

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 2017

SESSION OF 2017

201ST OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 52

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI) PRESIDING

PRAYER

HON. WILLIAM C. KORTZ II, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Good morning, everyone.

Please join with me in reciting the Lord's Prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us, and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory are yours, now and forever. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Kortz.

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Tuesday, September 12, 2017, will be postponed until printed.

Members and guests, for those of you who are not typically in our chamber, we have both a Republican and a Democratic Caucus and both chambers meet on their own oftentimes before or after coming to the floor. The Republican Caucus is still in a meeting. It should not be much longer. We are going to be at ease for a short period of time. So I would invite everybody to please stay on the floor while we are at ease, but they should be back on the floor here shortly and we would continue to move forward with our business here.

As we are at ease, if anybody wishes to take the guests around the chamber, please feel free. I will give you the permission to do so. Just once we come back up and I bring us back into order, I would ask everybody to please again take

their seats. But in the interim, it is perfectly appropriate for anybody to take guests to come see other parts of the chamber. I am fine with that. So we are going to be at ease at this time.

Representative Cruz, you can speak now, if you would like, or if you want to wait until we are all back, it is up to you. You want to wait. Okay. So, Representative Cruz, you will be our first order of business, sir. Thank you to members and guests.

So the House will stand at ease.

Members, we are not called back to order just yet, but we will be at 11:45. So for all members in the Republican and Democratic Caucuses, we will be calling the House into order at 11:45 a.m. and then we will proceed with our formalities and voting.

The hour of 11:45 a.m. having arrived, the House will once again come to order.

Members, I would ask you to please take your seats. Please take your seats.

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER. We have a request, folks. They are guests of Representative Jordan Harris. Jennifer Ruiz and – I believe I am saying this right – Tierra Prickett are here with the Health Partners Plans from the Mandela Washington Fellowship in Philadelphia. They are being granted permission to take still photos, videotaping, and videotaping with audio. So they can come on to the House floor. They have our permission to come on to the House floor during session.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. We are going to turn to the respective whips.

The majority whip requests leaves of absence for Representative Daryl METCALFE of Butler County for the day and Representative Jim CHRISTIANA of Beaver County for the day. Without objection, those will be granted.

The minority whip requests leaves of absence for Mary Jo DALEY of Montgomery County for the day, Flo FABRIZIO of Erie County for the day, Mark ROZZI of Berks County for the day, Kevin HAGGERTY of Lackawanna County for the day, Jared SOLOMON of Philadelphia County for the day, Curtis THOMAS of Philadelphia County for the day, and Steve KINSEY of Philadelphia County for the day. Without objection, those leaves will be granted.

MASTER ROLL CALL

The SPEAKER. We are going to proceed to a vote on the master roll. I would ask members to please proceed to vote.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Representative CEPHAS has requested to be placed on leave. Without objection, that will be granted. That is Representative Cephas has requested to be placed on leave.

MASTER ROLL CALL CONTINUED

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—189

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

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—13

Cephas	Fabrizio	Haggerty	Rozzi
Christiana	Gabler	Kinsey	Solomon
Daley	Gillen	Metcalfe	Thomas
English			

LEAVES ADDED—6

Evankovich	McClinton	Vazquez	Wheeland
Jozwiak	Schlossberg		

LEAVES CANCELED—11

Cephas	Evankovich	Kinsey	Vazquez
Christiana	Gabler	McClinton	Wheeland
Daley	Jozwiak	Schlossberg	

The SPEAKER. One hundred and eighty-nine members have voted on the master roll. We do have a quorum.

Members, I know we have important work to do, but we do have many resolutions today and there are many members that wish to speak on the resolutions. So I am going to go right into those.

CALENDAR**RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35**

Ms. PICKETT called up **HR 457, PN 2328**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the week of September 18 through 22, 2017, as "Youth 2 Youth: Partners 4 Peace Week" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Representative Kinsey is on the House floor. He should be placed on the master roll. And I did not see Representative Kinsey earlier. He should actually be placed on the earlier vote. He should be marked in the affirmative on the earlier vote. It was my fault. So Representative Kinsey should be marked as present for the earlier vote, and he is also on the master roll. That is my fault.

CONSIDERATION OF HR 457 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Does anybody wish to speak on HR 457? Representative Tina Pickett, on the resolution. Members, if you can please take your seats. Members, please take your seats.

Representative Pickett is recognized.

Ms. PICKETT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank my colleagues for their support of this resolution. This seeks to honor a number of young people in Pennsylvania, young people who have been dealt some of life's harshest circumstances and are working very hard to confront the challenges before them.

HR 457 recognizes next week, September 18 to 22, as "Youth 2 Youth: Partners 4 Peace Week" in Pennsylvania. This initiative, which seeks to prevent violence in Pennsylvania and around the country, is spearheaded by Job Corps students. These students, who are often from low-income households, are enrolled in the U.S. Department of Labor's Job Corps program to obtain hands-on training. Job Corps is the nation's largest technical training program for students between 16 and 24 years of age. I think it is remarkable that we have so many students, some of whom are with my local Job Corps program in Sullivan County and some of them who are here with us today. They want to be part of the solution rather than adding to the problem.

During the last few years, we have seen the toll that violence takes on our youth. I not only speak of physical violence, either in our streets or in our schools, but victimization that takes place over the Internet. Instances of cyberbullying are growing at alarming rates and with deadly consequences.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am so glad the Youth 2 Youth: Partners 4 Peace program does exist. This initiative seeks to encourage their peers to talk openly about violence, aggression, and bullying; learn how peers have been affected by youth violence; empower one another to make a difference; and explore solutions for the future. Job Corps students are using this program to expand the conversation about violence and to talk about how this violence is impacting their peers and their communities, all with the hope of getting people their ages to put down the guns, talk about their differences, and improve their communities.

This initiative began 2 years ago, and so far I have been impressed that this continues because so much is at stake. These young people want to better themselves and their families and, with that, their communities. I think we can applaud all of that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to mention the four Job Corps centers in our State – Keystone Job Corps in Drums, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Red Rock in Lopez – and to personally thank the staff and faculty at these centers for giving these bright young men and women the opportunity to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, we do have the pleasure of having been joined by students and representatives from Job Corps today, and if it would please you, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if they might be allowed to rise for recognition?

The SPEAKER. Yes. Would our guests please rise for recognition, please. That is so outstanding that you are here with us today. Thank you so much.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—190

Baker	Emrick	Kulik	Rapp
Barbin	Evankovich	Lawrence	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Evans	Lewis	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Everett	Longietti	Reed
Bernstine	Farry	Mackenzie	Reese
Bizzarro	Fee	Madden	Roae
Bloom	Fitzgerald	Maher	Roe
Boback	Flynn	Mako	Roebuck
Boyle	Frankel	Maloney	Rothman
Bradford	Freeman	Markosek	Ryan

Briggs	Fritz	Marshall	Saccone
Brown, R.	Gainey	Marsico	Sainato
Brown, V.	Galloway	Masser	Samuelson
Bullock	Gergely	Matzie	Sankey
Burns	Gillespie	McCarter	Santora
Caltagirone	Godshall	McClinton	Saylor
Carroll	Goodman	McGinnis	Schemel
Causser	Greiner	Mehaffie	Schlossberg
Charlton	Grove	Mentzer	Schweyer
Comitta	Hahn	Metzgar	Simmons
Conklin	Hanna	Miccarelli	Sims
Cook	Harkins	Millard	Snyder
Corbin	Harper	Miller, B.	Sonney
Corr	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Staats
Costa, D.	Harris, J.	Milne	Stevens
Costa, P.	Heffley	Moul	Sturla
Cox	Helm	Mullery	Tallman
Cruz	Hennessey	Murt	Taylor
Culver	Hickernell	Mustio	Tobash
Cutler	Hill	Neilson	Toepel
Davidson	Irvin	Nelson	Toohil
Davis	James	Nesbit	Topper
Dawkins	Jozwiak	Neuman	Vazquez
Day	Kampf	O'Brien	Vitali
Dean	Kaufner	O'Neill	Walsh
Deasy	Kauffman	Oberlander	Ward
DeLissio	Kavulich	Ortitay	Warner
Delozier	Keefer	Pashinski	Warren
DeLuca	Keller, F.	Peifer	Watson
Dermody	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Wentling
Diamond	Keller, W.	Petri	Wheatley
DiGirolamo	Kim	Pickett	Wheeland
Donatucci	Kinsey	Pyle	White
Dowling	Kirkland	Quigley	Youngblood
Driscoll	Klunk	Quinn, C.	Zimmerman
Dunbar	Knowles	Quinn, M.	
Dush	Kortz	Rabb	Turzai,
Ellis	Krueger	Rader	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—12

Cephas	English	Gillen	Rozzi
Christiana	Fabrizio	Haggerty	Solomon
Daley	Gabler	Metcalf	Thomas

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Cruz, I apologize. I had said that you would be our first order of business, and I did not see you on the floor. But Representative Cruz will be next, and I believe it is on unanimous consent, and then I will be calling on Representative Stephens after this.

STATEMENT BY MR. CRUZ

The SPEAKER. Representative Cruz.
Mr. CRUZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to take this opportunity to thank members of both sides of the aisle for four resolutions that were introduced and passed yesterday, and I received affirmative votes from both sides of the aisle. So I wanted to take the opportunity to thank all the members, and the resolutions were HR 452, the newborn screening; HR 453, leukodystrophy awareness; and

HR 454, Krabbe awareness. These are all resolutions concerning the illnesses that children are born with here in the Commonwealth, and we are bringing public awareness.

I also wanted to take the opportunity to thank you for HR 451, celebrating Hispanic Heritage Month. We want to make sure that we get the opportunity to share the attributes and the contributions that Latinos have done in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and with the affirmative vote that you gave us on the resolution, that will be done.

So thank you once again, Mr. Speaker and all the members of this chamber. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Cruz.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. Representative Todd Stephens, on unanimous consent.

Mr. STEPHENS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just have some remarks to submit for the record relative to an Eagle Scout in my district.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to bring to the attention of the Speaker and the members of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives the name of Thomas Devery, who has recently been awarded Scouting's highest honor – Eagle Scout.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to the members of the House of Representatives the following citation of merit honoring Thomas Devery.

Whereas, Thomas Devery earned the Eagle Award in Scouting. This is the highest award that Boy Scouts of America can bestow and as such represents great sacrifice and tremendous effort on the part of this young man. Thomas is a member of Troop 542.

Now therefore, Mr. Speaker and members of the House of Representatives, it is my privilege to congratulate and place in the Legislative Journal the name of Thomas Devery.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Representative Mary Jo Daley is on the House floor and should be placed on the master roll.

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. KORTZ called up **HR 465, PN 2356**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the 230th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution of the United States and honoring the vision and perseverance of the framers who crafted our nation's governing document during the Constitutional Convention of 1787.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. Representative Kortz is recognized.

Mr. KORTZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Representative Boback and I would like to thank our colleagues for their support for HR 465 that recognizes the 230th anniversary of the signing of the United States Constitution. This momentous occasion took place—

The SPEAKER. Sir, just please suspend for a moment, and that is my fault for not calling everybody to order here prior to your remarks.

Members, please take your seats. Guests, if you are going to stay in the chamber, which is perfectly appropriate, please take your seats. If you are going to exit, I would ask that you exit at this time before our next speaker has the floor. So if anybody needs to exit, if you could do so at this time. Thank you.

Representative Kortz, I know this is really quite significant for our country and certainly for this Commonwealth and the city of Philadelphia, and I would ask you to proceed.

Mr. KORTZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Representative Boback and I are honored to bring forth HR 465, honoring and recognizing the 230th anniversary of the signing of the United States Constitution. This momentous occasion took place in Philadelphia September 17, 1787.

The Constitution is the foundation of our individual freedoms. It is the statement of the basic principles and the rules of government. It is the framework of our entire government. Two hundred and thirty years ago, Mr. Speaker, some of the greatest thinkers of their time, including George Washington and Pennsylvania's own Benjamin Franklin, created a document that balanced the needs of the individual States among the needs of our new emerging country. Their work created a living, breathing document that is still valid and viable to this day. They developed a plan which established three coequal branches of government – legislative, executive, and judicial – and they devised a system of checks and balances that instilled power in and oversight of each of the branches; hence, each an equal partner and free from the interference from the other two.

While the Constitution is not perfect, our Founding Fathers in their wisdom incorporated a provision that allowed for alterations. This has resulted in 27 amendments over these 230 years that have addressed such varying issues such as the entire Bill of Rights, Presidential succession, African-American freedoms and voting rights, as well as the voting rights for women and 18-year-olds.

The judicial branch has also interpreted numerous clauses of the Constitution as laws test the limits of what is constitutional. The Constitution stands proudly alongside the Magna Carta, the English Bill of Rights, and the French Declaration of Rights of Man and Citizen, as well as our own Declaration of Independence.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution is a living document which has stood the test of time and tribulation. It has seen our nation through times of war and peace, depression and prosperity, growth and change.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting today that we take a moment to reflect on this amazing document created by our Founding Fathers. It is the backbone that helped create what I believe is the greatest nation on earth.

Thank you for recognizing this historic moment in this historic chamber. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Kortz.

Representative Boback, please.

Ms. BOBACK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Along with my colleague, Representative Kortz, I, too, ask for your unanimous support of my resolution encouraging school districts across the Commonwealth to take part in the Preamble Challenge on Constitution Day, which is Monday, September 18.

This year, as we celebrate the 230th anniversary of the U.S. Constitution, we look intentionally at its verbiage and what it does for us and what it continues to do for generations to come. Its Preamble is one of my favorite parts. These first 52 words encapsulate what this nation stands for and why the framers made our government a republic. They provide a guiding light for us and our government. They represent the ideas of our Founding Fathers and what they wanted to see the United States put forth.

I am hopeful that by participating in this challenge, which asks students to recite, sing or dance, or create a video or skit, that these students will better understand the Preamble and what it means.

Pedro Rivera, the Secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and his staff will be sharing a video on Facebook and Twitter of they themselves taking the Preamble Challenge, and I ask that all members consider putting it on your own Web site.

I hope this resolution and the Secretary's video motivates schools across this Commonwealth to participate in the Preamble Challenge and celebrate the anniversary of the Constitution of the United States of America. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Joe Markosek, the minority Appropriations chair.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to, first of all, congratulate the gentleman and the lady for this resolution. I certainly support it and would ask everybody to support it.

I thought I would just share, since we are talking about this subject, I thought I would just share a little bit of history here in the House of Representatives. Thirty years ago when we were celebrating the 200th anniversary of our Constitution, our Speaker at the time and our leadership at the time took the entire State House to Philadelphia on the grounds of Independence Hall, and we held a session day to commemorate the 200th anniversary. Now, that is 30 years ago now, and there are not too many of us around that remember that. But I would maybe call on the Parliamentarian to correct me if I am wrong, but I think that was a regularly scheduled session day. It might be one of the few that we have had outside of this building, if I am not mistaken. But nevertheless, that was to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the U.S. Constitution, and here we are 30 years later commemorating it again and it still lives on as a viable document. So I just thought I would share that with the members. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Chairman Markosek, once we finalize all the aspects of the budget, I think we ought to go down there and have one for the 230th. Thank you for telling us, and that was a formal session, according to the Parliamentarian. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—191

Baker	Emrick	Kulik	Rapp
Barbin	Evankovich	Lawrence	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Evans	Lewis	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Everett	Longietti	Reed
Bernstine	Farry	Mackenzie	Reese
Bizzarro	Fee	Madden	Roae

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—11

Cephas	Fabrizio	Haggerty	Solomon
Christiana	Gabler	Metcalfe	Thomas
English	Gillen	Rozi	

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

* * *

Ms. BOBACK called up **HR 466, PN 2361**, entitled:

A Resolution encouraging school districts in this Commonwealth to participate in the Preamble Challenge on September 18, 2017.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. I believe that the remarks of the good lady and the good gentleman covered this resolution as well.
Does anybody else wish to speak?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—191

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—11

Cephas	Fabrizio	Haggerty	Solomon
Christiana	Gabler	Metcalfe	Thomas
English	Gillen	Rozzi	

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

The SPEAKER. We are going to turn to the uncontested calendar. There is another resolution on the House calendar. I know Chairman Marsico is going to be speaking on that particular resolution, but we are going to turn to the uncontested House calendar first.

UNCONTESTED CALENDAR

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. KINSEY called up **HR 448, PN 2274**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of September 2017 as "Emergency Preparedness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mrs. DAVIS called up **HR 449, PN 2344**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing August 31, 2017, as "International Overdose Awareness Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. KINSEY called up **HR 463, PN 2354**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the week of September 10 through 16, 2017, as "Direct Support Professionals Week" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Ms. QUINN called up **HR 467, PN 2362**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of July 2017 as "Fragile X Syndrome Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. MATZIE called up **HR 468, PN 2363**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the week of September 24 through 30, 2017, as "Rail Safety Week" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. NEILSON called up **HR 474, PN 2368**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing September 13, 2017, as "National Celiac Disease Awareness Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. MURT called up **HR 477, PN 2376**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of September 2017 as "Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania in an effort to urge pregnant women not to drink alcohol and to remind women who are considering becoming pregnant to abstain from drinking any type or amount of alcohol.

* * *

Ms. HARPER called up **HR 482, PN 2385**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of September 2017 as "Civic Education Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. FARRY called up **HR 483, PN 2386**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing September 22, 2017, as "National Falls Prevention Awareness Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. HAGGERTY called up **HR 484, PN 2387**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of September 2017 as "Pulmonary Fibrosis Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mrs. TOEPEL called up **HR 486, PN 2389**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of September 2017 as "Realtor Safety Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Ms. BOBACK called up **HR 493, PN 2397**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the week of September 24 through 30, 2017, as "Active Aging Week" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolutions?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—190

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

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

NAYS—1

Tallman

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—11

Cephas	Fabrizio	Haggerty	Solomon
Christiana	Gabler	Metcalfe	Thomas
English	Gillen	Rozzi	

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

The SPEAKER. I will be with the members to speak on those in just a second.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. MARSICO called up **HR 476, PN 2372**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the 175th anniversary of South Hanover Township, Dauphin County.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. I would ask everybody to please take their seats. Please take your seats. Please take your seats. All members, please take your seats. There are guests here with us today on this resolution, so I am asking all members to please take your seats. Members, if I can, please, we have guests with us here today on the resolution. Please take your seats. If you have conversations, take them off the House floor.

Chairman Ron Marsico, on HR 476.
Mr. MARSICO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
And thanks, members, for your attention.

Today I have the honor to include all of you in celebrating the commemoration of the 175th anniversary of the founding of South Hanover Township in Dauphin County, in the 105th Legislative District.

Just some history. The area known as South Hanover was part of a large portion of land in William Penn's Holy Experiment in the Commonwealth. The township was originally part of Lancaster County, but during a session of the Lancaster County Court in 1736-37, Hanover Township was established. In 1785 Hanover Township was split into two separate townships, East Hanover Township and West Hanover

Township. Eventually West Hanover Township in Dauphin County was divided into East and South Hanover Townships, and South Hanover Township was officially established on March 4, 1842.

If you are all in the area, you can join me in celebrating the great history we have in Pennsylvania with the development of historic townships such as South Hanover Township. Their celebration is scheduled for September 23 from 1 to 4 at the newly constructed township building located on Route 39 just a few miles from Hershey, right next to the nationally recognized Antique Auto Museum.

I would like to thank those that have joined us today as part of the South Hanover Township's 175th anniversary committee. To the left of the rostrum – and please rise as I announce your name – are Elaine Cassel. Elaine. Barbara Carney and Penny Pollock, the manager of the township. Penny. Welcome to all of you. And congratulations, and thanks to leaders and members for supporting HR 476.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

On the question recurring,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

CONSIDERATION OF HR 476 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—190

Baker	Ellis	Krueger	Rader
Barbin	Emrick	Kulik	Rapp
Barrar	Evankovich	Lawrence	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Evans	Lewis	Readshaw
Bernstine	Everett	Longiotti	Reed
Bizzarro	Farry	Mackenzie	Reese
Bloom	Fee	Madden	Roae
Boback	Fitzgerald	Maher	Roe
Boyle	Flynn	Mako	Roebuck
Bradford	Frankel	Maloney	Rothman
Briggs	Freeman	Markosek	Ryan
Brown, R.	Fritz	Marshall	Saccone
Brown, V.	Gainey	Marsico	Sainato
Bullock	Galloway	Masser	Samuelson
Burns	Gergely	Matzie	Sankey
Caltagirone	Gillespie	McCarter	Santora
Carroll	Godshall	McClinton	Saylor
Causer	Goodman	McGinnis	Schemel
Charlton	Greiner	Mehaffie	Schlossberg
Comitta	Grove	Mentzer	Schweyer
Conklin	Hahn	Metzgar	Simmons
Cook	Hanna	Miccarelli	Sims
Corbin	Harkins	Millard	Snyder
Corr	Harper	Miller, B.	Sonney
Costa, D.	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Staats
Costa, P.	Harris, J.	Milne	Stephens
Cox	Heffley	Moul	Sturla

Cruz	Helm	Mullery	Tallman
Culver	Hennessey	Murt	Taylor
Cutler	Hickernell	Mustio	Tobash
Daley	Hill	Neilson	Toepel
Davidson	Irvin	Nelson	Toohil
Davis	James	Nesbit	Topper
Dawkins	Jozwiak	Neuman	Vazquez
Day	Kampf	O'Brien	Vitali
Dean	Kaufer	O'Neill	Walsh
Deasy	Kauffman	Oberlander	Ward
DeLissio	Kavulich	Ortitay	Warner
Delozier	Keefer	Pashinski	Warren
DeLuca	Keller, F.	Peifer	Watson
Dermody	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Wentling
Diamond	Keller, W.	Petri	Wheatley
DiGirolamo	Kim	Pickett	White
Donatucci	Kinsey	Pyle	Youngblood
Dowling	Kirkland	Quigley	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Klunk	Quinn, C.	
Dunbar	Knowles	Quinn, M.	Turzai,
Dush	Kortz	Rabb	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—12

Cephas	Fabrizio	Haggerty	Solomon
Christiana	Gabler	Metcalfe	Thomas
English	Gillen	Rozzi	Wheeland

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

The SPEAKER. The following members have requested to speak on uncontested House resolutions that have already been passed. These have been passed, so they will be thanking you for your vote. And I am just going to give you the order that has been listed here on my sheet, and if you will just be prepared to speak right after, I will call upon you. But Representative Matzie will be first on HR 468; Representative Harper, HR 482; Representative Kinsey will be speaking, I believe, on two resolutions, 448 and 463; Representative Marguerite Quinn will be speaking on HR 467; Representative Toepel will be speaking on HR 486; Representative Murt will be speaking on HR 477; and Representative Samuelson will be speaking on HR 483 and he will be joined by Representative Farry.

STATEMENT BY MR. MATZIE

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls upon Representative Matzie to speak on HR 468.

Mr. MATZIE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and House colleagues.

HR 468, designating the week of September 24 to September 30, 2017, as "Rail Safety Week" in Pennsylvania, is an important notion for a couple of reasons. First, it raises awareness across our Commonwealth of the need for rail safety education, reminding and empowering the public to keep themselves safe near railroad tracks at all times. Second, in conjunction with U.S. Rail Safety Week, this resolution promotes the shared goals of reducing collisions, fatalities, and injuries at highway rail crossings and preventing trespassing on or near railroad tracks.

You might not know it, but each year there are approximately 2,000 collisions at highway and rail crossings throughout the United States. That has been pretty consistent over the past several years. Another consistent pattern has been the approximately 250 deaths and roughly 900 to 1,000 injuries suffered during those collisions. Another death occurred in my district over the weekend. If you are thinking those types of accidents are not likely to happen, or well, they only happen to other people who live far away, you better think again.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration tracks the numbers, and here is what they say: three out of four crashes occur within 25 miles of a motorist's home, 50 percent of all crashes occur within 5 miles of home, and a motorist is almost 20 times more likely to die in a crash involving a train than in a collision involving another motor vehicle.

Trains are constantly rolling in my district with Norfolk Southern and CSX both having main lines running directly through the center of my district. So hearing trains and the trains working throughout has become a common occurrence. You do not realize just how fast they come on you, so stay off the tracks.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mr. MATZIE. I will submit the remainder of my remarks for the record, and I thank you for your attention.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Matzie.

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

While gains have been made in highway rail crossing safety, much more remains to be done. Although crossing collisions plummeted by 83 percent over the past four decades, preliminary Federal statistics for 2016 show that total crossing fatalities rose nearly 14 percent over the prior year, resulting in 265 deaths.

Trespassing is an even bigger problem. Every day people are walking, exercising, and taking pictures on or too close to the tracks, resulting in nearly 1,000 deaths and injuries a year. Shockingly, in the United States, a person or vehicle is hit by a train about every 3 hours.

By declaring September 24 through 30, 2017, "Rail Safety Week" in Pennsylvania, we in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives are calling attention to the need for renewed dedication to saving lives near tracks and trains.

I thank you for your support of this important resolution and the potentially life-saving reminders it provides.

STATEMENT BY MS. HARPER

The SPEAKER. Representative Kate Harper, on HR 482.

Ms. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members of the General Assembly.

It is very appropriate that today we unanimously approved HR 482, which celebrates Civic Education Awareness Month, the same month as we are celebrating the anniversary of the United States Constitution because this is where it all began – the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution – and this is where it began.

I have a constituent, Ricky Buttacavoli, who has made it his life's work to encourage people to learn about their government and how it works. Even though Pennsylvania does require civics education and has authorized the Education Department to

develop tests to see what people are learning, all of the surveys are showing an appalling ignorance by our students of what our government is and does and how it works. So I think it is important for us in the month of our Constitution's anniversary, this month, to remind people it is important to know about the Constitution, about our government, how it works so that they can be involved, because Pennsylvania is also where the best description of the United States representative democracy ever took place and that was right at Gettysburg, where Abraham Lincoln called us government of the people, by the people, and for the people. And I think in this chamber at least we can all agree that our government works better when the people are involved.

Thank you for your support.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (MATTHEW E. BAKER) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady.

The Chair recognizes Representative Kinsey on HR 448 and HR 463.

STATEMENT BY MRS. EVANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Representative Evans, you may proceed.

Mrs. EVANS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I want to thank my cosponsor, Representative Kinsey, and all of my colleagues for supporting HR 448, which designates September 2017 as "Emergency Preparedness Month" here in Pennsylvania.

We recognize September as "Emergency Preparedness Month" to bring awareness to the importance of having the resources necessary to withstand threats such as natural disasters, cyberattacks, pandemic diseases, and various acts of terrorism. A wise man once said, "By failing to prepare, you are preparing to fail." HR 448 reminds us what is at stake if we fail to keep our residents safe.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady.

STATEMENT BY MR. KINSEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Representative Kinsey.

Mr. KINSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When Representative Evans and I introduced this resolution in May, we had no idea how it would resonate with us today. Hurricane Harvey and Hurricane Irma marked the first time two Atlantic category 4 hurricanes made landfall during the same year. The economic costs of these hurricanes could cost the United States economy \$290 billion. But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, it cost many of our fellow human beings their lives.

According to recent weather models, Hurricane Jose could be a potential threat for the east coast, and although it would take a few days to be certain, we must make sure that our Commonwealth and our residents have the resources and knowledge they need to remain safe. It starts with making a plan and becoming educated on how to best respond to emergencies.

Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. Thank you to my colleagues, thank you to Rep. Hill-Evans, for their support of HR 448.

And, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, if you do not mind, at this time if we can just have a moment of silence for those folks in Houston, those folks in Florida who have been devastated by these hurricanes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes, sir.

I ask at this time that all members rise in a moment of silence.

(Whereupon, a moment of silence was observed.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, members.

Thank you, Representative Kinsey and Representative Evans.

THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI) PRESIDING

STATEMENT BY MR. KINSEY

The SPEAKER. Representative Kinsey, you may proceed.

Mr. KINSEY. Thank you again, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before you to thank my colleagues for their vote on HR 463. And, Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I just want to also recognize Representative Maher from Washington and Allegheny Counties, and the reason I am bringing up Representative Maher, Mr. Speaker, is because Representative Maher is also a cosponsor for HR 463, which designates September 10 through September 16 as "Direct Support Professionals Week" in Pennsylvania.

You know, Mr. Speaker, many of us are likely to know someone who provides care for a person with developmental disabilities, mental illness, or possibly a person with chronic medical conditions. Direct support professionals spend countless and often tiresome hours assuring that the person in their care is bathed, fed, dressed, taking their needed medications, and more importantly, that they are comfortable. The efforts of these people allow those in need to live with dignity in our communities.

Mr. Speaker, many of us may not necessarily recognize this, but at this moment, direct support professionals are facing a workforce crisis in Pennsylvania. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that I just want to step back for a second because in every single district in the 67 counties of this Commonwealth there are folks who depend on individuals to provide for them. And, Mr. Speaker, Representative Maher and I think that it is utterly important that we take the time out to recognize these individuals who are providing those services.

So, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Representative Maher and myself, we just want to thank all of the members here for their support of HR 463, and when you get back to your specific counties, if you do not mind just reaching out to one of those social service agencies or somebody in your community that you know that is providing these services and just let them know that we thank them for the work that they are doing.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Kinsey.

Representative Kinsey, did you— I apologize. You are completed on both resolutions, right? Okay. Thank you very much.

STATEMENT BY MRS. TOEPEL

The SPEAKER. Representative Marcy Toepel is recognized to speak on HR 486.

Mrs. TOEPEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I would like to thank the members for their unanimous support of HR 486. Real estate agents have helped many of us through the most stressful times of our life, and I can attest to that personally since my husband is a real estate agent. But buying or selling a home comes with many challenges, but real estate agents, with their experience and advice, minimize them. These talented individuals are truly invaluable. Unfortunately, real estate agents can be in risky situations when they are showing homes in isolated locations to complete strangers. Historically there have always been a few deaths to homicide each year among real estate agents. However, more recently real estate homicides are rising sharply. To help remind realtors to prioritize their safety as well as that of their clients, please join me and thank you once again for supporting September as Realtor Safety Month in Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Chairwoman Toepel.

STATEMENT BY MR. MURT

The SPEAKER. Representative Tom Murt is recognized to speak on HR 477.

Mr. MURT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I express my gratitude to the members for their support of HR 477.

Mr. Speaker, it affects more infants than spina bifida, Down syndrome, and muscular dystrophy combined. Fetal alcohol syndrome is a group of mental, physical, and neurological birth defects that are the direct result of alcohol use during pregnancy. Recognizing fetal alcohol spectrum disorders can be difficult. Early and accurate information is key to receiving appropriate educational and mental support.

Mr. Speaker, fetal alcohol syndrome covers a wide range of problems, including hyperactivity, heart problems, deformed limbs, poor social skills, problems seeing or hearing, kidney defects, and delayed development in thinking, speech, and motor skills.

Mr. Speaker, what is so frustrating is that these conditions are easily preventable. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, as many as 5 per 100 babies are impacted by prenatal exposure to alcohol. Complicating this, more than 50 percent of women of childbearing age drink alcohol, while 10 percent drink alcohol while they are pregnant.

By declaring September 2017 as "Fetal Alcohol Awareness Month" in our Commonwealth, we are taking an important step forward in educating women who consume alcohol and are or who could become pregnant. Mr. Speaker, our hope and our prayer is that they understand that consuming alcohol, even the smallest amount, can cause serious problems for their unborn child. Today we are sending an important message: There is no safe amount of alcohol that can be consumed during pregnancy. Abstaining from alcohol during pregnancy is the surest way to prevent fetal alcohol syndrome.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Murt.

STATEMENT BY MR. FARRY

The SPEAKER. Representative Samuelson and Representative Farry, on HR 483.

Mr. FARRY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to our colleagues for their unanimous support.

HR 483 is about fall awareness, appointing September 22 as "National Falls Prevention Awareness Day." With the significant number of seniors we have in this Commonwealth, falls are a real issue. They are actually the leading cause of injury-related deaths, and approximately 30 older Pennsylvanians die every week because of fall-related injuries.

This is a resolution I sponsored over the last many years. I appreciate the continued support, and my colleague here from the Lehigh Valley has some further comments.

STATEMENT BY MR. SAMUELSON

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you.

I would like to thank Representative Frank Farry of Bucks County, the prime sponsor of this resolution.

This year marks the 10th anniversary of National Falls Prevention Awareness Day. The theme, "10 Years Standing Together to Prevent Falls," highlights the fact that falls prevention is everyone's concern. Falls impact seniors, their families, and their loved ones. If a senior falls and loses their independence due to that fall, families may need to provide more at-home care or be faced with the decision of whether to put their parent or grandparent in a long-term-care facility. The good news is, there are things we can do to reduce the risk: have your eyes checked and have your prescription drugs reviewed regularly, eliminate fall hazards from around the home by removing throw rugs or installing handrails along stairs or in the bathroom, and also improve lighting around the house.

You can also engage in exercises that improve balance. Since 2005 the Pennsylvania Department of Aging's Healthy Steps program has been helping Pennsylvanians aged 50 and older to reduce their fall risk through education and exercise classes that improve health, strength, and balance. Each year one-quarter of senior citizens fall. Some of these falls are serious enough to lead to emergency room visits, hospitalization, loss of independence, or even death. But falls do not have to be part of aging. There are steps we can all take to reduce the risk and help keep our seniors safe.

So thank you to Representative Farry for bringing attention to this critical issue for our seniors, and thanks to each member of the House for your vote in support of Resolution 483.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. Members, earlier in the rear of the House, and I am sorry we moved into the resolutions, but they did have an opportunity to tour the House and also to have access to the

floor activity and media coverage, but we had the Mandela Washington Fellowship for Young African Leaders; they were here and they were guests of Representative Jordan Harris and Representative Donna Bullock. This program aims to invest in the new generation of young African leaders and provide them with practical skills that can help take their current work to the next level. Local organizations within the city of Philadelphia are hosting the group for their professional development experience. The 13 fellows were chosen from a pool of more than 64,000 applicants across 49 countries in sub-Saharan Africa. I would ask all of you to approach Representatives Jordan Harris and Donna Bullock for more information. Thank you very much.

Members, we are going turn to the regular House calendar, page 5 of the regular House calendar.

As is often the case, my good friend and colleague, Chairman Matt Baker, will act as pro tem. I am on the House floor in some conversations.

And, Chairman Baker, if you could please. Thank you.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Happy to serve, Mr. Speaker.

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 555, PN 578**, entitled:

An Act designating a portion of State Route 562 in Berks County as the General Carl A. Spaatz Memorial Highway.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1602, PN 2120**, entitled:

An Act designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 1008 over the Codorus Creek, in East Manchester Township and Hellam Township, York County, as the SPC Martin Wilson Kondor Memorial Bridge.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1608, PN 2126**, entitled:

An Act designating the bridge carrying U.S. Route 22 over the Juniata River, Norfolk Southern Corporation rail tracks and State Route 1010 (Penn Street) in Smithfield and Henderson Townships, Huntingdon County, as the Trooper Landon E. Weaver Memorial Bridge.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1510, PN 1935**, entitled:

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

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

Mr. **CAUSER** offered the following amendment No. **A03353**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 3, by striking out the period after "Bridge" and inserting ; and designating a bridge on that portion of Sunnyside Road over the Oswayo Creek, Shinglehouse Borough, Potter County, as the PVT Malon Stanley Memorial Bridge.

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 7 and 8 Section 2. PVT Malon Stanley Memorial Bridge.

(a) Findings.—The General Assembly finds and declares as follows:

(1) PVT Malon Stanley, a native of Potter County, was drafted into the United States Army at the start of World War II and served in the 1st Cavalry Division.

(2) PVT Malon Stanley was part of the forces that stormed Leyte Island under the command of General MacArthur. PVT Malon Stanley was killed while providing cover for his fellow troops who were ordered to retreat.

(3) PVT Malon Stanley was posthumously awarded the Purple Heart for his service.

(b) Designation.—The bridge #4017-0124-0220 located on Sunnyside Road over the Oswayo Creek, Shinglehouse Borough, Potter County, is hereby designated the PVT Malon Stanley Memorial Bridge.

(c) Signs.—The Department of Transportation shall erect and maintain appropriate signs displaying the name of the bridge to traffic in both directions on the bridge.

Amend Bill, page 2, line 8, by striking out "2" and inserting 3

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

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. On that question, the gentleman, Chairman Causer, is recognized.

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

Mr. Speaker, this amendment would add an additional bridge designation. It would designate the Pvt. Malon Stanley Memorial Bridge on Sunnyside Road in the borough of Shinglehouse in Potter County. I would ask for support for the amendment.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. While the vote is being taken, the Chair is in receipt of a request for leave of absence for the gentlemen, Representatives **VAZQUEZ** and **SCHLOSSBERG**. Without objection, the leaves will be so granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 1510 CONTINUED

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—187

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—15

Cephas	Gabler	Metcalf	Thomas
Christiana	Gillen	Rozzi	Vazquez
English	Haggerty	Schlossberg	Wheeland
Fabrizio	Jozwiak	Solomon	

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

On the question,

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. At this time the Democrat leader, Mr. Dermody, is recognized for a caucus announcement.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats will caucus at 12:45; 12:45, Democratic caucus. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

At this time there will be no Republican caucus.

HEALTH COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair also would like to announce that immediately at the first break the Health Committee will be meeting in room G-50 of the Irvis Office Building.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. DiGIROLAMO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman, Representative DiGirolamo, rise?

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For a caucus announcement, caucus meeting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is no caucus announcement at this time.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Southeast Caucus.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. My apologies. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There will be a Southeast Caucus meeting in room 148 immediately at the break. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will now be in recess until the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

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

**THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI)
PRESIDING****RULES COMMITTEE MEETING**

The SPEAKER. The Speaker calls on the majority leader for an announcement.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the House Republican Appropriations conference room.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess.

RECESS EXTENDED

The time of recess was extended until 6 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

LEAVES OF ABSENCE CANCELED

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

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

HB 358, PN 376

By Rep. BAKER

An Act providing for a volunteer health care practitioner certification; and imposing powers and duties on the Department of Health.

HEALTH.

HB 1613, PN 2412 (Amended)

By Rep. BAKER

An Act amending Title 35 (Health and Safety) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the Health Care Cost Containment Council, for its powers and duties, for health care cost containment through the collection and dissemination of data, for public accountability of health care costs and for health care for the indigent.

HEALTH.

HB 1739, PN 2336

By Rep. BAKER

An Act providing for direct primary care, medical service agreements and insurance, for medical service agreement requirements, for use of health savings accounts or flexible spending accounts and for use of other health care practitioners.

HEALTH.

BILLS ON CONCURRENCE REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HB 453, PN 2410 (Amended)

By Rep. REED

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, implementing the 2017-2018 Commonwealth budget and instituting future budget implementation: in Treasury Department, providing for provisions for General Assembly; in Department of Auditor General, further providing for audits of agencies receiving State aid and providing for audits of interstate commissions; in procedure for the disbursement of money from the State Treasury, further providing for settlement agreements and enforcement actions; in oil and gas wells, further providing for definitions, providing for Oil and Gas Lease Fund and further providing for oil and gas operations in the South Newark Basin; in transportation network companies and motor carrier companies, providing for regulation of taxicabs and limousines by parking authority of city of the first class, for penalties and for provision of transportation network service; in Underground Storage Tank Indemnification Fund, further providing for transfer; in Pennsylvania Gaming Economic Development and Tourism Fund, further providing for other grants; in Tobacco Settlement Fund, further providing for use of fund; in Pennsylvania Race Horse Development Fund, further providing for definitions, for fund and for distributions from fund; in miscellaneous limitations and transfers, further providing for drug and alcohol programs and providing for Workers' Compensation Security Fund; in 2016-2017 restrictions on appropriations for funds and accounts, repealing provisions relating to fund transfers; in general budget implementation, further providing for Department of Community and Economic Development, for Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board, for Department of Human Services and for Commonwealth Financing Authority Restricted Revenue Account and providing for State Employees' Retirement System Restricted Account and for Public School Employees' Retirement System Restricted Account; in school district debt refinancing bonds, further providing for sinking fund charges for school building projects, for limitation on new applications for Department of Education approval of public school building projects and for Public School Building Construction and Reconstruction Advisory Committee; providing for Tobacco Annuity Liquidation; repealing provisions relating to 2012-2013 budget implementation and 2012-2013 restrictions on appropriations for funds and accounts; providing for 2017-2018 budget implementation and for 2017-2018 restrictions on appropriations for funds and accounts; making an editorial change; and making related repeals.

RULES.

HB 1431, PN 2411 (Amended)

By Rep. REED

An Act designating that portion of State Routes 54, 901 and 2023 in Northumberland County and Schuylkill County as the Honorable Robert E. Belfanti, Jr., Memorial Highway; designating Exit 18 of State Route 43, known as the Searights Road interchange, in Fayette County as the Staff Sgt. John P. Wanto Vietnam Veteran Exit; designating Exit 15 of State Route 43, known as the Old Pittsburgh Road interchange, in Fayette County as the Lance Corporal Russell W. Naugle Vietnam Veteran Exit; designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 2003 over the Yellow Breeches Creek, South Middleton Township, Cumberland County, as the Sgt. Adam C. Schoeller Memorial Bridge; designating a portion of State Route 18 in West Fallowfield Township, Crawford County, as the Staff Sergeant James Douglas Mowris Memorial Highway; designating a portion of State

Route 100 from the intersection of Main Street and Tilghman Street in Upper Macungie Township, Lehigh County, to the intersection of Claussville Road and Kernsville Road in Lowhill Township, Lehigh County, as the Captain Mark T. Resh Memorial Highway; designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 18 (College Avenue) over the Little Shenango River, Greenville Borough, Mercer County, as the Greenville Veterans Memorial Bridge; designating that portion of State Route 3078 and State Route 3090 in York County from the intersection with State Route 116 to the intersection with State Route 3042 as the Private First Class Donald R. Gise Memorial Road; designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 1005, known as Church View Road, Segment 0180, Offset 0000, over Beaver Creek, South Woodbury Township, Bedford County, as the PFC/POW William G. Koontz Memorial Bridge; and designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 588 over Interstate 376, Chippewa Township, Beaver County, as the TFC Blake T. Coble Memorial Bridge.

RULES.

The SPEAKER. Members, we are going to call up on – it is a supplemental A House calendar – if you will look at your supplemental A House calendar. It is HB 453, PN 2410, page 1 of today's supplemental A House calendar. Now, this is a concurrence in Senate amendments as amended by the House. So the bill was a House bill, it went to the Senate, it was amended, it came back to the House, it was amended in Rules, and it will now be in front of this body.

We cannot vote it, I believe, till 9:40 p.m. We are going to start debate on the bill. But it cannot be voted on until 9:40 p.m., given the rules with respect to notice. I think it is 6 hours after the Rules Committee votes. So we cannot vote it until 9:40 p.m. But we can begin debate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILLS ON CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS AS AMENDED

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to the following **HB 453, PN 2410**, as further amended by the House Rules Committee:

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, implementing the 2017-2018 Commonwealth budget and instituting future budget implementation: in Treasury Department, providing for provisions for General Assembly; in Department of Auditor General, further providing for audits of agencies receiving State aid and providing for audits of interstate commissions; in procedure for the disbursement of money from the State Treasury, further providing for settlement agreements and enforcement actions; in oil and gas wells, further providing for definitions, providing for Oil and Gas Lease Fund and further providing for oil and gas operations in the South Newark Basin; in transportation network companies and motor carrier companies, providing for regulation of taxicabs and limousines by parking authority of city of the first class, for penalties and for provision of transportation network service; in Underground Storage Tank Indemnification Fund, further providing for transfer; in Pennsylvania Gaming Economic Development and Tourism Fund, further providing for other grants; in Tobacco Settlement Fund, further providing for use of fund; in Pennsylvania Race Horse Development Fund, further providing for definitions, for fund and for distributions from fund; in

miscellaneous limitations and transfers, further providing for drug and alcohol programs and providing for Workers' Compensation Security Fund; in 2016-2017 restrictions on appropriations for funds and accounts, repealing provisions relating to fund transfers; in general budget implementation, further providing for Department of Community and Economic Development, for Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board, for Department of Human Services and for Commonwealth Financing Authority Restricted Revenue Account and providing for State Employees' Retirement System Restricted Account and for Public School Employees' Retirement System Restricted Account; in school district debt refinancing bonds, further providing for sinking fund charges for school building projects, for limitation on new applications for Department of Education approval of public school building projects and for Public School Building Construction and Reconstruction Advisory Committee; providing for Tobacco Annuity Liquidation; repealing provisions relating to 2012-2013 budget implementation and 2012-2013 restrictions on appropriations for funds and accounts; providing for 2017-2018 budget implementation and for 2017-2018 restrictions on appropriations for funds and accounts; making an editorial change; and making related repeals.

On the question,

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

The SPEAKER. We can begin debate on HB 453, PN 2410, concurrence in Senate amendments as amended by the House.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

The SPEAKER. Representative Steve Samuelson will start. Yes, sir. You may proceed.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A parliamentary inquiry with regard to the 6-hour rule.

The SPEAKER. Yes. Now, just give me a second till I get the Parliamentarian here for a second.

Go ahead, Representative Samuelson.

Mr. SAMUELSON. A parliamentary inquiry. On the computer screens it says that this amendment is still being revised at 6:05 p.m. So if I add 6 hours to 6:05 p.m., that puts it after midnight, which is of course against the rules of the House. If we cannot see the amendment right now, how is the 6 hours already starting?

The SPEAKER. The rule, as I understand it – and I will check on this, Representative Samuelson, if you will just give me a moment – is 6 hours from the time that the Rules Committee votes. But let me just check. Okay?

As you know, an hour before the Rules Committee the language had to be submitted to all members of the Rules Committee, including the House Democratic leaders. That was done. It was actually over an hour before the vote took place. And that is a public meeting. That is a public meeting, reporters were present, the media was present, as were members from outside the legislature. So 1 hour, over an hour before the Rules Committee, that language was given to House Democratic leadership and was made available to the public, and it was a public forum with a public vote. So a bill receives action on concurrence – at least 6 hours have elapsed from the time the bill and its amendatory language is available to the public.

Past precedent is that when that language is given an hour before the Rules Committee meeting and a public vote is taken on that Rules Committee meeting, that that is available to the public. As I said, the media— I was at the meeting; the media

was present as were people outside of Rules Committee members. So it was available to anybody in the media, in the public, and in your caucus. I think you caucused on it because it had been given to Democratic leadership. I believe they would have made copies of the legislation for you or that they would have made copies of the summary of the legislation. But it is definitely from the vote.

Mr. SAMUELSON. I just follow up with a technical point about that 6-hour rule. If you are saying that copies of an amendment were available a couple hours ago, our computers are telling us right now that copies of the actual bill are not yet available because Legislative Reference Bureau is still revising HB 453. So if the amendment was out there publicly but the bill is not yet in final form, how can the 6-hour rule have already started?

The SPEAKER. Well, the amendment— All that LRB is doing is putting or— Yeah, it is LRB. LRB is just taking the amendment and actually inserting it into the bill, but the amendment itself is the new language.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Got you. Not part of my parliamentary inquiry, but I prefer the old 24-hour rule.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Sir, I understand. I believe the rules were adopted unanimously.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

CONSIDERATION OF HB 453 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Representative Greg Vitali. Representative Vitali.

Members, one other – this is a budget vote, so, everybody, there is a 5-minute clock based on our rules.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek, do you wish to be recognized? Did you want to go first, Representative Markosek?

Mr. MARKOSEK. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. You may.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the rules, the House rules, and I also know it is late in the day, but we did not have a whole lot of time to discuss this amendment today, particularly our staff, who really gets down into the details, and we are trying to provide our members with as much analytical detail as we can. I understand that there is a 5-minute ruling here relative to this and it is an appropriations bill, so I know the rule. However, I was going to ask the Speaker if the Speaker would be willing to waive that rule or would have the power to waive that rule for this particular purpose here tonight. This would allow our members—

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek, the Chair— Sir, it is without question that rule applies and you agree with that. I do not have the power as Speaker to waive that on my own. I do not have the power to do it. Rule 19(b) calls for 5 minutes. Yes, sir, I just do not— The Speaker does not have the power to do that.

Mr. MARKOSEK. All right. Mr. Speaker, thank you. I did not think there was any harm in asking.

The SPEAKER. No, absolutely not and I appreciate it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Representative Jim Christiana is on the House floor. Without objection, he will be added to the master roll.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 453 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Representative Vitali, sir, you are called upon. Sir, there is a 5-minute clock based on rule 19(b) and you may proceed, sir.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I urge nonconcurrency to HB 453. This is an irresponsible, ill-conceived piece of legislation, which will do much harm to the citizens of Pennsylvania in many ways.

I have chosen to focus in on some of the environmental problems with this bill. I am particularly concerned with the transfers contained in this bill as they affect the environment. The first transfer I would like to talk about is a \$100 million transfer from the Underground Storage Tank Indemnification Fund. This is what the DEP (Department of Environmental Protection) Secretary Pat McDonnell said about that: "...Removing \$100 million from the—

The SPEAKER. Representative Vitali— Hey, would we please stop the clock for a second. I do not want to take any time away from Representative Vitali.

Would everybody please take your seats. Please take your seats. The good gentleman is entitled to be heard. The good gentleman is entitled to be heard. Please take your seats. I do know that there is going to be a need for some conversations. This is an important – all our legislation is important, but this is dealing with the budget. If you do have conversations, I would just ask if you could take them off the House floor. I would appreciate that. But I would ask, I know people are limited by the time here; they have the right to be heard.

Representative, it says 4 minutes, but you actually have about 4 minutes and 10 seconds. So I will add 10 seconds to that.

You may proceed.

Mr. VITALI. "...Removing \$100 million from the Underground Storage Tank Indemnification Fund undermines the payment of cleanups for about 1,000 sites where toxic and carcinogenic chemicals from petroleum products threaten residents." That is a danger to human health.

With regard to the \$70 million transfer from the Recycling Fund, this is what the Pennsylvania Association of Township Supervisors says: "...It would permanently take critical funds from local governments as well as redirect funds to the state's general fund through one-time transfers. Moving these funds

would force all municipalities to increase property taxes" – increase property taxes – "for 2018. Do not balance the state's budget on the backs of local government!"

With regard to the Environmental Stewardship Fund, the \$70 million transfer from the Environmental Stewardship Fund, this is what Trout Unlimited said: "...We are writing today to urge you to oppose" – oppose – "efforts to balance..." the "budget by relying on special transfers from the Environmental Stewardship Fund...and other...funds.... Local watershed groups, county conversation districts, and organizations like TU are...relying on these funds to implement on-the-ground projects that protect and restore our most significant natural resources."

With regard to the Conservation District Fund where \$2.5 million is being removed, the County Commissioners oppose this. This is what they say: "Those funds have been committed to conservation districts this fiscal year, and support positions, technical assistance to farmers and special projects that are vital to improving water quality and offering other local environmental services throughout the commonwealth, and are already reflected in the district's budgets."

Mr. Speaker, we need to reject this irresponsible proposal and go back to the drawing board and enact a revenue package that has reoccurring sources of revenue like the personal income tax. I ask for a nonconcurrency vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative.

Representative Longietti.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what I am concerned about is found on pages 48 through 51 of the bill and it is called Tobacco Annuity Liquidation. Essentially what this is, is Pennsylvania, like all other States, gets a tobacco settlement payment every year from the major tobacco companies, and right now that is about \$350 million a year and so this provision would require us to sell that for an upfront payment of at least \$1 billion.

And when you look at that, you know, one of the things that pops out at me is that it says that the Commonwealth shall not be obligated to pay any amount provided in the sales agreement or other contract. So the Commonwealth is not going to stand behind that. They are going to say, whatever that tobacco settlement money is, that is what you get, but if that money is interrupted for some reason and in the past we have seen some of that money diminish because we were not fulfilling our obligations under the settlement agreement, then the buyer is at risk, the buyer takes the risk. It is a very risky investment.

And so in recognition of the fact that there may not be many people that, many entities that are interested in bidding on a risky investment, the specific language of this bill requires that our two pension systems, our two pension systems have to submit a statement of qualifications and a statement of interest. Even if they are not interested, they have to submit a statement of interest that they are interested in incurring an additional billion dollars' worth of debt. They are already debt laden. Now, these systems have a fiduciary obligation. They have a fiduciary obligation to look out for the best interest of pensioners and members of the system, and in my view, we are telling them that they many have to violate that fiduciary obligation by submitting a statement of interest in this arrangement.

Now, who else would be out there potentially to bid on this arrangement, this risky investment? Well, we all heard the commercials before, J.G. Wentworth. They are a company.

They happened to be located in Pennsylvania. They are a company and they run the ads that say, you know, you have a stream of payments that you want to sell and you need money now and they will buy it for an upfront payment. Well, I actually took it upon myself when I heard of this arrangement to call J.G. Wentworth, and I actually got somebody on the phone who was, in my view, relatively articulate. I identified myself. I said, calling from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. We have got about a billion dollars that we want to raise by selling our tobacco settlement payments or a future stream of payment, and would your company be interested on bidding on that?" And the lady knew exactly what I was talking about. I was surprised. And she said, "We would not bid on that." She said, "We only purchase a stream of payments from insurance companies, like a structured settlement, and the tobacco settlement money involves an administrator and we would not bid on that. We would not be interested in that." And that tells me that they understand when an administrator is involved like this, that there could be court cases, there could be reasons why that stream of payment could be interrupted. So I asked her the further question of, well, what other entities would be out there that would be interested in purchasing under this arrangement? And she said, "There are none that I'm aware of."

And so now we know why this language is put in here forcing our pension systems that we all acknowledge have serious debt issues to offer a letter of interest in incurring an additional billion dollars' worth of debt. It is not a good investment for them. It is not a good deal for the Commonwealth. We should oppose this legislation for a number of reasons, but specifically because this hoax, this scheme, on the tobacco settlement money is a bad idea. We are not going to have bidders. It is going to force our pension systems to issue a letter of interest in a bad investment that they should not be involved in that violates their fiduciary duty.

So I would urge a "no" vote on concurrence. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Joe Emrick.

Mr. EMRICK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand in full support of this amendment. As we have stated on many occasions, Mr. Speaker, the comments that the transfer of these funds will destroy grants and other projects just is not true. Our primary objective in developing this plan was to make sure that no operations of these funds would be affected. These funds were left with ample surpluses in their 999 and 998 accounts. There were other criteria we used to make sure there were no legal obligations, bonds, and other criteria. In addition, of the 40 or so special funds in the shadow budget that we withdrew money from, just about all of them have been used for this exact purpose in the past. So there is past precedent to do exactly what we are doing here today.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other things I would like to bring up to this caucus and this chamber is the fact that many of us, if not all of us, have had environmental grants, multimodal grants, transportation grants in our districts that have been applied for either through our county, local, or legislative offices and have been denied. And for what purpose, Mr. Speaker? Lack of funds; insufficient funds. Yet when you go on the Treasury's Web site and you look at the transparency portal, you can see, which is updated daily, the massive amounts of surplus dollars, taxpayer dollars sitting in these accounts. So, Mr. Speaker, at some point somebody is going to have to start answering some

very difficult questions about why just about every legislator and our counties are being denied grants because of insufficient funds as we are told over and over again. And I look forward to the day that we get some of those answers and we have the opportunity to ask those questions.

So, Mr. Speaker, I stand in full support of this legislation and would ask my colleagues to be an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dan Frankel.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. Frankly, it is past time for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to get down to the business of governing instead of pursuing fantasies of money hidden away under mattresses and locked in vaults. I understand that some of my colleagues spent the last few weeks scouring through the State budget and I laud their efforts, but I am sorry to say, there is no buried treasure there.

Instead of secret chests of jewels that we can raid to fund our government, we have real agencies like the Insurance Department protecting consumers, real consumers. We have got funds that provide low-interest loans so that communities do not need to rely on Wall Street bankers to get the toxins out of their soil or to strengthen their neighborhoods. And most inexplicably, we have made a commitment on a bipartisan basis to battle the opioid crisis in the State that has ravaged us and we are taking money away from that crisis. We are raiding transportation, public transportation. It is not just Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. It is dozens of transportation agencies in urban, rural, and suburban areas across this State.

And then we have got some funds that we already spend very, very wisely. The Tobacco Settlement Fund does not reflect any untapped riches. Those are funds that provide a match for Medicaid so that low-income seniors do not get kicked out of nursing homes or stay home uncared for.

It is time to leave fantasy land and get real. Ninety-eight, 98 of my House Republican colleagues already voted on how they would like to spend the government's money. Now they need to figure out where that money is coming from. That is the work of legislators, that is the work of adults, and it is how the people of Pennsylvania expect us to behave.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kate Klunk.

Ms. KLUNK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of concurrence on HB 453. Earlier this year the House Republicans passed a budget, and here we are today, it is September 13, and we have a plan to move Pennsylvania forward in a responsible way. I know some of my colleagues say that this plan is irresponsible, but I would say that this is the right thing to do.

You know, when I was running for office, my father looked at me and he said, "Kate, make sure when you go to Harrisburg you keep the constituents of your district in mind and you make sure every single night when you return home from Harrisburg and you lay your head on that pillow that you know that you did the right thing for the people who you represent."

Mr. Speaker, I would say that this is responsible. I have listened to my constituents over the past 2 1/2 months. I have sat in the Appropriations conference room right off of this floor with a group of my colleagues who got to work. We dug into over 218 of these special funds. We went on the Treasury's transparency portal. We pulled those numbers. We looked at those charts. And we determined after a very, very long,

thorough, and fair process that there were a number of these funds sitting with excess surplus dollars that were the people of Pennsylvania's dollars, taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I think about this in a very simple way. If you have money sitting in a savings account, do you use that money or do you take your credit card and do you swipe and put that on your credit card with interest? No, you do not. You go in your savings account. You do not swipe that credit card. You do not go to the bank and borrow, because, Mr. Speaker, that cost more money in the long run. And, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, we do not have that credit card to get cash back. We are not getting cash back and we are not getting miles.

When we take out that loan, when we kick that can down the road, you know who is going to be paying for that, Mr. Speaker? My unborn child. Yes; many of you might not realize I am pregnant. There is a little bit of a bump here in the front. But as I stand here today, I think about my unborn child. Do I want to be saddling him or her with extra debt? Do I want to be taxing my constituents more when we have money sitting in these accounts? No, Mr. Speaker, I do not. The people of my district do not. This is a pathway forward that puts the people of Pennsylvania first, Mr. Speaker.

Every single person in this room should be thinking about those constituents back home. That is what I do every single day, and today, Mr. Speaker, again I rise in support of HB 453. This is the right thing to do. This is responsible. It is not the most perfect plan, but, Mr. Speaker, one thing that I learned here on the first day after talking with some of my colleagues who have been here a long time is that nothing appears perfect. But you know what, we have all given a little bit in this, and really, at the end of the day this is going to be a win for the people of Pennsylvania. I look forward to casting my "yes" vote, and I hope my colleagues will join me in that as well. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Leader Dermody, would you like to go at this time? Okay. Leader Dermody. There are other members who will be speaking after the leader, but he wishes to speak at this time.

Mr. DERMODY. I do, Mike. I think I can speak twice though.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Also, you do not have a time clock.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is not May, it is not June; it is September 13. Several months ago the overwhelming majority of this body overwhelmingly supported a spending plan to run our Commonwealth and adequately fund the programs for the people of Pennsylvania. Now here we are on September 13 to fund that plan with a one-party agreement that is more of an attack on the people of Pennsylvania than it is a reflection of their priorities.

This proposal is devastating to our environment. It cuts \$300 million. It cuts \$100 million from the Underground Storage Tank Fund. I believe it guarantees a reduction in our credit rating that will cost the people of Pennsylvania, the taxpayers of Pennsylvania, hundreds of millions of dollars. It cuts mass transit significantly, over a hundred million dollars, and it will add another billion dollars. Next year we will face, because if this bill should ever become law, a billion-dollar deficit once again.

It is time for us to act responsibly. We are here to work with anybody who will speak with us to come up with a funding plan that adequately funds and adequately takes care of the people of Pennsylvania, has recurring revenue so we avoid the problems we face right now. We fix the deficits that we face and we adequately fund the programs that will protect and make Pennsylvania prosper.

It is time for us to stop the shenanigans. It is time for us to get serious. This is not a time to begin negotiations. It is a time to end the negotiations. We need to step up, get a realistic plan that actually raises real revenue, that solves the problem, pays for the spending plan we all voted for, and move Pennsylvania forward. We need to nonconcur.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Eric Nelson.

Mr. NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today in support of this budget, not complete and total support. In my eyes, in my opinion, we should be taking more of these off-line saving accounts. It is fundamentally wrong that we allow in government at the end of a fiscal year a transfer, a shift, of taxpayer moneys to off-line accounts that are not transparent to the people. This practice itself should change. This hall should amend that past mistake, because it is wrong that we have projects being denied; that we have bridges to be built, we have farms to be purchased, and this money is not being used for the people. But if it is just sitting there, the last thing we would want to do is to raise taxes to fix a one-time shortfall.

We spent too much last year, and to create recurring revenue and to create new taxes to fix a one-time problem is only going to result in expanding government and we are going to find, unfortunately, new ways to spend that money.

So I am disappointed that we are not taking more of those identified lost funds. I applaud the Taxpayers' Caucus and the Appropriations Committee for doing these transfers, and I look forward to deeper dives to prevent this from happening in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Madeleine Dean.

Mrs. DEAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to the legislation in front of us. We are 75 days from the passage of our budget. Seventy-five days, nearly one-quarter into this fiscal year, and I rise for some simple reasons, but from very dire ones. This plan is risky and reckless, and make no mistake, it is a massive tax increase. Let me say that again: this is risky and reckless and a massive tax increase.

Here are four reasons why, very briefly. Number one, it proposes a form of tobacco securitization, \$1 billion. That is a fancy way of saying a fire sale of the next 10 years' worth of our right to the tobacco settlement funds for the purposes for which they should be applied. Now we are going to fire-sale them off, \$1 billion for a \$1 billion payment that will be extremely costly to future generations. Number two, it has a vague and puzzling gaming proposal that assumes \$225 million in new revenues. I do not know where that is coming from, but certainly that is not going to be recurring revenues. That is going to be a prayed-for, heavy-duty licensing set of dollars. Number three, most importantly, it raids \$630 million or more out of funds that

may or may not have surpluses and for purposes that do not match the mission of those funds. That is \$630 million. Number four, why does all of this matter? Because our credit rating, which suffered five downgrades under the previous administration, is at risk and is ready to be cut again.

You all got letters yesterday from Auditor General Eugene DePasquale and Treasurer Joe Torsella, detailing the gravity of our credit downgrades and our cash-flow crisis. Credit downgrades are tax increases. Make no mistake, we already pay more than \$100 million in increased borrowing because of our credit unworthiness. I am certain that no one on either side of the aisle wants to continue that, and yet, guess what? We got a letter today from Fitch, the credit agency Fitch, and I will end with this quote from them today: "Pennsylvania enacted a spending plan for fiscal 2018 before the start of the year but has yet to enact a revenue package to provide full funding. A final fiscal 2018 budget heavily reliant on one-time measures would be inconsistent with Fitch's expectations of progress in addressing the structural budget gap. The commonwealth must also address a sizable revenue shortfall..." from last year, which Fitch assumes will be addressed with one-time sources at this late stage.

That is no way to run a government, that is no way to run your own checkbook, but sadly, that becomes the paradox of Pennsylvania government. Let it not happen tonight. I will be a "no" vote.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

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

CONSIDERATION OF HB 453 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Representative McCarter, the floor is yours.

Mr. McCARTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There are many times we rise to speak about important issues in this chamber, and surely the spending bill, at this time 75 days into this process, falls into that category. But unfortunately, what is before us tonight, without a doubt, is one of the most egregious examples of a one-sided presentation of reality that I surely have encountered.

Mr. Speaker, we have had many, many days, 75, since we passed that budget bill and I am really sad that this is the best my colleagues on the opposite side can muster. We are supposed to be here to make the lives of the people in Pennsylvania better, not worse, but the transfers of more than \$600 million in funds from numerous off-budget accounts is a decimation of the environment, our public transportation systems across the State, our schools, our highways, our innovation funds, our airports, our sewer systems, our farms, our public safety, our doctors, our hospitals. In addition, we have a sale of our tobacco settlement funds that is risky, financially unsound, and in reality, is a smoke-and-ashes plan. The smoke is in our eyes and the ashes will fall upon our retirement systems, the PSERS (Public School Employees'

Retirement System) and SERS (State Employees' Retirement System) systems. Why do I say this? Well, I will use the example of what happened in Wisconsin in 2002. They borrowed about \$1.3 billion at what cost, \$5.9 billion from the settlement funds that they were supposed to get. That is a loss of almost \$4 billion. Now, if we even get better terms, it is not hard to imagine, it will cost us \$3 billion for the \$1 billion we see in this proposal. And who gets the risk? Our pension funds. The other losers in this, of course, are the health areas supported by the tobacco funds, which include many, many areas, everything from cancer research to schools that teach about what cancer is and the education programs, to on-and-on programs.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, the most likely buyer of this sale of our tobacco funds is probably the tobacco companies themselves. What a great deal. They get \$3 billion, theoretically, for buying for \$1 billion. That is not a bad deal, and then they just deduct it from what they give back to the States across the country. That is a sad state of affairs.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to get serious and make the gas companies pay their fair share, not reduce the projects and transportation or roads and a myriad of other areas that are crucial to the people of Pennsylvania. I urge a "no" vote on concurrence. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kristin Phillips-Hill.

Mrs. HILL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, a budget and how we fund it is a vision. It tells us who we are, what we value, what our priorities are, and where we want to be in the future. Mr. Speaker, we cannot adopt a revenue plan whose vision is status quo and more of the same; more tax hikes, more borrowing, more debt, and less opportunity. Our vision for funding the budget has been, and continues to be, one that says digging deeper into the taxpayer's pocketbook should not be the default solution. Instead, we should utilize existing taxpayer money to assure that the core functions of government are funded and we efficiently and effectively meet the needs of the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in a fiscally responsible manner.

Please join me in support of HB 453, because it is never too late to stand in support of the people who pay our bills. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Steve Samuelson.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to the concurrence vote on HB 453. I know I only have 5 minutes. I want to talk about four points.

First of all, the process by which this bill was slapped together this afternoon is really lacking. I know when I questioned the lack of the availability of the text earlier, I was told to get a copy of the 17-page amendment by Representative Dave Reed, which I did. Then within the last half hour, the 95-page bill that we are actually voting on became available on our screens. So the members of this House, as of now, have had less than 30 minutes to digest a 17-page amendment, the original House bill, and the changes to the Fiscal Code the Senate made in July. This is no way to do business. We should have at least a full 24 hours to review this proposal for the legislators and for the public to digest exactly what is in the final proposal here.

Secondly, there is a part of this proposal that suggests that we sell the tobacco settlement payments for the next 10 years to some investor. We do not even know what investor that would be. Would it be someone from Wall Street? We do not even

know. But just think about this: this asset that we have, the \$350 million a year in tobacco settlement payments coming in for the next 10 years, well, that is \$3.5 billion. Even if I discount for present value, it is still about \$2.9 billion. Well, what are my Republican colleagues willing to do? They are willing to sell an asset that is worth \$2.9 billion to the current and future taxpayers of Pennsylvania at a fire sale price of \$1 billion. That is 34 cents on the dollar. That is ridiculous. That is going to make someone very rich who buys this asset, and it is also going to shortchange the taxpayers of Pennsylvania for the next 10 years. It will also threaten all the programs, from tobacco cessation to health care, that are currently funded by those tobacco settlement dollars. It is very shortsighted to give that up in 1 year and not even think about the next 9 years.

There is also a section that takes \$50 million out of the Keystone Park and Recreation Fund. On the new version of the bill that just came up within the last half hour, it is on page 94, line 17, \$50 million coming out of that fund. Well, what is that fund used for? Well, it is used for programs that benefit conservation, flood control, water treatment, jobs, tourism, recreation, parks, higher education, historic preservation and our public libraries. Each one of us in this chamber is familiar with grants that have come out of the Keystone Park and Recreation Fund, Key 93. Many of those grants have benefited your community and my community. If you take \$50 million out of that fund, that is less money available for conservation, flood control, parks, recreation, historic preservation, and public libraries. There is no denying that.

Finally, I am very concerned about something towards the very end of the bill. It is a 95-page bill, but tucked away on page 94, line 22, this proposal takes \$4 1/2 million away from the Substance Abuse Education and Demand Reduction Fund. Well, what is that? Those are moneys that became available from fines that were paid for DUI cases, in certain cases, and also certain drug offenses. That money is supposed to go for grants, for counties and nonprofits to fight addiction. We have heard a lot of talk from members of this House on both sides of the aisle that we need to do something about the heroin and opioid crisis in this State.

Today, September 13, 2017, a large majority of my colleagues are going to vote to reduce the amount of money available for substance abuse and demand reduction for drug treatment programs by \$4 1/2 million. Our constituents will call in the coming days and say, "Who took that money away from fighting the opioid crisis?" The answer is, "Anyone who votes for this amendment."

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Mike Tobash.

Mr. TOBASH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Many of us understand that this is a very difficult vote. This budget vote is always a very difficult vote, and why? Because budget votes affect all Pennsylvanians. This vote is for collecting from our citizens, asking them to pay. I can tell you, it is far easier to give than it is to ask, especially in times like these. We have fallen short. We have overspent. We have a deficit from last year of over \$1 billion.

So what would we do? What would we do in our own homes? What would we do for the people that we collect from, and what would we expect them to do? Would we borrow or would we spend down some surplus? The question becomes, do we have savings? Do we have a surplus in our State accounts? And the answer is most certainly we do.

In Pennsylvania government special accounts today, we have got over \$9 billion, and make no mistake, there is a surplus. So if you fell short in your home or small business, would you borrow or use some savings? Is that not what we do? Is that not what savings are for? This plan does not affect any programs. This plan does not stop any projects. This plan to fund this budget does not lay anyone off. This addresses a one-time shortfall, a one-time deficit, being solved with a one-time fix, \$9 billion in accounts, less than 10 percent of the surplus being used not to borrow against Pennsylvania's future and our children. This allows an opportunity to use our money and then pay ourselves back.

I have heard discussion about our retirement accounts, and we have talked about it many times in this chamber. Does it not make sense that we give an opportunity to add an additional \$400 million into the accounts of our retirees and future retirees of this State? This plan enables us to do this. We would do this just like we would ask our citizens and expect them to do. This is a time when we should not start kicking the can down the road again.

I am asking my colleagues to make this vote in favor of our taxpayers, our citizens, the programs that we fund, and the future of Pennsylvanians. Thank you, my friends, and thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Pam DeLissio.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on record today with some of my concerns about HB 453, and these are just a few of the concerns.

First of all, from everything I have read and discussions that I have had, and these are both discussions in dialogues that have been partisan as well as bipartisan, there does appear to be a general acknowledgement that we, in fact, have a structural deficit. So if we cannot accept that as an underlying factor of this discussion, we have even more problems than we know. So that structural deficit did not just occur this past year and does not just exist for 2017-2018. This is my seventh budget year, and for all of those 7 years, in fact, there has been some form of a structural deficit, and the definition of that is it is inherent. There is no amount of recurring revenue that is in place to deal with the expenses that we are committed for.

The discussion about surplus from these non-General Fund accounts. First of all, these accounts have all been set up via statute, and I certainly do not object to the concept of a comprehensive review of these funds to determine if their purpose still exists, if in fact there is a surplus, and what is the function and use of those funds. I have heard from many, many organizations who are using and are the beneficiaries of these funds, and it certainly appears from the mail that I have gotten over the last several weeks that these funds, in fact, are active, valid, and would bring harm if the amount of dollars that is anticipated to be borrowed from these funds was – and the fact about that surplus becomes even more questionable because, originally, I believe, close to \$1 billion in those funds were to be transferred. Now it is \$630 million. So either somehow there were not as much surplus funds as they anticipated or we are using that money to plug a hole. Either way, it is bad form.

In reference to the sale of the Tobacco Settlement Fund, when you in fact take an asset and try to reduce its value by almost two-thirds, that is an act of desperation, and there is no way I can go home to my constituents and explain in any way how that sale is meaningful and is appropriate in order to meet

this year's budgetary needs. And when we talk about kicking the can down the road, once that sale is consummated, if in fact a buyer could be identified, those dollars from the Tobacco Settlement Fund, about \$350 million becomes money that is missing from next year's budget.

So this is not hard to figure out. So that is, in fact, not solving any problem, because we do have a structural deficit and none of this is really correcting that structural deficit. And then what has become one of my favorite things to comment on is that, in fact, there still remains in here \$200 million from the Joint Underwriting Association. That money was anticipated to be quote, unquote, "borrowed" last fiscal year. There was a lawsuit that was initiated to prevent the legislature from doing that, and this year the money is just going to be taken, not borrowed. I maintain that this is not legal to do, that in fact those premiums were paid and if it is truly in excess, it should be returned to those who paid the premiums. So that alone leaves a big hole in the budget. And I see it, again, gaming money that is in here. We did not come up with last year's \$100 million for gaming. I am not sure how we will come up with this year's \$220 million for gaming.

So these are some of the concerns that I have that I appreciate putting on the record, and, Mr. Speaker, with that in mind, I will be a "no" vote on that budget and really encourage my colleagues to continue to give this bill their very thoughtful consideration as to how they are going to go back home and explain this.

Over the past 30 years it is my understanding that a personal income tax, for instance, has been increased three times, decreased one time, and was last raised 13 years ago in 2004. So if we are not willing to get substantive recurring revenue in the budget, then we need to start looking at program cuts. That would be more responsible than the budget before us.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Ryan Mackenzie.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is an important piece of legislation that we are voting on for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. This is a piece of legislation which protects our taxpayers and puts them first and foremost. Let us go back to how we got here.

Back in the spring we had the opportunity to send the Senate a budget that was balanced, something that meets our constitutional requirement. We had the spending. We had the revenue. They were in sync. We sent it over to the Senate. We waited for quite a while to hear back with their response, and then at the final hour, we received word that they had sent us a spending plan. I voted against that spending plan, because we did not have the revenue to support it. Some of our colleagues did different things, but after that vote, a coalition of people who voted for and against the bill came together and decided that we had to do something.

We decided that we needed to find a responsible way to pay for the spending that had already been approved. We turned to a lot of different options. We went down some dead ends, we did a lot of trial and error, and at the end of the day, we found 218 other special funds in Pennsylvania State Government. The General Fund is labeled Fund No. 1 and there are 217 of these other funds. We looked at the receipts and the disbursements that went in and out of those funds every year. We looked at the fund balances in both their checking and their savings accounts. Many of these have two separate accounts. At the end of the day

we found about \$10 billion that we felt could be accessed. We went through with a fine-tooth comb. We looked at what was legally accessible. We crossed out things that were Federal dollars or had matching funds tied to them. Then we looked at what was financially accessible, again, not trying to disrupt the operation of these funds. We scoured and found out that we had what we believed was \$1.2 billion that was accessible.

After long discussions with our colleagues, with many constituents back home about programs that they felt were important to our community, we turned to a group, an even broader coalition of our colleagues came together, in unison, to come up with this plan that is before us this evening. This is a real solution to the spending and the deficit that has accrued here in Pennsylvania. It is something that we should be proud of. Before having a knee-jerk reaction and turning to taxpayers for one more dollar of their hard-earned money, we have a solution here in front of us that relies on money that has already been collected from our taxpayers. It is real money that is sitting in accounts that can be used to pay for the deficit that we have in our Pennsylvania State budget.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for an affirmative vote on this, because this is the responsible thing to do. If you have money sitting around and accessible to pay off your bills, why would you turn to the taxpayers and ask them to pay one more time? They already are overtaxed. We know that. We know that Pennsylvania taxpayers pay the 10th highest burden in State and local taxes in the entire country. Do not ask them for more of their money, and please vote "yes" in concurrence on this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Bryan Barbin.

Mr. BARBIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This morning we recognized the 230th anniversary of the Constitution without recognizing who was the person who gave those freedoms to the Constitution. It was Penn. He was first to suggest union of colonies, first to suggest liberty of conscience, first to suggest tripartite government. He laid it all on us. He was also the first to give a House of Representatives the right to bring up their own laws and have them enacted. Up to that point, the laws could only be provided by the provincial governors.

So what is our problem? Our problem is, we have got a \$1.5 billion problem from last year, because we put things in the budget like gaming, like a loan from the medical malpractice fund. It is \$1.5 million, and we have got a \$700 million recurring budget problem. Those are the numbers, \$2.2 billion. The Senate sends us a package that gives us \$600 million of tax increases that are basically on the back of fixed-income seniors, the surcharges that will go into effect with the electric utility taxes, the gas tax, and the Comcast tax. It does not really get us the \$700 million, and it is not fair to stick it on the seniors. Okay.

So where are we? Here is where we are – and I get up each budget season and say this, but I am going to say it again – a democracy cannot exist in a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover they can vote themselves largesse from the public treasury. Once the majority votes for candidates that put up the most benefits, democracy collapses. It is followed by dictatorship. We have not dealt with the budget, we have not dealt with the pension, and now what we have come up with is approximate – we put on paper that we have \$2.2 billion. What we do not have is any recurring income.

So what do we have? We have what Franklin told us we would have. We gave you the democracy; now let us see if you can keep it. We are now at the point where we cannot keep it, because we refuse to do one of two things: we refuse to cut spending for the special interests that we will not even talk about, i.e., charter school payments of \$1.5 billion of our \$6 billion of public school funding or our cyber costs of over \$400 million.

Now, if you do not do that, what happens? What happens is we pretend like we have a budget better than the Senate's. It is slightly better than the Senate's, but it does not have recurring revenue in it, which means we are going to get a credit downgrade. When we get a credit downgrade, we are going to have to pay more interest on all of our debt, \$100 million or more. So we want to move the process forward. This would have been a lot better to do in maybe April, maybe May, but we are still missing the key component that we need to solve the problem. Even if you had a billion-five from funds to take care of this year's problem, you still do not have \$700 million to pay for the recurring revenues.

Now, this is why I object to it, and I will finish then. I object to this, because when we do this, we do not require all taxpayers to contribute equally. Special interests do not; factory workers do. When we do this, we do not require any tax loopholes to be closed. We have got the worst tax system for corporate taxes, for sales taxes, for personal income taxes of any State around us. And last, because we do these things, the person who really is entitled to get the money of a surplus, the veteran, the 1 percent that protects all of the rest of us, we cannot even take care of their needs. It is wrong. If you want to solve this problem, do it right. There should be at least \$100 million left over so that the people that fight for us get what they need to survive.

The SPEAKER. Representative John Maher.

Mr. MAHER. In April this chamber passed a budget, a spending plan, a revenue plan; in April. Now, those of us who are in this chamber are not in the other chamber. We are not in the Governor's Office. So where we are is, in fact, that we have a spending plan without a full set of revenues. Let us put that in perspective. Overall spending in Pennsylvania totals about \$80 billion each year. About \$30 billion of that comes from our General Fund, and the balance, \$50 billion, comes from these other funds. The difference between our expected revenues and our expected spending amounts to about 2 percent. Now, in the real world if you had a gap of 2 percent, you would just sit down and sort it out. A gap of 2 percent could only possibly be a crisis from the mouth of a politician, an "Oh my God, the sky is falling." Oh, come on. Two percent we need to solve. We can solve that with good intentions.

Now, I have got good news, good news for those who might have been frightened by the misunderstandings that have been echoing through this chamber. Every dollar appropriated for the year ahead will be delivered. Every dollar that would be sent out from Pennsylvania through operational law will be sent out; every dollar. There is no shortchanging of any program or activity. Not one dollar.

Now, you might ask, how can this be? And I would ask you, have you ever had a mortgage? Do you know anybody who ever had a mortgage? Well, let me explain to you how that deal works. You have got a contract and you need to pay the bank an amount. That amount is what you are due to pay back your debt, but there is probably also an escrow part. That may be your

property taxes, it may be insurance, it may be other things. And at the end of the year, there is a difference between what was actually paid in under your commitment and what was paid out under your commitment, and that difference, if it is in your favor, is your money. Over the years, if that difference were to accumulate, we have laws that say, "Hey, Mr. Banker, that money belongs to the person who mailed it in, because he had a deal to pay that money in, and you had a deal to pay that money out, and whatever is left over is still his," and so it is with all these other special funds. We have made commitments by operation of law that they have money to come in, and we have made commitments about how that money gets sent out, and over the years we have a balance. That balance is idle cash. And just like that mortgage payer, that idle cash should come back to its proper owner, and in this case, that proper owner is the taxpayers of Pennsylvania.

Now, have any of you ever played the Powerball? I do from time to time, and you know, if you win the Powerball, you get a choice. You get to take all the money in a lump sum or you get the money over the course of years. Now, it is the same prize either way. It is the same thing. And it is up to the person to decide, do they want it over a number of years, which always sounds like more money, or do they want it today, which sounds like less money. But it is the same money. It is the same prize. Now, if a person elects to take that lump sum, like somebody just did, for about \$400 million, nobody went up to them and said, "Oh my God, you are now \$700 million in debt." They are not in debt. They are the happiest person in America for that moment in time, but they are certainly not in debt. And so it is with this tobacco settlement. We have a stream of payments and we have a duty to use the monetary assets that Pennsylvania owns, before we ask the taxpayers to reach into their pockets.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I hope I have cleared up the confusion on these financial matters for my colleagues, because it is really not that complicated. This is simple and I ask for your support.

The SPEAKER. Representative Schlossberg.

Mr. SCHLOSSBERG. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, like many of the members in this chamber, I check Facebook on a daily basis, and like many of you, I get a real kick out of the "On this day" feature. For those of you who are not on Facebook, it is a relatively new feature that lets you see what you talked about on a specific day and time. Now, my "On this day" feature on June 30 every year is very, very depressing. It is usually something to the effect of "Hi from Harrisburg. Here we are trying to get our budget right and trying to solve this pretty persistent budget deficit."

Now, there are a variety of reasons why we are in this limbo-like state with our budget. Chief among them, I would argue, is an inability to realistically budget our revenues and our expenses. Every year we face a choice: Do we raise revenue or do we make major cuts to popular programs that educate students, protect our seniors, and create jobs? Now, sometimes, more often than not, we take a third option. We use some sort of budgetary gimmick. We increase sin taxes, we make one-time transfers, or we create fake numbers that do not actually line up with reality. We demand fiscal responsibility from ourselves on a personal level and from our citizens, with hard consequences as a penalty for violation. But I make the argument that we do not hold this body to the same standards. Without revenue increases or spending cuts, we will continue to be stuck in that budgetary limbo, checking our Facebook statuses, and coming

to the conclusion that every June 30 our revenue does not line up with our expenses.

A brief analysis of the proposal in front of us shows that there is roughly \$800 million in one-time revenue transfers. Just to be clear, this is money that will not be available next year, and it comes from a proposal that will almost certainly result in a credit downgrade, potentially costing taxpayers \$100 million in the upcoming budget cycle. This budget is creative, but creativity does not get you where you need to be. That \$800 million will not be back next year. That means we will start the 2018-2019 budget year \$800 million behind the eight ball, just to get us back to square one, to say nothing to increasing funding to programs that all of us could support, things like Pre-K, community college, basic education, job creation, opioid reduction, and more. If this budget passes and becomes the law of the land, we are creating a major structural deficit next year, once again.

All of us in this room, as elected officials, at some point or other, have probably been guilty of keeping our vision more narrow than it should be and focused only on what is in front of us. That being said, I have to ask the question: in 2018 what rabbits will we pull out of our hat? What transfers will we make? I have a sincere, sincere question for my colleagues: if this budget passes, what are we going to do next year? I urge a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. Representative Cris Dush.

Mr. DUSH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Integrity first, service before self, and excellence in all we do. Those are the three core values of the United States Air Force. Ladies and gentlemen, for the last 8 weeks I have had the opportunity and the pleasure and the honor to serve with a group of about 17 people who reflect those values on a daily basis. They have been criticized. The work product that we have produced has been criticized and lied about, twisted, but we have held fast.

One of the previous speakers suggested that we were going after military funds. Well, let me tell you something about those military funds. Those military funds have been sitting there and supposed to have been going out to veterans' homes, not just with this administration, but prior administrations. That money has not gone out. It has been put into savings accounts instead. Now, for me, a retired Air Force veteran who has got a son in the Air Force going into harm's way on a daily basis, I have a problem with that assessment that was made. My son just made national news down there in Houston, because he had to go out and buy a baby harness that ended up helping save two infants, along with the rest of a nine-person family, out of an apartment building.

I know what it is to make sure that our 911 operators, our emergency responders, have their money, and the kind of slanderous things that have been poked at us over this thing are just that, slander, and anybody that wants to take us on, they better have their facts, because I know we have ours. In fact, all of these people who have been up here and criticizing and saying that this money does not exist, where were you when we were sitting down there over the last 8 weeks, because I have not seen a single one of you. You have not been there to pick up the information. You have not been there searching. We have. And I have got a serious problem with criticizing, when you do not have the guts to come in and try to solve it on your own, or at least team up and do it.

I stumbled onto this group because I happened to be in here on a Wednesday, the Wednesday following the big blowup, and I will tell you what, I am so glad I came in and had the opportunity to be a part of this, because what we uncovered is misfeasance, malfeasance, and I am sure we are going to end up finding fraud. Let me tell you something. Just in Fund No. 1, the General Fund, forget about the 218 special funds, Children and Youth, money that had not been driven out for our Children and Youth in the counties, \$64 million is still sitting there from 2012, 2013, and 2014. Oh, wait a minute. No. There is more. On the SAP system, the Treasurer's system, it shows how the money from the 2012 and 2014 line items were correctly transferred from one year to the next on to the '16-'17. But you know, when you look at the 2013 line item, there is \$6,300,000 missing. The Governor's Office has not been responsive to any of our inquiries. Money is missing. It is unaccounted for. It is unreported.

Commitments. We cannot get a response for a commitment. It is high time we started subpoenaing them. The reason we are not getting them, I am very certain, is because they do not exist. The ones that do exist, we have been able to track down most of them – well, let us put it this way: we are comfortable with the ones that we have tracked down.

We are at the last minute. I did not vote for this budget, but I came in with people who voted for it and voted against it, because we realize we have a problem. If you did not show up, you have no business criticizing our work product. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Rosita Youngblood.

Ms. YOUNGBLOOD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This budget bill, the latest scheme by the House Republican Caucus, should be called the special interest budget bill. It cuts funding for programs that people all across the Commonwealth utilize, while continuing to give tax breaks, big tax breaks, to the special interests. It cuts funding for job creation programs, to keep big oil and gas companies from paying their fair share. It cuts small business programs, just to continue the special treatment of big corporations. It cuts funding for transportation services in Philadelphia and all across the Commonwealth, in order to avoid having out-of-State mega corporations pay their fair share.

This budget does not put people first. It puts special interests first. This budget does not put people first. It puts special interest groups first. It seems House Republicans will do anything to avoid having big oil and gas companies pay their fair share. They are willing to sell off State assets, selling taxpayers down the river, just to avoid having big oil and gas companies pay their fair share. They hijacked a severance tax bill to once again avoid having big oil and gas companies pay their fair share. The raiding of funds that provide programs that working families use to pay for corporate welfare is disingenuous, it is dishonest, it is downright unthinkable, but it is exactly what this bill does.

Let us be honest with the people of the Commonwealth. This bill is the special interest budget bill for big corporations.

The SPEAKER. Representative Paul Schemel.

Mr. SCHEMEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Despite the fact that this is a complicated issue, the choice is actually fairly simple. We can either tax our constituents or we can use the money that we already have. We can either borrow, pay back over 32 years with interest, or we can use the money

that we already have. Honestly, my constituents do not really know what this choice is even about.

Nonrecurring debt is two-thirds of the problem, two-thirds of the gap that we have to fill. We are using nonrecurring funds to fill a nonrecurring debt. It is imminently reasonable. There has been a lot of hand wringing about these special fund accounts. Despite the agencies' and lobbyists' warnings of fiscal collapse, they have been unable to produce evidence to support their alarmist statements. They have been unable to explain why the figures which they provide to our Treasurer appear not to be accurate.

Mr. Speaker, this is inside baseball. My constituents deal with real issues, dollars and cents – dollars and cents that they use to pay their mortgage, pay their electric bill, to pay off their car payments. They do not have time for bureaucrats and their turf. They do not have time for lobbyists and their clients. They need that time to pay their mortgage, their car payment, and their bills. Mr. Speaker, this is inside baseball, and my clients have neither the time nor the money to pay for a costly ticket to an inside baseball game.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (MATTHEW E. BAKER) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Sturla, on concurrence.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this proposal. However, I do want to commend the Republican Caucus that has been supportive of this on one particular issue. On page 7 of the amendment that was added to the bill, lines 17 through 22, they say, "The Commonwealth experienced a revenue deficit of..." over a billion dollars "...in General Fund revenue collections for fiscal year 2016-2017." And two, "The Commonwealth's General Fund continues" – and I repeat – "continues to experience a structural deficit where annual expenditures exceed recurring revenue collections."

Now, heretofore, only the Senate Republicans, the Senate Democrats, the Governor, and the House Democrats have acknowledged that there actually is such a thing as a structural deficit. At least in this document we finally have House Republicans acknowledging that there is a structural deficit and that it has been ongoing. I commend you for that. However, what you are proposing continues that structural deficit. In addition to the devastating cuts that have been outlined by many members, this proposal has insufficient funds to balance out next year.

Several members on the other side have pointed out that, you know, families use their savings, but they do not use their savings that are already committed. When they get their paychecks and deposit it, they do not go, "Look, I've got a big fund balance. I'm going to go on vacation." They say, "Oh, but there's a big fund balance today, but tomorrow I've got to pay the mortgage, and then I've got to pay a car payment next week, and then we've got to buy food, and then we've got to do other things," and so they do not spend that entire fund balance. What we have heard here is that there are \$630 million being taken

from special funds that are already committed to programs and projects throughout the State, and we are going to take it and spend it on something else.

Additionally, the transfer that is used from the Tobacco Settlement Fund means that \$350 million coming into that fund for the next 10 years will not exist. So we have not balanced anything. What we have done is said, "Let us take \$650 million that would go out from the special funds next year, let's take \$350 million that would go out from the Tobacco Settlement Fund and let's spend it on the General Fund." Well, that is a billion dollars that is not going out so that we can put another billion dollars out. It does not solve any problem. It is still a billion dollars shy. And next year that \$350 million for the Tobacco Settlement Fund is not going to be there, and the \$100 million extra that you are paying, because you got your credit downgraded, is going to be another \$100 million that is not there. So you have dug yourself a half-billion-dollar additional structural deficit every year.

Mr. Speaker, this is like taking a payday loan, and we have had discussions about this in the House. If you cannot pay your bills, it is not a good idea to go take a payday loan, because you will not be able to pay them, plus the heavy interest that you are paying on a payday loan. That is what we are doing here. It is a payday loan.

The best description that you can give to this proposal would be to paraphrase that great American philosopher, Whimpy, who said, "I'd gladly pay you Tuesday for a billion hamburgers today." That is what this is, only the cartoon is not that funny anymore. There is an impending credit downgrade, and this proposal is not going to be accepted by either the Senate and/or the Governor. We will default on payments on Friday, and again, on Monday, and as somebody said, once they come back and repossess your house and repossess your car, it does not matter if a week later you say, "I have the payment." They do not give you your car back. They do not give you your house back.

Mr. Speaker, this is folly. I encourage a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Mr. DiGirolamo, on concurrence.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There was a commercial a few years ago. It was for a fast food restaurant and the line was "Where's the beef?" Everybody remember that commercial? "Where's the beef?" Well, as I look at this bill that we have before us tonight, my question would be, where is the recurring revenue? Where is the recurring revenue in this bill, and in particular, for many of us it is really important, where is the tax on Marcellus Shale?

But let us talk a little bit about what is in the bill. There is a billion dollars of – I do not know what you want to call it, there are a lot of different names – borrowing is one of the words we use. Now, I am not crazy about doing that, but I would be willing to vote for something like that if it was part of a package that had recurring revenue in it. When I look at the fund transfers that are in this bill, money for mass transit, money for transportation, and that is just not infrastructure projects, Mr. Speaker, that is Pennsylvania jobs. Many of our environmental programs are being attacked in this bill, and that is something that is not only important to me but important to many of us on both sides of the aisle.

I would also like to concentrate on one of the lines that is being transferred, the Substance Abuse and Education Demand Reduction Fund, and remind the members who care about addiction and this epidemic that we have with the opiates and the heroin what that funds does. It funds counties, all of our counties' prevention and treatment programs. It funds the Commonwealth Prevention Alliance, which is active in almost all of our counties. There is a program in there that it funds that works with families that are suffering with loved ones who have addiction. It funds an employee assistance program for people in the workforce with addictions, and it also funds a victim's witness panel for people who have lost loved ones from DUI (driving under the influence); a very, very important fund that is located in PCCD, the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency.

I would also like to point out to another State, Illinois, and we all realize what happened in Illinois. They put off for years making tough decisions on their budget till this year they had to do something and they were forced to raise taxes dramatically to cover almost a \$10 billion structural deficit. Mr. Speaker, for too long we have been putting our budget together here in Pennsylvania with rubber bands and glue and paper clips, as I like to call it. It is time that we get serious and it is time that we put some recurring revenue into this budget, and I am going to close with one question that I want you to all ask yourself: if this budget that is in front of us becomes law, what do we do next year? What do we do next year, Mr. Speaker, when we are back here in a more difficult position? What are we going to do next year? Where is the recurring revenue?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlelady, Representative Mary Jo Daley.

Ms. DALEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to dive deep into an area affected by this revenue plan. I think it is really important that we put a human face on people affected by our decisions. So over the past couple of months I have had multiple conversations with the tobacco dependence program manager for Suburban Community Hospital in Montgomery County. She was incredibly concerned over the Senate plan to securitize the Tobacco Settlement Fund. I received an e-mail from her today where she said, "It's so hard to believe that things could get worse with this budget! And not just for tobacco but everyone." Over the few months she shared her concerns that funds would not be available for tobacco cessation. She was concerned for her own job but also for the people she helped to quit smoking. I could really identify with her passion for her work, because I have lived with the effect of smoking, not only in my district, as I listen to the nonsmoking residents of the public housing facility down the street from my office and their concerns for secondhand smoke, but for friends and colleagues struggling to quit smoking, because their grandchildren asked them to, and most personally, because I watched my late husband, a smoker since elementary school, struggle to quit after his diagnosis with cancer of the larynx. He was able to finally stop smoking, but he did lose that battle with cancer. So I understand the concerns of the American Lung Association, the American Heart Association, the tobacco dependency program manager, as they anticipate the loss of tobacco settlement funds. Because the programs likely to have their funding cut, severely cut, if not entirely eliminated, are the grant programs that rely exclusively on tobacco payments as

their revenue source: the Cure Research Program, hospital uncompensated care payments, and smoking cessation programs. There could also be deep cuts in the funding for the following Medicaid programs supported with tobacco revenue, like nursing home care, community-based services, and health-care coverage for disabled workers.

So I plan to vote "no" on this so-called revenue package, because to me, it says the priorities of this legislature really do not serve the people of Pennsylvania. I happen to believe that this package shortchanges the people of Pennsylvania by finding ways to cut the services that Pennsylvanians want and deserve. It is really tough to quit smoking, and by diverting tobacco settlement funds to balance our budget, it is not a service to our taxpayers. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Rothman, on concurrence.

Mr. ROTHMAN. I was speaking earlier, Mr. Speaker, with one of my colleagues and we were talking about Yogi Berra. There are a lot of Yogi Berra stories, but he had one where he went and ordered a pizza and the guy at the pizzeria said, "Would you like me to cut this into eight slices or six slices?" and Yogi said, "Cut it into six. I'm not that hungry."

I just want to point out why we are here today right now; why we have this structural deficit, this hole, this shortfall, of \$1.5 billion. Revenues that were estimated were not coming in, and in November the Governor knew it, and in April the Governor knew it, and other Governors in the past stopped and suspended spending, but this Governor continued to spend and spent \$400 million more than we had budgeted. So the \$1.5 billion is because we spent more money than came in. So what does a family do, what does a business do, when faced with the same situation? It is simple. It is common sense. You stop spending, you cut spending, or, if you have savings or assets, you go and take those savings or you take those assets and sell them. That is what this plan does.

I commend, I commend my colleagues for the work they did this summer in finding, in finding these surpluses, these lapsed, these dormant accounts. This is what a family would do, this is what a business would do, and this is what the General Assembly should do, to fill this hole and fix this deficit so we get on with doing the people's business.

Remember it was not that long ago the Governor proposed selling the Farm Show Complex and doing a sale leaseback, selling assets. The proposal from the Senate is to raise taxes on every Pennsylvania family and every Pennsylvania business. So think about that. We are either going to take money out of the people's money that we are holding in these special accounts or we are going to take it out of their savings accounts and their pockets and businesses and families will see their money taken. This makes sense. It is not perfect, but it is exactly what any family, what any business, and what any adult would do. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlelady, Ms. Madden, on concurrence.

Ms. MADDEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I read HB 453 and the various negative news articles discussing the bill, the saying "Robbing Peter to pay Paul" kept coming to mind. With my "no" vote on HB 453, I will be honoring the wishes of my constituents in the 115th District who took the time to write and pled with me not to support the

cuts to special funds, programs including transportation, environmental, agriculture, and recycling, just to name a few.

I can also not support the reckless proposal to sell off the Tobacco Fund. Take a moment and think about the absurdity of refusing to raise new revenue, despite a credit watch and the looming threat of another credit downgrade, which will result in millions of dollars in increased interest payments, while liquidating one of the programs that delivers payments in perpetuity. This is a bad bill that I cannot support, and I hope my colleagues will not support it as well.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes Representative Keefer on concurrence.

Mrs. KEEFER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

About 8 weeks ago a group of us got together to figure out what we could do to resolve this budget issue situation we were in with the revenue spending plan, and after scouring through 218 special fund accounts, we were really surprised to find that many of these accounts had a savings account. So in addition to having end-of-year surplus fund balances year after year, they had savings accounts. This means that their end-of-year balance had increased to a point where the Treasurer had to take those funds and place them into a 998 reserve account. These are for programs – like people were talking about the recycling program; it is sitting on almost \$100 million, while our counties are discontinuing many different programs due to lack of funding.

So if we want to be upset about something, we should be upset that these funds are not getting back out to the districts, the communities, the programs that they were intended to go to. That is where the anger should be, that is where the frustration should be in this. So as we look back and we see these funds sitting there, equate it to, you know what? I have a savings account, and we are going to go on vacation with this, but my roof comes off. Guess what? We are going to tap these savings accounts. Why would we not do it? It would be ridiculous to borrow money to pay for prior year's debt. It makes no sense financially. Nobody does that in their own home finances.

This is a reasonable plan that we offer the taxpayers. It satisfies last year's debt and this year's spending without taxing, borrowing, or bonding one more time. And listen, we are all committed. This is not the end here, as far as these special funds. There is a reason that these special funds are operating. They are going on autopilot. They are able to accumulate these surpluses instead of having lapsing funds that go back into the General Fund like any other General Fund line item.

Specifically, the Senate added \$500 million, \$500 million to our budget proposal that we sent over in April, but they added an additional \$400 million in spending to these special funds. They took it off-line. Why? Because we do not look at it every year. We do not scrutinize it and we do not have to vote it in or out every year. Many of these accounts are overfunded. It is time we brought them to light, and it is time that we roll this back. It is a spending problem. It is definitely a spending problem that we have in this Commonwealth, so I encourage everybody's support in this proposal. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes Representative Pashinski on concurrence.

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

It is always a pleasure to hear my colleagues and the views that we all have, and I certainly respect all the efforts and all the creativity surrounding how to deal with our budget deficit.

I would like to begin by using a word, and the first word is "managing" and the second word is "mirror." First word is "managing," the second word is "mirror." I have heard accusations about various Assemblies that have created a problem or various Governors that have created a problem. The bottom line is, we are all part of this budget. It is our responsibility – the Senate, the House, and the Governor.

I hate to say it, but I am having trouble with these numbers. How do we get five credit downgrades? How do we get four from 2010 to 2014? What do those credit downgrades cost us? Those credit downgrades cost us \$142 million more a year in interest. Multiply that by 7 years, that is almost \$1 billion. I do not know whether that is very good managing.

You know, there was a time that we were looking at ways to garner new dollars, to reinvest in Pennsylvania. We are looking at the Delaware loophole; the numbers that came through were anywhere from \$300 million to \$600 million, once fully funded. If we would have changed that Delaware loophole, lowered the corporate net income tax, we would have had ourselves another \$1.7 billion, but we did not do that. The other members did not do that. We could not do that. We did not have the majority, so we lost another \$1.5 billion.

We looked at the severance tax, and the severance tax, going back to 2010, we suggested around 5 percent. If we would have maintained that 5 percent, we would have had \$2.4 to \$2.8 billion ahead today. We would not find ourselves in this hole, but we did not manage that. We could not get that passed. And right now the Marcellus industry is drawing 5.1 trillion cubic feet of gas last year, and we made less money than we did in 2011-2012. Management, not so good. Those three things right there, that is over \$3 billion that we could have had, and if we would not have had a hole. We chose not to make those decisions. We chose not to make the tough ones.

But one that is killing me right now, one that is really, really bothering me is when we are getting \$350 million a year from the tobacco settlement, and over 10 years that equals \$3.5 billion – \$3.5 billion and we are willing to trade that off for a one-time payment of \$1 billion? That is not good management, Mr. Speaker. That is desperation; that is desperation. It is not good management. It is time we bring out the mirror.

When we answer these questions of why we did not do this, it is because they were tough decisions to make, but you know what? If we would have made those decisions, we would not have been in this situation that we are in today. We cannot continue to make these decisions that are going to impact everyone in the State of Pennsylvania.

We need recurring dollars. We have the avenues for the recurring dollars – the severance tax, the Delaware loophole. Those two things alone, when fully funded, when that infrastructure for Marcellus Shale is complete and the price of an Mcf (1,000 cubic feet) goes from \$1.50 to \$3.50, we are going to take the same amount of gas out. At 5.1 trillion cubic feet today, at \$1.53, it is worth \$7.8 billion. When it is \$3.50, it is worth \$15.6 billion, and we will not have this problem.

Take out the mirrors. It is about managing. It is about making the tough decisions. There are great people in this hall, great people on the other side. We have a big responsibility. Let us work together and get it done. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative/Chairman Taylor, on concurrence.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

I really do not have too much of a problem whatsoever with most of this proposal. I do not even have a problem with most of the fund transfers, but I do have one specific very important problem with the transfers in transportation.

For many of you who have not been here long, there is a set of issues in this Capitol. They are called long-term unresolvable issues. We have tax reform. We have liquor privatization. We have now budgets are part of that. But prior to recently, one of our long-term unresolvable issues was dedicated, predictable, stable funding for mass transit. And after decades – it used to be a yearly problem – but after decades, through Act 44 in about 2006, we provided for stable funding. But due to the capital projects – the bridges and the rails and the problems that needed to be corrected for which there was not enough funding – many of you supported Act 89, which provided even more stability and predictability for capital projects for mass transit. This proposal, to me, whether it is \$347 million, whether it is \$300 million, whether it is \$50 million, it is absolutely wrong to take money from that fund. We are looking to make sure that we can stabilize, repair, and have an infrastructure that transports 500,000 people, 500,000 people to work just in the southeast region alone, let alone the other 12 transit agencies.

This money – we have had these discussions. I had discussions with many of my colleagues. In my opinion, this is not extra money. This is not money sitting around doing nothing. This is money that is scheduled to be used for roads and bridges that are used by mass transit, the multimodal funds that are spread around the entire Commonwealth and that all of us have access to.

So at this point, I am going to be a "no" on this proposal.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TAYLOR. And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a parliamentary question that affects me personally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, to be on the side of caution, I am of counsel to a firm that represents clients that utilize some of these funds. I just want to make sure I do not have a conflict in casting my vote on this particular issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentleman kindly come to the desk so this could be discussed further.

Mr. TAYLOR. Sure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Bill Keller, on concurrence.

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

I always like to follow my chairman because he is so eloquent, and everybody should pay attention to him. And I am not of counsel to anybody, so I think I can say whatever I want.

I just want to point out some things. I know mass transit does mean a lot to everybody in here, but especially to the southeast members, mass transit, especially SEPTA (Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority), means a lot.

And as the chairman said, Act 89 of 2013 paved the way for a critically needed investment in our State's transportation infrastructure. Now we stand here talking about dismantling what we worked so hard over decades to achieve. HB 453 raids several transportation-related funds, but I want to highlight what it does to mass transit, specifically SEPTA. This bill would take \$50 million from the Public Transportation Trust Fund. SEPTA stands to lose \$32 million in State operating funds and \$4 million in local matching funds under this proposal.

I want to highlight that on July 1 of this year, SEPTA implemented a 7-percent fare increase to its riders, so it is not like everyone is not trying to do as much as they can. This reduction will create a budget shortfall in SEPTA's operating budget for the current fiscal year and would require another fare increase of 8 to 10 percent – two fare increases in 1 year. Riders cannot afford that, and SEPTA cannot afford to lose ridership.

We met this morning with Amazon. One of the things they are looking at in Pennsylvania – and the gentleman spoke, too, about it – was that their public transportation was so good. So if Amazon comes to Pennsylvania and they are going to hire 30,000 to 50,000 new employees, that is what they were looking at, transportation. The next thing SEPTA has to do is have a reduction in service. The reduction in service will hurt businesses that are looking for Pennsylvania, and it will hurt businesses that are in Pennsylvania.

Please vote "no" on this bill that decimates the public transit system in Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative Dowling on concurrence. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. DOWLING. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today in support of HB 453. The reason I support this bill is not because I think it is perfect, nor do I think it is exactly what I would do if I was to write the budget. I support it because it is a fiscally responsible way to complete the State budget process and provide the funds needed to balance the 2017-2018 spending plan.

I support it because it got rid of a long series of special provisions in the Senate Fiscal Code. One might call them WAMs, or walking around moneys, such as \$100,000 for GPS (global positioning system) devices for people with disabilities in Lehigh County, \$500,000 for an antiviolence task force in Delaware County, \$500,000 for the expansion of an adult autism program in Lehigh County, \$100,000 for an early education center in Lehigh County, and \$500,000 for merit scholarships at Mansfield University. These are or may be worthwhile projects but should be funded at the local level, not by taxpayers across the Commonwealth.

And I support it because it is the best option available to us to meet our constitutional duties of passing a balanced budget without further burdening the taxpayers of this Commonwealth.

We have heard some members raising concern about how transferring money from special funds will have a negative impact on the programs that those funds support, but a thorough look at these funds has found millions, even billions of taxpayer dollars sitting dormant in savings accounts. These funds are in excess of what programs need to operate or meet their obligations.

Even if there are some short-term impacts for some of these funds, I would argue that the impacts of higher taxes on our constituents are a far greater concern. Under the Senate plan, a family of four would be saddled with at least \$180 more in taxes every year, not to mention the cost of repaying the \$1.3 billion the Senate plan proposes to borrow.

If we fail to pass this bill tonight, I see tax hikes in the future for the people of Pennsylvania. I did not come here to force the people I represent to pay more of their hard-earned money to support government.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would urge a vote in the affirmative.

THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative.

RESPONSE TO INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. Representative Taylor had a parliamentary inquiry. Based upon the facts stated on the record, plus the fact that the individual receives no pecuniary benefit from the representation of clients, the Chair sees no conflict and you are certainly permitted to vote on this legislation.

Representative Mike Carroll.

Mr. CARROLL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there have been quite a number of speakers today that have highlighted some of the transfers that are problematic. Just to name a few: the Environmental Stewardship Fund, the Recycling Fund, Keystone Recreation Fund, and others. But it also seems obvious that folks in the chamber do not want to hear it from House Democrats. Folks in the chamber seem to have made up their mind that those funds can sustain those transfers.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to remember and recall what two speakers immediately before me highlighted, and that is the impact in the world of mass transit with respect to the transfer of \$50 million. In that case, Mr. Speaker, you do not have to take the word of the gentleman from Philadelphia or the other gentleman from Philadelphia or even me. All you have to do is take the word of SEPTA, because it is SEPTA who was saying that a fare increase of 8 to 10 percent will occur, and it is SEPTA who is saying that service routes will be reduced.

My suspicion, Mr. Speaker, is if we ask the Port Authority, we would get the same answer. If we ask COLTS (County of Lackawanna Transit System) or the other smaller third-class city transit authorities, we would get the same answer from them as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, at least in the world of the mass transit funding cut, we have the experts who are responsible for providing those services who are making those declarations, not me. So, Mr. Speaker, if you want to accept as a fact – and I do not – that all these transfers can occur without any harm whatsoever, at least consider what is being told to us by SEPTA, by the Port Authority, and by the other transit agencies, that this action will reduce service and provide for immediate fare increases – and that is them saying it, not me.

Mr. Speaker, this is an ill-advised proposal. It needs to be rejected. It is way too late in the calendar to be fooling around with a one-party agreement. It is time to reject this proposal, Mr. Speaker, and find a solution that is acceptable to the two chambers and the administration. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dan Moul.

Mr. MOUL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This has certainly been a long time coming. I do want to, one more time, thank all of those who spent their summer in here with me trying to find a solution to this budget debacle that we are in. Certainly, no one planned this to happen, but it happened, and we were very dedicated to try and find a solution to our problem.

Right now we have some choices to make. I do not believe that there is any appetite on either side of this aisle here tonight to vote for tax increases on people's electric bills, on their gas bills, on their cell phones. I do not think that there is any appetite to do long-term borrowing against future revenues on the tobacco settlement. The one thing I do know is that our constituents voted us into office to come here and get in the game. They did not vote us into office to sit on the sidelines and watch the game. Now, if somebody says, we want to do nothing, that I call watching the game. You can do that from home. If you want to vote for tax increases, stand up to the microphone and say, "I want to vote for tax increases," but I do not think there are too many people that are going to take a microphone tonight and say, "I want to raise your taxes."

This is the plan that is up for a vote tonight, so if you do not want to do anything and you do not want to vote for tax increases and you do not want to vote for this, what are you for? The one thing I have not heard with all the speakers tonight, other than I have heard plenty of times do not do this, but I have not heard one time, "We should do something else," and name it. Tell us what it is that you have on your mind that we should be doing to get us out of this jam. It is easy to criticize something you do not like. It is awfully difficult to come up with your own plan.

A group of dedicated members came here almost every day since we recessed to figure this out. I do not want to sound smug, but if there is a better plan out there than what we have to get us moving forward with this budget, somebody please lay it on my desk so I can take a look at it. But if you cannot do that, be for something, stand for something. Do not just say no and sit on the sidelines. I am going to take my toys out of the sandbox and go home. Do not be that person; lead. We are all supposed to be leaders of our community. Stand for something.

We put together a plan that utilizes one-time transfers, and I will stand here and tell you, after analyzing the numbers all summer long, I can tell you that the transfers that we are making will not disrupt the flow of any of these funds. So when you get those e-mails saying, well, we are not going to be able to fund this and we are not going to be able to do that project in your district, do not believe it. The letters you got from the Secretaries, they are good soldiers to their boss, the Governor. When the administration says, "We need you to write a letter," of course they are going to write a letter; that is their boss. But what they have not done since we put all of this forward is show us the proof.

I made the statement early on that we have done all of the background data checking that we could possibly do. We came up with our answers and we moved forward. If there is something out there, let us know, but the day after we present this, if we missed something, somebody would come forth and say, "Hey, you missed this. We have these projects that are spoken for." To this moment nobody has given us a copy of their contracts and said, "Here they are." Sure, there is plenty of propaganda that says we are going to cut this funding and we are going to have to do that – show us why. Please, bring us that information, show us why. Maybe they will show it to the Senate when this lands over there, and I would certainly appreciate sending this to the Senate with your affirmative vote on HB 453 concurrence.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. I have Representative Diamond and Representative Ryan, and then I have, on the Democratic leadership side, I know Chairman Markosek wishes to speak and Representative Hanna wishes to speak. Then on the Republican side of the leadership, it is Chairman Saylor and Representative Cutler.

Chairman, do you mind if I call on – and that way I will just do the leaders together, if that is okay with you?

Representative Russ Diamond.

Mr. DIAMOND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk tonight, and I kind of want to talk in the plain language of the folks who sent me here to Harrisburg to do their bidding. I want to talk about the transfers from the special funds. When these special fund savings accounts were first revealed to me, this is how I felt: I felt like maybe my spouse was pressuring me to go out and get a second job because we had all these bills that we had to pay at home. So I go out and I bust my butt and I get that second job, but then I find out my spouse is burying cash in the backyard in Mason jars. That is what I felt like when I found out.

Now, let us give another example about the transfers from these special funds in the plain language of the folks who sent me here to Harrisburg to do their bidding. Imagine you and your spouse, Mr. Speaker, have set up a college fund for little Johnny, assuming that college would be costing \$15,000 per year. Little Johnny goes off to college. In the middle of his senior year you find out, oh, it was not \$15,000 a year, it was \$12,000 a year. At the same time you find out that the house roof has some leaks in it. Now, you have a couple choices here. Do you do the responsible thing that a responsible head of a household would do and fix your roof so that the rest of your house does not get ruined by water, or do you listen to little Johnny who may want to attend a needless fifth year of college when he has already gotten his degree, maybe be pressured by the university president who loves the \$12,000 you are paying for a needless year of college? What would you do? The folks back home in my district would do the responsible thing and fix their roof. This is a one-time transfer to fix a one-time problem: the deficit from last year and the shortage this year.

It is amazing to me, kind of ironic to me, that I hear folks on the other side of the aisle talking about recurring revenue to fix a structural deficit. Well, if you look at the last 3 years of these funds that we are taking transfers from in HB 453, you will see that they are in fact recurring revenue to support the projects

that those funds were set up to do. The folks who have said – and I know you have all gotten the same e-mails I have, the same type of e-mails. They act like this is not going to be funded this year. They will get recurring revenue.

Finally, on the issue of a structural deficit, Mr. Speaker, there is a way to cure a structural deficit and that is to change the structure. I do not know about you, Mr. Speaker, but the folks back home who sent me here to do their bidding, they have said, enough is enough. Government needs to spend less. It needs to get smaller, not bigger. We need to change our ways in Harrisburg. These fund transfers are the first step in doing that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on concurrence for HB 453. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Frank Ryan.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, thank you so much.

HB 453 is my bill. When I became a freshman, about a month into my term of office, I crafted this 4-page bill, and it was passed by 192 to 0. I was pretty pumped up. It went over to the Senate and it came back a 77-page bill. That would be the equivalent of calling Cabela's and ordering a canoe and having them deliver an aircraft carrier. But as you look back at what happens, we have to look at our financial responsibility. Our financial responsibility covers a broad gamut, but it includes those citizens in this Commonwealth, 60 percent of whom are living from paycheck to paycheck. A tax increase, a gross receipts tax, is the most regressive tax of all. It falls on those who have the least ability to pay.

I have heard people talk about credit downgrades. I have lived in that world, but I was elected by the citizens of my district to represent them and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, not Standard & Poor's, not Moody's, and not any other credit agency. Please remember, those are the same credit agencies that gave a complete pass to virtually every bank and virtually Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and every other individual organization involved in the housing bubble that burst that created one of the greatest economic debacles in the history of this nation.

I was not elected by these rating agencies, but I have a financial responsibility to make sure that we do the right thing, and this bill with the amendments for concurrence is the right thing to do, and I urge a "yes" vote.

We must enact this bill to get back to the basics of budgeting and finance. We have to establish financial discipline. Just keep in mind, as you look about the \$630 million that we are talking about transferring from these special funds, that they are surplus. I personally looked at them, and to show you how much of it is a surplus, the Treasurer has already used \$750 million of that and will in fact, as a result of this budget passing, return \$120 million to those funds.

Right before I came up to speak, I got an e-mail from a special interest group, and it said, Frank, we have looked at the records and we still have \$5.5 million outstanding for obligations going back to 2013, and they thought that would convince me, and instead, it stiffened my resolve that these are surplus funds. How dare we take money from citizens of this Commonwealth who need it to make their ends meet after seeing double-digit increases in health insurance. How dare we take it from them 4 years before we need it, and even with that, we have accounted for those funds.

Additionally, I want to just make this comment. My bill, HB 453, when and if it is enacted, will save \$400 million because it requires agencies that get audited by the Auditor General to respond to those audits and it gives the Appropriations of the House and the Senate the ability to determine if those funding levels continue.

Let us get on with the business of the Commonwealth. Let us get on with the business of a financial rescue plan. Let us tighten our belts the way we have asked every citizen to do in the Commonwealth. Let us remember when we say to them, it is only \$5 more per week, then why do we not just say to us out of \$32 billion budget, perhaps we can recognize our responsibility to not waste \$650 of hard-earned money.

Please vote for this bill. Let us get on board and help us fix the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Ryan Warner.

Mr. WARNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of HB 453, and though I voted against last year's budget and this year's budget simply because I believe they spent too much money and because I think it was a little out of line to vote for spending packages before we had a revenue package, I still feel responsible to be part of the solution, and though it is not perfect, I believe that this proposal is the best path moving forward.

This plan takes idle government funds that exist in an off-line shadow budget to fill the gap to fund this year's budget. I believe that this is a far better proposal than raising taxes on the hardworking taxpayers of Pennsylvania, because that is the only other solution. That is the only other option if this plan does not pass.

In my opinion, cutting spending would have been the best solution to balance the budget, but that time is gone.

However, the plan before us now makes the most out of tax dollars we have available to balance a budget without asking the taxpayers of today and future generations for more of their hard-earned money. I know it has been stated multiple times today that we are using committed funding; that is simply incorrect. These are idle funds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as we speak of committed funds of bureaucrats of Harrisburg, we left out the thoughts of one very important committed fund, and that is the committed funds of the taxpayers of Pennsylvania, because these folks do not have committed funds to pay a higher gas bill, to pay a higher electric bill, and to pay a higher phone bill, and, Mr. Speaker, that is why I am supporting HB 453. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. If any other members wish to speak before I turn to the leaders of the caucuses – are there any other members that wish to speak before I turn to the leaders of the caucuses?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Representative Evankovich is on the House floor. Do you wish to speak, sir? No. Okay.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 453 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. So this will be the order: it will be Chairman Markosek, Chairman Saylor, Representative Hanna, and Representative Cutler. All four leaders do not have a clock.

You may begin, Chairman Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Good evening, Mr. Speaker. It has been a privilege to be a State Representative in this chamber for as long as I have had the privilege to do that, a long time, but I have never witnessed an attempt by either political party to plunder, to plunder the very Pennsylvanians who rely on us to work for them and uphold our State's motto of "Virtue, Liberty and Independence." Never before until now. This bill changes everything.

While it is good that rank-and-file members of the House are working together, what they have forced on us is the stuff of fantasy and bad, very bad accounting. What does your checkbook balance tell you each month? It tells you that you have the exact amount of money to spend today or that you have a balance that must cover the bills not yet paid. We all feel pretty wealthy the day after payday. Most of us have direct deposit. After payday it is deposited in our account, and if we go online and check our balance of our account the next day, it looks pretty good. But what we are forgetting sometimes is that, hey, we have a mortgage payment, we have a car payment, and by the time the end of the month rolls around, that balance does not look so good. And I have heard over and over here tonight about all of this money that we have squirreled away that is not being spent, and gee, we do not have to do what we really should do and bite the bullet and raise new revenue because we have got billions just laying around. You know, it is interesting. I would like to think that my staff is pretty good, but they never told me that.

I am surprised to learn that we have several billion dollars just sitting around, that there is nothing better to do with it than what this proposal says.

With this bad idea, Mr. Speaker, the House Republicans have decided to forget all those bills coming due, forget the legal promises made to nonprofits, community organizations, commuters, clean water advocates, and addicted gamblers, and empty countless checking accounts with already committed dollars.

This is a phony budget proposal, and it is a dangerous budget proposal. It is stunning that we are even debating the merits of this sophomoric idea.

Republican presenters of this anti-Pennsylvania budget have promised that it would not cost one job, compromise one service, or require any tax increases. Really? Really? That is fake news. It would do all of those things. It would cost us many jobs, much service, and local and State taxes would all have to increase to pay for those services, that education, and all of those bond costs that will come due. And I might remind you that our bond ratings as of next week – as soon as this is passed, because it is not going to fool Wall Street – those bond ratings are going to go down, and that is a major tax increase on all Pennsylvanians.

HB 453 will take \$50 million, as mentioned before, from mass transit. It would trigger massive cuts in rail and mass transit services, and demand steep fare increases. I might remind folks here that all 67 counties have mass transit. If you have a shared-ride program in your area, that is mass transit.

HB 453 would raid the Environmental Stewardship Fund of nearly \$70 million and would seriously hurt our Growing Greener Program and our ability to pay back the money borrowed to make them work.

This is outrageous. This is not one job lost, this is not one tax increase; no, not one, but many, many tax increases for local governments and school districts, many job losses in transit and in our nonprofits.

House Republicans are looking to raid funds that have committed reserves that are not tax dollars, and they are seeking to take funds that are legally required to be spent in ways that have nothing to do with the General Fund. Unicorns and rainbows are what this exercise is all about, except the unicorns are telling lies, and at the end of each rainbow with this project, instead of a pot of gold is a pot of acid rain and contaminated water.

In summary, this proposal robs Peter to pay Paul – Peter being the 2018-2019 budget; Paul being this year's budget. The Republican raid would take money already committed to pay bills for completed projects and promised services. This proposal robs many specific funds and uses the money for other items, which represents a cut to many programs our constituents need and depend on. This proposal could still hurt our bond rating, as I mentioned. Wall Street will not be fooled by this phony proposal, if adopted, and they will make Pennsylvanians pay more.

None of this proposal corrects our chronic structural deficit, just ersatz, phony, and make-believe funding for only 1 year. Our budget problems will compound next year. So cancel that next trip to Disney World unless you are planning to propose this fairy tale as a movie script for the evil stepmother of Cinderella, because even Goofy would not believe this.

Vote "no" on this bad idea and let us get back to the serious work of funding the 2017-2018 budget, which most of us, the spending plan, have already approved. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. I would just caution that references to Disney are getting a little far astray, but other than that, Representative Saylor, the floor is yours.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, the budget we have been debating here puts people first. Is it not something that we are all elected to do is to put the people that we represent first in our agenda here, not the special interests who are looking at how they can spend these dollars? Should it not be important that taxpayers do not have to find a tough time to pay an electric bill or a heating bill this winter because we raised the taxes and made them more unaffordable? This is not about helping to fund somebody's little pet project.

House Republican members passed a responsible budget back in April which reduced spending, cut through the bureaucracy, and eliminated a lot of the duplicative bureaucracy and agencies. It also included additional revenues respectful of taxpayers and of supporting local and small businesses, refusing to take up the House no-tax revenue package – the Senate passed and Governor Wolf supported – about \$600 million in additional taxes on energy and telephone consumers, as well as borrowing \$1.3 billion to cover the Governor's deficit.

We asked, back during the Appropriations hearing in February and March, the administration to deliver to the House Appropriations Committee dates for the commitment of many of these funds. We have yet to receive those all these months later, yet to receive an honest accounting of the funds that belong to the taxpayers of Pennsylvania. Since when do you get to just ignore the Appropriations Committee and the members of the House in giving us the projects that truly you are claiming are not going to be funded? And even over the last few days as the letters went out from the Secretaries about all of these funds that we are taking, they could not identify all the projects that are committed from these funds. Sound dishonest to you? Does it sound like it is a phony proposition that they are making just to scare people?

Working as a team, the Appropriations Committee and the members of the House Republican Caucus have worked through several different proposals, from the Senate proposal and the Governor Wolf proposal to the current fund transfer that we have before us, and thanks to these efforts, we put together a fiscally responsible package, which puts the people of Pennsylvania first and saves taxpayers dollars in the long run and keeps government operating and our schools open.

Working men and women of this State deserve better than just another tax increase from their elected Representatives. This plan serves as an alternative to taxing, bonding, or borrowing to pay off the unpaid debts from this last fiscal year by using our current resources without new and increased taxes.

Even my good friend who just spoke before me voted to transfer funds out of these accounts in the past, and most likely for a very good reason, just as we are doing today. The General Assembly will also share the burden of the Governor's excessive spending by using a portion of our own reserve funds to help show that we are willing to share in solving this problem.

I want to thank everybody who has been involved in helping put this together and who have worked hard on this important piece of legislation. I ask the members of the House to put the people of Pennsylvania first, and I encourage you to vote "yes."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Mike Hanna.

Mr. HANNA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct just a few inaccuracies. First, the gentleman from Allegheny County tried to draw a parallel between the Republican proposal to sell the tobacco settlement to the discounting of lottery payouts. The lottery site says that a \$500 million prize is reduced to \$359 million in lump sum; that is 72 percent.

On the other hand, what the Republican proposal suggests today with monetizing the tobacco settlement is more akin to what Wisconsin did in monetizing a fund that they had, and just like in Wisconsin, the discount there was from \$5.9 billion to \$1.3 billion; that is 22 percent, 22 percent. I think that is a radical difference from the 72 percent that is the discount on lottery payouts. So I believe that the gentleman from Allegheny would agree with me that while 72 percent makes sense, 22 cents on a dollar is rather foolish.

Contrary to the statements of the gentlelady from York, not all dollars in these funds are paid by taxpayers. For example, the Insurance Regulation and Oversight Fund is made up of insurance company fines and fees, and that is why its use is rightly restricted to insurance department oversight. That is the definition of a "restricted fund."

Mr. Speaker, what we have here today is an exercise in futility. It would be comical if it were not so important. This entire process is completely baffling and shows a contempt for good-faith negotiating and compromise. Let me remind you, we are already a quarter of the way through the fiscal year and you are going through budgetary gymnastics that are typically reserved for the month of April. It is as if you are starting over and ignoring the fact that the major rating agencies have not warned you that the Commonwealth's credit rating will be downgraded again this coming Monday. By avoiding your elected responsibilities, this is, without a doubt, a tax on working Pennsylvanians. It is not overt, but a credit downgrade will be felt by all taxpaying constituents and businesses.

Mr. Speaker, according to Fitch Ratings, in a letter that was delivered today, they will, and I quote, assess whether proposed measures include reasonable estimates of anticipated revenues, and whether those revenues are sufficiently sustainable over the long term, end quote. Let me repeat those last few words: and assess whether they are sufficiently sustainable over the long term.

This House Republican plan that was just provided to us only a few short hours ago fails miserably in addressing budget and fiscal realities and is in no way meeting the standard of long-term sustainability. So when that downgrade comes, it is you, the PA House Republicans, who will own that downgrade. It is the House Republicans and the House Republicans only that will be responsible for the coming credit downgrade.

The political games and negotiating amongst yourselves, without the input of the other three caucuses and the Governor, needs to end now. We are months into the fiscal year and all we have before us is a bill that your leaders describe as a "conversation starter."

We need to get serious. As the Governor, the Auditor General, and the Treasurer have said, Pennsylvania runs out of money Friday, and real, irreversible consequences will follow. A credit downgrade will come Monday. To say you want to start over 2 days before such deadlines is just patently irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, a number of my Republican friends have analogized this situation to a mortgage situation. That analogy can be extended to a mortgage foreclosure. When you say that you will fix this after Pennsylvania runs out of money, after Pennsylvania's credit is further downgraded, it is akin to saying, "Hey, I will get a second job after the bank has foreclosed." Mr. Speaker, it will be too late.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative.
Representative Bryan Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I thank everyone for their attention this evening, and I genuinely appreciate the debate that we are having about this issue because I think it is a fundamental difference between the two approaches. We have been admonished to act responsibly, to treat this as we would at home, how we view our own budgets, and we have been asked to get serious.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is, we have been serious since April when we passed the first budget and the first funding plan. We were serious when we passed the next group of bills, and we patiently waited while others sat on the sideline.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that we should all act responsibly, which is exactly what this approach does. It would have been great to see some responsible actions by the Governor when the revenue collections began to lag. Every Governor before him, regardless of party, put items in budgetary reserve – never an easy decision, but a fiscally prudent one.

Mr. Speaker, it would have been nice to see the Treasurer not issue the checks or perhaps counsel the Governor then that the best financial management was only to spend what we have. While we have had a very robust debate here and into the evening, the fact is – and facts are important – this funding plan does not cut a single operational line in the budget that was passed. Those operational lines remain intact in the budget vehicle, as the gentleman from Allegheny County pointed out, and they are the same lines that we looked at previously.

This is truly a debate and a discussion, as the gentleman from Lebanon County brought up, about hiding money all across government. This is a discussion regarding cash surpluses and cash flow, two fundamental differences in accounting.

As the gentleman from Lebanon County pointed out, it is incredibly poor financial management to bury Mason jars of money in the backyard. Not only is that a bad investment strategy, but it is also bad public policy.

In terms of how our taxpayers expect us to approach this problem, it is spend the money that we have, the money that is not encumbered. And for those who question the money's existence, I would simply point to the Treasurer. You might ask, why? That is because the Treasurer is already using this money on the short-term loan program. He is loaning it out on a revolving basis, the very program that he is threatening to cease next week.

Additionally, I would argue this was the same money that was used during the impasse in 2015 to continue to pay governmental lines. The money is real. It is sitting in programs, many times on autopilot, simply collecting reserves. While we did not dive too deep into the numbers here tonight and we stayed at a higher level of policy, the truth is, when you look at the cash flow management of all of these accounts and account for the encumbrances that are on the Treasurer's Web page, and the various financial portals that we have here in the Commonwealth, the difference exists between the cash flow and the cash surplus.

When you take a look at that from a financial perspective, as the other gentleman from Lebanon County did, it is important that you match apples to apples. These programs have accrued surpluses that are currently unencumbered. These programs have this money sitting there.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that we should protect the environment. I agree that we should responsibly fund government, but the truth is, when you have money that is simply accruing to higher and higher balances, it is poor cash management not to use it to meet your needs. The best way to protect the environment is to take some of that unused money and fund DEP at the levels we agreed to. There is nothing green about governmental red tape putting money into accounts simply to sit. That is not friendly to the environment, and it is not friendly to the taxpayers. I would urge a "yes" vote.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Representative Cephas is on the House floor and should be placed on the master roll, and Representative McClinton is on the House floor and should be placed on the master roll.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 453 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. The minority leader has requested to speak a second time.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that this proposal was not a product of negotiations between the House, the Senate, and the Governor, and I think everybody in this room knows it is not likely to ever become law. And the only way we can finally complete this budget is to engage in serious negotiations with all the parties in the House and the Senate and come up with a product that can move Pennsylvania forward. This needs to happen now, and we cannot continue to waste time on political gamesmanship.

MOTION TO NONCONCUR IN SENATE AMENDMENTS AS AMENDED

Mr. DERMODY. In tonight's Rules Committee meeting, the majority leader expressed an interest in engaging in serious negotiations. That is one area where we are in full agreement, and as such, Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a motion.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. You may state your motion, please.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, section 396 of Mason's Manual provides that "Every original main motion may be amended, and all other motions may be amended, except those contained in the following list...." The motion to concur was not included in that list. As such, Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the current question to make a motion to nonconcur and request a committee of conference with the Senate. This will immediately allow us to get together with the Senate and engage in serious negotiations to finally end this budget.

The SPEAKER. Sir, this, I think, will go down in the unique annals of first-time requests. At some point if you will just let me know who had this brainchild, but please come on up, please come on up and we will try to do our due diligence here.

Members, the House will be at ease for a short period. As everybody has been informed, we cannot vote on HB 453 concurrence. We are not going to go at ease at this time. We will have a ruling here shortly.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

MOTION RULED OUT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. Members, please take your seats.

We have before us a concurrence in Senate amendments as amended by the House. The bill was amended in the Rules Committee. Those are the facts before us. The motion is to amend this concurrence in Senate amendments as amended by the House such that it has turned into a motion to nonconcur,

which would be step two, and to go to conference committee, which will be step three.

This motion is out of order. It really was not that close. It is complicated, because the motion is an interesting one, having three steps to it, but you cannot move to amend to nonconcur because you cannot nonconcur in this bill, which has not only been amended by the Senate – if it came over and it was not amended again by the House, that would be a different inquiry. I am not saying what the ruling would be, but it is a different inquiry. But it was amended by the House, so you cannot nonconcur in that. The vote is whether or not you are concurring in the Senate amendments as amended by the House. In order to nonconcur and progress to a conference committee, it would really, essentially, require a motion to suspend in order to revert to a prior printer's number, and I believe the motion to suspend is a two-thirds vote.

The fact of the matter is that there is a way, I guess, to seek the same ends, and if the rules already provide for that, that is further evidence that this unique motion is designed to circumvent what would be a motion to suspend. Certainly the gentleman may make a motion to suspend, if he so desires.

In addition, it is, to a significant extent, undermining the integrity of the vote in front of us, which is an equitable reason for the ruling as well.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. DERMODY. We had a discussion at the rostrum about the possibility of rereferring this to the Rules Committee or a motion to reject the report of the Rules Committee and rerefer to Rules, to have a vote in the Rules Committee to send it to conference committee. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. You can move to recommit, certainly, to the Rules Committee. If the hope is that the amendments would be removed in the Rules Committee, I mean, I do not see that as being a likely occurrence, but you could certainly make that motion, and you can also move to suspend, as I have indicated.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker, if we vote to send it back to the Rules Committee, are the amendments not automatically stripped from the bill?

The SPEAKER. No, sir.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker, I refer you to rule 30.

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

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker, in rule 30, it states, in part, "If the House rejects the report of any such bill or joint resolution, the bill or joint resolution shall be automatically returned to the Committee on Rules as last passed by the Senate."

The SPEAKER. Sir, the House has already accepted the committee's report. That is why we have it up for a vote.

Representative Dermody, I believe your – I think it was a parliamentary inquiry about moving to recommit; as I said, with a motion to recommit, that would not automatically strip the amendments out of the concurrence in the House amendments.

But I think that you have something else you want to now raise, if I am not mistaken.

MOTION TO REJECT RULES COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. DERMODY. Yes. If that is out of order, I would like to make a motion to reject the report of the committee under rule 30.

The SPEAKER. The leader has moved to reject the report of the Rules Committee in amending HB 453. That is an aside. I will hold off on the aside.

The paragraph 3 of rule 30, "Bills Amended By the Senate," reads as follows: "Any two members may object to the report of any bill or joint resolution containing Senate amendments amended by the Committee on Rules." That would be Representative Dermody and I believe Representative Hanna. "The objection must be raised prior to the bill or joint resolution being put to a roll call vote. The question shall be decided by a majority vote of the members elected to the House." I believe that is 102. "If the House rejects the report of any such bill or joint resolution, the bill or joint resolution shall be automatically returned to the Committee on Rules as last passed by the Senate." So it would just go back to Rules, but under those circumstances the amendments would be stripped, but it would go back to Rules. Rules, of course, would have the opportunity to reamend and put them back in and send it back to the floor, and we really could be here for quite a few days going back and forth, but so be it. We can try to avoid the vote.

So the ruling is that with the objection filed by Representative Dermody and Representative Hanna, the vote before us, the motion to suspend rule 30 is in front of us. It would need 102 "yes" votes. So if you wish to send—

On the question,

Shall the House object to the report of the Committee on Rules to HB 453?

The SPEAKER. Representative Maher, the floor is yours. You may speak.

Mr. MAHER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to clarify that I believe a motion to suspend requires two-thirds.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Representative Maher, a motion to suspend would, but my reading of rule 30, which is a motion to — it is not really a motion to suspend. It is a motion to object to the report of the bill from the Rules Committee. That is not really a correct — that is not your fault. That is the designation's fault.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MAHER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir, you may proceed.

Mr. MAHER. My memory may be fading with the clock, but I seem to remember at the start of session this evening that the Speaker received a series of reports that this chamber accepted. My memory is also that one of those reports was the report of the Rules Committee. So the question about whether or not to accept that report, Mr. Speaker, my inquiry would be, did we not do that before the motion that we have been debating for some hours before us? I think that that is business long past.

The SPEAKER. The good gentleman would be correct about an earlier motion, but I must say that the explicit, I believe it is pretty exact language, that the objection must be raised prior to the bill or joint resolution being put to a roll-call vote. And now I understand, what is the definition of "being put to a roll-call vote," but the good gentleman really is raising, I believe — and I apologize; I do not mean to speak for him because I think it is a very legitimate inquiry — if the language put to a vote actually is being put to a vote begins with the call up of the bill for debate and the acceptance of the report or is it the actual vote itself? In consultation with the Parliamentarian, it would be the actual vote itself.

So at this time it is a motion to object to the report of any bill containing Senate amendments amended by the Committee on Rules. The ruling is that the objection is being raised prior to the bill being put to a roll-call vote. There are two members that have requested it. The question is to be decided by a majority vote of the members elected to the House. The end result is that it goes back to the Rules Committee even though the amendments will be out, but the Rules Committee may of course once again amend the bill and send it back to the House. Those are just the next steps, so that everybody understands.

If anybody else wishes to question the Chair on this or to raise a parliamentary inquiry, you certainly may.

Representative Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. On the motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the members to support the motion so that we can rereport this bill to the Rules Committee tonight, report it out, and nonconcur and send it to a conference committee this evening.

The SPEAKER. Representative Reed, the leader.

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

Not to belabor this any longer, I would urge the members to reject this procedural motion. I respect what the minority leader, his intent of the goal to get the bill over to the Senate in a position to negotiate a final budget. Unfortunately, though, if you actually send this bill back to the Rules Committee, it restarts the 6-hour clock, and since we have an 11 o'clock deadline in the House of Representatives, that bill could actually not be sent over to the Senate tonight. So if your goal was to get it to the Senate quickly to actually have a discussion on a final product, the quickest way to actually do that is to send this bill over to the Senate. Now, I am not under any illusion that we are going to have the unanimous consent to do that, but I think we should probably get on with that vote. And I just want to make sure everybody understands the technical side of restarting that clock, because the bill will have changed and we do have a 6-hour waiting period within the House for that consideration.

So for that and amongst a number of reasons, I would ask the members to reject this procedural motion and let us get on with the vote on what we have been debating for a number of hours now. Thank you.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. Representative Neuman, you may proceed sir.

Mr. NEUMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry, please.

The SPEAKER. You may proceed.

Mr. NEUMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If we would send this back as the Senate sent it over to us, and the Rules Committee would kick it out of Rules as the Senate sent it over to us, then the 6-hour rule would not apply. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. That is correct. The only thing I would say, Representative Neuman, is that is not what is in front of us, and with all due respect, that can be raised at a later – all those kind of conjecture questions can be raised, but it is not what is in front of us.

Mr. NEUMAN. The reason I asked that, Mr. Speaker, is the majority leader claimed that the clock would start over if it would go back to Rules as the Senate has sent it and we brought it out from the Rules Committee as the Senate sent it over. So I was just seeking clarification.

The SPEAKER. Yes; it would not be a likely occurrence, but that of course is true. But it is not in front of us so it is not a ruling, but that is true, though. That would be a correct interpretation.

Now, Representative Reed. I apologize.

Mr. REED. In light of that and being an imperfect person myself who apparently does not always ask the right question to get the right answer, I would like to amend my comments and say, how about we just vote "no" on a procedural motion like this and get on with the vote for HB 453, and I will end with a period at that sentence as opposed to the second half of my discussion before.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

All those in favor of the motion to object to the report under rule 30, under rule 30, if you are in favor of that objection to the report, you will be voting "yes." If you are opposed to that, you will be voting "no."

On the question recurring,

Shall the House object to the report of the Committee on Rules to HB 453?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—76

Barbin	Dawkins	Harris, J.	O'Brien
Bizzarro	Dean	Kavulich	Pashinski
Boyle	Deasy	Keller, W.	Petrarca
Bradford	DeLissio	Kim	Rabb
Briggs	DeLuca	Kinsey	Ravenstahl
Brown, V.	Dermoddy	Kirkland	Readshaw
Bullock	Donatucci	Kortz	Roebuck
Burns	Driscoll	Krueger	Sainato
Caltagirone	Evans	Kulik	Samuelson
Carroll	Fitzgerald	Longietti	Schlossberg
Cephas	Flynn	Madden	Schweyer
Comitta	Frankel	Markosek	Sims
Conklin	Freeman	Matzie	Snyder
Costa, D.	Gainey	McCarter	Sturla

Costa, P.	Galloway	McClinton	Vazquez
Cruz	Gergely	Miller, D.	Vitali
Daley	Goodman	Mullery	Warren
Davidson	Hanna	Neilson	Wheatley
Davis	Harkins	Neuman	Youngblood

NAYS—118

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

English	Gillen	Metcalfe	Solomon
Fabrizio	Haggerty	Rozzi	Thomas

Less than the majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the objection failed.

The SPEAKER. The motion to object to the report fails.

Members, we cannot vote on the concurrence in Senate amendments as amended by the House until 9:40. We are about 7 minutes away.

Representative Maher is recognized.

Mr. MAHER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me we have reached the end of actual debate on the underlying question, and I would make a motion to proceed.

The SPEAKER. The good gentleman has moved to proceed with a vote on HB 453 on concurrence.

Representative Maher.

Mr. MAHER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As it is looks like my Democratic friends may require longer than the 5 minutes remaining before we could proceed to determine if they would agree to proceed, I am withdrawing my motion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Maher.

BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. We are going to temporarily go over HB 453, just temporarily.

* * *

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to the following HB 1431, PN 2411, as further amended by the House Rules Committee:

An Act designating that portion of State Routes 54, 901 and 2023 in Northumberland County and Schuylkill County as the Honorable Robert E. Belfanti, Jr., Memorial Highway; designating Exit 18 of State Route 43, known as the Searights Road interchange, in Fayette County as the Staff Sgt. John P. Wanto Vietnam Veteran Exit; designating Exit 15 of State Route 43, known as the Old Pittsburgh Road interchange, in Fayette County as the Lance Corporal Russell W. Naugle Vietnam Veteran Exit; designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 2003 over the Yellow Breeches Creek, South Middleton Township, Cumberland County, as the Sgt. Adam C. Schoeller Memorial Bridge; designating a portion of State Route 18 in West Fallowfield Township, Crawford County, as the Staff Sergeant James Douglas Mowris Memorial Highway; designating a portion of State Route 100 from the intersection of Main Street and Tilghman Street in Upper Macungie Township, Lehigh County, to the intersection of Claussville Road and Kernsville Road in Lowhill Township, Lehigh County, as the Captain Mark T. Resh Memorial Highway; designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 18 (College Avenue) over the Little Shenango River, Greenville Borough, Mercer County, as the Greenville Veterans Memorial Bridge; designating that portion of State Route 3078 and State Route 3090 in York County from the intersection with State Route 116 to the intersection with State Route 3042 as the Private First Class Donald R. Gise Memorial Road; designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 1005, known as Church View Road, Segment 0180, Offset 0000, over Beaver Creek, South Woodbury Township, Bedford County, as the PFC/POW William G. Kooztz Memorial Bridge; and designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 588 over Interstate 376, Chippewa Township, Beaver County, as the TFC Blake T. Coble Memorial Bridge.

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

MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION UNDER RULE 21

The SPEAKER. Folks, on this naming of a significant number of roadways, we would need a motion to proceed. We only have 5 minutes to go until we vote on it, but we need a motion to proceed.

Representative Barbin.

Mr. BARBIN. Mr. Speaker, I will make the motion to proceed.

This is a bridge naming for Representative Belfanti. It is well deserved, and I ask that we proceed.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

We have a motion to proceed that we take a vote on HB 1431, concurrence in Senate amendments and then amended by the House.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—179

Table listing names of members who voted 'YEAS' (179 total). Includes names like Baker, Barbin, Barrar, Benninghoff, etc., and their corresponding names in the right column.

NAYS—15

Table listing names of members who voted 'NAYS' (15 total). Includes names like DeLissio, Fitzgerald, Harris, J., Krueger, etc., and their corresponding names in the right column.

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Table listing names of members who were 'EXCUSED' (8 total). Includes names like English, Fabrizio, Gillen, Haggerty, Metcalfe, Rozzi, Solomon, Thomas.

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

On the question recurring, Will the House concur in Senate amendments as amended by the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER. We will proceed to the underlying concurrence in Senate amendments as amended by the House.

Does anybody wish to speak on this vote?

So the question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate as amended by the House?

It is moved by Representative Barbin that we concur in those amendments, and we have already had a summary of the bill.

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—194

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

English	Gillen	Metcalfe	Solomon
Fabrizio	Haggerty	Rozzi	Thomas

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.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 453 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Members, the hour of 9:40 having arrived, the leader calls up HB 453, PN 2410. It is on supplemental A House calendar for concurrence in Senate amendments as amended by the House.

On the question recurring,

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

The SPEAKER. The Rules Committee had further amended it in the House. We had significant debate on that.

The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate as amended by the House?

Moved by the gentleman, the majority leader, that the House concur in these amendments.

Those voting to concur will be voting "aye"; those voting to nonconcur will be voting "nay."

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—103

Baker	Gillespie	Maloney	Roae
Barrar	Godshall	Marshall	Roe
Benninghoff	Greiner	Marsico	Rothman
Bernstine	Grove	Masser	Ryan
Bloom	Hahn	McGinnis	Saccone
Boback	Harris, A.	Mentzer	Sankey
Brown, R.	Heffley	Metzgar	Santora
Causer	Helm	Miccarelli	Saylor
Christiana	Hennessey	Millard	Schemel
Cook	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Simmons
Corbin	Hill	Milne	Sonney
Corr	Irvin	Moul	Staats
Cox	James	Mustio	Tallman
Culver	Jozwiak	Nelson	Tobash
Cutler	Kampf	Nesbit	Toepel
Day	Kaufner	Oberlander	Toohil
Delozier	Kauffman	Ortitay	Topper
Diamond	Keefer	Peifer	Walsh
Dowling	Keller, F.	Pickett	Ward
Dunbar	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Warner
Dush	Klunk	Quigley	Wentling
Ellis	Knowles	Quinn, C.	Wheeland

Emrick	Lawrence	Rader	Zimmerman
Everett	Mackenzie	Rapp	
Fee	Maher	Reed	Turzai,
Fritz	Mako	Reese	Speaker
Gabler			

NAYS—91

Barbin	DeLissio	Kim	Petri
Bizzarro	DeLuca	Kinsey	Quinn, M.
Boyle	Dermoddy	Kirkland	Rabb
Bradford	DiGirolamo	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Briggs	Donatucci	Krueger	Readshaw
Brown, V.	Driscoll	Kulik	Roebuck
Bullock	Evankovich	Lewis	Sainato
Burns	Evans	Longiotti	Samuelson
Caltagirone	Farry	Madden	Schlossberg
Carroll	Fitzgerald	Markosek	Schweyer
Cephas	Flynn	Matzie	Sims
Charlton	Frankel	McCarter	Snyder
Comitta	Freeman	McClinton	Stephens
Conklin	Gainey	Mehaffie	Sturla
Costa, D.	Galloway	Miller, D.	Taylor
Costa, P.	Gergely	Mullery	Vazquez
Cruz	Goodman	Murt	Vitali
Daley	Hanna	Neilson	Warren
Davidson	Harkins	Neuman	Watson
Davis	Harper	O'Brien	Wheatley
Dawkins	Harris, J.	O'Neill	White
Dean	Kavulich	Pashinski	Youngblood
Deasy	Keller, W.	Petrarca	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

English	Gillen	Metcalfe	Solomon
Fabrizio	Haggerty	Rozzi	Thomas

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.

The SPEAKER. We are going to be doing housekeeping at this time.

BILLS RECOMMITTED

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

HB 555;
 HB 1510;
 HB 1602; and
 HB 1608.

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

HOUSE SCHEDULE

The SPEAKER. Members, tomorrow will not be a voting session day. Many of the members and staff will be attending the funeral service for our departed colleague, Representative Dan McNeill. So we will not be having a voting session day or a nonvoting session day tomorrow, and it is unlikely that we will be in voting session on Friday, given tonight's vote. You will be getting that from the Clerk's Office sometime tomorrow, notice with respect to Friday, but we will not be in voting or nonvoting session day tomorrow.

And for those who are not aware of it, Representative McNeill's services start at 11 a.m. tomorrow. I myself will be attending, and I know many other members will be as well.

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. We are going to be in recess until the call of the Chair. We will be in recess until the call of the Chair. There will not be voting or nonvoting session tomorrow.