

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

TUESDAY, JULY 11, 2017

SESSION OF 2017

201ST OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 47

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI) PRESIDING

PRAYER

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let us bow our heads.

Dear God, in Your Word You tell us there is no wisdom, no insight, no plan that can succeed against the Lord. The horse is made ready for the day of battle. The victory rests with the Lord.

Lord, today as we find ourselves on the final day perhaps of the culmination of months and years of work and dedication and devotion that people have put into different initiatives and pieces of legislation and bills and amendments that are going to impact the citizens of our Commonwealth in very, very important ways, Lord, let us all remember, as we gather here each trying to do our best to make what we believe is a positive difference, let us remember to subordinate all of it to You, God, because the victory belongs to the Lord, as it should.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Monday, July 10, 2017, will be postponed until printed.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 1656 By Representatives FARRY, NEILSON, BIZZARRO, MEHAFFIE, DAVIS, GALLOWAY, TAYLOR, SIMMONS and IRVIN

An Act amending Title 4 (Amusements) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in general provisions, further providing for definitions; in Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board, further providing for general and specific powers and providing for hybrid and skill-based devices; in licensees, further providing for Category 3 slot machine license, for slot machine testing and certification standards, for license renewals and for multiple slot machine license prohibition; in table games, further providing for table game device and associated equipment testing and certification standards; providing for Category 4 locations, for airport gaming and for sports wagering; in revenues, further providing for gross terminal revenue deductions, for establishment of State Gaming Fund and net slot machine revenue distribution and providing for gaming tax normalization; in administration and enforcement, further providing for liens and suits for taxes and for prohibited acts and penalties and providing for casino liquor license; in miscellaneous provisions, further providing for repayments to State Gaming Fund; in keno, providing for general provisions, for authorization of lottery game, for operation and for revenue; and making related repeals.

Referred to Committee on GAMING OVERSIGHT, July 11, 2017.

No. 1658 By Representatives CHARLTON, FREEMAN, SOLOMON, MILLARD, HILL-EVANS, DiGIROLAMO, WARD and SIMS

An Act providing for violence prevention committees in health care facilities, for their powers and duties, for remedies and for the powers and duties of the Department of Labor and Industry.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, July 11, 2017.

No. 1659 By Representatives TOBASH, PICKETT, KAUFFMAN, GROVE, COX, BENNINGHOFF, DUNBAR, RYAN, TURZAI, SAYLOR, KAUFER, STAATS, MILLARD, O'NEILL, A. HARRIS, WARD, ZIMMERMAN, SANKEY, HEFFLEY, B. MILLER, GILLEN, BLOOM, PHILLIPS-HILL, MILNE, NELSON, EVERETT and KLUNK

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Human Services Code, in general powers and duties, providing for work requirements for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, July 11, 2017.

SENATE BILLS FOR CONCURRENCE

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

SB 6, PN 1085

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, July 11, 2017.

SB 172, PN 1067

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, July 11, 2017.

SB 403, PN 401

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, July 11, 2017.

SB 677, PN 798

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, July 11, 2017.

SB 697, PN 863

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, July 11, 2017.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. Members, my understanding is that the Democratic Caucus will be breaking at this time, I believe, to review the code bills from yesterday.

Representative Mike Hanna is recognized for a caucus announcement.

Mr. HANNA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats will caucus at 11:45. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

With respect to the Republican Caucus, the code bills that the Democrats are going to caucus on now we have already caucused on, so any further caucus announcement is going to be done through e-mail communication.

We will be at recess until the call of the Chair, after our colleagues have had an opportunity to caucus those bills.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. Representative Tom Murt is recognized.

Mr. MURT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to request a correction to the record. Would this be the appropriate time?

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. You certainly may.

Mr. MURT. Mr. Speaker, on the final vote for HB 1354 I was incorrectly recorded in the affirmative. I would like to be recorded in the negative, please.

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

Mr. MURT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. At this time the House will stand in recess to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

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

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. We are going to do leaves of absence.

Representative Tom QUIGLEY of Montgomery County has requested leave of absence for the day. Without objection, that will be granted.

The minority whip requests leaves of absence for Representative Daniel McNEILL of Lehigh County for the day, Representative Carol Hill EVANS of York County for the day, Representative Angel CRUZ of Philadelphia County for the day, Representative Rob MATZIE of Beaver County for the day, Representative Sid KAVULICH of Lackawanna County for the day, and Representative Patrick HARKINS of Erie County for the day. Without objection, that will be granted.

MASTER ROLL CALL

The SPEAKER. Members, please proceed to vote on the master roll.

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—194

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

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

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Cruz	Kavulich	McNeill	Sonney
Evans	Matzie	Quigley	Zimmerman
Harkins			

The SPEAKER. One hundred and ninety-four members voting on the master roll, a quorum is present.

CALENDAR

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 446, PN 1088**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.177, No.175), known as The Administrative Code of 1929, further providing for title of act; implementing the 2017-2018 Commonwealth budget and instituting future budget implementation; in administrative organization, providing for employees with access to Federal tax information; in organization of independent administrative boards and commissions, providing for Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency; in Commonwealth agency fees, providing for Higher Education Regulatory Restricted Account, further providing for Department of Health to collect fees, for Department of Labor and Industry to collect fees and for Pennsylvania State Police; in powers and duties of Office of Attorney General and its departmental administrative boards, providing for collections by Attorney General; in powers and duties of Department of Corrections, providing for notice of public hearing for State correctional institution closure; providing for Joint Underwriting Association; in powers and duties of Department of Environmental Protection, its officers and departmental advisory boards and commissions, further providing for Environmental Quality Board and for municipal recycling grants and providing for water treatment facilities; providing for powers and duties of Department of Conservation and Natural Resources; in Department of Aging, providing for older adult daily living centers; in powers and duties of Department of Human Services and its departmental administrative and advisory boards and commissions, providing for child protective services fees; in powers and duties of the Department of Drug and Alcohol Programs, providing for drug and alcohol recovery houses; in powers and duties of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, providing for alternative energy portfolio standards; providing for judicial administration; making editorial changes; and making related repeals.

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

The SPEAKER. Members, we have in front of us SB 446, PN 1088. It is an Administrative Code bill.

Two items with respect to this bill: Members, there is a technical amendment, in consultation with our House Parliamentarian; the Speaker has spoken with him. Amendment 2960 is the amendment filed by Representative Cutler, amendment 2960. It is a technical amendment. There was a misprint on a number. We can vote on this right now on the amendment. The bill itself we would not be able to vote on until 7:45 p.m.

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

Mr. **CUTLER** offered the following amendment No. **A02960**:

Amend Bill, page 49, line 22, by striking out "\$0.65" and inserting

6.5%

Amend Bill, page 50, line 4, by striking out "\$0.65" and inserting 6.5%

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

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

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, very simply, there are two corrections: one on page 49, line 22, and one on page 50, line 4, where we are changing a number that was incorrectly inserted as a dollar amount, \$0.65, when it was supposed to be a percentage amount, 6.5 percent.

I would ask the members to please support it.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

Baker	Ellis	Kortz	Rapp
Barbin	Emrick	Krueger	Ravenstahl
Barrar	English	Kulik	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Evankovich	Lawrence	Reed
Bernstine	Everett	Lewis	Reese
Bizzarro	Fabrizio	Longiatti	Roae
Bloom	Farry	Mackenzie	Roe
Boback	Fee	Madden	Roebuck
Boyle	Fitzgerald	Maher	Rothman
Bradford	Flynn	Mako	Rozzi
Briggs	Frankel	Maloney	Ryan
Brown, R.	Freeman	Markosek	Saccone
Brown, V.	Fritz	Marshall	Sainato
Bullock	Gabler	Marsico	Samuelson
Burns	Gainey	Masser	Sankey
Caltagirone	Galloway	McCarter	Santora
Carroll	Gergely	McClinton	Saylor
Causer	Gillen	McGinnis	Schemel
Cephas	Gillespie	Mehaffie	Schlossberg
Charlton	Godshall	Mentzer	Schweyer
Christiana	Goodman	Metcalfe	Simmons
Comitta	Greiner	Metzgar	Sims
Conklin	Grove	Miccarelli	Snyder
Cook	Haggerty	Millard	Solomon
Corbin	Hahn	Miller, B.	Staats

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Cruz	Kavulich	McNeill	Sonney
Evans	Matzie	Quigley	Zimmerman
Harkins			

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 third consideration as amended?

The SPEAKER. Now, members, we cannot vote this bill until 7:45 tonight. So we are going to begin debate on the Administrative Code.

On the question recurring,

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

Bill as amended 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?

At this time the Chair would call upon the Appropriations chair to provide us a summary of the Administrative Code.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SB 446 was amended with the following properties in them: It added fees for the department for protective child services. It added operation moneys for the Attorney General's Office. It also had some fees for criminal history checks. It added what the Governor wanted for the Department of Labor and Industry,

some additional fees to help offset some costs that are there, as well as in the Department of Ed some fees they had requested and the Governor to help offset costs that they have as well. There is also a cleanup due to the 2016-2017 fiscal year with the Joint Underwriting Association for the transfer of \$200 million to the General Fund.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does anybody else wish to speak on the Administrative Code?

Representative Bob Godshall?

Yes, sir. Chairman Godshall.

Mr. GODSHALL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Last night SB 446 was amended in Appropriations to include language requiring that the solar energy credits necessary for our electric utilities and generation suppliers to comply with the Alternative Energy Portfolio Standards Act be purchased only from in-state solar installations. I oppose this amendment for several reasons.

This amendment was stricken from the Administrative Code bill last session based upon its harm to electric ratepayers by my amendment in the Rules Committee. What has changed now that makes this an appropriate policy for Pennsylvania?

Subsidy to the solar industry— Could I have some—

The SPEAKER. Yes. Please suspend.

Members, please take your seats. Members, please take your seats. Any conversations please take to the anterooms.

Chairman Godshall, you may proceed, sir.

Mr. GODSHALL. Subsidies to the solar industry. The solar industry has been propped up by government subsidies since its inception. This is yet another example of government picking winners and losers at the expense of consumers. Owners of solar energy already receive State money to purchase and install their systems. They participate in net metering, which gets them paid the retail rate for excess energy generated by their systems. They do not pay transmission charges on their electric bill, which means that even though these systems place a burden on the electric grid owners, they pay nothing towards the costs of maintaining the grid infrastructure. During the 2014-15 AEPS compliance period 74 percent of all solar credits needed for compliance were purchased from in-state generators in Pennsylvania. An in-state purchase requirement serves no purpose other than to be one more subsidy that puts money into the hands of solar owners at the expense of electric ratepayers.

Increased costs to consumers. All AEPS compliance costs are paid for by consumers through their electric bills. In-state only solar credit purchase requirements increase the price of credits, and the price of credits in States that have adopted this policy far exceeds those in Pennsylvania. In 2016 a solar credit in New Jersey cost \$200; in Massachusetts, \$380; in Washington, DC, \$440; and in Pennsylvania, \$62. The language amended into SB 446 will increase consumer electric bills.

During the 2014-15 AEPS compliance period, 206,121 solar credits were purchased at a cost of just over \$16 million in Pennsylvania. The weighted average price of a solar credit during this period was \$78.62. This language will increase solar credit prices to levels seen in other States with closed borders. Here is an example of what we can expect in Pennsylvania. Assuming a \$200 SREC price similar to New Jersey, the cost to Pennsylvania electric utilities and generation suppliers to purchase the solar credits necessary to comply with AEPS in 2014, instead of being \$16 million, would have been \$41.2 million. That is just for the solar part of AEPS.

Owners of solar alternative energy systems have made it their own choice to invest in solar. The State did not mandate this investment and it is wrong for us to subsidize this investment on the backs of ratepayers of the Commonwealth. I wonder if the homeowners and businesses in this State who lobbied for this change and support higher SREC prices realize that it is their family, friends, and neighbors who have to pay the higher costs. Maybe they do know but simply do not care.

I have real concerns about this provision. How you vote on this bill is up to you. There are many good provisions to SB 446, but another solar bailout is not one of them, because the bailout is at our constituents, your and my expense, and I have a real concern about this situation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative DeLissio.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on the bill?

The SPEAKER. You may proceed.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Mr. Speaker, just a brief comment.

I see in the Administrative Code that again this year we are going to attempt to use the PA Professional Liability Joint Underwriting Association "excess" funds – and I put excess in quotes – as a one-time transfer of about \$200 million into the General Fund. This was identified in last session. It was understood that those dollars could not be transferred in any meaningful way to do that, and in fact, this was one-time money and our citizens and our Commonwealth are expecting us to come up with recurring revenue. So I see we are making this attempt yet again this year with different language which is ordering this organization to make those transfers. I further understand that there is a lawsuit that is out there and it will be interesting to see how that lawsuit unfolds as it pertains to the transfer of this \$200 million.

I object to the use of any type of one-time money, and not being aware of all of the particulars and details of this, I wonder if not – that those dollars that are now deemed to be excessive should not be returned to those individuals that were mandated to put those dollars in that fund, if that fund is that overfunded.

So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Members, there are no other— Representative Neuman. Sorry, sir.

Mr. NEUMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to ask the majority Appropriations chair to stand for a few questions, if you would.

The SPEAKER. Representative Saylor will accept the questions on interrogation, sir.

You may proceed.

Mr. NEUMAN. Within the Administrative Code, Mr. Speaker, the Joint Underwriting Association, these seem to be premiums that are paid by individuals on policies. Is that your understanding of how the JUA is funded?

And these premiums, when they pay these premiums are they paying them for the specific reason that the JUA was designed or is there catch-all language that says that these moneys and your premiums can be transferred to the General Fund at any time?

Mr. SAYLOR. You are asking if there is anything under current law that says that these funds can be transferred to the General Fund whenever we want them. Is that the question?

Mr. NEUMAN. Is there anything that allows the people that are paying these premiums to know that these premiums may be used for purposes other than what they are paying these premiums for?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is a State entity, so any number of these entities similar to this could expect at any point in time that these funds would be transferred. It has been done in the past, and I am sure it will be done in the future.

Mr. NEUMAN. So you are saying in the past JUA premium funds have been transferred to the General Fund?

Mr. SAYLOR. No, but other funds have done the same situation of what we are doing here, with the support of the Governor.

Mr. NEUMAN. Are the other funds similar to the setup of the JUA where we have no oversight over them?

Mr. SAYLOR. Since the JUA was created by the General Assembly, we do have oversight over it, and again, we are working with the Governor and he agrees with this transfer and he is the one who appoints members to that board.

Mr. NEUMAN. And the premiums that are paid, these are not – this is not a tax. There is no understanding from somebody that is paying these premiums – let me put it this way: the understanding for people that are paying these premiums is they are to be used for the Joint Underwriting Association that was designed to offset any type of medical liability insurance, not to be – they do not pay these premiums to fund our General Fund. Is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. But again, as I stated earlier, this has been done in other funds. When the General Assembly needs funds, it does take and utilize those funds for the purpose of the General Fund's needs.

Mr. NEUMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill, please?

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir.

You may proceed— Before you proceed, Representative Neuman, I apologize.

Members, if you could please take your seats. Members, this is a budget bill and a number of folks have come up to me and intimated we should be on a 5-minute clock. I did not have Representative Godshall on the 5-minute clock, and I am not going to have Representative Neuman on the 5-minute clock, but we are supposed to have a 5-minute clock here, and that is my error.

Representative Neuman, you may proceed, and subsequent to this, if anybody wishes to speak, it would be a 5-minute clock. If either leader has an objection, please come up, but that is the rule.

Representative Neuman, you may proceed.

Mr. NEUMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There are a number of concerns within this piece of legislation, now the Admin. Code. The one that I am focusing on is the Joint Underwriting Association transfer of \$200 million. These moneys are not our moneys. These moneys were paid by individuals for a specific purpose to be put in the JUA, and as we have seen last year where we tried to borrow \$200 million from the JUA, we ended up in court and here we are today about a direct transfer of \$200 million that is not our money.

This is as if an outside organization which the JUA is, it was created by the legislature, but it is an outside association collecting fees for a specific purpose and that purpose was never intended to fund our General Fund or backfill any type of shortfall that we have. So I would proceed with caution pretending like this \$200 million is actually real money. I do not believe it is in the purview of the legislature to take this \$200 million, and I think that at the end of the day I will not be here next year, but you will be here next year talking about \$200 million that we are missing because this is not our money. This is the JUA's money paid by individuals, paid by premiums that individuals expected to be kept in this association.

So I would encourage that we proceed with caution to pretend like this \$200 million is actually going to be here when we need it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Maher, and I do apologize, but we are going to institute the 5-minute clock at this time.

Mr. MAHER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will be brisk.

For the information of the members, I wanted to make sure that they were aware that in Article XIX, it adds a provision dealing with the Recycling Fund and the sunset date for the fee. Now, those of you that can remember as far back as 2 days ago will recall we had this discussion on the floor of the House and we had legislation supporting a 1-year extension. The bill summary says we have a 1-year extension. But those who were supportive of Representative Carroll's amendment which sought a longer extension – the amendment was defeated in this House 2 days ago – will be happy to know that the longer extension is what is, in fact, appearing in this legislation.

I had been encouraged when I heard we were doing a technical correction on this bill and I thought perhaps that was the technical correction that was coming. It was not. But I think you need to understand, if this makes a difference to you, you are being asked to vote for something that you voted against 2 days ago. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Curtis Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to try to stay within my 5 minutes.

I am concerned about a number of things within SB 446 and I am probably more concerned with what is not in the bill. And so, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that there is not – there are increased fees around the Department of Labor and Industry. There are increased fees around the State Board of Education. There are increased fees by the Attorney General. There are increased fees around the Environmental Quality Board. And so, Mr. Speaker, it almost looks like fees have replaced taxes in the 2017-18 Administrative Code.

But my concern runs to the fact that it has been 29 years since we have increased minimum wage in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania is the only State along the Northeastern corridor where we are asking people to pay rent, buy food, put clothes on themselves and their kids at \$7.25 an hour. It is a national disgrace.

And so, Mr. Speaker, my question to you and/or the chair of the Appropriations Committee, and that is, how soon can we move to bring up HB 1520 and act on that and make it a part of the Administrative Code? That is my concern, Mr. Speaker. Every district, all 223 districts in Pennsylvania, especially places like Mon Valley, coal miners, rural, urban parts of Pennsylvania, there are people crying out for a decent wage and they cannot get it because we have failed to act on HB 1520.

HB 1520 offered by our colleague, the gentlelady from Dauphin County, Representative Patty Kim, but is supported by all 80-plus members of this side of the House, but I know that there are people on the other side that also know that it is time for us to provide people in Pennsylvania with a decent wage; \$7.25 an hour is an assault and is disgraceful to people that we represent. And it is not about white, black, yellow, or brown. It is about the people of Pennsylvania.

And so, Mr. Speaker, as I close, I ask the Appropriations chairperson, if not you, when can we move to bring HB 1520 up for consideration and make it a part of the Administrative Code?

I will wait for an answer.

The SPEAKER. Wait. Representative Thomas, do you seek to ask questions on interrogation?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Okay. I think if we could give a few seconds back to Representative Thomas, the Appropriations chair will stand for interrogation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman asked when he can expect for a certain bill to come up before this House. At this point in time the Appropriations chair does not, nor does the Appropriations Committee have that bill in its consideration. So I cannot speak for when that bill may be scheduled for a vote by the committee that it is in. So that is the best I can do, Representative Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, my other question is whether or not as we close out and add reality to the actions that we took last Friday is there any plan on your part to consider increasing the minimum wage in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania? It was a part of the Governor's original address and it has been a part of the discussion of this House all along. So my question to you is whether you have any plans to bring this issue up or deal with this issue before we close out these budget negotiations?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Sir, please suspend, sir. My apologies, Mr. Chair.

Representative Thomas, this will be the last – the 5 minutes has expired. The chair will answer, but there is no more time.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the answer to your question is again the same one I gave earlier. The bill is not in my committee, so I cannot answer when it will come up for a vote or when this House will consider the Governor's request. At this point the only thing we have before us is SB 446. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I have exhausted my time, but prior to the Appropriations chair speaking, there was a question that was made to you as the Speaker. On the question I noted a discharge resolution has been filed on behalf of HB 1520, and so my question to you is whether there will be an opportunity to take up that discharge resolution.

The SPEAKER. Sir, that is not what is in front of us, but if you want to come up at some point today to the rostrum, I will ask the Parliamentarian and we will get the information. I just do not have the facts in front of me and I will find out.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Members, I do not see anybody else wishing to speak on the—

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. Representative Neilson, sir.

Mr. NEILSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As you see, nobody else is here to stand up, and we got handed these 70 pages about an hour ago. I want to know if we can still reserve time later on since we cannot vote this until 7:30. There are hundreds of fees that are involved in this bill and are going to go up, and I would like to review them a little more carefully and reserve my right, as an elected official of this body, to be able to speak on this prior to being voted later tonight.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. NEILSON. I know we have a 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. Yes. There may be a motion to proceed at a certain point and see if there is agreement on moving forward to be done for the day. I know that is not at this time, but if you want to take your time to review it, please do so.

Mr. NEILSON. No. I just wanted to make sure that we are not cutting debate now. We can still debate this later. There is a bunch more people here.

The SPEAKER. Not until there is a motion to proceed that passes would we be able to vote this until 7:45 p.m.

Mr. NEILSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Sir, that was a parliamentary inquiry. You do not lose your 5 minutes.

At this time there are no more requests to speak on SB 446.

BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. SB 446 is passed over temporarily.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. HANNA

The SPEAKER. Representative Hanna, you had, I believe, a parliamentary inquiry on a discharge resolution?

Sir, you may proceed.

Mr. HANNA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to give notice of intention to call up Discharge Resolution No. 2 on the 2d legislative day or any day thereafter, if we can. Discharge Resolution No. 2 discharges the Environmental Committee from the Marcellus Shale tax bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 227**, **PN 1087**, entitled:

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 and providing for Every Student Succeeds Act State plan review; in school directors, providing for school director training programs; in school, district financial recovery, further providing for additional criteria and providing for financial administrator in financial watch school district; in grounds and buildings, further providing for limitation on new applications for Department of Education approval of public school building projects; in district superintendents and assistant district superintendents, further providing for reports, for manner of election or approval and for term and salary of assistants; in professional employees, further providing for causes for suspension, for persons to be suspended and for appeals

to Superintendent of Public Instruction; in certification of teachers, further providing for granting provisional college certificates and for evaluation of applicants for certification; in pupils and attendance, further providing for nonprofit school food program; in drug and alcohol recovery high school pilot program, further providing for establishment of drug and alcohol recovery high school pilot program, for scope of program and selection of students, for establishment and payment of tuition, for term of drug and alcohol recovery high school pilot program and for reporting; in terms and courses of study, further providing for alcohol, chemical and tobacco abuse program and for agricultural education and providing for Commission for Agricultural Education Excellence; in community colleges, further providing for financial program and reimbursement of payments and repealing provisions relating to annual report; in rural regional college for underserved counties, further providing for establishment; in educational tax credits, further providing for limitations; in transfers of credits between institutions of higher education, further providing for definitions, for duties of public institutions of higher education and for Transfer and Articulation Oversight Committee; in funding for public libraries, providing for State aid for fiscal year 2017-2018; in reimbursements by Commonwealth and between school districts, further providing for student-weighted basic education funding, for payments to intermediate units, for assistance to school districts declared to be in financial recovery status or identified for financial watch status and for Ready-to-Learn Block Grant; in the State Board of Education, further providing for powers and duties of the board; further providing for the applicability of Act 2016-138; and making related repeals.

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?

This bill cannot be voted until 7:45 p.m., but at this time we will begin debate on the bill.

Chairman Stan Saylor, the majority Appropriations chair, on the bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SB 227 has the following provisions in it. It has an extension of the State graduation moratorium. It has the ESSA (Every Student Succeeds Act) review requirements in it. It does require school board and charter school trustee training. It provides for formulas for the basic education funding formula, the IUs (intermediate units), the libraries, the community colleges, and the Ready to Learn Block Grant. It also provides for the EITC tax credit (educational improvement tax credit). It also creates uniform higher education articulation agreements for prior learning. It extends the State Board master plan timelines. There are also revisions and elimination of the outdated reporting and approval requirements. There is an extension of nonpublic truancy provisions in this legislation as well. There are opioid awareness program requirements in this bill. There is a creation of a commission of agricultural education and excellence. There is an update to the teacher prep programs. Also, lunch shaming in this bill is prohibited. We have economic and furlough order changes. We have an extension of the PlanCon application moratorium as well that was included in here.

That is the gist of the bill's containment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does anybody wish to speak on SB 227?

Representative Carroll.

Mr. CARROLL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does a litany of things, as was just highlighted by the majority Appropriations chair.

One worth noting is that this bill contains economic furloughs for our public school teachers. And for those that have any concern with respect to how that will unfold in our school districts, I think that by itself is caution enough that we should not advance this bill. An economic furlough scenario for our public school teachers, my opinion, results in some of our very best teachers being let go under the banner of economic need, and I am not a big fan of letting very good, exceptional teachers relieved of their position in our school districts because school boards have very few choices when it comes to finances.

So, Mr. Speaker, for that reason alone – economic furloughs embedded in this bill – is reason enough to not support SB 227, and I think that by itself should demand that this bill be rejected, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

The SPEAKER. Does anybody else wish to speak on SB 227? Does anybody else wish to speak on SB 227?

BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. Members, we will be temporarily going over SB 227 because we cannot vote it until 7:45 without a motion to proceed. That is also, obviously, true with SB 446, and both have been debated.

BILL ON CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS AS AMENDED

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to the following **HB 59, PN 2224**, as further amended by the House Rules Committee:

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Human Services Code, in general powers and duties, providing for salary, medical and hospital expenses for employees of the Department of Human Services and survivors' benefits and for evaluation of software programs' efficiency; in public assistance, providing for total population coordinated care management, further providing for persons eligible for medical assistance, providing for medical assistance waiver for treatment at institutions for mental disease related to substance use disorder, for additional funding requests for medical assistance appropriations in fiscal year 2017-2018 and for supporting self-sufficiency for medical assistance recipients, further providing for medical assistance benefit packages, coverage, copayments, premiums and rates and providing for electronic asset verification for medical assistance eligibility based on age, blindness or disability; in children and youth, further providing for provider submissions and for adoption opportunity payments and reimbursement; in nursing facility assessments, further providing for administration and repealing provisions relating to calculation; providing for ambulatory surgical center data collection; and making a related repeal.

On the question,

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

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

The Chair recognizes Representative Moul for a brief description of the Senate amendments as amended by the

House. So he will be covering Senate amendments and House amendments and the underlying bill.

Representative Moul, the floor is yours.

Mr. MOUL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am not so sure this is going to be real short, but I will do my best to go through what the amended part is in HB 59.

This House bill as amended in Rules adds provisions into the Human Services Code: establishes a new section, 216; moves the Act 534 employees to the Department of Human Services; establishes a new section, 217, requiring DHS to issue a request for information to evaluate the efficiency of medical assistance, SNAP (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program), and TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) programs; requires the department to issue a request for proposal for an entity to coordinate managed care in a selected MA (medical assistance) MCO (managed-care organization) region for a 1-year pilot program; requires the department to have a 1-year annual enrollment for medical assistance for an individual who is Medicaid eligible to stay on the MA MCO plan for 1 year; requires the department to pursue a waiver under the Social Security Act, which would allow for the coverage of services rendered for substance abuse disorder for an IMD (Institute of Mental Disease) for longer than 15 days; requires the department to request a waiver from the appropriate Federal agency for modification for the fee for service or capitated MA; requires the department to take a waiver for those on MA with respect to reasonable job search and employment requirements; establishes a premium for children who are MA eligible with a diagnosed disability for those families who have an income of over 1,000 percent of the Federal poverty level; extends the time for providers to submit documentation for out-of-home placement services for the State to receive Federal and State reimbursement; establishes an electronic asset verification program, which requires financial institutions to participate in the asset verification program as required by the Federal government; amends nursing facility assessment to ensure payments align with the Community HealthChoices annual rate setting; and establishes a new article to do a data collection on ambulatory surgical centers.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dan Frankel.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to HB 59, which will throw a wrench into the operations of public health care in this State and fundamentally threaten care for hundreds of thousands of people across the Commonwealth.

If you are looking for the source material for much of this bill, it is easy to find. It is a former Secretary of the Department of Public Welfare under Governor Corbett who was given a blank check to cut Medicaid and public assistance in 2011 and 2012. To cut welfare spending at the Department of Public Welfare in 2011, the Secretary was given the ability to change eligibility and rules of every public assistance program and sign almost any contract without hearings and with limited notice. Attempts were made at the time to cut maternity leave coverage for pregnant women. Thousands of poor Pennsylvanians were cut from benefits because of the chaos caused to the system by unilateral changes proposed against welfare fraud. At the time important care to disabled children was threatened. Drug treatment for thousands of people was disrupted.

Unfortunately, today we continue to risk great harm to our citizens in the name of reform. We apparently have not learned the lessons from 2011 when the votes of this majority party in this chamber led to great distress for our human services providers. It seems to me that every single mistake made in 2011 is being enabled again today in this bill, but there is one huge frightening difference between then and now. Now we live in a world where, thanks to an Executive order signed by the President on January 20 of this year, the Federal government must grant any waiver, must grant any waiver and any change when a State asks for it on the basis of cost. The President's Executive order did not talk about balancing cost-cutting requests against the harm of losing care or treatment. Instead, the only standard is reducing cost, and that is a dangerous standard to have in the world of human services.

Let me talk about a few specific objections to the bill. I am concerned about the work requirement waiver for people receiving medical assistance. We know that in general people want to work, even many sick people want to work, and that is why 58 percent of the people receiving medical assistance today are already working. I believe that this issue is a red herring and one that is highlighted as a feel-good measure for some in this chamber. Work requirements for our most vulnerable citizens are anything but feel-good, if you ask me.

One of the exceptions allowed for is not finding a specialist, but there is no exception for the inability to find a primary care doctor. I recently learned of a veteran who signed up for Medicaid and picked a provider who did not have a good network in his specific geographic area. He did not know how to look for the list of providers under the network before he signed up, and ultimately, this veteran had real problems getting the care he needed. Mr. Speaker, that veteran and that family would be harmed by this bill. Why would this chamber vote to potentially limit thousands of veterans and their families from finding doctors under Medicaid?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have very real concerns about how this bill presents a direct attack on the education of people with disabilities and targets public education. Many of us have seen the TV series "Speechless," which tells the story of a family with a teenager with cerebral palsy. That student has an aide that helps out in their public school. This television series accurately depicts the impact of these services, which in Pennsylvania are often paid by Medicaid. Millions and millions of dollars for aides and physical occupational assistance are put into our schools through medical assistance. This bill puts that funding at risk as well.

This bill is bad. It is harmful to the families of our Commonwealth. It is mean-spirited and misguided.

I am a "no." We should all be a "no." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Frankel.
Representative Scott Petri.

Mr. PETRI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today I want to discuss one section of this bill and the amendments that cause great pause in my mind. It deals with section 454 (A.1). This is the provision that would ask for a waiver for families who have severely disabled children who are being taken care of 24/7 at home.

Many of these families I have visited with personally in my district, and while it sounds like the limit is high at 1,000 percent of Federal poverty, for a family of four, that is approximately \$250,000. Mr. Speaker, when you deduct from

their incomes, when you deduct from their incomes the taxes that are associated with property, financial, and you consider the fact that in many of these homes both have to work to make ends meet and then you consider the cost of taking care of a family member 24/7, hooked on every machine known to mankind, I just do not believe that this is a wise provision, and for those reasons I cannot support this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Petri.

Representative Schlossberg.

Mr. SCHLOSSBERG. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I join my colleagues in rising in opposition to HB 59. My opposition, like many, is multifaceted, but I want to specifically talk about the people that Representative Petri was just talking about and their families, the so-called loophole kids. This, as you know, could potentially raise the medical assistance premiums for 61,000 Pennsylvania families. I do not think many of us truly realize just how damaging this legislation can be to families who find themselves in huge financial jeopardy through no fault of their own. Just so we are clear, families with the children who use this program usually have private insurance. What their medical assistance does is cover their children who are severely disabled and cover costs that are not borne by private insurance regardless of the income level. By enacting HB 59, we are not hammering freeloaders, we are not protecting the super wealthy. We are hurting families who cannot afford to take care of severely disabled, autistic, or otherwise incapacitated children.

Second, I must ask about the law of unintended consequences with this legislation. The vast majority of families who would be affected by this bill face real and significant financial pain. In many cases, their budgets are already stretched well beyond the breaking point. So let me ask you this: Let us say that this bill becomes law and families suddenly and unexpectedly find themselves forced to pay two health insurance premiums instead of one. If a family can no longer afford their private insurance, they may drop it, which means they wind up on Medicaid. As a result, the cost to the State will increase, not decrease. This bill creates a situation where more people, not less, could potentially wind up on medical assistance.

Third, if you care about reducing local property taxes, as I know many of us do, you should have grave concerns about this legislation. As we debate this bill, please keep this in mind: Medicaid is not only used by poor families and the parents of severely disabled children, it is used by school districts who have to provide health services to these children, and at last count that number was \$134 million to Commonwealth school districts. If a parent becomes more reliant on Medicaid, which could happen if we force them into a situation where they can no longer afford private insurance, a school district will be forced to pay even more for these services. This will not cut costs to Medicaid. It will only shift them to school districts. At a time when each and every one of us is attempting to find a way to control property taxes, this legislation will, without a doubt, increase costs to school districts. This, in turn, will lead to another negative effect on our property taxes.

I must also admit that I am more than a little concerned that we do not know the answers to some of the questions that this legislation has proposed about costs. No one – well, many of us in here agree that this bill has the potential to increase costs to medical assistance and school districts. What is frightening to me as a policymaker is that we do not know just how much

those costs may rise. Many of us tout our private-sector experience and note that government should be run like a business. That being said, drawing on my own experience, I cannot imagine what would have happened if I had ever told my boss that I had a great cost-cutting idea even if I was not completely sure how much money an idea would cost and even if I knew such a program had the potential to backfire and hurt other customers.

All of us are painfully aware of the financial challenges facing the State. As such, we have been given a choice: balance the budget by asking those with means to pay a fair share, or do so by asking families with severely disabled children to pay higher health premiums. Let me frame that choice another way: ask those who have more to contribute more to our society, or ask those who suffer the most to sacrifice even more. This is not a financial decision. It is a moral one. We are asking vulnerable citizens to dig even deeper into their already stretched pockets, despite the fact that they find themselves in need of help through no fault of their own, no bad choices, and no failures of personal judgment. These are not children who just reside in big cities. These are children and families who live in every corner of Pennsylvania, from Ogontz Avenue in Philadelphia to the most rural section of Cambria County. They are families like yours and mine, families who never chose to live every day in financial and emotional pain, families who require community care to keep a roof over their head and food on their table. HB 59 jeopardizes their stability, their future, and their livelihood, all under the misguided notion of personal responsibility and cost-cutting.

It is for these reasons that I urge a "no" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Charlton.

Mr. CHARLTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to speak in opposition to HB 59, specifically on the issue of the so-called loophole kids. We speak as if these families are getting a free ride, and frankly, it is insulting.

I am going to go over some of the costs of these families that they burden every day. Your average Chrysler Pacifica, the base model is about \$28,000. To get one with a wheelchair ramp, \$60,000; home modifications in the tens of thousands of dollars; ramps at \$2,000; wider doorways, \$5,000; a stair lift at \$3,000; modified showers and bathtubs, \$8,000. The list goes on. None of this is covered by your insurance, neither your primary nor your secondary. These are borne by the homeowners themselves. These do nothing to improve the value of that car. You cannot sell that car with a lift afterwards because people do not look for them. You cannot sell your house with modified bathrooms and doorways because nobody is looking for those. These families face these burdens every day.

Simple items that they want, like playhouses, they run about \$80 at Toys "R" Us. To get one that is wheelchair accessible, it is now \$300 because nobody makes them and you have to go to a specialty maker. For my daughter to play with Play-Doh as a 6-year-old with her sisters means that we had to buy a special table that her wheelchair could fit under because a kitchen table is too tall and a coffee table is too low. You tell me that I should be paying more. Please, tell me that.

There is no level of income that I could earn that would be able to correct what happened to my daughter. There is no amount of income that anybody could earn that can correct the injury that happened to their child. I find it insulting that we stand here and say, "Yeah; maybe another 50 bucks won't hurt them."

The psychological torture that those parents go through every day is unfathomable. The pain that they go through every day wondering what their child is going to do when they grow up and the parents have passed away is unfathomable. To suggest that we should just charge them a couple other bucks is unfathomable.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Charlton.

Representative DeLissio.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago for my first budget I began my comments for what was then the Welfare Code bill and is today the Human Services Code bill. There but for the grace of God go I or any of us. And I find myself having to bring back that comment because 7 years ago the Human Services Code bill was a very offensive bill on a lot of levels. It really did provide the opportunity for serious harm to many of our citizens, and I do not think there are any colleagues in the chamber who support the idea of fraud or waste or abuse. I think we could say categorically and across the board that we are against that, but we clearly have different ways of approaching how to ferret out fraud, waste, and abuse.

I remember specifically Act 22 of 2011 and stating that we were totally abdicating our responsibilities as a State legislature because we were imbuing a lot of power to the then Secretary of the Department of Welfare to carry out a lot of these reforms in order to address fraud, waste, and abuse, and of the quarter of a billion dollars, if my memory serves, of the quarter of a billion dollars that were to be realized as a result of this, we realized, I believe, less than \$20 million. And let me repeat that. Less than 10 percent of the intended amount to be recovered was realized, and part of that is because the amount of bureaucracy that we created in order to go after this reform became very cumbersome. And in fact, I remember remarks I made in a hearing was that we were spending a dime to pick up a penny. I fear that HB 59 today includes so many components in it that we are again spending a dime to pick up a penny, and in the meantime, we will be upsetting and upending many, many lives of not only older adult citizens but young children and many folks in between.

I am sure that there are other ways for us to approach ensuring that dollars spent within the Medicaid program are indeed spent for their intended purpose, and in fact, I suspect that many of those programs happen now and happen today.

The one thing I have not seen in conjunction with this legislation is any type of solid substantive data or evidence to indicate that these matters do exist in reality, and this is the same thing that happened 7 years ago, Mr. Speaker.

So for all of those reasons, I will be a "no" vote and urge my colleagues to also consider a strong "no" vote for what I think is a very – can adversely impact our citizens. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Will Tallman.

Mr. TALLMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am going to speak in favor of HB 59. I cannot believe anyone would be opposed to this bill when it is 1,000 percent of the Federal poverty level. Why would you be opposed? It makes absolutely no sense to me. I think it is around \$236,000, \$238,000. They surely should be able to pay \$50 a month.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Schweyer.

Mr. SCHWEYER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to oppose HB 59 as currently amended. Some of our esteemed colleagues today offered reasons why this bill is unacceptable to many here in the House chamber. Many of the provisions included in HB 59 are unacceptable to the residents of Pennsylvania, both those who need medical assistance today and those who may one day need this most basic safety net program.

One of the more underreported aspects of HB 59 so far today is a provision that would allow this or future administrations the ability to apply for a Federal waiver to eliminate nonemergency medical transportation. Now, to my constituents back home and to all the people of Pennsylvania who may be tuning in to the debate today, please allow me to translate this bureaucratic speak into something resembling English: This bill would start the process of taking away safe and reliable transportation for those who need physical therapy, kidney dialysis, chemotherapy, and a whole host of other medical needs. I personally cannot, in good conscience, return to my district in Allentown and tell my seniors who are in renal failure that they cannot get a ride to their dialysis appointment. I, Mr. Speaker, cannot in good conscience return to my district and tell those suffering from cancer that they will no longer have a safe and reliable ride to their chemotherapy treatment. Mr. Speaker, if any member of the General Assembly is not moved by compassion or concern for those suffering, those who are most at risk, you should also consider the financial aspects of this.

Let us consider, if you will, a Pennsylvania senior in renal failure and let us keep in mind that each and every member of this General Assembly has people like this who are living in their district. Everyone here knows that if that person fails to attend their regular appointment for dialysis, they would inevitably end up in the emergency room and will likely have a costly hospital stay. All those costs, mind you, will be borne by the taxpayers through the medical assistance program, as would, ironically, the ambulance ride there.

This policy proposal may save a few dollars at the onset but will certainly cost more down the road. And it has the added factor of being harmful to the point of life-threatening to the most at-risk Pennsylvanians.

Access is often talked about, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the availability of doctors, nurses, pharmacists, technicians, and the facilities in which they simply heal the sick. Access is often talked about in terms of the availability of a patient to pay for those health services that we call health insurance, but I submit to you that access also includes the ability of a citizen to simply get to a health-care facility. Eliminating medical transportation for thousands of Pennsylvanians has the same effect as closing hospitals or canceling their insurance.

Make no mistake about it, a vote for HB 59 is effectively a vote to eliminate access to health care from thousands of working class, at-risk Pennsylvanians suffering from many of the most common yet life-threatening ailments.

Vote "no" on HB 59. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative.

Representative Kristin Phillips-Hill.

Mrs. HILL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I came here today and did not have the intention to speak but felt that, having served as a school board director, maybe I could provide some clarity on this question of loophole children.

Nothing in this legislation will change. People currently do not have to enroll their child in Medicaid, so school districts will not see a change. Actually, I spoke to a parent in my district who had a child with a severe disability who chose not to enroll their child on Medicaid and then, as the cost of providing the equipment and the services rose, made the decision to put that child on Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, I said this last week and I will say it again, we are facing the inevitability of funding cuts to our entitlement programs from Washington, DC. We are facing severe financial challenges here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In 2005, under the Rendell administration, this body passed Act 42. It established section 454 of the Human Services Code, which allowed the Department of Human Services to request premiums for those individuals at 200 percent of the Federal poverty level. The Rendell administration and subsequent administrations never were able to acquire a waiver to do so.

What HB 59 does, it requires the Governor to request a waiver from the Federal government for premium payments for children who qualify for medical assistance and whose family's income is over 1,000 percent of the poverty level. Pennsylvania is the only State in the nation that does not factor in a family's income when determining eligibility for Medicaid. This measure will help ensure that we protect this benefit for the most needy and most vulnerable residents of Pennsylvania. As an example, a family of four at 200 percent of the poverty line in 2017 is \$48,600. A family of four at 200 percent of the poverty line in 2005 was \$38,700. HB 59 has increased that family of four at 1,000 percent of the poverty line with an income of \$246,000.

Again, we need to make sure that those who are the most needy and most vulnerable receive the benefits that they need. We also have to be focused on preserving medical assistance in Pennsylvania, and that is what this measure does in a way that will not impact our school districts. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Margo Davidson.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, is there someone that could stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Representative Moul has indicated he will so stand, Representative Davidson.

Representative Moul is prepared.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring your attention to section 411.1 of this legislation that calls for a required RFP for a pilot program. What is the value of the required contract under this bill?

Mr. MOUL. Mr. Speaker, it is a percentage of the savings to the Commonwealth resulting from the use of the health initiative that this is going to provide.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. I am sorry. Could you repeat that dollar amount, if you could.

Mr. MOUL. There is no dollar amount. It is a percentage of the savings.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Thank you.

On the bill.

Mr. Speaker, what looks like a sweetheart deal carved out in this Medicaid reduction bill, it is interesting to me on a number of levels because it is requiring us, it is requiring the department to issue an RFP for a value unknown, and there will be one such contract made so that it is a sole source contract on the backs of the cuts that we are creating to our school districts.

I have had many school board members who call to say that this would have a devastating impact on their school districts as it relates to families with special needs. We have heard from our colleagues about the devastating cuts to people who will have to face other options to get the medical needs for their children. We have heard from colleagues on both sides of the aisle about the devastating cuts to people who have severe disabilities at a time when we are carving out a sweetheart, sole source contract for somebody in the Commonwealth to provide services at a cost that we do not even know, that we cannot even describe, but we are going to require the department to do it.

For this alone, Mr. Speaker, I cannot in good conscience— It is egregious to me that we would carve out a sweetheart deal for some provider, corporate welfare, at a time when we are telling families of disabled children that you cost us too much.

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

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Davidson.
Representative Sheryl Delozier.

Ms. DELOZIER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If I may interrogate the maker of the bill?

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

Ms. DELOZIER. Thank you very much.

I have a couple questions with the numbers. The numbers are flying around. We have had a number of statements as to the fact that we are going to hit the most vulnerable people in our Commonwealth. And my understanding, in reading through the notes that we have received asking a number of questions, I seem to come up with a different math problem for those that are the most vulnerable. So I have some quick questions.

Pennsylvania, 1 of 50, what happens in other States on this issue?

Mr. MOUL. We are the only State, Mr. Speaker, that does not do this program at this time.

Ms. DELOZIER. Okay. So we are 1 of 50 States, so 49 other States all have gone to this ability to say with this measurement— I know everyone does it a little differently, I understand, correct?

Mr. MOUL. We are the only State in the country that uses the child's income as the eligibility threshold instead of the family. This switches it to the family income.

Ms. DELOZIER. So Pennsylvania bases the cost on what a child makes?

Mr. MOUL. I believe that was done intentionally back then because children relatively have no income.

Ms. DELOZIER. Well, that was kind of where I was.

And a child, I am assuming, 18 and under?

Mr. MOUL. Yes.

Ms. DELOZIER. Okay.

So a child makes, if they are a teenager, as my son is, and just gets a job of some sort, that would be used for how much would be paid. But a 6-year-old does not have a job, so therefore they would not pay anything. Is that correct?

Mr. MOUL. That is correct.

Ms. DELOZIER. Okay. So we are the only State that uses a child's income.

With that ability in the income with making this change, what families are affected by this? So an average family of four, can you give me a scenario as to what their income would be and what it would cost them?

Mr. MOUL. Okay. According to the Federal poverty level guidelines, right now a family of four would not have to pay a penny out of pocket until that family of four had an income level at 1,000 percent, which is where this bill goes, until they had a family income of at least \$246,000. Now, let me break that down just a little bit for you: \$246,000 is \$20,500 per month gross. Net take-home, depending on what you have deductions for, you are roughly taking home somewhere between \$12,000 and \$13,000 per month. And if we follow the CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program) guidelines, you are talking about asking somebody that has between \$12,000 and \$13,000 a month of liquid assets, liquid revenue, every month to pay about 50 bucks.

Ms. DELOZIER. Okay. So we are asking a family—

Mr. MOUL. It is very nominal.

Ms. DELOZIER. I am sorry?

Mr. MOUL. It is very nominal. It is a very small amount.

Ms. DELOZIER. So a family making approximately \$250,000, who now pays nothing for these services, would now be asked, with this bill, to pay \$50 a month?

Mr. MOUL. That is correct.

Ms. DELOZIER. Okay.

So I understand that other speakers have mentioned other costs, certainly those with disabilities, but the ability for us to transfer that— And so this would not affect any family that made even \$240,000?

Mr. MOUL. If you are a family of four, that is absolutely correct.

Ms. DELOZIER. Okay, using that threshold.

Mr. MOUL. You could literally make \$245,900 a year and it would not affect you.

Ms. DELOZIER. Okay. Thank you very much.

On the bill, Mr. Speaker?

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

Ms. DELOZIER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think that many of us, we can all agree that there is no one in this chamber that does not want to assist families that have children with disabilities, but the bottom line is that our Federal dollars are being cut, we have more people on the services, and we have to figure out a fairness issue as to exactly how we administer these services.

At this point in time, we are not, with this bill, looking at someone who is below poverty level, we are not looking at someone who cannot afford \$50 a month. We need to balance this out, because as we have seen in State government, if we do not look for revenue generation, we are going to have to cut people entirely. So from my opinion, I would prefer that those making \$250,000 or more pay \$50 to allow for some that are at the other end of the spectrum who cannot afford to pay \$50 and still get the services that they need for their child. I think it is a fairness issue, and it is one that 49 other States have done and we have not seen where there has been a huge issue. We need to continue this and make it work.

I ask for a "yes" vote on this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Delozier.

Representative Dan Miller.

Mr. D. MILLER. You know what I would prefer? I would prefer the insurance companies to pay for it.

And let me say this, that the vast majority of people who are going to fit into this, they have private insurance. Well, why then do they need Medicaid in this State? If you are getting private insurance, why do you need it in the first place? Well, let me tell you why. When my son was first diagnosed with autism, my wife and I sat in a parking lot, and after the tears and after the confusion, we said, "Don't worry. We at least know that both of us individually have private health insurance that is pretty good." It was not long after that that we realized that that did not mean a lot, that despite the fact that we had two high-quality health-care insurance policies, we would be in trouble for the 36 hours a week that my son needed for TSS (therapeutic support staff), for the occupational therapist, for the speech therapist, for the physical therapist, that not only could we not afford to do it but of course our insurance coverage was not going to cover it in the first place. That was the first time I met my State Senator, a good guy. I showed up in his office and I told him, I said, "Listen, thankfully my son did get coverage through medical assistance," and he said to me, "Dan, I'm so happy for you. That's really good. I'm glad to hear it." And I appreciated his sincerity, but I said to him, "You know what amazes me though, that is not my point. My point is, why doesn't the health insurance that we paid for cover my son's full range of autism needs?" Now, that question kind of got addressed to some degree by this legislature not too long after in relation to Act 62, where, as a compromise, we created a threshold number somewhere around \$36,000 now, \$37,000, for which the insurance companies had to cover and anything afterwards the taxpayer covers.

So this form of, in my opinion, corporate welfare was designed to cover to say to these insurance companies, "That's okay. If Dan Miller's son happens to break his arm, well, you're on the hook, but God forbid that kid gets autism, God forbid that son has autism with it and we're not going to cover it or we're not going to cover the majority of the services that he needs."

Let us talk about the need that comes up, because do you know how my son learned to eat? Do you know how my son learned to eat? It was not from a service that we could get in Pennsylvania. We had to go out of State and we had to go rent a home and we had to take time off of work and we had to sit there for 8 hours a day for weeks on end as a special service that was not covered taught my son how to eat.

I am not someone who would fall under this threshold. I do not think there are many of us here that would, but if you think that a \$50 fee, or whatever the number at the end of the day is, is somehow not a big deal to ask, then you have not walked in the shoes of a family who is struggling to keep everything going. You have not walked in the shoes of a family who is trying to figure out where they can get the services done. You have not walked in the shoes of a family who says, "I've got to go rent a second home somewhere where I can get the services so maybe my son can eat." You have not done it.

We sit here now with this and we say, "Well, it's only this amount." How many times have we heard from many of our colleagues, "Well, we can't do something because it is a slippery slope"? We come back 1 year, it is 50 bucks for those who are \$1,000 over the limit, next year maybe it is 900 percent, maybe 400 percent. Maybe somebody had a bill that was 200 percent. Well, that sounds familiar.

This right here does nothing to help families with disabilities, and at the end of the day, even if it were to be done, you know what I would prefer? The money that was gained from this was filtered back into a waiting list where thousands of Pennsylvanians are still there waiting for us to pay for services to help them be sure that their child can eat in a day, but no, General Fund revenue has to be done.

This bill here needs to be defeated. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Miller.

Representative Dawn Keefer.

Mrs. KEEFER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, I keep hearing about the devastating impact to our most vulnerable, but the human services budget is growing at a rate of 6 to 7 percent a year, while our revenues are only growing at an average rate of 3 percent. There is absolutely no way our Commonwealth and the taxpayer can keep that pace.

What about the devastation our Commonwealth and our most vulnerable will realize when we are bankrupt? What will we do for those most vulnerable at that point? We have to get our budget under control. We owe it to our most vulnerable.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a "yes" vote on this. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Conklin.

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

I want to thank the good debate that is going on here today.

You know, sometimes we talk about what-ifs, and those who know me know when a speech starts about what-ifs, I walk out of the room, because really, I have never dealt my life with what if could be and what if that. What I deal my life with is pragmatism. When I would look at something, I look at the pragmatic view. I hear the what is.

Now, you have heard two speeches here on both sides of the aisle of what is, of what the reality is, not the what if we think our ideology may be, but what is. You see, I go to a church that is very clear to me what we pray. I go twice a week because—I need probably four times a week, but I go twice a week. It is very clear to me that we talk about we must take care of the environment, we must take care of our parents, we have to take care of the most vulnerable among us, and we have to take care of our children and our widows. It is Biblical, if that is what you believe.

Now, I am going to tell you what is. What is walking the aisles among you right now is another person, who will stay nameless because they asked. They have four children. They are married. They have a mortgage. Their one child nothing covers, in this aisle. One hundred and twenty thousand dollars a year just for one machine. That does not include what the other Representative talked about, the day care and the need of nurses coming in.

Now, I am going to use the figures that were given to start with. We just looked it up. The insurance would be \$249 and we are \$239 a month to cover that. I understand that is still no big deal to many of you because that is what if. It is somebody else but not me. But what happens if it is you? You are sitting – and let us use the maker of the bill's analogy – you are living off \$13,000 a month, you have four children and a mortgage and your wife and yourself. The reality of it is, the first \$120,000 of your income goes to a special machine to keep your child alive, not because you asked for your child to be sick or not because you asked to make less money so you could be in a category, because you were well educated and you had God's gift to give

you a good job and you were able to help out your community. So your first \$120,000 a year goes to that. That is leaving you \$26,000. That is the maker's numbers, \$26,000 a year. Now, remember I am telling you the machine is not covered under any insurance. So now you have victims. Who are the victims? The victims are the other three children, because you know all four of these children, most likely, will be brought up in that good house, which they will be. They are going to go to college and they are going to be productive human beings, but we are going to make a decision because we think, what if something is going to happen? I am telling you what is happening. What is going to happen is, you are going to put that family into bankruptcy. They are going to lose their house. Their children are not going to have the same resources that they had. What you are going to do is you are going to put them in the system. Congratulations. You know, that is not what we are here to do.

If you want to be a bean counter, be an accountant. It is a good profession. If you want to be responsible, be responsible with the families that we take care of. Get up and talk about the what-ifs. I do not mind. That is fine. I will probably leave like I many times do because I get bored with you, because you are good people, but it is a boring conversation.

I am going to tell you what the what-is is. The what-is is, we had two members who stood up and told you about their children. The what-is is, we have people walking among you right now that would be bankrupt tomorrow if you had your way, and your way is not the right way. Your way is to count the money. I am telling you, I count the bodies and the souls that we save every day. It is not about the investment that you are going to make today. It is the investment we are going to make 25 years down the road.

So I am asking you, think about this. We do not need 102 votes on this. Give it 95. Many of you can vote the way you want to if, but I am going to tell you the reality is, you are going to hurt families, but most of all, you are going to hurt what you stand up for, and that is the children of this great State.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Conklin.
Representative Tom Murt.

Mr. MURT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to HB 59, and I would like to make reference to one aspect of the legislation. Mr. Speaker, in the bill there are many provisions that would have a negative impact on the families that utilize Medicaid services. One such provision that would have a negative impact on children with disabilities who currently qualify for medical assistance are often referred to as "loophole kids." Mr. Speaker, loophole kids often come from homes with one or two working parents. These are the working poor, Mr. Speaker, and these families generally have private health-care insurance coverage and are paying health insurance premiums, but, Mr. Speaker, these children might have autism, they may have an intellectual disability, they may have a developmental disability, or a combination of all of the above.

Mr. Speaker, 60 percent of statewide funds are spent to provide behavioral services in classrooms, but these services come at a cost to parents and are required services under the IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act) for the student to receive the necessary services in the classroom. Parents will have no choice in such a scenario but to recover the costs from the school districts.

Mr. Speaker, these changes are significant and will absolutely result in a negative impact for many individuals and families who desperately rely on these services.

Mr. Speaker, I ask rhetorically, why were there no hearings? Why no robust stakeholder engagement on the impact of these proposed changes? Why no vetting of these proposed changes?

Mr. Speaker, we are approaching a population of families who care for children with special needs. We are asking them to pony up the money. We are asking them to help us out of this financial quandary.

What we should be doing is entertaining a reasonable and a nominal tax on the extraction of natural gas in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Murt.

Representative Garth Everett.

Mr. EVERETT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today in support of HB 59, and I want to take you back about 3 or 4 years when my grandson, Nolan, was having his heart transplant, and grandson Nolan is on Medicaid and he now receives in-home services, has recently been diagnosed as being on the autism spectrum. And I will just point out that while my son-in-law and my daughter both have good jobs, they do not make more than \$245,000 a year, and this will not impact Nolan in the least, nor will it impact any of the children that we have heard about today in this room, because I do not believe the speakers that got up make more than \$245,000 a year, at least that is not the paycheck that I am getting out of this chamber.

So I just want everybody to remain calm and remember that this only is going to impact families who make in excess of \$245,000, or whatever the exact number is, and it will not impact those services, and that this is a bill that, overall, is a good bill.

And I would ask everybody in the chamber to think about this rationally, not emotionally, and support the bill and vote for it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Bryan Barbin.

Mr. BARBIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to the bill.

I made this speech before, but I think it is appropriate to make it again. In 1682 we had a legislature. We had bills presented. There were 10 days to amend them. We knew what was in every bill, and you got to vote up or down for a particular item.

This particular bill has been put together in the last hour. Instead of doing a bill to fund our government, we have decided to throw together a lot of different items in an omnibus Administrative Code. No one knew what the items would be until this morning. Now we are asked to take one or vote them all down because there is something in it that we do not like. None of these individual items could have passed on their own and they are now thrown together in a bill, which we have had less than 24 hours to review. Some of the provisions in these bills have been objected to by the people that actually will be exposed to the new legislative mandate. For instance, this particular provision for additional premiums has been objected to by the intermediate units. They have indicated that this may become a cost for the intermediate units in every district throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I would have liked to have had some assurance by having one of them come

up and say why this either does or does not apply to be a regular committee, a regular process, where we get to decide whether this aspect of the omnibus bill is good or bad, but we did not get to do that.

So I am going to vote "no" because there is no light on this bill. I am going to vote "no" because people that we should be listening to say this is a bad bill. For that reason I will be voting "no."

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Barbin.
Representative Dush.

Mr. DUSH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the maker of the bill rise for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Yes; the gentleman has indicated he will stand for interrogation. You may proceed.

Mr. DUSH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this whole program is centered around the Federal poverty lines, and just for a little bit of context, in my district the median family income for a family of four is \$23,000 and change. That is below the Federal poverty line. More than half of my constituents are living under the Federal poverty guidelines. Now, to put that in perspective, the Medicaid expansion, the cutoff is \$33,948 for that same family of four; for subsidized child care, it is \$48,600. Do those services end up getting cut at that level, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. MOUL. Not to my knowledge, no.

Mr. DUSH. All right. For free CHIP, \$50,444; for the subsidized CHIP, it is \$69,984. And let us do a little bit more perspective here. For a member of this House who has four children and his wife was staying at home taking care of those children, the cutoff is \$93,830 for the subsidized CHIP program. Member or his wife, it does not matter to at any rate, my point is this, Mr. Speaker: more than half of my constituents make less than that \$24,600, and when you look at 1,000 percent more as the cutoff, the people who are making 1,000 percent more than what my constituents are earning.

And, Mr. Speaker, I have a question. Will that service be cut off at \$24,600 if that person has that money?

Mr. MOUL. No, sir. It will not.

Mr. DUSH. So if this—

Mr. MOUL. I saw where you were going with this, and yes, the answer is, for a legislator who has a nonworking spouse and four children, we would also be eligible for this program, for Medicaid.

And one other thing that you want to keep in mind is that for every single person that we consider, I guess America considers fairly wealthy after making \$246,000 and above, for every one of those people that do not pay a small portion, that is one less person – poor person, we would say – that is not going to be receiving benefits.

Mr. DUSH. Actually, that goes right with what President Barack Obama stated. He says that every rich person who does not pay a small copay keeps a poor person from receiving benefits. And to hear these arguments—

The SPEAKER. Please.

Mr. DUSH. —on the other side—

The SPEAKER. Sir, are you still with interrogation? I do not want to use up your time.

Mr. DUSH. All right. To the question, or to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard—

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. On the bill.

Mr. DUSH. —an awful lot of arguments today for people defending the possibility or defending against somebody having to pay a \$50 copay who is making \$250,000 a year, and with that \$50 copay, they are going to be receiving every bit of the same benefits as everybody else who does not have to pay. Now, I have a hard time figuring out how you are justifying what essentially is a cable bill payment for somebody who is making \$250,000 a year, an argument against them making at least that much of a payment.

Mr. Speaker, for once I really have to agree with President Obama. These people should have to pay at least something. Fifty dollars is what it starts out as. Come on, Mr. Speaker, let us be real here. Who are you defending against having to have \$50 taken out of their pay in order to pay when they are bringing home \$12,000? I have people that do not bring home that much in a year.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Dush.
Representative Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I had not planned on speaking today, but after hearing some of the comments today about how we have to get our fiscal house in order and that the way we can get our fiscal house in order is by having persons who have children with disabilities pay more, I could not sit still.

The previous speaker talked about President Obama saying people that make a little bit more money should pay a little more so that those that do not can have a little more in terms of health care. We are not talking about every person in the State of Pennsylvania that makes more than \$245,000 putting in fifty bucks. If that were the case, I might vote for this. What we are talking about here is saying a person whose child has a disability and makes more than \$245,000 a year having to put in the extra fifty bucks. Not everyone, just the person with a child with disabilities. That is cruel.

If you want to raise the personal income tax and go to a graduated income tax in the State of Pennsylvania so everyone making more than \$245,000 a year in the State of Pennsylvania puts in a little more so that we can actually lessen the lists of waiting lists for persons with disabilities so that we can do some good for the people of the State of Pennsylvania, I am all for it; count me in.

But when you want to pick out parents of children with disabilities who happen to be successful and say they are the ones that are going to pay more because their children have disabilities – not because they make \$245,000, because there are a whole lot of other people that make \$245,000 or more that are not going to pay a cent. The qualifying factor is, here you have a child with a disability. That is who you want to pay more.

To follow up on my colleague from the southeastern part of the State: you do not want to tax the Marcellus Shale industry, you do not want to tax a CEO (chief executive officer) who is making more than \$245,000 in the gas industry unless they have a child with disabilities, then you will take another fifty bucks from them.

Mr. Speaker, there are a whole lot of other reasons in this bill to vote "no," but this one is probably the most cruel of those. I urge a "no" vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Sturla.
Representative Eli Evankovich.

Mr. EVANKOVICH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a prolonged debate on a bill that would make some changes, some very needed changes to our welfare system, and we have really narrowed in, the debate has really narrowed in on one aspect of that bill, and I just want to add a little fact granularity to what we are discussing here. This number, \$246,000, a family of four, we are balking over whether or not that family should pay an extra \$50 maximum per month, \$50 maximum per month for the government that they are using.

I remember we had a debate in this hall in November of 2013 talking about gasoline taxes, and I remember people saying you should pay for the government you use. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are arguing over that \$50 a month, and I just want to lay out for the membership of this body just how much money we ask them to fork over voluntarily just for the pleasure of living in our great State.

Mr. Speaker, a family of four making \$246,000 a year, we ask them freely to give over \$629 a month to the State Treasury; that is \$7,552 a year. If you live in a neighborhood like mine, which has pretty low property taxes, we ask them to pay \$583 a month, or \$7,000 a year. We ask them to pay about \$205 a month for income tax, local income tax; that is \$2,460 a year. Just in Pennsylvania tax alone, that is \$1,417 a month, or \$17,012 a year.

And we are arguing over \$50 a month for government that they use, and let us not forget the Federal government. We all know where we stand on taxation. We hear the arguments over and over again in this chamber; we hear them on the campaign trail. Well, just for your information, Mr. Speaker, a family of four making \$246,000 a year with a halfway decent C.P.A. (certified public accountant) doing their taxes will pay \$52,522 in base taxes, plus 33 percent of the difference between \$246 and \$233. That is a total of \$56,822 a year, or \$4,735 a month.

So let us get this straight: without any other fees, without any other taxes, we are voluntarily asking a resident of Pennsylvania making \$246,000 a year with a family of four to pay \$6,152 a month, or \$73,834 a year, and we are arguing over \$50 a month.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for an affirmative vote on HB 59. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Samuelson.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There has been a lot of discussion on how this bill would affect families who have children with disabilities, and a lot of the speakers on the Republican side of the aisle threw out the number, well, it is only \$50 a month. Well, as I am listening to the debate, I looked it up. In this bill – you can look it up yourself; it is on page 11 of this bill – there is no mention of a \$50-a-month premium. I know the gentleman from Adams County said it is only going to be \$50 a month, but what if the Federal government looks at the language of this bill and sees how it is structured. It is lines 3 to 12 on page 11. It says that the premiums are going to be in accordance with the Children's Health Insurance Program. Premiums will be "...IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PREMIUMS ASSESSED FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO RECEIVE...INSURANCE THROUGH THE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM..." THAT IS THE ONLY GUIDANCE THIS BILL PROVIDES.

So I looked up the premiums for the Children's Health Insurance Program. You might be surprised to find that it makes no reference to 1,000 percent of poverty. In Children's Health

Insurance there are three levels, from zero to 200 percent – I am sorry – from zero to 208 percent of poverty, Children's Health Insurance is free to the recipient; between 208 and 314 percent of poverty, you can get Children's Health Insurance, but there is a subsidy from the State to help out; above 314 percent of poverty, you pay the full price of the program. You can get Children's Health Insurance, it is called Cover All Kids, but above 314 percent, you pay full price.

So if that is the way we handle the Children's Health Insurance Program, and this bill, that was written last night, less than 24 hours ago, directs you to look at the language, what if some bureaucrat in Washington, DC, looks at this language and says, "Okay. We're going to copy what this bill says about Children's Health Insurance." That means that every family impacted by this bill would of course be above 314 percent, and they would have to be full price – not full price on Children's Health Insurance, they would have to be full price on medical assistance.

You can look throughout this bill for any reference to \$50 a month; it is not there. I know we have the gentleman from Adams County saying it is only \$50 a month, but look for it in writing. This bill should be subject to hearings. It should be subject to give-and-take questions and answers. It should not be an amendment that is shoved in in the Rules Committee at 5:45 last night with no consumer – no family with a child with a disability had an opportunity to raise a question about this. We should base our decision today on facts and what is in writing, not on just a promise that someday it is only to be \$50.

Think about this. What if the income level that is mentioned on page 11 is just for the first year? What if in the second year the income level is truly dropped to 314 percent of poverty? Since we have a pilot program in year 1, what if somebody in the Department of Human Services says, let us truly follow CHIP. Let us go down to 314 percent of poverty. Then you are not talking about families over \$200,000; you are talking about a family of three at \$64,000. You are talking about a family of four at \$77,000. You are talking about a single mother with one child with a disability at \$50,993.

And if the language of this bill could be interrupted by some bureaucrat to have that person pay full price to get needed services, I think we better take more time. We should vote "no" on this version of the bill. Let us have some discussions. Let us have some hearings. If you want to propose something like this, you need input from the citizens.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Baker.

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

I rise in support of this legislation.

And I just want to point out a document I have in my hand. It is the health and human services document submitted by the Governor to the budget appropriations office, and we are astounded to find out that for the 2017-18 fiscal year, we are asking for \$39.3 billion in health and human services funding. Now, granted, that includes Federal matching funds as well. And this document, although it looks like a budget document, is only the welfare document, the health and welfare document. It is 761 pages long.

We are, Mr. Speaker, on an unsustainable track of funding public welfare in Pennsylvania, all while we know that we will be seeing a declining match in Federal funding going forward. We are at a fiscal crisis and cliff, and that cliff is going to get steeper and steeper as we go on. If we cannot make some cost

savings – a little bit here, a little bit there – on behalf of the taxpayers, we are going to be back every year fighting over how we balance this budget. Almost \$40 billion in health and human services for the next fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, we need to start somewhere and we need to start with this legislation. I think it is a modest, reasonable approach. And 1,000 percent of the poverty level, I have never heard of that anywhere. I have never heard of that in the Obamacare subsidies. It is not 1,000 percent. It is less than half that. This is as lucrative and as beneficial as any State that I know of. A quarter of a million dollars, family of four, paying \$50 a month, or \$600 a year, sounds pretty reasonable to me, and I know the vast majority of my constituents would agree with that.

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Gene DiGirolamo.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Much of the debate on this bill has focused on the issue of the copays, and I am not going to go after that issue, but this bill does concern me on three different levels, and I am going to try to lay them out for everybody in the House here today.

First, the issue of the IMD exclusion that is in this bill, HB 59, is an incredibly important issue to drug and alcohol, and it asks for the administration to apply for a waiver from CMS (Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services) to pull drug and alcohol out of this IMD exclusion. I have been told that the administration has asked for this language. I still have concerns because they could do this on their own. They do not need language in a bill to be able to do this. They could do this on their own and apply for the waiver. So that concerns me.

Second, on "Section 411.1" – like the lady from Delaware County pointed out – on pages 5, 6, and 7, a "TOTAL POPULATION COORDINATED CARE MANAGEMENT." This is based on a pilot program in Alaska; that is correct, a pilot program in Alaska. A pilot program is to be awarded to one Medicaid managed care for one region. In addition to the contract, the department is allowed to pay a contingency fee to the plan based on cost savings. To me, Mr. Speaker, this is an incentive payment that could result in denial of care. This also, I think, will duplicate the services that are provided by our SCAs (single county authorities), our county SCAs and our county mental health systems. This sets up a single telephone access point and private portal for each MA recipient. This assumes that computer access for people that have Medicaid – many of them do not have computer access. And, Mr. Speaker, we are in the middle of a drug and alcohol epidemic with the heroin and opiates. Why do we want to put this confusion and duplication on top of these people?

And the most important part for me, Mr. Speaker, is this work requirement that is in this bill. For expanded Medicaid, for expanded Medicaid, let us have the debate about whether we need a work requirement for our expanded Medicaid population. That is a good issue to have a debate about. Most of these people, from my standpoint, are already in the workplace anyway, but that is something we can have a debate and discussion about.

A work requirement for traditional Medicaid, Mr. Speaker, that population that are on traditional Medicaid – and you can look it up on the Department of Human Services – half of that population are children, over 1 million are children; a quarter of that population, over 500,000, are disabled, and most of them severely disabled; the rest of the population, Mr. Speaker, are

made up of chronically ill adults, people who are in nursing home care. And remember, Mr. Speaker, Medicaid, not Medicare, pays for two out of three of the people that are in nursing home care in Pennsylvania. Chronically ill adults and moms who are taking care of their children, Mr. Speaker. We have to be very, very careful with this population. They are our most vulnerable. I do not see what people in that population are going to be able to work. Mr. Speaker, we are going to put another level of bureaucracy and paperwork on top of what they are already going through, Mr. Speaker.

You have gotten the e-mails. Just to point out a few of them: The Disability Rights Network, opposed; the Arc of PA, opposed to HB 59; PA Partnerships for Children, opposed, serious concerns about the impact it could have on children's health-care needs and coverage; the Community Providers Association, which is the largest provider association in Pennsylvania, they are also opposed, Mr. Speaker, to this bill.

We have got to be very, very careful. The two gentlemen, one on the Republican side and the other on the Democratic side, who are taking care of severely disabled children, Mr. Speaker, I think they said it perfectly. We need a "no" vote on HB 59. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Eric Nelson.

Mr. NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of this bill. And just to clarify, there is recognized disagreement between if \$50 a month – or, I think, specifically, it would be \$53 a month copayment – would be too much for somebody who is bringing home \$20,000 a month. From my perspective, in my district, in talking with my county, that is a reasonable ask, and I understand we may disagree.

But when it comes to the much more important and much larger elements of welfare reform, we have had repeated hearings throughout the State to talk about the very specific niche of able-bodied Pennsylvanians who do not have to work but yet are receiving monthly benefits. It was clarified through research. No list has been included because no change is going to occur to the people who are excluded currently.

The intent of this welfare reform is to break the generational recurrence of dependence. It is to be able to create an opportunity where a person either has to work 20 hours a week or they have to take a class or they have to volunteer. It is incumbent upon this body to help those who cannot help themselves, and also we share a responsibility to help those who can help themselves realize they can do so. Requiring an individual to have to volunteer their time is not a big ask. Encouraging someone to work 20 hours a week is also not a big ask. And if they want to do neither, than they can go and retrain to get a skill where they want to do.

This is a big step forward for Pennsylvania. Many counties have a work requirement and it is not that big of a change. But, Mr. Speaker, I ask all of us to support this bill and allow Pennsylvania to break the generational poverty conundrum that we struggle with today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Jordan Harris.

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

Mr. Speaker, every so often you get in the mail, if you have been to the doctor, or God forbid, something happened and you had to go to the hospital, every so often you get in the mail a letter from your insurance company and you read it. And in bold letters across it says, "This is not a bill, right? And every so

often, you know, I have gotten that letter and I have looked down at the bottom and it is a shocking kind of feeling when you read this letter. But thank God I have insurance, because printed across this letter is, "This is not a bill."

But, Mr. Speaker, for some of our folks across the Commonwealth, that actually is a bill, because for some of our folks in the Commonwealth who have children with disabilities, the things that are necessary for them are not covered by their insurance. So, Mr. Speaker, for me, the type of contempt that I have heard from some with regards to our constituents who have children with a disability – we talk about the most vulnerable among us. Well, I do not know who could be more vulnerable than a young person with a disability. This is not about their parent and their parent's income, because regardless of what the parent makes, many of those parents are digging in their pocket month after month to pay for care for their child that is not covered by their insurance.

Mr. Speaker, today I got an e-mail from one of my constituents. She sent me an e-mail about one of my younger constituents, 18-month-old Natalie Curcio. Natalie's parents live in the district with Natalie, and Natalie is 18 months old and when Natalie was born she was born profoundly deaf. Natalie is on Medicaid, and because of it, Natalie was given a cochlear implant. Over the last 6 months Natalie has been able to get therapy that has helped her with speaking and hearing. Now after 6 months, Natalie is catching up with all of the other children in her class who were born with their hearing.

You know, the story of Natalie touched me because I have a cousin who was also born profoundly deaf, but he got a cochlear implant, and because of that implant, he now is speaking and he graduated from high school and he has gone on to college because of that implant.

Mr. Speaker, I am fearful of what will happen to Natalie. I am fearful because of the money that Natalie's parents have to pay for out of their pocket for Natalie's care. Mr. Speaker, if 18-month-old Natalie is not the most vulnerable among us, then I do not know who is.

Mr. Speaker, I know we are not supposed to, but this is a picture of Natalie. Her mother wanted me to share it with everyone. Think about Natalie when you vote on HB 59. I already know how I am voting. I am not voting against Natalie. I am not voting against any of the children who are like Natalie. I hope you do the same.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Stephens. Todd Stephens.

Mr. STEPHENS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is no question that we need to rein in State government spending. We have seen spending go out of control particularly in areas like those that we are discussing here today. And there certainly are a lot of questions about this bill. We have heard there are going to be dire consequences. We have heard there are going to be significant issues. We have heard that our schools might have some issues. We have heard there may be other unintended consequences. I would have liked to have seen a more meaningful opportunity for stakeholders to provide some input so we could hear from them and dig in on some of the concerns that they have raised.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, though, my biggest concern is that to start with reforms in this area I think is misguided. You know, we have several corporate welfare programs that provide benefits to millionaires and even billionaires. We have several corporate welfare programs that provide benefits to

people in other countries. We have several corporate welfare programs that are not achieving their stated goals or purposes or creating the jobs they claim to create.

So when we are sitting here and saying, jeez, we should save \$6 million by reforming a welfare program, I am concerned that are we are starting with programs that at least have all these questions concerning the benefits they provide for disabled children in Pennsylvania and their families and not starting with some of those other programs with well-documented shortcomings our own IFO (Independent Fiscal Office) has identified. And we are not starting with those, Mr. Speaker, and I have a serious concern about that.

I would recommend that this body move on and tackle some of these other tougher issues like the \$800 million in corporate welfare before we go ahead and try to reform the programs that might help our most vulnerable in our population.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative.

Representative Seth Grove.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today there has been a lot of discussion about many aspects of HB 59, an omnibus Human Services Code change, mostly to try to rein in some spending in a very responsible way. If you look at the IFO report on government expenditure growth over the next 5 years, DHS alone will attribute to \$3.8 billion over the next 5 years. That is \$2.1 million a day of new spending that we need to come up with in the General Assembly – \$2.1 million a day.

Last week we did some work on some, I think, some pretty good Medicaid reform bills in this House that passed by a wide breadth of votes. Today we have some other changes, some good changes, changes that allow greater access to substance abuse, payments to providers for out-of-home placements, electronic asset verification, nursing home facility assesses, ambulatory service facility study, limitations on Act 534 employees, total population coordinated care, efficiency evaluation, work requirement, institute of mental disease waiver, supplemental appropriation waiver request, loophole premiums – some robust policy changes that will change the dynamic of that cost curve embedded down to within our revenue cost structure.

A lot of the discussion has been on, obviously, the kids in loophole proposal. If you break down the actual demographics, out of the total percent of children in this, their income cohorts, it covers about 6 percent of the families; 6 percent make over \$200,000. So it is actually less than 2 percent that are affected. About the average cost per person, \$17,626. If you make over, over a quarter of a million dollars, quarter of a million dollars, family of four, maybe one child within this program, you are looking at \$50 copay or \$600. Many of you pay more for your health insurance in this chamber than what we are asking responsibly. For the most part, it is followed under CHIP as well, which Pennsylvania residents are paying at 200 percent of the poverty level. It is fair and it is equitable moving forward, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we are never going to change the dynamic. We are never going to reinvent government unless we can rein in costs of State government in a responsible way, where we are not kicking individuals off, our most vulnerable off important programs. That is the scope of these reforms within this bill. It is to protect the most vulnerable, ensure those that have the ability to pay can pay, and ensure that we institute responsible

work requirements to ensure that those that are capable of working work.

And we have seen it in other States. Growth of revenue to the General Fund, growth of self-sufficiency, growth of individuals' work to be self-sustainable. Mr. Speaker, we have seen it in multiple States. Maine, for example, individuals, prior to installing work requirements under the TANF Program, were making about \$3.7 million a year. After work requirements, their income increased to over \$8 million. That is improving people's lifestyle, improving people's quality, improving health-care outcomes for individuals, Mr. Speaker. I think it is appropriate, I think it is responsible, and I think it is good government, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that we sustain our welfare programs.

Currently, Mr. Speaker, Medicaid assistance is getting cut currently. Regardless of what the Federal government may or may not do, Federal reimbursements are dropping. This year alone it was a \$199 million cut from the Federal government. That will be reduced each year for the next 4 years. It is a reality. The Federal government will never, ever, ever, ever keep their promises. Look at our special education costs. They were supposed to pick up a majority of our special education costs. Here we are, almost self-funding our special education costs because they refuse to do the job.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot count on the Federal government. They will not come through for us. We need to make sure we provide the protections and the sustainability of these important programs from now into the future. We cannot do that unless we do these changes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, for the sanctity of the most vulnerable, for the sanctity of budget predictability, for the sanctity of making sure we do the right thing today, I hope you will join me in voting "yes" to HB 59 to make sure we protect the most vulnerable regardless of what happens at the Federal level.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Krueger-Braneky.

Ms. KRUEGER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today in opposition of this bill because of a young man who lives in my district named Jake. Jake is 16 years old and he lives in Aston, Pennsylvania, in Delaware County. A few months ago his mom and dad came to see me. His dad is a police officer in Delaware County. In his volunteer hours he works as a volunteer firefighter, and his mom is a nurse. They came to see me because they were concerned about what they were hearing out of Washington – the cuts to Medicaid, the impact on kids like Jake – and they came to me because they wanted to know that they believed Medicaid had saved his life. Now, Mr. Speaker, Jake's dad called me this morning, because after watching Washington for weeks and weeks and weeks and calling his Congressman and calling his Senator, today, Mr. Speaker, he woke up and Jake's Medicaid care was under attack right here in Harrisburg.

And I have to say, as I have looked at the language in this bill, HB 59, there is a passage in the Bible that has come to me over and over and over again. And I know that one thing that I share with a number of my colleagues across the aisle is a deep commitment to Christian faith. And I, like many others, read the Bible when I wake up in the morning, and I ran for office because I believed that I have a Biblical call to work on behalf of justice.

Mr. Speaker, in the book of Matthew, chapter 25, there is a passage where God gathers. God gathers the angels and He gathers the sheep and the goats. "Then the king says to those at his right hand, 'Come, you that are blessed by my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; for I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink, I was a stranger and you welcomed me, I was naked and you gave me clothing, I was sick and you took care of me, I was in prison and you visited me.' Then the righteous answered him," saying "'Lord, when was it that we saw you hungry and gave you food, or thirsty and gave you something to drink? And when was it that we saw you a stranger and welcomed you, or naked and gave you clothing? And when was it that we saw you sick or in prison and visited you?' And the king answered them," and said "'Truly I tell you, just as you did it to one of the least of these who are members of my family, you did it to me.'"

" 'Truly I tell you, just as you did it to one of...these who are members of my family, you did it to me.' "

And, Mr. Speaker, this is the Bible verse that I have not been able to get out of my mind during this debate today. Who will we stand with? The poor, the sick, the children and the widows? Or the insurance companies, the oil executives, or whomever else whose corporate handouts we seem to be being trying to protect by picking on those who get Medicaid?

Mr. Speaker, there is a choice before us today. Will we be sheep or goats? Mr. Speaker, I am standing with the least of these. I rise in opposition to this bill and ask my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Members, the maker is permitted to speak a second time. The maker will be given an opportunity to speak a second time, unless anybody else wishes to speak?

Representative Frank Ryan. Frank Ryan. I am sorry. I did not have your name down, and I apologize. Representative Ryan.

And then after the maker will be the leadership for both sides.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for allowing me to speak today.

You know, I heard some terms that were bandied about today, and I know the good gentleman from Centre County was not referring specifically to accountants in a pejorative way, but I also heard the word "cruel" and other things of that nature in light of this particular bill, HB 59.

And I merely would say this: as an accountant, in 2014, I walked across the United States – 2,806 miles, 6,309,250,000 steps – to raise awareness of the needs of the children with disabilities. So when we talk about Biblical passages, I would tell you that that walk that I made was a walk of atonement and a walk of gratitude. And I had said my entire life that my responsibility was to remember to ask people that I have hurt to forgive me, to ask people that I have helped to help another, and to ask people that I have disappointed to pray for me. And the act of gratitude and the walk of gratitude is for Scott's child; Alex's child, Grayson; for Brian's son, to recognize what these families are going through.

We are delusional if you even remotely believe for a second that the current State programs are doing anything to help children with disabilities. In the State of Maryland, I was told by a regulator, after spending 28 years of helping children with

disabilities, that a child with autism must be cured within 6 months. Get real. Let us make decisive actions and let us stop using rhetoric and bandy about. If we talk about the dangers of bureaucrats, I would agree with that comment entirely, and that is precisely why our government, Committee of State Government has had hearings on SRBC (Susquehanna River Basin Commission), because we, too, are concerned about the accuracy and actions of bureaucrats.

Let us have the compassion, though, for those in need. Let us have the compassion, though, for those who are paying. Let us take a look at the children with illnesses.

My daughter is a cancer survivor. Three of her children have been in the NICU (neonatal intensive care unit), and my wife and I have helped cover the cost of the copays, the deductibles, and other costs that occurred.

Every property owner in the Commonwealth, when we take care of the costs of children with disabilities, as we should when the Federal government has shirked its responsibilities – and those of you who have signed the resolution, that letter that I have been circulating to get the Federal government to start funding what it said it was going to fund – let us take care of the children with disabilities, but this is not too much to ask.

And I am going to finally make this comment. My first child died, and I would love, I would love to have had the chance to see my first child raised as a disabled child, but I do not have that chance.

Please support this bill. Let those of us with means help those in need, and let us stop playing around with those people who have the greatest need and let us help those who need the help the most.

The SPEAKER. Do any other members wish to speak before the maker of the bill or the leaders?

Representative Dan Moul.

Mr. MOUL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

After that last speech, I— It is hard to follow that one, but I will do my best.

I heard one of our Representatives here speak about one piece of the bill, and he is the only person that spoke on it, that changes to 15-day rule that MA will pay for somebody in – and let us just call it what it is: drug rehabilitation. This is something that the Governor wants, something that the administration wants, and in all honesty, it is something that every single person in the General Assembly should want, because I do not think there is one person in here that I work with that does not know somebody who has been affected by drug abuse. And I could say opioid abuse, but it usually always leads to a heroin problem. At 15 days you are not getting over a heroin addiction. This bill removes that. That is just one thing we want to think about. It does not restrict the funding to the 15 days.

One of the other things that was just touched on very, very slightly, and this is probably the most crucial part of bill that nobody has talked about yet. And back in 2005, policy director Donna Cooper worked for Governor Rendell – policy director – and she advocated for something that became law. She advocated for these premium payments. Act 42 of 2005 established section 454 of the Human Services Code, which allowed the Department of Human Services to request premium payments for these individuals at 200 percent of poverty level.

Now, I want you to think about that. All of you who are afraid or against putting this into statute at 1,000 percent, it is

currently under Act 42 of 2005 at 200 percent. If this does not become law and we do not move this bar up five times from where it is now, and we get, and we will eventually get a different administration and they implement this, instead of somebody, instead of this \$50 kicking in and the sliding scale starting at \$246,000, it will now start at \$48,000. Today, today if we implement this 1,000 percent over the Federal poverty level, if we implement this, it affects between 4 and 5 percent of those families that are on this. If we let it go at today's statute, if we do not change this, when the next administration comes in and they implement this – and they will – you have already heard what financial distress we are in – and they will – it will affect 73 percent of the people that are on it today.

So you have your choice. You can either vote to move it from 200 percent – and please, do not take my word for it. Google it. Look it up. It is Act 42 of 2005. It is right there in black and white. It is at 200 percent today. We are actually trying to move it in the direction most of my colleagues that are against this bill want it to move in. So to vote "no" on this is to say, "Sooner or later we're going to get most of the people caught up in this," rather than saying, "We're only going to get a few caught up in it, just the very wealthy."

Now, one of the things that I kept hearing over and over and over during the last Presidential election was that the wealthy are not paying their fair share. Now we are asking those that make roughly a quarter of a million dollars a year to pay a little bit, and the same people that were saying, "The wealthy aren't paying their fair share," are saying, "Oh, no, we don't want them to pay a penny. We want it to be free." So somebody that makes \$10 million a year, to be grotesque with my example, can live in this State, have a child with these needs, and not pay a penny toward the premium. Is that fair? That is the question you have to ask yourself. Who does it affect?

I also heard – and God bless those that have children that are confined, that are extremely sick, and we want to help them, believe me. As vice chair of Children and Youth, I want to tell you, I have heard it all, I have seen it all, and I want to tell you, we want to help those children. But the number one diagnosis for children that are on the program is autism. They can be very, very functional. Number two is ADD (attention deficit disorder)/ADHD (attention deficit hyperactivity disorder). Again, can be very functional. We can limit the scope of what we think about to those that are confined to a wheelchair or those that are confined to a bed, but yes, that is some of them, and God bless those people and God bless those families. But the vast majority is not them. And if the family is making a quarter of a million dollars a year, we have to think about, are we going to cheat poor people down the road by not making those that make a lot of money pay just a little bit towards their premium? If they are making that much money, they should have some skin in this game.

You also heard that the increase for medical assistance each year goes up between 6 and 7 percent. Our revenues coming in go up less than 3 percent. If we do not figure out a way to get a little bit more infusion into this system, if we do not figure that out, less people are going to have benefits, and the people it is going to hurt are those that need them the most.

Please vote "yes" for this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Leadership on both sides.

Representative Hanna, I believe. Representative Mike Hanna.

Mr. HANNA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to reiterate all that has already been said. This bill clearly hurts our most vulnerable and there are plenty of reasons that we should be voting "no," not the least of which is the procedure which this bill has been presented to us today. So again I am asking everyone to vote "no" on this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Bryan Cutler, on the bill.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will urge the members to vote "yes" for this, and I would like to offer several quick reasons why.

During this debate we admittedly heard a lot of very personal and sometimes tragic stories. We have also heard some about hope and something about fear, winners and losers, and the way that all of this was positioned in the chamber here today. But I believe that the gentleman from the Lehigh Valley indicated that we should be focused on facts, and I believe that he is correct.

The facts that we are looking at are as follows. Under the Affordable Care Act as passed in the previous administration, there are two things that are certain: one is that we will be given less money to supplement our Medicaid expenditures; and two, we will certainly be given more responsibility to manage that as a State. Regardless of what happens in that debate going forward, those two things are certain. So it is our job to take the facts that we have and balance them.

I believe the prime sponsor of the bill articulated very well the issue and the area that we are looking at. We are talking about less than 6 percent of the current population. You are likely to, on average, take \$17,626 per year in services for a premium that would start at \$600 a year. But the real question and the real fact that we should look at, I believe, is this: Do you trust the administration? Do you trust the administration? I do, because when you look at history, I believe that we have been more generous or more reasonable in how this is positioned. The prime sponsor pointed out that the current law is 200 percent of poverty. The Affordable Care Act subsidies stop at 400 percent of poverty. This starts at 1,000 percent.

Mr. Speaker, while we have spent a lot of time focusing on this, this one portion of the bill, I would like to highlight some of the other pieces, because I believe that they are important in order to get our Medicaid spending under control at the budgetary level. We heard the rate of increase is 6 to 7 percent. Revenues are flat to 3 percent.

When I started in the health-care industry over 20 years ago, things were very different. We paid bills in a different way. It was a fee-for-service model, and the Affordable Care Act has focused us on a quality-based model where we reward outcomes, not just the number of visits that you have. Contained in this bill are two pieces that I think will supplement that and continue to transform our health-care system.

This bill would require DHS to issue a request for information in order to evaluate the efficiency of our programs. They have a provision for the total population or coordinated care delivery for groups. Many of us have health-care systems that are doing just this already. They are being innovative. They are saving money. They are also having better outcomes. I believe that is something that we should encourage. I believe that that is something that is good.

Mr. Speaker, like many of the residents and the taxpayers we have talked about today, we are putting some reasonable limits on the churning or the changing of insurance policies. They have the same exceptions that many of us have at our own employers – a serious life event, relocation into a different area, or a verified health condition which requires a specialist not covered by the MCO. We are asking government to live like many of the residents in our areas already live.

The gentleman that spoke earlier from Bucks about the IMD waiver; Mr. Speaker, this is very important and several folks have alluded to it. We need a waiver in order to offer services beyond 15 days so that we can be successful with treating opioid addiction and the heroin problem, not simply have a revolving door in and out of patients that are not successful.

When you look at the supplemental appropriation waiver request, I know that that is a mouthful, and as one of my colleagues did earlier, they translated it – this is very simple. We are going to ask the government to take the money that they already have and have lapsed and put elsewhere, to spend this money more efficiently before they come and ask for supplemental waivers. Taxpayers expect us to do that. Our residents expect us to deliver the best services that we can at the least cost to them while caring for everyone. I believe with these pieces in the bill, we can do that.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at the payments to providers for out-of-home placements, the electronic asset verification of MA eligibility for the aged and disabled, Mr. Speaker, that is required federally and has been worked on by many of the stakeholders. The nursing home facility assessment and the ambulatory surgical facility study all will look at and streamline these processes as well as we move forward and as we try to deliver better care at a better cost.

Mr. Speaker, that is a goal I believe that we all should be for, and I would urge a "yes" vote.

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

Baker	Fee	Lewis	Reed
Barrar	Fritz	Mackenzie	Reese
Benninghoff	Gabler	Mako	Roae
Bernstine	Gillen	Maloney	Roe
Bloom	Gillespie	Marshall	Rothman
Boback	Greiner	Marsico	Ryan
Brown, R.	Grove	Masser	Saccone
Causar	Hahn	McGinnis	Sankey
Christiana	Harris, A.	Mentzer	Saylor
Cook	Heffley	Metcalfe	Schemel
Corbin	Helm	Metzgar	Simmons
Corr	Hennessey	Miller, B.	Staats
Cox	Hickernell	Milne	Tallman
Culver	Hill	Moul	Tobash
Cutler	Irvin	Mustio	Toepel
Day	James	Nelson	Toohil
Delozier	Jozwiak	Nesbit	Topper
Diamond	Kampf	O'Neill	Walsh

Dowling	Kaufer	Oberlander	Ward
Dunbar	Kauffman	Ortitay	Warner
Dush	Keefer	Peifer	Watson
Ellis	Keller, F.	Pickett	Wentling
Emrick	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Wheeland
English	Klunk	Quinn, M.	
Evankovich	Knowles	Rader	Turzai,
Everett	Lawrence	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS—91

Barbin	DeLuca	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Bizzarro	Dermody	Krueger	Readshaw
Boyle	DiGirolamo	Kulik	Roebuck
Bradford	Donatucci	Longietti	Rozzi
Briggs	Driscoll	Madden	Sainato
Brown, V.	Fabrizio	Maher	Samuelson
Bullock	Farry	Markosek	Santora
Burns	Fitzgerald	McCarter	Schlossberg
Caltagirone	Flynn	McClinton	Schweyer
Carroll	Frankel	Mehaffie	Sims
Cephas	Freeman	Miccarelli	Snyder
Charlton	Gainey	Millard	Solomon
Comitta	Galloway	Miller, D.	Stephens
Conklin	Gergely	Mullery	Sturla
Costa, D.	Goodman	Murt	Taylor
Costa, P.	Haggerty	Neilson	Thomas
Daley	Hanna	Neuman	Vazquez
Davidson	Harper	O'Brien	Vitali
Davis	Harris, J.	Pashinski	Warren
Dawkins	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Wheatley
Dean	Kim	Petri	White
Deasy	Kinsey	Quinn, C.	Youngblood
DeLissio	Kirkland	Rabb	

NOT VOTING—1

Godshall

EXCUSED—9

Cruz	Kavulich	McNeill	Sonney
Evans	Matzie	Quigley	Zimmerman
Harkins			

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.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Godshall.

Mr. GODSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I was temporarily away from my desk on the House floor, and when I returned, the vote had already closed when voting HB 59. I would like this to be corrected as a "no" vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SENATE MESSAGE

HOUSE BILL
CONCURRED IN BY SENATE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 1285, PN 1589**, 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 1285, PN 1589

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

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

The SPEAKER. Members, the other two bills on the calendar cannot be voted upon until 7:45 p.m. without a motion to proceed. All members have had an opportunity to speak on it, although I did give Representative Neilson more time on SB 446.

Representative Neilson, do you wish to speak on the Administrative Code at this time? No. He waives off. He waives off.

So at this time we are going to stand in recess. We are going to stand in recess at this time until the call of the Chair.

Oh, I apologize. Before we go into recess, though, Representative Toepel, for an announcement, and then Representative Frankel, if you have an announcement as well.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. Representative Toepel, please proceed.

Mrs. TOEPEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Republicans will report to caucus immediately. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Toepel.

No minority caucus announcement.

So at this time the majority will be meeting in the majority caucus room immediately.

There is no minority caucus at this time.

Votes on the other two bills cannot occur until 7:45 p.m.

RESOLUTION

Mr. REED called up **HR 83, PN 433**, entitled:

A Resolution directing the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee to study vote-recording systems for the House of Representatives.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HR 83 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

RESOLUTION REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HR 83 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

The SPEAKER. The House stands in recess until the call of the Chair.

Folks, while we are in recess, we will come back to order just because Representative Frankel does now want to make an announcement.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. Representative Frankel, you may proceed, sir.

Mr. FRANKEL. Democrats will now caucus immediately. Thank you. Democrats will caucus. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Members, as the minority caucus chair has indicated, the minority caucus will be meeting now immediately, and the majority caucus will be meeting now immediately.

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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The chamber will go into recess until the call of the Chair.