

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 2017

SESSION OF 2017

201ST OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 29

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

**THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI)
PRESIDING**

PRAYER

HON. SID MICHAELS KAVULICH, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let us bow our heads:

In the Gospel of Matthew, chapter 5:13-16, Jesus says to his disciples, "You are the salt of the earth," and "You are the light of the world," but if you lose your taste or hide your light, you are no longer good for anything.

Strive to keep your taste. It is what makes you the person you are and the reason that the people who trust you sent you here. You are the seasoning that makes their lives better, the reason they come back to feed on the decisions you make for them.

Let your light shine brightly. It is your light that shows the way for the people of your district, the people of this great Commonwealth, as they depend on you as the beacon of truth, the light that will lead them to a positive existence.

And finally, let the Father of all that is good, the Father of all creation guide you in your decisions this day. Pray that He will send the Holy Spirit down upon each and every one of us so that when we make those choices, whatever they may be, they will be first for His glory and honor, and also for the good of His holy people.

We ask You, Father, to bless this great chamber, to bless the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and to bless this great United States of America. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Tuesday, June 6, 2017, will be postponed until printed.

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

HB 366, PN 951

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act making appropriations from the Professional Licensure Augmentation Account and from restricted revenue accounts within the General Fund to the Department of State for use by the Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs in support of the professional licensure boards assigned thereto.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 367, PN 952

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act making appropriations from the Workmen's Compensation Administration Fund to the Department of Labor and Industry and the Department of Community and Economic Development to provide for the expenses of administering the Workers' Compensation Act, The Pennsylvania Occupational Disease Act and the Office of Small Business Advocate for the fiscal year July 1, 2017, to June 30, 2018, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2017.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 368, PN 953

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act making an appropriation from a restricted revenue account within the General Fund to the Office of Small Business Advocate in the Department of Community and Economic Development.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 369, PN 954

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act making an appropriation from a restricted revenue account within the General Fund to the Office of Consumer Advocate in the Office of Attorney General.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 370, PN 955

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act making an appropriation from the Public School Employees' Retirement Fund to provide for expenses of the Public School Employees' Retirement Board for the fiscal year July 1, 2017, to June 30, 2018, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2017.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 371, PN 956

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act making an appropriation from the State Employees' Retirement Fund to provide for expenses of the State Employees' Retirement Board for the fiscal year July 1, 2017, to June 30, 2018, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2017.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 372, PN 957

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act making appropriations from the Philadelphia Taxicab and Limousine Regulatory Fund and the Philadelphia Taxicab Medallion Fund to the Philadelphia Parking Authority for fiscal year July 1, 2017, to June 30, 2018.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 373, PN 958

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act making appropriations from a restricted revenue account within the General Fund and from Federal augmentation funds to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission for the fiscal year July 1, 2017, to June 30, 2018.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 374, PN 959

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act making appropriations from the restricted revenue accounts within the State Gaming Fund and from the State Gaming Fund to the Attorney General, the Department of Revenue, the Pennsylvania State Police and the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2017, to June 30, 2018, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2017.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 383, PN 386

By Rep. MARSICO

An Act amending Title 20 (Decedents, Estates and Fiduciaries) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in ownership of property and legal title and equitable estate, further providing for right to dispose of a decedent's remains.

JUDICIARY.

HB 442, PN 1929 (Amended)

By Rep. MUSTIO

An Act providing for plumbing contractors licensure; establishing the State Board of Plumbing Contractors and providing for its powers and duties; conferring powers and imposing duties on the Department of Labor and Industry; establishing fees, fines and civil penalties; establishing the Plumbing Contractors Licensure Account; and making an appropriation.

PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE.

HB 863, PN 1930 (Amended)

By Rep. MUSTIO

An Act amending the act of February 19, 1980 (P.L.15, No.9), known as the Real Estate Licensing and Registration Act, in definitions, further providing for definitions; in qualifications and applications for licenses and registration certificates, further providing for qualifications for license; in duties of licensees, further providing for comparative market analysis disclosure and providing for broker price opinion; in Real Estate Recovery Fund, further providing for establishment of the fund; and making related repeals.

PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE.

HB 866, PN 972

By Rep. O'NEILL

An Act amending the act of December 31, 1965 (P.L.1257, No.511), known as The Local Tax Enabling Act, in local taxes, further providing for definitions, for payroll tax, for payment of tax to other political subdivisions or states as credit or deduction and withholding tax, for limitation on assessment and for tax limitations; in consolidated collection of local income taxes, further providing for definitions, for declaration and payment of income taxes, for tax collection committees, for powers and duties of Department of Community and Economic Development, for powers and duties of tax officer and for withholding and remittance; and, in collection of delinquent taxes, further providing for penalties and for costs of collection of delinquent per capita, occupation, occupational privilege, emergency and municipal services, local services and income taxes.

FINANCE.

HB 871, PN 991

By Rep. O'NEILL

A Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in taxation and finance, further providing for exemptions and special provisions.

FINANCE.

HB 1106, PN 1931 (Amended)

By Rep. MUSTIO

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 1420, PN 1784

By Rep. O'NEILL

An Act amending the act of December 19, 1990 (P.L.1200, No.202), known as the Solicitation of Funds for Charitable Purposes Act, further providing for registration of charitable organizations, financial reports, fees and failure to file.

FINANCE.

HB 1421, PN 1785

By Rep. O'NEILL

An Act amending the act of December 19, 1990 (P.L.1200, No.202), known as the Solicitation of Funds for Charitable Purposes Act, further providing for registration of charitable organizations, financial reports, fees and failure to file, for registration of professional fundraising counsel and contracts and for registration of professional solicitors, contract and disclosure requirements, bonds, records and books.

FINANCE.

HB 1451, PN 1851

By Rep. MARSICO

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts, further providing for senior judge operational support grants.

JUDICIARY.

**BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE,
CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED**

SB 8, PN 719

By Rep. MARSICO

An Act amending Titles 4 (Amusements), 18 (Crimes and Offenses), 30 (Fish), 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) and 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, extensively revising forfeiture provisions as follows: in administration and enforcement relating to gaming, further providing for prohibited acts and penalties; in inchoate crimes, further providing for the offense of manufacture, distribution, use or possession of devices for theft of telecommunications services; in assault, further providing for the offense of terrorism; in loss of property rights relating to sexual offenses, further providing for general rule and repealing provisions relating to process and seizure, to custody of property and to disposal of property; in forgery and fraudulent practices, further providing for the offenses of copying and recording devices and for trademark counterfeiting; in riot, disorderly conduct and related offenses, further providing for the offense of gambling devices, gambling, etc.; in wiretapping and electronic surveillance, further providing for seizure and forfeiture of electronic, mechanical or other devices; in minors, further providing for sentencing and penalties for trafficking drugs to minors; in nuisances, further providing for the offense of scattering rubbish; in other offenses, further providing for drug trafficking sentencing and penalties; in vehicle chop shop and illegally obtained and altered property, further providing for loss of property rights to Commonwealth and repealing provisions relating to procedure with respect to seized property subject to liens and rights of lienholders; in enforcement relating to Fish and Boat Code, further providing for forfeiture of fish and devices; in actions, proceedings and other matters generally relating to Judicial Code, providing for forfeiture of assets; in forfeitures, repealing provisions relating to controlled substances forfeiture, to terrorism forfeiture and to procedure with respect to seized property subject to liens and rights of lienholders; in size, weight and load relating to Vehicle Code, further providing for transporting foodstuffs in vehicles used to transport waste; in liquid fuels and fuel use tax enforcement, further providing for forfeitures and process and procedures and for disposition of fines and forfeitures; providing for conduct of forfeiture; and making repeals of provisions of the Liquor Code and another act relating to certain forfeiture of property.

JUDICIARY.

SB 560, PN 922 (Amended)

By Rep. MARSICO

An Act amending Titles 18 (Crimes and Offenses) and 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in wiretapping and electronic surveillance, further providing for definitions, for exceptions to prohibition of interception and disclosure of communications, for exceptions to prohibitions in possession, sale, distribution, manufacture or advertisement of electronic, mechanical or other devices and for expiration of chapter; and providing for recordings by law enforcement officers.

JUDICIARY.

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HB 119, PN 1927

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.177, No.175), known as The Administrative Code of 1929, providing for certified drug and alcohol recovery houses and establishing the Certified Drug and Alcohol Recovery House Fund Account.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1287, PN 1562

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act authorizing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission and

the Governor, to grant and convey to the Warrior Run-Fort Freeland Heritage Society certain lands situate in Delaware Township, Northumberland County.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1288, PN 1578

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in registration of vehicles, further providing for person with disability plate and placard.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1388, PN 1749

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of May 17, 1921 (P.L.682, No.284), known as The Insurance Company Law of 1921, in comprehensive health care for uninsured children, further providing for expiration.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1411, PN 1776

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act designating a portion of State Route 18 in West Fallowfield Township, Crawford County as the Staff Sergeant James Douglas Mowris Memorial Highway.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1431, PN 1842

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act designating a portion of State Routes 54, 901 and 2023 in Northumberland County and Schuylkill County as the Honorable Robert E. Belfanti, Jr., Memorial Highway.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**HOUSE BILLS
INTRODUCED AND REFERRED**

No. 1510 By Representatives CAUSER, BAKER, BENNINGHOFF, BIZZARRO, CALTAGIRONE, COX, DiGIROLAMO, DUSH, ENGLISH, FREEMAN, GILLEN, HAHN, A. HARRIS, HELM, HICKERNELL, JAMES, KINSEY, LONGIETTI, MILLARD, MILNE, MURT, MUSTIO, PASHINSKI, PICKETT, RAPP, RYAN, SANKEY, SONNEY, WARD, WENTLING and WHEELAND

An Act designating a bridge on that portion of Avenue A over the Allegheny River, Coudersport Borough, Potter County, as the Commander Philip F. "Jet" Palmatier, Jr., Memorial Bridge.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, June 7, 2017.

No. 1511 By Representatives M. QUINN, CORR, BARBIN, DOWLING, W. KELLER, MILLARD, PASHINSKI, SCHLOSSBERG and WARREN

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, in hotel occupancy tax, further providing for definitions and for imposition of tax and establishing the Tourism Promotion Fund.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, June 7, 2017.

No. 1512 By Representatives MICCARELLI, BULLOCK, BOBACK, DRISCOLL, MENTZER, BARRAR, ZIMMERMAN, WHEELAND, DeLUCA, FARRY and GILLEN

An Act amending the act of June 27, 2006 (1st Sp.Sess., P.L.1873, No.1), known as the Taxpayer Relief Act, in State funds formula, further providing for certification and calculation of minimum and maximum modifiers and for the Property Tax Relief Reserve Fund, providing for senior citizen tax relief and further providing for State property tax reduction allocation.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, June 7, 2017.

No. 1513 By Representatives MARSHALL and HELM

An Act amending Titles 24 (Education) and 71 (State Government) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in retirement for school employees, providing for supplemental annuity commencing 2017; and, in retirement for State employees and officers, providing for supplemental annuity commencing 2017.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, June 7, 2017.

No. 1514 By Representatives RAPP, WATSON, SAYLOR, HELM, CAUSER, PICKETT, KINSEY, JAMES, DRISCOLL, ROZZI, PASHINSKI, CALTAGIRONE, MILLARD, A. HARRIS, DEASY, WHEELAND and BENNINGHOFF

An Act providing for the Early Childhood Vision Care Education Program and for powers and duties of the Department of Health.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, June 7, 2017.

No. 1515 By Representatives DUSH and W. KELLER

An Act amending the act of May 1, 1933 (P.L.103, No.69), known as The Second Class Township Code, in auditors and accountants, further providing for auditor's compensation.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, June 7, 2017.

No. 1516 By Representatives DUSH, BAKER, BIZZARRO, BURNS, CALTAGIRONE, CAUSER, COX, DAVIS, DiGIROLAMO, DONATUCCI, ENGLISH, FREEMAN, GROVE, HAHN, HENNESSEY, JOZWIAK, KINSEY, LONGIETTI, MARSICO, MILLARD, NEILSON, O'NEILL, PICKETT, READSHAW, REED, RYAN, SANKEY and TALLMAN

An Act designating a bridge to be constructed on that portion of State Route 119 over the Pine Run Creek, Rayne Township, Indiana County, as the PFC Frank Enzer Weiss United States Marine Corps Bridge.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, June 7, 2017.

SENATE BILLS FOR CONCURRENCE

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

SB 434, PN 473

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, June 7, 2017.

SB 589, PN 887

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, June 7, 2017.

SB 624, PN 697

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, June 7, 2017.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Are there any leaves of absence requested for today?

Representative Chris RABB requests to be placed on leave of absence. Without objection, that will be granted.

MASTER ROLL CALL

The SPEAKER. Members, please proceed to vote on the master roll. We will now take the vote on the master roll. Members will proceed to vote.

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—198

Baker	Ellis	Klunk	Ravenstahl
Barbin	Emrick	Knowles	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Kortz	Reed
Benninghoff	Evankovich	Krueger	Reese
Bernstine	Evans	Kulik	Roae
Bizzarro	Everett	Lewis	Roe
Bloom	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roebuck
Boback	Farry	Mackenzie	Rothman
Boyle	Fee	Madden	Rozzi
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Maher	Ryan
Briggs	Flynn	Mako	Saccone
Brown, R.	Frankel	Maloney	Sainato
Brown, V.	Freeman	Markosek	Samuelson
Bullock	Fritz	Marshall	Sankey
Burns	Gabler	Marsico	Santora
Caltagirone	Gainey	Masser	Saylor
Carroll	Galloway	Matzie	Schemel
Causer	Gergely	McCarter	Schlossberg
Cephas	Gillen	McClinton	Schweyer
Charlton	Gillespie	McGinnis	Simmons
Christiana	Godshall	McNeill	Sims
Comitta	Goodman	Mehaffie	Snyder
Conklin	Greiner	Mentzer	Solomon
Cook	Grove	Metcalfe	Sonney
Corbin	Haggerty	Metzgar	Staats
Corr	Hahn	Miccarelli	Stephens
Costa, D.	Hanna	Millard	Sturla
Costa, P.	Harkins	Miller, B.	Tallman
Cox	Harper	Miller, D.	Taylor
Cruz	Harris, A.	Moul	Thomas
Culver	Harris, J.	Mullery	Tobash
Cutler	Heffley	Mustio	Toepel
Daley	Helm	Neilson	Toohil
Davidson	Hennessey	Nelson	Topper
Davis	Hickernell	Nesbit	Vazquez

Dawkins	Hill	Neuman	Vitali
Day	Irvin	O'Brien	Walsh
Dean	James	O'Neill	Ward
Deasy	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Warner
DeLissio	Kampf	Ortitay	Warren
Delozier	Kaufner	Pashinski	Watson
DeLuca	Kauffman	Peifer	Wentling
Dermody	Kavulich	Petrarca	Wheatley
Diamond	Keefer	Petri	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Keller, F.	Pickett	White
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Youngblood
Dowling	Keller, W.	Quinn, C.	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Kim	Quinn, M.	
Dunbar	Kinsey	Rader	Turzai,
Dush	Kirkland	Rapp	Speaker

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Lawrence	Murt	Quigley	Rabb
Milne			

LEAVES ADDED—8

Brown, V.	Gergely	McGinnis	Rothman
Evankovich	Haggerty	O'Neill	Thomas

LEAVES CANCELED—4

Brown, V.	Evankovich	O'Neill	Rabb
-----------	------------	---------	------

The SPEAKER. There are 198 members voting on the master roll. We have a quorum.

UNCONTESTED CALENDAR

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. RYAN called up **HR 223, PN 1301**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing November 10, 2017, as "Marine Corps Day" in Pennsylvania in honor of the United States Marine Corps' birthday.

* * *

Mrs. KULIK called up **HR 311, PN 1639**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of June 2017, as "Myasthenia Gravis Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. EVERETT called up **HR 329, PN 1708**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the week of June 4 through 10, 2017, as "Chesapeake Bay Awareness Week" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mrs. BULLOCK called up **HR 365, PN 1862**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of June 2017 as "Healthy Living and Healthy Eating Month" in Pennsylvania and encouraging all residents to eat healthily and exercise.

* * *

Mr. CRUZ called up **HR 372, PN 1899**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of June 2017 as "Cytomegalovirus Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. FABRIZIO called up **HR 373, PN 1900**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of June 2017 as "Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolutions?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—198

Baker	Ellis	Klunk	Ravenstahl
Barbin	Emrick	Knowles	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Kortz	Reed
Benninghoff	Evankovich	Krueger	Reese
Bernstine	Evans	Kulik	Roae
Bizzarro	Everett	Lewis	Roe
Bloom	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roebuck
Boback	Farry	Mackenzie	Rothman
Boyle	Fee	Madden	Rozzi
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Maher	Ryan
Briggs	Flynn	Mako	Saccone
Brown, R.	Frankel	Maloney	Sainato
Brown, V.	Freeman	Markosek	Samuelson
Bullock	Fritz	Marshall	Sankey
Burns	Gabler	Marsico	Santora
Caltagirone	Gainey	Masser	Saylor
Carroll	Galloway	Matzie	Schemel
Causer	Gergely	McCarter	Schlossberg
Cephas	Gillen	McClinton	Schweyer
Charlton	Gillespie	McGinnis	Simmons
Christiana	Godshall	McNeill	Sims
Comitta	Goodman	Mehaffie	Snyder
Conklin	Greiner	Mentzer	Solomon
Cook	Grove	Metcalfe	Sonney
Corbin	Haggerty	Metzgar	Staats
Corr	Hahn	Miccarelli	Stephens
Costa, D.	Hanna	Millard	Sturla
Costa, P.	Harkins	Miller, B.	Tallman
Cox	Harper	Miller, D.	Taylor
Cruz	Harris, A.	Moul	Thomas
Culver	Harris, J.	Mullery	Tobash
Cutler	Heffley	Mustio	Toepel
Daley	Helm	Neilson	Toohil
Davidson	Hennessey	Nelson	Topper
Davis	Hickernell	Nesbit	Vazquez
Dawkins	Hill	Neuman	Vitali
Day	Irvin	O'Brien	Walsh
Dean	James	O'Neill	Ward
Deasy	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Warner
DeLissio	Kampf	Ortitay	Warren
Delozier	Kaufner	Pashinski	Watson
DeLuca	Kauffman	Peifer	Wentling
Dermody	Kavulich	Petrarca	Wheatley
Diamond	Keefer	Petri	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Keller, F.	Pickett	White
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Youngblood
Dowling	Keller, W.	Quinn, C.	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Kim	Quinn, M.	
Dunbar	Kinsey	Rader	Turzai,
Dush	Kirkland	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Lawrence Murt Quigley Rabb
Milne

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

* * *

Mr. REED called up **HR 367, PN 1863**, entitled:

A Resolution designating June 12, 2017, as "Behavior Analyst Appreciation Day" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION RECOMMITTED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HR 367 be recommitted to Rules.

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

CALENDAR

RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Ms. TOOHL called up **HR 370, PN 1888**, entitled:

A Resolution honoring the lives and memory of those killed and injured during the bombing at the Ariana Grande concert at Manchester Arena in Manchester, England.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Tarah Toohil.

Members, please take your seats. Members, please take your seats.

Ms. TOOHL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to ask our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their unanimous support of HR 370, which honors the lives and memory of those killed and injured during the bombing last month at the Ariana Grande concert at Manchester Arena in England. We also extend our condolences to their families and express our gratitude to all the emergency workers, first responders, and volunteers for their lifesaving efforts in the aftermath of this horrific act of terrorism.

What had been planned to be a fun night of music turned tragic in the blink of an eye. As concertgoers were leaving the arena, a bomb went off killing 22 people, injuring more than

100 others, and leaving families frantically searching for their loved ones.

The cruelty of this attack, which targeted an audience made up mainly of young teenage girls, was shocking even by contemporary standards of terrorism. ISIS (Islamic State of Iraq and Syria) later claimed responsibility. Manchester sent a strong message of defiance to the terrorist group on Sunday when Ms. Grande, right afterwards with other singers, performed for a crowd of 50,000 people to benefit the victims of the suicide bombing. The One Love Manchester concert took place less than 24 hours after the terror attack in London that left 7 people dead; well, at that time it was 7, but it turned to 22.

Mr. Speaker, we stand in support of our friends in Great Britain who refuse to let the terrorists win by choosing not to live in fear.

Once again, I thank my House colleagues for their support of this resolution, and we ask for your affirmative vote honoring the lives lost in the concert bombing and sending our sincerest condolences to the families.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Toohil.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—198

Baker	Ellis	Klunk	Ravenstahl
Barbin	Emrick	Knowles	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Kortz	Reed
Benninghoff	Evankovich	Krueger	Reese
Bernstine	Evans	Kulik	Roae
Bizzarro	Everett	Lewis	Roe
Bloom	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roebuck
Boback	Farry	Mackenzie	Rothman
Boyle	Fee	Madden	Rozzi
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Maher	Ryan
Briggs	Flynn	Mako	Saccone
Brown, R.	Frankel	Maloney	Sainato
Brown, V.	Freeman	Markosek	Samuelson
Bullock	Fritz	Marshall	Sankey
Burns	Gabler	Marsico	Santora
Caltagirone	Gainey	Masser	Saylor
Carroll	Galloway	Matzie	Schemel
Causar	Gergely	McCarter	Schlossberg
Cephas	Gillen	McClinton	Schweyer
Charlton	Gillespie	McGinnis	Simmons
Christiana	Godshall	McNeill	Sims
Comitta	Goodman	Mehaffie	Snyder
Conklin	Greiner	Mentzer	Solomon
Cook	Grove	Metcalfe	Sonney
Corbin	Haggerty	Metzgar	Staats
Corr	Hahn	Miccarelli	Stephens
Costa, D.	Hanna	Millard	Sturla
Costa, P.	Harkins	Miller, B.	Tallman
Cox	Harper	Miller, D.	Taylor
Cruz	Harris, A.	Moul	Thomas
Culver	Harris, J.	Mullery	Tobash
Cutler	Heffley	Mustio	Toepel
Daley	Helm	Neilson	Toohil
Davidson	Hennessey	Nelson	Topper
Davis	Hickernell	Nesbit	Vazquez
Dawkins	Hill	Neuman	Vitali
Day	Irvin	O'Brien	Walsh
Dean	James	O'Neill	Ward
Deasy	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Warner
DeLissio	Kampf	Ortitay	Warren

DeLozier	Kaufer	Pashinski	Watson
DeLuca	Kauffman	Peifer	Wentling
Dermody	Kavulich	Petrarca	Wheatley
Diamond	Keefer	Petri	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Keller, F.	Pickett	White
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Youngblood
Dowling	Keller, W.	Quinn, C.	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Kim	Quinn, M.	
Dunbar	Kinsey	Rader	Turzai,
Dush	Kirkland	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-5

Lawrence	Murt	Quigley	Rabb
Milne			

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

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. Representative Nesbit is recognized.
Mr. NESBIT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to correct the record. On HB 119, amendment 1542, my vote was not recorded, and it should have been recorded in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir, that will be reflected in the record.

RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. KAUFER called up **HR 376, PN 1912**, entitled:

A Resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Reunification of the City of Jerusalem.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-198

Baker	Ellis	Klunk	Ravenstahl
Barbin	Emrick	Knowles	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Kortz	Reed
Benninghoff	Evankovich	Krueger	Reese
Bernstine	Evans	Kulik	Roae
Bizzarro	Everett	Lewis	Roe
Bloom	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roebuck
Boback	Farry	Mackenzie	Rothman
Boyle	Fee	Madden	Rozzi
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Maher	Ryan
Briggs	Flynn	Mako	Saccone
Brown, R.	Frankel	Maloney	Sainato
Brown, V.	Freeman	Markosek	Samuelson
Bullock	Fritz	Marshall	Sankey
Burns	Gabler	Marsico	Santora
Caltagirone	Gainey	Masser	Saylor
Carroll	Galloway	Matzie	Schemel
Causar	Gergely	McCarter	Schlossberg
Cephas	Gillen	McClinton	Schweyer
Charlton	Gillespie	McGinnis	Simmons

Christiana	Godshall	McNeill	Sims
Comitta	Goodman	Mehaffie	Snyder
Conklin	Greiner	Mentzer	Solomon
Cook	Grove	Metcalfe	Sonney
Corbin	Haggerty	Metzgar	Staats
Corr	Hahn	Miccarelli	Stephens
Costa, D.	Hanna	Millard	Sturla
Costa, P.	Harkins	Miller, B.	Tallman
Cox	Harper	Miller, D.	Taylor
Cruz	Harris, A.	Moul	Thomas
Culver	Harris, J.	Mullery	Tobash
Cutler	Heffley	Mustio	Toepel
Daley	Helm	Neilson	Toohil
Davidson	Hennessey	Nelson	Topper
Davis	Hickernell	Nesbit	Vazquez
Dawkins	Hill	Neuman	Vitali
Day	Irvin	O'Brien	Walsh
Dean	James	O'Neill	Ward
Deasy	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Warner
DeLissio	Kampf	Ortitay	Warren
DeLozier	Kaufer	Pashinski	Watson
DeLuca	Kauffman	Peifer	Wentling
Dermody	Kavulich	Petrarca	Wheatley
Diamond	Keefer	Petri	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Keller, F.	Pickett	White
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Youngblood
Dowling	Keller, W.	Quinn, C.	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Kim	Quinn, M.	
Dunbar	Kinsey	Rader	Turzai,
Dush	Kirkland	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-5

Lawrence	Murt	Quigley	Rabb
Milne			

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

STATEMENT BY MR. RYAN

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to recognize Representative Frank Ryan, who is going to speak on HR 223, which was already voted upon unanimously.

Representative Frank Ryan.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, if I could ask all the former Marines to come up to the podium.

This is a resolution honoring the United States Marine Corps, but if I could ask you the reason why we would be doing this today rather than on November 10, which will be an appropriate day as well, is that this was a period of time of the 99th anniversary of the Battle of Belleau Wood, and that was a battle in which Gen. John Pershing made the comment that "The deadliest weapon in the world is a Marine and his rifle." It is where the term "Devil Dog" came about. It is where the term the Germans recognized after six sustained attacks that they were able to overcome.

But as you look at what has happened in this process, the Marine Corps in that one 30-day window had a period of time in which we sustained more casualties to that day—

The SPEAKER. Members, please take your seats.
Mr. RYAN. —we had sustained—

The SPEAKER. I apologize, sir. Just give me a moment. Thank you.

Members, if you will please take your seats.

Mr. RYAN. The Marine Corps sustained more casualties in that one 26-day window than in the history of the Marine Corps to that date, and it is only fitting that it be done around the same period of time as the celebration and the recognition of the sacrifices on D-day, which was the largest amphibious assault in the history of the world by the United States Army, and frequently as a joint forces activity, we do this together.

As the junior Marine in the House of Representatives, but as a senior Marine colonel, it would give me great pleasure to recognize Harry Readshaw as part of this resolution as well. And I would like to present Harry with my battle cap that I wore in Iraq with Operation Iraqi Freedom, as well as a coin, which is a representation, a challenge coin of a United States Marine, as a symbol of my devotion to what he has done to honor the Marine Corps over so many years. So as the junior member turns to the senior member, I want to thank you for what you have done.

Mr. READSHAW. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Colonel. That is unexpected. He asked me if I would say a few words, but the presentation was unexpected.

As we have considered, but as we dwell upon and I think about HR 223 today, I would like to recall the Marine Corps Hymn lyrics, which most people recognize. It begins with the lyrics:

From the Halls of Montezuma
To the shores of Tripoli;
We fight our country's battles
In the air, on land, and sea.
First to fight for right and freedom
And to keep our honor clean;
We are proud to claim the title
Of United States Marine.

The verses continue describing the Marine Corps' history, honor, valor, and dedication to our country. There are some extra verses that have been composed but not officially adopted, and some of those new lyrics which have not been officially adopted were written after Desert Storm by William Perkins, and they read:

In all our years of fighting,
in some battles that were rough.
From the rigs of the Continental ships,
to the rigs in the Persian Gulf.
But we've taught the world respect for,
and exactly what it means.
The eagle, globe, and anchor of,
the United States Marine.

And as the stanza continues, it reads:

Standing ready to do battle,
The United States Marines,
For the cause of right and freedom,
The United States Marines;
If the People need to call upon
The United States Marines,
They will find us always faithful,
The United States Marines.

Marine Corps Day, as described in HR 223, calls for us to recognize the birthday of the Marine Corps, which will be November 10 of this year, and as we celebrate that and as we look forward to that and the customs that will arrive and be observed on that day, I say semper fi and oorah to all the Marines present. Thank you.

Mr. RYAN. The Speaker handed me a note just a few seconds ago. He said, "You've been a little bit unruly so morning formation tomorrow is at 0500. For Bud Cook and Ed Neilson, that means the big hand is on the 12 and the little hand is on the 5.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, gentlemen.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Representative GERGELY requests to be placed on leave. Without objection, that will be granted.

Representative ROTHMAN has requested to be placed on leave. Without objection, that will be granted.

Representative Vanessa BROWN has requested to be placed on leave. Without objection, that will be granted.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. We are going to go to House guests, and located to the left of the rostrum, we welcome youth leaders from the Pennsylvania State Grange: Junior Princess Kaylen Leiby, Junior Prince Jeffrey McCartney, Youth Ambassadors Sara Benzio and Casey Kerschner, and Outstanding Young Patrons Jennifer Nauss and Philip Vonada. These fine individuals are guests of Representative Causer, Representative Day, Representative Christiana, Representative Marshall, Representative Cox, Representative Delozier, and Representative Wheeland. Thank you so much for being with us today. Thank you.

And we have with us a really good friend and former colleague, Representative Tom Creighton. Welcome back, Tom, and his family. Please stand with your family. Tom, as you know, is the guest of Representative Mindy Fee. Representative Creighton served the 37th Legislative District in Lancaster County from 2000 to 2012. Tom, it is so great to have you here. Thank you, my good friend. I will see you in a moment. Thank you.

Guests of Representatives Todd Stephens and Tom Murt are in the rear of the House. They are students from the Keith Valley Jazz Band, and they will be playing in the East Wing Rotunda this afternoon. Please stand. We are looking forward to hearing from you later today. Great of you to be here.

In the rear of the House, Representative Judy Ward has brought to us Davis Collins, and he is a junior credit analyst with T. Rowe Price and he covers State and local governments. Great to have you with us today, Davis. Thank you for being here.

I am just going to ask our members if you will please have a seat. Members in the back – if the Sergeants at Arms could just clear the back there just a little bit for us. Thank you.

Located in the rear of the House, we have guests of Representative Gainey and Representative Wheatley. They are members of the Pittsburgh Black Media Federation. Please stand as I call your name: Tory Parrish, Brian Cook, Chris Moore – we all know Chris from the radio. How are you doing,

Chris? – LaMont Jones, Sheila Beasley, and Tene Croom. Thank you so much for being with us here today. It is an honor to have you here today. Thank you— And television.

Located in the rear of the House, we welcome Abigail Aragonés and Mikala McBride. They are interning with Representative Hill-Evans this summer. With them is Dolores Minaya from the district office. Please stand. Where are you? Thank you very, very much for being with us today.

Following Representative Phillips-Hill for the day is Abby McDermott. Abby is a senior at Dallastown Area High School. Abby, where are you? Abby, great to see you. Thanks so much for being here today.

Representative Sturla, please, you are invited to the rostrum to present a citation for a State champion.

Members, please take your seats. We have a State champion that has traveled some distance to be with us.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Representative Bernie O'NEILL has requested to be placed on leave. Without objection, that will be granted.

NATHAN HENDERSON PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Members, it is my honor today to recognize Nathan Henderson, who is a senior at J.P. McCaskey High School. His mother, Grace, is in the back.

And I want to present him with a citation for capturing first place in the Class AAA boys 3200-meter run event at the 2017 PIAA State Track and Field Championships. Now, for those that do not want to figure out the math, 3200 meters is about 2 miles. He clocked a time of 9:01.77. It is a personal best for Mr. Henderson, and one of the fastest winning times in State history. Nathan holds McCaskey school records in the 1600 meter of 4:11; the 3200 meter of 9:01; and in additional track accomplishments, he is a three-time Lancaster-Lebanon League champ in the 1600 and 3200 meters. He is the Lancaster-Lebanon League record holder for the 3200 meter; District III champion in 2015, 2016, and 2017; and a district record holder for the 3200.

He also is accomplished in cross-country and was the medalist in the 2015 District III Class AAA Championships, and the accolades go on and on. He has done many good things at the State and district levels.

So I want to wish Nathan the best of luck as he continues his education and athletic pursuits at Syracuse University, where he will continue his running career and intends to study psychology.

So with that, I would like to bring – oh, there he is. He is back here – and present this citation to him recognizing his State win. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, Nathan.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. Representative Robert Freeman of Northampton County has guests in the gallery: Amey Senape, Michael Kramer, Chiara Kramer. Please rise. Thank you so much for being with us today. Thank you.

And Justin Simmons brings us Dr. Richard Kolecki. Dr. Kolecki, great to have you here on the House floor. Thank you so much for being with us.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1388, PN 1749**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 17, 1921 (P.L.682, No.284), known as The Insurance Company Law of 1921, in comprehensive health care for uninsured children, further providing for expiration.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

Baker	Ellis	Klunk	Ravenstahl
Barbin	Emrick	Knowles	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Kortz	Reed
Benninghoff	Evankovich	Krueger	Reese
Bernstine	Evans	Kulik	Roae
Bizzarro	Everett	Lewis	Roe
Bloom	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roebuck
Boback	Farry	Mackenzie	Rozzi
Boyle	Fee	Madden	Ryan
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Maher	Saccone
Briggs	Flynn	Mako	Sainato
Brown, R.	Frankel	Maloney	Samuelson
Bullock	Freeman	Markosek	Sankey
Burns	Fritz	Marshall	Santora
Caltagirone	Gabler	Marsico	Saylor
Carroll	Gainey	Masser	Schemel
Causar	Galloway	Matzie	Schlossberg
Cephas	Gillen	McCarter	Schweyer
Charlton	Gillespie	McClinton	Simmons
Christiana	Godshall	McGinnis	Simms
Comitta	Goodman	McNeill	Snyder
Conklin	Greiner	Mehaffie	Solomon
Cook	Grove	Mentzer	Sonney
Corbin	Haggerty	Metcalf	Staats
Corr	Hahn	Metzgar	Stephens
Costa, D.	Hanna	Miccarelli	Sturla

Costa, P.	Harkins	Millard	Tallman
Cox	Harper	Miller, B.	Taylor
Cruz	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Thomas
Culver	Harris, J.	Moul	Tobash
Cutler	Heffley	Mullery	Toepel
Daley	Helm	Mustio	Toohil
Davidson	Hennessey	Neilson	Topper
Davis	Hickernell	Nelson	Vazquez
Dawkins	Hill	Nesbit	Vitali
Day	Irvin	Neuman	Walsh
Dean	James	O'Brien	Ward
Deasy	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Warner
DeLissio	Kampf	Ortitay	Warren
Delozier	Kaufer	Pashinski	Watson
DeLuca	Kauffman	Peifer	Wentling
Dermody	Kavulich	Petrarca	Wheatley
Diamond	Keefer	Petri	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Keller, F.	Pickett	White
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Youngblood
Dowling	Keller, W.	Quinn, C.	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Kim	Quinn, M.	
Dunbar	Kinsey	Rader	Turzai,
Dush	Kirkland	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-9

Brown, V.	Milne	O'Neill	Rabb
Gergely	Murt	Quigley	Rothman
Lawrence			

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 1287, PN 1562**, entitled:

An Act authorizing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission and the Governor, to grant and convey to the Warrior Run-Fort Freeland Heritage Society certain lands situate in Delaware Township, Northumberland County.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-194

Baker	Ellis	Klunk	Ravenstahl
Barbin	Emrick	Knowles	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Kortz	Reed
Benninghoff	Evankovich	Krueger	Reese
Bernstine	Evans	Kulik	Roae
Bizzarro	Everett	Lewis	Roe
Bloom	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roebuck
Boback	Farry	Mackenzie	Rozzi
Boyle	Fee	Madden	Ryan
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Maher	Saccone
Briggs	Flynn	Mako	Sainato
Brown, R.	Frankel	Maloney	Samuelson
Bullock	Freeman	Markosek	Sankey
Burns	Fritz	Marshall	Santora
Caltagirone	Gabler	Marsico	Saylor
Carroll	Gainey	Masser	Schemel
Causar	Galloway	Matzie	Schlossberg
Cephas	Gillen	McCarter	Schweyer
Charlton	Gillespie	McClinton	Simmons
Christiana	Godshall	McGinnis	Sims
Comitta	Goodman	McNeill	Snyder
Conklin	Greiner	Mehaffie	Solomon
Cook	Grove	Mentzer	Sonney
Corbin	Haggerty	Metcalfe	Staats
Corr	Hahn	Metzgar	Stephens
Costa, D.	Hanna	Miccarelli	Sturla
Costa, P.	Harkins	Millard	Tallman
Cox	Harper	Miller, B.	Taylor
Cruz	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Thomas
Culver	Harris, J.	Moul	Tobash
Cutler	Heffley	Mullery	Toepel
Daley	Helm	Mustio	Toohil
Davidson	Hennessey	Neilson	Topper
Davis	Hickernell	Nelson	Vazquez
Dawkins	Hill	Nesbit	Vitali
Day	Irvin	Neuman	Walsh
Dean	James	O'Brien	Ward
Deasy	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Warner
DeLissio	Kampf	Ortitay	Warren
Delozier	Kaufer	Pashinski	Watson
DeLuca	Kauffman	Peifer	Wentling
Dermody	Kavulich	Petrarca	Wheatley
Diamond	Keefer	Petri	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Keller, F.	Pickett	White
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Youngblood
Dowling	Keller, W.	Quinn, C.	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Kim	Quinn, M.	
Dunbar	Kinsey	Rader	Turzai,
Dush	Kirkland	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-9

Brown, V.	Milne	O'Neill	Rabb
Gergely	Murt	Quigley	Rothman
Lawrence			

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 1288, PN 1578**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in registration of vehicles, further providing for person with disability plate and placard.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

Baker	Ellis	Klunk	Ravenstahl
Barbin	Emrick	Knowles	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Kortz	Reed
Benninghoff	Evankovich	Krueger	Reese
Bernstine	Evans	Kulik	Roae
Bizzarro	Everett	Lewis	Roe
Bloom	Fabrizio	Longiatti	Roebuck
Boback	Farry	Mackenzie	Rozzi
Boyle	Fee	Madden	Ryan
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Maher	Saccone
Briggs	Flynn	Mako	Sainato
Brown, R.	Frankel	Maloney	Samuelson
Bullock	Freeman	Markosek	Sankey
Burns	Fritz	Marshall	Santora
Caltagirone	Gabler	Marsico	Saylor
Carroll	Gainey	Masser	Schemel
Causar	Galloway	Matzie	Schlossberg
Cephas	Gillen	McCarter	Schweyer
Charlton	Gillespie	McClinton	Simmons
Christiana	Godshall	McGinnis	Sims
Comitta	Goodman	McNeill	Snyder
Conklin	Greiner	Mehaffie	Solomon
Cook	Grove	Mentzer	Sonney
Corbin	Haggerty	Metcalfe	Staats
Corr	Hahn	Metzgar	Stephens
Costa, D.	Hanna	Miccarelli	Sturla
Costa, P.	Harkins	Millard	Tallman
Cox	Harper	Miller, B.	Taylor
Cruz	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Thomas
Culver	Harris, J.	Moul	Tobash
Cutler	Heffley	Mullery	Toepel
Daley	Helm	Mustio	Toohil
Davidson	Hennessey	Neilson	Topper
Davis	Hickernell	Nelson	Vazquez
Dawkins	Hill	Nesbit	Vitali
Day	Irvin	Neuman	Walsh
Dean	James	O'Brien	Ward
Deasy	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Warner
DeLissio	Kampf	Ortitay	Warren
Delozier	Kaufer	Pashinski	Watson
DeLuca	Kauffman	Peifer	Wentling
Dermody	Kavulich	Petrarca	Wheatley
Diamond	Keefer	Petri	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Keller, F.	Pickett	White
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Youngblood
Dowling	Keller, W.	Quinn, C.	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Kim	Quinn, M.	
Dunbar	Kinsey	Rader	Turzai,
Dush	Kirkland	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Brown, V.	Milne	O'Neill	Rabb
Gergely	Murt	Quigley	Rothman
Lawrence			

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 1411, PN 1776**, entitled:

An Act designating a portion of State Route 18 in West Fallowfield Township, Crawford County as the Staff Sergeant James Douglas Mowris Memorial Highway.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Members, I would ask that you please take your seats.

Representative Wentling, the floor is yours on HB 1411.

This bill honors SSgt. James Douglas Mowris, and we are going to hear from Representative Wentling on the bill.

Sir.

Mr. WENTLING. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As just a young man, James Douglas Mowris enlisted in the United States Army in 1984, just after he graduated from Conneaut Lake High School in Crawford County. With that, he started a 20-year career in the Army and U.S. Army Reserves. It was a job and an adventure that would see him posted around the world in places such as Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Honduras, El Salvador, Kosovo, and Cuba. During that time he achieved the rank of staff sergeant.

A few years after the devastating terror attacks on September 11, 2001, Staff Sergeant Mowris was serving in Afghanistan with the 805th Military Police Company. On January 29, 2004, Staff Sergeant Mowris was part of a group of soldiers who were clearing an enemy weapons cache in Afghanistan when an explosion occurred. Staff Sergeant Mowris and seven other brave souls were killed that day. Though Staff Sergeant Mowris' life ended—

The SPEAKER. Sir, please suspend just for a moment. My apologies.

Members, please take your seats. Let us close the doors of the House. Members, please take your seats. Any conversations, I know many are important, but I would ask that you please just

take them to the back of the House. If anybody needs to get out the doors for the conversations, it is understood. We will let you out. If anybody else needs to head out for conversations, we understand.

Sir, you may proceed.

Mr. WENTLING. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Though Staff Sergeant Mowris' life ended, his memory continues to live and his life continues to impact others. After his death, a new playground in his adopted home of Aurora, Missouri, was dedicated in his honor. The park is near a softball field where Staff Sergeant Mowris played shortstop. The playground is now a bustle of activity, with children playing and laughter in the air. Staff Sergeant Mowris' widow, Michele, told a newspaper that a playground is a fitting tribute to her husband. "He was a big kid at heart," she said. "He would have been right in the middle of all of it."

Now I ask you to join me in voting for another tribute, this one near his hometown, to Staff Sergeant Mowris. This legislation would rename a section of State Route 18 in Crawford County, also known as Conneaut Lake Road, as the Staff Sergeant James Douglas Mowris Memorial Highway. It is my hope that by renaming this section of highway, others will not only learn of Staff Sergeant Mowris' sacrifice, but also the kind of man he was. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Wentling.

The Sergeants at Arms can open the doors of the House.

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—194

Baker	Ellis	Klunk	Ravenstahl
Barbin	Emrick	Knowles	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Kortz	Reed
Benninghoff	Evankovich	Krueger	Reese
Bernstine	Evans	Kulik	Roae
Bizzarro	Everett	Lewis	Roe
Bloom	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roebuck
Boback	Farry	Mackenzie	Rozzi
Boyle	Fee	Madden	Ryan
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Maher	Saccone
Briggs	Flynn	Mako	Sainato
Brown, R.	Frankel	Maloney	Samuelson
Bullock	Freeman	Markosek	Sankey
Burns	Fritz	Marshall	Santora
Caltagirone	Gabler	Marsico	Saylor
Carroll	Gainey	Masser	Schemel
Causar	Galloway	Matzie	Schlossberg
Cephas	Gillen	McCarter	Schweyer
Charlton	Gillespie	McClinton	Simmons
Christiana	Godshall	McGinnis	Sims
Comitta	Goodman	McNeill	Snyder
Conklin	Greiner	Mehaffie	Solomon
Cook	Grove	Mentzer	Sonney
Corbin	Haggerty	Metcalfe	Staats
Corr	Hahn	Metzgar	Stephens
Costa, D.	Hanna	Micarelli	Sturla
Costa, P.	Harkins	Millard	Tallman
Cox	Harper	Miller, B.	Taylor
Cruz	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Thomas

Culver	Harris, J.	Moul	Tobash
Cutler	Heffley	Mullery	Toepel
Daley	Helm	Mustio	Toohil
Davidson	Hennessey	Neilson	Topper
Davis	Hickernell	Nelson	Vazquez
Dawkins	Hill	Nesbit	Vitali
Day	Irvin	Neuman	Walsh
Dean	James	O'Brien	Ward
Deasy	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Warner
DeLissio	Kampf	Ortity	Warren
Delozier	Kaufner	Pashinski	Watson
DeLuca	Kauffman	Peifer	Wentling
Dermody	Kavulich	Petrarca	Wheatley
Diamond	Keefer	Petri	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Keller, F.	Pickett	White
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Youngblood
Dowling	Keller, W.	Quinn, C.	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Kim	Quinn, M.	
Dunbar	Kinsey	Rader	Turzai,
Dush	Kirkland	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Brown, V.	Milne	O'Neill	Rabb
Gergely	Murt	Quigley	Rothman
Lawrence			

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 1431, PN 1842**, entitled:

An Act designating a portion of State Routes 54, 901 and 2023 in Northumberland County and Schuylkill County as the Honorable Robert E. Belfanti, Jr., Memorial Highway.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

As you know, Representative Masser did speak about this yesterday.

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—194

Baker	Ellis	Klunk	Ravenstahl
Barbin	Emrick	Knowles	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Kortz	Reed
Benninghoff	Evankovich	Krueger	Reese
Bernstine	Evans	Kulik	Roae
Bizzarro	Everett	Lewis	Roe
Bloom	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roebuck
Boback	Farry	Mackenzie	Rozzi
Boyle	Fee	Madden	Ryan
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Maher	Saccone
Briggs	Flynn	Mako	Sainato
Brown, R.	Frankel	Maloney	Samuelson
Bullock	Freeman	Markosek	Sankey
Burns	Fritz	Marshall	Santora
Caltagirone	Gabler	Marsico	Saylor
Carroll	Gainey	Masser	Schemel
Causar	Galloway	Matzie	Schlossberg
Cephas	Gillen	McCarter	Schweyer
Charlton	Gillespie	McClinton	Simmons
Christiana	Godshall	McGinnis	Sims
Comitta	Goodman	McNeill	Snyder
Conklin	Greiner	Mehaffie	Solomon
Cook	Grove	Mentzer	Sonney
Corbin	Haggerty	Metcalfe	Staats
Corr	Hahn	Metzgar	Stephens
Costa, D.	Hanna	Miccarelli	Sturla
Costa, P.	Harkins	Millard	Tallman
Cox	Harper	Miller, B.	Taylor
Cruz	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Thomas
Culver	Harris, J.	Moul	Tobash
Cutler	Heffley	Mullery	Toepel
Daley	Helm	Mustio	Toohil
Davidson	Hennessey	Neilson	Topper
Davis	Hickernell	Nelson	Vazquez
Dawkins	Hill	Nesbit	Vitali
Day	Irvin	Neuman	Walsh
Dean	James	O'Brien	Ward
Deasy	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Warner
DeLissio	Kampf	Ortitay	Warren
Delozier	Kaufer	Pashinski	Watson
DeLuca	Kauffman	Peifer	Wentling
Dermody	Kavulich	Petrarca	Wheatley
Diamond	Keefer	Petri	Wheeland
DiGirolando	Keller, F.	Pickett	White
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Youngblood
Dowling	Keller, W.	Quinn, C.	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Kim	Quinn, M.	
Dunbar	Kinsey	Rader	Turzai,
Dush	Kirkland	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Brown, V.	Milne	O'Neill	Rabb
Gergely	Murt	Quigley	Rothman
Lawrence			

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.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 922, PN 1910**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 71 (State Government) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in preliminary provisions relating to retirement for State employees and officers, further providing for definitions.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

(Bill analysis was read.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Representative O'Neill is on the floor and should be placed on the master roll.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 922 CONTINUED

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, sir, HB 922.

Mr. VITALI. Could we have a brief explanation of this bill from the maker?

The SPEAKER. Representative Vitali, you are not going to speak on the bill?

Mr. VITALI. Let me be more precise. I will ask the maker on interrogation to briefly explain this bill.

The SPEAKER. Representative Tallman, will you stand for interrogation and briefly explain the bill?

He has agreed to do so.

Members, please take your seats. Members, please take your seats.

Representative Tallman, the floor is yours, sir.

Mr. TALLMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The explanation is really brief. It takes the Susquehanna River Basin Commission's future employees and takes them out of the State Employees' Retirement System. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Sir, Representative Vitali, do you wish to speak on the bill?

Mr. VITALI. Right. I do have some concerns with the bill. I am a little confused, because I did not see it on the marked calendar today. I was told by staff yesterday this bill was dead, and that is why this caught me by surprise a bit.

My concern here is why we are taking the Susquehanna River Basin Commission out of the SERS program. And the concern is that they are being singled out in a retaliatory way because they have incurred the wrath of the agricultural community with regard to the issuance of permits, and that is the allegation that has been made in caucus and that is very concerning.

I note in this bill that— So the question really becomes, why, why is the Susquehanna River Basin Commission being singled out when so many other similar entities are in this? If

you look at the bill itself, on its face it indicates many other similar-type entities—

The SPEAKER. Representative Vitali, will you please suspend for just a moment. Thank you.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. Representative Tallman, you raise a point of order. Could you please state it for the record.

Mr. TALLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Delaware is questioning my motives. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. As we all know, under the House rules we do not question motives or intention of the maker. However, I think the gentleman's question really is reflective of, what is the rationale behind removing the Susquehanna River Basin Commission from SERS? I would say the notion that anybody is being punitive is precarious. I would say that, but I think you can make a statement about what you understand the rationale to be without impugning, impugning what those in support of the bill might be.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you.

I want to make a couple of points, and one point is almost obvious in the bill itself. If you look at the bill, what the bill simply does is remove one commission from a long list of commissions that are included in SERS. The bill itself has 11 different commissions included in SERS – the Turnpike Commission, the Delaware River Port Authority, the Port Authority Transit Corporation, and on and on and on. So why are we just singling out the Susquehanna River Basin to be removed from SERS when there are 10 other similar-type entities that are left in? Why is this one group being singled out? That is a question I have in my mind.

I am looking at an e-mail from the Independent Fiscal Office. It is from a Matthew Knittel, dated the 6th, I guess, which was yesterday, and it indicates that this bill has no significant fiscal impact, and that leads me to believe, well, the reason cannot be to save money because this has no fiscal impact. So if you have something that has no fiscal impact, why are they being singled out? I just do not know why this group is being singled out.

I can tell you I have a copy of a letter purportedly from the Susquehanna River Basin Commission. They do not want to be taken out of SERS. So you have a group that does not want to be taken out of SERS, there is no financial benefit to it being taken out of SERS, and you have similar groups in SERS. So really, why, why are we doing this bill? Again, I can only tell you— I am not impugning the maker's motives, but when I was asking staff yesterday, "What's going on here?" that is what was being said.

You know, the belief was that we did not like the permits, the agriculture community did not like the permits that were being issued by them, and taking them out of SERS was a way to slap them down.

So I just have some real concerns about this. There are unanswered questions. This is not a bill that has come on my radar screen until very recently, but I just have a lot of questions, and I think we need the answers to those questions before we move forward with this.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. Members, we are going to temporarily go over HB 922.

MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION UNDER RULE 24

The SPEAKER. At this time Representative Cutler is going to do a motion to proceed, I believe, on HB 119, PN 1927, supplemental A House calendar. The 24-hour period since being amended would be 12:42 p.m. We have less than an hour, and I know that they were agreed-upon amendments. There are three agreed-upon amendments.

So, Representative Cutler, the floor is yours.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the motion to proceed on HB 119. The time that it could be appropriately voted would be 12:42. I believe the members have had ample time to review the bill and the associated amendments that we adopted yesterday and would like to move this along.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. Representative Dermody, on the motion to proceed, sir.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the members to support the motion to proceed on HB 119.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Representative HAGGERTY has requested to be placed on leave. Without objection, that will be granted.

MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION UNDER RULE 24 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—176

Baker	Dunbar	Kinsey	Reed
Barbin	Dush	Kirkland	Reese
Barrar	Ellis	Klunk	Roae
Benninghoff	Emrick	Knowles	Roe
Bernstine	Evankovich	Kortz	Roebuck
Bizzarro	Evans	Kulik	Rozzi
Bloom	Everett	Lewis	Ryan
Boback	Fabrizio	Longietti	Saccone

Boyle	Farry	Mackenzie	Sainato
Bradford	Fee	Madden	Sankey
Briggs	Fitzgerald	Maher	Santora
Brown, R.	Flynn	Mako	Saylor
Bullock	Frankel	Maloney	Schemel
Burns	Fritz	Markosek	Schlossberg
Caltagirone	Gabler	Marshall	Schweyer
Carroll	Gainey	Marsico	Simmons
Causer	Galloway	Masser	Sims
Cephas	Gillespie	McClinton	Solomon
Charlton	Godshall	McGinnis	Sonney
Christiana	Goodman	Mehaffie	Staats
Comitta	Greiner	Mentzer	Stephens
Conklin	Grove	Miccarelli	Sturla
Cook	Hahn	Millard	Taylor
Corbin	Hanna	Moul	Thomas
Corr	Harkins	Mustio	Tobash
Costa, D.	Harper	Neilson	Toepel
Costa, P.	Harris, A.	Nelson	Toohil
Cox	Harris, J.	Nesbit	Topper
Cruz	Heffley	O'Brien	Vazquez
Culver	Helm	O'Neill	Vitali
Cutler	Hennessey	Oberlander	Walsh
Daley	Hickernell	Ortitay	Ward
Davis	Hill	Pashinski	Warner
Dawkins	Irvin	Peifer	Warren
Day	James	Petrarca	Watson
Deasy	Jozwiak	Petri	Wentling
DeLissio	Kampf	Pickett	Wheatley
Delozier	Kaufer	Pyle	Wheeland
DeLuca	Kauffman	Quinn, C.	White
Dermody	Kavulich	Quinn, M.	Youngblood
Diamond	Keefer	Rader	Zimmerman
DiGirolamo	Keller, F.	Rapp	
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Ravenstahl	Turzai,
Dowling	Keller, W.	Readshaw	Speaker
Driscoll	Kim		

NAYS-18

Davidson	Krueger	Metzgar	Neuman
Dean	Matzie	Miller, B.	Samuelson
English	McCarte	Miller, D.	Snyder
Freeman	McNeill	Mullery	Tallman
Gillen	Metcalfe		

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-9

Brown, V.	Lawrence	Murt	Rabb
Gergely	Milne	Quigley	Rothman
Haggerty			

A majority of the members required by the rules having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the motion was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A CONTINUED

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 119, PN 1927**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.177, No.175), known as The Administrative Code of 1929, providing for certified drug and alcohol recovery houses and establishing the Certified Drug and Alcohol Recovery House Fund Account.

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 Tina Davis rises with respect to the bill. You may proceed.

Mrs. DAVIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today in strong support of HB 119.

During my time in office, I have heard from countless parents, individuals in recovery, and local officials who have shared the urgent need to monitor recovery houses. Such housing is meant to provide hope, healing, and reinvention to individuals in recovery and their families. Unfortunately, too many recovery houses fall short on the promises delivered to residents and their families and result in tragedy.

Although the legislation will never completely eradicate the tragedies amongst this population, it will most certainly help many individuals identify housing that has taken the steps to ensure that it is a safe environment committed to recovery.

I want to thank the gentleman from Luzerne County for bringing this bill to the House floor and working tirelessly with me to address many of the concerns raised by my constituents.

I also want to thank the Certified Drug and Alcohol Recovery Housing Task Force for their time, commitment, and recommendations on this issue.

And finally, I want to thank all the courageous families who spoke up at the many hearings that I held on this.

I ask for your support. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Aaron Kaufer.

Mr. KAUFER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to thank Representative Davis, Representative Farry, Representative DiGirolamo, and Representative Cruz for moving this legislation forward. This is a big bill moving forward here today in the House, and I look forward to getting this remedied and fixed for all Pennsylvanians.

This is a huge issue addressing our opioid epidemic going on throughout the Commonwealth, and I ask my colleagues for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Davis and Representative Kaufer.

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-194

Baker	Ellis	Knowles	Ravenstahl
Barbin	Emrick	Kortz	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Krueger	Reed
Benninghoff	Evankovich	Kulik	Reese
Bernstine	Evans	Lewis	Road

Bizzarro	Everett	Longietti	Roe
Bloom	Fabrizio	Mackenzie	Roebuck
Boback	Farry	Madden	Rozzi
Boyle	Fee	Maher	Ryan
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Mako	Saccone
Briggs	Flynn	Maloney	Sainato
Brown, R.	Frankel	Markosek	Samuelson
Bullock	Freeman	Marshall	Sankey
Burns	Fritz	Marsico	Santora
Caltagirone	Gabler	Masser	Saylor
Carroll	Gainey	Matzie	Schemel
Causser	Galloway	McCarter	Schlossberg
Cephas	Gillen	McClinton	Schweyer
Charlton	Gillespie	McGinnis	Simmons
Christiana	Godshall	McNeill	Sims
Comitta	Goodman	Mehaffie	Snyder
Conklin	Greiner	Mentzer	Solomon
Cook	Grove	Metcalfe	Sonney
Corbin	Hahn	Metzgar	Staats
Corr	Hanna	Miccarelli	Stephens
Costa, D.	Harkins	Millard	Sturla
Costa, P.	Harper	Miller, B.	Tallman
Cox	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Taylor
Cruz	Harris, J.	Moul	Thomas
Culver	Heffley	Mullery	Tobash
Cutler	Helm	Mustio	Toepel
Daley	Hennessey	Neilson	Toohil
Davidson	Hickernell	Nelson	Topper
Davis	Hill	Nesbit	Vazquez
Dawkins	Irvin	Neuman	Vitali
Day	James	O'Brien	Walsh
Dean	Jozwiak	O'Neill	Ward
Deasy	Kampf	Oberlander	Warner
DeLissio	Kaufner	Ortitay	Warren
Delozier	Kauffman	Pashinski	Watson
DeLuca	Kavulich	Peifer	Wentling
Dermody	Keefer	Petrarca	Wheatley
Diamond	Keller, F.	Petri	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	White
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Pyle	Youngblood
Dowling	Kim	Quinn, C.	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Kinsey	Quinn, M.	
Dunbar	Kirkland	Rader	Turzai,
Dush	Klunk	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-9

Brown, V.	Lawrence	Murt	Rabb
Gergely	Milne	Quigley	Rothman
Haggerty			

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.

SENATE MESSAGE

HOUSE BILL
CONCURRED IN BY SENATE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 202, PN 161**, with information that the Senate has passed the same without amendment.

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 202, PN 161

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in preliminary provisions, further providing for Keystone Exams.

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

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. Representative Marcy Toepel is recognized for a caucus announcement.

Mrs. TOEPEL. Republicans will caucus immediately at the break. We would be prepared to return to the floor at 1 o'clock.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. Representative Dan Frankel, for a caucus announcement, sir.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Democrats will caucus immediately. Thank you.

STATE GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Representative Daryl Metcalfe is recognized for I believe a committee announcement.

Mr. METCALFE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the House State Government Committee will hold a voting meeting immediately at the break in room G-50 of the Irvis Office Building to consider HB 1095 and HR 284, as well as any other business that may come before the committee, Mr. Speaker. So that is a voting meeting of the House State Government Committee immediately upon the break, room G-50 of the Irvis Office Building, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

The State Government Committee will hold a voting meeting immediately at the break in room G-50 of the Irvis Office Building to consider HB 1095 and HR 284, as well as any other business that may come before the committee.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Members, we will be returning to the floor at 1 p.m. The House is recessed until 1 p.m.

RECESS EXTENDED

The time of recess was extended until 1:15 p.m.; further extended until 1:30 p.m.; further extended until 1:45 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls upon the majority leader for a committee announcement.

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

There will be a meeting of the House Rules Committee at 2 p.m. There will be a meeting of the House Rules Committee at 2 p.m. in the House Appropriations conference room. The meeting will be at 2 p.m. in the House Appropriations conference room. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

The Rules Committee will meet at 2 p.m. in the House Appropriations conference room.

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

HB 1095, PN 1357

By Rep. METCALFE

An Act requiring identification of lawful presence in the United States as a prerequisite to the receipt of public benefits.

STATE GOVERNMENT.

**RESOLUTION REPORTED
FROM COMMITTEE**

HR 284, PN 1556

By Rep. METCALFE

A Resolution urging the Congress of the United States to repeal the Environmental Protection Agency's MS4 program.

STATE GOVERNMENT.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

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

**BILLS ON CONCURRENCE
REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**

HB 151, PN 1571

By Rep. REED

An Act amending Title 12 (Commerce and Trade) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Small Business First, further providing for definitions; in machinery and equipment loans, further providing for definitions and for reporting and inspection; in Pennsylvania Industrial Development Program, further providing for definitions; providing for entertainment economic enhancement program; and making a related repeal.

RULES.

HB 271, PN 1942 (Amended)

By Rep. REED

An act amending Titles 3 (Agriculture), 4 (Amusements) and 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in race horse industry reform, repealing definitions and provisions relating to place and manner of conducting pari-mutuel wagering at racetrack enclosure and to pari-mutuel wagering at nonprimary locations and further providing for licensing costs and fees and for operations; providing for fantasy contests, establishing a Lottery Sales Advisory Council within the Department of Revenue and providing for iLottery; in general provisions, further providing for legislative intent and for definitions; in Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board, further providing for Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board established, for general and specific powers, for licensed gaming entity application appeals from board, for board minutes and records, for regulatory authority of board, for slot machine license fee, for reports of board and for diversity goals of board; in licensees, further providing for Category 1 slot machine license and for Category 3 slot machine license, providing for remaining Category 2 licenses, further providing for number of slot machine licenses, for slot machine license application, for supplier licenses and for manufacturer licenses, providing for nongaming service provider, further providing for slot machine testing and certification standards and for license renewals, providing for slot machine license operation fee and further providing for change in ownership or control of slot machine licensee; repealing provisions related to multiple slot machine license prohibition and prohibiting undue economic concentration; in table games, further providing for authorization to conduct table games, for table game tournaments, for other financial transactions, for table game device and associated equipment testing and certification standards, for table game authorization fee and for local share assessment; providing for interactive gaming, for sports wagering, sports wagering tax and local fee assessment and for slot machines at nonprimary locations; in revenues, further providing for gross terminal revenue deductions, for establishment of State Gaming Fund and net slot machine revenue distribution and for Pennsylvania Gaming Economic Development and Tourism Fund; in administration and enforcement, further providing for responsibility and authority of the Department of Revenue, for wagering on credit, for compulsive and problem gambling program, for financial and employment interests, for political influence, for regulation requiring exclusion or ejection of certain persons, for repeat offenders excludable from licensed gaming facility, for list of persons self excluded from gaming activities, for investigations and enforcement and for prohibited acts and penalties and providing for casino liquor licenses; in miscellaneous provisions, further providing for appropriations and for repayments to State Gaming Fund; providing for video gaming; establishing the Video Gaming Fund, the Fire Company and Emergency Responder Grant Fund, the City of the First Class Enforcement Fund, the Lottery Stabilization Fund and the Gun Violence Task Force Fund; in riot, disorderly conduct and related offenses, further providing for the offense of gambling devices, gambling, etc.; and making related repeals.

RULES.**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

The SPEAKER. Representative THOMAS has requested to be placed on leave. Without objection, that will be granted.

CALENDAR CONTINUED**RESOLUTIONS**

Mr. RYAN called up **HR 222, PN 1300**, entitled:

A Resolution urging the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to enact H.R. 303 to permit full, concurrent receipt of military retired pay and other veterans compensation, including dependent allowances.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

Baker	Ellis	Knowles	Ravenstahl
Barbin	Emrick	Kortz	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Krueger	Reed
Benninghoff	Evankovich	Kulik	Reese
Bernstine	Evans	Lewis	Roe
Bizzarro	Everett	Longietti	Roe
Bloom	Fabrizio	Mackenzie	Roebuck
Boback	Farry	Madden	Rozzi
Boyle	Fee	Maher	Ryan
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Mako	Saccone
Briggs	Flynn	Maloney	Sainato
Brown, R.	Frankel	Markosek	Samuelson
Bullock	Freeman	Marshall	Sankey
Burns	Fritz	Marsico	Santora
Caltagirone	Gabler	Masser	Saylor
Carroll	Gainey	Matzie	Schemel
Causer	Galloway	McCarter	Schlossberg
Cephas	Gillen	McClinton	Schweyer
Charlton	Gillespie	McGinnis	Simmons
Christiana	Godshall	McNeill	Sims
Comitta	Goodman	Mehaffie	Snyder
Conklin	Greiner	Mentzer	Solomon
Cook	Grove	Metcalfe	Sonney
Corbin	Hahn	Metzgar	Staats
Corr	Hanna	Miccarelli	Stephens
Costa, D.	Harkins	Millard	Sturla
Costa, P.	Harper	Miller, B.	Tallman
Cox	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Taylor
Cruz	Harris, J.	Moul	Tobash
Culver	Heffley	Mullery	Toepel
Cutler	Helm	Mustio	Toohil
Daley	Hennessey	Neilson	Topper
Davidson	Hickernell	Nelson	Vazquez
Davis	Hill	Nesbit	Vitali
Dawkins	Irvin	Neuman	Walsh
Day	James	O'Brien	Ward
Dean	Jozwiak	O'Neill	Warner
Deasy	Kampf	Oberlander	Warren
DeLissio	Kaufman	Ortitay	Watson
Delozier	Kauffman	Pashinski	Wentling
DeLuca	Kavulich	Peifer	Wheatley
Dermody	Keefer	Petrarca	Wheatley
Diamond	Keller, F.	Petri	White
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Youngblood
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Pyle	Zimmerman
Dowling	Kim	Quinn, C.	
Driscoll	Kinsey	Quinn, M.	Turzai,
Dunbar	Kirkland	Rader	Speaker
Dush	Klunk	Rapp	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Brown, V.	Lawrence	Quigley	Rothman
Gergely	Milne	Rabb	Thomas
Haggerty	Murt		

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

* * *

Ms. PICKETT called up **HR 337, PN 1735**, entitled:

A Resolution urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that would allow states to regulate air ambulance billing and pricing practices.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

Baker	Ellis	Knowles	Ravenstahl
Barbin	Emrick	Kortz	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Krueger	Reed
Benninghoff	Evankovich	Kulik	Reese
Bernstine	Evans	Lewis	Roe
Bizzarro	Everett	Longietti	Roe
Bloom	Fabrizio	Mackenzie	Roebuck
Boback	Farry	Madden	Rozzi
Boyle	Fee	Maher	Ryan
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Mako	Saccone
Briggs	Flynn	Maloney	Sainato
Brown, R.	Frankel	Markosek	Samuelson
Bullock	Freeman	Marshall	Sankey
Burns	Fritz	Marsico	Santora
Caltagirone	Gabler	Masser	Saylor
Carroll	Gainey	Matzie	Schemel
Causer	Galloway	McCarter	Schlossberg
Cephas	Gillen	McClinton	Schweyer
Charlton	Gillespie	McGinnis	Simmons
Christiana	Godshall	McNeill	Sims
Comitta	Goodman	Mehaffie	Snyder
Conklin	Greiner	Mentzer	Solomon
Cook	Grove	Metcalfe	Sonney
Corbin	Hahn	Metzgar	Staats
Corr	Hanna	Miccarelli	Stephens
Costa, D.	Harkins	Millard	Sturla
Costa, P.	Harper	Miller, B.	Tallman
Cox	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Taylor
Cruz	Harris, J.	Moul	Tobash
Culver	Heffley	Mullery	Toepel
Cutler	Helm	Mustio	Toohil
Daley	Hennessey	Neilson	Topper
Davidson	Hickernell	Nelson	Vazquez
Davis	Hill	Nesbit	Vitali
Dawkins	Irvin	Neuman	Walsh
Day	James	O'Brien	Ward
Dean	Jozwiak	O'Neill	Warner
Deasy	Kampf	Oberlander	Warren
DeLissio	Kaufman	Ortitay	Watson
Delozier	Kauffman	Pashinski	Wentling
DeLuca	Kavulich	Peifer	Wheatley
Dermody	Keefer	Petrarca	Wheatley
Diamond	Keller, F.	Petri	White
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Youngblood
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Pyle	Zimmerman
Dowling	Kim	Quinn, C.	
Driscoll	Kinsey	Quinn, M.	Turzai,
Dunbar	Kirkland	Rader	Speaker
Dush	Klunk	Rapp	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Brown, V.	Lawrence	Quigley	Rothman
Gergely	Milne	Rabb	Thomas
Haggerty	Murt		

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 200, PN 253**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 19, 1990 (P.L.1372, No.212), known as the Early Intervention Services System Act, further providing for title of the act, for definitions and for child identification, assessment and tracking system; and making editorial changes.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1490, PN 1909**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 66 (Public Utilities) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for water and sewer authorities in cities of the second class.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1285, PN 1589**, entitled:

A Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, further providing for exemptions and special provisions.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1239, PN 1466**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in licensing of drivers, further providing for classes of licenses.

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

The SPEAKER. We now have a number of second consideration bills that have amendments.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 877, PN 1697**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Human Services Code, in fiscal provisions relating to public assistance, providing for distribution of SNAP benefits.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Representative Chris Rabb is on the House floor and should be placed back on the master roll.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 877 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Now, for HB 877 we have a number of amendments.

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

Ms. **TOOHIL** offered the following amendment No. **A01586**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 11, by striking out all of said line and inserting
Section 476. Distribution of SNAP Benefits.—The following shall apply:

(1) Within six

Amend Bill, page 1, by inserting between lines 16 and 17

(2) The department may implement a tiered distribution schedule in order to deter any hardships as a result of the change in the distribution date under this section for an individual receiving the benefits.

(3) The guidelines under this section shall utilize a method which is uniform throughout this Commonwealth so that the distribution date for benefits does not change if an individual receiving benefits moves to a different county of residence in this Commonwealth, including, but not limited to, using the first letter of the last name of an individual receiving benefits to set the date of distribution.

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

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes Representative Toohil.

Ms. TOOHIL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment provides a legislative fix so that SNAP (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program) recipient families are not negatively impacted by the staggered release of benefits.

This is a safeguard for SNAP recipients, and I am requesting an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

All those in favor of the amendment will be voting "aye"; those opposed will be voting "nay." Members— Please strike. I apologize. My apologies.

Representative DeLissio is recognized on the House floor.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, will the maker of the amendment answer a question, please?

The SPEAKER. Yes; the Representative has agreed to stand for interrogation.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I know Community Legal Services had a couple of weeks ago penned a letter about their concern about any type of transition period and people not missing benefits for an extended period of time during a transition. Does this amendment address those concerns, and do in fact we have anything from Community Legal Services communicating that they are okay with it?

The SPEAKER. Members, a lot of work ahead of us this evening, I understand. Would you please just take your seats. Members, please take your seats. Members, please take your seats. I know we would all like to move forward quickly here. Boy, this is an active session. Members, if you could please take your seats. And just so that Representative DeLissio and Representative Toohil can be heard, all conversations to the back floor. If we can, if anybody needs to have a conversation, if you could take it off the House floor. We are going to close the doors of the House. Anybody who needs to get off for a conversation, we are going to close the doors of the House. Thank you, Sergeants at Arms, please close the doors of the House.

Representative DeLissio, will you please restate your question, and we are going to turn the microphone up loud.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago in reference to HB 877, Community Legal Services had written a letter expressing their concern that by changing to what is being proposed that recipients of these benefits could actually either be so disrupted, or possibly even I guess miss benefits, or have their benefit schedule delivered in such a way that there could be an extended time between benefits, at least during the transition that they expressed that concern. And I am asking to see if this amendment addresses that concern, and furthermore, if it does, do we have anything subsequently from Community Legal Services? I did not see anything in my e-mail, but that does not mean the prime sponsor of the bill may not have received something.

The SPEAKER. Representative Toohil, you may proceed.

Ms. TOOHL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment addresses the issue where there might be a hardship or a gap in payment because of the change, especially during that first transition month. So that is why we put this amendment in there, to make sure that it is codified. And we do not have a secondary letter from the legal services that you noted.

Ms. DeLISSIO. One additional question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, do we know if transitioning to this – and since the amendment is about the transition period, I will ask it here instead of on the bill – do we know if there is an affiliated cost with this for the counties and for the Department of Human Services to make this transition to this new system?

Ms. TOOHL. So there is a cost associated with it. There have been a couple of different numbers that have gone out there. Secretary Dallas from DHS had noted that there would be, the changes that go on in this system – which it is an outdated system and there needs to be changes anyhow – that for 1.9 million recipients that are out there, and that number fluctuates, he had a highball estimate of \$1.7 million. But that

number we do not feel is accurate and we are going to be getting a new number after we get through the amendments from Appropriations.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative DeLissio, do you wish— Please open the doors of the House. Thank you. Please open the doors.

Representative DeLissio, do you wish to speak on the bill? No.

Does anybody else wish to speak on the bill?

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Representative EVANKOVICH has requested to be placed on leave. That will be granted, without objection.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 877 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

Baker	Ellis	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Barbin	Emrick	Krueger	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Kulik	Reed
Benninghoff	Evans	Lewis	Reese
Bernstine	Everett	Longietti	Roae
Bizzarro	Fabrizio	Mackenzie	Roe
Bloom	Farry	Madden	Roebuck
Boback	Fee	Maher	Sizzi
Boyle	Fitzgerald	Mako	Ryan
Bradford	Flynn	Maloney	Saccione
Briggs	Frankel	Markosek	Sainato
Brown, R.	Freeman	Marshall	Samuelson
Bullock	Fritz	Marsico	Sankey
Burns	Gabler	Masser	Santora
Caltagirone	Gainey	Matzie	Saylor
Carroll	Galloway	McCarter	Schemel
Causar	Gillen	McClinton	Schlossberg
Cephas	Gillespie	McGinnis	Schweyer
Charlton	Godshall	McNeill	Simmons
Christiana	Goodman	Mehaffie	Sims
Comitta	Greiner	Mentzer	Snyder
Conklin	Grove	Metcalfe	Solomon
Cook	Hahn	Metzgar	Sonney
Corbin	Hanna	Miccarelli	Staats
Corr	Harkins	Millard	Stephens
Costa, D.	Harper	Miller, B.	Sturla
Costa, P.	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Tallman
Cox	Harris, J.	Moul	Taylor
Cruz	Heffley	Mullery	Tobash
Culver	Helm	Mustio	Toepel
Cutler	Hennessey	Neilson	Toohil
Daley	Hickernell	Nelson	Topper
Davidson	Hill	Nesbit	Vazquez
Davis	Irvin	Neuman	Vitali
Dawkins	James	O'Brien	Walsh
Day	Jozwiak	O'Neill	Ward

Dean	Kampf	Oberlander	Warner
Deasy	Kaufer	Ortitay	Warren
DeLissio	Kauffman	Pashinski	Watson
Delozier	Kavulich	Peifer	Wentling
DeLuca	Keefer	Petrarca	Wheatley
Dermody	Keller, F.	Petri	Wheeland
Diamond	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	White
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Pyle	Youngblood
Donatucci	Kim	Quinn, C.	Zimmerman
Dowling	Kinsey	Quinn, M.	
Driscoll	Kirkland	Rabb	Turzai,
Dunbar	Klunk	Rader	Speaker
Dush	Knowles	Rapp	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Brown, V.	Haggerty	Murt	Rothman
Evankovich	Lawrence	Quigley	Thomas
Gergely	Milne		

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?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Vanessa Brown is on the House floor and should be placed back on the master roll.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 877 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Representative Gainey has a number of amendments.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. **GAINEY** offered the following amendment No. **A01324**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 16, by striking out "twenty-five-day" and inserting
ten-day

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes Representative Gainey.

Mr. **GAINEY**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand to rise because for centuries, for centuries we have always had a system where, whether it was our veterans, our poor, our senior citizens, those that depend on the SNAP program, they know that they can get their benefits within 1 to 2 to 10 days. To move this to 25 days or even do a semi, which

is not bad but it would have a tremendous impact on the way our seniors do their grocery shopping, our veterans. There is nothing wrong with the system before, and the type of damage that this would have to the poor people in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I believe that if we accept this amendment and make it 10 days just like every other county, if we do all counties within 10 days, we have a better opportunity of making sure that our most vulnerable citizens are taken care of and they do not have to change a whole lot of their habits knowing how difficult – we all know how difficult it is for our poor, our poorest, our poor residents to get around. We want to make sure we are doing what is right by them, whether it is our veterans, our seniors, and particularly moms with children. They depend on these SNAP benefits, and I am asking them to move from a 25- to a 10-day period. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Toohil, on the amendment, please.

Ms. **TOOHIL**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Because all SNAP recipients get paid their benefits on days 1 through 10 in Pennsylvania, we are trying to have it go extended, that it is staggered for a 25-day period, because some of the counties everyone gets paid on day 1 and then there is a surge on the stores where then there is a lack of fresh produce, there is a lack of milk, bread, vegetables because so many people are going to the store on that one same payday when the funding goes into the account.

So other States have recently been changing their models as well. Delaware went from a 6-day period to 19 days, and Georgia went from 10 days to 19 days. So here we are extending throughout the period would be from day, it would be for day 1, where people would start to get benefits, to day 25.

So the good gentleman from Allegheny County, while I do see that he is trying to make a compromise at day 10, we already do have some people that get recipients from days 1 through 10, and we are still having the deficit of food inside the stores. So I would ask for a negative vote on this amendment, please.

The SPEAKER. Representative Gainey, on the amendment, sir.

Mr. **GAINEY**. For you all to know in your district what it means for people that depend on their SNAP programs, particularly the first of the month, for us to make a, for us that sit there and have a conversation about merchants not being able to have fresh produce, not being able to stock their shelves, or not being able to have the right staff to work, that is the merchants' problem. That is part of a business model and that business model should be able to speak to the fact that they can staff their stores.

What I am saying is that if you want to extend it to 25 days, we are going to have people that are going to run out of food. In our districts 1.9 million people, they said, depend on the SNAP program. Why would we change something to benefit merchants instead of making sure that what we are doing is protecting our most vulnerable citizens such as our veterans, our seniors, and mothers with children, to make sure that they are getting their SNAP benefits when they expect?

I am asking people to support this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Bill Kortz, on the amendment.

Mr. **KORTZ**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the maker of the amendment stand for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Representative Gainey, he wants to ask if you will stand? Thank you, sir.

Mr. KORTZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I heard from the good lady that a lot of the merchants are going to run out of food. Have you ever seen this in your district? Have you seen merchants run out of food?

Mr. GAINEY. I have never seen a merchant run out of fresh produce or food. Never. It has never happened. My community, one of my neighborhoods has a food desert. We have got to work on trying to get a supermarket there. Now, you want my seniors and my veterans to have to change their whole pattern on how they get their food and how they bring it back because a merchant has run out of food or because a merchant is saying that they do not have enough staff? If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, let us be honest, they would not accept that from any of us. Why should we accept that from them?

Mr. KORTZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the amendment?

The SPEAKER. Yes. Representative Kortz, you may proceed.

Mr. KORTZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would urge all my colleagues to vote for this amendment. I have never seen any of my food merchants run out of food. Never. This will definitely impact children. We are talking about children being impacted, not having the ability to get food. That is absolutely unacceptable and wrong. Please vote for this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Steve Samuelson, on the amendment, sir.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you. I realize this bill and this amendment deal with the SNAP program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. I do want to address the elephant in the room, that this exact program was just in the news 2 weeks ago. The President has proposed a \$200 billion cut in food stamps, or SNAP, a 25-percent cut.

I think the Gainey amendment would make sure that we do not cause unnecessary delays to our constituents receiving nutrition assistance. And yes, that does include children and families and constituents in all of our communities. So in the light of the discussions going on in Washington, including the possibility of a 25-percent reduction as proposed by the President of the United States, I think the Gainey amendment is a very good measure to make sure that we make sure this program runs efficiently for our citizens. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Does anybody else wish to speak?

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—84

Barbin	Deasy	Kim	Petrarca
Bizzarro	DeLissio	Kinsey	Petri
Boyle	DeLuca	Kirkland	Rabb
Bradford	Dermody	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Briggs	DiGirolamo	Krueger	Readshaw
Brown, V.	Donatucci	Kulik	Roebuck
Bullock	Driscoll	Longiatti	Rozzi
Burns	Evans	Madden	Sainato
Caltagirone	Fabrizio	Maher	Samuelson

Carroll	Fitzgerald	Markosek	Schlossberg
Cephas	Flynn	Marshall	Schweyer
Comitta	Frankel	Matzie	Sims
Conklin	Freeman	McCarte	Snyder
Costa, D.	Gainey	McClinton	Solomon
Costa, P.	Galloway	McNeill	Sturla
Cruz	Goodman	Miller, D.	Taylor
Daley	Hanna	Mullery	Vazquez
Davidson	Harkins	Neilson	Vitali
Davis	Harris, J.	Neuman	Warren
Dawkins	Kavulich	O'Brien	Wheatley
Dean	Keller, W.	Pashinski	Youngblood

NAYS—110

Baker	Fritz	Mako	Roae
Barrar	Gabler	Maloney	Roe
Benninghoff	Gillen	Marsico	Ryan
Bernstine	Gillespie	Masser	Saccone
Bloom	Godshall	McGinnis	Sankey
Boback	Greiner	Mehaffie	Santora
Brown, R.	Grove	Mentzer	Saylor
Causer	Hahn	Metcalfe	Schemel
Charlton	Harper	Metzgar	Simmons
Christiana	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Sonney
Cook	Heffley	Millard	Staats
Corbin	Helm	Miller, B.	Stephens
Corr	Hennessey	Moul	Tallman
Cox	Hickernell	Mustio	Tobash
Culver	Hill	Nelson	Toepel
Cutler	Irvin	Nesbit	Toohil
Day	James	O'Neill	Topper
DeLozier	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Walsh
Diamond	Kampf	Ortitay	Ward
Dowling	Kaufe	Peifer	Warner
Dunbar	Kauffman	Pickett	Watson
Dush	Keefer	Pyle	Wentling
Ellis	Keller, F.	Quinn, C.	Wheeland
Emrick	Keller, M.K.	Quinn, M.	White
English	Klunk	Rader	Zimmerman
Everett	Knowles	Rapp	
Farry	Lewis	Reed	Turzai,
Fee	Mackenzie	Reese	Speaker

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Evankovich	Lawrence	Murt	Rothman
Gergely	Milne	Quigley	Thomas
Haggerty			

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. GAINEY offered the following amendment No. A01325:

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 11 and 12, by striking out "six months" and inserting three years

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. Representative Gainey, on the amendment.

Mr. GAINEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To implement this change, the Department of Human Services has stated that they would need longer than 6 months because this would be a whole system change to the 1.9 million people that are receiving SNAP.

My amendment states that maybe we should move it to 3 years. So I am asking my colleagues to join me today. If we are going to do this, let us at least make sure that we do it right, because the truth is, if we are doing it in 6 months, we are rushing it through and we are not doing it correctly. And if we are going to rush it through, there are going to be some people that fall through the cracks and that are going to be hurt by this. If we really want to make sure that we are protecting the people that have elected us to be here, the most we can do is make sure that we are doing a system that is appropriately done correctly.

I am asking my colleagues to vote to move it to 3 years. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Toohil.

Ms. TOOHL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Three years is a very long time. Other States that have done the transition have done it in a shorter time period. The 6-month time period is actually very moderate. So we are giving time for the changes to be implemented and for DHS to deal with the computer system. So I am requesting a negative vote just because it is too long of a time period, 3 years.

The beneficiaries on these systems fluctuate, so you can have 30,000 new people coming on to the system getting SNAP. In the last month the numbers have changed. So 3 years is very far out, and we are requesting that this change get implemented within 6 months. And it does not reduce benefits. People are not going to be getting less money on the card. They are not going to have less access. It is actually helping that you have more access to fresh produce and vegetables, bread, milk – the things that people vitally need and are going to the stores and that it is not there.

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Gainey, on the amendment, sir.

Mr. GAINEY. Mr. Speaker, on States that have implemented this, they have had many people, many people fall through the cracks. I do not want to see our Pennsylvanians get hurt. I think that 6 months is entirely too fast, and we all know that changing the system in 6 months is very ambitious. I am asking for an affirmative vote on this. The least we could do is make sure if we are going to make the change we do it right for the people of Pennsylvania. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—78

Bizzarro	Deasy	Keller, W.	Pashinski
Boyle	DeLissio	Kim	Rabb
Bradford	DeLuca	Kinsey	Ravenstahl
Briggs	Dermody	Kirkland	Readshaw
Brown, V.	Donatucci	Kortz	Roebuck
Bullock	Driscoll	Krueger	Rozzi
Burns	English	Kulik	Sainato

Caltagirone	Evans	Longietti	Samuelson
Carroll	Fabrizio	Madden	Schlossberg
Cephas	Fitzgerald	Markosek	Schweyer
Comitta	Flynn	Matzie	Sims
Conklin	Frankel	McCarter	Snyder
Costa, D.	Freeman	McClinton	Solomon
Costa, P.	Gainey	McNeill	Sturla
Cruz	Galloway	Miller, D.	Vazquez
Daley	Goodman	Mullery	Vitali
Davidson	Hanna	Neilson	Warren
Davis	Harkins	Neuman	Wheatley
Dawkins	Harris, J.	O'Brien	Youngblood
Dean	Kavulich		

NAYS—116

Baker	Gabler	Marshall	Roae
Barbin	Gillen	Marsico	Roe
Barrar	Gillespie	Masser	Ryan
Benninghoff	Godshall	McGinnis	Saccone
Bernstine	Greiner	Mehaffie	Sankey
Bloom	Grove	Mentzer	Santora
Boback	Hahn	Metcalfe	Saylor
Brown, R.	Harper	Metzgar	Schemel
Causer	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Simmons
Charlton	Heffley	Millard	Sonney
Christiana	Helm	Miller, B.	Staats
Cook	Hennessey	Moul	Stephens
Corbin	Hickernell	Mustio	Tallman
Corr	Hill	Nelson	Taylor
Cox	Irvin	Nesbit	Tobash
Culver	James	O'Neill	Toepel
Cutler	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Toohil
Day	Kampf	Ortitay	Topper
Delozier	Kaufner	Peifer	Walsh
Diamond	Kauffman	Petrarca	Ward
DiGirolamo	Keefer	Petri	Warner
Dowling	Keller, F.	Pickett	Watson
Dunbar	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Wentling
Dush	Klunk	Quinn, C.	Wheeland
Ellis	Knowles	Quinn, M.	White
Emrick	Lewis	Rader	Zimmerman
Everett	Mackenzie	Rapp	
Farry	Maher	Reed	Turzai,
Fee	Mako	Reese	Speaker
Fritz	Maloney		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Evankovich	Lawrence	Murt	Rothman
Gergely	Milne	Quigley	Thomas
Haggerty			

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. GAINEY offered the following amendment No. A01326:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 16, by inserting after "schedule."
The General Assembly shall appropriate sufficient funds and develop a dedicated funding source for information technology expenses and other administrative expenses incurred by the department to implement this section.

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Gainey, on that amendment, please.

Mr. GAINEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, we have not even identified how we are going to pay for this, so we are talking about a whole system change and we do not have any idea where we are going to get the money. We were just told that the money would be, that the cost would be extremely expensive. We are in a budget crunch right now. We are trying to raise money for revenue right now and we are going to add to our debt by doing something that really, really is not going to be beneficial for individuals that are on SNAP.

I believe that we should hold this bill up until we find out how we are going to pay for it, because if we are just going to pass something and we do not know how we are going to pay for it, again that is another injury to the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. So I am asking our colleagues – at least we agree on one thing: we are in a budget crisis. Let us at least say, if we agree on that, that we should not vote on anything unless we know where the money is going to come from to pay for it or we are just going to add more debt that we are already dealing with right now.

Thank you. I am asking for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. Representative Toohil, on the amendment, please.

Ms. TOOHIL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A lot of the SNAP program is federally funded, so this is not an issue. DHS is constantly revamping their computer systems in different ways. They very often are sending out letters and notifications as they are adding new SNAP beneficiaries monthly and even weekly. And what we are asking is that the 67 counties have a uniform process where families are able to receive the benefits on their card between day 1 and day 25 instead of days 1 through 10.

I would ask for a negative vote on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. Representative Gainey, on the amendment, sir.

Mr. GAINEY. Mr. Speaker, the one thing we did not hear is how we are going to pay for it. We are dealing with a budget crisis. We already have a great amount of debt that we are trying to, trying to get rid of, and now we are going to add to the debt without finding a line item on which we are going to pay for this.

Again, from the beginning, this is a bad bill, and I am asking my colleagues to vote for the amendment that I put forth.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—80

Barbin	Dean	Keller, W.	Pashinski
Bizzarro	Deasy	Kim	Petrarca
Boyle	DeLissio	Kinsey	Rabb
Bradford	DeLuca	Kirkland	Ravenstahl
Briggs	Dermoddy	Kortz	Readshaw
Brown, V.	Donatucci	Krueger	Roebuck

Bullock	Driscoll	Kulik	Rozzi
Burns	Evans	Longietti	Sainato
Caltagirone	Fabrizio	Madden	Samuelson
Carroll	Fitzgerald	Markosek	Schlossberg
Cephas	Flynn	Matzie	Schweyer
Comitta	Frankel	McCarter	Sims
Conklin	Freeman	McClinton	Snyder
Costa, D.	Gainey	McNeill	Solomon
Costa, P.	Galloway	Miller, D.	Sturla
Cruz	Goodman	Mullery	Vazquez
Daley	Hanna	Neilson	Vitali
Davidson	Harkins	Nelson	Warren
Davis	Harris, J.	Neuman	Wheatley
Dawkins	Kavulich	O'Brien	Youngblood

NAYS—114

Baker	Fritz	Mako	Roae
Barrar	Gabler	Maloney	Roe
Benninghoff	Gillen	Marshall	Ryan
Bernstine	Gillespie	Marsico	Saccone
Bloom	Godshall	Masser	Sankey
Boback	Greiner	McGinnis	Santora
Brown, R.	Grove	Mehaffie	Saylor
Causer	Hahn	Mentzer	Schemel
Charlton	Harper	Metcalfe	Simmons
Christiana	Harris, A.	Metzgar	Sonney
Cook	Heffley	Miccarelli	Staats
Corbin	Helm	Millard	Stephens
Corr	Hennessey	Miller, B.	Tallman
Cox	Hickernell	Moul	Taylor
Culver	Hill	Mustio	Tobash
Cutler	Irvin	Nesbit	Toepel
Day	James	O'Neill	Toohil
DeLozier	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Topper
Diamond	Kampf	Ortitay	Walsh
DiGirolamo	Kaufman	Peifer	Ward
Dowling	Kauffman	Petri	Warner
Dunbar	Keefer	Pickett	Watson
Dush	Keller, F.	Pyle	Wentling
Ellis	Keller, M.K.	Quinn, C.	Wheeland
Emrick	Klunk	Quinn, M.	White
English	Knowles	Rader	Zimmerman
Everett	Lewis	Rapp	
Farry	Mackenzie	Reed	Turzai,
Fee	Maher	Reese	Speaker

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Evankovich	Lawrence	Murt	Rothman
Gergely	Milne	Quigley	Thomas
Haggerty			

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

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Gainey withdraws amendment 1327.

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

Mr. **DAWKINS** offered the following amendment
No. **A01641**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 15, by striking out "monthly" and inserting
semimonthly
Amend Bill, page 1, line 16, by striking out "twenty-five-day"
Amend Bill, page 1, line 16, by striking out the period after
"schedule" and inserting
of ten days and twenty-five days, respectively. During each
distribution schedule, benefits shall be distributed proportionally, or as
proportionally as practicable.

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

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The **SPEAKER**. Representative Dawkins, on the amendment, sir.

Mr. **DAWKINS**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am actually withdrawing that amendment, 1641, and I am going to introduce a late-filed amendment, which is 1727.

The **SPEAKER**. Yes, sir.

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

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

The **SPEAKER**. Sir, the late-filed amendment will require a motion to suspend, and you may make that motion.

Mr. **DAWKINS**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do make the motion to suspend the rules. I have spoken to the prime sponsor of the bill, and I do commend her on the great work she has done on this particular legislation. I would ask the House members for the suspension so we can talk a little bit about the amendment that I put forth, and I believe we both agree that this would actually make the bill better.

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

The **SPEAKER**. Representative Toohil, on the motion, please.

Ms. **TOOHIL**. I would request on this motion that it would be a negative vote, not to suspend the rules.

The **SPEAKER**. Representative Cutler, on the motion, please.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would urge a "no" vote on suspension of the rules.

The **SPEAKER**. Representative Dawkins, on the motion, if you wish to speak again.

Mr. **DAWKINS**. No.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—78

Barbin	Dean	Keller, W.	Petrarca
Bizzarro	Deasy	Kim	Rabb
Boyle	DeLissio	Kinsey	Ravenstahl
Bradford	DeLuca	Kirkland	Readshaw
Briggs	Dermody	Kortz	Roebuck
Brown, V.	Donatucci	Krueger	Rozzi
Bullock	Driscoll	Kulik	Sainato
Burns	Evans	Longietti	Samuelson
Caltagirone	Fabrizio	Madden	Schlossberg
Carrroll	Fitzgerald	Markosek	Schweyer
Cephas	Flynn	Matzie	Sims
Comitta	Frankel	McCarter	Snyder
Conklin	Freeman	McClinton	Solomon
Costa, D.	Gainey	McNeill	Sturla
Costa, P.	Galloway	Miller, D.	Vazquez
Cruz	Goodman	Mullery	Vitali
Daley	Hanna	Neilson	Warren
Davidson	Harkins	O'Brien	Wheatley
Davis	Harris, J.	Pashinski	Youngblood
Dawkins	Kavulich		

NAYS—116

Baker	Gabler	Marshall	Roae
Barrar	Gillen	Marsico	Roe
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Masser	Ryan
Bernstine	Godshall	McGinnis	Saccone
Bloom	Greiner	Mehaffie	Sankey
Boback	Grove	Mentzer	Santora
Brown, R.	Hahn	Metcalfe	Saylor
Causer	Harper	Metzgar	Schemel
Charlton	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Simmons
Christiana	Heffley	Millard	Sonney
Cook	Helm	Miller, B.	Staats
Corbin	Hennessey	Moul	Stephens
Corr	Hickernell	Mustio	Tallman
Cox	Hill	Nelson	Taylor
Culver	Irvin	Nesbit	Tobash
Cutler	James	Neuman	Toepel
Day	Jozwiak	O'Neill	Toohil
Delozier	Kampf	Oberlander	Topper
Diamond	Kaufner	Ortitay	Walsh
DiGirolamo	Kauffman	Peifer	Ward
Dowling	Keefer	Petri	Warner
Dunbar	Keller, F.	Pickett	Watson
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Wentling
Ellis	Klunk	Quinn, C.	Wheeland
Emrick	Knowles	Quinn, M.	White
English	Lewis	Rader	Zimmerman
Everett	Mackenzie	Rapp	
Farry	Maher	Reed	Turzai,
Fee	Mako	Reese	Speaker
Fritz	Maloney		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Evankovich	Lawrence	Murt	Rothman
Gergely	Milne	Quigley	Thomas
Haggerty			

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 as amended?

The SPEAKER. I do not see any further amendments on the bill.

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 913, PN 1713**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 8 (Boroughs and Incorporated Towns) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, adding provisions related to incorporated towns, and providing for storm water management plans and facilities.

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

Mr. **MUSTIO** offered the following amendment
No. **A01519**:

Amend Bill, page 4, line 21, by striking out "may" and inserting shall

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

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, Representative Mustio is recognized; amendment 1519.

Mr. **MUSTIO**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Last session we passed similar legislation to fix the storm water legislation in second-class townships. This series of bills that Representative Everett has helps to fix other municipalities and boroughs. The bill that we passed and was signed into law last session had a provision in it that said local municipalities "shall" provide credits to those individuals or companies that install storm water improvement measures.

The bill as currently written says "may" do that, giving local municipalities the discretion as to whether or not local individuals or businesses get credit for improving their property when others do not go to that expense. So this series of bills, there are going to be several amendments changing the "may" provision to "shall," and for consistency, so that those that invest in protecting storm water runoff should get the appropriate credit and those that do not should obviously pay a little more. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Bryan Barbin.

Mr. **BARBIN**. I rise in support of the Mustio amendment. One of the things that we always are supposed to be considering is both the uniformity clause and the equal protection clause of the United States Constitution. If you are providing a township with the statement that you "shall" provide a credit, there is no just reason to not do it for the other municipal entities that we are bringing up today.

So I agree with Representative Mustio: if it is in the prior bill that we enacted, it ought to be in this bill. I ask everyone to vote to add this amendment.

The SPEAKER. Representative Freeman.

Mr. **FREEMAN**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Mustio amendment. Although he did make reference to the previous legislation which passed in a previous session regarding townships of the second class and the "shall" provision that exists in that statute, we should be clear that that was inserted by the Senate and came back to us, so it was not the original intent of this House to mandate a "shall" provision for exemptions or for credits.

I think we really need to leave this decision to our local elected officials on the ground within those communities that this series of bills will address to empower them to deal with fees for storm water management. They will have to make decisions on the ground as to what is deserving, what project that was built before is deserving of a proper credit or exemption, and I really think we are micromanaging when we are looking over their shoulder and telling them they have to provide that credit or exemption.

Let us trust our local elected officials to do the right thing, to be fair, and frankly, if they are not fair in the application of their fees, they can always be challenged in court. So there is an impetus for them to make sure that they are very evenhanded. But let us not have us here in Harrisburg dictate to our local officials as to whether they have to mandatorily provide an exemption or a credit. Let us leave that up to the local levels.

So I would urge a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. Representative Mustio.

Mr. **MUSTIO**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to address a couple of the comments made by the previous speaker, whom I respect immensely. The reason that it was not included in the legislation as it left the House was because, as all of us know, sometimes there are bills that come before us, that things are brought to our attention at the last minute, and we said, you know what? This is probably something that we can fix over in the Senate – which the Senate, believe it or not, did actually fix something correctly that time.

My concern is, if we do not, if we do not make this a "shall" provision and we let the locals decide whether or not they are going to do that, in essence we are giving them taxing authority, and why do we want our local residents going to court? Let us take that ability to go court out of their hands and just say, if you are installing this type of device or this tank on your property that prevents storm water overflow into the streams or wherever, that we are going give them credit for that.

I think now we should fix it. We voted on concurrence when it came back to approve that, and I think now is the time. Let us get it right the first time so it goes right to the Senate. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Everett, on the amendment.

Mr. **EVERETT**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would request that you vote "yes" on this amendment for the reasons that my colleagues have set forth. It will make it consistent with the legislation that was already enacted, and if we do not change it here, the result will be that it will get changed in the Senate as it did last time and get sent back to us to concur in their amendments. So I think it still allows municipalities the ability to decide how much credit they will

give to the improvements that are made. It does not say they have to give them full credit or how much credit they have to give it. It just says that they will give them credit.

And for all those reasons I would ask for a "yes" vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—110

Baker	Emrick	Kulik	Reed
Barbin	English	Lewis	Reese
Barrar	Everett	Maher	Roae
Benninghoff	Fee	Mako	Roe
Bernstine	Flynn	Markosek	Rozzi
Bloom	Fritz	Marshall	Ryan
Boback	Gabler	Marsico	Sankey
Brown, R.	Gillen	Masser	Santora
Caltagirone	Gillespie	McGinnis	Saylor
Causer	Godshall	Mentzer	Schemel
Charlton	Greiner	Metzgar	Simmons
Christiana	Grove	Miccarelli	Sonney
Cook	Hahn	Millard	Stephens
Corbin	Harris, A.	Moul	Tallman
Corr	Heffley	Mustio	Taylor
Costa, D.	Helm	Nelson	Tobash
Costa, P.	Hennessey	Nesbit	Toepel
Cox	Hickernell	O'Neill	Toohil
Culver	Hill	Oberlander	Topper
Cutler	Irvin	Ortitay	Walsh
Delozier	James	Peifer	Warner
DeLuca	Jozwiak	Pickett	Watson
Diamond	Kampf	Pyle	Wentling
DiGirolamo	Kaufer	Quinn, C.	Wheeland
Dowling	Kauffman	Quinn, M.	White
Dunbar	Klunk	Rader	
Dush	Knowles	Rapp	Turzai,
Ellis	Kortz	Readshaw	Speaker

NAYS—84

Bizzarro	Donatucci	Kinsey	Petri
Boyle	Driscoll	Kirkland	Rabb
Bradford	Evans	Krueger	Ravenstahl
Briggs	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roebuck
Brown, V.	Farry	Mackenzie	Saccone
Bullock	Fitzgerald	Madden	Sainato
Burns	Frankel	Maloney	Samuelson
Carroll	Freeman	Matzie	Schlossberg
Cephas	Gainey	McCarter	Schweyer
Comitta	Galloway	McClinton	Sims
Conklin	Goodman	McNeill	Snyder
Cruz	Hanna	Mehaffie	Solomon
Daley	Harkins	Metcalfe	Staats
Davidson	Harper	Miller, B.	Sturla
Davis	Harris, J.	Miller, D.	Vazquez
Dawkins	Kavulich	Mullery	Vitali
Day	Keefer	Neilson	Ward
Dean	Keller, F.	Neuman	Warren
Deasy	Keller, M.K.	O'Brien	Wheatley
DeLissio	Keller, W.	Pashinski	Youngblood
Dermody	Kim	Petrarca	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Evankovich	Lawrence	Murt	Rothman
Gergely	Milne	Quigley	Thomas
Haggerty			

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?

The SPEAKER. There are no further amendments.

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 914, PN 1068**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 8 (Boroughs and Incorporated Towns) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in storm sewers and watercourses, further providing for authority of boroughs and for manner of financing work.

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

Mr. **MUSTIO** offered the following amendment
No. **A01520**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 13, by striking out "may" and inserting
shall

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

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, Representative Mustio; 1520.

Mr. MUSTIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Same comments as on the last amendment.

The SPEAKER. Representative Freeman, on the amendment, please.

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Once again, I rise to oppose this amendment for all the reasons I stated on the last piece of legislation. I think this is really something we need to leave up to the discretion of our local elected officials as to whether it is appropriate to grant an exemption or a credit. We should not be making that decision. We should not be looking over their shoulder based upon the circumstances that are on the ground in their particular community. Let us give them that authority. Let us not take that away. I urge a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. Representative Everett, on the amendment, please.

Mr. EVERETT. I again would ask for a "yes" vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—103

Barbin	Emrick	Kulik	Reese
Barrar	English	Lewis	Roe
Benninghoff	Everett	Maher	Rozzi
Bernstine	Fee	Mako	Ryan
Bloom	Fritz	Marshall	Sankey
Boback	Gabler	Marsico	Santora
Brown, R.	Gillen	Masser	Saylor
Burns	Gillespie	McGinnis	Schemel
Caltagirone	Godshall	Mentzer	Simmons
Causser	Greiner	Metzgar	Sonney
Charlton	Grove	Miccarelli	Stephens
Christiana	Hahn	Millard	Tallman
Cook	Harris, A.	Moul	Taylor
Corbin	Heffley	Mustio	Tobash
Corr	Helm	Nelson	Toepel
Costa, D.	Hickernell	Nesbit	Toohil
Costa, P.	Hill	O'Neill	Topper
Culver	Irvin	Oberlander	Walsh
Cutler	James	Ortitay	Warner
Delozier	Jozwiak	Peifer	Watson
DeLuca	Kampf	Pyle	Wentling
Diamond	Kaufer	Quinn, C.	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Kauffman	Quinn, M.	White
Dowling	Klunk	Rader	
Dunbar	Knowles	Readshaw	Turzai,
Dush	Kortz	Reed	Speaker
Ellis			

NAYS—91

Baker	Driscoll	Kirkland	Rabb
Bizzarro	Evans	Krueger	Rapp
Boyle	Fabrizio	Longiotti	Ravenstahl
Bradford	Farry	Mackenzie	Roae
Briggs	Fitzgerald	Madden	Roebuck
Brown, V.	Flynn	Maloney	Saccone
Bullock	Frankel	Markosek	Sainato
Carroll	Freeman	Matzie	Samuelson
Cephas	Gainey	McCarter	Schlossberg
Comitta	Galloway	McClinton	Schweyer
Conklin	Goodman	McNeill	Sims
Cox	Hanna	Mehaffie	Snyder
Cruz	Harkins	Metcalfe	Solomon
Daley	Harper	Miller, B.	Staats
Davidson	Harris, J.	Miller, D.	Sturla
Davis	Hennessey	Mullery	Vazquez
Dawkins	Kavulich	Neilson	Vitali
Day	Keefer	Neuman	Ward
Dean	Keller, F.	O'Brien	Warren
Deasy	Keller, M.K.	Pashinski	Wheatley
DeLissio	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Youngblood
Dermody	Kim	Petri	Zimmerman
Donatucci	Kinsey	Pickett	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Evankovich	Lawrence	Murt	Rothman
Gergely	Milne	Quigley	Thomas
Haggerty			

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

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 915, PN 1069**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 24, 1931 (P.L.1206, No.331), known as The First Class Township Code, providing for storm water management plans and facilities.

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

Mr. **MUSTIO** offered the following amendment
No. **A01521**:

Amend Bill, page 3, line 28, by striking out "may" and inserting shall

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

The SPEAKER. So on amendment 1521, the Chair recognizes Representative Mustio.

Mr. MUSTIO. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the membership for a consistent vote. This is the same comments as on the other bills.

The SPEAKER. Representative Freeman, on the amendment, please.

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Once again I urge a "no" vote. This really is a decision that should be in the hands of our local officials. They should determine based upon the circumstances on the ground as to whether to grant a credit or an exemption. We should not be dictating that. So please, I urge a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. Representative Everett, on the amendment.

Mr. EVERETT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Once again for the reasons set forth, I would ask for a "yes" vote to make all these municipalities consistent. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—106

Baker	Ellis	Kulik	Reese
Barbin	Emrick	Lewis	Roe
Barrar	English	Maher	Rozzi
Benninghoff	Everett	Mako	Ryan
Bernstine	Fee	Marshall	Sainato
Bloom	Fritz	Marsico	Sankey
Boback	Gabler	Masser	Santora
Brown, R.	Gillen	McCarter	Saylor

Burns	Gillespie	McGinnis	Schemel
Caltagirone	Godshall	Mentzer	Simmons
Causer	Greiner	Metzgar	Sonney
Charlton	Hahn	Miccarelli	Stephens
Christiana	Harris, A.	Millard	Tallman
Cook	Heffley	Moul	Taylor
Corbin	Helm	Mustio	Tobash
Corr	Hickernell	Nelson	Toepel
Costa, D.	Hill	Nesbit	Toohil
Costa, P.	Irvin	O'Neill	Topper
Culver	James	Oberlander	Walsh
Cutler	Jozwiak	Ortitay	Warner
Delozier	Kampf	Peifer	Watson
DeLuca	Kaufner	Pickett	Wentling
Diamond	Kauffman	Pyle	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Klunk	Quinn, C.	White
Dowling	Knowles	Quinn, M.	
Dunbar	Kortz	Rader	Turzai,
Dush	Krueger	Reed	Speaker

NAYS—88

Bizzarro	Driscoll	Kim	Rabb
Boyle	Evans	Kinsey	Rapp
Bradford	Fabrizio	Kirkland	Ravenstahl
Briggs	Farry	Longietti	Readshaw
Brown, V.	Fitzgerald	Mackenzie	Roae
Bullock	Flynn	Madden	Roebuck
Carroll	Frankel	Maloney	Saccone
Cephas	Freeman	Markosek	Samuelson
Comitta	Gainey	Matzie	Schlossberg
Conklin	Galloway	McClinton	Schweyer
Cox	Goodman	McNeill	Sims
Cruz	Grove	Mehaffie	Snyder
Daley	Hanna	Metcalfe	Solomon
Davidson	Harkins	Miller, B.	Staats
Davis	Harper	Miller, D.	Sturla
Dawkins	Harris, J.	Mullery	Vazquez
Day	Hennessey	Neilson	Vitali
Dean	Kavulich	Neuman	Ward
Deasy	Keefer	O'Brien	Warren
DeLissio	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Wheatley
Dermody	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Youngblood
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Petri	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Evankovich	Lawrence	Murt	Rothman
Gergely	Milne	Quigley	Thomas
Haggerty			

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?

The SPEAKER. There are no other amendments.

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 916, PN 1070**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 11 (Cities) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in watercourses, flood protection projects and storm water systems, further providing for establishing and changing watercourses, flood protection projects and storm water systems and for assessment of benefits and liens.

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

Mr. **MUSTIO** offered the following amendment
No. A01522:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 6, by striking out "may" and inserting shall

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Mustio, on the amendment, please.

Mr. MUSTIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Same comments as on the previous bills.

The SPEAKER. Representative Freeman, on the amendment, please.

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Once again I urge a "no" vote. This really should be a decision left to our local officials. Let them determine whether we are giving an exemption or a credit. Let us not dictate that from here in Harrisburg. I urge a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. Representative Everett, on the amendment, please.

Mr. EVERETT. I would ask my colleagues for a "yes" vote.
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—106

Baker	Ellis	Kulik	Reese
Barbin	Emrick	Lewis	Roe
Barrar	English	Maher	Rozzi
Benninghoff	Everett	Mako	Ryan
Bernstine	Fee	Marshall	Sankey
Bloom	Fritz	Marsico	Santora
Boback	Gabler	Masser	Saylor
Brown, R.	Gillen	McGinnis	Schemel
Burns	Gillespie	Mentzer	Simmons
Caltagirone	Godshall	Metzgar	Sonney
Causer	Greiner	Miccarelli	Stephens
Charlton	Hahn	Millard	Tallman
Christiana	Harris, A.	Moul	Taylor
Cook	Heffley	Mustio	Tobash
Corbin	Helm	Nelson	Toepel
Corr	Hickernell	Nesbit	Toohil
Costa, D.	Hill	O'Neill	Topper
Costa, P.	Irvin	Oberlander	Walsh
Culver	James	Ortitay	Ward
Cutler	Jozwiak	Peifer	Warner

Delozier	Kampf	Pickett	Watson
DeLuca	Kaufer	Pyle	Wentling
Diamond	Kauffman	Quinn, C.	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Klunk	Quinn, M.	White
Dowling	Knowles	Rader	
Dunbar	Kortz	Readshaw	Turzai,
Dush	Krueger	Reed	Speaker

NAYS—88

Bizzarro	Driscoll	Kim	Petri
Boyle	Evans	Kinsey	Rabb
Bradford	Fabrizio	Kirkland	Rapp
Briggs	Farry	Longietti	Ravenstahl
Brown, V.	Fitzgerald	Mackenzie	Roae
Bullock	Flynn	Madden	Roebuck
Carroll	Frankel	Maloney	Saccone
Cephas	Freeman	Markosek	Sainato
Comitta	Gainey	Matzie	Samuelson
Conklin	Galloway	McCarter	Schlossberg
Cox	Goodman	McClinton	Schweyer
Cruz	Grove	McNeill	Sims
Daley	Hanna	Mehaffie	Snyder
Davidson	Harkins	Metcalfe	Solomon
Davis	Harper	Miller, B.	Staats
Dawkins	Harris, J.	Miller, D.	Sturla
Day	Hennessey	Mullery	Vazquez
Dean	Kavulich	Neilson	Vitali
Deasy	Keefer	Neuman	Warren
DeLissio	Keller, F.	O'Brien	Wheatley
Dermody	Keller, M.K.	Pashinski	Youngblood
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Evankovich	Lawrence	Murt	Rothman
Gergely	Milne	Quigley	Thomas
Haggerty			

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 1, PN 902**, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 24 (Education), 51 (Military Affairs) and 71 (State Government) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, extensively revising pension provisions as follows: In Title 24: for retirement for school employees, in the areas of preliminary provisions, of membership, contributions and benefits, of school employees' defined contribution plan and of administration and miscellaneous provisions; and for health insurance for retired school employees, in the area of preliminary provisions. In Title 51: for employment preferences and pensions, in the area of military leave of absence. In Title 71: for boards and offices, in the area of Independent Fiscal Office; and for retirement for State employees and officers, in the areas of preliminary provisions, of membership, credited service, classes of service and eligibility for benefits, of contributions, of benefits, of State employees' defined contribution plan and of administration, funds,

accounts, general provisions. Providing, as to the revisions: for construction and administration, for applicability, for liability, for member statements and for suspension of provisions of the Public Employee Retirement Study Commission Act.

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

The SPEAKER. There are four amendments that have been offered. Representative McGinnis offered 1632 and 1635, Representative Conklin offered 1659, and Representative Barbin offered 1682. However, they will all be ruled out of order. The appropriate rule – it is a statute and a rule – requires that there be an actuarial note provided by the Independent Fiscal Office. This is in 43 P.S. § 1407, which is Act 100 of 2016, and it is also in the rules.

I am not aware of any other amendments, but those amendments – 1632, 1635, 1659, and 1682 – are ruled out of order for not having an actuarial note provided by the Independent Fiscal Office.

There are no other amendments.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 831, PN 1840**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in general provisions relating to operation of vehicles, further providing for obedience to authorized persons directing traffic and providing for drivers in organized motorcycle processions; and, in rules of the road in general, further providing for following too closely.

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

Mrs. **BULLOCK** offered the following amendment
No. **A01510**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 5, by striking out "AND,"
Amend Bill, page 1, line 9, by striking out the period after "~~officers~~" and inserting
; and, in other required equipment, further providing for exhaust systems, mufflers and noise control and prescribing penalties.
Amend Bill, page 5, by inserting between lines 22 and 23
Section 4. Section 4523 of Title 75 is amended by adding a subsection to read:
§ 4523. Exhaust systems, mufflers and noise control.

* * *

(f) Prohibition of straight pipe exhaust systems on motorcycles.—

(1) No person may operate a motorcycle with a straight pipe exhaust system. A person who violates this subsection shall be fined as follows:

(i) Not less than \$250 for a first offense.

(ii) Not less than \$500 for a second or

subsequent offense.

(2) As used in this subsection, the term "straight pipe exhaust system" shall mean a straight-through exhaust system that does not contain baffles or otherwise does not meet the requirements relating to mufflers under this section.

Amend Bill, page 5, line 23, by striking out "4" and inserting

5

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Bullock is recognized on the amendment.

Mrs. BULLOCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer amendment 1510 to HB 831. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my amendment is to reduce excessive motorcycle noise. Particularly, Mr. Speaker, the amendment prohibits persons from operating a motorcycle with the straight pipe exhaust system. This is an alteration to the exhaust system. It is my understanding that there is not a lot of clarity in the existing law of whether or not the straight pipes are prohibited, and it has caused a lot of confusion for police officers in the city of Philadelphia, but I have also heard from a police officer in York who agreed that he needed additional clarity.

In Philadelphia we have motorcycle riders that are racing up and down the Ben Franklin Parkway in my district, and actually racing up and down the art museum steps. Residents complain about noise. Police officers complain about being able to enforce certain regulations without this clarity.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the amendment defines the "straight pipe exhaust system" as "...a straight-through exhaust system that does not contain baffles or otherwise does not meet the requirements relating to mufflers...."

Finally, Mr. Speaker, persons found in violation of this prohibition will be subject to a fine of not less than \$250 for the first offense and not less than \$500 for the second or subsequent offenses.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Keller, on the amendment, please.

Mr. M. KELLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to read directly from the law itself. It says, "Every motor vehicle shall be equipped with a muffler or other effective noise suppressing system in good working..." condition "...and no muffler or exhaust system shall be equipped with a cutout, bypass or similar device."

In speaking with PSP (Pennsylvania State Police), the law already addresses this. This amendment is not needed and it is not an agreed-to amendment and I would ask our members to vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Representative Bullock, on the amendment.

Mrs. BULLOCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just would like to encourage a "yes" vote. This amendment merely provides clarity for law enforcement officers, but at the local level, our police departments, which I have heard from two. So as I mentioned, I heard from the Philadelphia Police Department as well as from an individual police officer in York.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—60

Boyle	DeLuca	Keller, W.	Ravenstahl
Bradford	Dermody	Kim	Roebuck
Brown, V.	DiGirolamo	Kinsey	Samuelson
Bullock	Donatucci	Kirkland	Schlossberg
Caltagirone	Driscoll	Krueger	Schweyer
Cephas	Fabrizio	Madden	Sims
Comitta	Fitzgerald	Markosek	Solomon
Costa, P.	Flynn	McCarter	Sturla
Cruz	Frankel	McClinton	Taylor
Daley	Freeman	McNeill	Vazquez
Davidson	Gainey	Miller, D.	Vitali
Davis	Galloway	Neilson	Warren
Dawkins	Hanna	O'Brien	Wheatley
Dean	Harris, J.	Quinn, M.	White
DeLissio	Hennessey	Rabb	Youngblood

NAYS—134

Baker	Everett	Longietti	Rapp
Barbin	Farry	Mackenzie	Readshaw
Barrar	Fee	Maher	Reed
Benninghoff	Fritz	Mako	Reese
Bernstine	Gabler	Maloney	Roae
Bizzarro	Gillen	Marshall	Roe
Bloom	Gillespie	Marsico	Rozzi
Boback	Godshall	Masser	Ryan
Briggs	Goodman	Matzie	Saccone
Brown, R.	Greiner	McGinnis	Sainato
Burns	Grove	Mehaffie	Sankey
Carroll	Hahn	Mentzer	Santora
Causer	Harkins	Metcalfe	Saylor
Charlton	Harper	Metzgar	Schemel
Christiana	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Simmons
Conklin	Heffley	Millard	Snyder
Cook	Helm	Miller, B.	Sonney
Corbin	Hickernell	Moul	Staats
Corr	Hill	Mullery	Stephens
Costa, D.	Irvin	Mustio	Tallman
Cox	James	Nelson	Tobash
Culver	Jozwiak	Nesbit	Toepel
Cutler	Kampf	Neuman	Toohil
Day	Kaufner	O'Neill	Topper
Deasy	Kauffman	Oberlander	Walsh
Delozier	Kavulich	Ortitay	Ward
Diamond	Keefer	Pashinski	Warner
Dowling	Keller, F.	Peifer	Watson
Dunbar	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Wentling
Dush	Klunk	Petri	Wheeland
Ellis	Knowles	Pickett	Zimmerman
Emrick	Kortz	Pyle	
English	Kulik	Quinn, C.	Turzai,
Evans	Lewis	Rader	Speaker

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Evankovich	Lawrence	Murt	Rothman
Gergely	Milne	Quigley	Thomas
Haggerty			

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 699, PN 750**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Human Services Code, in public assistance, further providing for reimbursement for certain medical assistance items and services.

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

Ms. **PICKETT** offered the following amendment
No. **A01428**:

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 2 and 3
(3) For air ambulance transport, not less than three thousand three hundred twenty-five dollars and fifty-three cents (\$3,325.53).
Amend Bill, page 2, line 3, by striking out "(3)" and inserting
(4)
Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 5 and 6
(5) Notwithstanding any other law to the contrary, for air mileage, not less than twenty-two dollars and forty-five cents (\$22.45) per mile.

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

The **SPEAKER**. The good lady, Representative Pickett, on the amendment, please.

Ms. **PICKETT**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, amendment 01428 does raise that Medicaid reimbursement level for air ambulance, as you heard, to \$3,325.53 per flight. That is based on 66 percent of the Medicare rural payment level, and in addition, \$22.45 per mile.

Recently with the House Insurance Committee we did have a hearing on this issue. We talked about the air ambulance costs and realized that a number of constituents have received bills for over \$50,000 for an emergency trip to a hospital. We learned that part of the problem is the extremely low reimbursement for Medicaid and Medicare; \$200 per flight is currently paid and it is very low. This is irresponsible, as it forces the costs on to our private citizens for the balance billing. Many of our constituents are getting bills for over \$30,000 in balance billing.

This amendment is a start in getting government to do the responsible thing by paying a fair share and not shifting those costs and the large air ambulance bills to each of our constituents. I urge you to vote for the amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**. Representative Causer, on the amendment, please.

Mr. **CAUSER**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment. The underlying bill deals with Medicaid reimbursement for ground ambulance services, and certainly it is very important for us to also support our air ambulance services. So this is an agreed-to amendment, and I ask the members to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to speak on second consideration at the appropriate time.

The **SPEAKER**. Yes.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

Baker	Dush	Knowles	Rapp
Barbin	Ellis	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Emrick	Krueger	Readshaw
Benninghoff	English	Kulik	Reed
Bernstine	Evans	Lewis	Reese
Bizzarro	Everett	Longietti	Roae
Bloom	Fabrizio	Mackenzie	Roe
Boback	Farry	Madden	Roebuck
Boyle	Fee	Maher	Rozzi
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Mako	Ryan
Briggs	Flynn	Maloney	Saccone
Brown, R.	Frankel	Markosek	Sainato
Brown, V.	Freeman	Marshall	Samuelson
Bullock	Fritz	Marsico	Sankey
Burns	Gabler	Masser	Santora
Caltagirone	Gainey	Matzie	Saylor
Carroll	Galloway	McCartner	Schemel
Causer	Gillen	McClinton	Schlossberg
Cephas	Gillespie	McGinnis	Schweyer
Charlton	Godshall	McNeill	Simmons
Christiana	Goodman	Mehaffie	Sims
Comitta	Greiner	Mentzer	Snyder
Conklin	Grove	Metcalfe	Solomon
Cook	Hahn	Metzgar	Sonney
Corbin	Hanna	Miccarelli	Staats
Corr	Harkins	Millard	Stephens
Costa, D.	Harper	Miller, B.	Sturla
Costa, P.	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Tallman
Cox	Harris, J.	Moul	Taylor
Cruz	Heffley	Mullery	Tobash
Culver	Helm	Mustio	Toepel
Cutler	Hennessey	Neilson	Toohil
Daley	Hickernell	Nelson	Topper
Davidson	Hill	Nesbit	Vazquez
Davis	Irvin	Neuman	Vitali
Dawkins	James	O'Brien	Walsh
Day	Jozwiak	O'Neill	Ward
Dean	Kampf	Oberlander	Warner
Deasy	Kaufner	Ortitay	Warren
DeLissio	Kauffman	Pashinski	Watson
Delozier	Kavulich	Peifer	Wentling
DeLuca	Keefer	Petrarca	Wheatley
Dermody	Keller, F.	Petri	Wheeland
Diamond	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	White
DiGrolamo	Keller, W.	Pyle	Youngblood
Donatucci	Kim	Quinn, C.	Zimmerman
Dowling	Kinsey	Quinn, M.	
Driscoll	Kirkland	Rabb	Turzai,
Dunbar	Klunk	Rader	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Evankovich	Lawrence	Murt	Rothman
Gergely	Milne	Quigley	Thomas
Haggerty			

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?

The SPEAKER. On second consideration, Representative Causer.

Mr. CAUSER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to offer some brief remarks on HB 699 on second consideration.

Mr. Speaker, our emergency medical services system in Pennsylvania really is in a state of crisis. The system is on the edge of collapse all across the Commonwealth, and one of the biggest issues facing our EMS services is Medicaid reimbursement. When you think about a basic life support EMS trip for an ambulance being reimbursed \$120 and no mileage for the first 20 miles, you cannot, you cannot operate an ambulance service for that little amount of money. This is the same rate that has been set and has been used since 2004 – a very low rate. And this is a problem all across the Commonwealth, but coming from a rural area, I can tell you it is a huge problem in rural Pennsylvania.

I would ask the members to think about it. Think about your constituents; think about your family and friends. What would happen when they have a medical emergency and you call 911 and there is no ambulance to respond? There are ambulance services across the Commonwealth that are going out of business, and this is a major issue.

So, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the support that HB 699 has gotten thus far and ask the members to continue supporting this lifesaving issue and supporting HB 699. Thank you.

On the question recurring,

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

BILL ON CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 151, PN 1571**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 12 (Commerce and Trade) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Small Business First, further providing for definitions; in machinery and equipment loans, further providing for definitions and for reporting and inspection; in Pennsylvania Industrial Development Program, further providing for definitions; providing for entertainment economic enhancement program; and making a related repeal.

On the question,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

The SPEAKER. Moved by the gentleman, Representative Cutler, that the House concur in those amendments.

The Chair recognizes Representative Cutler for a brief description of the underlying bill and the Senate amendments.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate made one change by taking the entertainment tax credit and making it consistent with all of the other tax credits that are currently available in the Commonwealth, by making the enactment date there; however, it will not have any fiscal impact on the Commonwealth because we would need to appropriate that money in order for it to be effectuated. I would urge a "yes" vote.

The SPEAKER. Representative Vitali. Yes, sir.

Mr. VITALI. For whatever it is worth, I do want to note for the record that the administration is opposed to this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. Representative Jake Wheatley, on the bill on concurrence in Senate amendments.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. You may proceed.

Mr. WHEATLEY. I am trying to figure out, sir, if in fact this bill – the underlying bill was a definition change for DCED (Department of Community and Economic Development) agents and now it is talking about a Tax Code subject matter – if in fact it violates our, you know, more than one subject matter rule?

The SPEAKER. Sir, at this point it seems, in conversing with the Parliamentarian, that it meets single subject and original purpose from our review of the rules, but you may move to say that it is unconstitutional and then state your purpose if you think it violates the single-subject rule of the State Constitution, and you may make that motion.

Mr. WHEATLEY. So before I make any motions, so you are saying, from you-all's take on the original bill language being a definition change of DCED agents that now in that definition change of agents we are talking about a tax credit to a specific industry, meets the single-subject definition under you-all's take?

The SPEAKER. We have not had an official ruling on it, but I will say this to you, that the Chair has consistently deferred on the issue of single subject and original purpose to the body, such that they should make a motion and then have it voted on by the body.

Mr. WHEATLEY. So I will so move, if I can, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. And, sir, what we do is if that arises – and even then, it is in deference to the body and making that motion and taking a vote thereon – it is done with amendments on the House floor. This was an amendment that was offered, this was an amendment that was offered in the Senate and adopted in the Senate. But you can make a motion based on constitutionality if you believe it is violative of those provisions, and then you would have to argue it and a vote would be taken on the floor.

CONSTITUTIONAL POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WHEATLEY. Sure. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make that motion – of the way that I am reading both what this bill's original purpose and intent was and what our Constitution kind of talks about as it relates to having a single-subject matter – I would like to make that motion that this is in violation.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Article III, section 3.

The SPEAKER. Yes; Article III, section 3?

Mr. WHEATLEY. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. Okay. The gentleman, Mr. Wheatley, raises the point of order that HB 151, PN 1571, which is on concurrence in Senate amendments, is unconstitutional. The Speaker, under rule 4, is required to submit questions affecting the constitutionality of a bill to the House for decision, which the Chair now does. And I have recognized Representative Wheatley. He has cited Article III, section 3.

On the question,

Will the House sustain the constitutionality of the bill?

The SPEAKER. Sir, do you wish to make any further comments on the constitutionality motion?

Mr. WHEATLEY. Only as it relates to the original bill left here with a definition of defining a DCED agent and came back and now we are now voting on something that is dealing with tax credits for a specific industry. So certainly under my understanding, that is more than one subject matter, and I am not even sure they are directly related.

So I would just encourage the members to not concur – or I mean to support this motion, and then we figure out another way of how we get to the support of this issue.

The SPEAKER. Representative Cutler, on the motion.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments but respectfully disagree. The question is whether or not the amendment that was adopted by the Senate is in fact germane or related to the underlying bill. I would offer the following explanation: Mr. Speaker, the unifying issues would be those programs that are currently under the jurisdiction of DCED. The original bill and purpose was to evaluate and redefine the term "agent," because there were issues surrounding the oversight of that current program. Likewise, this amendment that was made by the Senate relates to the tax credit program, which they currently oversee, and merely made the dates consistent with other tax credits that are currently also overseen by that.

So when the issues of germaneness and the Constitution's single-subject rule come up, they are not always synonymous. The single-subject court cases are helpful when considering germaneness, and probably the most famous or seminal case defined as "single subject" would be the *City of Philadelphia v. Commonwealth*. In the *City of Philadelphia* the court adopted a practical germaneness test on whether there was a single subject that satisfied so long as the legislation at issue possesses some single unifying subject to which all provisions of the act are relevant.

So when you take a look at that, Mr. Speaker, these are both programs under the purview of DCED. They both deal with the direct administration of those two underlying programs, and therefore, I would say that the amendment that was adopted by the Senate is in fact germane, and I would urge us to vote against the motion of constitutionality and move to the underlying bill as amended.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

All those in favor— Let me restate that. Those voting "aye" are voting to declare that the bill is in fact constitutional. Those voting "nay" will be voting to declare that the bill is in fact unconstitutional.

On the question recurring,

Will the House sustain the constitutionality of the bill?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—116

Baker	Gabler	Marshall	Roe
Barrar	Gillen	Marsico	Ryan
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Masser	Saccone
Bernstine	Godshall	McGinnis	Sankey
Bloom	Greiner	Mehaffie	Santora
Boback	Grove	Mentzer	Saylor
Brown, R.	Hahn	Metcalfe	Schemel
Causar	Harper	Metzgar	Simmons
Charlton	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Sonney
Christiana	Heffley	Millard	Staats
Cook	Helm	Miller, B.	Stephens
Corbin	Hennessey	Moul	Sturla
Corr	Hickernell	Mustio	Tallman
Cox	Hill	Nelson	Taylor
Culver	Irvin	Nesbit	Tobash
Cutler	James	O'Neill	Toepel
Day	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Toohil
Delozier	Kampf	Ortitay	Topper
Diamond	Kaufer	Peifer	Walsh
DiGirolamo	Kauffman	Petri	Ward
Dowling	Keefer	Pickett	Warner
Dunbar	Keller, F.	Pyle	Watson
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Quinn, C.	Wentling
Ellis	Klunk	Quinn, M.	Wheeland
Emrick	Knowles	Rader	White
English	Lewis	Rapp	Zimmerman
Everett	Mackenzie	Reed	
Farry	Maher	Reese	Turzai,
Fee	Mako	Roae	Speaker
Fritz	Maloney		

NAYS—78

Barbin	Dean	Keller, W.	Pashinski
Bizzarro	Deasy	Kim	Petrarca
Boyle	DeLissio	Kinsey	Rabb
Bradford	DeLuca	Kirkland	Ravenstahl
Briggs	Dermody	Kortz	Readshaw
Brown, V.	Donatucci	Krueger	Roebuck
Bullock	Driscoll	Kulik	Rozzi
Burns	Evans	Longietti	Sainato
Caltagirone	Fabrizio	Madden	Samuelson
Carroll	Fitzgerald	Markosek	Schlossberg
Cephas	Flynn	Matzie	Schweyer
Comitta	Frankel	McCarter	Sims
Conklin	Freeman	McClinton	Snyder
Costa, D.	Gainey	McNeill	Solomon
Costa, P.	Galloway	Miller, D.	Vazquez
Cruz	Goodman	Mullery	Vitali
Daley	Hanna	Neilson	Warren
Davidson	Harkins	Neuman	Wheatley
Davis	Harris, J.	O'Brien	Youngblood
Dawkins	Kavulich		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Evankovich	Lawrence	Murt	Rothman
Gergely	Milne	Quigley	Thomas
Haggerty			

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the constitutionality of the bill was sustained.

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

The SPEAKER. At this point we are going to continue with the vote. Those voting to concur will be voting "aye"—

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. Representative Wheatley, on the bill, and it is a bill on concurrence in Senate amendments.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Yes. I have a second parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. You may proceed.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Again, from this legislation, how would – I am trying to get you to help me understand. If we have laws that say we cannot specifically create bills that benefit a single, specific, special party, special legislation, can you help me then understand or help me see how we could constitutionally vote in support of this bill?

It is my understanding that this bill, if passed, would specifically benefit one institution in the Commonwealth. So is that, in essence, a violation of this special legislation for one single entity?

The SPEAKER. Sir, I am not aware of the point that you may be raising, but even so, if you believe that there is another provision of the Constitution that this bill on concurrence in Senate amendments violates, you are free to make that motion and to provide the evidence with respect to that motion. Evidence – I apologize for that term – but provide your rationale and the basis for your rationale of that motion. So I myself do not know to what you are referencing.

Mr. WHEATLEY. So I just want to be clear, Mr. Speaker. So I might be wrong and I have been wrong before, but can we create legislation that only benefits one entity in our Commonwealth or this special legislation to benefit one entity in our Commonwealth? Can we do that?

The SPEAKER. Representative Wheatley, with all due respect, I am not here to – in this role as Speaker, I do not offer legal opinions. You can talk to the minority House counsel and your fellow members if you believe, you know, what the interpretation is of a constitutional provision.

Now, if you believe that this bill on concurrence in Senate amendments violates a particular provision in the Constitution, you may move that the bill is unconstitutional and set forth those reasons. If your reasons are that it is special legislation and special legislation violates the Constitution, you can say that on the record here and then just provide what you know of the facts and what you know of the bill that would lead you to believe that, and then members can proceed to vote on that. But

I do not – just like in – I cannot tell you, "Oh, this is what the Constitution—" That is not my role. My role is to let you make that motion and to give you the opportunity to make the case to the members.

Mr. WHEATLEY. May I ask then for one minute to—

The SPEAKER. Oh; yes. Take your time.

We will stand at ease for just a few moments.

Representative Wheatley, we are back in order. The House is back in order.

CONSTITUTIONAL POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. Representative Wheatley, you may proceed.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a motion that this bill is unconstitutional based on Article III, section 32, of our Constitution that basically talks about "The General Assembly shall pass no local or special law in any case which has been or can be provided for by general law and specifically the General Assembly shall not pass any local or special law."

The reason why I say it is special is because in the bill itself it talks about "a concert tour promotion company, concert tour management company or other concert management company subject to tax under Article III, IV, or VI of the Tax Reform Code," and from what I understand, that currently in the Constitution there is only one entity that benefits from a change in the law or a change in this tax credit process, which I ultimately believe then violates that article under that section.

The SPEAKER. Members, the gentleman, Mr. Wheatley, raises the point of order that HB 151, PN 1571, on supplemental B House calendar is unconstitutional.

The Speaker, under rule 4, is required to submit such a question affecting the constitutionality of this bill to the House for decision. I am now doing that. I recognize that Representative Wheatley has made the argument that HB 151 is violative of Article III, section 32, of the Pennsylvania State Constitution; Article III, section 32.

On the question,

Will the House sustain the constitutionality of the bill?

The SPEAKER. Representative Wheatley, do you wish to speak on the motion?

Mr. WHEATLEY. Well, I cannot— No.

I just feel like, again, we need to be very careful in what we are doing. I do not want any one of us to be accused later on of violating the Constitution, and so I just want to bring it to our attention that unless someone can help me understand how multiple entities in the Commonwealth with this change can benefit from this particular change, this is a special provision being made for one institution, and I think that is a problematic precedent.

The SPEAKER. Representative Cutler, on the motion for constitutionality.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, again, I understand what the gentleman is trying to get to; however, I again respectfully disagree with him. I believe the gentleman's concern arises from the language that was actually included in Act 84, which was HB 1198 from 2015-16 session.

Mr. Speaker, under Article III, section 20, of the Constitution, it does in fact allow the legislature and clearly outlines how we can draft legislation. It says, "The Legislature shall have power to classify counties, cities, boroughs, school districts, and townships according to population, and all laws passed relating to each class, and all laws passed relating to, and regulating procedure and proceedings in court with reference to, any class, shall be deemed general legislation within the meaning of this Constitution."

Mr. Speaker, I believe the point the gentleman is bringing up would be if we were to specifically name a municipality, such as Pittsburgh. However, Article III, section 20, clearly outlines the process by which it can be done. It is already existing law in the existing program.

I would urge, again, a defeat of this motion of constitutionality. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Members, those who will be voting "aye" are voting to declare the bill to be constitutional; those who will be voting "no" will be voting to declare the bill to be unconstitutional and violative of Article III, section 32.

On the question recurring,
Will the House sustain the constitutionality of the bill?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—119

Baker	Gillen	Marsico	Roe
Barrar	Gillespie	Masser	Ryan
Benninghoff	Godshall	McGinnis	Saccone
Bernstine	Greiner	Mehaffie	Samuelson
Bloom	Grove	Mentzer	Sankey
Boback	Hahn	Metcalfe	Santora
Brown, R.	Harper	Metzgar	Saylor
Causar	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Schemel
Charlton	Heffley	Millard	Simmons
Christiana	Helm	Miller, B.	Sonney
Cook	Hennessey	Miller, D.	Staats
Corbin	Hickernell	Moul	Stephens
Corr	Hill	Mustio	Sturla
Cox	Irvin	Nelson	Tallman
Culver	James	Nesbit	Taylor
Cutler	Jozwiak	Neuman	Tobash
Day	Kampf	O'Neill	Toepel
Delozier	Kaufer	Oberlander	Toohil
Diamond	Kauffman	Ortitay	Topper
DiGirolamo	Keefer	Peifer	Walsh
Dowling	Keller, F.	Petri	Ward
Dunbar	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Warner
Dush	Klunk	Pyle	Watson
Ellis	Knowles	Quinn, C.	Wentling
Emrick	Lewis	Quinn, M.	Wheeland
English	Mackenzie	Rader	White
Everett	Maher	Rapp	Zimmerman
Farry	Mako	Reed	
Fee	Maloney	Reese	Turzai,
Fritz	Marshall	Roae	Speaker
Gabler			

NAYS—75

Barbin	Dawkins	Harris, J.	Pashinski
Bizzarro	Dean	Kavulich	Petrarca
Boyle	Deasy	Keller, W.	Rabb
Bradford	DeLissio	Kim	Ravenstahl
Briggs	DeLuca	Kinsey	Readshaw
Brown, V.	Dermody	Kirkland	Roebuck
Bullock	Donatucci	Kortz	Rozzi
Burns	Driscoll	Krueger	Sainato

Caltagirone	Evans	Kulik	Schlossberg
Carroll	Fabrizio	Longiatti	Schweyer
Cephas	Fitzgerald	Madden	Sims
Comitta	Flynn	Markosek	Snyder
Conklin	Frankel	Matzie	Solomon
Costa, D.	Freeman	McCarter	Vazquez
Costa, P.	Gainey	McClinton	Vitali
Cruz	Galloway	McNeill	Warren
Daley	Goodman	Mullery	Wheatley
Davidson	Hanna	Neilson	Youngblood
Davis	Harkins	O'Brien	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Evankovich	Lawrence	Murt	Rothman
Gergely	Milne	Quigley	Thomas
Haggerty			

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the constitutionality of the bill was sustained.

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

The SPEAKER. We are going to return to the bill.
Representative Wheatley.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Mr. Speaker, now that we know that it is constitutional, I have a question. As the Democratic chairman of the Finance Committee that deals with the majority of our tax credit policy and programs, that as a matter of public policy, we are now, if this were to be passed, would be taking a tax credit that citizens are basically paying for and providing and putting it into a commerce title that specifically deals with private entities.

The SPEAKER. Sir, I do think you are making an argument in opposition to the bill, which you are permitted to do, but I did not know if you were making an inquiry, because you are—

Mr. WHEATLEY. I am just on the bill.

The SPEAKER. You are on the bill itself.

Yes. You may continue to proceed.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Okay. Thank you, sir.

And so the real question becomes, why are we doing something that is counter to what should be good policy and good practice? Most of our tax credits are not in our commerce title. There are tax credit programs that are specifically itemized and specifically shown to our public. We also know we are in a budget-challenged year, so to have a facility tax credit, no matter how valuable the facility might be, to have that hidden in commerce, away from all of the other tax credits that we have, should have us and our taxpayers asking the question, "Why?"

Now, certainly I think there are a lot of worthy causes and certainly this program was supposed to kick in next year, so if this program was kicking in next year, we have a budget process that we are going through this year, why now do we want to take it from that process and hide it in commerce? I believe that if we are going to be consistent, then we need to make sure we stop the practice of benefiting one entity over other entities in special ways. I have been around here long enough to know and hear from all of my colleagues that talk about fairness, talking

about not benefiting one entity as a detriment of the other entity. This, to me, seems like that practice: a tax credit that benefits one entity, not treated like all other tax credits but is being hidden in a title that is unrelated to tax credits.

I would just challenge all of us – I know it is late. I know we are trying to get out of here. I know we have favors and all types of things we were trying to do. This is not good policy. We should take this back to the drawing board. There is no rush. This program was going to kick in next year. There is no rush. We should reject this, nonconcur, and take this up and do it right.

So I would ask my colleagues to please nonconcur, vote to nonconcur, and we can deal with this in a proper manner. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Wheatley.

Representative Margo Davidson on the bill, on concurrence in Senate amendments.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the maker of the bill stand for interrogation? It might just be a one-question interrogation.

The SPEAKER. Representative Cutler will stand for interrogation, and you may proceed.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, is the purpose of this particular legislation to sell tax credits in order to create a way for this particular entity to take care of certain expenses that they would not otherwise be able to take care of?

The SPEAKER. Representative Cutler, I apologize.

Yes; Representative Cutler will answer that, please.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My understanding in watching the Senate Appropriations hearing and the committee hearing where this was adopted was to make this tax credit consistent with all of the other tax credits that were also inserted into Act 84 last year, to make the dates consistent as well as the transferability.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. To be clear, Mr. Speaker, will the entity be allowed to sell the tax credits?

The SPEAKER. Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, the goal, as stated in the Senate when it came back to us, was to make it consistent with all of the other tax credits, so that the degree that they are transferable, or "sellable," I believe was the word that you used, as well as the enactment date, was to make them consistent across the board. However, again, it is worth to be noted that this will have no fiscal impact up until the point that the programs are in fact funded. All it allows is for the creation of the program by DCED to have the consistent dates and the consistent treatment across all the tax credits.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, on the bill?

The SPEAKER. Yes. Representative Davidson, on the bill, please.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is very concerning to me as a former small business owner and someone who normally supports tax credits. This particular tax credit proposal, not only is it specific to a particular industry and a particular entity, which makes it different on the face than any other tax credit, but it allows this business to sell the tax credits, which in effect makes it a financing tool for this particular business.

Now, our Commonwealth is not in the business of being a finance entity, and therefore, I find it highly irregular that not only are we providing a tax credit for a specific entity, but we are allowing this entity to use the credit as a financing tool to finance their business enterprise. This is highly irregular,

Mr. Speaker. It is highly speculative, Mr. Speaker, and on top of that, if it were to act as a security – which in this case, it is acting as a finance security – it is not being taxed. The profit that the business is getting from a financing activity is not being taxed. So we are providing double benefit to one specific entity in the Commonwealth to the detriment of our taxpayers, without having the benefit of benefiting the common wealth of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I am offended that we would allow such a practice to start here in the Commonwealth, and I would urge my fellow colleagues that care about fairness, that care about the taxpayers in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I urge a "no" vote on this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Todd Stephens, and then Representative Eddie Day Pashinski.

Mr. STEPHENS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, you know, as we head into budget time here in the Commonwealth, I am concerned about the fiscal impact that this bill is going to have. You know, whenever you allow tax credits to be transferred, you now ultimately impact the amount of revenue that the Commonwealth is bringing in. I do acknowledge, much to my chagrin, that most of our tax credits are transferable, so this bill, you know, providing some consistency in that regard, I understand. But as we are looking for revenue between now and June 30, I do hope that our Appropriations staff and the rest of those crunching the numbers take a hard look at this corporate welfare, and in particular, those tax credit programs with transferable provisions in them, because all we do then is say that if you do not have any tax liability in PA, you can sell your tax credit to someone who does, and those people no longer are contributing to the Commonwealth.

So for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to raise my concerns with the bill and urge the folks, as they are putting the budget together, to take a hard look at the corporate welfare programs – I think it has been tagged at about \$800 million – and take a hard look at those ones in particular where there is transferability of tax credits.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Pashinski.

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

Just for some clarification, if I may interrogate the maker?

The SPEAKER. The good gentleman has said that he will stand for interrogation. Representative Cutler is prepared to answer your questions.

Mr. PASHINSKI. Thank you very much.

In the city of Wilkes-Barre, in the area that I have the honor of serving, we have the Mohegan Sun Arena, and we also have the Kirby theater. Those two entities have also rented out their space to various musical groups and performers for the rehearsal, exactly the same as they would be doing at Clair Brothers. Under those circumstances, in your bill, will those performers then be allowed a tax credit in Wilkes-Barre or in any other theater throughout Pennsylvania that provides the same service?

The SPEAKER. Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Mr. Speaker, it is not usually customary for me to do this; however, I would have to ask the gentleman a question back in regards to what class of county these facilities are in and how they are otherwise categorized, because that is

going to be dictated by the plain reading of the language of the bill.

Mr. PASHINSKI. Luzerne is a third class.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If I could ask a further follow-up question, I would have to ask: What is the seating capacity in the venue, because that is also outlined in the plain text of the bill?

Mr. PASHINSKI. The Mohegan Sun Arena has a capacity of 10,000, and the Kirby has a capacity of 1800.

Mr. CUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I would direct the gentleman to page 3 of the bill, line 29 through page 4, line 30, because it is there that those classifications are outlined into which ones are categorized as class 1, class 2, and class 3 venues, and without knowing the specifics and the accuracy of the gentleman's answers in regards to the capacities and the locations of them in the corresponding municipalities, it would be difficult to ascertain as to whether they specifically comply. But like I said, I am happy to read that into the record, if the gentleman would like.

" 'CLASS 1 VENUE' " is "A STADIUM, ARENA, OTHER STRUCTURE OR PROPERTY OWNED BY A MUNICIPALITY OR AN AUTHORITY FORMED UNDER ARTICLE XXV-A OF THE ACT OF JULY 28, 1953...KNOWN AS THE SECOND CLASS COUNTY CODE, AT WHICH CONCERTS ARE PERFORMED..." and they have to also meet all of the qualifications to be "LOCATED IN A CITY OF THE FIRST CLASS OR A COUNTY OF THE SECOND CLASS." IT "IS CONSTRUCTED IN A MANNER IN WHICH THE VENUE HAS A SEATING CAPACITY OF AT LEAST 14,000.

" 'CLASS 2 VENUE' " is "A STADIUM, ARENA OR OTHER STRUCTURE AT WHICH CONCERTS ARE PERFORMED AND WHICH IS ALL OF THE FOLLOWING: LOCATED OUTSIDE THE GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARIES OF A CITY OF THE FIRST CLASS OR A COUNTY OF THE SECOND CLASS." It "IS CONSTRUCTED IN A MANNER IN WHICH THE VENUE HAS A SEATING CAPACITY OF AT LEAST 6,000.

" 'A CLASS 3 VENUE' " is "A STADIUM, ARENA OR OTHER STRUCTURE WHICH IS ANY OF THE FOLLOWING: LOCATED WITHIN A NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT ZONE, AS DEFINED IN 1902-B OF THE TAX REFORM CODE...OWNED BY OR AFFILIATED WITH A STATE-RELATED INSTITUTION AS DEFINED IN 62 PA.C.S. § 103" or "OWNED BY THE COMMONWEALTH AND AFFILIATED WITH THE STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION."

And I will defer to the gentleman as to whether or not they fall within those three subcategories.

Mr. PASHINSKI. Thank you, sir.

After hearing the details of that, it appears as though your legislation applies to just one entity.

The SPEAKER. Representative, are you still in interrogation?

Mr. PASHINSKI. Yes, sir; I am.

The SPEAKER. Sir, you are going to have to phrase that as a question.

Mr. PASHINSKI. The question is, after hearing the wording of your bill, it appears that it has been defined so specifically as to relate only to that one particular venue in Lititz. Is that correct?

Mr. CUTLER. No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PASHINSKI. So if it is not correct, then are you suggesting that in the State of Pennsylvania we have many venues that would qualify for this tax credit?

Mr. CUTLER. Respectfully, I believe the gentleman is confused between which facilities can apply for the tax credits and those locations which were previously defined, and, as I stated, that will host the concerts – two separate activities.

The SPEAKER. Sir, do you wish to speak on the bill?

Mr. PASHINSKI. Yes, I do.

The SPEAKER. Representative Pashinski, on the bill.

Mr. PASHINSKI. Contrary to what the gentleman just stated, the facility is still the same whether it is in rehearsal or in performance. There is no difference, because the entire amount of equipment and production necessary in preparation for a performance is used during that rehearsal period.

I appreciate the opportunity for the interrogation, and I thank the good gentleman for allowing me to ask the questions. It is still rather confusing, but thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Barbin, on the bill, please.

Mr. BARBIN. Thank you.

I rise in opposition or I rise for nonconurrence of the bill.

This sounds strikingly similar to TV commercials we have all heard where the guy says, "Let me look at your mouth. You've got a bad cavity there. Oh, that is good." And then the guy says, "Yeah, that's bad." He says, "Well, aren't you going to fix it?" and he says, "No, I'm a dental monitor. I'm not a dentist," and he walks away and has lunch.

We have identified the fact that only second-class county facilities get this credit. That is wrong. We have a chance to fix the problem by nonconcurring. We should nonconcur. We are not here to monitor tax problems; we are here to fix them.

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—114

Baker	Fritz	Maloney	Roe
Barrar	Gabler	Marshall	Ryan
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Marsico	Saccone
Bernstine	Godshall	McGinnis	Sankey
Bloom	Greiner	Mehaffie	Santora
Boback	Grove	Mentzer	Saylor
Brown, R.	Hahn	Metcalfe	Schemel
Causar	Harper	Metzgar	Simmons
Charlton	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Sonney
Christiana	Heffley	Millard	Staats
Cook	Helm	Miller, B.	Stephens
Corbin	Hennessey	Moul	Sturla
Corr	Hickernell	Mustio	Tallman
Cox	Hill	Nelson	Taylor
Culver	Irvin	Nesbit	Tobash
Cutler	James	O'Neill	Toepel
Day	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Toohil
Delozier	Kampf	Ortitay	Topper
Diamond	Kaufman	Peifer	Walsh
DiGirolamo	Kauffman	Petri	Ward

Dowling	Keefer	Pickett	Warner
Dunbar	Keller, F.	Pyle	Watson
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Quinn, C.	Wentling
Ellis	Klunk	Quinn, M.	Wheeland
Emrick	Knowles	Rader	White
English	Lewis	Rapp	Zimmerman
Everett	Mackenzie	Reed	
Farry	Maher	Reese	Turzai,
Fee	Mako	Roae	Speaker

NAYS—80

Barbin	Dean	Kavulich	O'Brien
Bizzarro	Deasy	Keller, W.	Pashinski
Boyle	DeLissio	Kim	Petrarca
Bradford	DeLuca	Kinsey	Rabb
Briggs	Dermody	Kirkland	Ravenstahl
Brown, V.	Donatucci	Kortz	Readshaw
Bullock	Driscoll	Krueger	Roebuck
Burns	Evans	Kulik	Rozzi
Caltagirone	Fabrizio	Longietti	Sainato
Carroll	Fitzgerald	Madden	Samuelson
Cephas	Flynn	Markosek	Schlossberg
Comitta	Frankel	Masser	Schweyer
Conklin	Freeman	Matzie	Sims
Costa, D.	Gainey	McCarter	Snyder
Costa, P.	Galloway	McClinton	Solomon
Cruz	Gillen	McNeill	Vazquez
Daley	Goodman	Miller, D.	Vitali
Davidson	Hanna	Mullery	Warren
Davis	Harkins	Neilson	Wheatley
Dawkins	Harris, J.	Neuman	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Evanovich	Lawrence	Murt	Rothman
Gergely	Milne	Quigley	Thomas
Haggerty			

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 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 151, PN 1571

An Act amending Title 12 (Commerce and Trade) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Small Business First, further providing for definitions; in machinery and equipment loans, further providing for definitions and for reporting and inspection; in Pennsylvania Industrial Development Program, further providing for definitions; providing for economic entertainment enhancement program; and making a related repeal.

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

BILLS RECOMMITTED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that SB 1 and HB 1490 be recommitted to the Appropriations Committee.

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

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Chairman Stan Saylor of the Appropriations Committee for a committee announcement.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There will be an immediate meeting of the Appropriations Committee in the majority Appropriations conference room. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Members, the House is going to stand in recess while the Appropriations Committee meets. Once the committee is done with its work, we will be back on the House floor. So we stand at a short recess for the Appropriations Committee to meet.

AFTER RECESS

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

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**HB 1490, PN 1909**

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 66 (Public Utilities) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for water and sewer authorities in cities of the second class.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 1, PN 902

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Titles 24 (Education), 51 (Military Affairs) and 71 (State Government) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, extensively revising pension provisions as follows: In Title 24: for retirement for school employees, in the areas of preliminary provisions, of membership, contributions and benefits, of school employees' defined contribution plan and of administration and miscellaneous provisions; and for health insurance for retired school employees, in the area of preliminary provisions. In Title 51: for employment preferences and pensions, in the area of military leave of absence. In Title 71: for boards and offices, in the area of Independent Fiscal Office; and for retirement for State employees and officers, in the areas of preliminary provisions, of membership, credited service, classes of service and eligibility for benefits, of contributions, of benefits, of State

employees' defined contribution plan and of administration, funds, accounts, general provisions. Providing, as to the revisions: for construction and administration, for applicability, for liability, for member statements and for suspension of provisions of the Public Employee Retirement Study Commission Act.

APPROPRIATIONS.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

CONSIDERATION OF HB 922 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. Representative Vitali, on HB 922, PN 1910. We were temporarily over on that, but we are back on the bill.

Mr. VITALI. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

There is barely about a fifth of this chamber here.

The SPEAKER. We welcome the debate.

Mr. VITALI. I am sorry?

The SPEAKER. We welcome the debate.

Please feel free to speak on the bill.

Mr. VITALI. Well, first of all, a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

This bill was not listed as marked for today. I have the House calendar and I am looking at this bill and it is marked as "over" for today.

Now, it has been the long precedent of this chamber that we respect the fact that the bill is marked "over," that we do not run it, and the purpose is it is impossible to bring to the floor materials for every bill we might consider, and I am just concerned that by running this bill today, we are establishing a – which I think would be a very discourteous precedent of running a bill which has been marked "over" for today. I am trying to—

The SPEAKER. Representative Vitali, the leader has listed the bill for a vote. It was listed and it is on the voting schedule. My understanding is that bills do, from time to time, even if listed "vote" or "over" on the voting schedule, do sometimes go from "over" to "voting." The leader has set this HB 922 for a vote.

Mr. VITALI. I do understand that, but it is a very rare occurrence, as I understand it.

I also might want to note that the Democratic chairman of the State Government Committee, the gentleman from Montgomery County – actually, if I can get his attention. We are on HB 922 right now. I know that chairman had an interest in the bill, so I thought it would be important to wait until the chairman arrived, and he in fact has arrived.

The SPEAKER. Representative Vitali, thank you.

Do you have any other comments on the bill itself?

Mr. VITALI. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

Would the maker of the bill stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Representative Tallman has indicated he will stand for interrogation, and you may proceed.

Mr. VITALI. So my question to the maker is, why are we singling out the Susquehanna River Basin Commission for removal from SERS? What is the intent here?

Mr. TALLMAN. As I was going through, as the term we use here "line by line," in the Susquehanna River Basin Commission's budget, I found out that a substantial portion of their budget goes to pay pensions, and so when I asked that question, I found out they were part of SERS and that they also were not a State employee. And since that time – if you wish to offer the bill, I would like to be second – we have found out 26-plus agencies that are not State agencies and their employees are part of SERS. So they all need to be off.

Mr. VITALI. Right. So in this bill, if you look at your own bill, on page 2, from line 15 to line 22, there lists a series of 11 nonagencies, and you just choose to isolate one. Now, why is it that you just chose the 1 of the 9 non-State agencies for removal as opposed to the other 10?

Mr. TALLMAN. The reason is, as I was doing the research on the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, I found out they were part of SERS and that they are not State employees. That is the reason.

Mr. VITALI. And the other 10 on this list in your bill that are not deleted?

Mr. TALLMAN. Yeah, you can do that on a bill. If you want to introduce it, I would like to be second on that. Thank you.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I want to make a couple of points here, if I could.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Representative Vitali, this is your second time on the bill.

Mr. VITALI. I just want to bring out a letter by the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, dated May 8, where they object to their being removed from SERS, and they make the point that they contribute more to the State, with regard to their pensions, than they are receiving in benefits. They make the point in this letter that last year their contributions exceeded \$1 million, but they only received \$473,000 from the Commonwealth. So they were a net beneficiary; they benefited the system. They feel that they are being singled out here.

And I think the fact that this bill would not save the fund any money is highlighted by the fact that the Independent Fiscal Office has an actuarial note for this bill that says it has minimal fiscal impact. So this does not save money. The Susquehanna River Basin Commission does not want to be removed. There are other similar entities that are not being singled out. They are a net beneficiary to the Commonwealth, and I am very concerned with this because, in discussing this with staffers, the belief was that they were being singled out because the agricultural community did not like the way they were issuing permits. So when we – I have concerns that a group is being singled out to be removed from SERS simply because of the permits they were issuing in doing their job in keeping the waters of this Commonwealth in a safe manner.

So I have some concerns with this bill and I will be voting "no."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

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

CONSIDERATION OF HB 922 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Representative Matt Bradford is recognized on HB 922.

Members, there are only two bills in front of us this evening, HB 922 and HB 271.

Representative Bradford.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the House State Government Committee recently, we have had the opportunity to do quite a bit of research on the Susquehanna River Basin Commission. My understanding is that for the next two Mondays we will be having hearings on the actions and practices of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission and their attempts to protect the entire waterway, including the Chesapeake Bay, and as a consequence, I have had the opportunity to read up on an organization, a compact that I previously did not know much about.

I did not realize, frankly, that there were four members of the commission: the States of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and New York, as well as the Federal government, who were all members. And I did not realize that the compact signed several decades ago, in order to protect the river basin, required us, under Article 15, section 5: "Create and abolish offices, employments and positions as it deems necessary for the purpose of the commission, and subject to the provisions of this article, fix and provide for the qualification, appointments, removal, term, tenure, compensation, pension, and retirement rights of its officers and employee."

So whether someone takes issue with some of the actions of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, which I understand that some of the majority party have expressed those concerns, Pennsylvania obviously has an obligation under the compact to provide for pension benefits.

And with that, if it is okay, Mr. Speaker, I would ask if the gentleman from Adams would stand for interrogation.

The SPEAKER. Yes. He will stand for interrogation.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the gentleman tell me, what is the pension that would be provided pursuant to the compact if HB 922 is to become law?

Mr. TALLMAN. That will be totally the obligation of the commission to come up with their own retirement plan.

Mr. BRADFORD. I am sorry; did you say it will be up to the commission?

Mr. TALLMAN. Yes. SRBC.

Mr. BRADFORD. Right. Now, you realize under Article 15, it explicitly says that it shall have a pension plan?

Mr. TALLMAN. It is all future employees will be into a plan that is – the Susquehanna River Basin Commission will be required to come up with on their own. They can do a pension, but if you look at it, if you look at the costs, the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, it is really significant. It is a significant line item in their budget.

Mr. BRADFORD. And I am sorry, sir. I just cannot hear you. I do not think you are talking into the mike.

Mr. TALLMAN. Yes. As was just been pointed out to me, it is not that they have to be part of SERS, the State Employees'.

Mr. BRADFORD. Right, and I appreciate you want to remove them from the plan. You do not necessarily have a plan going forward. Is that what you are saying?

Okay. Could I ask the gentleman from Adams what is his opinion about the footprint rule and after the amendments that were placed in? If a pregnant woman has left her term, her time, her employment with the SRBC to have a child, and decides subsequently to come back to work in employment in the Commonwealth, is she still an employee of the Commonwealth?

One of the concerns that I raised yesterday with my amendment is that this bill would have the disproportionate impact on women who leave employment. Are you understanding that this could have that impact on women who leave on maternity leave?

Mr. TALLMAN. It would not have that impact at all.

Mr. BRADFORD. I would point out to the gentleman that yesterday, respectfully, he said he does not think anybody should come back to SERS, and at the time, and I do not want to say it was cavalier, but you were pretty blunt in your opinion about what would happen. Has your opinion changed since that time?

Mr. TALLMAN. There is no break in service for maternity leave.

Mr. BRADFORD. And what if she leaves to have children and decides to come back? She leaves her employment and comes back?

Mr. TALLMAN. If the employee terminates their employment, the footprint rule no longer applies.

Mr. BRADFORD. Yeah. Now, do you realize that the footprint rule has held true in every other State by State agency in the Commonwealth up until now?

I am sorry. I do not think I can hear you. You are not using the mike.

Mr. TALLMAN. Yeah. I am not sure it is germane to the bill so— We are talking about one particular Susquehanna River Basin Commission, which is part of SERS, State Employees' Retirement System.

Mr. BRADFORD. Yeah. I could be wrong, and again, because you were not using the mike, I was not able to hear everything you said, but I think you said, "It is time for a change; so be it"?

Mr. TALLMAN. It is not germane.

Mr. BRADFORD. Okay, but that is not what you said, I do not think, with all due respect. But I do not want to belabor the point. What I do want to ask, and I know the gentleman from Delaware had raised this concern, when we treat one agency different, and this is an agency that has come under some criticism – and again, I would never want to make the mistake of questioning anyone's motives, and I do not want to read any of these press releases from some of the individuals who make clear their contempt for the agency and subsequently—

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. Representative Maher, sir, for what purpose do you rise?

Mr. MAHER. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. You may proceed.

Mr. MAHER. The object of interrogation is supposed to be to gain an understanding of the question that is before us, not to engage in debate, and I think the gentleman has really gone far afield, and I encourage him to either return to interrogation or get on with debate, but not to mix them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Yes. Representative Bradford, asking the gentleman about previous statements he may or may not have made is not getting to what the underlying bill is. If you wish to speak on the bill itself, I think everybody is very much ready for that.

Mr. BRADFORD. Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your encouragement, and I will take that under consideration.

The SPEAKER. You may still interrogate, if you wish, if the gentleman will stand for it.

Mr. BRADFORD. No, no. I would appreciate if the gentleman – and I know the gentleman from Delaware tried to get to this point, but I am really at a loss. The comparison was made in committee the other day that PSBA (Pennsylvania School Boards Association), another agency similarly situated in some ways, had asked for its employees to be removed from the SERS system, and I was supportive of that. I supported it in committee and I believe I supported it on the floor. I think, obviously, if an agency chooses to come out of the pension, it should. But here you seem to be targeting a specific agency, an agency that, admittedly – and again, I do not want to put words in your mouth and I do not want to debate. I think it is a statement of fact. You have been very critical of – in fact, you have two hearings in the next 2 weeks—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Yes; you may proceed.

Mr. CUTLER. Mr. Speaker, while I think it is appropriate to debate the underlying tenets of the bill, I think that it would be inappropriate, by House rules, to question the motives or intent of any member for offering a piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER. Representative Bradford, the good gentleman is correct. Also, you have not asked – and I do not mean to be disrespectful – you have not asked a question. If you have a question about the bill, you may ask any question you want, but you are making statements at this time.

If you want to say, "I hear they are having these committee hearings over the next week and I think it is related to this" and "vote 'no' on the bill," you know, that is your argument.

Mr. BRADFORD. I did not know he shared my opinions.

The SPEAKER. You may proceed, but that is not a question for interrogation.

Mr. BRADFORD. No, no. I was just laying the foundation for the simple question of why the Susquehanna River Basin Commission – it is not like PSBA who asked to come out of the commission – why the SRBC? Why now?

Mr. TALLMAN. I already repeated the answer.

I came upon that they are a part of SERS. They are not a State agency. Actually, they have employees that live in New York State, and that is the total reason why I would like to do it to all of them. If you want to do that bill, like the same offer I did to the other gentleman, I would like to be second on that bill. Thank you.

Mr. BRADFORD. And at this time I will, Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence, on the bill.

The gentleman in committee made that same point that he was going to – and I believe the chairman joined him in saying he would be drafting legislation to take out all of these bistate agencies, that he looked forward to doing that. And I mentioned

that the same arguments have been made about elected officials, and I noted that a lot of people say, well, why are these folks in the pension plan? And while I hear the gentleman making the rhetorical flourish that he looks forward to seeing such legislation, I notice such amendment was not offered by the gentleman.

I am not in favor of taking the Susquehanna River Basin Commission. I support their efforts to clean up our waterways. I think the work that they have done with the Chesapeake Bay and throughout our Commonwealth, in many cases, should be lauded. I realize, reading his press releases, that he does not share my enthusiasm for some of their work, and I appreciate that and I appreciate his right to be critical. But what I do not appreciate, and let us be clear, I do not want to question his motives. I question his prioritization. If we want to start picking off agencies because we do not agree with their agenda, I am not questioning their motives, I am questioning their prioritization. Why are we prioritizing the SRBC on the day before we are bringing up landmark historic pension reform? Out of nowhere, we are targeting the pension of SRBC employees at the same time that we are having numerous hearings, because certain members do not like policies of that compact. Pennsylvania has agreed to it. Whether we like it or not, that is our commitment to clean water.

Now, I can appreciate and fully understand that some will take issue with different positions they may take, but I would note that HB 922's focus on the SRBC alone is curious. It is neither the largest nor the smallest. It is not the only interstate agency. It is not the only one that elected to participate in SERS. It is not the only one with employees that reside outside of Pennsylvania. It is not the only one with regulatory authority. It is not the only one that receives an annual State appropriation. And it is not the only one that collects fees. But it is the only one that has two committee hearings in the next 2 weeks that are critical of their operations. So again, I am not questioning motives; I am questioning timing and I am questioning prioritization.

The pension plan has been used as a political football for too long, and we are paying the price for it, and when I say "we," I mean our school districts and our taxpayers. We should not be so cavalier as to sit here and try to play political gamesmanship with our pension funds. If we have an issue with the SRBC, there are hearings in the works. You will have your opportunity. But I fear, without in any way questioning anyone's motives, that what we are doing here today—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Cutler first, and then Representative Metcalfe.

Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. I was merely indicating that the gentleman from Butler County was wishing to seek recognition as a point of order.

The SPEAKER. Representative Metcalfe.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER. You may proceed.

Mr. METCALFE. I think it is pretty common knowledge that we are not supposed to assess motives to somebody's legislation or legislative initiatives. Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Mason's Legislative Manual, which our rules reference, in section 124, subsection 3: "It is not the person but the measure that is the subject of debate and it is not allowable to arraign the motives of a member, but the nature or consequences of a measure may be condemned in strong terms," and subsection 1 states, "In debate a member must confine remarks to the question before the House, and avoid personalities."

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. It seems to me, we are running a fine line here. We do tend to give members some leeway, but I have to say, just saying that it is not about questioning motives, but getting at the heart of it – questioning motives – we are running afoul or close to afoul of section 124.

I think what you could – not just Representative Bradford, but any member should state, here is what I think is wrong with the bill, and go, one, two, three, four, here is what is wrong with the bill and why it is wrong. I think we were pretty close to having that done. I think he was about ready to conclude, so I am going to turn it over to Representative Bradford—

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, continued point of order.

The SPEAKER. Sir, I have already ruled, and that is it. We are going to go to Mr. Bradford.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, another point of order.

The SPEAKER. A separate point of order; yes, sir.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, if someone is claiming that a maker of legislation is proposing that legislation because they have it in for another organization, is that not a motive, Mr. Speaker, that he is attributing to that individual? Even though he comes back and says that he is not attributing a motive, just because he says he is not attributing a motive, has he not just done so, Mr. Speaker, by claiming— And he did the same thing in the committee meetings that I called out of order at the same time, and to come to the floor and to try it all over again, Mr. Speaker, under your watch, I find offensive.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

It is the same point of order, and the gentleman has been admonished to please not violate section 124, subsections 1 and 3, of Mason's Legislative Manual, which is referenced in our rules.

As I said, I would just state in conclusion what the points are that you oppose about the bill and not question motives with respect to the maker of the bill or those in support of the bill. Thank you.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you again, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for your ruling. I appreciate it.

As you noted, I was about to wrap up, and I wanted to wrap up with this point, and it actually is— I do not want to be redundant and go through this pile of recent articles about the great work that the SRBC does, and I do not want to get off into a germaneness issue, but I think the employees of the SRBC should be appreciated. And I think by taking away pension rights to one organization like that is problematic, and I say that because, you know, I was going through some of the recent articles. You know, here is one: "Cabot is fined (again) for drilling without approval." That is one of the articles most recently about the SRBC. "State could be ready to rule if Susquehanna is 'sick' by this summer." That is the kind of work that the SRBC does. Now, I realize there are other more controversial positions they may take, and I do not want to bore you by going through all these, but what I want to say is, I am

afraid that we are sending the wrong message to the employees of the SRBC about the important work that they do.

Look, I do not want to see them picked out for disparate treatment. I want them to know that they will be treated like any other State employee. As someone who supports pension reform and appreciates the efforts that the Speaker has led to make that a conversation to have, I just do not want us to go down the road of making this into a political football. I want us to do good public policy. I want to thank the SRBC for the good public policy they do to ensure clean water, for their great work in helping clean up the Chesapeake. I think we should all support that.

So again, if we want to take away pensions from individual organizations, I do not want to belabor the point. I just want to say, let us be clear, let us be fair, let us be down the road, let us be straight about it, and let us treat all State employees the same.

And with that, I ask that we vote against HB 922 and show that this building, just like the Speaker's ruling, is fair and it appreciates the fact that everyone should be treated fairly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir.

Representative Dan Moul is recognized on the bill.

Mr. MOUL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will try to be brief.

Sometimes when you stand here and make an argument following the previous speaker, things jump out and say to you, does the previous speaker actually know what he is talking about? I do not mean—

The SPEAKER. Members, please.

Mr. MOUL. I certainly do not—

The SPEAKER. We are late in the evening. I think he was referencing the speaker, not the prior speaker on the bill.

POINT OF ORDER

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

The SPEAKER. Now, please; please.

Who is raising a point of order?

Representative Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. I believe the speaker is trying to impugn the reputation of another member, and I believe that is improper.

The SPEAKER. Go ahead; I am sorry. Representative Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. It is improper, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I was seeking recognition.

The SPEAKER. Members, if we can – and, sir, just please suspend. Look, we are headed into a month of significant debates on many important bills, and we really need to make sure that we are not, in any way, impugning the reputation or motives of any other of our colleagues. There has been a great deal of collegiality and respect in this institution. I have certainly been honored to see that here, and if we could, amongst all members, just stick to the merits of the bill, positive or negative, and put them forth for the members and the public.

Representative Moul, the floor is yours.

Mr. MOUL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me send my sincerest apologies. I am just a simple guy from Adams County. Sometimes things come out wrong. Let me restate this; let me restate this. I think the previous speaker

might have had a few facts incorrect. Let me see if I can correct them.

First of all, we heard a couple of times that this agency – which is a mistake in itself – has to do with our clean water, our water quality. I heard that said a few different times. Water quality is the responsibility of the Department of Environmental Protection and the Fish and Boat Commission. SRBC is water quantity only. They regulate water quantity. They have nothing to do with water quality.

I heard the term "agency" several times – not just the previous speaker, but the one before him. Let us get it straight. This is a compact. These people have nothing to do with being a State employee. They are not related to the State. Their paychecks do not come from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. They are their own entity.

We are trying to clean up our pension system. We have heard several times, why them? Why now? We have been looking at this agency for other reasons over the past couple of years and fell into this. There is a group of us that are very concerned with this agency. We discovered this and then later on we found out that there are at least, at least 23 other organizations – and I will call them organizations because they are not State agencies – organizations that have their employees on our State pension system.

No one here is writing a bill that kicks any current employee off. This is for new hires only. So we have a group of people that are defending people to put on our broken-down, underfunded pension system that do not even work for us yet. Some of them are not even born yet. I cannot wrap my head around why we would want to do that knowing the fact that every single corner of this State you hear "pensions, pensions, pensions" and we need to get it fixed, but yet we have got a group of people trying to keep people that do not even work for us on our pension system. That is going to rebound on us down the road, if it has not already.

Why are we trying to protect this? We do not want to hurt anybody that is already there. We just want to stop it going forward. And what they choose to do for a retirement system for their employees, just like the private sector, is their business, not ours.

Please vote "yes" on this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kristin Phillips-Hill, on the bill, please.

Mrs. HILL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I will say to you, regardless of your opinion of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission and its work, whether you think it is magnificent or whether you think it is less than stellar, we are not here to discuss that this evening.

I think what we are here discussing is, is it appropriate for the taxpayers of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to bear sole responsibility for the cost of the maintenance and administration of the pension for the employees of a multistate commission that includes the Federal government? If you believe that the Pennsylvania taxpayer should be responsible to pay for the administration and maintenance of the pension system of people who are not solely responsible to the Pennsylvania taxpayer, then please, by all means, vote against this measure. If you believe that Pennsylvania taxpayers should bear that responsibility jointly with the other member States and the Federal government, please vote for HB 922.

Join me in this simple measure of reform. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Kristin Phillips-Hill.

Representative Brett Miller, on the bill.

Mr. B. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just briefly, the debate here at hand has nothing to do with what the SRBC does, as was mentioned by the previous speaker.

But the thing that I want to point out here is a very simple concept, that each of us, several days ago or perhaps in the last week, received an IFO note in our e-mails designating that the impact of this bill is de minimis in its impact. So on that basis alone, that point was not yet brought out, but just to remind the members of the House that the IFO did send out a note designating that this is a de minimis impact on our current pension system.

So I would encourage an affirmative vote on HB 922. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in regards to some of the statements made previously, I just wanted to correct the record and actually read the section regarding the pensions and what we are obligated as a Commonwealth to provide. Under section 15.1, subsection (b) 5, it says that the commissioners would have the authority to "Create and abolish offices, employments, and positions as it deems necessary for the purposes of the commission, and subject to the provisions of this article, fix and provide for the qualification, appointments, removal, term, tenure, compensation, pension, and retirement rights of its officers and employees."

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Adams County pointed out that while the compact does in fact mention retirement rights, pensions, and compensation, it does not prescribe a particular matter, and statutorily going forward, I do believe that we could in fact prescribe a new or different proposal, as the gentledady from York County outlined.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, when you look at the variety of different groups that now qualify for this, I think that the gentleman's story regarding how he came upon this one, and then some of the subsequent research that was initiated by the gentledady from York County who previously spoke – she got a letter from the State Employees' Retirement System, and I wanted to read from it, because I think that it is very instructive to the underlying debate that we are currently having now. Mr. Speaker, when they asked about the various groups that qualified for SERS, it said, "While the SERS Legal staff has been unable to locate all of the specific documents directly related to the inclusion of these organizations as participating employers, it is widely accepted that they were included in the Canteen Act, which was passed in the mid 1950's, and has been cited on many occasions when discussions such as this occur."

Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of each of these individual organizations and their underlying missions. I think it is fair to say that the majority of this chamber supports those groups and their missions. It is a question of, should we revisit a legal determination made nearly 70 years ago and on questionable legal precedent and possibly outdated statutes that cannot be located by the legal staff that are actually tasked with determining which employees get which benefits?

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is appropriate that we revisit this, and I would urge a "yes" vote.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

CONSIDERATION OF HB 922 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—114

Baker	Fee	Mako	Roae
Barrar	Fritz	Maloney	Roe
Benninghoff	Gabler	Marshall	Ryan
Bernstine	Gillen	Marsico	Saccone
Bloom	Gillespie	Masser	Sankey
Boback	Godshall	Mehaffie	Santora
Brown, R.	Greiner	Mentzer	Saylor
Causer	Grove	Metcalfe	Schemel
Charlton	Hahn	Metzgar	Simmons
Christiana	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Sonney
Cook	Heffley	Millard	Staats
Corbin	Helm	Miller, B.	Stephens
Corr	Hennessey	Moul	Tallman
Cox	Hickernell	Mustio	Taylor
Culver	Hill	Nelson	Tobash
Cutler	Irvin	Nesbit	Toepel
Day	James	O'Neill	Toohil
DeLozier	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Topper
Diamond	Kampf	Ortitay	Walsh
DiGirolamo	Kaufer	Peifer	Ward
Dowling	Kauffman	Petri	Warner
Dunbar	Keefer	Pickett	Watson
Dush	Keller, F.	Pyle	Wentling
Ellis	Keller, M.K.	Quinn, C.	Wheeland
Emrick	Klunk	Quinn, M.	White
English	Knowles	Rader	Zimmerman
Evankovich	Lewis	Rapp	
Everett	Mackenzie	Reed	Turzai,
Farry	Maher	Reese	Speaker

NAYS—80

Barbin	Dean	Kavulich	Pashinski
Bizzarro	Deasy	Keller, W.	Petrarca
Boyle	DeLissio	Kim	Rabb
Bradford	DeLuca	Kinsey	Ravenstahl
Briggs	Dermody	Kirkland	Readshaw
Brown, V.	Donatucci	Kortz	Roebuck
Bullock	Driscoll	Krueger	Rozzi
Burns	Evans	Kulik	Sainato
Caltagirone	Fabrizio	Longiotti	Samuelson
Carroll	Fitzgerald	Madden	Schlossberg
Cephas	Flynn	Markosek	Schweyer
Comitta	Frankel	Matzje	Sims
Conklin	Freeman	McCarter	Snyder

Costa, D.	Gainey	McClinton	Solomon
Costa, P.	Galloway	McNeill	Sturla
Cruz	Goodman	Miller, D.	Vazquez
Daley	Hanna	Mullery	Vitali
Davidson	Harkins	Neilson	Warren
Davis	Harper	Neuman	Wheatley
Dawkins	Harris, J.	O'Brien	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Gergely	McGinnis	Murt	Rothman
Haggerty	Milne	Quigley	Thomas
Lawrence			

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

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

The SPEAKER. Members, we cannot vote on HB 271, PN 1942, until later this evening.

**THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
(MATTHEW E. BAKER) PRESIDING**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be at ease.

The House will come to order.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B CONTINUED

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS
AS AMENDED**

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to the following **HB 271, PN 1942**, as further amended by the House Rules Committee:

An act amending Titles 3 (Agriculture), 4 (Amusements) and 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in race horse industry reform, repealing definitions and provisions relating to place and manner of conducting pari-mutuel wagering at racetrack enclosure and to pari-mutuel wagering at nonprimary locations and further providing for licensing costs and fees and for operations; providing for fantasy contests, establishing a Lottery Sales Advisory Council within the Department of Revenue and providing for iLottery; in general provisions, further providing for legislative intent and for definitions; in Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board, further providing for Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board established, for general and specific powers, for licensed gaming entity application appeals from board, for board minutes and records, for regulatory authority of board, for slot machine license fee, for reports of board and for diversity goals of board; in licensees, further providing for Category 1 slot machine license and for Category 3 slot machine license, providing for remaining Category 2 licenses, further providing for number of slot machine licenses, for slot machine license application, for supplier licenses and for manufacturer licenses, providing for nongaming service provider, further providing for slot machine testing and certification standards and for license renewals, providing for slot machine license operation fee and further providing for change in ownership or control of slot machine licensee; repealing provisions related to multiple slot machine license prohibition and prohibiting undue economic concentration; in table games, further

providing for authorization to conduct table games, for table game tournaments, for other financial transactions, for table game device and associated equipment testing and certification standards, for table game authorization fee and for local share assessment; providing for interactive gaming, for sports wagering, sports wagering tax and local fee assessment and for slot machines at nonprimary locations; in revenues, further providing for gross terminal revenue deductions, for establishment of State Gaming Fund and net slot machine revenue distribution and for Pennsylvania Gaming Economic Development and Tourism Fund; in administration and enforcement, further providing for responsibility and authority of the Department of Revenue, for wagering on credit, for compulsive and problem gambling program, for financial and employment interests, for political influence, for regulation requiring exclusion or ejection of certain persons, for repeat offenders excludable from licensed gaming facility, for list of persons self excluded from gaming activities, for investigations and enforcement and for prohibited acts and penalties and providing for casino liquor licenses; in miscellaneous provisions, further providing for appropriations and for repayments to State Gaming Fund; providing for video gaming; establishing the Video Gaming Fund, the Fire Company and Emergency Responder Grant Fund, the City of the First Class Enforcement Fund, the Lottery Stabilization Fund and the Gun Violence Task Force Fund; in riot, disorderly conduct and related offenses, further providing for the offense of gambling devices, gambling, etc.; and making related repeals.

On the question,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Moved by the gentleman, Mr. Ortity, that the House concur in the amendments.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Ortity, for a brief description of the Senate amendments as amended by the House.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. ORTITAY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The House Rules Committee amended this bill to include fantasy sports, iLottery, iGaming, airport gaming tablets, VGTs (video gaming terminals), sports betting, offtrack betting slots, and casino simulcasting. It also includes the local share fix. It has changes to the table games, for the LSA (Local Share Account) distribution changes, as well as for the slots. It also addresses the casino liquor license, the loan repayment, and has other miscellaneous Title 4 changes as well as Title 3 changes as well.

That is about as brief as I can give you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

MOTION TO POSTPONE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Vitali, on concurrence.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would move to postpone consideration of HB 271 until 11 tomorrow morning, and I would like to speak on that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Vitali, makes a motion to postpone HB 271, PN 1942, until tomorrow at 11 a.m.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that motion, the gentleman, Mr. Vitali, is recognized.

Mr. VITALI. Mr. Speaker, I am holding up HB 271. It is a 234-page bill. It only came into the public realm, this language was only available to the public a little after 2 o'clock this afternoon. It is physically impossible for these House members who have been participating in caucus and floor debate to have read these 271 pages. But more importantly, the public, the people who this will affect, have not had the opportunity to understand what is in this and to give input to their elected officials, which they are entitled to. We as House members have not had the chance to seek counsel from the experts on gambling and the other people we rely on.

Mr. Speaker, just in listening to caucus discussions on this, questions were raised about WAMs (walking-around moneys) that were tucked into this, even organizations which we could not identify because they were stated so broadly. Mr. Speaker, my experience with thick bills sprung at us very quickly is that very frequently things are tucked into them which we only discover after the fact.

Mr. Speaker, I think no one will be prejudiced by delaying this until tomorrow. Nothing is going to change between now and tomorrow. We still have the full month of June to deal with our matters, and, Mr. Speaker, the consequences of making errors are great. This bill, as I understand it in the most broadest terms, would authorize up to 40,000 video terminals throughout our Commonwealth.

I just think that prudence dictates that this bill be read by any House member who wants to read it, read by any expert or advocate who wants to read it, and then have a discussion once it has been fully read. So I think in order to do that, we need to delay this until at least tomorrow and move forward.

So I would ask for a "yes" vote on this motion to postpone.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Samuelson, on the motion to postpone.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I concur with the words of Representative Vitali on the need to postpone this bill.

I would add another point. Here we are voting, potentially, on a bill to expand gaming in Pennsylvania, and the language of this bill is actually not available to the members of the House of Representatives on the House floor. I am looking at computers on both sides of the aisle, and if you try to call up this bill, it says, "loading text," loading text. That might be because the bill was just written 5 1/2 hours ago, but still we should have the ability to see the text of a bill that is on the House floor and not vote on something that is not available to us.

So I say "yes" to Vitali's motion. Let us postpone until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning, and let us have this debate in the light of day.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

And just for the information of the members, it has been loaded now and is available on the system.

On the motion to postpone, the Chair recognizes the majority leader, Mr. Reed.

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

I would respectfully ask the members to oppose the motion to postpone consideration of HB 271. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Mr. Samuelson, is seeking recognition for the second time on the motion to postpone.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do acknowledge that the text of the bill has now been loaded on our computers about 1 minute ago. I apologize; I have not gotten all the way up to page 675 in the last 60 seconds. I still think that a bill like this, 675 pages long, should deserve more than a scant 5 1/2 hours of debate.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Vote "yes" on the Vitali motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—62

Bizzarro	Dean	Harris, J.	O'Brien
Boyle	DeLissio	Kavulich	Pashinski
Bradford	DeLuca	Keller, W.	Petri
Briggs	Donatucci	Kim	Rabb
Brown, V.	Driscoll	Kinsey	Ravenstahl
Bullock	Evans	Kirkland	Roebuck
Caltagirone	Fabrizio	Krueger	Samuelson
Carroll	Fitzgerald	Madden	Schlossberg
Cephas	Flynn	Matzie	Schweyer
Comitta	Frankel	McCarter	Sims
Conklin	Freeman	McClinton	Solomon
Costa, D.	Gainey	Miller, D.	Vitali
Cruz	Galloway	Mullery	Warren
Daley	Goodman	Neilson	Wheatley
Davis	Hanna	Neuman	Youngblood
Dawkins	Harkins		

NAYS—132

Baker	Farry	Mako	Roe
Barbin	Fee	Maloney	Rozzi
Barrar	Fritz	Markosek	Ryan
Benninghoff	Gabler	Marshall	Saccone
Bernstine	Gillen	Marsico	Sainato
Bloom	Gillespie	Masser	Sankey
Boback	Godshall	McNeill	Santora
Brown, R.	Greiner	Mehaffie	Saylor
Burns	Grove	Mentzer	Schemel
Causar	Hahn	Metcalfe	Simmons
Charlton	Harper	Metzgar	Snyder
Christiana	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Sonney
Cook	Heffley	Millard	Staats
Corbin	Helm	Miller, B.	Stephens
Corr	Hennessey	Moul	Sturla
Costa, P.	Hickernell	Mustio	Tallman
Cox	Hill	Nelson	Taylor
Culver	Irvin	Nesbit	Tobash
Cutler	James	O'Neill	Toepel
Davidson	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Toohil
Day	Kampf	Ortitay	Topper
Deasy	Kaufner	Peifer	Vazquez
Delozier	Kauffman	Petrarca	Walsh
Dermody	Keefer	Pickett	Ward
Diamond	Keller, F.	Pyle	Warner
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Quinn, C.	Watson
Dowling	Klunk	Quinn, M.	Wentling
Dunbar	Knowles	Rader	Wheeland
Dush	Kortz	Rapp	White
Ellis	Kulik	Readshaw	Zimmerman

Emrick	Lewis	Reed	
English	Longiatti	Reese	Turzai,
Evankovich	Mackenzie	Roae	Speaker
Everett	Maheer		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Gergely	McGinnis	Murt	Rothman
Haggerty	Milne	Quigley	Thomas
Lawrence			

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

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Returning to final debate on concurrence, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Kinsey, on concurrence.

Mr. KINSEY. Mr. Speaker, will the maker of the bill stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has indicated he will, and you may proceed, sir.

Mr. KINSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in the legislation – I am just asking questions for clarity – my first question, Mr. Speaker, is, one of the conditions in this legislation states that "AN ESTABLISHMENT LICENSEE SHALL..."—

THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER. Representative Kinsey, if you could.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. McCarter.

I am not sure for what purpose you rise.

Mr. McCARTER. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Again, it was called out just a few minutes ago of how the text of this particular bill was not on our computers. It came up for one minute, and now again it is showing loading. For those of us that do want to read this bill, that text of the bill, the text of the bill should be available for us to do that, and I would ask that we suspend discussion until the bill is up so we can read it.

The SPEAKER. Sir, if you log in by bill number, please feel free. Give that an attempt. I know that it is in the system.

Do you have it, Representative McCarter? Yes. Okay.

If you pull up the bill by referencing the bill number in LDP (Legislative Data Processing), you will be able to have the bill in front of you.

Representative Kinsey, I do apologize that you were interrupted, but you may start from the beginning and just proceed.

Mr. KINSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So going back, Mr. Speaker, my first question is, in the conditions listed in the proposed legislation, it states, "THE VIDEO GAMING AREA SHALL AT ALL TIMES BE MONITORED BY AN" establishment "EMPLOYEE...." My question, Mr. Speaker, are there provisions that state that the employee must be of a certain age, and also, are there provisions that state any training requirements for such employee?

Mr. ORTITAY. Yes, Mr. Speaker. At minimum, they have to be 18 years old, and they also have to go through a mandatory problem gambling program as well.

Mr. KINSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My next question is, again in the legislation it states that establishment licensees shall post one sign in the video gaming area and one sign by an ATM (automatic teller machine) with a toll-free problem gambling phone number maintained by DDAP (Department of Drug and Alcohol Programs). Mr. Speaker, with that requirement, are the posted signs required to be of a certain size and a certain font?

Mr. ORTITAY. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe so; no.

Mr. KINSEY. So individuals who might have a vision impairment, how would they be able to recognize the reading— And I am asking primarily in regards to somebody who might have a vision problem or things of that nature.

Mr. ORTITAY. I do not believe that is in this particular bill, but I believe that the Gaming Control Board has regulation over that and could probably handle that on their own.

Mr. KINSEY. So, Mr. Speaker, will that answer apply to individuals where English may not necessarily be their main language?

Mr. ORTITAY. Yes.

Mr. KINSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the term "minor" is listed throughout the legislation; however, I did not see it defined in the legislation. Is there somewhere that clarifies what a minor is in this particular legislation?

Mr. ORTITAY. It is listed as "a person under 21 years of age."

Mr. KINSEY. Under the age of 21?

Mr. ORTITAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. KINSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, machines are to be capped at 40,000 – I believe that is what is listed in the legislation – machines are to be capped at 40,000. Are there any parameters to ensure that a particular section, and let us just say of the first-class city, is not saturated with these types of machines?

Mr. ORTITAY. No.

Mr. KINSEY. So therefore, in the city of the first class, for instance, which has bowling alleys, stop-and-gos literally at almost at every single corner, we are saying that a city like Philadelphia can be saturated with VGTs all throughout?

Mr. ORTITAY. It is possible, but they still have to meet the requirements that are still laid out in the bill. So, I mean, it is possible, but it is hard to tell.

Mr. KINSEY. Right. But the requirements do not require a particular distance. Again, in the city of the first class, if we have stop-and-gos literally at almost every corner, there are no parameters that say that it has to be within a certain distance from another place of business.

Mr. ORTITAY. All right. One of the provisions in the bill says that the liquor establishments less than 1,000 square feet must undergo an inspection by the LCE (liquor control enforcement) officer, so that is part of it.

Mr. KINSEY. The establishment must have 1,000— I am sorry; I cannot hear you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ORTITAY. My apologies. The liquor establishments less than 1,000 square feet must undergo an inspection by an LCE officer.

Mr. KINSEY. Okay. So therefore, if the stop-and-gos in the city of Philadelphia actually meet the requirement of 1,000 square feet, and there could be another stop-and-go within a block or half a block, there is nothing in the legislation that stops the saturation of the VGTs in stop-and-gos in the city of Philadelphia?

Mr. ORTITAY. No, there is nothing in the legislation.

Mr. KINSEY. Mr. Speaker, one last question. In the legislation it states that only suppliers are required to maintain a place of business in Pennsylvania, but suppliers may only sell or provide VGTs to terminal operators. Terminal operators will be directly interacting with the establishments. Are terminal operators also required to maintain a place of business in Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. ORTITAY. They would have to be licensed here but not necessarily located here.

Mr. KINSEY. So a business from Canada can come into our Commonwealth and basically operate. So we are talking about businesses outside of the State of Pennsylvania can come to our Commonwealth and make money off of our citizens?

Mr. ORTITAY. It is possible, but I will say that it is difficult because they will have to comply with all our requirements, and if they are not from here or are local to here, they may not be willing or familiar with the requirements laid out.

Mr. KINSEY. So if they adhere to all of our requirements, and let us just say that they are from North Korea or China, in retrospect, they can still come here and operate and make money off of the citizens of this Commonwealth?

Mr. ORTITAY. Mr. Speaker, I would still be under the assumption that they would have to legally be able to do business here in the United States, particularly with the countries that you just mentioned. I am not quite sure that any companies from those countries would be eligible here.

Mr. KINSEY. I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker.

And I guess the point that I am really trying to drive at is that if suppliers are required to maintain a place of business in Pennsylvania, why are the terminal operators not required to do such?

Mr. ORTITAY. I believe what we were trying to do was treat this the same way we do with the companies that operate the casinos here in Pennsylvania as well.

Mr. KINSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, on the bill?

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir, you may speak on the bill.

Mr. KINSEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the answers that the speaker gave to my questions. I thank him for taking the time.

However, Mr. Speaker, I must stand up and share with my colleagues that I think that this legislation is bad legislation, and I say that for a variety of reasons.

Mr. Speaker, these machines could possibly be in every single neighborhood, every shopping mall across the Commonwealth, restaurants, bowling alleys – any place that has a liquor license.

Mr. Speaker, I come from the city of the first class, and we are currently dealing with issues of stop-and-gos. Stop-and-gos are deteriorating the city of Philadelphia, and as it stands right now, Mr. Speaker, we can barely enforce the liquor laws that we have on the books, yet this bill will give stop-and-gos full-scale slot machines and gaming.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we should not and cannot support this shots-and-slots legislation. This shots-and-slots legislation will basically turn our Commonwealth into the Wild West. Communities like mine are sick and tired of being targeted, Mr. Speaker, by businesses from outside our Commonwealth that come into our communities and literally help deteriorate these communities, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to let you know that I am opposed to this proposal because in addition to deteriorating our communities, I am also looking at this legislation and questioning the damage that it is going to do to our property tax relief across the Commonwealth. Mr. Speaker, according to the Department of Revenue, VGTs in neighborhoods across the Commonwealth and the shots-and-slots proposal before us today will reduce the revenue dedicated to the property tax relief by nearly \$500 million over 5 years, Mr. Speaker. That is a half billion dollars lost on property tax relief for our seniors across the Commonwealth. VGTs will also cut into our lottery programs, these programs that help seniors afford prescription drugs and transportation services.

Mr. Speaker, when I look at this bill, the bottom line for me is that there is going to be \$200 million less for our senior programs, \$200 million less for transportation services, \$200 million less for PACE (Pharmaceutical Assistance Contract for the Elderly) and PACENET (Pharmaceutical Assistance Contract for the Elderly Needs Enhancement Tier) programs, \$200 million less for our seniors not just in Philadelphia but across the Commonwealth. Mr. Speaker, the shots-and-slots bill before us today is just bad public policy. It is bad for our taxpayers, it is bad for our seniors, it is bad for my community, and it is bad for your community.

And, Mr. Speaker, I just want to end my comments, Mr. Speaker. If anybody, if anyone here goes on Philly.com, it lists that Parx Casino was just fined \$35,000 for underage gambling, underage gambling, but yet when you look at this legislation, we are talking about lowering the age for iGaming and fantasy sports to 18. Mr. Speaker, why are we encouraging, why are we encouraging our young folks to gamble? Mr. Speaker, why are we engaging young folks to do something that can cause harm not only to themselves but to their families? Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill.

And, Mr. Speaker, I just want to note for the record, I want to note for the record that in the Rules Committee, I voted for this to come out. I voted for this piece of legislation to come out, because initially, Mr. Speaker, I was led to believe that this would generate revenue for our Commonwealth, for our seniors, and for our programs that provide services. But now that I am reading through the fine lines, Mr. Speaker, I recognize that this shots-and-slots piece of legislation will do nothing but hurt us.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Kinsey.

We have five members who wish to speak: Representative Petri, and then it will be Representative Donatucci, Representative Youngblood, Representative Wheatley, and Representative Dawkins.

We are able to vote on the bill at 8:10.

Representative Petri and Representative Kortz.

Representative Petri, the floor is yours.

Mr. PETRI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today something happened that has not happened in a while. There was a Rules Committee meeting and there was a gut-and-replacement amendment offered, and I think I saw the amendment in print around 1 o'clock. So 7 hours ago we had a major change in the legislation that was before us.

If you remember the original legislation when it left this House, it dealt with some problem gambling issues, and of course we know as members that the Senate added some provisions with regard to Internet gaming. Now, when the Senate handled the Internet gaming, they established a two-tier or two-rate number, 1 percentage equal to what our existing casinos pay for slot-type activities and one for poker. And so at least when the Senate sent us the bill, whether you are for Internet gaming or not – I am not; I believe it is socially irresponsible – but nonetheless, when they sent it over, at least it followed and had the industries matched in rates. In Rules, for some reason, we decided to cut the rate that the State would receive and the taxpayers would receive for Internet gaming. Now, there are many people around the Commonwealth that believe that Internet gaming will cause a loss of revenue to casinos. There are some casinos that say it will not. To the extent that that argument is correct, today we are being asked to exchange 54 percent for a lower rate, whether that be 15 for certain Internet activities or 34 – whatever it is – for VGTs.

Of real concern to me is this idea that we are going to institute video gaming terminals. Now, my committee had a hearing on that issue, but there was not extensive opportunity here from the Gaming Control Board and from the police department about what the costs and procedures should be to ensure that this would be done properly. And in case the members are wondering what the bill says in that regard, I would have you turn to section 3303 on page 196, and reading from that section, you will find that this bill proposes temporary regulations and temporary licenses. We have no idea what the Gaming Control Board considers to be the real cost of law enforcement and properly checking these applications. What we do know is this bill would force them to do everything, put out an application within 60 days and complete the review within 120 days. The applicant will receive a temporary license which can be taken back from them in a year. If I were investing money in a business, I do not think I would be happy with a temporary license, but as the committee that is responsible for rolling out legislation that we can have confidence in, I do not have that today.

If you read the provisions, it even has under "(C) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—WHEN PROMULGATING TEMPORARY REGULATIONS REGARDING THE APPLICATION, BACKGROUND INVESTIGATION AND RENEWAL...FOR AN ESTABLISHMENT LICENSE OR REGULATIONS REGARDING...LICENSEE'S DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF VIDEO GAMING UNDER THIS PART, THE BOARD SHALL CONSIDER PROMULGATING REGULATIONS THAT MINIMIZE THE REGULATORY BURDEN ON ESTABLISHMENT LICENSEES AND ESTABLISHMENT LICENSE APPLICANTS..." and then it goes on. So what we are saying in this legislation is, Gaming Control Board, please use the loosest scrutiny you can so we can have our money and

we can have it now. That is completely irresponsible. Even if you think that language is appropriate, do you not think you would like to hear from the Gaming Control Board and from the State Police as to what resources they will need in order to implement these rules that we are presenting to them? We do not have that information, and I can tell you that the regulatory costs that are established in here, which have now been capped, will be inadequate in the minds of the State Police to do what they need to do to undertake this new responsibility.

Of equal concern to me, and it should be to you, is the lack of an opt-in provision. What does that mean? In Illinois when they adopted this type of gaming, they did so because they could not get the votes for a bridge-and-road replacement fund and they needed bonding, and so what they did was they came up with this type of revenue, video gaming. It grew in the rural areas, but in the areas where there were casinos, the Gaming Control Board issued a report and said that all we did was shift chairs on the boat. They lost money and they lost activity in the area of Chicago and their other big cities, and they gained activity in the rural areas, but in the end, the growth of the total tax was very stagnant. Keep in mind, Illinois' tax rate is much less than ours. But one thing they did do, they absolutely insisted on that we are not, is a local opt-in. The gentleman just spoke very eloquently, from Philadelphia, about his concerns for his communities. Out in the lobby there is a map, and the dots overlap so much of the potential VGT sites that I do not see any area that is not covered.

In my community we have a bunch of places that my wife and I and family like to go to dinner. You have them too – New Hope, Newtown, Doylestown. I have talked to every one of those three municipalities, and I am thinking about all the great places we have in Pennsylvania where you go and you can enjoy. If you pass this bill the way it is written, you – not them – will have forced your communities to have video gaming terminals in every licensee in your community. When I spoke to the mayor of New Hope on Friday, he said, "Are you kidding me? You're going to do that without my ability to say no? How could you do that to me?" And I said, "Mayor, I will not do that to you, but I cannot guarantee that the rest of the House will not force that on you." Do not do it. When your constituents find out that the laundromat turned into a suds and gambling place, when every place they go they see video gaming terminals, they will rightfully blame you, and your local officials will be glad to help them blame you.

Listen, we have only had this bill for 6 hours and there are already reporters calling members about some of the interesting groups that are receiving moneys out of this bill that none of us knew about until we read it that have nothing to do with gaming, absolutely nothing – an arts center, we are going to build a Y, we are going to pay for a pool.

Look, there is another alternative. There is an alternative in my committee. That alternative is so much better. It needs more work, but it is so much better than what we have. That alternative would produce \$360 million annually in projected recurring tax revenue; create 3,000 new jobs; \$600 million in new investment; 4,000 construction jobs; 26 new local shares; a 54-percent tax rate, not this 30-something, 15 percent; \$700 million in indirect economic benefits; \$240 million in upfront cost, and not this complicated, convoluted regulatory scheme that we have no idea whether it will be effective or will

be done. The only thing we know is once we make it law, the Gaming Control Board will be stuck with it, and we will be left with a surprising bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. PETRI. Based upon all the things I have said, Mr. Speaker, I would move that this bill be recommitted to the House Gaming Oversight Committee for purposes of a hearing, specifically with the Gaming Control Board and with the State Police, on the actual cost of implementing this bill.

The SPEAKER. We have a motion in front of us to refer the bill to the Gaming Oversight Committee.

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Reed, on the motion, and then Representative Dermody, on the motion.

Representative Reed.

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

Respectfully, I would ask the members to oppose the motion to recommit this bill to the Gaming Oversight Committee. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative DiGirolamo.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to support the gentleman's motion to refer the bill to the Gaming Committee. We barely had a few hours to look at this bill, Mr. Speaker. Let us give the chairmen and the members of the Gaming Committee the work that they are supposed to be doing and taking this bill and looking at it and studying it. There are too many unanswered questions, Mr. Speaker, about the amendment that was inserted in the Rules Committee barely 6 hours ago.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the members to vote "yes" on the motion to recommit. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Ed Neilson, on the motion to recommit.

Mr. NEILSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, rise in support of this motion. Being a member of the House Gaming Committee since I started, this really has to get looked through thoroughly. There are 700 pages here, and I think all the members should have it since we would not postpone it until tomorrow and give us a night to sleep on this.

This is a life-changing issue. I mean, we see the quality of life, right in this bill, being ripped out from all the communities, and as a member of the House, I think it is our duty. This is the people's House. We represent the people, and I think they care more than we know. I mean, we are seeing stuff out there now about how some of these VGT spots can be put right across the street from churches, right across the street from schools and day cares. I mean, this is something that we need to really debate, and I think we have got to get it back to committee.

So I stand in support, and I hope the members will stand with us.

The SPEAKER. Representative McCarter, on the motion.

Mr. McCARTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again I would stand in support of this motion as well.

Again we are having the same problem on our screens that we had before. We still cannot see the bill in a consistent manner. This would be helpful to be able to do – and it is

amazing how every time we get up here, it seems like it comes back, but it would be able to give us time to read the bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. I must say, the LDP that is on the screen in front of our rostrum, the bill is on the screen.

Does anybody else wish to speak on the motion?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—78

Bizzarro	Evans	Kim	Petri
Boyle	Fabrizio	Kinsey	Quinn, M.
Bradford	Farry	Kirkland	Rabb
Briggs	Fee	Krueger	Roe
Brown, V.	Fitzgerald	Lewis	Roebuck
Bullock	Flynn	Madden	Samuelson
Carroll	Frankel	McCarter	Schlossberg
Cephas	Freeman	McClinton	Schweyer
Comitta	Gainey	McNeill	Sims
Cruz	Galloway	Mehaffie	Solomon
Daley	Gillen	Mentzer	Staats
Davidson	Goodman	Miller, B.	Vazquez
Davis	Greiner	Miller, D.	Vitali
Dawkins	Hanna	Mullery	Warren
Dean	Harkins	Neilson	Watson
DeLissio	Harper	Nesbit	Wheatley
DiGrolamo	Harris, J.	Neuman	White
Donatucci	Hickernell	O'Brien	Youngblood
Driscoll	Kavulich	Pashinski	Zimmerman
Dush	Keller, W.		

NAYS—114

Baker	Dunbar	Longiotti	Reese
Barbin	Ellis	Mackenzie	Roe
Barrar	English	Maher	Rozzi
Benninghoff	Evankovich	Mako	Ryan
Bernstine	Everett	Maloney	Saccone
Bloom	Fritz	Markosek	Sainato
Boback	Gabler	Marshall	Sankey
Brown, R.	Gillespie	Marsico	Santora
Burns	Godshall	Masser	Saylor
Caltagirone	Grove	Matzie	Schemel
Causer	Hahn	Metcalfe	Simmons
Charlton	Harris, A.	Metzgar	Snyder
Christiana	Heffley	Miccarelli	Sonney
Conklin	Helm	Millard	Stephens
Cook	Hennessey	Moul	Sturla
Corbin	Hill	Mustio	Tallman
Corr	Irvin	Nelson	Taylor
Costa, D.	James	Oberlander	Tobash
Costa, P.	Jozwiak	Ortitay	Toepel
Cox	Kampf	Peifer	Toohil
Culver	Kaufner	Petrarca	Topper
Cutler	Kauffman	Pickett	Walsh
Day	Keefer	Pyle	Ward
Deasy	Keller, F.	Quinn, C.	Warner
DeLozier	Keller, M.K.	Rader	Wentling
DeLuca	Klunk	Rapp	Wheeland
Dermody	Knowles	Ravenstahl	
Diamond	Kortz	Readshaw	Turzai,
Dowling	Kulik	Reed	Speaker

NOT VOTING—2

Emrick	O'Neill
--------	---------

EXCUSED—9

Gergely	McGinnis	Murt	Rothman
Haggerty	Milne	Quigley	Thomas
Lawrence			

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

The SPEAKER. The bill is not recommitted to the Gaming Oversight Committee.

On the question recurring,
Will the House concur in Senate amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER. At this time, Representative Petri, you may proceed.

Mr. PETRI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And thank you for members who supported me on that motion.

I think it is important that we really have a dialogue with our law enforcement and Gaming Control Board. I would urge you not to vote for a bill that has VGTs in it before you have talked to your local folks back home, your local communities, and we know what the real cost of this will be.

But I want to speak a moment to the folks that might be watching at home and the newspaper reporters. You know, as a chairman, to be excluded from an important discussion which took place yesterday, I have got to tell you, I am personally offended. Not just for me – I am no one special; I am just like any other member in this room – but my counterpart on the Democratic side would have liked to have been there as well. We could have alerted members and thrown ideas that would have made this a better bill.

But clearly what you have now is a trade down and a loss of revenue. Make no mistake, the Property Tax Relief Fund will decline. My local casino has calculated that the loss and cannibalization from VGTs will be on order of 30 percent.

Now, I am not really here as a member because of the casino. I am here because of the employees and all the benefits that spin out from gaming, whether it be horse racing, farm preservation, drug and alcohol addiction, property tax relief, etc. And even if my local casino is wrong, I can tell you, every other casino anticipates a 20-percent loss of employment. So let me ask you, why would we vote for a bill that is going to unemploy 20 percent of the 18,000 people that work in this industry? Those are direct relationships; that does not include the indirect relationships.

But even more importantly – and I mentioned this in caucus, but I will share it with both sides of the aisle – who are we really doing this bill for? Is it really for our restaurants? If that were the case, why did we tie their hands in the negotiations? Why does this bill require them to enter into a 5-year agreement with someone who is going to deliver daily cash to fill up their machines and who is going to have a key to their restaurant so they can get there before the hour opens up and who is going to have control over that area of their restaurant? Their employees

are not allowed to touch the machines. They are not allowed to be involved. That third party, whom the gentleman correctly mentioned, will likely be an out-of-stater or a partner with a local company that is out of State. Why would we not allow the restaurant to cut whatever deal they could make in their community? What we have done in this bill is say they cannot receive more than a certain percentage and they must sign a 5-year contract. You tell me if you are the proprietor who owns and operates that segment of your business.

I cannot honestly say to my bars and taverns and restaurants at home that this is a good idea. If we were trying to do something good for them, we would have let the market dictate those terms. We would have just set forth a tax rate. But remember, it is because we are trying to jam something through quickly and we are trying to get it in under the cover of night.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a trade of 54 percent for 37.4 percent, the taxpayer will figure that one out. They will follow the money. Yeah, and when your employees start losing their jobs and the property tax relief drops and there are no construction jobs from this business – oh, and by the way, your local elected officials call you up and say, "What did you do to me?" – you will get the message.

Do not do this. There is a better solution. If VGTs are defeated tonight, that solution is right on the cusp. VGTs and category 4, or satellite casinos, cannot coexist. So it is up to you. Do you want new construction, do you want new jobs, do you want a real local share? Or do you want to go back home and say to your local community, "Oh, you got a new local share. It is 1,000 bucks," and they say, "Are you kidding me? I can't hire a police officer for 1,000 bucks. Thank you but no thank you."

This is a bad idea. Let us pass on it. Vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Representative Donatucci.

Ms. DONATUCCI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand in opposition to HB 271. Mr. Speaker, the authorization of VGTs in the over 9,000 restaurant liquor licenses across this Commonwealth is bad for Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, VGTs are bad for older Pennsylvanians, bad for children, bad for families, and bad for our State Lottery Fund and State Gaming Fund.

I cannot count the number of times I have heard that VGTs will help our bars and taverns. If this is the case, Mr. Speaker, I am puzzled by the fact that I, as the chair of the Philadelphia delegation, have not been approached by a representative of the Pennsylvania Tavern Association.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have a saturation of stop-and-gos in the city of Philadelphia that can end up with a high saturation of VGTs. This makes a bad situation worse. In our delegation we actually have a member who has a stop-and-go bar right next door to his district office. Philadelphia families do not want gambling in their corner stores.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will submit that VGTs authorized in HB 271 are not all about helping bars and taverns but more about helping those out-of-State VGT terminal operators from Vegas and Chicago. Mr. Speaker, these terminal operators do not have much, if any, presence in this Commonwealth; however, these people from Vegas and Chicago are all queued up to make hundreds of millions of dollars off the backs of Pennsylvania's bars and taverns and our defenseless constituents. We should also consider how HB 271 will affect the small terminal operators in this State. Will Pennsylvania

terminal operators be able to compete against these big boys from Vegas? I do not think so.

I know there is language in HB 271 that throws a couple of bones to the lottery; nevertheless, we should all be concerned about the impact VGTs will have on the State Lottery Fund. We should be concerned about how the proliferation of VGTs authorized will affect senior citizen programs that are paid for out of the Lottery Fund. Mr. Speaker, I am talking about PACE and PACENET, property tax and rent rebate, and transportation services. We should also be concerned about how the proliferation of VGTs will impact senior citizens' property tax relief paid for by money from casino gaming.

How would the authorization of VGTs impact the money some of your municipal and volunteer fire and EMS companies get from State gaming dollars authorized under the fire company and EMS grant programs established under Title 35? Mr. Speaker, the fire company and EMS grant programs get \$25 million in gaming money every year. The liquidity of the State Lottery Fund and the State Gaming Fund is crucial to many people across the Commonwealth, especially older Pennsylvanians in urban, rural, and suburban areas. But, Mr. Speaker, with HB 271 we just do not know how the authorization of VGTs will affect the liquidity of the State Lottery Fund or the State Gaming Fund.

When it comes to dollars, we just do not know how much. But, Mr. Speaker, these out-of-State terminal operators know there will be an adverse impact on the State Lottery Fund. They know this because they agreed to give the lottery a cut. I submit that the proposed dollars HB 271 would give to the Lottery Fund is a slap in the face, and therefore, to older Pennsylvanians who benefit from lottery-funded programs.

With 9,296 active restaurant liquor licenses statewide, the authorization of VGTs in bars and taverns, truck stops, bowling alleys, and stop-and-gos will impact the liquidity of both the State Lottery Fund and the State Gaming Fund. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit that this amendment is bad for the Commonwealth. This amendment is bad for our children, it is bad for our families, and it may be terminal for some older Pennsylvanians who depend on PACE and PACENET, property tax relief, rent rebate, and other senior programs supported by the State lottery.

This amendment masquerades as something that would bring real dollars to the Commonwealth. Instead, HB 271 is just bad public policy.

Mr. Speaker, I stand strongly to oppose HB 271. It is bad for Pennsylvania, it is bad for Philadelphia, and I ask my colleagues to stand with me as a solid "no." Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Donatucci.

Members, we are at a point that we are able to vote the bill.

At this time – because I am trying to keep it balanced – Representative Mustio will be going, then Representatives Youngblood, Wheatley, Dawkins, Kortz, and Dean are all scheduled to speak.

Representative Mustio.

Mr. MUSTIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Unfortunately, I do not have comments for the record because there are too many things that the prior speaker said or failed to say that I need to address.

My good friend, chairman of the Gaming Committee, Chairman Petri started reading about promulgating temporary regulations, but he did not read the entire section. He left off

very key points. The section says that "WHEN PROMULGATING TEMPORARY REGULATIONS REGARDING THE APPLICATION, BACKGROUND INVESTIGATION AND RENEWAL PROCESS FOR AN ESTABLISHMENT LICENSE OR REGULATIONS REGARDING AN ESTABLISHMENT LICENSEE'S DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF VIDEO GAMING UNDER THIS PART, THE BOARD SHALL CONSIDER PROMULGATING REGULATIONS THAT MINIMIZE THE REGULATORY BURDEN ON ESTABLISHMENT LICENSEES," but it also says, "AND ESTABLISHMENT LICENSE APPLICANTS TO THE EXTENT THAT:

"ALL REQUIREMENTS, DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES ARE FULFILLED UNDER THIS PART." Please note that this section comes from our State Regulatory Review Act.

Now, the chairman also said that why not let the free market play its role in establishment of fees, the amount that the taverns will get versus the amount that the operator will get. Well, what we did when we looked at this legislation for the last 3 years— And for the people watching at home, please know that this just is not coming up tonight. We have had this vote last session. We vetted this bill, we have changed it, and we have made it much better, as are the other parts of this legislation like the iGaming.

Mr. Speaker, the reason we did not have the ability in this legislation for negotiation to take place between the tavern owner or the club and the operator is because when that happened in other States, it was a very slow ramp up with installation of the slot machines or VGTs. There started to become disputes between the operators and the locations, ultimately going and making appeals to the elected officials to please settle this and establish a fixed rate. So now they are competing on service.

Mr. Speaker, we also heard in Illinois how there is local control. We do not have that in Pennsylvania because our liquor licenses are controlled at the State level. In Illinois the local mayor is responsible for handing out liquor licenses and they vote on that locally. That is not what we want in Pennsylvania if we are truly interested in getting revenue for our General Fund. The prior speaker talked about there is a 54-percent tax rate. Even if you talk to the casinos or the horsemen, they do not call it a tax rate because the part that goes to the Horseman's Fund, they do not consider that a tax. None of that 54 percent comes to our General Fund. Zero comes to our General Fund, Mr. Speaker. Under this legislation, this will all be new money to our General Fund.

How many of us have received calls or e-mails in our office right about this time of year or a few months from now, whenever people get their school tax bills? And the comment is, "I thought our property taxes were going to be going down when we got the passage of slots in Pennsylvania? Governor Rendell promised that." And what do we say? "Oh, it's on there. It's in the homestead." No one knows. But you know what they will know? They will know when the money to the General Fund, when this is fully implemented, is \$350 million just for VGTs and you are able to send additional basic school education funding back to your local districts. They will know that.

They will also know when 67 counties and all the municipalities that have VGTs in them are receiving local share. We are not picking winners and losers by who gets the Gaming

Control Board license award. You are able to pick winners and losers tonight for every district that you represent. And we worked with many of the Representatives from the city of the first class to try and fix their stop-and-go, or stop or shop, or whatever they were calling it, problem. And there is language in the legislation that tries to address that. There is also language in the legislation that funds the officers that are going to go out and inspect that you have been crying for for years.

But again, if you want to find a reason to say no, you can always find reasons to say no. What we are trying to do is give you reasons to say yes, and turn a system that is currently very, very poor for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with the way the casinos are running it, to something that is very beneficial.

The last 5 to 6 years, slots revenue in the State of Pennsylvania is stagnant, stagnant. If that was on the stock – if those numbers were on the stock exchange, your stock would be going down. You are not making return to your investors. Our investors are also our constituents. So what our constituents are saying with this legislation is, we want to diversify. We want to go after more of the market share, and that is exactly what happened in Illinois. If you read the reports that have been done, the State of Illinois is a winner because of what they have done for VGTs. The casinos have hurt themselves because they put casinos on the borders of Illinois, just like what has happened in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, Ohio, New York. They have all come in after us – right? – and we are starting to see the impact that that has had. That is why we are having stagnation. That is why the casinos came to us and said, "Hey, we want to diversify. Give us the opportunity for table games." All we are saying is let us diversify for our taxpayers, let us diversify for our local municipalities, let us diversify for our fire departments that have liquor licenses.

One of the great things— It was said earlier that there was not the proper vetting of this legislation. Well, it is actually being used in a YouTube video – that kind of takes a shot at me, because it is incomplete – where the Representative from Philadelphia says, you do know that these can be in nursing homes? You know, how many of us knew before he asked that question that nursing homes in Pennsylvania can have liquor licenses? I sure did not, but you know what? I am going to be 60 this year, and I am going to go find that nursing home. At some point I want to be in that nursing home, and I am going to go to my State Rep at that time— And I am going to go to my—

The SPEAKER. Sir, please suspend.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. Representative Neilson, for what purpose do you stand?

Mr. NEILSON. The gentleman just called me out.

Mr. MUSTIO. No, I did not.

Mr. NEILSON. He said the gentleman from Philadelphia who questioned him about the nursing homes, and that was me. He knows who it was. He might as well put it online. It is right online. The video has been on PCN (Pennsylvania Cable Network). It has been all over the place. I asked him and it is true.

Mr. MUSTIO. Mr. Speaker?

Mr. NEILSON. It is true.

Mr. MUSTIO. Mr. Speaker, I did not finish—

The SPEAKER. Everybody, please suspend.

Mr. NEILSON. I am not going to have him talk about me, take shots when I am sitting in my chair—

The SPEAKER. Representative Neilson, come on up, please. Representative Mustio, please come up. Representative Neilson, please come up. Representative Mustio, if you could please come up too, please.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

The SPEAKER. Representative Mustio, the floor is yours.

Mr. MUSTIO. All right. The truth be told, we had that all planned to get all of your attention – all right? – and I think we did that.

No, if I can finish. What I said, and it is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that we are not permitted to use gentlemen's or gentleladies' names on the House floor. That is my understanding. So I did not use the gentleman's name, but my intention of the comment was that I have been on the House Liquor Committee since I first was elected in 2003. I personally did not know that a liquor license could be obtained by an assisted living facility, and my point was that that was the reason that the interrogation and the vetting in the Gaming Committee that we heard earlier was not done, right? That is why I was so good, because you did your job, you did your homework, and I was not aware that an assisted living home could have a liquor license. I was following that up to say I am 60 and I would like to go to a nursing home like that someday. And if it is not in this— And we took it out of the bill because of you, but I will come back and demand my State Rep add it back in when I go to a nursing home. That was my point.

The truth be known, I am a Penguins fan and he is a Flyers fan, and he is still a "no" and I am a "yes," but whatever.

All right. All right. I am going to start over.

These comments are not for the record.

All right. A couple of other things that we did – and I am seriously off track here – a couple of other things that we did do in the legislation, in Illinois, as the chairman mentioned in caucus, in Illinois they have what is called slot parlors, where you can have five slot machines, a muffin, and a bottle of Fireball all because it is locally controlled. Local control brought them that. The local people said we want a liquor license there. We want muffins and Fireball and five slot machines, right? And you know who did that? Individuals that went out and bought lots of individual locations.

Now, we heard earlier from one of the speakers that, you know, these out-of-State Las Vegas VGT operators, how many of our casinos are Pennsylvania-based? How many are Las Vegas-based? Come on. Let us be serious about this.

How many taverns are in Pennsylvania? I know there are 2500 taverns in the Tavern Association, and the taverns are for this. And you know what? I think we have some taverns that are located across from day-care centers, churches, schools, right? And they have been there for years. These are these same taverns that are sponsoring our Little League teams, right? Donating to the food banks. Doing all those good things for the community. Yet at the same time these taverns have had their smoking privileges limited. We did not do that at the casinos. We have cut back on their ability to sell six packs, you know, all to their detriment. All they are asking for is an opportunity to receive something that they have invested in Pennsylvania for decades, if not centuries, before we approved slots in 2004 in

Pennsylvania. I think it is time we step up. It is time we diversify.

Mr. Speaker, the provisional licenses provide an opportunity for us to ramp up. In other words, ramping up means we want to get these machines up and running as quickly as possible so that we can generate the revenue that we are going to promise to the General Fund. Our Gaming Control Board is awesome. I have total faith in our Gaming Control Board, as is evidenced by the casino in Bucks County that was mentioned earlier that got fined for permitting underage gamblers. Mr. Speaker, nobody is perfect. Nothing is perfect. No business is perfect. I am pretty sure no politician is perfect either. Not all in this State are, though, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, restaurants, your fine dining restaurants, your chain restaurants – the Olive Gardens, the Applebee's, TGI Fridays – they are not going to be the locations for these. They are going to be in your clubs. They are going to be in your fire halls that have liquor licenses. They are going to be in your local taverns, Mr. Speaker. Our local governments are in favor, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, in closing, VGTs are good for older Pennsylvanians. VGTs are good for families. They are good for children. All the programs that are funded out of our General Fund, VGTs will be good for that, Mr. Speaker.

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

The SPEAKER. Members, I just want to remind you, we could vote the bill right now. I am just teasing.

Representative Youngblood, the floor is yours.

Ms. YOUNGBLOOD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Rampant expansion of slot machines in our communities, including in stop-and—

The SPEAKER. Members, please take your seats.

Ms. YOUNGBLOOD. Yes; because I have a soft voice.

The SPEAKER. Representatives, please take your seats, and if there are any conversations, I would ask that you take them off the House floor.

Representative Youngblood, the floor is yours.

Ms. YOUNGBLOOD. Thank you, sir.

Rampant expansion of slot machines in our communities, including in stop-and-gos, is creating a shots and slots Wild Wild West in Philadelphia. According to the Department of Revenue's numbers, there will be a loss of \$500 million for property tax relief over 5 years, plus a net loss to the lottery of more than \$200 million over 6 years, even if you include a minimum of 3.5 percent funding for the lottery.

Mr. Speaker, we have more than 1700 licenses in the city of Philadelphia. That means one-third of all VGTs will be placed in our communities in the city of Philadelphia. I invite anyone in this chamber to come to my district, or any district in Philadelphia, so they can see for themselves the hazard and the hardship that the stop-and-gos have caused. Do you have 1700 licenses in your community that are eligible to get VGTs? No. We do. And now that VGTs, to echo my colleagues from Philadelphia, these shots-and-slots establishments will run wild across the city of Philadelphia and the Commonwealth.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we have a shovel-ready project in Philadelphia, and that means the second casino license – where it did not say "may"; it said "shall" – was awarded to the city and the county of the first class. And look what happened in Bethlehem when MGM pulled out of the deal to buy the Sands because of the VGT proposal. We cannot let that happen in Philadelphia or the Commonwealth.

I urge everybody to vote "no" on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Representative Wheatley.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, is the maker of this or sponsor of this bill willing to stand for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Mr. Speaker, I just have a few good-government questions to ask.

The SPEAKER. Yes; he will stand for interrogation.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Mr. Speaker, are there any provisions in this bill that prevent any licensee from making contributions to anyone in the political process, as we do with our casino licenses?

Mr. ORTITAY. Everyone except the truck stop owners and the— Everyone except the tavern owners and the truck stop owners.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Everyone except the tavern owners and truck stop owners are prohibited from making contributions?

Mr. ORTITAY. Correct.

Mr. WHEATLEY. All right.

And for the licensees for the VGTs, I heard the argument or the statement around why we do not have them at 54 percent like we have our slots, but I have not heard the rationale for why that is good for Pennsylvanians, when if in fact the money that we get from – the taxation that we get from the VGTs is coming straight to the General Fund, and if in fact we want to make sure there is a level playing field across the gaming atmosphere, what is the rationale for charging 37 percent on VGTs versus 54 percent in our physical casinos?

Mr. ORTITAY. Mr. Speaker, it is not economically viable because they have to share the revenue with the terminal holder – with the terminal operator and the establishments. There is an extra person, an extra entity involved in that, that is not involved with the casinos.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Okay. And then finally, we had the same discussion and debate when we did the expansion of gaming with the casinos around having some local control over the amount of licensees that could be in one municipality or not. Is there anything in this bill that gives local municipalities some control over the number of potential licensees that could be in their potential municipality?

Mr. ORTITAY. Mr. Speaker, no; there is not.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, on the bill?

The SPEAKER. Yes. Representative Wheatley, on the bill.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Mr. Speaker, when we expanded gaming before with the casinos, I reluctantly supported it, and it was under the same assumption that I think we are faced with currently. We were faced with budget shortfalls. The Governor at the time campaigned on getting this expansion of gaming and that it would bring \$3 billion or more to the Commonwealth and we all went for it, and it has worked to some degree. Now we are faced with another budgetary shortfall. We have all sorts of expansion of gaming that is involved in this current bill, and at some point I have to ask myself, what is going to be the best thing for Pennsylvanians?

Now, in a lot of ways, I know people already have made their decision on what they are going to do on this particular bill, but I just want us to ask the question as we move forward,

are we going to be the type of Commonwealth that predicates our revenues and the future of our children on gambling expansion at every opportunity? And because people are already doing it does not make it right.

The fact of the matter is, we have some serious financial obligations and questions, and I am still not convinced. Just like we had questions around the casino expansions and what they would actually bring in, just like we had questions when we did small games of chance and what we thought they would bring in, I have questions around what the projections of what this will do and what the value of this will be for Pennsylvanians. We have an industry right now that is doing somewhat of what we thought it would do, which is our casinos. We have now, if we pass this, there is a potential of cannibalizing those operations. I have a concern, based off of what my district looks like and what parts of my district already has oversaturations of liquor licenses that I share on the south side, and now in growing other areas of my district, that this could potentially cause more harm than good.

But forget all of that. Let us talk about what we want or what we think we want as a Commonwealth as our financing mechanism to fuel and fund our programs. The way that we are going, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the next thing we will be talking about is full, full taxation and recognition of all the other sinful things that we can think of just because we do not want to answer the real question of how we can possibly fund the operation of government.

The only thing I am asking us to do, these expansions of gambling models are not working for a budgetary fix, and I would ask us to not support this bill and to look at other ways to get the revenue we need to support our budget. So again, all I am saying is, we have to be careful in how we go about the financing of the operation of this Commonwealth, and we cannot continue to do it on expanding of gaming and other nonsensical behaviors of people.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dawkins.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today if I can briefly interrogate the maker of the bill? I promise it will be brief. There was a certain question that came up throughout the testimony tonight, and I wanted some clarification just so we can move forward.

The SPEAKER. Representative Ortitay will stand for interrogation, and you may proceed.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There was a part of the discussion tonight that talked about square footages around less than 1,000 square feet. It would be inspected by – I did not catch who is doing the inspection for those properties?

Mr. ORTITAY. It is the LC (liquor control) officer.

Mr. DAWKINS. So the LC officer will go out. If you are less than 1,000 square feet, what exactly are they looking for when they go out to these different establishments?

Mr. ORTITAY. Mr. Speaker, they are looking for compliance with the Liquor Code.

Mr. DAWKINS. So in event, in the city of the first class, where we have the stop-and-gos that have the bulletproof glass, they do not have the 35 seats or public restrooms, are these some of the things they are going to be looking for, and will they be denied if they do not have these particular items in their location?

Mr. ORTITAY. Mr. Speaker, no. I mean, if there are violations that are found, then that will be given up to the Liquor Control Board, but outside of that, no.

Mr. DAWKINS. So when you say the LC will go out and look for compliance, what exact compliance would they be looking for? Because it was my understanding that these establishments are required to have seating requirements, and public restrooms in order to operate. Is that not the same enforcement that would be used by LC?

Mr. ORTITAY. If the liquor control officer finds a violation, they are going to give it to the Liquor Control Board for further action.

Mr. DAWKINS. So in this bill, would the LC have the authority to cease operation in that location? What exactly happens if an individual is in default or not in compliance? Is that just a written ticket citation, or is there any other?

Mr. ORTITAY. Mr. Speaker, it depends on the severity of the violation. And again, we are getting into terms of the liquor— We are getting into liquor law here, not so much what is contained in this bill.

Mr. DAWKINS. Okay. The reason I ask that, I mean, in the city of the first class, as we already belabored tonight, we have a severe issue around our stop-and-go locations, and these locations are eligible to sell takeout of six-packs and they do shots by the glass through the bulletproof glass window. My fear is, when we talk about the 1,000 square feet – I did have an amendment on the bill that talked about square footage being a requirement for VGTs, which is why I am asking – what are going to be some of the compliance pieces to ensure that those particular locations are in compliance? But based on your description, I kind of fail to understand that is not their intent to go out to check and see if they have the seating requirements or the public restrooms. Is that correct?

Mr. ORTITAY. They are looking for the basic requirements of what the Liquor Control Board requires when they are getting a liquor license. Outside of that, that is all they are looking for.

Mr. DAWKINS. Okay.

Mr. ORTITAY. Because if it does escalate into a violation and continues onto that, then they could eventually be labeled under another designation and then they would not be eligible to get a VGT license.

Mr. DAWKINS. Okay.

The second question – around regulations, who is going to be the regulator of these particular VGT units or terminals in these different locations?

Mr. ORTITAY. The Gaming Control Board.

Mr. DAWKINS. The Gaming Control Board. Okay.

Mr. ORTITAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAWKINS. Last question, and then I want speak on the bill itself. Earlier it was mentioned that there was some carveout in terms of dollars that are going to be going to other entities outside of things related to gaming or related to the municipalities. Could you list some of those entities that are going to be receiving funding or have a carveout in this particular bill?

Mr. ORTITAY. I will name a couple: \$2 million to the Gun Violence Task Force; we are also looking at \$3 million to LCE for assignment of no less than seven additional agents for Philadelphia; we are also looking at \$2 1/2 million to drug and alcohol programs, \$2 1/2 million to fire and EMS grants, and then \$2 1/2 million or .2 percent, whichever is higher, to compulsive and problem gambling.

Mr. DAWKINS. Are any of those that you just named, do they require any additional legislation?

Mr. ORTITAY. Yes.

Mr. DAWKINS. Is that legislation already drafted?

Mr. ORTITAY. It is required to do this two-step process through a different bill. We cannot do them in the same.

Mr. DAWKINS. So when are we looking to do the drafting of the other part that goes with this bill?

Mr. ORTITAY. My assumption is that it will occur at budget time, typically every year.

Mr. DAWKINS. So we are going to pass a bill that has allocated funding for these different entities but we do not have the language to actually fund that entity. Is that correct?

Mr. ORTITAY. Yes.

Mr. DAWKINS. Interesting.

On the bill, Mr. Speaker?

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

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, this has been a challenge. And again, I promised the members I would be brief so I am not going to take up too much time, but I think this issue is too important for us to kind of glaze over. I think we need to take our time and really look through the details.

What I have heard from previous speakers is that they are interested in fixing some of the problems we have in the city of the first class. I remember when this bill came up last session and we talked about fixing the same problems we have in the city of the first class, we had an entire term to do those fixes and I have yet to see any of those fixes actually occur. My hope is that we are going to move into that direction and produce the fix for the city of the first class.

When we talk about over 1700 potential "R" licenses out there in the city of the first class, it really bothers me that potentially all these locations could have a terminal. It is a fact that 75 percent of gamblers have a drinking disorder, so when we talk about putting VGTs inside of stop-and-gos, that is a concern for me. I have heard members of this House say it is not a problem, but when you live in a community such as mine that is downtrodden with poverty, downtrodden with addiction – and we are talking about opioid use, but here we are putting another vice inside of that community.

For all my folks, not only in the Philadelphia delegation, but all my folks in this House, I want you to take a strong, strong look at what we are getting ready to do and what we are getting ready to pass and ask yourself, do you have someone in your family that may be struggling from addiction and what is it that this may do to that family?

We have yet to vet this bill thoroughly. I think we need to table this bill or have further discussion, because here we are talking about putting \$2 million into a fund that we cannot fund because we do not have the language to do so. That is irresponsible of this body, and I would urge a "no" vote on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kurt Masser.

Mr. MASSER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, when I want to know about education issues, I often would turn to the gentleman in the front row. If I want to know about insurance issues, I would turn to my friend from Schuylkill County; education, I will turn to my friend in the back. This is my wheelhouse. See, I have been in the business for 30 years. Everybody in this chamber likes to say we are for small businesses. It is time to show it.

To me, this comes down to Wall Street versus Main Street. When these four casinos wanted 24-hour liquor licenses, the taverns objected. The casinos replied that it is not the same clientele. They say VGTs will cannibalize their business, yet they have no problem building new casinos on all of our borders. They say that they have been good partners with the Commonwealth. They have, and so have we. We have held up our end of the bargain. You know who else have been good partners with the Commonwealth? The taverns and clubs who have been our partners since William Penn, paying property taxes, payroll taxes, and on and on.

We could just pretend. We close our eyes and pretend that we are voting against this because we are against the online gaming or we are against the VGTs. Let us pretend it is not happening. This bill is addressing things that are happening right now across your street and on every street corner. Your constituents are doing this unprotected in an unregulated environment benefiting offshore companies, and no one is held accountable. A "no" vote means that is acceptable.

I have heard about the bad actors. First, let me be clear, that if you or your license has been suspended within the past 3 years, if you have been declared a nuisance bar, you will not be licensed to get VGTs. I have heard about the bad actors. I want to help to fix that issue.

But you also have reputable business owners. You have reputable tavern owners. You have reputable clubs in all of your districts. A "no" vote tells your good business owners they do not matter as much; because of those bad actors, they cannot do it. It tells your VFWs (Veterans of Foreign Wars), your legions, your fire halls, you are not as important as these bad actors. We cannot let you improve your business because of them.

This would allow your good business owners and clubs to survive, hire more people, improve their buildings. Like I said, I have been in the business for 30 years. I know the business. Our local taverns, including myself, have sponsored youth baseball teams, youth football teams, fire companies, ambulances, EMS, Children's Miracle – the list goes on and on. The good business owners that all of you have are doing these same things.

My local officials will thank me when we pass this bill. There is a local share to help them with blight, fire, EMS, and economic development, money they desperately need.

I ask everyone for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. Representative Bill Kortz.

Mr. KORTZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of HB 271, and I urge all my colleagues to vote in the affirmative on this bill.

It is an omnibus bill that does many good things. Most important to many of us is that it will help the veterans' organizations and the volunteer fire departments pay their electric bill.

I will submit the rest of my remarks for the record.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of HB 271.

Mr. Speaker, this omnibus bill includes a fix to the shares issue, a very important fix that is required because of a Supreme Court ruling last year.

Mr. Speaker, it also gives the casinos many other games they want that will help their businesses and help our revenue issue.

Mr. Speaker, it also addresses an issue very important to many of us – a way to help fund VFWs, American Legions, and volunteer firefighters by allowing up to maximums of five machine VGTs as long as they have a liquor license. This will help these veteran organizations and volunteer firefighters pay their electric bills.

Tonight I have heard arguments that the VGTs will impact casino profits by 20 to 30 percent – that is the casinos speaking. I believe that is absolutely false and fake news by the casinos.

The reality is, Mr. Speaker, the gray zone machines are in use right now. They are currently in service and no revenue is being collected.

Mr. Speaker, there is another clientele that are not – I repeat – are not going to the casinos. They like to sit in their veterans clubs and volunteer firefighting clubs and see their friends, and yes, maybe play a few dollars in the machines.

One casino, Penn National, is in favor of VGTs.

Another point made this evening is that the VGTs will be everywhere, in laundromats, etc. Well, Mr. Speaker, VGTs are only allowed in establishments that have a liquor license. I do not know of any laundromats that serve booze. So, Mr. Speaker, this is time to move on.

I urge a "yes" vote.

The SPEAKER. Representative Madeleine Dean.

Mrs. DEAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to tell you about my vote on this important piece of legislation because I admire my colleagues on both sides of the aisle talking about the pros of a massive expansion of gaming or talking about the cons of putting more gaming into your communities.

But I am not here to talk about the pros or the cons, the brick and mortar, the VGTs, the iGaming, what is it going to do to kids, what is it going to do to the casinos, because I do not know about you, but in the 6 hours since this bill was released, I have been in at least five voting meetings. I have been in two caucuses. I have been here with you for hours of session, where we have been voting on other pieces of legislation. So I have to admit to you, Mr. Speaker, I have not read the 675 pages of this bill. Even if I peel off the 200 pages that are stricken, I have not read the 465 pages of this bill.

I will be a "no" vote because it is 9 o'clock at night and I am pretty sure my constituents would prefer I understand the gravity of this bill and the expansion of gaming and what revenues it will really bring to Pennsylvania and what risks and harms before I would vote "yes" on something like this. Six hundred and seventy-five pages: if you have all had the chance to read it, I do not know how you did it. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will try and be brief. For those of you that know me, we will be out of here by 11 o'clock. No, I am just—

Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out some of the things that this bill does do. It clears up existing problems for casinos with the local share fix. It provides for fantasy sports betting, lottery expansion, iGaming, and in that it will regulate illegal iGaming that is currently going on and now have the State's oversight of that. There will be airport gaming tablets, VGTs, and in that case, we will regulate 40,000 illegal machines that currently exist.

For those of you that were not around, and I was not even around when there was a former Attorney General that went to jail for taking campaign kickbacks from people that were operating illegal VGTs in their bars, this issue has been around for 30 years, and for 30 years there have been members that have turned a blind eye to this. It is about time we finally put this into a category that allows us to regulate this and control it and actually get some dollars for the citizens of Pennsylvania off of this.

Mr. Speaker, this will help local bars and taverns. And contrary to some comments that were made earlier, these establishments with VGTs will not be able to be in shopping malls. In fact, they will not be able to be in any building where there is a contiguous other business that is in that same building. So these will be freestanding, stand-alone establishments that have a liquor license that will be eligible.

It was also pointed out by some of my colleagues that not all of those liquor establishments that are freestanding will necessarily want one of these in their bars or their restaurants. There are a whole lot of fine dining establishments in the city of Philadelphia that I do not think would allow one of these things in their establishment if you tried.

Mr. Speaker, there will be an extra \$3 million to the LCE for Philadelphia just for enforcement so we can start to go after some of those stop-and-gos. I will say that I, too, am concerned about the stop-and-gos in Philadelphia, but those stop-and-gos are problems right now and there are no VGTs. Mr. Speaker, what we need to do is do something about the stop-and-gos, not something about the VGTs.

Mr. Speaker, this will also allow for sports betting, for offtrack betting slots, or OTB slots, and clean up some of the LSA conditions. Our local fire departments and VFWs and American Legions will benefit from this bill.

Mr. Speaker, there will be construction jobs in every county as a result of VGTs being included in this bill. Mr. Speaker, bar owners can negotiate with multiple vendors. They will not be locked in to one vendor.

The local share, which will be split by all those communities that do not have a casino now, is going to be \$40 million a year. Your local communities will have access to \$40 million a year.

Mr. Speaker, this will also diversify our gaming industry in the State of Pennsylvania. Currently there is the lottery, which is run by the State, and there are the casinos. At some point in time if the only other person that controls things in the entire State is the casinos, we become a slave to them in that their demands control all our revenues for gaming in the State of Pennsylvania. This allows us to have multiple partners, so if one aspect is seeing a downturn or they want to decide that they want to get a lower rate or they want something else, we also have the other partner that may be doing better, has other opportunities for us, and can generate dollars for the State of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the township supervisors in the State of Pennsylvania, their association has endorsed VGTs in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I have heard a lot about, you know, how much money that we are going to be losing as a result of this, but what I always say, if you listen to the speakers closely, what they would tell you is, over a 5-year period, we will lose this much, and usually it is about the same amount that we are going to gain in a 1-year period as a result of this bill. When VGTs are fully operational, if we get the same kind of return that they did in Illinois, it is a billion dollars a year, about

\$350 million to the State of Pennsylvania every year. That does not just solve this year's problem; it solves future years' problems.

And I also heard, "Well, if one is at 54 percent, why should the other be at 37.5 percent?" I will point out that table games in the casinos are at 14 percent, iGames are at 16 percent, fantasy games are at 19 percent. The reason for the varying rates of some of these is that they require different levels of service. If I am going to service 5,000 slot machines in a casino, I call up my vendor and they show up with a team to 1 location that has 1 power source and I take care of them in 1 place. If I am going to service 5,000 machines, 5,000 VGT machines, I am going to have to drive to at least 1,000 different locations to service 5,000 machines. There is a cost involved with that. That cannot have the same rate of return, then, just because, the same way that when we said table games is at 14 percent, we said you cannot fry the dealer and produce money as quickly as you can when somebody is sitting there by themselves pulling the slot handle. That is the reason for the difference in rates.

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage a "yes" vote. There is a lot of good in this bill for everyone. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Roebuck.

Mr. ROEBUCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wanted to speak briefly, hopefully, about this issue. It is an issue that deeply concerns me. It is not a new issue. It is an issue that I have been talking about ever since I have been in this legislature. Because of problems created by the current system is a problem that has been an increasing blight in the city that I represent, in the neighborhood in which I live.

Understand the speaker before me just said all the good things in this bill and all the things that are going to be positive, but where were you when we have been saying year after year that we have serious problems with the liquor law and with the growth of stop-and-gos? Where have you been? What have you done? The reality is, you have done absolutely nothing, and the danger here is that with this bill, you will do even less.

Let me just give you the scenario. You have a nice restaurant. It has an "R" license, and that license is sold to someone who has no interest in a restaurant where you could take your wife and kids, no interest in a restaurant where you go and have a good meal. He is interested or she is interested in selling liquor. And so that becomes not a place to eat because suddenly there are no chairs and tables, suddenly there is no health license, suddenly there is no bathroom you can use. In fact, there is no food at all. And when questioned about having no food, that owner is told by the Liquor Control Board to put a menu up, and says, go across the street and buy the food. No bathroom? Go behind the building and do what you have to do. No enforcement of the health license? That is okay. This is what you have put in my city, and this is wrong. This bill does not make it any better. It has a potential for making it a lot worse.

Now, I understand the need of those who want to have access to some of the things with veterans clubs and fire companies and all them. That is fine and good, but do not do that at my expense. I am willing to support that, but unless you have enforcement in this bill, unless you have a way to address our problems, this bill is terrible. It is awful. It makes things worse for me, for every constituent I represent. It is morally wrong, and those who vote for it ought to understand that, that what you are doing to my city, to my constituency is morally wrong. And if you do not want to fix the problem, do not expand the problem, but you have an obligation to fix the problem before

you do this. If you do not fix the problem, then you have all of the weight of everything that is wrong, that will blight my community, that will kill individuals of my community. That is on you, and you ought to be ashamed.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Vazquez.

Mr. VAZQUEZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What I would have to say is that we do not need this. I am talking to all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. This is a nonpartisan bill. In the district that I represent, and State Representative Angel Cruz and State Representative Rosita Youngblood and Kinsey in the 179th, I mean, listen, this is not only just for north Philadelphia, but this is across the whole Philadelphia, whole Pennsylvania. Gambling, it is a problem. It is an addiction just like drugs.

So I would please ask all my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill. "No." Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Chris Sainato.

Mr. SAINATO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will not be long, but I remember last year when we spoke on this issue and the time come. Now, this time around it was on an amendment with the VGTs. Now the VGTs are inside the bill with everything else. And I have sat back and I have listened to the debate tonight. There are parts of this bill I am not really super fond about. There are other parts I think are very good.

I know people are concerned about local share. Unfortunately, most counties do not get local share. So there are winners and losers. I said last year sometimes you have got to make a choice. Do we do VGTs or do we have people that want to vote for a PIT (personal income tax)? I remember saying it last year. And I know there are many in this House who would love to vote for a PIT. I am not one of them, Mr. Speaker.

I said it last year and I will say it this year: if we can raise two to three to four hundred million dollars for future problems – we have a \$2 billion deficit. We have programs that need to be paid for. There is local share now with the VGTs that will go out to the rural communities. Those who have got nothing from gaming, if their communities take it, they are going to have an opportunity to share in the pie. It may not be a big pie like the casino districts, but the other districts are going have a small pie.

And it goes back to what my colleague from Lancaster said and my colleague from Allegheny said, when it comes to VGTs, we are talking mom-and-pop liquor establishments. We are talking about VFWs. We are talking about fire halls. Do you not think we should do something for Mom and Pop once in a while? Everyone is so concerned about the casinos, which they have done a good job. They have employed people and they have done some of the things they are supposed to do, but should they have everything? We cannot give anything to a local club, a local bar in Pennsylvania? Those are the ones who pay taxes. Those are the ones who employ people, and if five machines are going to put a casino under, then maybe they need to look at their business model a little bit better, Mr. Speaker.

So I just urge my colleagues, let us do the right thing. I am going to vote for this. I voted for gaming for 20 years, but if VGTs were not in this bill, I probably would not vote for it because there is a lot of stuff in here that everyone is concerned about. We are so concerned about certain aspects of this bill, but in the general sense, everyone will get something to bring back to their districts, so I encourage a "yes" vote.

The SPEAKER. Representative Mike Carroll and then Representative Gene DiGirolamo, and those will be the last two. Representative Carroll waives off.

Representative DiGirolamo.

Mr. DIGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I will be brief.

I rise in opposition to this bill, HB 271. One of the previous speakers said that this bill will be a good thing for our family and our children because of the revenue that it is going to generate, Mr. Speaker. I think this has the potential to be a disaster for our family and our citizens and our community, Mr. Speaker, because – and I want to tell you why very quickly – because you are going to get individuals that are going to go to these taverns and bars, and they are going to go there with the intent to have a couple of drinks and have a good time. And after they have a couple of drinks, they are going to find themselves in front of these VGTs and they are going to be losing their rent money, their money for food, and their money for their mortgages, Mr. Speaker.

This has the potential to be a disaster for our children, our families, and our communities, and I ask you to vote "no" on this bill, HB 271. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Does anybody else wish to be recognized?

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—102

Barbin	English	Kulik	Roae
Barrar	Evankovich	Lewis	Rozzi
Benninghoff	Everett	Longietti	Ryan
Bernstine	Flynn	Maher	Saccone
Bloom	Fritz	Marshall	Sainato
Brown, R.	Gabler	Marsico	Sankey
Burns	Gillespie	Masser	Santora
Caltagirone	Goodman	Matzie	Saylor
Causar	Grove	Metzgar	Schemel
Christiana	Hahn	Miccarelli	Snyder
Conklin	Harper	Millard	Sonney
Cook	Harris, A.	Moul	Stephens
Corbin	Heffley	Mullery	Sturla
Corr	Helm	Mustio	Tallman
Costa, D.	Hennessey	Nelson	Tobash
Costa, P.	Hill	Nesbit	Toepel
Cutler	Irvin	Oberlander	Toohil
Davidson	James	Ortitay	Topper
Deasy	Jozwiak	Petrarca	Walsh
Delozier	Kampf	Pyle	Ward
DeLuca	Kauffman	Quinn, C.	Warner
Diamond	Keefer	Rader	Wentling
Dowling	Keller, M.K.	Ravenstahl	Wheeland
Dunbar	Kim	Readshaw	
Dush	Klunk	Reed	Turzai,
Ellis	Kortz	Reese	Speaker

NAYS—89

Baker	Driscoll	Kirkland	Pickett
Bizzarro	Emrick	Knowles	Quinn, M.
Boback	Evans	Krueger	Rabb
Boyle	Fabrizio	Mackenzie	Rapp

Bradford	Farry	Madden	Roe
Briggs	Fee	Mako	Roebuck
Brown, V.	Fitzgerald	Maloney	Samuelson
Bullock	Frankel	McCarter	Schlossberg
Carroll	Freeman	McClinton	Schweyer
Cephas	Gainey	McNeill	Simmons
Comitta	Galloway	Mehaffie	Sims
Cox	Gillen	Mentzer	Solomon
Cruz	Godshall	Metcalfe	Staats
Culver	Greiner	Miller, B.	Taylor
Daley	Hanna	Miller, D.	Vazquez
Davis	Harkins	Neilson	Vitali
Dawkins	Hickernell	Neuman	Warren
Day	Kaufner	O'Brien	Watson
Dean	Kavulich	O'Neill	Wheatley
DeLissio	Keller, F.	Pashinski	White
Dermody	Keller, W.	Peifer	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Kinsey	Petri	Zimmerman
Donatucci			

NOT VOTING—3

Charlton	Harris, J.	Markosek
----------	------------	----------

EXCUSED—9

Gergely	McGinnis	Murt	Rothman
Haggerty	Milne	Quigley	Thomas
Lawrence			

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

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

BILLS RECOMMENDED

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

HB 200;
 HB 699;
 HB 831;
 HB 877;
 HB 913;
 HB 914;
 HB 915;
 HB 916;
 HB 1239; and
 HB 1285.

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

VOTE CORRECTIONS

The SPEAKER. Representative O'Neill wishes to be recognized.

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

Mr. Speaker, on HB 271, on the motion to recommit, my buttons were jammed and I was not recorded, and I would like to be recorded in the negative.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir.

Representative Charlton.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, on the last vote, my machine was not recording my vote. I would like to be recorded as a "yes" vote.

The SPEAKER. The record will so reflect.

Representative Hennessey is recognized.

Mr. HENNESSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With regard to the concurrence vote on HB 271, I voted "yes."

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mr. HENNESSEY. I would have additional remarks I would like to submit for the record.

The SPEAKER. Yes; they will be accepted. Please submit them.

Mr. HENNESSEY. Thank you.

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

Mr. Speaker, I stand to establish the parameters upon which I am about to cast my vote on HB 271.

My primary concern, as chair of Aging, is the economic security of the Lottery Fund and the expected negative impact of VGTs on lottery ticket sales.

To address that concern, this bill establishes a \$38 million payment to the PA Lottery its first year, and I am promised that that \$38 million figure will be checked and rechecked as this bill progresses, and increased if the developing facts require.

More importantly, this bill requires that each year, enough money will be placed into the fund to equalize the adverse effect of VGTs on the fund. Additionally, express language of the bill directs 3.5 percent of gross revenues from VGTs each year into a lottery stabilization fund, setting aside additional funds to assure available moneys going forward to maintain this legislative promise to hold the lottery harmless. My purpose has been to secure the Lottery Fund for our seniors.

The promises in this bill which I have discussed led me to believe that that goal will be accomplished.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to bring to the attention of the Speaker and the members of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives the name of Dane James Gilmer, who has recently been awarded Scouting's highest honor – Eagle Scout.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to the members of the House of Representatives the following citation.

Whereas, Dane James Gilmer has earned the Eagle Award in Scouting. This is the highest award that Boy Scouts of America can bestow and as such represents great sacrifice and tremendous effort on the part of this young man. Dane is a member of Troop 147.

Now therefore, Mr. Speaker and members of the House of Representatives, it is my privilege to congratulate and place in the Legislative Journal the name of Dane James Gilmer.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek is recognized.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, apparently my button did not work. I would like to be recorded in the positive.

The SPEAKER. On the House bill concurrence vote, 271?

Sir, will you state the bill? It is the HB 271 concurrence? Correct. And you want to be recognized as affirmative.

Does anybody else wish to be recognized?

STATEMENT BY MR. COSTA

The SPEAKER. Representative Paul Costa.

Mr. P. COSTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to be recognized on personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. You may proceed.

Mr. P. COSTA. Thank you. I want to thank all the members who just voted for concurrence for this past bill. As most of you have been around here for a long time, I have been supporting this bill for a long time, and as you know, I could not do it myself. If it was not for Representative Mark Mustio – I know we are not supposed to mention names; I apologize – but Mark picked up the ball and carried it across the goal line, and I want to thank him very much and thank all of you that voted for this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

STATEMENT BY MR. MUSTIO

The SPEAKER. Representative Mark Mustio is recognized.

Mr. MUSTIO. Mr. Speaker, my button did not stick, but I do want to say thank you to everybody on both sides of the issue. Everybody had a lot of great points. We obviously have a long way to go yet. We have 102 people that voted "yes" that I know want to be part of making this bill better, and those that voted "no" will have an opportunity when it comes back from the Senate to make it even better again.

I really want to thank Josiah Shelly for all the work he did, and my leader for walking up and down the aisle getting votes today, and, Mr. Speaker, thanks for putting up with the little show here we had on the floor today. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Mustio.

Does anybody else wish to be recognized?

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 Harry Lewis moves that the House will be adjourned until June 9, tomorrow, at 9 a.m., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

Remember, folks, we are going to be starting at 9 a.m., and we will be voting sharp at 9 a.m. We do not have any presentations tomorrow morning, any presentations tomorrow morning or speakers. We will be going right into votes at 9 a.m. on the House floor.

Representative Martina White is recognized.

Ms. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just to clarify, tomorrow is June 8, not the 9th, correct?

The SPEAKER. I apologize. Yes; you are absolutely right. June 8. It is June 8. It was written here June 9, but it is June 8, at 9 a.m.

Thank you very much, Representative White.

Ms. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. It was written as the 9th, but it is June 8, tomorrow, Thursday, at 9 a.m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

Thank you very much, Representative White.

Members, again, we will be starting promptly at 9 a.m. tomorrow. Thank you.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to, and at 9:27 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.