

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

TUESDAY, AUGUST 25, 2015

SESSION OF 2015

199TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 61

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI) PRESIDING

PRAYER

The SPEAKER. Our prayer today will be offered by Pastor Brett Hartman of the New Covenant Fellowship Church in Mechanicsburg.

Reverend.

PASTOR BRETT HARTMAN, Guest Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let us pray:

Our Father in heaven, the searcher of all our hearts, we come before You today and we ask for Your forgiveness and we seek Your direction and Your wisdom. We know that in Your Word it says that we are to love and respect one another, and yet, Father, the more we know about one another, the less we seem to care.

We have exchanged our commitment to build in the bonds of trust easy applause and polarizing extremes. Father, we have forgotten our call to love. Instead of humble self-donation, we have employed exploitation. Instead of personal integrity, we now have flexible loyalties. Instead of seeking to understand, we fight to be understood. Instead of celebrating the dignity of one another, we resign to rancor and rivalry. And instead of cultivating peace, we have enabled obvious evils.

Search us today and know us, O Lord. Cleanse us from sin and set us free. We pray for those who are being sworn in today, for Donna Bullock and Leanne Krueger-Braneky and Joanna McClinton and Ed Neilson and Greg Rothman. As they strive to unite for the common good of this great State, which we love, which You love, we ask that You would give them faith and courage to fulfill the promises that they will be sworn in to today.

And, Father, we pray that You would empower them, for we are helpless without Your power. Unless You empower them, unless You empower our Representatives, unless You empower our legislators, Father, they can know the ideal and not reach it, they can know the right and not do it, they can make a promise and not keep it, they can comprehend the extent of their duty and not perform it, and they can seek truth and never fully find it.

Guide and bless these men and women who have been sent to love and serve this great Commonwealth. Hope to overcome, faith to endure, and love to unite.

And I pray this in the name of my savior, Jesus Christ. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Wednesday, July 22, 2015, will be postponed until printed.

JOURNALS APPROVED

The SPEAKER. The following 2015 Journals are in print and, without objection, will be approved:

Monday, May 4;
Tuesday, May 5;
Wednesday, May 6;
Thursday, May 7; and
Monday, May 11.

COMMUNICATION FROM BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF CITY TRUSTS

The SPEAKER. The Speaker acknowledges receipt of the 2014 Annual Report for the Board of Directors of City Trusts, acting for the city of Philadelphia.

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

RESOLUTION REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HR 437, PN 2100

By Rep. BARRAR

A Resolution urging the Congress of the United States and the Department of Defense to expeditiously address the safety and protection of United States Armed Forces personnel within the borders of the United States.

VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS.

HOUSE RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 431 By Representatives J. HARRIS, ROZZI, COHEN, SCHLOSSBERG, V. BROWN, DAVIDSON, C. PARKER, THOMAS, KIRKLAND, BOYLE, MILLARD and YOUNGBLOOD

A Resolution urging the Congress of the United States to oppose the forced removal of Haitians and people of Haitian descent from their homes by the Government of the Dominican Republic.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, August 10, 2015.

No. 432 By Representatives J. HARRIS, KINSEY, MURT, D. COSTA, FREEMAN, O'BRIEN, THOMAS, V. BROWN, ROZZI, MILLARD, HELM, COHEN, KORTZ, DAVIDSON, DEASY and DONATUCCI

A Resolution directing the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee to conduct a comprehensive study on the compensation provided to administrators of charter schools across this Commonwealth.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, August 10, 2015.

No. 435 By Representatives METCALFE, TALLMAN, BARRAR, DUSH, MCGINNIS, KAUFFMAN, TRUITT, BLOOM, GROVE, ROAE, KNOWLES, EVERETT, MOUL, WARD, SCHEMEL, GREINER, CUTLER, KRIEGER, PETRI, ELLIS, MARSHALL, TOOHIL, WATSON, PHILLIPS-HILL, RAPP, GABLER, MUSTIO, TOEPEL, STAATS, MALONEY and KILLION

A Resolution impeaching Kathleen G. Kane, Attorney General of Pennsylvania, for misbehavior in office.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, August 10, 2015.

No. 437 By Representatives WHITE, PYLE, READSHAW, CORBIN, THOMAS, MURT, PICKETT, BARRAR, VEREB, KRIEGER, METZGAR, BOBACK, HEFFLEY, TAYLOR, KIRKLAND, QUIGLEY, HICKERNELL, TOEPEL, YOUNGBLOOD, DRISCOLL, DIAMOND, METCALFE, HARHART, A. HARRIS, MILLARD, TOPPER, DUSH, SANTORA, KLUNK, ROAE, ZIMMERMAN, FARRY, MAJOR, BLOOM, GIBBONS, CAUSER, GREINER, WARNER, GINGRICH, KAUFFMAN, PHILLIPS-HILL, MARSHALL, MARSICO, LONGIETTI, EVERETT, D. COSTA, SANKEY, CUTLER, HENNESSEY, RADER, WATSON, TALLMAN, WARD, D. PARKER, GILLEN, TOBASH, FARINA, BENNINGHOFF, GABLER, GROVE, BIZZARRO, KNOWLES, IRVIN, JOZWIAK, FEE, MALONEY, DONATUCCI, BARBIN, KORTZ and SCHLEGEL CULVER

A Resolution urging the Congress of the United States and the Department of Defense to expeditiously address the safety and protection of United States Armed Forces personnel within the borders of the United States.

Referred to Committee on VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, August 10, 2015.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 946 By Representatives BAKER, FABRIZIO, D. COSTA, STAATS, LONGIETTI, DAVIS, GIBBONS, PICKETT, PASHINSKI, CRUZ, GROVE, McNEILL, YOUNGBLOOD, M. K. KELLER, KILLION, P. COSTA, COHEN, THOMAS, EVERETT, CARROLL, FARRY, SCHLOSSBERG, PHILLIPS-HILL, M. DALEY, WARD, READSHAW, HARKINS, MURT, SAYLOR, GOODMAN, GALLOWAY, BARRAR, BOYLE, MICCARELLI, DeLUCA, NEUMAN, MATZIE, TOEPEL, WATSON and KNOWLES

An Act providing for pharmacy audit procedures.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, August 18, 2015.

No. 947 By Representatives FABRIZIO, BAKER, D. COSTA, V. BROWN, STAATS, LONGIETTI, DAVIS, GIBBONS, PICKETT, PASHINSKI, CRUZ, GROVE, McNEILL, YOUNGBLOOD, M. K. KELLER, KILLION, P. COSTA, COHEN, THOMAS, EVERETT, CARROLL, FARRY, SCHLOSSBERG, PHILLIPS-HILL, M. DALEY, WARD, READSHAW, HARKINS, MURT, SAYLOR, GOODMAN, GALLOWAY, BARRAR, BOYLE, MICCARELLI, DeLUCA, NEUMAN, MATZIE, TOEPEL, WATSON and KNOWLES

An Act providing for registration of pharmacy benefits managers and for maximum allowable cost transparency.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, August 18, 2015.

No. 1020 By Representatives DEAN, SANTARSIERO, FRANKEL, FREEMAN, M. DALEY, BROWNLEE, DONATUCCI, SCHLOSSBERG, McNEILL, COHEN, BOYLE, D. COSTA, VITALI, TRUITT, STURLA, SCHWEYER, ROEBUCK, SIMS and McCARTER

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in firearms and other dangerous articles, providing for report of theft or loss of firearm; and prescribing a penalty.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, August 10, 2015.

No. 1030 By Representatives DEAN, SANTARSIERO, W. KELLER, THOMAS, V. BROWN, O'BRIEN, DAVIS, ROZZI, M. DALEY, SIMS, GAINEY, ACOSTA, YOUNGBLOOD, SCHREIBER, STURLA, FRANKEL and COHEN

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

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, August 10, 2015.

No. 1173 By Representatives DAVIS, DONATUCCI, THOMAS, SCHREIBER, FRANKEL, O'BRIEN, READSHAW, McNEILL, CALTAGIRONE, MURT, SIMS, KINSEY, ROEBUCK, STURLA, GOODMAN, COHEN, SANTARSIERO, DEAN, BRADFORD, SCHWEYER and D. COSTA

An Act amending the act of November 29, 2004 (P.L.1383, No.180), known as the Uniform Crime Reporting Act, in higher education security information, further providing for crime statistics and security policies and procedures; and providing for Pennsylvania safe campuses.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, August 21, 2015.

No. 1176 By Representatives DELOZIER, COHEN, BRADFORD, CALTAGIRONE, D. COSTA, M. DALEY, DEAN, DEASY, DONATUCCI, FRANKEL, GILLEN, KAVULICH, KIM, KINSEY, MACKENZIE, McNEILL, MILNE, MURT, D. PARKER, PASHINSKI, RAPP, ROSS, SANTARSIERO, SCHWEYER, SIMS, WARD and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act promoting women's health and economic security by eliminating discrimination and ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth or a related medical condition.

Referred to Committee on LABOR AND INDUSTRY, August 21, 2015.

No. 1240 By Representatives QUINN, DELOZIER, BARBIN, DEAN, DeLUCA, EVERETT, MURT, MUSTIO, PASHINSKI, PICKETT, REESE and WATSON

An Act amending the act of December 19, 1990 (P.L.1200, No.202), known as the Solicitation of Funds for Charitable Purposes Act, further providing for definitions, for powers and duties of secretary and for registration of charitable organizations, financial reports, fees and failure to file; providing for supplemental financial disclosure and for financial statements for specific disaster relief solicitations; further providing for registration of professional fundraising counsel and contracts, for registration of professional solicitors, contract and disclosure requirements, bonds, records and books; providing for individual licensure of professional solicitor officers, employees and agents; further providing for investigation, subpoenas, injunctions and court orders, for administrative enforcement and penalties and for criminal penalties; and establishing the Charitable Organization Regulation Account.

Referred to Committee on COMMERCE, August 10, 2015.

No. 1477 By Representatives DiGIROLAMO, GAINEY, D. MILLER, WHEELAND, KINSEY, ROZZI, DAVIS, LONGIETTI, DRISCOLL, BARRAR, D. COSTA, SCHLOSSBERG, GERGELY, FARRY, HARHAI, HANNA, DERMODY, McNEILL, HARKINS, DeLUCA, CARROLL and FLYNN

An Act amending the act of December 5, 1936 (2nd Sp.Sess., 1937 P.L.2897, No.1), known as the Unemployment Compensation Law, in preliminary provisions, further providing for the definitions of "base year," "credit week" and "employer"; in contributions by employers and employees, providing for supplemental contributions by employees

and further providing for reciprocal agreements; and, in compensation, further providing or qualifications required to secure compensation and for rate and amount of compensation.

Referred to Committee on LABOR AND INDUSTRY, August 10, 2015.

No. 1478 By Representatives ROZZI, O'BRIEN, HARKINS, YOUNGBLOOD, CALTAGIRONE, THOMAS, BISHOP, KINSEY, V. BROWN, PASHINSKI, McNEILL, MILLARD, MURT, M. DALEY, A. HARRIS, FARINA, D. COSTA and COHEN

An Act establishing the Infant Vision Information, Education and Wellness Program; and providing for powers and duties of the Department of Health.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, August 10, 2015.

No. 1479 By Representatives HARHAI, KOTIK, DIAMOND, THOMAS, GILLESPIE, MAHONEY, GODSHALL, TOOHL and DeLUCA

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in preparation for and conduct of primaries and elections, further providing for regulations in force at polling places.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, August 10, 2015.

No. 1480 By Representatives SANTORA, DAVIS, YOUNGBLOOD, TOEPEL, THOMAS, R. BROWN, A. HARRIS, MUSTIO, MASSER, SAINATO, KORTZ, EMRICK, HEFFLEY, SAYLOR, PHILLIPS-HILL, PETRI, KILLION, CARROLL, DAY, DEASY, KAUFFMAN, KNOWLES, GIBBONS and QUINN

An Act amending the act of December 20, 2000 (P.L.724, No.99), known as the Municipal Code and Ordinance Compliance Act, further providing for definitions; providing for issuance of use and occupancy certificate; and further providing for compliance requirement.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, August 10, 2015.

No. 1481 By Representatives HICKERNELL, CUTLER, SAYLOR, MAJOR, STEPHENS, LAWRENCE, DIAMOND, PICKETT, MALONEY, MILLARD, EMRICK, FEE, REGAN, BLOOM, WARNER, KAUFFMAN, KAUFER, MENTZER, WARD, METCALFE, PYLE, KNOWLES, B. MILLER, MURT, KLUNK, TALLMAN, TRUITT, O'NEILL, GILLEN, MARSICO, M. K. KELLER, ROAE, BOBACK, TOOHL, RADER, DUSH, PHILLIPS-HILL, McGINNIS, A. HARRIS, HELM, ZIMMERMAN, GREINER, EVERETT, KRIEGER, MOUL, WATSON, GINGRICH, GILLESPIE, SACCONI, GABLER, MILNE, JOZWIAK, DUNBAR and BENNINGHOFF

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in reimbursements by Commonwealth and between school districts, prohibiting supplemental funding to school districts.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, August 10, 2015.

No. 1482 By Representatives GROVE, SAYLOR, MILLARD, TALLMAN, STEPHENS, DUNBAR, MILNE, GODSHALL, FARRY, A. HARRIS, CUTLER, MENTZER, ZIMMERMAN, BENNINGHOFF and GABLER

An Act amending the act of December 31, 1965 (P.L.1257, No.511), known as The Local Tax Enabling Act, providing for optional property tax elimination.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, August 10, 2015.

No. 1483 By Representatives KAMPF, THOMAS, MILLARD, HELM, MURT, BOBACK, ROZZI, BAKER, BARRAR, A. HARRIS, EVERETT, KILLION, COX, ROSS, F. KELLER, KAUFFMAN, GABLER, WARD, MILNE, BLOOM, WATSON, ZIMMERMAN, GILLEN, SCHEMEL, GILLESPIE and FARRY

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in particular rights and immunities, providing for civil immunity for volunteer practitioners.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, August 10, 2015.

No. 1484 By Representatives GILLEN, BARRAR, READSHAW, BARBIN, BISHOP, BOYLE, CALTAGIRONE, COHEN, D. COSTA, DAVIDSON, DRISCOLL, GODSHALL, HARHAI, A. HARRIS, HELM, IRVIN, JOZWIAK, KAUFFMAN, KAVULICH, KILLION, KORTZ, MILLARD, MURT, QUINN, RAPP, THOMAS, WATSON and FARINA

An Act amending the act of October 30, 1987 (P.L.375, No.75), entitled, "An act providing for the designation of certain trees and land on the grounds of the State Capitol in Harrisburg as "Soldiers' Grove" in honor of war veterans; imposing duties upon the Department of General Services; and making an appropriation," further providing for duties of Department of General Services; and providing for preservation of "Soldiers' Grove" and for construction.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, August 10, 2015.

No. 1485 By Representative THOMAS

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, in educational tax credits, providing for oversight.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, August 10, 2015.

No. 1486 By Representative THOMAS

An Act establishing the STEMM Pathways Initiative Program and the STEMM Opportunity Fund; and conferring powers and imposing duties on the Department of Education.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, August 10, 2015.

No. 1487 By Representatives QUINN, DEAN, HEFFLEY, DUSH, HELM and ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in procedure for the disbursement of money from the State Treasury, providing for payments to political subdivisions due to budget impasse and for investments through line of credit to political subdivisions due to budget impasse.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, August 13, 2015.

No. 1488 By Representatives DAVIS, SCHREIBER, V. BROWN, READSHAW, McNEILL, ACOSTA, THOMAS, HARHAI, COHEN, MURT, JAMES, ROZZI, GALLOWAY, D. PARKER and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.177, No.175), known as The Administrative Code of 1929, in powers and duties of the Department of Drug and Alcohol Programs, providing for definitions, for duties of department, for funding, for certification, for registry, for violations, for restricted account, for compliance with other laws and for task force.

Referred to Committee on HUMAN SERVICES, August 21, 2015.

No. 1489 By Representatives DAVIS, C. PARKER, KINSEY, THOMAS, YOUNGBLOOD, MURT, ACOSTA, CALTAGIRONE, COHEN, HARKINS, D. COSTA, DRISCOLL, SAMUELSON, D. PARKER, DONATUCCI and ROEBUCK

An Act amending Title 53 (Municipalities Generally) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the inspection and regulation of mobile food vehicles in cities of the first class that use propane or other combustible fuel.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, August 21, 2015.

No. 1490 By Representatives PETRI, CALTAGIRONE, COHEN, D. COSTA, DRISCOLL, JAMES, LONGIETTI, MURT, PASHINSKI, SAYLOR and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending Title 53 (Municipalities Generally) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for cultural improvement district advisory committees and for neighborhood improvement districts; and repealing the Neighborhood Improvement District Act.

Referred to Committee on URBAN AFFAIRS, August 13, 2015.

No. 1491 By Representatives TAYLOR, GREINER, PASHINSKI, GODSHALL, ENGLISH, SCHLOSSBERG, THOMAS, W. KELLER, BURNS, DONATUCCI, O'BRIEN, JOZWIAK, FARRY, PETRI, COHEN and WATSON

An Act amending the act of October 9, 2008 (P.L.1408, No.113), known as the Scrap Material Theft Prevention Act, further providing for definitions, for identification requirements for sale of scrap materials to scrap processors and recycling facility operators and for commercial accounts.

Referred to Committee on CONSUMER AFFAIRS, August 13, 2015.

No. 1495 By Representatives REESE, BENNINGHOFF, CAUSER, COHEN, D. COSTA, DIAMOND, GODSHALL, M. K. KELLER, MAHONEY, MILLARD, THOMAS and ZIMMERMAN

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in forfeitures, providing for Pennsylvania Game Commission forfeitures.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, August 13, 2015.

No. 1496 By Representatives STEPHENS, SCHWEYER, SACCONI, DRISCOLL, MILLARD, McNEILL, COHEN, MARSICO, TAYLOR, MURT, DeLUCA, BARRAR, D. COSTA and MILNE

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

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, August 13, 2015.

No. 1497 By Representatives STEPHENS, BARRAR, REGAN, HEFFLEY, HARHART, MARSICO, TAYLOR, MURT, DeLUCA, D. COSTA, MOUL, WATSON and MILNE

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

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, August 13, 2015.

No. 1498 By Representatives STEPHENS, FREEMAN, ROZZI, SCHLOSSBERG, BOBACK, GROVE, THOMAS, JOZWIAK, SACCONI, HARPER, MARSICO, JAMES, QUINN, PHILLIPS-HILL, D. COSTA, TOEPEL, MILNE, O'NEILL, KIM, O'BRIEN, MUSTIO, KAVULICH, MACKENZIE, TRUITT, ACOSTA, WARD, FARRY, COHEN, WATSON and DEAN

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in firearms and other dangerous articles, further providing for duties of the Pennsylvania State Police.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, August 13, 2015.

No. 1502 By Representatives SNYDER, SCHLOSSBERG, YOUNGBLOOD, DRISCOLL, O'BRIEN, R. BROWN, KINSEY, GIBBONS, McNEILL, D. COSTA, ROZZI, WARNER, THOMAS, BIZZARRO, MURT, READSHAW, WATSON, MAHONEY, FARINA, EVERETT, M. DALEY, HANNA, SIMS, BURNS, MATZIE, GOODMAN and DEAN

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in disabled veterans' real estate tax exemption, further providing for exemption.

Referred to Committee on VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, August 13, 2015.

No. 1503 By Representatives REESE, COX, GABLER, HEFFLEY, M. K. KELLER, LONGIETTI, MARSHALL, MASSER, MENTZER, MURT, MUSTIO, PEIFER, PICKETT and SNYDER

An Act amending the act of August 9, 1955 (P.L.323, No.130), known as The County Code, further providing for incompatible offices, for solicitor to the controller, for counsel, for solicitor to county treasurer in certain counties, for appointment and qualifications, for solicitor in certain counties, for solicitor to coroner, for solicitor to register in certain counties and for solicitor to recorder of deeds in certain counties.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, August 14, 2015.

No. 1504 By Representatives MURT, CALTAGIRONE, COHEN, D. COSTA, DRISCOLL, GODSHALL, KINSEY, ROZZI, THOMAS, WARD and ZIMMERMAN

An Act amending the act of July 9, 1976 (P.L.817, No.143), known as the Mental Health Procedures Act, in involuntary examination and treatment, further providing for persons who may be subject to involuntary emergency examination and treatment.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, August 14, 2015.

No. 1505 By Representatives BRIGGS, ROZZI, J. HARRIS, D. COSTA, READSHAW and COHEN

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in books, furniture and supplies, providing for purchase and use of green cleaning products.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, August 21, 2015.

No. 1506 By Representatives WARNER, METCALFE, ENGLISH, REESE, ZIMMERMAN, HEFFLEY, METZGAR, SANKEY, KAUFFMAN, MARSICO, SONNEY, ROAE, COX, TALLMAN, IRVIN, M. K. KELLER, D. COSTA, SAYLOR, KLUNK, KRIEGER and HELM

An Act providing for the English language as the official language of the Commonwealth; and imposing a certain restriction on use of appropriated funds.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, August 21, 2015.

No. 1507 By Representatives TRUITT, THOMAS, BARRAR, DRISCOLL, D. MILLER, WARD, McGINNIS, V. BROWN and MURT

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

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, August 21, 2015.

No. 1508 By Representatives TOOHIL, BIZZARRO, COHEN, D. COSTA, DIAMOND, EVERETT, FARINA, FREEMAN, MURT, SAYLOR, SCHLOSSBERG, YOUNGBLOOD, ZIMMERMAN and WHEELAND

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, in city revitalization and improvement zones, further providing for definitions.

Referred to Committee on COMMERCE, August 21, 2015.

No. 1509 By Representatives SCHLOSSBERG, ROZZI, KINSEY, FRANKEL, McNEILL, COHEN and O'BRIEN

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in criminal homicide, further providing for the offense of voluntary manslaughter.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, August 25, 2015.

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER. Some announcements.

Dennis Owens of ABC 27 will be videotaping the proceedings.

Lara Greenberg and Kyle Cooper of CBS 21 will be videotaping the proceedings.

Pete Muntean of WGAL will be videotaping the proceedings.

And Eric Heisler of WHTM-TV ABC 27 will be videotaping the proceedings.

I would ask the leaders of both the majority and minority caucuses and the Appropriations chairs of the respective caucuses to please approach the Speaker's rostrum. I would like the leaders of both caucuses and the Appropriations chairs to please approach the rostrum at this time.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

The SPEAKER. Members and guests, members and guests, please take your seats.

SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS**SWEARING-IN OF NEW MEMBERS**

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House will now take up a special order of business, the swearing-in of Representatives-elect Greg Rothman of the 87th Legislative District, Leanne Krueger-Braneky of the 161st Legislative District, Ed Neilson of the 174th Legislative District, Joanna McClinton of the 191st Legislative District, and Donna Bullock of the 195th Legislative District. The Speaker hears no objections.

ELECTION RETURNS PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the Sergeant at Arms of the House.

The SERGEANT AT ARMS. Mr. Speaker, Marian Schneider, Deputy Secretary for Elections and Administration.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the Deputy Secretary for Elections and Administration, Marian Schneider.

Ms. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege and honor of presenting the election returns and the certification of campaign expense compliance for the special elections held on August 4, 2015, in the 87th and 161st Legislative Districts and the special elections held on August 11, 2015, in the 174th, 191st, and 195th Legislative Districts.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

The Speaker appreciates the Deputy Secretary being present in the hall of the House.

The Speaker requests that the clerk will read the returns at this time.

The following election returns were read:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

TO THE HONORABLE SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, GREETINGS:

I have the honor to present the official returns of the Special Election for Representative in the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania held in the eighty-seventh Legislative District, as the same have been certified to and filed with my office by the Cumberland County Board of Elections. Greg Rothman, having received the highest number of votes in the Special Election, and having complied with the provisions of Article XVI of the Pennsylvania Election Code pertaining to Primary and Election Expenses, was duly elected a Representative in the General Assembly.

(SEAL)

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of the office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth at the city of Harrisburg, this twenty-fourth day of August in the year of our Lord two thousand fifteen and of the Commonwealth the two hundred fortieth.

Pedro A. Cortés
Secretary of the Commonwealth

* * *

OFFICIAL RESULTS

SPECIAL ELECTION
REPRESENTATIVE IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
87th Legislative District

AUGUST 4, 2015

<u>DEMOCRATIC</u>	<u>VOTES</u>
Bob Charles 115 Winfield Drive Camp Hill, PA 17011	2,829

<u>REPUBLICAN</u>	
Greg Rothman 1 Gunpowder Road Mechanicsburg, PA 17050	4,202
Scattered Write-Ins	37

As of August 18, 2015

* * *

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

TO THE HONORABLE SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, GREETINGS:

I have the honor to present the official returns of the Special Election for Representative in the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania held in the one hundred sixty-first Legislative District, as the same have been certified to and filed with my office by the Delaware County Board of Elections. Leanne Krueger-Braneky, having received the highest number of votes in the Special Election, and having complied with the provisions of Article XVI of the Pennsylvania Election Code pertaining to Primary and Election Expenses, was duly elected a Representative in the General Assembly.

(SEAL) IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of the office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth at the city of Harrisburg, this twenty-fourth day of August in the year of our Lord two thousand fifteen and of the Commonwealth the two hundred fortieth.

Pedro A. Cortés
Secretary of the Commonwealth

* * *

OFFICIAL RESULTS

SPECIAL ELECTION
REPRESENTATIVE IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
161st Legislative District

AUGUST 4, 2015

<u>DEMOCRATIC</u>	<u>VOTES</u>
Leanne Krueger-Braneky 624 Magill Road Swarthmore, PA 19081	5,268

<u>REPUBLICAN</u>	<u>VOTES</u>
Paul A. Mullen 709 Lamp Post Lane Aston, PA 19014	4,482

As of August 24, 2015

* * *

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

TO THE HONORABLE SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, GREETINGS:

I have the honor to present the official returns of the Special Election for Representative in the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania held in the one hundred seventy-fourth Legislative District, as the same have been certified to and filed with my office by the Philadelphia County Board of Elections. Ed Neilson, having received the highest number of votes in the Special Election, and having complied with the provisions of Article XVI of the Pennsylvania Election Code pertaining to Primary and Election Expenses, was duly elected a Representative in the General Assembly.

(SEAL) IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of the office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth at the city of Harrisburg, this twenty-fourth day of August in the year of our Lord two thousand fifteen and of the Commonwealth the two hundred fortieth.

Pedro A. Cortés
Secretary of the Commonwealth

* * *

OFFICIAL RESULTS

SPECIAL ELECTION
REPRESENTATIVE IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
174th Legislative District

AUGUST 11, 2015

<u>DEMOCRATIC</u>	<u>VOTES</u>
Ed Neilson 3812 Chalfont Drive Philadelphia, PA 19154	2,459

<u>REPUBLICAN</u>	<u>VOTES</u>
Timothy Dailey 2016 Solly Ave. Philadelphia, PA 19152	1,413

As of August 20, 2015

* * *

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

TO THE HONORABLE SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, GREETINGS:

I have the honor to present the official returns of the Special Election for Representative in the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania held in the one hundred ninety-first Legislative District, as the same have been certified to and filed with my office by the Philadelphia and Delaware County Boards of Elections. Joanna McClinton, having received the highest number of votes in the Special Election, and having complied with the provisions of Article XVI of the Pennsylvania Election Code pertaining to Primary and Election Expenses, was duly elected a Representative in the General Assembly.

(SEAL) IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of the office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth at the city of Harrisburg, this twenty-fourth day of August in the year of our Lord two thousand fifteen and of the Commonwealth the two hundred fortieth.

Pedro A. Cortés
Secretary of the Commonwealth

* * *

OFFICIAL RESULTS

SPECIAL ELECTION
REPRESENTATIVE IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
191st Legislative District

AUGUST 11, 2015

DEMOCRATIC VOTES

Joanna McClinton
6021 Washington Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19143

1,806

REPUBLICAN

Charles A. Wilkins, Jr.
862 W. Cobbs Creek Parkway
Yeadon, PA 19050

184

TRACEY GORDON PARTY

Tracey Gordon
6543 Windsor St.
Philadelphia, PA 19142

568

As of August 20, 2015

* * *

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

TO THE HONORABLE SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, GREETINGS:

I have the honor to present the official returns of the Special Election for Representative in the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania held in the one hundred ninety-fifth Legislative District, as the same have been certified to and filed with my office by the Philadelphia County Board of Elections. Donna Bullock, having received the highest number of votes in the Special Election, and having complied with the provisions of Article XVI of the Pennsylvania Election Code pertaining to Primary and Election Expenses, was duly elected a Representative in the General Assembly.

(SEAL)

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of the office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth at the city of Harrisburg, this twenty-fourth day of August in the year of our Lord two thousand fifteen and of the Commonwealth the two hundred fortieth.

Pedro A. Cortés
Secretary of the Commonwealth

* * *

OFFICIAL RESULTS

SPECIAL ELECTION
REPRESENTATIVE IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
195th Legislative District

AUGUST 11, 2015

DEMOCRATIC

VOTES

Donna Bullock
3128 W. Berks Street
Philadelphia, PA 19121

2,587

REPUBLICAN

Adam A. Lang
2111 Master Street
Philadelphia, PA 19121

417

As of August 20, 2015

CERTIFICATE ON ELECTION EXPENSES

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

TO THE HONORABLE SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, GREETINGS:

In accordance with the provisions of Section 1632(b) of the Pennsylvania Election Code, 25 P.S. § 3252(b), I do hereby certify that the candidate who was elected Representative in the General Assembly from the 87th District in the Special Election held August 4, 2015, Greg Rothman, has filed all of the reports and statements of contributions and expenditures required by the provisions of Article XVI of the Pennsylvania Election Code entitled "Primary and Election Expenses."

(SEAL)

Witness my hand and the seal of the office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth this twenty-fourth day of August, 2015.

Pedro A. Cortés
Secretary of the Commonwealth

* * *

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

TO THE HONORABLE SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, GREETINGS:

In accordance with the provisions of Section 1632(b) of the Pennsylvania Election Code, 25 P.S. § 3252(b), I do hereby certify that the candidate who was elected Representative in the General Assembly from the 161st District in the Special Election held August 4, 2015, Leanne Krueger-Braneky, has filed all of the reports and statements of contributions and expenditures required by the provisions of Article XVI of the Pennsylvania Election Code entitled "Primary and Election Expenses."

(SEAL) Witness my hand and the seal of the office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth this twenty-fourth day of August, 2015.

Pedro A. Cortés
Secretary of the Commonwealth

* * *

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

TO THE HONORABLE SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, GREETINGS:

In accordance with the provisions of Section 1632(b) of the Pennsylvania Election Code, 25 P.S. § 3252(b), I do hereby certify that the candidate who was elected Representative in the General Assembly from the 174th District in the Special Election held August 11, 2015, Ed Neilson, has filed all of the reports and statements of contributions and expenditures required by the provisions of Article XVI of the Pennsylvania Election Code entitled "Primary and Election Expenses."

(SEAL) Witness my hand and the seal of the office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth this twenty-fourth day of August, 2015.

Pedro A. Cortés
Secretary of the Commonwealth

* * *

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

TO THE HONORABLE SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, GREETINGS:

In accordance with the provisions of Section 1632(b) of the Pennsylvania Election Code, 25 P.S. § 3252(b), I do hereby certify that the candidate who was elected Representative in the General Assembly from the 191st District in the Special Election held August 11, 2015, Joanna McClinton, has filed all of the reports and statements of contributions and expenditures required by the provisions of Article XVI of the Pennsylvania Election Code entitled "Primary and Election Expenses."

(SEAL) Witness my hand and the seal of the office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth this twenty-fourth day of August, 2015.

Pedro A. Cortés
Secretary of the Commonwealth

* * *

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

TO THE HONORABLE SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, GREETINGS:

In accordance with the provisions of Section 1632(b) of the Pennsylvania Election Code, 25 P.S. § 3252(b), I do hereby certify that the candidate who was elected Representative in the General Assembly

from the 195th District in the Special Election held August 11, 2015, Donna Bullock, has filed all of the reports and statements of contributions and expenditures required by the provisions of Article XVI of the Pennsylvania Election Code entitled "Primary and Election Expenses."

(SEAL) Witness my hand and the seal of the office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth this twenty-fourth day of August, 2015.

Pedro A. Cortés
Secretary of the Commonwealth

OATH OF OFFICE ADMINISTERED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker requests that the members-elect come forward to the well of the House for the purpose of taking the oath of office. Please bring your Bibles. If a family member or friend will be accompanying you with respect to the holding of your Bible, please, I would ask those family or friends to come up to the well at this time as well.

The oath of office required by Article VI, section 3, of the Constitution of Pennsylvania will now be administered by the Honorable Vic Stabile, judge, Superior Court of Pennsylvania. Judge.

JUDGE STABILE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Representatives, congratulations to each one of you. It is my privilege to administer your oath of office today. My best wishes for your success in this chamber.

If each of you are ready, please place your left hand on your Bible and raise your right hand. Repeat after me then: Do you solemnly swear that you will support, obey, and defend the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of this Commonwealth and that you will discharge the duties of your office with fidelity? If so, please say "I do."

(Members asserted oath.)

JUDGE STABILE. Congratulations.

The SPEAKER. Family and friends may take their seats.

Members, if you could stay with us in the well here for just a moment. Members, our new members, if you could stay with us in the well right here for a few moments.

Myself and the two leaders will give you some welcome remarks, and we are so honored to have you now as members of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives.

REMARKS BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. To Representatives Donna Bullock and Leanne Krueger-Braneky, Joanna McClinton and Greg Rothman, welcome. And I am certainly pleased to welcome back to the House, Representative Ed Neilson.

Members, you are now part of a body that originated in 1682, when it was created by William Penn, the founder of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The 42-member colonial assembly, the Provincial Assembly, first met at Upland, near Chester, Pennsylvania. The formation of this body in which you are going to serve predates the ratification of the United States Constitution by more than 100 years.

You are now a member of the first and therefore oldest continually elected governmental body in the United States of America. All of us collectively wish you the greatest success as you embark on what may be the most challenging and yet most rewarding professional opportunity of your life.

With that, let me have you take your seats. We are going to introduce some of your guests and dignitaries that you brought here today, followed by the remarks from the leaders.

Thank you so much.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. When I introduce you as a family member or guest or dignitary, I would ask that you please stand and rise. Members and guests, the only thing I would ask is that if you could hold off until we have introduced everybody, and we have a good crowd here today, that we will hold our applause until the end.

With Representative Bullock today are her husband, Otis; her sons, Malcolm and Xavier; her mother, Elizabeth Johnson; and her mother-in-law, Denita Washington. I also understand that today, as is our Chief of Staff Karen Coates', it is your birthday today, Ms. Johnson, and we wish you a happy birthday on this special, special occasion. Thank you. Please be seated.

We welcome Representative Krueger-Braneky's guests: her husband, David, please stand; her son, Wendell; parents, Lorraine and Walter Krueger; and her in-laws, Stephen and Frieda Braneky. Welcome to the hall of the House. Thank you.

Representative McClinton's mother, Rachel McClinton, is with us today, along with her aunt, Pam Scott; niece, Desiree McClinton; and cousins, Regina and Aria Whortenberry. Please rise, and thank you so much for being with us today.

With Representative Neilson, we saw his wife, Doris – please stand – and sons Kevin, Steven, and Ryan. Welcome back again to this great chamber. I understand Ed's brother, Tom, is here as well and his in-laws, Daniel and Diane Hinds. If they are here, please stand. Thank you.

With Representative Rothman today are his parents, Bill and Sue Rothman, and his children, Ellie, Mia, and Nicholos. Please stand. Thank you.

Now, we have a number of members and former members. The former House member from the 191st Legislative District and now Senator from the 8th Senatorial District and a good friend to many of us, Anthony Williams is here today as a guest of Representative McClinton. Senator.

Representative Rothman has as his guests former Representative Jeff Coleman from the 60th District and Representative Grell, his predecessor and our good friend, from the 87th Legislative District. Please stand.

Representative Krueger-Braneky has as a guest former Representative Bryan Lentz from the 161st Legislative District. Representative Lentz.

And with Representative Bullock, we welcome the former Representative of the 195th Legislative District, Michelle Brownlee, and former Representative Gary Williams from the 197th Legislative District. Thank you for being with us.

I will run through these dignitaries: Judge Timika Lane of the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County; Judge Kathryn Streeter Lewis, formerly of the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County; Barb Cross and Jim Hertzler, Cumberland County Commissioners; Janice Davis, the

president of Darby County Council; and Patrick McKenna, the councilman of Darby County Council. Please stand.

Our very good friend, and welcome again, Darrell Clarke, the Philadelphia City Council president. Darrell. And with him are two other council members, Jannie Blackwell and Marian Tasco. Please stand.

The mayor of Swarthmore Borough, Timothy Kearney. Mayor. The mayor of Yeadon Borough, Rohan Hepkins. And a Brookhaven Borough council member, Janice Sawicki. Janice.

The Chair would like to thank these former legislators, family members, friends, dignitaries, all. You are very special to be here with us today on the swearing-in of our newest members. For some of you, it is perhaps the first time you have seen the splendor of this magnificent House of Representatives, but the reverence for the hall comes not only from its spectacular architecture and art but from those who serve in the seats within. As Representatives and as family members and guests, we are honored to spend this day with you today.

REMARKS BY MAJORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. I would call upon our majority leader, Representative Dave Reed, for remarks, to be followed by our minority leader, Representative Frank Dermody. Thank you.

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

And to the friends and family members and supporters of our five new legislators, I say welcome to the hall of the House and congratulations on your victories last – I guess this month, a couple weeks ago for many of you and an extra week for a couple more of you.

To Greg, Leanne, Joanna, and Donna, welcome to the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. To Ed, welcome back. I knew when Ed left a couple years ago, he could not help himself of coming back here to Harrisburg, and we are very happy to see you back in the hall of the House.

I just want to say a few very short points.

First, congratulations, and enjoy the celebration of this morning because later on today we will get into the business of governing and politics and moving this day forward. But most importantly, I would say to each of you, you have each been blessed with a tremendous opportunity, an honor bestowed upon you by the folks you now represent in your districts back home. They have put their trust, their faith, and their responsibility in you to represent their interests in Harrisburg but also to lead your communities back home. Both are coequal parts of the equation.

As you do so, always remember that there are folks who came before you and there are folks who will come after you. The title on your door will never change, but the name will. The only distinction you now have is that opportunity to make yourself worthy of the incredible responsibility you have been given; to make yourself worthy of the place in history you now hold; to make that opportunity one that is meaningful to you, your family, and your community. You have a real chance to change the world one person, one family, one district, and one State at a time.

We will get into partisan differences. We will get into regional differences. We will get into policy differences, but never forget that your place in history will be marked by the legacy you leave, by the way you conduct yourself, and the way you represent your community and your Commonwealth in the

days ahead. Make good decisions, personally and professionally. Treat others as you wish to be treated yourself, both on the floor and off the floor. And most importantly, live up to the expectations of those who believed in you enough to put you in these offices. They are grand expectations, but you can meet those expectations if you work each and every day and try to do the right thing for the right reasons. In this profession, folks will disagree with you either on the House floor or back at home on a daily basis. All you can try to do is do the right thing for the right reasons to the betterment of the majority of the citizens who live in this State.

If you live up to those expectations, you will be worthy of that place in history that has been bestowed upon you today. We are here to help you, to guide you, to assist you in any way. We look forward to working with you in the days and weeks ahead. Congratulations, good luck, and enjoy your tenure in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REMARKS BY DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the Democratic leader, Representative Dermody, for remarks.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Leader Reed, Judge Stabile, Councilman Clarke, Councilwoman Blackwell, colleagues, distinguished guests, and I would also like to welcome back Bryan Lentz, Michelle Brownlee, Gary Williams, and Senator Tony Williams. Welcome to all our family members, especially our family members and supporters and friends of our new colleagues. Welcome one and all to the hall of the House.

It is a great day for this House as we welcome five newly elected members. Each of the men and women who just took the oath of office has succeeded in different endeavors. Each of them brings something unique and valuable to the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, Donna Bullock is a lawyer and a Temple University alumna. For the last several years, she worked on the staff of the Philadelphia City Council President Darrell Clarke, who is with us today. And before her work for the city, she worked for a private law firm in Philadelphia and for Community Legal Services. She formed and advised nonprofit organizations, small businesses, and community groups. Donna Bullock has also served on several boards and task forces, including the Smith Memorial Playground, the Columbia North YMCA Advisory Board, the West Philadelphia Child Care Network, and the Philadelphia Mayor's Office Community Service Advisory Board. She has a record of community service and will continue that in this hall of the House.

Mr. Speaker, Joanna McClinton also is an attorney, and like Donna, Joanna has exhibited devotion to bettering people's lives. A lifelong resident of southwest Philadelphia, Joanna was a student leader and a dean's list student at La Salle University. Joanna then attended Villanova University School of Law, and she used her legal training to serve as an assistant public defender in Philadelphia for 7 years. Two years ago she combined her passion for the community and love of the law by becoming chief counsel to State Senator Tony Williams. As a youth ministry leader at her West Philadelphia church, Joanna McClinton organized positive programs for children, mentoring them and reminding them that their dreams can come true. She

is also a volunteer with Outreach to Youth and Hands of Compassion American Sign Language Ministry.

Mr. Speaker, Ed Neilson is a familiar face to most of us. It was not that long ago that he served in this House, and we are delighted that he is back with us. He is a well-known civic leader, youth sports coach, and a proud member of the labor movement in his native northeast Philadelphia. He is a member or IBEW (International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers) Local 98 and served as Pennsylvania Deputy Secretary of Labor and Industry for Governor Rendell. Ed's legislative priorities include job creation, protection of older residents, improving public safety, and improving our public schools, and as many of us know, Ed Neilson has a way of making sure that his priorities and constituents are not forgotten or neglected.

Mr. Speaker, after working in community and economic development for 15 years, Leanne Krueger-Braneky ran for the House as a progressive vote for change. She has received national attention for her work in economic development, advised the White House Business Council in the needs of small businesses. Leanne was the first director of the Sustainable Business Network of Greater Philadelphia. Under her leadership, it grew into an organization that helped to attract more Federal green jobs to the area than any other region in the country. Leanne also worked in economic development at the national level, at the Business Alliance for Local Living Economies. She holds an M.B.A. (master of business administration) from Eastern University and a B.A. (bachelor of arts) from Rutgers. She lives in Swarthmore, Delaware County, with her husband and young son.

Finally, Greg Rothman is joining us as a new member from Cumberland County's 87th District. He has built a successful career in real estate and is a leader in the county's Republican Party. I look forward to getting to know him better as we work on Pennsylvania's issues together in this House.

And to all of you, I say welcome. We welcome your energy, your enthusiasm, your desire to help make this a better State. You have come from five different districts, each of those who have selected you and chose you to be their voice. Whether it is your 1st day in this chamber or your 20th year here, you walk in this room every day and you will say to yourself, "I get to work here." It will leave a huge impression on you every single day.

And I especially want to welcome the family members and supporters of the new members. It was because of your support that got them here, and you should share this celebration with them today. The support and encouragement that you continue to provide to our new members are critical to their success. Every one of us in this body has a group of people like you back home that makes it possible for us to do this job. Your friendship, your counsel, your support make the frequent absences and the unusual demands of this job bearable. Without your help, quite simply, it would be impossible for them to do it, to do this job.

So each of our new colleagues, I say good luck. The office you now hold is a challenging one, particularly at a time like this, when our State faces incredibly important decisions, and as you have already heard, we will start facing some of those today. This job requires your full-time attention, and we know you will put your best effort into it. You will not win all the arguments, but with luck we will work together to help move Pennsylvania forward, and you will also leave with a feeling and sense of personal accomplishment.

Try to get to know your House and Senate colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Try to get with those with whom you might not think you have much in common. More often than not, you will find that we all have many things in common. We care about our constituents. We care about our districts. We care about our State.

It is a testament to each of you that you were selected to run as candidates and that the voters elected you. You are joining us in the middle of a session where intense work on the State budget and many other issues are under way. So jump right in. Make yourselves heard. That is why the people from your districts sent you here. It is an exciting time to serve in this House, and I am confident that each of you will do what it takes, and working together, all of us will help move Pennsylvania forward.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Reed, and thank you, Representative Dermody, for those outstanding remarks.

Once again, congratulations to our newest members.

That concludes our ceremony.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. We are going to recognize our majority caucus chair, Representative Sandy Major.

Ms. MAJOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to announce Republicans will caucus at 1:30. I would ask all our Republican members to please report to our caucus room at 1:30. We would be scheduled to come back on the floor, Mr. Speaker, at 2 p.m. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Madam Chair.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

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

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Democrats will also caucus at 1:30. Democrats will caucus at 1:30.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Members, we will be in recess then till 2 p.m., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

RECESS EXTENDED

The time of recess was extended until 2:30 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (JOHN MAHER) PRESIDING

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Democratic whip, who requests leaves of absence for the gentleman, Representative DeLUCA, and the gentleman, Representative O'BRIEN, for the day. Without objection, those leaves are granted.

The Chair recognizes the majority whip, who requests leaves of absence for Representatives EVERETT, KAMPF, METCALFE, SACCONI, TRUITT, VEREB, and SIMMONS. Without objection, those leaves are granted.

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

Dermody	Kavulich	Pashinski	Wheatley
Diamond	Keller, F.	Payne	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	White
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Youngblood
Driscoll	Killion	Petri	Zimmerman
Dunbar	Kim	Pickett	
Dush	Kinsey	Pyle	Turzai,
Ellis	Kirkland	Quigley	Speaker

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

DeLuca	Metcalf	Saccone	Truitt
Everett	O'Brien	Simmons	Veréb
Kampf			

LEAVES CANCELED—4

Everett	O'Brien	Simmons	Veréb
---------	---------	---------	-------

The SPEAKER pro tempore. One hundred and ninety-four members having voted on the master roll call, a quorum is present.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair notes the presence on the floor of the House of the gentleman, Representative Everett. His name will be added to the master roll.

CALENDAR

RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. BRIGGS called up **HR 107, PN 665**, entitled:

A Resolution honoring the life and public service contributions of William F. Ross of Montgomery County and extending condolences to his family.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—195

Acosta	English	Klunk	Quinn
Adolph	Evankovich	Knowles	Rader
Baker	Evans	Kortz	Rapp
Barbin	Everett	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Fabrizio	Krieger	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Farina	Lawrence	Reed
Bishop	Farry	Lewis	Reese
Bizzarro	Fee	Longietti	Regan
Bloom	Flynn	Mackenzie	Roae
Boback	Frankel	Maher	Roebuck
Boyle	Freeman	Mahoney	Ross
Bradford	Gabler	Major	Rothman
Braneky	Gainey	Maloney	Rozzi
Briggs	Galloway	Markosek	Sainato
Brown, R.	Gergely	Marshall	Samuelson

Brown, V.	Gibbons	Marsico	Sankey
Bullock	Gillen	Masser	Santarsiero
Burns	Gillespie	Matzie	Santora
Caltagirone	Gingrich	McCarter	Saylor
Carroll	Godshall	McClinton	Schemel
Causer	Goodman	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Christiana	Greiner	McNeill	Schreiber
Cohen	Grove	Mentzer	Schweyer
Conklin	Hahn	Metzgar	Sims
Corbin	Hanna	Miccarelli	Snyder
Costa, D.	Harhai	Millard	Sonney
Costa, P.	Harhart	Miller, B.	Staats
Cox	Harkins	Miller, D.	Stephens
Cruz	Harper	Milne	Sturla
Culver	Harris, A.	Moul	Tallman
Cutler	Harris, J.	Mullery	Taylor
Daley, M.	Heffley	Murt	Thomas
Daley, P.	Helm	Mustio	Tobash
Davidson	Hennessey	Neilson	Toepel
Davis	Hickernell	Nesbit	Toohil
Dawkins	Hill	Neuman	Topper
Day	Irvin	O'Neill	Vitali
Dean	James	Oberlander	Ward
Deasy	Jozwiak	Ortitay	Warner
DeLissio	Kaufner	Parker, C.	Watson
Delozier	Kauffman	Parker, D.	Wentling
Dermody	Kavulich	Pashinski	Wheatley
Diamond	Keller, F.	Payne	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	White
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Youngblood
Driscoll	Killion	Petri	Zimmerman
Dunbar	Kim	Pickett	
Dush	Kinsey	Pyle	Turzai,
Ellis	Kirkland	Quigley	Speaker
Emrick			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

DeLuca	Metcalf	Saccone	Truitt
Kampf	O'Brien	Simmons	Veréb

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY
SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Earlier today we spent time celebrating arrivals to the House of Representatives, and today, with some real sadness, I am noting the departure of one of our treasured staff.

Mary Geiger, whom you see before you here, has worked a combined 31 years of State service, including about 20 years in the House and a dozen years with the State Police or thereabouts, and she has worked with me these past many years, and I, for one, will miss her. And I hope you will all join me in wishing Mary all the best upon her retirement. Mary Geiger, please stand.

**THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI)
PRESIDING**

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. P. COSTA called up **HR 446, PN 2122**, entitled:

A Resolution congratulating Chalfant Borough upon the momentous occasion of its centennial anniversary.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—195

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

DeLuca	Metcalfe	Saccone	Truitt
Kampf	O'Brien	Simmons	Vereb

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

* * *

Mr. JOZWIAK called up **HR 447, PN 2123**, entitled:

A Resolution celebrating the 250th anniversary of the establishment of Shartlesville in Upper Bern Township, Berks County.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in supporting HR 447.

This resolution celebrates the 250th anniversary of the establishment of the village of Shartlesville in Upper Bern Township.

Shartlesville was established when the Shartle family in 1765 built the structure known as the Shartle Log Cabin Inn.

Many of the first settlers were of German and Swiss descent and earned a living as skilled carpenters and craftsmen. By 1830 the village had its own post office. The population of the village surged to 225 residents by 1885.

The small village continued to grow, and by its bicentennial year in 1965, it was home to 378 people. In 2004 more than 400 people called Shartlesville their home.

If any of my colleagues have not yet visited this historic village, I would encourage them to do so. Shartlesville restaurants offer Pennsylvania Dutch cooking, and this unique miniature village is a tourist destination.

This year – 2015 – marks the 250th anniversary of the founding of Shartlesville. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution honoring the proud 250-year history of Shartlesville. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—195

Acosta	English	Klunk	Quinn
Adolph	Evankovich	Knowles	Rader
Baker	Evans	Kortz	Rapp
Barbin	Everett	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Fabrizio	Krieger	Readshaw

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

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-8

DeLuca	Metcalfe	Saccone	Truitt
Kampf	O'Brien	Simmons	Vereb

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

* * *

Ms. HAHN called up **HR 448, PN 2124**, entitled:

A Resolution congratulating Chapman Borough, Northampton County, on the occasion of its 150th anniversary.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-195

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

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-8

DeLuca	Metcalfe	Saccone	Truitt
Kampf	O'Brien	Simmons	Vereb

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

* * *

Ms. V. BROWN called up **HR 450, PN 2126**, entitled:

A Resolution expressing condolences upon the passing of H. Julian Bond, civil rights leader, political activist, legislator and educator, and honoring his life and contributions to this nation and the African-American community.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—195

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

DeLuca	Metcalf	Saccone	Truitt
Kampf	O'Brien	Simmons	Vereb

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

UNCONTESTED SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. FARINA called up **HR 438, PN 2102**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of September 2015 as "Pulmonary Fibrosis Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Ms. BOBACK called up **HR 445, PN 2119**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the Nicholson Bridge in the Borough of Nicholson, Wyoming County.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolutions?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—195

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

Donatucci	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Youngblood
Driscoll	Killion	Petri	Zimmerman
Dunbar	Kim	Pickett	
Dush	Kinsey	Pyle	Turzai,
Ellis	Kirkland	Quigley	Speaker
Emrick			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

DeLuca	Metcalfe	Saccone	Truitt
Kampf	O'Brien	Simmons	Vereb

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Representative Simmons is in the hall of the House and will be placed on the master roll. Thank you, Representative.

BILL AND VETO MESSAGE REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes Chairman Bill Adolph, chair of the Appropriations Committee. I would ask all members to please take their seats.

Chairman Adolph.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to congratulate the new members for their big day, and as the Speaker and the leaders said earlier, you know, that was the nice part of the day. Today we are going to get into some business, but I can tell you, it is very important for the folks that we are trying to help here today.

Mr. Speaker, I make a motion to remove HB 1192, PN 1959, and the accompanying veto message from the table and place them on the supplemental calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Adolph, has moved that HB 1192, PN 1959, and the accompanying veto message be removed from the table.

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

The SPEAKER. On the motion, the Speaker recognizes Chairman Adolph.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I make this motion to remove HB 1192 and the accompanying veto message from the table because it gives us an opportunity here today to do what is right for the people of Pennsylvania.

Back on June 30 the General Assembly sent the Governor a balanced budget. Forty-five minutes later the Governor made an unprecedented decision to veto the entire budget. This decision to veto the entire budget, in my opinion, was an error in

judgment, because, Mr. Speaker, this decision failed to recognize the consequences that would result from this decision.

History will show that budget disagreements between the legislature and the executive are not uncommon. However, what has traditionally happened is the Governor has used his authority to line-item veto and blue-line areas of the budget where we disagree, which allowed other funds to continue to flow to other areas of the budget to minimize the disruption to the Commonwealth and its citizens. Unfortunately, our Governor decided to make a political statement and to veto the entire budget and, in turn, use people and service providers as an effort to win support for his entire budget. I cannot explain why the Governor made this decision. Like all of us here today, we have our own opinions, but whatever that decision was, it was not a good decision.

Let us look at where we are now. Again, I fully acknowledge that we continue to disagree on the issues of raising taxes and spending in certain areas of the budget, but HB 1192 contains over 270 line items that we had the same or even higher than what the Governor proposed in his March budget proposal. Some of these line items that are the same or even more than what the Governor proposed fund services for rape crisis and domestic violence centers, grants to students returning to college this week, and funds for our school districts to provide transportation so that a bus will show up for its students across the Commonwealth who are waiting on the corner to go to their first day of school. Mr. Speaker, these funds did not have to be vetoed. The groups that would normally receive these funds need our help and are asking us today to help them. They have shared with us the negative impact that they have experienced from not having these funds.

For example, Congreso is a nonprofit human service provider in the city of Philadelphia that provides education, health and welfare services, and crisis intervention to the Latino community. This organization is a model of an efficient organization that provides tremendous value to the community that far exceeds the amount of money they receive from the State and Federal government. Instead of encouraging this type of organization, the Governor's veto and subsequent withholding of funds has paralyzed this organization and put them in a position to make drastic service reductions. Let me read from a letter they sent to the Governor regarding the impact his veto is having on this organization. "Due to the Budget impasse and indecisions in Harrisburg as of September 1, 2015 Congreso must..." make these decisions:

"All employees will receive a 40% reduction in pay: exempt staff will continue to work five days and non-exempt staff will not work" but "two days per week, therefore grossly impacting...the community.

"330 children will not have access to after school programing, causing an economic impact to their parents who rely on..." this program "...after school activities.

"We will not be able to provide emergency relocation services to victims of domestic violence.

"11 full-time employees will be furloughed without pay..." starting "...September 1st – October 31st....

"It is unacceptable that the most vulnerable and those who serve the most vulnerable are having to carry the burden of Harrisburg's indecisions." They write, "I implore you on behalf of the domestic violence victims who we cannot relocate, for 330 children who will not have a safe afterschool option, and

for Congreso employees who live pay check to pay check, resolve this budget impasse or find a stop gap measure to support...." We are giving them that opportunity today. It is unacceptable that organizations like Congreso across the Commonwealth are in similar situations.

We have all heard of the United Way and we have all heard from the United Way on the impact of the budget impasse. They told us that a survey of their members found half of their respondents are experiencing cash flow problems; 23 percent of human service agencies have exhausted their funds; 60 percent plan to access lines of credit, adding additional unanticipated costs; 28 percent were curtailing services that include emergency food, safety for domestic violence victims, rental assistance, and many other critical human services. A United Way official said, and I quote, "Our elected officials really need to take action to assure...funding for essential state-funded programs so that providers and community organizations can address the basic needs of their constituents. The impasse is impeding their ability to supply vital services for..." those that need it the most.

Mr. Speaker, today we have that opportunity to fix this error in judgment, to fix this problem, honor our responsibilities to support these organizations, and provide the funding that is so important to these organizations while we continue to negotiate a budget.

Social service organizations are not the only ones affected by this veto. School students across the Commonwealth that attend parochial schools receive State support for textbooks and materials. I have dozens of e-mails that have been sent to me over the last several days from families who have told me their children have started school and they do not have textbooks. The Pennsylvania School Boards Association sent us all a letter this morning that says, "With the fiscal stress increasing for school districts with no state budget in place, short-term relief in the form of Title 1, Title 2, Pupil Transportation, School Food Services, as well as Safe Schools will provide needed funding in a few key areas to assist schools as the current school year begins. These funds would help prevent many..." schools "...from having to incur additional, unanticipated expenses as work continues on finding a state budget agreement."

As we consider this motion, take a moment and realize the opportunity we have here. We have the opportunity to set aside politics and do what is right. I have talked to many of you. Why can we not agree on certain items? I have looked through these line items. We have agreed on the funding. Both the Governor and us, we have agreed on these. The Governor made a mistake. He vetoed the entire budget. I served under Governor Rendell. We did not agree on the total budget, but he did not do what this Governor did. Now we can repair that, we can correct that, and continue to negotiate a budget.

I ask you to support this motion to remove HB 1192 from the table so that we can correct the wrong that has been caused by this unnecessary full budget veto for certain funding line items while we continue to negotiate. Mr. Speaker, let us put caucus politics aside, let us put politics aside. Let us do what the people of Pennsylvania have asked us to do, represent them. We are talking about \$3 billion today that we can get out to these agencies and these schools and take care of the most vulnerable people in Pennsylvania. Please, please, think for yourselves and make this good vote. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. Members, on this motion, only the leaders are able to argue on the motion along with the maker of the motion.

Representative Dermody is recognized.

I would also just note that if the Appropriations chair for the minority caucus wishes to speak as well, I would recognize that.

Representative Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, HB 1192 was unacceptable on June 30 and it is unacceptable today, and what we all know is, HB 1192 is just the fifth year of a Corbett budget, a budget that cut – that did nothing to restore funding cuts to education, human services, and to the people who need it the most in Pennsylvania. And make no mistake about it, that is what that bill that is up there today, that is all it does.

Now, we stood before this House and we considered this sham budget and we explained that we would never vote for a political stunt, but trying to remove this from the table to do line-item vetoes is nothing but a political stunt. We are 2 months later from June 30. The budget is 8 weeks overdue. We still have not addressed school funding cuts. We have not addressed cuts to human services. We have the fifth year of a Corbett budget. We have done nothing to promote economic development. We have done nothing to bring jobs to Pennsylvania. The only thing we have done and what we have done in spades is passed sham budget proposals rather than engage in serious budget negotiations that could lead to the end of this budget impasse. This is another political stunt.

Without going into detail, everyone knows that this process and this proposal are unconstitutional. You simply cannot line-item override a bill that was not line-item vetoed. All this stunt will do is give false hope to people that some relief may be on the way and only to crush that hope when the process is declared unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have time to waste on these games. We do not have money to waste on these games. Because of the sham proposals and because of the lack of negotiations, children are going without quality care and they are suffering. Adults with serious mental illnesses are in need of care and suffering. Working families who rely on local food banks to get them through lean times are suffering. Older Pennsylvanians seeking help to live at home and stay out of expensive nursing home care are suffering. Let us stop the games and get down to actual budget negotiations. I could go on and on and on, but what is the point? We would be wasting valuable time when we should be negotiating a real budget.

Mr. Speaker, this piecemeal process of this is unconstitutional. The motion to remove this bill from the table simply does not work, and we ought to be back doing the job of negotiating a responsible budget that helps all Pennsylvanians, that restores education funding, that restores the cuts to human services, and we ought to do it in a comprehensive way. This is nothing but a political stunt. You know it. I know it. You have all voted the last 5 years, not all of you, but several of you over the last 4 years and the fifth year for these budget cuts, for the cuts to human services.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. DERMODY. So what we ought to do right now is adjourn and go back upstairs to the room we just left with the Governor and the other four caucuses and negotiate a budget that makes sense for the people of Pennsylvania. So I make a motion to adjourn so that we can do just that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Members, please.

Representative Dermody has moved to adjourn.

Sir, do you wish to specify a specific date and time?

Mr. DERMODY. Until we have a budget, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Dermody, you do have to supply—

Mr. DERMODY. September 21, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Okay. September 21 of 2015 at 11 a.m.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. The motion to adjourn is a privileged motion, so the motion that will now be in front of us will be Representative Dermody's motion to adjourn to September 21, 2015.

Representative Reed.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, we would oppose the motion to adjourn.

And I would point out that we met with the Governor at 12:30 today. We requested to meet with the Governor this afternoon to continue budget negotiations. The Governor declined, and it appears from his official schedule it is because he is in Pittsburgh, where Governor Wolf will attend a panel discussion on Advancing Global University and Industry Partnerships today at 4 p.m. The discussion will take place at the Rashid Auditorium, Gates-Hillman Computer Science Center, 5000 Forbes Avenue in Pittsburgh. So if we could get the Governor here to have a budget discussion, as we offered and requested this afternoon, we could take a break. But since the Governor is not here and we have an opportunity to actually send desperately needed funding for human service programs to the people who need it the most today, it seems like we should take advantage of that opportunity, particularly since 274 out of the 401 line items in the budget are his numbers.

I understand that maybe the Governor has a problem accepting yes when we agree with his proposals, but there is no reason for us not to send this money to these programs when they need it. They are his numbers, and some of them are increases over last year's spending, particularly the domestic violence program, rape crisis centers, 10-percent increases over last year's funding. There is no reason to uphold this money until the Governor gets back from his trip to Pittsburgh.

Let us move on with this process. There is no reason to close down business at 3 o'clock today when a lot of human service agencies are wondering whether they are going to be able to bring their employees back tomorrow.

We would oppose the motion to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if the leader is ready to go back upstairs and start negotiating this budget, I believe we just walked past and I saw the Governor. I believe he is still in the building, and I am sure if we are ready to do that, we can go right back upstairs and try to get something that is responsible for the people of

Pennsylvania instead of something that is teasing people that will actually never come to fruition because it is unconstitutional and will never become law.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—82

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

NAYS—114

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

DeLuca	Metcalfe	Saccone	Vereb
Kampf	O'Brien	Truitt	

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

**BILL AND VETO MESSAGE
REMOVED FROM TABLE CONTINUED**

The SPEAKER. We will return to the motion to remove HB 1192, PN 1959, and the accompanying veto message from the table and place them on a supplemental calendar.

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

The SPEAKER. On the motion, Representative Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, my good friend from Delaware County when he made his motion brought out an example of an entity in Pennsylvania that he claims would be not funded properly and that this somehow would be a bad thing. He was talking about the Philadelphia Latino education folks called Congreso. And I just want members to know that the gentelady who represents them from Philadelphia met with them last Friday, and they told her that what they really wanted, more even than just their own particular funding, was an overall well-funded budget that takes care of all of the problems that we have in Pennsylvania and moves this State forward. That is not something that is just pulled out of the air, that is smoke and mirrors like we have seen so often in the past, something that will solve the structural deficit, because we know, as we move forward even beyond this year, unless we really do a good budget this year, we are going to be stuck with similar budgets and even worse in the next several years.

You know, it is interesting here, in the last 5 years that I have had the very great opportunity to be elected by my peers as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that we have fought, our caucus has fought time and time again for more funding for human services, and keep in mind, 5 years ago human services were cut drastically, not by the votes from our caucus, but by the votes from the Republican Caucus here in the House. We did not vote for those budgets because they did hurt people. They were painful votes. They were things that we did not think not only that we should do but the people of Pennsylvania at the end of the day did not want us to do. And here we are 5 years later, budget 5.0, if you will, and interestingly enough, all of a sudden I am hearing from the Republican Caucus that they are interested in human services. They want to fund human services. Where were they 4 years ago, 5 years ago when they cut human services to the bone? The counties still are not recovering. In fact, the money that even we are talking about here today does not bring the counties back to where they were 5 years ago when Governor Corbett cut the human services line items for the counties.

This is nothing more, as our leader has said, than a political gimmick. This is a gimmick, and I am not even sure what the outcome is. We have been at the table negotiating. I know they say we have not, but we have. They have not agreed with us on much, and we have not agreed with them on much, quite frankly, but that is what negotiations are. They are not done here on the floor of the House with some subterfuge-type votes to try to confuse the people of Pennsylvania and to fool the

people of Pennsylvania. This is not good government. This is what everybody is complaining about that is going on in Washington, DC, right now. People are not standing up here and doing the right thing, and that is a problem.

This is a very difficult budget. I do not see any quick end to it. We are going to be here for a while; I get it. We are not going to get everything that we want and they are not going to get everything that they want either, but we have to sit down and negotiate, negotiate, and negotiate until we come up with some solution for Pennsylvania. That is what Pennsylvanians deserve, that is what we should give them, and that is what we should do here today, is do the right thing.

And I would ask that we vote "no" on the motion to remove from the table by my good friend from Delaware County. Please vote "no." Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. Representative Reed.

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

Maybe the minority leader and I have a different definition of "political stunts," because I do not think it is a political stunt when you look to immediately send money to human service programs that desperately need it so they do not shut their doors, particularly when you take the funding levels and those of which were actually proposed by the Governor and by the Democratic Appropriations Committee chairman. The numbers that we are looking to run are 274 out of 401 line items that are absolutely agreed upon. They were presented by the Governor in his budget address, and my colleague, the Democratic Appropriations chairman, actually introduced those exact numbers in HB 1125 and offered those exact numbers as an amendment to HB 1192. We are not looking to cut any programs. We are not even looking at a disagreement. All parties – the House, the Senate, Republican, Democrat, and the Governor – agree upon those numbers. Two hundred and seventy-four line items in this budget are agreed upon, and we actually had made an offer to the Governor last week to agree upon a 275th line item, a \$400 million increase in basic education funding.

There is no reason to withhold funding for these programs when we all agree upon them other than to hold these programs and the consumers they service, the victims they serve, as hostage in this game of chicken over who can increase taxes the most across this country. This is an opportunity for us to do what is right, to send money to folks who deserve these dollars and then to do so in a manner which is agreed to – a 10-percent increase in domestic violence funding, a 10-percent increase in rape crisis funding, driving out the Federal dollars to education that are merely a pass-through from the State that we have to redistribute to the school districts that were caught in the political gamesmanship of the Governor vetoing an entire budget instead of actually taking time to read it.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this to come to an end. We can negotiate the 125 line items that are not agreed to, but we can do so while driving out the money to these services. Even if we could get the Governor to meet with us again today and we reach a budget agreement this afternoon, we all know, because of the budget process, it is going to take several weeks to get a budget bill the whole way through the legislative process and to his desk for his signature. This is a way to immediately drive out funds to those who need it the most in Pennsylvania.

And like I said, we are not asking folks to put their differences aside today on items that are not agreed to. We took the House Democratic Appropriations chairman's numbers and

we took the Governor's numbers and decided to agree with those numbers for the sake of getting the money to the folks who need it the most. Today is an opportunity for us to do that, to do it in an expedited fashion, and the Senate has assured us they will come back tomorrow and take the same action so those funds are flowing by the end of the week. There is no reason for these hostages not to be released, these victims to be serviced, and for us to move forward and try to iron out the differences that remain.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the members to support the motion to remove HB 1192 from the table for consideration this afternoon. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Adolph, Chairman Adolph, has moved that HB 1192, PN 1959, and the accompanying veto message be removed from the table.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. Representative Gergely's button is not registering, so they are going to take a look at that before we close the vote.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—114

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

NAYS—82

Acosta	Davis	Harkins	Parker, C.
Barbin	Dawkins	Harris, J.	Pashinski
Bishop	Dean	Kavulich	Petrarca
Bizzarro	Deasy	Keller, W.	Ravenstahl
Boyle	DeLissio	Kim	Readshaw

Bradford	Dermody	Kinsey	Roebuck
Braneky	Donatucci	Kirkland	Rozzi
Briggs	Driscoll	Kortz	Sainato
Brown, V.	Evans	Kotik	Samuelson
Bullock	Fabrizio	Longietti	Santarsiero
Burns	Farina	Mahoney	Schlossberg
Caltagirone	Flynn	Markosek	Schreiber
Carroll	Frankel	Matzie	Schweyer
Cohen	Freeman	McCarter	Sims
Conklin	Gainey	McClinton	Snyder
Costa, D.	Galloway	McNeill	Sturla
Costa, P.	Gergely	Miller, D.	Thomas
Cruz	Gibbons	Mullery	Vitali
Daley, M.	Goodman	Neilson	Wheatley
Daley, P.	Hanna	Neuman	Youngblood
Davidson	Harhai		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

DeLuca	Metcalfe	Saccone	Vereb
Kampf	O'Brien	Truitt	

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

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER. Members, an announcement.

Lara Greenberg and Kyle Cooper of CBS 21 are videotaping with audio for their 6 p.m. news. Thank you.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR C

BILL VETOED BY GOVERNOR

The House proceeded to consideration of the veto message on **HB 1192, PN 1959**, entitled:

An Act to provide from the General Fund for the expenses of the Executive and Judicial Departments, the State Government Support Agencies and the General Assembly of the Commonwealth, the public debt and the public schools for the fiscal year July 1, 2015, to June 30, 2016, for certain institutions and organizations, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015; to provide appropriations from the State Lottery Fund, the Tobacco Settlement Fund, the Aviation Restricted Account, the Hazardous Material Response Fund, The State Stores Fund, the Milk Marketing Fund, the Home Investment Trust Fund, the Emergency Medical Services Operating Fund, the Tuition Account Guaranteed Savings Program Fund, the Banking Fund, the Firearm Records Check Fund, the Ben Franklin Technology Development Authority Fund, the Oil and Gas Lease Fund, the Home Improvement Account, the Cigarette Fire Safety and Firefighter Protection Act Enforcement Fund, the Insurance Regulation and Oversight Fund, the Pennsylvania Racehorse Development Restricted Receipt Account, the Justice Reinvestment Fund and the Multimodal Transportation Fund to the Executive Department; to provide appropriations from the Judicial Computer System Augmentation Account to the Judicial Department for the fiscal year July 1, 2015, to June 30, 2016; to provide appropriations from the Motor License Fund for the fiscal year July 1, 2015, to June 30, 2016, for the proper operation of several departments of the Commonwealth and the Pennsylvania State Police authorized to spend Motor License Fund money; to provide for the appropriation of Federal funds to the Executive Department of the Commonwealth and for the payment of bills remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015; and to provide for the additional appropriation of Federal and State funds from the General Fund and the State Lottery Fund for the Executive Department of the Commonwealth for the fiscal

year July 1, 2014, to June 30, 2015, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015.

MOTION FOR LINE OVERRIDE OF VETO

The SPEAKER. Representative Adolph is recognized.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for that vote.

Mr. Speaker, I move that pursuant to Article IV, sections 15 and 16, of the Constitution of Pennsylvania the House proceed with reconsideration of the following items in HB 1192: budget implementation language contained on page 7, line 18, through page 8, line 11; page 15, lines 1 through 3; and page 192, lines 17 through 21, title language and short title; page 193, line 30, through page 195, line 30, abbreviations and appropriations from the General Fund; page 205, line 23, through page 208, line 13, Federal augmentation appropriations and block grants; page 376, line 12, through page 380, line 7, Federal funds and necessary miscellaneous provisions; page 381, lines 4 through 10, lapsing of unused funds; page 384, lines 23 through 29, effective date. In addition, page 269, lines 2 through 5, which authorizes the appropriation of sums to the Department of Human Services; and page 290, line 25, through page 291, line 2, which provides State and Federal funding for rape crisis centers.

The SPEAKER. As the good gentleman has indicated, turning to supplemental C House calendar, Chairman Adolph has called up the veto override on HB 1192, PN 1959, and in front of us at this time and with respect to that override, it contains the specific lines that were made mention of by Chairman Adolph on the record.

On the question,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The SPEAKER. Representative Adolph, on the motion.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I know that was a lot of numbers, a lot of lines, a lot of pages, but let me tell you what this is all about. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override the Governor's veto of the rape crisis program's appropriation in the Department of Human Services and ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for an affirmative vote.

HB 1192 appropriates \$9.639 million for this line item for the 2015-16 fiscal year. It is very, very important to note that this amount is the exact same amount requested by the Governor in his March 3 budget, the exact same amount as proposed by my good friend from Allegheny County, Chairman Markosek. Moreover, it is also important to note that this funding amount represents a 10-percent increase in funding for this line item over the amount provided in the fiscal year 2014-15. This bill is a 10-percent increase provided in the year 2014-15 and a 13.5-percent increase provided in the 2013-14 fiscal year on this line item.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this, and I am asking my colleagues once again, we could make the front pages of every newspaper of Pennsylvania if we did the right thing today and provided funding that we all agree on. These numbers will not

change no matter when that budget is agreed upon, but this is the right thing. These folks are depending on it. They depend on us to do the right thing. Let us put the State legislature on the same page as the Governor. Show the Governor that we want these fundings that we all agree on. The Governor agrees on it.

Talk about political stunts. Vetoing that budget and vetoing this funding was the political stunt. Let us correct that and do the right thing and support this motion. Thank you so much. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dermody, on the motion to override.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, clearly, the political stunt is this motion to override this line-item veto. Whether you vote "yes" or "no" on this unconstitutional override, it does nothing to speed up real financial relief to service providers. What it does is it gives nothing but false hope to those providers and the people they serve in order to serve the political ins of the Republican Party. Mr. Speaker, I say this process gives false hope because, as everyone knows, this piecemeal process of line-item overriding the Governor's veto in a bill that was not line-item vetoed is patently unconstitutional, but do not take my word for it. You do not have to take my word for it. Mr. Speaker, take the word of one of the most respected legal authorities in our State government, the nonpartisan Reference Bureau. Mr. Speaker, in a legal opinion dated August 11, 2015, an opinion that is currently being e-mailed to all of you, I believe, the LRB (Legislative Reference Bureau) concluded that "Under the Constitution of Pennsylvania, the General Assembly must reconsider a vetoed bill in the manner in which the bill was vetoed. Because the Governor vetoed the General Appropriation Act of 2015 in its entirety, the bill must be reconsidered as a whole and not on a line-by-line basis. Furthermore, reconsidering a general veto on a line-by-line basis would lead to the unconstitutional result of effectively rewriting and enacting new legislation without executive approval in contravention of the presentment clause of the Constitution of Pennsylvania."

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on about what is wrong with this process, but that would be wasting our valuable time that should be used in negotiating a real budget. This is an unconstitutional process. All these service providers you are so greatly concerned with today that you have not been concerned with for 5 years will get nothing.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mr. DERMODY. In the interest of not wasting any more time, I will submit the rest of the opinion, the LRB's opinion, I will submit that for the record.

But let us make no mistake about it, this override, these overrides are not going to get a dime or a nickel to the people who need it the most. What will be sitting down and negotiating a real budget. This is nothing but a cynical waste of time, Mr. Speaker. The people we represent do not need false hope; they do not need games. They need a real budget that works for all Pennsylvanians. Vote "no."

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

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Legislative Reference Bureau

August 11, 2015

LEGAL OPINION

This opinion is issued to the requestor and the requestor's staff for individual use. The Legislative Reference Bureau issues only advisory opinions and does not issue rulings or binding legal opinions.

Vincent C. DeLiberato, Jr.
Director

SUBJECT: Constitutionality of Overriding the Governor's General Veto on a Line-by-Line Basis.

QUESTION PRESENTED

Does the Constitution of Pennsylvania permit the General Assembly to override the Governor's general veto of House Bill 1192, Printer's No. 1959 (2015), the General Appropriation Act of 2015, on a line-by-line basis?

BRIEF ANSWER

No. Under the Constitution of Pennsylvania, the General Assembly must reconsider a vetoed bill in the manner in which the bill was vetoed. Because the Governor vetoed the General Appropriation Act of 2015 in its entirety, the bill must be reconsidered as a whole and not on a line-by-line basis.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

By letter dated July 28, 2015, to Vince DeLiberato, Director of the Legislative Reference Bureau, Representative Frank Dermody requested a legal opinion as to whether the Constitution of Pennsylvania permits the General Assembly to override the Governor's general veto of House Bill 1192, Printer's No. 1959 (2015), the General Appropriation Act of 2015, on a line-by-line basis.

DISCUSSION

Does the Constitution of Pennsylvania permit the General Assembly to override the Governor's general veto of House Bill 1192, Printer's No. 1959 (2015), the General Appropriation Act of 2015, on a line-by-line basis?

The Constitution of Pennsylvania provides the Governor with two options for vetoing a bill passed by the General Assembly: general and line item. Article IV, § 15 of the Constitution of Pennsylvania (hereinafter referred to as § 15) requires that each bill passed by the General Assembly be presented to the Governor. Pa. Const. (1984 Ed.) Article IV, § 15, *Purdon's Statutes*, Const. Art. 4, § 15 (2011). If the Governor does not approve the bill, § 15, *inter alia*, allows the Governor to issue a veto of the entire bill, a general veto. The general veto authority under § 15 applies to all bills, including appropriation bills. If the disapproved bill includes appropriations, Article IV, § 16 of the Constitution of Pennsylvania (hereinafter referred to as § 16) allows the Governor to veto distinct appropriations in the bill, *i.e.*, a line-item veto. Pa. Const. (1984 Ed.) Art. IV, § 16, *Purdon's Statutes*, Const. Art. 4, § 16 (2011).

Where the Constitution clearly expresses a process, "that procedure must be followed to the exclusion of all others, including a procedure which the legislature may prefer..." *School Districts of Deer Lakes and Allegheny Valley v. Robert P. Kane*, 463 Pa. 554, 564, 345 A.2d 658, 663 (1975). Section 15 provides the sole process for overriding a veto. *See Jubelirer v. Rendell*, 598 Pa. 16, 27-28, 953 A. 2d 514, 521 (2008).

Under § 15, the Governor must send a vetoed bill back to its house of origin for reconsideration. "If after such re-consideration, two-thirds of all the members elected to that House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent with the objections to the other House by which likewise it shall be re-considered." Pa. Const. Art. IV, § 15. Section 16 states that an "item or items of appropriation disapproved shall be void,

unless *re-passed according to the rules and limitations prescribed for the passage of other bills over the Executive veto.*" Pa. Const. Art. IV, § 16 (emphasis added). As the only rule or limitation that provides for the passage of bills over an executive veto, § 15 must be examined to determine the process for overriding a line-item veto under § 16.

Section 15 instructs the Governor to send the vetoed "bill" back to the house in which the bill was generated, where the "bill" may be reconsidered and voted on a second time. Pa. Const. Art. IV, § 15. This can be contrasted with § 16, which states that the "item or items of appropriation" not approved by the Governor are sent back to the General Assembly for reconsideration. Pa. Const. Art. IV, § 16. It follows that the General Assembly in reconsidering a line-item veto may vote to override only those vetoed "items of appropriation," not the bill as a whole. In contrast, the veto of House Bill 1192, Printer's No. 1959 (2015) was not a line-item veto of a general appropriations bill, but a veto of the bill *in toto*, to be reconsidered in accordance with § 15. Section 16 is inapplicable to the veto of a bill in its entirety.

A critical distinction between a § 16 line-item veto and a § 15 general veto is expressed in a Governor's veto message. For a § 16 line-item veto, the message reads that the bill at issue is approved with exceptions (the vetoed line items). For a § 15 general veto, the message reads that the bill at issue is being returned absent approval. Unlike a § 16 line-item veto, the operative provisions of a bill vetoed under § 15 are not enacted into law. As such, the General Assembly may not reconsider the individual line items that make up a general appropriation bill on a line-by-line basis since there is no framework within which to consider them when the operative provisions of the bill are vetoed as a whole. Since no portion of a bill is approved under a § 15 veto, the bill lacks a title and an enacting clause, both of which are required for a bill to pass constitutional muster. A bill's title and enacting clause are not "items" that can be reconsidered under § 16. The only available avenue for reconsideration of a general appropriation bill which is vetoed in its entirety is reconsideration in

accordance with § 15, and § 15 contemplates reconsideration of a bill as a whole.

It is beyond the scope of this legal opinion as to whether the General Assembly may reconsider, by separate vote, each line item disapproved by the Governor in a veto under § 16. Research, however, has indicated that the General Assembly has reconsidered vetoed line appropriations as separate items at least once in the past. On June 13, 1978, the House of Representatives divided the question of the Governor's line-item vetoes to reconsider one line-item veto separately from other vetoed appropriations. *See* bill history, House Bill 2246, Printer's No. 3156 (1978). After a parliamentary inquiry into the legal basis for dividing the question, the House voted on and passed a motion to divide the question on June 13, 1978. The members did not debate the legal framework for dividing the question. On June 20, 1978, a majority of the Senate voted to suspend the Senate rule on dividing the question and proceeded to vote on the line-item vetoes as a single package. Two years earlier, on June 29, 1976, the General Assembly reconsidered a general veto of a budget-related bill under § 15. The bill dealt with appropriating Federal funds received by the Commonwealth. No member moved to divide the question, and the bill was reconsidered and overridden in its entirety. *See* bill history, Senate Bill 1542, Printer's No. 2068 (1976). Research fails to reveal an occasion when a Governor of this Commonwealth vetoed a general appropriation bill in its entirety, and thus a subsequent override of a general veto of a general appropriations by the General Assembly has never been considered.

Finally, overriding a general veto by reconsidering and repassing individual items of an appropriation bill may lead to an unconstitutional result. The legislation would essentially need to rewrite the bill if every item does not receive the necessary two-thirds vote. For example, if the line items for one department or a special fund are not restored by a two-thirds vote, then those items cannot appear in the bill. Eliminating the non-overridden provisions

effectively amends the original bill during the reconsideration process, and the bill repassed to override the veto would not be the same bill originally received by the Governor. In such a case, the General Assembly would have the ability to write, pass and enact a new bill in contravention of the presentment clause of the Constitution of Pennsylvania. Pa. Const. Art. IV, § 15.¹ This "rewrite" of the bill does not occur when the General Assembly reconsiders a bill vetoed in its entirety because the language of the bill remains the same as long as the two-thirds vote to override is achieved.

CONCLUSION

Under the Constitution of Pennsylvania, the General Assembly must reconsider a vetoed bill in the manner in which the bill was vetoed. Because the Governor vetoed the General Appropriation Act of 2015 in its entirety, the bill must be reconsidered as a whole and not on a line-by-line basis. Furthermore, reconsidering a general veto on a line-by-line basis would lead to the unconstitutional result of effectively rewriting and enacting new legislation without executive approval in contravention of the presentment clause of the Constitution of Pennsylvania.

¹ Section 15 requires that every bill passed by the General Assembly be presented to the Governor, who then has the option to sign or veto the bill.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Representative Vereb is in the hall of the House and will be placed on the master roll.

CONSIDERATION OF MOTION FOR LINE OVERRIDE OF VETO CONTINUED

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. Representative Mustio.

Mr. MUSTIO. Mr. Speaker, are members permitted to interrogate—

The SPEAKER. Representative Mustio—

Mr. MUSTIO. —or is it just leaders?

The SPEAKER. Yes, if I might.

It is my understanding from the Parliamentarian that any member speaking on budget bills, there is a 5-minute clock except for the leaders, and we are going to restart that here for

you. But my understanding is, everybody has 5 minutes, and including within that 5 minutes is a time for interrogation if the person to whom you wish to interrogate accepts that opportunity to be interrogated.

Mr. MUSTIO. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Now, please proceed.

Mr. MUSTIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The minority leader raised some points, and I just wanted to ask him some questions, if he will entertain them.

The SPEAKER. The minority leader has declined.

Mr. MUSTIO. Okay. Then I will ask and he does not have to answer them.

He raised the issue that they were going to be unconstitutional, and I guess I am a little bit confused on how this procedure works today. It was my understanding, at least the way it was explained to me, that if we voted with a number of "yes" votes that enabled this to override the Governor's veto, that the legislation or that particular line item that we passed would then go to the Senate. They would come in and entertain it, and assuming they did the same, that that would then authorize the release of those funds. He claims that that would be unconstitutional. My question to him was, one, who has the standing to determine that that is unconstitutional? In other words, which one of the Democrat members is going to go file a lawsuit to prevent the rape crisis centers from getting money or, you know, what organization would have standing? That was what I wanted to ask him, that question.

I will not use up any more of my time, but that was the issue that came to mind.

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

Representative Reed.

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

You know, sometimes in this building we get caught up in who is right and who is wrong – Republican, Democrat. Sometimes members are forced by their own Governor to make votes that maybe they do not agree upon to uphold his vetoes and we forget about the folks who are really impacted by these line items out there in our communities across the Commonwealth.

This particular line item, the funding for our rape crisis centers, when it passed HB 1192 was budgeted at \$9.639 million. That represented a 10-percent increase over the funding that was provided last year. That funding amount also represents this same exact funding amount the Governor proposed in his budget address on March 3. It also represents the same exact funding amount that the Democratic chairman of the House Appropriations Committee proposed in his budget as presented in HB 1125 as well as the amendment he filed to HB 1192 when it moved through the legislative process, all three parties to this discussion in exact agreement on a 10-percent increase for rape crisis centers across the Commonwealth.

It is easy to talk about numbers, though. Sometimes, probably, it is more important to talk about the folks who are actually impacted by these dollars not flowing to our rape crisis centers. Perhaps we should look at the victims of rape and sexual assault across this Commonwealth and the statistics provided by the Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Statistics, just so we have an idea of the folks we are withholding funding from today. The ages of the victims:

Eleven percent of those who are victims of rape and sexual assault are ages 15 to 17, 15 percent are ages 18 to 20, 21 to 29 years old is 26 percent of the victims, and 45 percent of the victims were over 30 years of age.

And then if we look at what the victims were doing at the time of the assault, we see some truly disturbing statistics. At the time the victims were assaulted, 11 percent of them were working in their profession, 1 percent was going to and from work, 3 percent were going to and from school, 4 percent were going to and from another place, 5 percent of the victims were actually in school at the time they were assaulted – 5 percent of the victims were in school at the time they were assaulted – 29 percent were engaged in a leisure activity away from home, 20 percent were sleeping, and 25 percent were engaged in another activity at home. These are the victims of the crimes. These are the things they were doing, going about their daily business, when they were victimized by the offenders across the State. These are the folks that voting against this motion to override this veto is withholding funding from. You are not withholding it from the Republican Party. You are not withholding it from the Democratic Party. You are not withholding it from legislators inside this Capitol. You are withholding it from victims across this State.

And when you look at the statistics on Pennsylvania crime rates, in the year 2013, the most recent statistics available, 2,638 victims were forcibly raped in this Commonwealth – 2,638 people that you are denying rape crisis services to as a result of your failure to send agreed-to funds to these rape crisis centers. That is 20 to 25 folks out of every 100,000 people that exist in this State. I represent a rural county with a population of around 90,000 people in Indiana County. According to those statistics, 20 to 25 of those folks will be raped in the next year. If we do not send these funds to them, they will have no rape crisis center to fall back on to help them survive the horrible tragedy that has been bestowed upon them.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to do the right thing. We have the opportunity to agree upon the Governor's number, the House Democratic number, the House Republican number, and send these dollars to these services today, not next week, not next month, not next year, whatever budget proposal might be finalized on the items we disagree upon. Let us send these agreed-to dollars to the victims who need it the most.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Bryan Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there were some questions as to the constitutionality of what we are working on today, and I simply wanted to share some what I think are very on-point legal precedents.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, there was reference to the actions that are before us and a memo that was distributed by the minority leader, and I would simply like to point out that on page 1, the Legislative Reference Bureau only issues advisory opinions. They are just that; they are an opinion. And then further on, on page 6, they go on to say, "Research fails to reveal an occasion when a Governor of this Commonwealth vetoed a general appropriation bill in its entirety, and thus a subsequent override of a general veto of a general appropriations by the General Assembly has never been considered." So, Mr. Speaker, in regards to the memo, one, it is advisory, and two, it is in fact unprecedented. The actions of

this Governor were unprecedented in the denial of money for these services.

Mr. Speaker, absent prior precedents or prior decisions, I think it is instructive to look at what the Constitution says is our legislative authority, and these are simply the highlights, given the 5-minute time limitation. The legislative authority of the Commonwealth resides in the General Assembly, and the Governor's authority to veto is a limited, derivative legislative authority. The reason that is important is because the General Assembly has all the powers not specifically prohibited by either the State or the Federal Constitution. The General Assembly's constitutional authority provides it with the same options, the same options, that the Governor has, regardless of how he characterizes his exercise of the veto. The only constitutionally prescribed legislative response is the same for both Article IV, sections 15 and 16, a two-thirds majority requirement. Mr. Speaker, that is the only prescriptive part contained in the Constitution regarding the override of a veto. Article IV, section 16, in fact has not been literally construed for 114 years. In 1901, based on the Governor's determination of his own authority, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court determined that the Governor could unilaterally reduce the amount of any item even though it was not enumerated as such a power in section 16. The legislature, as a coequal branch of government, has the ultimate legislative authority and is entitled to no less deference.

Mr. Speaker, we could get into some of the cases that have discussed this, and I think it is worth mentioning, since we do have a little bit of time left. The foundational principle is the separation of powers that is found explained I think fairly well in *Jubelirer v. Rendell*, and additionally, that same case recognizes the legislative authority being vested in the General Assembly. Article II, section 1, of our Constitution clearly says, "The legislative power of this Commonwealth shall be vested in a General Assembly, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives." And the *Jubelirer* case affirmed, and I am quoting from the case from 2008, that "All affirmative legislative powers are given exclusively to the General Assembly." To the extent that these powers are not prohibited by either the State or the Federal Constitution, we have a long litany of additional cases that show how this power can be exercised. Under the *Clymer* case in 1845 by our own Supreme Court, "The cardinal rule is, that the state legislature has all the powers not prohibited by either of the two constitutions."

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, as recently as the *Stilp v. Com., Gen. Assembly* case in 2009, "...a reviewing court must narrowly construe a constitutional provision which places limitations on the power of the Legislature, as, unlike the federal Constitution, the powers not expressly withheld from the General Assembly inhere in it."

Mr. Speaker, to sum this up, quite plainly, our Constitution gives us all legislative authority that is not expressly prescribed as in the methodology by which we need to follow, or if it is absent, we have the rules to determine our own course. Mr. Speaker, that is laid out in both the rules as well as Mason's Manual and prior court precedents where the courts have recognized that we have this authority.

So is this unprecedented? The answer is yes, but only because the Governor's actions were first unprecedented, and to that regard, we have the constitutional authority and, I would argue, the constitutional duty to ensure that those citizens who

need this funding in fact receive it in a timely manner, and this is the most time-efficient way to ensure that they are paid.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Hanna.

Mr. HANNA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of responses to some of the issues that have been raised.

First off, you know, I have to ask, where was all this concern for human services 5 years ago when you cut everything by 10 percent?

And secondly, am I hearing the gentleman from Allegheny County and the gentleman from Indiana County correctly when they say that we should ignore the Constitution or ignore what is right and wrong and instead just take a chance that no one will take this to court? I mean, I think that is what I heard, and that certainly does not make sense to me.

Mr. Speaker, if there was any doubt about this being a stunt, I think we can put that to rest by just sharing with you that your Appropriations chair held a press conference last week to talk about this process and what he intended to do. Mr. Speaker, I am here to share with you that we were never consulted, never asked if we could support any of this, and until today, just 3 hours ago, was the first time that anyone asked us where we stood on this, and even at that point, Mr. Speaker, no one shared with us which line items they were going to make the motion for. We are learning for the first time here on the floor. Now, if that does not scream political stunt to you, I do not know what does. I mean, clearly, if they had any hope of accomplishing this, they would have shared that with us long before we got here. They know it cannot be done without us.

And, Mr. Speaker, finally, the most important argument, whether it is constitutional or unconstitutional. I am submitting to you that you need to put your faith in the Legislative Reference Bureau, the people who do this on a professional basis, on a nonpartisan basis every single day of the year, and they said it cannot be done this way. I would also submit to you that law professors across this State have said unanimously that it cannot be done this way. And with respect to the legal authority that was just cited to you, I believe that is the same legal authority that was wrong on voter ID after you passed that and the courts said it was no good. It was wrong on Act 13 and the courts said you were wrong. The preemption of municipal firearms was rejected after you were told that it was going to be constitutional. AdultBasic was rejected by the courts after you were told it was going to be constitutional, and the first effort at tort reform was rejected by the courts after you were told it was going to be constitutional. The legal authorities that have been tested here have clearly demonstrated that you should be going with the Legislative Reference Bureau and not with the arguments that were just made by my counterpart, the Republican whip.

Mr. Speaker, for all those reasons I would ask that we vote "no" on this override. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Stephens.

Mr. STEPHENS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I know there has been a lot of discussion from both sides of the aisle as it relates to these issues, but I think it is really important that we refocus the discussion on the people that benefit from these programs. They do not care about the politics of this, they do not care about the party label after your

name, they do not care about the party label after the Governor's name, or anything else like that. What they care about is that when they need help, they get it; that when they have a problem and they place that phone call from a hospital in the middle of the night, that there is someone there to answer the call; that when they need services to relocate themselves and their loved ones from an abusive situation, that there is someone there to help them, that the resources are available for them. All of this is lost on them.

There is someone right now in Pennsylvania who needs help, and they are not sitting at home watching PCN (Pennsylvania Cable Network) to see what we are doing about this budget nonsense in their opinion. They just want to know that when they pick up the phone, someone is going to answer and help is going to be on the way. And we have an opportunity here, you know, we have an opportunity to make sure that that help is available for them through the resources that we provide.

If you have any wonder about whether or not there are real people that are affected, just ask your local rape crisis centers, right? I mean, I took it upon myself to reach out to the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape and ask, "Hey, how are some of your facilities dealing with the impasse?" I would urge all of the members to do that, and if you do, you might have a better perspective on what we are here to accomplish today.

The generic answer I got was that the best finance programs have said that October is the latest they can last. Most are approaching massive layoffs and shutdowns, but there are some individual rape crisis centers from around the Commonwealth that have particularly dire situations. Quote, "Barring significant donor support, we would have to close our doors and lay off all staff entirely. I have laid myself off one day a week, no other staffer laid off at this point."

Another rape crisis center, up in the Scranton area: "We have already had to cut back in hours of operation." And another one: "We are making plans for layoffs in September gradually, we think. We have 6 of the staff that can wait for money, but the rest of the 22 will need to try to get unemployment by mid- to late September. We will have to cancel prevention education programs. Forty-three years of building relationships down the drain, and losing good staff and training new. We had two people leave and we are waiting to fill, so there will be more pressure on the staff that may get laid off. Way to build morale."

These are people that are on the front lines helping our constituents, our constituents. They do not care about party labels, they do not care about politics, and they do not care about the nonsense that they view as the budget impasse we are dealing with. What they care about is when they place a phone call for help, someone answers that call, and the help is there for their use. So I would urge the members of both sides of the aisle to support this particular initiative and restore this funding for rape crisis centers, so that when that call comes in, someone answers it, there is someone on the other line who can lend a helping hand.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kate Harper.

Ms. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, when I first got here some years ago, there were two things that surprised me about this place. The first was that well more than half of the legislators that I met were here for the right reasons. I had thought from what I had heard that

they were in it for themselves, but most legislators, I discovered, are here because they wanted to do the right thing for the right reason and they cared about the communities they represented and the Commonwealth at large and the public good.

The second thing that I learned that really surprised me was that you come here prepared to vote to help people and almost every vote requires you to weigh tradeoffs. You help this person, that person gets hurt; you give something to this person, that person pays for it; and that was very difficult. But I have to tell you, a "yes" vote on this has no downside and does the right thing for the right reason.

I am a rank-and-file member. I am not in the negotiating sessions with the Governor. I would love to have a balanced budget that 102 of us could vote for and pass, but they are trying to do that, the leaders; I believe that. They are trying and they are not there yet.

We could vote to override this line-item veto; no one gets hurt because we all agree that these services are important for Pennsylvania. We all agree on that. We do not have a disagreement. The Governor does not disagree; you do not disagree; I do not disagree. We all agree that the rape crisis centers should be funded. All you have to do is vote "yes."

If you vote "yes" and the Senate comes back tomorrow and does what they have told us they can do, the rape crisis centers get their money on Friday. We can still fight over the larger issues in the budget that we do not agree on, but on the stuff we agree on – and there are hundreds of line items out of which we are only going to deal with about two dozen this afternoon – let us vote "yes," let us get it done, let us do it. That is what we want to do.

This is a good thing. You have nothing against rape crisis centers. I have nothing against rape crisis centers. They perform a very valuable service, so let us vote "yes."

Do not be worried about constitutionality. Let me tell you, I am a lawyer, I am a lawyer. I read this memo that the gentleman from Allegheny sent out.

Mr. Speaker, I have the floor.

The SPEAKER. Members, members, please. Members, please. The gentelady from Montgomery County has the floor. Please suspend.

Members, please. These are important votes in front of us.

Representative Harper, the floor is yours.

Ms. HARPER. Thank you.

I read this memo; I am a lawyer. It does not cite a single case that holds the vote we are about to take as unconstitutional – not a single one.

So to go back to my point, most of us are here for the right reasons to do the right things. Most of us do not disagree that rape crisis centers need funding and they need it sooner rather than later. We give up nothing by taking care of those things we agree on.

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

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Representative Petri.

Mr. PETRI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to address the members on the commonsense aspect of the constitutionality argument. You know, the Governor has raised that question in his letter that he wrote to all members yesterday as to whether this vote is constitutional or not. So let us talk in plain language.

Something is constitutional, initially, when we vote and say it is – it is a little odd, but it is something that happens here – but ultimately, it is for a judge to decide. But a judge does not decide that issue unless there is a controversy, and in order to have a controversy, there have to be two squabbling parties. There has to be somebody withstanding.

So let us take the present vote, does anyone in this chamber believe that rape crisis centers are going to challenge our vote to give them money now? Of course not. Why would they? This is the amount they expect to receive, this is the amount they say they need to operate their operations and take care of our constituents, and it is the amount that they would receive.

So who is it that is going to bring this challenge to say it is unconstitutional? Is it the Governor? If so, why would the Governor do that?

I think the majority leader used the word "hostage" and it is exactly what I was thinking. It is a hostile word, it is a hostile action, but that is the only logical perspective I can have, that somebody wants to file a challenge against an organization that does a good job in providing necessary services and we are going to deny them the money now so that we can gain something else. And the Governor's letter is very instructive, to me, as to what he wants.

He indicates on the first page, he has three goals: reduce property taxes, eliminate the deficit, and a commonsense severance tax. Okay, so let us say that is his ultimate goal. We know that that package is \$8 billion in taxes. We also know today that on the floor of this House, there has been not one single vote for that combined package. So as of yesterday, the Governor is still demanding \$8 billion in new taxes as a method of gaining compliance with his entire budget.

The spend side of his budget is very admirable. We would all like to have money for various items, but the truth is, the truth is that today we have human service folks that need funding. We are starting with the rape crisis centers. We have the ability to deliver the money, and the only logical argument that is being offered is, it is unconstitutional, and I say, who would bring that challenge and shame on them if they do.

Thank you. Vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Representative Quinn.

Ms. QUINN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have to say if anyone just tuned into PCN and they saw the casual chatter and even just heard recent laughter in this chamber, that they would find it hard to believe that we are presently discussing whether or not we are going to take a vote to immediately fund our rape crisis centers.

Are we really that desensitized to rape by TV shows like "Law and Order," "CSI," all of the rest, where at the end of 1 hour the bad guy is either caught or not and another show begins? That is not what rape is about. How could we consider not driving immediate dollars out?

I know some of you have been in this chamber far longer than I, and we have just welcomed some others – and I hope you never have to do this – but if you have ever picked up the phone and talked to a parent or a spouse of someone who has been raped, you will know that that is not a 1-hour episode and then the channel is changed. You will know that that person suffers physical, emotional damage, and they need the services, the unique services that our rape crisis centers are trained to deliver.

Do the right thing. This is not a game. This is life, and it is a matter of life and death for many.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Representative Pyle.

Mr. PYLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, 24 hours ago I was sitting on a boat in the middle of the Allegheny River oblivious to everything around me just waiting for us to come back and do something about these funding issues, and you know what, Mr. Speaker? That water did not care if I was Republican or Democrat or male or female, it just kept going. Then in the big picture, this Commonwealth, this big place – 46,000 square miles – I cannot pretend that I understand what life in the city of the first class is like, but I do not think they could pretend what it is like living in a sixth-class county.

What I know, Mr. Speaker, is that when you talk about high honorable positions like Speaker and Governor and leader, those are things that are probably going to be, for me as an individual man, beyond my reach. That is never really what I have been about. I have been about coming here, like every single one of us, to improve the quality of life where I live.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to be straight with you, I am a little ashamed today. I know when I go home and I walk through SHOP 'n SAVE or Walmart and people walk up to me and go, "Can you fix this? Can you fix this?" I want to go, "Yeah," but sometimes I know it is going to be tough, and if I cannot, I just tell them I cannot.

Mr. Speaker, we can fix this. We can fix this. I do not care, just like the water in that river, if you are Republican or Democrat or male or female or young or old. We have an agreed-to number, specifically for the rape and domestic violence centers, that they think will allow them to continue their mission. Mr. Speaker, when I sit down and everybody is done talking, I am going to press the green button, and I am going to know I can lay my head down just fine knowing, as the lady said, I did the right thing.

Now, look, if you are looking for a pin cushion, go ahead, fire away, if that is what it takes to get the money flowing to these absolutely essential, critical services. The lady from Bucks County nailed it. This is not something you can quantify. It is very difficult to measure. But what we do know is that those centers help.

Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to beat anybody up, you have seen me do it far more effectively than this, but I am going to be straight with you people, they call us honorable for a reason. The honorable vote is to restore funding to our rape and domestic violence centers. The honorable thing to do is not to stand there and gloat over the husk of the dead; it is to do the right thing. I think the path to that right thing involves pressing the green button, saying, yeah, we do believe we have a value, that people who have been subjected to the most intimate of personal offenses, that we do care and we are going to help.

Now, I will stand here for anybody who wants to listen and I will be good to my word, I will stand against that wall and let you hurl as many insults at me as you want, I do not care, but if that is what it takes to get your vote, I am willing to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all of those with a conscience, please vote "yes." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Neuman.

Mr. NEUMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have heard a lot about the debate today, and one thing that I will agree with the gentelady from Montgomery County is, everyone does want to fund rape centers. There is nobody in here that does not want to adequately fund rape centers. That is for sure. But we saw five people get sworn in today. These five people took an oath. We took the same oath. This oath tells us to obey and defend the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of this Commonwealth.

We can put up votes today, and say it does pass, we have another problem. Other people took this same oath and they will be listening to advisers, advisers that give opinions, opinions that we are hearing today, opinions like the LRB gave us today, and their advisers are going to tell them not to pay the bill.

This is so blatantly unconstitutional. By the letter of the law, Article IV, section 15; Article IV, section 16, of our Constitution of Pennsylvania does not allow the legislature to divide a veto.

Now, the Governor was clear when he vetoed, and you can agree or disagree with his veto, that is fine. "I am returning herewith, without my approval, House Bill 1192, Printer's Number 1959." That is what is before us.

If you look at precedent before when the Governors did line-item vetoes, there were specific line items. Some were approved. The ones that were approved were not listed. The ones that were vetoed were listed, and the legislature only had standing – you want to talk about standing – they only had standing to take up the lines that were individually vetoed.

We cannot take a bill and divide it, legislatively, under our rules, under the Constitution. This, in my opinion, again, my opinion, and I believe the opinion of experts all over the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and I would argue if we submitted it to experts across the country, they would agree that this is clearly unconstitutional. We, as legislators, have to uphold our oath and the ones that we are submitting this to have to uphold their oath. And I believe similar to the LRB and similar to experts across the Commonwealth, the advisers of the executive branch, if this would pass, would tell them not to pay this, and then we are fighting in court. The last thing we want to do is fight in court when we have serious business to get down to.

Mr. Speaker, I humbly request that we even take this motion off the table and not bring our institution to this level and sit down and negotiate. This is not a stopgap measure. This is an unconstitutional potential override of line items that we do not have the power to do.

We all want to fund what these line items are talking about – the line items that have been taken specifically out of the budget – but that is not what is before us today. The only thing that is before us today, as a whole, is HB 1192, PN 1959.

The emotional arguments are compelling, the constitutional arguments, I believe, are fact, and we need to look at our Constitution, look at our oath, and make sure that we are doing things that are not going to give people false hope, that we are not going to be able to run home and tell people that you are going to get funding by Friday, because if we do pass this, the likelihood of even getting funding by Friday is not right, and then we are even in a bigger predicament.

So I humbly request that we vote "no" or this motion be taken off the table, for our institution not to stoop to this level to try to use political maneuvers in order to override certain line items in which we have no power to do. I request everyone to vote "no."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kaufer.

Mr. KAUFER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we are elected here to be Representatives, regional Representatives elected from districts, not elected here to be Republicans or Democrats, though that might be how our constituents might view us, but we are elected here to be Representatives, and that means tough decisions sometimes.

I have been back in my district now for a couple months, and as I have been listening to people say, "When are you going to reach a budget deal? When is there going to be a budget in place?" I have been saying the same thing for basically 2 months, "Well, we agree on 274 of the line items, 274 out of 401."

Today we are talking about voting on something we already agree on. We agree on the numbers we are talking about. We are not fighting over numbers. We are not talking about how much money we are putting into this. We already agree upon it.

In Luzerne County, I already went to go talk to our executive director of our victim resource center, and before we had a motion to adjourn until the end of September, the victim resource center in Luzerne County already took out \$100,000 line of credit, which will be ending in mid-September, mid-September. We are not talking about coming back until the end of September. Victims in Luzerne County will not have the services. That is according to the executive director herself, that there will be cuts in services and staff layoffs if we do not have a compromise deal before mid-September.

Maybe it means a little more to me because a friend of mine was raped and was in this victim resource center, and maybe it does mean something because I had a friend who had to go and receive these services, and thank God they were there. But for people today to sit around here and pretend to hide behind a political agenda when we already agree to these numbers, I am glad I am not you.

This is a tough vote for everybody here today, but we are here, this is as a legislative body, to make a decision about funding essential programs. I hope you will join with me today because I know that my friend – I am going to go back and see her probably later tonight, and I am going to look her in the eye and tell her the vote I made.

I hope nobody here has ever had to deal with the same situation I have with a close personal friend. I beg you, Mr. Speaker; I implore you to make the right vote here today. I beg you to vote "yes."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Curtis Thomas. Representative Thomas waives off.

Representative Bryan Barbin.

Mr. BARBIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today I rise to make this quick point: I did not agree to all these budget items that we have said we have agreed to. The whole process of the appropriations process is to come to an agreement on all items. It is not to come to an agreement on 11 or 12 that we discover what they were 3 hours ago. There is a provision of the Constitution that says you have to have a

printed bill so it can be amended, so you can make these decisions.

It is not about rape crisis; it is about having an appropriation.

I am embarrassed to go home and tell people I do not have a budget, but that is the same embarrassment that all of us have had for the last 2 months. So the bottom line is, today we have a proposal that says, with a little smoke and mirrors, with a little paper and wire, we can patch through something that can help a couple people. Well, I do not want to help a couple people.

Our decisions are supposed to help everybody and our decision is supposed to have a full appropriations bill. So when you are prepared to bring a full appropriations bill up that we can amend, so I can say I am in agreement or the vote has gone down and I can live with that because that is what compromise is about, then I am going to vote for the bill. But until then, the people of Pennsylvania have as much right to public school funding as they do to rape crisis funding.

Since we did not know what the items would be today, I do not know who the other people are because we were not told. We were not given a bill to look at. We were not given a bill to amend. When you veto the whole appropriations bill, you have to go back and start over. Those are the rules that have been in place forever.

We should stick by them. We should just stay here. We should call the Senate back in. All of us should stay here until we get it done, but this does not get it done. I will be voting "no."

The SPEAKER. Representative Fred Keller.

Mr. F. KELLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today just to set a few things straight in the record. We did pass a budget. I saw some signs today when I came to the Capitol, "Do your job: Pass a budget." We did that on June 30. We did that with the funds that were available, a 3.6-percent increase in General Fund spending. We did it. It was rejected by Governor Wolf.

So now we are here today as a result of the Governor's action in the second month of the Tom Wolf government shutdown, and to get money out to the needed services, we are looking at all legislative options we have.

I have read Article IV, sections 15 and 16, of the Constitution, and being that the Governor has the authority to approve or disapprove single line items in the appropriations bill, I would assume that we have, by what I read, the authority to override those vetoes line by line.

So I just want to make one thing clear, when previous budgets were brought up and human services by the gentleman from Allegheny County and he said that we did not care about these things over the last few years, just to set the record straight, in '10-'11, the last year of Governor Rendell's administration, State funding in human services was \$8.8 billion; in '11-'12, State money was \$10.5 billion; '12-'13, 10.6 – excuse me, '12-'13 budget, 10.6; '13-'14, 10.9; '14-'15, \$11.2 billion. This was brought up in Appropriations when we talk about cuts. They are not cuts.

We actually asked, they were asked, you know, the Secretary of the Budget, did he intend on calling the Obama administration and asking them to restore the cuts they made to Pennsylvania, and the answer was no. I wonder how many of my colleagues on that side of the aisle have called the Obama administration and asked them to restore the cuts. Yet they are asking the hardworking Pennsylvanians to reach deeper into their pockets and restore the Obama administration cuts.

I think it is wrong. We have an opportunity to do what is right here today and get money going to the most vulnerable citizens of this Commonwealth. It is time we right what was wronged on June 30 and we vote to override the Governor's veto on these items.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative John Maher.

Mr. MAHER. In the nearly half century since our Constitution has granted Governors the opportunity to line-item veto budget appropriations, we have never before had a Governor veto all line items, never happened, and we have never had a Governor veto line items that were exactly the amounts that he requested.

Now, why the Governor chose to veto all line items continues to be a mystery to me. But the Constitution provides that the Governor can line-item one – or veto one or all of the lines in a budget, and it seems very reasonable to me that the legislature then has the opportunity to override the vetoes of one or as many lines in the budget as the Governor has vetoed.

In this case, the question before us should be so simple. The Governor asked for this amount for this very important public service. The Governor asked for this amount. The legislature appropriated this amount. The Governor then vetoed the line items throughout the budget, including the one for this amount that he had asked for. If we are really putting the people of Pennsylvania first and if you are really actually interested in constructive efforts, let us at least agree to fund the amounts for these important programs where the amount at stake is exactly what the Governor asked for.

You are being asked and given the opportunity to stand up for citizens who face life crises. You are being asked to simply agree with the Governor's request for this amount of money. We have all agreed on this side. Can you not find it in your hearts to agree to fund? Let us start building some consensus.

Two-thirds of the budget are amounts – of the line items that were vetoed were for amounts equal to or even in some cases more than the Governor requested.

It is an untested question in the courts of Pennsylvania as to what happens after a Governor vetoes all line items in a budget. I read with interest the opinion from the LRB, and generally, I find myself agreeing with them, but in this case, I think they are mistaken because of the line-item veto provisions, and in this case, the Governor has vetoed all the line items and I think it is entirely appropriate that we address them one at a time.

So if you agree with the Governor that these services are important and if you agree with the Governor's request for the amount for the year ahead, the year that we are in actually now, then join us. Let us start building areas of agreement instead of focusing on what divides us. Let us come together for the greater good, for the Commonwealth, and vote to override this line item.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Members, we are at the point where only the leaders and the Appropriations chairs are about to speak. If there is anybody else that would like to speak before I turn it to the leaders or the chairs – is there anybody else that would like to speak?

Representative Dermody, would you like to be recognized? No.

Representative Reed, and then I will go to Representative Markosek and then close with Representative Adolph.

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will not reiterate my comments from earlier. I would ask if the gentleman, the minority whip, would stand for brief interrogation.

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

Representative Reed, you may proceed, and, Representative Hanna, thank you.

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the minority whip outlined several different reasons during his comments why he believed folks should vote against the overriding of the veto and sending money directly to rape crisis centers. One of those points was that we did not ask him soon enough or in a nice enough fashion to do so, so we should vote "no."

My only question to the minority whip would be, are you serious about denying funding to rape crisis centers because we were not nice enough in how we asked the question to you?

Mr. HANNA. The point is that if you were serious about this, you would have come to us. You know you cannot pass it with your votes alone. You know you do not have the votes to do a veto override. If you really wanted to accomplish something today, you would have come to us in advance.

Instead, you chose to do the theater last week with a press conference. You went to the press before you came to us. Then today, you waited until noon with an unscheduled meeting, asked us to come down, unscheduled, when you knew we had another meeting, and that is the first time you said to us, "You think you can put up any votes?" And you did not even share with us what you were going to put up there, and you still have not, it is not in writing yet.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, on the motion?

The SPEAKER. Representative Reed, on the motion.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I understand that—

The SPEAKER. Please suspend, sir.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I understand that I am new at this position. I have only been in this position for 6 months, so I apologize to the gentleman if I did not approach him in the proper manner and ask him in the proper manner, but I do not believe that is a reason to hold up funding for rape victims today.

We could still do the right thing. We could send this directly to the victims who are in need. Sometimes you have to put your egos aside, and I can admit that I was wrong in doing so and I should have sat down with him sooner. But I am not willing to tell a rape victim that my mistake is the reason we are withholding their funding today.

So I would ask that the gentleman accept my apology for that, and that we get on with the business and we actually send this money to the victims, and I will try to do better next time. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dermody wishes to be recognized.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have had this discussion about this funding for the rape crisis centers. The only folks, the only folks that are holding back money from adequately funding rape crisis centers are you because you will not engage in legitimate budget negotiations. I am tired of hearing— Oh, yeah. Yes, it is. Yes, it is.

I spent 6 years in the D.A.'s office—

The SPEAKER. Members—

Mr. DERMODY. —in Allegheny County prosecuting rape cases.

The SPEAKER. Sir, sir—

Mr. DERMODY. No. No, I am speaking now, Mr. Speaker. All right.

The SPEAKER. Members, please, Representative Dermody—

Mr. DERMODY. No, no.

The SPEAKER. —Representative Dermody has the floor, and I would like all members to please give him their attention.

Representative Dermody, the floor is yours, sir.

Mr. DERMODY. I know personally from my experience in the D.A.'s office because I actually prosecuted rape cases – the Speaker knows that – and I have seen what happens with rape crisis centers and I have seen when they have not received adequate funding. I know what they go through because I know what rape victims go through. because I have been on my hands and knees trying to get testimony from them to convict a rapist.

Now, we will fight for additional funding, and where were you the last 4 years when it came to additional funding for the rape crisis centers? We will continue to fight for additional funding for rape crisis centers to make sure they have the adequate funding to do their job, but we will not support an override of a veto.

As you have just heard from the whip, this is nothing but a scam and you know it. It is a stunt and it is about time you are called on it. We will be there and we will fight for adequate funding for rape crisis centers and every other worthy program in this State. We will make sure our kids get educated, but we need to sit and negotiate a budget that is responsible for everybody.

The SPEAKER. There are only two remaining speakers, unless somebody else wishes to be called upon. Representative Markosek, and then we will close with Representative Adolph.

Representative Markosek, the floor is yours.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it would be very difficult for me to say much more than my two previous colleagues here on the Democratic side who have just got done speaking. I think they pretty much summed it all up.

Let me just point out a couple of things. You know, earlier in the debate, there was a lady, my good friend, the young lady from Montgomery, brought up the fact that we should not bother or we should not worry about constitutionality. I would say to her that your leadership is listening to you because they are not worried about constitutionality either.

Let me also respond to my good friend, the majority leader, who pointed out that some of the numbers involved here were similar to numbers that I introduced in HB 1125. Keep in mind that HB 1125 was an entire budget that took into effect a whole lot of things, not just the several line items that we are talking about here. Had we been back there at that time just talking about these several line items, I can tell you I would have put in a lot more money for these various human services, a lot more money for rape crisis, all of those things. You have to look at it in entirety, in the milieu, in the background that that was introduced.

Let me say finally that we need to make this go away today. We need to vote "no" on the override so that we can, so that we can go back to the table. I am available whenever the leadership

over there and I am sure our leadership is available. We will meet whenever you want to meet, but we need to be talking about a budget in its entirety, not just the line-by-line budget like we are doing here on the floor of the House, wasting the time of all of our members here. Now, let us just shoot this down, let us go on, and then let us come up with an agreed-to budget that we are willing to sit down with you and come to an agreement on.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Adolph.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as we have been negotiating this budget – and obviously, we do not agree on a total spend number, we certainly do not agree on the tax package that the Governor has put forward, but it was not because we are not trying. There is a definite disagreement on the total spend number and the total tax package, but these line items—

I also apologize to my good friend, Chairman Markosek. I tried to get together with him. But actually, we had a meeting with the Governor at 12:30, and there were certain members of our leadership that wanted to wait to see how that meeting went at 12:30 today before the final decision was going to be made on our actions today.

We were not happy with the outcome of that meeting. The Governor asked for another 24 hours.

I just want you to know – and this is just my opinion, and I have been sitting around some budget tables for about 6 years now, various Governors – the end is not near. The end is not near. We are far apart. I know my good friends on the other side of the aisle that are at the same table as I know that, that there are major disagreements. This is something that has never been done before because this Governor vetoed an entire budget that has never been done in our lifetime.

We have raised this line item 10 percent 4 straight years. So we were there, we are with you on these line items, the Governor is with us on these particular line items, the people of Pennsylvania are with us on these line items.

I have heard this constitutionality question back and forth. I have an outstanding legal counsel. He spent the entire last 4 days looking over court cases prior – never been a vote like this.

It is kind of interesting to a nonattorney, okay, and Representative Neuman, I think you made a lot of good points and I think you are from Westmoreland County and you did a great job. But as a nonattorney, as a nonattorney it is interesting to me to ask the question, why did we not ever vote on constitutionality? This is the body that determines whether it is constitutional or not, and no one over there, even with all their concerns, you never raised the question of whether this is constitutional. So I do not know what that is all about. If I really believed this was unconstitutional, I would have made that motion. I have heard it so many times on this floor.

So there is a reason, there is a reason, but I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, a month from now, 60 days from now, when we do not have a budget and these poor folks – and this is just the first one – are calling your office—

And that press conference that I attended, I did not call that press conference. I have relationships with those folks. They called my office. They wanted us to come out and discuss this with them. I asked them, "Are you willing to go public?" And they said, "Yes." That is how that press conference was called.

So I am telling you, and I am going to tell you right now, this is an opportunity to put politics aside, continue to negotiate, and get the money to those that need it the most.

I ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs, shall the items as stated in the motion authorizing an appropriation to the rape crisis centers along with budget implementation language become law, the prohibition of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

So with respect to the motion to override, those in favor will be voting "aye"; those opposed will be voting "nay."

On the question recurring,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Before we close the record, Representative O'Brien is here for the floor vote and will be placed on the master roll, Representative O'Brien.

**MOTION FOR LINE OVERRIDE OF VETO
CONTINUED**

On the question recurring,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—115

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

NAYS—83

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

DeLuca	Metcalfe	Saccone	Truitt
Kampf			

The SPEAKER. The yeas are 115; the nays are 83. Less than two-thirds majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the Governor's veto is sustained.

MOTION FOR LINE OVERRIDE OF VETO

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Adolph, is recognized.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I move that pursuant to Article IV, sections 15 and 16, of the Constitution of Pennsylvania, the House proceed with reconsideration of the following items in HB 1192, PN 1959: page 269, lines 2 through 5, which authorizes the appropriation of sums to the Department of Human Services; page 290, line 12 through line 24, for State appropriation to domestic violence programs and Federal appropriation to family violence prevention services, and SSBG (social services block grant), domestic violence programs; and the budget implementation language for the first motion.

On the question,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The SPEAKER. Chairman, you may proceed on the motion.

Mr. ADOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a motion to override the Governor's veto of the domestic violence programs appropriation in the Department of Human Services, and I ask my colleagues for affirmative vote.

HB 1192 appropriates \$16.851 million for this line item for the 2015-16 fiscal year. It is important to note that this amount is exactly the same as the amount requested by the Governor in his March 3 budget, the exact same amount as Chairman Markosek has appropriated in his House bill.

Moreover, it is also important to note that this funding amount represents a 10-percent increase in funding for this line item over the amount provided in the 2014-15 fiscal year. This builds on a 10-percent increase provided in 2014-15 and 2013-14.

The domestic violence programs appropriation provides to 60 local domestic violence programs serving all 67 counties through the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence. Services include emergency crisis intervention, services such as counseling and temporary shelter; ongoing services include supportive counseling and referrals to other community services. Local programs also provide prevention and community education services to identify persons needing assistance to reduce the incidents and lessen the risk of domestic violence.

Nearly 43,000 victims, 43,000 victims of domestic violence were projected to be served in the years 2014-15, including approximately 111 days of shelter and an estimated 166,000 hours of counseling. With the 10-percent increase in State funds, more than 47,000 Pennsylvania victims are expected to be served in 2015-16.

We need to get the dollars flowing that are provided in HB 1192 to these critical service providers, the same dollars that the Governor agrees with, the same dollars that Chairman Markosek in his budget agrees with. They should not have to wait any longer while the rest of the budget is ironed out. The line item is not in dispute.

This motion also includes two Federal appropriations in the amount of \$3.081 million for family violence prevention services and \$5.705 million from the social services block grant that supports domestic violence programs. And again, these are all of the Governor's requested funding amounts and they are not in dispute.

Let us do the right thing today by overriding these veto line items. I ask for an affirmative vote.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. On the question, will the House agree to the motion?

Representative Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the Constitution has changed in the last 5 minutes. This is unconstitutional. This motion to override the veto is unconstitutional, just as the last one was.

I would like to incorporate – or I would like to submit for the record the LRB's opinion on the constitutionality of these overrides.

I would urge all the members to vote "no" for this political stunt, once again, that you are trying to pull off here.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

(The Legislative Reference Bureau's legal opinion was previously submitted for the record.)

The SPEAKER. Representative Dush.

Mr. DUSH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of this override.

On the constitutionality question, under some Supreme Court decisions, *Norris v. Clymer*, the cardinal rule is, the State legislature has all the powers not prohibited by either of the two Constitutions, and Congress shall have none but those given. The Constitution allows to the legislature every power which it does not positively prohibit.

We do have the authority to do a line-item override of this budget. In 1968 when we gave the Governors the authority to do the line item, by extension we gave ourselves the ability to be able to do the override on each of those line items. The same power is reflected in *Norris v. Clymer*.

There has been a lot of conversation today about political stunts. Sitting over on the other side of the aisle because of the numbers that we have, I happened to be around when a political stunt occurred at the passing of this piece of legislation in the first place. I am sitting here listening to one of the Representatives who got the call. Well, what do you mean he got the call? He got the call from the Governor, he does not want this to be a bipartisan bill.

Three members of this House left the floor as a result of those phone calls.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

Mr. DUSH. That is a stunt.

POINT OF ORDER

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Dermody, you have a point of order, sir?

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker, I believe the current speaker is talking about the motives of members and I believe he is inaccurately describing what went on in the bill that he is talking about, so I believe this is out of order.

The SPEAKER. I would instruct the good gentleman and all the members, you may at all times talk about the policy or the details of the legislation or the motion in front of us, but at no time are we to in any way get to the underlying motives or intentions with respect to any party or any member of this august chamber.

So, sir, if you can please just keep the remarks right to the motion and the underlying legislation. Thank you very, very much.

Mr. DUSH. I will do that, but I would also request that the chairman apply the same to—

The SPEAKER. Please suspend, sir. Please suspend.

As the occasion arises, if any member wishes to raise a point of order, you certainly may, but at this time the point of order was raised with respect to your remarks.

You may proceed. You have 2 minutes and 53 seconds left, and we would like to move forward on this particular motion to override.

So, Representative, please proceed.

Mr. DUSH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have had the opportunity to speak with people in the provider community. Those providers have told us that they care about their clients, but with the full override of this budget, they are not getting paid. They are having to take out loans.

Yet these people face a dilemma. They have 30 days that they have to give notice to those clients should they not have the money to continue. They have to provide a 30-day notice. In other words, they are facing legal action as a result of this veto. We have the authority and we also have the responsibility.

As one of my providers said, the Governor, with his veto of this thing, became a deadbeat dad to these kids that are wards of the State, especially when we agreed with the Governor's request on the amount of money.

Now, by extension, if the Governor is going to abrogate that responsibility, the responsibility falls to us. I am not going to be called a deadbeat dad back home. I do not think any of us want that label put on us. We have a responsibility to those kids. Those kids are wards of the State. They are the people that we have to take care of. We have a constitutional and legal responsibility to make sure that that service is provided because this legislature made those laws.

So how do we turn around and tell those people that, "No, we're not going to provide the money"? We tell those providers, "No, you're on the legal hook because we refuse to take that step."

I am not going to do it to the providers; I am not going to do it to the children. We need to provide for those kids, and I encourage a "yes" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Members, if we could. I would ask members to please take your seats. Members, please take your seats.

Any conversations, if you could take them to the chambers outside of the hall.

Chairman Markosek is recognized on the motion to override. Thank you.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly again, very similar to the last go-around with this whole episode, you know, I am asking for a "no" vote on the override of this motion, and really, there are two main reasons, which I will reiterate. One, of course, is the constitutionality or lack thereof. It is unconstitutional. We all pretty much know that. These things, even if they would pass, which I doubt, but even if they would, probably would not end up going anywhere.

The other thing is, too, you know, I feel pretty good about a bill that I introduced here a couple of months ago, HB 1125. You know, the leadership has mentioned it several times. I really feel proud that I was able to introduce that bill, and it is getting so much notoriety here today. And keep in mind, I will reiterate this again, that that bill was an overall budget bill. It included a lot more than just these lines that we are talking about in these particular motions. It included money for education. It included money for a lot of things in the budget that most of us in the room, quite frankly, want. So I do not think comparing my bill and the line items is really fair based on what the whole intent was of that bill. And I would say again, and now again for the second or third time, if I were putting a bill in just for these lines, I would make them a whole lot more – a lot larger than what they really are now.

So I think we need to do everything here based on the overall budget. That is what Appropriations is all about. That is our job, particularly those on the Appropriations Committee, to do an entire budget, not pick and choose low-hanging fruit in order to make political statements, political stunts if you will. That phrase has been used here today many times, and it is essentially what this is.

So I would reiterate, please, a "no" vote on this override, and let us move forward with negotiating a really good budget for Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Tom Killion.

Mr. KILLION. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the time. Just a few brief comments. I had the great privilege of serving for a number of years, 5 years actually, on the Delaware County Domestic Abuse Board. And shortly after, we passed the budget, our budget, that included

\$1.5 million, 10 percent, additional funding, which was the Governor's request. So we hear about, we want to negotiate a budget. Well, this has already been negotiated and agreed to. We all agreed that we wanted to increase funding to domestic abuse by \$1.5 million, totally agreed to. Get a call the day after that from the executive director of the Delaware County Domestic Abuse Project just thanking us, thanking everyone in this room, including the Governor, for the increase in funding so desperately needed.

And just to talk about Delaware County, last year alone we serviced in Delaware County 3,790 victims of domestic violence. At our shelter, which I have visited many times, we house 66 adults and 88 children in emergency situations to get them out of their homes. They needed a place to go because they were being abused. Over 4500 people use their 24-hour hotline.

Well, I had met with the executive director last week, not over the phone, where she called me to thank me. She actually took the time to drive to my office to tell me— I watched her go from grateful to frantic. She was like, "Tom, I'm going to have to try to borrow money." And the environment out there is different. It is completely different. Since we had the mortgage-backed securities collapse, which caused the market to collapse, underwriting on bank loans has gotten much tighter. She is not even sure she could raise the money for a loan, and I do not even want to get into the fact that we are going to be wasting money on interest that could have been going to services. She may be forced to close the shelter. She may be forced to shut the hotline down.

These individuals will have nowhere to go. I firmly believe that after we passed our budget at the end of June and it went to the Governor's desk, he obviously did not read it because he vetoed it in less than an hour. As we have heard already, there were 274 lines out of 400, and this is one of them that was agreed to. It is not necessary to hold the money from these people. These are real people with real problems.

This whole issue of constitutionality – anyone watching at home, their eyes are probably glazing over. We are getting different opinions. Some lawyers say it is constitutional. Some lawyers say it is unconstitutional. The only one then – once this gets out, if it gets out – that could challenge that is somebody with standing, and they would have to take it to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. That will never happen, ever. I cannot think of a single individual or an organization that would take a case to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, Pennsylvania Supreme Court to try to stop funding domestic abuse programs. That individual or person would be as popular as that dentist that shot Cecil the lion. It is just not going to happen. It is a moot issue.

This is extremely important to these families that are suffering from abuse. We need to get this done. It has been agreed to by everyone on both sides of the aisle, in both chambers, and the Governor. It is simple. Just vote "yes."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Vitali.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to this motion to override. One of the previous speakers on the Republican side relayed that a constituent had told him, "When are you going to pass the budget?" All of our constituents have told us that that is what we need to do. We need to pass a budget.

And the Appropriations chair from Delaware County indicated that is a long way off. Why is it a long way off? It is a long way off because to some degree, as opposed to previous budgets, the pressure has been taken off of us to pass a budget. Employees are still being paid. This is my 23d budget, and the pressure is off. So the question becomes, will overriding the Governor and will piecemeal passing line item by line item take us to that ultimate conclusion of where we need to get to? Will voting "yes" today take us closer to passing a budget ultimately that funds education and funds all the important things, or will it take us further away? I submit that doing this piecemeal and taking the pressure off, at least giving the illusion, takes us further away from what we actually need to do. Pressure is part of this process.

Both sides have firmly held principles and are backed by very important interest groups. To the Democrats, it is very important we fully fund education, we pass a reasonable severance tax. These are important principles backed by important interest groups. The Republicans, on the other hand, feel pension reform is very important, privatization of liquor, and so forth. Both sides have to move. And the only way we are going to be able to move from these important positions that are very tenaciously held by us is pressure. And if you start to do this piece by piece, you remove the pressure that is part of this process.

So, Mr. Speaker, if you are really serious about ultimately getting our schools funded, getting reasonable taxation, getting this thing done, getting the constituents what they deserve, which is a final budget, I believe the correct vote on this is "no." So I would ask for a "no" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Jordan Harris.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a comment about a comment that was made by the gentleman from Jefferson County. I was going to put this in writing, but the gentleman brought that comment to the floor, so I feel as though I must address it.

Mr. Speaker, in a letter authored on August 24, the gentleman questioned the intent of myself and several of my colleagues for not voting on the final passage of the budget bill. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear to the gentleman and make it clear to all of the members of this chamber that there was only one reason that I was not here to vote on the bill, and it is the first time that I have missed a session day, and that reason was to bury my grandmother, who was a very important figure in my life.

So contrary to rumors about a meeting or a conversation with the Governor about my vote on final passage, it was actually the death of the second most important person in my life that stopped me from being here to serve my constituents, and I think that my constituents will be happy to know that I honored my grandmother's life on that day. And I would ask that we no longer besmirch the names of members in writing or at this microphone and that we hold the dignity of this House in order as it has been done for hundreds of years.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Santora.

Mr. SANTORA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, met with the administrators from these domestic violence providers, and they are in dire straits. We need to provide this funding. I come from the private sector, and in the

private sector, when you agree on something, it comes off the table and you negotiate the things that you do not agree on.

My colleague from Delaware County brought up education funding and that when we take these items off, that there will not be pressure. You better believe there will be pressure for education funding in this Commonwealth to be increased. I support increased education funding. It has been put on the table. Let us not nix these items. We need to provide for human services today and move forward on the rest of the budget negotiations in the days to come.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Jerry Knowles.

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

About a year ago I read an editorial in one of the papers, and what it said is that if the facts are on your side, you pound the facts. If the truth is on your side, you pound the truth. If neither are on your side, you pound the table. Well, guess what? That is exactly what is going on with some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

In the 6 years that I have been here, we have all had to make tough decisions, and one of the things that I find out is that the terms "smoke and mirrors," "political stunt," "gimmick," "sham," "stunt," that is an easy way out. That is an easy way out when you have to make a tough decision. So what I say is, man up and lady up, and do what is right for the people of Pennsylvania and the people of your districts.

Constitutionality. Some say it is constitutional; some say it is not. I am not a lawyer. I am not a lawyer, but eventually maybe a judge will have to make that decision. I may not be a lawyer, but I know what is right. I know what is right for the people of Pennsylvania, and I know what is right for the people of the district that I represent. I know when to push that green button, and this is one of those times. I do know that if 136 of us vote "yes" – between both sides we need 136 votes – if 136 of us vote "yes," the 43,000 people that need the services of domestic violence, the centers will get that funding and those people will get the help that they need and the service that they need.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I ask for a "yes" vote.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dan Frankel.

Mr. FRANKEL. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity about 3 weeks ago to speak to about 50 or 60 CEOs of nonprofits across the State of Pennsylvania, all of whom are facing the challenges that have been articulated here today. But by and large, the vast majority of them understood what was at stake here and understood what we are fighting for here on this side, which is a sustainable solution to a long-term problem that they have been facing for the past 4 years under the Corbett budgets. They want a fix, not a Band-Aid, which is what we are talking about here. And the only way to get to a permanent, sustainable fix is to look at a comprehensive budget that solves problems for the long term. Otherwise, we are going to be right back here next year and the year after and the year after, trying to solve problems. We need sustainable revenues to protect the services that you so dearly talk about here but that need a sustainable solution. Band-Aids do not do it.

They do not do it, and in order for us to get to that sustainable solution, the nonprofit CEOs that I talk to get it. They get that we need to work this out, and they are prepared to work through the issues that they have in terms of finding a way to continue to provide services to their communities. But they

know that short-term pain is going to be some long-term gain for them if we do our job and create the sustainable solution, not the Band-Aid that this approach is taking. This gets us nowhere in the long run. It gets us right back here. If this succeeds, next year we are in the same spot in an election year.

We have the opportunity to negotiate a long-term, sustainable solution with sustainable revenues to fund these programs, and that is why we need to get back to the negotiating table, not go through the theatrics that we are experiencing today. Let us work together. Let us stop this act. Let us get to a sustainable solution, where we negotiate a long-term solution to the problems that this Commonwealth has endured for the past 4 years.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Todd Stephens.

Mr. STEPHENS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it is pretty frustrating, and frankly, I think quite disrespectful to all the folks out there who need domestic violence services to hear this process referred to as "an act," "a sham," or "theatrics." The bottom line is, a vote today can help restore that necessary funding, those needed resources for those folks requiring domestic violence services. Just as an overview, statewide, from the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence, they serve 85,000 people. They have sheltered 8600 individuals. They have provided 377,000 hours of counseling and fielded 120,000 hotline calls. They have turned away – and this is critical, Mr. Speaker – turned away 6100 requests for shelter due to lack of capacity or shelter services; turned away 6100 requests for help.

Well, you know what, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity today. We have an opportunity today to provide the funding that both sides of the aisle have called for, that the Governor has proposed so that those resources can begin flowing to these necessary and important providers across our Commonwealth.

You know, the minority leader is not the only person in the room who has prosecuted rapists and people who have committed horrific domestic and sexual violent acts upon others, and the bottom line is, when you are in the courtroom fighting day after day as a prosecutor, you do not just talk the talk, you walk the walk.

Growing up, my father used to tell me, "Don't tell me. Show me." Well, guess what? To the other side of the aisle, do not tell me; when it is time to vote, show me that you in fact will stand up for those victims of domestic violence and the providers that provide the necessary services for them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. At this stage, all members who have requested to speak have had that opportunity. Before I see if the leaders want to speak on this motion, is there any other member that wishes to be recognized?

Okay. At this time I am going to ask Representative Dermody, would you like to speak, sir?

Representative Reed?

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

Very briefly, I think it is important to know the folks who this line item benefits. This line item benefits over 60 local domestic violence programs across the Commonwealth, and those 60 programs, during the last year, served 85,643 domestic violence victims and their children, served 268 teen victims of dating violence, 219 of which were girls and 49 of which were boys. These line items sheltered 8,651 victims and their children, answered 120,000 hotline phone calls, supported

victims with 377,432 hours of counseling and advocacy, and also presented 16,365 community education and training events for over 352,000 people in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Those are the folks who are hurt by not sending this money to our 60 local domestic violence programs across the Commonwealth; real victims, real people, mothers, daughters, husbands, wives, sons, and daughters who are victims to domestic violence.

This proposed increase, which, once again, is the same number the Governor proposed increasing, the House Democratic chairman of the Appropriations Committee proposed increasing, and we proposed increasing as well by 10 percent. Actually, to put it into a more historical reference category, many folks have talked about the last 4 years of the Corbett budgets. This actually represents a 36-percent increase over the last Rendell budget, a \$4.4 million increase over the Rendell budget, let alone the 4 years in between. So a 36-percent increase in domestic violence funding over the Rendell budget is contained within this line item. And to give you another reference point, the last line item we talked a little bit about, rape crisis, actually was a 24-percent increase over the last Rendell budget, not over the Corbett budgets but actually historical funding in addition to the last Rendell budgets, which were the high-water mark for funding for these programs.

So today, Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity to drive out this funding immediately so none of those 83,000 people across this Commonwealth who are unfortunately the victims of domestic violence day in and day out have to worry about their services being pulled out from underneath them. We can deliver these dollars. We can do so today, and then we can get on on negotiating the components of the budget that are not agreed upon by all parties. I would ask the members to support the motion to override the veto to send money to our domestic violence programs.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek and Representative Adolph have waived off.

Members, those who are— I apologize. I guess I have to technically cover this.

The question recurs, shall the items in HB 1192, PN 1959, as stated in the motion become law, the prohibition of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

On that question, those in favor of those items becoming law will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "nay."

On the question recurring,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—115

Adolph	Godshall	Marshall	Regan
Baker	Greiner	Marsico	Roae
Barrar	Grove	Masser	Ross
Benninghoff	Hahn	McGinnis	Rothman
Bloom	Harhart	Mentzer	Sankey
Boback	Harper	Metzgar	Santora
Brown, R.	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Saylor
Causar	Heffley	Millard	Schemel
Christiana	Helm	Miller, B.	Simmons
Corbin	Hennessey	Milne	Sonney
Cox	Hickernell	Moul	Staats

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

NAYS—83

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

DeLuca	Metcalfe	Saccone	Truitt
Kampf			

The SPEAKER. The yeas are 115; the nays are 83. Less than two-thirds majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the Governor's veto is sustained.

MOTION FOR LINE OVERRIDE OF VETO

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Adolph, is recognized.

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

Ladies and gentlemen—

The SPEAKER. Members, members, please suspend. Members, please, if you would kindly take your seats, clear the aisles. Any conversations, I would just ask that you please take them to the rooms outside of the chamber.

Members, please, if you could take any conversations to the rooms outside the chamber. Thank you.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I move that pursuant to Article IV, sections 15 and 16, of the Constitution of Pennsylvania, the House proceed with reconsideration of the following items in

HB 1192, PN 1959: page 240, line items 13 through 16, which authorizes the appropriation of sums to the Department of Education; page 248, line 6 through line 20, which provides State and Federal funding for school food services and food and nutrition – local; and the budget implementation language from the first motion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the good gentleman, Representative Adolph.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override the Governor's veto of the school food service appropriation and Department of Education budget and ask my colleagues for an affirmative vote. HB 1192 appropriates \$32.488 million for this line item that is paid out of the school districts, and it is the same exact amount that the Governor requested in his March 3 budget, the same exact number that Chairman Markosek in his House bill number. This is a formula-driven line item that provides State matching dollars for the Federal Child Nutrition Act.

I think some of you are going to be surprised when you hear the type of money that we are not sending out through the Federal funds. The Federal appropriation included in HB 1192 for this program included in this motion is \$695.7 million. Let me repeat that, \$695.7 million in Federal funds that can begin flowing to our school districts now as their doors are beginning to open for the 2015-16 school year.

Both the State and Federal appropriations included in this motion total \$728.2 million, and this amount is not in dispute between HB 1192 and the Governor's proposal. Again, these are the Governor's requested amounts. While we continue to work on the remainder of the Department of Education budget, whether there are differences between the Governor's request and the funding amounts included in HB 1192, Mr. Speaker, I can think of absolutely no reason why these agreed-upon State and Federal dollars for our school food services should be held up any longer.

I ask my colleagues on both the—

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. Representative, please suspend.

Representative Rapp, point of order.

Ms. RAPP. Mr. Speaker, could you please call for order in the House so that we could hear? Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Members, we are going to let Representative Adolph continue.

It actually, to me, appeared more quiet than it has been for a couple times on today's floor. But, members, if we could, please take your seats.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you to the ladies and gentlemen for indulging in these facts and figures, but I think it is important because I guarantee you, when you get home and you are no longer in the capital beltway and you receive phone calls from your school board and from your school districts, remember we had an opportunity

here to send to them a combination of State and Federal dollars, totaling over \$728.2 million.

Please, think of the kids that are going to school this week and we are not providing money for their lunches and breakfasts.

So thank you very much for your consideration, and I ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, again, this is unconstitutional and it is not part of an overall budget agreement, so I would very briefly ask all the members to please vote "no." Thank you.

(The Legislative Reference Bureau's legal opinion was previously submitted for the record.)

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

The question recurs then, shall the items in HB 1192, PN 1959, as stated in the motion become law, the prohibition of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

On that question, those in favor of those items becoming law will vote "aye," and those opposed will vote "nay."

On the question recurring,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—115

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

NAYS—83

Acosta	Davis	Harkins	Parker, C.
Barbin	Dawkins	Harris, J.	Pashinski
Bishop	Dean	Kavulich	Petrarca
Bizzarro	Deasy	Keller, W.	Ravenstahl

Boyle	DeLissio	Kim	Readshaw
Bradford	Dermody	Kinsey	Roebuck
Braneky	Donatucci	Kirkland	Rozzi
Briggs	Driscoll	Kortz	Sainato
Brown, V.	Evans	Kotik	Samuelson
Bullock	Fabrizio	Longietti	Santarsiero
Burns	Farina	Mahoney	Schlossberg
Caltagirone	Flynn	Markosek	Schreiber
Carroll	Frankel	Matzie	Schweyer
Cohen	Freeman	McCarter	Sims
Conklin	Gainey	McClinton	Snyder
Costa, D.	Galloway	McNeill	Sturla
Costa, P.	Gergely	Miller, D.	Thomas
Cruz	Gibbons	Mullery	Vitali
Daley, M.	Goodman	Neilson	Wheatley
Daley, P.	Hanna	Neuman	Youngblood
Davidson	Harhai	O'Brien	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

DeLuca	Metcalfe	Saccone	Truitt
Kampf			

The SPEAKER. The yeas are 115; the nays are 83. Less than two-thirds majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the Governor's veto is sustained.

MOTION FOR LINE OVERRIDE OF VETO

The SPEAKER. The good gentleman, Representative Adolph, is recognized.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I move that pursuant to Article IV, sections 15 and 16, of the Constitution of Pennsylvania, the House proceed with reconsideration of the following items in HB 1192, PN 1959: page 251, lines 18 through 25, authorizing appropriations to the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency and for the State appropriation for the payment of education assistance grants; and the budget implementation language from the first motion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The SPEAKER. On that motion, Representative Adolph is recognized.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override the Governor's veto of the grants to the students' appropriation and the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency budget. HB 1192 includes \$355.235 million for this important program. Mr. Speaker, this is actually a \$10.347 million or 3-percent increase over the amount provided in the '14-'15 fiscal year and actually is an increase over the Governor's requested amount by \$10 million.

This need-based program administered by PHEAA provides grants to eligible Pennsylvania residents in need of financial aid to attend postsecondary school as undergraduate students. I would note that PHEAA has also been providing \$85 million out of its own earnings in recent years to support this important program. The grants for students program has distributed more

than \$9.47 billion, representing 6.4 million awards since the program's inception in 1966. Many of you, as well as your children and grandchildren in some cases, would not have been able to go to school if it was not for these PHEAA grants.

Again, with a new academic year just beginning with students reporting to colleges and our universities for the start of the fall semester, there is no good reason that this appropriation should not be enacted so that the dollars may flow to our postsecondary institutions while we continue to work on the rest of the budget.

I ask my colleagues for an affirmative vote to override the veto of this very, very important higher education proposal. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, nobody in this chamber has done more for PHEAA than my colleague across the aisle, the good chairman of the Appropriations Committee, but what he is trying to do is unconstitutional, and I would ask for a "no" vote. Thank you.

(The Legislative Reference Bureau's legal opinion was previously submitted for the record.)

The SPEAKER. The question recurs, shall the items in HB 1192, PN 1959, as stated in the motion become law, the prohibition of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

On that question, those in favor of those items becoming law will vote "aye," and those opposed will vote "nay."

On the question recurring,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—115

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

NAYS—83

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

DeLuca	Metcalfe	Saccone	Truitt
Kampf			

The SPEAKER. The yeas are 115; the nays are 83. Less than two-thirds majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the Governor's veto is sustained.

MOTION FOR LINE OVERRIDE OF VETO

The SPEAKER. The good gentleman, Representative Adolph, is recognized.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I move that pursuant to Article IV, sections 15 and 16, of the Constitution of Pennsylvania, the House proceed with reconsideration of the following items in HB 1192, PN 1959: page 221, lines 16 through 19, authorizing appropriations to the Department of Agriculture; page 224, line 21 through line 23 for State appropriations to the farmers market food coupons; page 224, lines 24 through 30 for Federal appropriations for farmers market food coupons; page 225, lines 1 through 11 for Federal appropriations to the senior farmers market nutrition; and the budget implementation language from the first motion, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

On the question,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The SPEAKER. On the motion, Representative Adolph is recognized.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override the Governor's veto of the farmers market food coupons appropriation in the Department of Agriculture's budget. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for an affirmative vote. HB 1192 appropriates \$2.079 million for this line item, and it is

the exact same amount that the Governor requested in his March 3 budget, the exact same figure that Chairman Markosek has in his House bill.

Again, there is no dispute on the funding amount for this program. The Farmers' Market Nutrition Program provides access to the fresh Pennsylvania-grown fruits and vegetables to those eligible for the WIC Program – women, infants, and children – including pregnant and breastfeeding women, children ages 2 to 4 years who are nutritionally at risk, as well as senior citizens age 60 and above who do not exceed 185 percent of the U.S. Federal poverty level. Recipients can use the food coupons at Pennsylvania's farmers markets, which also benefit more than 1100 farm families who supply produce for the markets. The Department of Ag reports that nearly 300,000 low-income seniors, women, and children benefit from the use of farmers market food coupons. This motion also includes two related Federal appropriations for farmers market food coupons in the amount of \$3.5 million and for the senior farmers market nutrition in the amount of \$2.2 million.

And again, these are the Governor's requested funding amounts, and they are not in dispute. While we continue to work on the remainder of the budget – I promise these figures will not be changed – whether there are differences between the Governor's request and the funding amounts included in HB 1192, I can think of no reason why these agreed amounts, whether they be State or Federal dollars, for the Farmers' Market Nutrition Program that total nearly \$7.8 million should be held up any longer.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your consideration.

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, my colleague has introduced a very well-meaning motion. However, it is unconstitutional, and I ask for a "no" vote. Thank you.

(The Legislative Reference Bureau's legal opinion was previously submitted for the record.)

The SPEAKER. The question recurs, shall the items in HB 1192, PN 1959, as stated in the motion become law, the prohibition of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

On that question, those in favor of those items becoming law will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "nay."

On the question recurring,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—115

Adolph	Godshall	Marshall	Regan
Baker	Greiner	Marsico	Roae
Barrar	Grove	Masser	Ross
Benninghoff	Hahn	McGinnis	Rothman
Bloom	Harhart	Mentzer	Sankey
Boback	Harper	Metzgar	Santora
Brown, R.	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Saylor
Causar	Heffley	Millard	Schemel
Christiana	Helm	Miller, B.	Simmons
Corbin	Hennessey	Milne	Sonney

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

NAYS—83

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

DeLuca	Metcalfe	Saccone	Truitt
Kampf			

The SPEAKER. The yeas are 115; the nays are 83. Less than two-thirds majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the Governor's veto is sustained.

MOTION FOR LINE OVERRIDE OF VETO

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Adolph, is recognized.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I move that pursuant to Article IV, sections 15 and 16, of the Constitution of Pennsylvania, the House proceed with reconsideration of the following items in HB 1192, PN 1959: page 209, lines 4 through 7, authorizing appropriations to the executive offices; page 215, line 21 through line 23 for State appropriations to the victims of juvenile offenders; and the budget implementation language from the first motion I moved.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question,
Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law,
the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The SPEAKER. On the motion, Representative Adolph is recognized.

Mr. ADOLPH. Mr. Speaker, can we be at ease just for a second?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Members, the House will be at ease for a few moments.

The House is back in order.

Representative Adolph is recognized on the motion.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override the Governor's veto of the victims of juvenile offenders appropriation administered by the Commission on Crime and Delinquency within the budget of the executive offices. HB 1192 provides \$1.3 million for this line item, which is the same amount requested in the Governor's March 3 budget and the same amount provided in 2014-15. Again, this appropriation amount for 2015-16 fiscal year is not in dispute between the Governor's budget and HB 1192.

Mr. Speaker, a \$1.3 million appropriation will fund grants and technical assistance to district attorneys' offices, juvenile probation offices, and community-based victim service programs to support victims of crime whose offenders are under the age of 18. This is one of the programs administered by the Commission on Crime and Delinquency to ensure victims of crime get the help they need to transcend their trauma and move forward with their lives.

In 2013-14, these funds supported the provision of services to approximately 33,000 victims, witnesses, and significant others of crime victims. Again, Mr. Speaker, this \$1.3-million appropriation is not in dispute between the Governor's March 3 budget and HB 1192. Our counties and crime victim service providers should not have to wait on receiving this important State funding as we negotiate the rest of the Commonwealth's 2015-16 budget. The veto of this line item should be overridden today, and I ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek is recognized.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, this is unconstitutional, and I ask the members to please vote "no."

(The Legislative Reference Bureau's legal opinion was previously submitted for the record.)

The SPEAKER. The question recurs, shall the items in HB 1192, PN 1959, as stated in the motion become law, the prohibition of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

On that question, those in favor of those items becoming law will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "nay."

On the question recurring,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law,
the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—115

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

NAYS—83

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

DeLuca	Metcalfe	Saccone	Truitt
Kampf			

The SPEAKER. The yeas are 115; the nays are 83. Less than two-thirds majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the Governor's veto is sustained.

MOTION FOR LINE OVERRIDE OF VETO

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Adolph, is recognized.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move that pursuant to Article IV, sections 15 and 16, of the Constitution of Pennsylvania, the House proceed with reconsideration of the following items in HB 1192, PN 1959: page 209, lines 4 through 7, authorizing appropriations to the executive offices; page 215, line 30, through page 216, line 2, for State appropriations to juvenile probation services; and the budget implementation language from the first motion, Mr. Speaker.

On the question,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The SPEAKER. On that motion, the Chair recognizes Representative Adolph.

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

I rise in support of the motion to override the Governor's veto of the juvenile probation services appropriation administered by the Juvenile Court Judge's Commission within the budget of the executive offices. HB 1192 provides \$18.945 million for this line item, which is the same amount requested by the Governor's March 3 budget and the same amount provided in 2014-15. Again, this appropriation amount for 2015-16 fiscal year is not in dispute between the Governor's budget and HB 1192.

The \$18.945 million appropriation will provide direct financial support to counties to offset salary costs for juvenile probation officers in all 67 counties of the Commonwealth. In 2014-15, approximately 35 training programs were provided to 1500 juvenile justice practitioners.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this \$18.945 million appropriation is not in dispute. The veto of this line item should be overridden today, and I ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek is recognized.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, again, the motion is unconstitutional. We will be submitting the LRB report for the record as well. I would ask for a "no" vote.

(The Legislative Reference Bureau's legal opinion was previously submitted for the record.)

The SPEAKER. The question recurs, shall the items in HB 1192, PN 1959, as stated in the motion become law, the prohibition of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

On that question, those in favor of those items becoming law will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "nay."

On the question recurring,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—115

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

NAYS—83

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

NOT VOTING—0**EXCUSED—5**

DeLuca	Metcalfe	Saccone	Truitt
Kampf			

The SPEAKER. The yeas are 115; the nays are 83. Less than two-thirds majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the Governor's veto is sustained.

MOTION FOR LINE OVERRIDE OF VETO

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Adolph, is recognized.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move that pursuant to Article IV, sections 15 and 16, of the Constitution of Pennsylvania, the House proceed with the reconsideration of the following items in HB 1192, PN 1959: page 240, lines 13 through 16, which authorizes the appropriation of sums to the Department of Education; page 246, lines 12 through 14, for State appropriation for payments on account of pupil transportation; and the budget implementation language from the first motion, Mr. Speaker.

On the question,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The SPEAKER. Representative Adolph is recognized on the motion.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override the Governor's veto of the pupil transportation appropriation in the Department of Education budget and ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for an affirmative vote.

HB 1192 appropriates \$549.1 million for this line item that is paid out to school districts and is the same exact amount that the Governor requested in his March 3 budget. While we may have differences on how much we should appropriate or how much we can afford on other education appropriations and where the money is coming from to pay for these line items, there is no disagreement between us on this more than half-a-billion-dollar appropriation that is driven out to our school districts and intermediate units per our formula in the School Code. There is no reason these payments should not begin flowing immediately. More specifically, this appropriation provides reimbursement to school districts and intermediate units for regular transportation to and from school.

Again, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason to continue to withhold this agreed-upon funding from our school districts. I ask all for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Sturla wishes to be recognized.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to speak, because as has been pointed out numerous times, all of these motions are unconstitutional, but I keep hearing that these are agreed-to line items, and while they may have been in people's initial proposals, I do not know that there was any agreement that was come to on any of them. And in a lot of those initial proposals, there was the assumption that there would actually be the money to pay for them. And we know that 1192, when it passed, had a \$3 billion structural deficit, and so without appropriate funding and appropriate revenue to pay for those, none of those line items are agreed to.

So I would appreciate the point that hopefully we discontinue referring to these as agreed-to appropriations or agreed-to numbers. These are agreed to if, possibly agreed to, if and when there are appropriate funding levels, but until such time, it is interesting to see hundreds of millions of dollars being spent without any idea of where the money is coming from to pay for them.

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Brandon Neuman.

Mr. NEUMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, the majority Appropriations chair, I have all the respect in the world for, and he keeps saying he does not see a reason as to why we should not override this veto. Well, this is clearly unconstitutional. We do not have the power to vote and to divide HB 1192 the way that it was vetoed. Now, if it was a line-item veto, we could take it line by line and actually go through the vetoes.

Now, most recently Governor Corbett exercised power he did not have when he line-item vetoed the Fiscal Code. And what did the legislature do? We ran to the courts and sued him because it was unconstitutional. And now that we are exercising power that we do not have, we are going to ignore the Constitution. We are going to ignore the Constitution, put up all these votes for political purposes. The only thing that remains consistent is the Constitution. The politics of this House is what remains inconsistent. And we need to be consistent and vote this down because this is unconstitutional.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Bryan Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of our legislative authority, I thought I had done a fairly good job of explaining that previously, but I would like to revisit some points now with some additional time in greater detail because I think it is instructive on how we are proceeding today. The Constitution specifically authorizes the legislature to override a certain—

The SPEAKER. Sir, just for a second, please suspend; just for a second.

Members, we have a number of members who want to speak on this issue. We are going to go to Representative Cutler, then there is Representative Grove, Representative Samuelson. If we could please give them our attention. If there are any conversations, I would ask you to please take them to the rooms outside of the chamber. All members, please take your seats. Let us please give our speakers, who are all under a 5-minute limit, the opportunity to speak as requested.

At this time the floor will be with Representative Bryan Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the legislature is specifically authorized to override a full veto or a line-item veto by utilizing the same procedure. The two sections of the Constitution which have been repeatedly referred to, section 15 and section 16, are textually linked. Regardless of how the Governor characterizes his veto, the only difference between Article IV, sections 15 and 16, is how the Governor is to act, not how the legislature acts or responds. In other words, for a full or a partial, as we are attempting here, veto of an appropriations bill, the constitutionally prescribed legislative response and procedure is exactly the same. As a result, the two options available to the Governor are two options that are also available to the General Assembly, and his decision or characterization does not constrain the legislators.

When you look at our House rules, House rule 31, concerning bills vetoed by the Governor, it draws no distinction between the consideration of vetoes or line-item vetoes. It simply references the procedure for consideration of a veto pursuant to Article IV, section 15, of the Constitution, the same procedure that is applicable to both. The House is

constitutionally authorized to determine the procedures whereby vetoed bills are considered. Article II, section 11: "Each House shall have power to determine the rules of its proceedings...."

Furthermore, Mason's Manual also recognizes this authority: "A constitutional provision relating to legislative consideration of vetoed bills is construed in connection with the constitutional provision authorizing each house to determine its rules of procedure." Mason's Manual of legislative procedure, section 754, subsection 7. The fundamental legislative authority of the General Assembly allows it to override the veto of a line item, including any necessary to effectuate that language. The chairman has made that distinction repeatedly throughout his motions, and it is regardless of the appearance of the Governor's limited authority to line-item veto.

The *Jubelirer* case clearly stated, "...a provision of an appropriation bill is an item if it directs that a specific sum of money be spent for a particular purpose." In *Jubelirer*, citing a 2006 decision by a Colorado Supreme Court, they clearly said that in order to effectuate the legislative authority of the General Assembly to override a line-item veto, that portion of the bill which is an indivisible part of the line item must also be subject to override.

So despite claims to the contrary that this is somehow an unconstitutional process, that is simply not true. The *Jubelirer* decision clearly said that we are to include the following: the source of funds, the destination of funds, and any attendant language necessary to effectuate the item. Article IV, section 16, of the Constitution provides both the General Assembly and the Governor with control over the particulars of a general appropriations bill. It is a clear expression of intent to give the Governor to the extent of refusing approval the same control over particulars of a general appropriations bill as the General Assembly can also exercise. That is from the *Commonwealth v. Barnett* case in 1901. The General Assembly is the primary source of legislative authority in the Commonwealth as verified by our Constitution and therefore is able to override a line and include the necessary attendant language regardless of the form of a Governor's veto and how he characterizes it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think it is also instructive to read Article IV, section 16. It has not been construed literally for over 100 years. I referenced this in my first set of comments. In 1901, in the same *Barnett* case, they clearly said that the Governor could unilaterally reduce the amount of any item. When you recognize this and look at the case, in the dissent, Justice Mestrazat noted the limited existential danger to legislative authority which would result from reading into section 16 of the Governor's power to reduce an appropriation. It is simply a rebalancing of the legislative authoritative scales between our chamber, the Senate, and the Governor. We absolutely have this authority and we should continue to do so, and I encourage our members to exercise that legislative authority so that we can appropriate the money to those individuals who so desperately need it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Seth Grove, followed by Representative Steve Samuelson.

Representative Seth Grove.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Here we are on about our eighth vote to override some line items. To date, I tallied it up, if this one fails, it will be \$981 million, \$981 million that will not be going to our human services organizations or our school districts. This line alone is

roughly \$549 million for pupil transportation. School has started. Students are moving between schools and home.

But I have to question, how did we get to this point where we are at today doing a veto override? It started with the Governor's budget address, March. In June we held a vote right here on the Governor's tax package. If you do not have the taxes, the money to spend, as my good colleague from Lancaster said, you do not have the money to spend on those line items. That was overwhelmingly voted down.

Now, I do not believe that there is unanimous nonsupport for the Governor's taxes. I think there are colleagues of mine that would be more than happy to put up that \$12.7 billion tax increase. In reality, it did not happen. That reset the budget negotiations away from tax increases to what at least the House Republicans passed to the Governor's desk and the Senate Republicans, a no-tax-increase budget. What we are doing today is layering what the Governor introduced in his budget plan, what the chairman of the Democratic Appropriations introduced as the Governor's plan, and the House Republican, or the Republican proposal that was vetoed to find those line items, that there was no difference or maybe had a slight increase in their funding. It is that simple.

What we are doing today is not about politics. It is not about trying to admonish the Governor. It is not about getting people on the record voting against stuff. It is literally about trying to fund these organizations and these services that literally everybody has agreed to. There is no debate over pupil transportation. As a matter of fact, it is a reimbursement. School districts fill out how much they need, put it to PDE (Pennsylvania Department of Education), and we give them that amount of money on a reimbursement plan.

This is not politics. This is simple governing. We are trying to get these organizations money that they need to keep their doors open and continue doing services. We can still do this and reach a global agreement on a budget negotiation. It is not that difficult. Unfortunately, I think political posturing has effectuated our votes today, and we need to move away from it. This is a good line item to focus on because it is literally a reimbursement.

No matter who is in charge of this General Assembly, this line item would have been at that level regardless of what happened because it is a reimbursement. It is not driven by our wants, our needs, budget negotiations. It is driven by a formula that school districts use to reimburse, PDE uses to reimburse.

This is a commonsense vote to ensure that school districts will get over half a billion dollars for pupil transportation. It is not politics. It is not about the Governor. It is not about anybody else. It is about the need to get funding moving. And we are far off. The Governor is still talking about his \$12.7 billion tax increase when that was removed from the table June 1. How do you negotiate against something that obviously does not have the votes? It is not a matter of getting Republican or Democrat votes. There are not 102 votes in this chamber for his budget. Regardless if you are Republican or Democrat, it is not there.

So we need to move on, move off the politics, get to governing, get some of these line items approved to get the money flowing to what I think everybody views as important line items. I would appreciate an affirmative vote on this veto override so at least some school districts can start getting half a billion dollars in State reimbursements and not continue to be held hostage through this budget impasse.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Samuelson.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I know several speakers have talked about the constitutional concerns when a Governor vetoes the entire budget but a single legislator decides to pick out individual line items in an unprecedented exercise. I know there are procedural concerns. We are voting this entire day without these motions being in writing. On our computer we have the entire budget that was vetoed. We have a motion stated at a microphone, not in writing that any of us have. It is the first time I can remember in 16 years that I have served in this legislature that we are voting on something that is verbal.

But I rose to speak because this particular motion highlights the ridiculous nature of a piecemeal budget. If you listen to what the gentleman from Delaware County is proposing, he is proposing that we vote on the line item for school bus transportation, pupil transportation, and it is listed on our printouts, but he skipped over 11 lines above that. There is another line item for basic education funding. Over \$5 billion in the proposed budget for basic – over \$6 billion, \$6.1 billion in the Governor's proposed budget for basic education, \$5.6 billion in the Republican version of the budget. So there is a disagreement over how much we should fund for basic education. But just think about this. The House majority is willing to talk about funding for buses to get the kids to school but they are not willing to adequately fund the education that goes on at the school. We are voting for bus transportation, but we are not talking about the entire education budget. How ridiculous is that?

What if I would use this Republican logic in other parts of life? I think we should take pride that the Pittsburgh Steelers are undefeated in Super Bowls. If you just ignore Super Bowl XXX and Super Bowl XLV, the Pittsburgh Steelers are 5 and 0 in Super Bowls. The Comcast Tower, you might not have known this, but the Comcast Tower in Philadelphia is the tallest building in the United States. All you have to do is ignore the other 18 buildings that are taller, but the Comcast building in Philadelphia is the tallest building in the United States. And I know the gentleman from Delaware County is still a little bit heartsick about the 1964 Phillies. They were 6 1/2 games ahead with 12 games to play, but I want to say personally to the gentleman from Delaware County, if you just ignore those last 12 games of the season, the Phillies won the 1964 pennant.

You cannot vote on a piecemeal budget. Several problems. What if you start running through the line items and then you get to a point where you have used up— You are talking about a \$10 billion or \$11 billion or \$12 billion education budget. If you pick and choose, how are you going to fund the entirety of public education in Pennsylvania if you fund certain line items and not all of the line items? Who is deciding which line items out of the 400 or 500 line items of this budget we bring up?

You can listen all day long today, but the gentleman from Delaware County is not going to bring up a motion to fund basic education in Pennsylvania. So you can vote on this motion to fund the buses, but you have to be concerned about the totality of public education in Pennsylvania.

I urge a "no" vote on the piecemeal budget.

The SPEAKER. Representative Benninghoff.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will keep my comments brief, but I sit here and I listen to this debate going on and on, and I just cannot imagine how we vote against some of these things. You know, I sit here as a

former coroner and think about juvenile probation services, the victims of juvenile offenders, and I think, how do our local communities not have these funds sent to us and how do we that are elected by the membership not get that money to them?

I realize we are moving on to pupil transportation, but that is just one of the small costs within education that is needed on a day-to-day basis.

One of the only reasons I got up to speak is I keep hearing this unconstitutionality. Then I hear others get up and say, well, I am going to vote against this because it is not enough money. Well, the reality under the Rendell years when there was a budget impasse, we, the legislature, had the ability then and we have the ability now that in the future months if there are additional dollars available, supplementals can be done. But at the end of the day, whether you are voting against domestic violence or you are voting against rape crisis or you are voting against juvenile probation services, crime does not stop; it does not wait until budgets get passed. And people can sit there and wrangle around all the time. Victims' needs, subsequent to these crimes occurring, do not stop as we sit here and try to debate constitutionality and whether we ought to vote on it now or we ought to vote on it tomorrow or we ought to vote on it in a couple weeks. The reality is, there was a budget passed, there was money in there, the same budget that we were operating on June 24, June 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, throughout that fiscal year, and what did we do? We took that budget and added more money to it and put it forth.

I rise in support of this initiative as well as the ones prior and the ones to follow, because I think we need to get money back to our districts. Families need this, crime victims need this, and the bottom line is, we have an inherent responsibility to do this. The supplementals can be filed anytime we want. We are here to work. We are here to get the money back to our legislative districts, because the bottom line is, we sit here and people point fingers. The taxpayers are still working, and guess what? They are still paying taxes. And where is that tax money? Sitting in the State Treasury waiting for the Governor's Office to cut it loose. That is not right. People should not have to be worried about whether they can get a loan or whether they are going to get their electric shut off or whether they are going to be able to get food. I have gotten 10 e-mails alone today from family-based child-care centers who are worried that they are not going to be able to provide the breakfasts and the lunches that they provide for these children, who are children of families that both parents are working trying to sustain their home. That is wrong. They are going to work. They are taking care of their families. They are paying taxes.

It is time the legislature votes "yes" on these initiatives and gets people's tax dollars back in their homes and takes care of the people in our communities. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Bryan Barbin.

Mr. BARBIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to this motion for the reason that we have spelled out in the past. There is a problem here that nobody seems to really want to address. The problem is that we do not have any budget until 102 people in the House agree with 26 people in the Senate and the Governor signs the bill.

Now, the part that is being overlooked here when we go line by line, school bus transportation, is there was a different election result. In Corbett's last 5 years, he had something called the Zogby rule. It was not written down in any manual, but what it said was, we are going to spend \$14,000 for a cyber school

despite the fact that the cost for that cyber school did not come anywhere close to \$14,000. Now, if we go this way, this motion, pick and choose individual line items for the school part, we will never resolve the real question that causes us to be here in August, 2 months late on a budget. The Governor is a different Governor. He does not agree with the Zogby rule. The Zogby rule costs \$500 million. Every other State in the nation caps cyber schools at \$5800 or less. We say \$14,000.

What this does, this motion to say we are going to take each line that we could agree to, it refuses to accept the fact that we will have no budgets for school funding until we resolve things like the Zogby rule or the special education rule. Until you do a complete budget, you cannot get the Governor, who does not agree with the Zogby rule, to go along with the Senate and the House Republicans that have let it go for 5 years. I do not agree with the Zogby rule. I think we should deal with all of the basic education line items at one time, take an up-or-down vote on the Zogby rule. If the Zogby rule is still good on the majority vote, then it goes to the Governor. He either signs it and we have a bill or we do not, but what we are doing today, all it does is delay the money to the public schools.

Do I think we should consolidate schools? Yes, but we ought to consolidate the charters that are not working. Only 25 percent of them are working. What this motion does is say, we are never going to get to that discussion. We are never going to sit down at a table and say, you know, the 25 percent of the 160 charter schools that are working, 40 of them, we are going to let those go. Anybody who is in the other 75 percent, the 120 that are not working, they have got to go back to public school and we are going to give the money back to the public school to have the teachers there to do the job. We do not get that discussion if we do these motions line by line with school transportation and pretend we are fixing the problem. We need to fix the whole problem, not half of the problem.

I urge a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. Do either of the leaders or the Appropriations chairs wish to be recognized?

(The Legislative Reference Bureau's legal opinion was previously submitted for the record.)

The SPEAKER. The question then recurs, shall the items in HB 1192, PN 1959, as stated in the motion become law, the prohibition of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

On that question, those in favor of those items becoming law will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "nay."

On the question recurring,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—115

Adolph	Godshall	Marshall	Regan
Baker	Greiner	Marsico	Roae
Barrar	Grove	Masser	Ross
Benninghoff	Hahn	McGinnis	Rothman
Bloom	Harhart	Mentzer	Sankey
Boback	Harper	Metzgar	Santora
Brown, R.	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Saylor
Causar	Heffley	Millard	Schemel
Christiana	Helm	Miller, B.	Simmons

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

NAYS—83

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

DeLuca	Metcalfe	Saccone	Truitt
Kampf			

The SPEAKER. The yeas are 115; the nays are 83. Less than two-thirds majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the Governor's veto is sustained.

MOTION FOR LINE OVERRIDE OF VETO

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Adolph, is recognized.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to try to stay with the safe schools initiatives. I will not talk about the Phillies, I will not talk about the Comcast building, I will not talk about the five Governor Corbett budgets, but we will try to keep this moving.

I move that pursuant to Article IV, sections 15 and 16, of the Constitution of Pennsylvania the House proceed with reconsideration of the following items in HB 1192, PN 1959: page 240, lines 13 through 16, which authorizes the

appropriation of sums to the Department of Education; page 250, lines 17 through 18, for State appropriation for safe schools initiatives; and the budget implementation language from the first motion, Mr. Speaker.

On the question,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The SPEAKER. Representative Adolph, on the motion.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override the Governor's veto of the safe schools initiatives appropriation in the Department of Education's budget, and I ask my colleagues for an affirmative vote.

HB 1192 appropriates \$8.527 million for this line item, which is the same amount that the Governor requested in March and a line item with \$8.522 million appropriated in 2014-15. This appropriation supports the work of the Pennsylvania Department of Education's Office for Safe Schools that provides services to our school districts in the following areas: school safety and security programs, crisis intervention, coordination of antiviolence efforts, and the development of policies and strategies to combat school violence. Roughly \$6.5 million out of the \$8.5 million appropriation is comprised of safe school grants that are awarded on a competitive basis to schools to fund programs which help prevent and address school violence.

I ask for an affirmative vote, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, we think this motion is unconstitutional. We have a report from the Legislative Reference Bureau that we will submit for the record, and I am asking the members to vote "no."

(The Legislative Reference Bureau's legal opinion was previously submitted for the record.)

The SPEAKER. The question recurs, shall the items in HB 1192, PN 1959, as stated in the motion become law, the prohibition of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

On that question, those in favor of those items becoming law will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "nay."

On the question recurring,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—115

Adolph	Godshall	Marshall	Regan
Baker	Greiner	Marsico	Roae
Barrar	Grove	Masser	Ross
Benninghoff	Hahn	McGinnis	Rothman
Bloom	Harhart	Mentzer	Sankey
Boback	Harper	Metzgar	Santora
Brown, R.	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Saylor
Causser	Heffley	Millard	Schemel
Christiana	Helm	Miller, B.	Simmons
Corbin	Hennessey	Milne	Sonney
Cox	Hickernell	Moul	Staats
Culver	Hill	Murt	Stephens

Cutler	Irvin	Mustio	Tallman
Day	James	Nesbit	Taylor
DeLozier	Jozwiak	O'Neill	Tobash
Diamond	Kaufner	Oberlander	Toepel
DiGirolamo	Kauffman	Ortitay	Toohil
Dunbar	Keller, F.	Parker, D.	Topper
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Verb
Ellis	Killion	Peifer	Ward
Emrick	Klunk	Petri	Warner
English	Knowles	Pickett	Watson
Evankovich	Krieger	Pyle	Wentling
Everett	Lawrence	Quigley	Wheeland
Farry	Lewis	Quinn	White
Fee	Mackenzie	Rader	Zimmerman
Gabler	Maher	Rapp	
Gillen	Major	Reed	Turzai,
Gillespie	Maloney	Reese	Speaker
Gingrich			

NAYS—83

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

DeLuca	Metcalfe	Saccone	Truitt
Kampf			

The SPEAKER. The yeas are 115; the nays are 83. Less than two-thirds majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the Governor's veto is sustained.

MOTION FOR LINE OVERRIDE OF VETO

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the good gentleman, Representative Adolph.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move that pursuant to Article IV, sections 15 and 16, of the Constitution of Pennsylvania the House proceed with reconsideration of the following items in HB 1192, PN 1959: page 240, lines 13 through 16, which authorizes the appropriation of sums to the Department of Education; page 246, lines 23 through 29, for a Federal appropriation for individuals with disabilities education; page 248, line 30, through page 249, line 4, for Federal appropriation for ESEA (Elementary and Secondary Education Act) - Title I - local; page 249, line 5 through line 7, for Federal appropriation

for Title II – improving teacher quality – local; and the budget implementation language from the first motion, Mr. Speaker.

On the question,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The SPEAKER. Representative Adolph, on the motion, please.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This override motion simply covers three Federal appropriations in the Department of Education's budget. There are no State funds included in this override motion, so there are no funds that enter into our State revenue expenditure and General Fund balance calculations. Again, all amounts requested by the Governor in his March 3 budget and included in HB 1192.

The motion simply requests to override the Governor's veto for these three Federal appropriations as follows so that our Department of Education has the authority to draw these dollars down from the Federal government and pay them out to our school districts: Individuals with Disabilities Education Act funds in the amount of \$457 million. These Federal funds assist local education agencies in providing a free, appropriate public education to all children with disabilities in our schools. Subgrants are made to each of the 29 intermediate units to work with respective member districts to supplement services to students with disabilities.

Number two, Title I funds under the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the amount of \$625 million. These Federal funds provide financial assistance to local education agencies. Federal Title I programs are designed to help children meet the State content and performance standards in reading, language arts, and mathematics.

Number three, Title II funds, improving teacher quality in the amount of \$130 million. These Federal funds are focused on upgrading the expertise of teachers and other school staff to enable them to teach all children and to meet the challenges.

Mr. Speaker, all told, these Federal appropriations represent up to \$1.2 billion in Federal dollars that cannot help our schools because of the Governor's blanket veto of HB 1192.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to be affirmative on this motion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek, on the motion, please.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Unconstitutional. Vote "no."

(The Legislative Reference Bureau's legal opinion was previously submitted for the record.)

The SPEAKER. The question recurs, shall the items in HB 1192, PN 1959, as stated in the motion become law, the prohibition of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

On that question, those in favor of the items becoming law will vote "aye," and those opposed will vote "nay."

On the question recurring,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—115

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

NAYS—83

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

DeLuca	Metcalfe	Saccone	Truitt
Kampf			

The SPEAKER. The yeas are 115; the nays are 83. Less than two-thirds majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the Governor's veto is sustained.

MOTION FOR LINE OVERRIDE OF VETO

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Adolph, is recognized.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move that pursuant to Article IV, sections 15 and 16, of the Constitution of Pennsylvania the House proceed with reconsideration of the following items in HB 1192, PN 1959: page 240, lines 13 through 16, which authorizes the appropriation of sums to the Department of Education; page 249, lines 21 through 23, for State appropriation for services to nonpublic schools; and the budget implementation language from the first motion, Mr. Speaker.

On the question,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The SPEAKER. Representative Adolph, on the motion.

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

I rise in support of the motion to override the Governor's veto of the services in the nonpublic school's appropriation in the Department of Education's budget and ask my colleagues for an affirmative vote.

HB 1192 appropriates \$87.939 million for this line item, which is \$1.555 million more than the amount appropriated in the 2014-15 fiscal year. While the Governor's March 3 budget requested \$4.48 million more for this line item, we can act now to get these funds flowing to our intermediate units to ensure our nonpublic school students can get these important services here at the outset of the school year. Like with other textbooks and material programs, the Commonwealth has a long tradition of appropriating funds in our budget to help our nonpublic schools provide services to children enrolled in kindergarten through 8th and 12th grades. This program provides specified services to any student who is enrolled in a nonpublic school. It is projected that over 200,000 students attending approximately 2,000 schools will be eligible to participate in these services during the 2015-16 school year.

Again, Mr. Speaker, overriding the Governor's veto is the fastest way to get these time-critical funds moving. Let us do the responsible thing and override the Governor's veto of this \$87.9 million line item included in HB 1192 and support our nonpublic schools.

I ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, an unconstitutional motion. Please vote "no."

(The Legislative Reference Bureau's legal opinion was previously submitted for the record.)

The SPEAKER. The question recurs, shall the items in HB 1192, PN 1959, as stated in this motion become law, the prohibition of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

On that question, those in favor of those items becoming law will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "nay."

On the question recurring,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—115

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

NAYS—83

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

NOT VOTING—0**EXCUSED—5**

DeLuca	Metcalfe	Saccone	Truitt
Kampf			

The SPEAKER. The yeas are 115; the nays are 83. Less than two-thirds majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the Governor's veto is sustained.

MOTION FOR LINE OVERRIDE OF VETO

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the good gentleman from Delaware County, the Appropriations chair, Mr. Adolph.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move that pursuant to Article IV, sections 15 and 16, of the Constitution of Pennsylvania the House proceed with reconsideration of the following items in HB 1192, PN 1959: page 221, lines 16 through 19, authorizing appropriations to the Department of Agriculture; page 226, lines 6 through 18, for a State appropriation to the State Food Purchase Program; and the budget implementation language from the first motion, Mr. Speaker.

On the question,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Adolph, on the motion.

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

I rise in support of the motion to override the Governor's veto of the State food purchase appropriation in the Department of Agriculture's budget.

HB 1192 provides \$18.438 million for this important program, which is \$1 million more or 5.7 percent more than the amount appropriated in the 2014-15 fiscal year. While the Governor's March 3 budget requests \$1.9 million more for this line item, we can act now to get these funds flowing for this important program as we continue to work with the administration on finalizing the Commonwealth's 2015-16 budget.

The State Food Purchase Program provides cash grants to counties for the purchase and distribution of food to needy individuals. Funding is allocated to each of the 67 counties based on unemployment eligibility for food stamps and medical assistance. The Department of Agriculture's Bureau of Food Distribution also helps facilitate the movement of food from farms, processors, and other channels to those at risk for hunger. Those vulnerable Pennsylvanians at risk for hunger should not have to wait any longer for these dollars to begin to flow to our counties.

I ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative John Maher.

Mr. MAHER. Come on, Mr. Speaker. This is for food banks, which means this is food for families and children. These folks have no place to go if this gets delayed further. They cannot go and borrow from this source or that source. This is literally food for desperate families and their children.

You know, it has occurred to me that there are some members on the other side of the aisle who have never, ever voted in favor of appropriating \$1 for food banks or for education or for anything. We hear a lot of talk that you do not think it is enough or it is enough but it is just not part of the package that, by the way, you voted against as well, but this is not about the rhetoric. These are real families across Pennsylvania, and if you do not vote for this funding, you are telling them they should just quit eating. That is not, that is not the right answer. It is the wrong answer by any measure, and I hope you will look within yourselves and think about those families and those children who depend upon the food banks before you get high and mighty and say you are not going to

vote for it because of this reason or that reason or another reason. Those hungry families, it will not make any difference to them what your reason was.

This is the amount the Governor asked for. This is the amount that both houses of the legislature approved. Please, please, get past the rhetoric. Help feed these families.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do not—

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek, I apologize.

Representative Samuelson, and then I will certainly come to you as Appropriations chair.

Representative Samuelson.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you.

The last speaker from Allegheny County just said this is the amount the Governor asked for. Actually, this line item that the Republican majority is bringing up, the amount that is being brought up is less than the Governor asked for, and if you go and talk to the folks at the food banks – I have attended a meeting with some of the folks from my food banks in the Lehigh Valley – this line item has been stuck at about \$18 million for several years. If you go back 6 years ago, this line item was at \$18 million. So now today, we are talking about \$18.4 million after 6 years. The Governor has asked for \$20.3 million. So there is a clear difference between the Governor and the Republican majority on this line item. If you talk to the folks at the food banks, they say the need to adequately fund our food banks in Pennsylvania is more like \$22 million or \$23 million or \$24 million. Read the letter that they sent you in June. They are asking for a lot more than that. They are not asking for \$18 million. They are asking us to get serious and negotiate a budget that adequately funds our food banks and the other line items in the budget.

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, this is unconstitutional, this motion, and please vote "no."

(The Legislative Reference Bureau's legal opinion was previously submitted for the record.)

The SPEAKER. The question recurs, shall the items in HB 1192, PN 1959, as stated in the motion become law, the prohibition of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

On that question, those in favor of these items becoming law will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "nay."

On the question recurring,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—115

Adolph	Godshall	Marshall	Regan
Baker	Greiner	Marsico	Roae
Barrar	Grove	Masser	Ross
Benninghoff	Hahn	McGinnis	Rothman
Bloom	Harhart	Mentzer	Sankey
Boback	Harper	Metzgar	Santora
Brown, R.	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Saylor

Causer	Heffley	Millard	Schemel
Christiana	Helm	Miller, B.	Simmons
Corbin	Hennessey	Milne	Sonney
Cox	Hickernell	Moul	Staats
Culver	Hill	Murt	Stephens
Cutler	Irvin	Mustio	Tallman
Day	James	Nesbit	Taylor
Delozier	Jozwiak	O'Neill	Tobash
Diamond	Kaufer	Oberlander	Toepel
DiGirolamo	Kauffman	Ortitay	Toohil
Dunbar	Keller, F.	Parker, D.	Topper
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Verb
Ellis	Killion	Peifer	Ward
Emrick	Klunk	Petri	Warner
English	Knowles	Pickett	Watson
Evankovich	Krieger	Pyle	Wentling
Everett	Lawrence	Quigley	Wheeland
Farry	Lewis	Quinn	White
Fee	Mackenzie	Rader	Zimmerman
Gabler	Maher	Rapp	
Gillen	Major	Reed	Turzai,
Gillespie	Maloney	Reese	Speaker
Gingrich			

NAYS—83

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

DeLuca	Metcalfe	Saccone	Truitt
Kampf			

The SPEAKER. The yeas are 115; the nays are 83. Less than two-thirds majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the Governor's veto is sustained.

MOTION FOR LINE OVERRIDE OF VETO

The SPEAKER. Representative Adolph is recognized.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move that pursuant to Article IV, sections 15 and 16, of the Constitution of Pennsylvania the House proceed with reconsideration of the following items in HB 1192, PN 1959: page 240, lines 13 through 16, which authorizes the appropriation of sums in the Department of Education; page 249, lines 24 through 27, for State appropriations for textbooks, instructional material, and

instructional equipment for nonpublic schools; and the budget implementation language from the first motion, Mr. Speaker.

On the question,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The SPEAKER. Representative Adolph, on the question.

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

I rise in support of the motion to override the Governor's veto of the textbooks, instructional materials, and equipment for the nonpublic school's appropriation in the Department of Education's budget, and I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for an affirmative vote.

HB 1192 appropriates \$26.751 million for this line item, which is \$473,000 more than the amount appropriated in 2014-15. While the Governor's March 3 budget requested \$1.37 million more for this line item, we can act now to get the funds flowing so that our nonpublic schools can get the textbooks and materials they need here at the outset of the school year rather than making them wait as we continue to work with the administration on finalizing the Commonwealth's entire 2015-16 budget. Overriding the Governor's veto of this line item today is the fastest way to get these dollars moving so that our nonpublic school students are not put at a disadvantage at the start of the school year.

Again, Mr. Speaker, overriding the Governor's veto is the fastest way to get these time-critical funds moving. Let us do the responsible thing and vote "yes." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kathy Watson, on the motion.

Mrs. WATSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I do not speak very often from down here. Every now and then I get to be up there.

But very seriously, I am speaking today not just as the State Representative for the 144th but as a former teacher, certainly as a parent, and as chairman of the Children and Youth Committee for the House. I have listened all afternoon and have been very disturbed by many of the things that I heard, some of which are just inaccurate, but more importantly, I think when I listen, I listen as a citizen of Pennsylvania, not their State Representative.

I am not an attorney, but I am someone who has spent a number of years here who remembers 2009 when we had a budget impasse before that lasted until October, and it was at that time that I got to know, particularly, my nonpublic schools in the 144th. They are indeed what at home we call our parochial schools, and since then I have had a wonderful relationship with those principals as well. In fact, I called them when I saw where this was all headed and said, "This means you're not going to get your textbooks again." I remember 2009 vividly and many of you were not here. It was terrible. And what they did and what the strategy will be this time will be that they ask every child to bring in a ream of paper, and they sit at night and they take the master workbook that they have gone out to buy and then they run them off, because when you were talking about children, particularly first to eighth grades, a lot of their work is done in a workbook so that they can go back over it. The teacher can check it.

I am asking for support, if not for all the other line items that were human service items that disturbed me, but certainly for this one. I do not want this to be repeated again. School starts, in

most places, on Monday, the 31st. It looks like we have already told them we are not supplying the funding for some of the nonpublic transportation and the buses. The children in my legislative district are fortunate enough to be encompassed in the Central Bucks School District, and that district will see to it that those children get to school and is standing the cost and using money that they have in reserve, but I know there are many of you who do not have that opportunity and you represent districts that cannot do that for their own public school children, let alone for their nonpublic school children. I feel very strongly about this, strongly enough to say to you, Mr. Speaker, for heaven's sakes, I am a Presbyterian and I am standing here – and an Irish one at that – and I am standing here and fighting for nonpublic parochial schools. I think I would make my nana proud if she was alive today. That is a little joke, but it is very serious.

I respectfully request, can you just break it one time and at least make sure that these children get their textbooks, because it comes from our Department of Ed. They have no way of supplying it. The orders are not going in, and the children deserve at least to have the textbooks and the workbooks to learn.

Thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Speaker. Obviously, I am in support of this, and I know I represent plenty of the folks when I go back home who say, I do not care about constitutionality. What I care about is, where is the money and can we move on and get things done in Pennsylvania? Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Harper.

Members, members, please. We are nearing the end of the motions that we are going to be addressing on the floor for today.

At this time I would like to turn the floor over to Representative Harper.

Please, any conversations, if you could take them to the rooms outside of the chamber. I would ask all members to please take your seats. Members, please take your seats or take the conversations to the rooms outside of the chamber. Please, members.

Representative Harper.

Ms. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would also like to thank my colleague from Delaware County for making the motion to allow the nonpublic schools to get their textbooks and equipment. I would like to thank my colleague from Bucks County for being so incredibly eloquent on why, if you are going to make one vote this afternoon, this is the one that you should make.

Like many of you, I received a bunch of e-mails saying that children in my district would go without textbooks if we did not get the budget done. So I carefully called my school superintendents and discovered that that was not true of any of the public schools. In fact, my public schools are mostly funded at home, get very little State aid, and are not having any trouble paying for textbooks. And I responded that way to all the e-mails saying, "I have consulted the North Penn School District and the Wissahickon School District, and we are not having any problems getting textbooks." I got one answer back that said, "My child goes to St. Helena's and that's not what Sister says." And by the way, having gone to a Catholic school myself, I paid attention. So I called St. Helena's and discovered that they cannot order their textbooks until we assure them that the money is there and that the process for getting approval from

the Department of Education for the textbooks that can be reimbursed and ordering those textbooks and getting those textbooks in a good year takes quite a bit of time, which has already passed. They literally cannot order the textbooks that they need at St. Helena's, and I will bet you have a school like that in your district. I will tell you why. In Pennsylvania 120,983 students go to a parish or Catholic school. All of those students are saving their local school districts collectively \$967,864,000 at a minimum, and they benefit by very little in our budget.

This is not a big line item for us. This is not something the Governor should fault you for releasing. And we have the money. You know this. Every time you buy something at a store, that 6 percent goes to Harrisburg. We have got this money. We can do this. We can get it done. And we really have people in all of our districts who need it. The money is there. I do not think the Governor can fault you if you depart from him on this one vote, and I do think that the people that you represent will be very grateful. Please, please, let the money go. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, this is unconstitutional, and I would ask all the members to please vote "no."

(The Legislative Reference Bureau's legal opinion was previously submitted for the record.)

The SPEAKER. The question recurs, shall the items in HB 1192, PN 1959, as stated in the motion become law, the prohibition of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

On that question, those in favor of those items becoming law will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "nay."

On the question recurring,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—115

Adolph	Godshall	Marshall	Regan
Baker	Greiner	Marsico	Roae
Barrar	Grove	Masser	Ross
Benninghoff	Hahn	McGinnis	Rothman
Bloom	Harhart	Mentzer	Sankey
Boback	Harper	Metzgar	Santora
Brown, R.	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Saylor
Causer	Heffley	Millard	Schemel
Christiana	Helm	Miller, B.	Simmons
Corbin	Hennessey	Milne	Sonney
Cox	Hickernell	Moul	Staats
Culver	Hill	Murt	Stephens
Cutler	Irvin	Mustio	Tallman
Day	James	Nesbit	Taylor
Delozier	Jozwiak	O'Neill	Tobash
Diamond	Kaufert	Oberlander	Toepel
DiGrolamo	Kauffman	Ortity	Toohil
Dunbar	Keller, F.	Parker, D.	Topper
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Vereb
Ellis	Killion	Peifer	Ward
Emrick	Klunk	Petri	Warner
English	Knowles	Pickett	Watson
Evankovich	Krieger	Pyle	Wentling
Everett	Lawrence	Quigley	Whealand
Farry	Lewis	Quinn	White

Fee	Mackenzie	Rader	Zimmerman
Gabler	Maher	Rapp	
Gillen	Major	Reed	Turzai,
Gillespie	Maloney	Reese	Speaker
Gingrich			

NAYS—83

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

DeLuca	Metcalf	Saccone	Truitt
Kampf			

The SPEAKER. The yeas are 115; the nays are 83. Less than two-thirds majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the Governor's veto is sustained.

MOTION FOR LINE OVERRIDE OF VETO

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Adolph, is recognized.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if you bear with me for a little bit, I am going to combine seven motions into one. They are community-based health-care subsidy, cancer screening services, school district health services, services for children with special needs, community-based family centers, Red Cross Extended Care Program, nurse family partnerships, and they are the seven motions.

Mr. Speaker, I move that pursuant to Article IV, sections 15 and 16, of the Constitution of Pennsylvania the House proceed with reconsideration of the following items in HB 1192, PN 1959: page 259, line 8 through line 11, authorizing appropriations to the Department of Health; page 264, line 25 through line 27, for the State appropriation to the community-based health-care subsidy.

Page 259, line 8 through line 11, authorizing appropriations to the Department of Health; page 264, line 30, through page 265, line 1, for State appropriations to cancer screening services.

Page 259, line 8 through line 11, authorizing appropriations to the Department of Health; page 265, line 22 through line 25, for State appropriations to school districts health services.

Page 259, line 8 through line 11, authorizing appropriations to the Department of Health; page 267, line 30, through page 268, line 2, for State appropriation for services to children with special needs.

Page 269, lines 2 through 5, which authorizes the appropriations of sums to the Department of Human Services; page 288, line 8 through line 23, for State appropriations to community-based family services, and Federal appropriations to family preservation – family centers; family resource and support – family centers; and Title IV-B – family centers.

Page 306, line 4 through line 7, which authorizes the appropriation of sums to the Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency; page 307, line 4 through line 6, for State appropriations to the Red Cross Extended Care Program.

Page 269, lines 2 through 5, which authorizes the appropriation of sums to the Department of Human Services; page 289, line 29, through page 290, line 8, for the State appropriation to the Nurse Family Partnership Program and Federal appropriation for medical assistance – Nurse Family Partnership; page 290, line 9 through line 11, for Federal appropriation to the MCH (maternal and child health) – early childhood home visiting; and the budget implementation language from the first motion, Mr. Speaker.

On the question,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The SPEAKER. Representative Adolph, on the motion.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For all the reasons why I have stated previously, I urge an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dush.

Mr. DUSH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of this.

But I also owe an apology today to Representative Harris. I had in the letter to the Governor and I intimated it here on the floor, what I had heard, actually, was associated with a separate bill. It was within a day or two of the same thing, and in my head in that short period of time I had associated the two. Representative Harris was actually at his grandmother's funeral, and I want to extend my apology, my humble apology, and correct the record on that. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to combine my seven it is unconstitutional and vote "no" into one. This motion is unconstitutional, and please vote "no."

(The Legislative Reference Bureau's legal opinion was previously submitted for the record.)

The SPEAKER. The question recurs, shall the items in HB 1192, PN 1959, as stated in the motion become law, the prohibition of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

On that question, those in favor of the items becoming law will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "nay."

On the question recurring,

Shall the items in the bill as stated in the motion become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—115

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

NAYS—83

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

DeLuca	Metcalfe	Saccone	Truitt
Kampf			

The SPEAKER. The yeas are 115; the nays are 83. Less than two-thirds majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the Governor's veto is sustained.

RECONSIDERATION MOTIONS FILED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker is in receipt of reconsideration motions filed by the gentlemen, Mr. Reed and Mr. Cutler, that the override votes on HB 1192 that were defeated on the 25th day of August be reconsidered, and the motions will be filed.

STATEMENT BY MR. DIAMOND

The SPEAKER. Representative Russ Diamond is recognized on unanimous consent.

Mr. DIAMOND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to express my gratitude to my colleagues and friends here on the House floor, to staff members, to members of the public for their extension of sympathy and condolences upon the passing of one of my greatest heroes, my father. Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Diamond, with deepest sympathy. Thank you.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. MICCARELLI

The SPEAKER. Representative Miccarelli, on unanimous consent.

Mr. MICCARELLI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wanted to rise to wish Representative Maloney a happy 55th birthday, but it may be a little late for that. So, Dave, enjoy the rest of your evening.

The SPEAKER. Representative Maloney, you look much younger than that. Happy birthday.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. Representative Briggs, sir, on unanimous consent.

Mr. BRIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am just submitting comments to a condolence resolution that we voted on earlier this morning for William Ross, HR 107.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Briggs. That will be accepted.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor William Ross, an honorable Pennsylvanian who served his country, his community, and his neighbors often and freely.

Bill served our country in the Army during World War II and bore witness to three major campaigns: the Battle of the Bulge, Central Europe, and Rhineland.

After returning to American soil, Bill graduated from Penn State, became the owner of the National Paint Center in Lansdale, and eventually made a living as a real estate agent. While he enjoyed his professional life, he continued to serve his community and fellow man in other ways.

Bill was a devout member of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church in Bridgeport and even belonged to their Holy Name Society. Each year at their annual feast, Bill would pitch in where he was needed to ensure the event was a success.

Bill was also very active as a member of the Bridgeport-Upper Merion Lions Club, the Four Chaplains, and the L.A.M. (Loggia Antonio Meucci) -Valley Forge Lodge 1776 Sons of Italy, where he formerly served as president.

His love and passion for his community carried over into a love for politics. Bill was a former Upper Merion Township supervisor and former head of the Montgomery County Democratic Party. He also served on the Montgomery Redevelopment Authority.

Mr. Speaker, Montgomery County owes a debt of gratitude to William Ross for his dedication to civic duty and commitment to mankind, and I am proud to recognize him today on the House floor.

On a personal note, Bill was a friend of mine, and I will miss him dearly, especially our conversations at his poll on Election Day.

I thank my colleagues in the House for their support for this resolution and recognition for this great man. Thank you.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. Representative Hahn, on unanimous consent.

Ms. HAHN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to thank the members for their unanimous support of HR 448 earlier today, recognizing the Borough of Chapman on their 150th anniversary, and I would like to submit remarks for the record.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative. They will be so accepted.

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I ask for your support of HR 448, which recognizes the 150th anniversary of the Borough of Chapman in Northampton County.

The municipality gets its name from William Chapman, who came to the United States in 1842 while in his midtwenties. Chapman grew up amidst the slate quarries of Cornwall County, England, and plied the same trade in this country after purchasing land in 1850.

He formed the Chapman Slate Company and did what many successful businesses of his day did in creating an accompanying small town in which his employees could live, work, and raise a family. On October 25, 1865, Chapman Borough, Northampton County, was incorporated.

The town quickly grew to a population of approximately 700 residents in the early 20th century, and the Chapman name became synonymous with quality workmanship that found its way into State Capitol buildings in New York and Connecticut. While Chapman Slate Quarries closed its doors in 1959, the homes that surrounded William Chapman's place of business remained and are, in some cases, occupied today by descendants of those original workers.

The borough will officially recognize its 150th anniversary this Saturday with a celebration scheduled for borough hall. I congratulate Chapman on this milestone and hope my colleagues will do likewise by supporting HR 448.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to bring to the attention of the Speaker and the members of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives the name of Timothy Gerald Czupich, who has recently been awarded Scouting's highest honor – Eagle Scout.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to the members of the House of Representatives the following citation.

Whereas, Timothy Gerald Czupich has earned the Eagle Award in Scouting. This is the highest award that the Boy Scouts of America can bestow and as such represents great sacrifice and tremendous effort on the part of this young man. Timothy is a member of Troop 34.

Now therefore, Mr. Speaker and members of the House of Representatives, it is my privilege to congratulate and place in the Legislative Journal the name of Timothy Gerald Czupich.

* * *

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to bring to the attention of the Speaker and the members of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives the name of Eric Hun Gasper, who has recently been awarded Scouting's highest honor – Eagle Scout.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to the members of the House of Representatives the following citation.

Whereas, Eric Hun Gasper has earned the Eagle Award in Scouting. This is the highest award that Boy Scouts of America can bestow and as such represents great sacrifice and tremendous effort on the part of this young man. Eric is a member of Troop 145.

Now therefore, Mr. Speaker and members of the House of Representatives, it is my privilege to congratulate and place in the Legislative Journal the name of Eric Hun Gasper.

* * *

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to bring to the attention of the Speaker and the members of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives the name of Jacob Steinberg, who has recently been awarded Scouting's highest honor – Eagle Scout.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to the members of the House of Representatives the following citation.

Whereas, Jacob Steinberg has earned the Eagle Award in Scouting. This is the highest award that Boy Scouts of America can bestow and as such represents great sacrifice and tremendous effort on the part of this young man. Jacob is a member of Troop 34.

Now therefore, Mr. Speaker and members of the House of Representatives, it is my privilege to congratulate and place in the Legislative Journal the name of Jacob Steinberg.

STATEMENT BY MR. NEUMAN

The SPEAKER. Representative Neuman, on unanimous consent.

Mr. NEUMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Washington Post reported on a very serious issue that happened in Washington County not too long ago where we had 25 overdoses in a 48-hour period, including 3 fatalities. Narcan was able to save some of the lives of the individuals that overdosed.

I know that we have an opiate task force that is going on right now, but I think that this is an issue that is consistent throughout the Commonwealth and throughout America, and I hope that we can come together for prevention programs in our schools to make sure that they do not start the first time, that we can come together for rehabilitation of people with addiction, and we can fight this heroin that is really infecting our constituents so that we can have a better community for our next generation to grow up in. So I just hope that the task force, the opiate task force, comes back with some really good recommendations of this. No piece of legislation is going to solve this whole problem. We need to be in our communities

and make sure that we are trying to prevent this and our next generation from starting day one.

But thank you for recognizing me, Mr. Speaker, and hopefully the Washington Post never comes back to Washington County to report on a tragedy like this.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. MARKOSEK

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek, on unanimous consent.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today is also Representative Mike Hanna's birthday. So happy birthday to Mike Hanna.

The SPEAKER. Happy birthday, Representative Hanna.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. BAKER

The SPEAKER. Representative Matt Baker, on unanimous consent.

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

I would like to wish happy birthday to Karen Coates today. Happy birthday, Karen.

The SPEAKER. Karen, many cheers.

Do any other members wish to be recognized?

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that SB 748 and SB 897 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. Representative Kate Klunk of York County moves that this House now be adjourned until Monday, September 21, 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 6:45 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.