored in based on the type fuel we are using – coal versus gas versus nuclear.

I think statistics are pretty clear. When you have increased burning of coal, for example, you have increased asthma attacks, increased heart attack rates. There are certain health-care consequences.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend.

POINT OF ORDER

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

Mr. NEUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate if the member could stay focused on the amendment and the amending of the bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You probably should be encouraging the Speaker to stay focused on what is going on too.

I would ask the gentleman, Mr. Vitali, to focus his remarks to the content of the amendment.

Mr. VITALI. Well, let me just— Because I do not— Perhaps the gentleman was not paying attention. Let me just read the amendment and then he will realize why my remarks were relevant. The amendment says, "and take into consideration health care and physical damage costs that result from climate change." Now, that precisely is what I was talking about. The amendment talks about including costs associated with health care.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that the plan, that the EPA-proposed rules, for example, will reduce by 25 percent these traditional air pollutants, things like NOx and SOx, and to be specific, this would result in things like 6,000 premature deaths would be avoided, 150,000 asthma attacks would be avoided, 8,300 heart attacks would be avoided. The health benefits, it is estimated by the EPA rule, would be between \$55 billion and \$93 billion when fully implemented.

So what I am suggesting with regard to the lady's legislation when she suggests that the lowest health-care, lowest cost approach be taken, I am agreeing with that, but what I am saying is that we have to look at costs in a broader way. There are costs when you have these power plants emitting pollutants into the air, and that causes, in a statistically demonstrated way, our constituents to become sick, our constituents to go to the hospital, our constituents to miss days of work. There is a dollar figure attached to increased health-care costs. There is a dollar figure attached to people missing work. According to the EPA, when this rule, when this EPA rule, proposed June 2, is fully implemented, for every dollar invested, Americans would reap \$7 in health-care benefits. So I agree with the lady that we have to consider costs, but I think we really have to determine costs more broadly.

I also want to talk about costs from the perspective of damage. Now, they may not seem very immediate to you, but if you had a home along the Jersey Shore when Hurricane Sandy swept through, or if you lived in the community devastated by a Hurricane Sandy and you saw and you experienced damage, you would understand that costs have to be viewed in a much broader sense, because the reality is, this EPA-proposed rule is meant to ameliorate climate change, and climate change has tremendous costs from a physical standpoint, because the way climate change works, one, it causes sea levels to rise, and two, it heats up the level sea level – and I am saying this because I am trying to lay out how this increases cost. I am going to draw the relationship between these two in a moment. Costs are increased by climate change, costs we need to address in this bill, because when sea levels rise, when you do have a storm like Sandy, it starts at a higher plateau and it goes further inland. The other point here, in addition to it starting at a higher plateau, the hotter the ocean temperature, the greater the velocity of the storm. So that there are costs, and the greater the velocity of the storm and the higher level it starts, that increases the damage, so you have billions and billions of dollars in damage as a result of a Hurricane Sandy.

I mean, there are other costs associated with climate change I think that have to be taken into account. This summer we read in the papers about the wildfires out west due to drought – devastating costs, devastating damage. Mr. Speaker, I agree that costs need to be taken into account, but we have to look at it

broadly. We had a hearing in the city of Philadelphia about 2 years ago, and the Philadelphia water company, they sent a representative, and they testified right now that we are already paying the cost of climate change, because when they build their infrastructure, when they build their new infrastructure to withstand sea level rise and withholding storms, they have to spend more money in their infrastructure. So we are really already spending a considerable amount of time in costs.

Mr. Speaker, we have in this State in our budget, in the budget we will be passing soon, we have line items for things like West Nile virus. That is a cost. Our West Nile virus eradication program has a cost. Now, let me see if I can just sort of draw the connection between that budget item that we might be voting on within the next day or two and the EPA-proposed rule, which the lady is attempting to influence here.

We have these vectors, these mosquitos, who now are migrating further and further north into areas that they have never been, and that is attributable to climate change. Warming temperatures are attributable to climate change, and that is a cost which we are paying.

We also have a cost relating to Pennsylvania's ski industry. The warmer our climates become, the warmer that Pennsylvania's climate becomes—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend.

I would suggest while you have been doing a very diligent job of rementioning some of the critical elements of your two-line amendment, the broad examples are bordering on just being a little bit dilatory, in a sense, and I would suggest that the member focus on what the purpose of this amendment is as it is addressed to the bill and not all of the examples that you might be able to come up with as to explain what elements of your amendment are.

Mr. VITALI. Well, just to sort of bring it around, maybe I can start from the beginning.

In 2013 President Obama came out with his Climate Action Plan, and that plan—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. TURZAI. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. VITALI. —that plan was really critically important.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend. Will the gentleman suspend.

Maybe you did not understand what I was suggesting.

I was suggesting that the examples of what this may mean do not need to be elaborated on. What you need to be debating is how this language that you have proposed is important to be in this bill or not.

Mr. VITALI. Right. Right. Well, the point I am trying to make is, I do not think it is really obvious the costs, the total costs that climate change has. The costs, you know, it is easy to look at the costs of a given fuel – look at the cost of gas, look at the cost of coal, and look at other fuels – and make that comparison and just say, let us pick the lowest cost fuel. But my point is that there are these other consequences that do not necessarily show up on the balance sheet, you know, the balance sheet but have to be paid for in very real ways. For example—

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TURZAI. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman, Mr. Turzai, will state his inquiry.

Mr. TURZAI. We certainly understand that there are amendments filed, including this by the good gentleman from Delaware County, but with all due respect, if the gentleman does not want to keep his debate specifically to the amendment and get to the point, I know many members on both sides of the aisle have been requesting everybody to entertain a motion for a previous question. I think it is only appropriate that the good gentleman get to the point and stay on target.

The SPEAKER. I will take that inquiry as to whether or not that would be in order. The gentleman would not be in order at this moment. The gentleman, Mr. Vitali, does still have the floor.

The gentleman, Mr. Vitali, may proceed.

Mr. VITALI. And it would be very unfortunate with the most important issue of climate change.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman, Mr. Vitali—

Mr. VITALI. One of the other costs that I think we need to take into account, I know a lot of members of this General Assembly and I think a lot of Pennsylvanians enjoy trout fishing and the cold waters required for trout fishing, and I think we have – we, by warming our streams in Pennsylvania, are hurting a very important recreational activity with regard to trout streams. That is the cost—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

You know, I have tried to be somewhat polite about this. I am asking you to not repeat over and over these myriad of examples when that is not really speaking to the substance of your amendment as to why that should be in the bill or not in the bill, and I would ask the gentleman to focus on that and not a litany of examples, please.

Mr. VITALI. Well, in all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the more I can bring home the point of all the costs we do not think about when we make these decisions about energy choices, the more likely it is that the members of this General Assembly will support my amendment.

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems with regard— You know, Mr. Speaker, in summary, the choices we make with regard to the energy we choose have many costs simply beyond the utility bills we pay. So I am suggesting that the State, in developing its State implementation plan, considers other costs other than simply the cost of the utility, but consider the broad societal costs of failing to deal with climate change.

So I would ask for an affirmative vote.

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

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the lady from Greene County, Mrs. Snyder.

Mrs. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Everything that is in this amendment is already incorporated in the bill. It is duplicative and the DEP will take everything into consideration when it develops its plan. So I would ask for a "no" vote. Thank you.

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

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

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will echo the gentlelady's comments that spoke previously, and in fact, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman actually proved why we should vote down his amendment. He provided the very reasons in the debate itself.

Mr. Speaker, the debate regarding climate change and the impacts of it is very broad. This bill, however, is very specific. This bill deals with carbon dioxide regulations, and the plan that we are being required to create in terms of the Federal regulations is related to that. The gentleman himself went far afield talking about NOx and SOx and other issues that are on other regulations. Very simply, Mr. Speaker, I believe he was prejudging any plan that we might have. We will have a time for that debate as we approve the plan, and I would offer that we should oppose the amendment at this time, because we will have the time in the future, Mr. Speaker, to have the debate that the gentleman wants to have, and this bill is not the place for it.

Please oppose the amendment. Thank you.

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

For the second time, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Vitali. The gentleman waives off.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—51

Bishop	Daley, M.	Kinsey	Sabatina
Boback	Davidson	Kirkland	Samuelson
Boyle, B.	Davis	McCarter	Santarsiero
Boyle, K.	Dean	McGeehan	Scavello
Bradford	DeLissio	Miller, D.	Schlossberg
Briggs	Donatucci	Miranda	Schreiber
Brown, V.	Evans	Mullery	Sims
Brownlee	Frankel	Mundy	Stephens
Caltagirone	Freeman	Neilson	Sturla
Carroll	Gainey	O'Brien	Thomas
Cohen	Harper	Painter	Vitali
Conklin	Kavulich	Parker	Wheatley
Costa, D.	Kim	Roebuck	

NAYS—149

Adolph	Fee	Kortz	Petrarca
Aument	Fleck	Kotik	Pickett
Baker	Flynn	Krieger	Pyle
Barbin	Gabler	Kula	Rapp
Barrar	Galloway	Lawrence	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Gergely	Longiatti	Readshaw
Bizzarro	Gibbons	Lucas	Reed
Bloom	Gillen	Mackenzie	Reese
Brooks	Gillespie	Maher	Regan
Brown, R.	Gingrich	Mahoney	Roae
Burns	Godshall	Major	Rock
Causar	Goodman	Maloney	Ross
Christiana	Greiner	Markosek	Rozzi
Clay	Grell	Marshall	Saccone
Clymer	Grove	Marsico	Sainato
Corbin	Hackett	Matzie	Sankey
Costa, P.	Haggerty	McGinnis	Saylor
Cox	Hahn	McNeill	Simmons
Cruz	Haluska	Mentzer	Smith

Culver	Hanna	Metcalfe	Snyder
Cutler	Harhai	Metzgar	Sonney
Daley, P.	Harhart	Miccarelli	Stern
Day	Harkins	Micozzie	Stevenson
Deasy	Harris, A.	Millard	Swanger
DeLozier	Harris, J.	Miller, R.	Tallman
DeLuca	Heffley	Milne	Taylor
Denlinger	Helm	Mirabito	Tobash
Dermody	Hennessey	Molchany	Toepel
DiGirolamo	Hickernell	Moul	Toohil
Dunbar	James	Murt	Topper
Ellis	Kampf	Mustio	Truitt
Emrick	Kauffman	Neuman	Turzai
English	Keller, F.	O'Neill	Vereb
Evankovich	Keller, M.K.	Oberlander	Waters
Everett	Keller, W.	Pashinski	Watson
Fabrizio	Killion	Payne	White
Farina	Knowles	Peifer	Youngblood
Farry			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Masser	Petri	Quinn
--------	-------	-------

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

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

Mr. VITALI offered the following amendment No. **A08592**:

Amend Bill, page 6, lines 9 through 30; page 7, lines 1 through 30; page 8, lines 1 through 7, by striking out all of said lines on said pages and inserting

(7) Consult at least monthly with the State Plan Implementation Advisory Committee.

Section 5. State Plan Implementation Advisory Committee.

(a) Establishment.—There is established within the department the State Plan Implementation Advisory Committee. The purpose of the committee shall be to advise the department during the development of the provisions for the implementation of the State plan.

(b) Membership.—The membership of the committee shall consist of eight members of the General Assembly who shall be appointed as follows:

(1) Two members appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate.

(2) Two members appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(3) Two members appointed by the Majority Leader of the House of Representatives.

(4) Two members appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

(c) Appointment.—Members of the committee shall be appointed within 30 days of the effective date of this act.

(d) Terms of service.—Members of the committee shall serve until final approval of the State plan by the EPA.

(e) Chairperson.—The chairperson of the committee shall be elected from among and by a majority vote of the members appointed under subsection (b).

(f) Meetings.—Within 60 days of the effective date of this act, the department shall call the first meeting of the committee and shall establish a schedule for monthly meetings of the committee to assist the department in crafting the State plan.

(g) Expenses.—Members of the committee shall serve without compensation.

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

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

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what this does, because I think the— What this does is deletes the portion of the legislation which requires approval by the General Assembly and in its place puts in another means for the General Assembly to give input. It creates an advisory committee very similar to what we discussed two or three amendments ago.

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of reasons for doing this, and I wanted to talk about why I do not think it is necessary for the legislature to give approval or disapproval, because I do not think— I sort of want to explain what the State implementation plan is, and then by doing that try to make you understand why we already have that input.

A State implementation plan consists of a series of regulations and legislation. They have to be things like that – regulations, legislation – that are enforceable. The EPA will not accept a State implementation plan unless it has enforceable elements in it. Now, both of those elements— So you are basically talking about regulations and legislation. Obviously, things like legislation, as our AEPS moves forward, that obviously is enforceable. So our State implementation plan has that, and we have already passed on that as a body and we can revisit that at any point as a body.

The other thing it has are regulations. Each regulation we pass, there is input at multiple times for the legislature. Every regulation we pass has to go through the Environmental Quality Board process and the IRRC process, the Independent Regulatory Review Commission process.

Now, with regard to the Environmental Quality Board, that has legislators sitting on that board, about a half a dozen. It is a public process which requires numerous points of public notice, public input. It has an Attorney General review component to it, which is another check. It is chaired by the Secretary of the Department of Environmental Protection, in this case Chris Abruzzo, who has been appointed by the Governor, an elected official. So the Environmental Quality Board process, where all regs have to go through, has built into it public input, legislative input.

Additionally, once these regulations that are contained in the State implementation plan complete the Environmental Quality Board process, they then go through the IRRC regulatory process, and that process contains points where if this legislature wanted to stop any regulation going through because it was too onerous, it could stop that regulation. So right now already built into this process of us creating a State implementation plan, there is this ability for the legislature to stop dead in its tracks any element of that State implementation plan. So you might say, well, what is the matter with having another check, you know, belt and suspenders? What is the matter with that point?

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a problem with delay. There is a problem if the State does not enact an implementation plan in a timely fashion, in which case the Federal government would step in. Now, admittedly, we have tweaked the bill from its inception to ameliorate that impact to some degree, but the

reason for this amendment is the fact that we do not need legislative approval of a State implementation plan because we already have that State oversight in it. We do not want to create additional levels of bureaucracy needlessly.

So what this amendment would do would be, instead of creating a mechanism for delay, it creates this legislative committee, which has to meet monthly, monthly with the DEP to sort of go over each element of this plan. And so because there is this monthly component where there is this interaction, which is just what we want, the current structure is not necessary. So I would ask for an affirmative vote.

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

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the lady from Greene County, Mrs. Snyder.

Mrs. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We more than tweaked the bill. We amended the bill to ensure there would not be a FIP (Federal Implementation Plan). The intent of this legislation is to provide elected officials with oversight and approval of the State plan, and this amendment eliminates that language, defeating the entire purpose of the bill. I would ask for a "no" vote.

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

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

Mr. KORTZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, removing section 5 from the bill is a bad idea. The General Assembly needs to have input in it just as we did in Act 129 of 2008.

The other part of it, about the implementation advisory committee, we just rejected that in the last amendment.

I would urge a "no" vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—30

Boyle, B.	Conklin	Kim	Samuelson
Boyle, K.	Daley, M.	Kinsey	Santarsiero
Bradford	Dean	Kirkland	Sims
Briggs	DeLissio	Miranda	Sturla
Brown, V.	Evans	Mundy	Thomas
Brownlee	Frankel	Painter	Vitali
Caltagirone	Freeman	Parker	Wheatley
Cohen	Galloway		

NAYS—170

Adolph	Farina	Krieger	Pickett
Aument	Farry	Kula	Pyle
Baker	Fee	Lawrence	Rapp
Barbin	Fleck	Longietti	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Flynn	Lucas	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Gabler	Mackenzie	Reed
Bishop	Gainey	Maher	Reese
Bizzarro	Gergely	Mahoney	Regan
Bloom	Gibbons	Major	Roae
Boback	Gillen	Maloney	Rock
Brooks	Gillespie	Markosek	Roebuck
Brown, R.	Gingrich	Marshall	Ross
Burns	Godshall	Marsico	Rozzi
Carroll	Goodman	Matzie	Sabatina

Causer	Greiner	McCarter	Saccone
Christiana	Grell	McGeehan	Sainato
Clay	Grove	McGinnis	Sankey
Clymer	Hackett	McNeill	Saylor
Corbin	Haggerty	Mentzer	Scavello
Costa, D.	Hahn	Metcalfe	Schlossberg
Costa, P.	Haluska	Metzgar	Schreiber
Cox	Hanna	Miccarelli	Simmons
Cruz	Harhai	Micozzie	Smith
Culver	Harhart	Millard	Snyder
Cutler	Harkins	Miller, D.	Sonney
Daley, P.	Harper	Miller, R.	Stephens
Davidson	Harris, A.	Milne	Stern
Davis	Harris, J.	Mirabito	Stevenson
Day	Heffley	Molchany	Swanger
Deasy	Helm	Moul	Tallman
Delozier	Hennessey	Mullery	Taylor
DeLuca	Hickernell	Murt	Tobash
Denlinger	James	Mustio	Toepel
Dermody	Kampf	Neilson	Toohil
DiGirolamo	Kauffman	Neuman	Topper
Donatucci	Kavulich	O'Brien	Truitt
Dunbar	Keller, F.	O'Neill	Turzai
Ellis	Keller, M.K.	Oberlander	Vereb
Emrick	Keller, W.	Pashinski	Waters
English	Killion	Payne	Watson
Evankovich	Knowles	Peifer	White
Everett	Kortz	Petrarca	Youngblood
Fabrizio	Kotik		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Masser	Petri	Quinn
--------	-------	-------

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

On the question recurring,

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

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

The House will come to order.

On the question recurring,

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

MOTION FOR PREVIOUS QUESTION

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Speaker recognizes the lady from Clarion County, Ms. Oberlander.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move for the previous question pursuant to rule 61, my motion for the previous question concerning whether the House will agree to the bill on second consideration as amended.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The lady, Ms. Oberlander, moves the previous question on HB 2354, PN 3843, on page 3 of today's House calendar. Those who second this motion will rise and remain standing until their names are recorded. Twenty members are required.

The lady, Ms. Major; the gentleman, Mr. Everett; the gentleman, Mr. Knowles; the lady, Ms. Toohil; the gentleman, Mr. Miller; the gentleman, Mr. Ellis; the gentleman, Mr. Pyle; the gentleman, Mr. Tallman; the gentleman, Mr. Reed; the gentleman, Mr. Cutler; the gentleman, Mr. Metcalfe; the gentleman, Mr. Hickernell; the lady, Ms. Rapp; the gentleman, Mr. Roae; the gentleman, Mr. Causer; the gentleman, Mr. Topper; the gentleman, Mr. Truitt; the gentleman, Mr. Lucas; the gentleman, Mr. Reese; the lady, Mrs. Brooks; the gentleman, Mr. Moul, just for good measure.

The motion for the previous question having been made and seconded, those in favor of the motion for the previous question will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "no." An "aye" vote is a vote to end all debate and bring the House to an immediate vote.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Samuelson, from Northampton County rise?

Mr. SAMUELSON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Normally the House votes on bills on third reading. If this motion were to pass and it would be moved to an immediate vote on second reading, if the State Constitution says we have to wait until third reading, what is the impact of this vote?

The SPEAKER. Under most cases we do not – you are correct – we do not have a roll-call vote on second consideration. If this motion passes, then I would do what I normally do and say, "Will the House agree to the bill? Agreed to," because we have cut off all debate on other amendments.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Would we still have a third reading tomorrow on this legislation?

The SPEAKER. You mean, are you concerned about a roll-call vote? Yes, of course, presuming that it is called up on – you know, it would be on third consideration and it would be considered again, yes.

Mr. SAMUELSON. And final parliamentary inquiry. If this motion would pass, are any— The House has considered six amendments to this bill; I am sorry, five amendments to this bill. There are more than 30 that have been filed. If this amendment would pass, would this cut off debate or would it cut off all possible amendments by members of this House?

The SPEAKER. By virtue of the motion that was made, it would cut off further debate on all the amendments and any subsequent debate on the actual second consideration of the bill, which we rarely have second consideration debate. However, it is conceivable. So it would cut off the debate, and as part of that, it would embody any amendments that have not yet been considered.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Okay. Are members of the House allowed to speak on this motion?

The SPEAKER. It is not debatable. The motion to move the previous question is not debatable.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. I will repeat: An "aye" vote is a vote to end all debate, bringing the House to an immediate vote.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—102

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

NAYS—98

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Masser	Petri	Quinn
--------	-------	-------

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

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

(Bill as amended will be reprinted.)

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 622, PN 2222**, entitled:

An Act providing for the licensure of persons providing debt settlement services, for powers and duties of the Department of Banking and Securities and for enforcement; imposing civil penalties; and making a related repeal.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

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

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

NAYS-6

Brooks	Metcalfe	Rapp	Thomas
McGinnis	Miranda		

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-3

Masser	Petri	Quinn
--------	-------	-------

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 1543, PN 3829**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of October 17, 2008 (P.L.1645, No.132), known as the Home Improvement Consumer Protection Act, providing for the definition of "time and materials"; and further providing for application fees and for home improvement contracts.

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-200

Adolph	Emrick	Kinsey	Petrarca
Aument	English	Kirkland	Pickett
Baker	Evankovich	Knowles	Pyle
Barbin	Evans	Kortz	Rapp
Barrar	Everett	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Fabrizio	Krieger	Readshaw

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

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-3

Masser	Petri	Quinn
--------	-------	-------

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 1013, PN 3883**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in pupils and attendance, further providing for home education program.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

Mr. McCARTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the maker of the motion please stand for interrogation?

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

Mr. McCARTER. One second, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am curious to know under this particular bill, would a student aged 17 be eligible to get a diploma whose parent has determined that they are ready to graduate and has been certified by a hired evaluator; in other words, someone who is not 18, the normal age for graduation. Would that be possible?

Mr. GILLEN. Seventeen years of age and they have committed themselves to all the necessary requirements and completed all of those requirements?

Mr. McCARTER. All the requirements as their parent has certified and said that they have finished and the evaluator has said that they have—

Mr. GILLEN. There is nothing under the bill that establishes a basement or ceiling as far as the age.

Mr. McCARTER. So it could be at any age then. Is that correct? It could be as early as 12 or 10—

Mr. GILLEN. No.

Mr. McCARTER. —if in fact that would be the case?

Mr. GILLEN. No.

Mr. McCARTER. What would prevent that?

Mr. GILLEN. Current law.

Mr. McCARTER. Protocol?

Mr. GILLEN. Current law.

Mr. McCARTER. Current law. Why? Could someone not have— If the parent certifies that they have reached the level of having completed all of those particular courses, would that not justify, in a sense, the evaluator then saying that if they have passed that, that they could do that?

Mr. GILLEN. If you are going to complete 4 years of high school English, 3 years of math, and all the addendum requirements, it could not be compacted as narrowly as you are describing.

Mr. McCARTER. Well, if it could be at 17, could it be 16?

Mr. GILLEN. It would be current law. I think you are asking about what is in the bill.

Mr. McCARTER. All right. Who determines the curriculum for each of the homeschooling entities?

Mr. GILLEN. The State has a standard for required subjects.

Mr. McCARTER. And within that standard, let us say, would it be possible for, let us say, that someone could take a position within, let us say, social studies courses or in science classes that the earth still is – that the sun goes around the earth?

Mr. GILLEN. Who is the someone that you referred to—

Mr. McCARTER. Well, in the case of the—

Mr. GILLEN. —prior to the last statement?

Mr. McCARTER. The parent, I assume, creates the curriculum for the homeschoolers or they are using particular materials that could be purchased in some way from various different groups and consequently someone could sell a package that suggests that those are possible. Is that possible under this as well?

Mr. GILLEN. That is not in the bill, and I am not aware of such a scenario.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (MATTHEW E. BAKER) PRESIDING

Mr. McCARTER. On the bill, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. McCARTER. Mr. Speaker, since I have become a State Rep, I have had a chance to meet with several of the homeschool parents in my community, and I must admit I have been very, very impressed by a number of the homeschooling programs that they have actually carried out, and I commend them highly in terms of that. But unfortunately, I think there is another side to this also, that this particular bill, since it takes away from the ability of school districts, local school districts to monitor what takes place in homeschooling, leaves a door open and I think is very problematic. I think there is a chance here, not with the intended consequences that I think the maker of motion is making, I think that there are unintended consequences that could happen, however, and I want to address a couple of those.

As legislators, I think we should all be in favor of a bill that makes it easier for high school students to graduate by removing roadblocks that may be inhibiting their progress. However, we should most certainly not be in favor of a bill that makes it entirely too easy for a homeschooled student to be granted a high school diploma without the proper checks and balances to ensure that they have received a proper education. That is not the point of our education system, Mr. Speaker. Our goal should not be to churn out students with a nice-looking diploma they can hang on the wall. We must prepare them for future endeavors so they can lead successful and satisfying lives while many Pennsylvanians complete – or as Pennsylvanians now compete in a global economy.

HB 1013 severely limits the checks and balances a school district is given in overseeing the appropriateness of a home education program taking place within his district. It also makes several deletions to the concurrent program requirements relating to academic accountability. Mr. Speaker, why are we removing academic accountability in homeschooling? It is our duty to ensure that students are receiving the proper education, and while I am certainly not against homeschooling in any context and believe that the vast majority of our homeschooled children receive a fine education, there needs to be a system which ensures the education is not being shortchanged or misdirected.

This bill removes all ability for a school district to check on a student's progress and ensure that they are receiving an education worthy of a Pennsylvania diploma. It places all responsibility to monitor, evaluate, and certify that the homeschooled child is receiving a proper education on the parents and the independent evaluator who is paid by the parents. This person is not necessarily a high school teacher.

This person is not even necessarily a college graduate. It is not someone from the district reviewing tests and papers. In fact, the school district will no longer receive any paperwork about the quality of education a child is receiving besides a report from an evaluator – who, again, is paid by the parents – stating that they believe a proper education has taken place.

Furthermore, Pennsylvania is currently spending millions of dollars to implement rigorous Pennsylvania core standards to assure that our high school diplomas have meaning and can stand with diplomas from other States. Why then are we moving accountability and oversight for home-educated students in the opposite direction?

Mr. Speaker, HB 1013 creates a double standard for diplomas awarded in Pennsylvania, along with the opportunity for others to take advantage of this situation and misdirect the education of children to potentially radical ideas that may not be part of the mainstream of what we have in Pennsylvania. We would hope, we would hope that this particular bill, in a sense, does not do that, but the door has been opened, and I would hope in the future that we take that into consideration, and I ask my colleagues to join me in a "no" vote at this time. Thank you.

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 for the gentleman, Mr. ADOLPH. Without objection, the leave of absence will be so granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 1013 CONTINUED

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

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to preface my remarks by stating that I certainly support the ability of people to homeschool their children. I think it is an opportunity that we have long enshrined in Pennsylvania and that, by and large, the vast majority of homeschool parents do an excellent job of homeschooling their children.

At the same time my concern with this bill is that we are changing the law in terms of the involvement of superintendents to be able to review, at least on paper, the homeschool program. Under current law they have the opportunity to look through the portfolio and determine whether in their view an appropriate education is taking place, and I think superintendents have a vested interest to do that. Number one, they are concerned about all the students that reside within their geographic boundaries, and number two, on occasion those students return to the regular public school and we need to make sure that they are prepared for the grade level that they are in.

Now, the problem with this bill is that it sets up a process whereby the superintendent, upon a reasonable belief, can trigger a process of review by a hearing. However, the superintendent has no ability to form a reasonable belief because they have no ability to review the portfolio in the first instance. So we have created a system that looks like there is a check and a balance, but actually there is not. How does one form a reasonable belief without looking at the portfolio from the first instance? When I asked that question in committee, the

answer was, "They could have a report from a neighbor." I do not think that is a really strong piece of evidence. We certainly do not want a scenario where neighbors, for whatever reason, are turning in a fellow neighbor because they do not believe an appropriate education is occurring, or worse yet, because of some other personal animus that might be between the two neighbors.

And so I think the bill has some strong attributes to it, but why are we eliminating the process of the superintendent reviewing the portfolio? I am not going to say that every superintendent is infallible, but by and large these are folks that are selected by school districts that have gone through rigorous training and I think that we should have some degree of confidence in.

And so it is for that reason that I rise to oppose the bill. Once again, I do not want my opposition to the bill to be misinterpreted that somehow I do not support the right of parents to homeschool children and that they somehow do not, by and large, do a good job of that. But there are instances, and I have seen them on occasion, where it is not occurring, and we have to give the superintendent the tool to review that portfolio, and so that is why I oppose the bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. TOPPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to add a little bit of a different perspective as a homeschool graduate and someone who has been through a lot of these requirements. And let me just say that I have heard some mischaracterizations over the past few days about homeschooling, and so I would just like to say this: I thank my parents for making the sacrifices that they needed to in order to provide me with the best education that they saw fit, because as a parent that is our responsibility. It is not the government's. And so I certainly appreciate the sacrifice that they showed in making sure that I received the best education for my particular unique circumstances of which each of our children has.

I would also like to say I have heard some comments about what happens when the supervisor, who is the parent, does not have a college degree or maybe they do not have a teaching degree, and all I can say is this: my mom was a waitress and then a stay-at-home mom without a college degree. And if you would ask me, "Well, Topper, how do you think she did as a supervisor of a home education program?" I would say, "She did a pretty doggone good job."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the maker of the bill stand for brief interrogation?

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

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Under the current homeschooling legislation, homeschool parents that choose to homeschool their children, they would have to select a curriculum that is approved by the Department of Education. Is that not true?

Mr. GILLEN. The Pennsylvania Department of Education has the required subject areas, but it is not specific as to curriculum.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Does the curriculum have to be approved by an outside authority other than the homeschool parent, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. GILLEN. The bill is silent on outside authorities.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Under current law, does a homeschool parent have to submit the curriculum to any outside authority to make sure that that curriculum meets the standards of education in the Commonwealth?

Mr. GILLEN. There would be circumstances under which that were true.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Once a homeschool parent has permission to homeschool their child under the Commonwealth standards, is there any way that a superintendent with your bill can look into whether or not the education is appropriate?

Mr. GILLEN. If the superintendent has a reasonable belief at any point during the school year, yes, they can request a certification through the supervisor of the homeschool and the evaluator consummates that certification. We are talking about a clinical psychologist, teaching professionals, certified educators.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. And is a hearing process generated if there is an inquiry made by the superintendent?

Mr. GILLEN. There is a provision within the bill for a hearing process. The school board would select a hearing officer and determination would be made at that point as to whether an appropriate education is taking place or not.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. So there is an evaluation process in place in the current bill that would allow the superintendent and the Department of Education to determine whether or not appropriate education is taking place in that homeschool?

Mr. GILLEN. That is correct.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill.

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

Mrs. DAVIDSON. I believe that we should applaud the choices of parents to make the sacrifice to homeschool their children. The cost to the Commonwealth is very minimal, and if we are providing a mechanism whereby we approve in the Commonwealth the curriculum that is used and there is an evaluation process going forward up until the time of graduation, I see no reason why homeschooled children should not be entitled to the same level of diploma as any other child educated under the Commonwealth, and so therefore I urge a "yes" vote.

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

Mr. PETRARCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of this legislation. When I listen to colleagues on my side of the aisle, they say that we like homeschooling, we support homeschooling, we just do not trust anyone involved with homeschooling.

We have an evaluator. Affidavits are put in. Students are evaluated at the end of the year. I applaud the gentleman from Berks. I think that his bill streamlines the process, and I think it is good for homeschooled children in Pennsylvania.

I want to focus on the diploma part of this legislation. Under the Pennsylvania homeschool law as it stands now, when it was first written there was no mechanism in that law to allow for diplomas for homeschool students, and as a result, in my opinion at least, homeschool students have been discriminated against in this Commonwealth. Graduates, children who have gone through 12 years or the 12th year of a homeschool

program, when they have applied to schools in Pennsylvania, be it fine art schools, even mechanic schools, some of our universities have said, you do not have a diploma; therefore, you must take a GED (general educational development), or in some situations because there was no mechanism for a diploma, diploma programs sprang up across Pennsylvania and they have their own curriculum that works for some families and does not work for others. Again, as a result, some families, even PHEAA (Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency) students that apply for PHEAA that are not graduates of a homeschool diploma program or do not take a GED are ineligible for PHEAA dollars. So this legislation would fix that.

And again, Mr. Speaker, I think homeschool students in Pennsylvania have more than proved themselves over the years. And again, I support this legislation and ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

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, so that there is no confusion about where I am and what I support, let me get that out early, let me get the record clear. I support parents taking responsibility for the education of their children, but I do not want, I do not want to get so caught up in that that I forget the world that we live in. There are some penitentiaries that have a higher population than some communities. In the last few years there has been an explosion of women incarcerated in Pennsylvania. There are almost a million children born from crack-addicted parents that are out there without parents, some in the foster system, some on the street.

And, Mr. Speaker, everybody could not be like the last speaker's parents. Everybody is not going to be like Pattie Thomas, my mama, that raised seven of us, and I graduated from the top of my law class, my law school. So, Mr. Speaker, that is good, and I thank God for those of us that have been able to make it, but there are a whole bunch of children who did not ask to come here but are here and have a right to be able to access the same things that other people access.

And so to that end, Mr. Speaker, I am a big advocate for homeschooling, but I think that it is wrong when we set up this separate paradigm. We have one system of accountability for kids that go to public school and this bill provides another paradigm of accountability.

Mr. Speaker, we are this year celebrating where America is from 1954 when there were kids that could not go to school or kids could not go to school because they were the wrong color or they are from the wrong background. Here is what it has to do with. Mr. Speaker, it is not, it is not good for us to set up these different boxes full of God's children. If education is important, if we are holding to our constitutional duty to provide for a system of public education, then we need to create situations where all children can achieve and we are able to measure their achievement and we are able to monitor and provide the kind of support that they need.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I applaud you for advancing this bill, but it is wrong at this time. We need a system that supports the standards that we have established. I think that the Pennsylvania Department of Education has laid out some good standards and systems of accountability, and for those who homeschool, they should have to comply with that. We do not need to create a situation where folks can do something else and expect

something different than what other children might be receiving, and that is my problem tonight, that is my problem with homeschooling.

And I would like for you to ask if you would withdraw your bill and go back and tailor it to the requirements outlined by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and make sure that homeschoolers are measured by the same standards that in-school children are measured. I ask you to do that.

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

Ms. BOBACK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

May I interrogate the maker of the bill?

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

Ms. BOBACK. Thank you.

My question has to do with the military. So when a student, a homeschooled student finishes the course or graduates, what do they have in their hand as far as the military requirements go?

Mr. GILLEN. Nothing. We are the only State in the United States of America that has de facto graduation requirements for homeschoolers but then at the end of that highway do not acknowledge it with a certificate, a diploma, or any documentation that they could approach the United States military with. And as a member of the Veterans Affairs Committee, that is of grave concern to me. We have patriotic young men and women who want to join the United States military. In fact, this very issue has been brought to our attention by recruiters who would be favorably disposed toward a change in Pennsylvania law.

Ms. BOBACK. So what do you do now if somebody is desperately wanting to go into the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, whatever?

Mr. GILLEN. They would have to pursue a certification outside of current Pennsylvania— Excuse me; they would have to pursue a certification or diploma outside the traditional realm.

Ms. BOBACK. Above and beyond what they get in a homeschool setup?

Mr. GILLEN. One of the ways you can actually achieve diploma status in Pennsylvania is to go to college and earn 30 graduate – 30 hours in college in order to receive a Pennsylvania diploma. So you would actually have to attend an institution of higher learning. There is also the possibility of a GED route.

Ms. BOBACK. Thank you very much for your answer.

Mr. GILLEN. You are welcome.

Ms. BOBACK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to support HB 1013. Our parents are always I believe the primary educators of their children regardless of what educational decisions they make for them. Now, whether you choose a public school, a private school, parochial school, homeschool, parents are always, you know, the most important part of this, but for those parents who take on that extra, that extra need, that extra time and effort to choose to homeschool, I think we have to greatly respect that effort that they put into it.

Now, I know many homeschool families and many children who are currently and have been homeschooled and their educations to me seem fantastic. They are pretty much all very bright and well educated. This bill I believe provides a process

to allow the parents who choose to do this, to do it without the added strings that are currently in place.

Now, I have three children, all of them aged 4 and under, and as my wife and I sit and often discuss what we are going to do with our children, it may be public school, it may be our church's Catholic school, or it may be homeschooling. My wife is a certified teacher, and now she stays at home with our young children right now and may continue to do so. I do not know what we are going to decide, but if, by chance, we do decide to be a homeschooling family, I want to make sure that we have equal rights and a fair process to do so. So that is why I will be supporting HB 1013, and I thank the gentleman for introducing this bill.

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

Mr. CLYMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of HB 1013. Most of what I wanted to say has already been said so I will kind of shorten my remarks.

But having a relationship with many homeschoolers, I will tell you that for the overwhelming majority of these homeschoolers, they are very polite, they have manners. They are learning the traditional family values, which to me are so important. Their history lessons are on target. They are learning about what our great country is all about. They interact with other friends who are members who attend public schools. They take field trips. Mr. Speaker, they are involved in community projects. They do volunteer work. They do so many things outside the academics, and many of them do go on to higher education, but they are good citizens, and that is what we should be about, having our students become good citizens. So whether they are at a public school or homeschoolers or private schools, that is the bottom line, so they can take their place in our society and continue the great legacy of this great nation of ours, and they do that.

So I again ask support of this legislation.

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

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

I certainly respect everyone's opinions here this evening, and as a father, grandfather, and also as a former teacher, just to share some thoughts with the body as well, there is no doubt that the greatest teachers that I have ever had were my mother and father. There is no question about that, and there is no question about the love that you receive from your mom and dad.

As a teacher, I witnessed all sorts of children that came to our school district with a variety of problems, and the school in total, in whole, would take those children in and do everything they could to make them productive citizens. The experiences that I have had, though, indicate that 9 out of 10 times, any child that was educated at home that came back to our education institution was well behind the academics of the students that were within that school. On a very rare occasion did we have a student that came from homeschooling that was at the level or beyond the level of an academic advancement.

I have great respect for all the parents that take on this responsibility and have the resources in which to be able to teach their children all the necessary academics for them to become whatever they want to be. It seems very possible to

make it from grade one or kindergarten to grade six and well beyond into seventh, eighth, and ninth, but as we get into the high school grades and we begin talking about algebra II and trigonometry and physics and chemistry, it becomes extremely difficult for any one person to master all of those academics, all those skills.

As I indicated to you earlier, there is great respect that I feel for everyone in their opinion and great respect for the parents that have taken this responsibility and have presented such success.

To the maker of this bill, to the wonderful child that they have educated, a great example of the success and certainly, you know, great future, and to our colleague that also presented himself, you know, what a tremendous testament it is that you are here, that you are here and able to provide your vote for the betterment of those that you represent.

So I just share that with you as someone who taught for many years and who experienced firsthand and in my experience. I would urge a "no" vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is in receipt from the minority leader for a request for leave of absence for the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. EVANS. Without objection, the leave will be so granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 1013 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question recurs, shall the bill pass finally? Agreeable to the provisions of the Constitution, the yeas—

Mr. GILLEN. Clancy, can I make—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pardon me.

Mr. GILLEN. Okay.

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

Mr. GILLEN. Thank you much for a spirited debate.

I would just like to respond to one of the comments that I heard that home educators are somehow outside of the mainstream. I heard many remarks this evening that conceivably were outside of the mainstream. Many of our perspectives in this building may be outside the mainstream. And you know what? That is what this country was built on. This is not just about homeschool. This is about freedom, the freedom to make decisions on behalf – the freedom to make the decision and the choices in your home education program, and I recommend an affirmative vote on HB 1013.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. McCarter, for the second time on final passage.

Mr. McCARTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do not want anyone in this chamber to misstate what I stated earlier when I used the word "mainstream." I was not suggesting in any way, shape, or form that the people today who are homeschooling their children are out of the mainstream. That was not what I said. What I was suggesting, however, is

that when you remove the safeguards, when you remove the ability of local school districts to be able to monitor and be able to check what is going on, that leaves a door open for others to take advantage of that situation. That is all I was suggesting within the comments of that.

And I would hope that no one takes offense, in a sense, who is currently homeschooling. I have the greatest respect for the parents and for the homeschooling effort that has been done that allows people to do that, the greatest of respect, but I do worry that there are groups out there who could take advantage of this. That would be the unintended consequences that would in fact invalidate the great work that is being done by homeschoolers across the State of Pennsylvania at the present moment, and I would hope that that does not happen so that the discrediting of all the efforts that are being done by good homeschoolers would be lost as part of this as an unintended consequence.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Gillen, for the second time on final passage.

Mr. GILLEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Anybody who read the bill would understand that there is accountability built into the bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The members will please suspend.

We did check the record. He had been interrogated on several occasions, and he was entitled for second recognition.

Anyone else seeking recognition? Seeing none.

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—133

Aument	Farry	Krieger	Rapp
Baker	Fee	Lawrence	Reed
Barbin	Fleck	Lucas	Reese
Barrar	Gabler	Mackenzie	Regan
Benninghoff	Galloway	Maher	Roe
Bloom	Gibbons	Major	Rock
Boback	Gillen	Maloney	Ross
Brooks	Gillespie	Marshall	Saccone
Brown, R.	Gingrich	Marsico	Sainato
Caltagirone	Godshall	Matzie	Sankey
Carroll	Greiner	McGinnis	Saylor
Causar	Grell	Mentzer	Scavello
Christiana	Grove	Metcalfe	Schreiber
Clymer	Hackett	Metzgar	Simmons
Corbin	Hahn	Miccarelli	Smith
Costa, D.	Haluska	Micozzie	Snyder
Cox	Harhai	Millard	Sonney
Cruz	Harhart	Miller, R.	Stephens
Culver	Harper	Milne	Stern
Cutler	Harris, A.	Mirabito	Stevenson
Davidson	Heffley	Moul	Swanger
Day	Helm	Mullery	Tallman
Delozier	Hennessey	Murt	Taylor
DeLuca	Hickernell	Mustio	Tobash
Denlinger	James	Neilson	Toepel
Dermody	Kampf	Neuman	Toohil
DiGrolamo	Kauffman	O'Neill	Topper
Dunbar	Keller, F.	Oberlander	Truitt

Ellis	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Turzai
Emrick	Killion	Peifer	Vereb
English	Kim	Petrarca	Watson
Evankovich	Knowles	Pickett	Wheatley
Everett	Kotik	Pyle	Youngblood
Farina			

NAYS—65

Bishop	Deasy	Kinsey	Parker
Bizzarro	DeLissio	Kirkland	Pashinski
Boyle, B.	Donatucci	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Boyle, K.	Fabrizio	Kula	Readshaw
Bradford	Flynn	Longietti	Roebuck
Briggs	Frankel	Mahoney	Rozzi
Brown, V.	Freeman	Markosek	Sabatina
Brownlee	Gainey	McCarter	Samuelson
Burns	Gergely	McGeehan	Santarsiero
Clay	Goodman	McNeill	Schlossberg
Cohen	Haggerty	Miller, D.	Sims
Conklin	Hanna	Miranda	Sturla
Costa, P.	Harkins	Molchany	Thomas
Daley, M.	Harris, J.	Mundy	Vitali
Daley, P.	Kavulich	O'Brien	Waters
Davis	Keller, W.	Painter	White
Dean			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Adolph	Masser	Petri	Quinn
Evans			

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 402, PN 3881**, entitled:

An Act imposing duties on lessees of oil and natural gas leases; and providing for the recording of surrender documents from oil and natural gas leases and of affidavits of termination, expiration or cancellation.

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—198

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Adolph	Masser	Petri	Quinn
Evans			

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 2345, PN 3730**, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 13 (Commercial Code) and 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in general provision, providing for construction; and in particular rights and immunities, further providing for required disclosures in connection with rental-purchase agreement and for lessee's right to acquire ownership.

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. Cohen, is recognized.
Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this bill regulates the rent-to-own industry, which has a highly controversial history in Pennsylvania and at one point was banned in Pennsylvania. It was set up, reestablished about 20 years ago with regulations designed to prevent the details and the abuses of low-income consumers that had led it to be banned in the first place.

Now, people go into places and they rent goods and they pay much more in rent, very often, than they would pay to simply buy the goods. And the existing legislation sets forth the rule that you take – that a person has the right to buy a good if he pays one-half of the money – the person has a right to buy the good if the general price for the good is one-half of what he has already paid for it, plus, I believe, \$500.

This is a formula that is designed to stop the exploitation of low-income individuals. It has worked to a substantial degree. We do not hear, for instance, of any effort to ban the rent-to-own industry under this formula. The rent-to-own industry is making decent profits. We do not hear them beating on our doors complaining. They are all over Pennsylvania and there is no effort to ban them. By allowing them to set up any price to buy their goods, we are allowing them to make it virtually impossible for people to buy the goods no matter how much money they have sent in rent. This is not probably in the interest of the rent-to-own industry, although their lobbyists obviously believe it is in their interest.

But in any case, whatever effect this has on the rent-to-own industry, it is clear what effect it is going to have on consumers. Consumers are going to be in a position where no matter how much money they pay for a product, they may not be able to buy it. It depends upon what the contract is, and the rent-to-own business can set forth any kind of contract it wants to do.

And the people who patronize the rent-to-own industry are not the most discriminating of consumers. They are people with limited incomes and limited ability to put out the amount of money that is needed to buy products, and they are people obviously with limited credit as well.

I think this is a bill that low- and moderate-income consumers do not need. I think despite the support of the rent-to-own industry, this is a bill that is not in the long-term interest of the rent-to-own industry, and it is certainly not in the long-term interest of low- and moderate-income consumers who patronize the rent-to-own industry.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this legislation.

Now, we have a similar situation with electric rates right now. People are told they can switch to an electric rate supplier and they have to sign a new agreement. And the new agreement gives them immediate reduction rates, but the electric rate supplier has the ability to raise the rates at any time. And we have a bill introduced by the gentleman from Montgomery County, the head of the Consumer Affairs Committee, to deal with that situation.

I believe these two bills are very, very similar in what they are offering consumers. They deal with the same fundamental issue even though they deal with it in two completely different contexts. I think the bills ought to be considered together.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. COHEN. And I would move that this bill be tabled until such time as we deal with Mr. Godshall's bill so that we can deal with them together and have all the issues on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The question is on the motion to table by the gentleman, Mr. Cohen.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question of the motion to table, the Chair recognizes the majority whip.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We would oppose tabling of this bill. It has had hearings, it has gone through the process, and the previous speaker is actually a sponsor of the bill. We think it is a very good bill and should move forward so we can move this bill over to the Senate.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

And on the motion to table, the gentleman, Mr. Cohen, is recognized for the second time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, for the record, I was formerly a cosponsor of the bill, until I thoroughly read it and digested it and understood the implications of it, and I have withdrawn my cosponsorship of it. I believe it is not in the public interest or in the interest of the rent-to-own industry for this legislation to pass. And therefore, I would strongly urge that we support the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is nondebatable except for the leaders. I did notice other members seeking recognition.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—84

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

NAYS—114

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Adolph	Masser	Petri	Quinn
Evans			

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

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the gentleman, Mr. Caltagirone, is recognized.

Mr. CALTAGIRONE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just to set the record straight. The Office of the Attorney General and the Office of the Attorney General Consumer Protection support this legislation. I would urge a favorable vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Marsico, on his legislation.

Mr. MARSICO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is a vote that came out of committee. It was unanimous in committee. We worked with the Democrat leadership, the Democrat chair to advance this legislation. It is consumer-friendly. It is a consumer protection bill, and once again supported by the Bureau of Consumer Protection and the Office of Attorney General. So I ask for a "yes" vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Thomas, on final passage of HB 2345.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. THOMAS. Once I vote on this, can we go to a budget and some issues around education and jobs?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Thomas, in due time, but right now this bill is before us for consideration. It is not the budget.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I ask that question because these last few bills that we have been dealing with, we are really putting more monkeys on people's backs, and if people are already struggling, why should we be doing things that make life more difficult? This rental purchase industry is not a good industry. It is not a good industry.

I remember during my early days, we spent 3 days on this because we were trying to figure out whether people should be able to pay the balance of their agreement and then be able to own the property. And we went back and forth on that issue because the industry did not want people to be able to pay their balance and then own the property. They wanted you to pay triple the outstanding amount and then maybe be considered for ownership.

In this particular bill, there are no benefits to the average consumer. We are not protecting anybody, other than maybe the industry, and I am not even going to imply that. But vote "no" on this bill.

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

Mr. SAMUELSON. I would like to interrogate the sponsor of the bill.

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

Mr. SAMUELSON. Okay. There was a mention earlier about hearings being held. When you look at this bill, it was introduced on June 12 and it was voted out of committee on June 17. Were public hearings held within that 5-day period? I mean, the bill was introduced about 2 1/2 weeks ago. Have there been public hearings this month on this specific—

Mr. MARSICO. Mr. Speaker, there was a meeting held on the bill. There was not a public hearing. I did not mention a public hearing. I said that it was supported, it was unanimous in committee, and we had a meeting.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Okay. One further question: Under current law, is there a cap on how much a rent-to-own business can charge? I think the cap is no more than 150 percent of the value of the purchase price of that item that is being rented. Is that cap being changed by this bill? Is there still going to be a cap on how much a rent-to-own business can charge, or is that being lifted as long as there is a written contract?

Mr. MARSICO. There will not be a statutory cap. It will make you disclose the price in the contract.

Mr. SAMUELSON. So the bill requires disclosure. Does the existing law, before this bill comes up, does the existing law have a cap of 150 percent that would protect the consumer?

Mr. MARSICO. It has a cap. Let me read you the formula, it is current law. "...any time after tendering an initial rental payment, a lessee may acquire ownership of the property that is the subject of the rental-purchase agreement by tendering an amount equal at a maximum to the amount by which the cash price of the leased property exceeds 50 percent of all rental payments made by the lessee. "

Mr. SAMUELSON. Okay. And last question: If this bill passes, that cap is removed?

Mr. MARSICO. Yes. It removes the formula and then requires that a rental purchase agreement specify a price or formula or method for calculation of the purchase price.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The question recurs, shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provisions of the Constitution— Pardon me. I am sorry. Yes, sir.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Cohen, for the second time.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, when I originally cosponsored the bill, I did so because the memo for the bill said this bill gets rid of a confusing formula. What the memo did not say is that the reason for the formula was as you make more payments, the buyout price goes down. So under current law, the more you pay, the less the buyout payment.

This bill gets rid of the formula, and instead, any price, any formula, any method is okay. And when people go to the rent-to-own industry stores, they are not usually looking for the best deal. They are looking for any deal where they could get the credit to get the product that they are interested in renting.

So under this bill, you can make 99 out of 100 payments in a contract and the price could be the same after the 100th payment as it is for the first payment. This bill allows any price, any formula, any method, provided that there is disclosure in a contract.

This is not in the public interest of Pennsylvania. Any price, any formula, any method is not in the interest of the public in Pennsylvania. The cap is in the interest of the public in Pennsylvania. This bill removes the existing cap. Again, I urge a "no" vote.

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—145

Aument	Farina	Krieger	Pickett
Baker	Farry	Kula	Pyle
Barrar	Fee	Lawrence	Rapp
Benninghoff	Fleck	Longietti	Ravenstahl
Bizzarro	Flynn	Lucas	Readshaw
Bloom	Gabler	Mackenzie	Reed
Boback	Gergely	Maher	Reese
Brooks	Gibbons	Mahoney	Regan
Brown, R.	Gillen	Major	Roae
Burns	Gillespie	Maloney	Rock
Caltagirone	Gingrich	Markosek	Ross
Carroll	Godshall	Marshall	Saccone
Causar	Greiner	Marsico	Sainato
Christiana	Grell	Matzie	Sankey
Clymer	Grove	McGinnis	Saylor
Conklin	Hackett	Mentzer	Scavello
Corbin	Hahn	Metcalfe	Schreiber
Costa, D.	Haluska	Metzgar	Simmons
Costa, P.	Harhai	Miccarelli	Smith
Cox	Harhart	Micozzie	Snyder
Culver	Harkins	Millard	Sonney
Cutler	Harper	Miller, R.	Stephens
Davis	Harris, A.	Milne	Stern
Day	Heffley	Mirabito	Stevenson
Deasy	Helm	Moul	Sturla
DeLozier	Hennessey	Mullery	Swanger
DeLuca	Hickernell	Murt	Tallman
Denlinger	James	Mustio	Taylor
Dermody	Kampf	Neilson	Tobash
DiGirolamo	Kauffman	Neuman	Toepel
Dunbar	Keller, F.	O'Neill	Toohil
Ellis	Keller, M.K.	Oberlander	Topper
Emrick	Killion	Pashinski	Truitt
English	Knowles	Payne	Turzai
Evankovich	Kortz	Peifer	Vereb
Everett	Kotik	Petrarca	Watson
Fabrizio			

NAYS—53

Barbin	Dean	Kim	Roebuck
Bishop	DeLissio	Kinsey	Rozzi
Boyle, B.	Donatucci	Kirkland	Sabatina
Boyle, K.	Frankel	McCarter	Samuelson
Bradford	Freeman	McGeehan	Santarsiero
Briggs	Gainey	McNeill	Schlossberg
Brown, V.	Galloway	Miller, D.	Sims
Brownlee	Goodman	Miranda	Thomas
Clay	Haggerty	Molchany	Vitali
Cohen	Hanna	Mundy	Waters
Cruz	Harris, J.	O'Brien	Wheatley
Daley, M.	Kavulich	Painter	White
Daley, P.	Keller, W.	Parker	Youngblood
Davidson			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Adolph Masser Petri Quinn
Evans

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 2194, PN 3399**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 53 (Municipalities Generally) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for investment of authority funds.

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—198

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

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Adolph Masser Petri Quinn
Evans

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**

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

**BILLS ON CONCURRENCE
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS**

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 185, PN 3863**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 12, 1986 (P.L.1559, No.169), known as the Whistleblower Law, further providing for the definitions of "appropriate authority," "good faith report" and "public body," for protection of employees and for penalties.

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

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

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HB 185 was amended by the Senate to state that employers are not prohibited from taking disciplinary action against employees who make reports of wrongdoing or waste by an employer if that report is made in bad faith.

The bill was unanimously passed by this House and extended coverage under the Whistleblower Law to the General Assembly and its agencies, which are not currently covered under this or a similar law.

It is a good-government reform bill that will help to root out corruption and waste in the legislative branch. It can produce cost savings to the taxpayers and help to bolster public confidence in this body. The amendments simply ensure that these reports will also be made in good faith. And so I ask for concurrence in Senate amendments and thank this body.

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—198

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Adolph Masser Petri Quinn
Evans

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

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

* * *

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 118, PN 3864**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 12, 1986 (P.L.1559, No.169), known as the Whistleblower Law, further providing for the definitions of "appropriate authority," "employee," "employer" and "good faith report," for protection of employees, for enforcement and for penalties.

On the question,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

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

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

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

HB 118, known as the whistleblower bill, was designed to run at the same time as the gentleman from Lawrence County's. The amendments that were made in the Senate are the same amendments. Two of them are very technical in nature, defining an employer, and the final one, the new provision to allow the employers to take disciplinary action if it was not made in good faith. Thank you.

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—198

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

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Adolph	Masser	Petri	Quinn
Evans			

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

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

BILLS SIGNED BY SPEAKER

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

HB 118, PN 3864

An Act amending the act of December 12, 1986 (P.L.1559, No.169), known as the Whistleblower Law, further providing for the definitions of "appropriate authority," "employee," "employer" and "good faith report," for protection of employees, for enforcement and for penalties.

HB 185, PN 3863

An Act amending the act of December 12, 1986 (P.L.1559, No.169), known as the Whistleblower Law, further providing for the definitions of "appropriate authority," "good faith report" and "public body," for protection of employees and for penalties.

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

STATEMENT BY MR. ELLIS

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Butler County, Mr. Ellis, under unanimous consent.

Mr. ELLIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to publicly thank my colleagues in this chamber that were here this term, the term before, and the term before, and finally, we were able to pass what is actually probably going to be a model for whistleblower protection law across the country.

We worked a lot with the AFL-CIO, Common Cause, the chamber of commerce, and it was a bipartisan effort. In the House, I was obviously helped by Representative Gibbons, Representative Gergely, and I just wanted to thank all of them for helping out. And mostly, I wanted to thank the staff that did the hard work over the last 6 years, especially the staff in the Speaker's Office. Thank you very much.

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 that Republicans will caucus tomorrow morning, that is Monday morning at 11:30. I would ask our Republican members to please report to our caucus room on Monday morning at 11:30. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

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

Mr. FRANKEL. Democrats will caucus at 11:30 tomorrow morning. Democrats will caucus at 11:30. Thank you.

BILLS RECOMMENDED

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

- HB 1436;
- HB 2354;
- SB 145;
- SB 1185; and
- SB 1422.

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:

SB 1001;
SB 1197; and
SB 1255.

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

CALENDAR CONTINUED

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1243**, **PN 3194**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in firearms and other dangerous articles, further providing for persons not to possess, use, manufacture, control, sell or transfer firearms and for Pennsylvania State Police.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 1243 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 1243 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 second consideration of **HB 1623**, **PN 2507**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, further providing for evaluation of applications for certification.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 1623 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 1623 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 second consideration of **HB 2011**, **PN 2987**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in firearms and other dangerous articles, further providing for limitation on the regulation of firearms and ammunition.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 2011 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 2011 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 second consideration of **HB 2066**, **PN 3439**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of July 14, 1961 (P.L.637, No.329), known as the Wage Payment and Collection Law, expanding the scope of the act.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 2066 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 2066 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. The Speaker recognizes the lady, Mrs. Corbin, from Chester County, who moves that this House do now adjourn until Monday, June 30, 2014, at 1 p.m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the motion?
Motion was agreed to, and at 10:34 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.