

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

SUNDAY, JUNE 28, 2015

SESSION OF 2015

199TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 54

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 3 p.m., e.d.t.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (JOHN MAHER) PRESIDING

PRAYER

HON. STEPHEN BLOOM, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Dear Lord, You have assembled in this room a passionate array of strong leaders who believe fiercely and intensely in the causes we advocate. In the hours, days, and weeks ahead, there will be much discussion, disagreement, discord, and disharmony in our midst. It is part of why we are here. But when we disagree, Lord, let us do so respectfully, knowing each of us is a precious child of Yours in Your sight.

There will be times when we get impatient, exhausted, and discouraged, but, Lord, let us remember the constant hope we have in You. There will be times when we say or do things we wish we had not, when we are hurtful to others or we ourselves get hurt, but, Lord, let us be quick to apologize and quick to forgive. For each of us, Lord, there will be battles we win and battles we lose, but, Lord, let us be humble in victory and gracious in defeat.

Lord, You have set the standard by Your own willing sacrifice, Your radical humility, Your eternal patience, Your relentless willingness to forgive, Your unfailing mercy. Empower us, Lord; give us the courage to follow Your example. This I pray in the name of my Lord and savior, Jesus Christ. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Saturday, June 27, 2015, will be postponed until printed.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority whip, who requests a leave of absence for the gentleman from Tioga County, Representative BAKER, for the day. Without objection, that leave will be granted.

The minority whip requests leave of absence for Representative BARBIN of Cambria County for the day and Representative DeLUCA of Allegheny County for the day. Without objection, those leaves are granted.

The Chair notes the presence on the floor of the House of Representatives of Matt Gabler, who returns to us from his reserve duty. Welcome back to the House.

MASTER ROLL CALL

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

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—194

Acosta	Everett	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Adolph	Fabrizio	Kotik	Readshaw
Barrar	Farina	Krieger	Reed
Benninghoff	Farry	Lawrence	Reese
Bishop	Fee	Lewis	Regan
Bizzarro	Flynn	Longietti	Roae
Bloom	Frankel	Mackenzie	Roebuck
Boback	Freeman	Maher	Ross
Boyle	Gabler	Mahoney	Rozzi
Bradford	Gainey	Major	Saccone
Briggs	Galloway	Maloney	Sainato
Brown, R.	Gergely	Markosek	Samuelson
Brown, V.	Gibbons	Marshall	Sankey
Burns	Gillen	Marsico	Santarsiero
Caltagirone	Gillespie	Masser	Santora
Carroll	Gingrich	Matzie	Saylor
Causer	Godshall	McCarter	Schemel
Christiana	Goodman	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Cohen	Greiner	McNeill	Schreiber
Conklin	Grove	Mentzer	Schweyer
Corbin	Hahn	Metcalfe	Simmons
Costa, D.	Hanna	Metzgar	Sims
Costa, P.	Harhai	Miccarelli	Snyder
Cox	Harhart	Millard	Sonney
Cruz	Harkins	Miller, B.	Staats
Culver	Harper	Miller, D.	Stephens
Cutler	Harris, A.	Milne	Sturla
Daley, M.	Harris, J.	Moul	Tallman
Daley, P.	Heffley	Mullery	Taylor

Davidson	Helm	Murt	Thomas
Davis	Hennessey	Mustio	Tobash
Dawkins	Hickernell	Nesbit	Toepel
Day	Hill	Neuman	Toohil
Dean	Irvin	O'Brien	Topper
Deasy	James	O'Neill	Truitt
DeLissio	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Verab
Delozier	Kampf	Ortitay	Vitali
Dermody	Kaufner	Parker, C.	Ward
Diamond	Kauffman	Parker, D.	Warner
DiGirolamo	Kavulich	Pashinski	Watson
Donatucci	Keller, F.	Payne	Wentling
Driscoll	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Wheatley
Dunbar	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Wheeland
Dush	Killion	Petri	White
Ellis	Kim	Pickett	Youngblood
Emrick	Kinsey	Quigley	Zimmerman
English	Kirkland	Quinn	
Evankovich	Klunk	Rader	Turzai,
Evans	Knowles	Rapp	Speaker

ADDITIONS—0**NOT VOTING—0****EXCUSED—4**

Baker Barbin DeLuca Pyle

LEAVES ADDED—3

Evans Milne Kirkland

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Those present voting "yea" are 194. A quorum being present, the House will proceed.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority caucus secretary, Representative Oberlander, for the purpose of an announcement.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Republicans will caucus immediately, and we will be prepared to return to the floor at 4 o'clock. Republicans will caucus immediately, and we will be prepared to return to the floor at 4 o'clock.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the minority caucus chair, Representative Frankel, for the purpose of an announcement.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Democrats will caucus at this time – right now, 3:15. Democrats will caucus at 3:15. Thank you.

LABOR AND INDUSTRY COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlelady from Lebanon County, Representative Gingrich, for the purpose of an announcement.

Mrs. GINGRICH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to announce that the Labor and Industry Committee will meet immediately at the break in G-50 to consider one bill, so it should be a short meeting. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady.

The Labor and Industry Committee will meet immediately at the break in G-50 to consider one bill.

Any further announcements?

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House stands in recess until 4 o'clock, unless earlier recalled by the Chair.

RECESS EXTENDED

The time of recess was extended until 4:15 p.m.; further extended until 4:30 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI) PRESIDING**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

The SPEAKER. The minority whip has indicated that Representative EVANS of Philadelphia would like to be marked on leave of absence for the day. That request will be granted.

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

HB 725, PN 843

By Rep. GINGRICH

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

LABOR AND INDUSTRY.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

SB 166, PN 1135 (Amended)

By Rep. MARSICO

An Act amending Titles 18 (Crimes and Offenses) and 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in criminal history record information, further providing for general regulations and providing for order for limited access; and, in governance of the system, providing for petition for expungement or order for limited access fee.

JUDICIARY.

SB 210, PN 121

By Rep. MARSICO

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in juries and jurors, further providing for exemptions from jury duty.

JUDICIARY.

SB 663, PN 1136 (Amended)

By Rep. MARSICO

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.

JUDICIARY.

SB 747, PN 1115

By Rep. MARSICO

An Act amending the act of March 20, 2002 (P.L.154, No.13), known as the Medical Care Availability and Reduction of Error (Mcare) Act, further providing for punitive damages; providing for punitive damages study; and imposing duties on the Insurance Commissioner.

JUDICIARY.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 1378 By Representatives MILNE, MILLARD, MURT, COHEN and COX

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in general budget implementation, further providing for the Department of Revenue.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, June 28, 2015.

No. 1404 By Representatives HARHAI, KOTIK, O'BRIEN, HARKINS, THOMAS, KAVULICH, MAHONEY, GOODMAN, COHEN, BRIGGS, ROZZI and McNEILL

An Act amending Titles 15 (Corporations and Unincorporated Associations) and 25 (Elections) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in corporate powers, duties and safeguards, providing for shareholder approval for campaign contributions; and providing for limitations on individual campaign contributions.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, June 28, 2015.

No. 1406 By Representatives YOUNGBLOOD, HANNA, ROZZI, SCHLOSSBERG, MILLARD, O'BRIEN, BISHOP, V. BROWN, THOMAS, READSHAW, DAVIDSON, COHEN, MAHONEY, KINSEY, ROEBUCK, DONATUCCI and SCHWEYER

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, in tax for education, further providing for exclusions from sales and use tax.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, June 28, 2015.

No. 1409 By Representatives RAPP, PICKETT, KAUFFMAN, COX, TRUITT, ZIMMERMAN, MILLARD and RADER

An Act amending the act of November 10, 1999 (P.L.491, No.45), known as the Pennsylvania Construction Code Act, in adoption and enforcement by municipalities, further providing for administration and enforcement.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, June 28, 2015.

No. 1419 By Representatives GREINER, HEFFLEY, MILLARD, DIAMOND, TRUITT, FEE and COHEN

An Act amending the act of May 25, 1945 (P.L.1050, No.394), known as the Local Tax Collection Law, further providing for bonds of tax collectors, for joint tax collection district and for collection of municipal taxes by county treasurer; and providing for abolishment of the office of tax collector.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, June 28, 2015.

No. 1420 By Representatives SCHWEYER, MUSTIO, P. COSTA, ROZZI, MILLARD, YOUNGBLOOD, THOMAS, GROVE, SCHLOSSBERG, SCHREIBER, BARBIN, COHEN and GIBBONS

An Act amending the act of April 12, 1951 (P.L.90, No.21), known as the Liquor Code, in preliminary provisions, further providing for definitions; and, in distilleries, wineries, bonded warehouses, bailees for hire and transporters for hire, further providing for limited wineries.

Referred to Committee on LIQUOR CONTROL, June 28, 2015.

No. 1421 By Representatives HELM, KORTZ, DAVIS, KNOWLES, QUINN, READSHAW, ROZZI, MILLARD, MUSTIO, MURT, THOMAS, R. BROWN, D. COSTA, SAYLOR, JOZWIAK, MILNE, BRIGGS, McNEILL, PEIFER, BIZZARRO, DEASY, SANTARSIERO, SCHREIBER, MACKENZIE, BARBIN, HARHAI, DRISCOLL, RAVENSTAHL, D. MILLER, TOEPEL, MATZIE, MAHONEY, KOTIK, PASHINSKI, GERGELY, GOODMAN, FARINA, BURNS, KIM, GALLOWAY, DONATUCCI, YOUNGBLOOD, STURLA, SNYDER, CORBIN, EVERETT, NEUMAN, GIBBONS, C. PARKER, BOBACK and SANTORA

An Act regulating home inspectors; providing for funds, for licensure, for disciplinary action, for remedies and for penalties; and repealing provisions relating to home inspections.

Referred to Committee on PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE, June 28, 2015.

No. 1422 By Representatives JOZWIAK, J. HARRIS, ENGLISH, ROZZI, MAHONEY, COHEN, O'BRIEN, BARBIN, CALTAGIRONE, COX, RADER, GAINNEY, SCHWEYER, FRANKEL, McNEILL, KAUFER, D. PARKER, D. COSTA, KORTZ, DeLISSIO, JAMES, DIAMOND, EVERETT and KINSEY

An Act amending the act of April 14, 1972 (P.L.233, No.64), known as The Controlled Substance, Drug, Device and Cosmetic Act, further providing for prohibited acts and penalties.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, June 28, 2015.

No. 1423 By Representatives HELM, PAYNE, DIAMOND and KORTZ

An Act amending Title 4 (Amusements) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in general provisions, further providing for legislative intent and definitions; in Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board, further providing for general and specific powers and regulatory authority of board; and, in revenues, providing for games of skill tax.

Referred to Committee on GAMING OVERSIGHT, June 28, 2015.

No. 1424 By Representatives MAJOR, PICKETT, MALONEY, CAUSER, MILLARD, GODSHALL, RAPP, McNEILL, HELM, MURT, IRVIN, ZIMMERMAN, THOMAS, A. HARRIS, COHEN and PEIFER

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

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, June 28, 2015.

No. 1425 By Representatives J. HARRIS, KIM, DUSH, KINSEY, GAINEY, THOMAS, ROEBUCK, V. BROWN, ROZZI, DAVIS, ACOSTA, WHEATLEY, SCHLOSSBERG, SNYDER, GODSHALL, SIMS, MAHONEY, DAWKINS, COHEN, GOODMAN, WARD, BRIGGS, CALTAGIRONE, DeLISSIO, D. MILLER, YOUNGBLOOD, C. PARKER, SANKEY, KIRKLAND, DAVIDSON, GROVE, SCHREIBER, FRANKEL, HANNA, FLYNN, GIBBONS, BIZZARRO and D. COSTA

An Act amending Titles 18 (Crimes and Offenses) and 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in criminal history record information, further providing for general regulations and providing for order for limited access; and, in governance of the system, providing for petition for expungement or order for limited access fee.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, June 28, 2015.

SENATE BILLS FOR CONCURRENCE

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

SB 77, PN 53

Referred to Committee on GAME AND FISHERIES, June 28, 2015.

SB 129, PN 1120

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, June 28, 2015.

SB 356, PN 887

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, June 28, 2015.

SB 524, PN 1076

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, June 28, 2015.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The minority whip indicates that Representative KIRKLAND would like to be marked on leave of absence for the remainder of the day. That request will be granted.

CALENDAR

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 655, PN 650**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, establishing the Non-narcotic Medication Assisted Substance Abuse Treatment Grant Pilot Program; in special funds, further providing for funding, for State Workers' Insurance Board and for expiration; in the Tobacco Settlement Fund, further providing for use; in the Pennsylvania Race Horse Development Fund, further providing for distribution; in general budget implementation, further providing for the Department of Community and Economic Development, for the Department of Public Welfare, for the Pennsylvania State Police and for the Environmental Quality Board; providing for 2015-2016 budget implementation, for 2015-2016 restrictions on appropriations for funds and accounts and for required lapses of money in funds and accounts; and making related repeals.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Vitali, I understand is withdrawing his amendment, 2736.

Representative Vitali, you are recognized for the purpose of withdrawing the amendment.

Thank you, sir.

MR. VITALI. I will be withdrawing this amendment, just to be a team player and you know, just to work with everybody. It is just who I am.

I just wanted to talk about what the amendment does and the importance of the issue just as we go forward.

What this would do would be to restore the Oil and Gas Lease Fund back to its original purpose. This was a fund that collects money from the development of State lands and uses it for conservation purposes, dams, flood control, and recreation, but recently it has become increasingly a cash cow for General Fund operations. What this in short would do would be to basically say that all moneys in that fund have to be used for those purposes, and it would be at the discretion of the DCNR (Department of Conservation and Natural Resources) to distribute the moneys. Maybe we will do this sometime in the upcoming weeks.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

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 **SB 330, PN 775**, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 18 (Crime and Offenses) and 53 (Municipalities Generally) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in other offenses, repealing the offense of municipal housing code avoidance; and, in neighborhood blight reclamation and revitalization, providing for failure to comply with a code requirement.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 687, PN 673**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 68 (Real and Personal Property) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in general provisions for planned communities, further providing for applicability of local ordinances, regulations and building codes.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 688, PN 674**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 68 (Real and Personal Property) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in general provisions for condominiums, further providing for applicability of local ordinances, regulations and building codes.

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

BILL RECOMMITTED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that SB 655 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

STATEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Members, we would like to welcome back our colleague, Representative and Capt. Matt Gabler, who was serving with the Pennsylvania Army National Guard, the 28th Division, over the last 2 weeks. So welcome back, Representative Gabler.

RULES AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETINGS

The SPEAKER. Representative Adolph, the Appropriations chair, we are going to recognize for an announcement.

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

Mr. Speaker, there will be an immediate Rules meeting in the Republican Appropriations conference room, and then after that, we will meet in the majority caucus room – the Appropriations Committee – at probably like 5:10. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Chairman Adolph.

The Rules Committee will be meeting immediately in the conference room over at Appropriations, and then around 5:10, the Appropriations Committee will be meeting in the majority caucus room.

Thank you, Representative Adolph.

Members, we are going to go at ease for those committee meetings. We are going to go at ease for those committee meetings. But we would likely be moving forward with additional business at approximately 5:20, but we are just going to be at ease.

The House will come to order.

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEES

HB 561, PN 634

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of December 31, 1965 (P.L.1257, No.511), known as The Local Tax Enabling Act, in consolidated collection of local income taxes, further providing for definitions.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1154, PN 1966

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in registration of vehicles, further providing for display of registration plate.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1161, PN 1512

By Rep. REED

An Act amending the act of December 22, 1983 (P.L.306, No.84), known as the Board of Vehicles Act, further providing for definitions and for license to engage in business.

RULES.

HB 1205, PN 1863

By Rep. REED

An Act establishing the Results First Project; and providing for data collection and analysis by the Independent Fiscal Office.

RULES.

HB 1275, PN 1685

By Rep. REED

An Act amending the act of May 1, 1933 (P.L.216, No.76), known as The Dental Law, further providing for definitions and for restricted faculty license.

RULES.

HB 1278, PN 1836

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in other required equipment, further providing for television equipment.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1279, PN 1967

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act designating a section of Christopher Columbus Boulevard between Oregon Avenue and Washington Avenue in the City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia County, as the William J. Guarneri and Edward "Babe" Heffron Memorial Boulevard.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1329, PN 1883

By Rep. REED

An Act requiring certain hospitals to allow patients an opportunity to designate caregivers in patients' medical records and imposing duties on hospitals.

RULES.

SB 438, PN 389

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 982 over the Loyalhanna Creek, Westmoreland County, as the Lance Corporal Joseph E. Roble Memorial Bridge.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 538, PN 1134

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of July 2, 1993 (P.L.345, No.48), entitled "An act empowering the General Counsel or his designee to issue subpoenas for certain licensing board activities; providing for hearing examiners in the Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs; providing additional powers to the Commissioner of Professional and Occupational Affairs; and further providing for civil penalties and license suspension," further providing for definitions; providing for reporting of sanctions and criminal proceedings and for temporary and automatic suspension; and further providing for civil penalties.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A**BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1161, PN 1512**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 22, 1983 (P.L.306, No.84), known as the Board of Vehicles Act, further providing for definitions and for license to engage in business.

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 1275, PN 1685**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 1, 1933 (P.L.216, No.76), known as The Dental Law, further providing for definitions and for restricted faculty license.

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 1205, PN 1863**, entitled:

An Act establishing the Results First Project; and providing for data collection and analysis by the Independent Fiscal Office.

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

Mr. **NEUMAN** offered the following amendment
No. **A02754**:

Amend Bill, page 4, line 15, by striking out all of said line and inserting

(b) Duty.—

(1) Data sources identified by the Independent Fiscal Amend Bill, page 4, by inserting between lines 19 and 20

(2) The Independent Fiscal Office shall work collaboratively with data sources as necessary to ensure that the data provided is of appropriate content and conforms to practicable format specifications. Data requirements of the Independent Fiscal Office shall take into account work flow requirements of data sources.

(c) Results.—A data source may not be charged a fee to receive the results generated from data it submits under this section.

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

The **SPEAKER**. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Neuman for a brief description of the amendment.

Mr. **NEUMAN**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is my understanding that this is an agreed-to amendment. It has some language that the administration was requesting, and the maker of the bill was willing to put this language into the piece of legislation to move it forward.

So I thank the prime sponsor for his willingness to do this, and I would request an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The **SPEAKER**. Representative Dunbar, on the amendment.

Mr. **DUNBAR**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman from Washington County is correct, this is an agreed-to amendment, and I thank him for his willingness to work with me on that, and I urge an affirmative vote.

The **SPEAKER**. Thank you, sir.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—192

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—6

Baker	DeLuca	Kirkland	Pyle
Barbin	Evans		

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

On the question,

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

Mr. NEUMAN offered the following amendment No. **A02750**:

Amend Bill, page 4, line 15, by striking out all of said line and inserting

(b) Duty.—

(1) Data sources identified by the Independent Fiscal Amend Bill, page 4, by inserting between lines 19 and 20

(2) The Independent Fiscal Office shall work collaboratively with data sources as necessary to ensure that the data provided is of appropriate content and conforms to practicable format specifications. Data requirements of the Independent Fiscal Office shall take into account work flow requirements of data sources.

(c) Results.—A data source may not be charged a fee to receive the results generated from data it submits under this section.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Neuman for a brief description of the amendment.

Mr. NEUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would request that this amendment be withdrawn at this time.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

So amendment 2750 will be withdrawn.

On the question recurring,

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

Ms. DONATUCCI offered the following amendment No. **A02618**:

Amend Bill, page 4, by inserting between lines 19 and 20

(c) Disclosure of data.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), any data collected and submitted to the Independent Fiscal Office by a data source in accordance with the requirements of this act shall conform with and be subject to the requirements of the act of February 14, 2008 (P.L.6, No.3), known as the Right-to-Know Law, and any applicable Federal or State law governing confidentiality, including, but not limited to, the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) (Public Law 104-191, 110 Stat. 1936).

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Donatucci for a brief description of the amendment.

Ms. DONATUCCI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The purpose of amendment 02618 is to ensure the confidentiality of data collected by State agencies and legislative and constitutional offices and submitted to the IFO (Independent Fiscal Office). Mr. Speaker, this amendment would simply require that data collected from data sources conform with and be subject to the Right-to-Know Law and State and Federal laws governing confidentiality, including HIPAA.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative. Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, while I understand the maker of the amendment's concerns, I unfortunately must stand in opposition to this amendment.

It is clear that in working with the gentleman from Westmoreland County, as we worked through this issue with the different interested parties, there were a couple things that became apparent. One, this is only aggregate data, and two, the concerns expressed are regarding personal medical information or other kinds of personalized data that are already protected under Federal law. And I believe that other safeguards already exist in the bill, as well as other statutes; so therefore, I would urge opposition to avoid any unnecessary confusion. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Donatucci, for the second time.

Ms. DONATUCCI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Although I appreciate the gentleman's comments, I am still asking to ensure that confidentiality, especially including HIPAA, is abided by, and so I am still going to urge a positive vote on this amendment. Thank you.

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

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—83

Table with 4 columns of names: Acosta, Bishop, Bizzarro, Boyle, Bradford, Briggs, Brown, V., Burns, Caltagirone, Carroll, Cohen, Conklin, Costa, D., Costa, P., Cruz, Daley, M., Daley, P., Davidson, Davis, Dawkins, Dean, Deasy, DeLissio, Dermody, DiGirolamo, Donatucci, Driscoll, Fabrizio, Farina, Flynn, Frankel, Freeman, Gainey, Galloway, Gergely, Gibbons, Godshall, Goodman, Hanna, Harhai, Harkins, Harris, J., Kavulich, Keller, W., Kim, Kinsey, Kortz, Kotik, Longietti, Maher, Mahoney, Markosek, Matzie, McCarter, McNeill, Miller, D., Mullery, Mustio, Neuman, O'Brien, Parker, C., Pashinski, Petrarca, Ravenstahl, Readshaw, Roebuck, Rozzi, Sainato, Samuelson, Santarsiero, Schlossberg, Schreiber, Schweyer, Sims, Snyder, Sturla, Taylor, Thomas, Vitali, Ward, Watson, Wheatley, Youngblood

NAYS—109

Table with 4 columns of names: Adolph, Barrar, Benninghoff, Bloom, Boback, Brown, R., Causer, Christiana, Corbin, Cox, Culver, Cutler, Day, Greiner, Grove, Hahn, Harhart, Harper, Harris, A., Heffley, Helm, Hennessey, Hickernell, Hill, Irvin, James, Marshall, Marsico, Masser, McGinnis, Mentzer, Metcalfe, Metzgar, Miccarelli, Millard, Miller, B., Milne, Moul, Murt, Regan, Roae, Ross, Saccone, Sankey, Santora, Saylor, Schemel, Simmons, Sonney, Staats, Stephens, Tallman

Table with 4 columns of names: Delozier, Diamond, Dunbar, Dush, Ellis, Emrick, English, Evankovich, Everett, Farry, Fee, Gabler, Gillen, Gillespie, Gingrich, Jozwiak, Kampf, Kaufer, Kauffman, Keller, F., Keller, M.K., Killion, Klunk, Knowles, Krieger, Lawrence, Lewis, Mackenzie, Major, Maloney, Nesbit, O'Neill, Oberlander, Ortitay, Parker, D., Payne, Peifer, Petri, Pickett, Quigley, Quinn, Rader, Rapp, Reed, Reese, Tobash, Toepel, Toohil, Topper, Truitt, Vereb, Warner, Wentling, Wheeland, White, Zimmerman, Turzai, Speaker

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—6

Table with 4 columns of names: Baker, Barbin, DeLuca, Evans, Kirkland, Pyle

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

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

The SPEAKER. It is my understanding that all other amendments have been withdrawn. If anybody else wishes to offer a timely filed amendment, if you could please state so now; otherwise, it is my understanding that all amendments have been withdrawn.

On the question recurring, 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 B

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of HB 561, PN 634, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 31, 1965 (P.L.1257, No.511), known as The Local Tax Enabling Act, in consolidated collection of local income taxes, 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—192

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—6

Baker	DeLuca	Kirkland	Pyle
Barbin	Evans		

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 538, PN 1134**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of July 2, 1993 (P.L.345, No.48), entitled "An act empowering the General Counsel or his designee to issue subpoenas for certain licensing board activities; providing for hearing examiners in the Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs; providing additional powers to the Commissioner of Professional and Occupational Affairs; and further providing for civil penalties and license suspension," further providing for definitions; providing for reporting of sanctions and criminal proceedings and for temporary and automatic suspension; and further providing for civil penalties.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

(Bill analysis was read.)

DECISION OF CHAIR RESCINDED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair rescinds its statement that SB 538 was agreed to on third consideration.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

The SPEAKER. It is my understanding that Representative Curtis Thomas has filed an amendment on third consideration; that is amendment 2850. We would need a suspension to be able to entertain an amendment filed on third consideration.

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

The SPEAKER. Representative Thomas, do you wish to proceed?

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, I rise to ask for suspension of the rules to allow for amendment 2850 that will in essence strengthen the bill itself.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Mr. THOMAS. And, Mr. Speaker, is this the appropriate time to provide some background information on the amendment?

The SPEAKER. Sir, just a brief description for this motion, a brief description for the motion to suspend. Should the motion to suspend succeed, you will definitely be able to talk more on the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In essence, we have these nursing programs across the State and many hospitals in rural, suburban, and urban Pennsylvania. If for some reason or another you have problems with that nursing program, under current regs, current law, those credits are not transferable.

So if you wanted to transfer from Erie Presbyterian hospital nursing program to Montgomery County nursing program because of resources at that particular hospital, you would not be able to do that. You would have to start all over again, take out another loan, to kind of make up those credits that you need,

and so what my amendment would do is allow for transferability of credits from one hospital to another.

The SPEAKER. Does anybody else wish – the leaders, any leader wish to be recognized on the motion to suspend? Only the leaders and the maker of the motion can speak on this motion.

Leader Reed.

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We would ask the members to oppose the motion to suspend the rules. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Minority Leader Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Representative from Philadelphia has come up with a good idea. We ought to support the motion to suspend the rules. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—74

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

NAYS—118

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

Gillen	Major	Rader	Zimmerman
Gillespie	Maloney	Rapp	
Gingrich	Marshall	Reed	Turzai,
Godshall	Marsico	Reese	Speaker

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—6

Baker	DeLuca	Kirkland	Pyle
Barbin	Evans		

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

On the question recurring,
Will the House 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—192

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

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—6

Baker	DeLuca	Kirkland	Pyle
Barbin	Evans		

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1154, PN 1966**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in registration of vehicles, further providing for display of registration plate.

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?

Dom Costa, Representative Costa, is recognized.

Mr. D. COSTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Basically in short, what this bill does— It was brought to our attention, a number of our colleagues who are law enforcement officers in the co-prime, from the law enforcement community, that this bill is very bad for law enforcement. It is not a bill to give police officers an excuse to pull people over; it is a bill that will basically not change what is happening today.

We have done many bills in the past where we found that there were unintended consequences, bad unintended consequences. This will have bad unintended consequences for law enforcement officers, because like all of us who go out and register our vehicles, pay insurance, and get that little sticker, it gives law enforcement the actual ID (identification) to show that that has been done correctly and you are basically conforming with the law.

And the other option to this sticker is that—

The SPEAKER. Representative Costa, if you will please suspend.

I apologize. Representative Costa, please continue.

Mr. D. COSTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The only alternative to these stickers would be a camera in every police unit, patrol unit, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Those cameras which scan licenses for stolen and expired are \$18,000 apiece. Now, I do not know any of us that can put out that kind of money to support our local law enforcement.

The State F.O.P. (Fraternal Order of Police) and the Troopers Association support this bill, and like I said, this bill, the only thing it does do is keep it status quo.

Now, there has been talk— Law enforcement, when we pull someone over, we get DUI (driving under the influence) arrests, we get people without insurance, which are a hazard out there because if they hit your family, my family, or any one of our constituents, they have no insurance, they have no protection. We have taken many, many vehicles off the road.

Now, the citation for this particular incident is a 1301 violation for the Vehicle Code. If we are going to talk numbers, I will give you some numbers. The Commonwealth will lose. The years 2009 and 2010 – these are statistics – local police officers wrote 171,278 citations for that violation, State Police wrote 88,500, so 259,778 citations were written for that at \$113.50 apiece. That is \$29,484,803 in citations.

Now, here is who is going to lose if this goes out because there is not going to be any way for our officers to know except to run license plates. They have to look up – they have to get on the computer, run the license plate, and then they have the potential of being accused of profiling if they do it. Now, as we know, our officers have a tough enough time, and to go around and just say, "Well, I am going to look at this car and run a license plate to see if it is expired," it just does not happen. The sticker is a positive way of seeing if it is expired.

Now, your EMS (emergency medical services) Fund is \$10 from the \$113; local police, \$1.7 million; State Police, toward the EMS Fund, \$885,000. In 2 years the EMS Fund got \$2,597,000. The actual CAT Fund (Catastrophic Loss Benefits Continuation Fund), the catastrophic fund, it is \$40 on this citation. I will be brief, in 2 years between both departments and both agencies, \$10,391,120 that that CAT Fund will lose just from that citation. Your fine alone, which our communities get half of, between the two organizations, \$6.5 million to round it off, \$6.5 million. Half of that is going to your local communities in 2 years. And then the court cost is another \$10 million.

So I think it is time that we look at this. I heard numbers that they are going to lose here, but you know, I would like to find another fund to take it from than the Transportation Fund, but unfortunately, they are both related. So I am asking for an affirmative vote. Like I said, we have the support of the statewide Fraternal Order of Police and the Troopers Association, so I am asking for an affirmative vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Ellis.

Mr. ELLIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on HB 1154, I believe that I have a conflict of interest in this legislation and I will be abstaining from voting.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to rule 64, the gentleman will be excluded from voting.

Representative Dan Truitt.

Mr. TRUITT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to HB 1154 for multiple reasons.

My first reason is, it will cost the Commonwealth additional money to continue to produce these stickers and mail them out to the public. The second reason, we have been hearing about why we want to keep these stickers and one reason they say we want to keep these stickers is because when people do not have the sticker on their car, it provides an opportunity for the Commonwealth to raise revenue. I do not think we are supposed to create laws to create opportunities for people to break the law so that we can make money off of it. That is just not the way it is supposed to work.

But then finally what I think is most important, I do not think that when the framers of the Constitution created the amendment that said that we had a right not to have unreasonable searches and seizures that it was their intention that we would go out and create ways to fabricate probable cause so that we could be pulled over and have our cars searched and so forth.

I think this runs contrary to the spirit of the Constitution, I think it runs contrary to the purpose for which we are supposed to create State laws, and it does take money out of the Transportation Fund that we really should be using for other things.

So I encourage my colleagues to vote "no," and I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Vitali.

Mr. VITALI. Could I just ask the maker of the bill a couple of questions?

The SPEAKER. Yes, he has indicated he will stand for interrogation.

Mr. VITALI. I am just trying to get clear what this does. So this has to do with those little color stickers that have the current year that are in the corner of your license plate. Is that it? And under current law, they have to be there so that the police officer can see you have a current tag, right?

The SPEAKER. Go ahead, Representative Costa, you can respond.

Mr. D. COSTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, that is correct.

Mr. VITALI. Okay. So this bill, what does this bill, your bill, do with that current requirement of having those stickers on the license plate?

Mr. D. COSTA. It actually keeps it the same as it is today. In other words, when you mail your check into PENNDOT, you will receive that little sticker that will go to showing that you complied with the law, that you have insurance – because you have to show PENNDOT your certificate of insurance so that they know that you are insured and it has to be for a number of months.

Mr. VITALI. Okay. So if your bill passes, things will stay exactly as they are?

Mr. D. COSTA. Yes. Act 89, which this bill was on, actually took that out – the ability for you to send in every month. Okay? So this actually will stop that from happening.

Act 89 said that they will stop printing the stickers and they will do an optional biannual registration, if you would like, and the problem is, if you stop putting stickers on, there is no way for law enforcement or anybody to verify your plate is good.

Mr. VITALI. So just to be clear, if we vote for this, the practice of keeping those stickers on your license plate will continue, but if this bill does not become law, then that practice will stop. Is that correct?

Mr. D. COSTA. Exactly right, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. COSTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Vereb.

Mr. VEREB. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Taking revenue out of the equation, why did we not do away with inspection and emissions stickers as well? And probably the reason is because no one wanted vehicles driving around without any idea if they were even inspected or emission tested.

I voted for this legislation and realized that we made a mistake, a mistake on a number of fronts. It is not about probable cause and search and seizure alone and revenue, but from a motorist safety perspective. There is a good chance that if you are driving around with a car that has a sticker on it that is past due or expired, two things have happened. One, you forgot to apply and/or put the new sticker on the car, or two, it is expired, and if it is expired, you mostly likely – 90 percent chance you have no insurance.

This is an indicator for law enforcement, it is an indicator, frankly, for us as motorists to know what other people on the highway have and do not have, and I encourage a "yes" vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Barry Jozwiak.

Mr. JOZWIAK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to just reiterate what Representative Vereb said.

This sticker on this plate is essential to the law enforcement community. Cops do not – they are not psychic; they cannot figure out who has an expired plate and who does not. Without that sticker on that plate, that person does not have insurance. They more than likely do not even have a driver's license. I would like to see that on; the State Police have told me they prefer the sticker on; the local police, the F.O.P.s, have said the same thing.

I would urge a "yes" vote for this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Russ Diamond – please suspend, sir.

Members, just a few more speakers. Please, let us give them our attention.

Representative Diamond, the floor is yours.

Mr. DIAMOND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to this legislation for a number of reasons.

The first thing that comes to my mind is the cost savings and the advancement of technology for the Commonwealth cost savings.

I mean, a long time ago Pennsylvania was a two-license-plate State – you had to have one on the front; you had to have one on the back – then we stopped doing that. Then at some point we stopped printing license plates every single year because it was a cost savings and we went to the sticker.

Well, I cannot believe that part of the reason we are not actually going away from the sticker is because technology has caught up to us. And although I will credit the maker of the bill for announcing that the cost of these systems to automatically

read license plates is \$18,000, I just went on my computer and I saw one on eBay for \$129. Now, that is just a camera, and I agree, it is not tying into the whole database and there is extra expense with that. But I believe that the expiration of the sticker provision here is okay because it is in 2017, and I think technology will advance by that time, so we can have automated license plate readers.

They are everywhere, by the way. They are at tollbooths. They are in some police cars. Back in 2011 we had 25 of these systems amongst the Pennsylvania State Police. These systems can read 1800 license plates per minute. So if we are worried about the efficacy of worrying, "Is this person driving with an expired registration," well, finding 1800 potential violators per minute is way better than what you could get with an officer typing in, or looking and then typing in, and then confirming that it is expired and maybe being distracted from driving.

The other reason I oppose this bill – and I urge the members to vote "no" on this bill, Mr. Speaker – is because I think that the notion of using law enforcement for revenue enhancement is simply wrongheaded. The reason we should have law enforcement on the streets is to enforce the laws and to lock up criminals. I do not think that we should use law enforcement strictly for revenue enhancement purposes.

So for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge the members to vote against this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Jerry Knowles.

Mr. KNOWLES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of HB 1154.

When the form shows up on the doorstep for the renewal of your registration, people send in the fee, they get back the registration card, and then they get back that little sticker that they place on the license plate, and that is a clear indication to people that they are indeed up to date in terms of that registration plate and that vehicle.

Mr. Speaker, many people do not send in that fee. Many people, they just drive around without that sticker. And talking to some of my friends in the law enforcement community, there is a great number of people who drive around with expired registration plates.

Mr. Speaker, when a police officer is on patrol, he is out patrolling to look for crime, to look for suspicious activity, and I can tell you that one of the things he does is he looks at that license plate to be certain that that vehicle is indeed legally registered to be operated in the Commonwealth and in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about dollars. This is about taking a tool out of the tool chest of the law enforcement community. And as has been indicated by one of the previous speakers, if you want to talk about dollars, the money that is generated as a result of people not adhering to the law – and that is why they are being cited, by the way. They are being cited because they are not adhering to the law. And you are taking one of those tools out of their tool chest.

Mr. Speaker, to do away with this is not fair to people who pay for their registration and who put that sticker on their car, and I would urge my colleagues to vote in support of HB 1154.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Mike Carroll.

Mr. CARROLL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to HB 1154. I will not repeat the reasons that were stated by members preceding me,

but I would point out one additional detail and fact for all of us to consider.

You know, in 2015 it is very common for people to renew their vehicle registration online, and when they review the vehicle registration online, they simply hit the "print" button on their computer at home, and a registration card is generated right in your own home. To return to a registration sticker requires PENNDOT to take the unnecessary extra step to mail a sticker to prove what you already know, which is your registration was renewed. You just did it on your home computer.

So for all the reasons that were previously stated, please consider the fact that it is 2015, we renew these things online, we renew them in our home for the convenience of our constituents, and for the sake of the Motor License Fund, I urge a "no" vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dan Miller.

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

Will the maker stand for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The maker has indicated he will stand for interrogation. You may proceed.

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

Mr. Speaker, I ask this question knowing the gentleman's experience. We have heard testimony here today about revenue and seeking of revenue, and I wonder in relation to this bill, and going off of the maker's experience, if the maker can tell me or tell this body how often either he was instructed or he has instructed law enforcement officials to go get and look for these stickers because somebody needs to bring more money into the municipality that he worked for?

Mr. D. COSTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In answer to that question, as a police officer for 28 years, never have I instructed, nor is this a revenue thing. This is not a revenue thing for law enforcement.

It is a tool, as my colleague said, in the box, and without it, there is no way— You can get anything you want online, but there is no way for a police officer behind your vehicle to know that you have up-to-date insurance, that you have actually, without a sticker on there, that actually you even went online to get that done.

This is a must for law enforcement. It is not a fishing expedition. Believe me, law enforcement is much too busy to do that. But when they are driving around, that is part of their job. That is the job that we mandated they do and we are going to take the tools off of them.

So again, I thank you and I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Miller, do you want to speak on the—

Mr. D. MILLER. On the bill.

The SPEAKER. On the bill, please, yes.

Mr. D. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the answer to my question, and I rise in support of HB 1154.

I would have no problem, Mr. Speaker, with talking about the day where we will be looking to fund directly the types of equipment that would allow for our departments to operate with those cameras that would read license plates to tell us information that is necessary to effectuate our law. The reality of it is, we are passing laws and expecting our law enforcement officials to make sure that they are effectuated. They are out there to be sure that cars are registered, cars are insured, and

those things are done in order to be sure that when something happens, that the proper recourse is justified and happens. We need to be sure that these cars do have the minimum insurance, are legal on the road, and are safe to drive.

In order for that to happen, we need to be sure that our law enforcement officers are able to view the cars properly to be able to see whether or not that car is legal. There is no other way at this time to do it than besides to address \$18,000 worth of cost to every vehicle that is out there to be sure that these cars are safe on the road.

Mr. Speaker, because of that and because we do not want to be in a situation where law enforcement officers are doing things on a more haphazard basis, we should be providing a law or keeping a law that allows them to do it in a way that is right in front of their faces, is easy for them to see, and make sure that all these cars are safe on the road.

I would urge a "yes" vote on 1154.

The SPEAKER. Representative Gary Day.

Mr. DAY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of HB 1154.

As I listened to the debate today, I wanted to talk about what is registration for. You know, registration, the system, is for accounting of vehicles and it is a user fee.

Well, before we even get the sticker, it is an accounting of vehicles in the Commonwealth and a user fee on automobiles. Law enforcement is a blanket over the community to protect us. It is well known that criminal behavior starts in steps. It is well known that you start with double parking in a community, a small minor offense, and criminal behavior increases over time.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the best legislation is done—

The SPEAKER. Members— Sir, please suspend.

Members, I realize it is Sunday evening and this one, it is not clear where this one is going to go, so— But if we could, if everybody— Representative Day and then Representative Dom Costa are our last two speakers. Please, let us please provide attention to Representative Day here, and then Representative Dom Costa will close.

All members, please take your seats. Members, please take your seats.

Representative Day, the floor is yours, sir.

Mr. DAY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I appreciate that because I was not going to speak on this issue, but we had so many members standing up talking about actually turning away from law enforcement's advice. Law enforcement has said to us, "Hey, this is a mistake, and we need to correct this." Our own, our own members, former law enforcement officers from both sides of the aisle, have stood, and I thought, I thought, boy, we will just let them take the day because I think they are right on this from their experience.

Law enforcement is that blanket, that when they do catch someone, it is not for the money, but it is for that those people who have not registered their vehicle could possibly be committing other offenses. Many times when you get pulled over for that sticker, you are just reminded, "Hey, get your license registered. Get your vehicle registered."

Our own law enforcement officers here in our caucus, our colleagues, are asking, from both sides of the aisle, for a "yes" vote on this, and I intend to support them on HB 1154, and I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Dom Costa, for the second time.

Mr. D. COSTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just to round this off so we can conclude it. The bottom line is, law enforcement across this Commonwealth has got in touch with us, both the State F.O.P. and the Troopers Association, and asked us to keep this important tool. We have spent money, tons of money, on law enforcement to support them. Now I am asking you to continue your support of law enforcement and vote this bill affirmatively.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Jordan Harris.

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

Not to prolong this, but I just have one question for the maker of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Representative Costa will stand for interrogation. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. J. HARRIS. Thank you.

So if there are no more stickers, how would law enforcement know if a person is registered or not?

Mr. D. COSTA. They would not, unless they would have to run the license plate through their computer or over the microphone.

Mr. J. HARRIS. Okay. Under current law, are law enforcement officers able to randomly run your license plate?

Mr. D. COSTA. Generally they do not, unless there is a suspicion for some reason, possible stolen, if it matches a description that they have on their hot sheet of a vehicle like a gray Ford pickup truck with a dented fender.

Mr. J. HARRIS. So without the sticker, without the sticker, the only way to know if a car is registered is to run the actual plate?

Mr. D. COSTA. That is correct, unless you have an \$18,000 reader.

Mr. J. HARRIS. So would not having, in your opinion, would not having a sticker increase law enforcement running license plates to see if people are registered?

Mr. D. COSTA. I do not believe it would increase that because they would have to have some kind of probable cause or thought to believe that there is something afloat. So they probably would not run it, which would probably increase the number of people without valid stickers – or valid plates and valid insurance.

Mr. J. HARRIS. Okay.

I guess what I am trying— I do not want to prolong. I am trying to get to, without the sticker you do not know if the car is registered, but you do not believe that more officers will run the plate to find out if people are registered?

Mr. D. COSTA. No, I do not believe they would.

Mr. J. HARRIS. Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That concludes my question.

The SPEAKER. Representative Hal English.

Mr. ENGLISH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand in support of HB 1154. I do not believe this is an intrusion into your life. It is a minor inconvenience. There is accountability for insurance and registration to operate on our roadways. As my colleague from Philadelphia was raising with the maker, concerning about privacy, how else will law enforcement know whether you are registered or not? If you are concerned about privacy by someone being stopped because

they do not have the sticker or the registration, I think privacy gets invaded further because they can run all the tags, and thus, I think the privacy issue is alleviated by voting in support of this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dan Truitt, for the second time.

Mr. TRUITT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will keep it really, really short. I just want to remind everybody that when you go to get your car inspected, you have to show the folks at the body shop that you have a valid registration and valid auto insurance, and that is a much bigger sticker on your car than that little, tiny one on your license plate.

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—155

Acosta	Evankovich	Klunk	Rader
Adolph	Everett	Knowles	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Fabrizio	Kortz	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Farina	Kotik	Reed
Bishop	Farry	Krieger	Reese
Bizzarro	Fee	Lawrence	Regan
Bloom	Flynn	Lewis	Roebuck
Boback	Frankel	Longietti	Ross
Boyle	Freeman	Mackenzie	Sainato
Bradford	Galloway	Mahoney	Samuelson
Briggs	Gergely	Major	Santarsiero
Brown, R.	Gibbons	Marshall	Santora
Brown, V.	Gillen	Marsico	Saylor
Burns	Gillespie	Masser	Schemel
Caltagirone	Gingrich	Matzie	Schlossberg
Causar	Godshall	McCarter	Schreiber
Cohen	Goodman	McNeill	Simmons
Conklin	Greiner	Mentzer	Snyder
Corbin	Hahn	Miccarelli	Sonney
Costa, D.	Hanna	Millard	Stephens
Costa, P.	Harhai	Miller, B.	Sturla
Cruz	Harhart	Miller, D.	Tallman
Culver	Harkins	Milne	Taylor
Cutler	Harper	Moul	Thomas
Daley, P.	Harris, A.	Mullery	Tobash
Davidson	Harris, J.	Murt	Toepel
Davis	Heffley	Nesbit	Toohil
Dawkins	Helm	Neuman	Verb
Day	Hennessey	O'Brien	Vitali
Dean	Hickernell	O'Neill	Ward
Deasy	Hill	Oberlander	Warner
Delozier	James	Parker, D.	Watson
Dermody	Jozwiak	Pashinski	Wheeland
DiGiolamo	Kampf	Payne	White
Donatucci	Kauffman	Peifer	Youngblood
Driscoll	Kavulich	Petrarca	Zimmerman
Dunbar	Keller, M.K.	Petri	
Dush	Killion	Quigley	Turzai,
Emrick	Kim	Quinn	Speaker
English			

NAYS—36

Carroll	Irvin	Metcalfe	Saccone
Christiana	Kaufer	Metzgar	Sankey
Cox	Keller, F.	Mustio	Schweyer
Daley, M.	Keller, W.	Ortitay	Sims
DeLissio	Kinsey	Parker, C.	Staats

Diamond	Maher	Pickett	Topper
Gabler	Maloney	Rapp	Truitt
Gainey	Markosek	Roae	Wentling
Grove	McGinnis	Rozzi	Wheatley

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Baker	DeLuca	Evans	Pyle
Barbin	Ellis	Kirkland	

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 1278, PN 1836**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in other required equipment, further providing for television equipment.

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—192

Acosta	Fabrizio	Krieger	Readshaw
Adolph	Farina	Lawrence	Reed
Barrar	Farry	Lewis	Reese
Benninghoff	Fee	Longietti	Regan
Bishop	Flynn	Mackenzie	Roae
Bizzarro	Frankel	Maher	Roebuck
Bloom	Freeman	Mahoney	Ross
Boback	Gabler	Major	Rozzi
Boyle	Gainey	Maloney	Saccone
Bradford	Galloway	Markosek	Sainato
Briggs	Gergely	Marshall	Samuelson
Brown, R.	Gibbons	Marsico	Sankey
Brown, V.	Gillen	Masser	Santarsiero
Burns	Gillespie	Matzie	Santora
Caltagirone	Gingrich	McCarter	Saylor
Carroll	Godshall	McGinnis	Schemel
Causar	Goodman	McNeill	Schlossberg
Christiana	Greiner	Mentzer	Schreiber
Cohen	Grove	Metcalfe	Schweyer
Conklin	Hahn	Metzgar	Simmons
Corbin	Hanna	Miccarelli	Sims
Costa, D.	Harhai	Millard	Snyder
Costa, P.	Harhart	Miller, B.	Sonney
Cox	Harkins	Miller, D.	Staats
Cruz	Harper	Milne	Stephens

Culver	Harris, A.	Moul	Sturla
Cutler	Harris, J.	Mullery	Tallman
Daley, M.	Heffley	Murt	Taylor
Daley, P.	Helm	Mustio	Thomas
Davidson	Hennessey	Nesbit	Tobash
Davis	Hickernell	Neuman	Toepel
Dawkins	Hill	O'Brien	Toohil
Day	Irvin	O'Neill	Topper
Dean	James	Oberlander	Truitt
Deasy	Jozwiak	Ortitay	Vereb
DeLissio	Kampf	Parker, C.	Vitali
Delozier	Kaufner	Parker, D.	Ward
Dermody	Kauffman	Pashinski	Warner
Diamond	Kavulich	Payne	Watson
DiGirolamo	Keller, F.	Peifer	Wentling
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Wheatley
Driscoll	Keller, W.	Petri	Wheeland
Dunbar	Killion	Pickett	White
Dush	Kim	Quigley	Youngblood
Ellis	Kinsey	Quinn	Zimmerman
Emrick	Klunk	Rader	
English	Knowles	Rapp	Turzai,
Evankovich	Kortz	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Everett	Kotik		

Brothers" film. And those of us that were lucky to be here a few years ago, Matt Ryan brought every Pennsylvania member of Company E, 2d Battalion, 506th Parachute Infantry Regiment of the 101st Airborne. They were in this chamber and we honored them, and it was a great day.

Pennsylvania has many heroes, but these two gentlemen who were from my neighborhood, they were my friends, Bill and Babe. I worked with them down on the waterfront. They are two great gentlemen. They died recently. Representative Miccarelli honored them with a resolution on the floor of the House. And I am pleased to ask for a positive vote on this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—6

Baker	DeLuca	Kirkland	Pyle
Barbin	Evans		

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1279, PN 1967**, entitled:

An Act designating a section of Christopher Columbus Boulevard between Oregon Avenue and Washington Avenue in the City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia County, as the William J. Guarnere and Edward "Babe" Heffron Memorial Boulevard.

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 Keller is recognized.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is presented by the Motor License Fund of Pennsylvania. It is naming part of Columbus Boulevard in south Philadelphia for William "Wild Bill" Guarnere and Edward "Babe" Heffron. That is the neighborhood they were from. Everyone knows they are portrayed in the "Band of

YEAS—192

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—6

Baker DeLuca Kirkland Pyle
Barbin Evans

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 438, PN 389**, entitled:

An Act designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 982 over the Loyalhanna Creek, Westmoreland County, as the Lance Corporal Joseph E. Roble 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—192

Acosta	Fabrizio	Krieger	Readshaw
Adolph	Farina	Lawrence	Reed
Barrar	Farry	Lewis	Reese
Benninghoff	Fee	Longietti	Regan
Bishop	Flynn	Mackenzie	Roae
Bizzarro	Frankel	Maher	Roebuck
Bloom	Freeman	Mahoney	Ross
Boback	Gabler	Major	Rozzi
Boyle	Gainey	Maloney	Saccone
Bradford	Galloway	Markosek	Sainato
Briggs	Gergely	Marshall	Samuelson
Brown, R.	Gibbons	Marsico	Sankey
Brown, V.	Gillen	Masser	Santarsiero
Burns	Gillespie	Matzie	Santora
Caltagirone	Gingrich	McCarter	Saylor
Carroll	Godshall	McGinnis	Schemel
Causar	Goodman	McNeill	Schlossberg
Christiana	Greiner	Mentzer	Schreiber
Cohen	Grove	Metcalfe	Schweyer
Conklin	Hahn	Metzgar	Simmons
Corbin	Hanna	Miccarelli	Sims
Costa, D.	Harhai	Millard	Snyder
Costa, P.	Harhart	Miller, B.	Sonney
Cox	Harkins	Miller, D.	Staats
Cruz	Harper	Milne	Stephens

Culver	Harris, A.	Moul	Sturla
Cutler	Harris, J.	Mullery	Tallman
Daley, M.	Heffley	Murt	Taylor
Daley, P.	Helm	Mustio	Thomas
Davidson	Hennessey	Nesbit	Tobash
Davis	Hickernell	Neuman	Toepel
Dawkins	Hill	O'Brien	Toohil
Day	Irvin	O'Neill	Topper
Dean	James	Oberlander	Truitt
Deasy	Jozwiak	Ortitay	Vereb
DeLissio	Kampf	Parker, C.	Vitali
DeLozier	Kaufner	Parker, D.	Ward
Dermody	Kauffman	Pashinski	Warner
Diamond	Kavulich	Payne	Watson
DiGirolamo	Keller, F.	Peifer	Wentling
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Wheatley
Driscoll	Keller, W.	Petri	Wheeland
Dunbar	Killion	Pickett	White
Dush	Kim	Quigley	Youngblood
Ellis	Kinsey	Quinn	Zimmerman
Emrick	Klunk	Rader	
English	Knowles	Rapp	Turzai,
Evankovich	Kortz	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Everett	Kotik		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—6

Baker DeLuca Kirkland Pyle
Barbin Evans

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

Ordered, That the clerk return the same to the Senate with the information that the House has passed the same without amendment.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1385, PN 1960**, entitled:

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

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

The SPEAKER. 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 Markosek is recognized.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, higher education is a critical priority that we need to address, of course, in this budget. HB 1385 falls short of the Governor's plan to fully restore, over the next 2 years, funding for institutions of higher education, including our State-related universities such as Penn State.

My bill, HB 1126, would increase funding for Penn State by 11 percent and the Pennsylvania College of Technology by 7 percent. That is up in Williamsport. This bill would only increase funding for Penn State by 3 percent. However, however, it increases funding for the Pennsylvania College of Technology by 11 percent.

Just a few weeks ago, the Appropriations Committee traveled to Williamsport for regional hearings and meetings, and I must say that the two gentlemen from Lycoming were very gracious in hosting the committee there, and what we saw was really great. I had the pleasure of visiting the Pennsylvania College of Technology. We had a meeting there, and I was impressed with the campus and what they are achieving, and I know all members of the committee who attended were impressed as well.

Perhaps, had the committee traveled down the highway a little bit further, down to State College, the majority would be convinced that an 11-percent increase for all those students would be similarly justified. We can do better, we should do better, and we must do better before I can support this bill.

For that reason I ask all members to vote "no" on HB 1385. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dan Moul.

Mr. MOUL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will try to make this brief. I do this every year. I get up and speak about why we should not be doing this. I think it is mostly because of accountability. For all of you who are parents out there, think about this for a second. Your child walks up to you and says, "Mom, Dad, can I have 20 bucks?" What is the first question out of your mouth? We will all say it together, "What do you need it for?" Some of us say, "Only \$20?"

We give, and this year nearly a half a billion dollars, to just a handful of schools, and we do not even ask them how they are going to spend it. Sometimes I wonder, do they really need it when they can afford to pay a president of a university \$600,000 a year, when they supply him two jets instead of one, when they have enough money to go buy a law school that they really did not need? They are supposed to keep the tuitions down. At least that is what we were told years ago. That is why this was started. It helps to keep the tuitions down at these schools. And for that, two of these schools that we are getting ready to fund have the dubious distinction of being the number one and number two highest instate tuition in the country. So that is what we get for half a billion dollars.

You want to help students? What about students that go to other universities that are not on this list or that do not go to a State school that might not offer what they want to take? What about those students? What about the students that might go to York College, where I went, or Gettysburg or a whole list of other schools? We take somebody's tax money and send it to just a handful of schools, but all the students that go to these other schools for what it is they want to take, they get no benefit from it.

What we should be doing, it is like I say every single year, we should be starting a voucher program with this money. I do not have a problem with helping the students. I want to help the students. But to send the money to schools without asking them how they are going to spend it is irresponsible with the taxpayers' money. It is just irresponsible. You would not treat your child that way. We should not treat the taxpayers' money that way. Let us start a voucher program with this and give it to the students equally and fairly and let them spend it at any accredited school within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that they want, and it will definitely drive the prices of that tuition down. It will make them compete for that money, for those dollars.

To just hand it to them is the wrong way, and for that, once again, Mr. Speaker, I am going to be voting "no" on these.

Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. Representative Tom Killion.

Mr. KILLION. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in favor of HB 1385. We heard the last speaker talk about tuition. Well, tuition is relative. I have two daughters. I went to Penn State, so I am Penn State proud. I put two daughters through Penn State. One is fully, gainfully employed off my payroll. The other one is currently a grad student at a private college.

When my youngest got accepted to Villanova, Drexel, University of Pennsylvania, and Penn State, and I said, "Becca, it's your choice. It's your choice." Well, let me tell you, when she came and said, "Dad, I have thought about it. I want to go to Penn State," I breathed a huge sigh of relief.

Those other schools, I was looking at a tuition bill between fifty and sixty-five thousand dollars a year. My daughter went, including room and board, for a little bit over \$25,000 a year. We are blessed to have an institution like Penn State, a great institution, a world-class school that you can go to for \$25,000 a year.

I would like to see more, but in this budget climate, I bet Penn State is pleased to get a 3-percent increase. I ask the members to vote "yes" on HB 1385.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kate Harper.

Ms. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, rise to support Penn State, Pitt, Temple, and Lincoln's special appropriations. The money that the Commonwealth gives these universities is worth somewhere in the neighborhood of \$9,000 per student, per tuition; \$9,000. It is the difference for many people between whether they can go to college or not.

These are great institutions. They do a wonderful job educating our students, and I have got to tell you, I paid private school tuition. I know what that is like. I really think that it would be a terrible mistake for the minority party and its leaders not to support Penn State, Pitt, Temple, and Lincoln. These appropriations require a supermajority.

If the members do not support them, all of them, the appropriations will fail and they will get nothing, nothing. How can you go home and face your constituents if you vote against Penn State, Pitt, Temple, and Lincoln? How can you do it? I cannot. I will be supporting them, and I would ask that all of you support them. And for those of you who think you can get away with it by saying it was not enough money, then that result

is zero. Remember, the Governor's budget would have taxed room and board at these universities and at every other university in Pennsylvania. Do you really think that is better for Pitt, Penn State, Temple, and Lincoln? I do not. I ask that the members please support the appropriations to these fine universities to let your constituents have a shot at a great college education.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Curtis Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to HB 1385, and I rise in opposition to it for two reasons. Number one, Mr. Speaker, in the original proposal for these State-relateds, no one was able to tell me why one State-related university was appropriated an 11-percent increase and then only provided a 7-percent increase to Lincoln University. We talk about these State-relateds as a group, but we are unable to explain the disparity which existed in the beginning and it exists now. Lincoln University is a real anchor in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It is the only university in the United States where the Honorable Thurgood Marshall was educated, graduated, and became a shining star from Lincoln University. Kwame Nkrumah, President of Ghana, educated in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Temple University, University of Pittsburgh, Penn State, the last 4 years, the last 4 years they have suffered drastically, and, Mr. Speaker, they have been raising money privately and publicly to try and provide a quality education for the students to come to Temple. Temple University is in my district. I see the university every day. I witness the uncut diamonds that come in and go out shining, and that is why I support a Temple-made student.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Governor has proposed an 11-percent increase. I would propose a 22-percent increase, given how they have had to suffer these last 4 years and even before that, because we had almost 8 years where all we talked about was, "You didn't get a surplus, so now you have to suffer." And in the Governor's proposal, each of these universities has said that they would hold down tuition. Let me say that again. Each of these universities has committed themselves to hold down on tuition increases when it comes to the Governor's proposal.

So, Mr. Speaker, because the hour is late, I am not going to cave in on these State-relateds. I am not going to do that. I am going to stand strong and support the Governor's proposal and any additional revenues that can be provided to these very important bright lights in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania: Penn State, University of Pittsburgh, Temple University, Lincoln University. Go, go, go. Vote "no" on HB 1385.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kerry Benninghoff.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, rise and ask the members to support HB 1385. This is a line item to support our State-related universities. After the last couple of years when the economy had been a little tighter than it is this year, we are finally able to give them some additional funding, and I think we have to think about the fact that these universities may be located in certain areas geographically, but their outreach and the benefit is not only statewide but worldwide.

Several years ago when there was an outbreak that knocked out a large population of the honeybees and the ability for us to have our pollination occur with many of our food products, many were very concerned about prices soaring and the

resources being available. It was universities like Penn State University that addressed this problem and took it head-on. People not only in Pennsylvania were looking for the outreach of that work and what the results of that were going to be but across the world. These research universities provide many opportunities, not only for our children's education, but for you and I to live better, healthier lives. In this budget are additional dollars to address the Avian Flu problem, again, so Penn State's research department can try to help us address this growing problem not specifically to Pennsylvania but to our country as a whole.

These entities that wait on us to provide funding, Mr. Speaker, sit anxiously awaiting the numbers so they can finalize their own budgets on a fiscal year. We owe it to them to get it done tonight so they know where it is that they are going to be and they can set their tuition rates for our families and our friends throughout our community and those who choose to attend Penn State.

In addition, we have great universities, not only Penn State, Pitt, Temple, and Lincoln, but these universities provide tremendous research. A "no" vote tonight is voting against Hershey Medical Center, one of the premier cancer treatment centers; it is voting against our new, what I consider world-renowned Children's Hospital there at Hershey Medical Center, providing those of us who live in the midstate the ability to treat our families closer to home and not have to be traveling west and east to some of the larger institutions or even out of our own State. A vote against these higher institution appropriations does not just hurt those institutions, but it is the people that they serve, both in their student population and the tremendous results of the research that they provide.

I would ask you to join us in supporting this appropriation. When I spoke to Penn State's people and some of the others, they were pleased that we were able to give them something better this year, something additional than we were able to do in the past. They see that we are trying to make improvements and investments in higher education and the wonderful research they do for our communities.

Please join me in voting "yes" on HB 1385. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Matt Bradford.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to HB 1385 for one simple reason. It seems like there is a general case of amnesia that is striking this building. We are talking about some increase in higher education funding, but I think we are forgetting a 19-percent cut, a 19-percent cut that Governor Corbett made just 4 or 5 short years ago. And my colleague and friend across the aisle from Montgomery County, when she talks about a 3-percent increase, that is about a one-sixth restoration for what was cut 4 years ago and compounded for the 5 years since.

In Appropriations hearings, the leaders of these universities stood up and assured that a funding level less than what the Governor proposed was an assurance of another tuition increase this year. A vote for HB 1385 is a vote for a tuition increase, make no doubt about it.

Now, this amnesia may make one believe that saying, I am going to take away 18 and give back 3, well, that is called cut off my arm and give me back my pinky and say, "Well, you are ahead of the game." That is a rigged game, and it is not truthful, and it is not fair, and it is not the way we should talk to our young kids about how we educate them.

Now, let us get honest. We can talk about the Governor's budget proposal and what fees may have been taxed in it, but it also talks about a severance tax, and I do not see us talking about a severance tax to fund education in Pennsylvania. I hear us continue to talk about a 3-percent increase and look at that shiny object and hopefully you will not remember that 18-percent cut. People remember. Our schools had to cut services and had to cut teachers and professors.

What are we doing here to act like a vote against HB 1385 is anything other than what it is? A vote against HB 1385 is standing up for adequate funding for our State-related universities. It is saying that we are not going to continue what we have done for the last 5 years. We are not going to slash and burn education so that we can defend natural gas drillers, so that we can go on with the same old semantics. We need to start funding our schools at the appropriate level.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order.

The SPEAKER. Stop. Sir, please suspend. At this time, point of order, Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the gentleman is far afield regarding specifically school funding to higher ed.

The SPEAKER. Representative Bradford, you are directed, with respect to the bill in front of us, it is about the funding amount for Penn State University. If you could please stick to that topic, we would appreciate it.

Mr. BRADFORD. And respectfully, Mr. Speaker, the gentledady mentioned proposals in the—

The SPEAKER. Sir, hold on.

Mr. BRADFORD. —Governor's budget that were alternatives to this, so I think—

The SPEAKER. Representative Bradford, please suspend just for a second.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Representative Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do believe the gentledady talked about taxing room and board. She mentioned all those things, and we ought to be treated the same. We ought to be treated fairly. She opened the door. Representative Bradford is only refuting those statements.

The SPEAKER. Sir, at the time the good gentleman was speaking, an objection was raised, a point of order was raised. No point of order was raised during the other member's speaking. That is accurate.

Look, I have given some direction to the good gentleman.

Sir, you have 2 minutes left to — about 2 minutes and 12 seconds to continue. You may proceed, but with the admonition please stick to the bill in front of us.

Mr. BRADFORD. And again, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the admonition, but I think fairness dictates that if we are going to talk about alternatives to funding education in Pennsylvania and we are going to talk about the Governor's proposal, let us talk about it in total. Let us talk about a Governor's budget that proposes a severance tax to fund education. Let us talk about a full restoration of higher education funding, not about 3 percent when the cut was 18 percent 5 years ago.

The SPEAKER. Representative Bradford, if you might, just for a second, if you could come up with Leader Dermody just for a moment, please. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Bradford, may continue, sir.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So while some would prefer amnesia, what I say is let us get back to full restoration. A 19-percent cut to our State-relateds 5 years ago has stood for 5 years too long. Let us talk about really investing in education. Let us talk about passing a real severance tax. Let us do what is right by our higher ed. Let us get ourselves the Governor's budget with an 11-percent increase to make up for the cuts that have been sustained.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Representative Reed, point of order.

Mr. REED. No disrespect, but come on now. The gentleman voted against the funding for the Governor's budget and now wants to spend that money.

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

Mr. REED. If the gentleman would like us—

Mr. DERMODY. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. REED. —to bring that up again—

Mr. DERMODY. Point of order.

Mr. REED. —we will do so.

We will go over this bill, and we will bring it up again and see if the gentleman has the guts—

Mr. DERMODY. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. REED. —to vote for it today.

Mr. DERMODY. Point of order.

The SPEAKER. Members, members, members, please.

Boy, Sunday night. If I could have both leaders please come to the rostrum. Thank you.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Members, members, we will stand, we will stand in recess. Thank you.

Members, at this time we will stand in recess until 7:30. We will stand in recess until 7:30 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

CALENDAR CONTINUED

CONSIDERATION OF HB 1385 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Representative Bradford, the floor is yours.

My understanding is, the time left on the clock is 1 minute and 20 seconds, I believe. Let me just get an official read: 1 minute and 19 seconds.

You may proceed, sir.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I apologize for the delay. I do want to quickly go back and just sum up real quickly.

We need to fund education. We have an obligation to do it.

This bill falls woefully short of restoring the cuts that have been made over the last 5 years. That may be uncomfortable for

some. They may not want to vote for the revenue, like a severance tax, to deal with that underfunding, but the time to pass a severance tax and appropriately fund education is now. We waited too long. We should not question anyone's votes or character. We should just live with the hard reality. We have a revenue shortfall. We have cut education in the past. The people did not want that. They turned out a Governor over it. Now we have an opportunity to go in a different direction for Pennsylvania.

Let us go in a new direction for Pennsylvania. Let us adequately fund higher education. Let us do it by moving off of House bill whatever this is and let us move on to the Governor's plan to make partial restorations over 2 years and get us back to '08-'09 funding, which is the right thing to do for our students and for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Members, other than the leaders and the Appropriations chair, Representative Everett, Representative Conklin, Representative Dush, and Representative Christiana have asked to speak. After those individuals speak, I am going to give the opportunity to the leaders and the Appropriations chair. The last individual to speak will be the Appropriations chair, Bill Adolph.

Representative Miccarelli.

Mr. MICCARELLI. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MICCARELLI. Will a transcript of the conversation at the rostrum be available to the body following session this evening? I withdraw that.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

I can assure the Representative and the audience that—Well, let me just stop there.

Okay. Representative Everett is next, and then we will go to Representative Conklin.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support HB 1385 and the \$240 million that it would send to Penn State, which is a significant increase, \$6 million. And again, it may not be the increase that some would like to send there, but as I did last night when we were debating the budget bill, I will remind those in the chamber that though a severance tax may be very popular in Montgomery County, I can guarantee you in Lycoming County, Centre County, where the University Park main campus is and many of the other campuses are in Pennsylvania, a severance tax is not popular and nobody wants to see it. And I will not go into the whys and wherefores of that, but I will point out that if you want to spend more money as we pointed out last night, you have to be able to raise taxes and appropriate more revenue to do so.

We had the opportunity to do that here in this chamber, and neither the member from Montgomery County that spoke earlier or—

POINT OF ORDER

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. I think we have drifted from the bill that is at hand about voting for a nonpreferred, and I think we ought to be careful how we do our debate here this evening. I believe the gentleman is going into an area that is not related to this bill.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I would say that I am going exactly where the previous speaker went.

The SPEAKER. Representative Everett, just suspend for a second, please.

Look, it is clear that the leaders of both sides are asking for the debate to focus on the funding here with respect to Penn State, which is the subject of HB 1385. I would just direct the speaker and all members to please focus the rest of our comments on that particular issue. That will be for everybody who is going to speak, on both sides of the aisle, HB 1385. That has been recognized by both leaders and by the Speaker.

Representative Everett, you may continue, and you have 3 minutes and 51 seconds.

Mr. EVERETT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HB 1385 increases the funding for Pennsylvania State University, which I would also remind the members that that is not just main campus, and that is just not the Pennsylvania College of Technology in Williamsport. That is branch campuses throughout our Commonwealth that educate thousands and thousands of people who graduate, have more than 40,000 students across the Commonwealth. And you know, if that is what you want to do, if you do not want to fund Penn State and its many branch campuses, then you should vote against this bill. This is a significant increase. It is moving back toward where we may want to be, may need to be. As previous speakers have said, they may think that we fund these universities like Penn State more than we have already.

I would say that this is a robust increase for the Pennsylvania State University. I am an alum, two-time alum. My father was. My kids are. And I think it is a world-class university, that we are funding it sufficiently, and I can tell you that I have not been contacted by anybody from Penn State that is complaining about this appropriation.

I would ask for a "yes" vote, and I would again remind those that if you want to spend more money, you have got to be able to vote to raise more money.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The majority whip has indicated that Representative MILNE has asked to be placed on leave for the rest of the day. That request will be granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 1385 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Representative Conklin, the floor is yours, sir.

Mr. CONKLIN. I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I want to start out by saying there has been some discourse, and there is no way, Mr. Speaker, I am going to bring up that Republican amendment that was the largest tax increase in the State's history, which I am proud of my colleagues on this side who soundly voted it down, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to go there tonight. But where I am going to go is with my colleagues who were talking about, who were talking about standing up for higher education.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell you how proud I am to listen to the folks on the other side of the aisle saying it is time to stand up for Penn State, and I want to thank them for that because it is

time to stand up for Penn State, but it is also time to stand up for Lincoln and Temple and every other university in this State. It is time to stand up for those nonpreferreds. You know what, we can sit back and we can talk all we want, but history, history is the barometer of what is going on.

You see, year after year I said, "You know what? I'm going to go along with them. I'm going to believe what they're talking about." They are saying, "You know what, we are going to fund our universities." But all that I have seen is a \$91 million cut to our universities, \$91 million. And they put \$6 million back, and they say, "You know what, this is good enough, students." You know what, our universities promised they would not raise tuition if we were able to fund them, but now they are taking their promise, they are going to use it against them, Mr. Speaker. They are going to say, "You know what, see, we gave you a couple pennies and you're still raising tuition." That is not the deal.

The deal was that we made a commitment to our young people in Pennsylvania. We made a commitment that we can send them to a university like Lincoln and Temple and Pitt and Penn State and we can keep it affordable. I cannot tell you how proud I am every time I hear one of my colleagues stand up and talk about how great Penn State is. I cannot thank these alumni enough for being in this hall tonight. I cannot thank these alumni enough for sending their students and their children to Penn State University.

I want to thank you, but I want to thank you one more time. Stand with me. Stand with me tonight and say, "You know what, we've had enough of these cuts," that we can do better. Stand with me tonight, and do not vote for this. Stand up for those students. Stand up for funding. Let us not try to twist a \$91 million cut into something good.

Let us stand up and do something good. Let us stand up for our universities for a change. Let us stand up for our children that we are sending to Penn State and say, "You know what, we're going to help out our instate students. We're going to make sure they're funded properly." Let us stand up. Let us vote this down and come back with a good bill, something that we can be proud of, something that you can send your children to Penn State University and save a few dollars, that we can do it correctly, that we can make these kids benefit, because, you know, not every child is wealthy. Not every child has a father who is a legislator or a mother that is a legislator. Not every child comes from a rich family. You know, these students have to take out student loans and they are strapped with those for almost half their life after they come out.

We have an opportunity to do it right now. I know we kid around and we mess around and we try to find the best way to go and we try to take the political advantage, but this time I am asking you, stick to your words. Stand up for higher ed tonight. Stand up for what you believe in and vote "no." Fund your children's education. Fund the next generation. Let us not try to twist this. Let us not try to tell our children we are giving them steak when we are giving them tofu because they need red meat. They need to get out there and do the right thing.

Stand with me, stand with the children, stand with the taxpayers, and let us put that \$91 million back. Vote "no."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dush waives off.

Representative Christiana.

Mr. CHRISTIANA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the members to support HB 1385, which represents a real 3.6-percent increase for Penn State and its branch campuses, a real \$8.4 million increase, not some theoretical increase that may happen or that someone may have proposed. And what that is is an opportunity for us to increase funding for Penn State.

But what we are hearing is that we should vote this down and have a 100-percent defunding of Penn State so that we are in a better position to negotiate and leverage for more. But to the public that is out there, there is an alternative. We could pass this bill, have an on-time budget with a modest 3.6-percent increase, and if the Governor and others on the other side of the aisle want more, we could come back and continue to negotiate and do a supplemental budget. If you get the votes to raise taxes for more funding, you do not have to shut down the government. You do not have to defund Penn State's allocation. We can come back and do that afterwards.

I think it is reckless to stand here and say that we should vote this down, go into the next fiscal year with no money for these kids in this institution, and say that there is this theoretical increase that might happen in a week or so if we just vote it down. I also think it is shortsighted to talk about ways to help parents that are going to these institutions and support a proposal that adds tax increases. Thank goodness the kids that this will help are not paying tax increases on books. Thank goodness. This may not be a big enough increase, but the good news is to the parents, they currently in Pennsylvania are not paying sales tax on books. They are not paying taxes on meal plans or room and board. This is an institutional funding bill. That is true. And it needs to be funded by revenue sources that individuals pay. And so I do not think it is actually anywhere off the course of reasonable debate to talk about the taxes that will pay for this or a theoretical increase, a larger increase, which is the sole reason the other side of the aisle is threatening to vote against this tonight, which we do need their votes because of this bill needing two-thirds to pass it.

The House Republicans, I think, are committed and the Senate Republicans are committed to getting this on-time budget on the Governor's desk on time, but this is one part where we cannot do that. We need two-thirds of the chamber. And if that means the other side of the aisle does not help send this bill to the Senate, that means July 1, there are no dollars going to the Penn State institutions and its branch campuses.

I am not prepared to do that, Mr. Speaker. I am prepared to send this bill to the Senate. And if we want to negotiate long into the summer for additional funding or higher tax increases, the other side of the aisle that would like to finally vote for, then maybe we will do that. But let us not shut down Penn State because of that wish list and theoretical increase.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. Representative Murt. Tom Murt has an inquiry, please.

Mr. MURT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry and request a ruling concerning my potential conflict I may have under House rule 65 and by extension Article III, section 13, of our Pennsylvania Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, essentially my inquiry is whether or not as an adjunct faculty member at Penn State Abington, I will be permitted to vote on HB 1385, which is before us for final passage at this time?

The SPEAKER. Sir, in discussing with the Parliamentarian, you are a member of a class. This is not specific to you personally, and you may without conflict vote on this particular bill, HB 1385.

Mr. MURT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. At this time Representative Sturla has the floor.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in fiscal year '11-'12, this line, this bill, this particular appropriation that we do, nonpreferred, was cut 19 percent. The next year in 2012, that 19-percent cut was sustained again for a compounded 38 percent. In '13-'14, it was cut again by 19 percent, for a compounded 57-percent cut. In '14-'15, that 19-percent cut was sustained again for a 76-percent cut total, and now this proposal to cut it only 16 percent over the 2010-2011 funding level, for a grand total of 92 percent cut, almost a full year's worth of funding gone to this institution.

Mr. Speaker, even if we sustain the 16-percent cuts instead of the 19-percent cuts, and we only make it 13 percent next year and 10 percent the year after that and 7 percent the year after that and 4-percent cut the year after that, by the time we get to the year 2020, it will be another 50-percent cut from this institution.

Mr. Speaker, we wonder why college tuitions are on the rise. We sit and ponder why we are one of the bottom States in terms of funding for higher education on a per capita basis, and yet the numbers are pretty simple. It is because we do not fund them.

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Mike Vereb waives off.

Representative Mark Mustio, the floor is yours. Representative Mustio waives off.

Representative John Maher.

Mr. MAHER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The importance of education was perhaps illustrated by the terrible arithmetic we just heard. I will not waste our precious time going through the corrections on that homework.

I will observe that those who are simply against funding State-related universities, I have no particular advice other than to wish you felt otherwise. But those who claim that they support our State-related universities, and Penn State in particular, have a very clear option that sends a very positive message to the students and the families of those students and all those associated with these universities, which is to understand that we can appropriate today what we perceive as being available, and in the future, if we perceive that additional funds are available, there certainly could be a supplemental appropriation. But for the families who have to make tuition payments, keep in mind in the next week or so Penn State will be setting the tuition for the fall. The bills go out almost immediately thereafter. The bills must be paid by August 7. And if the message that you send with a "no" vote today is that the universities cannot depend and count on any State support when they set those tuition rates and when they send out their tuition bills, I think you are gambling with the future of these students and their families.

If you really believe that Penn State and the other State-relateds deserve support – and I would be with you in seeking higher support if we knew where that money was coming from

– but if you really believe that you want to support the university, you have got to vote "yes" today. And when somebody asks, "Where does the money go?" I will just observe – and, Mr. Speaker, you may wish to rule me out of order because I am most familiar with the University of Pittsburgh, where for the record I have served as a trustee at times with other members of this General Assembly; Representative Frankel was an outstanding trustee – the amount of tuition discount given to Pennsylvania students is about 2 1/2 times the entire State support that we provide. That is a pretty good return for our Pennsylvanians, 2 1/2 times.

Now, I do not know what the statistics are for the other State-relateds, but I would ask you again, let us not put these families and these students in an intersection where you are saying, yeah, you are for them, but you are going to vote against them. If there is more money at a future time, let us bring up a supplemental appropriation. But today the question is, do you want to support Penn State? Do you want to support the other State-relateds? And if your answer to that is genuinely yes, there is only one vote, and that is "yes."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Members, we are going to turn to the leaders and then to the Appropriations chair. I know Leader Dermody wishes to speak.

Leader Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago Governor Corbett proposed a 50-percent cut to our State-related universities. He voted for a 19-percent cut. We did not. And you voted to sustain those cuts for 4 years. The results of those cuts were significant tuition increases at all of our State-related universities. Our families, our kids, they paid more, significantly more, because of those cuts.

This year, Governor Wolf has proposed an 11-percent increase in the subsidies to our State-related universities. At the Appropriations hearings, the four presidents of those State universities stated that with that increase they would be able to hold the line on tuition increases. Make no mistake about it, this is a vote for a tuition increase.

We can do better, we should do better, and we will not vote "yes" until we do better. That is that simple.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think earlier one of the speakers mentioned that these nonpreferreds require a two-thirds vote, and I believe the speaker even mentioned that they really could not get this passed without the help of the Democratic Caucus. If that were really the case and they were serious about getting this passed, would you not have come to us, would the Republican Caucus not have come to us and said, "Look, we know you have a bill in that reflects the Governor's 11-percent increase for Penn State and the other nonpreferreds. We want to work with you and do something. Let's talk." Instead, no. That did not happen.

Unilaterally, the Republican Caucus came up with these nonpreferred appropriation bills, which we had no input on. If they needed our votes, why did they not talk to us?

Let me just say what a "no" vote on these nonpreferred bills is. A "no" vote is a vote against an increased tuition, because in our Appropriations hearings, we had all of the nonpreferred, State-related presidents in front of us, and the main question at those hearings, probably got asked more than any other

question, was, what are you doing about tuition, what do you need to keep tuition down, and how can we help you do that? And basically they said that the Governor's proposal would give them a chance to do that. That is what I introduced. Instead, we have this, a unilateral bill in front of us now. No input, but yet folks expect us to put up our votes for something that we have no say in. I do not know anybody that would do that.

And you know, there is a lot of talk in here tonight about how great Penn State is, and I am sure they feel the same way about the other nonpreferreds. We all feel the same way about these. Every member in this body is for Penn State and Pitt and Lincoln and Temple and the veterinary school. A "no" vote does not mean that you are against those institutions. What it means is, you want a chance to negotiate something that will really help them, not this bill, not these bills that will essentially be tuition-increase bills if they are eventually passed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of you to consider that and vote "no" so that we can get to the table and come up with good bills for nonpreferred universities, nonpreferred entities in Pennsylvania, and move forward to protect our students and the stakeholders of these wonderful institutions.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Adolph.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of HB 1385.

And I will just give you a little history that I have seen through experience here regarding these nonpreferred appropriation bills. I have been here when we have had previous administrations that would like to take the entire four State-related universities' appropriation completely out of the General Fund and set up slot machines in order to fund these educations. That was something that I did not think would work. I was in the minority. I stood up against that Governor. Four years ago I was in the majority, and that administration wanted to cut the nonpreferreds for this institution by 50 percent. I was the first person in this chamber to say I cannot support that type of cut, but to stand here tonight and say a "no" vote is showing support for that university and for those students, I do not understand.

This budget process is about having a balanced budget. The gentleman from Allegheny County is absolutely correct. If negotiations go on, there can be supplemental appropriations, but for those that have said that this chamber and this budget is not friendly with Penn State University, if you add up all their appropriations, it is over \$440 million throughout the budget in various departments and in various grants, \$220 million in this proposal, a \$6.4 million increase.

And let us not forget about Pennsylvania College of Technology, which, as Chairman Markosek mentioned, I visited not too long ago. The first time I went to Williamsport, very impressed with that institution. Something like 99 percent of all their graduates have jobs upon graduation. Fantastic. Obviously, their tuition is peanuts compared to Penn State, based upon enrollment, but they are getting an 11.4-percent increase. A vote "no" is a vote against that small institution tonight.

I do not have a crystal ball. I do not know what is going to happen in the next months ahead, but I do know we are going to be sending an awful lot of our students to Penn State University and I certainly would like to see them receive this type of funding. Do not forget what the Pennsylvania Higher Education

Assistance Agency supplies those students that go there, close to \$500 million for about 170,000 kids statewide to various universities. So the taxpayers of Pennsylvania are putting their hard-earned tax dollars into a lot of good higher education institutions – State-owned, State-related, and private.

So a "yes" vote tonight is a "yes" vote toward those universities. I do not want to micromanage Penn State University, but I do know they deserve this appropriation and they deserve to move this process. Please, let us try to put politics aside and help these universities help our students get educated. Please support HB 1385. Thank you so much.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to HB 1385 not because I believe in prolonging the process or barring this fine institution from receiving funding, but because I voted against a budget bill yesterday that did not appropriate enough funding for our educational system as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, while the Republican-proposed budget offered a 3-percent increase for institutions of higher education, by contrast the Governor proposed increases between 7 and 11 percent. This institution, its educators, and students deserve more. Mr. Speaker, this minimal increase is not enough for any of our institutions of higher education and will likely force each institution to increase tuition costs.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will be voting "no" on HB 1385 because this nonpreferred bill, sponsored by the Representative from Delaware County, contains only a fraction of the Governor's requested funding increase, and I will not stop fighting for appropriate levels of funding for all of our educational institutions.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—110

Adolph	Gingrich	Maher	Ross
Barrar	Godshall	Major	Saccone
Benninghoff	Greiner	Marshall	Sankey
Bloom	Grove	Marsico	Santora
Boback	Hahn	Masser	Saylor
Brown, R.	Harhart	Mentzer	Schemel
Causar	Harper	Metzgar	Simmons
Christiana	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Sonney
Corbin	Heffley	Millard	Staats
Cox	Helm	Miller, B.	Stephens
Culver	Hennessey	Murt	Tallman
Cutler	Hickernell	Mustio	Taylor
Day	Hill	Nesbit	Tobash
Delozier	Irvin	O'Neill	Toepel
Diamond	James	Oberlander	Toohil
DiGirolo	Jozwiak	Ortitay	Topper
Dunbar	Kampf	Parker, D.	Truitt
Dush	Kaufner	Payne	Vereb
Ellis	Kauffman	Peifer	Ward
Emrick	Keller, F.	Petri	Warner
English	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Watson
Evankovich	Killion	Quigley	Wentling

Everett	Klunk	Quinn	Wheeland
Farry	Knowles	Rader	White
Fee	Krieger	Reed	Zimmerman
Gabler	Lawrence	Reese	
Gillen	Lewis	Regan	Turzai,
Gillespie	Mackenzie	Roae	Speaker

NAYS—81

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Baker	DeLuca	Kirkland	Pyle
Barbin	Evans	Milne	

Less than the two-thirds majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the bill fell.

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1386, PN 1961**, entitled:

A Supplement to the act of July 28, 1966 (3rd Sp.Sess., P.L.87, No.3), entitled "An act providing for the establishment and operation of the University of Pittsburgh as an instrumentality of the Commonwealth to serve as a State-related university in the higher education system of the Commonwealth; providing for change of name; providing for the composition of the board of trustees; terms of trustees, and the power and duties of such trustees; authorizing appropriations in amounts to be fixed annually by the General Assembly; providing for the auditing of accounts of expenditures from said appropriations; providing for public support and capital improvements; authorizing the issuance of bonds exempt from taxation within the Commonwealth; requiring the chancellor to make an annual report of the operations of the University of Pittsburgh," making appropriations for carrying the same into effect; and providing for a basis for payments of such appropriations, for a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

The SPEAKER. 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 Markosek.
Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, not to belabor the point, this, again, is – these all, the rest of these, are pretty much the same. We had no input, and they are tuition-increase bills. I would recommend a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. Representative Adolph.

Mr. ADOLPH. This is a "yes" vote to help this fine institution and the students be able to make a better life for themselves. A "no" vote is shutting down their appropriation. So, please, vote "yes."

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to HB 1386 not because I believe in prolonging the process or barring this fine institution from receiving funding, but because I voted against a budget bill yesterday that did not appropriate enough funding for our educational system as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, while the Republican-proposed budget offered a 3-percent increase for institutions of higher education, by contrast the Governor proposed increases between 7 and 11 percent. This institution, its educators, and students deserve more. Mr. Speaker, this minimal increase is not enough for any of our institutions of higher education and will likely force each institution to increase tuition costs.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will be voting "no" on HB 1386 because this nonpreferred bill, sponsored by the Representative from Delaware County, contains only a fraction of the Governor's requested funding increase, and I will not stop fighting for appropriate levels of funding for all of our educational institutions.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—111

Adolph	Godshall	Major	Ross
Barrar	Greiner	Marshall	Saccone
Benninghoff	Grove	Marsico	Sankey
Bloom	Hahn	Masser	Santora
Boback	Harhart	Mentzer	Saylor
Brown, R.	Harper	Metzgar	Schemel
Causar	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Simmons
Christiana	Heffley	Millard	Sonney
Corbin	Helm	Miller, B.	Staats
Cox	Hennessey	Murt	Stephens
Culver	Hickernell	Mustio	Tallman
Cutler	Hill	Nesbit	Taylor
Day	Irvin	O'Neill	Tobash
Delozier	James	Oberlander	Toepel
Diamond	Jozwiak	Ortitay	Toohil
DiGirolamo	Kampf	Parker, D.	Topper

Dunbar	Kaufer	Payne	Truitt
Dush	Kauffman	Peifer	Vereb
Ellis	Keller, F.	Petri	Ward
Emrick	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Warner
English	Killion	Quigley	Watson
Evankovich	Klunk	Quinn	Wentling
Everett	Knowles	Rader	Wheeland
Farry	Krieger	Rapp	White
Fee	Lawrence	Reed	Zimmerman
Gabler	Lewis	Reese	
Gillen	Mackenzie	Regan	Turzai,
Gillespie	Maher	Roae	Speaker
Gingrich			

NAYS—80

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Baker	DeLuca	Kirkland	Pyle
Barbin	Evans	Milne	

Less than the two-thirds majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the bill fell.

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1387, PN 1962**, entitled:

A Supplement to the act of November 30, 1965 (P.L.843, No.355), entitled "An act providing for the establishment and operation of Temple University as an instrumentality of the Commonwealth to serve as a State-related university in the higher education system of the Commonwealth; providing for change of name; providing for the composition of the board of trustees; terms of trustees, and the power and duties of such trustees; providing for preference to Pennsylvania residents in tuition; providing for public support and capital improvements; authorizing appropriations in amounts to be fixed annually by the General Assembly; providing for the auditing of accounts of expenditures from said appropriations; authorizing the issuance of bonds exempt from taxation within the Commonwealth; requiring the President to make an annual report of the operations of Temple University," making an appropriation for carrying the same into effect; providing for a basis for payments of such appropriation; and providing a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

The SPEAKER. 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 Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is the nonpreferred appropriation for Temple University, and since you have all memorized all of my remarks, I am not going to repeat them. Vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Representative Adolph, on HB 1387.

Mr. ADOLPH. Vote "yes" for the appropriation for Temple University, the home of the Temple Owls, a great inner-city university that takes care of some of the poorest families in our Commonwealth. I hate to see them without this type of funding.

Thank you.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to HB 1387 not because I believe in prolonging the process or barring this fine institution from receiving funding, but because I voted against a budget bill yesterday that did not appropriate enough funding for our educational system as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, while the Republican-proposed budget offered a 3-percent increase for institutions of higher education, by contrast the Governor proposed increases between 7 and 11 percent. This institution, its educators, and students deserve more. Mr. Speaker, this minimal increase is not enough for any of our institutions of higher education and will likely force each institution to increase tuition costs.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will be voting "no" on HB 1387 because this nonpreferred bill, sponsored by the Representative from Delaware County, contains only a fraction of the Governor's requested funding increase, and I will not stop fighting for appropriate levels of funding for all of our educational institutions.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—111

Adolph	Godshall	Major	Ross
Barrar	Greiner	Marshall	Saccone
Benninghoff	Grove	Marsico	Sankey
Bloom	Hahn	Masser	Santora
Boback	Harhart	Mentzer	Saylor
Brown, R.	Harper	Metzgar	Schemel
Causar	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Simmons
Christiana	Heffley	Millard	Sonney
Corbin	Helm	Miller, B.	Staats

Cox	Hennessey	Murt	Stephens
Culver	Hickernell	Mustio	Tallman
Cutler	Hill	Nesbit	Taylor
Day	Irvin	O'Neill	Tobash
Delozier	James	Oberlander	Toepel
Diamond	Jozwiak	Ortitay	Toohil
DiGirolo	Kampf	Parker, D.	Topper
Dunbar	Kaufner	Payne	Truitt
Dush	Kauffman	Peifer	Vereb
Ellis	Keller, F.	Petri	Ward
Emrick	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Warner
English	Killion	Quigley	Watson
Evankovich	Klunk	Quinn	Wentling
Everett	Knowles	Rader	Wheeland
Farry	Krieger	Rapp	White
Fee	Lawrence	Reed	Zimmerman
Gabler	Lewis	Reese	
Gillen	Mackenzie	Regan	Turzai,
Gillespie	Maher	Roae	Speaker
Gingrich			

NAYS—80

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Baker	DeLuca	Kirkland	Pyle
Barbin	Evans	Milne	

Less than the two-thirds majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the bill fell.

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1388, PN 1963**, entitled:

A Supplement to the act of July 7, 1972 (P.L.743, No.176), entitled "An act providing for the establishment and operation of Lincoln University as an instrumentality of the Commonwealth to serve as a State-related institution in the higher education system of the Commonwealth; providing for change of name; providing for the composition of the board of trustees; terms of trustees, and the power and duties of such trustees; providing for preference to Pennsylvania residents in tuition; authorizing appropriations in amounts to be fixed annually by the General Assembly; providing for the auditing of accounts of expenditures from said appropriations; providing for public support and capital improvements; authorizing the issuance of bonds exempt from taxation within the Commonwealth; requiring the President to make an annual report of the operations of Lincoln

University," making an appropriation for carrying the same into effect; providing for a basis for payments of the appropriation; and providing a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

The SPEAKER. 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 Markosek is recognized.
Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
This is the Lincoln University nonpreferred appropriation. I am asking the members to please vote "no."

The SPEAKER. And Representative Lawrence, on HB 1388, sir.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
I would just like to take a moment to speak on Lincoln University. It is in my district, and I am a former board member of the institution.

I would just like to say that Lincoln University has a proud history and a commitment to the students it serves, and the board of Lincoln has made the decision, I believe, I believe, I could be wrong on this, but I believe it is the only of the State-relateds or the State schools that has committed to holding the line on tuition for students regardless of what this General Assembly does for the next year. I say that to show the commitment of the institution to the students it serves.

I also think it is important to mention that should this bill fail today, unlike, just to speak very candidly, Penn State, which probably has the resources, frankly, to open without the appropriation that we provide to them, I think it is fair to say there might be a real question as to whether the doors will be open this fall if Lincoln University does not receive its appropriation from the Commonwealth. If you look at the percentage that the State appropriation is of each of the State-relateds' budgets, I believe Penn State's is 2 percent. Our appropriation is 2 percent, I believe. I have been told it is a little higher than that of Penn State's total budget. With Lincoln it is close to 20 percent.

I would just encourage the members – I understand that we may have political differences and I understand there are legitimate policy differences that we may have – but I would just encourage, particularly only on this vote for Lincoln University, to think twice before casting a "no" vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
The SPEAKER. Representative Adolph, Representative Adolph, on HB 1388.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you.
Obviously, I would love you to vote for this bill because Lincoln University is different than the other three State-related universities. But I also want to remind some of my good friends on the other side of the aisle, the last 2 years none of these universities received increases and we got two-thirds vote here. So now we are going to give them a 3-percent increase and you are voting "no." So how do you vote for a zero increase and in

the following year the same universities receive a 3-percent increase and you are voting "no"?

Please let us get this done. Let us help Lincoln University. Please support this appropriation. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek, for the second time.

Mr. MARKOSEK. I was not going to speak the second time, but the reason why they did not get anything the last couple of years is because of the Republican majority as well as the Governor at the time that cut them, cut the heck out of them. That is why they did not have it, and now we throw them a bone at 3 percent. Let us do better. Let us say "no" to this and negotiate something better for all of these nonpreferred universities. Thank you.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to HB 1388 not because I believe in prolonging the process or barring this fine institution from receiving funding, but because I voted against a budget bill yesterday that did not appropriate enough funding for our educational system as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, while the Republican-proposed budget offered a 3-percent increase for institutions of higher education, by contrast the Governor proposed increases between 7 and 11 percent. This institution, its educators, and students deserve more. Mr. Speaker, this minimal increase is not enough for any of our institutions of higher education and will likely force each institution to increase tuition costs.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will be voting "no" on HB 1388 because this nonpreferred bill, sponsored by the Representative from Delaware County, contains only a fraction of the Governor's requested funding increase, and I will not stop fighting for appropriate levels of funding for all of our educational institutions.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring, Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—111

Table listing names of representatives who voted 'Yeas' (111 total): Adolph, Barrar, Benninghoff, Bloom, Boback, Brown, R., Causer, Christiana, Corbin, Cox, Culver, Cutler, Day, DeLozier, Diamond, DiGirolamo, Dunbar, Dush, Godshall, Greiner, Grove, Hahn, Harhart, Harper, Harris, A., Heffley, Helm, Hennessey, Hickernell, Hill, Irvin, James, Jozwiak, Kampf, Kaufner, Kauffman, Major, Marshall, Marsico, Masser, Mentzer, Metzgar, Miccarelli, Millard, Miller, B., Murt, Mustio, Nesbit, O'Neill, Oberlander, Ortitay, Parker, D., Payne, Peifer, Ross, Saccone, Sankey, Santora, Saylor, Schemel, Simmons, Sonney, Staats, Stephens, Tallman, Taylor, Tobash, Toepel, Toohil, Topper, Truitt, Vereb.

Table listing names of representatives who voted 'Nays' (80 total): Ellis, Emrick, English, Evankovich, Everett, Farry, Fee, Gabler, Gillen, Gillespie, Gingrich, Keller, F., Keller, M.K., Killion, Klunk, Knowles, Krieger, Lawrence, Lewis, Mackenzie, Maher, Petri, Pickett, Quigley, Quinn, Rader, Rapp, Reed, Reese, Regan, Roae, Ward, Warner, Watson, Wentling, Wheeland, White, Zimmerman, Turzai, Speaker.

NAYS—80

Table listing names of representatives who voted 'Nays' (80 total): Acosta, Bishop, Bizzarro, Boyle, Bradford, Briggs, Brown, V., Burns, Caltagirone, Carroll, Cohen, Conklin, Costa, D., Costa, P., Cruz, Daley, M., Daley, P., Davidson, Davis, Dawkins, Dean, Deasy, DeLissio, Dermody, Donatucci, Driscoll, Fabrizio, Farina, Flynn, Frankel, Freeman, Gainey, Galloway, Gergely, Gibbons, Goodman, Hanna, Harhai, Harkins, Harris, J., Kavulich, Keller, W., Kim, Kinsey, Kortz, Kotik, Longietti, Mahoney, Maloney, Markosek, Matzie, McCarter, McGinnis, McNeill, Metcalfe, Miller, D., Moul, Mullery, Neuman, O'Brien, Parker, C., Pashinski, Petrarca, Ravenstahl, Readshaw, Roebuck, Rozzi, Sainato, Samuelson, Santarsiero, Schlossberg, Schreiber, Schweyer, Sims, Snyder, Sturla, Thomas, Vitali, Wheatley, Youngblood.

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Table listing names of representatives who were excused (7 total): Baker, Barbin, DeLuca, Evans, Kirkland, Milne, Pyle.

Less than the two-thirds majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the bill fell.

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of HB 1389, PN 1964, entitled:

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

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

The SPEAKER. 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 Markosek, on the bill. Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is the nonpreferred appropriation for the University of Pennsylvania veterinary school, and again, I would ask all of us,

let us vote "no." Let us go negotiate something a heck of a lot better for them than what is in this tuition-increase bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Adolph.

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

I would like to bring out – these are just numbers – last year the University of Pennsylvania veterinary school received \$28 million and they also received \$261,000 for the Center for Infectious Diseases. In the Governor's proposal in 2015, they were level-funded. Governor Wolf level-funded the only veterinary university in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. This proposal increases it by 3 percent, an additional \$840,000. I do not know what type of increase the chairman knows that the Governor does not agree with because here is his proposal. He was a zero increase. We are proposing to increase it by 3 percent, \$840,000, and they still want to vote "no." I do not know what they are drinking on the other side of the aisle, but it is certainly not math. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. Representative Ross.

Mr. ROSS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had the opportunity to talk to some of the representatives of the University of Pennsylvania veterinary school about the proposed appropriation. They are satisfied with the appropriation as we suggested, so therefore, since they are comfortable with this, believe that they can perform the valuable services necessary to protect the farm assets that we have here in Pennsylvania, the farm animals, and make sure that we do not have infectious diseases going through the farmer community. We have earlier voted for money to help with avian flu prevention.

I think it is critical that we send a clear message on this critical issue to make sure that we continue to provide the services, the veterinary services that this Commonwealth needs for their farming industry, and I hope that we will see reason today and give the University of Pennsylvania veterinary school what they have asked for.

The SPEAKER. Representative Mullery.

Mr. MULLERY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will throw some numbers out. A \$9.6 billion endowment, up \$1.4 billion since last year. At \$28 million, they have got enough for 350 years' worth of funding when we are here scratching for pennies. Vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Representative Boback, followed by Representative Watson.

Ms. BOBACK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Avian flu, avian flu. Have you heard of it? Dangerous, coming our way. I happen to serve on the Agriculture Committee, and the University of Pennsylvania had a seat, had a seat in our discussions. We are talking about the Center for Infectious Diseases. We are talking about the veterinarian school. And I, too, like Representative Ross, have spoken with the representatives, and they are willing to start with this 3 percent. They need it, we need protection, and they are there for us.

I say vote "yes," University of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Watson.

Mrs. WATSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In full disclosure, yes, I am a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, not of the veterinary school. The veterinary school came to speak to me, and as you have heard others talk, indeed they were happy with the 3 percent.

I must correct the record respectfully, sir, and tell you that having attended and well aware all those years ago when the big thing for the veterinary school was probably dinosaurs roaming the earth, but regardless of that, the veterinary school has always been almost the unwanted child of the University of Pennsylvania. When you talk about endowments, when you look that up, the veterinary school does not have access to any of that. The veterinary school did not— They have their own smaller endowment. The veterinary school did not raise tuition. It is highly sought after to attend there. They were very concerned. They have gone and gotten outside funding and have done all of that. So they are making due, and they really protect our farm industry first in Pennsylvania.

I would also mention that it was so important to this body that later the veterinary school named their hospital there for small animals as the Matthew J. Ryan Veterinary Hospital, former Speaker Ryan, but to suggest that they have that kind of money and all behind them, they do not. They are a separate entity of the University of Pennsylvania, and they do not have access, quite frankly, to that wonderful endowment, which gave me a free academic scholarship. So I am very grateful to the university. Well, I got money and I got to go to a good school, and my parents could not have afforded to send me. So that was a good thing. So I am appreciative. But Penn certainly is not behind the veterinary school as they should be.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Roebuck.

Mr. ROEBUCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would point out that the University of Pennsylvania veterinary school is in my legislative district. In fact, I can walk to it from my home. It is a great institution, but it deserves better support from this legislature. I would urge you to vote "no" on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Representative Petrarca.

Mr. PETRARCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think if the veterinary school needs money, maybe they can get it from the \$9.6 billion endowment that they have – the endowment was less than \$8 billion 2 years ago when I spoke against their appropriation – or maybe they can take it from the \$2 million they pay their president every year.

I think when you look at the University of Pennsylvania, my biggest problem with that university is, I do not believe that they educate enough Pennsylvania students, certainly no Pennsylvania students in the numbers that I think they should be from western Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Miccarelli.

Mr. MICCARELLI. First and foremost, in regards to the last speaker, the University of Pennsylvania educates more students from the State of Pennsylvania than any other State, than all of their foreign students combined. There are many members of this body that are graduates, yours truly included.

On top of that, I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is the height of hypocrisy for the other side to tell us here today that we can do better. We can do better than zero percent, and that is exactly what this bill does and that is why we should support it. The other side wants zero, a flat fund, for the University of Pennsylvania, and if they vote "no" on this, there will be zero dollars, there will be zero dollars for the University of Pennsylvania veterinary school.

More than that, it is not like students can go to another vet school here in Pennsylvania, because there is only one, and that is why we have to continue to support it.

As the gentlelady from Bucks County said, there is no endowment. The University of Pennsylvania veterinary school is not a rich, big institution that people are making it out to be. We need to support them as they support the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Vote "yes."

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to HB 1389 not because I believe in prolonging the process or barring this fine institution from receiving funding, but because I voted against a budget bill yesterday that did not appropriate enough funding for our educational system as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, while the Republican-proposed budget offered a 3-percent increase for institutions of higher education, by contrast the Governor proposed increases between 7 and 11 percent. This institution, its educators, and students deserve more. Mr. Speaker, this minimal increase is not enough for any of our institutions of higher education and will likely force each institution to increase tuition costs.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will be voting "no" on HB 1389 because this nonpreferred bill, sponsored by the Representative from Delaware County, contains only a fraction of the Governor's requested funding increase, and I will not stop fighting for appropriate levels of funding for all of our educational institutions.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring, Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—111

Table listing names of representatives who voted 'yea', including Adolph, Barrar, Benninghoff, Bloom, Boback, Brown, R., Causer, Christiana, Corbin, Cox, Culver, Cutler, Daley, P., Day, DeLozier, Diamond, DiGirolamo, Dunbar, Dush, Ellis, English, Evankovich, Everett, Godshall, Greiner, Groves, Hahn, Harhart, Harper, Harris, A., Heffley, Helm, Hennessey, Hickernell, Hill, Irvin, James, Jozwiak, Kampf, Kauffer, Kauffman, Keller, F., Keller, M.K., Killion, Klunk, Knowles, Major, Marshall, Marsico, Masser, Mentzer, Metzgar, Miccarelli, Millard, Miller, B., Murt, Mustio, Nesbit, O'Neill, Oberlander, Ortitay, Parker, D., Payne, Peifer, Petri, Pickett, Quigley, Quinn, Rader, Ross, Saccone, Sankey, Santora, Saylor, Schemel, Simmons, Sonney, Staats, Stephens, Tallman, Taylor, Tobash, Toepel, Toohil, Topper, Truitt, Vereb, Ward, Warner, Watson, Wentling, Wheeland.

Table listing names of representatives who voted 'nay', including Farry, Fee, Gabler, Gillen, Gillespie, Gingrich, Krieger, Lawrence, Lewis, Mackenzie, Maher, Rapp, Reed, Reese, Regan, Roae, White, Zimmerman, Turzai, Speaker.

NAYS—80

Table listing names of representatives who voted 'nay', including Acosta, Bishop, Bizzarro, Boyle, Bradford, Briggs, Brown, V., Burns, Caltagirone, Carroll, Cohen, Conklin, Costa, D., Costa, P., Cruz, Daley, M., Davidson, Davis, Dawkins, Dean, Deasy, DeLissio, Dermody, Donatucci, Driscoll, Emrick, Fabrizio, Farina, Flynn, Frankel, Freeman, Gainey, Galloway, Gergely, Gibbons, Goodman, Hanna, Harhai, Harkins, Harris, J., Kavulich, Keller, W., Kim, Kinsey, Kortz, Kotik, Longietti, Mahoney, Maloney, Markosek, Matzie, McCarter, McGinnis, McNeill, Metcalfe, Miller, D., Moul, Mullery, Neuman, O'Brien, Parker, C., Pashinski, Petrarca, Ravenstahl, Readshaw, Roebuck, Rozzi, Sainato, Samuelson, Santarsiero, Schlossberg, Schreiber, Schweyer, Sims, Snyder, Sturla, Thomas, Vitali, Wheatley, Youngblood.

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Table listing names of representatives who were excused, including Baker, Barbin, DeLuca, Evans, Kirkland, Milne, Pyle.

Less than the two-thirds majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the bill fell.

RECONSIDERATION MOTION FILED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker is in receipt of a reconsideration motion from Representatives Cutler and Reed, who move that HBs 1385, PN 1960; 1386, PN 1961; 1387, PN 1962; 1388, PN 1963; and 1389, PN 1964, which did not receive two-thirds vote and therefore were defeated on this day of June 28, that they will be reconsidered, that those five bills will be reconsidered.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Representative Hanna, for what reason do you rise?

Mr. HANNA. To submit some remarks for the record on those five bills.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. Those will be accepted.

BILLS RECOMMITTED

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

HB 1161;
 HB 1205;
 HB 1275;
 SB 330;
 SB 687; and
 SB 688.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. At this time Representative John Maher is recognized. Sir, for what reason do you rise?

Mr. MAHER. For an announcement, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. Please proceed.

Mr. MAHER. To remind the members of the Environmental Resources and Energy Committee that we have a meeting, voting meeting tomorrow morning at 11 a.m., G-50 in the Irvis Building, to consider SB 875, SB 307, HB 471, and SB 513.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

There will be an Environmental Resources and Energy Committee meeting tomorrow morning at 11 a.m. in room G-50, Irvis Office Building.

Members, if you could, we do have a few announcements and I have one more housekeeping. I am going to finish the housekeeping, and then we will do the announcements.

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

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

HB 773;
 SB 1;
 SB 329;
 SB 487;
 SB 678;
 SB 812;
 SB 813;
 SB 814;
 SB 815;
 SB 816;
 SB 817;
 SB 818;
 SB 819; and
 SB 820.

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

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Representative Adolph is called upon 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. There will be an immediate meeting of the Appropriations Committee in the majority caucus room.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

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

Ms. MAJOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to announce Republicans will caucus tomorrow, Monday, at 12 noon. I would ask our Republican members to please report to our caucus room tomorrow at 12 noon. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Madam Chair.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. The minority caucus chair, Representative Dan Frankel, is recognized for an announcement.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The SPEAKER. Thank you very much, Mr. Frankel.

COMMERCE COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Representative Harris, for an announcement.

Mr. A. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just a reminder, the House Commerce Committee will have an informational meeting tomorrow at noon at G-50 in the Irvis Office Building. It should not take very long, so hopefully we can get members to caucus very quickly after that.

The SPEAKER. There will be a Commerce Committee meeting tomorrow at noon in G-50 in the Irvis Office Building.

The House is going to be going at ease at this time. The House will be going at ease at this time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. Representative Grove. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GROVE. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROVE. There was a list of motions to reconsider. Was HB 283, amendment 808, part of that?

The SPEAKER. No, it was not.

Mr. GROVE. Is there a motion to reconsider that at this time at all filed?

The SPEAKER. No, not that I have been presented; no.

Mr. GROVE. Okay. I just wanted to make sure we are checking that. We do not want to raise taxes anymore. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. At this time the House will stand in recess.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Members, just for your information, we are keeping the desk open because we are going to be awaiting the Appropriations Committee report. There will be no further votes this evening, and we are going to stand at ease. And so we are going to be at ease and not in recess. We are going to be at ease.

And we will be coming into session tomorrow at 1 p.m. We will be coming into session at 1 p.m., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

There are no further votes this evening. The desk is open to await a committee report. Thank you.

BILL REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

SB 655, PN 1137 (Amended)

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, establishing the Non-narcotic Medication Assisted Substance Abuse Treatment Grant Pilot Program; in special funds, further providing for funding, for State Workers' Insurance Board and for expiration; in the Tobacco Settlement Fund, further providing for use; in the Pennsylvania Race Horse Development Fund, further providing for distribution; in general budget implementation, further providing for the Department of Community and Economic Development, for the Department of Public Welfare, for the Pennsylvania State Police and for the Environmental Quality Board; providing for 2015-2016 budget implementation, for 2015-2016 restrictions on appropriations for funds and accounts and for required lapses of money in funds and accounts; and making related repeals.

APPROPRIATIONS.

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. Representative Jim Cox, who is on the House floor, moves that this House be adjourned until Monday, June 29, 2015, at 1 p.m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to, and at 8:44 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.