

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 2016

SESSION OF 2016

200TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 12

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 Father John Michael McFadden of St. Theresa Parish in New Cumberland, and he is the guest of Representative Tim Hennessey.

FATHER JOHN MICHAEL McFADDEN, Guest Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Loving and gracious God, we acknowledge Your presence among us this day. We ask You to pour out Your blessings on our Commonwealth and our nation today. May these men and women whom we have elected to do the business of the people of Pennsylvania be given an inspired vision of the common good. May they meet the many challenges they face with resolve and the determination to rise above partisan politics. May Your grace bestow upon the members of this House a lively sense of hope and the virtues of justice, wisdom, and compassion, that they may be true instruments of Your will in carrying out their noble vocation as public servants. We pray that the work of this House will contribute to the flourishing of this Commonwealth so that all its peoples and families will be raised in dignity, encouraged in solidarity, and blessed with ordered liberty.

And in the spirit of this day's celebration, we rise today through God's strength to pilot us, God's might to uphold us, God's wisdom to guide us, God's eye to look before us, God's ear to hear us, God's hand to guide us, and God's shield to protect us. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Father.
And happy St. Patrick's Day to everybody by a day.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

HB 176, PN 170

By Rep. O'NEILL

An Act providing for grants to regional police departments; imposing powers and duties on the Center for Local Government Services and the Department of Community and Economic Development; providing for transfers from the State Gaming Fund; and repealing provisions in Title 4 relating to transfers from State Gaming Fund.

FINANCE.

HB 577, PN 646

By Rep. MAHER

An Act amending the act of May 29, 1945 (P.L.1134, No.405), entitled "An act to create a commission to act jointly with commissions appointed for like purpose by the States of West Virginia and Maryland, the Commonwealth of Virginia and the District of Columbia, which, together with three members to be appointed by the President of the United States, shall constitute the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, with power to cooperate in the abatement of the existing pollution, and in the control of future pollution of the waters of the drainage basin of the Potomac River within the States of Maryland and West Virginia, the Commonwealth of Virginia and the District of Columbia; to authorize the Governor of the State to execute on behalf of this State a compact with representatives of other states for the purpose of forming the above-mentioned commission; and creating a Potomac Valley Conservancy District; providing for the appointment of the Pennsylvania members of said commission for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and their terms of office; and providing an appropriation," further providing for membership of commission and for appointments.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY.

HB 1895, PN 2971 (Amended)

By Rep. MAHER

An Act amending the act of July 6, 1989 (P.L.169, No.32), known as the Storage Tank and Spill Prevention Act, further providing for Underground Storage Tank Indemnification Board.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY.

SB 879, PN 1618 (Amended)

By Rep. O'NEILL

An Act providing for the establishment of a savings program by the Treasury Department to encourage savings accounts for individuals with disabilities; establishing the Pennsylvania ABLE Savings Program and the ABLE Savings Program Fund; and imposing duties on the Treasury Department.

FINANCE.

SENATE MESSAGE

**HOUSE AMENDMENTS
TO SENATE AMENDMENTS
CONCURRED IN BY SENATE**

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, informed that the Senate has concurred in the amendments made by the House of Representatives to the Senate amendments to **HB 838, PN 2656**.

BILL SIGNED BY SPEAKER

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

HB 838, PN 2656

An Act designating a bridge on that portion of Garrett Road over the Darby Creek, Upper Darby Township, Delaware County, as the Honorable Nicholas A. Micozzie Bridge; designating the section of Pennsylvania Route 849 in Newport, Perry County, as the United States Navy Petty Officer 1st Class A. Louis De Lancey Memorial Highway; designating the 700 to 800 block of U.S. Route 13, also known as the Chester Pike, in Prospect Park Borough, Delaware County, as the Officers Luke Arlington Conner and J. Horace Callaghan Memorial Highway; and making a related repeal.

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

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The **SPEAKER**. The majority whip indicates that Representative **SAYLOR** of York County wishes to be placed on leave for the day, Representative **PHILLIPS-HILL** of York County wishes to be placed on leave for the day, and Representative **DiGIROLAMO** of Bucks County wishes to be placed on leave for the day. Without objection, those will be granted.

The minority whip indicates that Representative **McNEILL** of Lehigh wishes to be placed on leave for the day, Representative **STURLA** of Lancaster County on leave for the day, Representative **CRUZ** of Philadelphia County on leave for the day, Representative **BRADFORD** of Montgomery County on leave for the day, Representative **CALTAGIRONE** of Berks County on leave for the day, Representative **BOYLE** of Philadelphia County on leave for the day, and Representative **Pete DALEY** of Washington and Fayette Counties wishes to be placed on leave for today. Without objection, those requests will be granted.

MASTER ROLL CALL

The **SPEAKER**. Members, we are going to proceed to take the master roll. Could you please take your seats. We are going to be taking the master roll. All members, please take your seats.

We have much to cover today. We are about to take the master roll. Members, you will proceed to vote.

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—189

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

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—11

Boyle	Cruz	Hill	Saylor
Bradford	Daley, P.	McNeill	Sturla
Caltagirone	DiGirolamo	Peifer	

LEAVES ADDED—2

Keller, W.	Roebuck
------------	---------

LEAVES CANCELED—4

Bradford	Caltagirone	Daley, P.	Hill
----------	-------------	-----------	------

The **SPEAKER**. One hundred and eighty-nine members having voted on the master roll, a quorum is present.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. Located to the left of the rostrum, the Chair welcomes Abigail Hogan. Abigail, if you will please stand. Thank you for joining us. You are a guest, I understand, of Representative Becky Corbin. Thank you so much for being with us today.

To the left of the rostrum, the Chair welcomes Jaclyn Victor and her father, Justin. Please stand. Great to have you. It is my understanding you are shadowing Representative Carroll for the day, right? Thank you for being with us. Did I say your first name correctly? I did. Okay. Thank you.

Located to the left of the rostrum, the Chair welcomes Madeline Suba, and Madeline is a plebe cadet in the United States Military Academy at West Point. She is here with her mom, Kathy, and friend, Susan Harry. It is great to have you here today. They are guests of Representative Rich Irvin. Thank you so much for being here today.

Representative Margo Davidson has guests, medallion taxicab owners. Are they here? In the gallery. Please stand, and welcome. We appreciate your taking the time to be here today. Thank you.

Representative Tom Killion has members and staff here today of the State Street Miracles. I believe they are in the gallery. Could you please stand? Those folks associated with State Street Miracles please stand. They are actually in the back of the House. It is great to see you. Thank you for being with us today.

To the left of the rostrum, we welcome Frances Del Duca; her daughter, Maureen Del Duca; and Dean Katherine Pearson, and they are here with Penn State's Dickinson School of Law, the one located in Carlisle, and they are guests of Representative Kate Klunk. So please, it is so great to have you here today. Thank you so much. Thank you.

UNCONTESTED CALENDAR**RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35**

Mr. DeLUCA called up **HR 695, PN 2853**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the year 2016 as "The Year to Cure Cancer" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. MURT called up **HR 700, PN 2884**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of March 2016 as "Deep Vein Thrombosis Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Ms. TOOHIL called up **HR 706, PN 2899**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of March 2016 as "Intellectual Disability Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. SCHREIBER called up **HR 728, PN 2935**, entitled:

A Resolution designating March 16, 2016, as "Kick Butts Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. PASHINSKI called up **HR 732, PN 2950**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of March 2016 as "Music in Our Schools Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolutions?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Kristin Phillips-Hill is on the floor and should be placed on the master roll.

**CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTIONS
PURSUANT TO RULE 35 CONTINUED**

On the question recurring,

Will the House adopt the resolutions?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—190

Acosta	Farina	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Adolph	Farry	Krueger	Readshaw
Baker	Fee	Lawrence	Reed
Barbin	Flynn	Lewis	Reese
Barrar	Frankel	Longietti	Regan
Benninghoff	Freeman	Mackenzie	Roae
Bizzarro	Gabler	Maher	Roebuck
Bloom	Gainey	Mahoney	Ross
Boback	Galloway	Major	Rothman
Briggs	Gergely	Maloney	Rozzi
Brown, R.	Gibbons	Markosek	Saccone
Brown, V.	Gillen	Marshall	Sainato
Bullock	Gillespie	Marsico	Samuelson
Burns	Gingrich	Masser	Sankey
Carroll	Godshall	Matzie	Santarsiero
Causer	Goodman	McCarter	Santora
Christiana	Greiner	McClinton	Schemel
Cohen	Grove	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Conklin	Hahn	Mentzer	Schreiber
Corbin	Hanna	Metcalfe	Schweyer
Costa, D.	Harhai	Metzgar	Simmons
Costa, P.	Harhart	Miccarelli	Sims
Cox	Harkins	Millard	Snyder
Culver	Harper	Miller, B.	Sonney
Cutler	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Staats
Daley, M.	Harris, J.	Milne	Stephens
Davidson	Heffley	Moul	Tallman
Davis	Helm	Mullery	Taylor
Dawkins	Hennessey	Murt	Thomas
Day	Hickernell	Mustio	Tobash
Dean	Hill	Neilson	Toepel
Deasy	Irvin	Nesbit	Toohil

DeLissio	James	Neuman	Topper
Delozier	Jozwiak	O'Brien	Truitt
DeLuca	Kampf	O'Neill	Vereb
Dermody	Kaufer	Oberlander	Vitali
Diamond	Kauffman	Ortitay	Ward
Donatucci	Kavulich	Parker, D.	Warner
Driscoll	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Watson
Dunbar	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Wentling
Dush	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Wheatley
Ellis	Killion	Petri	Wheeland
Emrick	Kim	Pickett	White
English	Kinsey	Pyle	Youngblood
Evankovich	Kirkland	Quigley	Zimmerman
Evans	Klunk	Quinn	
Everett	Knowles	Rader	Turzai,
Fabrizio	Kortz	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Boyle	Cruz	McNeill	Saylor
Bradford	Daley, P.	Peifer	Sturla
Caltagirone	DiGirolamo		

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

STATEMENT BY MR. PASHINSKI

The SPEAKER. We will begin with the following individuals to speak. Representative Pashinski wishes to speak on HR 732.

Representative Pashinski, the floor is yours.

Mr. PASHINSKI. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much, and I am very grateful to all my colleagues for supporting HR 732. I thank you for cosponsoring it. I also thank you for supporting it today.

I do not know anyone that does not really enjoy music, whether it is listening or singing or playing an instrument. That enjoyment generally starts at a young age, maybe in the nurturing of your mom or grandma, but the bottom line is, I think we all know the value of music.

As a former music teacher, I have seen firsthand on a regular basis, class after class, the advantages that music allows for all of our children to be able to grow, and also help them academically. The benefit goes far beyond that, though, because music encourages things like creativity, things that develop critical-thinking skills and reasoning skills, promoting diversity and discipline, study skills and communication skills. These are the tools needed for the classroom, the workforce, and certainly, for life.

Unfortunately, many take music for granted, many of the arts, and with certain budget cuts in our schools, many have eliminated music classes, leaving our students, many of them, with one less major opportunity to grow, to express their creativity, and to find their gifts.

Every child should experience music education. We as a culture are best served when our children's minds and hearts are given the best opportunity to grow, to grow with the knowledge and understanding of music.

I cannot imagine life without it. We know that it is the universal form of communication. Plato himself said it is that form of communication like no other. It certainly is a powerful tool that enhances our world, and I am grateful to all of you for recognizing the impact this will have on all of our lives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I thank you, I have in my hand, I have this large book that was distributed last year to all the Representatives here in the legislature. And in this large book there are 1400 children that have offered their personal accounting of how important music has been to their lives. And yesterday, Mr. Speaker, Representative Matt Baker, offered me a great lesson in how to demonstrate a message. So this book that has 1400 personal accountings by children in Pennsylvania that are explaining why music is important to them, I would like to read each one of these 1400 accountings – I am only kidding, only kidding. We have a lot of work to do.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you very much. Jimmy, I want to thank you very much. Thank you, colleagues. I appreciate the support of HR 723.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative.

STATEMENT BY MS. TOOHL

The SPEAKER. Representative Tarah Toohil wishes to speak on HR 706.

Representative, the floor is yours.

Ms. TOOHL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would also like to ask my colleagues from Delaware County to come up with me today. They do have special guests here.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues for their unanimous support of HR 706, which designates the month of March as "Intellectual Disability Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

Now, in the back, dressed in red and white – you will see them all the way in the back – that is State Street Miracles. Would you give them a round of applause? We are so glad you are here. The House of Representatives wanted to recognize these great supporters of HR 706.

These individuals are a very talented performance troupe. They will be performing at 1 p.m. in the rotunda, and we will all be there to see you. We are very proud of you. They live in Pennsylvania. They work, they vote, and they are very active in representing and working hard to promote intellectual disabilities and what you are able to accomplish. So thank you for spreading awareness. It is very appropriate that you are here today while we are doing this House resolution.

In Pennsylvania there are more than 56,000 Pennsylvanians with intellectual disabilities that receive services and support. In addition, there are more than 37,000 children, including a significant number who have intellectual disabilities, that receive early intervention services.

Public awareness and education improve the understanding of intellectual disabilities and the programs that are needed to meet the specific needs of those individuals. Unfortunately, in Pennsylvania there are nearly 14,000 individuals who continue to wait for services on waiting lists. These programs would ensure that they have the opportunity to participate in the range of life experiences that all of us enjoy in our homes and in our communities.

We want to thank and express our appreciation for those Pennsylvanians who conduct this special outreach, education and services, and urge the citizens of the Commonwealth to give year-round support to efforts which enable those with intellectual disabilities to live full and productive lives.

So once again, thank you to all of you, our colleagues, for supporting HR 706. Thank you so much.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Tony DeLuca is recognized to speak on HR 700. I apologize; that is on HR 695.

I understand Representative DeLuca is not here yet.

STATEMENT BY MR. MURT

The SPEAKER. Representative Tom Murt is recognized to speak on HR 700. Representative Murt, the floor is yours.

Mr. MURT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, according to the American Heart Association, up to 2 million Americans are affected annually by what is known as deep vein thrombosis, more commonly known as blood clots, yet most Americans have little or no awareness of the potential problems caused by blood clots. That is why it is so important that we passed HR 700.

Mr. Speaker, deep vein thrombosis represents one of the most commonly occurring and serious medical conditions, yet it has not received the same attention as heart attack or stroke.

Mr. Speaker, in all candor, our public is not as educated about the potential health risks of deep vein thrombosis or the symptoms as we should be, and it is critical that the public recognize these symptoms so they can seek urgent medical help when necessary.

It is estimated that every minute at least one person in the United States develops an unwanted blood clot in a deep vein, usually in the leg. If left untreated, part of a deep vein thrombosis can break off and form what is called a pulmonary embolism – a blood clot that travels to the lungs. At least every 5 minutes someone dies from a pulmonary embolism.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, blood clots can affect people of any age and health status, and that is why it is so important that we have declared March "Deep Vein Thrombosis Awareness Month" in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and by raising awareness, we will be saving lives.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

CALENDAR

RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Ms. KLUNK called up **HR 723, PN 2916**, entitled:

A Resolution honoring the life of Professor Louis F. Del Duca and expressing condolences to his family upon his passing on November 27, 2015.

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. Representative Klunk, the floor is yours.

Ms. KLUNK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to Representative Stephen Bloom, who is joining me today.

Today I rise with great sadness but with great pride to pay tribute to a dedicated individual whose belief in our legal system led him to shape the lives and careers of countless students and legal professionals, including many of our House legal staff, drafting attorneys in the Legislative Reference Bureau, and House members.

Professor Louis F. Del Duca dedicated nearly 60 years to legal academia as a professor at the Dickinson School of Law in Carlisle. He was internationally recognized as a leading scholar in the fields of commercial and comparative law, the internationalization of legal education, and the harmonization of laws.

Known to many as the Duke, Professor Del Duca was a Distinguished Faculty Scholar Emeritus and the longest serving faculty member at the Dickinson School of Law. He established the school's master of comparative law degree program and founded and managed the school's first international and study abroad programs. He was often found leading students throughout Florence and Vienna well up into his eighties.

In addition to having an illustrious tenure at Dickinson, Professor Del Duca participated as a member of the U.S. Secretary of State's Committee on International Trade Law, served as the president of the International Academy of Commercial and Consumer Law, collaborated with the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law, and served as the editor of the Pennsylvania Bar Association Quarterly since 1968. And over his tenure he arranged personally for six United States Supreme Court Justices to be guest jurists in the Dickinson Law study abroad summer programs in Europe.

Sadly, Professor Del Duca passed away in Washington, DC, while with his family on November 27, 2015. He will certainly be missed by all, including his family, colleagues, and friends from across the globe. His wife, Frances; daughter, Maureen; and Dickinson School of Law colleague, Dean Katherine Pearson, join us today to honor his memory. Thank you so much for joining us today.

In the legal community, Professor Del Duca will forever be remembered for his dedication and research in the legal field, which he was doing up until the day before he died. To the end of his life he was passionately involved in the law, in learning more about it, in learning about life through the law, and in giving us all the benefit of his distinctive insights.

The Duke developed friendships in all areas of the law and in all places of this world, including a very special friendship with former United States Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia. Above all, Professor Del Duca will be remembered for his devotion to the students he taught, including me; in his faith in our judicial system; and his respect and dedication to public service. As we honor Professor Del Duca's memory today, I am personally grateful and inspired by individuals who have chosen to devote their lives to teaching and mentoring. Professor Del Duca – or as we alums call him, the Duke, will live on as part of a continuing fabric of the institution, influencing the lives of countless more students, staff, and colleagues from all over the world through his memory at the Dickinson School of Law.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask that members of this legislative body join me in honoring the memory of this influential educator and legal scholar by unanimously passing this resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—190

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Boyle	Cruz	McNeill	Saylor
Bradford	Daley, P.	Peifer	Sturla
Caltagirone	DiGirolamo		

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

The SPEAKER. May God bless. Thank you so much for being with us today. Thank you.

**MEMORIAL SERVICE
IN HONOR OF
HON. JOHN MYERS**

The SPEAKER. Representative Kinsey.

Representative Kinsey is recognized to speak on a condolence resolution for a former House member, John Myers. I would ask the Sergeants at Arms to close the doors of the House as we remember a former colleague that has passed away.

CONDOLENCE RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER. The clerk will read the resolution for us first.

The following resolution was read:

**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

CONDOLENCE RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, The House of Representatives of Pennsylvania wishes to honor the memory of the Honorable John Myers, a former member of the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania who served the 201st Legislative District with honor and distinction and who passed away at the age of sixty-eight on December 6, 2015; and

WHEREAS, Born on October 17, 1947, in Philadelphia, Mr. Myers was a graduate of Germantown High School and Lincoln University. He served this country with honor and distinction as a member of the United States Navy from 1964 to 1968 and was a former MH/MR Specialist with the Commonwealth Community Treatment Team. Active in his community, Mr. Myers was an honorary Board member of the Germantown Settlement CDC and a member of the Philadelphia Workforce Development Corporation, the Northwest Action Committee, the Germantown Business Association, the Enon Tabernacle Baptist Church and the Prince Hall Masons; and

WHEREAS, Elected to the House of Representatives in 1995, Mr. Myers served the constituents of the 201st Legislative District faithfully for eight consecutive terms. During his tenure, he was a member of the Agriculture and Rural Affairs and Liquor Control Committees and was also Chair of Subcommittees for the Appropriations and Health and Human Services Committees and Democratic Chair of the Health Committee; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania proclaim with enduring sorrow the passing of John Myers; and extend heartfelt condolences to his wife, Joyce Myers; daughter, Tracie Page; brothers, Eric, David and William, Jr.; sisters, Gwendolyn Ewell and Maryann Perry; and many other family members and friends; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution, sponsored by Representatives Stephen Kinsey, Louise Williams Bishop, Vanessa Lowery Brown, Angel Cruz, Margo L. Davidson, Dwight Evans, Thaddeus Kirkland, Cherelle L. Parker, James R. Roebuck, Jr., W. Curtis Thomas, Jake Wheatley, Jr., and Rosita C. Youngblood on December 7, 2015, be transmitted to Joyce Myers.

Stephen Kinsey, Sponsor
Mike Turzai, Speaker of the House

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. Representative Kinsey has been kind enough to speak today with respect to the passing of Representative John Myers, and please, Representative Kinsey, the floor is yours, sir.

Mr. KINSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand humbly before this esteemed body so that we can properly pay our respects to the loss of one of our own, former State Representative John Myers of the 201st Legislative District.

The Honorable Myers was born October 17, 1947, and departed us on December 6, 2015, almost 3 years to the day that he left office.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Representative Myers' life was that of a humble man. Born and raised in the Germantown section of Philadelphia, he attended the local public schools, including Germantown High School. Representative Myers entered the United States Navy, serving in Vietnam from 1964 to 1968. Upon his return to the Germantown community, Representative Myers, like many of his peers during this period of time, recognized that the struggles facing inner-city youths were insurmountable.

So in the early 1970s, Representative Myers, along with his friends, most notably the late Honorable David P. Richardson, Jr., formed an organization called United Progressives. This group changed the social, economic, and political structure, not only in the northwest section of Philadelphia, but throughout the city as a whole.

The apparatus of politics became Representative Myers' weapon of choice. He used his knowledge and all that he learned in the streets to develop strategies to master electoral politics. The powerful Northwest Action Committee became his vehicle to help community activists become elected officials. Folks such as the late David P. Richardson, Jr., former Philadelphia City Councilwoman Donna Reed Miller, former House and Senate member, LeAnna Washington, and yours truly, just to name a few, benefited in part from Myers' political prowess. Many of us in the city of Philadelphia know that with the untimely death of David P. Richardson, Jr., that it was John Myers who was chosen in a special election November 7, 1995, to fill the void left by Dave's departure.

Representative John Myers was sworn into office on November 21, 1995, and was reelected to eight consecutive terms thereafter. During Representative Myers' years while serving as a member of the House, he served on the Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee and the Liquor Control Committee, and he was subcommittee chairman for both the Appropriations Committee and the Health and Human Services Committee, working his way to become the Democratic chairman of the Health Committee.

And, Mr. Speaker, let us not forget the colorful side of Representative Myers. He was a man who often said what he meant, and he meant what he said, but only in a way that he could say it. Representative Myers was a man who tackled many crucial issues, issues that focused on health, public safety, economic development, and crime. He was noted for pushing for gun safety legislation and his historic welfare bill of rights. Resigning from this audacious body in 2012, Representative Myers then refocused his attention to his family, to his friends, and to his village.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

Mr. KINSEY. Mr. Speaker, we are joined here today by members of that village that John Myers so dearly loved: his beloved wife of 34 years, Miss Joyce Myers. Miss Joyce Myers, will you please stand. His daughter, Tracie; Tracie, please stand. I believe we have his sisters, Maryann and Gwendolyn. We have his brothers, David and Eric, who are with us today; please stand. His niece, Bonita, who is always there; please stand. His political sister – I am sorry; his political wife, let me get it straight – his political wife, Senator LeAnna Washington. In fact, I am going to ask all of the Myers family to please stand.

We also have with us former staffer – whom many of you have seen in the House, and when you saw John Myers, you saw this gentleman with him always – Clarence Mitchell, who is in the rear, who was always by John Myers' side; staffers Stacey Wright, who is currently my chief of staff, and Annette Gordy, who worked with Representative Myers in my office, who flew in from Florida just to be here today. We have a host of friends: Councilwoman Donna Reed Miller, Mjenzi Traylor, Bill Ryan, Reverend Shine. In fact, I am going to ask all the members from the Myers village to please stand.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the members of this body join me in welcoming the family and friends from the village in which the Honorable John Myers called his home.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The SPEAKER. Members, please remain standing, because those in favor of this resolution will rise and remain standing as a mark of respect for our deceased former member, this Navy veteran, this community neighbor, this distinguished House member.

All guests, I appreciate that you are with us standing.

(Whereupon, the members of the House and all visitors stood in a moment of silence in solemn respect to the memory of the Honorable John Myers.)

The SPEAKER. The resolution has been unanimously adopted.

May God bless you, Mrs. Myers, and your family. Senator Washington, thank you for being with us, and former Representative. Thank you.

Members, if you could, please take your seats. Members, please take your seats.

REMARKS BY MR. EVANS

The SPEAKER. Representative Dwight Evans will be recognized.

Members, if we could ask you to please take your seats, and guests. Thank you.

Representative Evans, the floor is yours, sir.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few comments to my good friend, Steve Kinsey, in what he had to say about John

Myers, because John Myers was someone that I knew extremely well also, and he was someone whom I learned a great deal from.

John Myers, better known as – they called him Johnny Boy. He was assigned to me by Dave Richardson in the 1970s, and John Myers was the one who basically taught me a lot about politics, taught me a lot about politics. Dave Richardson said to John Myers, "I want you to help this young guy and I want you to spend some time and to educate him about the political process." And John Myers and I met – this is in the 1970s – we met literally for weeks just about every night over talking about running for State Rep.

And if you knew anything about John Myers, John Myers was what I call unapologetically Black, unapologetically Black. And what John meant when he said that was that he did not apologize about being Black. He said and he understood that that did not mean anti-anyone else. John was the kind of person, as Steve mentioned, who was going to speak his mind.

I learned a lot from John Myers. John Myers in that time that he spent with me helped a great deal of having me understand the importance of public service, the importance of involvement.

John Myers was not the kind of person that you would describe as a show horse. He was definitely a workhorse. John Myers did not like the press, did not even want to be around the press, but John Myers wanted to be about work and especially work for Black people. John Myers knew more than anybody I have ever seen about the importance of what Black people meant to this State. He did not apologize about that. He would tell you upfront where he stood and he would always be a person that showed passion. He would show it on his sleeve and sometimes people would not understand him, but you just had to know John Myers. And for those of you who had the opportunity to work with him and to know him, he really cared for all people. He was very passionate. When he was dealing with health and welfare, he was dealing with the young children. You know, that is the way John Myers was.

Some of you may remember those who were around – and Sam Smith was the Speaker at that time – we did a session on guns, and I remember I introduced a discharge resolution, and I said to John, "I need you to go get me 27 signatures." John Myers went on that mission and got 27 signatures, and we had an entire House discussion on guns. But John knew at the end of the day that we were all in this together.

If you really understood John, John was about people and doing the right thing. John especially was about helping poor people. He did not apologize about that. He did not apologize about that at all.

So I say to all of you that we need some more John Myerses on both sides. We need somebody who really understood, why is he here?

So you met John's family and you saw some of John's friends, but John was the kind of person that in the 17 years he served in this body, I believe he helped make a difference in this body, in the city, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I will personally never, ever forget John Myers, because his wife, Joyce, would tell you, we used to have 5-o'clock-in-the-morning phone calls and we used to call it study groups. That is what we would do. We would discuss on the phone about the issues that we face today and how we could make a difference.

John made me a better person and a better legislator because he was always the kind of person trying to make a difference among the people, and he never held a grudge. He never held a grudge. I do not care how much you thought about John, John always understood that this was not personal, that you have to get over it. That is the way John would approach it. You needed not to carry those kinds of internal issues you may have in yourself. John was the kind of person, anyone who knew John Myers and worked with John Myers, there was no way you could not like John Myers, no way you could not like him.

So he will be missed, but I hope that his spirit in some way will carry over as we deal with the issues we have today.

Again, thank you and God bless you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

STATEMENT BY MR. DeLUCA

The SPEAKER. Representative Tony DeLuca is recognized to speak on HR 695. Representative DeLuca, the floor is yours.

Mr. DeLUCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to thank all my colleagues here for their affirmative vote on HR 695 this morning.

You know, Mr. Speaker, when President Obama announced the creation of the Cancer Moonshot Task Force and asked that we put forth a concerted national effort to end cancer as we know it, I was struck by how big the task is, yet I realize how successful our nation has been when faced with other equally large health problems.

I introduced HR 695 to declare 2016 as "The Year to Cure Cancer" in Pennsylvania, to not only call for an intensive effort in Pennsylvania to find these elusive cures, but to shine a light on the issue on the State level and in all the States in our country.

According to the American Cancer Society, there will be an estimated 83,560 new cases of cancer in Pennsylvania alone in 2016. Cancer is the second most common cause of death in the United States, and it accounts for one out of four deaths. So as you can see, cancer is an enormous and complicated disease. Some form of cancer touches virtually every family in our country in some way, including my own family.

As rampant as this disease is, it is alarming to me that in 2016 we still have not identified more definitive causes and cures for cancer. We have made incredible strides. Most certainly there is groundbreaking research going on as we speak right here in Pennsylvania, but I cannot help but wonder, what can we do and what more can we do? What will it take to eradicate this disease, and yes, Mr. Speaker, this epidemic?

Jonas Salk, who was from Pittsburgh, developed the vaccine to prevent polio with only his brain and a microscope. Smallpox has been 100 percent wiped out with vaccines worldwide. Modern scientists have discovered the cause of tetanus, rabies, yellow fever, measles, whooping cough, and others, which can also be prevented or stopped in their tracks with vaccines, yet cancer continues its destruction of your body, your mind, your personality, your family, your friends, your financial resources, and also, your dignity. Too many of our Commonwealth's citizens have faced a cancer diagnosis in some manner, and I have introduced HR 695 for all of them – the families, the parents of young children, the spouses, and their siblings.

HR 695 is a collective voice for all those individuals, the voices tired and weak and simply unheard that are touched by this disease.

Mr. Speaker, there must be national, State, and even local support of research and treatment efforts if we are ever going to win this battle for the future generations and all the children, men, and women out there.

With this resolution, I am hopeful that all States make a real and concerted effort to support collaboration efforts to back information-sharing and to promote an all-out national effort to find a cure sooner rather than later. I ask that all entities across the country actively join the national effort to shoot for the moon. I ask for State legislatures across the country to lend their support by a resolution similar to HR 695.

Mr. Speaker, 45 years ago when Ronald Reagan – 45 years ago when we had the war on cancer declared, we cannot wait and the children cannot wait another 45 years.

I want to thank you for this vote, and God bless you.

The SPEAKER. Members, we are going to start the program with respect to the Irish dancers in just a moment. We are going to take some photos briefly here with Representative Myers' family, and then we will proceed to the festivities.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Members, Representative Tim Hennessey will be taking over at this time at the rostrum.

Representative Hennessey, the floor is yours, sir.

Mr. HENNESSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you to Father McFadden for your opening prayer as we began today's House session on the eve of St. Patrick's Day, and a grand welcome to all our members and staff and guests and to our viewers across our Commonwealth who join us today on PCN, the Pennsylvania Cable Network.

Today we celebrate the histories, the interlaced histories of Ireland and Pennsylvania. William Penn, the founder of Penn's Woods, was himself the son of Admiral William Penn of the English Royal Navy. While the father fought for England and against Ireland in the English Civil War, Admiral Penn later settled his family in Ireland. His son, William, forswore the family military ways and became a Quaker, and thereby fell out of favor with his father. Soon after, the younger Penn left County Cork in his early twenties bound for the New World, about 1867. Once William Penn had established Penn's Woods, a wave of Irish immigrants followed him seeking religious and personal freedoms in the New World and the unbridled opportunity that the colonies afforded them, especially in Pennsylvania. Coal miners, canal builders, steelworkers, railroad workers, and many other hard workers came to the Commonwealth and helped to weave the tapestry of Pennsylvania and to build a society that we cherish today.

The Irish famine from 1845 to 1849 saw the most sustained flow of Irish immigrants to America, and many came to Pennsylvania. Irish influences shaped our labor movement and our cultural development. The Molly Maguires are emblematic of the labor union strife we sustained here in Pennsylvania, and ultimately, they helped to forge our modern-day workforce.

And Grace Kelly as an actress and Gene Kelly as a dancer are lasting testaments to Irish contributions to our Commonwealth's culture.

McDADE-CARA SCHOOL IRISH DANCERS PRESENTED

Mr. HENNESSEY. And speaking of dancers like the great Gene Kelly, today we are graced, thanks to Representative Mike Driscoll, with dancers from the McDade-Cara School of Irish Dance in Springfield, Delaware County. They are here to display the ongoing Irish spirit as it is best displayed in Irish dancing.

Our dancers are here in the well of the House in their brightly colored outfits. I have asked them if they have ever danced in a hall quite this grand, and they all said no. So please give them a warm welcome.

And we have with us – girls, if you would stand – we have with us Bridget Benetta, Darcy Sweeney, Regan Sweeney, Evelyn Kennedy, Katie Repp, Norah Bice, Megan McGrory, Tara Sheehan, and Hannah McGillian. They range in ages from 15 to 10. I am not going to disclose anybody's age for you today.

Girls, if you would have a seat, we will start off with a two-hand reel done by Regan Sweeney and Darcy Sweeney.

Gee, while they wrestle with this technology, maybe I should tell you an Irish joke or two. The reception to my offer was rather underwhelming, so I will just forget about that.

(A two-hand reel was performed.)

Mr. HENNESSEY. Thank you, girls.

Next we have a four-hand reel performed by Tara Sheehan, Hannah McGillian, Bridget Benetta, and Megan McGrory, a four-hand reel.

(A four-hand reel was performed.)

Mr. HENNESSEY. Thank you, girls.

In case you are wondering, the last time I was that light on my feet I was 7 years old.

Now we are going to have a number called "Vanishing Lake," performed by Norah Bice.

While we work out the technical difficulties, the girls will be performing a little bit later in the main rotunda here in the Capitol and outside of the Irish lunch that we have prepared for you down in 60 East Wing in the small rotunda, and you are all welcome to join us for that.

(Dance performed to "Vanishing Lake.")

Mr. HENNESSEY. Thank you very much, Norah.

We have now a three-hand reel by Darcy Sweeney, Evelyn Kennedy, and Katie Repp.

(A three-hand reel was performed.)

Mr. HENNESSEY. Thank you, Darcy, Evelyn, and Katie.

We now have a ribbon dance performed by Regan Sweeney, Norah Bice, Tara Sheehan, Bridget Benetta, Megan McGrory, and Hannah McGillian.

(A ribbon dance was performed.)

Mr. HENNESSEY. Thank you, girls.

I do not know about you guys out there, but I get exhausted just watching them dance.

We have two final dances. A special St. Patrick's Day dance is going to be performed by Darcy Sweeney, Katie Repp, and Evelyn Kennedy.

(A St. Patrick's Day dance was performed.)

Mr. HENNESSEY. And now finally, a treble reel. All of our great dancers will participate.

(A treble reel was performed.)

Mr. HENNESSEY. Wow. Thank you very much, girls.

The McDade-Cara School of Irish Dance in Springfield, Delaware County, you have made yourselves proud. Thank you.

We hope you have enjoyed this celebration, this few minutes of Irish celebration in celebrating the Irish history in Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for giving us the time to display the talents of our young dancers.

And on behalf of the Irish Caucus of the House of Representatives, I invite members, staff, and guests to an Irish lunch in room 60, East Wing, which will begin after we break shortly for lunch.

And to all of us gathered here in the Capitol and those watching on PCN across our Commonwealth, happy St. Patrick's Day 2016.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Hennessey.

Thank you, young ladies, for an outstanding performance.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

HB 1704, PN 2972 (Amended) By Rep. HARHART

An Act amending the act of May 23, 1945 (P.L.913, No.367), known as the Engineer, Land Surveyor and Geologist Registration Law, further providing for definitions, for continuing professional competency requirements and for exemption from licensure and registration.

PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE.

HB 1841, PN 2877 By Rep. HARHART

An Act amending the act of December 20, 1985 (P.L.457, No.112), known as the Medical Practice Act of 1985, further providing for perfusionist.

PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE.

HB 1842, PN 2878 By Rep. HARHART

An Act amending the act of October 5, 1978 (P.L.1109, No.261), known as the Osteopathic Medical Practice Act, further providing for perfusionist.

PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE.

HB 1864, PN 2880

By Rep. HARHART

An Act amending the act of May 3, 1933 (P.L.242, No.86), referred to as the Cosmetology Law, further providing for student practice upon the public for pay prohibited.

PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Chairman Adolph, for a committee announcement, sir. Thank you.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

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

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

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

Ms. MAJOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to announce Republicans will caucus today at 12:45. I would ask our Republican members to please report to our caucus room at 12:45. We would be prepared to come back on the floor, Mr. Speaker, at 1:45. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Madam Chair.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. Chairman Dan Frankel, the minority caucus chair, for an announcement.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Democrats will caucus at 12:45. Democrats will caucus at 12:45.

COMMERCE COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Chairman Adam Harris, for a committee announcement.

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

There will be a brief voting Commerce Committee meeting in room B-31; Commerce Committee, room B-31. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. There will be a brief voting Commerce Committee meeting in room B-31.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MRS. DAVIDSON

The SPEAKER. Representative Margo Davidson, on unanimous consent.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for your vote on the sickle cell anemia on the medical marijuana bill.

But I also want to announce for the southeast delegation, as well as the Philadelphia delegation, if you can meet the taxicab and medallion owners for a brief meeting for 5 minutes, 10 minutes tops, in G-50 of the Irvis building; G-50 Irvis Building, now. Thanks.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 1:45 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

HB 1184, PN 1544 By Rep. A. HARRIS

An Act amending the act of November 29, 2006 (P.L.1463, No.163), known as the Credit Reporting Agency Act, further providing for security freeze.

COMMERCE.

HB 1600, PN 2974 (Amended) By Rep. A. HARRIS

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in veteran-owned small businesses, further providing for definitions and for regulations and providing for business fee exemption.

COMMERCE.

BILL REPORTED AND REREFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON URBAN AFFAIRS

HB 1535, PN 2169 By Rep. A. HARRIS

An Act amending Title 64 (Public Authorities and Quasi-Public Corporations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Commonwealth Financing Authority, further providing for indebtedness; and establishing the Blight Demolition Bond Issuance Program.

Reported from Committee on COMMERCE with request that it be rereferred to Committee on URBAN AFFAIRS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will be so rereferred.

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HB 914, PN 2859 By Rep. ADOLPH

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

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1103, PN 1419 By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of October 4, 1978 (P.L.864, No.167), known as the Storm Water Management Act, further providing for definitions and for effect of watershed storm water plans.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1605, PN 2320 By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act establishing the Heritage Area Program to identify, protect, enhance and promote the historic, recreational, natural, cultural and scenic resources of this Commonwealth and to stimulate community revitalization and economic development through regional heritage conservation, recreation, tourism and partnerships; and repealing provisions in The Fiscal Code relating to heritage areas.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 3, PN 1609 By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act establishing a medical marijuana program; providing for patient and caregiver certification and for medical marijuana organization registration; imposing duties on the Department of Health; providing for a tax on medical marijuana organization gross receipts; establishing the Medical Marijuana Program Fund; establishing the Medical Marijuana Advisory Board; establishing a medical marijuana research program; imposing duties on the Department of Corrections, the Department of Education and the Department of Human Services; and providing for academic clinical research centers and for penalties and enforcement.

APPROPRIATIONS.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. MAHER called up **HR 738, PN 2956**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the bicentennial of the City of Pittsburgh.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—190

Acosta	Farina	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Adolph	Farry	Krueger	Readshaw
Baker	Fee	Lawrence	Reed
Barbin	Flynn	Lewis	Reese
Barrar	Frankel	Longietti	Regan
Benninghoff	Freeman	Mackenzie	Roae
Bizzarro	Gabler	Maher	Roebuck
Bloom	Gainey	Mahoney	Ross
Boback	Galloway	Major	Rothman
Briggs	Gergely	Maloney	Rozzi
Brown, R.	Gibbons	Markosek	Saccone
Brown, V.	Gillen	Marshall	Sainato
Bullock	Gillespie	Marsico	Samuelson
Burns	Gingrich	Masser	Sankey
Carroll	Godshall	Matzie	Santarsiero
Causer	Goodman	McCarter	Santora
Christiana	Greiner	McClinton	Schemel
Cohen	Grove	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Conklin	Hahn	Mentzer	Schreiber
Corbin	Hanna	Metcalfe	Schweyer
Costa, D.	Harhai	Metzgar	Simmons

Costa, P.	Harhart	Miccarelli	Sims
Cox	Harkins	Millard	Snyder
Culver	Harper	Miller, B.	Sonney
Cutler	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Staats
Daley, M.	Harris, J.	Milne	Stephens
Davidson	Heffley	Moul	Tallman
Davis	Helm	Mullery	Taylor
Dawkins	Hennessey	Murt	Thomas
Day	Hickernell	Mustio	Tobash
Dean	Hill	Neilson	Toepel
Deasy	Irvin	Nesbit	Toohil
DeLissio	James	Neuman	Topper
Delozier	Jozwiak	O'Brien	Truitt
DeLuca	Kampf	O'Neill	Vereb
Dermody	Kaufner	Oberlander	Vitali
Diamond	Kauffman	Ortitay	Ward
Donatucci	Kavulich	Parker, D.	Warner
Driscoll	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Watson
Dunbar	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Wentling
Dush	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Wheatley
Ellis	Killion	Petri	Wheeland
Emrick	Kim	Pickett	White
English	Kinsey	Pyle	Youngblood
Evankovich	Kirkland	Quigley	Zimmerman
Evans	Klunk	Quinn	
Everett	Knowles	Rader	Turzai,
Fabrizio	Kortz	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-10

Boyle	Cruz	McNeill	Saylor
Bradford	Daley, P.	Peifer	Sturla
Caltagirone	DiGirolamo		

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

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1703, PN 2849**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in snowmobiles and all-terrain vehicles, further providing for operation by persons under age sixteen and for mufflers and noise control.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 385, PN 1363**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 8, 2004 (P.L.1801, No.238), known as the Transit Revitalization Investment District Act, in general provisions, further providing for definitions; in TRID creation and location, further providing for criteria for proposed TRID, for TRID designation, for implementing authority, for TRID planning study factors, for roles and responsibilities of public transportation agencies and municipalities and for amendments to TRID planning study; in land development powers of public transportation agencies, further providing for development or redevelopment of property; in

value capture approaches, further providing for creation of value capture area and for dedication of tax revenues; providing for grant of TRID revenue; and, in community involvement, further providing for public meeting to explain TRID and alternative implementation approaches.

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

Mr. **TAYLOR** offered the following amendment
No. **A04941**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 27, by inserting after "property" and providing for additional powers of management entities and for prohibition on management entities

Amend Bill, page 1, line 29, by striking out "capture of TRID tax revenue" and inserting

grant of TRID revenue; and establishing the TRID Fund

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 11 and 12

"Bond." The term includes bond, note, instrument, refunding bond, refunding note or other evidence of indebtedness or obligation.

* * *

"Eligible project." Development or improvement within a TRID, including construction, infrastructure and site preparation, reconstruction or renovation of a facility within a TRID which will result in economic development or transit-oriented development in accordance with the TRID and the TRID planning study.

Amend Bill, page 2, line 13, by striking out "or transit" and inserting

, county or public transportation

Amend Bill, page 2, line 15, by inserting after "district"

management association

Amend Bill, page 2, line 20, by striking out all of said line

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 5 and 6

* * *

Amend Bill, page 3, lines 6 and 7, by striking out ", 502, 701 and 702" and inserting

and 502

Amend Bill, page 4, line 23, by inserting after "ordinance."

In a city of the third class, situate within a county of the second class A, the designation and boundaries of the TRID shall be made exclusively by the governing body of the county.

Amend Bill, page 5, line 6, by striking out the bracket before "A"

Amend Bill, page 5, line 6, by inserting a bracket before "participating"

Amend Bill, page 5, line 9, by striking out "The"

Amend Bill, page 5, line 10, by striking out "and the transit" and inserting

, which made the designation under section 302, and the public transportation

Amend Bill, page 6, line 15, by striking out "utilized" and inserting

provided

Amend Bill, page 6, line 21, by inserting a bracket before "transit"

Amend Bill, page 6, line 21, by inserting after "transit"

] public transportation

Amend Bill, page 7, line 18, by striking out "AND NOTES"

Amend Bill, page 9, line 17, by striking out "OR NOTES"

Amend Bill, page 9, line 18, by striking out "FUND OF ANY TRID DISTRICT" and inserting

account

Amend Bill, page 10, by inserting between lines 3 and 4

Section 3. The act is amended by adding sections to read:

Section 505. Additional powers of management entities.

In addition to other powers and functions of management entities granted under this act, a management entity shall have the power to provide or borrow money for purposes of executing a TRID, a TRID

planning study or for an eligible project. A management entity may also issue bonds, if permitted to do so under Commonwealth statute, for the purposes of executing a TRID, a TRID planning study or for an eligible project.

Section 506. Prohibition on management entities.

A member of the management entity may not receive money directly or indirectly from the TRID.

Section 4. Sections 701 and 702 of the act are amended to read:

Amend Bill, page 10, line 21, by inserting a bracket before "generated"

Amend Bill, page 10, line 21, by inserting after "within"] transferred to

Amend Bill, page 11, line 21, by inserting after "TRID," or eligible projects

Amend Bill, page 11, line 22, by striking out "OR NOTE"

Amend Bill, page 11, line 23, by inserting after "PROJECTS" or eligible projects

Amend Bill, page 11, line 24, by striking out "THAT WILL CONTRIBUTE TAX REVENUE"

Amend Bill, page 11, line 29, by striking out "3" and inserting 5

Amend Bill, page 12, lines 1 through 30; page 13, lines 1 through 22; by striking out all of said lines on said pages and inserting
GRANT OF TRID REVENUE

Section 801. Establishment.

There is established a special fund in the State Treasury to be known as the TRID Fund. Moneys deposited into the fund and interest which accrues from those funds shall be used for the purposes delineated in this chapter.

Amend Bill, page 13, lines 25 and 26, by striking out all of line 25 and "TRID fund" in line 26 and inserting

department

Amend Bill, page 13, lines 29 and 30, by striking out "Department of Community and Economic Development" and inserting

department

Amend Bill, page 13, line 30; page 14, line 1; by striking out "AND" in line 30 on page 13 and "THE DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE" in line 1 on page 14

Amend Bill, page 14, lines 4 and 5, by striking out "Department of Community and Economic Development" and inserting

department

Amend Bill, page 14, line 6, by inserting a period after "applications"

Amend Bill, page 14, lines 6 through 10, by striking out "provided that an application under this section" in line 6 and all of lines 7 through 10

Amend Bill, page 14, line 18, by striking out "a TRID fund" and inserting

an application

Amend Bill, page 14, line 22, by striking out "fund" and inserting Fund

Amend Bill, page 14, lines 23 through 30; pages 15 through 19, lines 1 through 30; page 20, lines 1 through 29; by striking out all of said lines on said pages and inserting

Section 805. Transfers.

(a) Matching funds.—The amount of money transferred from the TRID Fund utilized for the construction, including related site preparation and infrastructure, reconstruction or renovation of facilities, shall be matched by other sources of funding at a ratio of two fund dollars to one private dollar.

(b) Report.—By April 1, following year one, and for each year thereafter, the management entity shall file an annual report with the department and the Office of the Budget that contains a detailed account of the TRID Fund money expenditures and the expenditures of funds from other sources and a calculation of the ratio in subsection (a) for the prior calendar year. The agencies shall determine whether sufficient funding from other sources was utilized.

(c) Credit of matching funds.—For the purposes of meeting the matching funding requirement, the agencies shall allow a management entity to demonstrate that a multiyear eligible matching funding investment was made in a particular year. In subsequent years, the management entity shall refer to the gross matching fund investment in the year it was established and carry forward a credit in an amount of the original investment minus the funds already applied as a matching fund requirement, up to the remaining matching funds.

(d) Deduction.—If it is determined that insufficient funding from other sources was utilized under subsection (a), the amount of TRID Fund money utilized under subsection (a) in the prior calendar year shall be deducted from the next transfer of the fund.

(e) Financial approval.—Upon being satisfied that all requirements have been met including private dollar match, the department shall notify the State Treasurer to issue a grant in an amount not to exceed \$350,000 annually, as established by the Secretary of the Budget per TRID.

(f) Sales tax transfer.—On June 1, 2016, and on each June 1 for the next 20 calendar years, \$700,000 from the tax imposed by Article II of the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, shall be transferred to the TRID Fund for payment to the first two TRIDs approved under section 802(b).

(g) Remaining TRID Fund money.—Each year after the transfers from the TRID Fund to the TRIDs under subsection (f), any money remaining in the TRID Fund shall be returned to the General Fund.

(h) Grants to other TRIDs.—For any TRID other than the first two TRIDs approved under section 802(b), the department may provide grants of up to \$350,000 each year for the purposes delineated in this chapter.

Amend Bill, page 20, line 30, by striking out "811" and inserting 806

Amend Bill, page 21, line 2, by striking out "810" and inserting 805

Amend Bill, page 21, line 4, by striking out "OR NOTES"

Amend Bill, page 21, line 12, by striking out "OR NOTES"

Amend Bill, page 21, line 18, by striking out "810" and inserting 805

Amend Bill, page 21, lines 27 through 30; page 22, lines 1 through 28; by striking out all of said lines on said pages and inserting Section 807. Expiration.

The TRID Fund shall expire on December 31, 2035. Upon expiration, money in the fund not encumbered shall lapse to the General Fund.

Amend Bill, page 22, line 29, by striking out "813" and inserting 808

Amend Bill, page 23, line 1, by striking out "its TRID fund" and inserting

the TRID Fund

Amend Bill, page 23, line 2, by striking out "810" and inserting 805

Amend Bill, page 23, line 2, by striking out "OR NOTES"

Amend Bill, page 23, line 3, by striking out "DEBT" and

inserting

bonds

Amend Bill, page 23, line 4, by striking out "DEBT" and inserting

bonds

Amend Bill, page 23, lines 8 and 9, by striking out "OR NOTES of the contracting authority" and inserting

of the management entity

Amend Bill, page 23, lines 13 and 14, by striking out all of line 13 and "(3)" in line 14 and inserting

(2)

Amend Bill, page 23, line 16, by striking out "DEBT" and inserting

bonds

Amend Bill, page 23, line 18, by striking out "(4)" and inserting

(3)

Amend Bill, page 23, lines 19 and 20, by striking out "OR NOTES"

Amend Bill, page 23, lines 24 through 30; page 24, lines 1 through 4; by striking out all of said lines on said pages

Amend Bill, page 24, line 5, by striking out "815" and inserting 809

Amend Bill, page 24, line 6, by striking out "Department of Community and Economic Development." and inserting department and

Amend Bill, page 24, line 7, by striking out "and the department"

Amend Bill, page 24, line 9, by striking out "4" and inserting 6

Amend Bill, page 24, line 23, by striking out "entity" and inserting agency

Amend Bill, page 25, line 2, by striking out "5" and inserting 7

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Taylor on the amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment is an agreement between the prime sponsor and our staffs and the administration.

As many of you know, TRID (Transit Revitalization Investment District) legislation has been around for at least a decade and a half. Senator Pileggi's bill was an attempt to reform it and make it a little more user-friendly, to put it as simply as possible. The administration kind of relooked at the entire program, wanted to redesign it, so the beginning of this amendment calls for a system that is very similar to the past even though there is only one TRID in Pennsylvania so far, but it will really become one that has a very defined cost for the administration. It will be more of a grant program instead of the administration overseeing each and every – the administration of each and every TRID application or existing TRID.

So this is an agreed-to amendment by the administration. I ask for your support.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—190

Acosta	Farina	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Adolph	Farry	Krueger	Readshaw
Baker	Fee	Lawrence	Reed
Barbin	Flynn	Lewis	Reese
Barrar	Frankel	Longietti	Regan
Benninghoff	Freeman	Mackenzie	Roae
Bizzarro	Gabler	Maher	Roebuck
Bloom	Gainey	Mahoney	Ross
Boback	Galloway	Major	Rothman
Briggs	Gergely	Maloney	Rozzi
Brown, R.	Gibbons	Markosek	Saccone
Brown, V.	Gillen	Marshall	Sainato
Bullock	Gillespie	Marsico	Samuelson
Burns	Gingrich	Masser	Sankey
Carroll	Godshall	Matzie	Santarsiero
Causar	Goodman	McCarter	Santora

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Boyle	Cruz	McNeill	Saylor
Bradford	Daley, P.	Peifer	Sturla
Caltagirone	DiGirolamo		

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

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 644, PN 1089**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 71 (State Government) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Independent Fiscal Office, further providing for definitions, for duties of office and for access to information.

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

The SPEAKER. It is my understanding that all amendments are withdrawn.

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

The **SPEAKER**. Representative Matzie, sir, my understanding is that you have a late-filed amendment, 5916; 5916. To address the late-filed amendment, members would need a motion to suspend.

I am going to turn the floor over to Representative Matzie.

Members, Representative Matzie has the floor, please.

Mr. **MATZIE**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to make a motion to suspend the rules to offer an important amendment, amendment 5916.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment would extend the same requirements being imposed on the Independent Fiscal Office regarding collective-bargaining agreements to contracts being awarded to outside legal counsel by some of our State-affiliated agencies, most notably the Turnpike Commission and **PASSHE** (Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education).

Mr. Speaker, the prime sponsor of this bill in the Senate has suggested that we need the bill because of the costs associated with the Commonwealth's collective-bargaining agreements, but, Mr. Speaker, there are government agencies out there spending millions of taxpayer dollars on outside legal counsel without any accountability. Should we not know what they are costing us as well?

I ask for a "yes" vote on my motion to suspend. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The **SPEAKER**. On the motion to suspend, Representative Cutler.

Mr. **CUTLER**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's interest in this, but given the positioning of the bill, I would urge opposition to this amendment. Thank you.

The **SPEAKER**. All those in favor of— I am sorry, Frank. Representative Dermody. I am losing it after yesterday's debate. They went on long and I apologize; I do apologize. To the minority leader, Representative Dermody, I do apologize.

Mr. **DERMODY**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

No, my name is Frank. I am fine with that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I just urge the members to support the Matzie amendment. It is another area that this bill would help. It would help for accountability in State government, and I believe it is a good amendment for this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—83

Acosta	Donatucci	Kim	Petrarca
Barbin	Driscoll	Kinsey	Ravenstahl
Bizzarro	Evans	Kirkland	Readshaw
Briggs	Fabrizio	Kortz	Reese
Brown, V.	Farina	Kotik	Roebuck

Bullock	Flynn	Krueger	Rozzi
Burns	Frankel	Lawrence	Sainato
Carroll	Freeman	Longietti	Samuelson
Cohen	Gainey	Mahoney	Santarsiero
Conklin	Galloway	Markosek	Schlossberg
Costa, D.	Gergely	Marshall	Schreiber
Costa, P.	Gibbons	Masser	Schweyer
Daley, M.	Goodman	Matzie	Sims
Davidson	Hanna	McCarter	Snyder
Davis	Harhai	McClinton	Thomas
Dawkins	Harkins	Moul	Vereb
Dean	Harris, J.	Murt	Vitali
Deasy	Heffley	Mustio	Ward
DeLissio	Irvin	Neilson	Wheatley
DeLuca	Kavulich	O'Brien	Youngblood
Dermody	Keller, W.	Pashinski	

NAYS—107

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Boyle	Cruz	McNeill	Saylor
Bradford	Daley, P.	Peifer	Sturla
Caltagirone	DiGirolamo		

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

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The **SPEAKER**. Representative Bill **KELLER** has requested to be placed on leave of absence. Without objection, that will be granted.

NONPREFERRED APPROPRIATION BILLS RECONSIDERED

The SPEAKER. A number of motions to reconsider have been filed. There were motions to reconsider for SB 912, SB 913, SB 914, SB 915, and SB 916. Each of those is a nonpreferred appropriation requiring a two-thirds vote for the underlying vote. For the motion to reconsider, it requires a majority of those voting.

Representative Reed, my understanding is that if you so desire, you can do a motion to reconsider with respect to all of those.

Mr. REED. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes that Representative Pete Daley is on the House floor and should be placed on the master roll.

RECONSIDERATION MOTION CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Please proceed, sir.

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

I would make a motion to reconsider the votes on SB 912, SB 913, SB 914, SB 915, and SB 916. Thank you.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. Representative Dermody, on the motion to reconsider, which encompasses SB 912, SB 913, SB 914, SB 915, and SB 916. Sir, Representative Dermody, on that motion, sir.

Mr. DERMODY. Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the motion.

The SPEAKER. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reconsider these bills, but I would like to reconsider them at the right time, and that right time would be when we have the money to pay for them. I think we ought to be sitting down negotiating an adequate funding plan for '15-'16 and next year '16-'17 so we can have sufficient revenue to pay for the nonpreferreds this year and next year, and we have done that. Let us reconsider these, pass them, and take care of our State-related institutions.

In the meantime, we should vote "no" for reconsideration. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does anybody else wish to be recognized on the motion?

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—129

Adolph	Godshall	Major	Roae
Baker	Greiner	Maloney	Ross
Barrar	Grove	Marshall	Rothman
Benninghoff	Hahn	Marsico	Saccone
Bloom	Harhai	Masser	Sainato

Boback	Harhart	Matzie	Sankey
Brown, R.	Harper	Mentzer	Santora
Burns	Harris, A.	Metcalfe	Schemel
Causser	Heffley	Metzgar	Schweyer
Christiana	Helm	Miccarelli	Simmons
Conklin	Hennessey	Millard	Snyder
Corbin	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Sonney
Cox	Hill	Milne	Staats
Culver	Irvin	Murt	Stephens
Cutler	James	Mustio	Tallman
Day	Jozwiak	Nesbit	Taylor
Delozier	Kampf	O'Neill	Tobash
Diamond	Kaufert	Oberlander	Toepel
Dunbar	Kauffman	Ortity	Toohil
Dush	Kavulich	Parker, D.	Topper
Ellis	Keller, F.	Payne	Truitt
Emrick	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Vereb
English	Killion	Petri	Ward
Evankovich	Klunk	Pickett	Warner
Everett	Knowles	Pyle	Watson
Farry	Kortz	Quigley	Wentling
Fee	Kotik	Quinn	Wheeland
Gabler	Lawrence	Rader	White
Gergely	Lewis	Rapp	Zimmerman
Gibbons	Longietti	Ravenstahl	
Gillen	Mackenzie	Reed	Turzai,
Gillespie	Maher	Reese	Speaker
Gingrich	Mahoney	Regan	

NAYS—60

Acosta	Dean	Goodman	Neilson
Barbin	Deasy	Hanna	Neuman
Bizzarro	DeLissio	Harkins	O'Brien
Briggs	DeLuca	Harris, J.	Pashinski
Brown, V.	Dermody	Kim	Readshaw
Bullock	Donatucci	Kinsey	Roebuck
Carroll	Driscoll	Kirkland	Rozzi
Cohen	Evans	Krueger	Samuelson
Costa, D.	Fabrizio	Markosek	Santarsiero
Costa, P.	Farina	McCarter	Schlossberg
Daley, M.	Flynn	McClinton	Schreiber
Daley, P.	Frankel	McGinnis	Thomas
Davidson	Freeman	Miller, D.	Vitali
Davis	Gainey	Moul	Wheatley
Dawkins	Galloway	Mullery	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—1

Sims

EXCUSED—10

Boyle	Cruz	McNeill	Saylor
Bradford	DiGirolamo	Peifer	Sturla
Caltagirone	Keller, W.		

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 912, PN 1415**, entitled:

A Supplement to the act of April 1, 1863 (P.L.213, No.227), entitled "An act to accept the grant of Public Lands, by the United States, to the several states, for the endowment of Agricultural Colleges," making appropriations for carrying the same into effect; providing for a basis for payments of such appropriations, for a method

of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure; and making an appropriation from a restricted account within the Agricultural College Land Scrip Fund.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Chairman Adolph, on the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, SB 912 is a nonpreferred appropriation for Penn State University. It provides for a 5-percent increase in general support, an increase of \$10.7 million; and an 11.4-percent increase for the Pennsylvania College of Technology. Altogether it is an increase of 5.5 percent, \$12.7 million, bringing Penn State University's appropriation for the fiscal year '15-'16 to \$244,400,000.

Just on a point that I think we need to talk about today for all these nonpreferred appropriations: I am wearing a green tie on March 16. Tomorrow is officially St. Patrick's Day. These four State-related universities are more than half done with the second semester of this school year. I think it is time that this General Assembly votes in a nonpartisan way. Let us not mention what has been said over the past 8 months and let us do the right thing and let us get these universities the much-needed money.

These universities have been contacted by the national association, which is concerned about this budget impasse and the lack of funding that they receive from the State this year. I was glad to see that there was an awful lot of support in the reconsideration vote. That is one step in the right direction.

Let us complete this. Let us get these outstanding institutions the money so we do not jeopardize these universities.

I ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you so much.

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek.

Members, please take your seats. Members, please take your seats. I would ask that everybody please take any conversations to the rooms offside the chamber floor. Members, please take your seats.

Representative Markosek, you have the floor, sir.

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

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

Well, here we are again talking about the nonpreferred appropriations. This particular one, SB 912, is Penn State, and of course we have Pitt, Temple, Lincoln, and the Penn school of veterinary – all important, all very crucial to the fabric of Pennsylvania, all institutions that we all support. In fact, my son goes to Pitt. So I obviously have a strong affinity for that institution as well as Penn State and all the rest of them.

The problem that we have here is, without an overall funding plan for our budget, we will be put in a situation of not properly funding our basic education, units of education, our basic education while we are funding our higher education – nonpreferred appropriations, or our State-related universities. It has nothing to do with whether or not we want to fund Penn State or Pitt or Temple or Lincoln or Penn. It has nothing to do

with that. It is all about funding them and funding our local schools back home. Think about when your school back home has to shut its doors – and it is only a question of when; it is not if. Every one of us in here will face that if we do not get this done, but when they shut their doors, you have to go back and say, well, I voted for Penn State but I did not vote to fund your situation back home on a meaningful, sustainable budget, because the budget that is floating around out there that we may deal with later will not do that for a very long period of time, either, and essentially, by the summer or next year when school starts again, we will be right back in the same old boat. It is not the way to do these things.

The chairman mentioned, and he mentioned it a number of times while we were having our budget hearings, that there is another way, there is another way, and I agreed with him. And that other way is finding a compromise for an overall comprehensive budget, not a pick-and-choose budget where we find certain things to fund but not the other things.

Let us all vote "no" on these. We can vote "yes" on them later. We can bring them up again later after we have an overall budget where we fund not only the higher ed, not only the nonpreferreds, the State-relateds, but the State System of Higher Ed as well, our community colleges, properly fund PHEAA (Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency), and also our basic education entities throughout the Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a "no" vote in regards to voting these down, but then let us all meet, let us all get together, let us all compromise, and let us get it done in a comprehensive manner.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—137

Acosta	Gingrich	Maloney	Regan
Adolph	Godshall	Marshall	Roae
Baker	Greiner	Marsico	Ross
Barbin	Grove	Masser	Rothman
Barrar	Hahn	Matzie	Saccione
Benninghoff	Harhai	Mentzer	Sainato
Bizzarro	Harhart	Metcalfe	Sankey
Bloom	Harper	Metzgar	Santarsiero
Boback	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Santora
Brown, R.	Heffley	Millard	Schemel
Burns	Helm	Miller, B.	Schweyer
Causser	Hennessey	Milne	Simmons
Christiana	Hickernell	Moul	Snyder
Conklin	Hill	Mullery	Sonney
Corbin	Irvin	Murt	Staats
Cox	James	Mustio	Stephens
Culver	Jozwiak	Nesbit	Tallman
Cutler	Kampf	Neuman	Taylor
Day	Kaufner	O'Neill	Tobash
Delozier	Kauffman	Oberlander	Toepel
Diamond	Kavulich	Ortitay	Toohil
Dunbar	Keller, F.	Parker, D.	Topper
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Truitt
Ellis	Killion	Petrarca	Vereb
Emrick	Klunk	Petri	Ward
English	Knowles	Pickett	Warner
Evankovich	Kortz	Pyle	Watson

Everett	Kotik	Quigley	Wentling
Farry	Lawrence	Quinn	Wheeland
Fee	Lewis	Rader	White
Gabler	Longietti	Rapp	Zimmerman
Gergely	Mackenzie	Ravenstahl	
Gibbons	Maher	Readshaw	Turzai,
Gillen	Mahoney	Reed	Speaker
Gillespie	Major	Reese	

NAYS-51

Briggs	DeLissio	Goodman	Neilson
Brown, V.	DeLuca	Hanna	O'Brien
Bullock	Dermoddy	Harkins	Pashinski
Carroll	Donatucci	Harris, J.	Roebuck
Cohen	Driscoll	Kim	Rozzi
Costa, D.	Evans	Kinsey	Samuelson
Costa, P.	Fabrizio	Kirkland	Schlossberg
Daley, M.	Farina	Krueger	Schreiber
Daley, P.	Flynn	Markosek	Sims
Davis	Frankel	McCarter	Vitali
Dawkins	Freeman	McClinton	Wheatley
Dean	Gainey	McGinnis	Youngblood
Deasy	Galloway	Miller, D.	

NOT VOTING-2

Davidson	Thomas
----------	--------

EXCUSED-10

Boyle	Cruz	McNeill	Saylor
Bradford	DiGirolamo	Peifer	Sturla
Caltagirone	Keller, W.		

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 914, PN 1417**, entitled:

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

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage.
The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Representative Adolph, sir, please go right ahead.
Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I thank the ladies and gentlemen of this General Assembly for their previous vote.

SB 914 relates to Temple University. This proposal increases Temple University's appropriation by an even 5 percent, an increase of \$6.996 million, bringing their total appropriation up to \$146,913,000.

I have with me a letter that the president of Temple University received just recently, on March 10, from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, and as I mentioned in my comments earlier, this Middle States Commission on Higher Education is concerned about the lack of State funding for Temple University as a result of this budget impasse.

I ask the members of this General Assembly to consider my comments regarding Penn State. It is March 16. These universities are now halfway through their second semester. We have national organizations coming in and questioning what this does to their financial status. It is so important that we get these moneys to these fine institutions. Let us work together. Let us get this money to them.

Thank you so much. I ask you for a "yes" vote on SB 914.
Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative.
Chairman Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Very briefly, really nothing— The things that I talked about earlier are really still the same. We do not have an overall budget. Compromise, compromise, compromise, compromise. Let us set this aside. Let us compromise and get a real budget that not only includes these items that we are all in favor of but we move forward and solve all of the other problems in Pennsylvania that we have with not having a budget.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. Would the chair stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Yes. I believe the good gentleman will stand. Chairman Adolph has agreed that he will stand, Representative Thomas.

Members, please take your seats. I do apologize, but I do want to give Representative Thomas the opportunity to ask his questions. All members, please take your seats. All members, please take your seats.

Chairman Adolph will take your questions, sir. Please proceed.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let me first thank you for the increase to Temple University from 3 percent to 5 percent, but not to the 7 percent that we had originally proposed.

But I have some confusion as to how we are able to increase an appropriation without corresponding revenues. Can you share with me how you are going to pay the additional revenues to Temple University?

Mr. ADOLPH. With the current revenue coming in to the Pennsylvania Treasury.

Mr. THOMAS. Coming from where?

Mr. ADOLPH. Coming from the taxpayers of Pennsylvania.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, are we still— We have not satisfied '15-'16's budget, correct?

Mr. ADOLPH. Hopefully, that will be taken care of later on today.

Mr. THOMAS. Okay. Until we—

Mr. ADOLPH. This is just one of the many budget bills that needs to be completed so we can move on to the fiscal year '16-'17.

Mr. THOMAS. Okay.

So, Mr. Speaker, what is the vehicle by which we are going to be providing revenues to Temple and the other three State-related universities?

Mr. ADOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the current revenues that are being provided, which the Governor has certified, will be enough revenue for these nonpreferred appropriations. I have provided the members the balance sheets. This is a balanced budget that also includes the revenue for these nonpreferred appropriations, five all together – four to the four State-related universities, as well as the University of Penn vet school. All this money has been accounted for and certified based upon the revenues that are projected through June 30, 2015.

Mr. THOMAS. So, Mr. Speaker, is there any merit to the notion that you will be taking these revenues from PHEAA and using it for higher education?

Mr. ADOLPH. When you get into the balance sheet, when you get into the balance sheet, PHEAA's mission for many years, Mr. Speaker, as you know and many members of this General Assembly know, PHEAA has been putting some of their earnings into the State grant lines for many years. That is no different than this year other than it will be additional money, up to \$125 million, in order to balance the State grant line.

Mr. THOMAS. So it is correct that when you make reference to the Treasury, when you state that moneys in the Treasury that are targeted for PHEAA, that you will use part of those appropriations to fund these four State-relateds?

Mr. ADOLPH. Not true, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the money that PHEAA is contributing to the General Fund will only be designated to the State grant program.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ADOLPH. You are more than welcome, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to comment on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Sir, your time is running out, but you definitely may.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I strongly support appropriation and support for Temple University, Lincoln University, the University of Pitt, and Penn State. Students need it, but, Mr. Speaker, when we started down this road, we were talking about funding State-relateds with the understanding that these universities will hold down on tuition increases and that they would do some other things.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it is hard for me to vote "yes" on something that I do not understand where it is coming from. I have not seen any certification from the Pennsylvania Department of Treasury or the government, and until I see where the money is coming from and when I see—

The SPEAKER. Representative Thomas—

Mr. THOMAS. —that we have sufficient revenues—

The SPEAKER. Representative Thomas; I am sorry, but on the budget bills we do have a 5-minute time constraint.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not know about that either, but I do not really—

Mr. Speaker, I just want to close out on this. Number one, I do not know where the revenues are coming from. Number two, I do not know how this lines up with our structural deficit and our other revenue needs, and until those things are clear, I cannot support this bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Thomas, we have given you sufficient leeway, sir. We have given you sufficient leeway. We have to let other people speak. There is a 5-minute time limit with respect to budgetary discussion on the floor.

Representative Vereb.

Mr. VEREB. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On this Temple appropriation, in regards to the gentleman from Philadelphia's last comments, this money that is going to fund these schools is the same pot of money that has been funding everything else in this Commonwealth since we have had budget after budget shot down, voted down, vetoed, whatever it may be.

And I think it is time that these State-relateds stop being pawns in this process, Mr. Speaker. We deal with this every year with these nonpreferreds, and I absolutely urge, you have an opportunity to make this owl – I had to check on that quote, Mr. Speaker – it is time to make the owl hoot, Mr. Speaker, and vote "yes." Go Owls.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Steve Samuelson.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I support funding for Temple University and have for many years, and I am glad to see we are talking about an increase for Temple University, but something the Appropriations chairperson said concerns me. He was asked about the budget. He said, I hope we take care of that later today. So then I looked at the budget that he was referring to, and it is the same budget that he is talking about bringing up later today that reduces funding for PHEAA by \$39 million. So that is a 13-percent cut. So then I am wondering to myself, we are talking about Temple University. Do any students at Temple University rely on a PHEAA grant? The gentleman from Delaware County knows the answer. I know the answer. All of you know the answer. Yes, thousands and thousands of students at Temple University rely on a PHEAA grant.

So here we have the Republican proposal for higher education. Look at your computer screen. There appears to be an increase of 6.99—

The SPEAKER. Oh, I apologize. Please continue. I thought there was a point of order. I apologize, Representative Samuelson. Please proceed. We will add the additional time. Please proceed.

Mr. SAMUELSON. On your computer screen it appears that the Republican majority is talking about an increase for Temple University of \$6.99 million, a 5-percent increase. I believe there is bipartisan agreement on that when this budget is all said and done. Both caucuses have talked about an increase for Temple University. But then the gentleman from Delaware County refers to the rest of the budget, and if you look at that budget that he is referring to – he brought it up in the debate on this bill – there is a \$39 million cut in PHEAA funding. Now, I ran the percentages. General Fund dollars for PHEAA are going down by \$39 million. That is a 13-percent cut. A 13-percent reduction

is the Republican idea for PHEAA. Now, what is that going to mean for our students? Does that mean that our students that might get a grant of \$2400 a year are going to be cut by 13 percent? I think we should reject such an approach. And if you take a historical look at this line item, it is not just the 13 percent the Republican majority is trying to get today from PHEAA. Go back 6 years in this line item. This line item used to have \$407 million; \$407 million.

The budget that is going to come up later this afternoon has \$266 million. So I had mentioned a 13-percent cut this year, a \$39 million cut, but if you look at the totality of what has been happening to PHEAA for the last 6 years, the Republican majority has cut or will cut, if this bill passes later today, \$141 million. That is the wrong direction for our students. Our students need PHEAA grants. The students at Temple University need PHEAA grants. And if we are going to be robbing Peter to pay Paul, if we are going to be saying that we have an increase this hour and 2 hours later cutting, it does not make any sense. And if you look at the raw numbers, a \$7 million increase now and then the majority will want you to vote on a \$39 million reduction later this afternoon, that makes no sense. We should be funding our students, we should be supporting PHEAA, and we should be supporting our institutions of higher education.

I urge a comprehensive vote on the budget and not this piecemeal approach where we are robbing Peter here and paying it with some other funding source later.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Adolph.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to try to set the record straight. When you take a look under the Higher Education Assistance Agency, on our tracking run you will see that PHEAA will contribute \$125 million of its earnings. When you match that with the State appropriation of \$266,235,000, it will cover all student grants for the year '15-'16. As a matter of fact – and there are many members of this General Assembly who are on the PHEAA Board – when the Governor blue-lined the PHEAA grants, when he blue-lined \$6 billion in HB 1460, PHEAA willingly, because it is our mission, put together \$11 million and sent the '15-'16 student grants out to the universities. All the student grants for the year '15-'16 have gone out based upon the Governor's blue-line and PHEAA's willingness to move ahead and put the earnings to those grants.

There are many line items, and anyone that understands the budget process knows that there are other revenue sources throughout the Commonwealth that help supplement the General Fund. PHEAA has always, always, and the gentleman knows this, supplemented the grants to students. Those grants have gone out, Mr. Speaker. PHEAA is being level-funded based upon the money that they are going to put in to the General Fund but only because of reducing that line item from HB 1460, because that is the amount of money that is available. So instead of trying to do some type of retroactive tax increase on March 16, PHEAA has accelerated their contribution. So I just want to be certain that everyone in this House knows that this is not a cut to the PHEAA grants. They have already received their money. Okay? And this is a supplement to the State appropriation rather than doing a retroactive tax increase. It is a way we balance this budget that is going to be in front of you today.

But the gentleman was not correct saying that this was a cut to PHEAA and a cut to the student line item. PHEAA for many years has been putting in money. A bipartisan board puts that money in there and the management works very hard and able to put their earnings in there.

So I just want to set the record straight. PHEAA is not being cut. It is a combination of State allocation money and the PHEAA earnings get to the grants. Thank you so much.

The SPEAKER. Representative Mike Carroll.

Sir, Representative Mike Carroll is next in line. You have spoken on the budget. On the budgetary bills, you only may speak one time on that.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. You have a point of order, sir? Please proceed.

Mr. THOMAS. Yeah; tomorrow is St. Paddy's Day. We are wearing the same tie, but I do not see a clock on him.

The SPEAKER. The majority leader, the minority leader, and the Appropriations chairs do not, have not ever historically had time limits with respect to their budgetary remarks. That has been true for Republican and Democrat since I have served.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to see if you were treating me differently.

The SPEAKER. No, sir. Every other member had— There is a 5-minute limit that is in the rules. It has been in the rules since I have been a member here.

Representative Carroll, you may proceed, sir.

Mr. CARROLL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I carefully listened to the exchange between the gentleman from Northampton and the gentleman from Delaware, and I believe that the gentleman from Delaware is correct when he says that the student grants for this fiscal year went out. They did. But this removal of funding from PHEAA will be a direct attack on student grants in the fiscal year that starts July 1. It will be the first time that I can ever remember that we used PHEAA money for basic ed consistent with what the gentleman from Delaware answered when he was asked by the gentleman from Philadelphia whether or not this \$50 million transfer was for Temple University. The response, interestingly, was no, and it was no because what we are going to do here is take PHEAA earnings and apply them to basic ed at the expense of students' grants that begin in the fiscal year July 1.

The SPEAKER. Sir, please suspend.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The majority leader.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, point of order?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. REED. I believe we are debating the nonpreferred appropriation for the university at Temple. I appreciate the sentiment for folks who would like to discuss the budget bill and the balance sheet in totality. We are going to have that opportunity in a couple of hours. I would encourage folks, if at all possible, to keep their remarks focused on Temple University and then we will keep those remarks for later on today and we will have a full discussion on keeping our schools open across the Commonwealth over the next couple of weeks. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. This bill in front of us is about the 5-percent increase to Temple University. That is what this is about. In the interrogation between, I believe, Representative Thomas and the Appropriations chair, they went into PHEAA, which was really astray from what is in front of us. This is not a debate about the budget bill that may be here later today to be voted upon. This is about the increase to Temple University. Everybody's comments are going to be restricted to the increase to Temple University, and I would direct the gentleman to please stay on that bill.

Mr. CARROLL. Well, I guess, Mr. Speaker—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. Please state your point of order, sir.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker, this is a budget bill, and the money that we are discussing here from PHEAA is part of this budget bill so it is proper for the gentleman to be discussing it. The gentleman from Philadelphia or from Delaware County, who is the Appropriations chairman, is the one who brought it into play here, and I believe the gentleman should have an opportunity to state the reason and refute the argument that we just heard. And it is part of a budget discussion, an overall budget discussion about where the money is going to come from to pay for this appropriation to Temple University, Penn State, Pitt, Temple, and Lincoln—

The SPEAKER. We have definitely given leeway. It began with Representative—

Mr. DERMODY. —so he should be allowed to discuss it. He has got 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. We have definitely given leeway here, given that the interrogation between Representative Thomas and Chairman Adolph opened the door, but we need to get back to the discussion on the Temple budget increase.

Representative Carroll, please proceed.

Mr. CARROLL. I guess I will hold my conversation relative to the use of student grant funds for next year for basic ed to later in the afternoon because I have a feeling this exact same conversation will occur then.

Mr. Speaker, on the process here relative to the nonpreferreds and our State-related universities, I simply offer this: We are going to propose and likely pass a 5-percent increase that can never be funded because we do not have the funds to provide it, at the same moment in time when our school districts are struggling and holding meetings around the State considering how they are going to close their doors. Mr. Speaker, this is the cart before the horse if I ever saw one. We need to have a conversation about how to fund our school districts and worry about the nonpreferreds after we have solved the problem that we face with our preferred appropriations. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Carroll.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—145

Acosta	Galloway	Mahoney	Reed
Adolph	Gibbons	Major	Reese
Baker	Gillen	Maloney	Regan
Barbin	Gillespie	Marshall	Roae
Barrar	Gingrich	Marsico	Ross
Benninghoff	Godshall	Masser	Rothman
Bizzarro	Greiner	Matzie	Saccone
Bloom	Grove	Mentzer	Sainato
Boback	Hahn	Metcalfe	Sankey
Briggs	Harhai	Metzgar	Santarsiero
Brown, R.	Harhart	Miccarelli	Santora
Bullock	Harper	Millard	Schemel
Burns	Harris, A.	Miller, B.	Schweyer
Causar	Heffley	Milne	Simmons
Christiana	Helm	Moul	Snyder
Conklin	Hennessey	Mullery	Sonney
Corbin	Hickernell	Murt	Staats
Cox	Hill	Mustio	Stephens
Culver	Irvin	Neilson	Tallman
Cutler	James	Nesbit	Taylor
Daley, P.	Jozwiak	Neuman	Tobash
Davis	Kampf	O'Brien	Toepel
Day	Kaufar	O'Neill	Toohil
Dean	Kauffman	Oberlander	Topper
Delozier	Kavulich	Ortitay	Truitt
Diamond	Keller, F.	Parker, D.	Vereb
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Ward
Dunbar	Killion	Petrarca	Warner
Dush	Klunk	Petri	Watson
Ellis	Knowles	Pickett	Wentling
Emrick	Kortz	Pyle	Wheeland
English	Kotik	Quigley	White
Evankovich	Lawrence	Quinn	Zimmerman
Everett	Lewis	Rader	
Farry	Longietti	Rapp	Turzai,
Fee	Mackenzie	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Gabler	Maher	Readshaw	

NAYS—45

Brown, V.	Driscoll	Harkins	Pashinski
Carroll	Evans	Harris, J.	Roebuck
Cohen	Fabrizio	Kim	Rozzi
Costa, D.	Farina	Kinsey	Samuelson
Costa, P.	Flynn	Kirkland	Schlossberg
Daley, M.	Frankel	Krueger	Schreiber
Davidson	Freeman	Markosek	Sims
Dawkins	Gainey	McCarter	Thomas
Deasy	Gergely	McClinton	Vitali
DeLissio	Goodman	McGinnis	Wheatley
DeLuca	Hanna	Miller, D.	Youngblood
Dermody			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Boyle	Cruz	McNeill	Saylor
Bradford	DiGirolamo	Peifer	Sturla
Caltagirone	Keller, W.		

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

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

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. Representative Davidson, you are recognized.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I was not recorded on SB 912. I should be recorded in the negative.

The SPEAKER. Thank you very much. That will be so recorded.

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 915, PN 1418**, entitled:

A Supplement to the act of July 28, 1966 (3rd Sp.Sess., P.L.87, No.3), known as the University of Pittsburgh—Commonwealth Act, making appropriations for carrying the same into effect; and providing for a basis for payments of such appropriations, for a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage.
The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Chairman Adolph, on SB 915, sir.

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

And thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your last vote.

This vote here, SB 915, is an appropriation to the University of Pittsburgh. It is a 5-percent increase in their general support. The increase is \$6.7 million, bringing their general support up to \$140,693,000. They also get an appropriation for rural education outreach. It is a \$200,000 increase, from \$2.3 million to \$2.5 million, for an 8.7-percent increase.

Mr. Speaker, for all the reasons that I have stated for Penn State University, for Temple University, I echo those same comments for this fine institution, University of Pittsburgh. I ask you for an affirmative vote on SB 915. Thank you so much.

The SPEAKER. Chairman Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, again, as I mentioned before, my son goes to Pitt so I certainly am all for Pitt, but my previous remarks still stand. We need an overall budget, and I would ask all the members to please vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Representative Maher.

Mr. MAHER. Hail to Pitt.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—145

Acosta	Galloway	Mahoney	Reed
Adolph	Gergely	Major	Reese
Baker	Gibbons	Maloney	Regan
Barbin	Gillen	Marshall	Roae
Barrar	Gillespie	Marsico	Ross
Benninghoff	Gingrich	Masser	Rothman
Bizzarro	Godshall	Matzie	Saccone
Bloom	Greiner	Mentzer	Sainato
Boback	Grove	Metcalfe	Sankey
Brown, R.	Hahn	Metzgar	Santarsiero
Bullock	Harhai	Miccarelli	Santora
Burns	Harhart	Millard	Schemel
Causar	Harper	Miller, B.	Schweyer
Christiana	Harris, A.	Milne	Simmons
Conklin	Heffley	Moul	Snyder
Corbin	Helm	Mullery	Sonney
Costa, D.	Hennessey	Murt	Staats
Costa, P.	Hickernell	Mustio	Stephens
Cox	Hill	Neilson	Tallman
Culver	Irvin	Nesbit	Taylor
Cutler	James	Neuman	Tobash
Daley, P.	Jozwiak	O'Brien	Toepel
Davis	Kampf	O'Neill	Toohil
Day	Kaufner	Oberlander	Topper
Deasy	Kauffman	Ortitay	Truitt
Delozier	Keller, F.	Parker, D.	Vereb
Diamond	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Ward
Dunbar	Killion	Petrarca	Warner
Dush	Klunk	Petri	Watson
Ellis	Knowles	Pickett	Wentling
Emrick	Kortz	Pyle	Wheeland
English	Kotik	Quigley	White
Evankovich	Lawrence	Quinn	Zimmerman
Everett	Lewis	Rader	
Farry	Longietti	Rapp	Turzai,
Fee	Mackenzie	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Gabler	Maher	Readshaw	

NAYS—45

Briggs	Driscoll	Harris, J.	Pashinski
Brown, V.	Evans	Kavulich	Roebuck
Carroll	Fabrizio	Kim	Rozzi
Cohen	Farina	Kinsey	Samuelson
Daley, M.	Flynn	Kirkland	Schlossberg
Davidson	Frankel	Krueger	Schreiber
Dawkins	Freeman	Markosek	Sims
Dean	Gainey	McCarter	Thomas
DeLissio	Goodman	McClinton	Vitali
DeLuca	Hanna	McGinnis	Wheatley
Dermody	Harkins	Miller, D.	Youngblood
Donatucci			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Boyle	Cruz	McNeill	Saylor
Bradford	DiGirolamo	Peifer	Sturla
Caltagirone	Keller, W.		

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 916, PN 1419**, entitled:

A Supplement to the act of July 7, 1972 (P.L.743, No.176), known as the Lincoln University-Commonwealth Act, making an appropriation for carrying the same into effect; providing for a basis for payments of the appropriation; and providing a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage.
The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that, Representative Adolph is called upon.
Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

And once again, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the men and women that supported the University of Pitt with that nonpreferred appropriation. Thank you so much.

SB 916 is an appropriation to Lincoln University, a historical university for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania located in Chester County. Mr. Speaker, Lincoln University is receiving a 7-percent increase. The year before, '14-'15, they received \$13,163,000. This \$921,000 increase of 7 percent will bring their total State appropriation to \$14,084,000.

They have new administration at Lincoln University. They came in front of the Appropriations board during the hearings and they were heading in an unbelievable direction, and we are really looking forward to getting this money to them. So please consider the appropriation, consider the time, and please vote "yes" for Lincoln University. Thank you so much.

The SPEAKER. Chairman Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, I know Lincoln was in front of our committee and they run a wonderful program there, a wonderful institution, but my comments are still the same. We need an overall compromise budget to solve not only this problem with their funding, but the funding of all the other things in our Commonwealth that need funded. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Representative Lawrence.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to encourage my colleagues to vote in the affirmative for SB 916. This appropriation makes up a substantial portion of Lincoln's annual budget – I believe it is along the lines of 25 percent of their annual budget. It is a significant fiscal impact on the university. I will mention that the issue of tuition increases came up earlier with regard to one of the other nonpreferreds. Lincoln has made the commitment and has held the line on tuition with a tuition freeze, so that is not the case here at Lincoln. I know that they are very much looking forward to this funding. I would like to encourage my colleagues, again, for an affirmative vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Chairman Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Lincoln University as I rose in support of Temple University, as I have stood in the past in support of the University of Pittsburgh and I have stood in support of Penn State. And, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to put up a "yes" vote once I see the money. I have heard today that it is coming from the Treasury. Then I heard it is going to come from the PHEAA program. It sounds like voodoo. Until I have some clarity on where the money is coming from, I cannot in good faith, as much, as passionate as I am about Temple and Lincoln, I cannot in good faith put up a vote on this money when I do not know where it is coming from.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—147

Acosta	Gergely	Mahoney	Reed
Adolph	Gibbons	Major	Reese
Baker	Gillen	Maloney	Regan
Barbin	Gillespie	Marshall	Roae
Barrar	Gingrich	Marsico	Ross
Benninghoff	Godshall	Masser	Rothman
Bizzarro	Greiner	Matzie	Saccone
Bloom	Grove	McClinton	Sainato
Boback	Hahn	Mentzer	Sankey
Brown, R.	Harhai	Metcalfe	Santarsiero
Brown, V.	Harhart	Metzgar	Santora
Bullock	Harper	Miccarelli	Schemel
Burns	Harris, A.	Millard	Schweyer
Causer	Harris, J.	Miller, B.	Simmons
Christiana	Heffley	Milne	Snyder
Conklin	Helm	Moul	Sonney
Corbin	Hennessey	Mullery	Staats
Cox	Hickernell	Murt	Stephens
Culver	Hill	Mustio	Tallman
Cutler	Irvin	Neilson	Taylor
Daley, P.	James	Nesbit	Tobash
Davidson	Jozwiak	Neuman	Toepel
Davis	Kampf	O'Neill	Toohil
Dawkins	Kaufner	Oberlander	Topper
Day	Kauffman	Ortitay	Truitt
Delozier	Keller, F.	Parker, D.	Vereb
Diamond	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Ward
Dunbar	Killion	Petrarca	Warner
Dush	Klunk	Petri	Watson
Ellis	Knowles	Pickett	Wentling
Emrick	Kortz	Pyle	Wheeland
English	Kotik	Quigley	White
Evankovich	Lawrence	Quinn	Youngblood
Everett	Lewis	Rader	Zimmerman
Farry	Longietti	Rapp	
Fee	Mackenzie	Ravenstahl	Turzai,
Gabler	Maher	Readshaw	Speaker
Galloway			

NAYS—43

Briggs	Donatucci	Harkins	Pashinski
Carroll	Driscoll	Kavulich	Roebuck
Cohen	Evans	Kim	Rozi

Costa, D.	Fabrizio	Kinsey	Samuelson
Costa, P.	Farina	Kirkland	Schlossberg
Daley, M.	Flynn	Krueger	Schreiber
Dean	Frankel	Markosek	Sims
Deasy	Freeman	McCarter	Thomas
DeLissio	Gainey	McGinnis	Vitali
DeLuca	Goodman	Miller, D.	Wheatley
Dermody	Hanna	O'Brien	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Boyle	Cruz	McNeill	Saylor
Bradford	DiGirolamo	Peifer	Sturla
Caltagirone	Keller, W.		

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 913, PN 1416**, entitled:

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

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. Representative Dean.

Mrs. DEAN. This is personal privilege, not on the bill. Would that be allowed now?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mrs. DEAN. Thank you.

On SB 914 I was recorded in the affirmative. I wish to change that vote to the negative. I hope the record will reflect that.

The SPEAKER. Yes; it will be so reflected.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 913 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Chairman Adolph, on the bill.

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

And once again I want to thank the ladies and gentlemen of this General Assembly that supported the last appropriation for Lincoln University. I know Lincoln University I am sure is elated right now.

SB 913, Mr. Speaker, is for the University of Penn vet school, also located in Chester County. This is the only vet school that we have in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and if you have ever had the opportunity to visit it, you know what I am talking about. It is a fantastic institution. The work that they do in training our future veterinarians is fantastic. And they are going to receive a 5-percent increase from last year's appropriation. Their veterinarian activities received \$28 million last year. They are going to receive \$29,400,000, a \$1.4 million increase. They also have a center for infectious disease. They are going to receive a 5-percent increase there as well, for a total of \$274,000. Their total appropriation will be \$29,674,000.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the finest institutions in Pennsylvania. We all take pride in it. We know how important agriculture and the animals are to everyone here in Pennsylvania. Just to give you a little history, I remember how proud we were when Smarty Jones, when Smarty Jones was injured and he went to the University of Penn vet school to be healed.

Please vote "yes" on this very important appropriation. Thank you so much.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Chairman Markosek.

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

Mr. Speaker, as an aside, a couple of years ago the Appropriations Committee traveled to the Penn vet school, and I know the majority chairman had an interesting experience there and I will let him tell you that if you ask him one on one. I cannot say what that was here publicly, but nevertheless, it is a wonderful organization, tremendous organization. They do great things. I agree with everything that he said about the accolades that they should have. But again, we need to fund them and all of the other things in Pennsylvania that we need funded out of this budget.

I would ask for a "no." Let us set all these aside, get back to negotiating a real compromise budget. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Cutler, followed by Representative Barbin.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as we look back over the past year, one of the issues that has consistently come up, and I know that we have received e-mails pertaining to this, is the issue related to the extension funding of Penn State and ag-related funding such as for avian influenza. Mr. Speaker, this school plays a very important role in animal diseases, and it is a pillar in terms of being an institution of education. I think it is most important to note that the Governor himself had indicated that prior to signing any of the bills related to the 4-H and other ag-related items and extension services, he would need to have all the nonpreferreds prior to do doing so because he could not justify signing that without those bills.

So for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would urge an affirmative vote on this so that we can complete this package and ensure the Governor has that opportunity. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Barbin, sir.

Mr. BARBIN. I rise in opposition to this nonpreferred, and the reason that I rise is, we are asking the taxpayers to decide not to give money to a State-related university where the State-relateds have for their history made sure they provided discounted tuition. This is a private institution, and this private

institution does really good work. In the past we have not moved forward with nonpreferred appropriations like this when our budget is either out of balance or we have not provided a similar increase to our public education line item. The House bill that is on its way from the Senate provides roughly a \$260 million increase on a \$6 billion line item.

So there are two questions you have got to ask yourself here. Number one, if we are not giving the public education line item a 5-percent increase, why should we be doing it for a private university, no matter how good their prior activities on behalf of the Commonwealth are? And the second thing you would have to ask yourself is, even if you decide you are going to provide a nonpreferred appropriation to Penn because you want to help veterinary medicine and veterinary medicine students, why are you increasing it by 5 percent when you are not doing that for veterans homes, you are not doing it for basic education?

This is different than the last four votes we have taken. The last four votes we have taken are our own State System universities. They were cut by 10 percent in the prior administration. If we give them back 5 percent, they are still down 5 percent. This, on the other hand, is not something that we can afford to do if we have not decided to balance the budget, and we have not.

So I ask everyone on this appropriation to not support a preferred or a nonpreferred appropriation to a private university.

The SPEAKER. Representative Miccarelli.

Mr. MICCARELLI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The previous speaker made a statement which I believe is not accurate. He said there is no reduced tuition for students of Pennsylvania. Not only does the University of Pennsylvania veterinary school provide reduced tuition for Pennsylvania residents, but further, they are also given admission preference as well on top of that. The Penn vet school helps protect our food supply here in Pennsylvania as part of the Pennsylvania animal health and diagnostic lab system, and on top of it, the Secretary of Agriculture, Health, and the chairs of the Agriculture and Health Committees sit on the board of that school. So the idea that there is no reduced tuition for Pennsylvania residents is factually inaccurate.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Chris Ross.

Mr. ROSS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do not want to be repetitive – the prior speaker raised the point that I was going to make – but I did think it is important to correct the record. I believe the tuition at veterinary schools is extremely high across the country, and it is a particular burden for Pennsylvania residents to pay that high tuition going into fields particularly related to agriculture and large animal veterinarian medicine, which are not always well compensated. And in fact, we do offset the tuition for Pennsylvania residents by \$10,000 per year, as I understand it, so it is a very substantial subsidy which is critical because those same Pennsylvania residents are most likely to serve the agriculture community here in Pennsylvania. So failure to supply the money that we have been giving through this nonpreferred is a serious threat to being able to support those same people that are serving our agricultural industry.

So I know that many people in the past have supported the Penn vet school and I appreciate their support in the past, and I hope that we will once again provide this valuable resource to Pennsylvania residents. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Pete Daley.

Mr. DALEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As a former chairman of the Agriculture Committee, I had the absolute pleasure to help fund the vet school. I visited there many times and I served as the Democrat member of the University of Pennsylvania vet school oversight committee on the council of trustees, and I can tell you this: There are 116 faculty members that are world-class. The New Bolton Center is beyond anyone's description anywhere in the world. It has the greatest center for large animal hospitals. It is one of the best. We have some of the greatest veterinary doctors in the world that perform there. There are Nobel Laureates that are there. There is a \$10,000 reduction in tuition if you live in Pennsylvania. It is \$10,000 less if you are outside. As a matter of fact, there is a preference if you live in Pennsylvania to be admitted to the school, and if you stay here and practice, there is a special remuneration program. The Ryan Veterinary Hospital in Philadelphia was named for former Speaker Matthew Ryan. It is one of the best. They have over 10,000, 10,000 patients a year. They are called upon all over the world, all over the United States. They are the best.

I find it incredulous that anyone would vote against the University of Pennsylvania, and I rise in support of this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Thomas, on the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to stand and kind of echo what my colleague and other colleagues have said about this stellar school. And I stand to make sure that the record reflects that I am prepared to support this appropriation once it comes back from the Senate, survives the Governor's veto, and the money is clear as to where we are going to get it.

The SPEAKER. Thank you very much, sir.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Representative Bradford is on the House floor and should be placed on the master roll.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 913 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,

Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—142

Acosta	Gibbons	Mahoney	Reed
Adolph	Gillen	Major	Reese
Baker	Gillespie	Maloney	Regan
Barrar	Gingrich	Marshall	Roae
Benninghoff	Godshall	Marsico	Ross
Bizzarro	Greiner	Masser	Rothman
Bloom	Grove	Matzie	Saccone
Boback	Hahn	McClinton	Sainato
Briggs	Harhai	Mentzer	Sankey
Brown, R.	Harhart	Metcalfe	Santarsiero
Bullock	Harper	Metzgar	Santora
Burns	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Schemel
Causser	Heffley	Millard	Schweyer
Christiana	Helm	Miller, B.	Simmons

Conklin	Hennessey	Milne	Snyder
Corbin	Hickernell	Moul	Sonney
Cox	Hill	Mullery	Staats
Culver	Irvin	Murt	Stephens
Cutler	James	Mustio	Tallman
Daley, P.	Jozwiak	Nesbit	Taylor
Davis	Kampf	Neuman	Tobash
Day	Kaufner	O'Neill	Toepel
Delozier	Kauffman	Oberlander	Toohil
Diamond	Kavulich	Ortitay	Topper
Dunbar	Keller, F.	Parker, D.	Truitt
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Vereb
Ellis	Killion	Petrarca	Ward
Emrick	Klunk	Petri	Warner
English	Knowles	Pickett	Watson
Evankovich	Kortz	Pyle	Wentling
Everett	Kotik	Quigley	Wheeland
Farry	Lawrence	Quinn	White
Fee	Lewis	Rader	Zimmerman
Gabler	Longietti	Rapp	
Galloway	Mackenzie	Ravenstahl	Turzai,
Gergely	Maher	Readshaw	Speaker

NAYS—49

Barbin	DeLuca	Hanna	O'Brien
Bradford	Dermody	Harkins	Pashinski
Brown, V.	Donatucci	Harris, J.	Roebuck
Carroll	Driscoll	Kim	Rozzi
Cohen	Evans	Kinsey	Samuelson
Costa, D.	Fabrizio	Kirkland	Schlossberg
Costa, P.	Farina	Krueger	Schreiber
Daley, M.	Flynn	Markosek	Sims
Davidson	Frankel	McCarter	Thomas
Dawkins	Freeman	McGinnis	Vitali
Dean	Gainey	Miller, D.	Wheatley
Deasy	Goodman	Neilson	Youngblood
DeLissio			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Boyle	DiGirolamo	McNeill	Saylor
Caltagirone	Keller, W.	Peifer	Sturla
Cruz			

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

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

SENATE MESSAGE

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

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, informed that the Senate has concurred in the amendments made by the House of Representatives by amending said amendments to **HB 1327, PN 2969**.

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

SENATE MESSAGE

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

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 1801, PN 2968**, with information that the Senate has passed the same with amendment in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives is requested.

RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Speaker calls upon the majority leader, Dave Reed, with respect to an announcement.

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

There will be an immediate meeting of the House Rules Committee in the Appropriations conference room. There will be an immediate meeting of the House Rules Committee in the Appropriations conference room. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

The House will stand at ease for the Rules Committee meeting. Members will proceed to the Rules Committee meeting who are on that committee, and the House will stand at ease in the interim. Thank you.

The House will come to order, please.

BILLS ON CONCURRENCE
REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HB 1327, PN 2969

By Rep. REED

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in financially distressed municipalities, providing for financial recovery; in oil and gas wells, providing for the Environmental Stewardship Fund; in tax credits, providing for Department of Community and Economic Development; in special funds, further providing for funding, for State Workers' Insurance Board, for expiration and for other grants; in additional special funds, further providing for use of the Tobacco Settlement Fund and for distributions from the Pennsylvania Race Horse Development Fund and providing for miscellaneous limitations and transfers and for the Natural Gas Infrastructure Development Fund; in general budget implementation, further providing for the Department of Community and Economic Development, for the Department of Environmental Protection and for the Department of General Services, providing for the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board, further providing for the Department of Human Services, for the Pennsylvania State Police and for the Environmental Quality Board and providing for the Commonwealth Financing Authority; providing for school district debt refinancing bonds; providing for 2015-2016 budget implementation; making a related repeal; and making editorial changes.

RULES.

HB 1801, PN 2968

By Rep. REED

A Supplement to the act of December 29, 2015 (P.L. , No.10A), 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 and the Justice Reinvestment 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, 2014," further providing for additions to appropriations and replacement of appropriations from the General Fund for the expenses of the Executive Department, the General Assembly and Government Support Agencies of the Commonwealth 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; providing for replacement of appropriations from the Tobacco Settlement Fund to the Executive Department; further providing for additions to appropriations from the Pennsylvania Racehorse Development Restricted Receipt Account to the Executive Department; and providing for required lapsing of money in the General Fund.

RULES.

The SPEAKER. Members, we are turning to supplemental A House calendar. We have three bills to do on third consideration before we move to SB 3. And as you know, we will not be able to vote SB 3 until 5:17 p.m., but I will start here at this time.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1103, PN 1419**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of October 4, 1978 (P.L.864, No.167), known as the Storm Water Management Act, further providing for definitions and for effect of watershed storm water plans.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Representative Vitali, on the bill.

Mr. VITALI. I was going to yield to the prime sponsor, who may want to just talk about his bill first.

The SPEAKER. Okay. He did not ask to speak, but you have the floor.

Mr. VITALI. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to this bill, and I just wanted to give a little bit of background and maybe outline some of the stakeholder positions on this. What this bill would do would be to exempt something called high tunnels from the Storm Water Management Act. So this bill would create an exception in the Storm Water Management Act for something called high tunnels. And what high tunnels are – and I will just read the definition in the bill – high tunnels are structures "...for the production, processing, keeping, storing, sale or shelter of an agricultural commodity...." They are sort of a quasi-permanent, quasi-temporary structure, and they can be constructed in different ways. The base can be a solid concrete base, it could be ground, it could be crushed stone, but they are structures and they do affect storm water plans.

I want you to know that the Department of Environmental Protection opposes this bill, and the reason is that these structures, although they are only semipermanent in nature, do affect the management of storm water. And this could be critical downstream from the farms in which these structures are located. When you take away land permeable to rains, during heavy rains it could cause flooding downstream causing damage and danger and erosion to property. It could exacerbate, it could exacerbate pollution issues also.

So in addition to the Department of Environmental Protection opposing, the county commissioners also have concerns with this bill. Regrettably, the gentleman had an amendment yesterday which was withdrawn that would have addressed those county commissioner concerns, but that was withdrawn. Let me tell you why the county commissioners have concerns with this bill, and this is a letter they recently sent. I am sorry; it was actually December 18 of 2015. This is a quote from their letter: "A high tunnel," which we are talking about here, "can have significant lot coverage, and therefore create changes in runoff timing and volume calculations which would have meaningful downstream impacts. It can also affect erosion" – they talk about erosion – "or increase in nutrients and sediment into local waterways." They also talk about how this bill might also hurt our efforts to clean up the Chesapeake Bay, and I am going to quote from the letter, "...it is also critical in the Chesapeake Bay watershed where we must make certain reductions across all sectors in nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment to meet...requirements..." of the EPA.

So the problem here with regard to this bill is it does erode the storm water management plan which each county has to set up, and for that reason the DEP opposes and the county commissioners have concerns. So I would ask for a "no" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Chairman Maher, on the bill.

Mr. MAHER. Thank you very much.

I can tell that the gentleman who was just talking about the high tunnels has never been in a high tunnel, because they are not constructed the way he is describing ordinarily.

Consider a couple of things. The Federal government sees high tunnels as so beneficial to water management and controlling nutrient runoff that the Federal government is offering grants to Pennsylvania farmers to put them up. Now,

consider the storm water issue. Rain falls in a farmer's field, no high tunnels up. Where does the rain line up? On the farmer's field. He puts up a high tunnel, rain falls. Where does the rain line up? In the farmer's field. Do we really need to go through some planning process to figure that out? I do not think so. And I would ask you to join with Pennsylvania agriculture, help promote the farm-to-table initiatives, and bring our agriculture home in the colder months by supporting this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Zimmerman, on the bill, please.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This bill, HB 1103, is a bill that our farmers in Pennsylvania really need. It is a bill that is supported by the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau. It is supported by the vegetable growers. It is supported by USDA (United States Department of Agriculture). It is really a bill they need. And in too many cases we have municipalities asking for large earth and berms and stone filter-type beds for storm water management and really messing up the integrity of the farmland. So what we really need is to pass this bill and help our farmers throughout Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Representative Vitali, for a second time.

Mr. VITALI. Just to add, the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture does not support this bill either. So thank you.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—154

Adolph	Gergely	Mackenzie	Reed
Baker	Gibbons	Maher	Reese
Barbin	Gillen	Mahoney	Regan
Barrar	Gillespie	Major	Roae
Benninghoff	Gingrich	Maloney	Ross
Bizzarro	Godshall	Markosek	Rothman
Bloom	Goodman	Marshall	Rozzi
Boback	Greiner	Marsico	Saccone
Brown, R.	Grove	Masser	Sainato
Burns	Hahn	Matzie	Sankey
Carroll	Hanna	McGinnis	Santora
Causar	Harhai	Mentzer	Schemel
Christiana	Harhart	Metcalfe	Schreiber
Conklin	Harkins	Metzgar	Schweyer
Corbin	Harper	Miccarelli	Simmons
Costa, P.	Harris, A.	Millard	Snyder
Cox	Harris, J.	Miller, B.	Sonney
Culver	Heffley	Milne	Staats
Cutler	Helm	Moul	Stephens
Daley, P.	Hennessey	Mullery	Tallman
Day	Hickernell	Murt	Taylor
DeLissio	Hill	Mustio	Thomas
Delozier	Irvin	Nesbit	Tobash
Dermody	James	Neuman	Toepel
Diamond	Jozwiak	O'Neill	Toohil
Dunbar	Kampf	Oberlander	Topper
Dush	Kaufer	Ortitay	Truitt
Ellis	Kauffman	Parker, D.	Vereb
Emrick	Kavulich	Pashinski	Ward
English	Keller, F.	Payne	Warner
Evanovich	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Watson
Everett	Killion	Petri	Wentling
Fabrizio	Klunk	Pickett	Wheatley
Farina	Knowles	Pyle	Wheeland
Farry	Kortz	Quigley	White

Fee	Kotik	Quinn	Zimmerman
Flynn	Lawrence	Rader	
Gabler	Lewis	Rapp	Turzai,
Gainey	Longietti	Readshaw	Speaker

NAYS—37

Acosta	Dawkins	Galloway	O'Brien
Bradford	Dean	Kim	Ravenstahl
Briggs	Deasy	Kinsey	Roebuck
Brown, V.	DeLuca	Kirkland	Samuelson
Bullock	Donatucci	Krueger	Santarsiero
Cohen	Driscoll	McCarter	Schlossberg
Costa, D.	Evans	McClinton	Sims
Daley, M.	Frankel	Miller, D.	Vitali
Davidson	Freeman	Neilson	Youngblood
Davis			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Boyle	DiGirolamo	McNeill	Saylor
Caltagirone	Keller, W.	Peifer	Sturla
Cruz			

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 914, PN 2859**, entitled:

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

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—132

Acosta	Evans	Kotik	Regan
Adolph	Fabrizio	Krueger	Roebuck
Barbin	Farina	Lewis	Ross
Bizzarro	Farry	Longietti	Rozzi
Boback	Fee	Mackenzie	Sainato
Bradford	Flynn	Mahoney	Samuelson
Briggs	Frankel	Markosek	Santarsiero
Brown, R.	Freeman	Matzie	Santora
Brown, V.	Gainey	McCarter	Schemel
Bullock	Galloway	McClinton	Schlossberg
Burns	Gergely	Mentzer	Schreiber

Carroll	Gibbons	Miccarelli	Schweyer
Cohen	Gingrich	Millard	Sims
Conklin	Godshall	Miller, B.	Snyder
Corbin	Goodman	Miller, D.	Staats
Costa, D.	Greiner	Mullery	Stephens
Costa, P.	Hahn	Murt	Taylor
Culver	Hanna	Neilson	Thomas
Cutler	Harhai	Nesbit	Tobash
Daley, M.	Harkins	Neuman	Toepel
Daley, P.	Harper	O'Brien	Toohil
Davidson	Harris, J.	O'Neill	Topper
Davis	Helm	Parker, D.	Vereb
Dawkins	Hennessey	Pashinski	Vitali
Day	Hickernell	Payne	Watson
Dean	James	Petrarca	Wheatley
Deasy	Kampf	Petri	Whealand
DeLissio	Kauffman	Quigley	White
DeLuca	Kavulich	Quinn	Youngblood
Dermody	Killion	Rader	Zimmerman
Donatucci	Kim	Ravenstahl	
Driscoll	Kinsey	Readshaw	Turzai,
Ellis	Kirkland	Reed	Speaker
Emrick	Kortz		

NAYS—59

Baker	Gillen	Maher	Pyle
Barrar	Gillespie	Major	Rapp
Benninghoff	Grove	Maloney	Reese
Bloom	Harhart	Marshall	Roae
Causer	Harris, A.	Marsico	Rothman
Christiana	Heffley	Masser	Saccone
Cox	Hill	McGinnis	Sankey
DeLozier	Irvin	Metcalfe	Simmons
Diamond	Jozwiak	Metzgar	Sonney
Dunbar	Kaufner	Milne	Tallman
Dush	Keller, F.	Moul	Truitt
English	Keller, M.K.	Mustio	Ward
Evankovich	Klunk	Oberlander	Warner
Everett	Knowles	Ortitay	Wentling
Gabler	Lawrence	Pickett	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Boyle	DiGirolamo	McNeill	Saylor
Caltagirone	Keller, W.	Peifer	Sturla
Cruz			

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1605, PN 2320**, entitled:

An Act establishing the Heritage Area Program to identify, protect, enhance and promote the historic, recreational, natural, cultural and scenic resources of this Commonwealth and to stimulate community revitalization and economic development through regional heritage conservation, recreation, tourism and partnerships; and repealing provisions in The Fiscal Code relating to heritage areas.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage.
The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Representative James, on the bill, please.

Mr. JAMES. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

May I begin first by thanking the members of the body for passing this bill unanimously last session.

I would just like to make a few comments about the history of the bill. In 1989 Heritage Area Program was established, and then the DCNR (Department of Conservation and Natural Resources) was created in '95 and empowered to administer the program. Today my bill will strengthen the concept by providing dedicated funding. The program will identify, develop, and promote historic, recreational, cultural, and scenic resources in PA, and it has already stimulated community revitalization. DCNR will distribute operating funds based on established goals and policies to each of the 12 heritage areas. DCNR will be limited to 5 percent of the funding appropriated annually for the program for administrative expenses. Please consider that last year tourists purchased an estimated \$2 billion in goods and services in PA. Twenty-five thousand jobs are supported.

I ask my colleagues for a "yes" vote. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—191

Acosta	Fabrizio	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Adolph	Farina	Krueger	Readshaw
Baker	Farry	Lawrence	Reed
Barbin	Fee	Lewis	Reese
Barrar	Flynn	Longietti	Regan
Benninghoff	Frankel	Mackenzie	Roae
Bizzarro	Freeman	Maher	Roebuck
Bloom	Gabler	Mahoney	Ross
Boback	Gainey	Major	Rothman
Bradford	Galloway	Maloney	Rozzi
Briggs	Gergely	Markosek	Saccone
Brown, R.	Gibbons	Marshall	Sainato
Brown, V.	Gillen	Marsico	Samuelson
Bullock	Gillespie	Masser	Sankey
Burns	Gingrich	Matzie	Santarsiero
Carroll	Godshall	McCarter	Santora
Causer	Goodman	McClinton	Schemel
Christiana	Greiner	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Cohen	Grove	Mentzer	Schreiber
Conklin	Hahn	Metcalfe	Schweyer
Corbin	Hanna	Metzgar	Simmons
Costa, D.	Harhai	Miccarelli	Sims
Costa, P.	Harhart	Millard	Snyder
Cox	Harkins	Miller, B.	Sonney
Culver	Harper	Miller, D.	Staats
Cutler	Harris, A.	Milne	Stephens
Daley, M.	Harris, J.	Moul	Tallman
Daley, P.	Heffley	Mullery	Taylor
Davidson	Helm	Murt	Thomas
Davis	Hennessey	Mustio	Tobash
Dawkins	Hickernell	Neilson	Toepel

Day	Hill	Nesbit	Toohil
Dean	Irvin	Neuman	Topper
Deasy	James	O'Brien	Truitt
DeLissio	Jozwiak	O'Neill	Vereb
Delozier	Kampf	Oberlander	Vitali
DeLuca	Kaufner	Ortitay	Ward
Dermody	Kauffman	Parker, D.	Warner
Diamond	Kavulich	Pashinski	Watson
Donatucci	Keller, F.	Payne	Wentling
Driscoll	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Wheatley
Dunbar	Killion	Petri	Wheeland
Dush	Kim	Pickett	White
Ellis	Kinsey	Pyle	Youngblood
Emrick	Kirkland	Quigley	Zimmerman
English	Klunk	Quinn	
Evankovich	Knowles	Rader	Turzai,
Evans	Kortz	Rapp	Speaker
Everett			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Boyle	DiGirolamo	McNeill	Saylor
Caltagirone	Keller, W.	Peifer	Sturla
Cruz			

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

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

VOTE CORRECTIONS

The SPEAKER. Representative Emrick, on unanimous consent, sir.

Mr. EMRICK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just to correct the record.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. You may proceed.

Mr. EMRICK. On HB 914 I was recorded in the affirmative. I would like to be recorded as a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. Okay, sir; yes. That will be recorded.

Representative Tina Davis is recognized on unanimous consent.

Mrs. DAVIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On SB 912 I would like to change my vote to a "yes" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Yes, you may. Go ahead. Representative Davis, will you restate that. You wanted to— Restate it.

Mrs. DAVIS. I was a "no." I wanted— I want— My button is— Gosh; I told you I want to be a "yes" vote.

The SPEAKER. Okay. Thank you. I am sorry.

Mrs. DAVIS. This is a bad day today.

The SPEAKER. No problem. I have stumbled up here too, and I apologize as well.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CAUSER called up **HR 616, PN 2848**, entitled:

A Resolution directing the Joint State Government Commission, with assistance from the Independent Fiscal Office, to conduct a study on the impact of regulations and policies concerning Pennsylvania's horse racing industry.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. Does anybody wish to speak on that resolution?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—191

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

Driscoll	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Wheatley
Dunbar	Killion	Petri	Wheeland
Dush	Kim	Pickett	White
Ellis	Kinsey	Pyle	Youngblood
Emrick	Kirkland	Quigley	Zimmerman
English	Klunk	Quinn	
Evankovich	Knowles	Rader	Turzai,
Evans	Kortz	Rapp	Speaker
Everett			

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-9

Boyle	DiGirolamo	McNeill	Saylor
Caltagirone	Keller, W.	Peifer	Sturla
Cruz			

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

* * *

Mr. TAYLOR called up **HR 622, PN 2671**, entitled:

A Resolution directing the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee to conduct a comprehensive review of the appropriate and justifiable level of Motor License Fund support for the Pennsylvania State Police given the constitutional protection of that fund.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. Does anybody wish to speak on the resolution?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-191

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

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

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-9

Boyle	DiGirolamo	McNeill	Saylor
Caltagirone	Keller, W.	Peifer	Sturla
Cruz			

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. REED called up **SR 55, PN 653**, entitled:

A Concurrent Resolution establishing a forestry task force to study issues concerning the renewal and management of this Commonwealth's forests; providing for an advisory committee; and directing the Joint Legislative Air and Water Pollution Control and Conservation Committee to provide administrative support to the task force.

On the question,
Will the House concur in the resolution of the Senate?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-191

Acosta	Fabrizio	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Adolph	Farina	Krueger	Readshaw
Baker	Farry	Lawrence	Reed
Barbin	Fee	Lewis	Reese
Barrar	Flynn	Longietti	Regan
Benninghoff	Frankel	Mackenzie	Roae
Bizzarro	Freeman	Maher	Roebuck
Bloom	Gabler	Mahoney	Ross
Boback	Gainey	Major	Rothman
Bradford	Galloway	Maloney	Rozzi
Briggs	Gergely	Markosek	Saccone
Brown, R.	Gibbons	Marshall	Sainato
Brown, V.	Gillen	Marsico	Samuelson

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Boyle	DiGirolamo	McNeill	Saylor
Caltagirone	Keller, W.	Peifer	Sturla
Cruz			

The majority of the members elected to the House having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the resolution was concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A CONTINUED**BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 3, PN 1609**, entitled:

An Act establishing a medical marijuana program; providing for patient and caregiver certification and for medical marijuana organization registration; imposing duties on the Department of Health; providing for a tax on medical marijuana organization gross receipts; establishing the Medical Marijuana Program Fund; establishing the Medical Marijuana Advisory Board; establishing a medical marijuana research program; imposing duties on the Department of Corrections, the Department of Education and the Department of Human Services; and providing for academic clinical research centers and for penalties and enforcement.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage.
The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER. Members, I am going to permit on the floor for this discussion Anthony Grove of WPMT Fox 43, and they will be videotaping with audio. So they will be on the House floor. And James Roxbury of the Roxbury News for videotaping with audio. Both will be given about approximately 10 to 15 minutes on the House floor.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 3 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Those who wish to speak on debate, we are prepared.

Representative Millard, sir. Representative David Millard.

Mr. MILLARD. On the bill. On the bill, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. MILLARD. Will the maker of the bill stand for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. While it is a Senate bill, I believe Chairman Marsico will stand for interrogation. He is coming up to the front now.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Speaker, in the bill it calls for the establishment of a computerized registry containing information relating to patients, caregivers, practitioners, growers, and the list goes on and on. Specifically, on caregivers, who would be identified as a caregiver?

Mr. MARSICO. That is a good question. Thanks for asking that. We should have explained that before. If the patient is not able to get, have the means to get the medication, they would ask for a caregiver to do that, a caregiver to get that medication for them.

Mr. MILLARD. Would a caregiver be limited— In other words, is the identification of a caregiver just restricted to those that would be administering the medication?

Mr. MARSICO. Like I said before, that caregiver would be designated by the patient and that caregiver would be able to go pick up the medicine. So I do not understand—

Mr. MILLARD. But would a care— My question— I will give an example, if I may. If an individual, we will say husband and wife, the husband is identified as the caregiver to go to the pharmacy, or whoever is providing, you know, the medication, if they have other things on their agenda for that day that will take them out of the home and somebody else comes in who is either a relative or a neighbor, would that neighbor be eligible to provide that medication at a certain time in the absence of the identified caregiver, who, in this case, would be a family member?

Mr. MARSICO. Actually, that would be anyone that would be designated by the patient.

Mr. MILLARD. So if I were in a situation where I needed to have a neighbor come in in my absence and administer medication at a given time, I would have to make sure that that neighbor, A, is registered as a caregiver in a database; B, is registered as a caregiver to even come in and provide any comfort and care? And have an ID card?

Mr. MARSICO. Well, once again, the caregiver means that they are allowed to go the dispensary and get the medicine.

Mr. MILLARD. So again, just to be clear, only to obtain medicine from an authorized distributor of the medicine, that is the only reason for having an individual identified as a caregiver and on a database.

Mr. MARSICO. That is correct.

Mr. MILLARD. Can more than one individual be identified as a caregiver for a single patient?

Mr. MARSICO. Yes.

Mr. MILLARD. Thank you very much for your answers.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. Representative Millard, thank you. Representative Cohen.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago I introduced the first medical marijuana bill that had been introduced in the legislature for about 25 years. The response was not immediate. People wanted information. I am very pleased, I am very pleased that the medical marijuana community, which was then in its beginning stages, has grown and grown and spread throughout Pennsylvania and has made very clear to members of this legislative body and to the Senate how important an issue medical marijuana is. Today we are on the cusp of passing this legislation because of the very active public support that has been generated around the State. I would like to thank the chair of the Judiciary Committee, the Democratic chair of the Judiciary Committee, the members of the task force that was formed to work on this matter, and many other legislators who are interested, of both parties, for their outstanding work seeking to craft a consensus on this legislation.

Every line of this bill is not perfect, but there are no perfect bills that pass the General Assembly. I would hope either this bill or something very close to it would be enacted by the State Senate. I think that we have an excellent chance to have a genuine bipartisan achievement in an era in which genuine bipartisan achievements are very hard to come by.

I strongly urge a "yes" vote on passage of SB 3.

The SPEAKER. Representative Becky Corbin, on SB 3.

Mrs. CORBIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The approval of medicinal chemicals should be done through the Food and Drug Administration. This agency was established over 100 years ago as the Bureau of Chemistry, a subject I know something about, as a scientific regulatory public health agency, tasked with, among other things, ensuring that drugs intended for human use are safe and effective.

Mr. Speaker, I will not question the anecdotal evidence that medical marijuana is effective against seizures because it is just that, anecdotal; no science, no data, no controlled experiments. Have there been any clinical trials, randomized blind or double-blind studies testing the efficacy of the active ingredients in medical marijuana? Has there been any stability testing done? What happens to the active ingredients when they are exposed to high temperatures and high humidity? How does the active

ingredient degrade under these conditions? These are things that are asked of every application that is made before the FDA. What possible drug interactions could occur? What exactly is the recommended dosage based on? Mr. Speaker, these questions are asked by the FDA whenever an NDA (new drug application) or an IND, investigational new drug application is submitted for approval. None of this is being done for medical marijuana. What kind of quality control measures will be taken? Who or what entity will formulate the methods development for analysis and be responsible for the quality control of its synthesis or production?

Until these questions are answered, I cannot support this bill, and I respectfully ask my colleagues to vote against SB 3. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Flo Fabrizio.

Mr. FABRIZIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Oftentimes, and no matter how well-intentioned we are, and whether fairly or unfairly, we in this legislature are maligned for what we have done, and more recently probably for what we have not done.

Today we have an opportunity to do something that the vast majority of Pennsylvanians support. We can enhance the quality of life for thousands of people – men, women, and children – whose afflictions, maladies, and physical conditions, along with dreaded diseases, have relegated them and their families to a life of suffering, pain, and torment. We have the opportunity to provide a pathway that will ease their physical and emotional suffering, and we have the opportunity to help alleviate the undue and unnecessary burden that these less fortunate Pennsylvanians shoulder on a daily basis. There are far too few times that the criticality of a situation can be resolved so easily and readily.

Legalization of medicinal marijuana is our key to open the door to a world of comfort, a world of less pain, less nausea, less seizures, a world that is a little brighter, a world that is a little warmer, and a world that is far more tolerable than the dark recesses in which thousands of afflicted persons have found themselves.

It is within our grasp to give people a second chance, and in the case of children, their first chance at an improved life, a life devoid of chronic symptoms of debilitating physical conditions, a life devoid of undeserved and unwarranted fear of continued suffering, and a life devoid of emotional strain, but most importantly, a life that holds forth promise of a better tomorrow when previously there was little or no hope for anything but continued anguish.

Last year, through the legislative process in a series of hearings, we met many individuals and their families who were given a first or second chance at that better life. Their testimony, as well as the testimony of medical experts, physicians, and others, left little doubt as to the efficacy of medicinal marijuana as it relates to the relief of a myriad of chronic conditions.

We are well aware that medicinal marijuana is not a cure for many of the diseases afflicting countless individuals, but it can and does provide that much sought-after temporary relief heretofore unattainable for many of those in ill health. Temporary, yes, but who can place enough of a premium on those few hours of comfort that cannabis can provide? Given a regimen of continued use in an improved and controlled fashion, cannabis has proved effective in instances where other substances have not.

We understand that the major concern presented by those who have opposed the use of medicinal marijuana is that it is an addictive substance because of its classification as a Schedule I substance under the Controlled Substance Act. Please be reminded that cocaine is classified as a Schedule II substance.

A 1994 study ranked six substances to determine the relative physical addiction properties. Out of the six substances that were studied, marijuana was found to be the least addictive, and far less addictive than alcohol or nicotine. There are drugs that are far more toxic, far more dangerous, and with far more severe effects that can be purchased at any time in any drug store in this Commonwealth, but yet we continue to demonize marijuana.

Opioid addiction and the resultant deaths from prescription drugs have become epidemic in our society, and yet the continuous overprescribing and misuse and abuse of these drugs remains unchecked. In a recent study conducted by Dr. Marcus Bachhuber, who is a practicing internal medicine physician and a research fellow at the Philadelphia Veterans Affairs Medical Center and the University of Pennsylvania, it was found and published in the Journal of the American Medical Association that the average yearly rate of opioid painkiller overdose deaths in States with medical marijuana laws was 25 percent lower than in States without the laws. By legalizing medicinal marijuana, not only do we reap its direct benefits for those in need of its use, we also reap the attendant benefits of reducing the death rate of opioid painkiller overdoses.

Opponents of legalized medicinal marijuana purport that there is very little empirical data and very little conclusive evidence to corroborate its benefits, but I can cite the results of research in over 100 studies that refute that claim. Opponents of legalized medicinal marijuana also profess that anecdotal accountings of its benefits are unreliable and unscientific, but look into the tearful eyes of a tortured mother who has seen the remarkable effects cannabis has had on her suffering 3-year-old and tell her it is unscientific.

You may have heard of Charlotte Figi, a child who began having seizures shortly after birth due to a condition known as Dravet syndrome, a rare, severe form of epilepsy which could not be controlled by medication. By age 3 this baby girl was having 300 seizures per week, despite being on 7 different medications. A strain of cannabis called Charlotte's Web, which is low in THC (tetrahydrocannabinol) and high in CBD (cannabidiol), limited her seizures to two or three per month. Tell her mother that this remarkable improvement was not scientifically based.

There is also the case of Irvin Rosenfeld, the longest survivor of the final four Federal cannabis patients in the United States. During one of our hearings he testified that he was a sufferer of a severe bone tumor disorder that causes excruciating pain. For the past 32 years he has been receiving cannabis cigarettes from the Federal government at the rate of 10 per day. As a result, and according to his testimony, he has been able to accomplish much more than he would have ever expected because cannabis was the right medicine at the right time for him. Tell him that it was unscientific.

In addition, at one of our hearings a hospital nurse told us about M.L., a patient that was in her mid-twenties and was dying from a rare and aggressive form of cancer of the abdomen. Her pain was being treated with a morphine pump. Medical personnel were unsure as to what was making her

sicker, the morphine or her illness. Had medicinal marijuana been prescribed instead of morphine, her dying days may have been more comfortable and far more humane than they actually were. Anecdotal, yes; unscientific, maybe – but irrefutably real and true.

Ours is a decision to make. Do we join the other 24 States that have demonstrated their unyielding compassion for their seriously or terminally ill residents, or do we turn our backs on the means to provide thousands of friends, neighbors, and loved ones an improved quality of life – a life rid of pain and suffering, a life with meaning, a life no longer fraught with fear and anxiety, and just plainly speaking, a life, not an existence.

Let us prove that we in Pennsylvania care. Vote "yes" on SB 3.

The SPEAKER. Representative Jerry Knowles.

Mr. KNOWLES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are two groups who are advocating for medical marijuana. The one group – and I was pretty shocked at the number of them who were pretty upfront about it – view this as a major step in legalization of marijuana. Make no mistake about it, there is that group out there and it is a big group. The other group is the folks who genuinely believe that this will be good, it will be good for people who suffer from medical conditions. They are sincere. They mean what they are saying. I would really like to be a part of that group. I wish that I could be a part of that group, because my heart goes out to little kids who are suffering with seizures. My heart goes out to them. My heart goes out to people who are dying of cancer and who, they believe, that this would be helpful to them.

Mr. Speaker, my concern is that this is not being done right. It should be done in the same fashion as the Representative had indicated it should be done, in the same fashion as every other drug. Mr. Speaker, we have an FDA (Food and Drug Administration). I as a former cop could not vote for this. This is in direct violation of Federal law. I would not do that. As a former cop, I was always taught when I was a policeman that you either change the law or let us just do away with the FDA. Let us just do away with them. But it is against the law. It is against the Federal law.

Mr. Speaker, there is a list of groups here, and there are 40 groups: Pennsylvania Medical Society, the American Medical Association, the American Academy of Family Physicians, the American College of Physicians, the American Psychiatric Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Academy of Neurology, the American Epilepsy Society, and the National Multiple Sclerosis Society. There is an additional 30 or so. These are medical professionals. This is what they do. You want me to get on board? You convince them that it is a good idea. If you can convince them that it is a good idea, then it is something that I could seriously consider.

As I noted a little earlier, I was a cop back in the seventies, okay, a long time ago. But you know what? That is the period of time when all this pot stuff started. That is when all this stuff started. And when I was a policeman I saw friends whose lives were ruined by marijuana. Their lives were ruined.

Now, you can tell me, you can tell me that marijuana is not addictive. You can tell me that everybody that smokes marijuana does not go on to do stronger drugs – heroin, cocaine. You can tell me that. But guess what? If you talk to a drug user, and if they are honest with you, those who are on the stronger drugs, guess what they are going to tell you, guess what they

started on? They started on marijuana. And they did not get the high and they did not get the satisfaction, so what did they do? They moved on to a stronger drug.

Make no mistake about it. Make no mistake about it, this is a dangerous drug. It is a dangerous drug, and it is a gateway drug. Make no mistake about that.

I had a friend, young guy, family guy. He came into my office and he was passionately opposed to this. He had two kids. He was passionately opposed to it. He brought along with him, off of the Internet, it was an advertisement for California, but medical marijuana. He said, "Can I use your phone?" So I have my personal cell and I gave him my personal cell. He picks it up and he makes the call. The doctor's office answered the phone. He said, "Doc, I'm from Pennsylvania" – now he had, this was on speaker. I heard this with my own ears – he said, "Doc, I'm from Pennsylvania. I'm coming out there in June. I want to make an appointment." "Well, you do not really have to make an appointment. You can just stop by when you get here. An appointment isn't really necessary." He says, "What about my medical records? Should I bring along my medical records?" "Well, if you want to bring them along, you can bring them along. If you want to bring them along, you can bring them with you." He said, "Doc, you know, I've got to be honest with you. I have high blood pressure." You know what the response was? "You come on out. We'll take care of you."

We have got to do this thing the right way. We have got to do it the right way.

I had a conversation with a drug expert. This guy is a drug expert. He works for a major police agency. He is a drug expert. So he was out in California, and he said, "You know what? I think I'm going to see how difficult it is to get a medical marijuana card." He went into a doctor's office. He said the doctor's office was like a 12-by-12 room. There was somebody sitting at the front desk, and he walked in and he said, "I'm here to apply for a medical marijuana card." "Well, we need some identification." He pulls out his Pennsylvania driver's license. "You've got to be a resident of California." "Oh," he said, "how long have you been here?" "I've been here about a week." "You only need to be here 48 hours." He said, "Why not just use the address at the hotel, because to be honest with you, they don't really check it." So guess what? He used the address from the hotel. "And what is your medical problem?" He wrote on there, "I have bad knees. I have bad knees."

So he gets in to see the doctor. And the doctor says, "What is your problem?" He says, "Well, I have bad knees." He said, "Does marijuana help you?" He said, "Honestly, I don't know. I never tried it." He said, "Well, do you have swelling in your knees?" He said, "Yes." He said, "Do you think it would help you?" He said, "Yes." So guess what? He issued him a medical marijuana card. It cost him \$130 for 3 months. And guess what else they gave him? They gave him coupons. They gave him coupons for two free units of marijuana and a pipe.

Now, listen, this is what scares the living heck out of me. We have got to do this right. We have got to do this right, because, quite frankly, if you would have told me 5 years ago that the State legislature here in Pennsylvania would be making this vote, I would have told you that you were crazy. I am very concerned that we are going to be back here next session voting on legalizing marijuana. That is what I am afraid of. That is scary stuff.

Mr. Speaker, I will close and I will ask all of you who are supporting this legislation to do the citizens of Pennsylvania a favor. Make sure that we do not turn into a California, that we do not turn into a Colorado, and that we do not turn into a Washington, so that we become the laughingstock of this country.

I ask you folks that are supporting this legislation to do that for my grandchildren, for your grandchildren, and for the people of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a "no" vote on this piece of legislation. Thank you.

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER. Members, I believe I am saying the name correctly, Rebecca Droke with the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette has been granted permission to take still photos in the gallery. Of course, they can only be with respect to the floor and with respect to folks in the gallery, but that has been granted. She will have 10 minutes to take those photos. So that permission has been granted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Representative Caltagirone is on the House floor and should be placed on the master roll.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 3 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Representative Mike O'Brien is next.

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

You know, in the midseventies I liked to go to La Salle College – University now – on a Saturday night and watch the movies. One of my favorites was when they had comedy nights and I would go up and watch the Marx Brothers, but my favorite was "Reefer Madness." The past couple days in this chamber the conversations have become reefer madness and not a discussion on a medical issue.

Now, I suffer from something called trigeminal neuralgia. Trigeminal neuralgia is when the trigeminal nerve misfires, causing searing pains in your face. You cannot eat, you cannot talk, you cannot sleep. They call it the suicide disease. It is so intense it is called the suicide disease.

Interestingly enough, within the legislation the use of medical marijuana is allowed for that sort of disease. One in 44,000 people have trigeminal neuralgia. Somebody in your district you will deny a lack of a searing suicidal pain. Someone in your district you will deny some relief from epilepsy. And perhaps the saddest thing is you will have a victim of cancer so doped up on morphine that in her final moments they cannot express their love to their families.

Before you cast a vote, put aside philosophy, put aside agenda, and think for a moment, and think for a moment of giving a moment of relief to the afflicted.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative.

Representative Mike Vereb.

Mr. VEREB. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My good friend from Tamaqua brought up some valid points, ones of which I disagree with today. My good friend from the

western part of the State was up and gave a great, I think, analytical presentation to us. I think we all who are going to be "yes" are going to be "yes," and I think who all are going to be "no" are going to be "no," and I do not think what I am going to say is going to change that, but I just need to address a few things.

For those of us who have been engaged with one of those two groups that were mentioned, that is the group that is upstairs. That is the group that has been down in the rotunda. It has been the families, a family of which exists from my district. If you were up there an hour ago, you would see a mom stomach feeding her child. Now, if you are willing to go up there and watch what goes on and watch what these families go through and still vote "no," that is obviously your prerogative, and I understand the arguments with the FDA.

But you know, the FDA has approved all these other narcotics. They approved the same drugs that have created a national crisis and a statewide crisis, and since when under the Obama administration, when am I, a Republican, going to embrace the FDA? Give me a break.

Mr. Speaker, every drug that is used in a hospital, every drug is illegal to possess on the street. I should be more specific. Drugs that are used in operating rooms, intensive care units, you cannot buy those drugs legally on the street, yet they went through that FDA process.

We talk about addictions. You know, everything is addicting. Being here – it is not so addicting to me anymore – but everything in life, from the coffee machine to cigarettes to alcohol, of which we/I have voted to expand where one of those addictions are sold.

I agree with my good friend from Tamaqua. This was difficult. It is no longer difficult for me to vote "yes." In fact, I would not do anything other than vote "yes" for this bill.

I held a hearing 2 years ago this week in my district, and I was a "no," but Erin McCann, who is upstairs there, she said, "Mike, I really wish you would do a hearing on this." And we all know Senator Folmer, and I forget who the other panelists were, but I sat and I listened as an elected official in a town hall. I listened to what people were saying, and I just looked at myself. I was in a township meeting room with a police station beneath me, and I just said, there is no way that I cannot do anything but to look into this further and to support the effort to provide relief that we have heard about from many speakers to these families.

So as my friend – and in the seventies, I believe, respectfully, I was in grade school, but in the eighties and nineties I was on the street, and I agree, drugs are not a good thing when they are not used properly, when they are not dispensed of properly. But even when they are dispensed properly, we now know that those same drugs that are dispensed and not fully used are then sold or recovered by family members, and that creates an immediate addiction in families and destroys family after family after family, and I know this because it started with my nephew. If we do not soon open our eyes and recognize that our pharmaceutical companies and our doctors do not start controlling the FDA-approved drugs, you will be here, you will be here to fix that crisis, and I hope to be part of it before November 30.

But I do not care what the FDA has to say, because what they have said in regulation may be right, but in reality is wrong. So it is time for pharma, it is time for our doctors, it is time for our pharmacies to stop the real crisis in this country,

and that is our opioid addiction that is going on in almost every one of our households, whether we want to know it, admit to it or not.

This is not an opioid. This is a relief to great families who are suffering right in front of us in this chamber, and just think, we vote "yes" and the little town in the rotunda goes away.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote. As a former law enforcement officer, as a former narcotics officer, as a former whatever, and as a parent, and as a relative to a nephew tragically going through, tragically going through something that needs a fix, but we need business, we need the chamber, my good friend from Allegheny, get your friends into chamber, we need to start holding pharma, CVS, and doctors responsible for the real crisis that is going on here in Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Pete Daley. Waives off.

Representative Mike Regan.

Mr. REGAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would first like to thank the leadership, both Democratic and Republican leadership, for us being here today on this vote. I really wondered many times if this would ever really happen, and I am so grateful that we are here with the opportunity to vote on this very, very important bill – certainly the most important one of my time as a State Representative.

Thank you to Chairman Petrarca and Chairman Marsico for their hard work and dedication. Thank you to Representative Benninghoff for his supervision of our task force, which I have to say that our task force was a mix of Republicans and Democrats, and it was really a fascinating civics lesson for me to get Republicans and Democrats – some were pro, some were con – to come together and talk about this very important issue and come out of that with a consensus of how we should proceed forward, and that ultimately ended up being Representative Marsico's amendment.

So there have been some amazing things that have transpired on our way to this day right here, but you know, when I think about this bill, I really think about a certain group of people, beginning with Gracie Witwer, 9 months old, whose parents knew she had epilepsy and were so hopeful that we as a body would act so she may be able to participate and receive some medical marijuana that would help her with her epileptic symptoms. Unfortunately, Gracie died at age 9 months from SUDEP (Sudden Unexpected Death in Epilepsy). She died waiting for us to act.

I think about Dane Freedman, a decorated Marine corporal. He came home from the war and could not escape what he went through. Took his own life. Waiting.

I think about my father-in-law, Frank Yuhas, stage IV lymphoma, walked the street at 175 pounds. At 100 pounds, he had to venture out into the night because he was so sick from chemo and he could not eat, and we were worried he was going to starve to death. The only thing that helped him was marijuana, but he could not find it many times, so he suffered. I cannot help but think that his life would have been so much better at the end if he had relief. And countless others with debilitating illness, waiting, waiting for us to act.

And then there are those who are illegally healing every day, those who wait and wonder if they are going to get arrested, incarcerated for trying to help themselves or help a loved one.

And I think of little Anna, little 8-year-old Anna, who has epilepsy, who has autism, and whose little brain was seizing nonstop. Nonstop. Can you imagine? With a little drop of oil in

a piece of fudge every day that little girl who was sinking into oblivion is now active and functioning and healthy and with us up here in the gallery.

I think of my high school friend, Randy Robertson, who received a death sentence from his doctor: 3 months, terminal bile duct cancer. Terminal; 3 months. As his family prepared his death chamber in his room, just to make him comfortable as he rode out the 3 months of pain and torture and agony of having to be on opioids and all the medicines they were giving him. A friend brought him some medical marijuana oil. I saw Randy last week in Lemoyne, Pennsylvania, gassing up his Harley, literally a year after he received that death sentence. I am not saying that medical marijuana was the only thing that helped Randy, but it was a combination of his doctor's supervision, the medicine they gave him, and the medical marijuana which saved his life, and he is with us today up there, waving to us right now.

We have a moral obligation to do what is right here. My faith tells me that this is the moral, compassionate, right thing to do. Too many people are waiting. Too many people will die if we do not act. Is there anything more important? Is there anything more important than people's lives, people who are suffering?

Please, I beg you, I implore you, vote "yes" on this bill. God bless you.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER. At this time Mark Walters with the York Daily Record will be given permission to take still photos in the gallery for the next 10 minutes. Mark Walters with the York Daily Record will be taking still photos in the gallery.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 3 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Bryan Barbin, Representative Bryan Barbin. Mr. BARBIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I listened very closely to what the last speaker said, and I agree with him that there ought to be a way to help some of the people that are here in the balcony. My only question when we had amendments and my question that still remains is, we are putting ourselves in a position just like we did with Narcan, and what I want to tell you is, the way this bill is written right now, we will have the same problem with medical marijuana.

One of the earlier speakers indicated that there was a little bit of a question about caregivers and can they be people that get this medical marijuana for patients. I remember when I was growing up I worked construction, and one of the things that would happen at the beginning of the month – some people lived in houses – at the beginning of the month the Social Security checks came out, and the Social Security checks never went to some of the elderly people. That happens. That is reality.

This bill has provisions in it that say you can have five caregivers and two caregivers at any one time.

My other problem with this bill is not for the people in the balcony. They should be helped. The Governor said initially, before we even brought this bill out, that he was going to authorize a pilot program for those people who have seizures. They should be helped. People that have epilepsy should be

helped, people that are in hospice. My parents died within 10 days. They were heavily medicated. Medical marijuana may have helped them and their doctors should have been able to give it to them. I am not sure they would have taken it. I have had other uncles with cancer that have used Marinol to try to get rid of some of the effects, and I think medical marijuana could help those people.

My problem is this: Just like Narcan – we have got all this Narcan going out. People go into the emergency room, they get the Narcan, they leave immediately before anything else can be done, and those same people end up overdosed. We have problems. If you just say because there is a good reason to give it to someone, that you are not going to be careful about what the details are, you are going to have other problems. Our problem with Narcan is people leave the emergency room, Narcan wears off 5 hours later, guess where they are going? They are going back for another dose of heroin.

The problem with this bill is, we are sitting here and we are saying because these people should be helped – and I believe they should be helped – we are going to allow caregivers to show up at dispensaries to get these drugs. That should not happen, and we should have way more tight requirements than this bill has if we are going to allow medical marijuana.

The other big problem in this bill is, they do not want to just give medical marijuana to people up there who need it. They want to give medical marijuana – we went through all these things – juvenile diabetes, fibromyalgia. That is a condition that the grower wants to have so we do move from the group that needs it to the group that says marijuana is good for everyone.

My last point: Marijuana is not good for everyone, just like heroin is not good for everyone. Representative Vereb was right. We owe this Commonwealth a duty to go in and say that this drug epidemic we have should be made less. The problem with this bill as it is written is it will create additional marijuana problems that we are not handling in the midst of a narcotics problem. It is not that marijuana is worse than heroin; it is better than heroin. It is less addictive. The problem is we have an epidemic drug abuse problem that we are not dealing with.

In Johnstown we had 30 overdoses in the last 3 weeks. Five people died. This does not make the situation better if we are going to give medical marijuana out to everyone.

For that reason I will not be voting "yes" today. I hope that some of these things, some of the conditions, the 17 conditions are reduced to the ones for the people that are really in the balcony, and I think if we change the caregiver provisions, that when this comes back from the Senate, I will be voting for it. But as of today, I am not willing to make Johnstown worse because we are going to hand medical marijuana out to everyone, because we have not dealt with heroin in Johnstown.

The SPEAKER. Representative Jeff Pyle.

Mr. PYLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to need a little guidance here, because I am not really sure if I am speaking on the bill or out of personal privilege, so feel free to jump in and let me know if I am still in bounds.

Four thousand and fifty-six days ago I was diagnosed with massive renal cell carcinoma requiring a 5 1/2 hour surgery at the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center at Shadyside. I was informed that if I stuck to my status quo and tried to quote, unquote, "tough it out," I would die. I was literally given the 10-day warning. The cancer within me was so big that they were afraid one of two things would happen: either it would

explode and shower cancer all through my guts, which would have been a death sentence, or it would continue its growth and hook up the vena cava and race to my heart, again, cutting my time very, very short. After consultation with a large, large number of people, we made the decision to go ahead and have the process done.

Now, earlier today we heard from my friend from Penn Hills what it is to be with cancer. We have heard quite a bit today about little kids with epilepsy in an effort to churn our hearts. Well, I am here to give you a different perspective.

I live with cancer every day. I am told there is a very high likelihood I will have it again. Now, I have got two daughters. They tell me what I have is hereditary, that I probably got it from my father. Two daughters.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you some things about cancer. When you are lying there, you pray more than you have ever prayed before, but the thoughts that go through your head: What happens next? Who is going to take care of my kids?

I was lucky a friend of mine, afflicted with the same thing, Joe Cook, came to visit me, and he gave me the hints. He said, "Jeff, they are not going to let you leave and go home until you can do three things: until you can eat, until you can walk, and until you can show the other end of eating." Feel free to chastise me on that one, Mr. Speaker.

The walking was not a problem. It was the eating. You just do not want to eat when there are 47 staples stuck in your guts. So Joe Cook came to me and Joe Cook offered me that oil, and I did not take it, because I said, "No, no; I am a State Rep. I've got to live what I preach."

Two daughters, Mr. Speaker, and with the odds somewhat likely that they will deal with this too, I want them to have access to comfort that I did not have. Mr. Speaker, when you are lying there looking at trays of food and you cannot touch them, but you know that eating that stuff is your ticket home. It was tough.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a chance today to improve the lives of those kids and old people like me. I think that it needs to be made clear that within this bill is not open green-leaf sales, and we can speculate where this goes all we want. I do not know. We can speculate on aliens landing out on the lawn and have about as much accuracy. But what I do know, Mr. Speaker, is that marijuana oils like Charlotte's Web that the gentleman identified earlier, there is no way to scientifically prove them, but we know they work.

Please let my kids have access to this. And that is the end of my personal privilege.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please vote in favor of SB 3.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Pyle.

Representative Dom Costa.

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

After the great Representative's gracious, gracious talk to us, I do not think there is anything more to be said. Please vote for SB 3.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER. Louis Griffith of WHP-TV CBS 21 has been granted permission to come onto the House floor to do videotaping with audio. Louis Griffith will be given access on the floor, of WHP-TV CBS 21. Thank you.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 3 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Representative Russ Diamond.

Mr. DIAMOND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of SB 3 as amended by the House.

I have to say, I am absolutely stunned and I greatly appreciate the wide variety of other supporters of this bill. From the liberal lion of the General Assembly to some of the most conservative members over here, there is a coalition that has formed that has seen the truth. I am stunned and very appreciative.

I want to thank the gentleman from Montgomery County for pointing out that many of the folks who will stand up and talk about the FDA would not trust the Federal government to do anything else, not trust the government, the Federal government, to do anything else, yet they want to rely on the FDA. The FDA has drug its feet, the Federal government has drug its feet, and it is time for Pennsylvania to act.

I want to thank the gentleman from Schuylkill County for sharing his story about California, but this is not California. We are doing this the Pennsylvania way. We are doing this the right way. I hope he stays for as many years as he needs to see fit that this does not become recreational marijuana. This is not California, Mr. Speaker. We are doing this the right way. The only thing he left out of his story is, did it work? Did it work for your friend? Did it relieve his swelling? We do not know.

We heard today some concerns about caregivers being able to show up and pick this medicine up. Well, I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I have in my own personal experience gone to CVS, Walmart, Rite Aid, and I have picked up Marinol, I have picked up OxyContin, I have picked up morphine sulfate for somebody whom I cared about. I was never appointed by a doctor or any kind of official board as a caregiver. I just showed up, told them the patient's name and their date of birth, and the pharmacist allowed me to take the drugs with me. All I had to do was sign for the insurance, and if you have ever seen my signature, you know that you do not know who picked that drug up. So the caregiver worry is really not appropriate.

We heard on second consideration a concern and the movement to, you know, assign this only to this company out there who is researching Epidiolex, and they also have a drug called Sativex, which is for multiple sclerosis. I think that is great and nothing in this bill precludes them from doing that. In fact, I think we ought to invite that company to come here, because they have to get their raw materials somewhere, right? Why not grow it right here in Pennsylvania under a controlled license under SB 3? These are the kinds of jobs we need to bring to Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker.

We heard a lot of talk on second consideration about this being the most illicit drug, and indeed it is. Let us go to Merriam-Webster and find out the definition of "illicit."

Primarily, illicit means "not allowed by law; unlawful or illegal." Well, Mr. Speaker, that is what we are here to change. The secondary definition, Mr. Speaker, is also "not morally acceptable." Well, this plant, this helpful plant is not morally acceptable because it has been illegal for about 80 years. It has been illegal for 80 years because of racist sentiment against Mexicans and because of yellow journalism by the paper pulp companies. We have been suffering. We have been the victims. The public has been the victims of yellow journalism and bad Federal policy for 80 years, and it is time for Pennsylvania to step up to the plate and reverse that.

I want to thank the gentleman from York for pointing out my friend, Randy, who is up there, stage IV bile duct cancer. Mr. Speaker, people do not come back from that. I have known Randy for about 25 years, and I kind of lost touch with him over the years, but I reconnected with him. And I want to say, God bless Randy and his family, and I am so glad, so glad that he was brave enough to break the law to cure himself, because he is here today.

And that is the thing about this, Mr. Speaker. You know, a lot of times when we talk about whatever bill we want to pass, whatever we want to become law, we talk in hypotheticals, and it is real easy to talk in hypotheticals and to surmise what will happen or what may happen when it is not about real people. But about 5 months ago when I first started really working on this issue within this chamber and with some of you, my colleagues, I started to get to know these people, not just talking about a stage IV bile duct cancer survivor – who is in complete response right now, by the way, Mr. Speaker, complete response, no trace of cancer in his system.

I am talking about the mothers who saw their children suffer up to 700 seizures a day. Imagine if that is your child. I am talking about the Iraq war veteran who, due to the side effects of the approved pharmaceuticals he was prescribed, found himself in a corner with a gun in his mouth contemplating suicide. Thank goodness he got out of that corner. I am talking about my neighbor, who is stricken with debilitating symptoms of multiple sclerosis, who spends most of her time on the couch because her body hurts so much. I saw my former mother-in-law die of multiple sclerosis, and I pray to God that we could have had this to help her as she progressed towards death. I am talking about the little boy who just when we were at ease today out at the bottom of the Capitol steps had a seizure, and his mother treated him with a cannabinoid. I hope he is okay. I was not around to stick around to see if he is okay. I sure hope he is.

And I am talking about a young, vibrant, and intelligent woman who is currently condemned to live a life in subsidized housing, who made the astonishing claim to me that one of her biggest goals is to pay taxes. She wants to get a job and pay taxes. Imagine, have you ever had someone say to you, "All I want to do is pay taxes"? I have. She has a doctor who says he would prescribe this if it were legal – or maybe we do not call it prescribe in this bill, we call it recommend. A doctor would give it to her if it were legal, but since it is not yet legal, her only other option – and this is a person who had part of her brain removed – her only other option is another dangerous surgery. These are the folks I have gotten to know in the last 5 months.

It is truly different sitting here in our – I will just call it – when we sit here in an ivory tower and we are talking about hypothetical things that we are going to do, it is really easy to try to pretend that we understand how it is going to work. It is

really different, Mr. Speaker, when these people are your friends and they are people that you love. It is way different.

So let us not do this for the hypothetical people. Let us do this for Randy. Let us do this for Dana and Lorelei. Let us do this for Lolly and Anna. Let us do this for Kara and Jackson. Let us do this for Jeff and Bailey. Let us do this for Hailey and Monroe. Let us do this for Heather and Hannah and Chuck and Pat and Kim and Michael – these are real people – and Beth. These are real people that we can help right now. We have a duty to help as many people as we possibly can.

You know, a lot of times when we are discussing things that State government does, there are people who would sit on the left part of this aisle and they want to make the claim that, well, you know, if you are a Christian, this is one of those "What would Jesus do?" things. And I often discount that, because what we do here at State government most often is we take from one group and give to another group. So I often write that argument off and say, you know, that is a straw man argument. This really is a WWJD moment, because we are not taking a single thing from anyone. All we are doing is offering potential treatment that will change the lives of countless people. It could be tens of thousands of Pennsylvanians. It could be hundreds of thousands of Pennsylvanians. We are giving them hope. We are giving them another option when all other options have exhausted.

Mr. Speaker, this is about real people. I urge a "yes" vote on SB 3.

And I want to tell you one thing, this is the most important thing here: sick people do not want to get high. They want to get better. Vote "yes" on SB 3.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Members, we have Representative Lawrence, Representative Flynn, Representative Cutler, Representative Sims, Representative Dush, Representative Baker all to speak, and then, of course, we will be concluding with Representatives Marsico and Petrarca.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. Representative Lawrence.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have some comments I would like to submit for the record.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Lawrence.

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us, SB 3, attempts to legalize marijuana for medical purposes. No action taken on this floor today can change the fact that marijuana remains a Schedule I controlled substance under Federal law, and is thus by definition illegal. The fact that the Federal government has continued this policy, even in light of 23 States taking action to legalize marijuana for medical purposes, is troubling and is perhaps the leading reason we are even debating this legislation today. For as with so many other issues, the lack of Federal action and perpetual dilly-dallying in Washington forces the States to take action instead.

Mr. Speaker, we have a President, President Obama, who has admittedly used marijuana in his earlier years. It was, as is my understanding, not for medical purposes. My point is not to make light of this bill or what is a serious issue. My point is that the President could, if he chose, champion this issue and perhaps lean on the FDA

for action, particularly on medical marijuana. For some reason, that has not taken place. I think it is important to point out again that the Federal government's inaction has contributed to an untenable situation, one that puts the several States in a difficult position, and one that has resulted in a piecemeal 50-State approach.

Mr. Speaker, as part of the Health Committee, I participated in three very solid hearings on this topic earlier this session. For a topic to receive three hearings across the State – in Philadelphia, Harrisburg, and Pittsburgh – is exceptionally unusual and speaks to the exceptional nature of this issue. I will add that these hearings were some of the best organized hearings I have had the pleasure of participating in during my short time in this House. There were many testifiers, very accomplished and knowledgeable about the issue at hand. Presenters were from both sides of the issue and gave very compelling testimony pro and con. I had a chance to ask a number of questions during these hearings, and received some very thoughtful responses. I have also done a great deal of additional research on my own to try to make an informed decision on the bill in front of us today.

I do not think that the members of this House can debate the fact that medical marijuana has shown promise in treating a number of different ailments, and that in particular, CBD oil has brought dramatic relief to some children suffering from seizures. I voted yesterday to support amendments that would have expanded access for additional children to participate in these types of treatments; regrettably these amendments failed.

With the aforementioned in mind, I cannot support SB 3 as it is written before us today. While I have a number of concerns about the broad approach contemplated by this legislation, I will keep my remarks to a few specifics.

First, marijuana is illegal under Federal law. As a result, no bank, at least no bank that participates in the Federal Reserve System, will deal with a medical marijuana business. As a result, medical marijuana businesses deal strictly in cash – no checks, no credit cards, no bank drafts, no wire transfers. As an all-cash operation, these businesses are ripe for crime and robbery. This has been seen in other States where marijuana is sold. Businesses are forced to make payroll, pay taxes, reimburse vendors, all with stacks of paper money. They can even take stacks of cash to IRS offices for payroll taxes. The regular business practices of medical marijuana operations dealing in large amounts of cash, for better or worse, closely resemble what would be called money laundering in any other instance. I closely questioned testifiers on this point during our hearings, and the issue is real and serious. Again, this issue comes not from anything we have or have not done in this House, it comes directly from the Federal government's lack of willingness to remove marijuana from Schedule I. There is nothing in this bill that contemplates how this Commonwealth and the future medical marijuana operations in this Commonwealth will deal with this issue.

Second, new pharmaceuticals in the United States go through an approval process overseen by the Food and Drug Administration. I will be the first to state that the FDA approval process is broken and needs reform. But for better or worse, that is the approval process. And the process is overseen by competent medical professionals with a background in research, chemistry – the sciences. Patient trials are conducted, double-blind, placebo controlled. Dangerous interactions and unexpected complications or reactions are noted and researched. Again, it is perhaps a process that needs to be reformed, but it is a workable process. It is a process that has prevented dangerous compounds from being introduced into the broad use in the United States. The approach we have seen with medical marijuana has been completely different – instead we are looking at a State-by-State effort, 50 State legislatures across the nation approaching the issue in a piecemeal manner. And I can only assume that the vast majority of State legislatures, including our very own, have zero or very few medical professionals among their membership. So the precedent being set here is that the 50 State legislatures – the membership, the legislators – with no medical training take on the approval of new pharmaceuticals on a State-by-State basis. I think that is a terrible precedent.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this bill is also simply not ready for prime time. As I pointed out yesterday, an individual with any trace of a Schedule I drug in their system is, if they are pulled over driving a car and tested, guilty of a DUI (driving under the influence) in the highest offense. That is existing State law under the Vehicle Code. Mandatory 72 hours in jail, mandatory fines, etc. I offered an amendment yesterday to simply advise medical marijuana cardholders of this situation, which unfortunately was not accepted. Marijuana, once used, stays in one's system for a long time. I fail to see how any adult utilizing medical marijuana would not, if regularly operating a motor vehicle, sooner or later receive a DUI. As I am sure the members of this august chamber are well aware, an individual who receives a DUI often faces years of protracted legal action, not to mention loss of their driver's license, which can create serious issues keeping employment. Again, this is the result of poorly drafted legislation that fails to envision what is going to come about if this bill is passed into law.

For these reasons and others I will be a "no" vote on this bill today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Flynn. We will go over Representative Flynn.

Representative Cutler.

I apologize. Representative Mentzer.

Mr. MENTZER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take my third and final swing here. I now understand that in this Assembly we have no medical doctors, no medical researchers. I am not sure about pharmacists, but I know we have a chemist, the gentlelady from Chester County, who I believe has the same concerns that some of us do. So once again I will need to rely on my logic and common sense.

Believe it or not, I voted for the Marsico amendment, because I believe, like most of us in here, that we really want to help the kids who are suffering from multiple seizures, epileptic seizures; the vets suffering from PTSD (post-traumatic stress disorder), cancer patients, and the terminally ill. Now we have to weigh what the medical profession is saying and what our constituents are saying.

Now, I have a constituent in my district that about 2 years ago came to me and was encouraging me to vote "yes" on medical marijuana, and he said something that stuck, and that was "What is the downside?" And I have been thinking about those comments for the last couple of years. It has given me pause. As a matter of fact, one of the issues that drew me to the Marsico amendment was the idea that there would be a limit on the THC content for cannabinoids. The THC component is the one in the cannabinoid that can create the high. I have been told that the cannabinoids that are used for recreational marijuana are between 5 and 6 percent THC. So in the Marsico original amendment there was a maximum amount of THC that could be required in any one dose of medical marijuana, and that was 10 percent. But an amendment was introduced that eliminated that maximum of THC content and allows for large concentrations of THC per dose, and it would make Pennsylvania unique. Of all the States that do not allow the smoking of marijuana's leaf, it would be the only State that has no cap on the THC amount per dose. Now, I would really need to have a medical professional tell me what the upside is to eliminating that 10 percent max.

This was the amendment that was the straw that broke the camel's back for me. There are many amendments that I believe would have made this bill much safer. I would encourage a "no"

vote on final passage until we can agree to a safer way to get cannabinoids to the many people who may benefit from cannabis.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Mentzer.

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER. Members, at this time the Speaker is granting permission to the following individuals from the media to come onto the House floor. Steve Esack of the Morning Call will be coming onto the House floor to take still photos and to do videotaping with audio, and he is with the Morning Call.

I believe I am saying this correctly, but I may not be, Harold Trulear of WGAL is going to be solely taking still photos in the gallery. That is Harold Trulear, just still photos in the gallery.

Eric Heisler of ABC-27 will be taking videotape with audio on the House floor. Everybody will be granted approximately 10 minutes. So I do want to make members aware that the media has been given access to the House floor and to the gallery.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 3 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Representative Marty Flynn.

Mr. FLYNN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of SB 3. I have heard people on both sides of the aisle plead why we should have it, why we should not have it, and one thing I noticed that my colleagues have not said is that marijuana is on the corner of every street in this country. We can all go 2 seconds and get it. All we are doing is allowing the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania who need this to access it legally, and that is a very, very important thing to realize, that these people who are suffering from these ailments – PTSD, epilepsy, everything – they do not have a chance to get this legally, and that is what we are doing. We are moving Pennsylvania forward instead of in neutral for once. Let us allow the people of Pennsylvania to get medical marijuana legally and help alleviate the pain that they have every single day.

Every State that has passed medical marijuana has seen a 25-percent decrease, 25-percent decrease in overdose opiate prescription drug deaths – 25 percent. That will move Pennsylvania forward. Vote "yes" and I guarantee no buildings will fall on you. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as we have worked through this debate, I certainly appreciate everyone's viewpoints and I would like to thank my colleagues for sharing their personal stories. I know my former roommate, the gentleman from Armstrong County, that was not easy for him, and I have the deepest respect for him, and I have the deepest respect for all of you as individuals and those who are in the balcony.

One of the things that I think that we have come to realize, though, here is that we as individuals can look at the same set of facts and sometimes arrive at different conclusions, and that, Mr. Speaker, is unfortunately where I am currently at, and I will share some personal stories myself.

I had a very close friend whom I worked with for years at the hospital who was given less than a year to live with pancreatic cancer. I know that she did try medical marijuana, and it unfortunately did not help her, but she still lived 8 more years.

And as many of you know I have consistently advocated for Lou Gehrig's disease, or ALS (amyotrophic lateral sclerosis), a disease that both of my parents had. And, Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you, seeing many of the patients and the diseases that are listed there, one of the problems that I have with the bill as currently drafted is the fact that we are picking winners and losers in terms of which disease or which patients get it and which do not. And I understand that there is a process in the future that goes forward that may expand those, you know, upon the recommendation of the clinic.

And I recently had a mother come in to advocate on behalf of the bill, and what she said to me was, you know, look, I understand this is only State law. There are still some Federal law issues. I would like to have the option of doing this for my children. And I understand that position, and perhaps if my own children were in a position, I, too, would advocate differently than I am now. Perhaps I would even move. I do not know what I would do. But I can tell you this: I do know that Lou Gehrig's disease in 5 to 7 percent of the cases is hereditary. At the time of my parents' diagnosis, genomes was not quite as advanced as it is today, and I do not know, at the time, if they tested negative for the gene. And I will be honest, I would rather just not know, because I am going to live my life the way that I want to live my life, and I accept that.

But thinking back to that mother's comments and having her eyes wide open in terms of what we are up against, I do have to highlight some concerns that have been brought up throughout the debate and the amendment process. I did vote for several of the other amendments that would have increased access to Epidiolex and some of the other medications, creating a closed health system amendment that was offered. And I certainly do not understand chemistry to the degree that the gentelady from Chester referenced earlier, but I can tell you this: I do know that the FDA has a process. I also agree with the gentleman from Lebanon County that it is painfully slow.

But when you look at the merits of what is before us, here is my concern. We are setting the path to bypass the FDA product approval process – whether the drugs are good or bad. We are saying we are willing to circumvent that process, the process that has been in place for over 100 years, because it is what is needed now, and maybe that is the best decision. Some people look at that and arrive at the answer to be yes. I simply do not.

And I referenced previously folks have said clinical trials are not advancing quickly enough, and I would probably agree. I think there are a lot of lifesaving drugs that are not advancing through the process quickly enough, but it does not mean that we should do this for every one.

And I referenced GW Pharmaceuticals, the company that just literally concluded their phase 3 trials and released results this week while we were debating the bill – a 39-percent reduction in seizure activity for those who took the drug, Epidiolex, as compared to 13 percent with the placebo group. It sounds like it worked to me, but they are going through the current process that is there.

And when I think to the mother's comments about having her eyes wide open as to what we are looking at going forward, here are some concerns that I do not believe have adequately been addressed.

And I think we all know how the vote is going to go. I have looked at the facts and arrived at my own decision to be a "no" vote. Many of you have looked at the facts and decided to be a "yes" vote, and that is fine. I think at the end of the day, we will all still respect each other, we will still work on other issues, but it is my hope that as the bill moves forward that we take into consideration some of these issues.

Banking. I know the gentleman from Philadelphia had an amendment, because even though there are memorandums of understanding by the Federal government, the reality is, there are still a multitude of Federal laws that are being enforced by a variety of Federal agencies. The LA Times and Forbes both did articles on banking and the difficulties related to the credit markets and the fact that the marijuana businesses typically have to deal in large amounts of cash.

You can look at the scope of practice issues, which is why, as we pointed out yesterday, that medical marijuana is recommended and not prescribed – that is similar to how Rhode Island's approach is – and the fact that pharmacists cannot handle this, which is why we have dispensaries. Most of this derives from the fact that it is a class I or Schedule I instead of a Schedule II substance, and the quickest route would be to reclassify it at the Federal level, but going back to the gentleman's point from Lebanon, they have not done that.

As recently as this year, the Federal government's Office of Personnel Management issued the following guidance to their Federal employees: "Federal workforce...remain unchanged..." at about "...4.1 million federal employees..." To this day, and as recently as May of 2015, the Federal government will still consider an illegal drug such as marijuana and possessing it and using it as a crime.

You can get into unemployment law issues, which we talked briefly about through the amendment process. Colorado, California, and Michigan have all litigated this to different conclusions. Some say you do qualify for benefits, some do not.

Property owners and landlords. The U.S. Attorneys have said that they have made it clear that property owners and landlords who rent or provide a location for medical marijuana dispensaries are subject to prosecution under 21 U.S.C., section 856.

Mr. Speaker, probably one of the most concerning unintended consequences I think is the impact that this could potentially have on patients who will unknowingly, potentially, commit Federal crimes now, because it is also illegal to own a firearm if you are under the influence or prescribed, or in this case recommended medical marijuana. I was surprised when I learned that, but when you look at the law, there have been multiple cases. Federal law prohibits anyone who uses marijuana, pursuant to the medical marijuana law or not, from possessing a firearm, which is a part of interstate commerce.

Further, gun dealers would be prohibited from selling a firearm to someone who they know uses medical marijuana, and that is actually a question for those of us who have gone through background checks when we purchased firearms, or when you apply for a concealed carry permit, that is a question. And my fear is our constituents, our friends, our neighbors will unknowingly answer that question incorrectly because they will think it is a medicine, and the Federal government has made it very clear that that continues to be an issue. The issuance of a concealed carry permit under Title 18, section 6109, subsection (vi), says, "An individual who is addicted to or is an unlawful user of marijuana or a stimulant..." and in this case, medical

marijuana, would be prohibited from applying for a permit or being granted a permit.

There are a lot of things that we should talk about. We can talk about the efficacy of the medicine. We can talk about the emotions of those who are afflicted by diseases that need changed.

My fear, Mr. Speaker, is that while this bill is well-intentioned, I cannot support it because of the conflicts with all of the existing Federal laws. It is time that the Federal government acts. I agree with the gentleman from Lebanon County. They need to reclassify this so that the studies can be done. And I realize that we have all arrived at different conclusions on this, but I think these are very real concerns that we need to take into serious consideration as we move forward. This will reach into our insurance laws, our unemployment laws, even landlord-tenant issues, and I do not believe that they have been adequately contemplated in the proposal before us. I will be a "no," but I hope that those issues are corrected.

And while I opened with this and I said this from the very beginning, I recognize that we can look at this issue, the facts and the patients, and arrive at different conclusions, and I hope that you can understand where I am coming from and why I cannot support this bill at this time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Brian Sims.

Mr. SIMS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I obviously rise in support of SB 3.

I have found myself very moved by the supporters in the room today, by the breadth of the support that we have seen from Philadelphia County to Allegheny County, to the very powerful words from my colleague from Armstrong County. And I suppose I am equally disturbed by a lot of what I am hearing from the opposition: made-up statistics about the deaths that medical marijuana has not caused, and co-opting tragedies and accidents that had nothing to do with medical marijuana to somehow justify not giving medicine to kids.

I want to make sure, as many of my colleagues have done before, that I recognize the families, many of whom are here today, that have been the driving force behind this issue. There is no question that their unwavering commitment, their dedication in the face of almost insurmountable odds in the face of our gridlock is certainly inspirational. I know that we, the supporters of this legislation, along with the 225,000 Pennsylvanians that will ultimately benefit from its passing, are extremely thankful.

I imagine you are sick and tired of our words, sick and tired of the back and forth; many of you are quite literally sick and tired, and you want us to pass this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, Republican or Democrat, progressive or conservative, I believe that every single member of the General Assembly is ultimately here because we strive to do one fundamental thing: to help our constituents and to help the people of Pennsylvania. And though our perspectives may differ on how to accomplish that mutual goal, we derive our motivations from this shared endeavor, no question.

There are people in our communities, there are people in this room right here, right now suffering from debilitating medical conditions. There are children with severe seizures. There are veterans scarred by war. There are those fighting HIV/AIDS (human immunodeficiency virus/acquired immunodeficiency syndrome), and those who suffer daily in perpetual pain. There are those battling cancer through round after round of

chemotherapy. We are not able to cure or even treat every illness, but we are able to provide an opportunity for roughly 225,000 Pennsylvanians to improve the quality of their life. As legislators, we cannot deny patients and their families a chance to alleviate some, just some of this immense suffering, a suffering that few of us can possibly understand, although many do. We cannot deny a family who has tried every option to treat its loved ones an attempt to find hope and solace in medical marijuana.

Mr. Speaker, during this time of political turmoil, we have achieved something unusual. We have achieved bipartisan support for legislation that will stem the tide of the opioid epidemic in our Commonwealth. We have come together to address every issue within our power to aid communities ravaged by opioid addiction and abuse. We took the much-needed step to expand the use of medication to save the lives of overdose victims. We have established a prescription drug monitoring database to investigate how these dangerous drugs are flooding our streets. And we have implemented a Good Samaritan policy that helped pave the way to more overdose victims getting the emergency medical service they need. As a legislature, Mr. Speaker, we have recognized this problem time and time again, and though we have adamantly disagreed on many issues, we have always worked together to address this particular crisis.

Today we have the opportunity to make a major bipartisan step in the fight against the opioid epidemic. In States that have accessible and effective medical cannabis programs, opioid-related overdoses have fallen by nearly 25 percent, as we have heard time and time again today. Let us not be mistaken, Mr. Speaker, we are not trailblazers when it comes to this program. Nearly half the States in our nation have implemented medical marijuana programs, and while opponents offer the parade of horrors that would come from passing this bill, frankly all of those of us in this room with common sense know that they are simply not true.

We have been fortunate enough to be able to look to other States for evidence, and there has been no dramatic rise in crime, no substantial diversion to the black market, or any serious adverse effects. If we look at the data, if we actually as a legislature look at the data available to us, we will see that since the first States passed medical marijuana nearly 20 years ago, we know that the fear and the opposition, however well-intentioned, have simply had no merit. There is no metric to measure the smile on a child's face when they can go a day without a seizure, a parent's joy when their child can laugh and play again, the pride a veteran feels when they can regain control of their life, or the hopeful relief of a patient in daily insufferable pain like many of the people in this room.

Despite our differences, despite our often opposing politics, this issue has gained such broad support in this body, and it is not because of the persuasive arguments. It is not because of the incredible statewide support or the recognition of a problem with a potential solution. The reason we are here today voting on this legislation is because there is not a member here that can look at those patients and those families and those children and not imagine what our lives and the lives of our loved ones would be like if they were similar. Few of us can imagine the frustration of being helpless when a person we love is suffering and, Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity to help. We have the opportunity to help.

It is for that reason and the fundamental shared reason which brought all of us to this chamber today that I will be voting "yes" on SB 3, and I strongly urge all of my colleagues to stop talking and to start acting and to support the people in the back of this room, because they have supported us and they deserve our support.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dush.

Mr. DUSH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am not going to raise the question that I had indicated earlier that I was going to raise. I already understand where most people are going to be on this, even with the question.

The reason I rise now is that in the rush to provide real relief, real relief to these people in the gallery – the people like my friend from Armstrong County; people like my friend, Joe, who passed away last year asking me to support the intent of this bill, and make no mistake about it, the intent to provide that relief to these people, I stand with them.

In law enforcement, there is a fundamental reality: once you pull the trigger, you cannot pull the bullet back into the gun. A legislative example of this is Act 9. Fifteen years ago they pulled the trigger on a 25-percent increase and now we are left trying to figure out how to solve a \$60 billion problem.

There is a good group of people behind this bill. They are people with real issues that this plant that God gave us has the ability, in some cases, to provide relief, people like my friend, Joe, whom I believe it probably could have helped. I stand with you people. I stand with those who are in support of this bill as far as the intent, but there is another group, a group with a lot of money and an alternative agenda that has been using these good people to force through legislation, the ends to which have none of the nobility of those people, those good people who have those serious problems. I stand in opposition of those who are using those good people.

An example of what I am talking about is how this bill will force employees of the Department of Health to make a decision about whether or not they are going to keep their job or violate a Federal law for a conspiracy to transport marijuana across State lines. Now, those employees are faced with a decision of, do I assist in doing something that could land me in jail for 5 years and cost me \$250,000, or if I am helping the second company as well and get charged with a second offense, look at an additional 10 years and \$500,000? Do I do that or do I refuse and possibly lose my job? That is the result of this rush. Honestly, I want it to be done and I want it to be done quickly, but I want it to be done right as well.

My good friend, Representative Mentzer, provided a good, in fact, an excellent alternative to this. It provides a means of getting this stuff out to make sure that it is properly controlled and to make sure that the medical studies are there as a part of this in order to help make the process more efficacious, to get results and a process in place to where we can actually go to the Federal government and make application, present results like my Representative friend from Chester County was talking about. We need serious study. We need serious results. If the Federal government is not going to do it, then let us legally, constitutionally do it in a way that we can present it back to the Federal government.

There is also another way we can get the Federal government moving. I have proposed a countermand amendment to the U.S. Constitution. We have got 26 States that have already

passed medical marijuana bills. We need 32. The way things are going, if we had enough States on board with the countermand amendment, we could do it constitutionally, force the Federal government to act, but that is the constitutional way of doing things. That is the part, that is the thing in law that connects the heart to the head. Unfortunately, with the way this law has been marketed and pushed, we have severed that connection and we are only reacting here to the heart. And we need to have that heart, we need to have that compassion for people who are hurting, but we have to, for the sake of the possible things, just this one thing about the Department of Health employees, is just one example. There have been numerous others explained here during the course of the day that have nothing to do with any false narrative.

I ask this body to please let us connect the heart to the head, let us get this done correctly, and even if we just have to – I am not going to make this recommendation – but if we want to refer it back and get it right, or hopefully the Senate will get it right on concurrence, but I beg you, please, connect the heart and the head.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Members, we have just two speakers left before Representative Petrarca, Representative Marsico, and Representative Reed will speak. At this time it will be Representative Baker, followed by Representative Cox, and then I will just see if anybody else wishes to speak prior to Representatives Petrarca, Marsico, and Reed.

Representative Baker, the floor is yours.

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

I rise to oppose SB 3. My position remains consistent with the medical and scientific experts that medicine should undergo extensive trials to ensure they are both safe and effective. SB 3 fails the medical approval process and puts both children and adults in substantial risk and harm.

We have had an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to address this issue and do it right. Unfortunately, this is not the right way to do it. I have said from the very beginning I would be in favor of a statewide expanded access program, FDA approved, for Epidiolex. We could put all 600 epileptic children with those special seizure disabilities into a program to see if this works. Epidiolex has great promise. It is probably going to get approved in 2017 for usage for these children long before this program, SB 3, is implemented. We could even add terminally ill people to investigational medication and try to help them in a more expeditious way, but, no; we have tried to put those amendments into this bill and it was rejected. It is regrettable. We could have helped people immediately.

Mr. Speaker, as the Health chairman, I have an obligation and a duty to read all the documents proffered before the Health Committee, and we have had numerous hearings on this issue. As the Health chairman, I think the combined professional opinions of the medical community should mean something. Their opinion should not be marginalized. Their opinion should not be minimalized. Their opinion should not be dismissive. My goodness, we are talking about medicine here and here we are bypassing the FDA approval process. We are legislating medicine when in fact it is not recognized as medicine, because under Federal law, it is illegal, and so it is going to create undue conflict and difficulties and problems going forward, given the inherent conflict with Federal law.

You know, I worked in a law firm for 12 1/2 years representing the disabled before Federal judges. I represented children, men, and women. I care very, very deeply about children, and I have seen a lot of different diseases and anomalies and impairments. I have done everything I can my whole life dealing with the medical community, the medical professionals, and trying to make a difference to improve health, health care, and health access, but, Mr. Speaker, this is not the right way to do it. We have an opportunity to do it right. We could be a national leader in doing this right, but SB 3 is not the way to do it.

When we ignore the opposition of the Medical Society, the American Medical Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics does not support this, the American Academy of Neurology – and my goodness, we are being totally dismissive and ignoring what the American Epilepsy Society has said. They have sent me two letters, one last year and one over this past weekend, and I would just like to quote from them. This is the American Epilepsy Society: "Despite the pressure of anecdotal evidence prevalent in the popular press and social media, for the past two years the American Epilepsy Society has been opposed to the expanded use of medical marijuana and its derivative, cannabidiol or CBD, in the treatment of children with severe epilepsy." They are opposed to SB 3. "At this time," they say, and I am quoting the American Epilepsy Society, "At this time there is no evidence from controlled trials that strongly supports the use of marijuana for treatment of epilepsy. Our position is informed by the lack of available research and supported by the position statements from the American Academy of Neurology, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and the American Medical Association."

My goodness, are we just going to ignore medicine? These folks go to medical school for a reason. These folks study science and medicine for a reason. Why are we being dismissive and ignoring their professional opinion? This is wrong, Mr. Speaker. The American Epilepsy Society has consistently advised States against acting on anecdotal evidence alone and has called for more research.

The American Medical Society in their letter supports the expanded access program for Epidiolex. They say that is the smart way to go, that is the best way to go. It is FDA supervised. Safety protocols are put into place. We are dealing with children's lives here. My goodness, all these medical associations live by a creed, a motto, "do no harm." They all believe that this is dangerous what we are doing. They believe that we need to do this right.

According to the Epilepsy Society, the Children's Hospital Colorado, who treats more epileptic children than any other hospital in the country, said that they "...found that artisanal 'high CBD' oils resulted in no significant reduction in seizures in the majority of patients and in those for whom the parents reported improvements, these improvements were not associated with improvement in electroencephalograms...the gold standard monitoring test for people with epilepsy." Additionally, and this is the do not harm part, Mr. Speaker, we want to help every one of these kids, but when they say to me 2 years in a row, 13 percent of the cases reviewed seizures worsened with marijuana, worsened with the use of cannabis, and in some patients there were significant adverse events. This is not me saying that, Mr. Speaker – and I am going to submit

this for the record so that this is part of the record – this is the American Epilepsy Society. They go on to say, "In sum, there simply is no clinical, controlled research to support the adoption of new CBD legislation for epilepsy such as your state" in Pennsylvania "is considering...vote no...." Their final few words on this document are "vote no on SB-3." I will be submitting that for the record.

I will also be submitting for the record, Mr. Speaker, the official Pennsylvania Medical Society's position in opposition to SB 3. I will be submitting the Save Our Society From Drugs document for the record, because I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to be submitting a groundbreaking Federal case here very, very shortly that has to do with the scheduling of one of these drugs from the foremost expert in the country, and perhaps the world, Dr. Madras.

The SPEAKER. Those will all be accepted into the record.

Mr. BAKER. Thank you.

And I also will be submitting for the record, Mr. Speaker, the official statement from the National Association of Drug Court Professionals, and I quote from the National Association of Drug Court Professionals, "marijuana" – this is not me, Mr. Speaker; this is the Drug Court Professionals – "...marijuana is the most commonly abused illegal drug among adults and youths in the United States...." They say – and I will be submitting the entire document – they oppose the legalization of marijuana. They oppose "...efforts to approve any medicine, including marijuana, outside of the FDA process...." I will be submitting that as well.

Also, I will be submitting the position statements regarding legalization of marijuana from the Pennsylvania Association of County Drug and Alcohol Administrators. They do not like this bill either. They support the position of the American Society of Addiction Medicine, the American Psychiatric Association, the American Medical Association, the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, and the American College of Physicians, who also oppose SB 3, as it is outside the approval process of the FDA.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot remember, and I may be wrong, but I cannot remember when the last time this august body voted on a bill that was in direct violation of Federal law. Marijuana is illegal pursuant to 21 U.S.C., §812(b)(1). The Federal "Controlled Substances Act...reserves drug scheduling processes to decisions made by the Attorney General, with advice from the DEA, FDA, and NIDA. A scheduling challenge is barred by 21 U.S.C. §877. That said, the evidence for marijuana to remain a Schedule I drug is rationally based to protect public health and safety."

And this is the criteria, and this is very, very important because this is going to lead into a recent Federal court case that upheld that marijuana needs to be a Schedule I drug: "Criteria for a Schedule I drug. The drug or substance has a high potential for abuse. The drug or substance has no currently accepted medical use in treatment in the United States," and "There is a lack of accepted safety for use of the drug or substance under medical supervision." Thus, marijuana is defined in Federal law as "an illicit drug" and illegal under the Controlled Substances Act.

Now, the Federal government acknowledges this as a Schedule I drug. The government recently took this position in a Federal court case last year. The Schedule I status of marijuana was upheld in Federal court in April of 2015 in *United States v. Pickard*. Mr. Speaker, the expert witness for the government

was Dr. Madras from Harvard Medical School, and I will be submitting the evidentiary hearing document of Dr. Madras about the dangerous, very dangerous effects of marijuana, and particularly THC. And this led to a court ruling last year upon challenge in Federal court in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California that marijuana should remain as a Schedule I drug because it "...has a high potential for abuse,...has no currently accepted medical use in treatment in the United States," and "There is a lack of accepted safety for use of the drug or substance...."

Now, the evidentiary hearing document of the *United States v. Brian Schweder* was on July 29, 2014, and I am going to be submitting that document in total, because the reason I am submitting these Federal court cases that just came down upholding marijuana as a Schedule I drug is because this likely will be challenged in court at some point, and it is very, very important that we get this on the record as a result. The final decision that came down last year upholding marijuana as having no medical use was decided in the United States District Court, the *United States v. Pickard*, and that is signed and dated April 17, 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to be submitting all these documents for the record, and I think we need to make sure, if we are going to do something, we need to do it right with respect to this issue. I think it is an unprecedented action. We are not doctors. We are not scientists. We are not medical experts, and we should not be dismissive of the experts that have proffered their expert testimony to this great body. My goodness, we have hearing after hearing, meeting after meeting in the Health Committee. We consider all of these experts when and if we need to when we are considering legislation. I find it astounding that we find ourselves now ignoring all of this.

The combined opinion of all the major medical associations oppose this, as it is outside the jurisdiction of the Federal government and the FDA approval process. We do not want to do harm. These doctors do not want to do harm. My goodness, most of these doctors in Pennsylvania are not going to give recommendations for marijuana and risk their medical licenses. There will be some that will give the recommendations, but the common misunderstanding that I hear back in my district, Mr. Speaker, is they were all under the opinion that you could go to a doctor, get a prescription, go to a pharmacy, and get your medication at the pharmacy. When I explained to them, no; that is not the way this is going to work. They can only give you a recommendation and then you have got to go to a dispensary, a pot shop, and then get your medicine – and by the way, it is still going to be illegal at the Federal level – they were astounded. Oh my goodness, very few people support it.

I was just at a drug recovery center in my district, grand opening of a drug addiction center in my district, and they told me the number one client that they see for treatment is alcohol, and secondly they treat people for marijuana abuse.

This court document and the expert testimony of Dr. Madras, she has done cutting-edge research on marijuana's effect on the brain, and she has said that marijuana actually primes the brain to crave heroin. Mr. Speaker, this is Dr. Madras, and I am going to be submitting this for the record. We need to be very, very careful, again, when we ignore the expressed will and professional opinions of the medical community.

We need to defeat SB 3. We need to protect children from harm's way. We need to listen to the American Epilepsy Society and not give children marijuana that is going to result in severe

adverse reactions and increase seizure activity, and in some cases, they had to be put into a coma to address those activities. The American Epilepsy Society said this.

Mr. Speaker, I have said enough. I am going to submit all of this for the record and ask for a "no" vote on SB 3.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Why I Oppose Legalizing Marijuana:

The debate over whether or not to legalize marijuana as medicine has been a very heated and lengthy one. The House Health and Judiciary Committees recently completed a combined series of hearings to further investigate this issue. The following reputable medical organizations and groups are opposed to the legalization of marijuana:

- Pennsylvania Medical Society
- American Medical Association
- American Academy of Family Physicians
- American College of Physicians
- American Psychiatric Association
- American Academy of Pediatrics
- American Academy of Neurology
- American Epilepsy Society
- National Multiple Sclerosis Society
- American Society of Addiction Medicine
- American Cancer Society
- American Glaucoma Foundation
- National Eye Institute
- American Academy of Ophthalmology
- American Lung Association
- American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry
- National Association of Drug Court Professionals
- National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke
- National Families in Action
- Drug Free Schools Coalition
- MOMSTELL
- Communities that Care Southeast Regional Educational Outreach Committee
- SAM (Smart Approaches to Marijuana) cofounders Patrick Kennedy and Kevin Sabet
- Parents Opposed to Pot
- Citizens Against Legalizing Marijuana (CALM)
- International Faith Based Coalition
- National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence
- Colorado Drug Investigators Association
- Save Our Society from Drugs (S.O.S.)
- Pennsylvania State Nurses Association opposes SB 3
- Pennsylvania Society of Anesthesiologists
- Pennsylvania Allergy and Asthma Association
- Pennsylvania Neurosurgical Society
- Robert H. Ivy Pennsylvania Plastic Surgery Society
- Pennsylvania Society for Pulmonary Disease
- Pennsylvania Rheumatology Society
- Pennsylvania Chapter of the American College of Cardiology
- Pennsylvania Occupational and Environmental Medical Society
- Pennsylvania Academy of Otolaryngology
- Pennsylvania Chapter of the American College of Physicians
- Pennsylvania Chapter American College of Emergency Physicians

- The Elks
- Pope Francis

These groups, by and large, encourage further testing and research of marijuana and do not support its legalization outside the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval process. After hearing all the hard evidence and heavily weighing the testimony from these reputable medical organizations and other groups, I continue to oppose the legalization of medical marijuana in the Commonwealth.

Marijuana is currently classified and defined by Federal law as a Schedule I drug under the Federal Controlled Substances Act, which defines marijuana as having a high potential for abuse, no currently accepted medical use in the United States, and lacking safety for use under medical supervision. The FDA considers marijuana an illegal drug, classified in the same category as heroin, LSD, crystal meth, ecstasy, and bath salts and; therefore, the FDA does not define marijuana as medicine but rather an illegal and harmful drug. The American Epilepsy Society stated in a letter to the Health Committee that it does not recommend legalization of artisanal cannabidiol (CBD) marijuana oils, "We urge you and your fellow committee members to delay adoption of new cannabis legislation and to continue to support and encourage new research." "A study by a team from Children's Hospital Colorado...found that artisanal 'high CBD' oils resulted in no significant reduction in seizures in the majority of patients," and that "not a single pediatric neurologist in Colorado recommends the use of artisanal cannabis preparations." The organization concluded that, "We urge you and your fellow committee members to delay adoption of new cannabis legislation and to continue to support and encourage new research." It is significant to note that the Children's Hospital Colorado have cared for the largest number of cases of children with epilepsy treated with cannabis in the U.S.

Even if legislation were to pass to legalize marijuana in Pennsylvania, it would still be illegal under Federal law pursuant to the Federal Controlled Substances Act.

Although most doctor and medical groups do not view marijuana as medicine, they do believe derivatives of marijuana can be potentially approved as medicine by the FDA, such as Marinol and Cesamet, which have been approved and are used to help cancer and HIV patients. Two other potential new medicines that are being developed, subject to FDA clinical trials, that are derivatives of cannabis, are Sativex and Epidiolex. Hopefully, the FDA will approve these drugs soon to treat cancer pain and epileptic seizures. If these medicines meet safety and efficacy tests, the FDA will approve them, doctors will be able to prescribe them, and pharmacies will be able to dispense them.

Marinol and Cesamet are medications that have been rigorously tested and approved by the FDA for the treatment of certain ailments. It is my fervent hope that the FDA conducts further testing on marijuana derivatives in various formulations and determines if this is, or is not, a chemical that can be used to treat certain illnesses beyond the limited compounds from marijuana that have currently been approved by the FDA.

However, I find no hard evidence at this time for legalizing marijuana in formulations other than those already approved by the FDA. In fact, my research and discussions with those in the medical community suggest there are very real and substantiated concerns as to the use of whole marijuana should it become legal. Growing marijuana, converting it to oils and other products and then selling it locally and statewide as "medical marijuana" I believe, per the documented testimony proffered to our joint Health and Judiciary Committees, will usher in many challenges and concerns, including:

- Product safety.
- Quality control.
- Packaging and labeling.
- Drug diversion, drug abuse, and drug addiction.
- Conflict with federal law.
- Increased crime.

- Dispensaries being located possibly too close to schools, day-care centers, churches, and parks.
- Lack of local control and zoning issues.
- Increased costs to human services, law enforcement, and drug treatment facilities.
- Increased drugged driving and vehicle accidents.
- Increased emergency room and hospital admissions.
- Increased efforts to bypass FDA approval process for other Schedule I illegal drugs or new drugs being developed.

The Pennsylvania Health Care Cost Containment Council revealed that in the last 3 years there were a total of 72,880 hospital admissions with a diagnosis of marijuana dependence and abuse. The National Association of Drug Court Professionals have stated that emergency room mentions for marijuana use now exceed those of heroin and are continuing to rise per The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality. According to the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy, marijuana is the most abused drug in the United States.

The approval of a drug that could be given to children and those dealing with any number of ailments is an awesome responsibility to place on lawmakers, and it is not one that can or should be made based solely on emotion or anecdotal information. That is why medical groups, such as those listed above, oppose legalization of marijuana outside the FDA approval process.

In the United States, all medications must undergo strict FDA approved clinical trials that include extensive randomized, peer-reviewed double-blind studies to prove they are safe, effective, and produce more benefits than risks. Interestingly, some medications already in use overseas and approved by European regulators are still required to pass muster with the FDA before they can be used here, a practice universally accepted by U.S. physicians and researchers.

There is a substantial amount of misleading information, causing many to believe that marijuana is harmless and is a panacea and miracle drug for a plethora of medical diseases, when the substantiated medical research that has been conducted up to this point simply does not support these claims. That is why the leading professional medical organizations do not support legalization of marijuana outside the FDA approval process.

As a lawmaker, it is not my place to do an end run around the FDA and legalize artisanal drugs that people can grow, make products from, and then sell for Commonwealth citizens to take, all without approval of the FDA, and outside what current medical practice allows. Central regulatory oversight by the FDA makes possible the recall of harmful drugs or contaminated batches and the dissemination of new information about drug safety. Medicines should undergo strict FDA clinical trials and an approval process to ensure they are safe and effective, prescribed by a doctor, and dispensed by a pharmacist. The good people of Pennsylvania deserve medicine that is proven to be safe and effective for both children and adults and is supported by the medical community and approved by the FDA and is not illegal under Federal law.

As chairman of the House Health Committee, I believe that I have consistently shown that I care deeply about the health and well-being of the people of this great State. I want only the best medicine that is proven to be safe and effective for our children and my heart breaks for both children and adults that have to endure serious medical conditions. I used to work in a law firm as a Disability Advocate representing the disabled before Federal administrative judges for over 12 years and I have seen much suffering, but I am also grateful for the good and great medicine that has been proven to be both safe and effective and approved by the FDA to have more benefits than harm. Medicine should be left to the medical and scientific experts and not politicians.

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mr. BAKER submitted documents for the Legislative Journal.

(For documents, see Appendix.)

The SPEAKER. Representative Cox.

Mr. COX. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It was about a year and a half ago that I was first introduced to this issue, and I am not going to tell you the whole story of my entire journey there, but I want to highlight a few things. But before I do that, I do want to say thank you to a few people that have been integral to this process, and they may or may not have been mentioned. I was not here for every second of every previous remark, but I want to thank Sarah Speed of the Democratic Caucus, and then Whitney Krosse, Tom Dymek, and Karen Dalton in the House Republican Caucus. They have done a great job in putting all this together, working on the amendments, literally over 200 amendments, and I would love for us to just give a round of applause to them.

About a year and a half ago I got a phone call from a young lady by the name of Dana Ulrich. She called me and told me the story of her child, Lorelei, and I listened intently, as I do with constituents when they call the office, and I forget how long I spoke with her, but she did not press me that day to make a decision. She did not press me to say yes or no on the issue, but she asked me to take a look at some research she was going to send me. She asked me to have an open mind. That was the beginning of my journey, because she sent me information and I took the time to read it, I took the time to do some additional research, and that was the beginning of the process where I realized that we cannot keep the status quo in Pennsylvania.

A number of months beyond that and I met Lolly. Lolly told me a similar story of her daughter, Anna. Not too long after that I met Luke and then Eric. Luke is a veteran who has shrapnel next to his spine. He has trouble sitting down. He has to either lie down or stand up most of the time to deal with the pain that he has from the shrapnel in his back. Eric suffers from tremendous PTSD, and getting marijuana illegally for a decorated military vet, getting marijuana illegally right now has been the only thing that has helped. He has shelves and shelves of medications given to him by doctors, the VA (Veterans' Administration), etc., but they knock him out. He cannot remember what happened over the course of 6 and 8 hours at a time when he takes those medications.

But one of the questions that Dana asked me in that first phone call was, she made the statement that, you know, you may not know me and you may not know my daughter and I get that, but she said, "Think of your own family. Surely someone in your own family has suffered." And it did not take me long, because I have a daughter, who is now 17, who had open-heart surgery at 4 months. She has had an additional six or more surgeries. I have lost track of the exact number. I thought of my wife who has had multiple C-sections (cesarean sections). We have got five children, three of those were C-sections. She cannot take pain medications because they make her deathly ill. Imagine having your stomach sliced open from a C-section and

then feeling like you have to throw up. And I think of my mother-in-law who had open-heart surgery last February. Each of these three individuals means a lot to me, and that is right in my own family.

But that conversation was the beginning of my journey, and since then I have done hours and hours of research. I have read through thousands of pages of documentation in print and on the Internet, and I sat through the same 3 days of testimony that Chairman Baker sat through. I walked away from those 3 days of testimony with a vastly different opinion than was just shared a few moments ago. I came away with the opinion, and I feel that it is backed by plenty of research, that doctors are in the best position to make the call on what their patients should be receiving, and doctor after doctor that I have spoken with and numerous doctors who testified refused to shut the door on medical marijuana as a medication. They refuse to slam the door shut. Most of them in fact said, "We would love the FDA to do something." Doctors are in a unique position. They cannot go head to head against the Federal government without losing their ability to prescribe medications, and that is something that is very valuable in their profession. Doctors refuse to give up hope that we have some future with this for their patients.

Hundreds of individuals have made their way through the Capitol over the last several months. In many cases they have made their way through the Capitol and into the hearts of the legislators that they have spoken with, and that is obvious by a lot of the discussion we have had on this bill this week.

I am going to ask you the same question that Dana asked me 18 months ago, and that is, if you do not care about the individual sitting out in the rotunda or the individuals walking through the hallways at different points over the last couple of years, think of someone in your own family. I think of a conversation I had with a fellow legislator – I am looking at him right now – and it was an eye-opening conversation for me. He said, "You know what? I think of the story of my own son and how he did not have another option." The doctor said, "I don't know if it's going to work, but let's give it a shot." He and his wife agreed to it, and his child is still with them today because of that.

That is the journey that I hope all of us would be willing to take. If not now, do not let this be the end of the discovery on this issue. Continue to dig into this. Let us make this a law and then let us continue to make it better. There are better ways to do it. No legislation ever passes the House and Senate perfectly, but do not take away the hope that the people in the gallery and the people in the rotunda have for an option that they have not yet had. Some have moved out of the State, some visit other States at their own risk. Let us not take away that hope.

It was Anne Frank, a young lady from the Holocaust era, who stated, "Where there's hope, there's life. It fills us with fresh courage and makes us strong again." Today we have the opportunity of offering hope to the parents of these children, to the patients, offering them the hope of letting them, along with their doctors, decide how to best treat the conditions they are dealing with on a daily basis. Let us pass SB 3 to give hope. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Petrarca.

Mr. PETRARCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am very eager to get to the vote on final passage, so I will be brief.

As I said earlier, I have been honored to be a part of the task force that worked diligently and very hard to put together this legislation, and I want to thank the members for their attention and the work that was done in the last few days as we went through a tremendous amount of amendments, and also thank the staff for their help and support as we did this.

We heard a number of things here today. I think some of them could be classified as whoppers, quite frankly, but I do not really want to focus on refuting a number of the things that we have heard here today. Instead, I want to focus on where we are heading and the positive things that this legislation will do.

The goal of SB 3 has been and is simple. It is to help Pennsylvanians, to help our residents, which obviously include veterans and children and those of our most vulnerable of Pennsylvania residents. This legislation is going to create a strictly controlled, a strictly controlled program in Pennsylvania. It is not in violation of Federal law, and it will create a serious research component as has been asked for by many.

What it will also do is it will, as has been said, allow us to help our most vulnerable residents. Opioids are killing us. They are killing a number of people every day across Pennsylvania and certainly across this country. This legislation is one step, and it is an effective way for us to break this cycle.

We have heard that many groups are in opposition to medical marijuana. There are a number of groups that support medical marijuana, and those that we were told were opposed to medical marijuana are asking for additional research.

In support of medical marijuana are the American Academy of HIV Medicine, the American Anthropological Association, the American Nurses Association, the Pennsylvania Nurses Association, the American Public Health Association, the Arthritis Research Campaign, Lymphoma Foundation, the National Association for Public Health Policy, the Natural Nurses Society on Addictions, and the list goes on.

We have also heard in Pennsylvania that 90 percent of Pennsylvania residents are in favor of medical marijuana, and there was a 2013 study published in the New England Journal of Medicine that stated that 76 percent of physicians nationwide support the use of medical marijuana.

I want to thank those who worked, again, so hard on this legislation – the advocates, the families, certainly the parents, and especially the mothers. Without you I do not think we could have gotten this done. I thank you.

I also want to thank from my district the Briggs family: Diana, Michael, Hailey, and especially their son, Ryan Briggs, who opened my eyes and brought me much-needed information about medical marijuana and how it can help Pennsylvanians.

I think it is time to stop making our most vulnerable Pennsylvanians criminals as they wait for treatment that they so desperately need.

Let us get on with the vote very shortly. I ask for your support, and thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Marsico.

Mr. MARSICO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. We spent a lot of hours debating this issue. I just wanted to take the opportunity to thank the bipartisan, bipartisan medical marijuana working group. Mr. Speaker, I want to take the liberty to mention the names, if that is okay?

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. You may proceed.

Mr. MARSICO. Members, colleagues, on that working group, first I want to thank Chairman Benninghoff for leading the group. I want to thank Chairman Petrarca for his leadership, Chairman Petrarca. Also I want to mention then the colleagues on the working group: Representative Jesse Topper, Representative Jim Cox, Representative Ed Gainey, Representative Sheryl Delozier, Representative Mary Jo Daley, Representative Mike Regan, Representative Pete Schweyer, Representative Aaron Kaufer, Representative Dom Costa, and Representative Brian Ellis. Thank you very much to our colleagues for all their time and work they put into this amendment, to these recommendations. I also want to thank Leader Reed and his staff, and also Leader Dermody and his staff for the help in putting this legislation together.

We have worked hard and long on coming to develop a number of recommendations that led to this amendment amending SB 3 to become part of the therapeutic arsenal of physicians to become available to those who need it most.

As I said before, this legislation as amended allows for change in growth of medical marijuana programs as we learn more about medical marijuana. Mr. Speaker, it is time to provide medicine for those patients across this Commonwealth that are suffering. There are many that desperately need this help. This bill will help change countless, countless lives.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the members of the Judiciary and Health Committees for your involvement in the hearing process, which we had across the Commonwealth. I think we had three hearings.

So, Mr. Speaker, once again, I support SB 3 as amended, and I ask for a "yes" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dermody, do you wish to speak?

Representative Reed.

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

It has been a long week discussing this topic. It has been a long couple years coming to today's vote.

I want to first thank all the members and all the staff on both sides of this issue who have done a tremendous job conducting themselves in a professional, forthright manner and having an honest, intellectual discussion on a major public policy issue of our time.

I also want to say that regardless of how you feel about this issue, I believe each and every member of this body is genuine in their belief. I do not think anybody wants to hurt children. I do not think anyone wants to lead our Commonwealth and our citizens down the wrong path. Whether you are for or against this particular proposal, I think you truly believe it is the right decision you are making today. I do not judge that. I respect that. We need more of that in this legislature.

For me, this issue has been a journey of a number of years. I spent most of my life opposed to the legalization of medical marijuana, not just since I became a legislator but before. That changed about a decade ago when in my office I hired as my secretary Pam Albert. Pam and her husband, Scott, have gone through more in their life than any couple and any family should ever have to go through. To lose their son, Noah, at a young age and to see their son, Braden, suffer seizure after seizure after seizure, day after day after day, as a husband and as a parent, I can only imagine what it takes to get up in the morning and to go to bed at night.

For the first couple years Pam worked with me, when this really was not a hot topic of debate in Harrisburg or across the country, we would talk from time to time about the issue and about the beginning of research on the topic and how it could aid children with seizures. And then week after week I would come to Harrisburg, and I would come in Sunday evening or Monday morning and there would be articles with new research, new exploration, and new thoughts on the issue on my desk. I freely admitted at the beginning I kind of shoved them to the side and went about the business of the day, but for some reason, one day I started reading them. And as the articles kept coming and the research and the opinions kept appearing on my desk, I kept reading them more and more and more. As time progressed and as I researched the topic on my own and I explored what has been done in other States and the struggles of other families, other grandparents, other parents, other brothers and sisters, and other children, I came to the realization of, who am I to hold back something that could be of benefit to so many?

So today, like I said, I believe we are all going to make whatever vote we make for the right reasons for our beliefs, but for me, when I make this vote, I make it because I look at Pam and I look at Scott and I remember watching them bury their son. I see every day the struggles Pam goes through with Braden, and I think to myself, if we can ease that burden just a bit, I want to be a part of doing so, and then I also think to myself, what if that was me and my son, what would I want others to do?

So I will be voting for SB 3 to move this bill over to the Senate and hopefully see it become law over the next week. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—149

Acosta	Ellis	Kim	Quinn
Adolph	Evankovich	Kinsey	Rader
Barbin	Evans	Kirkland	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Everett	Klunk	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Fabrizio	Kortz	Reed
Bizzarro	Farina	Kotik	Reese
Boback	Farry	Krueger	Regan
Bradford	Flynn	Longiatti	Roae
Briggs	Frankel	Maher	Roebuck
Brown, R.	Freeman	Mahoney	Rothman
Brown, V.	Gabler	Markosek	Rozzi
Bullock	Gainey	Marshall	Sainato
Burns	Galloway	Marsico	Samuelson
Caltagirone	Gergely	Masser	Sankey
Carroll	Gibbons	Matzie	Santarsiero
Causer	Gillen	McCarter	Santora
Christiana	Gillespie	McClinton	Schemel
Cohen	Gingrich	Miccarelli	Schlossberg
Conklin	Goodman	Millard	Schreiber
Costa, D.	Hahn	Miller, D.	Schweyer
Costa, P.	Hanna	Moul	Sims
Cox	Harhai	Mullery	Snyder
Culver	Harkins	Murt	Sonney
Daley, M.	Harper	Mustio	Stephens
Daley, P.	Harris, A.	Neilson	Tallman

Davidson	Harris, J.	Nesbit	Taylor
Davis	Helm	Neuman	Thomas
Dawkins	Hennessey	O'Brien	Tobash
Dean	Hill	O'Neill	Toepel
Deasy	Irvin	Oberlander	Toohil
DeLissio	Jozwiak	Ortitay	Vereb
Delozier	Kampf	Parker, D.	Vitali
DeLuca	Kaufer	Pashinski	Warner
Dermody	Kauffman	Payne	Watson
Diamond	Kavulich	Petrarca	Wheatley
Donatucci	Keller, F.	Pyle	White
Driscoll	Killion	Quigley	Youngblood
Dunbar			

NAYS—43

Baker	Harhart	McGinnis	Simmons
Bloom	Heffley	Mentzer	Staats
Corbin	Hickernell	Metcalfe	Topper
Cutler	James	Metzgar	Truitt
Day	Keller, M.K.	Miller, B.	Ward
Dush	Knowles	Milne	Wentling
Emrick	Lawrence	Petri	Wheeland
English	Lewis	Pickett	Zimmerman
Fee	Mackenzie	Rapp	
Godshall	Major	Ross	Turzai,
Greiner	Maloney	Saccone	Speaker
Grove			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Boyle	DiGirolamo	McNeill	Saylor
Cruz	Keller, W.	Peifer	Sturla

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

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR C

BILL ON CONCURRENCE
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 1801, PN 2968**, entitled:

A Supplement to the act of December 29, 2015 (P.L. , No.10A), 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 and the Justice Reinvestment 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, 2014," further providing for additions to appropriations and replacement of appropriations from the General Fund for the expenses of the Executive Department, the General Assembly and Government Support Agencies of the Commonwealth 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; providing for replacement of appropriations from the Tobacco Settlement Fund to the Executive Department; further providing for additions to appropriations from the Pennsylvania Racehorse Development Restricted Receipt Account to the Executive Department; and providing for required lapsing of money in the General Fund.

On the question,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

The SPEAKER. It is moved by the gentleman, Representative Irvin, that the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate.

The Chair recognizes the Appropriations chair, Representative Bill Adolph, for a brief description of the Senate amendments.

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

Mr. Speaker, HB 1801, as amended by the Senate, is a comprehensive 2015-2016 supplemental appropriations bill. The appropriations in this bill will supplement the appropriations that were enacted in December when the Governor signed, and partially vetoed, HB 1460, which became Act 10A. HB 1801, as amended by the Senate, restores 2015 funding to various appropriations that were line-item vetoed by the Governor. This includes funding for basic education, the Department of Education, Department of Corrections, Medicaid funding, and the Department of Human Services, and funding in many other departments and line items.

The total 2015-16 General Fund spending amount with the changes in HB 1801, when also including the nonpreferred appropriations bill for our higher education institutions, is \$30.031 billion. This is an \$878.6 million increase, or 3-percent increase, over 2014-15. The bill also includes an appropriation for the Tobacco Settlement Fund, for long-term-care services, and an appropriation for the Race Horse Development Fund for the ag-related programs.

Mr. Speaker, that is a summary of the Senate changes.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Does anybody wish to speak on HB 1801?

Chairman Markosek, you will please proceed.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, once again the majority party has gone off on its own and created a budget plan without working with the Democrats or the Governor. The budget proposed before us today does not represent any sort of compromise. This budget plan takes a bad budget, which was HB 1460 as it was sent to the Governor, and makes it even worse. This budget plan is

\$232 million less than HB 1460, which was unacceptable and out of balance and why the Governor blue-lined it.

While you will hear the majority boast about how this plan provides an additional \$50 million for basic education, you should know that the funding for basic education, special education, early intervention, and early childhood education remains \$227 million short of the bipartisan agreement. And under this plan, classroom funding to school districts would be less than the 2008-2009 budget year, the year before Federal stimulus. This plan fails to provide school districts with their full Social Security payments. It shorts them by \$87 million and it places PlanCon (Planning and Construction Workbook) funding at risk. This plan also fails to restore funding for county human services – programs such as mental health, intellectual disabilities, drug and alcohol treatment, homeless assistance, and county child welfare. This plan fails to fully fund the waiting list initiative for 300 adults with intellectual disabilities. This plan fails to fund initiatives to address the heroin epidemic, which we heard a lot about during the budget hearings. In fact, it reduces by 30 percent increased funding for this exact purpose in the Department of Drug and Alcohol Programs.

This budget continues to rely on the same old gimmicks and one-time funding sources. Plus, it includes over \$300 million in new, unrealistic cuts and lapses: \$200 million in unrealistic lapses, money agencies will not be able to afford to lapse under the proposed spending levels; \$93 million in unrealistic cuts to mandated medical assistance payments – mandated medical assistance payments. It underfunds the State correctional institutions by \$17 million. Therefore, this budget is out of balance by at least \$290 million. By their own admission, the financial statement, their statement, shows a significant deficit in 2016-2017 – the budget that is due in just 3 short months from now. We have to start fixing the problem, not making it worse.

Earlier this month, Standard & Poor's warned us that they would downgrade Pennsylvania's credit rating by the end of March if we fail to address the structural budget imbalance. This plan flies in the face of the recent S&P warning and jeopardizes the Commonwealth's fiscal health.

Let us not forget that this plan requires access to the capital markets to borrow money for PlanCon. This budget is irresponsible and not based in reality. The reality is, the Commonwealth faces chronic, significant structural budget deficits to the tune of about \$2 billion. We have come to the end of the road. We have come to the end of the road with one-time gimmicks and fixes. The credit rating agencies have warned us they are not going to stand for it any longer. We need to address the budget imbalance head-on, raise revenues, cut spending, or some combination of both. Without new revenues, this budget is bleak and requires deep, deep cuts. Schools and human services would bear the brunt of the cuts because there is no place else to find those magnitude of cuts.

I think we all assumed there would be a quick resolution and closure to the 2015-2016 budget once we returned to session in January, but here we are, March 16, with another budget that is on the fast track to nowhere. There is plenty of blame to go around, but we need to get back on track. We, House Democrats, are willing to do that, to do what it takes to bring closure to this budget. We were extremely close to passing a bipartisan spending plan in December. It represented a compromise. It represented a compromise. As you may recall, the Governor's original budget request was \$31.6 billion. The

Republican proposal sent to him in June, which was HB 1192, was \$30.2 billion. The bipartisan compromise, SB 1073, was roughly in the middle of those two plans at \$30.8 billion. That was a compromise. The Republican proposal sent to the Governor in December was \$30.3 billion, which reflected little movement from the Republicans June proposals.

Today Republicans propose a \$30 billion budget – even lower, even lower than those first two proposals, and even way lower than what the actual compromise was. So when you try to compromise, it is hard to do that when the other side just keeps coming in lower and lower instead of trying to meet somewhere in the middle. This budget proposal represents a setback rather than a compromise, even compared to previous Republican proposals. This budget does not even provide funding to reimburse school districts and human service providers for their borrowing costs incurred during the budget impasse.

Stop with the political games. Stop wasting precious time. Let us get back on track. Our school districts and human service providers need us to pass a comprehensive and realistic budget now. They do not have time for these games.

I ask all members to vote "no," and let us get back to negotiating a real budget for Pennsylvania that the people, our constituents back home, deserve.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Chairman Adolph, on the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of HB 1801, and I do that because it is March 16. Let me repeat that again. It is March 16. I know I have waited since June to reach a compromise budget. We have been unable to come to terms. I hear about compromise budgets; however, there were other issues involved, and that was all part of the compromise, and as each issue failed to materialize, so did the \$30.8 billion spending number, but more importantly, the revenue necessary to pay for it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on March 16, you have in front of you a budget that has record spending for basic education, a \$200 million increase over '14-'15, exactly 50 percent of what Governor Wolf's proposal was asking for. I do believe that is going halfway. But make no mistake, by passing this budget, we can continue to work together and learn by the mistakes that have been made by everyone since June to get the budget for '16-'17 done on time.

Let me tell you what we are not funding as a result of this impasse: funding for cancer screening; Epilepsy Foundation; ALS; rural hospitals, they are closing; schools will be closing in the next 30 days. I do not believe this is what you want. This budget keeps those schools open because it provides the funding necessary to keep them open.

We heard for 3 weeks during the hearings, when the Secretary of Agriculture came before us, and we heard the threat of 1100 people being laid off at Penn State as a result of the ag lines being vetoed. This provides full funding for them. We get these agencies what they need.

If we do not do this today, we are going to be faced with big-time problems here in Pennsylvania. And when you consider what is in this, the necessary funding, I really believe that is what the people of Pennsylvania want us to do: complete the job and get to work on next year's budget. Why go back and try to tax the people of Pennsylvania retroactively? That is what it would take in order to do another budget, retroactive taxation back to January 1, 2016. I am sure, I am sure we do not have the

votes for that type of increase in taxation, retroactively back to January, in this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, members of this House showed an awful lot of courage earlier on today when they put partisan politics away and voted for five nonpreferred appropriation bills to get much-needed money to Penn State University, Temple University, University of Pitt, Lincoln University, and the University of Penn Vet School. You had the courage then. This is the vehicle that gets that vote completed. You have to vote for this in order to get that completed.

The basic education funding formula that we are using in this helps over 400 school districts compared to the other distribution formula. Your school districts need the money. This is an increase of over \$200 million without a tax increase on your taxpayers. That is a pretty good sell for March 16, because after today, we are just going to prolong and prolong this impasse.

Let us stay together, let us vote this budget, let us keep our hospitals, let us keep our schools, let us fund higher education, and let us be proud of our vote today.

Thank you so much. I urge a "yes" vote for HB 1801. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I believe everybody here thinks and knows we need to pass a budget. We know it is March. It is time we get something done, but it is time we get something done that actually helps the people of Pennsylvania. We need a budget, but we do not need this one. Mr. Speaker, this budget is worse than HB 1460. This budget has millions of dollars of cuts. There is no new money for education. This budget takes money from PHEAA, takes money from our students in higher education, and you say you are supplementing that and you are giving it to K-12. Well, that is, once again, you are borrowing from Peter to pay Paul. We cannot keep telling Pennsylvanians fibs.

We need a responsible budget, a responsible budget that funds education adequately, funds all the budgetary needs of the people of Pennsylvania adequately. This budget does not save our schools. It puts them in even more jeopardy. We have talked about taking the money from PHEAA, from our college kids, and putting it in K-12. It does not help the long-term deficit; it makes it worse. Your own financial statement has the deficit at \$1.6 billion. It adds to the deficit. We should not be passing a budget that adds to that deficit. It is reckless. It is irresponsible.

For human services it would mean cuts to funding for rural access hospitals, medical assistance, resources for domestic violence shelters, rape crisis centers, investments in child care support, and services for working men and women. We will have to cut funding that goes to counties, which means deeper cuts to substance abuse treatment, mental-health services, homeless assistance, intellectual disabilities, and assistance to drug and alcohol programs.

We need to have some courage. We need to have the courage to stand up for the people who need us the most. We need to have the courage to make sure we stand up for the people of Pennsylvania, for the kids of Pennsylvania. Look, let us get together, let us sit down and finish this. Let us finish '15-'16 and '16-'17 in a responsible manner. The Governor tried to reach out and offer a plan where we would do some funding for a month or two for public schools, that we take care of those ag line items where we avoid layoffs with the agriculture extensions and the Department of Agriculture. We can avoid those types of

problems while we sit down and negotiate this budget. We want to finish this. We are willing to work with anybody to finish this. This does not finish it. This makes the problems worse.

Democrats were not included in crafting, we were not included in crafting this. This is not a compromise. This is dictating what the heck we are going to do, and it is a bad, bad plan. I do not want to be standing up here saying to vote "no," but it is the right thing to do. We have to vote "no." This budget does not work, but I want to work with the other side. We want to work with the other side for the next few weeks and put the budget together for '15-'16 and '16-'17, one that we can all be proud of finally.

Mr. Speaker, we need to vote "no" on this, and we need move forward on '15-'16 and '16-'17 to get this job done. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Dermody.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Representative ROEBUCK has requested to be placed on leave of absence for the remainder of the day. Without objection, that will be granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 1801 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Representative Reed.

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

I know it has been a long week and we have dealt with a lot of issues this week, but I do not think any issue is more important than the vote that we are about to take. And let me be clear about the process we have gone through as we have developed this proposal for consideration today. We have had conversations with the House Democratic leadership, the Senate Democratic leadership, the Senate Republican leadership, and the staff of the administration throughout the last 2 weeks as part of this process to try to close out the '15-'16 budget.

The fact of the matter is, we are at a point in the fiscal year where even for folks who would like to spend more money, even for the Governor who is willing to increase taxes to spend additional dollars, we have to come to the simple realization that none of that revenue can be implemented in time to spend as part of the '15-'16 budget. We are sitting here on March 16. It takes several months – whether it be additional taxes, gaming expansion, liquor privatization – to realize those revenues. They are not going to be able to be part of a spending plan to send dollars out to school districts, to agricultural programs, to human service programs as part of the '15-'16 budget. The only possibility to do just that would be if the members of this chamber embraced the Governor's retroactive income tax. And I know I have talked to the members on the Republican side of the aisle and a lot of members on the Democratic side of the aisle, and even folks who work in and out of the administration who have said a retroactive income tax is just not going to happen.

So here we are today with an opportunity to close out this budget. It is not an opportunity for one side to win and one side to lose, because nobody wins when we pass this budget today, but it is an opportunity to come to that realization that all sides have put priorities to the side in order to close out this budget. We have taken pension reform and liquor privatization and put them to the side for the time being. Folks have put additional

taxes, additional revenues to the side for the time being. Folks have put property tax reform to the side for the time being. Those are all priorities shared by all or some members of this body, the Senate, and the administration in one form or another. Those are all issues we need to have productive conversations about. We understand closing out '15-'16 does not necessarily solve every problem for '16-'17. Tough choices still await us, but we can discuss those choices, we can negotiate those choices, we can find conclusion on those items without schools closing.

Today is the opportunity to do that. We close out this budget with a \$200 million increase of basic education, a record spending amount for special education, early childhood education, and a 5-percent increase for higher education. We do so without tax increases on working families, and most importantly, we get to work immediately. I offered to the Governor today that we would go up to the Governor's Office when we leave this floor if he could close out '15-'16. Let us start negotiating '16-'17. Let us get it done early. The first step to doing that is to close out this budget and keep our public schools open, keep our universities running, and move on to the great discussion of '16-'17.

I urge the members to concur on this legislation, I urge the Governor to sign this legislation, and let us begin the discussion on finishing next year's budget with this budget finally done.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—128

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

Gibbons	Mahoney	Readshaw	
Gillen	Major	Reed	Turzai,
Gillespie	Maloney	Reese	Speaker
Gingrich	Marshall		

NAYS—63

Acosta	Dean	Goodman	Neilson
Barbin	Deasy	Hanna	O'Brien
Bradford	DeLissio	Harhai	Pashinski
Briggs	DeLuca	Harkins	Ravenstahl
Brown, V.	Dermody	Harris, J.	Rozzi
Bullock	Donatucci	Kavulich	Samuelson
Caltagirone	Driscoll	Kim	Santarsiero
Carroll	Evans	Kinsey	Schlossberg
Cohen	Fabrizio	Kirkland	Schreiber
Conklin	Farina	Krueger	Schweyer
Costa, D.	Flynn	Longietti	Sims
Costa, P.	Frankel	Markosek	Thomas
Daley, M.	Freeman	Matzie	Vitali
Davidson	Gainey	McCartner	Wheatley
Davis	Galloway	McClinton	Youngblood
Dawkins	Gergely	Miller, D.	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Boyle	Keller, W.	Peifer	Saylor
Cruz	McNeill	Roebuck	Sturla
DiGirolamo			

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

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS
AS FURTHER AMENDED BY THE SENATE
TO HOUSE AMENDMENTS**

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments as further amended by the Senate to House amendments to **HB 1327, PN 2969**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in financially distressed municipalities, providing for financial recovery; in oil and gas wells, providing for the Environmental Stewardship Fund; in tax credits, providing for Department of Community and Economic Development; in special funds, further providing for funding, for State Workers' Insurance Board, for expiration and for other grants; in additional special funds, further providing for use of the Tobacco Settlement Fund and for distributions from the Pennsylvania Race Horse Development Fund and providing for miscellaneous limitations and transfers and for the Natural Gas Infrastructure Development Fund; in general budget implementation, further providing for the Department of Community and Economic Development, for the Department of Environmental Protection and for the Department of General Services, providing for the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board, further providing for the Department of Human Services, for the Pennsylvania State Police and for the Environmental Quality Board and providing for the Commonwealth Financing Authority; providing for school district debt refinancing bonds; providing for 2015-2016 budget implementation; making a related repeal; and making editorial changes.

On the question,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments as further amended by the Senate to House amendments?

The SPEAKER. Moved by the gentleman, Representative Peifer, that the House concur in the amendments by the Senate.

The Chair recognizes Chairman Adolph for a brief description of those Senate amendments.

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

HB 1327, as it was most recently amended by the Senate Rules and Executive Nominations Committee, provides the language necessary to implement the Commonwealth's annual budget for the fiscal year 2015-2016. The bill passed the House on January 12, 2016. At that time the bill was written to match only the appropriations as enacted in Act 10A. After the Governor's vetoes of HB 1460, now that we have HB 1801 to provide supplemental appropriations, this bill is written to match those new appropriation levels.

The Senate inserted technical changes, updates to reflect either the passage of time since the House last amended the bill in January, updates to reflect the final appropriation amounts as prescribed in HB 1801. The notable changes to the bill are as follows: updating the formula for the transfers for the Race Horse Development Fund for money that is used for agriculture programs. The clean power plan deadlines have been altered to reflect the current stay of the Federal regulation put in place by the United States Supreme Court. And lastly, there are updates to the PlanCon bonding article for new dates and the deadlines and to provide clarity for the duties of the Office of the Attorney General on the review of this bond issue.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek, on HB 1327.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And good evening, Mr. Speaker.

This is the Fiscal Code bill, as was mentioned, and here is the long and short of it. The Fiscal Code is the operating manual for the general appropriations budget, and you have heard me tell this story before. If you have an appliance, you have an operating manual that goes with it. If you have a refrigerator, you have an operating manual that goes with that. If you have a washing machine, you have an operating manual that goes with that. If the appliance does not work, the operating manual is not going to do you any good either. You have to take that appliance back. Well, that is what we have here. We have a budget that does not work. So we now have an operating manual that is meaningless. It is operating a budget that does not work. The budget needs taken back. The operating manual needs taken back.

I would ask all the members to please vote "no." Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Chairman Adolph, on the Fiscal Code. No.

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments as further amended by the Senate to House amendments?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—120

Adolph	Godshall	Marsico	Regan
Baker	Greiner	Mentzer	Roae
Barrar	Grove	Metcalfe	Ross
Benninghoff	Hahn	Metzgar	Rothman

Bizzarro	Harhart	Miccarelli	Saccone
Bloom	Harper	Millard	Sainato
Brown, R.	Harris, A.	Miller, B.	Sankey
Burns	Heffley	Milne	Santora
Causar	Helm	Moul	Schemel
Christiana	Hennessey	Mullery	Simmons
Corbin	Hickernell	Murt	Snyder
Cox	Hill	Mustio	Sonney
Culver	Irvin	Nesbit	Staats
Cutler	James	Neuman	Stephens
Daley, P.	Jozwiak	O'Neill	Tallman
Day	Kampf	Oberlander	Taylor
DeLozier	Kauffman	Ortitay	Tobash
Diamond	Keller, F.	Parker, D.	Toepel
Dunbar	Keller, M.K.	Payne	Toohil
Dush	Killion	Petrarca	Topper
Ellis	Klunk	Petri	Ward
Emrick	Kortz	Pickett	Warner
English	Kotik	Pyle	Watson
Evankovich	Lawrence	Quigley	Wentling
Everett	Lewis	Quinn	Wheeland
Farry	Mackenzie	Rader	White
Fee	Maher	Rapp	Zimmerman
Gabler	Mahoney	Readshaw	
Gibbons	Major	Reed	Turzai,
Gillespie	Maloney	Reese	Speaker
Gingrich	Marshall		

NAYS—71

Acosta	Deasy	Harhai	Neilson
Barbin	DeLissio	Harkins	O'Brien
Boback	DeLuca	Harris, J.	Pashinski
Bradford	Dermody	Kaufer	Ravenstahl
Briggs	Donatucci	Kavulich	Rozzi
Brown, V.	Driscoll	Kim	Samuelson
Bullock	Evans	Kinsey	Santarsiero
Caltagirone	Fabrizio	Kirkland	Schlossberg
Carroll	Farina	Knowles	Schreiber
Cohen	Flynn	Krueger	Schweyer
Conklin	Frankel	Longietti	Sims
Costa, D.	Freeman	Markosek	Thomas
Costa, P.	Gainey	Masser	Truitt
Daley, M.	Galloway	Matzie	Vereb
Davidson	Gergely	McCarter	Vitali
Davis	Gillen	McClinton	Wheatley
Dawkins	Goodman	McGinnis	Youngblood
Dean	Hanna	Miller, D.	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Boyle	Keller, W.	Peifer	Saylor
Cruz	McNeill	Roebuck	Surla
DiGirolamo			

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments as further amended by the Senate to House amendments were concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

BILLS SIGNED BY SPEAKER

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

HB 1327, PN 2969

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in financially distressed municipalities, providing for financial recovery; in oil and gas wells, providing for the Environmental Stewardship Fund; in tax credits, providing for Department of Community and Economic Development; in special funds, further providing for funding, for State Workers' Insurance Board, for expiration and for other grants; in additional special funds, further providing for use of the Tobacco Settlement Fund and for distributions from the Pennsylvania Race Horse Development Fund and providing for miscellaneous limitations and transfers and for the Natural Gas Infrastructure Development Fund; in general budget implementation, further providing for the Department of Community and Economic Development, for the Department of Environmental Protection and for the Department of General Services, providing for the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board, further providing for the Department of Human Services, for the Pennsylvania State Police and for the Environmental Quality Board and providing for the Commonwealth Financing Authority; providing for school district debt refinancing bonds; providing for 2015-2016 budget implementation; making a related repeal; and making editorial changes.

HB 1801, PN 2968

A Supplement to the act of December 29, 2015 (P.L. , No.10A), 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 and the Justice Reinvestment 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, 2014," further providing for additions to appropriations and replacement of appropriations from the General Fund for the expenses of the Executive Department, the General Assembly and Government Support Agencies of the Commonwealth 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; providing for replacement of appropriations from the Tobacco Settlement Fund to the Executive Department; further providing for additions to appropriations from the Pennsylvania Racehorse Development Restricted Receipt Account to the Executive Department; and providing for required lapsing of money in the General Fund.

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

The SPEAKER. Chairman Thomas, please state your purpose in rising.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to offer some comments in reference to HB 1327, but I think you know I was just ignored and overlooked. I hope it does not turn into a pattern.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Thomas.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. Representative Mackenzie is recognized on unanimous consent.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I did just want to correct the record from earlier today. It was HB 914. I was mistakenly recorded as a "yes." I wanted to be recorded as "no" on that vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mr. FARRY 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 Elijah S. Brown, who has 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 of merit honoring Elijah S. Brown.

Whereas, Elijah S. Brown earned the Eagle Award in Scouting. This is the highest award that Boy Scouts can bestow and as such represents great sacrifice and tremendous effort on the part of this young man. Elijah is a member of Troop 29.

Now therefore, Mr. Speaker and the members of the House of Representatives, it is my privilege to congratulate and place in the Legislative Journal the name of Elijah S. Brown.

* * *

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 George Reese, who has 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 of merit honoring George Reese.

Whereas, George Reese earned the Eagle Award in Scouting. This is the highest award that Boy Scouts can bestow and as such represents great sacrifice and tremendous effort on the part of this young man. George is a member of Troop 102.

Now therefore, Mr. Speaker and the members of the House of Representatives, it is my privilege to congratulate and place in the Legislative Journal the name of George Reese.

* * *

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 Tyler Reichardt, who has 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 of merit honoring Jacob Tyler Reichardt.

Whereas, Jacob Tyler Reichardt earned the Eagle Award in Scouting. This is the highest award that Boy Scouts can bestow and as such represents great sacrifice and tremendous effort on the part of this young man. Jacob is a member of Troop 82.

Now therefore, Mr. Speaker and the members of the House of Representatives, it is my privilege to congratulate and place in the Legislative Journal the name of Jacob Tyler Reichardt.

BILLS RECOMMENDED

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

HB 1703;
SB 385; and
SB 644.

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

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

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

HB 1561;
HB 1766; and
SB 61.

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

CALENDAR CONTINUED

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 811**, **PN 870**, entitled:

An Act providing for the capital budget for the fiscal year 2015-2016.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that SB 811 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that SB 811 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Members, tomorrow will be a nonvoting session day. Tomorrow will be a nonvoting session day.

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 Keith Greiner moves that the House be adjourned until Thursday, March 17, 2016, at 11 a.m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the motion?
Motion was agreed to, and at 7:01 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.