

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

TUESDAY, MAY 1, 2018

SESSION OF 2018

202D OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 17

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI) PRESIDING

PRAYER

The SPEAKER. The prayer today will be offered by Andrew Kamis. He is the chaplain with Boy Scout Troop 670 of Ford City and Crew 589 in Apollo, and he is a guest today of Representative Lynda Culver.

ANDREW KAMIS, Guest Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

A Scout is reverent.

Dear Heavenly Father, we thank You for creating the forests, the wilderness, and most importantly, the people who care for them, along with all of the beautiful aspects that make the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania so remarkable. We also thank You for this amazing opportunity for the youth of this great Commonwealth to be represented here today.

We pray, dear God, that they listen, learn, and come to realize how fortunate they are to be a part of this great nation of the people. We pray that You continue to provide loving guidance for the men and women of our General Assembly as they govern.

We especially pray for wise choices when dealing with matters that directly affect our Commonwealth's youth, such as the opioid epidemic, education legislation, child poverty, and hunger.

Please continue to bless Boy Scouts of America in their pursuit to nourish and guide today's youth in leadership and good citizenship. We pray, dear Father, always for a better tomorrow, and we thank our elected leaders for their continued service. In Your name, Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Monday, April 30, 2018, will be postponed until printed.

Members, our prayer today was offered by Andrew Kamis, the chaplain of Boy Scout Troop 670, and that troop is actually located in Armstrong County. And Representative Lynda Culver has organized this salute to the Boy Scouts of America today, and we also have with us Representative Jeff Pyle.

All members should please come to the floor. All members should please come to the floor.

BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

HB 1197, PN 3471 (Amended) By Rep. MARSICO

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in inchoate crimes, further providing for the offense of corrupt organizations.

JUDICIARY.

BILL REPORTED AND REREFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON AGING AND OLDER ADULT SERVICES

HB 2247, PN 3296 By Rep. MARSICO

An Act amending Title 20 (Decedents, Estates and Fiduciaries) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in incapacitated persons, further providing for petition and hearing and independent evaluation.

Reported from Committee on JUDICIARY with request that it be rereferred to Committee on AGING AND OLDER ADULT SERVICES.

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

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. I would like to present Representative Lynda Culver, who will be making a presentation by the Boy Scouts of America. She is going to be joined by several Scouts here on the rostrum. I would ask all members to please take their seats. These individuals have traveled some distance to be with us today.

Representative Culver, the floor is yours.

Ms. CULVER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today I have the distinct honor to introduce to you the first group of youth from the Boy Scouts of America to ever present the report to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The Boy Scouts of America was created by an act of Congress and is therefore required to present a report to the U.S. Congress every year. Several States have begun to receive a report at the State level so that legislators could learn and hear about the good work of the Boy Scouts of America – what they are doing and how the program continues to evolve to meet the needs of our youth.

So today all of us here get to be part of Pennsylvania's history by being here for the first ever report to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Today you will find approximately 100 Boy Scouts, young men and women from around the Commonwealth involved in Scouting, sitting at the back of the House floor, and a lot of their mentors and Scoutmasters are up in the gallery.

Standing beside me today is Ripley Price. Ripley is an 18-year-old from Reading. She is in Venturing Crew 514 and she is the Northeast Region Venturing President. Behind me is Andrew Kamis from Kittanning, Pennsylvania. He is 15 and he is the chaplain, and if you missed it, he gave us our prayer today. I also ask of the young men and women and the adult volunteers up in the gallery and in the back of the floor, please stand and receive a warm welcome from my colleagues here in the chamber.

The Boy Scouts of America is an organization that is more than 100 years old and has stood the test of time. Their mission is to prepare young people to make ethical and moral choices over their lifetimes by instilling in them the values of the Scout Oath and the Scout Law, an organization that incorporates duty to God and to country. At a ceremony earlier today in the Capitol rotunda, Ripley Price highlighted the report, which has more than 120,183 youth mentored by 43,778 registered adult volunteer leaders in Pennsylvania. Of those, 2,456 Pennsylvania Scouts earn the coveted Eagle Scout Award, Scouting's highest rank, and Pennsylvania Scouts performed, led, or organized a staggering 1,035,489 hours of community service in this Commonwealth.

There are also many other facts and figures and information about the rapidly evolving changes in the Boy Scouts of America in the report that will be delivered to your offices later today. The thing you need to know about the Boy Scouts of America is that it just does not touch the life of a young Scouter who is a member of the troop; it touches the lives of family members, churches, community groups, government, and people of all ages, stages, and walks of life.

You may wonder how I could possibly know this. Well, I have been attending Boy Scout events for over 30 years and I see firsthand the difference that Scouting makes in their lives. I have witnessed them become leaders in their workplace, their churches, and their communities, and I have seen them build strong families. They do projects for seniors, veterans, emergency responders, churches, nursing homes, local communities, and State parks. They invest in their communities, they connect with people who live there, and they make lives better. I personally try to attend each and every Eagle ceremony. It is an important step in Scouting and in a young person's life, and I know that each of these Scouts is destined to make this world a better place. How, you ask? Well, it is one Scout at a time.

But if I am being truthful, I often feel as though I get more from the Boy Scouts than they get from me. I love to learn about their Eagle projects, their family, their troop, and how

their projects came to be. I walk away with a feeling of hope and peacefulness that, despite everything that is going on in this world today, everything is going to be okay because we have strong leaders coming up with a good set of morals and ethics. You see, you do not have to be a Boy Scout to live the Scout Oath and the Scout Law. Anyone can do it. In fact, I keep a copy of them in my desk here on the House floor and in the district, and when I am feeling confused or overwhelmed, when I feel like I need to be centered, I simply pull out my Scout Law and Oath and read down the list. I have provided each of you with a copy of the Scout Oath and Law so that you, at any time, may pull it out and to remind you how to lead with the same values as we teach the members of the Boy Scouts of America. Life would be easier if we could make a conscious decision to intentionally live by these guiding principles. Someone once asked me if I could sum up the Boy Scouts in just a few words, and I would say to that without hesitation: it is simply the best of the human experience.

So today we are going to conclude this event with Ripley Price leading the Boy Scouts and any friends who want to join in reciting the Scout Oath and Scout Law, after she presents the Speaker with the State of the Commonwealth Report. So thank you, Mr. Speaker, and to my colleagues for being a part of this really special moment on our Commonwealth's history.

REPORT PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. As we stated at the beginning of the presentation, Representative Lynda Culver for the first time has had the state of Boy Scouts of America presented to the Commonwealth. In addition to the presentation in the rotunda today, Ripley is with us from Venturing Scouts and she is going to present the state of Boy Scouts to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and we are so honored.

Scout Ripley Price is now going to read the Boy Scout Law and the Boy Scout Oath. I believe you are going to begin with the Oath, and Representative Culver and I will be next to her. Andrew, if you could stand with us as well, Andrew Kamis. And to all the Scouts in our audience if you could please stand up in the gallery, please stand, and Ripley please proceed.

Ms. PRICE. Scout sign.

"On my honor I will do my best to do my duty to God and my country to obey the Scout Law; to help other people at all times; to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight."

Scout Law: "A Scout is trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent." Two.

The SPEAKER. Ripley, thank you so much.

One hundred and twenty-thousand one hundred and eighty-three youth are served, and that includes Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, Venturers, Explorers, and Learning for Life. And just think about this: between them, 311,208 nights spent camping out in our beautiful environment here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Representative Culver, thank you so much for bringing this special presentation to the House floor, and, members, thank you for your participation. The Scouts at this time are going to be going to the Governor's waiting area – you know, where the press conferences are held. That is where they are going to be

taken to right now, and anybody who wishes to meet them for some photos, please feel free. We are going to get to voting here fairly soon, but at this time the Sergeants at Arms will bring the Scouts through the door here to my left. So, Scouts, if you will just follow up and Ripley will join you.

Former House member Scot Chadwick, where is that good gentleman? There he is. Scot, welcome. Thank you so much for being with this excellent organization and thank you for your service to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Thank you, my friend.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Sergeants at Arms will open the doors of the House.

Members, these individuals have traveled from Philadelphia. Representative Kevin Boyle, please stand. Representative Kevin Boyle, these are his guests. They are a group that meets in the Mayfair section of northeast Philadelphia, and they are seniors from St. Matthews. Please stand. We are so honored to have you here today. Thank you for making the trip to see the Capitol. We are very, very honored that you would take the time to be with us.

NORTH ALLEGHENY HIGH SCHOOL BOYS SWIMMING AND DIVING TEAM PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. At this time I am going to be introducing a State championship team. If the coaches could come up to the rostrum, along with, if these members of the team are here. Andrew Zhang, Jerry Chen, Mason Gonzalez, Joel Songer, Jack Wright, and Ricky Mihm, if you individuals could come here and the rest will be in the well of the House. So the coaches, please come up to the rostrum, and the individuals that I named, if they could come up the rostrum as well. The rest of the members will go right here into the well of the House. Anatole Borisov, also, please come up to the rostrum. If all the members could please take their seats. These young men traveled 4 hours to be with us today, and their coaches.

As you know, we bring up State champions for many sports here across the Commonwealth, 500 school districts. At this time I would like to congratulate the members of the North Allegheny High School Boys Swimming Team for winning the PIAA AAA title for the second straight year in a row. During the 2-day State competition at Bucknell University, these North Allegheny Tigers won 8 of the 11 events and medaled in all 11 events. They won three relays and they set national records in two of the relays.

I am going to be announcing each of the State champions, but the entire team, obviously, are champs. Head coach Patrick Wentzel – Coach, if you could just wave your hand to everybody – who was a State champ himself and swam at Ohio State and then came back to coach this team. Head coach Patrick Wentzel is to be commended for his dedication and leadership, which inspired the boys to do, really, their best. He also coaches the girls team as well, which won the Whitfield championship and won some other events as well, but the boys won the State championship for the second year in a row.

Mason Gonzalez, please raise your hand. Andrew Zhang, Jack Wright, and Rick Mihm combined to win the 400 free relay, but not only did they win that free relay, they broke the national high school record. They had set the public high school record for the nation in December. This time they broke the record for all high schools, which includes public and private, and it is a record that goes back to 2012 with a private school in Florida. And three Olympians, I understand, had set that record back at that school for Florida back in 2012. What an amazing record you just set. Thank you.

Again, as I say your name, please raise your hand. Mason Gonzalez, Jack Wright, Rick Mihm, and Joel Songer broke the national public school record and got the gold at States in the 200 free relay – another amazing record, two national records – and they both today, two of the three fastest times ever in the country. Obviously, winning a State championship is a huge accomplishment for any athlete or team and it takes an entire team. These were the individual medals. I hope I have these all correct. Jack Wright – please raise your hand – first place boys 200-yard free; Rick Mihm, first place boys 200-yard IM (individual medley); Mason Gonzalez, first place boys 50-yard free; Mason Gonzalez, first place boys 100-yard free; Jack Wright, second place boys 100-yard free; Rick Mihm, first place boys 500-yard free; Andrew Zhang, second place boys 100-yard backstroke; and Jerry Chen, third place boys 100-yard breaststroke. In addition to winning the freestyle events, correct me if I am wrong, on the medley relay – I think I have this right – Andrew Zhang, Jerry Chen, Anatole Borisov, and Joel Songer were the first-place boys. And was that the 200-yard medley relay? Yes. That is outstanding.

Also, the other members of the team are here in front of us. All the boys contribute because they push these individuals to be their very best. You could not do it without a whole team. I know that the other coaches, Jordan and Brittany, are here as well. If they could raise their hands. They are a big component part. I am particularly proud of this team because I represent this district and live in this district, and just an outstanding group.

The seniors: Mason Gonzalez; Mason is going to Stanford next year. Andrew is going to Northwestern, and where is Matthew? Where is Matthew Kuhn? Okay. Matthew is not with us today, but he is going to the University of Pittsburgh. Congratulations. I would appreciate if everybody could give them a rousing applause for these outstanding achievements.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Sergeants and Arms will open the doors of the House.

In addition, I have a parent here, the father of Mason Gonzalez, Steve Gonzalez, and Mason's grandmother, Lorette, as well. Please wave. Thank you for being with us today.

2017 BITUMINOUS COAL QUEEN PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. Pam Snyder, Representative Pam Snyder is welcomed to the rostrum. This young lady has traveled a good distance, so I would ask everybody to please take their seats.

Representative Snyder, I know you are good at getting the crowd's attention, so all yours.

Mrs. SNYDER. Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a very special young woman, our 2017 Pennsylvania Bituminous Coal Queen, Kacey Furlong.

Kacey is 17 years old and is a senior at Brownsville Area High School in my district. She serves as secretary of the National Honor Society, and is also a member of Student Council, Grand Marche Committee, National French Honor Society, Tri-Hi-Y, Student Forum, YEA, and the Yearbook Committee. Kacey is a tremendous dancer and has won a number of prestigious scholarships and awards at ballet schools from southwestern Pennsylvania all the way to New York City. Kacey was recently named to the West Virginia University Dance Team, where she plans to attend college and pursue a career in nutrition.

Also with us today are Kacey's wonderful parents, Dave and Roxie Furlong. Stand up and wave, Mom and Dad. And in the back of the House, we have the members of the King Coal Association Pageant Committee: Lisa Allison, Paddy Pratt, and Jean Hockenberry. Stand up and wave, girls. These ladies work really hard to make sure this pageant goes off without a hitch every year.

As many of my colleagues know, coal is a vital part of my district's economy. This tradition of honoring the Bituminous Coal Queen allows us to reflect on what coal jobs mean to the people of Greene, Washington, and Fayette counties. Kacey has embraced her reign and what it means to represent the men and women that go underground every day. Last week she went underground with them and it was quite an experience for her.

Please join me, all of my colleagues, in congratulating our 2017 Pennsylvania Bituminous Coal Queen, Kacey Furlong, as I present her with this House citation.

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Kacey, thank you so much, and congratulations.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. In the well of the House, we welcome guest page Cameron Gearhart, who is a senior at Chambersburg Area High School. His parents, Troy and Breese, are in the gallery. Cameron is the guest of Representative Rob Kauffman. Cameron, great to have you here.

In the well of the House, we welcome guest pages Yadiel Cruz-Cruz, Ronald Lake III, and Angel Cartagena, Jr. These are eighth grade students at York Academy and members of the basketball team, and they were undefeated in their regular season. They are guests of Chairman Stan Saylor. Thanks for joining us, young men.

In the well of the House, we welcome guest page Hope Onelangsy, who attends Mechanicsburg Area Senior High School, and she is the guest of Representative Delozier. Thank you very much, Hope, for being with us.

Good friends are here of Representative Harry Lewis. If they will please stand as I call them out: Joe and Monica Miller and their sons, C.J. and Kenny, and Monica's father, Kenneth. Thank you so much for being with us. It is great to have you here today. We are going to have you up here after the break.

To the left of the rostrum, we welcome Peter Wilson. Peter, please stand. He is the guest of Representative McCarter. Great to have you here today, Peter.

George Agadis is here shadowing – no, excuse me, his father is George Agadis. Michael Agadis is shadowing Representative Cutler for the day. Great to have you both here. Thanks so much for being with us.

To the left of the rostrum, we welcome Smita Groff, and she is shadowing Representative Mindy Fee for the day. Smita, thanks so much for being with us.

In the rear of the House, we have a great group. They traveled quite some distance to be with us. Representative Bud Cook has a Student Involvement Initiative. They come throughout his district in Washington and Fayette counties in the 49th District. They are here to promote tourism in that great area. I know, amongst other sites, that Frank Lloyd Wright's Fallingwater is in Fayette County. And if these good gentlemen could stand, those members of Representative Bud Cook's Student Involvement Initiative, please stand. They are in the back corner of the House.

In the gallery – please stand – is Philip Saggese, a student at the University of Pittsburgh and a guest of Representative Dave Zimmerman. Thank you for being with us.

The Pennsylvania Society of Radiologic Technologists are here as guests of Representative Bryan Cutler; large group, please stand. Welcome to the Capitol. Thank you so much for being here.

In the gallery we have interns from Representative Cephas's district office: Jimmy Koita, Avi Srinivasan, and policy director Azarri Badawi. Please stand; please stand, and come down to the floor when we break. Just come on down to the floor when we break. Thank you for your service. Thank you.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Representative SAYLOR and Representative Mark KELLER have requested to be placed on leave for the day, Mark Keller and Stan Saylor. And without objection, that will be granted.

Representatives Flo FABRIZIO, Vanessa BROWN, and Madeleine DEAN have all requested to be excused for the day with a leave of absence. Without objection, that will be granted.

MASTER ROLL CALL

The SPEAKER. We will now proceed to vote on the master roll.

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—194

Barbin	Emrick	Kulik	Ravenstahl
Barrar	English	Lawrence	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Evankovich	Lewis	Reed
Bernstine	Evans	Longietti	Reese
Bizzarro	Everett	Mackenzie	Roae
Bloom	Farry	Madden	Roe
Boback	Fee	Maher	Roebuck
Boyle	Fitzgerald	Mako	Rothman
Bradford	Flynn	Maloney	Rozzi
Briggs	Frankel	Markosek	Ryan
Brown, R.	Freeman	Marshall	Saccone
Bullock	Fritz	Marsico	Sainato
Burns	Gainey	Masser	Samuelson
Caltagirone	Galloway	Matzie	Sankey
Carroll	Gillen	McCarter	Santora

Causer	Gillespie	McClinton	Schemel
Cephas	Godshall	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Charlton	Goodman	McNeill	Schweyer
Christiana	Greiner	Mehaffie	Simmons
Comitta	Grove	Mentzer	Sims
Conklin	Haggerty	Metcalfe	Snyder
Cook	Hahn	Metzgar	Solomon
Corbin	Hanna	Miccarelli	Sonney
Corr	Harkins	Millard	Staats
Costa, D.	Harper	Miller, B.	Stephens
Costa, P.	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Sturla
Cox	Harris, J.	Milne	Tallman
Cruz	Heffley	Moul	Taylor
Culver	Helm	Mullery	Thomas
Cutler	Hennessey	Murt	Tobash
Daley	Hickernell	Mustio	Toepel
Davidson	Hill	Neilson	Toohil
Davis, A.	Irvin	Nelson	Topper
Davis, T.	James	Nesbit	Vazquez
Dawkins	Jozwiak	O'Brien	Vitali
Day	Kampf	O'Neill	Walsh
Deasy	Kaufer	Oberlander	Ward
DeLissio	Kauffman	Ortitay	Warner
Delozier	Kavulich	Pashinski	Warren
DeLuca	Keefer	Peifer	Watson
Dermody	Keller, F.	Petrarca	Wentling
Diamond	Keller, W.	Pickett	Wheatley
DiGirolamo	Kim	Pyle	Wheeland
Donatucci	Kinsey	Quigley	White
Dowling	Kirkland	Quinn, C.	Youngblood
Driscoll	Klunk	Quinn, M.	Zimmerman
Dunbar	Knowles	Rabb	
Dush	Kortz	Rader	Turzai,
Ellis	Krueger	Rapp	Speaker

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—6

Brown, V.	Fabrizio	Keller, M.K.	Saylor
Dean	Gabler		

LEAVES ADDED—9

Davidson	Lewis	Saccone	Vitali
Everett	Rabb	Santora	Wheatley
Hennessey			

LEAVES CANCELED—2

Keller, M.K.	Santora
--------------	---------

The SPEAKER. There are 194 votes on the House floor, so we have a quorum.

**HOUSE BILLS
INTRODUCED AND REFERRED**

No. 2305 By Representatives DOWLING, DRISCOLL, READSHAW, MILLARD, BERNSTINE, SAYLOR, WARNER, O'NEILL, BAKER, EVANKOVICH, SACCONI, BARRAR, D. COSTA, REESE, WALSH, CORBIN, MARSICO, CORR, RYAN, KORTZ, STEPHENS, QUIGLEY, FARRY, DAVIS, TOEPEL, WARD, PYLE, SIMMONS, JOZWIAK, CHARLTON, ZIMMERMAN, FRITZ, HARPER, TOOHI, NELSON, DAY, COX, GILLEN, WATSON, DeLUCA, SCHLEGEL CULVER and TURZAI

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in serious traffic offenses, further providing for fleeing or attempting to elude police officer.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, May 1, 2018.

No. 2323 By Representatives COX, BARRAR, CONKLIN, DAVIS, DeLUCA, DIAMOND, GILLEN, MILLARD, B. MILLER, MURT, ROTHMAN, SCHWEYER, SOLOMON, WARD, WATSON and WHEELAND

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in voting machines, further providing for requirements of electronic voting systems.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, May 1, 2018.

UNCONTESTED CALENDAR

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. LONGIETTI called up **HR 702, PN 3046**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the week of May 6 through 13, 2018, as "National Music Week" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. BURNS called up **HR 779, PN 3217**, entitled:

A Resolution designating May 1, 2018, as "Law Day" in Pennsylvania and urging lawmakers, attorneys, judges and schools to participate in this year's celebration.

* * *

Mr. RADER called up **HR 780, PN 3218**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the Vet 22 campaign and raising awareness for the ongoing epidemic of veteran suicide and the war at home with a symbolic color.

* * *

Mr. QUIGLEY called up **HR 794, PN 3245**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the 120th anniversary of the Battle of Manila Bay.

* * *

Mr. READSHAW called up **HR 801, PN 3260**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of May 2018 as "Junior Achievement Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. HEFFLEY called up **HR 825, PN 3317**, entitled:

A Resolution honoring Jacobus Franciscus "Jim" Thorpe by designating May 19, 2018, as "Jim Thorpe Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. JOZWIAK called up **HR 853, PN 3397**, entitled:

A Resolution honoring the memory of law enforcement officers who gave their lives in the line of duty in this Commonwealth and recognizing the memorial service in their honor at the Pennsylvania State Museum in the City of Harrisburg on May 7, 2018.

* * *

Mr. TURZAI called up **HR 856, PN 3400**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing "The Wall That Heals," a replica of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, DC, which will be on display at the State Capitol from May 9 through 13, 2018.

* * *

Mrs. DEAN called up **HR 857, PN 3410**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of May 2018 as "Bike Month," the week of May 14 through 18, 2018, as "Bike to Work Week" and May 18, 2018, as "Bike to Work Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. HANNA called up **HR 858, PN 3411**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing May 1, 2018, as "Bronchial Thermoplasty Awareness Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Ms. RAPP called up **HR 869, PN 3437**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the week of May 6 through 12, 2018, as "National Hospital Week" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Ms. QUINN called up **HR 870, PN 3438**, entitled:

A Resolution designating May 1, 2018, as "Health Care Information Technology Awareness Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Ms. McCLINTON called up **HR 872, PN 3444**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of May 2018 as "National Drug Court Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mrs. BULLOCK called up **HR 874, PN 3446**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of May 2018 as "Mental Health Awareness in the Black Community Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Ms. RAPP called up **HR 877, PN 3450**, entitled:

A Resolution designating May 14, 2018, as "Apraxia Awareness Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. MURT called up **HR 883, PN 3456**, entitled:

A Resolution designating May 1, 2018, as "The Battle of the Crooked Billet Day" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolutions?

The SPEAKER. Representative Jack Rader will be speaking on HR 780 and Representative Jozwiak will be speaking on HR 853. They both have guests. All other members who are going to be speaking on resolutions will do so at the end of the session day.

This is a very serious subject matter. I would ask everybody to please take their seats. Please take your seats. It is a very serious subject matter addressing veteran suicides. It is HR 780. Members, please take your seats.

Representative Rader, if you could introduce your guests at the beginning of your remarks, it would be appreciated, and you may proceed.

Mr. RADER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mark Baylis is up in – unfortunately, we could not get him up front here. Please stand up, Mark. You can tell by the color of his bow tie that it matches mine too. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to request the support of my colleagues for HR 780, which recognizes the Vet 22 campaign and its presence in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I have to acknowledge Mark Baylis from the Valor Clinic for his drive and desire to get this done, for without him it would not get done.

Vet 22 uses a symbolic bright neon yellow color to raise awareness about veteran suicide. It derives its name from the startling statistic that an average of 22 United States veterans take their own lives each day – 22 veterans take their lives each day. The campaign works to ensure that veterans and the families of all service members receive the same care and support they need. Vet 22 also directs attention to the Veterans Unstoppable program, which provides a free resource for Pennsylvania veterans who are struggling with post-traumatic stress and traumatic brain injury.

As the father of a daughter serving in the Navy, this cause is particularly close to my heart. Please join me in supporting this resolution, which aims to bring the issue of veteran suicide to light and helps veterans find the proper channels to deal with lingering mental health issues. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Before we vote, Representative Barry Jozwiak on HR 853, and if you could please introduce your guests at the beginning of your remarks, we would appreciate it.

Mr. JOZWIAK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask your support for an important House resolution, 853. But before I get into this, I would just like to recognize a few members from the police departments that are here. From the Pennsylvania State Police are the State Police State Troopers Association president, David Kennedy – please stand as I call your name – and his legislative liaison, Harry Dannehower. From the State F.O.P. (Fraternal Order of Police) are Joe Regan, whom most of you know; Jim Walsh, Vince DiCenzo; and the F.O.P. president from Berks County, where I am from, Joe Brown, Joseph Brown.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution honors two police officers, one deputy sheriff, and one State Police officer who all served in Pennsylvania and lost their lives in the line of duty. These four men recognized are: Scott Alan Moyer. He was a member of the Lehigh County Sheriff's Office. On September 23, 2009, Deputy Moyer suffered a fatal heart attack shortly after apprehending a man during a warrant service. Deputy Moyer was 43 years old. And I am glad my colleague is up here with me. I forgot to ask him to come up here. But this is a solemn thing, and Dom and I do this stuff together, as you all know.

Officer Shawn D. Rager was a member of the Johnstown City Police Department. Shawn was an original member of the SERT (Special Emergency Response Team) team, with the position of sniper, and a detective with the Cambria County Drug Task Force. He died at home. He was 45 years old.

Police officer Brian David Shaw. He was a member of the New Kensington Police Department. Officer Shaw was shot and killed while making a traffic stop on a vehicle at approximately 8 p.m. on November 17, 2017. After stopping the vehicle, the driver fled on foot and opened fire on Officer Shaw, mortally wounding him as he pursued the driver. Officer Shaw served with the New Kensington Police Department for only 5 months. He had previously served as a part-time officer for 3 years with the Cheswick Police Department, Frazer Police Department, and Springdale Township Police Department. He was only 25 years old.

Michael Paul Stewart III was a member of the Pennsylvania State Police. Trooper Stewart was killed in a vehicle crash on Route 711, at the Route 271 split, in Ligonier Township, Westmoreland County, at approximately 2:20 in the morning. Trooper Stewart's patrol vehicle was traveling southbound when a truck attempted to turn onto the roadway in front of him, causing a collision. Trooper Stewart suffered fatal injuries in the crash. He was only 26 years old and a member of the State Police for 3 years.

As a former member of the State Police and the former Chief of Police in Pittsburgh, we can tell you one thing: we remember these men, not because of how they died, but because of how they lived. They served their communities. They protected their communities. They sacrificed for the people in their communities.

Mr. Speaker, I offer this resolution as a way for us, on behalf of each and every Pennsylvanian, to show gratitude for the sacrifices of these four officers. We offer our heartfelt condolences to the families and loved ones of these four brave men. I ask my colleagues to support this Resolution No. 853.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Would all members please stand, and guests as well, if able, for a moment of silence for the lost officers.

(Whereupon, a moment of silence was observed.)

The SPEAKER. Thank you, members and guests. You may be seated.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

Barbin	Emrick	Kulik	Ravenstahl
Barrar	English	Lawrence	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Evankovich	Lewis	Reed
Bernstine	Evans	Longietti	Reese
Bizzarro	Everett	Mackenzie	Roae
Bloom	Farry	Madden	Roe
Boback	Fee	Maher	Roebuck
Boyle	Fitzgerald	Mako	Rothman
Bradford	Flynn	Maloney	Rozzi
Briggs	Frankel	Markosek	Ryan
Brown, R.	Freeman	Marshall	Saccone
Bullock	Fritz	Marsico	Sainato
Burns	Gainey	Masser	Samuelson
Caltagirone	Galloway	Matzie	Sankey
Carroll	Gillen	McCarter	Santora
Causar	Gillespie	McClinton	Schemel
Cephas	Godshall	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Charlton	Goodman	McNeill	Schweyer
Christiana	Greiner	Mehaffie	Simmons
Comitta	Grove	Mentzer	Sims
Conklin	Haggerty	Metcalfe	Snyder
Cook	Hahn	Metzgar	Solomon
Corbin	Hanna	Miccarelli	Sonney
Corr	Harkins	Millard	Staats
Costa, D.	Harper	Miller, B.	Stephens
Costa, P.	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Sturla
Cox	Harris, J.	Milne	Tallman
Cruz	Heffley	Moul	Taylor
Culver	Helm	Mullery	Thomas
Cutler	Hennessey	Murt	Tobash
Daley	Hickernell	Mustio	Toepel
Davidson	Hill	Neilson	Toohil
Davis, A.	Irvin	Nelson	Topper
Davis, T.	James	Nesbit	Vazquez
Dawkins	Jozwiak	O'Brien	Vitali
Day	Kampf	O'Neill	Walsh
Deasy	Kaufner	Oberlander	Ward
DeLissio	Kauffman	Ortitay	Warner
Delozier	Kavulich	Pashinski	Warren
DeLuca	Keefer	Peifer	Watson
Dermody	Keller, F.	Petrarca	Wentling
Diamond	Keller, W.	Pickett	Wheatley
DiGirolamo	Kim	Pyle	Wheeland
Donatucci	Kinsey	Quigley	White
Dowling	Kirkland	Quinn, C.	Youngblood
Driscoll	Klunk	Quinn, M.	Zimmerman
Dunbar	Knowles	Rabb	
Dush	Kortz	Rader	Turzai,
Ellis	Krueger	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—6

Brown, V.	Fabrizio	Keller, M.K.	Saylor
Dean	Gabler		

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

RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. At this time we will take announcements. The majority leader, Dave Reed, will start with our first announcement.

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

There will be an immediate meeting upon the break of the House Rules Committee in the Appropriations conference room; an immediate meeting of the House Rules Committee in the Appropriations Conference Room. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

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

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. For the Appropriations Committee, will there be a meeting? Representative George Dunbar, the vice chair of the committee, for an announcement.

Mr. DUNBAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The House Appropriations Committee will have a voting meeting at 12:15 in the majority caucus room; that is 12:15, Appropriations, majority caucus room.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

The House Appropriations Committee will have a voting meeting at 12:15 in the majority caucus room.

COMMERCE COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Representative Brian Ellis, chair of Consumer Affairs, I believe for a committee announcement.

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

The Commerce Committee will be having a voting meeting in G-50 at 12:45, G-50 Irvis Building.

The SPEAKER. If I misstated, the Commerce Committee. The Commerce Committee will be having a voting meeting in G-50 at 12:45, G-50 Irvis Building.

STATE GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Representative Metcalfe, for the purpose of State Government Committee.

Mr. METCALFE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The House State Government Committee will have a voting meeting in room B-31 of the Main Capitol to consider HB 482, as well as any other business that might be brought before the committee, Mr. Speaker. So members of the House State Government Committee, at the break, please come to B-31 Main Capitol. We will continue the consideration of HB 482 that we entertained earlier today in a previous meeting.

The SPEAKER. The House State Government Committee will have a voting meeting in room B-31 of the Main Capitol.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. Representative Marcy Toepel, for a majority caucus announcement.

Mrs. TOEPEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Republicans will caucus at 1 o'clock. We would be prepared to return to the floor at 2 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Madam Chair.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. The minority caucus chair, Representative Frankel, for a minority caucus announcement.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Democrats will caucus at 1 o'clock; Democrats will caucus at 1 o'clock. Thank you.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. CRUZ

The SPEAKER. Representative Angel Cruz is recognized on unanimous consent.

Mr. CRUZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to give notice of intent to call up Discharge Resolutions No. 7 and No. 8 on Tuesday, May 22, or the day after. These resolutions are related to HBs 669 and 666 respectively, which are both bills having to do with lead poisoning in Pennsylvania, especially the drinking water of schools and senior facilities and the paint that is used for day cares. I have been working two terms on this issue and it is time for us to have public hearings to investigate the lead drinking water that we have in Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

GAME AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Representative Keith Gillespie is recognized for a committee announcement.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At the break we will have a voting meeting of the House Game and Fisheries Committee in room 205 of the Ryan Office Building to discuss two bills and any other business that may come before the committee; that is 205 Ryan.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you very much.

The House Game and Fisheries Committee will meet in room 205 of the Ryan Office Building.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. At this time the House will stand in recess until 2 p.m.

RECESS EXTENDED

The time of recess was extended until 2:15 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**HB 209, PN 3162** By Rep. DUNBAR

An Act amending the act of June 25, 1982 (P.L.633, No.181), entitled "An act providing for independent oversight and review of regulations, creating an Independent Regulatory Review Commission, providing for its powers and duties and making repeals," further providing for definitions and for existing regulations; and establishing the Independent Office of the Repealer and providing for its power and duties.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1237, PN 2996 By Rep. DUNBAR

An Act amending the act of June 25, 1982 (P.L.633, No.181), known as the Regulatory Review Act, further providing for definitions, for proposed regulations and procedures for review and for final-form regulations and final-omitted regulations and procedures for review; providing for regulations deemed withdrawn; further providing for procedures for subsequent review of disapproved final-form or final-omitted regulations by the commission; and providing for concurrent resolution required for economically significant regulations.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1659, PN 3461 By Rep. DUNBAR

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

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1782, PN 3324 By Rep. DUNBAR

An Act amending Title 66 (Public Utilities) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in rates and distribution systems, providing for alternative ratemaking for utilities.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1792, PN 3465 By Rep. DUNBAR

An Act amending the act of June 25, 1982 (P.L.633, No.181), known as the Regulatory Review Act, further providing for procedures for subsequent review of disapproved final-form or final-omitted regulations.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1800, PN 3224 By Rep. DUNBAR

An Act amending Title 40 (Insurance) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in regulation of insurers and related persons generally, providing for medication synchronization.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1959, PN 3464 By Rep. DUNBAR

An Act providing for the administration of permits by State agencies, for a tracking system for permit applications, for the establishment of permit programs and for annual reports.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1960, PN 3463 By Rep. DUNBAR

An Act providing for regulatory compliance.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1997, PN 3352 By Rep. DUNBAR

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Human Services Code, in medical assistance, providing for medical assistance deemed eligibility program for in-patient behavioral health services.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2156, PN 3472 (Amended) By Rep. DUNBAR

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, providing for Career and Technical Education Partnership Tax Credit Program.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE
REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE****HB 478, PN 3434** By Rep. REED

An Act providing for outpatient psychiatric oversight.

RULES.

**BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES,
CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED****HB 482, PN 3474** (Amended) By Rep. METCALFE

An Act limiting assignment of State-owned vehicles.

STATE GOVERNMENT.

HB 1273, PN 1540 By Rep. GILLESPIE

An Act amending Title 34 (Game) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in permits relating to wildlife, further providing for definitions.

GAME AND FISHERIES.

HB 1603, PN 2121 By Rep. GILLESPIE

An Act amending Title 34 (Game) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in hunting and furtaking, further providing for trespass on private property while hunting.

GAME AND FISHERIES.

HB 1970, PN 3473 (Amended) By Rep. METCALFE

An Act amending the act of May 15, 1874 (P.L.186, No.120), entitled "An act declaring what offices are incompatible," further providing for offices of member of Congress and State Legislature.

STATE GOVERNMENT.

HB 2241, PN 3290

By Rep. ELLIS

An Act amending Title 53 (Municipalities Generally) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in other subjects of taxation, providing for prohibited fees, surcharges and taxes; and making inconsistent repeals.

COMMERCE.

SB 234, PN 1443

By Rep. ELLIS

An Act amending Title 12 (Commerce and Trade) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, authorizing assessments for energy improvements in districts designated by municipalities.

COMMERCE.

BILL REPORTED AND REREFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

HB 2167, PN 3251

By Rep. ELLIS

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in disposition of abandoned and unclaimed property, further providing for property held by business associations.

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

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

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Representative EVERETT and Representative SACCONI have requested to be placed on leave. Without objection, that will be granted.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1782, PN 3324**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 66 (Public Utilities) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in rates and distribution systems, providing for alternative ratemaking for utilities.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Mark Keller is on the House floor and should be placed back on the master roll.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 1782 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—191

Barbin	Emrick	Kulik	Ravenstahl
Barrar	English	Lawrence	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Evankovich	Longietti	Reed
Bernstine	Evans	Mackenzie	Reese
Bizzarro	Farry	Madden	Roae
Bloom	Fee	Maher	Roe
Boback	Fitzgerald	Mako	Roebuck
Boyle	Flynn	Maloney	Rothman
Bradford	Frankel	Markosek	Rozzi
Briggs	Fritz	Marshall	Ryan
Brown, R.	Gainey	Marsico	Sainato
Bullock	Galloway	Masser	Samuelson
Burns	Gillen	Matzie	Sankey
Caltagirone	Gillespie	McCarter	Santora
Carroll	Godshall	McClinton	Schemel
Causar	Goodman	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Cephas	Greiner	McNeill	Schweyer
Charlton	Grove	Mehaffie	Simmons
Christiana	Haggerty	Mentzer	Sims
Comitta	Hahn	Metcalfe	Snyder
Conklin	Hanna	Metzgar	Solomon
Cook	Harkins	Miccarelli	Sonney
Corbin	Harper	Millard	Staats
Corr	Harris, A.	Miller, B.	Stephens
Costa, D.	Harris, J.	Miller, D.	Sturla
Costa, P.	Heffley	Milne	Tallman
Cox	Helm	Moul	Taylor
Cruz	Hennessey	Mullery	Thomas
Culver	Hickernell	Murt	Tobash
Cutler	Hill	Mustio	Toepel
Daley	Irvin	Neilson	Toohil
Davidson	James	Nelson	Topper
Davis, A.	Jozwiak	Nesbit	Vazquez
Davis, T.	Kampf	O'Brien	Vitali
Dawkins	Kaufner	O'Neill	Walsh
Day	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.	Pickett	Wheatley
Diamond	Kim	Pyle	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Kinsey	Quigley	White
Donatucci	Kirkland	Quinn, C.	Youngblood
Dowling	Klunk	Quinn, M.	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Knowles	Rabb	
Dunbar	Kortz	Rader	Turzai,
Dush	Krueger	Rapp	Speaker
Ellis			

NAYS—1

Freeman

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Brown, V. Dean	Everett Fabrizio	Gabler Lewis	Saccone Saylor
-------------------	---------------------	-----------------	-------------------

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1997, PN 3352**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Human Services Code, in medical assistance, providing for medical assistance deemed eligibility program for in-patient behavioral health services.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—192

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

Cutler	Hickernell	Mustio	Toepel
Daley	Hill	Neilson	Toohil
Davidson	Irvin	Nelson	Topper
Davis, A.	James	Nesbit	Vazquez
Davis, T.	Jozwiak	O'Brien	Vitali
Dawkins	Kampf	O'Neill	Walsh
Day	Kaufner	Oberlander	Ward
Deasy	Kauffman	Ortitay	Warner
DeLissio	Kavulich	Pashinski	Warren
Delozier	Keefe	Peifer	Watson
DeLuca	Keller, F.	Petrarca	Wentling
Dermody	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Wheatley
Diamond	Keller, W.	Pyle	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Kim	Quigley	White
Donatucci	Kinsey	Quinn, C.	Youngblood
Dowling	Kirkland	Quinn, M.	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Klunk	Rabb	
Dunbar	Knowles	Rader	Turzai,
Dush	Kortz	Rapp	Speaker
Ellis	Krueger		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Brown, V. Dean	Everett Fabrizio	Gabler Lewis	Saccone Saylor
-------------------	---------------------	-----------------	-------------------

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1800, PN 3224**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 40 (Insurance) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in regulation of insurers and related persons generally, providing for medication synchronization.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—192

Barbin	Emrick	Kulik	Ravenstahl
Barrar	English	Lawrence	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Evankovich	Longietti	Reed
Bernstine	Evans	Mackenzie	Reese
Bizzarro	Farry	Madden	Roae
Bloom	Fee	Maher	Roe
Boback	Fitzgerald	Mako	Roebuck

Boyle	Flynn	Maloney	Rothman
Bradford	Frankel	Markosek	Rozzi
Briggs	Freeman	Marshall	Ryan
Brown, R.	Fritz	Marsico	Sainato
Bullock	Gainey	Masser	Samuelson
Burns	Galloway	Matzie	Sankey
Caltagirone	Gillen	McCarter	Santora
Carroll	Gillespie	McClinton	Schemel
Causar	Godshall	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Cephas	Goodman	McNeill	Schweyer
Charlton	Greiner	Mehaffie	Simmons
Christiana	Grove	Mentzer	Sims
Comitta	Haggerty	Metcalfe	Snyder
Conklin	Hahn	Metzgar	Solomon
Cook	Hanna	Miccarelli	Sonney
Corbin	Harkins	Millard	Staats
Corr	Harper	Miller, B.	Stephens
Costa, D.	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Sturla
Costa, P.	Harris, J.	Milne	Tallman
Cox	Heffley	Moul	Taylor
Cruz	Helm	Mullery	Thomas
Culver	Hennessey	Murt	Tobash
Cutler	Hickernell	Mustio	Toepel
Daley	Hill	Neilson	Toohil
Davidson	Irvin	Nelson	Topper
Davis, A.	James	Nesbit	Vazquez
Davis, T.	Jozwiak	O'Brien	Vitali
Dawkins	Kampf	O'Neill	Walsh
Day	Kaufner	Oberlander	Ward
Deasy	Kauffman	Ortitay	Warner
DeLissio	Kavulich	Pashinski	Warren
Delozier	Keefer	Peifer	Watson
DeLuca	Keller, F.	Petrarca	Wentling
Dermody	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Wheatley
Diamond	Keller, W.	Pyle	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Kim	Quigley	White
Donatucci	Kinsey	Quinn, C.	Youngblood
Dowling	Kirkland	Quinn, M.	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Klunk	Rabb	
Dunbar	Knowles	Rader	Turzai,
Dush	Kortz	Rapp	Speaker
Ellis	Krueger		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Brown, V.	Everett	Gabler	Saccone
Dean	Fabrizio	Lewis	Saylor

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 209, PN 3162**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 25, 1982 (P.L.633, No.181), entitled "An act providing for independent oversight and review of regulations, creating an Independent Regulatory Review Commission, providing for its powers and duties and making repeals," further providing for definitions and for existing regulations; and establishing the Independent Office of the Repealer and providing for its power and duties.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Representative Phillips-Hill, do you wish to speak on the bill? You get two opportunities to speak, if you want to go now and at the end. Are you prepared to go now?

Representative McCarter.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is the first of, obviously, several bills that we are going to look at today that deal with regulations and the repeal of regulations. This one, introduced by Representative Kristin Phillips-Hill, would establish the Independent Office of the Repealer, to make recommendations on which regulations should be repealed. It would also establish a moratorium on new regulations, placing a cap on the number of regulations, and require the repeal of existing regulations when promulgating new ones.

It is, without a doubt, Mr. Speaker, an intrusion into the traditional oversight responsibilities of the standing committees of the General Assembly. In fact, it is a very, very extensive reach. I think everyone here agrees on the need to review and improve legislation, regulations, etc. However, a new Office of the Repealer, which, in effect, is really a committee of three political appointees in this bill, and thus, it eliminates the process that we have used for years in this Assembly to be able to make good judgments on what regulations should be changed or repealed. We have that authority already. I do not think there is anyone in this Assembly that has not seen – even if you have been here only a few months – has not seen attempts by the committees to change regulations in one form or another. That is not new. It exists. And in fact, already if we take one example to improve the public benefit by changing regulations, we can see this with various different attempts even from different political points of view dealing with environmental issues. So with respect to environmental regulations, as an example, there are already the means to do this through amendment or elimination of regulations through the Environmental Hearing Board, and, Mr. Speaker, there is really, as I said, no one here who has not seen this take place.

So the end product, with this bill, we create, one, an untouchable bureaucracy with ill-defined powers and no obligation to consider public input and to coordinate with Commonwealth agencies, agencies that have been working on these regulations and promulgating them for literally scores and scores of years, in many cases, to make them efficient and good for the public benefit. In fact, under this bill, Mr. Speaker, HB 209, there is no guarantee of public input anymore, and in fact, this lack of guaranteed public input, when it comes to environmental issues, may in fact be a constitutional violation of Article I, section 27, of the Pennsylvania Constitution.

It also appears, in reading this bill, that the bill protects its documents from the Right-to-Know Law, not requiring disclosure by classifying this particular independent agency, the Office of the Repealer, as an independent agency, and therefore,

as a legislative agency under section 8 for purposes to avoid the Right-to-Know Law.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on about the nature of how this is an overreach and all of the other bills that are coming up in this package, but I think it is clear that we have the means to do this already. We do not need to change all of these particular items and create new bureaucracies, as in this bill, in HB 209, to create something as amorphous and ill-defined as the Office of the Repealer that brings up, frankly, pictures of something out of "Saturday Night Live."

I think this bill should be defeated. Thank you.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. We have two guests with us today to my left, and I hope they will stand.

Jim Vlasach. Jim is a guest of Representative Kulik from Kennedy Township in Allegheny County. Jim, thanks for being with us. And Larissa Simko is with us from Munhall in Allegheny County, and she is a guest of Representative Austin Davis. We appreciate both of them for taking the time to come and be with us on the House floor. Thank you so much.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 209 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Representative Kristin Phillips-Hill, on HB 209.

Mrs. HILL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, spring has finally arrived—

The SPEAKER. Members, please take your seats. Members, please take your seats.

Mrs. HILL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, spring has finally arrived. The flowers are blooming, the trees are blossoming, the air is warm and fresh, and Mother's Day is just around the corner, filling my mind with wonderful memories of my Grandmother Brown, because this time of year my grandmother was devoted to spring cleaning. Every drawer, every closet, every cupboard, and every shelf was deeply cleaned and organized before the dog days of summer were upon us. Methodically, she went through—

The SPEAKER. Representative Phillips-Hill, I am going to have you just suspend, and actually, I would like you to start from the beginning, because I do not think anybody has quite heard.

Members, could you please take your seats. Close the doors of the House. Any conversations can go off to the anterooms, please. Any conversations in the back of the House can go to the anterooms. Members, please take your seats. As I said, can the Sergeants at Arms ask any of the meetings to go to the anterooms, please. Members, please take your seats.

The gentlelady from York County may proceed. You may open the doors of the House.

Mrs. HILL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, spring has finally arrived. The flowers are blooming, the trees are blossoming, the air is warm and it is fresh, and Mother's Day is just around the corner, filling my mind with wonderful memories of my Grandmother Brown, because this time of year my grandmother was devoted to spring cleaning. Every drawer, every closet, every cupboard, and every shelf was deeply cleaned and organized before the dog days of summer were upon us. Methodically, she went through the

clutter, the accumulation of the past year and the contents of her home, donating what she no longer needed or had more than she needed to charity and disposing of things that were broken or out of date, leaving her home neat, tidy, and efficient.

HB 209 is the spring cleaning of Pennsylvania's regulatory structure. Quite frankly, it is about time. With well over 153,000 regulations on our books, our State's regulatory system has become the equivalent of extreme hoarding. We do not get rid of anything. These restrictions create impediments for individuals, local and county governments, and businesses of all shapes and sizes, limiting economic development and growth as well as job creation. These thousands upon thousands of regulations have been created under Republican and Democrat Governors, and they have been piling up for decades, leaving us drowning in red tape.

The World Bank and the Mercatus Center at George Mason University estimate that overregulation has a negative effect on economic growth. It ranges from .8 percent to 2.3 percent. Since 2000 Pennsylvania's yearly gross domestic product has averaged 1.5 percent. Based on those numbers alone, regulations have consumed all of the Commonwealth's economic growth. Think about it. So simply put, HB 209 establishes the Independent Office of the Repealer within the Independent Regulatory Review Commission, also known as IRRC, to identify obsolete or outdated or burdensome regulations to recommend for repeal.

Let me make this point and let me be very, very clear about this: there is nothing in this legislation that any particular regulation must be repealed. And I will repeat that again: there is nothing in this legislation that says any single regulation must be repealed. What it does say is that these recommendations must be made to us, because we have not been able to do this. You know, there is an Executive order back from the Ridge days that says that on the first Saturday, I believe, in February, and one of the months in the summer, that the Governor's Office must produce a document that identifies every regulation that they are in the process of promulgating. The last time I looked at it, there were over 272 new regulations being put into place and 2 being repealed. We are not doing a very good job. Furthermore, agencies that look to promulgate new regulations would be required to identify two existing regulations for repeal.

So one of the things that was referenced by the gentleman, my good colleague, was that this bill is not transparent. Nothing could be further from the truth. As a matter of fact, we amended this bill in committee at the request of the Pennsylvania NewsMedia organization because we want to be open and transparent in everything that we do. This office will work better when the entire populous of Pennsylvania has full and complete access to what it is doing.

So this office shall be a legislative agency for the purposes of the Right-to-Know Law. How would this office work? This office would adopt logical quantitative and qualitative rules to determine whether an existing statute or regulation is reasonable, unduly burdensome, detrimental to economic well-being, duplicative, onerous, defective, or in conflict with another statute or regulation. Next, it would perform a systemic review of existing statutes and regulations to identify existing statutes and regulations which may be appropriate for modification, revision, or repeal. The office would also establish a system with a publicly accessible Internet Web site that would allow the office to receive suggestions and

comments, along with supporting documentation, for modification, revision, or repeal from citizens, businesses, government agencies, or others, and reports on allegations of wasteful governmental practices. Additionally, it would implement a tracking system for following the progress made on any recommendation of repeal. The office will then report annually to the General Assembly on activities and progress of this independent office.

Please note that this bill would also require the delivery of a recommended repeal to the General Assembly of a statute – and the department or agency which promulgated it originally, in the case of a regulation – and should include a justification for the recommendation. Ultimately, the responsibility lies with us, the General Assembly. And I will say it again: there is absolutely nothing in this legislation that states any specific regulation must be repealed. We have seen similar efforts yield very positive results, not only for State government, but for individuals, local governmental entities, and businesses in places like Kansas, Rhode Island, Tennessee, North Carolina, and most recently the Federal government.

Once this office completes its mission with the assurance that the legislative efforts of our colleagues and the rest of the bills in this legislative package are adopted, addressing our future regulatory burden, a sunset provision in this legislation provides that the Office of the Repealer will end on June 30 of 2024. This might be the first bill that I have passed since my tenure here in this House where we actually have decided to get rid of something that we introduce.

Last evening my colleague from Montgomery County withdrew from consideration several amendments that would have prohibited specific regulations from being considered by the Office of the Repealer, everything from regulations regarding health care, abortion, you name it. There was one that suggested that they should exempt medical marijuana regulations from consideration, and here is what I would suggest. I would suggest that exempting any regulation from examination or consideration would be a huge mistake. What if the bureaucracy did not get it right? What if the regulations promulgated imposed burdensome requirements on patients seeking relief through the use of medical marijuana? What if the regulations make the growing, processing, distribution, and sales of medical marijuana so difficult and burdensome that no company wants to engage in doing business here in the Commonwealth? Do we not want the opportunity to make it right? Do we not want to have every assurance that legislative intent is reflected in regulations? Do we not have a responsibility to the people we represent to make sure that their government works for them?

Yesterday the House and Senate Education Committees held a joint public hearing on the RAND Corporation's study of the PASSHE (Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education) system, an independent study of our struggling State System of Higher Education. The report identified five possible options for change. Each of these options requires regulatory relief, and the report identified State regulations as a significant factor in the challenges that are facing our State System of Higher Education.

In previous hearings, the House State Government Committee examined the Susquehanna River Basin Commission and we looked at the costs that have been incurred as a result of the overregulation by the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, the duplicative regulations between the

Department of Environmental Protection and the Susquehanna River Basin Commission doing the exact same thing at huge costs: \$121,000 for municipal water well system monitoring that is already being done by DEP for a 4,000-person borough.

Mr. Speaker, spring is here. Let us clean up Pennsylvania's regulatory burden. Let us empower our citizens to succeed. Let us grow Pennsylvania's economy. Please, let us pass HB 209.

The SPEAKER. Representative Bradford.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the spirit of spring cleaning, I am going to begin where the good lady from York left off. Recently I had the opportunity to speak with some of my own constituents in East Norriton who are dealing with a quarry operation. And like many of us who have dealt with constituent issues, at first, if you have never dealt with a similar issue, you find yourself struggling to kind of get your bearings on what the statutory system is that defines such a use. And I have got to say, I had some very sophisticated constituents and they had done a lot of research, and there was an engineer and there was an attorney in the group, and what they did was really dig into DEP's and DCNR's (Department of Conservation and Natural Resources) and the Mining Bureau and all these different regulations, and you know what? What seem to be pretty mundane, boring regulations, all of a sudden what I realized from my good residents at East Norriton was there are regulations on how loud a crushing operation can be at a quarry, and there are also regulations about how much dust can fly through people's houses and windows and on their property, and I realize these are mundane issues, but these are what regulations are. They are the issues that, when we pass statutes, we do not always touch upon, but which protect the health, safety, and welfare of Pennsylvanians.

Now, let us be clear: there is no constituency for bad regulation or overregulation. I think we all know that there is a price to be paid when we overregulate, but I think we would be wrong – in fact, we would be ignorant – to not concede that there is also a major cost to be paid when government fails to protect the public safety. Whether it is lead in drinking water, whether it is food safety, any of the issues that now come up with shale drilling and such, people want to know that regulations are in place that will protect Pennsylvania's citizens.

Now, again, I applaud the lady from York, because I know she is very strong in her desire to root out excessive regulation, but we should be mindful to realize that creating a second superbureaucracy, of which this legislative body will drive and oversee, may not be the most efficient way to do it. We may be one of the largest legislative bodies in America, but frequently we are not the most efficient. I would argue that having this body, Pennsylvania's legislature, be in control – in fact, I would say, micromanaging the regulatory structure here in Pennsylvania – may not be the best use of this body.

I would point out again, as I did yesterday, that we have one statutory requirement: to pass a budget. We almost never do that on time and most people do not think we do it very well here in Pennsylvania. Now the public safety, health, and welfare, down to the decibel levels and the amount of dust particles in the air, we believe that we are the experts. I would argue there is a better way. I believe the Wolf administration has made tremendous improvements in the regulatory system here in Pennsylvania and I think it would be wrong – in fact, I think it would be foolhardy at this time – for this body to think it knows better on how to write regulations than the experts in the field in question.

So again, I would ask that all members oppose HB 209, and I thank you for the opportunity, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative McCarter, for the second time.

Mr. McCARTER. Thank you again, Mr. Speaker.

And I was moved by Representative Bradford's comments about the nature of safety and welfare, because I think there is an example that we need to think back on, and that example happened approximately 11 months ago and it took place in the city of London, in Grenfell Tower, where 71 individuals lost their lives in a fire that took place in a high-rise. And if you go back to that story, one of the things that became clear out of that story was that Parliament in England had adopted an action several years before in which it did a two-for-one elimination of regulations, and took on its own authority to go through those regulations, and in the process, eliminated some of the fire restrictions and the fire building material regulations that existed for high-rises. And that turned out to be, unfortunately, one of the reasons, the main reason why that particular fire in fact consumed 71 lives.

Doing away with regulations is not just a sport; it is life and death. And when we do these, we need to do them with the proper scrutiny to make sure that we are not just hurting people instead of just for our own sake of saying we eliminated regulations. I hope – in fact, I pray – that in fact we take this very, very seriously and know that this particular bill is not meant to make sure that these regulations will always be in place to protect us, but in fact will be potentially eliminated.

Thank you again, Mr. Speaker, and I hope you join me in opposing this measure.

The SPEAKER. Representative Seth Grove.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HB 209 is a pretty simple bill. It does create a new office, but it does something State government normally does not do: looks at what has already been created to see if we need it anymore. Why is that important, Mr. Speaker? I had a meeting a few months ago with the Governor's Office, and we were discussing the merger, his merger proposal. Part of that proposal was actually to look at some regulations between the Department of Human Services and the Department of Health. They have industries that are regulated by both those departments with competing regulations; competing regulations. One example was fire hydrants – one reg required them 2 feet, another one required them 3 feet – so that regulated entity had to have two fire hydrants, otherwise, depending on whatever inspector showed up that day, they would get fined. These are the things we need to look at through our regulatory process to make sure we do not have repetitive and unnecessary regulations through the many, many years that we started regulating industries in this Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, HB 209 does something we currently do not do. We currently do not do a review of old regulations. We do not know from industries which regulations are good or bad, and, Mr. Speaker, ultimately the decision falls back on the General Assembly whether to keep those regulations or not, through this office's due diligence and reviewing the regulations to find out what is not needed, what is antiquated, and what will help us drive economic growth into the future, Mr. Speaker.

HB 209 is a simple concept. It even has a sunset. When their job is done, they go away – not too many agencies have that clause built into it, Mr. Speaker. I think it is a good bill. I think it will help make Pennsylvania lean, mean, and more efficient,

and, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe for a second – for a second – that this office is going to jeopardize the health, welfare, and safety of the residents of this Commonwealth. I do not think that any Governor is going to appoint an individual to that that is going to go to that extreme. I think they are going to look at this from a very restrictive way to ensure that regulations they look at requesting a repeal to are those that do not make sense, that are incompatible with each other, and ensure that our industries do not have to follow pointless regulations that are just there to be there, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on HB 209 to advance regulatory reform and to provide economic growth in this Commonwealth.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

CONSIDERATION OF HB 209 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Representative Greg Rothman, on the bill, HB 209.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you to support this bill. Government passes all kinds of regulations that have, as we learned yesterday, unintended consequences. This bill establishes an opportunity for government to say, "We no longer need this regulation" or "This regulation didn't make sense." I think back to a regulation put into effect during the Rendell administration. There was no vote in this House on it or in this legislature. There was no law signed into effect, but it required for all new construction, all houses in Pennsylvania must have a sprinkler system. Immediately it added fifteen to twenty thousand dollars to the cost of the new home construction. It did not do anything about the existing homes, but for new home construction, it required that they all have a sprinkler system. Ninety-nine percent of the residential properties in Pennsylvania do not have a sprinkler system, but 100 percent of the new homes were going to have to have a sprinkler system. There was never any vote by this legislature, no law signed into effect, but yet that cost was put on potential homeowners. And it was by an act of this legislature that we repealed that regulation after it was shown the adverse effect it was having on raising the cost of home ownership in Pennsylvania.

This bill by the good lady from York County will allow a mechanism to be put into place for us to correct mistakes, because every once in a while government makes mistakes. And that is the reason why pencils have erasers. So when we have regulations that are no longer relevant, no longer necessary, we ought to have that mechanism in place, and I congratulate her on this bill and I urge you to support it.

The SPEAKER. Does anybody else wish to speak, any of the leaders? Anybody else wish to speak on this bill? Anybody else wish to speak?

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—108

Barbin	Gillespie	Marsico	Rothman
Barrar	Godshall	Masser	Ryan
Benninghoff	Greiner	McGinnis	Sainato
Bernstine	Grove	Mentzer	Sankey
Bloom	Hahn	Metcalfe	Santora
Boback	Harris, A.	Metzgar	Schemel
Brown, R.	Heffley	Miccarelli	Simmons
Burns	Helm	Millard	Snyder
Causar	Hennessey	Miller, B.	Sonney
Charlton	Hickernell	Milne	Staats
Christiana	Hill	Moul	Tallman
Cook	Irvin	Mustio	Taylor
Corr	James	Nelson	Tobash
Cox	Jozwiak	Nesbit	Toepel
Culver	Kaufner	Oberlander	Toohil
Cutler	Kauffman	Ortitay	Topper
Day	Keefer	Peifer	Walsh
Delozier	Keller, F.	Petrarca	Ward
Diamond	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Warner
Dowling	Klunk	Pyle	Watson
Dunbar	Knowles	Quigley	Wentling
Dush	Lawrence	Rader	Wheeland
Ellis	Longietti	Rapp	White
Emrick	Mackenzie	Reed	Zimmerman
Evankovich	Maher	Reese	
Fee	Mako	Roae	Turzai,
Fritz	Maloney	Roe	Speaker
Gillen	Marshall		

NAYS—83

Bizzarro	DeLuca	Kavulich	Pashinski
Boyle	Dermody	Keller, W.	Quinn, C.
Bradford	DiGirolamo	Kim	Quinn, M.
Briggs	Donatucci	Kinsey	Ravenstahl
Bullock	Driscoll	Kirkland	Readshaw
Caltagirone	English	Kortz	Roebuck
Carroll	Evans	Krueger	Rozzi
Cephas	Farry	Kulik	Samuelson
Comitta	Fitzgerald	Madden	Schlossberg
Conklin	Flynn	Markosek	Schweyer
Corbin	Frankel	Matzie	Sims
Costa, D.	Freeman	McCarter	Solomon
Costa, P.	Gainey	McClinton	Stephens
Cruz	Galloway	McNeill	Sturla
Daley	Goodman	Mehaffie	Thomas
Davidson	Haggerty	Miller, D.	Vazquez
Davis, A.	Hanna	Mullery	Vitali
Davis, T.	Harkins	Murt	Warren
Dawkins	Harper	Neilson	Wheatley
Deasy	Harris, J.	O'Brien	Youngblood
DeLissio	Kampf	O'Neill	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—9

Brown, V.	Fabrizio	Lewis	Saccone
Dean	Gabler	Rabb	Saylor
Everett			

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

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

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. Representative Chris Quinn, on unanimous consent.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, on the prior bill, my button malfunctioned. I meant to be recorded in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1237, PN 2996**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 25, 1982 (P.L.633, No.181), known as the Regulatory Review Act, further providing for definitions, for proposed regulations and procedures for review and for final-form regulations and final-omitted regulations and procedures for review; providing for regulations deemed withdrawn; further providing for procedures for subsequent review of disapproved final-form or final-omitted regulations by the commission; and providing for concurrent resolution required for economically significant regulations.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On the bill, Representative Dawn Keefer.

Mrs. KEEFER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This bill would put the power back into the legislature's hands. It simply takes any regulation that has been proposed that has a million dollar impact or greater across the Commonwealth and requires a concurrent resolution to be passed by both the House and the Senate before it may be implemented. And I think we all are beholden to take a look at these types of regulations, as elected officials. We should not be giving our power over to unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats.

Economic growth, that is what we are missing out on in the Commonwealth through our taxes and our regulations. It is a hostile business climate that we have in this Commonwealth and this bill would help to start addressing some of that to allow these businesses to grow, to produce – not have government give special handouts, pick winners and losers, but to allow the free market to work and businesses to succeed.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, we just had a case in November where revenue, via a final rule, they removed accelerated depreciation. This put businesses in such a bind, and we as a legislature had to scramble to correct that issue to help these businesses that had already done their taxes for the year to figure out what they were going to do regarding their investments in the Commonwealth. Again, we are missing out on this economic growth. Another one, specifically, we have to have – I had a doctor recently contact me and ask me if there was something I could do about his annual inspection of his trash can, coffeemaker, and microwave. Who is coming in to inspect that annually? The Fire Commission, and that is in addition to every other agency – the Department of Health, Labor and Industry.

This is a commonsense bill and I would ask for your support. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dan Frankel, on the bill.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to HB 1237. I am choosing to only speak on one of these so-called regulatory reform bills, but these remarks encompass my general opposition to all of them.

We have one job: to represent the constituents in our district, the people who send us to Harrisburg; to listen to expert testimony at committee hearings; work with advocacy groups to advance worthy proposals; and to vote on important legislation. Mr. Speaker, I cannot remember a time when a single one of my constituents told me that regulatory reform was a top priority of theirs. Yes, I have spoken to well-meaning folks who would like to see a little less red tape, and I am all for that, but the bills in front of us today, including HB 1237, are a pretty clear attempt to undercut the authority of the Governor, his or her Cabinet officials, and the Independent Regulatory Review Commission. Let us be clear: everyone has to vote their district, and these bills are in no way, shape, or form a priority for the residents of the 23d Legislative District that I represent.

Yesterday while we debated amendments to this legislation that would have promoted regulatory fairness for our veterans, taxpayers, and even victims of crimes, I was dismayed by the repeated argument from the other side that our amendments would jeopardize the, quote, "health and safety of Pennsylvanians." Those words ring hollow to me, especially during a legislative week wherein we are once again moving separate legislation to punish our most vulnerable citizens in regard to food access, and only a few weeks after this chamber voted to put people's medical assistance at risk.

Mr. Speaker, those are the actions that are jeopardizing the health and safety of Pennsylvanians. HB 1237 and the rest of this package are simply being used to place significant barriers in the path of regulators under the guise of good government. I do not buy it. While most of us can agree that we could use some tweaks in the system to cut down on the red tape, HB 1237 uses a sledgehammer to pound in a nail.

I will be voting "no," Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Mike Sturla, followed by Representative Bryan Barbin.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, will the maker of the bill rise for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Yes, she will so stand. The good lady will so stand.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, when we pass legislation around here, it is accompanied by a fiscal note, and in a lot of those pieces of legislation, we tell a department that, as a result of the legislation, they are now charged with promulgating regulations to accompany that piece of legislation. So in a hypothetical, if the piece of legislation's fiscal note says that it is going to cost \$20 million for the fiscal note, and the department, as a result of that piece of legislation, promulgates 50 regulations, because we have created a new department or we have created a new program, do each of those regulations need to have a resolution because the total bill was more than \$1 million? Or do you divide the 50 regulations by the \$20 million, and all of them would be less than \$1 million? Or do you pick out five regulations and say, "Well, those were the five that actually cost

the \$20 million. The other 45 didn't really cost anything." How do we go about that?

Mrs. KEEFER. So as the bill is currently written, it would be each regulation. So if that individual regulation has an economic impact of \$1 million or greater, as defined by the IFO (Independent Fiscal Office), that would have to go through both the House and Senate for a concurrent resolution.

Mr. STURLA. So when some piece of legislation is created that we get a packet of regulations that are maybe 40 pages long and there are 100 regulations, the IFO is going to have to go through each one of those and assign a fiscal note to each one of those regulations as it related to a \$20 million bill?

Mrs. KEEFER. Yes, they would, and IRRC does this already with some of them that go through their process.

Mr. STURLA. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if I could, on the bill?

The SPEAKER. Yes, Representative Sturla, you may speak on the bill, sir.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me—

The SPEAKER. Members, please, the good gentleman is entitled to be heard. If members could please take their seats or take any discussions off the House floor. Members, please take the discussions off the House floor. Members, please take the conversations off the House floor.

You may proceed, Representative Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we are creating a redundancy here. At some point in time the legislature, in the scenario I just mentioned, voted to spend \$20 million, and we charged the department with creating regulations about how we spend those \$20 million. Inherently in those regulations would be the notion that we were going to spend \$20 million, so we then need to not only approve that we have spent \$20 million, but then approve each regulation that says how we are going to spend those \$20 million, even though we have already approved the \$20 million. This is bureaucracy upon bureaucracy upon bureaucracy for things that we have already approved.

I cannot imagine us cluttering up government more than this particular piece of legislation. I would encourage members to vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Representative Bryan Barbin, and then — I do not think I see any other speakers — then it would just be the maker of the bill.

So, Representative Barbin, the floor is yours.

Mr. BARBIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to this bill, and these are my reasons. In the Declaration of Independence, it indicates that to secure the rights of government, we look to the "...just powers from the consent of the governed...." It further says that when "...any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new" form of government. However, it says that on such, the government, as altered, ought to be done "on such principles and organizing its powers" ought to be done in a way that shall most likely "effect their Safety and Happiness." And it further says that "prudence, indeed, will dictate that the Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient" purposes.

The problem with this bill is the fact that we want to rush to say we need a new law or set of laws to be able to say that a regulation is not working. It is either working or it is not. There

is a current system to take care of that. Number one, the person affected by the regulation can go into court and say, that regulation is not consistent with the statute; therefore, it is void. That is what Commonwealth Court does. The second way to deal with the problem is you go in to the standing committee, for which the regulation is written, and you say to the chairman of that committee, "This one really costs a whole lot of money. We shouldn't be spending this money and I don't think that it's really consistent with the statute," at which point the chairman of the committee has some legislation drafted to say he cannot do it.

What this bill would do is to say, after we have done all of that, we want to have somebody come in and say we need concurrent resolutions for any regulation that we feel is improper because it is too expensive. It is going to create a huge amount of problems and it will just depend on who is the person in charge of the House or the Senate.

Now, what the Declaration says, and it even says it on the plaque as you walk in, in the East Wing, and William Penn said it when he said to the legislature, do not do this lightly. If you want to change things, change them, but have a good reason for doing them. We do not have a good reason for changing the law that is going to make it more – it is going to cost a lot more money to do this, and it is going to set up a whole series of problems, because nobody has thought through what is going to happen after our first concurrent resolution or what is going to happen when we pass a law, but we say, "Well, we can't do that, because it's got to be by concurrent resolution."

Right now if the House wants to get rid of a regulation, it passes a bill and then it goes over to the Senate, and if it is a good idea, it gets passed, and then it goes to the Governor, and he says it is a good idea and he signs it. We are changing the whole system of government because somebody wants to say we have too many regulations.

We do have too many regulations, but this is not the way to fix it. I ask for a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. Representative Keefer.

Mrs. KEEFER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me start by saying there was a comment that was made that says this undercuts the authority of these agencies. These agencies get their authority from us, the General Assembly, and it is our duty to make sure that they are acting within the scope of the law, and too often they are not, and it is not going through committees and it is not going through the IRRC process. This would put the power back into the hands of the General Assembly and have them take responsibility of what they are supposed to be doing.

Another comment was about decluttering. They are all in favor of decluttering our regulations, but they opposed the last piece of legislation that would have cleaned up our regulations. We have a regulatory nightmare here in trying to decipher what is going on in the Commonwealth. Specifically, here is an example. An air compressor, there was just a new rule – not because of the law, but a new rule – every air compressor, regardless of PSI (pounds per square inch), has to have a minimum PSI gauge, not because any statistics that could be produced, because that was asked for, but because a new rule was just written arbitrarily on that. There are things we need for good safety measures and for the health and welfare of the Commonwealth, but we have gotten in way too deep. This, again, is a commonsense measure to start addressing that problem.

And again, I go back to economic growth. We all know that regulations are killing our small businesses. They cannot bear the burdens, anything comparable to what our larger industries can do, and if we want to help spur economic growth, which will help our revenues in this Commonwealth, this is a great measure to do that.

So I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this bill. Thank you.

On the question recurring,

Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—101

Barrar	Gillespie	Marshall	Rothman
Benninghoff	Godshall	Marsico	Ryan
Bernstine	Greiner	Masser	Sankey
Bloom	Grove	McGinnis	Schemel
Brown, R.	Hahn	Mentzer	Simmons
Causer	Harris, A.	Metcalfe	Sonney
Christiana	Heffley	Metzgar	Staats
Cook	Helm	Millard	Stephens
Corbin	Hennessey	Miller, B.	Tallman
Corr	Hickernell	Milne	Taylor
Cox	Hill	Moul	Tobash
Culver	Irvin	Mustio	Toepel
Cutler	James	Nelson	Toohil
Day	Jozwiak	Nesbit	Topper
Delozier	Kaufar	Oberlander	Walsh
Diamond	Kauffman	Ortitay	Ward
Dowling	Keefer	Peifer	Warner
Dunbar	Keller, F.	Pickett	Watson
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Wentling
Ellis	Klunk	Quigley	Wheeland
Emrick	Knowles	Rader	White
English	Lawrence	Rapp	Zimmerman
Evankovich	Mackenzie	Reed	
Fee	Maher	Reese	Turzai,
Fritz	Mako	Roae	Speaker
Gillen	Maloney	Roe	

NAYS—89

Barbin	DeLissio	Keller, W.	Pashinski
Bizzarro	DeLuca	Kim	Petrarca
Boback	Dermody	Kinsey	Quinn, C.
Boyle	DiGirolamo	Kirkland	Quinn, M.
Bradford	Donatucci	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Briggs	Driscoll	Krueger	Readshaw
Bullock	Evans	Kulik	Roebuck
Burns	Farry	Longietti	Rozzi
Caltagirone	Fitzgerald	Madden	Sainato
Carroll	Flynn	Markosek	Samuelson
Cephas	Frankel	Matzie	Santora
Charlton	Freeman	McCarter	Schweyer
Comitta	Gainey	McClinton	Sims
Conklin	Galloway	McNeill	Snyder
Costa, D.	Goodman	Mehaffie	Solomon
Costa, P.	Haggerty	Miccarelli	Sturla
Cruz	Hanna	Miller, D.	Thomas
Daley	Harkins	Mullery	Vazquez
Davidson	Harper	Murt	Vitali
Davis, A.	Harris, J.	Neilson	Warren
Davis, T.	Kampf	O'Brien	Wheatley
Dawkins	Kavulich	O'Neill	Youngblood
Deasy			

NOT VOTING—1

Schlossberg

EXCUSED—9

Brown, V.	Fabrizio	Lewis	Saccone
Dean	Gabler	Rabb	Saylor
Everett			

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

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

VOTE CORRECTION

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

Mr. SCHLOSSBERG. To correct the record.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir, you may proceed.

Mr. SCHLOSSBERG. On the previous bill, I wish to be recorded in the negative.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHLOSSBERG. Thank you.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

BILL ON CONCURRENCE
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 478, PN 3434**, entitled:

An Act providing for outpatient psychiatric oversight.

On the question,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Representative Tim HENNESSEY has indicated he is to be placed on leave. Without objection, that will be granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 478 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate?

Moved by the gentlelady, Ms. Pickett, that the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate.

Representative Pickett, if you would please give a brief description of the underlying bill and the Senate amendments. Thank you.

Ms. PICKETT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We do agree with the amendments that were made in the Senate. The amendment would change the definition of "advanced practice professional" to be limited to CRNPs (certified registered nurse practitioners) and PAs (physician assistants) with a mental health certificate or able to obtain a

mental health certificate within 2 years of the effective date of this section.

They also changed some terminology, replaced the term with "interactive audio and video," to allow the psychiatrist to provide the oversight needed via the need of these remote means.

Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the Senate's work on this bill with me and the work that has happened in this House on this bill. It is a bill that is very important to our mental health services, and particularly, in our rural areas where we simply cannot attain and place services of a psychiatrist, and this is going to give us a much better service to folks who need it, including dealing with a lot of our drug issues that have developed so heavily throughout our whole State.

So thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity and I appreciate the vote on this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—190

Barbin	Ellis	Krueger	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Emrick	Kulik	Readshaw
Benninghoff	English	Lawrence	Reed
Bernstine	Evankovich	Longietti	Reese
Bizzarro	Evans	Mackenzie	Roae
Bloom	Farry	Madden	Roe
Boback	Fee	Maher	Roebuck
Boyle	Fitzgerald	Mako	Rothman
Bradford	Flynn	Maloney	Rozzi
Briggs	Frankel	Markosek	Ryan
Brown, R.	Freeman	Marshall	Sainato
Bullock	Fritz	Marsico	Samuelson
Burns	Gainey	Masser	Sankey
Caltagirone	Galloway	Matzie	Santora
Carroll	Gillen	McCarter	Schemel
Causar	Gillespie	McClinton	Schlossberg
Cephas	Godshall	McGinnis	Schweyer
Charlton	Goodman	McNeill	Simmons
Christiana	Greiner	Mehaffie	Sims
Comitta	Grove	Mentzer	Snyder
Conklin	Haggerty	Metcalfe	Solomon
Cook	Hahn	Metzgar	Sonney
Corbin	Hanna	Miccarelli	Staats
Corr	Harkins	Millard	Stephens
Costa, D.	Harper	Miller, B.	Sturla
Costa, P.	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Tallman
Cox	Harris, J.	Milne	Taylor
Cruz	Heffley	Moul	Thomas
Culver	Helm	Mullery	Tobash
Cutler	Hickernell	Murt	Toepel
Daley	Hill	Mustio	Toohil
Davidson	Irvin	Neilson	Topper
Davis, A.	James	Nelson	Vazquez
Davis, T.	Jozwiak	Nesbit	Vitali
Dawkins	Kampf	O'Brien	Walsh
Day	Kaufner	O'Neill	Ward
Deasy	Kauffman	Oberlander	Warner
DeLissio	Kavulich	Ortitay	Warren
Delozier	Keefer	Pashinski	Watson
DeLuca	Keller, F.	Peifer	Wentling
Dermody	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Wheatley
Diamond	Keller, W.	Pickett	Wheeland
DiGirolo	Kim	Pyle	White
Donatucci	Kinsey	Quigley	Youngblood
Dowling	Kirkland	Quinn, C.	Zimmerman

Driscoll	Klunk	Quinn, M.	
Dunbar	Knowles	Rader	Turzai,
Dush	Kortz	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Brown, V.	Fabrizio	Lewis	Saccone
Dean	Gabler	Rabb	Saylor
Everett	Hennessey		

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments were concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

BILL SIGNED BY SPEAKER

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

HB 478, PN 3434

An Act providing for outpatient psychiatric oversight.

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

The SPEAKER. Members, we are going to turn to second consideration bills. We do have others on third consideration, but we need 24 hours or a motion to proceed, so we are going to finish all the other work in front of us.

CALENDAR

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 2213, PN 3231**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Human Services Code, in children and youth, further providing for adoption opportunity payments and reimbursement.

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 1887, PN 2642**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 24, 1931 (P.L.1206, No.331), known as The First Class Township Code, further providing for suits and property.

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 1888, PN 2643**, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 8 (Boroughs and Incorporated Towns) and 11 (Cities) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in corporate powers, further providing for personal property; and, in corporate powers, further providing for city property and affairs.

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 1889, PN 2644**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 27, 1953 (P.L.244, No.34), entitled "An act relating to and regulating the contracts of incorporated towns and providing penalties," further providing for power to convey.

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 1843, PN 3356**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 72 (Taxation and Fiscal Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for budget and for financial transparency.

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

Mr. **GROVE** offered the following amendment No. **A06961**:

Amend Bill, page 4, by inserting between lines 25 and 26

501. Definitions.

Amend Bill, page 4, line 26, by striking out "501" and inserting

502

Amend Bill, page 4, line 27, by striking out "502" and inserting

503

Amend Bill, page 4, line 28, by striking out "503" and inserting

504

Amend Bill, page 4, by inserting between lines 28 and 29

§ 501. Definitions.

The following words and phrases when used in this chapter shall have the meanings given to them in this section unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

"Commonwealth agency." Any office, authority, board, multistate agency or commission of the executive branch, an independent agency or a State-affiliated entity. The term includes any of the following:

(1) The Governor's Office.

(2) The Office of Attorney General.

(3) The Department of the Auditor General.

(4) The Treasury Department.

(5) An organization established by the Constitution of Pennsylvania, a statute or an executive order which performs or is intended to perform an essential government function.

(6) A legislative agency.

(7) A judicial agency.

"Independent agency." Any office, authority, board or agency of the Commonwealth that is not subject to the policy, supervision or control of the Governor.

"Judicial agency." Any of the following:

- (1) The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.
- (2) The Superior Court of Pennsylvania.
- (3) The Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania.
- (4) The Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts.

"Legislative agency." As defined in section 102 of the act of February 14, 2008 (P.L.6, No.3), known as the Right-to-Know Law.

"State-affiliated agency." Any of the following:

- (1) The Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board.
- (2) The Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency.
- (3) The State System of Higher Education.

Amend Bill, page 4, line 29, by striking out "501" and inserting 502

Amend Bill, page 5, line 11, by striking out "EITHER"

Amend Bill, page 5, line 12, by striking out "OR" and inserting and

Amend Bill, page 5, lines 13 and 14, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

(b) General Fund information.—The following shall apply:

(1) The State Treasurer shall provide on the transparency portal an analysis of the General

Amend Bill, page 5, lines 17 through 30; page 6, lines 1 through 6; by striking out all of said lines on said pages and inserting

(i) Cash flow within the General Fund which shall include a line graph showing changes in cash flow with a range starting from the 2014-2015 fiscal year.

(ii) The current General Fund balance.

(iii) General fund expenditures. The public shall be able to delineate expenditures under this subparagraph by appropriation paid out of the General Fund by the Commonwealth agency that made the expenditure.

(iv) General Fund revenues, including information relating to the difference between estimated revenues provided by the Independent Fiscal Office under section 605-B of the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.177, No.175), known as The Administrative Code of 1929, for the given fiscal year and actual revenues collected. The Treasury Department shall also include a graph comparing changes within the General Fund revenues and General Fund expenditures starting with the 2018-2019 fiscal year.

(2) In order to assist the State Treasurer in compiling the information required under this subsection for the analysis of the General Fund, each Commonwealth agency shall provide the information to the Treasury Department in a file format specified by the Treasury Department through interface files.

Amend Bill, page 6, line 12, by striking out "FUNDS" and inserting

accounts

Amend Bill, page 6, line 12, by inserting after "OF"

Commonwealth

Amend Bill, page 6, lines 15 through 17, by striking out "THE INFORMATION" in line 15 and all of lines 16 and 17

Amend Bill, page 6, line 23, by striking out "COMMONWEALTH" and inserting

Treasury

Amend Bill, page 6, line 25, by inserting after "INVESTMENTS"

managed by the Treasury Department

Amend Bill, page 6, lines 26 through 30; page 7, lines 1 through 3; by striking out "MONEY INVESTED BY THE COMMONWEALTH INTO BOTH" in line 26, all of lines 27 through 30 on page 6 and all of lines 1 through 3 on page 7 and inserting the daily balances of each fund within the investment pools managed by the Treasury Department. The State Treasurer shall ensure

the information is updated to reflect changes in investment pools and account balances from the close of business the previous day.

Amend Bill, page 7, line 14, by striking out "COST DRIVERS" and inserting

highest expenditures as designated by appropriation

Amend Bill, page 7, line 23, by striking out "FINANCES" and inserting

funds

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, Representative Seth Grove. Thank you, sir.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This was just cleanup language the Treasury recommended to place in the bill to help them administer their transparency portal more effectively.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would appreciate an affirmative vote.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—190

Barbin	Ellis	Krueger	Ravenstahl
Barrar	Emrick	Kulik	Readshaw
Benninghoff	English	Lawrence	Reed
Bernstine	Evankovich	Longietti	Reese
Bizzarro	Evans	Mackenzie	Roae
Bloom	Farry	Madden	Roe
Boback	Fee	Maher	Roebuck
Boyle	Fitzgerald	Mako	Rothman
Bradford	Flynn	Maloney	Rozzi
Briggs	Frankel	Markosek	Ryan
Brown, R.	Freeman	Marshall	Sainato
Bullock	Fritz	Marsico	Samuelson
Burns	Gainey	Masser	Sankey
Caltagirone	Galloway	Matzie	Santora
Carroll	Gillen	McCarter	Schemel
Causer	Gillespie	McClinton	Schlossberg
Cephas	Godshall	McGinnis	Schweyer
Charlton	Goodman	McNeill	Simmons
Christiana	Greiner	Mehaffie	Sims
Comitta	Grove	Mentzer	Snyder
Conklin	Haggerty	Metcalfe	Solomon
Cook	Hahn	Metzgar	Sonney
Corbin	Hanna	Miccarelli	Staats
Corr	Harkins	Millard	Stephens
Costa, D.	Harper	Miller, B.	Sturla
Costa, P.	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Tallman
Cox	Harris, J.	Milne	Taylor
Cruz	Heffley	Moul	Thomas
Culver	Helm	Mullery	Tobash
Cutler	Hickernell	Murt	Toepel
Daley	Hill	Mustio	Toohil
Davidson	Irvin	Neilson	Topper
Davis, A.	James	Nelson	Vazquez
Davis, T.	Jozwiak	Nesbit	Vitali
Dawkins	Kampf	O'Brien	Walsh
Day	Kaufman	O'Neill	Ward
Deasy	Kauffman	Oberlander	Warner
DeLissio	Kavulich	Ortitay	Warren
Delozier	Keefer	Pashinski	Watson
DeLuca	Keller, F.	Peifer	Wentling
Dermody	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Wheatley
Diamond	Keller, W.	Pickett	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Kim	Pyle	White

Donatucci	Kinsey	Quigley	Youngblood
Dowling	Kirkland	Quinn, C.	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Klunk	Quinn, M.	
Dunbar	Knowles	Rader	Turzai,
Dush	Kortz	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Brown, V.	Fabrizio	Lewis	Saccone
Dean	Gabler	Rabb	Saylor
Everett	Hennessey		

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?

Mr. **MARKOSEK** offered the following amendment No. **A06960**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 3, by striking out "BUDGET AND FOR"

Amend Bill, page 4, line 8, by striking out "CHAPTERS" and inserting
a chapter

Amend Bill, page 4, lines 9 through 22, by striking out all of said lines

Amend Bill, page 4, line 28, by striking out all of said line

Amend Bill, page 8, lines 1 through 12, by striking out all of said lines

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The **SPEAKER**. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes Representative Joe Markosek.

Mr. **MARKOSEK**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, taxpayers elected each and every one of us to do a budget every year and to do it well. No games. No tricks. Taxpayers understand that the budget process can be complicated. They realize that elected officials must strike an appropriate balance between the public's right to know and the internal discourse needed to develop a public proposal, which we often then call the Governor's budget. He has the duty to do that.

My amendment fixes two serious problems with my good friend, the gentleman from York's bill. First, it preserves the ability of the administration to prepare its budget proposal with candid – candid – internal discussion. After all, the Governor's executive budget is in fact the Governor's budget. Agencies have a role to play in preparing a budget, but it is the Governor's responsibility to submit a budget, submit a budget proposal to us, the General Assembly.

A good work product, a good work product requires the administration to have the space to privately conduct its review of the budget and privately debate decisions. If not for the direct

and time-honored practice of the Governor beginning the annual budget process this way, then remember we have a transparency law, a Right-to-Know, that explicitly recognizes that some conversations are internal. Documents related to predecisional budget recommendations and policies are expressly protected from public scrutiny by the Right-to-Know Law. This bill would undo that protection because it would not allow the Governor to take his agencies' budget, his own agencies' budget advice and deliberate privately on it before reaching his public decisions contained in the executive budget.

We do not require every internal budget proposal prepared by our staff to be made public. The Republicans do not do that; the Democrats do not do that. We do not require every draft piece of legislation to be posted to the legislative Web site. Preempting the executive budget and not allowing the Governor to make his budget proposal with honest internal discussion is not a recipe for good budget policy, and this bill would do all of that.

The second problem my amendment seeks to correct in this bill will be to protect us all from well-intentioned citizens who want to find budget appropriations at any time of the year. Opening the Commonwealth's accounting system, the S-A-P, SAP – this is a sophisticated accounting system – opening that to everyone would be like giving everyone a football helmet and telling them to go play in the NFL (National Football League). It just would not work. It is too complicated and too sophisticated, and the public is not going to understand it, and it is costly to open that up and do that.

Pennsylvanians are interested in the financial health of many entities. It could be a public company they work for or own stock in. It could be a church or a religious organization. It could be a club or a social organization. It could be their school or their State government. There are many tools to properly disclose financial information to inform decisionmakers and stakeholders. We have skilled professionals. We have financial statements. We have disclosure standards. We have discussion with the experts. We have audits. We have separate independent auditors. We have checks and balances. We have meetings and we have hearings – all of which take a lot of energy and expense, and we do all of that already. All of these tools are used to communicate accurate information to help make the best decision possible. Just providing access to a complex, sophisticated computer system, without expertise, without knowledge of its structure, without knowledge of its nuances, without knowledge of its pitfalls, will not provide quality, reliable information.

The implication of this bill is that the Democratic Governor must be doing something wrong or secretive during his crafting of budget proposals, and he is doing nothing more than what every Governor has ever done, both Democrat and Republican. This notion is unfair and it is squarely partisan, and for that reason it is wrong.

Pennsylvania is in the economic situation it is in because one party in this General Assembly, the majority party, has not been managing the budget well for the past 8 years. Pennsylvania is not, Pennsylvania is not in financial straits because the public has not had access to the tools used by budget negotiators, analysts, and the Governor. It is in economic distress because the General Assembly has not done its job in passing fair and well-funded budgets over the last many years.

For that reason I would ask that you support this amendment so that we clean this bill up and do what is fair, not only for us here, but for all Pennsylvanians.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dush. Representative Frank Ryan. Does anybody else wish to speak on this amendment?

Representative Dush, the floor is yours.

Mr. DUSH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the maker of the amendment be willing to rise for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The good gentleman has indicated he will so stand.

Mr. DUSH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, does the maker, in saying that the public will not understand the systems, think that the public in general is just not capable? I have accountants, I have business owners that are able to understand spreadsheets, flow charts, able to understand expenditures and that sort of thing. When I came and when I was running for office in the first place, having worked in the government for over 20 years and seen how the different pots of money even in the Federal government are misused—

The SPEAKER. Representative Dush, I am sorry. I did this to a member yesterday and I apologize. You are certainly entitled to speak on the amendment. If you have a question, though, it has got to be a direct question.

Mr. DUSH. It is but it is—

The SPEAKER. You have to ask a direct question. I did say it to members on the other side of the aisle yesterday. Please, just – and I have no problem with your speaking on the amendment, but if you are going to ask a question, ask a question.

Mr. DUSH. All right.

Mr. Speaker, my question is, if you are stating that the public will not be able to understand the system, are you saying that accountants that are our constituents, that business owners that are our constituents are not going to have the mental capacity to be able to actually look at these charts, look at these and understand them?

Mr. MARKOSEK. Well, there are two things that this amendment does. One is it suggests that certain aspects of the budget are things that are currently done not in the public purview, they are done privately, just like your Appropriations Committee does, our Appropriations Committee does. There are a lot of bills that we all discuss quite a bit before we actually decide to put a bill in. I am suggesting through my amendment here that what the gentleman from York has suggested with his bill is that we take away all of that and we just negotiate out in public before the Governor even has a chance to actually present his budget to us. I do not think you are going to get the best budget that you have.

The other thing is, there is another side to this, it is called the SAP system, which quite frankly, even after all of my years here, I am not very familiar with. Most of my staff and I think the staff on the other side is not very familiar with it. It is highly complicated. It is highly nuanced. It is highly technical and sophisticated. And as a result of that, by just letting the public go into that system – which, by the way, would cost us a lot of additional money to begin with, which I know a lot of people here do not want to spend the money – we would have a situation where we would be giving this, we would have this

particular item available to the public without properly explaining to them how it works and for them not knowing what it is like.

As I mentioned in my comments here, it would be like giving somebody an NFL football helmet and tell them, okay; here it is. You know what to do with it. Go out and play NFL football. They would not be prepared.

So this bill that my colleague has put together is flawed and this amendment is trying to correct that and save the Commonwealth money.

Mr. DUSH. Mr. Speaker, then are you saying that most of our Approps staff, most of the members do not have the ability to understand the SAP system?

Mr. MARKOSEK. They do not right now. It would cost a lot of money to train people to be able to understand that. I do not understand it, and if I do not understand it, how is anybody else going to understand it?

Mr. DUSH. Respectfully, if the members of this House do not understand it, what are we doing wrong that we should not make this out there in the public so everybody else can see how messed up it is?

Mr. MARKOSEK. It is a very complex system which I admit, I do not understand. My guess is, most of my staff does not understand it. Probably a lot of the staff on the other side does not understand it. And this is something that is very costly also, very costly, and I know how we all want to save money around here, especially some of our good friends on both sides of the aisle.

So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I have answered the question.

And I would ask you, sir, to please vote "yes" on my amendment.

Mr. DUSH. Well, Mr. Speaker, respectfully, I would like to ask, why is it so complicated? Why is it that we are in a position where it is so hard to understand?

The SPEAKER. Sir, my understanding is that I think the good gentleman—

Mr. DERMODY. The interrogation I believe has ended, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. —is done with interrogation.

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

The SPEAKER. But you may speak on the bill.

Mr. DUSH. A number of interesting points have been raised here. In our research into this in the Common Sense Caucus we found how complicated this was. In fact, when I first became familiar with the ledger 5, it was because the executive branch was shifting money around, hidden from our view.

I actually had a forensic accountant come in and take a look at the SAP reports, and his comment to me was, after he had been auditing the State of Florida's tax and budget, he said, "It's going to take a team of accountants years to figure this out." That is actually the point, I think, one of the points to the maker of this bill's whole intent is that we have got to get this out there so that everybody can see how screwed up it is.

Honestly, if the Appropriations Committee on either party at the amendment maker's statement that they do not understand the system by which we undertake the budget process, we have got a serious problem here. We have people – accountants, business owners – who understand sound business practices. It is about time we put that information out there for everybody to see so that we can have people that have solutions able to come to us and provide those solutions.

I ask for your opposition to this amendment and support of the bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Grove.

Representative Ryan waived off.

Representative Grove, on the amendment.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The purpose of this bill is to provide more transparency to the general public and the members in this esteemed body.

The two provisions that this amendment addresses is, one, publication of agency budget documents. Agencies know more about their budgets than any of us ever hope to know about a budget. Every year we have to base decisions on what we can attain and ascertain. Having access to what the agencies put in their budget will only strengthen our ability and knowledge of the fiscal conditions of the Commonwealth for good or for bad, but a realistic view of what our agencies are facing on a day-to-day basis. It is what the Governor bases his decision on. We should have access to that information moving forward, and nothing in those documents precludes the agencies from removing any decisions or any discussion points of the budget. The Governor can have that with his agencies any time he wants. He can do that.

Two, access to the State accounting system. To think that the members of this body and the general public are too stupid to actually access and utilize a computer program – there was just a school up here. I bet all those kids could utilize that system very, very, very easily, Mr. Speaker. For the life of me, I do not know why we want to hide spending and restrict financial documentation from the general public or for our own use in budgetary decisions, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask for a "no" vote on this, and maybe if the administration is open to further discussion – I did e-mail them to ask them about their thoughts on this and basically got a "We're not interested in working with you" response, so. Even during committee, my colleagues on the other side brought up some concerns around costs, and I tried to mitigate that through ensuring that there are not any costs for the Budget Office.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer's Office did their complete transparency portal from the ground up without asking for one additional penny from the taxpayers. The hardworking workers, employees of the Treasury did it on nights and weekends because they believe in providing greater access and greater financial knowledge to the general public and to this esteemed body. They have been great to work with. We ironed out any concerns they have in the last amendment. Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of comradery we should have, particularly dealing with transparency.

Just last week, Mr. Speaker, a nationally recognized entity released their transparency report on all 50 States. Pennsylvania went from a B to a C in just under a year. Why? Because other States are surpassing us and our transparency tools are subpar to those other entities, Mr. Speaker.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a "no" vote. Let us provide the taxpayers and the residents of this Commonwealth the amount of transparency they deserve on a day-to-day basis.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Markosek, on your amendment, sir.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, just briefly.

Again, to summarize, you know, this is not necessarily all about transparency right here with this amendment. This is

about the way we negotiate budgets, the way we should negotiate budgets, and the best way to do that.

My amendment I think keeps that, keeps that in place, keeps the current system in place. And keep in mind, this would affect both Governors. It would be no matter who was in office, they would have to comply with this.

So I would ask for an affirmative vote and let us move on from there.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

CONSIDERATION OF HB 1843 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—76

Barbin	Dawkins	Kavulich	Pashinski
Bizzarro	Deasy	Keller, W.	Petrarca
Boyle	DeLissio	Kim	Ravenstahl
Bradford	DeLuca	Kinsey	Readshaw
Briggs	Dermody	Kirkland	Roebuck
Bullock	Donatucci	Kortz	Rozzi
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	Solomon
Costa, P.	Galloway	McClinton	Sturla
Cruz	Goodman	McNeill	Thomas
Daley	Haggerty	Miller, D.	Vazquez
Davidson	Hanna	Mullery	Vitali
Davis, A.	Harkins	Neilson	Warren
Davis, T.	Harris, J.	O'Brien	Youngblood

NAYS—113

Barrar	Gillen	Marsico	Roae
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Masser	Roe
Bernstine	Godshall	McGinnis	Rothman
Bloom	Greiner	Mehaffie	Ryan
Boback	Grove	Mentzer	Sankey
Brown, R.	Hahn	Metcalfe	Santora
Causer	Harper	Metzgar	Schemel
Charlton	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Simmons
Christiana	Heffley	Millard	Sonney
Cook	Helm	Miller, B.	Staats
Corbin	Hickernell	Milne	Stephens
Corr	Hill	Moul	Tallman
Cox	Irvin	Murt	Taylor
Culver	James	Mustio	Tobash
Cutler	Jozwiak	Nelson	Toepel
Day	Kampf	Nesbit	Toohil
Delozier	Kaufman	O'Neill	Topper
Diamond	Kauffman	Oberlander	Walsh
DiGirolamo	Keefer	Ortitay	Ward
Dowling	Keller, F.	Peifer	Warner
Dunbar	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Watson
Dush	Klunk	Pyle	Wentling
Ellis	Knowles	Quigley	Whealand
Emrick	Lawrence	Quinn, C.	White

English	Mackenzie	Quinn, M.	Zimmerman
Evankovich	Maher	Rader	
Farry	Mako	Rapp	Turzai,
Fee	Maloney	Reed	Speaker
Fritz	Marshall	Reese	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—11

Brown, V.	Fabrizio	Lewis	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	Rabb	Wheatley
Everett	Hennessey	Saccone	

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

On the question recurring,

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

The SPEAKER. I do not see any other further amendments.

On the question recurring,

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 630, PN 1635**, entitled:

An Act providing for the licensure of limited lines travel insurance producers, for requirements for sale of travel insurance, for authority of limited lines travel insurance producers, for registration and training of travel retailers and for renewal of license.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—186

Barbin	Ellis	Kortz	Rader
Barrar	Emrick	Krueger	Rapp
Benninghoff	English	Kulik	Ravenstahl
Bernstine	Evankovich	Lawrence	Readshaw
Bizzarro	Evans	Longietti	Reed
Bloom	Farry	Mackenzie	Reese
Boback	Fee	Madden	Roe
Boyle	Fitzgerald	Maher	Roebuck
Bradford	Flynn	Mako	Rozzi
Briggs	Frankel	Maloney	Ryan
Brown, R.	Freeman	Markosek	Sainato
Bullock	Fritz	Marshall	Samuelson
Burns	Gainey	Marsico	Sankey
Caltagirone	Galloway	Masser	Santora
Carroll	Gillen	Matzie	Schemel
Causar	Gillespie	McCarter	Schlossberg
Cephas	Godshall	McClinton	Schweyer
Charlton	Goodman	McGinnis	Simmons
Christiana	Greiner	McNeill	Sims
Comitta	Grove	Mehaffie	Snyder
Conklin	Haggerty	Mentzer	Solomon
Cook	Hahn	Metcalfe	Sonney
Corbin	Hanna	Metzgar	Staats
Corr	Harkins	Miccarelli	Stephens
Costa, D.	Harper	Millard	Sturla
Costa, P.	Harris, A.	Miller, B.	Tallman
Cox	Harris, J.	Miller, D.	Taylor
Cruz	Heffley	Milne	Thomas
Culver	Helm	Moul	Tobash
Cutler	Hickernell	Mullery	Toepel
Daley	Hill	Murt	Toohil
Davis, A.	Irvin	Mustio	Topper
Davis, T.	James	Neilson	Vazquez
Dawkins	Jozwiak	Nelson	Vitali
Day	Kampf	Nesbit	Walsh
Deasy	Kaufner	O'Brien	Ward
DeLissio	Kauffman	O'Neill	Warner
Delozier	Kavulich	Oberlander	Warren
DeLuca	Keefer	Ortitay	Watson
Dermody	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Wentling
Diamond	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Petrarca	White
Donatucci	Kim	Pickett	Youngblood
Dowling	Kinsey	Pyle	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Kirkland	Quigley	
Dunbar	Klunk	Quinn, C.	Turzai,
Dush	Knowles	Quinn, M.	Speaker

NAYS—2

Roae	Rothman
------	---------

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—12

Brown, V.	Everett	Hennessey	Saccone
Davidson	Fabrizio	Lewis	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	Rabb	Wheatley

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

Ordered, That the clerk return the same to the Senate with the information that the House has passed the same with amendment in which the concurrence of the Senate is requested.

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 2154, PN 3187**, entitled:

An Act relating to conventional wells and the development of oil, gas and coal; imposing powers and duties on the Department of Environmental Protection; and providing for preliminary provisions, for general requirements, for underground gas storage, for enforcement and remedies, for related funds, parties and activities and for miscellaneous provisions.

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

AMENDMENTS RULED OUT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. There are two amendments filed: one is by Representative Wheatley, who I know is not here, amendment 6945; and amendment 6941 by Representative Carroll. They have been ruled out of order.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Yes, you may proceed.

Mr. DERMODY. Representative Kinsey will be offering the Wheatley amendment.

The SPEAKER. Okay. That is fine. Representative Kinsey will offer amendment 6945. It has been ruled out of order by the Speaker; and Representative Carroll has filed amendment 6941, which is ruled out of order by the Speaker.

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

Mrs. **SNYDER** offered the following amendment No. **A06979**:

Amend Bill, page 8, line 4, by striking out "active"

Amend Bill, page 11, line 3, by striking out "commercially"

Amend Bill, page 11, lines 4 through 6, by striking out ", and which is greater than 28" in line 4, all of line 5 and "and laterally extensive" in line 6

Amend Bill, page 65, line 27, by inserting before "Nothing"

(a) Unconventional wells.—

Amend Bill, page 65, by inserting between lines 28 and 29

(b) Coal and Gas Resource Coordination Act.—

(1) The requirements under section 5 of the act of December 18, 1984 (P.L.1069, No.214), known as the Coal and Gas Resource Coordination Act, for the issuance of a permit under the former act of December 19, 1984 (P.L.1140, No.223), known as the Oil and Gas Act, shall apply to this act.

(2) Nothing in this act shall be construed to change, repeal or otherwise affect the provisions of the Coal and Gas Resource Coordination Act.

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

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes Representative Pam Snyder, on the amendment.

Mrs. **SNYDER**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment adds clarifying language to ensure the applicability of the existing Coal and Gas Resource Coordination Act to permits issued for conventional wells under HB 2154. The amendment simply seeks to maintain existing practices and procedures within the Coal and Gas Resource

Coordination Act to protect the safety of the workers underground, coal miners, when a well operator proposes to drill through a coal mine. The adoption of this amendment is critical to safeguard those individuals who work underground while allowing for rightful recovery of coal and oil and gas resources.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. CAUSER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment clarifies that an applicant for a gas well permit must comply with the Coal and Gas Resource Coordination Act. Mr. Speaker, there are some technical issues with the amendment that I believe strongly need to be corrected. However, at this point, to move the process forward with consideration of this bill, I would urge the members to support amendment A06979.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—188

Barbin	Emrick	Kulik	Ravenstahl
Barrar	English	Lawrence	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Evankovich	Longietti	Reed
Bernstine	Evans	Mackenzie	Reese
Bizzarro	Farry	Madden	Roae
Bloom	Fee	Maher	Roe
Boback	Fitzgerald	Mako	Roebuck
Boyle	Flynn	Maloney	Rothman
Bradford	Frankel	Markosek	Rozzi
Briggs	Freeman	Marshall	Ryan
Brown, R.	Fritz	Marsico	Sainato
Bullock	Gainey	Masser	Samuelson
Burns	Galloway	Matzie	Sankey
Caltagirone	Gillen	McCarter	Santora
Carroll	Gillespie	McClinton	Schemel
Causer	Godshall	McGinnis	Schlossberg
Cephas	Goodman	McNeill	Schweyer
Charlton	Greiner	Mehaffie	Simmons
Christiana	Grove	Mentzer	Sims
Comitta	Haggerty	Metcalfe	Snyder
Conklin	Hahn	Metzgar	Solomon
Cook	Hanna	Miccarelli	Sonney
Corbin	Harkins	Millard	Staats
Corr	Harper	Miller, B.	Stephens
Costa, D.	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Sturla
Costa, P.	Harris, J.	Milne	Tallman
Cox	Heffley	Moul	Taylor
Cruz	Helm	Mullery	Thomas
Culver	Hickernell	Murt	Tobash
Cutler	Hill	Mustio	Toepel
Daley	Irvin	Neilson	Toohil
Davis, A.	James	Nelson	Topper
Davis, T.	Jozwiak	Nesbit	Vazquez
Dawkins	Kampf	O'Brien	Vitali
Day	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.	Pickett	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Kim	Pyle	White
Donatucci	Kinsey	Quigley	Youngblood
Dowling	Kirkland	Quinn, C.	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Klunk	Quinn, M.	
Dunbar	Knowles	Rader	Turzai,

Dush Ellis	Kortz Krueger	Rapp	Speaker
---------------	------------------	------	---------

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—12

Brown, V. Davidson Dean	Everett Fabrizio Gabler	Hennessey Lewis Rabb	Saccone Saylor Wheatley
-------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------

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?

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

The SPEAKER. Representative Brian Ellis calls up – there is amendment 7008. It is a late-filed amendment. It would require a motion suspend.

Representative Ellis.

Mr. ELLIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I ask that the members of the Assembly agree to suspend the rules to consider this amendment. I make the motion to suspend the rules.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. On that motion, Representative Causer, on the motion to suspend to add amendment 7008.

Mr. CAUSER. Mr. Speaker, respectfully, the amendment that we just passed that was previously offered was an agreement that was reached between the conventional operators and the Coal Association, and now it appears as though some from the Coal Association are trying to get some more bites at the apple, and so I do not think that is negotiating in good faith and do not support the motion to suspend the rules.

The SPEAKER. Does anybody else wish to speak on the motion to suspend the rules?

Representative Ellis.

Mr. ELLIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

While I generally agree with my colleague on almost every issue that comes before the House, with all due respect back to you, the bill changes five distinct things about well siting and coal in Pennsylvania. The gentelady's amendment corrects two of those and leaves three uncorrected.

I think it is okay for us to have a general conversation about what we favor, whether it be gas production or coal production, in Pennsylvania. That is realistic for a conversation, but not today. We are not making a huge policy decision. All we are asking in this amendment is to keep the status quo for coal. Again, hers did two; this would do the other three that were affected by the legislation.

I ask the members for consideration on this and an affirmative vote for those folks that count on mining in their areas, count on mining for the production in Pennsylvania, for the jobs that it has created and the taxes that we receive from the industry. So I would ask for an affirmative vote for the suspension of the rules.

BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. At this time we are going to temporarily go over the bill.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A CONTINUED

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1659, PN 3461**, entitled:

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

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

The SPEAKER. We can begin debate on this. We will not be able to vote it until 4:18 p.m. That is when it was amended 24 hours ago. So we will not be able to vote it for another 20 minutes, but we can begin debate on HB 1659, PN 3461.

Representative Tobash, on the bill.

The clerk first will read a summary of the bill.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Representative Frankel, on the bill.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to HB 1651. This legislation accomplishes one thing—

The SPEAKER. Sir, please suspend. 1659.

Mr. FRANKEL. I am sorry. You are right.

The SPEAKER. No, I just – for the record, I wanted it to be correct.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you.

This legislation accomplishes one thing and one thing only. It takes away the flexibility to get food to hungry Pennsylvanians. The Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program is designed to do just that, to ensure that people who need food can get food, and it is one of the most effective programs that exists in the Commonwealth. A large percentage of people eligible for SNAP use the program, including children, older adults, people in low-wage work, or those in between jobs already looking for work.

It seems obvious, but I guess today it is worth repeating: ensuring that hungry people get food is a big deal. One of our local hospitals, West Penn Hospital, now provides food benefits to people with diabetes, because as it turns out, having regular access to food can help you stay healthier. Studies looking at the obesity epidemic have found that having regular access to food actually helps prevent diabetes. Many school districts are encouraging children to eat breakfast because having access to food can help you learn more and be smarter. Food helps children control their behavior better, pay attention, stay calm. We want students to eat breakfast on mornings before big exams because it turns out food helps kids do better at testing.

Having food is good for your health, and that means the inverse is also true – not having food is bad for you and it is bad for our communities. Taking away food is not going to make it easier for people to get jobs. Hungry people do not perform better in job interviews. Having pangs in your stomach does not make it easier to network.

The Pennsylvania Department of Human Services should be allowed to do what it is doing – use a very successful program to help combat hunger and nutritional deprivation for our residents in need. Instead, this legislation puts barriers between hungry people and food. What are our priorities? I know where mine are. They are in making sure that people in desperate need of food get what they need so that they can be healthy, successful, and full participants in our community, which already includes working and finding work.

This legislation seems to be based on the theory that our job as legislators is to make people in need ever more desperate. We have seen a shocking number of bills lately to punish our most vulnerable populations. I look forward to the day when this chamber takes votes to lift these folks up rather than tear them down.

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

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Representative Carroll, on the bill, please.

Mr. CARROLL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to SNAP benefits, 100 percent, 100 percent of these funds are Federal funds, Mr. Speaker. Pennsylvania simply is the pass-through and operates the program that distributes these Federal funds. Any benefits that go unpaid to the residents of our State will go to 1 of the other 49 States, so passage of this bill today, the net effect of that is to transfer dollars from Pennsylvania to some other State or States across this nation.

The savings to the Commonwealth with the passage of this bill? Zero. No savings, Mr. Speaker. In fact, there might be an actual loss because it will cost the department more to oversee a program with more red tape. I pity the folks that are going to have to write the regulations on this considering the regulatory bills that we just passed a minute ago. I am not sure how we are going to get past the Office of the Repealer on this one, but, Mr. Speaker, this bill provides no savings whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, the SNAP beneficiaries of our State spend their dollars in our chain and our local grocery stores. Those stores have an expectation and a budget and a business model that expects these dollars to be spent. The absence of these dollars in our State, Mr. Speaker, will have a detrimental effect on grocery stores that are both chain – large grocery stores – and mom-and-pop grocery stores across this State.

Mr. Speaker, Republican and Democratic Governors going backwards in time have sought and received the approval for the allowance of these benefits to continue, and this is a radical departure from a policy that has been embraced by Republican and Democratic administrations.

And, Mr. Speaker, finally, with respect to the Federal oversight of this program, the Congress is considering a Federal farm bill at this very moment in time that will include language that will codify the treatment of SNAP benefits for citizens in the entire country. It seems wildly premature to me, Mr. Speaker, that Pennsylvania would venture out on its own in advance of a farm bill that will be considered by the Congress that will address this very issue.

I prefer, Mr. Speaker, not to take a second position to the other States in this country. Let us keep the Federal dollars that are on the table available to our citizens, and when and if the Congress decides to dial this program back, well, then we will be dialed back just like every other State. Mr. Speaker, it is time to put a pause to this. Let us let the Federal government have a say in how they distribute SNAP dollars. It is their money, not ours.

The SPEAKER. Representative Gene DiGirolamo, followed by Representative Mary Jo Daley.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As with the bill last week on the work requirement for people who are on Medicaid, I have a number of concerns about this bill, and I think it is important that we understand how the SNAP program works.

First and most importantly, it is 100 percent funded by the Federal government. There are no State dollars involved in SNAP; 100 percent funded by the Federal government. Now, on the administrative side, the cost, it is a 50-50 match between the State and the Federal government, so administering the program here in Pennsylvania, the State does pick up 50 percent of the cost and the Federal government picks up an additional 50 percent.

And it is also important to realize that these adults that are getting food stamps who are unemployed can only qualify for 3 months of SNAP over a 36-month period. Now, these are adults, able-bodied adults with no dependents can only qualify for 3 months in a 3-year period.

Mr. Speaker, if we kick people off the rolls, we are leaving dollars in Washington that should be coming into Pennsylvania, and what do people do with those dollars when they have food stamps? They buy food and grocery at local Pennsylvania businesses. I cannot imagine people in agriculture would be happy if we were kicking people off the rolls of SNAP, and I cannot believe that people who own stores – grocery stores, farmers markets – would be happy also by knowing that we will be kicking people off the rolls of SNAP, Mr. Speaker.

And again, the verification process – I mean, I have serious concerns about how that is going to work. And again, the cost, the cost is going to be split 50 percent between the Federal government and 50 percent between the State. It is actually going to cost us money here in Pennsylvania for the verification process to leave Federal funds in Washington that would be coming into Pennsylvania and helping feed Pennsylvanians.

Mr. Speaker, I have serious concerns about it and I am going to be voting "no." Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative.
 Representative Mary Jo Daley waives off.
 Representative Brad Roae, on the bill.
 Mr. ROAE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Two prior speakers both basically said that because the SNAP program is federally funded, we should not do anything about abuse in the program, but, Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania taxpayers pay Federal income taxes also. Pennsylvania companies pay the Federal corporate income tax. So I think it is a very weak argument that since the food stamp program, the SNAP program, is funded with Federal tax money, we should ignore abuse in Pennsylvania in Pennsylvania law. Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation to protect our constituents, our taxpayers, for the Federal taxes they pay and the State taxes they pay. And as far as the underlying bill goes, what we want, Mr. Speaker, we want people who really need to be on these programs to be on these programs, but people who should not be on these programs, we do not want them on these programs.

So I urge everyone to vote "yes" for the bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Tobash, on the bill.

Mr. TOBASH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Bill Clinton in 1996, he said that for decades our welfare system has undermined the basic values of work and responsibility and family, trapping generation after generation of people in poverty. He understands that, at that time, he understood that Washington, when they pay, they pay from taxpayer dollars. On August 22, 1996, he signed into law the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act, a comprehensive, bipartisan reform plan that changed this nation's welfare system to support moving families from welfare into the dignity of work.

And I will tell you about 1996. In 1996 we had historically low unemployment. He added the work requirements for food assistance. It was instituted in that year. But in Pennsylvania, we are waiving those requirements. Let me tell you about 1996. With historically low unemployment today in Pennsylvania and in the nation, we have lower unemployment rates than we did in 1996. In 1996 the Federal unemployment rate was 4.9 percent. Today it is 4.1 percent.

So with unemployment falling and when you take a look at this program, you will see that the nutrition assistance program recipients are on the rise, and the disturbing thing is that we have got double-digit increases since 2010 in a class of people that are able-bodied with no dependents. I am not talking about disabled veterans. We are not talking about single moms with young children. At a time when businesses are finding it difficult to fill skilled and unskilled positions and other States are moving to requirements that we do not allow the Federal requirement to be waived – other States like Maine, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Alabama – at that time, Pennsylvania is adding capable adults onto our welfare rolls.

On June 1, 2018, 16 more counties have been waived from this Federal commonsense requirement. That has Pennsylvania standing at 59 counties out of 67, along with 10 cities, and why? We have historically low unemployment. We have been through budget cycles where we are borrowing and taxing, and we have job creators that are advertising on billboards and in yard signs and they are seeking people who are capable of working. And we have got those people that are choosing welfare over an active work roll. We can grow Pennsylvania's economy. Pennsylvanians can prosper. Pennsylvania can prosper.

This bill simply asks capable people to work or to volunteer or to be in a training program to work. So who benefits? The hardworking guy and gal in the State of Pennsylvania, every taxpayer. When you talk about money coming from Washington, remember, it does not come from Washington; it comes from taxpayers. And the people who actually need these benefits – we have set up a system in the Commonwealth that thumbs its nose at our hardworking citizens. We have set up a system that is not need-based in the State of Pennsylvania but is choice-based.

How can you tell your friend that is working at a construction site that you support paying for people to stay home or go fishing when they are going to work? How can you tell the gal that puts in 10 hours a day that you support her neighbor choosing not to volunteer when she is working and volunteering?

Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan said that "...the best social program is a job." He also said that "We should measure welfare's success by how many people leave welfare, not by how many" people "are added."

We should be striving in the State of Pennsylvania and promoting the dignity of work. If we can do that and grow our economy at the same time, Mr. Speaker, that is the icing on the cake.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Members, we have 3 minutes before we can vote on this legislation, so what we are going to do is we will just be at ease for the next 3 minutes.

Representative Jordan Harris; yes, sir.

We are no longer at ease.

Representative Harris, the floor is yours.

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

Mr. Speaker, I was not going to stand and say anything about this legislation, but some of the comments that I heard by some of our recent speakers just, I just could not sit aside and allow them to go unchecked.

First and foremost, can we stop with the narrative that people sit at home every day and collect benefits, because that is just not the truth. There are so many folks in Pennsylvania that go out and work every day. They work 40 hours a week, and because they are not paid a decent wage, they can still not afford to take care of their family. So we need to stop with the rhetoric that people are sitting at home collecting this check, because I do not know if you looked at the numbers, but when you are on public assistance, you still have basically nothing. You have just enough, if that, to feed your family.

(Remarks stricken from the record.)

Vote however you want to vote. I get it. But standing up and belittling Pennsylvanians is not the way to go. People go to work every day and they still cannot feed their families. So if we want to have a real conversation about this issue, let us talk about paying people the fair wages that they deserve so they do not need SNAP benefits when they work 40 hours a week, so they do not need these types of support or programs when they go to work 40 hours a week. That is the real conversation that we should be having, because in my district and districts across this Commonwealth, people are not sitting at home to try to collect a check. No. They went to a school that failed them, and because the school failed them, they do not have the training to go out and get a decent job to take care of their family.

It is so easy to put your foot on the necks of people without dealing with and talking about the situations that have put them in the cycle of poverty in which they live. That is the real conversation we should be having, Mr. Speaker, and not this elitist conversation about people needing to go to work. They still go work and still cannot afford to feed their families. Let us talk about that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. It is now 4:18, so we can vote.

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Representative Bernie O'Neill, on the bill, please.

Mr. O'NEILL. Point of order, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. O'NEILL. A personal inquiry?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. O'NEILL. I just want to point out to the members of the Finance Committee, since we are in a lull here waiting for the bill, that we will be meeting tomorrow at 10 o'clock, even though session will start at 10 o'clock, for our voting meeting in G-50 on HB 2258. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Finance Committee will meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock in room G-50.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 1659 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,

Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—108

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

NAYS—79

Barbin	DeLuca	Keller, W.	Ravenstahl
Bizzarro	Dermody	Kim	Readshaw
Boyle	DiGirolamo	Kinsey	Roebuck
Bradford	Donatucci	Kirkland	Rozzi
Briggs	Driscoll	Kortz	Sainato
Bullock	Evans	Krueger	Samuelson
Caltagirone	Farry	Kulik	Schlossberg
Carroll	Fitzgerald	Longietti	Schweyer
Cephas	Flynn	Madden	Sims
Comitta	Frankel	Markosek	Snyder
Conklin	Freeman	Matzie	Solomon
Costa, D.	Gainey	McCarter	Sturla
Costa, P.	Galloway	McClinton	Taylor
Cruz	Godshall	McNeill	Thomas
Daley	Goodman	Miller, D.	Vazquez
Davis, A.	Haggerty	Murt	Vitali
Davis, T.	Hanna	Neilson	Warren
Dawkins	Harkins	O'Brien	White
Deasy	Harris, J.	Pashinski	Youngblood
DeLissio	Kavulich	Quinn, M.	

NOT VOTING—1

Charlton

EXCUSED—12

Brown, V.	Everett	Hennessey	Saccone
Davidson	Fabrizio	Lewis	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	Rabb	Wheatley

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

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

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. Representative Charlton. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. CHARLTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My button was not recording. I would like to be recorded in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2154 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Members, at this time we are going to return to HB 2154. We are going to return to HB 2154, PN 3187, page 3 of today's House calendar.

We had in front of us a motion to suspend for amendment 7008. We are going to go right back to where we were.

MOTION WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. Representative Ellis, the floor is yours, sir, on the motion to suspend for amendment 7008.

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

At this point, after consultation with the fine gentleman from McKean and his willingness to work through this issue as it

continues through the process, I am going ahead and removing the motion to suspend the rules.

The SPEAKER. My understanding is, then, the good gentleman is not going to proceed with the motion to suspend and that the late-filed amendment, 7008, is also withdrawn.

So we now have in front of us HB 2154.

On the question recurring,

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Carroll or Representative Dermody, either – who wishes to proceed?

RULING OF CHAIR APPEALED

The SPEAKER. Representative Carroll.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to appeal the ruling of the Chair on my amendment.

The SPEAKER. Yes; you may proceed, sir.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, amendment A0941 is the language provided by the gentleman from Lycoming with respect to the guaranteed minimum royalty. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir, if you will suspend for just a moment. I think, I am not sure you stated the amendment correctly. It is A6941. If you did say that, I apologize. A6941.

You may proceed.

Mr. CARROLL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Amendment A6941 is the guaranteed minimal royalty amendment, which is the language of the gentleman from Lycoming County which provides the 12 1/2-percent minimum royalty to leaseholders in the Marcellus Shale field.

Mr. Speaker, the courts have been quite clear that to pass muster under single subject, an act must have a single unifying subject to which all of its provisions are germane. Mr. Speaker, HB 2154 is to provide for the mining of oil and gas. My amendment provides for the mining of oil and gas by providing the guaranteed minimum royalty on leases, Mr. Speaker.

Too often this House, Mr. Speaker, uses procedural maneuvers to avoid substantive votes on issues that we all claim are important. Well, here is our chance to solve a problem that is widely known, widely been discussed in this building with respect to the thousands of Pennsylvanians who rightfully believe they are being shortchanged with respect to their minimum royalty.

A vote sustaining the ruling of the Chair, in my eyes, Mr. Speaker, and in the eyes of many Pennsylvanians with leases, is a vote against providing a minimum guaranteed royalty for gas and oil leases. I ask my colleagues to join me, Mr. Speaker, in standing up for thousands of Pennsylvanians with leases to ensure that they get their fair share of royalties by ensuring 12 1/2 percent of their royalty payment. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in providing for an opportunity to remedy this matter, which was brought to our attention by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court and brought to the attention of this membership by thousands of leaseholders across our State who have been clamoring, clamoring for a remedy to ensure that they get their fair royalty.

I ask for a vote in the affirmative of my motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Well, it is not a motion. You are taking an appeal from the Speaker's ruling, so let us be precise about that.

And the underlying bill, HB 2154, establishes a bounty program for plugging abandoned wells.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Your amendment—

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. No, I will not be interrupted.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. I am still speaking on the appeal.

Mr. DERMODY. Well, it is a motion, and I think the—

The SPEAKER. When I am finished speaking, I will recognize you.

There is a motion. It is an appeal taken from the Speaker's ruling – that is what we have in front of us – and it is an appeal from the Speaker's ruling. The Speaker ruled that the amendment 6941 is out of order. The underlying bill establishes a bounty program for plugging abandoned wells. This is a completely separate item that has had legislation introduced separately with respect to royalties on natural gas and oil leases.

Based on Article III, section 1, of the Constitution and House rule 27, it is out of order.

On the question,

Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

The SPEAKER. The leader may proceed. The leader may proceed.

Representative Maher, on the appeal.

Mr. MAHER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My colleague, my honored colleague who is the Democratic chair of the Environmental Resources and Energy Committee alongside with me, is correct in oh so many points that he raises. Unfortunately, the question before us is none of those points. The question before us is, is this amendment in order? And it is not.

As the gentleman explained, the amendment – his interest is dealing with unconventional wells. This bill is strictly and quite purposely dealing with conventional wells, and never the twain shall meet – we hope. In fact, DEP insists that never the twain shall meet, and neither should they meet in legislation. They are different subjects.

The Chair was quite correct to rule the amendment out of order, and I ask my colleagues to support the ruling of the Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

On the ruling, those in favor of sustaining the Chair's decision will be voting "aye"; those opposed will be voting "nay."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2154 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,
Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

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

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2154 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,
Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—110

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

NAYS—78

Barbin	Deasy	Kim	Petrarca
Bizzarro	DeLissio	Kinsey	Pickett
Boback	Dermoddy	Kirkland	Ravenstahl
Boyle	Donatucci	Kortz	Readshaw
Bradford	Driscoll	Krueger	Roebuck
Briggs	Evans	Kulik	Rozzi
Bullock	Fitzgerald	Longietti	Sainato
Burns	Flynn	Madden	Samuelson
Caltagirone	Frankel	Markosek	Schlossberg
Carroll	Freeman	Matzie	Schweyer
Cephas	Fritz	McCarter	Sims
Comitta	Gainey	McClinton	Snyder
Conklin	Galloway	McNeill	Solomon

Costa, D.	Goodman	Miller, D.	Sturla
Costa, P.	Haggerty	Mullery	Thomas
Cruz	Hanna	Neilson	Vazquez
Daley	Harkins	O'Brien	Vitali
Davis, A.	Harris, J.	Pashinski	Warren
Davis, T.	Kavulich	Peifer	Youngblood
Dawkins	Keller, W.		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—12

Brown, V.	Everett	Hennessey	Saccone
Davidson	Fabrizio	Lewis	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	Rabb	Wheatley

Less than a majority of the members elected to the House having voted in the negative, the decision of the Chair stood as the judgment of the House.

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

RULING OF CHAIR APPEALED

The SPEAKER. Representative Kinsey, I believe, is recognized.

Mr. KINSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to appeal the ruling of the Chair on amendment 6945.

The SPEAKER. Yes, you may proceed.

Mr. KINSEY. Mr. Speaker, the courts have been clear that to pass muster under the single-subject standard, an act must have a single unifying subject to which all the provisions are germane. Mr. Speaker, the subject of HB 2154 is to provide for the mining of oil and gas. Amendment 6945 also provides for the mining of oil and gas by imposing a severance tax on natural gas production.

Mr. Speaker, too often in this House procedural maneuvers are used to avoid substantive votes on issues that are important to the people of Pennsylvania, and this is no different. A vote sustaining the ruling of the Chair, in my eyes and in the eyes of many Pennsylvanians, is a vote against asking large corporate drillers to pay their fair share for their use of the natural resources of this Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in standing up for the average Pennsylvanian and not just giant corporate drillers by voting to overturn the ruling of the Chair. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. This is a procedural vote.

The Speaker has ruled that amendment 6945 is not germane with respect to the underlying bill, HB 2154, on the basis of Article III, section 1, of the Constitution and House rule 27.

The underlying bill establishes a program for plugging abandoned wells with respect to conventional natural gas wells. This amendment provides for a tax on unconventional gas wells and addresses minimum royalties. It has been ruled out of order.

On the question,
Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

The SPEAKER. Representative Causer, on the appeal of the Chair.

Mr. CAUSER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the ruling of the Chair. One of the things we are trying to accomplish with this legislation is to clearly separate the conventional from the unconventional, and the amendment that the gentleman is talking about is clearly patterned toward the unconventional. That is exactly what this legislation is trying to separate.

It is clearly not germane to the legislation, and I urge the members to support the ruling of the Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. One time on an appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2154 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Those in favor of sustaining the Chair's decision will vote "aye"; those opposed, "nay."

On the question recurring,

Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—107

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

NAYS—80

Bizzarro	DeLissio	Kinsey	Quinn, C.
Boback	DeLuca	Kirkland	Quinn, M.
Boyle	Dermody	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Bradford	Donatucci	Krueger	Readshaw
Briggs	Driscoll	Kulik	Roebuck
Bullock	Evans	Longietti	Rozzi
Burns	Fitzgerald	Madden	Sainato
Caltagirone	Flynn	Markosek	Samuelson
Carroll	Frankel	Matzie	Schlossberg
Cephas	Freeman	McCarter	Schweyer
Comitta	Gainey	McClinton	Sims
Conklin	Galloway	McNeill	Snyder
Costa, D.	Goodman	Miller, D.	Solomon
Costa, P.	Haggerty	Mullery	Sturla
Cruz	Hanna	Murt	Thomas
Daley	Harkins	Neilson	Vazquez
Davis, A.	Harris, J.	O'Brien	Vitali
Davis, T.	Kavulich	Pashinski	Warren
Dawkins	Keller, W.	Petrarca	White
Deasy	Kim	Pickett	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—13

Brown, V.	Fabrizio	Lewis	Santora
Davidson	Gabler	Rabb	Saylor
Dean	Hennessey	Saccone	Wheatley
Everett			

Less than a majority of the members elected to the House having voted in the negative, the decision of the Chair stood as the judgment of the House.

On the question recurring,

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

The SPEAKER. There are no other amendments on 2154.

On the question recurring,

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A CONTINUED

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1960, PN 3463**, entitled:

An Act providing for regulatory compliance.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

The SPEAKER. There are three bills on supplemental A House calendar. They cannot be voted upon until 5:19 p.m., 5:45 p.m., and 5:49 p.m. At this time we will begin debate on HB 1960, PN 3463.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

Does anybody wish to speak on HB 1960? Does anybody wish to speak on HB 1960?

Representative Mary Jo Daley, on HB 1960.

Ms. DALEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HB 1960 establishes the State Agency Regulatory Compliance Officer Act, providing for a compliance officer in each agency to work with regulated communities to resolve noncompliance issues, respond to questions, and other duties.

The compliance officer would develop agency policies and initiatives to further the purpose of the act, including educating the regulated community regarding new or amended statutes and regulations prior to implementation; establishing clear channels of communication to respond to questions or concerns regarding regulations; working with regulated communities to resolve noncompliance issues prior to the imposition of penalties; and providing a detailed explanation of each regulatory requirement.

Agencies are defined in the bill as "Any department, departmental administrative board or commission, independent board or commission, agency or other authority of this Commonwealth now existing or hereafter created, but shall not include the Senate or the House of Representatives, the Pennsylvania Fish Commission, the Pennsylvania Game Commission or any court, political subdivision, municipal or local authority."

It is going to empower each agency or the compliance officer to, within 20 days, issue opinions with respect to a person's duties under a regulation of the agency; establish guidelines for waiving any fees or penalties, provided the entity reports to the compliance officer the steps taken or will take to remedy the violation; and request and obtain information or advice from other staff to fulfill their duties. But there are concerns with this legislation, because it provides these individuals with the authority to legally interpret laws and regulations with respect to compliance and to establish means that would waive fines or penalties for self-reported violations of the law without any actual assurance that those violations are remedies.

So let us think about times when waiving a fine or penalty is entirely inappropriate. What if a regulated entity's actions cause death or severe injuries? What if a regulated entity causes a spill or other public health emergency that incurred hundreds of thousands of dollars or even millions of dollars' worth of Commonwealth or municipal resources to be used in the response and cleanup? In these cases, fines or penalties would be appropriate for reimbursing the Commonwealth for making sure the regulated entity takes corrective measures seriously or for other public purposes.

And when we think about the fiscal impact in addition to potentially not collecting fines for violations of regulations, that is an impact to our budget, and the cost of this act is supposedly going to be included in the cost of currently running the agencies, because it is presumed that each State agency would

be able to appoint the regulatory compliance officer from within existing staff, as agencies that issue regulations already utilize existing staff to prepare and draft regulations for approval by the Independent Regulatory Review Commission. So it seems like this is double work for these agencies because it has to be required for this as part of this job.

And all I want to say is, I think that we really have to acknowledge that the complement of the executive agencies are at their lowest level in more than 40 years. These agencies are already doing more with less, and this bill asks them to do even more with less, meaning that they have potentially less time to focus on serving the public and doing the job that they are already hired to do.

I urge you to vote "no" on this amendment – or on this bill. It is something that is duplicative and it is something that is already done. We already have this in the Regulatory Reform Act. It has been working just fine with lots of input possible from the General Assembly, despite the fact that that input is not always made according to the Independent Fiscal Office at the hearing that we had on this bill previously. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative John Maher, on HB 1960.

Mr. MAHER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The gentelady has expressed her deep concern that those that work for Pennsylvania will exercise their discretion in deciding things. We have 70-some thousand, maybe more, people that work for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, most of whom need to exercise their discretion to make decisions every day; in fact, some of them have to do it many times in a single day.

So I am not as concerned as my colleague that suddenly all of these decisions will be bad decisions. I agree, it is likely some of them will be bad decisions, but many of them will in fact be good decisions, and the government works this way every day. This is not a new thing. So the concerns that she has with this bill are not concerns for me and I ask you to join me in voting "yes."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Bradford, do you wish to speak on HB 1960?

Representative Bradford, on HB 1960.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HB 1960 by its own name would seem to be a simple idea of creating a single point of contact for regulatory issues, and in many ways, that seems like a swell enough idea. The State agency regulatory compliance officer would seem to be a person you could reach out to and ask for advice and figure out how to go about dealing through some red tape, but if you kind of scratch the surface a little bit and you read the statute, you come upon that this compliance officer is more of a commissar than a helpful welcome wagon.

The opinions that that person is able to provide are actually like get out of jail free for polluters or wrongdoers. In fact, and I will quote directly from the statute: "The opinion, or the agency's failure to provide an opinion upon request, shall be a complete defense in any enforcement proceeding initiated by the agency and evidence of good faith...in any...civil or criminal proceeding...." That, Mr. Speaker, is a very large get-out-of-jail-free card. That to me seems a little bit over the top.

Now, I know when we have talked about some of these other bills and some of the proponents thereof have suggested this is about getting Pennsylvania's economy moving, and I know that there is a litany of environmental organizations that have

opposed it. So I scratched a little deeper on who supports these types of bills, and you realize that they are national bills and you realize that they are in many States and they are supported by groups like the Mercatus Center and Americans for Prosperity. They are probably most known, those organizations, for being Koch brothers front organizations. Now, again, I find it disconcerting; if we want a single point of contact to deal with regulatory compliance, let us do that, but let us not say that that is what we are doing when what we are really doing here is the business of some of the biggest polluters in our nation.

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does anybody else wish to be recognized other than the maker of the bill? Does anybody else wish to be recognized but the maker of the bill?

On the bill, Representative Ellis.

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

I ask my colleagues, when we actually get to the vote, for an affirmative vote on HB 1960. Many of us in here heard a phrase a few years ago, "government that works." I believe this bill gets us down that path, because instead of creating an adversarial role between the departments and the community, we create an opportunity for us to work together and advance Pennsylvania. I think this is a logical, simple move in the right direction, and when we get to the vote, I will ask for an affirmative vote.

MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION UNDER RULE 24

The SPEAKER. I will entertain a motion to proceed. We cannot vote until 5:19. The time right now is almost 4:45 p.m. Representative Cutler, the majority whip.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to make a motion for HB 1792, HBs 1959 and 1960, a motion to proceed for the immediate consideration so that we can wrap up debate on these bills since it is such a close time. Thank you.

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Hanna, on the motion to proceed, with respect to HBs 1792, 1959 and 1960.

Mr. HANNA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We support the motion to proceed.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—157

Barbin	Emrick	Kirkland	Rapp
Barrar	Evankovich	Klunk	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Evans	Knowles	Reed
Bernstine	Farry	Kortz	Reese
Bizzarro	Fee	Kulik	Roae
Bloom	Fitzgerald	Lawrence	Roe
Boback	Flynn	Longiotti	Roebuck
Boyle	Frankel	Mackenzie	Rothman
Brown, R.	Fritz	Maher	Rozzi
Bullock	Gainey	Mako	Ryan
Burns	Galloway	Maloney	Sainato

Caltagirone	Gillespie	Markosek	Sankey
Carroll	Godshall	Marshall	Santora
Causer	Goodman	Marsico	Schemel
Cephas	Greiner	Masser	Schlossberg
Charlton	Grove	McGinnis	Schweyer
Christiana	Haggerty	Mehaffie	Simmons
Cook	Hahn	Mentzer	Sims
Corbin	Hanna	Metcalfe	Sonney
Corr	Harkins	Miccarelli	Staats
Costa, D.	Harper	Millard	Stephens
Costa, P.	Harris, A.	Moul	Taylor
Cox	Harris, J.	Murt	Tobash
Cruz	Heffley	Mustio	Toepel
Culver	Helm	Neilson	Toohil
Cutler	Hickernell	Nelson	Topper
Davis, A.	Hill	Nesbit	Vazquez
Dawkins	Irvin	O'Brien	Walsh
Deasy	James	O'Neill	Ward
DeLozier	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Warner
DeLuca	Kampf	Ortitay	Warren
Dermody	Kaufner	Pashinski	Watson
Diamond	Kauffman	Peifer	Wentling
DiGirolamo	Kavulich	Petrarca	Wheeland
Donatucci	Keefer	Pickett	White
Dowling	Keller, F.	Pyle	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Keller, M.K.	Quigley	
Dunbar	Keller, W.	Quinn, C.	Turzai,
Dush	Kim	Quinn, M.	Speaker
Ellis	Kinsey	Rader	

NAYS—30

Bradford	English	McNeill	Samuelson
Briggs	Freeman	Metzgar	Snyder
Comitta	Gillen	Miller, B.	Solomon
Conklin	Krueger	Miller, D.	Sturla
Daley	Madden	Milne	Tallman
Davis, T.	Matzie	Mullery	Thomas
Day	McCarter	Ravenstahl	Youngblood
DeLissio	McClinton		

NOT VOTING—1

Vitali

EXCUSED—12

Brown, V.	Everett	Hennessey	Saccone
Davidson	Fabrizio	Lewis	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	Rabb	Wheatley

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.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 1960 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—116

Barbin	Gillen	Marsico	Rothman
Barrar	Gillespie	Masser	Rozzi
Benninghoff	Godshall	McGinnis	Ryan
Bernstine	Greiner	Mehaffie	Sainato
Bloom	Grove	Mentzer	Sankey

Boback	Hahn	Metcalf	Santora
Brown, R.	Harper	Metzgar	Schemel
Burns	Harris, A.	Miccarelli	Simmons
Causer	Heffley	Millard	Snyder
Charlton	Helm	Miller, B.	Sonney
Christiana	Hickernell	Milne	Staats
Cook	Hill	Moul	Stephens
Corbin	Irvin	Murt	Tallman
Corr	James	Mustio	Taylor
Cox	Jozwiak	Nelson	Tobash
Culver	Kampf	Nesbit	Toepel
Cutler	Kaufner	Oberlander	Toohil
Day	Kauffman	Ortitay	Topper
Delozier	Keefer	Peifer	Walsh
Diamond	Keller, F.	Petrarca	Ward
Dowling	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Warner
Dunbar	Klunk	Pyle	Watson
Dush	Knowles	Quigley	Wentling
Ellis	Lawrence	Rader	Wheeland
Emrick	Longietti	Rapp	White
English	Mackenzie	Reed	Zimmerman
Evankovich	Maher	Reese	
Farry	Mako	Roae	Turzai,
Fee	Maloney	Roe	Speaker
Fritz	Marshall		

NAYS—72

Bizzarro	DeLissio	Kavulich	O'Neill
Boyle	DeLuca	Keller, W.	Pashinski
Bradford	Dermody	Kim	Quinn, C.
Briggs	DiGirolamo	Kinsey	Quinn, M.
Bullock	Donatucci	Kirkland	Ravenstahl
Caltagirone	Driscoll	Kortz	Readshaw
Carroll	Evans	Krueger	Roebuck
Cephas	Fitzgerald	Kulik	Samuelson
Comitta	Flynn	Madden	Schlossberg
Conklin	Frankel	Markosek	Schweyer
Costa, D.	Freeman	Matzie	Sims
Costa, P.	Gainey	McCarter	Solomon
Cruz	Galloway	McClinton	Sturla
Daley	Goodman	McNeill	Thomas
Davis, A.	Haggerty	Miller, D.	Vazquez
Davis, T.	Hanna	Mullery	Vitali
Dawkins	Harkins	Neilson	Warren
Deasy	Harris, J.	O'Brien	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—12

Brown, V.	Everett	Hennessey	Saccone
Davidson	Fabrizio	Lewis	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	Rabb	Wheatley

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1959**, **PN 3464**, entitled:

An Act providing for the administration of permits by State agencies, for a tracking system for permit applications, for the establishment of permit programs and for annual reports.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Representative Rothman, on the bill, 1959.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Democracy in America is a unique experience. We are a government of, by, and for the people. And included in this was the English philosopher John Locke's concept of the consent to be governed. We as citizens of America and citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania consent to be governed. We agree to follow the rules. We agree to obey the laws. We agree to comply with regulations. But implied in this consent to be governed is a government who will be just, transparent, reasonable, fair, and efficient.

Mr. Speaker, if government wants people to follow the rules, government should also follow the rules. There are statutory requirements that if you apply for a permit, that permit will be issued in a certain number of days – 60, 90, 120. In late January of 2018, Gov. Tom Wolf announced his plan to reduce the permit backlogs. There is no debate that there is paralysis by permit delay. His press conference was an admission of the backlogs, and his plan includes modernization of the permit processes using technology to improve both oversight and efficiency. The Governor of Pennsylvania recognizes that the permit paralysis is keeping Pennsylvania from enjoying the boom that is going around in the rest of the country.

In February of 2017, the U.S. and Pennsylvania's unemployment rate was the same, 4.8 percent. Last month, in March, the unemployment rate in the United States had dropped to 4.1. The unemployment rate in Pennsylvania is still 4.8 percent. It has not changed in 10 months.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the permit paralysis is causing us to miss out on this economic boom. We as a legislature owe it to the job creators, those seeking to build, who want to progress, who want to open businesses, and even school districts that want to open schools, to have a commonsense solution to the permit backlogs. My bill, 1959, will do that. It creates a solution to a real problem.

Think about this. If you ordered something from Amazon at Christmas, you could immediately track where it is in the process. You know it is being shipped, when it is going to arrive. The people who apply for permits ought to have the same customer service from government. That is what the Governor has promised. The Governor said he will support commonsense legislation that will bring the permit process in line with the industry it is engaged with.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does that. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

Mrs. COMMITTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This bill attempts to codify the permitting process across all agencies. It is an unfunded mandate providing for an added layer of bureaucracy, that is third-party review, without any additional staff or funding. I think it is also important to point

out that virtually every organization – conservation, water, clean energy, and environmental protection organization in Pennsylvania – is opposed to this bill and to each of these five bills, and I read from their letter: "...this grouping of bills before your committee would not serve the meritorious goal of creating a more efficient and effective government. These bills, in large part, create extraneous and added layers of bureaucracy, impede the roles of our executive branch agencies, and undermine the protections enforced and implemented by our state government. These bills put our environmental protections for Pennsylvanians at risk."

The most controversial aspect of this bill is the provision for third-party review. Of additional concern is the potential for constitutional issues and putting Federal dollars at risk. HB 1959 violates Article I, section 27, known as the environmental amendment of the Pennsylvania Constitution, and could compromise DEP's primacy delegation of Federal programs due primarily to effectively eliminating public participation to providing inadequate timeframes for review and creating third-party contractor review that is flawed. The third-party review process in this legislation is flawed. There are no deadlines on the third-party reviews. No conflict of interest requirements. Public participation is left out, and it is unclear who defends the permit appeal before the Environmental Protection Agency.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the DEP and virtually every environmental organization in Pennsylvania strongly oppose this bill and each of the five bills in this package. Anyone who is dedicated to upholding the Pennsylvania Constitution and who is dedicated to protecting the health of our people and our environment should be voting "no" on this bill.

I urge a "no" vote on HB 1959. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you again, Mr. Speaker.

Several weeks ago, we debated municipal third-party inspection, and that was a contentious debate. But for those who thought that it was a bad idea to have third-party inspection for the review of your neighbor's deck, maybe you should have some pause before we have third-party review for who insures the purity of our water and our air quality for all of our Commonwealth.

It is an absurd, perverse logic that is behind bills like HB 1959 when you have a government that year after year underfunds the very agencies and then uses permit delays to say, well, you cannot turn around the permits quick enough because we underfunded you, so we have the solution. We should privatize you and let the very private industry do those same inspections. That is the wolf guarding the henhouse. That is not being a good steward of our air and water. And I think what we learned from Act 13 is that we have a constitutional obligation to protect our environment, and HB 1959 is an abrogation of that responsibility to our air, to our water, to our children, and to our future of Pennsylvania.

So I would just simply say, let us vote down HB 1959. Let us do what the Wolf administration has already gone about doing, which is create efficiency and accountability in the system. Let us not gut the system in the interest of private business.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

CONSIDERATION OF HB 1959 CONTINUED

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

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, this is a particular issue that I have great interest in. In fact, I myself have met with DEP regarding the significant delays related to permitting. And I would like to commend our regional director because I believe he has put some steps in place to significantly decrease those time limits in terms of the waiting times that are associated with the permits. But I think that it is important that we highlight some numbers, as well as some facts, in this debate.

When you look at job growth year over year, from 2016 to 2015, our former colleague, Secretary of Labor, had issued a report: every sector of our economy grew except one. That one was construction jobs. The average wait time in our region, for example, is in excess of a year and half to 2 years, in some cases. In fact, I received, from a former developer here in the State, he indicated that he is going to go to Maryland and New Jersey where it is easier to get permits. He expressed his frustration in the wait time for a 2-year wait for a permit that was inside a paved parking lot to put a pad site in. It was already an impervious surface, yet the requirements that were put in place required him to wait.

So what impact does this have on jobs, you might ask? Why did I bring up the construction jobs? Mr. Speaker, quite simply, somebody in 2016 or 2017 will not be hiring people if they have to wait for 2 years to get a permit. It is very simple. The 2016- and 2017-year jobs will not be hired until 2018 or 2019. That number bears itself out when you look at our unemployment rate, where we are significantly above the national average. National average is 4.1 percent. Pennsylvania's is currently 4.8 percent.

Mr. Speaker, in regards to some of the facts regarding the issues, the issue of primacy was raised. That simply is not accurate in regards to this bill because DEP will still be the issuing authority. They can in fact delegate their own responsibilities and allow that to go forward and then ultimately be the issuing agent. Primacy would only be a concern if they were not the final issuing agent – some would argue that it is irresponsible, that we are not being good stewards of the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I personally believe that DEP can in fact carry this mission out. I myself met with them. In talking about solutions, this very proposal was one of the solutions that they offered. They discussed having a rate system where third-party reviews and perhaps higher fees could actually fund their equipment. I think it is a discussion that we should have. I think it is one that its time has come. I think it is time that we improve our economic situation here in the Commonwealth by expediting the permit process and ensuring the workers that want to go to work to work in construction sites can in fact get permits to do their job.

Mr. Speaker, this to me is the ultimate choke hold on governmental growth, making sure that people cannot get to work because we are waiting on permits. The government bureaucracy should not hold up the employment of individuals. I would urge a "yes" vote.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—112

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

NAYS—75

Boback	DeLuca	Kim	O'Brien
Boyle	Dermody	Kinsey	Pashinski
Bradford	DiGirolo	Kirkland	Quinn, C.
Briggs	Donatucci	Kortz	Quinn, M.
Bullock	Driscoll	Krueger	Ravenstahl
Caltagirone	Evans	Kulik	Readshaw
Carroll	Fitzgerald	Longietti	Roebuck
Cephas	Flynn	Madden	Rozzi
Comitta	Frankel	Markosek	Samuelson
Conklin	Freeman	Matzie	Schlossberg
Costa, D.	Gainey	McCarter	Schweyer
Costa, P.	Galloway	McClinton	Sims
Cruz	Goodman	McNeill	Solomon
Daley	Haggerty	Miccarelli	Sturla
Davis, A.	Hanna	Miller, D.	Thomas
Davis, T.	Harkins	Milne	Vazquez
Dawkins	Harris, J.	Mullery	Warren
Deasy	Kavulich	Murt	Youngblood
DeLissio	Keller, W.	Neilson	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—13

Brown, V.	Fabrizio	Lewis	Saylor
Davidson	Gabler	Rabb	Vitali
Dean	Hennessey	Saccone	Wheatley
Everett			

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1792, PN 3465**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 25, 1982 (P.L.633, No.181), known as the Regulatory Review Act, further providing for procedures for subsequent review of disapproved final-form or final-omitted regulations.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

Representative Kerry Benninghoff, on HB 1792.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I realize the time is late. I just wanted to remind the members here that this was the bill that we actually amended yesterday. One of the Democrat members asked that we add an amendment to allow a hearing prior to these being done, which we agreed to, and I would ask for unanimous support. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Krueger-Braneky, on the bill.

Ms. KRUEGER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to HB 1792. This bill would allow a House or Senate committee to report a concurrent resolution to repeal existing regulations, regulations that keep our air clean, our water clean, and that keep us safe. This bill would give the legislature the ability to veto State agency rulemaking at the expense of health, safety, and the welfare of Pennsylvanians, and it is potentially unconstitutional.

It does not even provide clear criteria upon which the legislature would need to decide if they are going to repeal a regulation, creating chaos in the regulated community and in the general public. This bill could even impact our compliance with the Federal government, jeopardizing our funding from Federal sources that require permanent and enforceable measures to be in place. If this bill were to be passed, no regulation could be considered permanent or enforceable. There is no minimum public notification period before a regulation is repealed. In fact, yesterday this chamber voted down an amendment twice that would have required at least 48 hours' notice to the public

so that they could review the language of a regulation before it would be repealed. There would be only 60 days before this legislation would go into effect.

It would only take a simple majority in order to repeal an existing regulation, including one that has been on the books and working for years. So 102 votes here in the House and 26 in the Senate could allow the legislature to give in to the whims of lobbyists and roll back regulations that are keeping our families safe. This bill would prohibit agencies from reissuing the same regulations in the future, and yesterday we also voted down an amendment that would have exempted regulations affecting the health and safety of Pennsylvanians.

Fundamentally, Mr. Speaker, this is a bill we do not need. We have got a constitutional obligation to put the safety of our Commonwealth above the wishes of oil and gas lobbyists, and I urge my opponents to reject this bill.

The SPEAKER. Does anybody else wish to speak on HB 1792?

Representative Bradford, on HB 1792.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you again, Mr. Speaker.

I stand in opposition to HB 1792, but I would be remiss if I did not point out that we have heard quite a bit and it has been pretty far afield about job growth in the Commonwealth and our unemployment rate. Now, I remember over the last 4 years hearing that our unemployment rate was high because spending was out of control, that was one of the reasons. Then it was, we needed to cut taxes, then if we did medical expansion under Obamacare, that would destroy the economy.

Now here we are at a 4.8 percent unemployment. Most people consider that pretty close to full employment. And the one thing that we are told that is standing in the way is if we just, we just give up on some of this air and water quality stuff, this is what is keeping us from, really, a robust economy.

Now, I do not mean to make light of the arguments put forth. I think there is an argument for cutting red tape and there is always a place for smart regulation, but I think those who are doing the bidding of big business should be mindful that in their desire – frankly, sometimes a lustful desire – to cut regulations that protect our air and water, that they are not necessarily doing what is right by the children, the people, and the future of our Commonwealth. Now, again, this bill, just like those that these packages consist of, in itself is supported by groups that are largely Koch brothers entities. Now, I realize that this is a much larger movement by these right-wing organizations, but for many of us who believe that air and water quality is one of the things we are here to protect, this is just another bill that we should reject out of hand.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—105

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

NAYS—82

Barbin	Deasy	Kim	Petrarca
Bizzarro	DeLissio	Kinsey	Quinn, C.
Boback	DeLuca	Kirkland	Quinn, M.
Boyle	Dermody	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Bradford	DiGirolamo	Krueger	Readshaw
Briggs	Donatucci	Kulik	Roebuck
Bullock	Driscoll	Longietti	Rozzi
Burns	Evans	Madden	Sainato
Caltagirone	Fitzgerald	Markosek	Samuelson
Carroll	Flynn	Matzie	Santora
Cephas	Frankel	McCarter	Schlossberg
Charlton	Freeman	McClinton	Schweyer
Comitta	Gainey	McNeill	Sims
Conklin	Galloway	Miller, D.	Snyder
Costa, D.	Goodman	Milne	Solomon
Costa, P.	Haggerty	Mullery	Sturla
Cruz	Hanna	Murt	Thomas
Daley	Harkins	Neilson	Vazquez
Davis, A.	Harris, J.	O'Brien	Warren
Davis, T.	Kavulich	Pashinski	Youngblood
Dawkins	Keller, W.		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—13

Brown, V.	Fabrizio	Lewis	Saylor
Davidson	Gabler	Rabb	Vitali
Dean	Hennessey	Saccone	Wheatley
Everett			

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

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

STATEMENT BY MR. TOPPER

The SPEAKER. Representatives Jesse Topper and Pete Schweyer are recognized on unanimous consent. If they will come up to the podium up front. They are recognized on unanimous consent.

Mr. TOPPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Last week we had the great privilege, on Bring Your Child to Work Day, to have some of our kids of staff members, and also of members, participate here on the floor of the House of Representatives. We would like to thank Representative Kauffman, Representative Gillen, Representative Hill-Evans, and all of the staff who made that day possible. Our kids really enjoyed it, including the young gentleman from Bedford and the lady from Lehigh County, who got into a debate on what the State candy should be, and it was fascinating.

So we really want to thank— I know the staff put a lot of work into it. I would like to thank the Chief Clerk, Mr. Reddecliff, for allowing the kids to be on the floor and to participate. Thank you all for your hard work. My son said, "Best day of the year." So thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. To the Chief Clerk? Thank you, Chief Clerk.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. GROVE

The SPEAKER. Representative Seth Grove, on unanimous consent.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to take a moment and wish my parents a happy 47th anniversary. I know they both deserve sainthood for raising my older brother; not me, just my older brother, who also happens to turn 40 next Monday. So happy early 40th birthday to my brother as well.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MS. DONATUCCI

The SPEAKER. Representative Donatucci I believe has an announcement.

Ms. DONATUCCI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There will be an immediate meeting of the Philadelphia delegation in conference room 331. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. Representative Bernie O'Neill is recognized, I believe for a committee announcement.

Mr. O'NEILL. No, Mr. Speaker, to correct the record.

The SPEAKER. Oh, I apologize, sir. You may proceed.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, on HB 1960, I was voted in the negative. I should have been recorded in the positive.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir.

VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Representative Steve Barrar, Chairman Barrar for a committee announcement.

Mr. BARRAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to remind the members that there is a voting meeting of the Veterans Affairs and Emergency Preparedness Committee at 9:15 tomorrow in room G-50.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

There is a voting meeting of the Veterans Affairs and Emergency Preparedness Committee at 9:15 tomorrow in room G-50.

Members, there are members who would like to speak on resolutions. They may do so at this time. Representative McClinton will be recognized on 872, Representative Bullock and Representative Cephas will be recognized on 874, Representative Murt will be recognized on 883, and Representative Barrar and Representative Sainato are recognized on 856.

I am going to begin with Representative Hanna on HR 858.

Please, members, these colleagues do want to speak. They have that opportunity, and if members and staff could exit towards the rear, we would appreciate it.

STATEMENT BY MR. HANNA

The SPEAKER. Representative Hanna, the floor is yours, sir.

Mr. HANNA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the members of this great body for joining me today in passing HR 858, which recognizes "Bronchial Thermoplasty Awareness Day" in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Michelle Auman, suffered from severe persistent asthma and was in need of this innovative procedure. Thanks to Boston Scientific, Michelle has received the treatment that she so desperately needed and is now living a happy and healthy life with her family. However, for many years, Mr. Speaker, her insurance company deemed this procedure experimental, which prevented her from experiencing life-changing benefits.

Mr. Speaker, scientific literature proves that bronchial thermoplasty is an established procedure that improves health outcomes while reducing costs over time. This outpatient procedure becomes cost-effective, because once it is performed in three sessions, the treatment is complete and does not need to be repeated, helping to offset any costs that can accrue annually.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is, those suffering from severe, persistent asthma can become severely debilitated. Every time Michelle was hospitalized – she had to spend days or weeks in the hospitals, including in the ICU (intensive care unit), all of which cost thousands of dollars.

As noted in the resolution, Mr. Speaker, those treated "experienced a 32 % decrease in severe asthma attacks, an 84 % reduction in asthma-related emergency room visits and 66 % fewer days lost from work, school and daily activities...."

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that Independence Blue Cross, Geisinger Health Plan, and Gateway Health Plan are the first insurance providers in Pennsylvania to cover bronchial thermoplasty. However, there is more work to be done. You may be interested in knowing that Harrisburg, Philadelphia, Allentown, Pittsburgh, and Scranton are 5 of the top 50 most challenging places to live with asthma, according to the Asthma and Allergy Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today to urge all insurance companies to cover this important procedure. I want to thank you all for voting in favor of recognizing May 1, 2018, as "Bronchial Thermoplasty Awareness Day" in Pennsylvania. Together we can help provide our constituents with better health-care coverage tailored to their individual needs.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

STATEMENT BY MS. McCLINTON

The SPEAKER. Representative McClinton is recognized on HR 872.

Ms. McCLINTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And thank you, fellow House members, for joining me to recognize the importance of drug courts right here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

HR 872 designates May 2018 as "National Drug Court Month" in the Commonwealth. The expansion of drug courts has played a major role in the fight against abuse and against mass incarceration throughout Pennsylvania. Judges in these courts work with a community team to develop a case plan that includes regular court appearances, treatment sessions, monitoring of one's compliance, and aftercare.

The great news is that these courts are in fact working. According to the National Institute of Justice, 84 percent of drug court graduates have not been rearrested or charged with a serious crime in the first year after their graduation.

Drug courts are not only a benefit to those who participate; they are good for taxpayers as well. For every dollar that we invest into drug courts, taxpayers save as much as \$3.36 in avoided criminal justice costs, according to the Urban Institute. The courts are truly a helpful tool to support families that are torn apart by a loved one who is battling addiction.

And I am proud to say that in my hometown, the City of Brotherly Love and Sisterly Affection, Philadelphia, my old office where I work, the Defender Association of Philadelphia was the first location in this Commonwealth to establish a drug court in 1997, and although my constituent, Erica Bartlett, Esquire, could not be here, I pay tribute to her for her tremendous work. Today she was in drug court in Philadelphia.

Since 1997 more than 40 counties followed suit to provide these alternatives to jail. I applaud the efforts and commitments of the judges, the case management professionals, volunteers, and families who support those who participate in drug courts.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

STATEMENT BY MR. MURT

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. Representative Tom Murt is recognized on HR 883.

Mr. MURT. In Hatboro, Pennsylvania, which is in my district, there was a battle in the Revolutionary War which went badly for the patriots; it was a British victory. But Crooked Billet Elementary School is the only school in the entire nation which is actually located on the site of a Revolutionary War battle. This school is in the town, the Borough of Hatboro. Today we recognize HR 883 declaring Crooked Billet Day in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I would like to submit the rest of my remarks for the record, Mr. Speaker, if that is okay?

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir, they will so be accepted.

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

Pennsylvania is known as the Keystone State in part because of its key role in the birth of the United States. Everyone is aware of the historical role Philadelphia played in the conception of American independence and as the birthplace of the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution. What is often unappreciated is the pivotal role played by those who lived in the countryside surrounding the city.

On the night of April 30, 1778 – 240 years ago this week – the British, in control of Philadelphia, marched out of the city with 850 men on foot and on horses. Their destination was the Billet, what is known today as Hatboro, Pennsylvania. Their mission was to stop the American Militia from disrupting the British supply lines into Philadelphia. Their other objective was to capture the leader of the militia, Gen. John Lacey, and decimate the 300 militiamen encamped with Lacey at the Billet.

The British marched through the Fox Chase area of Philadelphia, down the Huntington Pike, where they split up. The Queen's Rangers, a loyalist regiment, continued down Second Street Pike, and the 500 British regulars went left towards Old York Road. The plan was to have the British regulars wait in ambush along the Horsham Meeting Road near the Old Mill Inn in Hatboro. The Queen's Rangers were to drive the militia into the waiting British troops.

The militia was expected to retreat along the Horsham Meeting Road, which leads to Valley Forge and would have exposed the Continental Army. General Lacey, the youngest appointed general under Washington's command, was a native of Bucks County and knew the area better than any of the British soldiers. During the battle that commenced May 1, 1778, 26 militiamen were killed, 9 wounded, and 58 captured. But most importantly, General Lacey saved hundreds of lives by moving his united militia north into Bucks County – away from General Washington's men.

While the British reported no casualties, they never achieved their objectives. The militia continued disrupting supplies and General Lacey was never captured. While the British would claim this as a military victory, it was clearly a British failure thanks to the quick thinking and leadership of Gen. John Lacey. He is truly one of the unappreciated heroes of the American Revolution, and the Battle of the Crooked Billet is one of the turning points. And for that we declare May 1, 2018, as "The Battle of the Crooked Billet Day" in Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Are Representatives Barrar and Sainato here on the floor? Okay. We will give them an opportunity to speak tomorrow on HR 856. Representative Bullock, I know, submitted remarks on HR 874. Is Representative Cephas on the floor? Okay. And she submitted as well. Representative Bullock and Representative Cephas submitted remarks on HR 874.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mrs. BULLOCK submitted the following remarks for the Legislative Journal:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank my colleagues for supporting HR 874, which I introduced with Representative Morgan Cephas. This resolution designates May 2018 as "Mental Health Awareness in the Black Community Month" in Pennsylvania.

As many of you know, persistent racial inequality and race-based exclusion in the United States have led to continuing mental health disparities for African-Americans and a continuing mental health care gap, a gap that is only exasperated when we do not protect access to health care, or protect Medicaid expansion – without imposing added, unnecessary requirements on people who count on Medicaid for their health care. The gap is further deepened by a lack of representation in mental health media campaigns, a lack of culturally competent mental health professionals, and the expectation that people of color have grit, they are "resilient" or "strong," they can bounce back from trauma – never giving them permission to be human, to show vulnerabilities, or to ask for help.

These empowering affirmations can also be damaging because they do not allow people of color to be human, to show vulnerabilities, or to ask for help. They further stigmatize mental health in our communities and undermine the efforts to promote mental health and wellness. As a result, only an estimated 25 percent of African-Americans seek access to mental health services, compared to 40 percent of people from other racial groups. At the same time, it is estimated that African-Americans are 20 percent more likely to experience serious mental health problems than the general population.

To promote mental health awareness in communities of color, marriage and family therapists Jaynay Johnson and Farida Saleem-Boyer established the Black Brain Campaign in 2016 to strengthen families within the African-American community. Over the last 2 years the Black Brain Campaign has prompted clinicians in the Philadelphia area to explore mental health reforms for African-Americans. The campaign has also included help from school- and community-based counselors, mental health professionals, health-care providers, social service providers, health policy experts, and mental health advocates. I am grateful for all of their work. I am also grateful because by adopting this resolution today, the House of Representatives recognizes an imperative for health-care policy reforms, interventions, and initiatives to eliminate mental health disparities based on race, ethnicity, education, income, or geography.

Thank you for helping me to raise awareness of this problem and of the work that is being done to address it.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Miss CEPHAS submitted the following remarks for the Legislative Journal:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, would like to say thank you to our fellow House members for supporting HR 874, designating the month of May 2018 as "Mental Health Awareness in the Black Community Month" for our State.

It is critical for us to raise awareness about the state of mental health in the Black community, but also, we need to make an honest assessment to identify the needs of people who may have poor mental health because they have experienced a heightened level of gun violence, domestic violence and abuse, bullying, or have been affected by the climate of drugs in their communities. We need a deep conversation about the lasting consequences of those experiences amongst victims, survivors, and their families.

For those with mental health disorders like depression, seeking help should be considered a strength and not a weakness. But the standard perception of seeking treatment is shame, indignity, and embarrassment. Such characteristics are widely considered a stigma within the African-American community. One 2008 study found that more than one-third of African-Americans actively seeking treatment believed talking about their anxiety would lead to negative interactions by their peers, and a portion of them could not talk about their mental health issues with family members. The alarming statistics associated with race exclusion and lack of access do not help those that are in need of care.

We all understand that cultural shifts take time, but that cannot hinder our efforts to increase awareness and strengthen mental health services. We must work to destigmatize this issue and educate our local communities for the sake of all those throughout the Commonwealth suffering in silence.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The following report was read:

Committee on Committees Supplemental Report

In the House of Representatives
May 1, 2018

RESOLVED, That

Representative Stephen Barrar, Chester and Delaware Counties, resigns as a member of the State Government Committee.

Respectfully submitted,
Robert Godshall, Chairman
Committee on Committees

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?
Resolution was adopted.

BILLS RECOMMITTED

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

HB 1843;
HB 1887;
HB 1888;
HB 1889;
HB 2154; and
HB 2213.

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

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

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

HB 2044;
HB 2162;
HB 2171;
HB 2256;
HB 2257;
HB 2264; and
HB 2297.

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

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, all remaining bills and resolutions on today's calendar will be passed over. The Chair hears no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. Representative Mike Hanna moves that we be adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 2, 2018, at 10 a.m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the motion?
Motion was agreed to, and at 5:18 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.