

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

SESSION OF 2015

199TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 31

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

**THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI)
PRESIDING**

PRAYER

The SPEAKER. The prayer will be offered by Pastor Morgan Kochenower of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of York, Pennsylvania. He is a guest of our colleague, Representative Seth Grove.

PASTOR MORGAN KOCHENOWER, Guest Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Father in heaven, I want to thank You so much for the opportunity that You have given to each one of us to serve. And, Lord, I want to thank You so much for the individuals who are in this room today, for the life they have given to serve others in this great State of Pennsylvania.

Lord, the decisions we make today will affect the youth and young people of tomorrow, and I pray that every decision we make sets this State up and sets this country up with great leaders in the future.

I pray for each family represented here today that You would bless them in every aspect of their lives, and I pray for the families that they represent in this State as well. The Bible says there is wisdom and a multitude of counselors, and I pray for the counsel that is given every day from here going forward, that You would bless it.

Father in heaven, we know that it is not always easy to know what the right thing to do is, so that is why we pray for Your counsel in those times when maybe it is just not that clear. So, Lord, we pray for clarity, we pray for wisdom, we pray for understanding, we pray for discretion. In every aspect, in every decision, in every situation we pray for it at all times.

I pray all these things in the name of Your son, Jesus Christ. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Monday, May 4, 2015, will be postponed until printed.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

HB 65, PN 1428 (Amended) By Rep. MARSICO

An Act amending Title 20 (Decedents, Estates and Fiduciaries) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for autopsies.

JUDICIARY.

HB 609, PN 682 By Rep. MARSICO

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

JUDICIARY.

HB 806, PN 1429 (Amended) By Rep. CAUSER

An Act amending the act of December 19, 1974 (P.L.973, No.319), known as the Pennsylvania Farmland and Forest Land Assessment Act of 1974, further providing for responsibilities of department and for responsibilities of county assessor in establishing use values.

AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS.

SENATE MESSAGE

HOUSE BILL
CONCURRED IN BY SENATE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 159, PN 145**, with information that the Senate has passed the same without amendment.

SENATE MESSAGE

RECESS RESOLUTION
FOR CONCURRENCE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, presented the following extract from the Journal of the Senate, which was read as follows:

In the Senate,
May 4, 2015

RESOLVED, (the House of Representatives concurring), Pursuant to Article II, Section 14 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, that when the Senate recesses this week, it reconvene on Monday, May 11, 2015, unless sooner recalled by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate; and be it further

RESOLVED, Pursuant to Article II, Section 14 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, that when the House of Representatives recesses this week, it reconvene on Monday, May 11, 2015, unless sooner recalled by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the House of Representatives for its concurrence.

On the question,
Will the House concur in the resolution of the Senate?
Resolution was concurred in.
Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The majority whip has indicated that Representative COX from Berks County has asked for a leave of absence for today. That leave is granted.

All members, we would ask that you please report to the floor. All members of the House, please report to the floor. Thank you.

BILL SIGNED BY SPEAKER

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

HB 159, PN 145

An Act amending Title 40 (Insurance) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for medical professional liability reciprocal exchange-to-stock conversion and for adoption of plan of conversion; imposing duties on Insurance Commissioner; providing for contents of plan of conversion, for optional provisions of plan of conversion, for alternative plan of conversion, for effective date of plan, for rights of subscribers whose policies are issued after adoption of plan and before effective date, for corporate existence, for conflict of interest, for failure to give notice, for limitation on actions, for reciprocal insurer insolvent or in hazardous financial condition, for rules and regulations, for laws applicable to stock company, for licensing of stock company and commencement of business as an insurance company, for amendment of policies and for prohibition on acquisitions of control.

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

MASTER ROLL CALL

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

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—200

Acosta	Evans	Kotik	Readshaw
Adolph	Everett	Krieger	Reed
Baker	Fabrizio	Lawrence	Reese
Barbin	Farina	Lewis	Regan
Barrar	Farry	Longietti	Roae
Benninghoff	Fee	Mackenzie	Roebuck
Bishop	Flynn	Maher	Ross
Bizzarro	Frankel	Mahoney	Rozzi
Bloom	Freeman	Major	Sabatina
Boback	Gabler	Maloney	Saccone
Boyle	Gainey	Markosek	Sainato
Bradford	Galloway	Marshall	Samuelson
Briggs	Gergely	Marsico	Sankey
Brown, R.	Gibbons	Masser	Santarsiero
Brown, V.	Gillen	Matzie	Santora
Brownlee	Gillespie	McCarter	Saylor
Burns	Gingrich	McGinnis	Schemel
Caltagirone	Godshall	McNeill	Schlossberg
Carroll	Goodman	Mentzer	Schreiber
Causer	Greiner	Metcalfe	Schweyer
Christiana	Grove	Metzgar	Simmons
Cohen	Hahn	Miccarelli	Sims
Conklin	Hanna	Millard	Snyder
Corbin	Harhai	Miller, B.	Sonney
Costa, D.	Harhart	Miller, D.	Staats
Costa, P.	Harkins	Milne	Stephens
Cruz	Harper	Moul	Sturla
Culver	Harris, A.	Mullery	Tallman
Cutler	Harris, J.	Murt	Taylor
Daley, M.	Heffley	Mustio	Thomas
Daley, P.	Helm	Nesbit	Tobash
Davidson	Hennessey	Neuman	Toepel
Davis	Hickernell	O'Brien	Toohil
Dawkins	Hill	O'Neill	Topper
Day	Irvin	Oberlander	Truitt
Dean	James	Ortitay	Vereb
Deasy	Jozwiak	Parker, C.	Vitali
DeLissio	Kampf	Parker, D.	Ward
DeLozier	Kaufman	Pashinski	Warner
DeLuca	Kauffman	Payne	Waters
Dermody	Kavulich	Peifer	Watson
Diamond	Keller, F.	Petrarca	Wentling
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Petri	Wheatley
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Pickett	Wheeland
Driscoll	Killion	Pyle	White
Dunbar	Kim	Quigley	Youngblood
Dush	Kinsey	Quinn	Zimmerman
Ellis	Kirkland	Rader	
Emrick	Klunk	Rapp	Turzai,
English	Knowles	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Evankovich	Kortz		

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Cox

LEAVES ADDED—8

Boyle	Fee	Gingrich	Quigley
Cox	Gergely	Matzie	Saylor

LEAVES CANCELED—3

Cox	Fee	Saylor
-----	-----	--------

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

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER. We have some announcements, permission for media access to the House floor for May 5, 2015. Thomas DiVito of the Penn State Intercollegiate Athletics is here to film today within the chamber. It is videotaping with audio.

And in addition, Mark Selders of Penn State University will be taking still photos, will be taking still photos.

Will all the members please take their seats. We have some very special guests with us this morning. If all members could please take their seats.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The minority whip has indicated that Representative MATZIE has asked for a leave of absence for today. That leave will be granted.

JAMES FRANKLIN PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. Members of the General Assembly, we are very honored to have with us today the head coach of the Penn State Nittany Lions, coach James Franklin. Please give him a warm welcome.

Coach Franklin happens to be in Harrisburg today as part of the Coaches Caravan, and this annual event gives alumni and fans and Pennsylvania citizens the opportunity to interact with several of the university's head coaches.

In addition to Coach Franklin, we are pleased to have with us – and if they could stand as I announce their names – the Penn State men's hockey coach, Guy Gadowsky; the women's golf coach, Denise St. Pierre; and for goodness' sake, I hope sometime you will think about me whenever you are retiring. I would love to have this job, the university's athletic director, Sandy Barbour, dynamic lady; and the alumni association executive director, Roger Williams. Roger.

As many of you know, in 2014 Coach Franklin succeeded Coach Paterno to become Penn State's sixth – no; actually, succeeded O'Brien to become Penn State's 16th head football coach, and he is currently in his second season leading the Nittany Lions. And, Coach, is it your fifth year as a collegiate head coach? Fifth year as a collegiate head coach. He is a native of Langhorne, Pennsylvania.

And we have a very good friend of his, Frank Farry, our colleague, Representative Frank Farry, from Bucks County, who is actually going to introduce him and tell us personally about Coach Franklin. I think Coach Franklin is going to address our august body today.

Representative Farry, the floor is yours.

Mr. FARRY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is with great pleasure I get to introduce my fellow 1990 Neshaminy graduate, James Franklin. He has had quite the career path in coaching. Previous to being Penn State's head coach, he was actually the University of Vanderbilt's head coach. So a group of us would go and we became big Vandy fans, and our local people could not understand why. We used

to have to battle to get the Vandy game on TVs at the local bars so we could watch James and root on his success in the very competitive SEC (Southeastern Conference). And he took a team that was a perennial doormat and actually took them to several winning seasons, and actually some bowl victories. And we could not be more proud when he became the head football coach at Penn State.

A local boy, born and bred; played football at Neshaminy, then went on to play at East Stroudsburg – correct, Coach, Stroudsburg? – where he set some records. And there is no harder working person that you will ever meet than Coach Franklin.

I had the honor to introduce him at a Neshaminy Hall of Fame event, or be part of the program to introduce him at a Neshaminy Hall of Fame event, earlier last year, and I made it clear that the best politician in the room was actually Coach Franklin. And I think you see his successes as he wears the Penn State brand, his success through recruiting, and just the dominate-the-State image.

So it is my pleasure to introduce my fellow Neshaminy grad and Bucks County native, Coach James Franklin.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Speaker, leaders, members, I cannot tell you how honored and humbled we are to be here today to have the opportunity to address the House.

It still seems like a dream that a kid growing up in the State of Pennsylvania, that went to East Stroudsburg University, has the opportunity to come back home and be the head football coach at a university of our great State of Pennsylvania. It is just unbelievable to me.

So we wake up every single morning just so proud of what we are doing and how we are doing it and whom we are representing. We will not be satisfied until we have the number one graduation rates in all of college football as well as our entire athletic department. We also know that we need to be successful on the football field as well, Big 10 championships and working towards national championships, but most importantly, to have a real, positive impact on the community, and when I say the community, that is obviously State College and our region, but that is the entire State of Pennsylvania as well.

So thank you so much for the opportunity to visit with you guys today. If there is ever anything that James Franklin, the Penn State football program, or our athletic department can do to help you, we will bend over backwards to do so. So thank you very much.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The majority whip has asked that Chairman Stan SAYLOR be marked on leave of absence for today. That leave is granted.

HOUSE RESOLUTION INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 316 By Representatives SCHREIBER, V. BROWN, McNEILL, D. COSTA, THOMAS, SCHLOSSBERG, BARRAR, READSHAW, COHEN, GIBBONS, ROZZI, MURT, IRVIN and DAVIS

A Resolution directing the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee to conduct a study on the issue of expanding the availability of natural gas to Pennsylvania homes, businesses, nonprofit organizations and units of government in the most cost-effective manner.

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, May 5, 2015.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 1109 By Representatives SCHREIBER, MILLARD, McNEILL, LONGIETTI, D. COSTA, THOMAS, COHEN, KINSEY, SAMUELSON, ROEBUCK and McCARTER

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 enrollment.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, May 5, 2015.

No. 1110 By Representatives SCHREIBER, CARROLL, DIAMOND, COHEN, LONGIETTI, ROZZI, McNEILL, MOUL, PASHINSKI, GIBBONS, M. DALEY and TOOHL

An Act amending the act of April 12, 1951 (P.L.90, No.21), known as the Liquor Code, in general provisions applying to both liquor and malt and brewed beverages, further providing for limiting number of retail licenses to be issued in each county.

Referred to Committee on LIQUOR CONTROL, May 5, 2015.

No. 1111 By Representatives SCHREIBER, COHEN, McNEILL, MURT, McCARTER, THOMAS, M. DALEY and KINSEY

An Act amending the act of May 17, 1921 (P.L.682, No.284), known as The Insurance Company Law of 1921, in fire and marine insurance, further providing for municipal certificate required prior to payment of fire loss claims.

Referred to Committee on INSURANCE, May 5, 2015.

No. 1112 By Representatives R. BROWN, BAKER, SCHLEGEL CULVER, DAVIS, DIAMOND, GILLEN, GRELL, GROVE, A. HARRIS, HEFFLEY, LAWRENCE, MASSER, MILLARD, MURT, D. PARKER, PEIFER, PICKETT, QUIGLEY, SAYLOR, TOPPER, WARD, WATSON, WHEATLEY and MILNE

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in school districts, providing for data collection reduction.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, May 5, 2015.

No. 1114 By Representatives DUSH, ACOSTA, BAKER, BENNINGHOFF, CAUSER, COHEN, D. COSTA, DAVIS, DiGIROLAMO, DONATUCCI, DRISCOLL, ELLIS, FARINA, GOODMAN, GROVE, HAHN, A. HARRIS, J. HARRIS, HEFFLEY, HENNESSEY, IRVIN, KNOWLES,

LONGIETTI, MAHONEY, MAJOR, MILLARD, MURT, O'NEILL, PAYNE, READSHAW, SCHWEYER, SONNEY, THOMAS, TOEPEL, VEREB, WHEELAND and GILLEN

An Act designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 3007 over the Redbank Creek, Summerville Borough, Jefferson County, as the Summerville Veterans Memorial Bridge.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, May 5, 2015.

2014 BITUMINOUS COAL QUEEN PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. Representative Snyder and Representative Mahoney, you are invited to the rostrum for the purpose of presenting a citation to the 2014 Bituminous Coal Queen. Please come forward. Representative Mahoney, please feel free to come up.

Members, Representative Snyder and Representative Mahoney will be presenting you Alyssa Gallagher.

Representative Snyder, the floor is yours.

Mrs. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to introduce Alyssa Gallagher, the reigning Pennsylvania Bituminous Coal Queen. We are very fortunate to have such royalty in our midst today. Moments after Alyssa won the title last summer in Uniontown, she said the thing she was most looking forward to was visiting the State Capitol, and here she is today.

I would like to tell you a little bit about this beautiful young lady. She is 18 years old, a senior at Laurel Highlands High School, and the daughter of Rodney Gallagher of Uniontown. Alyssa is captain of the Laurel Highlands Varsity Cheerleading Squad. She also is active in Students Against Destructive Decisions, Junior Achievement, the yearbook, and math club.

Aside from school activities, Alyssa is in her 15th year of dance classes at the Koza and Company Dance Studio in Uniontown. She will be attending Point Park College in the fall and major in dance with a minor in business. Someday she hopes to be a Radio City Rockette.

As part of the Coal Queen Pageant last summer, Alyssa was asked on stage what would be the one gift she would give her parents if she could. Alyssa said she would give the gift of time to her father, Rodney Gallagher, who is raising her and her siblings after her mother passed away 4 years ago. Alyssa knows firsthand the meaning of family and how fragile life can be. She later told a reporter that her dad is so proud of her and her siblings all the time, and, Alyssa, today we want you to know how very proud we all are of you.

Alyssa is joined today by her aunt, Toni Fields. Aunt Toni, please stand.

The Coal Queen Pageant is a long-standing tradition in southwestern Pennsylvania, and Alyssa has fulfilled her role as Coal Queen superbly, presiding at parades, community festivals, and sporting events.

Documentaries are made of this pageant. They pay homage to the coal industry in Fayette and Greene Counties as well as the contestants vying for the honor to represent their high school.

I invite all of my colleagues to attend the 62d Annual Pennsylvania Bituminous Coal Show and Coal Queen Pageant this August in Carmichaels in Greene County. You undoubtedly

will meet more people with the grace and charm of Alyssa, of whom we are very, very proud.

I also want today to recognize the pageant committee, who is here with Alyssa today and work so hard to ensure the pageant runs smoothly: Lisa Allison, Jean Hockenberry, and Paddy Pratt. They work diligently to make sure the pageant runs smoothly each year. Would you ladies please stand.

Alyssa, welcome to the hall of the House, and thank you for joining us here today and for accepting this House citation that Representative Mahoney and I are so proud to present you.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Snyder.

HERSHEY HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS SWIM TEAM PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. Representative Payne is invited to the rostrum for the purpose of presenting a citation to a championship team, the Hershey High School Girls Swim Team.

Representative Payne, Chairman John Payne. Chairman Payne, the floor is yours.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As we just had a sidebar, the coach of the Hershey Girls Swim Team is willing to come out and spend a week or two with your girls swim team, since for the third year in a row the Hershey girls beat the North Allegheny girls. Sorry, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to once again present members of the Hershey High Girls Swim Team. They won the PIAA State Swimming and Diving Class AAA Championship held back on March 13-14 at Bucknell University by amassing 262 points.

A gold medal was won in the 400 freestyle relay by the team of Vivian Tafuto, Kaley Buchanan, Maggie Lee, and Allie Raab, with a time of 3:22.82. Vivian also won gold in the 200 individual medley, with a time of 2:01.09; won gold in the 100 breaststroke, with a time of 1:00.74; and was named the 2014-2015 PIAA Class AAA Swimmer of the Meet. Thank you. Thank you. Allie also won the 200 freestyle, with a time of 1:48.01, and placed second in the 100-yard breaststroke, with a time of 1:00.84.

Joining me up front today for the 11th year in a row, Mr. Speaker – I have to report that this is my 13th year, and for 11 of those 13, the Hershey Swim Team, either the boys or the girls, has been here before this chamber – their head coach, Greg Fastrich; the girls team captain, Vivian Tafuto; and senior Maggie Lee join me at the rostrum. May I please have a round of applause for them. Thank you. The other members of the girls team are in the rear, and I would ask if they would stand at this time. They are joined by the athletic director, John Confer, and the Hershey High School principal, Dale Reimann. Please stand.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for the opportunity to recognize the Hershey Girls Swim Team, and I look forward to doing it again next year. Hopefully, they will be swimming against a team other than North Allegheny. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Payne, congratulations to these great champions, and I have to say, I understand it is always competitive. North Allegheny is right there. So we will

see. Hey, but it is Hershey. What a great, great program you have.

And thank you, girls. Congratulations.

MIKE GASBARRE PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. Located to the left of the rostrum, the Chair welcomes Mike Gasbarre, who is retiring as executive director of our Local Government Commission. He is here with his wife, Bonnie; and children, Ben and Kristen. If you could please stand. Thank you so much for your service. Thank you. Mike is officially here as the guest of Representative Ross, Chairman Ross.

REMARKS BY MR. ROSS

The SPEAKER. Chairman Ross, the floor is yours.

Mr. ROSS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to join in my congratulations to Mike. You know, I had the great good fortune in my freshman year 20 years ago to be assigned to the Local Government Commission. I did not realize what good fortune I had when it actually initially happened.

As many of you know, the Local Government Commission is made up of 10 legislators – 5 from the Senate and 5 from the House – 6 of whom are from the majority party in each of those bodies and the remaining 4 from the minority party.

And as many of the members know and I think some of the public realizes, not only do we have some partisan challenges internally between majority and minority in each of our chambers, but from time to time we have a little bit of a contentious relationship across the Capitol between the Senate and the House. And yet despite those problems, the Local Government Commission operates in a remarkably bipartisan, bicameral way to achieve a tremendous amount of good work, and we do it almost always by unanimous vote. Now, it is hard to imagine how that might happen, but the secret is basically the staff. The staff winds up developing issues that we can all agree on that are still important to the local government agencies and commissions and officials that we serve, as well as the members and also the citizens at large. They do that by careful review, tremendously professional work, and they put in long hours. They are here all the time when we are in session, and they also answer a raft of questions that come in directly to them through local officials or through the public at large.

Now, that staff is led by excellent people, and they have developed a sense of real professionalism and caring and a very positive collaborative nature, and really, the leadership of it is really particularly responsible. And Mike has actually served on this Local Government Commission as a staffer for 37 years, during that period of time, for 17 of which he was assistant director, and then for the last 11, executive director. He has inspired a staff. He is there early. He is there late. He gives them an example of incredibly professional work. He is fair, whether you are a member of the minority party or the majority party; he is fair to the youngest, newest member; he is fair to the public; and he delivers quality research and makes sure that the staff that he leads does so as well. And he is not a slavedriver, necessarily. He does have a tremendous sense of humor, which

I have enjoyed over the years, and he has been a wonderful friend to me and to the staff and to the other members of the Local Government Commission over that time.

I think that we as legislators, the elected and appointed and hired municipal officials, and private citizens across Pennsylvania have benefited tremendously because of Mike's service over the last 37 years. I know you all want to join me and those citizens at large in thanking him for his service and wishing him a tremendously enjoyable retirement with his family. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Ross.

REMARKS BY MR. KOTIK

The SPEAKER. Representative Kotik.

Mr. KOTIK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to add my heartiest congratulations to Mike Gasbarre. In all the years that I have been here in the legislature, whenever I had a thorny problem about local government, there is one person you could always turn to, and that was Mike Gasbarre. He negotiated a lot of land mines for me, kept me on the right path. And we are going to miss you, Mike, and we wish you the very best in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative.

REMARKS BY MR. FREEMAN

The SPEAKER. Representative Bob Freeman.

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to join with my colleagues in wishing Mike all the best in his retirement. He truly has been an outstanding public servant. As executive director for the Local Government Commission, on which I had served for many years, he has always displayed the highest levels of professionalism. He has shown dedication to his tasks and to his job. He has been an ideal individual to work with and is such a wealth of knowledge and expertise that his presence will be sorely missed in this Capitol Building. He is an outstanding public servant, and we wish him all the best in retirement and hope that we can count on his guidance and counsel in an unofficial capacity as we proceed with the work of the commission.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative.

REMARKS BY MS. HARPER

The SPEAKER. Chairwoman Harper.

Ms. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wanted to join my colleague, the minority chair of the House Local Government Committee, in recognizing and thanking Mike Gasbarre of the Local Government Commission for the invaluable support that he and they provide for us on the House Local Government Committee. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative.

CALENDAR

RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. ROSS called up **HR 284, PN 1334**, entitled:

A Resolution honoring Michael P. Gasbarre for his decades of service to the Pennsylvania Local Government Commission and to the residents of this Commonwealth.

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—198

Acosta	Evankovich	Knowles	Ravenstahl
Adolph	Evans	Kortz	Readshaw
Baker	Everett	Kotik	Reed
Barbin	Fabrizio	Krieger	Reese
Barrar	Farina	Lawrence	Regan
Benninghoff	Farry	Lewis	Roae
Bishop	Fee	Longietti	Roebuck
Bizzarro	Flynn	Mackenzie	Ross
Bloom	Frankel	Maher	Rozzi
Boback	Freeman	Mahoney	Sabatina
Boyle	Gabler	Major	Saccone
Bradford	Gainey	Maloney	Sainato
Briggs	Galloway	Markosek	Samuelson
Brown, R.	Gergely	Marshall	Sankey
Brown, V.	Gibbons	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brownlee	Gillen	Masser	Santora
Burns	Gillespie	McCarter	Schemel
Caltagirone	Gingrich	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Carroll	Godshall	McNeill	Schreiber
Causar	Goodman	Mentzer	Schweyer
Christiana	Greiner	Metcalfe	Simmons
Cohen	Grove	Metzgar	Sims
Conklin	Hahn	Miccarelli	Snyder
Corbin	Hanna	Millard	Sonney
Costa, D.	Harhai	Miller, B.	Staats
Costa, P.	Harhart	Miller, D.	Stephens
Cruz	Harkins	Milne	Sturla
Culver	Harper	Moul	Tallman
Cutler	Harris, A.	Mullery	Taylor
Daley, M.	Harris, J.	Murt	Thomas
Daley, P.	Heffley	Mustio	Tobash
Davidson	Helm	Nesbit	Toepel
Davis	Hennessey	Neuman	Toohil
Dawkins	Hickernell	O'Brien	Topper
Day	Hill	O'Neill	Truitt
Dean	Irvin	Oberlander	Vereb
Deasy	James	Ortitay	Vitali
DeLissio	Jozwiak	Parker, C.	Ward
Delozier	Kampf	Parker, D.	Warner
DeLuca	Kaufner	Pashinski	Waters
Dermody	Kauffman	Payne	Watson
Diamond	Kavulich	Peifer	Wentling
DiGirolamo	Keller, F.	Petrarca	Wheatley
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Petri	Whealand
Driscoll	Keller, W.	Pickett	White
Dunbar	Killion	Pyle	Youngblood
Dush	Kim	Quigley	Zimmerman
Ellis	Kinsey	Quinn	
Emrick	Kirkland	Rader	Turzai,
English	Klunk	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Cox Matzie Saylor

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

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. As our guests come up to the rostrum, we have three former members and good friends of this chamber who are present today, and I would ask that they please stand. Chairman Paul Clymer; Paul, great to see you, sir. Chairman Art Hershey and his wife, Joyce, I believe is also with him. Joyce and Art. And our good friend, RoseMarie Swanger. Representative Swanger, great to see you. Outstanding legislators, each and every one of them.

Members, just a few more guests that I would like to introduce on the House floor today.

In the rear of the House, the Chair welcomes members of the Daniel Boone Optimist Club of Douglassville, Berks County, and these are guests of Representative Dave Maloney. If you could please rise. Thank you for being with us today.

Located in the rear of the House, the Chair welcomes David Whiting. David is a senior at Messiah College majoring in political science and economics, and he is a volunteer in Representative Brett Miller's district office in Lancaster. David, can you please rise.

Students from the Fleetwood Area High School and their teacher, Mrs. Sanocki, are here as guests of Representative Jozwiak. Representative Jozwiak's granddaughter, Tara Wiley, is part of that group today. If you could please stand and rise. We welcome you to the House.

Located in the rear of the House, the Chair is honored, truly honored to welcome members of Blue Star Mothers of America. The Blue Star Mothers of America are women who have children serving in the military, Guard, or Reserves, or children who are veterans. The group is here with retired Maj. Gen. Randall Marchi and his wife, and these good guests are here with Representative Tom Killion of Delaware County. If you could please rise. Thank you very much for being with us today.

Located in the gallery, the Chair welcomes a group of seventh and eighth grade students from St. Jude School in Mountain Top. They are members of the National Junior Honor Society and are the guests of Representative Toohil, Representative Mullery, and Representative Boback. Could you please rise and give us a good wave. Thank you for being with us.

Also in the gallery, the Chair welcomes James and Diane Davidheiser and Ronald and Susanne Rhinehart. They are guests of Representative Toepel and Representative Maloney. If you could please rise and give us a wave. Thank you for being with us.

In the well of the House, the Chair welcomes guest page Noah Guyer, a fifth grade student at Holy Name of Jesus Elementary School. Noah is the son of Danielle Guyer – many

of you know Danielle – who is our director of budgetary affairs in the Speaker's Office, but Noah is a guest of Chairman Ron Marsico. Noah, great to see you. Thanks for being with us.

Located to the left of the rostrum is a very good friend, Miranda Simon. Miranda, if you could stand. Miranda is a senior at Fox Chapel High School in Representative English's district but also is neighboring to my own district. She is a member of the National Honor Society and a high school record holder in women's diving. Miranda, you were the diving champ for the WPIAL – correct? – and went to States, and she has signed a national letter of intent as a Division 1 athlete to attend George Washington University and will be a star diver there. Miranda, thank you for being with us today.

A guest of Representative Oberlander is Philip Clemens, and he is chairman of Clemens Family Corporation and CEO (chief executive officer) of Hatfield Quality Meats. Mr. Clemens was the guest speaker today at the Commonwealth Prayer Breakfast. He is seated with Rob Fields, and they are Donna Oberlander's guests. Thank you so much for joining us today.

In the well of the House, the Chair welcomes guest page Tara Lynn Patton. She is here with her mother and grandparents, who are seated in the gallery. Tara Lynn is the guest of Representative Karen Boback. Thank you so much for being with us today, Tara.

UNCONTESTED CALENDAR

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. MURT called up **HR 72, PN 374**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of May 2015 as "Cancer Caregivers Recognition Month" in Pennsylvania and honoring the vital role caregivers play in the lives of cancer patients.

* * *

Mr. D. COSTA called up **HR 201, PN 1020**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of May 2015 as "Ehlers-Danlos Syndrome Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. CALTAGIRONE called up **HR 221, PN 1139**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing May 7, 2015, as the "National Day of Prayer" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Ms. DONATUCCI called up **HR 262, PN 1252**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the week of May 10 through 16, 2015, as "National Nursing Home Week" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. SCHLOSSBERG called up **HR 268, PN 1258**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of May 2015 as "Mental Health Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. HICKERNELL called up **HR 274, PN 1264**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the week of May 2 through 10, 2015, as "National Travel and Tourism Week" and May 5, 2015, as "Tourism Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. COHEN called up **HR 278, PN 1323**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of May 2015 as "Asian-Pacific American Heritage Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. COHEN called up **HR 280, PN 1325**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of May 2015 as "Jewish American Heritage Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. READSHAW called up **HR 288, PN 1337**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the week of May 4 through 8, 2015, as "Small Business Week" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. KILLION called up **HR 289, PN 1338**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of May 2015 as "Blue Star Mothers of America Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. BARBIN called up **HR 293, PN 1353**, entitled:

A Resolution designating May 8, 2015, as "Military Spouse Appreciation Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. PASHINSKI called up **HR 296, PN 1356**, entitled:

A Resolution designating April 28, 2015, as "Workers' Memorial Day" in Pennsylvania in memory of workers killed, injured and disabled in the workplace and in recognition of the efforts of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Labor Council.

* * *

Ms. OBERLANDER called up **HR 298, PN 1358**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the week of May 11 through 15, 2015, as "Women's Lung Health Week" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Ms. CULVER called up **HR 302, PN 1387**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the week of May 10 through 16, 2015, as "Women's Lung Health Week" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. FARRY called up **HR 309, PN 1401**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of May 2015 as "Melanoma and Skin Cancer Detection and Prevention Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mrs. WATSON called up **HR 311, PN 1403**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of May 2015 as "Healthy Babies Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mrs. WATSON called up **HR 312, PN 1404**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of May 2015 as "Global Youth Traffic Safety Month" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolutions?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—198

Acosta	Evankovich	Knowles	Ravenstahl
Adolph	Evans	Kortz	Readshaw
Baker	Everett	Kotik	Reed
Barbin	Fabrizio	Krieger	Reese
Barrar	Farina	Lawrence	Regan
Benninghoff	Farry	Lewis	Roae
Bishop	Fee	Longietti	Roebuck
Bizzarro	Flynn	Mackenzie	Ross
Bloom	Frankel	Maher	Rozzi
Boback	Freeman	Mahoney	Sabatina
Boyle	Gabler	Major	Saccone
Bradford	Gainey	Maloney	Sainato
Briggs	Galloway	Markosek	Samuelson
Brown, R.	Gergely	Marshall	Sankey
Brown, V.	Gibbons	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brownlee	Gillen	Masser	Santora
Burns	Gillespie	McCarter	Schemel
Caltagirone	Gingrich	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Carroll	Godshall	McNeill	Schreiber
Causer	Goodman	Mentzer	Schweyer
Christiana	Greiner	Metcalfe	Simmons
Cohen	Grove	Metzgar	Sims
Conklin	Hahn	Miccarelli	Snyder
Corbin	Hanna	Millard	Sonney
Costa, D.	Harhai	Miller, B.	Staats
Costa, P.	Harhart	Miller, D.	Stephens
Cruz	Harkins	Milne	Sturla
Culver	Harper	Moul	Tallman
Cutler	Harris, A.	Mullery	Taylor
Daley, M.	Harris, J.	Murt	Thomas
Daley, P.	Heffley	Mustio	Tobash
Davidson	Helm	Nesbit	Toepel
Davis	Hennessey	Neuman	Toohil
Dawkins	Hickernell	O'Brien	Topper
Day	Hill	O'Neill	Truitt
Dean	Irvin	Oberlander	Vereb
Deasy	James	Ortitay	Vitali
DeLissio	Jozwiak	Parker, C.	Ward
Delozier	Kampf	Parker, D.	Warner
DeLuca	Kaufner	Pashinski	Waters
Dermody	Kauffman	Payne	Watson
Diamond	Kavulich	Peifer	Wentling
DiGirolamo	Keller, F.	Petrarca	Wheatley
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Petri	Wheeland

Driscoll	Keller, W.	Pickett	White
Dunbar	Killion	Pyle	Youngblood
Dush	Kim	Quigley	Zimmerman
Ellis	Kinsey	Quinn	
Emrick	Kirkland	Rader	Turzai,
English	Klunk	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Cox	Matzie	Saylor
-----	--------	--------

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

The SPEAKER. There are many members who will be speaking on the uncontested resolutions. We are going to begin with Chairman Hickernell.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. Representative Hickernell of Lancaster County is recognized on HR 274.

Members, if you can, please, let us give our colleague the floor. Representative Hickernell.

Mr. HICKERNELL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to submit remarks for the record, please.

The SPEAKER. Representative Hickernell, those will be accepted.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as chairman of the House Tourism and Recreational Development Committee to talk about Pennsylvania's second largest industry, tourism.

This week is National Travel and Tourism Week in the United States. It is a time when we celebrate the tourism industry and the many great things it contributes to our country, not just the jobs and local economic development that tourism provides, but the fun and relaxation that travel and leisure activities offer to all of us when we take time off from our daily labors.

This week visitors bureaus and private-sector tourism companies from across the State are gathered in Harrisburg for their annual spring conference. These are the people whose hard work brings an estimated 193 million visitors to Pennsylvania annually, with more than 65 million of them staying overnight. Whether they are here for business or to see our many wonderful attractions, visitors spend \$39 billion in our State and have a total tourism economic impact of \$41 billion.

Because of this, tourism supports 479,000 jobs in Pennsylvania and makes up 5 percent of the State's total economy. It also generates \$4.1 billion in tax revenue for State and local government. Without this revenue from visitors, Pennsylvania residents would have to pay that much more in taxes.

The value of tourism to Pennsylvania is not just limited to well-known destinations like Philadelphia, the Poconos, or Gettysburg. There are wonderful tourism assets in every county in Pennsylvania – rural, urban, and suburban.

We are an incredibly diverse State, and visitors can find whatever they want here. Whether it is hiking in the northern Pennsylvania Wilds, kayaking down a wild river in the Laurel Highlands, or enjoying a night on the town in a big city like Pittsburgh, we have something to offer any traveler. When we grow our tourism industry, when we bring more visitors to our State, every county benefits.

We are also in a unique position to market our many world-class tourism assets. We are close to tens of millions of potential travelers in the Northeast, making us a short commuter hop or a perfect drive-to destination with very affordable travel costs.

Clearly, we are a great place to visit, but if we do not tell tourists what we have to offer, they are not going to come. We need to work together – State government, local marketing agencies, and the private-sector tourism industry – to bring more visitors and visitor dollars to our State. That is my goal and the goal of the House Tourism Committee.

So on behalf of the members of the Tourism Committee and the House of Representatives, I would like to thank our State's second largest industry for everything they do to make our Commonwealth a great place to visit. Keep up the good work, and I wish you all a successful summer vacation season.

STATEMENT BY MR. FARRY

The SPEAKER. Representative Farry is recognized to speak on HR 309. Representative Farry.

Mr. FARRY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HR 309 makes this month Melanoma and Skin Cancer Detection and Prevention Month.

I just wanted to announce that tomorrow there will be free melanoma screenings in the East Wing Rotunda. So I encourage all members and staff to get a free melanoma screening tomorrow, East Wing Rotunda. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you very much, Representative Farry.

STATEMENT BY MS. CULVER

The SPEAKER. Representative Lynda Culver is recognized to speak on HR 302. Representative Culver.

Ms. CULVER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to encourage all my colleagues and thank them for their support of HR 302, which would designate the week of May 11th as "Women's Lung Health Week" in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, every 5 minutes a woman living in the United States is told she has lung cancer. Lung cancer is the leading cause of cancer death of women in the United States, surpassing breast cancer in 1987, and the death rate in women has more than doubled over the last 35 years.

To change that and tackle this women's health crisis, I ask you to join me in supporting the second annual American Lung Association's LUNG FORCE Turquoise Takeover in Pennsylvania. So please join me next week in the Turquoise Takeover and wear turquoise, change your Facebook and Twitter pages to turquoise, please do all you can do to make people aware, and remember, awareness is half the cure.

This initiative will help make lung cancer in women a public health priority, drive policy change, and increase research funding. Advocacy and increased awareness will result in more frequent and better treatment for women with these illnesses and could ultimately save lives.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Culver.

STATEMENT BY MR. SCHLOSSBERG

The SPEAKER. Representative Schlossberg is recognized to speak on HR 268.

Mr. SCHLOSSBERG. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the members for your unanimous adoption of HR 268, which marks May as "Mental Health Awareness Month."

On August 11 of last year, the actor and comedian Robin Williams committed suicide. He had long suffered from depression and substance abuse, among many other ailments. Like many of us in here, I mourned his death and questioned how a man of such life, humor, and power could make a decision to end his life.

Later that day while reading Facebook, I came across a friend who had written, and I am quoting, "Robin Williams killed himself. So sad that he lived a life without any faith in God." That status wound up being a defining moment for me because it so perfectly epitomized the feelings that so many people have towards mental health challenges.

One in four Americans actively suffers from a mental illness, which means that, by the numbers, 50 of us in this room are going through some sort of emotional challenge. One in two Americans suffers from mental illness over the course of their lifetimes, which means that half of us have endured such pain. And of those that suffer, only 30 to 40 percent will seek treatment.

Facebook statuses like the one that I read are part of the reason why so few people seek treatment for mental illness: They do not understand it. Depression, anxiety, and addiction are no more about faith or weakness than a broken bone is just in someone's mind.

Depression is real. It can kill. And 40,000 people committed suicide last year. If we can let people know that mental illness is real and that it can be cured, we can help people seek treatment, and if we can do that, we can save lives.

With that in mind, 2 days after Robin Williams committed suicide, I decided it was time to tell my story. In an op-ed in the Morning Call, I wrote about my own struggles with depression and anxiety. About the fact that I have been treated for both of these illnesses for the past 14 years and probably will for the rest of my life. About the fact that despite suffering from these issues, I have lived a very happy life so far, and I would like to think that I have been a productive member of society, despite any disagreements that my friends on the Republican side of the aisle may have with me.

In the interest of trying to break the stigma that surrounds mental illness, please give me a moment to be as explicit as possible. I know what it is like, and I am sure many of you do as well, to feel so hopeless that depression feels like a physical weight that literally weighs down upon you, making it impossible to see a brighter future and seeming to block out any hope. I know all too well the absolute and complete terror of an anxiety attack, which forces you to desperately seek escape from a threat that does not really exist, even at the perceived risk of humiliation and scorn. And during one particularly dark period of my life when I was a student at Muhlenberg, I remember thinking that life was not worth living, and that perhaps taking my life was a better idea than trying to continue it.

I chose to share my story because I believe that there are too many people who still think that mental illness is not real, and that can be deadly. We must let the world know that mental illnesses can be cured. I do not think I am any different than anybody else in this room or in this State, and with the help of professionals, I found my way out of the darkness, as have millions of other Pennsylvania residents. There are still millions more who needlessly suffer, and we must never cease in our efforts to help those people find peace.

As I look around this room, I am reminded that there is no one in here who has not been touched by mental illness. Maybe it is not you personally, but I would bet good money in any one of Pennsylvania's fine casinos that each and every one of us has a father, mother, brother, son, sister, daughter, or close friend who has seen their life hammered by these demons. I would urge all of you in this room to remind people that these issues are real, but more importantly, that with proper treatment they can be cured.

I would also urge all of you to tell your own stories in this or any other area. All of us follow in those who came before us, and I found the courage to tell my story in the courage of those who have told theirs.

Many members in this chamber have shared their own personal or family histories, be it with mental illness, sexual abuse, or addiction. They have proven to their constituents and to the world that elected officials are truly no different than the constituents we represent. We have all struggled, but we have all survived. Whatever differences we may have, every one of us in this room has defeated some demon – or maybe continues to fight them.

In sharing the story of my depression I was, I hope, able to inspire others, and I hope that my words will encourage you all to share your stories, whatever they may be. For all of the grief heaped upon elected officials, people still look up to us, and in sharing our struggles, we can remind our constituents that nothing is insurmountable.

Lastly, I say again to those who are depressed, to those who are anxious, addicted, or alone, please remember that there is no problem so great that there is no way out. There are thousands of people across this great Commonwealth who are willing to drop everything to help you find your own brand-new day. As long as you breathe, there is hope, and there are millions of us out there, including me, who are living proof that any difficulty can be overcome, even the ones that cannot be seen.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you very much, Representative Schlossberg, for those important words.

STATEMENTS BY MR. COHEN

The SPEAKER. Representative Cohen is recognized to speak on HR 278 and HR 280

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing these resolutions, and I appreciate the unanimous passage by the House, of two groups of Pennsylvanians who sometimes feel unappreciated. I am talking about Asian-Pacific Americans, memorialized in HR 278, and Pennsylvania's Jewish population in HR 280.

Both Asians and Jews have had similar success stories in the United States, both have been heavily concentrated in business,

and both have faced, at various times, discrimination and substantially but not totally overcome that discrimination.

Congress began in 1978 celebrating the first 10 days of May as Asian-Pacific American Heritage Week to coincide with two important milestones in Asian-Pacific American history: the arrival in the United States of the first Japanese immigrants on May 7, 1843, and contributions of Chinese workers to the building of the Transcontinental Railroad, completed May 10, 1869. In 1992 Congress expanded the observance to the entire month of May.

Asian-Americans who were seen by some, erroneously, as some sort of danger to this country are now increasingly recognized as the leaders of many professions in Pennsylvania, many businesses in Pennsylvania. They increasingly hold positions in government. They are a tremendous asset to our communities. I am very pleased; I have over 8300 people of diverse Asian heritages in my district, and honoring them sends them a message that the time of discrimination and fear has passed.

The Jewish population has been in this country since the time of the American Revolution. One of the leading financiers of the American Revolution was Haym Salomon. There are various historical markers in various parts of Pennsylvania celebrating Jewish people and their contributions to the American Revolution.

The hundreds of years of experience of the Jewish people here stands in stark contrast to the traditional experience and fear of anti-Semitism in other countries of the world. The experience in the United States has been a welcoming one, one of sensitivity of society as a whole, one of success in society as a whole.

In 2006 a campaign led by Representative Debbie Wasserman Schultz and Senator Arlen Specter, with the support of President Bush, led to May of 2006 to be officially designated as "Jewish American Heritage Month" in 2006 to recognize the more than 350-year history of Jewish contributions to American culture in diverse fields ranging from sports and arts and entertainment, to medicine, business, science, government, and military service.

This year President Obama proclaimed May 2015 as "Jewish American Heritage Month" and stated, in part, "In celebrating the contributions of the Jewish people to the progress of our country, we also reaffirm America's unwavering commitment to the security of the State of Israel and the close bonds between our two nations and our peoples."

For centuries Jews have reached for the blessings of freedom and opportunity in the United States. Today – as pillars of their families and leaders in the community – Jewish Americans represent a link in an unbroken chain of perseverance. During Jewish American Heritage Month, we celebrate the hard-fought progress won through struggle and sacrifice, and we rededicate ourselves to building a world where diversity is cherished and faith is protected.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the members of the House for their support of both of these resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Thank you very much, Representative Cohen.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. Representative Tom Murt is recognized to speak on HR 72.

Mr. MURT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues for the unanimous support of HR 72, which declares May as "Cancer Caregivers Recognition Month," and I will be submitting some remarks for the record. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you very much, Representative Murt.

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

The American Cancer Society estimates that 81,540 new cases of cancer will be diagnosed in Pennsylvania this year alone, and many of these cancer patients will require support from family members who are critical to the health-care providers.

Known as lay caregivers, these unpaid caregivers are in many cases a husband or wife, a partner, or an adult child. For many who are single, close friends, coworkers, and neighbors fill in this role. These caregivers provide 80 percent of the home-care services, which are often a complex array of tasks including physical, psychological, spiritual, and emotional support.

While caring for an individual with cancer can be extraordinarily stressful, many caregivers find satisfaction in providing care for a loved one with cancer. Many cancer patients are deeply grateful to their caregivers for their love and dedication, weathering the challenges and setbacks of cancer treatment, and sharing the triumphs with them. That support does not end after treatment concludes.

That is why our caregivers need our help and support, and why I thank my colleagues for declaring May as "Cancer Caregivers Recognition Month" in Pennsylvania.

STATEMENT BY MR. KILLION

The SPEAKER. I would invite Representative Tom Killion to the rostrum to speak on HR 289. You can come right up here, Tom. Thank you very, very much.

Mr. KILLION. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to thank my colleagues for unanimous support of the resolution recognizing May as "Blue Star Mothers of America Month" here in Pennsylvania.

In 1942 the Blue Star Mothers group was formed as a way to unite mothers who had sons and daughters in the military. We all know the sacrifices that are made by the men and women serving for us in the Armed Forces keeping this nation great, but back home, the moms suffer too. They worry day in, day out about their sons and daughters, many of whom may be in harm's way. And this group provides support for those mothers and has been around doing a fantastic job since 1942.

The Speaker has already introduced them, but I think they deserve another round of applause. I would like to thank the Blue Star Mothers for their dedication and their service to our country through the work of their sons and daughters. If you could just please rise so we can thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you very much, Representative Killion.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The chair of the Appropriations Committee, Representative Adolph, is called for an 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. Thank you.

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

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority caucus chair, Representative Major, for an announcement.

Ms. MAJOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to announce Republicans will caucus today at 11:30. I would ask our Republican members to please report to our caucus room at 11:30. We would be prepared, Mr. Speaker, to come back on the floor at 1 p.m. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you very much.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the minority caucus chair, Dan Frankel.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Democrats will caucus at 11:30. Democrats will caucus at 11:30.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. Located in the rear of the House, the Chair welcomes Parkland High School's political science club. They are guests of Representative Ryan Mackenzie. If you can please stand up, and welcome. Thank you so much for being here today. Parkland High School's political science club.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. At this time the House stands in recess. We will be back at 1 p.m., in session, unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

RECESS EXTENDED

The time of recess was extended until 2 p.m.; further extended until 2:15 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Representative GINGRICH has asked to be on leave. That leave will be granted.

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**HB 153, PN 1318**

By Rep. ADOLPH

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

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 384, PN 421

By Rep. ADOLPH

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

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 501, PN 1319

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act designating the Conodoguinet Bridge on that portion of State Route 641 over the Conodoguinet Creek, Hopewell Township, Cumberland County, as the Army Pfc. Harold "Sam" E. Barrick Memorial Bridge.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 683, PN 1427

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of June 27, 2006 (1st Sp.Sess., P.L.1873, No.1), known as the Taxpayer Relief Act, in senior citizens property tax and rent rebate assistance, further providing for definitions.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 779, PN 1320

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act designating a portion of State Route 254 in Northumberland County as the Staff Sergeant Thomas Allen Baysore Memorial Highway.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 875, PN 1426

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Public Welfare Code, in public assistance, further providing for verification of eligibility.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 934, PN 1330

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Public Welfare Code, in public assistance, providing for the establishment of KEYS.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE,
CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED****HB 204, PN 1444 (Amended)**

By Rep. HICKERNELL

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

TOURISM AND RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

BILL SIGNED BY SPEAKER

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

SB 79, PN 55

An Act amending the act of July 2, 2014 (P.L.876, No.98), entitled "An act designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 15 over the Yellow Breeches Creek, Carroll Township, York County, as the Glenn Bowers Memorial Bridge; designating a bridge on that portion of 17th Street over the 10th Avenue Expressway, City of Altoona, Blair County, as the Blair County Veterans Memorial Bridge; designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 764 over 31st Street, City of Altoona, Blair County, as the Alvin E. Morrison Memorial Bridge; designating West Erie Avenue from its intersection with North Second Street in Philadelphia City, Philadelphia County, to the point where it meets North Front Street in Philadelphia City, Philadelphia County, as Roberto Clemente Way; designating the interchange at the crossing of State Route 33 and Main Street (State Route 1022) in Palmer Township, Northampton County, as the Charles Chrin Interchange; designating the interchange between the portion of State Route 3009 and State Route 119 in South Union Township, Fayette County, as the Fred L. Lebder Interchange; and designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 711 over the Youghiogheny River in the City of Connellsville, Fayette County, as the Officer Robb McCray Memorial Bridge," further providing for Officer Robb McCray Memorial Bridge.

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

**STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION
PROPERTY REQUEST**

The SPEAKER. The Speaker acknowledges receipt of a communication from the State System of Higher Education requesting a resolution to authorize the sale of property in Mansfield, Pennsylvania. This will appear on tomorrow's calendar as State System of Higher Education Property Request No. 1 of 2015.

**COMMUNICATION FROM
INDEPENDENT FISCAL OFFICE**

The SPEAKER. The Speaker acknowledges receipt of the Independent Fiscal Office's initial review estimate for fiscal year 2015-16, submitted in accordance with 71 Pa.C.S. § 4105. Thank you.

(Copy of communication is on file with the Journal clerk.)

The SPEAKER. Members, please take your seats, and we will move to bills on second consideration. Members, please report to the floor.

CALENDAR CONTINUED**BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 972, PN 1332**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 17, 1921 (P.L.682, No.284), known as The Insurance Company Law of 1921, in life and endowment insurance and annuities, further providing for policy delivery.

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 122, PN 1321**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 20 (Decedents, Estates and Fiduciaries) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in minors, providing for tuition account program; and, in Pennsylvania Uniform Transfers to Minors Act, further providing for court authorization of a transfer.

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 424, PN 459**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in offenses against the family, further providing for concealing death of child.

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 74, PN 65**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in offenses against the family, further providing for the offense of endangering welfare of children.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Mr. **D. MILLER** offered the following amendment No. **A00996**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 14, by striking out "the" where it occurs the third time

Amend Bill, page 2, line 14, by inserting after "age"

or the child was under 13 years of age with a disability

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Representative Miller.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill does several good things and it makes sure that we are going to protect those who need the help the most. One of those things it obviously does is it deals with children under the age of 6, that is a very good thing.

Many of us, of course, are parents. We are familiar with the ages and the issues and the growth of children under the age of 6. It offers enhanced penalties and makes sure to give law enforcement tools to enforce the basic fact that we need parents to be mindful and attentive to keep their children safe. My amendment would add to that.

Mr. Speaker, we know that many people, many children under the age of 13 in particular, but many children deal with a series of disabilities that take them into situations that are not typical. This can often impede their ability to communicate. This can often impede them in the ways of intellectual disabilities and cognitive reasoning. This can often make it more difficult for them to voice their concerns, protect themselves, or remove themselves from situations of danger.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment would go to be sure that if you have a child under the age of 13 who has a disability – and it is not just any disability; it is all disabilities. Whether you have somebody with autism, whether you have somebody with an intellectual disability, or whether you have a child with a physical disability, we are demanding that the parents pay more attention than perhaps a child of typical needs could be. That is precisely because their needs are different, their abilities are different, and we have to be sure that they are given the same protections under law and the chance to succeed.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for an affirmative vote to extend this special protection to those children under the age of 13 with a disability in the Commonwealth.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kauffman, the floor is yours.

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

The SPEAKER. The good gentleman has indicated he will stand for interrogation.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, how is disability defined in your amendment?

Mr. D. MILLER. Thank you for the question, Mr. Speaker.

Disability is used in its common definition. It applies to anyone with a disability, so I do not specialize a particular type of disability. I do not limit it to any type of disability, rather those with a disability. So there is no definitional section to my amendment.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. So, Mr. Speaker, would a disability, a temporary disability like a broken leg be a qualification for a disability?

Mr. D. MILLER. With respect, Mr. Speaker, a broken leg does not, for example, mean that a child would receive an ACCESS card for the State, would not qualify for disability services through the State. So no, in that example it would not cover somebody with a broken leg, as the only issue that they had to deal with.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Okay. Further interrogation, Mr. Speaker.

Does this disability, is this defined as someone who is eligible for an ACCESS card because of their disability? Because that is not how you defined it, but yet that is how you qualified it.

Mr. D. MILLER. Again, with respect, Mr. Speaker, I do not define it. I believe it to be a term that is self-recognition. I believe that our State has used this in common parlance over and over again. I believe that it is easily discernible and easily definable simply by the fact of whether or not a child has a disability that is diagnosed with a doctor that allows them to receive benefits. It is not that difficult at all for the State, for example, with autism to recognize who has a disability. Those things are very easily ascertainable, often just by checking a mother or father's purse or wallet to pull out the ACCESS card.

So no, again, Mr. Speaker, there is no definition to the term "disability" in my amendment.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, would dyslexia be a disability?

Mr. D. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, just to save time, if one were to go through a list of ailments, I would not off-the-cuff have the list of every possible ailment that would be covered by the State as a disability. The other thing about it is that you will have issues of multiple illnesses that are contributing factors to diagnosable disabilities. That is why the issue in reality is best left to a doctor to be able to say that this person qualifies with this type of diagnosis.

So I am unable to give you a list of every possible disability that is recognized in the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, would a young person with severe autism at the age of 13 be less vulnerable than a person at the age of 12 with severe autism?

Mr. D. MILLER. Obviously autism has a wide range of possibilities on that spectrum. If the gentleman would be interested in furthering the protection to include all minors, I obviously would have no objection.

I believe that 12 is – under 13 is a good starting point; that is why I wrote it. I believe that that will account for those, perhaps, with autism whose verbal communication may suffer, but intellectually they would not.

So for example, if you had a 12-year-old who was nonverbal with autism locked in a car, well, they may be unable to speak. They, perhaps, would be better suited to be able to take proactive actions on their own as a child matures and is able to address some issues of their own on that accord.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. All right. Well, Mr. Speaker, on the amendment, please?

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. Representative Kauffman, the floor is yours.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I absolutely appreciate the intention and where I believe the maker of this amendment was trying to go. I do not necessarily disagree with a well-defined – if you are going to define disability well so that we understand what disability is in the legislation. This legislation as written has been out there, has been vetted well, has been supported by the District Attorneys Association in Pennsylvania. It is clearly defined.

I am concerned that disability is very broad. A 12-year-old with dyslexia could be considered disabled, who genuinely does not have the difficulty expressing oneself, which I think is one of the intents. It is one of the intents of my legislation at putting

that 6-year-old threshold in place. But taking a 12-year-old with dyslexia, and I have walked through my learning center back home, and if you take a 13-year-old who is severely disabled and you say they do not deserve special protection, but then someone who is 12 years old and has dyslexia does deserve that special protection. Very frankly, I do know that that was my intent, because it is meant to give special consideration for those who cannot express themselves well, who cannot cry out, who cannot speak for themselves.

So I actually think this amendment and this idea actually deserves further exploration to get something well-defined to put it into law.

This amendment would certainly kill this legislation because it is so vague. First of all, also, I believe it has due process problems. It could be a constitutional challenge because what folks are charged with needs to be very well-defined and this is so vague that it could include a lot of things that they are not familiar with or it could exclude them.

So I mean, I would actually love to sit down with the maker of the amendment and talk about it and see how we could come together and work on legislation together to do this, because I think it is a valid idea. I just do not think it has been well explored before it was placed as an amendment. It was not brought up in committee. It has never been brought up before and I do not even believe it is in bill form anywhere. I think it is a very good idea and I think we ought to look at it further, but not in the context of this bill.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Members, the majority whip has indicated that Representative Cox would like to be placed on the master roll. That is granted. Representative Cox is back on the master roll.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 74 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Representative, any other members have any other comments?

Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Unfortunately, I find myself in a position where I will encourage the members to oppose the amendment as drafted. I believe the gentleman has the best of intentions, but the maker of the bill has highlighted some very important concerns.

Mr. Speaker, there is extensive case law in the disabilities law arena, and for that reason these words all have important meanings behind them. And in cases like this where the terms are not specifically defined, it could create further litigation, which would further complicate the bill being applied as the maker wishes it to.

Basic statutory construction dictates that we must be very careful in how we approach issues, and for that reason I would urge a "no" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Miller.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words of the maker of the underlying bill and I believe our intentions to not be that different.

I would note that part of the words used today was to be sure to protect those who cannot speak for themselves, and admittedly, I think one of the examples was, what would be the difference between a 17-year-old and a 12-year-old? And I said that I would be interested in that as well.

The question that comes up, of course, is that kids with disabilities are a wide range of options here with it. We have a chance today to be sure that a typical child – and we all know it. We all have had those 4- or 5-year-olds who amaze us, those 4- or 5-year-olds who are excelling, and that is a blessing from God. That is tremendous. And they are able to communicate in every circumstance, in every scenario, in every situation, perhaps better than the parent would even as to what was going on.

We also know those 8-year-olds, those 10-year-olds, those 12-year-olds who struggle every day, who wake up in the morning and fight to speak and fight to communicate and go through hours and hours and hours of classes of TSS (therapeutic staff support) work, of therapy, of OT (occupational therapy), of everything else that would possibly help them communicate, we know that there are those children and there are more and more in this Commonwealth every day who are looking for help and are struggling to communicate. And in particular, the autism population, as we all know, is one that has been growing in our State and causing a variety of concerns across the board.

This amendment here gives us a chance to say that that typical and blessed child at 4 and 5 who has those communication skills, that we give that extra protection to, we will have to give the same extra protection to that 8-year-old, that 10-year-old, that 12-year-old who God has challenged or perhaps not as blessed as much in communication for them to be able to speak. Let us help them.

So I appreciate the comments of both the speaker and – so I appreciate the comments and I would ask everybody for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—84

Acosta	Dawkins	Harhai	Pashinski
Barbin	Dean	Harkins	Petrarca
Bishop	Deasy	Harris, J.	Ravenstahl
Bizzarro	DeLissio	Kavulich	Readshaw
Boyle	DeLuca	Keller, W.	Roebuck
Bradford	Dermody	Kim	Rozzi
Briggs	DiGirolamo	Kinsey	Sabatina
Brown, V.	Donatucci	Kirkland	Sainato
Brownlee	Driscoll	Kortz	Samuelson
Burns	Evans	Kotik	Santarsiero
Caltagirone	Fabrizio	Longietti	Schlossberg
Carroll	Farina	Mahoney	Schreiber
Cohen	Flynn	Markosek	Schweyer
Conklin	Frankel	McCarter	Sims
Costa, D.	Freeman	McNeill	Snyder
Costa, P.	Gainey	Miller, D.	Sturla
Cruz	Galloway	Mullery	Thomas
Daley, M.	Gergely	Murt	Vitali
Daley, P.	Gibbons	Neuman	Waters
Davidson	Goodman	O'Brien	Wheatley
Davis	Hanna	Parker, C.	Youngblood

NAYS—114

Adolph	Greiner	Marshall	Regan
Baker	Grove	Marsico	Roae
Barrar	Hahn	Masser	Ross
Benninghoff	Harhart	McGinnis	Saccone
Bloom	Harper	Mentzer	Sankey
Boback	Harris, A.	Metcalfe	Santora
Brown, R.	Heffley	Metzgar	Schemel
Causar	Helm	Miccarelli	Simmons
Christiana	Hennessey	Millard	Sonney
Corbin	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Staats
Cox	Hill	Milne	Stephens
Culver	Irvin	Moul	Tallman
Cutler	James	Mustio	Taylor
Day	Jozwiak	Nesbit	Tobash
DeLozier	Kampf	O'Neill	Toepel
Diamond	Kaufert	Oberlander	Toohil
Dunbar	Kauffman	Ortitay	Topper
Dush	Keller, F.	Parker, D.	Truitt
Ellis	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Vereb
Emrick	Killion	Peifer	Ward
English	Klunk	Petri	Warner
Evankovich	Knowles	Pickett	Watson
Everett	Krieger	Pyle	Wentling
Farry	Lawrence	Quigley	Wheeland
Fee	Lewis	Quinn	White
Gabler	Mackenzie	Rader	Zimmerman
Gillen	Maher	Rapp	
Gillespie	Major	Reed	Turzai,
Godshall	Maloney	Reese	Speaker

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Gingrich Matzie Saylor

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?
Bill was agreed to.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 124**, **PN 109**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in protection from abuse, further providing for commencement of proceedings.

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

Mr. **D. MILLER** offered the following amendment No. **A01055**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 13, by striking out "the defendant" and inserting any party

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Miller.

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

Mr. Speaker, I originally drafted this amendment with the idea of addressing one of the difficult parts of our legal system in the State of Pennsylvania. My experience and the experience of many, at least in Allegheny County courts, have always been with the challenges of the PFA (protection from abuse) system.

My belief was that my amendment would be able to give more information to the court to be able to tell the reality of the situation before reaching a burden in a PFA that is much lower than a criminal court obligation. The preponderance of the evidence and the often lack of an attorney makes these challenges extremely difficult for judges to safeguard children in this situation.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Mr. D. MILLER. However, in further conversation about this issue and in conversations with the gentleman on the other side of the aisle, I will ask that this amendment be withdrawn today with the hope that we will look to evaluate how to improve our PFA system in a deeper sense.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you very much, Representative Miller.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 410**, **PN 1322**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in support matters generally, further providing for liability for support; and, in child custody, further providing for consideration of criminal conviction.

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

Mr. **D. MILLER** offered the following amendment No. **A01152**:

Amend Bill, page 3, lines 8 and 9, by striking out "notwithstanding the objection of the parent who is a victim,"

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 9 and 10

(i) the parent who is a victim had an opportunity to address the court;

Amend Bill, page 3, line 10, by striking out "(i)" and inserting

(ii)

Amend Bill, page 3, line 12, by striking out "(ii)" and inserting

(iii)

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Miller.

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

This amendment simply clarifies that the victim of the offense, the underlying victim, the mother, would be sure to have her voice heard at a proceeding questioning her objection to the child visiting with the convicted father, and I believe it to be an agreed-to amendment.

The SPEAKER. Representative Reed.

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

We appreciate the gentleman's work on this amendment. It is an agreed-to amendment, and we would ask the members to support it. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you very much.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—198

Acosta	English	Knowles	Ravenstahl
Adolph	Evankovich	Kortz	Readshaw
Baker	Evans	Kotik	Reed
Barbin	Everett	Krieger	Reese
Barrar	Fabrizio	Lawrence	Regan
Benninghoff	Farina	Lewis	Roe
Bishop	Farry	Longietti	Roebuck
Bizzarro	Fee	Mackenzie	Ross
Bloom	Flynn	Maher	Rozzi
Boback	Frankel	Mahoney	Sabatina
Boyle	Freeman	Major	Saccone
Bradford	Gabler	Maloney	Sainato
Briggs	Gainey	Markosek	Samuelson
Brown, R.	Galloway	Marshall	Sankey
Brown, V.	Gergely	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brownlee	Gibbons	Masser	Santora
Burns	Gillen	McCarter	Schemel
Caltagirone	Gillespie	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Carroll	Godshall	McNeill	Schreiber
Causser	Goodman	Mentzer	Schweyer
Christiana	Greiner	Metcalfe	Simmons
Cohen	Grove	Metzgar	Sims
Conklin	Hahn	Miccarelli	Snyder
Corbin	Hanna	Millard	Sonney
Costa, D.	Harhai	Miller, B.	Staats
Costa, P.	Harhart	Miller, D.	Stephens
Cox	Harkins	Milne	Sturla
Cruz	Harper	Moul	Tallman
Culver	Harris, A.	Mullery	Taylor
Cutler	Harris, J.	Murt	Thomas
Daley, M.	Heffley	Mustio	Tobash
Daley, P.	Helm	Nesbit	Toepel
Davidson	Hennessey	Neuman	Toohil
Davis	Hickernell	O'Brien	Topper
Dawkins	Hill	O'Neill	Truitt
Day	Irvin	Oberlander	Vereb
Dean	James	Ortitay	Vitali
Deasy	Jozwiak	Parker, C.	Ward
DeLissio	Kampf	Parker, D.	Warner
Delozier	Kaufer	Pashinski	Waters
DeLuca	Kauffman	Payne	Watson
Dermody	Kavulich	Peifer	Wentling
Diamond	Keller, F.	Petrarca	Wheatley
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Petri	Wheeland
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Pickett	White
Driscoll	Killion	Pyle	Youngblood
Dunbar	Kim	Quigley	Zimmerman
Dush	Kinsey	Quinn	
Ellis	Kirkland	Rader	Turzai,
Emrick	Klunk	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Gingrich Matzie Saylor

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.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 11, PN 1036**, entitled:

An Act establishing the Lean Government Practices Program; and conferring powers and imposing duties on the Governor's Innovation Office.

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

Mr. GROVE offered the following amendment No. **A00700**:

Amend Bill, page 2, lines 20 and 21, by striking out "LEAN GOVERNMENT PRACTICES PROGRAM" and inserting TRANSFORMATION OFFICE

Amend Bill, page 3, line 11, by striking out "new"

Amend Bill, page 3, lines 13 and 14, by striking out "A COMMITTEE, WHICH WILL COORDINATE" and inserting the committee, which shall coordinate the program

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

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes Representative Grove on the amendment.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Amendment A00700 removes some redundancy within the legislation, HB 11. Working in conjunction with the administration, it also saves costs in the implementation of this lean management program by over \$700,000.

I would appreciate my colleagues' support of the amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Caltagirone, on the amendment.

Mr. CALTAGIRONE. I would like to concur with the gentleman and urge the members to vote in favor of it. It is true, the administration has worked with the Representative and it is an agreed-to amendment. Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—198

Acosta	English	Knowles	Ravenstahl
Adolph	Evankovich	Kortz	Readshaw
Baker	Evans	Kotik	Reed
Barbin	Everett	Krieger	Reese
Barrar	Fabrizio	Lawrence	Regan
Benninghoff	Farina	Lewis	Roae
Bishop	Farry	Longietti	Roebuck
Bizzarro	Fee	Mackenzie	Ross
Bloom	Flynn	Maher	Rozzi
Boback	Frankel	Mahoney	Sabatina
Boyle	Freeman	Major	Saccone
Bradford	Gabler	Maloney	Sainato
Briggs	Gainey	Markosek	Samuelson
Brown, R.	Galloway	Marshall	Sankey
Brown, V.	Gergely	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brownlee	Gibbons	Masser	Santora
Burns	Gillen	McCarter	Schemel
Caltagirone	Gillespie	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Carroll	Godshall	McNeill	Schreiber
Causar	Goodman	Mentzer	Schweyer
Christiana	Greiner	Metcalfe	Simmons
Cohen	Grove	Metzgar	Sims
Conklin	Hahn	Miccarelli	Snyder
Corbin	Hanna	Millard	Sonny
Costa, D.	Harhai	Miller, B.	Staats
Costa, P.	Harhart	Miller, D.	Stephens
Cox	Harkins	Milne	Sturla
Cruz	Harper	Moul	Tallman
Culver	Harris, A.	Mullery	Taylor
Cutler	Harris, J.	Murt	Thomas
Daley, M.	Heffley	Mustio	Tobash
Daley, P.	Helm	Nesbit	Toepel
Davidson	Hennessey	Neuman	Toohil
Davis	Hickernell	O'Brien	Topper
Dawkins	Hill	O'Neill	Truitt
Day	Irvin	Oberlander	Vereb
Dean	James	Ortitay	Vitali
Deasy	Jozwiak	Parker, C.	Ward
DeLissio	Kampf	Parker, D.	Warner
Delozier	Kaufer	Pashinski	Waters
DeLuca	Kauffman	Payne	Watson
Dermody	Kavulich	Peifer	Wentling
Diamond	Keller, F.	Petrarca	Wheatley
DiGirolo	Keller, M.K.	Petri	Wheeland
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Pickett	White
Driscoll	Killion	Pyle	Youngblood
Dunbar	Kim	Quigley	Zimmerman
Dush	Kinsey	Quinn	
Ellis	Kirkland	Rader	Turzai,
Emrick	Klunk	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Gingrich Matzie Saylor

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.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 934, PN 1330**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Public Welfare Code, in public assistance, providing for the establishment of KEYS.

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?

Representative DeLissio is recognized on the bill.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, will the prime sponsor of the bill stand for a brief question?

The SPEAKER. The good gentleman from Beaver County has indicated he will stand for interrogation.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, this bill codifies this program. It was changed from 24 months down to 12 months in 2011. This codifies it and reinstates it at 24 months, which gives folks who are under the TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) Program an opportunity to really advance themselves so they can earn a sustainable wage. My question has to do with the funding of the program.

It is currently funded, if I understand this correctly, Mr. Speaker, from TANF and SNAP (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program) funds, which are primarily Federal funds that the department currently directs to this program. I do not see anything in the legislation that speaks to funding.

So my question is, is the assumption that they will continue to use Federal funds exclusively for this program, or can there be a situation that arises whereby they have to identify other funding because we are now codifying this program?

Mr. CHRISTIANA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If I understand the gentlelady's question, if for some reason the Federal government stopped funding the TANF block grant, then we may be forced with a decision whether or not the State would want to supplement those funds. But I would urge the gentlelady that that is highly unlikely, and I hope that answers her question, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the answer.

The SPEAKER. Do any other members wish to be recognized?

Then the maker of the bill, Representative Christiana, is given the floor.

Mr. CHRISTIANA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we often hear how databases show there are thousands of available jobs in Pennsylvania, yet we hear from employers that many folks lack the skills and training necessary to land those jobs. And many of us would love to see individuals currently on Pennsylvania's welfare rolls moved over to the employment rolls and land those available jobs. Many of us share the goal of ending the cycle that, unfortunately, many families are passing down their dependence on government assistance to their next generation. And unfortunately, many individuals, their only family inheritance is being trapped in that cycle of poverty and government assistance.

And this program, the KEYS (Keystone Education Yields Success) program, was established for those individuals who were motivated to end that cycle, those individuals who wanted to transform their family's legacy to be different than the previous generations'.

So they enrolled in a community college for a certificate or a degree in a high-priority occupation, which would allow them to use their education time to count towards their work requirement needed for the TANF and SNAP benefits. And while these certificates and degrees often take 2 years to complete, their education time only counted for 12 months.

As the program is currently implemented, after 12 months they had to supplement those work requirement hours that they were using their education hours to count for, they would then have to add 20 hours of work. Well, to no one's surprise, we have seen huge numbers of folks unable to meet those demands, and they did not finish their certification or degree.

This bill is an easy fix. Just let those individuals use their education time for 24 months instead of 12, putting it in line with the 24 months that typically is needed to finish these programs for a high-priority occupation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this bill will not provide the broad and sweeping welfare reform that many of us desire, but it will have a significant effect on those individuals and their families who will be able to compete in the job market in those jobs that are available. They will be able to complete their degree or certification, which will put them in a better position to obtain those family-sustaining jobs.

And I ask my colleagues today who share my goal of robust welfare reform, let us not let that goal, that quest to stand in the way of this bill.

When the 24-month timeframe was in place and this program was framed to allow maximization of the program, it led to people getting high-priority jobs and moving off of the welfare rolls. Let us do that again, Mr. Speaker. Let us pass HB 934, restore the program to the time where it was maximized, and allow these folks to be better prepared for Pennsylvania's job market.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. Thank you.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—198

Acosta	English	Knowles	Ravenstahl
Adolph	Evankovich	Kortz	Readshaw
Baker	Evans	Kotik	Reed
Barbin	Everett	Krieger	Reese
Barrar	Fabrizio	Lawrence	Regan
Benninghoff	Farina	Lewis	Roae
Bishop	Farry	Longietti	Roebuck
Bizzarro	Fee	Mackenzie	Ross
Bloom	Flynn	Maher	Rozzi
Boback	Frankel	Mahoney	Sabatina
Boyle	Freeman	Major	Saccone
Bradford	Gabler	Maloney	Sainato
Briggs	Gainey	Markosek	Samuelson
Brown, R.	Galloway	Marshall	Sankey
Brown, V.	Gergely	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brownlee	Gibbons	Masser	Santora
Burns	Gillen	McCarter	Schemel
Caltagirone	Gillespie	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Carroll	Godshall	McNeill	Schreiber
Causer	Goodman	Mentzer	Schweyer
Christiana	Greiner	Metcalfe	Simmons
Cohen	Grove	Metzgar	Sims
Conklin	Hahn	Miccarelli	Snyder
Corbin	Hanna	Millard	Sonney
Costa, D.	Harhai	Miller, B.	Staats
Costa, P.	Harhart	Miller, D.	Stephens
Cox	Harkins	Milne	Sturla
Cruz	Harper	Moul	Tallman
Culver	Harris, A.	Mullery	Taylor
Cutler	Harris, J.	Murt	Thomas
Daley, M.	Heffley	Mustio	Tobash
Daley, P.	Helm	Nesbit	Toepel
Davidson	Hennessey	Neuman	Toohil
Davis	Hickernell	O'Brien	Topper
Dawkins	Hill	O'Neill	Truitt
Day	Irvin	Oberlander	Vereb
Dean	James	Ortitay	Vitali
Deasy	Jozwiak	Parker, C.	Ward
DeLissio	Kampf	Parker, D.	Warner
Delozier	Kaufner	Pashinski	Waters
DeLuca	Kauffman	Payne	Watson
Dermody	Kavulich	Peifer	Wentling
Diamond	Keller, F.	Petrarca	Wheatley
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Petri	Wheeland
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Pickett	White
Driscoll	Killion	Pyle	Youngblood
Dunbar	Kim	Quigley	Zimmerman
Dush	Kinsey	Quinn	
Ellis	Kirkland	Rader	Turzai,
Emrick	Klunk	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Gingrich Matzie Saylor

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.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The majority whip has asked that Representative FEE be marked on leave for the rest of the day and that Representative QUIGLEY be marked on leave for the rest of the day. Those leaves of absence will be granted.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 863, PN 1047**, entitled:

An Act designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 3006 over Spring Creek, Bellefonte Borough, Centre County, as the Bellefonte Veterans Bridge.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—196

Acosta	English	Kortz	Readshaw
Adolph	Evankovich	Kotik	Reed
Baker	Evans	Krieger	Reese
Barbin	Everett	Lawrence	Regan
Barrar	Fabrizio	Lewis	Roae
Benninghoff	Farina	Longietti	Roebuck
Bishop	Farry	Mackenzie	Ross
Bizzarro	Flynn	Maher	Rozzi
Bloom	Frankel	Mahoney	Sabatina
Boback	Freeman	Major	Saccone
Boyle	Gabler	Maloney	Sainato
Bradford	Gainey	Markosek	Samuelson
Briggs	Galloway	Marshall	Sankey
Brown, R.	Gergely	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brown, V.	Gibbons	Masser	Santora
Brownlee	Gillen	McCarter	Schemel
Burns	Gillespie	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Caltagirone	Godshall	McNeill	Schreiber
Carroll	Goodman	Mentzer	Schweyer
Causser	Greiner	Metcalfe	Simmons
Christiana	Grove	Metzgar	Sims
Cohen	Hahn	Miccarelli	Snyder
Conklin	Hanna	Millard	Sonney
Corbin	Harhai	Miller, B.	Staats
Costa, D.	Harhart	Miller, D.	Stephens
Costa, P.	Harkins	Milne	Sturla
Cox	Harper	Moul	Tallman
Cruz	Harris, A.	Mullery	Taylor
Culver	Harris, J.	Murt	Thomas
Cutler	Heffley	Mustio	Tobash
Daley, M.	Helm	Nesbit	Toepel
Daley, P.	Hennessey	Neuman	Toohil
Davidson	Hickernell	O'Brien	Topper
Davis	Hill	O'Neill	Truitt
Dawkins	Irvin	Oberlander	Vereb

Day	James	Ortitay	Vitali
Dean	Jozwiak	Parker, C.	Ward
Deasy	Kampf	Parker, D.	Warner
DeLissio	Kaufner	Pashinski	Waters
DeLozier	Kauffman	Payne	Watson
DeLuca	Kavulich	Peifer	Wentling
Dermody	Keller, F.	Petrarca	Wheatley
Diamond	Keller, M.K.	Petri	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Pickett	White
Donatucci	Killion	Pyle	Youngblood
Driscoll	Kim	Quinn	Zimmerman
Dunbar	Kinsey	Rader	
Dush	Kirkland	Rapp	Turzai,
Ellis	Klunk	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Emrick	Knowles		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Fee	Matzie	Quigley	Saylor
Gingrich			

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.

RESOLUTION

Mr. EVANKOVICH called up **HR 168, PN 1200**, entitled:

A Resolution urging the Department of Transportation to update its regulation on the documentation required for a name change to a driver's license or identification card.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

Mr. **EVANKOVICH** offered the following amendment
No. **A00822**:

Amend Resolution, page 1, line 7, by striking out "her" and inserting
the individual's
Amend Resolution, page 1, line 9, by striking out "her" and inserting
the individual's
a
Amend Resolution, page 1, line 10, by inserting after "or"
an
Amend Resolution, page 1, line 12, by striking out "her" where it occurs the first time and inserting
the individual's
Amend Resolution, page 1, line 12, by striking out "her" where it occurs the second time and inserting
the individual's
Amend Resolution, page 2, line 12, by striking out "her" where it occurs the first time and inserting
the individual's
Amend Resolution, page 2, line 12, by striking out "her" where it occurs the second time and inserting
the individual's
Amend Resolution, page 2, line 17, by striking out "her" where it occurs the first time and inserting
the individual's

Amend Resolution, page 2, line 17, by striking out "her" where it occurs the second time and inserting the individual's
 Amend Resolution, page 2, lines 18 and 19, by striking out "along with her" and inserting and

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Evankovich is recognized on the amendment.

Mr. EVANKOVICH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I ask for support on this amendment. It just fixes some pronoun issues we were having with the bill and it will make the resolution all that better, requesting that PENNDOT make these policy changes. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Any other members wish to be recognized on the amendment?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—196

Acosta	English	Kortz	Readshaw
Adolph	Evankovich	Kotik	Reed
Baker	Evans	Krieger	Reese
Barbin	Everett	Lawrence	Regan
Barrar	Fabrizio	Lewis	Roae
Benninghoff	Farina	Longietti	Roebuck
Bishop	Farry	Mackenzie	Ross
Bizzarro	Flynn	Maher	Rozzi
Bloom	Frankel	Mahoney	Sabatina
Boback	Freeman	Major	Saccone
Boyle	Gabler	Maloney	Sainato
Bradford	Gainey	Markosek	Samuelson
Briggs	Galloway	Marshall	Sankey
Brown, R.	Gergely	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brown, V.	Gibbons	Masser	Santora
Brownlee	Gillen	McCarter	Schemel
Burns	Gillespie	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Caltagirone	Godshall	McNeill	Schreiber
Carroll	Goodman	Mentzer	Schweyer
Causar	Greiner	Metcalfe	Simmons
Christiana	Grove	Metzgar	Sims
Cohen	Hahn	Miccarelli	Snyder
Conklin	Hanna	Millard	Sonney
Corbin	Harhai	Miller, B.	Staats
Costa, D.	Harhart	Miller, D.	Stephens
Costa, P.	Harkins	Milne	Sturla
Cox	Harper	Moul	Tallman
Cruz	Harris, A.	Mullery	Taylor
Culver	Harris, J.	Murt	Thomas
Cutler	Heffley	Mustio	Tobash
Daley, M.	Helm	Nesbit	Toepel
Daley, P.	Hennessey	Neuman	Toohil
Davidson	Hickernell	O'Brien	Topper
Davis	Hill	O'Neill	Truitt
Dawkins	Irvin	Oberlander	Vereb
Day	James	Ortitay	Vitali
Dean	Jozwiak	Parker, C.	Ward
Deasy	Kampf	Parker, D.	Warner
DeLissio	Kaufner	Pashinski	Waters
Delozier	Kauffman	Payne	Watson
DeLuca	Kavulich	Peifer	Wentling
Dermody	Keller, F.	Petrarca	Wheatley
Diamond	Keller, M.K.	Petri	Wheeland
DiGiroalamo	Keller, W.	Pickett	White

Donatucci	Killion	Pyle	Youngblood
Driscoll	Kim	Quinn	Zimmerman
Dunbar	Kinsey	Rader	
Dush	Kirkland	Rapp	Turzai,
Ellis	Klunk	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Emrick	Knowles		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Fee	Matzie	Quigley	Saylor
Gingrich			

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 adopt the resolution as amended?

The SPEAKER. We will now move to the underlying resolution as amended.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—196

Acosta	English	Kortz	Readshaw
Adolph	Evankovich	Kotik	Reed
Baker	Evans	Krieger	Reese
Barbin	Everett	Lawrence	Regan
Barrar	Fabrizio	Lewis	Roae
Benninghoff	Farina	Longietti	Roebuck
Bishop	Farry	Mackenzie	Ross
Bizzarro	Flynn	Maher	Rozzi
Bloom	Frankel	Mahoney	Sabatina
Boback	Freeman	Major	Saccone
Boyle	Gabler	Maloney	Sainato
Bradford	Gainey	Markosek	Samuelson
Briggs	Galloway	Marshall	Sankey
Brown, R.	Gergely	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brown, V.	Gibbons	Masser	Santora
Brownlee	Gillen	McCarter	Schemel
Burns	Gillespie	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Caltagirone	Godshall	McNeill	Schreiber
Carroll	Goodman	Mentzer	Schweyer
Causar	Greiner	Metcalfe	Simmons
Christiana	Grove	Metzgar	Sims
Cohen	Hahn	Miccarelli	Snyder
Conklin	Hanna	Millard	Sonney
Corbin	Harhai	Miller, B.	Staats
Costa, D.	Harhart	Miller, D.	Stephens
Costa, P.	Harkins	Milne	Sturla
Cox	Harper	Moul	Tallman
Cruz	Harris, A.	Mullery	Taylor
Culver	Harris, J.	Murt	Thomas
Cutler	Heffley	Mustio	Tobash
Daley, M.	Helm	Nesbit	Toepel
Daley, P.	Hennessey	Neuman	Toohil
Davidson	Hickernell	O'Brien	Topper
Davis	Hill	O'Neill	Truitt
Dawkins	Irvin	Oberlander	Vereb
Day	James	Ortitay	Vitali
Dean	Jozwiak	Parker, C.	Ward
Deasy	Kampf	Parker, D.	Warner

DeLissio	Kaufer	Pashinski	Waters
Delozier	Kauffman	Payne	Watson
DeLuca	Kavulich	Peifer	Wentling
Dermody	Keller, F.	Petrarca	Wheatley
Diamond	Keller, M.K.	Petri	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Pickett	White
Donatucci	Killion	Pyle	Youngblood
Driscoll	Kim	Quinn	Zimmerman
Dunbar	Kinsey	Rader	
Dush	Kirkland	Rapp	Turzai,
Ellis	Klunk	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Emrick	Knowles		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Fee	Matzie	Quigley	Saylor
Gingrich			

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A CONTINUED

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 153, PN 1318**, entitled:

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

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

The SPEAKER. 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?

Representative Vitali, you are recognized on the bill.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition of HB 153.

Mr. Speaker, I think this bill should be more aptly numbered HB 84,000, and I say that because this bill number was chosen because of what the maker of the bill thought was the most salient feature, which was reducing the legislature to 153, now 151, House members. But I think the most salient feature of this bill is the fact that it is going to increase the size of every legislative district in Pennsylvania to 84,000 people. Mr. Speaker, that is just too big, in my view, for good government.

Mr. Speaker, small districts, I believe as a general principle, are better than larger districts. Smaller districts give the legislators more independence from the influence of special interest group money, and smaller districts also allow the constituents to be more connected with their legislators.

And as you increase this district from its current 62,000 people per member to 84,000, which this bill would do, you make the members of this body more dependent on special interest group money and less connected with the people they represent. And so although this bill might have the appearance of good government, I think the reality is it makes government less responsive to the people we represent.

Mr. Speaker, our legislative districts are very large compared to others and this would just exacerbate that situation. Mr. Speaker, right now the smallest legislature, the smallest-sized district, I should say – and I say that is a good thing – the smallest-sized district is New Hampshire, with about 3,300 people for each legislator. Moving down to some of our connected districts: West Virginia at number 10; each legislator represents 18,000 people. That is good. Moving down the list: Delaware, the eleventh smallest number of people, 22,000 people. Maryland, each legislator in Maryland represents 41,000 people. Mr. Speaker, we are down the line at 33. We are 33 from the top as far as having the smallest number of people. That is too big. We should not be proud of being number 33.

With this bill, if it passes, and when this legislature goes down to 84,000, we will then drop down to 41st. We are heading in the wrong direction. Mr. Speaker, there are two basic problems that are really systematic to this body – and I have been here 23 years – that are exacerbated by this, that would be exacerbated by this bill. One would be gerrymandering and how that would be exacerbated, and two would be the effect of special interest groups. You do not have to go any further than the halls of this House today or the anteroom of this chamber today to see how lobbyists just are populating the hallways and how we as a body are dependent upon their affiliated packs in the escalating war for money. And believe me when I tell you, I am convinced that money drives this legislative process, and that is probably the most corrupting influence up here, and this bill will just make it worse. This bill will make it worse.

Mr. Speaker, right now a legislative district with 60,000 people, that we currently have, if you want to you can win it on pure shoe leather because your connection with the people you represent can be a one-on-one connection. If we become more dependent on special interest group money, it is not a one-to-one connection, it is not a person-to-legislator connection, it is our connection with lobbyists who give us money to buy TV ads, to get mailers, to connect with the district. That makes us less responsive to the people we represent.

Mr. Speaker, the connectivity, the one-to-one connectivity between constituent and legislator will be lost. Right now with a smaller district, most of the people I represent have personally met me, they have shaken my hand, they have had the opportunity to ask me questions. That is not true, frankly, with many State Senators.

Mr. Speaker, you lose that connection. People right now are alienated, alienated from the legislative process. They feel like they have lost this connection with their elected officials. And the State House is the last bastion of that connectivity. You cannot do it at the State Senate level. You cannot do it at the congressional level. This is the last bastion, and we should not be giving that up.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the problem of increasing the number of people we represent, we will also be increasing the geographic size of legislative districts. Mr. Speaker, that, frankly, is why the Farm Bureau opposes this piece of

legislation. The Farm Bureau, and I will quote their e-mail of today, May 5. They oppose this bill because it says it "...will have the practical effect of further eroding opportunities for access of rural constituents with their elected representative and for the representative to consider and advocate for the special needs of rural Pennsylvania. We urge a negative vote on HB 153...." That is today from the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau.

Mr. Speaker, and I will ask the good gentleman from House District 167 to correct me if I am wrong, but that legislative district is currently, currently, before its expansion, is 2,171 square miles – one State House district. It is about 80 miles across, that one State House district. If we increase the population of each House district, that problem will even get worse. That is not something we want to be doing.

I think the second big problem facing State government and that will be exacerbated by this proposal, this appearance of good government, will be gerrymandering. Right now we have so many seats that are simply noncompetitive because of the political nature of the Reapportionment Commission. We have many seats that are just simply safe Democrat and safe Republican, and there is not that battle and there is not that need to compromise. If we move this process forward by allowing further gerrymandering, we are going to become just like the U.S. Congress and the gridlock they suffer because of the gerrymandering that goes along there.

Mr. Speaker, it has been mentioned before, as we shrink from 203 to 151, there is going to be a real opportunity to gerrymander even more, exacerbating that situation. And that is why in addition to—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman just please suspend for a moment, please.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Representative Saylor has asked to be put back on the master roll. That will be granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 153 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. I do not want to interrupt anybody's floor speeches here. We do have a lot of members that want to speak on this bill and on other bills. I just wanted to just, please, state: members, we have a lot of folks that want to have an opportunity to speak. There is no time limit, but if each and every one of us could be respectful of the other person's opportunity, Republican and Democrat, to have an opportunity to speak on the bill, it will be greatly appreciated.

Representative, you may continue.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you.

And because of this opportunity for gerrymandering and redistricting abuse, that is why the League of Women Voters of Pennsylvania opposes this bill in their e-mail dated May 5, from Susan Carty, president of the League of Women Voters of Pennsylvania, quote, "...we will have to oppose House Bills 153 and 384. The League prefers that the General Assembly postpone shrinking the legislature until after the voters have adopted a redistricting reform amendment to the Pennsylvania Constitution." They are asking for a "no" vote today.

Just on one final point. Sometimes arguments are advanced that this will save money. Reducing State employment by 50 people will save money. There are 80,000 State employees.

Can you really credibly suggest that by reducing our State employment from 80,000 employees minus 5, it is going to have any appreciable impact upon costs? And frankly, even if you think it will, you have to ask yourself, do you not think the service you provide is more valuable than many other State employees that are out there? And if you do not think you are more valuable, then you should not be here.

Mr. Speaker, for the above reasons I would ask for a "no" vote on HB 153.

The SPEAKER. Members, we have 14 of our colleagues that would like to speak so far on this particular bill. I will just remind everybody if they can be succinct in their points, there is no time limit, but I think that the members and the public would appreciate that.

Representative Diamond, you are called upon, and the floor is yours.

Mr. DIAMOND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of this body who was born of the reform movement.

When I first started hanging around Harrisburg, I was outside on the front steps and I was shaking my fists at the members in this room. But at no time in those 10 years did I ever suggest that we reduce the size of this body. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to oppose this bill because of the unintended consequences it will have, because we are looking to move this bill in a vacuum.

We have to ask who will this bill, if finally adopted by the people, who will it empower? In my mind it will empower the special interests and lobbyists. They will be getting a 25-percent discount for access to this body. We will be empowering local party bosses to groom and raise handpicked successors in smoke-filled rooms. Also, at one time this body was run using strong-arm tactics and browbeating. Now, that has thankfully changed in the last 10 years and we have a good leadership team, but fewer members would make it easier for some future leader to return to strong-arm tactics and bullying to make this body run.

Let us talk about who this bill, if passed and adopted by the people, would disempower. It would disempower rural constituents. It would make it less likely that a constituent would get to meet with their Representative. While urban districts may not substantially increase in geographical size, some rural districts will vastly increase in size, increasing travel demands for the Representatives to meet with folks in the district.

Let me talk about the numbers for a second. I have heard a couple people say that 203 is not a magic number; in fact, it was a mistake. And in fact it was a mistake. It was a mapping mistake after the 1968 convention. Two hundred and three, however, is a magic number. I will argue that 151 is not a magic number; nor is 400, the number of members of the New Hampshire House; nor is 99, the number of members of the Ohio House. But 203 is in fact a magic number, not in the abstract, but in this situation, 203 is a magic number because it is the number of members we have now. It is important sometimes to have consistency. We cannot do change just for the sake of change.

I have also heard that this is a moneysaving proposition, but truly, if we want to save money, why do we not vote to eliminate our district offices? Why do we not vote to consolidate caucus operations or to merge our print shops together? That would really save money. Changing a number alone is not reform, Mr. Speaker. We are doing this in a

vacuum. When you do it in a vacuum, you will have unintended consequences. You will have a detrimental impact on rural constituencies.

Now, ultimately, I get it. The people will have the ultimate say on whether this is actually adopted as part of our Constitution. But it is our responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to give the people responsible proposals that are well thought out – not just well-intentioned, but well thought out. And if we think about the unintended consequences, Mr. Speaker, and the impact of this bill on the rural communities of our State, we should absolutely not pass this on to the voters to ratify at the ballot box.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Saccone of Allegheny County and Washington County.

Mr. SACCONI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Once again the House entertains this matter of shrinking our legislature. Now, you have to say, the people of Pennsylvania overwhelmingly support that. But there are those that still staunchly oppose it, as we just heard some clapping there. We voted for this several times now. I just want to lay out some of the arguments in favor of shrinking the legislature.

It is important to examine this subject objectively. Just remember, PA, Pennsylvania, operates the largest full-time legislature in the United States. The only legislature bigger than ours is New Hampshire, with 424, and it is a part-time legislature. That should be enough. That statement alone should be enough to persuade you, because that statement is ringing in the ears of our constituents back home. There are too many politicians in Harrisburg – that is what you hear – way too many politicians.

Now, I have taken the opportunity over the last 4 years to visit 14 State legislatures and to study how their systems work, and I think it is through the lens of comparison that we can see clearly the blemishes of our own system. So let us take a look at just a few of the other legislatures around us. Let us look at our neighbor, Ohio, which is nearly equivalent in population and size to Pennsylvania, very close. And it governs with a 99-member State House, 99 members; roughly 120,000 residents per Representative. So a smaller legislature is not impossible for a State our size. I visited that legislature and observed how it functioned, and I can tell you that on the floor of their House there is much less chaos and much more robust actual debate on the floor – not like here; most people are not even listening right now.

Most people come, when you bring your constituents up here— When you bring your constituents up here, the first thing they notice is the chaos, right? But in Ohio, when you look at Ohio, they actually listen to the debate. Go to Ohio. I am trying to compare Ohio to Pennsylvania. We can learn, we can learn from looking at other States, and Ohio has a lot of tolerance—

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (KATHARINE M. WATSON) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Ladies and gentlemen, the House will come to order, please. Ladies and gentlemen—

Mr. SACCONI. You are making my point. I love it. Thank you for making my point. I love the other side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would you suspend a moment, please. Would you suspend, sir, for a moment.

Mr. SACCONI. Yes, madam.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Ladies and gentlemen, the House will come to order. We are paying close attention. We let people have a little bit of leeway, but we never get too rowdy, do we? Of course not. Thank you.

You may continue, Mr.—

Mr. SACCONI. I would never be accused of ever getting rowdy.

I would also like to take a look at the State of Illinois, the fifth largest in population, just ahead of us and just slightly larger in size. It also functions very effectively with 118 Representatives. You remember, you may remember I invited one of the State Senators from Illinois here to be with us on the 150th anniversary of the Gettysburg Address just last year. He happens to occupy Abraham Lincoln's seat. And I was able to discuss with him and other legislators in Illinois how they function with a much smaller legislature. And then there is New York, third largest in population and slightly larger than us in size. They operate their House with 150 Representatives.

I heard it argued here, one of the arguments against this proposal is from our rural districts. Our rural colleagues say that a smaller legislature will hurt the rural districts, and for that, I would offer the example of Montana. Montana is the fourth largest State geographically and has a really good example of the rural-urban mix, over 147,000-square miles, and just under a million people in 56 counties. And a quarter of their population is in 4 cities, and they function effectively with 100 State Representatives and 50 Senators. I visited that legislature, and I talked with Senators and Reps there, and they feel that Montana is well represented. Their rural-urban split is well represented with only 100 State Representatives.

Other colleagues contend that Pennsylvania is a diverse State – and we are – but it is interesting that when you talk to Representatives in other States they also argue that their State is uniquely diverse. Ohio, as we said, is a rural State, with concentrated populations in two large cities such as Cleveland and Cincinnati. Illinois is a rural State, with a large concentration in Chicago and surrounding counties, yet both operate effectively with a smaller legislature.

Now, some colleagues say – actually, believe it or not, some colleagues say we should have a larger legislature. The larger the better, voice of the people. We need more legislators. But when you look at the example of the only legislature larger than ours, New Hampshire, 424 members, you see what happens is the voice of the people is so small that each individual legislator is neutered, and the leadership carries most of the weight. The individual legislators do not have much say. Others argue that a larger legislature cuts down on corruption, as it is difficult for lobbyists to influence a larger number of legislators. We heard that, kind of, from our colleague from Delaware County. In fact, a larger Assembly places the power in the hands of a few leaders, so lobbyists need only to influence those leaders to get their way.

Finally, at least a few colleagues tout the fact that the number we represent currently, around 63,000, is small enough that we can personally touch each one, each constituent. And I agree. As my good colleague from Delaware County noted, I have knocked on nearly 40,000 doors in the last several elections. My

wife and I routinely attend over 200 events in our district, as many of you probably do too. But under this bill our districts will become only slightly larger and will remain a size still reachable by a Representative that is willing to work at it. We will not forfeit our accessibility by shrinking the legislature.

As we said, there is nothing magical about that number, 203. It was arrived at arbitrarily. What we can safely say is that there is an effective number for a State our size and our population, and that number is somewhere between 100 and 175. We can learn from Ohio. We can learn from New York. We can learn from Illinois. We can learn from these other States, but we do not have to be them. I understand that. We can set our own standard within those guidelines, and that makes the proposed number of 151 a reasonable number for a State our size and with our population.

Still others argue that not much money will be saved, and that is relatively true. It will likely save maybe in the tens of millions, not the hundreds of millions. It is not that big of a savings. But the larger argument is about effectiveness of government, not just cost savings. Some argue that it is not the legislature that needs shrunk, it is the bureaucracy. Well, that is true also, but it is not an either/or argument. We can shrink both. Some people say we should start with the legislature. We should start at the top, and we should eventually work on shrinking State government overall, but we need to reduce our legislature.

In the end, the people desire a smaller legislature, and there is sound justification that our legislature is just too large. Remember, this legislation has to pass both House and Senate twice in two sessions before it goes to the people in a referendum where they can ultimately decide. The people want this, but they do not believe we will do it. I always hear back home, they say, "You will never vote yourselves out of a job. You politicians, you will never vote yourselves out of a job." But the truth is, in the House, we have. This is going to be the third time now that most of us are going to vote to vote ourselves right out of a job. So we have shown we will do that, and I think it is a good thing.

It is time we do what the people want. Do the right thing. Vote "yes" on HB 153.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you. And our next speaker – I think we have 13 more to go – Representative Longietti from Mercer County. You may begin.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, in a recent, about a year ago in the New York Times, Bruce Bartlett wrote, "But what really matters is how much population each legislator represents." Everything is relative. It is really based upon the number of people that we represent – our customers, as I would say. As we have heard, we represent about 62,500 people. There are 32 States where State Representatives represent fewer people than we do, 32 States. The median is Massachusetts. In Massachusetts they represent about 40,923 people compared to our 62,500. The overall average, and this accounts the outliers, the overall average is 65,740 across the nation. If you eliminate the 5 States below 10,000 constituents each and the 3 States above 200,000 each, the average is 56,021, which is fewer than what we represent.

The mode, the mode or the most frequently occurring number, is right where we are at. There are 5 States between 62,500 and 64,800. Now, if we adopt this bill and shrink the

legislature as requested, we will represent about 84,000 people. I heard a lot about Ohio. I am on the border with Ohio. You want to talk about Ohio? I will tell you a couple things. Number one is, they do not have district offices in Ohio. They do not provide the level of services that we provide in Ohio.

My good colleague across the border, while he is proud to serve in the Ohio Legislature, he will tell you that he is envious of what we have here in Pennsylvania. John Cox, a businessman in California who actually introduced an initiative in California to increase the size of their legislature, observed that a smaller number of people will be represented, which will improve democracy in his State.

Let us talk about the impact of this measure. How will it affect people? According to Tim Storey, a political analyst at the National Conference of State Legislatures, "The legislature is the people's body, the branch where people are able to access policymakers at the highest level." According to an analysis by Rosenthal, Loomis, and Hibbing, "In districts under 50,000...representatives can have personal contact with a sizeable proportion of constituents."

Do we want to go even further above that 50,000 constituent level? As has been stated, we are the people that are close to our constituents. We have regular contact with them. We understand what they think, the issues that are important to them. As we grow the districts, we lose that capability.

Do we want to become like the United States Congress? Your Congressman or woman, as much and as hard as they work, they cannot stay in touch with their constituents. Is it no wonder that people say Congress is out of touch. What about ceding our authority to the bureaucracy? As stated by NCSL, "The oversight of administrative agencies is greater among larger legislatures."

How many square miles will some of our colleagues have to cover? Our colleague from McKean County already has a district that is larger in square miles – imagine this – larger in square miles than over half of the United States Congress seats. How much bigger can we make his district and more difficult for him to represent his constituency? Is it no wonder, as stated, is it no wonder that the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau opposes this measure.

In 1999 – let us talk about cost, because cost is always mentioned – in 1999 a study by economist Mark Thornton and Marc Ulrich found that the more population per district, the bigger the size of government. Why is that? Because we provide a great level of services through our district offices, and as we shrink these districts, it causes other agencies to increase in order to provide those services.

Let us talk about effectiveness. So we have 203 members in this body. The Senate has 50. They are 25 percent the size of our House of Representatives. The proponents would have you believe that smaller means more effective. Has the Senate been more effective than the House in Pennsylvania? Year after year, year after year when we look at the number of bills that are adopted, there are more bills produced by the House than the Senate year after year. They are not more effective.

And who takes care of the constituents? You know, as House members, they come to the House district offices, and in many cases they do not come to the Senate offices. We are the workhorses. We are the ones that respond to the e-mails, answer phone calls personally, meet with constituents personally. When you get to the Senator, how often can a constituent meet with a State Senator? Not very often. They meet with staff.

So really what this comes down to is, we heard the popular opinion. Popular opinion: reduce the size of the legislature because people get mad at government. It is a visceral reaction, it is a gut-level reaction, it is a baneful reaction, but there is not a lot of thought into it. Just like people like lots of services and do not want to pay taxes, the polls always show that. As soon as this legislature gets cut in size, people will say, "Where are the services? Why can't I meet with my House member? Why isn't my House member at this function? Why doesn't he or she answer the phone and answer my e-mail? Why is it always a staff member?" It is really about that gut-level reaction.

And so the question that I have for all of us here today is, who is going to stand up for our profession? Who is going to stand up and say that we count, we matter, we serve our constituents, we work hard, we earn our paycheck? If we cannot stand up for our own jobs, for the people that we serve, for the constituents that we serve and say that this legislature matters, that this is about serving our constituents, if we cannot stand up and say that, who will?

Vote "no" on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you.

Our next speaker, Representative Dush, from Jefferson County.

Representative, you may begin.

Mr. DUSH. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Members, even as young as elementary school, the People's House is what this has been called. It was also called that in reference to the U.S. Congress, the U.S. House of Representatives.

We are supposed to be the closest Representatives, the people who have the closest contact, the most intimate contact, with the people in our districts. Right now every one of our constituents is one of 63,000 people trying to get our attention. You heard the numbers earlier that there are some States, most States actually have fewer constituents per Representative, easier access to their Representative. Most of those are part-time legislatures. Most of those operate a whole lot more effectively and efficiently than ours does.

There are a lot of people— I have heard arguments over and over again about a full-time professional legislature, yet when I come down here I do not see, there is an awful lot that I do not see that is very professional. The fact that we are chasing our tails all the time, going around from one meeting to another instead of sitting here and trying to solve problems and deal with the issues. Our caucus meeting today was more productive I think than any meeting that we have had so far this year, and it is because we actually spent time talking about a single issue. That is effectiveness. That is working things out. That is trying to work together and also referencing our constituents over and over again, talking about the people back home.

We spend so much time around here with lobbyists looking for our attention, bureaucrats looking for our attention, and yet we are not actually solving the problems. Our constituents will tell you the bureaucracy is putting so much pressure on them. We spend more time trying to pass bills and get something passed than holding the executive to account. That is not effectiveness.

The point was made earlier that the Senate, I hear over and over again from members of this body that the Senate does not have effectiveness, and yet they are only a quarter of the members that we have. Where is the effectiveness in reduced

numbers? If we are going to be effective, we need to start concentrating on being a coequal branch of this government. We need to start holding the executive and the judiciary to account. That means holding meaningful hearings. We need to have all hands on deck for this, 203 people right now. We have got the members to do it.

One of the encouraging things I have seen— I talked to my constituents and they kept asking me, when I was running, "How are you going to go down there and make a difference as one person?" I said, "I know I am going down there trying to eat an elephant a bite at a time, but the way you do that is a bite at a time." I get down here, and I tell them now, I said, "It is more of a blue whale, but the encouraging thing is I found a bunch of people who have been elected here in the last 8, 10 years or so that are trying to roll their sleeves up and actually get the job done." I am encouraged by that. I am really encouraged by that. But for heaven's sake, let us not diminish our ranks when we have got the people here right now. There is a breadth of experience that comes from having these 203 people. We have got school board directors, county commissioners, township supervisors, engineers, architects. We have got the people here that have the requisite wisdom and understanding that we can come together on issues and start sitting down and having meaningful discussions, but we have got to have the bodies present in order to do that.

This government since 1968 has exploded in size. We have become a professional legislature. But all of a sudden, now we have got an exploded bureaucracy. The only way we are going to rein this in is to have the people here, and I sense in the body that we have, we have got the people that can actually do it. But we need to have the people, and it is not going to happen overnight. It will not happen overnight, but we need to work together as a team and actually start making it happen.

The talk about New York and California with their huge populations, huge number of people, who really wants to be them? They have got worse problems than we do. Let us be who Ben Franklin wanted us to be. Let us be that light on that hill. You know, Franklin, he made the comment after the Constitutional Convention that he had been looking at the chair that Washington held. He saw that sun on there. It was a partially exposed sun and he was trying to decide whether or not it was a rising sun on a new day for a new nation or one that was setting on an experiment. He walked out of there saying that he thought it was a rising sun.

There is an awful lot that is going on in this country and in this State. We have all seen the degradation, and much of it has come about because the government has its hands in so many things. Let us turn things around and not let that sun set.

I ask you to please consider your constituents. They do not want to be one of 83,000 people. They want to be able to talk to you. If you are going to want to use electronic communications for something, let us use it for talking with each other while we are back in our districts. Let us get that personal conversation going again one on one with the people who are at the working end of things, that sense and know, because they are experiencing it, where the government is impacting them, and get that information back here and actually start solving problems.

Yesterday we had a reconsideration on a vote. And on that reconsideration, after that amendment, it kind of displayed the schizophrenia that we have got going on here with this issue. I believe it is worth additional consideration.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. DUSH. And, Madam Speaker, I would move that we refer this back to committee in order to have that discussion and get over the schizophrenia that we are experiencing here and actually have a good discussion on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Do I understand that the gentleman wishes to make a motion that this bill be recommitted to the State Government Committee?

Mr. DUSH. That is correct, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you.

The gentleman, Mr. Dush, has moved that HB 153 be recommitted to the State Government Committee.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that motion, the Chair recognizes the majority leader, Representative Reed.

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

I would ask that the members oppose the motion to recommit this piece of legislation. This is the beginning of the process to amend the Constitution. We are talking about a 4- to 5-year process, and there will be a lot of time for discussion throughout that process. And I understand the gentleman's concerns, and I am very respectful of those concerns, but unfortunately, I would ask the members to oppose the motion to recommit. Thank you.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Allow me to note that the— Excuse me then. We also have from the majority whip a notice that Representative Kaufer of Luzerne County wishes to be placed on leave. That will be done. All right. And we note visually that Representative Kaufer has returned. So that is the Speaker's error. We are glad you are back.

We also note, and the whip has noted, that Representative Fee from Lancaster County has returned. So we are good on that.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 153 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Moving back then to the discussion. We had then a motion to recommit 153 to the State Government Committee.

Representative Samuelson, do you wish to speak?

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The speakers so far today have talked about several concerns with this legislation. Yesterday I raised the concern about having a nonpartisan redistricting process tied to this legislation. I commend the gentleman from Jefferson County for making this motion.

I urge a "yes" vote on the motion to recommit to the State Government Committee so that these issues can be addressed through the committee process.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, sir.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—89

Acosta	Davis	Harhai	Pickett
Baker	Dawkins	Harkins	Rader
Barbin	Dean	Harris, J.	Rapp
Bishop	Deasy	Kavulich	Ravenstahl
Bizzarro	DeLissio	Keller, W.	Readshaw
Boback	DeLuca	Kim	Roebuck
Boyle	Dermody	Kinsey	Rozzi
Bradford	Donatucci	Kirkland	Sabatina
Briggs	Driscoll	Kortz	Sainato
Brown, V.	Dush	Kotik	Samuelson
Brownlee	Evans	Longietti	Santarsiero
Burns	Fabrizio	Mahoney	Schlossberg
Caltagirone	Farina	Markosek	Schreiber
Carroll	Flynn	McCarter	Schweyer
Causar	Frankel	McNeill	Sims
Cohen	Freeman	Miller, D.	Snyder
Conklin	Gainey	Mullery	Sturla
Costa, D.	Galloway	Neuman	Thomas
Costa, P.	Gergely	O'Brien	Vitali
Cruz	Gibbons	Parker, C.	Waters
Daley, M.	Goodman	Pashinski	Wheatley
Daley, P.	Hanna	Petrarca	Youngblood
Davidson			

NAYS—109

Adolph	Hahn	Marsico	Saccone
Barrar	Harhart	Masser	Sankey
Benninghoff	Harper	McGinnis	Santora
Bloom	Harris, A.	Mentzer	Saylor
Brown, R.	Heffley	Metcalfe	Schemel
Christiana	Helm	Metzgar	Simmons
Corbin	Hennessey	Miccarelli	Sonney
Cox	Hickernell	Millard	Staats
Culver	Hill	Miller, B.	Stephens
Cutler	Irvin	Milne	Tallman
Day	James	Moul	Taylor
Delozier	Jozwiak	Murt	Tobash
Diamond	Kampf	Mustio	Toepel
DiGirolamo	Kaufer	Nesbit	Toohil
Dunbar	Kauffman	O'Neill	Topper
Ellis	Keller, F.	Oberlander	Truitt
Emrick	Keller, M.K.	Ortitay	Vereb
English	Killion	Parker, D.	Ward
Evankovich	Klunk	Payne	Warner
Everett	Knowles	Peifer	Watson
Farry	Krieger	Petri	Wentling
Fee	Lawrence	Pyle	Wheeland
Gabler	Lewis	Quinn	White
Gillen	Mackenzie	Reed	Zimmerman
Gillespie	Maher	Reese	
Godshall	Major	Regan	Turzai,
Greiner	Maloney	Roae	Speaker
Grove	Marshall	Ross	

NOT VOTING—0**EXCUSED—3**

Gingrich	Matzie	Quigley
----------	--------	---------

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. We will return then to the speakers, and our next speaker is Representative Pashinski from Luzerne County, and I believe then there are 12 more following that. I would remind everyone if possible to condense your speech.

Representative Pashinski, you are welcome to begin.

Mr. PASHINSKI. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate that.

Over the last hour or so we have had the opportunity to listen to both sides of the issue, each side making very poignant positions, making a great deal of sense, speaking from their position, and I would like to also offer my own position.

Earlier today we heard one of our colleagues say how proud they were to stand up for this House. I am one of those colleagues that stands up with that person and says that as a State Representative, I am humbled to be here and I am proud to serve.

One of my duties is to listen to the people. One of my major duties is to be able to make myself available to the people that I represent, listen to their problems, bring those problems here to this House, to this magnificent complex of government, discuss it in committee, discuss it with all sides, and try to come up with solutions that will address and fix their problems.

People have lost trust in government. People have lost trust because their problems are not getting fixed, and their problems are not getting fixed because of political paralysis. We have an opportunity today to demonstrate once again how the democratic process takes shape. And we are, actually today we are working based upon the 1960s Constitutional Convention that said this number of Representatives would best serve the people of Pennsylvania. So far it seems as though it has worked, because wherever I go, at countless meetings throughout my district, my constituents will say to me, "Boy, we always get a chance to see you, Representative. We never get a chance to see our Senator." And I say, "What you must understand is that I represent 63,000 to 65,000 people. I can come to that night at the races. I can go to that senior tea. I can go to that Little League game. I can speak before the Rotary Club because I represent 63,000 to 65,000 people." But I said, "Your Senator represents 240,000 to 250,000 people," and as a result, it is impossible for that Senator to be in the same place at the same times as many times as we as Representatives can be. Yes, you will see their staff. They will have a much larger staff than us, but they will not see their Senator.

And then in that same conversation they will say, "Well, jeez, we never see our Congressman," and of course you know what the answer is there. "Our Congressman represents 770,000 people. How do you expect your Congressman, my Congressman, to be at all the events that I attend as State Representative?" And they say, "Well, I never thought about that. I never realized that a Congressman had 700,000 people to represent."

And then we talk about the State Senator. That State Senator, our State Senator represents 12.7 million Pennsylvanians. How on this God's green earth could that Senator be in the same places that we as Representatives are? Our job is to be with the people, to go to the people, to be with them, to find out what their problems are, their good and the bad. What is their pain and what is their suffering? And our job is to bring it back here and go through the arduous job of debating.

And I will tell you what else I tell my people, the people that I represent. I tell them that in this hall and on the other side of this magnificent building, there are Representatives and Senators that care. They care about their job, and we have incredible staff members that have dedicated their lives to this job of representing the people.

People are disenchanted with government because we do not fix things. This is an example of not fixing things, because this bill could be a possibility if we fixed the bill to have the proper redistricting plan, if we had an independent organization to make sure that the people were represented according to geographic area and similarities and numbers. We had that opportunity yesterday to make sure that an independent group would make sure that we would be redistricted legally, responsibly, and to make sure that the people we represent, their vote would count. That was voted down.

So today we are in a quagmire, trying to figure out what is the right thing to do. And I say to you, the 203 Representatives, when they do their job, when they go to the people and they find their concerns, has worked for a long time. The politics has embedded itself and has separated our ability to fix the problems of the people. As we continue to struggle throughout these next weeks of trying to fix the problems of the people of Pennsylvania with a budget that is fair and just, we will find and we will reveal exactly who we are, how much we care about the people we represent, or how much we are concerned about the influence that is rested upon us. Remember, that Constitutional Convention in the sixties stated that if we had more Representatives, the likelihood of influence would be less.

You know, we said that a Senator represented 12.7 million people. We could eliminate government if we had a king or a monarch, but that would not be representative government. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative, as we stand here today as Representatives listening to our constituents, it is incumbent upon us to regain their trust and do the right thing. This bill is flawed, severely flawed, and I ask for a "no" vote.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, Representative.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Chester County, Representative Truitt.

Representative, you have our attention.

Mr. TRUITT. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, up to this point today, most of the arguments on this bill or on this resolution have been arguments on the merits of reducing the size of the legislature. I want to remind my colleagues that this is not a bill to reduce the size of the legislature. This is a bill to let the people decide whether we should reduce the size of the legislature.

There is a reason that this is a constitutional amendment that is being proposed. We here in this room have a conflict of interest in this matter. It is the people who should decide things like whether we have one chamber or two, whether we are full-time or part-time, how long our term should be, and yes, how many of us there should be in the legislature.

So I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution and give the people a chance to decide whether we really need 203 members or whether they would be happy if there were fewer of us. I think they are qualified to make the decision. I think it will make for a great public debate once it goes on the ballot as a ballot measure, and I really think it is something that we should do.

So again I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this measure, and I look forward to the vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, Representative. And for your brevity, we thank you.

The Chair now recognizes Representative Freeman from Northampton County.

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose HB 153. I know that reducing the size of the State House of Representatives is perceived by many as a reform measure; however, in reality, the proposal will not achieve its hope for reforms and will in fact result in a number of unintended negative consequences for the political process here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Reducing the size of this House by 25 percent will obviously result in larger districts. Larger districts mean more expensive campaigns to get a candidate's message out to the voters. More costly campaigns mean more special interest money will be driven into the election process. The cost of elections in the House will go up, which means more special interest influence will be felt, both in the political process and in the legislative process here in Harrisburg.

That narrows our perspective as a legislative body, and in reality, it also diminishes the interest and the influence of the general public, the people that we are sent here to represent. One of the real benefits of a 203-member House is the smaller districts, which means that money is less significant of a feature in our campaigns. It is the personal door-to-door contact with the voters that matters the most in our races and can ensure the success of a less well-financed candidate who is willing to meet the voters by going into the neighborhoods and knocking on the their doors directly.

In many respects, Madam Speaker, this House is the only element of State government that still practices what is known as retail politics, where direct contact with voters is the centerpiece of the elections. The other segments of State government – the governorship, statewide row offices, even the State Senate with its much larger districts – practice wholesale politics, where a candidate's connection to voters is indirect through advertising buys, direct mail, and media-driven events. We are the only branch, we are the only branch of government in State government that still connects with voters at the grassroots level in one-on-one contact that is important to our very democracy. That will be less likely with larger districts and an increased emphasis on wholesale politics that will follow in the wake of larger districts.

Even as lawmakers, our small districts guarantee more face-to-face contact with the constituents who live in our districts, which empowers the average citizen to have their concerns heard and to influence the votes of their Representatives on public policy matters. It is a simple but very real fact that a smaller legislative body with larger districts will diminish the possibilities of direct contact with the public in those face-to-face encounters. One has only to look to the experience of our counterparts in the State Senate who, try as they may, find it difficult to make every event in their larger districts. We have all been to meetings and events where our local Senator is forced to send a member of their staff to represent them because they have way too many commitments in their larger districts.

Constituents have easy access to us in our district offices. I am sure every member in this chamber has had the opportunity to meet people who just walk into their district to talk about an issue. I am sure many members of this House, like myself, will often pick up the phone to answer calls that come in to their district. That is a very special direct contact with the people we represent, and that will be lost in larger districts.

As I said, constituents have easy access to us in our district office or as we go about our business, our everyday business in our hometowns. That will change with larger districts. We will lose the accessibility that makes our position in State government so very important and so very special.

It is our easy accessibility to constituents that makes our role in State government so unique and so prized because we confer directly with the public, giving the public the best avenue in State government to influence the process, have their voice heard, and through that direct dialogue with their elected Representatives, actually shape public policy.

The biggest argument that the proponents of this measure have made in reducing the size of the House by 25 percent is that it will save money. The reality is that the limited cost savings that will come from 52 less members will be quickly offset by the need for more staff to service the larger districts created by this proposal. Larger districts will also have an unintended negative consequence on representation both in a geographic sense and a policy context. Rural districts, as we have heard here today, will become overly large and difficult to service effectively. And our smaller urban districts, made up largely of cities of the third class, will be swallowed up in bigger districts where their special needs will get less attention and their influence in elections will be reduced significantly.

There needs to be one component of State government that is closest to the people and readily accessible. With 203 members, that is us. It is the small size of our districts, our 2-year terms of office, and the retail politics nature of our campaigns that ensure that. Let us not throw away on a misguided notion that a smaller House with larger districts will produce a better system. Let us not cause the magical experience of the people's ability to directly access their Representative to diminish in any way, shape, or form.

Let us retain through the 203-member House the easy ability for our citizens to personally express their viewpoints and influence the public policy process through direct encounters with their elected Representatives. That is the very essence of our role in State government, and we do a disservice to this institution and to our democracy if we diminish it in any way.

I urge a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, Representative.

The Chair now recognizes Representative Rapp from Warren County. Representative, you have the floor.

Ms. RAPP. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, we in this body are the Representatives and the voice of the people. One of the reasons our Founding Fathers constitutionally put that we were to run every other year was so that we would stay close to the people and so that we would listen to the people when we come here to Harrisburg to make decisions for the people.

Madam Speaker, I understand downsizing and I certainly support smaller government. I am a conservative who believes in smaller government. But we see time and time again a

growing bureaucracy where we see regulators wanting to make law instead of regulations. We also see that from the judicial branch of government.

This bill – and though I highly respect the sponsor of this bill – will create the loss of the voice for rural Pennsylvania. We will see more consolidated power in the urban areas. We will see an increase of staff. Last session when we debated this bill on the floor of this House, I was shocked to hear that for some members in urban areas with districts that are much smaller than mine, where I have three counties, two third-class cities, and 30-some townships, in districts that are smaller than one of my townships, some legislators in the urban areas had 8, 10 legislative staff people. With the size of my district and three counties, I have four and two offices.

This bill, in my opinion, does consolidate power. It will make it much more difficult and a hardship for rural legislators to meet with their constituents. One of the reasons the Farm Bureau and its members oppose this bill is the fear of losing their rural voice, and remember that agriculture is the number one industry in this State.

Again, I highly respect the sponsor of this legislation, but I will be a "no" vote on this bill to try to protect the rural voice of rural PA.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, Representative.

The Chair now recognizes Representative Sabatina of Philadelphia County. Representative Sabatina waives off. Thank you, sir.

The Chair now recognizes Representative Samuelson. Representative.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

This legislation provides for a reduction in the size of the House of Representatives from 203 members to 151 members, but as this bill is written, that reduction would be done through a partisan redistricting process. The reduction of 52 seats in the year 2021 would be done by the party leaders.

Our constituents all across Pennsylvania would like us to reform Harrisburg and reduce the power and influence of the party leaders. They do not want us to concentrate additional power in the hands of those party leaders. Now, we do not know who the party leaders will be in the year 2021, but this bill concentrates unprecedented power in the office of party leader. That is a recipe for disaster and will surely lead to partisan mischief.

Take a moment and imagine how the provisions of HB 153 will play out over the next 6 years if the reduction of 52 seats is done by party leaders. Those leaders would decide which legislative seats would stay and which legislative seats would go. A party leader with that kind of power could reward their friends and punish their enemies. A party leader with that kind of power could eliminate the seat of any legislator who dares to challenge the status quo or any legislator who opposes the party line. A party leader with that kind of power could eliminate the seat of any legislator who thinks independently and speaks out on the House floor. A party leader with that kind of power would have the ability to silence the voice of any legislator with whom they disagree. Come to think of it, a party leader with that kind of power could eliminate the seat of any legislator who voted against them in the caucus elections of November 2018 or the caucus elections of November 2020. Party leaders would

keep a naughty-and-nice list for 5 years, and the redistricting of 2021 would result in a political payback unprecedented in the history of Pennsylvania.

Today is Cinco de Mayo, so let me say that this bill, which would reduce the number of seats in the House through a partisan process, this bill gives party leaders the power to say "hasta la vista" to their political opponents. Why would this legislature want to give unprecedented power to the party leaders?

The League of Women Voters of Pennsylvania has asked us to adopt a nonpartisan redistricting process for Pennsylvania. In fact, the League of Women Voters has said that any bill that reduces the size of the legislature should not be adopted until a nonpartisan redistricting process is in place.

I urge you today to vote "no" on HB 153 and insist that Pennsylvania adopt a nonpartisan redistricting process. To adopt HB 153 without redistricting reform amounts to an unprecedented power grab by the party leaders. Fifty-two legislative seats would go and the party leaders would get to decide which ones. If we are going to reduce the size of the legislature, it matters who reduces the size of the legislature. We need a nonpartisan redistricting process in Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, Representative.

The Chair now recognizes Representative DeLuca from Allegheny County.

Mr. DeLUCA. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I did not intend to speak on this bill, but after hearing the gentleman from Westmoreland County and hearing a couple other gentlemen on the other side, I just had to get up and speak on it, because the fact is, I supported this bill. But as I think about it and I hear the arguments, I think about what the ramifications will be, not for a lot of us here in this chamber but for our children and our grandchildren in the coming years, the people whom we want to come up here and take our seats to be Representatives in this great body of ours.

You know, I heard the fact about Ohio, and I heard one of the members on the other side talking about let the people decide. Absolutely, I am for letting the people decide. Unfortunately, the people will not decide whether it is a part-time legislature, whether it is a full-time legislature, or anything else. This is about shrinking the members of the House. So it has nothing to do with letting the people decide.

If we are going to let the people decide, let us let the people decide about limiting outside income. When we voted in the 1960s the Constitution, the Pennsylvania constitutional amendment, they decided to modernize their State government from a part-time government to a full-time professional State legislature. They wanted a legislature that would be dedicated to serving the needs and would not be encumbered by duties that come with outside employment. We do not recognize that 1960s congressional constitutional amendment. I venture to say probably half or three-quarters of the members in here have outside income. Unfortunately, in Congress they recognize that. They limit the outside income.

Mr. Speaker, all we are going to do is disenfranchise the voters out there. Eight years ago one of our Senators on the other side held hearings – he was in the majority party – on reducing the size of the legislature and the Senate. He came to the conclusion it was not in the best interest of the people out

there, because the fact is you disenfranchise the rural communities, you disenfranchise a certain ethnic population, you disenfranchise a lot of people. That is not what we want in this Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

You know, if you want to play to the press and you want to say, well, this is what the people want – they do not want the bureaucracy to increase, they do not want to add more staffers out there who are going to make decisions on their lives whom they cannot vote for. If they are not satisfied on what we are doing, they vote us – they hire us and fire us every 2 years. And as you see the turnover in this House in the last 10 years, they certainly are not satisfied with some of the members, because they made the turnout, they made the turnover.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I voted for this every time, but as I think about it, this would be a bad, bad move for the future generations and the people that come to sit in every one of these chairs out there, and I would ask for a "no" vote this time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, Representative.

The Chair now recognizes Representative Daley. Sir, you may begin.

Mr. DALEY. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Why 203 members of the House? Why not 303? 403? In 1966 a group of all White guys got together and created a Constitutional Convention, and in 1968 the people of Pennsylvania passed it and came up with 203. Why? No one knows. But now we are talking about reducing the legislature. We hear how we cannot do that; the public does not want it. We should do that; the public wants it. You know, representative democracy is the toughest thing that mankind in the last 10,000 years has ever come up with, but it is the best that has ever been come up with in the last 10,000 years, and you are a part of that. We are all a part of that.

In 1994 I introduced a bill to create a unicameral legislature. I had 30 members of this chamber; 2 years later I had 15; 2 years later I had 10; 2 years later I did not introduce the bill. But then came Bonusgate and then came the pay raises and then there came indictments, and the public said it is time for reform.

You cannot compare Pennsylvania to West Virginia, Delaware, Texas, or any other State. We are the 17th largest economy in the world. We have 12 million people. We have the energy that will run America – Pennsylvania. But I am telling you one thing, the public demands reform. The public demands reform. The public demands reform now. The public demands reform from you. Now is the time. Now is the place. Vote "yes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, Representative, for certainly a rousing speech.

The Chair now recognizes Representative Causer from McKean County. Representative, you may begin.

Mr. CAUSER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise in opposition of HB 153, and my concern with HB 153 is diminished rural representation. When you draw larger districts, you tend to draw districts from rural Pennsylvania into the more suburban areas and then you truly lose a lot of your rural districts. So I am concerned about rural representation.

And I am just wondering, what is the goal? What is the goal of reducing the size of the legislature? I hear people say that it will cut costs, but we all know and anybody that has been here long enough knows that when you increase the size of districts, immediately additional staff is hired to cover those larger districts, and very quickly you would evaporate any cut in costs.

We all know that if we truly want to cut costs, we can do that and we just have to be serious about doing it.

I have heard a lot today about what the people want. And when you think about it, what do the people want? The people want us to reduce the size and cost of government, but what I think they really mean is they want us to reduce the bureaucracy. When you look at the executive agencies, the bureaucracy is huge. In my district, one example that is very concerning to us are regulations being put forward on the oil and gas industry, job-crippling regulations that are going to put a lot of people out of work; a bureaucracy out of control. If we want to control costs, let us control the bureaucracy. But it is not about, we should not be reducing the voice and the representation of the people. The people, when they have trouble with the bureaucracy, where do they go? They come to their legislators, and their legislators need to be open and accessible to helping them with that out-of-control bureaucracy.

Another thing that I have heard is that a smaller legislature will be more efficient or more manageable. Well, Madam Speaker, I do not know about you, but I did not come to Harrisburg to be managed by anyone, and I am not going to be.

Madam Speaker, let us maintain the voice of rural PA in the People's House and vote "no" to HB 153. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, Representative.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority whip, who notes that Representative COX from Berks County will be on leave for the rest of the day. Thank you.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 153 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair now recognizes Representative Brown from Philadelphia County. Representative Brown.

Ms. V. BROWN. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

This bill reduces legislators, reduces staff, reduces expenses; however, in the name of saving money, we would be undermining the key tenet of our democracy: local representation. Current population estimates count more than 12 million Pennsylvanians. Under our current legislative system, one Representative serves a district with an average population of about 62,000 people. Reducing the number of Representatives to the target number of 151 would mean that each Representative would instead stand in for 85,000 Pennsylvanians. Each Representative would be responsible for 33 percent more residents. In other words, the legislation is asking us to give up local representation in an effort to save money. I do not think this tradeoff is good for any Pennsylvanian, especially in the inner cities and minority residents.

For the past 50 years, minorities have been fighting for the right to vote and to get elected. The biggest gains have been in our cities. Reducing representation in those cities would reduce the gains we fought so hard to earn. The mantra to save money is actually a plan to reduce minority representation. In my mind, it is reminiscent of Muhammad Ali's rope-a-dope fighting style – use of the opponent against himself. That is what we will be doing by endorsing this plan. For example, Philadelphia is

currently served by 13 minority Representatives. Using this number above with some variations due to the uncertainties in the reapportionment process, the city would be served by only 9 or 10 minority Representatives. When you consider the demographics of Philadelphia city residents versus the more affluent suburbs, the lack of legislative access would be appalling. City residents are less likely to have reliable available transportation to fit their schedule, and inner-city residents are also less likely to have reliable computer and Internet access. The digital divide is real; I know and I see it on a regular basis with my constituents.

Fortunately, we have a chance to prevent these changes to our legislature. Any changes in numbers of Senators or Representatives would require a constitutional amendment. To amend the Pennsylvania Constitution, both chambers must vote in favor of this legislation in two successive legislative sessions and the bill must be then voted on by the electorate. Please keep this in mind in case this issue does come before us again in the next few years. Do not be lulled into the belief that it is about saving money.

As chairwoman of the Pennsylvania Legislative Black Caucus, I have a real fear that in an effort to save a small percentage in the State's budget, we are asking us to give up access to our local legislators. We must be vigilant in supporting all minorities in Pennsylvania, and I will not stand for us having less representation and dismantling all that we have achieved in this country.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, Representative.

The Chair now recognizes Representative Cohen from Philadelphia.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

A lot of the arguments that are made here are made without factual basis. We are told, for instance, that other legislatures which have fewer members than we are, are better than we are. We are not given any facts to base this up.

Without doing extensive research, I quickly found negative testimonials on the New York Legislature. All it took was a Google search. The Wall Street Journal describes the New York Legislature as a legislature "whose dysfunction has long proved a spectator sport." The Brennan Center for Justice says that the New York Legislature is notably "notorious for its dysfunction and subservience to special interests." The U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York says that "...public corruption is a deep-seated problem in New York State. It is a problem in both chambers; it is a problem on both sides of the aisle..." and one can find endless other examples of attacks on the New York State Legislature.

The fact that a legislature is smaller than our legislature does not in and of itself make it better. Now, the argument that you can get rid of the legislatures without losing anything is based on the static old conception that all we do is vote here, and that you can have the same, more or less, proportional representation of various parts of the State no matter how many people we have. So we can cut it 25 percent or 26 percent or even 50 percent or 75 percent and we will still have, more or less, the same proportional representation, but that is only a small part of the things we do.

If any legislator here – I doubt there is such a person; I doubt there has been such a person for a long time – but if any legislator just considers his job voting in Harrisburg, his constituents or her constituents are not being well served. What I do and what I am sure everybody or virtually everyone else here does is we serve as an advocate for our constituents. We serve as an advocate for their circumstances in dealings with State government. We serve as an advocate for them in dealing with local government. We may serve as an advocate for them in dealing with the Federal government or some college or university. We are on their side. We are ombudsman for the public interest, and that ombudsman function is going to be seriously reduced if there are fewer of us and we have less concentration, less contact with our constituents.

Various other responsibilities attached to our office – we wind up often as organizers. We have offices in our district, so if somebody wants to organize a local business association, we are one of the people who is contacted. Sometimes we help initiate the organization of cleanup drives, of charitable drives, of business associations, of school activists. We are an integral part of our communities.

Now, I agree with what Mr. Dush said. I thought his comments were the most profound. Representative Dush said that the best way to save money, not quoting him exactly, but the best way to save money is to solve problems, and he is absolutely right. The murder rate in Philadelphia has plummeted over the last 25 years and continues to go down. Each time a murder is not committed, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania saves about \$1 million over time. If we can cut the murder rate in Philadelphia and other parts of the State in half from what it is now, we would save many millions of dollars.

The dropout rate has gone down over time. It used to be that almost two-thirds of the schoolkids in Philadelphia would drop out before graduating. Now it is only about one-third. If we get that dropout rate down to zero or close to zero, we would save an awful lot of money in social problems.

And our committees ought to be much more active at oversight than they are. We tend to rush through bills without fully examining the administrative branches of government and without fully examining the educational system. If we did more, we could lower, we could lower costs in a very significant fashion.

Mr. Causer said he did not come here to be managed.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Excuse me, Representative. Would you suspend, please.

Mr. COHEN. Okay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the majority leader rise?

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman could kindly just keep to the subject at hand as opposed to the whole host of other subjects that have been noted with his speech. I know a lot of people want to speak on this topic. If we could just try to restrain ourselves just a bit and stay focused on the topic at hand, it would be appreciated. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you for your guidance.

And we would admonish everyone, if you could do that, that would be great.

We keep increasing our number up here, so we now have 10 more speakers. So indeed, if you stick to the subject and move quickly, it would be helpful. Your points become even more important. Thank you.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important votes that the vast majority of us—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I am sorry. Representative Cohen, would you suspend, please, again.

Mr. COHEN. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the minority leader, Representative Dermody, rise?

Mr. DERMODY. Madam Speaker, I would just like to point out that I believe that the Representative from Philadelphia was well within the realm of – with his comments on this were very relevant. Everything he spoke about was relevant to this bill, to reducing the size of the legislature, and I do not believe he was far from the field at all. Therefore, I think he should be allowed to continue and he should be free from interruption, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, Representative. Your remarks are duly noted.

Representative Cohen, I hope this is the last time I have to say it, but please continue.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, members of both the Democratic and Republican Caucuses have very serious objections to this bill. Many of our constituents who know about the real practical effects of this bill will have serious objections. However, we should not kid ourselves about the public vote. To have an informed vote on this subject will require the raising of many millions of dollars and very, very little money is spent on referendums. Virtually all referendums in this Commonwealth pass because simply there is no counterposition to the referendum question that is available to the voters. So while the voters will nominally have the power to make a decision on this issue, the fact is it can be safely presumed that like virtually all other referendums that have ever been presented to the voters, the voters will vote to ratify this. So our vote here is important. Our vote is not just moving the process along. Our vote is not just passively turning it over to the voters. Our vote is actually making a decision. We cannot assume the Senate will not pass this. We cannot assume the voters will thoughtfully consider this. We have to assume that we have the responsibility to make a decision as to whether or not this is a good idea. We have heard very little on the floor of the House today about why this is a good idea.

The argument that we heard in past sessions about how this is going to make the House run more efficiently, that seems to have faded away. What seems to be dominating this discussion today is the belief that the voters are demanding we do this. I would ask you to look at your e-mail boxes and see how much e-mail you have received from voters demanding this. I kind of doubt there is very much. I would ask you to look at the letters you have received. I kind of doubt there is very much. I do not think I have received a single letter. I do not think I have received a single e-mail. I doubt any of you have been flooded with e-mails or letters demanding you vote for this.

There comes a time in which we have to act on the basis of what we know. We cannot assume that this is just passing the subject along and this is just merely a matter of political calculation as to, can we defend this in a campaign? We can defend our votes on this because those of us who are against it are dealing with reality, and ultimately, the voters respect people who deal with reality.

I join many others and urge a "no" vote on final passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, Representative Cohen.

We now go to Representative Sainato from Lawrence County, and he will be followed by Representative Lawrence from Chester County.

Mr. SAINATO. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise today; I have listened to this debate. I have heard this debate the last two sessions – not a whole lot has changed. The way some speak, this is like the most earth-shattering legislation, the most urgent thing we need to do here in Harrisburg.

As the prior speaker said, I do not think I have gotten one e-mail on it. When I walk in my district, that is not what the constituents are telling me.

I remember many, many years ago my former chairman of Finance from up in Erie, the late Karl Boyes, a man I respected, and his famous line always was, retail politics, retail politics. And I always remember, I think when you talk about retail politics, the size of our district gives us the ability to meet our constituents one on one, to talk to them.

I first ran for this job in 1994. I am in my 21st year. There were six or seven people who ran in my primary. I spent \$9200 and I won the Democratic primary – \$9200. I look across this room and I think how much some of my colleagues had to spend to get here. Some spent a lot more. Some of them maybe spent what I did because they went out there and they knocked on doors and they did retail politics, and that is how they won their election.

Pass this bill, raise it to 84,000 people, retail politics is done. It is no longer retail politics. It is corporate politics, because you are going to have to raise a lot of money to win a seat in this House of Representatives, because let me tell you, it is going to be very difficult to meet 84,000 people as you go out into the field, not like you can do now. It is manageable. It takes a lot of work at 62,000. The average in this country is 41,000, as my colleague from Mercer County said, 41,000 in Massachusetts.

What is that magic number? What is the magic number? In the Constitutional Convention of 1968, that number was 203. I have gone through two reapportionments. Okay? Do you understand my district has gotten bigger each reapportionment? I look at some of my colleagues in the very rural areas. Ask the senior members, has your district shrunk? No. Your district has grown, and that is without cutting the size of the legislature, because in rural areas there may not be the growth so you actually divide 203 into the population of Pennsylvania and that tells you what you represent. We went from 58,000 to 60,000, now to 63,000. It grew. So our districts are bigger. So when you look at the numbers, when you look at the numbers, that is what it is about.

I heard yesterday one of my colleagues say that we must lead by example, we must lead by example, and I put that challenge out today. If this bill would become law in 2020, to those who are going to vote "yes" today, I encourage you to lead by

example. Go to your leader and say, "Mr. Leader, I volunteer to give up my seat," and I think that is when you lead by example. Do not go in and say, "please save me," as usually happens in a reapportionment. I went through two of them. No one went in there and said, I do not want to lose this or I wanted to lose that. So that is my challenge to some of my colleagues if this would become law in 2020. Go down and tell your leader now, Mr. Leader, we are giving up 41 seats. I am willing to put my name on the list to voluntarily give it up. So I would encourage my colleagues to do that if they truly believe, if they truly believe and want to lead by example.

I look at the facts on this, Mr. Speaker. Most people in this chamber are hardworking, on both sides of the aisle. You go out in your districts on weekends. This is a 7-day-a-week job. I think most of us take this very seriously. I respect my profession. I am not ashamed to be a member of the legislature. I am proud to be here, as my colleague from up in Scranton said. It is a privilege to be here. It is an honor that 62,000 people for 11 elections have sent me down here to represent their interests. That is what I do in my district. I have a district office and I have very good staff. My staff, in my opinion, is a true asset to me, because I am able to do what I have to do because of good staff, as many of you do. We travel around the State. We take care of people's needs and concerns.

In Pennsylvania we are considered full-time. Someone made a reference about Ohio. In Ohio they do not have district offices. They have got to call Columbus when they have problems. In my district they call my office. We do a lot more than most States in this country. We take pride in what we do. Our job is not just being here voting. When many of you leave here, you will be at your district office on Thursday or Friday. You will be out in your community over the weekend. People want to see me on the weekends. They do not want to see my staff. If you go to 84,000 people, what you will see, what you will see is staff.

It was brought up that the voters will have the ultimate say-so. Yes, they will. Ask the voters of California. I remember this many years ago. The voters voted to cut taxes and on the same ballot initiative, they voted to increase more money for education. And out in California, they said, "Okay, legislature. You figure it out. We just voted to cut taxes and we just voted to give more money to education." It does not add up. It does not add up.

We have real issues we need to deal with down here. We have a budget to deal with. We have needs, jobs, economic development. That is where we should be putting our time. I know there are going to be people who really are going to feel good. It is going to pass today. Oh, we really did well. We voted to cut the size of the legislature. Ask how many people really care back in your district. They want to talk about real issues – to a person who has a job that they are not making a whole lot of money or does not have the needs in the community or does not have medical care that they really need. Those are real issues. That is what we should be focusing on.

In closing, you know, we need to stand up for ourselves. Quit criticizing. We should all be proud. I am very proud to serve with the 203 people that are here on both sides. My committee that I chair with Chairman Barrar, those are outstanding people who work very hard, and we did something yesterday I think we are all very proud of. We worked together to accomplish

something for public safety in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. That was a good deal. Those are good people and those are hardworking people. It is time we stand up for ourselves instead of always criticizing the legislature. And do not get me wrong, we have sometimes, in every profession you have those that maybe do not meet people's expectations, but there are 203, and I will say to you out of those 203, the people that I know are good, hardworking people, and I enjoy serving with them. I enjoy being here, and I want to work as hard as I can for my constituency. And I think the numbers are the numbers.

And if you are from rural Pennsylvania, think about it. You may have one or two counties now. If you go to three or four counties, how can you honestly say that you will be able to represent those people in the way that you have done it? Think about that. How can you honestly say that to yourself? And I know you would try to do it, but you only have so many hours in the day to do it, and I think most people are already at the maximum of doing what they can do for the constituents they represent.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no." Do the right thing. Stand up for your profession, stand up for the 62,000, 63,000 people that you represent today.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, Representative.

And now the Chair recognizes Representative Lawrence from Chester County.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to make a few brief remarks, and I will be brief.

Madam Speaker, candidly, I am not a strong supporter of the legislation before us today. Any time someone talks about the consolidation of power in the hands of the few – or fewer, at least – I think it is prudent to proceed with caution.

And, Madam Speaker, I think there are great benefits to smaller legislative districts. I live close to the State of Delaware, which is by definition a very small place, and with a little effort, a regular citizen can meet their U.S. Senators, U.S. Congressman, even the Governor of the State, sometimes all at the same event.

Madam Speaker, I like the New Hampshire model, with many legislators who are part-time. I think they are paid \$100 a year plus mileage.

In my view, smaller districts help keep you accountable to the people who have elected you. But I have heard loudly and clearly from the people of my district, and they are, frankly, split on the issue. Some are very passionate that the number of legislators should be cut, and some agree that the consolidation of power in the hands of the few is a dangerous idea.

With that being said, Madam Speaker, we are not making a vote today, frankly, on shrinking the size of the legislature. We are making a vote to give the citizens of Pennsylvania the opportunity to decide. In the United States and in Pennsylvania, all power is inherent in the people. All free governments are founded on their authority. The people have the right to reform their government in such manner as they may think proper. And if HB 153 passes today and passes the Senate and passes the House again next session and passes the Senate again next session, then it will go to the people for a referendum vote. Madam Speaker, I believe the people of Pennsylvania want to vote on this issue. I believe the people of Pennsylvania deserve to have the opportunity to have a vote on this issue.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, while I am cool to the overall concept contained in HB 153, I will be voting in the affirmative today.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, Representative.

And now the Chair recognizes Representative Gainey of Allegheny County.

Mr. GAINEY. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I stand today to oppose HB 153. I have heard a whole lot of conversations about why we need to support this, but the reality is, we really should have sent it back to committee.

The truth of the matter is, there are some things as a House of Representatives that we have that no one else has, and one is that if you are a Representative that has between 62,000 to 64,000 members in your district, and your ability to touch them, your ability to be intimate, your ability to talk to them, your ability to do the service that is needed, that is a great thing that we should harness and know that we are providing excellent service to the people in our district. If we are talking about going up another 20,000, then we are beginning to become out of touch with the people who rely on us for so much, to cut down on the bureaucracy that we talked about here today. We have to think about how we better serve our constituents.

They said that they want to remove the politics and that doing this will remove politics. Well, if we really want to remove politics, why not have a nonpartisan committee talk about how we reduce government, if we are really going to talk about removing the politics from the day-to-day norms of the House. See, there is rhetoric and there is conversation. The rhetoric is that we want to remove the politics. The conversation is, if we really wanted to do it, we would be moving in that way to demonstrate to the people that we are sincere about what we are doing.

I heard them talk about that this is what the people want; we need to do what the people want. Well, not all the people want to do that. That is what you think you are hearing, but not all people want to do that. So I cannot buy into that.

And if we really are committed, then, as my colleague said, we need to lead by example. Do not just say that we should reduce the size of the House if you are not going to lead by example. Let us take the hypocrisy out and put in place things that make sense. If you are going to lead by example because you are saying that is what you believe in because you are saying this is what the people want, well, be the first to take that step. If you are not willing to be the first to take that step, then let us not be hypocritical about what we say, sending the wrong message to the people that we serve and telling them we are coming in the name of truth. The truth is we are doing this out of politics, and if we are doing this out of politics, then we are not doing it to serve people. We are doing it to serve special interests.

So at the end of the day, let us do what is right. Let us vote down HB 153. Let us give the people something they need. Government is about serving people. Government is about making sure that we are doing the things that are necessary to move the State forward, not about the hypocrisy of special interests to make it appear like we are doing something to take politics out of government. That is not the truth, and if you want to prove that you are the truth, then lead by example and start with yourselves. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, Representative.

The Chair now recognizes Representative Sturla, and Representative Sturla will be followed by Representative Kaufer.

Representative, you may begin.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

You know, I have heard a lot of rhetoric today about how this is what the people want, but every poll that I have seen shows that more than this, they want a Marcellus Shale tax. And here we are 4 months into this session and we have not seen that yet, and they want that many times more than they care about whether or not the size of the legislature—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Representative—

Mr. STURLA. —is 151—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. —will you suspend, please. Would you suspend, please, sir.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Representative Reed, majority leader, why do you rise?

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

We would just appreciate it if the gentleman would keep focused on this legislation. I understand his desire to see the Governor's tax code bill presented before the House. As soon as the minority party introduces that bill, we are happy to bring it to the floor for a vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will confine his remarks to this very meaty subject, by all the numbers that we have had speak, if you would, please, sir. Thank you.

You may continue.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

In reference to the majority leader, when there is a Marcellus Shale tax bill that we introduce, I will be glad to vote for it with you. I know that there are a whole lot of members on the other side that said they were interested in voting on something like that. It was just the previous Governor that was not interested in it. I think we can get that passed through. I think we should be doing that today instead of this kind of stuff, which will not take effect immediately.

This will not take effect for another 6 or 7 years at the earliest, but here we are blustering through this so that, what I heard was, the people can make the decision. Well, that is interesting, because we are only giving them one choice. Do you want it to be 151? Yes or no? Well, how about if they want it to be 100? What do they vote? What if they think that it ought to be a unicameral legislature because they think that we really ought to— When is that going to appear on the ballot? Why are we only giving them one choice? They are not being able to decide. You all decided that 151 seems like a number that you can live with because you can probably survive in your district. I can probably survive in my district.

You know, there is a part of me that says I should be for something like this because we have eight Representatives from my county – seven are Republican and one is Democrat. Should this become law, my guess is there will be one Democrat and six Republicans. So I, in theory, should be for this, if I want to be political about it. But we are not giving people an opportunity to see whether they want 100 members or a unicameral legislature or various other options that might be out

there. You all decided that this is the perfect number, and it is really not that the people get to choose what they want. You are asking them whether they are willing to accept what you decided. So let us not be too high and mighty about doing the people's business by saying we are going to go to 151.

Madam Speaker, if we really wanted to look at reducing the size of government, there are over 35,000 elected officials in the State of Pennsylvania. Let me repeat that number: 35,000. This bill proposes to reduce that number by 52. How about if we reduce all elected government in the State of Pennsylvania by 25 percent? We could eliminate 9,000 positions. We are not giving the people that option. We are giving them the option of reducing 35,000 by 52.

How about if we do a unicameral legislature? You know, a Senator costs twice as much as a House member. We could bring them in here. We could go to 253 total members, Senate and House. We could save \$95 million a year. No one in their wildest dreams— Even former Speaker Sam Smith said reducing the legislature the way we are proposing to do it here in this bill does not really save any money. I can save you \$95 million if we go to a unicameral legislature because I would just wipe out the Senate completely. They can come over here and sit over here with us. We do not do this double stuff. We do not have to mess around with what they think. We vote it once and it is done. Send it to the Governor, let us go, but we are not giving the people the opportunity to choose that.

So here we are, a choice of one. Take it or leave it. But you all can go back into your districts and beat your chests and say you are for reducing the size of government and it is a wonderful thing. It is none of that. What it is is less elected representation. We did not cut the number of lobbyists in the State. We did not cut the number of think tanks. We did not cut the number of editorial boards. We did not cut the number of anybody that influences public policy. We cut the one group that is elected by the people, the legislature, and in return we gave everybody else that is not elected more power.

Madam Speaker, I heard that maybe we should look to Illinois because they only have 115 members. They have a personal income tax of 5 percent. Do I hear any takers? Maybe we should do what New York does. They only have 150 Reps. They also ban fracking. Maybe we should look to New York. Montana has 100 Reps and 1 million people. That is 10,000 constituents per elected Representative. Maybe we should use that as a model. Gosh, we would have what, 1200 members, something like that, in the House? I do not think that is such a good model, but that is what we heard we should be looking to.

Madam Speaker, what we are seeing here today is an avoidance of the real issues facing the people of Pennsylvania in exchange for a hot-button issue that sounds good in the 10-second sound bite but really accomplishes nothing. In fact, we have heard some members say, "Well, they are going to vote for it today because you know what? It would have to pass in the Senate again this session and then next session would have to pass here and the Senate again the session after that. The chances of that happening are slim to none. So let's just go ahead and do it. What the heck." Well, we could run legislation up here every day that is meaningless. What the heck. Let us do it. That is not what this deliberative body should be about.

Madam Speaker, I suggest we reject this and get on with the real business for the people of Pennsylvania. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative.

Members, we have five additional members, and then of course Representative Knowles will go last as the prime sponsor of the bill. And I realize everybody has an opportunity to speak on the legislation. The more succinct and to the point of the issue, I think everybody would greatly appreciate it.

Representative Kaufer is called upon. Representative Kaufer, the floor is yours.

Mr. KAUFER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Reducing the size of the legislature is being sold as a cost-savings measure, but what are the real costs of such a policy? Let us look at the numbers. We are the second most expensive legislature behind California. California spends \$337 million. We spend \$307 million. And in third place, New York is at \$190 million – over \$100 million between Pennsylvania and New York, between second and third place. When you break it down per capita, we are the third most expensive legislature. Alaska is number one. They have roughly 700,000 people. Rhode Island is second. They have roughly 1 million people. Pennsylvania with 12.7 million people, 12.7 million people, and we are at \$24.08 per capita in our State government. It is out of whack.

The main thrust of this legislation has been portrayed as a cost-savings measure to make government more efficient and reform our institutions. Instead of reducing the size of our legislature, we are simply reducing the number of legislators and not addressing the true issue of the cost of the legislature, including our full-time or part-time status.

Like Representative Lawrence, I also think we should be moving towards a system like New Hampshire, with 400 part-time legislators that get paid \$100 a year, \$100 a year. If we want to talk about true cost savings, this is where we should be going.

While I do not agree with the reduction in the size of the legislature, there is a distinct difference between that and the right of the people to determine the formation of the people's government. And today, although I have grave reservations and do not believe that the people should pass this, I will be voting for this piece of legislation so that the people can determine what their government should look like.

I caution my colleagues as we move forward and the general public in turning this idea into a new formation of government; however, it is the right of the people to determine this.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Kaufer.

Representative O'Brien, Philadelphia County.

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

Youse and yinz. Where you at? Red your room. Different, but Pennsylvania and its nature; the people of the Commonwealth, oftentimes rowdy and often opinionated. Listen, listen, you will hear the voice of the people in this room, the voice of the people given to us as a sacred obligation, vox populi – the voice of the people.

Now, if we reduce the size of the legislature, we mute the voice of the people, we silence the voice of the people. We violate our sacred obligation to be the voice of the people, vox populi. Do not mute the voice of the people, let it sound proud, let it sound loud, let it be the soul of the Commonwealth.

This deserves a "no" vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Mr. O'Brien.

The majority whip, Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I know the hour is late so I will be brief. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of HB 153. I voted for it previously and I will do so again, and I would like to briefly share my reasons why.

Mr. Speaker, I think sometimes we focus too much on the details in terms of the specific numbers. Should it be 153 or 151? Why 203 instead of 201, as the gentleman pointed out earlier? The one thing that I have heard overwhelmingly back home, however, and what is guiding my vote today is the constituents want the right to vote on this very issue. They have been very clear that they want to see us live exactly the way that we are asking them to do: to do more with less. They want to see a reduction in the size and scope of government, and I think it is appropriate that we move the constitutional amendment process along so that they have the opportunity to vote.

Mr. Speaker, it is entirely possible as it passes this session and potentially next session and then heads out to a voter referendum, we do not know what the future holds and it is possible it may not pass. But the one thing that I absolutely believe is that as a free people we have the right to determine the size, the scope, and the direction of our government. That is a right that is vested in us as voters, and I applaud the gentleman's efforts both in terms of downsizing the House and the Senate, because I do believe that the voters – at least back home in the 100th District – have spoken overwhelmingly in favor of this.

Today we have heard a lot of reasons why we should not put this forward. It is not exactly the right number; it is not exactly the way that we each would do it. Mr. Speaker, I would offer that rare is the bill that 102 of us would all find perfect, but the one thing that I do think is absolutely perfect as we look down through the times of history is the will of the people and the right of self-governance. This bill gives us that right as voters, and I would encourage an affirmative vote so that the people can truly decide how they would like to be governed.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. We have two more speakers before the prime sponsor. Representative Hanna, the minority whip.

Mr. HANNA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to HB 153.

Several legislators, while interested in reform and efficiency, seem to forget that in 1968 in the spirit of reform, we ended up with what is now our current membership. Yes, increasing the House to 203 members was and is the face of reform. Partly a larger full-time legislature was deemed an important reform to ensure we were a coequal branch of government that could stand toe-to-toe with any Governor or a stubborn Senate who might ignore the best interests of our people. In 1968 the people of Pennsylvania decided increasing the number of Representatives allowed for a greater connection to the people we represent. Fewer Representatives, as you all know, will mean that our constituents will feel less connected and receive less response from their legislators.

Like you, I make every effort to respond to every letter and e-mail. The residents of our districts deserve to be heard. These are the people who will suffer greatly as a result of this proposal. We are their mouthpieces. We cannot sit back and allow their voices to go unheard.

Our role as public servants is vital. We need a sufficient number of legislators to provide the kind of representation our constituents deserve. I believe our current membership is that right number.

Mr. Speaker, while it has been said before, it bears repeating: The Pennsylvania Farm Bureau opposes any measure to reduce the size of Pennsylvania's legislature. The Farm Bureau rightly recognizes that a reduction in the number of legislative districts will erode opportunities for rural constituents to access their elected Representatives. Additionally, the League of Women Voters opposes HB 153, and as many of you know, the league would only support a reduction in the size of the General Assembly if we first reformed Pennsylvania's highly partisan method for redrawing legislative district boundaries. Since this body yesterday rejected amendments to reform the redistricting process, we would not see a bipartisan plan or process for redrawing and reducing these legislative districts.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not solve the problems that our Commonwealth is facing. In a time when our constituents need complete transparency and access to this chamber, we cannot further hinder their connection to their members. I urge all members to vote against HB 153.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Pyle of Armstrong County.

Mr. PYLE. Thanks, Speaker.

Been a long day, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You are welcome.

Mr. PYLE. I do not know what that was all about.

You know, every one of us comes here with some kind of inkling of government, something we read or something we heard or something we saw, and we all have our favorites. For those of us from Philadelphia, we like to look to Ben Franklin, who sat right there, and say one of the Founding Fathers of the whole shebang got started right there. Some of us find inspiration from the Founding Fathers, and one of those is my inspiration, Thomas Jefferson. Founder, University of Virginia; author, Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom; author, Declaration of Independence; and out of all those great works, out of all the profound, carved-on-mountainside profound things that Jefferson left us with, the one that sticks with me – democracy is a joyous cacophony of discord. It must involve the public, for they are the nation. For my Democrat friends, let me appeal to you with some Tip O'Neill – the only cure for the ills of democracy is more democracy.

You know, everybody likes to say this is cost saving, yet those savings are miniscule. We spend more on putting hot dog stands in State parks every summer than the savings of this. And I will bet you a dollar to a doughnut that if you go home and you ask your constituents, "Should we reduce the size of the legislature?" we are going to get the same response back from 203 diverse districts: "Yes, we should." And if you follow up with a question, "When should I quit?" They will look at you, and go, "Oh, no. No, no, no. Not you, the other guys." NIMBY, not in my back yard – we do not want to get rid of our guy, we want to get rid of the rest.

They say that in 1968 when this legislature was increased, they added more members to reduce the influence of lobbyists upon the lesser legislature. They added the Senate to act as a counterbalance to this evil lobbyist influence. Has that evil influence gone away? I do not know.

You know what, Mr. Speaker? They say we are a full-time legislature and we are too big and we are bloated, and those other States are part-time. I would be glad to work part-time. You want me to cut out working Sundays? Is that good? How about that? How about I do not have those conversations in the middle of Walmart Saturday night at 10 – which, by the way, was the best discussion I ever had on the minimum wage. Do you want to remove ourselves and insulate the government of this Commonwealth from accountability? And if we do take that number down, that is what we are doing.

You know what this is, Mr. Speaker? It is like that old beer commercial. It tastes great, but in the end, we are going to find out it is tremendously less filling.

Now, I promised my leadership I would keep it reined in and not range far afield, but the opposition to this has sound basis. The Farm Bureau fears rural influence will be sacrificed, and I feel they are correct. The League of Women Voters echoes former Speaker O'Neill's saying that the only way to cure what is wrong with us is to have more of us, with more eyes to see what is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I promised the leader here I would be kind, so I will not draw to anyone's attention, but to the gentleman from Delaware County, 5th of May 2015, it is a pleasure to vote with you.

Please oppose HB 153. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The prime sponsor, Representative Knowles, will be our last speaker. Are there any other speakers that would like to be recognized before Representative Knowles concludes?

Representative Knowles, hold on, please. I would ask that everybody please give Representative Knowles the courtesy to be heard.

Mr. KNOWLES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me start by thanking all of you regardless of what you had to say on the issue. I think that the comments that were made were certainly interesting. Needless to say, I do not agree with many of them, but I do respect the fact that we can all stand at this podium or at a podium and we can say what is on our mind and say what we think is best for the constituents that we represent.

Mr. Speaker, today we have a golden opportunity. We have a golden opportunity to lead by example in reducing the size of State government. Today we can take one of the first steps allowing to let the people decide, the people who pay the bills. The people who pay the bills will make the final decision.

Some people have talked about the money, that it is not much money. Well, I have to tell you, maybe it is not a lot of money in terms of the big scheme, but \$15 million where I come from is a lot of money. Reducing the size will also make for a more efficient legislature in building consensus. It will also make for better discussions and clearer debate.

This has nothing to do with control. It has to do with the two things that I just mentioned. I truly believe that, Mr. Speaker.

Now, they talked a little bit about the change from 63,000 to 83,000. I have to be honest with you, I do not think it is a big deal. I do not think it is a big deal. I believe that the technological advances in communication, in transportation, the modern communication mechanisms – e-mail, Facebook, Twitter, we have so many tools at our disposal that we never had before. And I will be honest with you, before we went into the new districts, I was representing somewhere in the area of

75,000 people, and I really could not tell the difference. It was not that big a deal to me.

Some of the city legislators are indicating that they are going to lose legislators. The rural legislators are indicating that they are going to lose legislators. Yeah, you are both right, but I think it is important to note that the ratio of representation between urban and rural members will remain equivalent. Make no mistake about it, make no mistake about that fact. There will be equal representation, one person for one vote.

Now, let me close by saying that I was very happy to take prime sponsorship of this bill, you know, when I asked if I could do so. I was very pleased and very happy because I believe strongly in this legislation. Former Speaker Sam Smith thought it was very important. I met with the Speaker some time ago and we discussed it, and it was very important to him and it is also very important to me and many other members sitting in this chamber.

What I would ask you all to do is think about what you are doing here. You are allowing the people to make the decision, the people who pay the bill.

Having said that, again I thank you for your participation in the process, and I would ask for an affirmative vote on HB 153.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The minority whip asks that Representative BOYLE be placed on leave, and that leave will be granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 153 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Before we do, I understand Representative Gergely wants to be marked on leave. Representative Hanna, mark him on leave? Representative GERGELY will be marked on leave, and that request is granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 153 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—139

Adolph	Gibbons	Mahoney	Regan
Baker	Gillen	Major	Roae
Barbin	Gillespie	Maloney	Ross
Barrar	Godshall	Markosek	Rozzi
Benninghoff	Goodman	Marshall	Sabatina
Bizzarro	Greiner	Marsico	Saccone
Bloom	Grove	Masser	Sankey
Boback	Hahn	McGinnis	Santarsiero
Bradford	Harhai	Mentzer	Santora
Brown, R.	Harhart	Metcalf	Saylor

Burns	Harper	Metzgar	Schemel
Caltagirone	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Schreiber
Carroll	Heffley	Millard	Simmons
Christiana	Helm	Miller, B.	Snyder
Conklin	Hennessey	Miller, D.	Sonney
Corbin	Hickernell	Milne	Staats
Costa, D.	Hill	Moul	Stephens
Culver	Irvin	Mullery	Tallman
Cutler	Jozwiak	Murt	Taylor
Daley, P.	Kampf	Mustio	Tobash
Davis	Kaufer	Nesbit	Toepel
Day	Kauffman	Neuman	Toohil
Deasy	Kavulich	O'Neill	Topper
Delozier	Keller, F.	Ortitay	Truitt
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Parker, D.	Verb
Dunbar	Killion	Payne	Ward
Ellis	Kim	Peifer	Warner
Emrick	Klunk	Petrarca	Watson
English	Knowles	Petri	Wentling
Evankovich	Kortz	Pickett	Wheeland
Everett	Krieger	Quinn	White
Farry	Lawrence	Ravenstahl	Zimmerman
Fee	Lewis	Readshaw	
Flynn	Mackenzie	Reed	Turzai,
Gabler	Maher	Reese	Speaker
Galloway			

NAYS-56

Acosta	DeLuca	Harris, J.	Rader
Bishop	Dermody	James	Rapp
Briggs	Diamond	Keller, W.	Roebuck
Brown, V.	Donatucci	Kinsey	Sainato
Brownlee	Driscoll	Kirkland	Samuelson
Causer	Dush	Kotik	Schlossberg
Cohen	Evans	Longietti	Schweyer
Costa, P.	Fabrizio	McCarter	Sims
Cruz	Farina	McNeill	Sturla
Daley, M.	Frankel	O'Brien	Thomas
Davidson	Freeman	Oberlander	Vitali
Dawkins	Gainey	Parker, C.	Waters
Dean	Hanna	Pashinski	Wheatley
DeLissio	Harkins	Pyle	Youngblood

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-6

Boyle	Gergely	Matzie	Quigley
Cox	Gingrich		

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 384, PN 421**, entitled:

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

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

The SPEAKER. 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-146

Adolph	Gabler	Mackenzie	Reese
Baker	Galloway	Maher	Regan
Barbin	Gibbons	Mahoney	Roae
Barrar	Gillen	Major	Ross
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Maloney	Rozzi
Bizzarro	Godshall	Markosek	Sabatina
Bloom	Goodman	Marshall	Saccone
Boback	Greiner	Marsico	Sankey
Bradford	Grove	Masser	Santarsiero
Burns	Hahn	McGinnis	Santora
Caltagirone	Hanna	Mentzer	Saylor
Carroll	Harhai	Metcalfe	Schemel
Christiana	Harhart	Metzgar	Schreiber
Conklin	Harper	Miccarelli	Simmons
Corbin	Harris, A.	Millard	Snyder
Costa, D.	Heffley	Miller, B.	Sonney
Culver	Helm	Miller, D.	Staats
Cutler	Hennessey	Milne	Stephens
Davis	Hickernell	Moul	Tallman
Day	Hill	Mullery	Taylor
Deasy	Irvin	Murt	Tobash
Delozier	James	Mustio	Toepel
DeLuca	Jozwiak	Nesbit	Toohil
Dermody	Kampf	Neuman	Topper
DiGirolamo	Kaufer	O'Neill	Truitt
Dunbar	Kauffman	Ortitay	Verb
Ellis	Kavulich	Parker, D.	Ward
Emrick	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Warner
English	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Watson
Evankovich	Killion	Peifer	Wentling
Evans	Kim	Petrarca	Wheatley
Everett	Klunk	Petri	Wheeland
Farina	Knowles	Pickett	White
Farry	Kortz	Quinn	Zimmerman
Fee	Krieger	Ravenstahl	
Flynn	Lawrence	Readshaw	Turzai,
Frankel	Lewis	Reed	Speaker

NAYS-49

Acosta	Dawkins	Keller, W.	Rapp
Bishop	Dean	Kinsey	Roebuck
Briggs	DeLissio	Kirkland	Sainato
Brown, R.	Diamond	Kotik	Samuelson
Brown, V.	Donatucci	Longietti	Schlossberg
Brownlee	Driscoll	McCarter	Schweyer
Causer	Dush	McNeill	Sims
Cohen	Fabrizio	O'Brien	Sturla
Costa, P.	Freeman	Oberlander	Thomas
Cruz	Gainey	Parker, C.	Vitali
Daley, M.	Harkins	Pyle	Waters
Daley, P.	Harris, J.	Rader	Youngblood
Davidson			

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-6

Boyle	Gergely	Matzie	Quigley
Cox	Gingrich		

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 501, PN 1319**, entitled:

An Act designating the Conodoguinet Bridge on that portion of State Route 641 over the Conodoguinet Creek, Hopewell Township, Cumberland County, as the Army Pfc. Harold "Sam" E. Barrick Memorial Bridge.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—195

Acosta	Evans	Kotik	Reed
Adolph	Everett	Krieger	Reese
Baker	Fabrizio	Lawrence	Regan
Barbin	Farina	Lewis	Roae
Barrar	Farry	Longietti	Roebuck
Benninghoff	Fee	Mackenzie	Ross
Bishop	Flynn	Maher	Rozzi
Bizzarro	Frankel	Mahoney	Sabatina
Bloom	Freeman	Major	Saccone
Boback	Gabler	Maloney	Sainato
Bradford	Gainey	Markosek	Samuelson
Briggs	Galloway	Marshall	Sankey
Brown, R.	Gibbons	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brown, V.	Gillen	Masser	Santora
Brownlee	Gillespie	McCarter	Saylor
Burns	Godshall	McGinnis	Schemel
Caltagirone	Goodman	McNeill	Schlossberg
Carroll	Greiner	Mentzer	Schreiber
Causar	Grove	Metcalfe	Schweyer
Christiana	Hahn	Metzgar	Simmons
Cohen	Hanna	Miccarelli	Sims
Conklin	Harhai	Millard	Snyder
Corbin	Harhart	Miller, B.	Sonney
Costa, D.	Harkins	Miller, D.	Staats
Costa, P.	Harper	Milne	Stephens
Cruz	Harris, A.	Moul	Sturla
Culver	Harris, J.	Mullery	Tallman
Cutler	Heffley	Murt	Taylor
Daley, M.	Helm	Mustio	Thomas
Daley, P.	Hennessey	Nesbit	Tobash
Davidson	Hickernell	Neuman	Toepel
Davis	Hill	O'Brien	Toohil
Dawkins	Irvin	O'Neill	Topper
Day	James	Oberlander	Truitt
Dean	Jozwiak	Ortitay	Vereb
Deasy	Kampf	Parker, C.	Vitali
DeLissio	Kaufer	Parker, D.	Ward
Delozier	Kauffman	Pashinski	Warner

DeLuca	Kavulich	Payne	Waters
Dermody	Keller, F.	Peifer	Watson
Diamond	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Wentling
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Petri	Wheatley
Donatucci	Killion	Pickett	Wheeland
Driscoll	Kim	Pyle	White
Dunbar	Kinsey	Quinn	Youngblood
Dush	Kirkland	Rader	Zimmerman
Ellis	Klunk	Rapp	
Emrick	Knowles	Ravenstahl	Turzai,
English	Kortz	Readshaw	Speaker
Evankovich			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—6

Boyle	Gergely	Matzie	Quigley
Cox	Gingrich		

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 779, PN 1320**, entitled:

An Act designating a portion of State Route 254 in Northumberland County as the Staff Sergeant Thomas Allen Baysore Memorial Highway.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—195

Acosta	Evans	Kotik	Reed
Adolph	Everett	Krieger	Reese
Baker	Fabrizio	Lawrence	Regan
Barbin	Farina	Lewis	Roae
Barrar	Farry	Longietti	Roebuck
Benninghoff	Fee	Mackenzie	Ross
Bishop	Flynn	Maher	Rozzi
Bizzarro	Frankel	Mahoney	Sabatina
Bloom	Freeman	Major	Saccone
Boback	Gabler	Maloney	Sainato
Bradford	Gainey	Markosek	Samuelson
Briggs	Galloway	Marshall	Sankey
Brown, R.	Gibbons	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brown, V.	Gillen	Masser	Santora
Brownlee	Gillespie	McCarter	Saylor

Burns	Godshall	McGinnis	Schemel
Caltagirone	Goodman	McNeill	Schlossberg
Carroll	Greiner	Mentzer	Schreiber
Causer	Grove	Metcalfe	Schweyer
Christiana	Hahn	Metzgar	Simmons
Cohen	Hanna	Miccarelli	Sims
Conklin	Harhai	Millard	Snyder
Corbin	Harhart	Miller, B.	Sonney
Costa, D.	Harkins	Miller, D.	Staats
Costa, P.	Harper	Milne	Stephens
Cruz	Harris, A.	Moul	Sturla
Culver	Harris, J.	Mullery	Tallman
Cutler	Heffley	Murt	Taylor
Daley, M.	Helm	Mustio	Thomas
Daley, P.	Hennessey	Nesbit	Tobash
Davidson	Hickernell	Neuman	Toepel
Davis	Hill	O'Brien	Toohil
Dawkins	Irvin	O'Neill	Topper
Day	James	Oberlander	Truitt
Dean	Jozwiak	Ortitay	Vereb
Deasy	Kampf	Parker, C.	Vitali
DeLissio	Kaufer	Parker, D.	Ward
Delozier	Kauffman	Pashinski	Warner
DeLuca	Kavulich	Payne	Waters
Dermody	Keller, F.	Peifer	Watson
Diamond	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Wentling
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Petri	Wheatley
Donatucci	Killion	Pickett	Wheeland
Driscoll	Kim	Pyle	White
Dunbar	Kinsey	Quinn	Youngblood
Dush	Kirkland	Rader	Zimmerman
Ellis	Klunk	Rapp	
Emrick	Knowles	Ravenstahl	Turzai,
English	Kortz	Readshaw	Speaker
Evangovich			

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-6

Boyle	Gergely	Matzie	Quigley
Cox	Gingrich		

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 683, PN 1427**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 27, 2006 (1st Sp.Sess., P.L.1873, No.1), known as the Taxpayer Relief Act, in senior citizens property tax and rent rebate assistance, further providing for definitions.

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-195

Acosta	Evans	Kotik	Reed
Adolph	Everett	Krieger	Reese
Baker	Fabrizio	Lawrence	Regan
Barbin	Farina	Lewis	Roae
Barrar	Farry	Longietti	Roebuck
Benninghoff	Fee	Mackenzie	Ross
Bishop	Flynn	Maher	Rozzi
Bizzarro	Frankel	Mahoney	Sabatina
Bloom	Freeman	Major	Saccone
Boback	Gabler	Maloney	Sainato
Bradford	Gainey	Markosek	Samuelson
Briggs	Galloway	Marshall	Sankey
Brown, R.	Gibbons	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brown, V.	Gillen	Masser	Santora
Brownlee	Gillespie	McCarter	Saylor
Burns	Godshall	McGinnis	Schemel
Caltagirone	Goodman	McNeill	Schlossberg
Carroll	Greiner	Mentzer	Schreiber
Causer	Grove	Metcalfe	Schweyer
Christiana	Hahn	Metzgar	Simmons
Cohen	Hanna	Miccarelli	Sims
Conklin	Harhai	Millard	Snyder
Corbin	Harhart	Miller, B.	Sonney
Costa, D.	Harkins	Miller, D.	Staats
Costa, P.	Harper	Milne	Stephens
Cruz	Harris, A.	Moul	Sturla
Culver	Harris, J.	Mullery	Tallman
Cutler	Heffley	Murt	Taylor
Daley, M.	Helm	Mustio	Thomas
Daley, P.	Hennessey	Nesbit	Tobash
Davidson	Hickernell	Neuman	Toepel
Davis	Hill	O'Brien	Toohil
Dawkins	Irvin	O'Neill	Topper
Day	James	Oberlander	Truitt
Dean	Jozwiak	Ortitay	Vereb
Deasy	Kampf	Parker, C.	Vitali
DeLissio	Kaufer	Parker, D.	Ward
Delozier	Kauffman	Pashinski	Warner
DeLuca	Kavulich	Payne	Waters
Dermody	Keller, F.	Peifer	Watson
Diamond	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Wentling
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Petri	Wheatley
Donatucci	Killion	Pickett	Wheeland
Driscoll	Kim	Pyle	White
Dunbar	Kinsey	Quinn	Youngblood
Dush	Kirkland	Rader	Zimmerman
Ellis	Klunk	Rapp	
Emrick	Knowles	Ravenstahl	Turzai,
English	Kortz	Readshaw	Speaker
Evangovich			

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-6

Boyle	Gergely	Matzie	Quigley
Cox	Gingrich		

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 875, PN 1426**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Public Welfare Code, in public assistance, further providing for verification of eligibility.

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—195

Acosta	Evans	Kotik	Reed
Adolph	Everett	Krieger	Reese
Baker	Fabrizio	Lawrence	Regan
Barbin	Farina	Lewis	Roae
Barrar	Farry	Longietti	Roebuck
Benninghoff	Fee	Mackenzie	Ross
Bishop	Flynn	Maher	Rozzi
Bizzarro	Frankel	Mahoney	Sabatina
Bloom	Freeman	Major	Saccone
Boback	Gabler	Maloney	Sainato
Bradford	Gainey	Markosek	Samuelson
Briggs	Galloway	Marshall	Sankey
Brown, R.	Gibbons	Marsico	Santarsiero
Brown, V.	Gillen	Masser	Santora
Brownlee	Gillespie	McCarter	Saylor
Burns	Godshall	McGinnis	Schemel
Caltagirone	Goodman	McNeill	Schlossberg
Carroll	Greiner	Mentzer	Schreiber
Causar	Grove	Metcalfe	Schweyer
Christiana	Hahn	Metzgar	Simmons
Cohen	Hanna	Miccarelli	Sims
Conklin	Harhai	Millard	Snyder
Corbin	Harhart	Miller, B.	Sonney
Costa, D.	Harkins	Miller, D.	Staats
Costa, P.	Harper	Milne	Stephens
Cruz	Harris, A.	Moul	Sturla
Culver	Harris, J.	Mullery	Tallman
Cutler	Heffley	Murt	Taylor
Daley, M.	Helm	Mustio	Thomas
Daley, P.	Hennessey	Nesbit	Tobash
Davidson	Hickernell	Neuman	Toepel
Davis	Hill	O'Brien	Toohil
Dawkins	Irvin	O'Neill	Topper
Day	James	Oberlander	Truitt
Dean	Jozwiak	Ortitay	Vereb
Deasy	Kampf	Parker, C.	Vitali
DeLissio	Kaufner	Parker, D.	Ward
Delozier	Kauffman	Pashinski	Warner
DeLuca	Kavulich	Payne	Waters
Dermody	Keller, F.	Peifer	Watson
Diamond	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Wentling
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Petri	Wheatley
Donatucci	Killion	Pickett	Wheeland
Driscoll	Kim	Pyle	White
Dunbar	Kinsey	Quinn	Youngblood
Dush	Kirkland	Rader	Zimmerman
Ellis	Klunk	Rapp	

Emrick	Knowles	Ravenstahl	Turzai,
English	Kortz	Readshaw	Speaker
Evankovich			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—6

Boyle	Gergely	Matzie	Quigley
Cox	Gingrich		

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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. KOTIK

The **SPEAKER**. Representative Nick Kotik, on unanimous consent, will be recognized.

Mr. KOTIK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am rising to make an announcement. The Blue Dog Democratic Caucus will – I knew that was coming – will convene tomorrow at 9 a.m. in G-11, Irvis Office Building; G-11, Irvis Office Building, 9 a.m.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**. Yes, sir. 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 11;
- HB 74;
- HB 122;
- HB 124;
- HB 410;
- HB 424; and
- HB 972.

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

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

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

- HB 189;
- HB 389;
- HB 499;
- HB 619;
- HB 752;
- HB 770;

HB 805;
HB 1039; and
SB 266.

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 gentleman, Representative Kaufer, moves that this House adjourn until Wednesday, May 6, 2015, at 11 a.m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the motion?
Motion was agreed to, and at 5:39 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.