

# COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

## LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

MONDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2016

SESSION OF 2016

200TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 61

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 1 p.m., e.d.t.

#### THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI) PRESIDING

#### PRAYER

The SPEAKER. The prayer today will be offered by Pastor Ed Guyer of Grace Christian Fellowship Church in Hancock, Maryland, and he is the guest of Representative Rick Saccone.

Pastor, welcome to our good State, and the opportunity to say the prayer is yours.

PASTOR ED GUYER, Guest Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Thank you very much.

Shall we pray:

Father in heaven, we humbly bow before You on this hour, seeking Your guidance and blessings upon the proceedings of this House. As the preamble to our Constitution reminds us, "WE, the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania," are to be "grateful to Almighty God for the blessings of civil and religious liberty, and humbly invoking His guidance...."

We therefore acknowledge that the citizens of this great State have been the recipient of countless blessings as a result of Your providence. We thank You for continued freedom in which to live our lives, to conduct business, to raise our families, and to worship according to the dictates of our conscience.

We thank You for the form of government that allows the people to elect Representatives, such as are present here this afternoon, to conduct the business of our State and to provide for appropriate legislation and financial resources so that life may go on in an orderly and lawful environment. We know that the issues confronting the men and women of this legislative chamber require wisdom, discernment, and courage, and we know that You, O God, are the ultimate source of eternal wisdom.

We therefore appeal to You, the creator and Lord of the universe, to guide in the deliberations and decisions of this body of Representatives. Grant to each member and to Speaker Turzai the understanding necessary to enact legislation and regulations that are first of all honoring to Your holy name, and therefore, also beneficial to the citizens of this State.

We acknowledge our failures of the past, times when we were focused on our own selfish ambitions or the special interests of a few to the detriment of the greater good of the entire State. Grant to this body the ability and vision to rise above partisan bickering so that a cooperative spirit will prevail.

We desire a State that officially acknowledges Your lordship and our ultimate accountability before You. As our Constitution stipulates, we are free to acknowledge our accountability to a God who will hand down future rewards and punishments; may we therefore understand that we are not free to live as we please without consequences. We violate Your eternal law at our peril.

So as the deliberations begin this afternoon, guide any business at hand and the decisions which will be made so that Your purposes are furthered, and when that end is accomplished, we know that Your blessing will follow.

We humbly present these petitions to You not based on our own worth but upon the merit of Your son, Jesus Christ, in whose name we pray. 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 Thursday, October 13, 2016, will be postponed until printed.

#### JOURNALS APPROVED

The SPEAKER. We do have Journals in print, and without objection, they will be approved. They are from Monday, April 11, 2016, and Tuesday, April 12, 2016.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

The SPEAKER. The Speaker acknowledges receipt of the annual report under Act 77 of 2004 for fiscal year 2015-2016 from the Department of General Services.

(Copy of communication is on file with the Journal clerk.)

### BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

**HB 1280, PN 1711** By Rep. GODSHALL

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, providing for prohibition of a plastic bag ban, fee, surcharge or tax.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS.

**HB 2381, PN 3965** By Rep. SAYLOR

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

EDUCATION.

**SB 881, PN 2141 (Amended)** By Rep. GODSHALL

An Act amending Title 66 (Public Utilities) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in general provisions, further providing for definitions.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS.

### HOUSE RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

**No. 1064** By Representatives BULLOCK, THOMAS, MCCLINTON, COHEN, SAVAGE, DIGIROLAMO, J. HARRIS, V. BROWN, MILLARD, A. HARRIS, KINSEY, D. COSTA, YOUNGBLOOD and M. DALEY

A Resolution urging Amtrak to redesignate the railroad station located at 2955 Market Street in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the "William H. Gray III 30th Street Station."

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, October 17, 2016.

**No. 1073** By Representatives PETRI, CALTAGIRONE, CORBIN, DIAMOND, PHILLIPS-HILL, SAYLOR and WATSON

A Resolution directing the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee to conduct a comprehensive review of the scope of records maintained and fees collected by the county recorder of deeds offices in this Commonwealth and to make recommendations.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, October 17, 2016.

### HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

**No. 2402** By Representative TOEPEL

An Act establishing the Rare Disease Advisory Council and providing for its powers and duties; and providing for duties of the Department of Health, the Insurance Department, the Department of Human Services and the Department of Education.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, October 17, 2016.

**No. 2403** By Representatives SANTORA, JAMES, PICKETT, SAYLOR, DEASY, GROVE and ZIMMERMAN

An Act amending the act of June 22, 1937 (P.L.1987, No.394), known as The Clean Streams Law, in other pollutions and potential pollution, further providing for potential pollution.

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, October 17, 2016.

**No. 2404** By Representatives TOOHL, D. COSTA, MACKENZIE and PICKETT

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

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, October 17, 2016.

**No. 2405** By Representatives SCHEMEL and WARD

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in school directors, further providing for persons not to be employed by or do business with district and exceptions.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, October 17, 2016.

**No. 2406** By Representatives COHEN, BARBIN, ROTHMAN and SCHWEYER

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in post-trial matters, further providing for eligibility for relief, providing for postconviction review for veterans with traumatic brain injury or post-traumatic stress disorder and further providing for jurisdiction and proceedings; and, in sentencing, further providing for sentencing procedure for murder of the first degree.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, October 17, 2016.

**No. 2407** By Representatives ZIMMERMAN, FEE, GREINER, KAUFFMAN, SAYLOR, HELM, D. COSTA, MILLARD, SONNEY, BLOOM, WARD, A. HARRIS, GROVE, GILLEN, MILNE, RADER and KORTZ

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in inchoate crimes, further providing for possession of weapon on school property.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, October 17, 2016.

### LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The minority whip requests leaves of absence for the following members: Representative Leslie ACOSTA of Philadelphia County for the day, Representative Mark COHEN of Philadelphia County for the day, Representative Margo DAVIDSON of Delaware County for the day, Representative Tony DeLUCA of Allegheny County for the day, Representative Dwight EVANS of Philadelphia County for the day, Representative Dan McNEILL of Lehigh County for the day, Representative Curtis THOMAS of Philadelphia County for the day, Representative Steve SANTARSIERO of

Bucks County for the day, Representative Frank BURNS of Cambria County for the day, Representative Kevin BOYLE of Philadelphia County for the day, and Representative Jake WHEATLEY of Allegheny County for the day. Without objection, those requests for leave will be granted.

The majority whip requests leaves of absence for the following members: Representative Will TALLMAN of Adams County for the day, and Representative Duane MILNE of Chester County for the day. Without objection, those will be granted.

### MASTER ROLL CALL

The SPEAKER. Members will proceed to vote on the master roll.

The following roll call was recorded:

#### PRESENT—190

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

#### ADDITIONS—0

#### NOT VOTING—0

#### EXCUSED—13

Acosta	Davidson	McNeill	Tallman
Boyle	DeLuca	Milne	Thomas
Burns	Evans	Santarsiero	Wheatley
Cohen			

#### LEAVES ADDED—3

Hanna	Harper	Hennessey
-------	--------	-----------

#### LEAVES CANCELED—4

Burns	Tallman	Thomas	Wheatley
-------	---------	--------	----------

The SPEAKER. There are 190 members having voted on that master roll, and a quorum is present.

Members, if you will please take your seats.

Representative Tom Quigley, Representative Warren Kampf, Representative Mike Vereb, and Representative Becky Corbin, if you will please come to the rostrum. Please come to the rostrum with your guests.

Members, I would ask you to please take your seats. We are going to be introducing very special guests that took the time to come to the beautiful House of Representatives, and I would ask if you could each please take your seats. We have many guests to introduce today and I want to give them our full attention. Please take your seats. I do apologize; we are going to wait until everybody is in their seats. We have a number of really distinguished visitors and I would ask everybody to please take their seats. As I said, please take your seats. Any conversations can take place in the anterooms off the House floor.

### SPRING CITY RED SOX AMERICAN LEGION PREP TEAM PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. Representative Tom Quigley.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Good afternoon, colleagues.

It is my pleasure to be joined up here today by my colleagues, Representative Mike Vereb, Representative Becky Corbin, and Representative Warren Kampf.

And it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you the Spring City Red Sox Legion Prep Team. These 14 young men worked together to become the 2016 Pennsylvania American Legion Prep State Champions and MBC (Montgomery/Berks/Chester) Prep League Champions. With the help of their team manager, Nick Rakowski, and two assistant coaches, Terry Kennedy and Mike Skrocki, the boys learned about dedication, perseverance, and teamwork on their way to claiming the State title.

Of course their parents played no small role in this achievement; their mothers and fathers shuttling them to and from practice, washing dirty uniforms, and cheering them on at the game. It is only with their support of their parents that these young men claimed the State title.

And, Mr. Speaker, I do have to say I had the great pleasure of being able to throw out the first pitch when the tournament opened, and yes, I did stand on the mound, and it did reach home plate.

And again, despite these gentlemen being less than 13 years old, these young men were committed to the game, developed their talents, and overcame challenges, and it is my pleasure to recognize, along with my colleagues, their achievements today.

Joining me behind us here on the House floor is Anthony Bamford, Nick Cagliola—

The SPEAKER. Raise your hands, gentlemen, as your name is called out, please.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Again, Anthony Bamford, Nick Cagliola, Travis Calvarese, Nathaniel Posner, and Jordan Sherry. And then, Mr. Speaker, in the back, my left corner, is the rest of the team: Evan Bruder, Justin Calvarese, John DiLullo, Kyle Kennedy, Jack Kisela, Dylan Krause, Connor McMahan, Robby Wilding, and unfortunately not able to join us was Zack Skrocki. Also joining us is assistant coach Terry Kennedy.

Again, could we have a round of applause for the team.

I now call on Representative Warren Kampf to make a few comments.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kampf, the floor is yours.

Mr. KAMPF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And in addition to the boys and their coach, I think up in the gallery we have some admiring moms and dads, so might you all wave to us or stand up, perhaps, and we will give you a round of applause.

And let me just lend my congratulations. What an awesome thing to be State champions for American Legion. As an eighth or ninth grader, I sure wish I had that when I was a boy. Congratulations, and good luck to you going forward, men.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Now, who was the pitcher in that final game? Who pitched that final game? Is he here? Dylan Krause, did you pitch that game? Congratulations to you and your teammates, and congratulations on that championship.

Representative Quigley, Representative Kampf, Representative Corbin, and Representative Vereb, thank you very much.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

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

At this time I call upon Representative Joanna McClinton. And I know she has an outstanding group with her today, they should come up with the Representative to the rostrum. If any other members wish to join Representative McClinton feel free but they are going to come up to the rostrum. Please come on up.

Members, I would ask everybody to please take their seats. Please take your seats. We have a distinguished group of guests with us today. All members, please take your seats. Any conversations can be held in the anterooms.

### STATEMENT BY MS. McCLINTON

The SPEAKER. Representative McClinton, the floor is yours.

Ms. McCLINTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am very proud today to introduce all of you to a distinguished group of young African-American men who are making a difference in communities all across both Philadelphia and Delaware Counties. I am thrilled to welcome to the House floor the members of the BMe Community, that is the Black Male Engagement Community. BMe is an award-winning network of community builders who are known for defining people by their contributions to society and enlisting incredible Black men who inspire and help build more caring and prosperous communities. In cities across the entire United States, BMe Community builds leadership networks, cobrands hundreds of events, and tells the story of how we are all working to make our futures better together.

During the past year the Philadelphia BMe Community leaders have done the following: They have had a Better Together Challenge, which highlighted the work that included developing new businesses, providing job training and job placement, offering financial literacy resources, real estate investment and property ownership training, and innovative ways to finance higher education. The BMe leaders held a back-to-school celebration at the Benjamin Franklin High School. BMe is also promoting a Spend Black campaign to help provide economic support to Black-owned businesses. During this year BMe has even had the privilege of playing a basketball game with the Police Athletic League at the Martin Luther King Recreation Center. This type of event helps to foster better relationships with members of the community and law enforcement.

Finally, there were several BMe Community leaders who received President Barack Obama's Volunteer Service Award for the great work that they have been doing throughout the city of Philadelphia. This is the highest award that anyone can receive as a volunteer. That award truly exemplifies the commitment that the BMe Community leaders have to building caring and prosperous communities in Philadelphia.

I ask that our colleagues join us in giving a very hearty welcome to these incredible men who are making a difference in our communities.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative McClinton, thank you so much.

And, sirs, thank you for the great work that you are doing, really, for the citizens of Pennsylvania. We are very, very appreciative. Thank you.

### GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. Located in the rear of the House, we welcome some guests of Representative Schlossberg: Lori Sywensky, who is CEO (chief executive officer) of Turning Point, and her sons, Tyler and Collin. If you could please stand. If you could please stand. Great; they are in the back right-hand corner, my back right-hand corner. Great to have you here today.

Representative Lynwood Savage has some guests. They are located here to the left of the rostrum. A junior at Cheyney University, Anitra Jackson, is here with her parents, Adrienne and John, and her grandmother, Victoria. Please stand. It is great to have you here today. Thank you.

Representative Savage, you have a resolution, correct? We are going to do those very shortly, and I apologize. You will be able to reintroduce your guests at that time. And that is my fault; my apologies. But we are going to get that very shortly.

Located in the rear of the House, a guest of Chairman John Payne and Chairman Ron Marsico is Dr. Chris Huffman. Dr. Huffman, thank you so much for joining us today.

Representative Phillips-Hill welcomes Audrey Copello, a senior at Dallastown High School, and she is interning in Representative Phillips-Hill's district office for the semester. Will you please stand. Thank you so much for being with us today, Audrey.

In the rear of the House, guests of Representatives Mindy Fee and Dave Hickernell are Bob and Kelly Zeager from Londonderry Township. Thank you so much for being with us today. Thank you.

Representative Barbin has guests in the rear of the House, and boy, I hope they come forward here. This is his son and daughter-in-law, Joshua and Ashley Barbin. Joshua and Ashley, where are you? Oh, it is great to see you. They are right there in the back with Representative Barbin. Welcome. So good to have you here.

Representative Sheryl DeLozier welcomes guest page Ryan Neely, who attends Mechanicsburg High School, and he is in the well of the House. Great to see you. Thank you so much, Ryan.

Also in the well of the House, Representative Madeleine Dean has a guest page, Maryah Burney. Maryah Burney, if you will please stand. Great to have you here, Maryah.

Chairman Marsico has a guest page in the well of the House. She is Chelsey Thomas. Chelsey, thanks so much for being with us today.

At this time, before we go to the resolutions, Representative Kristin Phillips-Hill is invited to the rostrum for the purpose of presenting a championship citation.

Members, please take your seats. Members, this will be our last presentation before we get to the resolutions, so I would ask everybody to please take your seats. Guests and members, please take your seats. How old are you, young man? We have a 9-year-old champion here that the good Representative is going to introduce us to, so please take your seats. Thank you.

### **MASON TUCKER PRESENTED**

The SPEAKER. Representative Phillips-Hill, you may proceed.

Mrs. HILL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is my honor to welcome Mason Tucker to the hall of the House. Mason is an exceptionally accomplished 9-year-old athlete. He learned to ride a bicycle without training wheels at the age of 2 and graduated to his first motorcycle at the age of 3. At age 5, Mason was selected by Cobra Motorcycles out of

Michigan to be a factory elite motocross rider on their team. He has maintained his elite factory rider status with Cobra Motorcycles since 2013, and has also been added to their international factory team ever since.

Mason went to Australia to race in the Australian National Championship 2 years ago and is the youngest child to ever have been selected to be on the national team. Mason has also qualified for the Loretta Lynn National Championship race, an event which is limited to the 40 fastest racers in each class in the entire United States. Many racers spend their entire careers attempting to simply qualify for this race, and Mason has not only qualified four times, but he finished third this summer in the 50cc race. Also this summer, Mason traveled to Canada for the Canadian Nationals and he won both classes.

To say we are proud of Mason in York County is an understatement. He demonstrates to us and to all of us in the Commonwealth what is possible when pure talent meets Pennsylvania ingenuity.

Mason practices routinely at his home track, Happy Ramblers, in York County. Numerous farmers in the York County area host Mason and some of his other racing friends to utilize their farmlands for practice.

And last but not least, Mason would not be able to be the racer he is without the support of his local school district and school, Dallastown Intermediate School, which has worked closely with him to allow him the academic and social benefits of receiving an exceptional public education, which is something that many motocross racers in this country are not able to do.

Joining Mason today are his principal, Dr. Erin Heffler, and his guidance counselor, Mrs. Gina Dougherty. Also joining Mason today is his father, Darren Tucker, who is not only Mason's dad, but his coach, mechanic, and chauffeur. Darren and Mason travel the country for races and practice time in the winter.

Please join me in welcoming Mason and Darren Tucker; principal, Dr. Erin Heffler; and guidance counselor, Mrs. Gina Dougherty to the House of Representatives, and to congratulate Mason on his amazing accomplishments in motocross in 2016.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Mason, congratulations, young man.

### **ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. KELLER**

The SPEAKER. We have some good news, and the Chair is going to call upon Representative Bill Keller on unanimous consent to provide it to us.

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

I would like to announce that over the weekend, we had our first grandchild born, William Francis Keller, on October 15, 2016; 7 pounds 7 ounces, 20 1/2 inches. Mother and baby are doing great; I am still checking on my son. But I say that little Will is off to a good start. He accomplished something I was never able to accomplish in my life. Believe it or not, I was never 7 pounds 7 ounces.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Representative Savage, if you would like to come down at this time, we will do the resolution that you have sponsored. Representative Savage. And thank you, sir. Thanks very much.

## CALENDAR

## RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. SAVAGE called up **HR 1044, PN 3996**, entitled:

A Resolution honoring the Commonwealth's ambassador for the White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. On that resolution— I would ask for your attention. I would ask for your attention. If everybody could please take their seats. If everybody could please take their seats.

Representative Savage, the floor is yours, sir.

Mr. SAVAGE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask for my colleagues' support for HR 1044 in honor of Anitra Jackson, whose academic achievements have brought her to the United States White House. Anitra is the only Pennsylvanian to be named by the White House as a Historically Black Colleges and Universities All-Star Student for 2016.

She currently attends Cheyney University and has received a full merit-based scholarship. Anitra is an exceptionally talented woman who is working for double majors in computer science and mathematics in hopes of becoming a computer engineer.

Her community involvement is not limited to athletics; she also is actively involved in several academic groups on campus. In addition, she is a member of the college's honor society, various academic and student council boards, and she has achieved the honor of being crowned Miss Cheyney 2016.

I also understand that Anitra's father and mother are here, whom I met earlier, and grandmother. They are here today as well, and I would like to thank them and congratulate them as well.

Also, special thanks to Cheyney University. I am very proud of historically Black colleges and universities. I have many close friends that have graduated from HBCUs, and I have a daughter that did as well.

In conclusion, I want to welcome Anitra again and congratulate her with this resolution for being the only college student in Pennsylvania to serve as an ambassador for the White House Initiative as a 2016 Historically Black Colleges and Universities All-Star Student.

Join me in unanimously voting on this resolution. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

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

## CONSIDERATION OF HR 1044 CONTINUED

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

The following roll call was recorded:

## YEAS—192

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

## NAYS—0

## NOT VOTING—0

## EXCUSED—11

Acosta	Cohen	Evans	Santarsiero
Boyle	Davidson	McNeill	Wheatley
Burns	DeLuca	Milne	

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

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, young lady. Thank you so much for being with us. We are going to just take a moment here to have a photo.

UNCONTESTED CALENDAR

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. MURT called up HR 975, PN 3780, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of October 2016 as "Lifesharing Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

\*\*\*

Ms. DONATUCCI called up HR 978, PN 3783, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing August 26, 2016, as "Women's Equality Day" in Pennsylvania.

\*\*\*

Ms. DONATUCCI called up HR 979, PN 3784, entitled:

A Resolution honoring female veterans who heroically served our country as members of the United States Armed Forces.

\*\*\*

Ms. DONATUCCI called up HR 980, PN 3785, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of September 2016 as "Polycystic Ovarian Syndrome Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

\*\*\*

Mr. MARSHALL called up HR 1038, PN 3960, entitled:

A Resolution designating the week of October 16 through 22, 2016, as "Community College Completion Week" in Pennsylvania.

\*\*\*

Ms. RAPP called up HR 1065, PN 4011, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the week of October 16 through 22, 2016, as "National Forest Products Week" in Pennsylvania.

On the question, Will the House adopt the resolutions?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-192

Table with 4 columns of names: Adolph, Artis, Baker, Barbin, Barrar, Benninghoff, Bizzarro, Bloom, Boback, Bradford, Farry, Fee, Flynn, Frankel, Freeman, Gabler, Gainey, Galloway, Gergely, Gibbons, Lewis, Longiotti, Mackenzie, Maher, Mahoney, Major, Maloney, Markosek, Marshall, Marsico, Readshaw, Reed, Reese, Regan, Roae, Roebuck, Ross, Rothman, Rozzi, Saccone

Table with 4 columns of names: Briggs, Brown, R., Brown, V., Bullock, Caltagirone, Carroll, Causer, Christiana, Conklin, Corbin, Costa, D., Costa, P., Cox, Cruz, Culver, Cutler, Daley, M., Daley, P., Davis, Dawkins, Day, Dean, Deasy, DeLissio, Delozier, Dermody, Diamond, DiGirolamo, Donatucci, Driscoll, Dunbar, Dush, Ellis, Emrick, English, Evankovich, Everett, Fabrizio, Farina, Gillen, Gillespie, Gingrich, Godshall, Goodman, Greiner, Grove, Hahn, Hanna, Harhai, Harhart, Harkins, Harper, Harris, A., Harris, J., Heffley, Helm, Hennessey, Hickernell, Hill, Irvin, James, Jozwiak, Kampf, Kaufner, Kauffman, Kavulich, Keller, F., Keller, M.K., Keller, W., Kim, Kinsey, Kirkland, Klunk, Knowles, Kortz, Kotik, Krueger, Lawrence, Masser, Matzie, McCarter, McClinton, McGinnis, Mentzer, Metcalfe, Metzgar, Miccarelli, Millard, Miller, B., Miller, D., Moul, Mullery, Murt, Mustio, Neilson, Nelson, Nesbit, Neuman, O'Brien, O'Neill, Oberlander, Ortity, Parker, D., Pashinski, Payne, Peifer, Petrarca, Petri, Pickett, Pyle, Quigley, Quinn, C., Quinn, M., Rader, Rapp, Ravenstahl, Sainato, Samuelson, Sankey, Santora, Savage, Saylor, Schemel, Schlossberg, Schreiber, Schweyer, Simmons, Sims, Snyder, Sonney, Staats, Stephens, Sturla, Tallman, Taylor, Thomas, Tobash, Toepel, Toohil, Topper, Truitt, Vereb, Vitali, Ward, Warner, Watson, Wentling, Wheeland, White, Youngblood, Zimmerman, Turzai, Speaker

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-11

Table with 4 columns of names: Acosta, Boyle, Burns, Cohen, Davidson, DeLuca, Evans, McNeill, Milne, Santarsiero, Wheatley

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

The SPEAKER. We have three sets of speakers on the resolutions today. We will begin with Representative Kathy Rapp and Representative Marty Causer, and they are going to speak on HR 1065, and Representative Matt Gabler and Representative Donna Oberlander will be with them as well. And they will be followed by Representative Murt on HR 975 and Representative Donatucci on HR 978.

I would ask all the members to please take your seats. These are important resolutions and the members deserve full attention. All members and guests, please take your seats. Members, please take your seats. Any conversations can be taken to the anteroom. Members, I would ask you to please take your seats.

**STATEMENT BY MS. RAPP**

The SPEAKER. Representative Kathy Rapp will have the floor, and she will be followed by Representative Marty Causer.

Ms. RAPP. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With the Allegheny National Forest located in our legislative districts, and as members of the House Environmental Resources and Energy Committee and also the Legislative Timber Caucus, I and my colleagues could not be more honored to sponsor this resolution designating this week as "National Forest Products Week" in Pennsylvania.

The purpose of this resolution is to help raise awareness of the importance and heritage of the Commonwealth's hardwood forests and to commend the forest products industry for its longstanding history of care and commitment to the responsible and sustainable use for our most renewable natural resources.

In 1690 the first paper mill in the United States was founded in Pennsylvania. Today more than 10 percent of the Commonwealth's manufacturing workforce is involved in the forest products industry, with approximately 60,000 Pennsylvanians making a livelihood connected to forestry. Not surprisingly, Pennsylvania-produced forest products encompass an incredibly wide range of limitless everyday uses, from facilitating education, communications, hygiene, food storage, and product protection to providing shelter and adding beauty to our homes.

From the perspective of economic impact and family-sustaining jobs, there are presently more than 3,000 separate businesses involved in Pennsylvania's forest products industry, with a presence in each of our 67 counties. Yet even with more than three centuries of dynamic growth, thanks to the industry's responsible stewardship of our forests and commitment to sustainable practices, Pennsylvania has more forests today than 25 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, it is for all of these reasons and countless others that time does not allow me to mention that we respectfully ask for a unanimous vote on HR 1065. Thank you, colleagues, for joining me in recognizing the "National Forest Products Week" in Pennsylvania.

And I believe that Representative Causer has a few remarks. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Rapp.

**STATEMENT BY MR. CAUSER**

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

Mr. CAUSER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we have millions of acres of forest land in Pennsylvania and this industry is so important to our economy, especially important in rural communities across the Commonwealth.

I would like to recognize the work of the Hardwoods Development Council, under the Department of Agriculture; the hardwood utilization groups; and the Pennsylvania Forest Products Association for all they do to promote forest products and support the industry in Pennsylvania.

So I would like to especially thank the gentlelady from Warren County for sponsoring this resolution, and I join my colleagues in asking for support for the resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Causer, and thank you, Representatives Gabler and Oberlander for joining Representatives Rapp and Causer.

**STATEMENT BY MR. MURT**

The SPEAKER. Representative Tom Murt is recognized to speak on HR 975.

Mr. MURT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for their support of HR 975, which establishes October as "Lifesharing Awareness Month" in our Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, lifesharing is when a family and a person with an intellectual or developmental disability choose to share a home and life experiences together. This is intended to become a long-term and trusting relationship in which the supported person becomes an extension of the family. Mr. Speaker, lifesharing is a high-quality and a long-term-living situation that provides an individual with a disability choice and true community integration.

Mentoring is the backbone of any productive community, Mr. Speaker. Mentors educate our children, teach job skills, and share a lifetime of expertise with new generations. In many ways, Mr. Speaker, you can judge a community's quality of life based on the strength of those who give back to others.

In that way, the Lifesharing Program is an invaluable resource to our community. Mentors in the Lifesharing Program open their hearts, their families, and their homes to those with developmental disabilities. When a mentor takes in and cares for an adult with special needs, they give something that money cannot buy – a helping hand, a home, and a family. Mr. Speaker, through their actions, these mentors show that every Pennsylvanian deserves to live life to the fullest. These families are more than home providers; they are teachers, advocates, friends, and a family unit.

For the person being mentored, lifesharing offers the opportunity to live in the community of their choice. By sharing their mentor's home, individuals are able to take part in the everyday, but critically important, activities of family life, while still receiving the supports they need. They can socialize with family and friends, manage household chores, discover new hobbies, and learn new skills to the best of their abilities. Lifesharing helps individuals lead fuller, more independent lives in the communities in which they live.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I add that lifesharing is a very efficient manner of caring for our brothers and sisters with intellectual and developmental disabilities. It is less expensive than institutionalization and less expensive than even group homes.

While there are many programs that offer mentoring services, lifesharing is an example of how to do it more efficiently and with greater success, and as the need for these services increases, it is critical that lifesharing continues to stand as an example of how to improve the lives of those who cannot help themselves. In that way, the Lifesharing Program is an invaluable resource to our community, and that is why it is



so important that we recognize the achievements of lifesharing and mark October as "Lifesharing Awareness Month."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, colleagues.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Murt.

### STATEMENT BY MS. DONATUCCI

The SPEAKER. Representative Donatucci is recognized to speak on HR 978.

Ms. DONATUCCI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to thank my colleagues for their support of Women's Equality Day in Pennsylvania.

August 26 is the official day designated as "Women's Equality Day." The significance of that date marks the passage of the 19th Amendment to the United States Constitution, giving women the hard-fought right to vote. I firmly believe that I would not be standing here in front of you, nor working beside you, if it were not for the resolve of women like Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, or Lucretia Mott, who was laid to rest in the city of Philadelphia. These women, along with so many others, led the crusade to break down gender barriers and cement the women's rights movement into history. Drawing attention to Women's Equality Day is a time to commemorate the accomplishments of women who have come before us, and a time to stand up and call attention to the inequalities women still face today.

A year ago I stood before you to recognize the 2015 anniversary of Women's Equality Day. At that time I said we still have a long way to go to make sure women have equal rights with men. Unfortunately, my words today are more of an echo than they are words of progression.

I will continue to fight for women's rights for as long as it takes to get us over the finish line. I support raising our State's minimum wage and I have yet again offered legislation to update Pennsylvania's Equal Pay Law. Everyone deserves to be paid fairly for their work, no matter their gender. It is long past time for us to close the embarrassing chapter in our history and pay women and men equally.

I also stand with the Women's Health Caucus to ensure women have access to quality health care. I hope my colleagues will support me – and women across the State – in these efforts.

Eleanor Roosevelt was fighting for women's rights long before her husband became President and she continued her quest for equal pay long after, advocating all the way through J.F.K.'s Presidency. Today I pick up the baton of our foremother's fight, vowing to do all that I can to make sure women's rights grow well beyond the right to vote.

Thank you again to my colleagues for their support, and a special thank you to my female friends and colleagues.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Donatucci.

### GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. Members, now we are going to recognize a championship team, and they have just come into the chamber. They are the guests of Representatives Greg Rothman, Sheryl Delozier, Mike Regan, Sue Helm, Ron Marsico, and Steve Bloom.

Members, you are invited to come to the rostrum. We are just going to be introducing this team.

Players from the Camp Hill Chargers, who played an exhibition game in the 2016 Little League World Series, are here with their parents and friends. If you will please rise. It is great to have you here with us today. Please rise. It is so great to have you here in the chamber. Thanks for being with us today.

### CALENDAR CONTINUED

#### RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. D. COSTA called up **HR 963, PN 3747**, entitled:

A Resolution honoring the law enforcement officers who lost their lives in the targeted attacks in Dallas, Texas, and Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and extending condolences to the families and friends of the victims and to the members of the Dallas and Baton Rouge communities.

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. On that question, Representative Dom Costa and Representative Madeleine Dean will both be recognized.

And if you will just wait. I would ask that members take their seats. We are honoring the law enforcement officers who lost their lives in attacks in Texas and Louisiana, so I would very much ask that everybody please take their seats. Members, we do need to have everybody please take their seats. We are going to be honoring fallen law enforcement officers.

Representative Dean, you may have the floor.

Mrs. DEAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and humbled to stand with my colleague and friend, Representative Dom Costa, to offer HR 963, honoring the law enforcement officers who lost their lives in targeted attacks this past summer in Dallas, Texas, and in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

On July 7, 2016, a single gunman, armed with an assault-style rifle, opened fire on a peaceful protest in Dallas, Texas. The gunman killed five law enforcement officers, wounding nine other folks.

The Dallas law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty were Brent Thompson, age 43, who had recently married; Michael Krol, age 40, who was an 8-year veteran of the Dallas police force; Patrick Zamarripa, age 32, who was a husband and a father of a daughter and a stepson; Lorne Ahrens, age 48, who was a husband and a father of a 10-year-old daughter and an 8-year-old son; Michael Smith, age 55, who was a husband and the father of 14-year-old and 10-year-old daughters, and who was a 27-year veteran of the Dallas Police Department.

Just 10 days later, you will all remember, after the Dallas shooting, on July 17 in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, three law enforcement officers were killed and three more were wounded with an assault-style weapon. The Baton Rouge law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty were Montrell Jackson, age 32, who was a husband and a father of a 4-month-old son; Matthew Gerald, age 41, who was a husband and a father of two daughters; and Brad Garafola, age 45, who was a husband and a father of four children.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that we could have a moment of silence for the fallen officers.

The SPEAKER. Yes. Members, please rise for a moment of silence for the fallen officers.

(Whereupon, a moment of silence was observed.)

The SPEAKER. Members, you may be seated.

Mrs. DEAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With the heightened tensions that our country has faced, I commend everybody in this room who is working to build police and community relationships in order that these tensions will be relieved, that we will trust one another, we will trust our police, we will trust our communities, and we will not have this kind of senseless, horrible violence.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Dean. Representative Dom Costa.

Yes, sir. You may be recognized.

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

I would like to thank our colleagues for taking up this resolution. It is unfortunate, this tragic, cowardly act of ambushing our law enforcement officers. Our jobs are tough enough, but for the law enforcement community, they can be assured that this body and this Commonwealth will not forget those who sacrificed and the brave people that they were and their families.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the body.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

On the question recurring,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—192

Adolph	Farry	Lewis	Readshaw
Artis	Fee	Longiotti	Reed
Baker	Flynn	Mackenzie	Reese
Barbin	Frankel	Maher	Regan
Barrar	Freeman	Mahoney	Roe
Benninghoff	Gabler	Major	Roebuck
Bizzarro	Gainey	Maloney	Ross
Bloom	Galloway	Markosek	Rothman
Boback	Gergely	Marshall	Rozzi
Bradford	Gibbons	Marsico	Saccone
Briggs	Gillen	Masser	Sainato
Brown, R.	Gillespie	Matzie	Samuelson
Brown, V.	Gingrich	McCarter	Sankey
Bullock	Godshall	McClinton	Santora
Caltagirone	Goodman	McGinnis	Savage
Carroll	Greiner	Mentzer	Saylor
Causar	Grove	Metcalfe	Schemel
Christiana	Hahn	Metzgar	Schlossberg
Conklin	Hanna	Miccarelli	Schreiber
Corbin	Harhai	Millard	Schweyer
Costa, D.	Harhart	Miller, B.	Simmons
Costa, P.	Harkins	Miller, D.	Sims
Cox	Harper	Moul	Snyder
Cruz	Harris, A.	Mullery	Sonney
Culver	Harris, J.	Murt	Staats
Cutler	Heffley	Mustio	Stephens
Daley, M.	Helm	Neilson	Sturla
Daley, P.	Hennessey	Nelson	Tallman
Davis	Hickernell	Nesbit	Taylor
Dawkins	Hill	Neuman	Thomas
Day	Irvin	O'Brien	Tobash
Dean	James	O'Neill	Toepel
Deasy	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Toohil

DeLissio	Kampf	Ortitay	Topper
Delozier	Kaufert	Parker, D.	Truitt
Dermody	Kauffman	Pashinski	Vereb
Diamond	Kavulich	Payne	Vitali
DiGirolamo	Keller, F.	Peifer	Ward
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Warner
Driscoll	Keller, W.	Petri	Watson
Dunbar	Kim	Pickett	Wentling
Dush	Kinsey	Pyle	Wheeland
Ellis	Kirkland	Quigley	White
Emrick	Klunk	Quinn, C.	Youngblood
English	Knowles	Quinn, M.	Zimmerman
Evankovich	Kortz	Rader	
Everett	Kotik	Rapp	Turzai,
Fabrizio	Krueger	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Farina	Lawrence		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—11

Acosta	Cohen	Evans	Santarsiero
Boyle	Davidson	McNeill	Wheatley
Burns	DeLuca	Milne	

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

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

**HB 2187, PN 3569**

By Rep. TAYLOR

An Act designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 4005 in Polk Township, Jefferson County, as the Polk Township Veterans Memorial Bridge.

TRANSPORTATION.

**SB 1086, PN 2142 (Amended)**

By Rep. TAYLOR

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in registration of vehicles, further providing for display of registration plate and for surrender of registration plates and cards upon suspension or revocation and providing for suspension of registration upon unpaid tolls; and, in fees, further providing for reinstatement of operating privilege or vehicle registration.

TRANSPORTATION.

**APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING**

The SPEAKER. Chairman Adolph is recognized for a committee announcement.

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

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

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

**REPUBLICAN CAUCUS**

The SPEAKER. The caucus chair, Representative Sandra Major, is recognized for a caucus announcement.

Ms. MAJOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to announce that Republicans will caucus today at 2:45. I would ask our Republican members to please report to our caucus room at 2:45. We would be prepared to come back on the floor, Mr. Speaker, at 3:30. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Madam Chair.

**DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS**

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

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Democrats will caucus at 2:45. Democrats will caucus at 2:45.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

**LABOR AND INDUSTRY COMMITTEE MEETING**

The SPEAKER. Representative Mauree Gingrich is recognized for a committee announcement.

Mrs. GINGRICH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to call an immediate meeting of the Labor and Industry Committee to consider HB 2382. The meeting will be held in Ryan 205, and that is immediately at the break. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Madam Chair.

There will be an immediate meeting of the Labor and Industry Committee to be held in Ryan 205.

Does anybody else wish to be recognized at this time?

**RECESS**

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 3:30.

**AFTER RECESS**

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

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

The SPEAKER. Representative Mike HANNA has requested to be placed on leave for the day. Without objection, that will be granted.

**BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE****HB 1528, PN 2298**

By Rep. ADOLPH

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

APPROPRIATIONS.

**HB 1530, PN 2300**

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in petition for adoption, further providing for consents necessary to adoption.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**HB 1885, PN 3075**

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending Titles 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) and 53 (Municipalities Generally) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in matters affecting government units, providing for exceptions to governmental immunity related to unauthorized aliens; and, in preemptions, providing for restriction on municipal regulation of official and employee communications relating to immigration status.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**HB 1968, PN 3964**

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act authorizing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission and the Governor, to grant and convey to the Bradford House Historical Association certain lands situate in the City of Washington, Washington County; and to grant and convey, at a price to be determined through a competitive bid process, certain lands, buildings and improvements situate in South Strabane Township, Washington County; and authorizing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Department of Military and Veterans Affairs and the Governor, to grant and convey to the Salvation Army, or its successors or assigns, certain lands, buildings and improvements situate in the Borough of East Stroudsburg, Monroe County.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**HB 2303, PN 3962**

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending Title 3 (Agriculture) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, making editorial changes; consolidating an article of The Administrative Code of 1929 relating to race horse industry reform; further providing for Pennsylvania Breeding Fund; and making a related repeal.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**HB 2338, PN 3963**

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act providing for student protection during the transition of a postsecondary education institution to new accreditation.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**SB 1062, PN 2109**

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending Titles 18 (Crimes and Offenses) and 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in burglary and other criminal intrusions, further providing for burglary; in minors, further providing for sentencing and penalties for trafficking drugs to minors and for drug-free school zones; in other offenses, further providing for drug trafficking sentencing and penalties; and, in sentencing, further providing for sentences for offenses committed with firearms, for sentences for certain drug offenses committed with firearms, for sentences for offenses committed on public transportation, for sentences for offenses against elderly persons, for sentences for offenses against infant persons, for sentence for failure to comply with registration of sexual offenders, for sentences for offenses committed while impersonating a law enforcement officer and providing for sentencing for burglary.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**SB 1311, PN 2061**

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending Titles 23 (Domestic Relations) and 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in adoption, further providing for grounds for involuntary termination; in child protective services, further providing for definitions and for release of information in confidential reports; and, in juvenile matters, further providing for definitions.

APPROPRIATIONS.

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

**HB 2382, PN 3970**

By Rep. GINGRICH

An Act amending the act of December 5, 1936 (2nd Sp.Sess., 1937 P.L.2897, No.1), known as the Unemployment Compensation Law, in determination of compensation, appeals, reviews and procedure, further providing for determination of compensation appeals and for decision of referee and further appeals and reviews.

LABOR AND INDUSTRY.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. METCALFE**

The SPEAKER. Members, if you will take your seats, we are going to be proceeding to second consideration and then third consideration, but before we do that, some good news from Chairman Daryl Metcalfe, who is recognized on unanimous consent.

Members, please take your seats.

Mr. METCALFE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make an announcement that my daughter and her husband were blessed with having our first grandbaby 3 months ago today, on July 17. So my wife and I are new grandparents and God has really blessed us with a beautiful little baby girl, Aviana Rose Swinto.

So I just wanted to make that announcement for the members to share that good news. It happened during the summer, but today is her 3-month birthday, so I thought it was an opportune time to get up and let everybody know of the good news that our family was rejoicing in that blessing from God, that we have a brand-new baby girl in the family, Aviana Rose.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You bet.

Congratulations, Grandpa.

**CALENDAR CONTINUED****BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 564, PN 1222**, entitled:

An Act selecting, designating and adopting celestine as the official State mineral of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

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 2293, PN 3777**, entitled:

An Act designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 741 over the Conestoga River, between Pequea Township and Lancaster Township, Lancaster County, as the Corporal Eric M. Torbert, Jr., Memorial Bridge.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1473, PN 2074**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the exclusion of veterans' benefit payments from income for Commonwealth programs.

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 2304, PN 3806**, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 51 (Military Affairs) and 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Department of Military and Veterans' Affairs, further providing for Pennsylvania Veterans' Memorial Trust Fund; in State Veterans' Commission and Deputy Adjutant General for Veterans' Affairs, further providing for Veterans' Trust Fund; in Pennsylvania Veterans' Memorial Commission, repealing provisions relating to the Pennsylvania Veterans' Memorial Trust Fund and to expiration; and, in registration of vehicles, further providing for Pennsylvania monument registration plate.

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 1525, PN 2345**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in adoption, further providing for definitions, for hearing and for petition for involuntary termination, providing for notice if identity or whereabouts of parent or putative father unknown, further providing for consents necessary to adoption and repealing provisions relating to consents not naming adopting parents.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Mr. **PETRI** offered the following amendment No. **A10290**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 21, by inserting a bracket before the period after "petition"

Amend Bill, page 2, line 21, by inserting after "petition."

] unless the petitioner requests a later date, in which case the hearing shall be scheduled not later than 30 days after filing of the petition.

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

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

Mr. PETRI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is a technical amendment and I would request the members' support.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED**

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

**CONSIDERATION OF HB 1525 CONTINUED**

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—192

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

Dermody	Kavulich	Payne	Vitali
Diamond	Keller, F.	Peifer	Ward
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Warner
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Petri	Watson
Driscoll	Kim	Pickett	Wentling
Dunbar	Kinsey	Pyle	Wheeland
Dush	Kirkland	Quigley	White
Ellis	Klunk	Quinn, C.	Youngblood
Emrick	Knowles	Quinn, M.	Zimmerman
English	Kortz	Rader	
Evanovich	Kotik	Rapp	Turzai,
Everett	Krueger	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Fabrizio	Lawrence		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—11

Acosta	Davidson	Hanna	Santarsiero
Boyle	DeLuca	McNeill	Wheatley
Cohen	Evans	Milne	

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

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

Mr. B. MILLER offered the following amendment No. A10224:

Amend Bill, page 5, lines 3 through 14, by striking out all of said lines

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

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes Representative Brett Miller for a brief description of the amendment.

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

Mr. Speaker, this amendment has to do with HB 1525, which deals with the relinquishment and termination of parental rights in the course of the legal process of adopting a child in Pennsylvania.

Basically what this amendment would do is it would take out one of the provisions that is currently in this bill dealing with the putative rights of fathers, putative fathers, and notifying them in the event that their rights were going to be terminated.

The current law is that putative fathers – there must be a diligent search made and proof of publication that their rights are about to be terminated. This bill would take that provision out and make it subject to the court's decision on whether or not to waive that provision based on whether or not they know of the whereabouts of that putative father.

So in essence what you have is, you have a double standard. If they know where the putative father is and they believe that that father is not acting in the best interest of the child, the court can waive the notification requirement for that putative father. If, however, they do not know where the putative father is, they are required to publish a notice and conduct a diligent search.

Mr. Speaker, what I am suggesting is that this is a double standard and that my amendment would take that provision out and require that a diligent search and notice of publication be sent to all parents, whether known where they are or unknown where they are. I believe that this takes away the subjectivity of the courts deciding what is in the best interest of the child and makes it a fair standard when dealing with the relinquishment of parental rights.

So I ask all members to support my amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. PETRI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would request that the members vote against this amendment. Unfortunately, it undoes the intent of the bill, which is essentially to save dollars and cents in trying to track down someone who has relinquished their rights, waived their rights, does not want to recognize the child, has no intent of being the father, and does not even want to be found. And so what this says is, once the father has relinquished his rights, the putative father, who may have just been identified and may or may not be the father, may have even gone to legal counsel who told them, "Don't take any active steps towards acting like the father, otherwise the court will determine you are the father." And so what we are trying to do is say, in that instance, you should not have to go back when the termination is going to be completed and refund them.

Experience indicates and practitioners tell us that oftentimes they cannot find the putative father after they found them originally, and therefore, they have to publish. And when the publication – first they have to try and find them, they have to submit an affidavit, hire a private investigator, ultimately publish, and it ends up being the same result, so this is a matter of expedition and saving moneys. Most practitioners tell us that my bill will save about \$5,000 in the process of adoption, which is a significant cost.

So reluctantly, I must ask the members not to support this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. All those in favor of the amendment will vote "aye"— Okay, wait; we will hold off.

Representative Vitali, I am sorry; you were not at a microphone at the time.

Representative Vitali.

Mr. VITALI. May I ask the maker of the amendment a quick question?

I will assume that is a yes.

I just want to understand, would a "yes" vote for this amendment – we vote "yes" – would it make it easier or harder to terminate the rights of the putative father? A "yes" vote, would a "yes" vote make it easier or harder?

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

Voting "yes" on this amendment would make it – I think the question is really not harder or easier, because currently a father must be notified of their parental rights about to be terminated. If you vote "yes" on this amendment, it will keep things in the status quo, that the parents must be notified. If you vote "no" on this, you will thereby make it such that the courts can unilaterally decide whether or not a parent's rights can be terminated.

So a "yes" vote would make it such that the parents would still have the right to be notified. And all we are talking about here is a 10-day notice, just 10 days, at which point if the

putative father does not respond or says no, then their rights can be relinquished. We are talking about 10 days, as is currently the case now.

Mr. VITALI. So I will just ask it another way.

So a "yes" vote would just be a little more protective of the rights of the putative father?

Mr. B. MILLER. Correct.

Mr. VITALI. Okay. Thank you.

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

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—50

Bizzarro	Dush	Kirkland	Readshaw
Bullock	Evankovich	Klunk	Roa
Burns	Fabrizio	Kortz	Saccone
Caltagirone	Freeman	Mackenzie	Savage
Conklin	Galloway	Mahoney	Simmons
Costa, P.	Gillen	Maloney	Tallman
Cox	Greiner	Masser	Thomas
Daley, P.	Harhart	Miller, B.	Truitt
Davis	Harkins	Nelson	Vitali
Day	Hill	Petrarca	Ward
Deasy	Jozwiak	Rader	Wentling
DeLissio	Keller, F.	Rapp	Zimmerman
Diamond	Kim		

NAYS—142

Adolph	Flynn	Major	Reed
Artis	Frankel	Markosek	Reese
Baker	Gabler	Marshall	Regan
Barbin	Gainey	Marsico	Roebuck
Barrar	Gergely	Matzie	Ross
Benninghoff	Gibbons	McCarter	Rothman
Bloom	Gillespie	McClinton	Rozzi
Boback	Gingrich	McGinnis	Sainato
Bradford	Godshall	Mentzer	Samuelson
Briggs	Goodman	Metcalfe	Sankey
Brown, R.	Grove	Metzgar	Santora
Brown, V.	Hahn	Miccarelli	Saylor
Carroll	Harhai	Millard	Schemel
Causar	Harper	Miller, D.	Schlossberg
Christiana	Harris, A.	Moul	Schreiber
Corbin	Harris, J.	Mullery	Schweyer
Costa, D.	Heffley	Murt	Sims
Cruz	Helm	Mustio	Snyder
Culver	Hennessey	Neilson	Sonney
Cutler	Hickernell	Nesbit	Staats
Daley, M.	Irvin	Neuman	Stephens
Dawkins	James	O'Brien	Sturla
Dean	Kampf	O'Neill	Taylor
Delozier	Kaufer	Oberlander	Tobash
Dermody	Kauffman	Ortity	Toepel
DiGirolamo	Kavulich	Parker, D.	Toohil
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Pashinski	Topper
Driscoll	Keller, W.	Payne	Vereb
Dunbar	Kinsey	Peifer	Warner
Ellis	Knowles	Petri	Watson
Emrick	Kotik	Pickett	Whealand
English	Krueger	Pyle	White
Everett	Lawrence	Quigley	Youngblood
Farina	Lewis	Quinn, C.	
Farry	Longietti	Quinn, M.	Turzai,
Fee	Maher	Ravenstahl	Speaker

NOT VOTING—0

## EXCUSED—11

Acosta	Davidson	Hanna	Santarsiero
Boyle	DeLuca	McNeill	Wheatley
Cohen	Evans	Milne	

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?

Ms. **DeLISSIO** offered the following amendment No. **A10314**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 3, by striking out "and" and inserting a comma

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 4 and 5, by striking out ", providing for notice if identity or whereabouts of parent or putative father unknown, further providing" and inserting  
and

Amend Bill, page 4, lines 14 through 30; page 5, lines 1 through 14; by striking out all of said lines on said pages

Amend Bill, page 5, line 15, by striking out "4" and inserting  
3

Amend Bill, page 7, line 19, by striking out "5" and inserting  
4

Amend Bill, page 7, line 27, by striking out "6" and inserting  
5

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative DeLissio for a brief description of the amendment.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment removes the requirement for ads. Currently this is not in law; it is practice. The courts periodically update their rules, and in fact, orphans' court has notified the PA Supreme Court via the PA Bulletin earlier this year of notice of updated rules. And if this is codified in law, then this is what they have to go forward with and there is no flexibility unless we were to revisit the law. And I also believe that an amendment coming behind mine is absolutely very comprehensive in what constitutes a diligent search, and this paves the way for that amendment.

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the members not to support this amendment. The amendment removes the provisions where we are codifying what a lot of our orphans' court judges require by way of a diligent search. The next amendment is the one important, and since the member brought up the next amendment, I think the next amendment will resolve some of the concerns the gentelady has raised. But understand, this amendment just codifies what your judges are requiring by way of a diligent search.

So I would ask the members not to support this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

## YEAS—73

Artis	Dermody	Keller, W.	O'Brien
Bizzarro	Donatucci	Kim	Pashinski
Bradford	Driscoll	Kinsey	Petrarca
Briggs	Fabrizio	Kirkland	Ravenstahl
Brown, V.	Farina	Klunk	Readshaw
Bullock	Flynn	Kortz	Roebuck
Burns	Frankel	Kotik	Sainato
Caltagirone	Freeman	Krueger	Samuelson
Carroll	Galloway	Longietti	Savage
Conklin	Gergely	Mahoney	Schlossberg
Costa, D.	Gibbons	Markosek	Schweyer
Costa, P.	Goodman	Matzie	Sims
Cruz	Greiner	McCartner	Snyder
Daley, P.	Harhai	McClinton	Sturla
Davis	Harkins	Miller, B.	Thomas
Dawkins	Harris, J.	Mullery	Vitali
Dean	Hill	Neilson	Ward
Deasy	Kavulich	Neuman	Zimmerman
DeLissio			

## NAYS—119

Adolph	Gillespie	McGinnis	Ross
Baker	Gingrich	Mentzer	Rothman
Barbin	Godshall	Metcalfe	Rozzi
Barrar	Grove	Metzgar	Saccone
Benninghoff	Hahn	Miccarelli	Sankey
Bloom	Harhart	Millard	Santora
Boback	Harper	Miller, D.	Saylor
Brown, R.	Harris, A.	Moul	Schemel
Causar	Heffley	Murt	Schreiber
Christiana	Helm	Mustio	Simmons
Corbin	Hennessey	Nelson	Sonney
Cox	Hickernell	Nesbit	Staats
Culver	Irvin	O'Neill	Stephens
Cutler	James	Oberlander	Tallman
Daley, M.	Jozwiak	Ortitay	Taylor
Day	Kampf	Parker, D.	Tobash
Delozier	Kaufner	Payne	Toepel
Diamond	Kauffman	Peifer	Toohil
DiGirolamo	Keller, F.	Petri	Topper
Dunbar	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Truitt
Dush	Knowles	Pyle	Vereb
Ellis	Lawrence	Quigley	Warner
Emrick	Lewis	Quinn, C.	Watson
English	Mackenzie	Quinn, M.	Wentling
Evankovich	Maher	Rader	Wheeland
Everett	Major	Rapp	White
Farry	Maloney	Reed	Youngblood
Fee	Marshall	Reese	
Gabler	Marsico	Regan	Turzai,
Gainey	Masser	Roae	Speaker
Gillen			

## NOT VOTING—0

## EXCUSED—11

Acosta	Davidson	Hanna	Santarsiero
Boyle	DeLuca	McNeill	Wheatley
Cohen	Evans	Milne	

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?

Ms. **YOUNGBLOOD** offered the following amendment No. **A10315**:

Amend Bill, page 5, by inserting between lines 14 and 15  
(d) Definitions.—As used in this section, the following words and phrases shall have the meanings given to them in this subsection unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

"Diligent search." A search made to identify and locate a parent or putative father for the purpose of providing notice in an adoption proceeding. A diligent search shall include, but not be limited to, all of the following:

(1) An inquiry to the United States Postal Service to determine the last known address of the individual.

(2) An inquiry to or search of the records of the Department of Human Services, or its equivalent in the state in which the individual may reside, including public assistance or benefits, child support payments and any other records maintained by the department that may contain a last known address for the subject of the inquiry.

(3) An inquiry to or search of the records of the Department of Transportation, or its equivalent in the state in which the individual may reside, relating to personal identification, driver's licensing, vehicle registration, traffic violations and other driving or vehicle related records that may contain a last known address for the subject of the inquiry.

(4) An inquiry to or search of the records of the Department of Corrections, the Department of State and the Department of Revenue or their equivalents in the state in which the individual may reside, that may contain a last known address for the subject of the inquiry.

(5) A search of marriage and divorce records, wills and estates, deeds and land records and any other public records filed with the jurisdiction in which the individual may reside.

(6) Inquiries to local law enforcement agencies and databases in the jurisdiction in which the individual may reside.

(7) An inquiry to the Pennsylvania State Police or other statewide law enforcement entities in the state where the person may reside.

(8) An inquiry to or search of the records of the Armed Forces of the United States as to whether there is any information as to the person.

(9) An Internet search including online search engines, social media, genealogy websites and any other online source that may provide the current residence or whereabouts of the subject of the inquiry.

(10) An inquiry to the United States Department of Homeland Security.

(11) An inquiry to the United States Department of State.

(12) Any other source the court determines to be necessary to identify and locate a parent or putative father for the purpose of providing notice in an adoption proceeding.

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

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes Representative Youngblood for a brief description of the amendment.

Ms. **YOUNGBLOOD**. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding this is an agreed-to amendment. The amendment would simply add a definition for the term "diligent search" and would put

into law commonly accepted practices and standards to ensure that steps are taken to locate the biological parents.

Again, thank you for this agreed-to amendment. I urge all members to vote "yes."

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

Mr. **PETRI**. I would urge the members to support this amendment. It is an excellent amendment, and I thank the gentlelady for her expertise in this area. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—192

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0



## EXCUSED—11

Acosta	Davidson	Hanna	Santarsiero
Boyle	DeLuca	McNeill	Wheatley
Cohen	Evans	Milne	

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

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.

**GUESTS INTRODUCED**

The SPEAKER. Located to the left of the rostrum, we welcome Sam and Josephine Lee. Sam is the superintendent of the Bensalem School District, and they are guests of Representative Gene DiGirolamo. Please rise. Thank you so much for being with us today.

Members, given the voting days left, there will be a number of our colleagues who will continue to present their final floor remarks as they retire from this august body.

**FAREWELL ADDRESS  
BY MR. SCHREIBER**

The SPEAKER. I would like to invite our good friend and colleague, Representative Kevin Schreiber. Kevin has served the 95th District of York County for over 3 years. He was elected in a special election in May 2013. He serves on the Appropriations, Education, Local Government, Environmental Resources and Energy, and Tourism and Recreational Development Committees. Prior to his election he served as economic and community development director for the city of York. At the completion of this term, Kevin will become the president and CEO of the York County Economic Alliance. He resides in York with his wife, Jen, and their dog, Lucy.

Representative Schreiber, the rostrum is yours, sir.

Mr. SCHREIBER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Leader Reed, Leader Dermody, colleagues, thank you all very much.

I just have to have a brief segue and say I was led to believe that this would be a roast, so prepare yourselves. We will now commence the airing of grievances. No. Just kidding. Perhaps just as some have taken this dais to make these remarks, they did not anticipate, as I, that that moment would come so soon, so this is really less a farewell speech as it is more a thank you.

Thank you for the privilege of serving with you these past several years. It has truly been an honor to be part of this august body and it is certainly an important chapter of my life, one that I will always look fondly upon.

Thank you to the many staff members throughout the entire Capitol, both Democratic and Republican Caucuses throughout all of State government. Thank you for all of the work that you

do to support this important institution and your daily efforts to improve our Commonwealth. So this is not a farewell, this is a thank you.

For instance, I am incredibly thankful to Representative Neal Goodman for seating me next to Representative Mike Carroll in my first term. I am also thankful to Representative Goodman for then moving me over here away from Representative Tommy Sankey. The jury is still out if I am appreciative of Representative Goodman for moving me in to share offices with Danny McNeill, so the jury is still out on that.

I am thankful to Representative Flo Fabrizio, that he will continue to hold the "best hair in the House" title, at least for the foreseeable future. And I am incredibly thankful that I have about an 8-second video of Chairman Markosek dancing in one of our Appropriations meetings, with Chairman Adolph just making an incredible face.

But all jest aside, it really has truly been an honor. It has been memorable, it has been a privilege, and not a day goes by thus far that I really do not think of all of the aspects that I will miss about this important position. We all get into this line of work to make a positive difference in our community. We all get into this line of work to make a positive difference in our Commonwealth. I have been fortunate to have that opportunity my entire career thus far, and I will now continue that opportunity with the charge of taking over the York County Economic Alliance.

And in speaking with those that have left the House, be it through retirement or career changes, as many of you have, the running constant message that they all share with me is that they miss the relationships that they forged. And really, how could you not when you just consider the sheer volume of time that we spend together in this room, the amount of time that we spend in caucus or committees or after hours? The friendships forged are perhaps the best intended consequence of this line of work, and I hope to maintain all of those.

We have made history together. We have made lasting stories. We have made memories, little that I will soon forget – except, of course, the time that Marty Flynn discharged a firearm. I love you, Marty.

But as this is a thank you more than a farewell, I have to offer my quick thanks to my wife, Jen; my incredible team that is here with us today – Sully, Kyle, Bronley, and Maria. I have to thank two dear friends of mine, Dave Cross and his daughter, Bailey. I have to thank Melissa and all of the individuals that came up today. I doubt any one of us would ever be in this chamber today if not for our supporters; if not for our loved ones, our friends, our family; and certainly, our communities, and I am grateful for mine.

So in summation, and to paraphrase Abraham Lincoln, every man is said to have his peculiar ambition – and we certainly have our peculiar ambitions in this room – but whether it be true or not, I can say, for one, that I have no other ambition so great as that of being esteemed by my fellow man, and not simply for the esteem itself, but by having rendered myself worthy of that esteem, and how far I shall succeed in gratifying that ambition is yet to be determined.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, colleagues.

COMMEMORATIVE GAVEL PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. Representative Schreiber, you are such a class act. You are always so professional and kind and worked so well with members on both sides of the aisle. I will tell you that you are definitely going to be missed. I recognize, however, that this is a great opportunity to go and become the president and CEO of the York County Economic Alliance, and you yourself have deep roots within that county, and it is an opportunity for you to serve in a different way.

Please accept this gavel on behalf of the House of Representatives, and congratulations to you, your wife, and it is just great to have all of your friends and staff and family here. Welcome to all of you. We are very appreciative of your being here today. Thank you.

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of HB 1516, PN 3869, entitled:

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in riot, disorderly conduct and related offenses, further providing for the offense of cruelty to animals.

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

The SPEAKER. It is my understanding that all amendments have been withdrawn. Representative Dan Miller has withdrawn amendment 9812, Representative Dean has withdrawn amendment 9841, and Representative John Maher has withdrawn amendment 9850.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of HB 2303, PN 3962, entitled:

An Act amending Title 3 (Agriculture) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, making editorial changes; consolidating an article of The Administrative Code of 1929 relating to race horse industry reform; further providing for Pennsylvania Breeding Fund; and making a related repeal.

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

Table listing names of representatives who voted 'YEAS' (192 total). Includes names like Adolph, Artis, Baker, Barbin, Barrar, Benninghoff, Bizzarro, Bloom, Boback, Bradford, Briggs, Brown, R., Brown, V., Bullock, Burns, Caltagirone, Carroll, Causer, Christiana, Conklin, Corbin, Costa, D., Costa, P., Cox, Cruz, Culver, Cutler, Daley, M., Daley, P., Davis, Dawkins, Day, Dean, Deasy, DeLissio, Delozier, Dermody, Diamond, DiGirolamo, Donatucci, Driscoll, Dunbar, Dush, Ellis, Emrick, English, Evankovich, Everett, Fabrizio, Farina, Farry, Fee, Flynn, Frankel, Freeman, Gabler, Gainey, Galloway, Gergely, Gibbons, Gillen, Gillespie, Gingrich, Godshall, Goodman, Greiner, Grove, Hahn, Harhai, Harhart, Harkins, Harper, Harris, A., Harris, J., Heffley, Helm, Hennessey, Hickernell, Hill, Irvin, James, Jozwiak, Kampf, Kaufert, Kauffman, Kavulich, Keller, F., Keller, M.K., Keller, W., Kim, Kinsey, Kirkland, Klunk, Knowles, Kortz, Kotik, Krueger, Lawrence, Lewis, Longietti, Mackenzie, Maher, Mahoney, Major, Maloney, Markosek, Marshall, Marsico, Masser, Matzie, McCarter, McClinton, McGinnis, Mentzer, Metcalfe, Metzgar, Miccarelli, Millard, Miller, B., Miller, D., Moul, Mullery, Murt, Mustio, Neilson, Nelson, Nesbit, Neuman, O'Brien, O'Neill, Oberlander, Ortitay, Parker, D., Pashinski, Payne, Peifer, Petrarca, Petri, Pickett, Pyle, Quigley, Quinn, C., Quinn, M., Rader, Rapp, Ravenstahl, Readshaw, Reed, Reese, Regan, Roae, Roebuck, Ross, Rothman, Rozzi, Saccone, Sainato, Samuelson, Sankey, Santora, Savage, Saylor, Schemel, Schlossberg, Schreiber, Schweyer, Simmons, Sims, Snyder, Sonney, Staats, Stephens, Sturla, Tallman, Taylor, Thomas, Tobash, Toepel, Toohil, Topper, Truitt, Vereb, Vitali, Ward, Warner, Watson, Wentling, Wheeland, White, Youngblood, Zimmerman, Turzai, Speaker.

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—11

Table listing names of representatives who were 'EXCUSED' (11 total). Includes names like Acosta, Boyle, Cohen, Davidson, DeLuca, Evans, Hanna, McNeill, Milne, Santarsiero, 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 1528, PN 2298**, entitled:

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

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

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—11

Acosta	Davidson	Hanna	Santarsiero
Boyle	DeLuca	McNeill	Wheatley
Cohen	Evans	Milne	

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 1530, PN 2300**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in petition for adoption, further providing for consents necessary to adoption.

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

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

Culver	Heffley	Mustio	Stephens
Cutler	Helm	Neilson	Sturla
Daley, M.	Hennessey	Nelson	Tallman
Daley, P.	Hickernell	Nesbit	Taylor
Davis	Hill	Neuman	Thomas
Dawkins	Irvin	O'Brien	Tobash
Day	James	O'Neill	Toepel
Dean	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Toohil
Deasy	Kampf	Ortitay	Topper
DeLissio	Kaufner	Parker, D.	Truitt
Delozier	Kauffman	Pashinski	Vereb
Dermody	Kavulich	Payne	Vitali
Diamond	Keller, F.	Peifer	Ward
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Warner
Donatucci	Keller, W.	Petri	Watson
Driscoll	Kim	Pickett	Wentling
Dunbar	Kinsey	Pyle	Wheeland
Dush	Kirkland	Quigley	White
Ellis	Klunk	Quinn, C.	Youngblood
Emrick	Knowles	Quinn, M.	Zimmerman
English	Kortz	Rader	
Evankovich	Kotik	Rapp	Turzai,
Everett	Krueger	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Fabrizio	Lawrence		

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-11

Acosta	Davidson	Hanna	Santarsiero
Boyle	DeLuca	McNeill	Wheatley
Cohen	Evans	Milne	

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 2338, PN 3963**, entitled:

An Act providing for student protection during the transition of a postsecondary education institution to new accreditation.

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

Adolph	Farina	Lewis	Readshaw
Artis	Farry	Longiatti	Reed
Baker	Fee	Mackenzie	Reese

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

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-11

Acosta	Davidson	Hanna	Santarsiero
Boyle	DeLuca	McNeill	Wheatley
Cohen	Evans	Milne	

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 **SB 1062, PN 2109**, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 18 (Crimes and Offenses) and 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in burglary and other criminal intrusions, further providing for burglary; in minors, further providing for sentencing and penalties for

trafficking drugs to minors and for drug-free school zones; in other offenses, further providing for drug trafficking sentencing and penalties; and, in sentencing, further providing for sentences for offenses committed with firearms, for sentences for certain drug offenses committed with firearms, for sentences for offenses committed on public transportation, for sentences for offenses against elderly persons, for sentences for offenses against infant persons, for sentence for failure to comply with registration of sexual offenders, for sentences for offenses committed while impersonating a law enforcement officer and providing for sentencing for burglary.

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 Dan Frankel is recognized on SB 1062.  
Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to SB 1062 for many of the reasons we talked about when we amended the bill in the House a couple of weeks ago. This bill broadly reinstates mandatory sentencing guidelines across many categories of crime – some violent, some less and not violent crimes, some drug-related – and it does so in what I believe was a nontransparent way.

As I said, at a time when the entire country is wrestling with the idea of criminal justice reform, where conversations are taking place in virtually every State and on a national basis, as part of the dialogue that we are now encountering in this election, I wish we were talking about this more. We are taking an approach that is basically railroading this back through, reinstating mandatory sentencing guidelines without a reasonable discussion. We have not had one single hearing, and we have stakeholders who have been frozen out of being able to have this discussion.

As I have said, this is not a way we should be doing something of this great magnitude of importance that is part of a national discussion that is bipartisan. You know, we do not do a lot of things in a bipartisan way but there is a bipartisan discussion taking place across this country. Democrats, Republicans, conservatives, and liberals are talking about doing criminal justice reform, and we are sitting here about to pass a piece of legislation that reinstates a scheme of sentencing across a broad cross section of different crimes without having that discussion.

And to think that folks who commit crimes are not being sentenced today without this scheme is also nonsense. The fact is, people are being held accountable, judges are making fair and reasoned sentences based on circumstances that are going to be variable in every single instance. We should not be doing this now. We should be having an intelligent, thoughtful discussion about criminal justice reform, the way the rest of this country is, instead of trying to do this in a manner that is not transparent and not thoughtful.

So I urge my colleagues to vote this down, and certainly if it does pass, I hope the Senate finds a way to deep-six it so we can have this discussion when we reconvene in January and do this the right way.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Representative Jeff Pyle.

Mr. PYLE. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

At stake right now we have SB 1062, which is a Title 18 directly addressing in part and parcel home-invasion burglaries. Did you hear that? Home-invasion burglaries. You are sitting in your house, unsuspectingly; some nefarious person comes blowing through the door to steal your stuff.

Now, the prior gentleman brought up some excellent points. Is our nation due for a big sit-down where we really expose each other's thoughts and listen to each other genuinely? Yes, absolutely. I hope I am invited to sit at that table. But again, for the cries of lack of transparency, let me review the title of this bill: "Home Invasion Burglaries." There is very little doubt as to what is happening there. What the bill does is it gives mandatory enhancements for criminal homicide, assault, kidnapping, sex offenses, arson-related offenses related to robbery, which is us, and related to victim or witness intimidation.

Mr. Speaker, I respect the gentleman who spoke prior, but I have got to tell you, this is probably the most no-brainer thing we have dealt with all day. Somebody breaks into your house, you sentence them. If they hurt you, they get extra time in the slammer.

I would like to ask everybody, please vote in support of SB 1062. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Madeleine Dean.

Mrs. DEAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, rise in opposition to SB 1062. I commend my colleague from Allegheny County for his thoughtful remarks and the kind of thoughtful discussion that we ought to have when we try to pass such legislation. Unfortunately, we did not have the opportunity to do that with this piece of legislation.

But if you are not persuaded by that, maybe take a look at the fiscal impact. As we saw in Appropriations just a couple of hours ago, the fiscal impact is anywhere from \$21 to \$85.5 million in direct costs under the Department of Corrections – 85.5 million additional dollars the Department of Corrections estimates for the extended incarceration, based on our legislation. That is the direct cost. That does not even begin to tell us the indirect cost – the cost to unemployment, the cost to the community, the cost to the family members of those incarcerated.

And maybe we would be willing to spend all that kind of money if it made good sense, if it made good policy, but actually, the data shows, the research shows that these mandatory minimum sentences do not deter crime, they are not effective, and in fact, what they do is just incarcerate people longer at a cost to the community. I ask for a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. Representative Mike Vereb.

Mr. VEREB. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I urge a "yes" vote on SB 1062. I think the gentleman from Armstrong highlighted pretty much the same positions that I would have said if he had not said them already. There are conversations about recidivism and savings in our corrections area, there is no question, and they are going on nationally. But when somebody blows through your door, Mr. Speaker, and holds a family at gunpoint, perhaps assaults someone, exactly where do you want that person to go to work or get a job or have an employment issue?

I think one thing that we missed in this discussion when we are talking about savings in corrections – part of a crime – there is the challenge that our victims face, Mr. Speaker. And let me just suggest this: There are a lot of things in this building that need to get deep-sixed, as the gentleman from Allegheny said. You know what has to stop getting deep-sixed are our crime victims and our soft stance in sticking up for those victims and their families, Mr. Speaker.

I am for dealing with recidivism, but it is going to be a cold day in this chamber, very cold, Mr. Speaker, when this chamber can turn its backs on the victims of crimes. These are not victimless crimes. This is not somebody with a very small possession of marijuana or cocaine. This is not retail theft. This is stuff where people are in your space where you raise families and kids. These are people that are there to hurt you and to take property. This is not just somebody that burglarizes a place with nobody home, Mr. Speaker. This is a violent crime. And who are we to tell the victims we would rather deep-six legislation to allow them to keep deep-sixing their family members? Let us stand for the victims, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dawkins.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today in opposition. But before I get into that testimony, I want to be clear: I do not want to continue down a road of divisive arguments between mandatory minimums versus nonmandatory minimums. I think we have seen nationally enough divisive talk that we are not able to come together as a body to come up with real recommendations to deal with this problem. I think we all agree that folks entering into your home illegally should be dealt with. I think we all agree that there should be a punishment.

Where we disagree is how we enforce that punishment and who should be the individuals making that recommendation of how much time individuals should serve for whatever particular crime they may commit. I think we have to give that discretion back to the judges. I think we have an elected body of judges for a reason. I think we have to be very careful when the legislature starts to make policies for sentencing enhancements or mandatory minimums when we do not know all the details of the case, because what I will say is that it is an unfair balance to who is going to get the time when we are talking about committing some of these crimes. We know when folks go into court, if they are being underrepresented or they do not have the knowledge or they do not have anyone around them who can potentially explain exactly the court proceedings, you may see a disproportional population of people that is going to be charged with an enhancement.

So I do not want to have any divisive talk in our chamber. I want us to come together and come up with a bipartisan sentencing agreement that we can allow the judges to do their jobs. I would encourage all my members to really consider and think about how do we, as a body, come up with a better way of dealing with this issue, because I think we all agree that we do not want unwarranted people in our homes.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Mike Regan.

Mr. REGAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, rise in support of SB 1062 and would concur with many of the comments made by my colleagues who are also in support of this bill.

This is really a heinous and egregious crime – very sudden, very violent – and the victims are impacted greatly by this crime, and the people who will commit this crime, Mr. Speaker, deserve to go to jail for a long, long time and the judge needs to have the ability to put them there.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The minority leader, Frank Dermody, on the bill.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate sent us a three-page bill with a sentencing enhancement for burglary when there are certain crimes committed in an occupied building. Now, the sentencing enhancement means that the Sentencing Commission makes a recommendation to the judge that there should be a sentencing enhancement if that person is found guilty of that crime. It is not a mandatory sentence. No mandatory sentence came over in this bill from the Senate. Burglary, a house invasion, a home invasion is not legal right now. It is a very serious crime that gets serious punishment, and what this bill did was enhance that sentence if certain crimes are committed when you commit that burglary, when you break in that home.

Now, what the House has done is amend it with 28 pages of mandatory sentencing, which we have gone over many, many times, and the previous speakers have said it, because mandatory sentencing makes no sense because it is sentencing without thought. Now, States all across this country – Georgia, Mississippi, Texas – have been repealing mandatory sentences. They have improved public safety. They have cut some costs. We ought to be talking about those issues.

And if you want to talk about a bill that enhances this sentence for breaking into a home and committing those terrible offenses, let us talk about that. That is something we can work with. That gives the judge the discretion to do the right thing and enhance that sentence for those hideous crimes; however, it does not impose mandatory sentencing that makes no sense.

We should vote "no." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Nick Miccarelli.

Mr. MICCARELLI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. There was a lady by the name of Sharon Conroy who came to my office. She was a part of the Parents of Murdered Children. She told me the tale of her son, Sean, who was beaten to death by four people on his way home from work in a Philadelphia subway. There was one of those people who killed her son who pled guilty to murder and conspiracy to commit murder and received 11 months in jail for murder and conspiracy to commit murder.

I understand that this bill does not cover everything that we would like; however, Mr. Speaker, I believe that when judges fail – as Judge Lerner of Philadelphia did in this case; he failed – people look to this House, the people's House, for redress. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that victims like Sean Conroy and mothers of victims like Sharon Conroy deserve to have their day in court and have a judge who is fair. However, sadly, some of our judges are not fair, and I urge members to support SB 1062. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Todd Stephens, on the bill.

Mr. STEPHENS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, and I just want to address a couple of the issues that have been raised during this discussion on this particular bill.

As it relates to the transparency and accountability issue, the portion of this bill that I think that speaker was referring to was actually passed by this body back on October 28 of 2015. And by the way, there was only one amendment offered to the two bills that have gone on to form the amendment that adds back the mandatory minimum sentences. There is no amendment offered by the gentleman from Allegheny, but he certainly had ample opportunity to do so; none whatsoever. As a matter of fact, he supported one of the bills, one of the bills he supported along with 164 other members of this chamber.

On the other bill, 143 members of this chamber supported that bill back on October 28, 2015. The idea that this is some ramrod attempt to stick these mandatories through at the last minute with no discussion, no deliberation, and no thought is just, frankly, wrong and flat-out false.

So in the end, we have had plenty of time to deliberate on these issues. We have had plenty of time to consider alternatives. We have had plenty of time to consider amendments. None were offered from the other side of the aisle; none. And now we stand here today and say, "Oh, we need to have a discussion." Well, the time for discussion is over. It is time to act. The people of Pennsylvania have been without the protection of these mandatory minimum sentences for too long.

As it relates to the economic impact on the Commonwealth, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, there are plenty of incorrect assumptions contained within the \$85 million price tag that was posited earlier by my good friend from Montgomery County. That \$85 million price tag seems to forget the one line from the Department of Corrections that says that this may not be 100 percent attributed to mandatory minimum sentences in terms of the costs – just seems to completely ignore that, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is, when you look at the real data, you are talking about something much less, something in the ballpark of \$20 million, and that is if we were reinstating verbatim the mandatory minimums that were in effect before, but we are not. What we are actually doing is we are rolling back some of the drug mandatories. We are eliminating some of the first-time marijuana mandatories. We are reducing some of the marijuana and cocaine mandatories. So you cannot compare apples to oranges and expect to prevail with that argument, Mr. Speaker.

As a result, I think we can eliminate the transparency argument. We can eliminate the cost argument. And let us talk about the impact on victims. You know, when I was a prosecutor, I had handled those cases of home invasions. I have handled those cases where you had a family member who says, "You know what? Whenever I walk in my house, I have to walk around the house and open up the door of every closet. I have to look behind the shower curtain, because the sanctity of my home was violated and I never know if someone is going to be back in my home to do more harm to me and my family."

Mr. Speaker, it is about time we stood up for victims. It is about time we reinstated these mandatory minimum sentences, and I urge a "yes" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Greg Vitali.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to this bill. I used to do – actually, it is almost a quarter of a century ago – criminal defense work, so I understand the basics of sentencing.

I think one thing we can all agree on, and in the hypotheticals described about a person coming into someone else's space, is that person should go to jail for a long, long time, and without mandatory minimum sentences, that is the outcome that will happen. So despite what the gentleman from Montgomery County has said, despite what the gentleman from Indiana County said, this is not about having heinous people go lightly. We all agree that is what should happen.

Now, without mandatory minimums, sentences are determined in a very logical way. The judge has sentencing guidelines, which is the basic way to determine sentencing, and basically, the judge considers two things. It is the prior record score of the victim – is he a person who has never offended or a chronic offender? And the offense gravity score – is it a very minor offense or is it a very serious offense? That creates a grid, and the judge, within the parameters of that grid, considering the prior record and the offense gravity, makes a sentence. Without mandatory minimums, a judge has the ability to do justice by imposing a sentence within the sentencing guidelines. That is a just and fair way to do it.

Now, the gentleman who spoke in support of this bill from Delaware County, my friend and a reasonable colleague, he cited an anecdote which appears unfair, and it very well may be, but the reality is, if there is one bad judge out there, the remedy is not to tie the hands of the 99 percent of other judges out there who want to do justice. If you have one judge that is not acting appropriately, do not make it impossible for the other judges to look at the facts and circumstances of each case. The remedy there is to work to get rid of that one judge.

Our system of justice requires the ability of judges, because they are impartial, because they are not subject to the political process like district attorneys are and assistant district attorneys are, who sometimes have a political career ahead of them. Judges, by their nature, by their long terms, and by the retention nature of their reelection, are insulated from the political process in sentencing so they can just do justice separate from politics.

In summary, we all want that heinous person to be dealt with seriously, but we want those who are just hapless and less guiltworthy, we want them to be treated fairly too. Mandatory minimums take away from a judge's ability to do justice, and that is why we should vote "no" on this. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. The last speaker that I have listed is Representative Jordan Harris.

Representative Harris.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of SB 1062.

Oftentimes, Mr. Speaker, we have good intentions in this chamber. Men and women from across this Commonwealth come to this chamber to do good on the behalf of those they serve, but oftentimes we see that good intentions do not always end with good legislation, and I think this is an exact case of that situation.

Mr. Speaker, I also think it is unfair to use victims of crime as if judges already cannot sentence criminals to the time that is going to be mandated in this bill. Judges can already sentence criminals to the time articulated in this bill. Mr. Speaker, when people go to court, they believe that a judge, a neutral arbiter, will look at the facts of the case and decide what is in the best interest of the victims, the Commonwealth, and the public as a

whole. This bill will no longer give judges the discretion to do what they believe is best suited for all parties. Mr. Speaker, what is the point of having judges? Why do we have a judiciary? If we are going to mandate the sentencing for every crime, what is the point of having judges with discretion?

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, study after study after study has been done that says that mandatory minimums do not work. They do not reduce crime and they do not deter crime. All they do is inflate the cost of our criminal justice systems. So I want my colleagues to be ready to go back to their districts and tell their constituents that they are going to raise their taxes in order to pay for our ballooning criminal justice system because we are reinstituting mandatory minimums that we know do not work.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I will say this: Mandatory minimums do not work because mandatory minimums are used to coerce lower-level offenders to take deals. When you go inside and a district attorney says to you, "If you do not take this deal, I am going to charge you with this, which has a 5-year mandatory minimum," most times people take a deal even when they are not guilty because they do not want to stand trial with a mandatory minimum hanging over their head. That is not justice. And in my district, time and time again I have seen people take deals because they were afraid of mandatory minimums that were hanging over their head. That is not what we are supposed to be doing in the people's House. That is not the criminal justice system that we want and that our voters want. They want us to reduce the population of folks in our criminal justice system. They would much rather pay for schools, roads, and bridges and not putting people in boxes.

This is the wrong way for Pennsylvania, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no" on SB 1062. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

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

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED**

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

**CONSIDERATION OF SB 1062 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—146**

Adolph	Gabler	Mackenzie	Readshaw
Baker	Galloway	Maher	Reed
Barbin	Gibbons	Mahoney	Reese
Barrar	Gillen	Major	Regan
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Maloney	Roae
Bizzarro	Gingrich	Marshall	Rothman
Bloom	Godshall	Marsico	Rozzi
Boback	Goodman	Masser	Saccone
Brown, R.	Greiner	Matzie	Sainato

Burns	Grove	McGinnis	Samuelson
Caltagirone	Hahn	Mentzer	Sankey
Causser	Harhai	Metcalfe	Santora
Christiana	Harhart	Metzgar	Saylor
Conklin	Harkins	Miccarelli	Schweyer
Corbin	Harper	Millard	Simmons
Costa, D.	Harris, A.	Miller, B.	Snyder
Costa, P.	Heffley	Moul	Sonney
Cox	Helm	Mullery	Staats
Culver	Hickernell	Murt	Stephens
Cutler	Hill	Mustio	Tallman
Daley, P.	Irvin	Nelson	Taylor
Davis	James	Nesbit	Tobash
Day	Jozwiak	Neuman	Toepel
Deasy	Kampf	O'Neill	Toohil
Delozier	Kaufner	Oberlander	Topper
DiGirolamo	Kauffman	Ortity	Truitt
Dunbar	Kavulich	Payne	Vereb
Dush	Keller, F.	Peifer	Ward
Ellis	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Warner
Emrick	Keller, W.	Petri	Watson
English	Klunk	Pickett	Wentling
Evankovich	Knowles	Pyle	Wheeland
Everett	Kortz	Quigley	White
Fabrizio	Kotik	Quinn, C.	Zimmerman
Farry	Lawrence	Quinn, M.	
Fee	Lewis	Rapp	Turzai,
Freeman	Longietti	Ravenstahl	Speaker

**NAYS—46**

Artis	Diamond	Krueger	Ross
Bradford	Donatucci	Markosek	Savage
Briggs	Driscoll	McCarter	Schemel
Brown, V.	Farina	McClinton	Schlossberg
Bullock	Flynn	Miller, D.	Schreiber
Carroll	Frankel	Neilson	Sims
Cruz	Gainey	O'Brien	Sturla
Daley, M.	Gergely	Parker, D.	Thomas
Dawkins	Harris, J.	Pashinski	Vitali
Dean	Kim	Rader	Wheatley
DeLissio	Kinsey	Roebuck	Youngblood
Dermody	Kirkland		

**NOT VOTING—0**

**EXCUSED—11**

Acosta	Davidson	Hanna	Milne
Boyle	DeLuca	Hennessey	Santarsiero
Cohen	Evans	McNeill	

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.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. MILLARD**

The SPEAKER. Representative Dave Millard, I understand, has an announcement. Representative Millard, for an announcement.

Mr. MILLARD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to call a meeting of the East Central Caucus immediately at adjournment in the majority caucus room. That is East Central Caucus, immediately upon the adjournment, in the majority caucus room. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.



### BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1885, PN 3075**, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) and 53 (Municipalities Generally) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in matters affecting government units, providing for exceptions to governmental immunity related to unauthorized aliens; and, in preemptions, providing for restriction on municipal regulation of official and employee communications relating to immigration status.

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

### MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

The SPEAKER. There are amendments filed on third consideration. These amendments are filed by Representative Sturla. For him to offer them, he must make a motion to suspend the rules to offer the amendments.

Representative Sturla, you are recognized.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules to allow for amendment A10615, which would extend the liability to an employer of an individual who is categorized as an "unauthorized alien" under this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Okay. So we have a motion to suspend for amendment 10615 to be offered. That requires a two-thirds vote.

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

### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. Representative Metcalfe, on the— Sir, I am sorry. Representative Metcalfe, can you state the purpose for which you want to stand? Under the rules, on a motion to suspend, only the maker of the motion, the maker of the bill, and the leaders can speak on that, but if you have another purpose for rising, please let me know.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, would I be able to stand to oppose the motion on behalf of the sponsor of the bill?

The SPEAKER. We have not done that. It is the leaders, the maker of the bill, and the maker of the motion, but if it should get past suspension, obviously you could speak on the amendment.

Mr. METCALFE. So, Mr. Speaker, precedent would not allow me to stand on behalf of the prime sponsor to ask for opposition to the suspension of the rules?

The SPEAKER. Well, the leader is right here.

Mr. METCALFE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. I think he is ready to do that.

The majority leader, on the motion.

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, I would ask the members to oppose the motion to suspend the rules. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On the motion, Representative Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would encourage members to support the motion.

What this amendment essentially would do, if allowed, would impose the same liability on employers who employ unauthorized aliens as it would on sanctuary cities. If in fact an unauthorized alien were convicted of a crime—

The SPEAKER. Representative Sturla, you have already set forth in your motion in a succinct manner – because it is a motion to suspend; this is not advocating for the amendment – you already succinctly set that forth in your motion. You are astray at this time.

Mr. STURLA. Okay.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

#### YEAS—61

Artis	DeLissio	Kavulich	Ravenstahl
Bizzarro	Dermody	Keller, W.	Readshaw
Bradford	Donatucci	Kim	Roebuck
Briggs	Driscoll	Kinsey	Rozzi
Brown, V.	Fabrizio	Kirkland	Samuelson
Bullock	Farina	Kortz	Savage
Caltagirone	Flynn	Krueger	Schlossberg
Carroll	Frankel	Mahoney	Schreiber
Conklin	Freeman	Markosek	Sims
Costa, P.	Gainey	McCarter	Snyder
Cruz	Galloway	McClinton	Sturla
Daley, P.	Gergely	Mullery	Thomas
Davis	Harhai	Neilson	Vitali
Dawkins	Harkins	O'Brien	Wheatley
Dean	Harris, J.	Pashinski	Youngblood
Deasy			

#### NAYS—131

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

## NOT VOTING—0

## EXCUSED—11

Acosta	Davidson	Hanna	Milne
Boyle	DeLuca	Hennessey	Santarsiero
Cohen	Evans	McNeill	

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

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

The SPEAKER. Sir, are you going to file a motion to suspend with respect to amendment 10604? Okay. That amendment has been withdrawn.

We will now proceed to a vote on third consideration.

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 Sims is recognized on the bill.

Mr. SIMS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the maker of the bill please rise for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Representative White has indicated that she will stand for interrogation. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. SIMS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this bill mandates that a police officer who has a reasonable cause to believe an individual under arrest is not legally present in the United States, quote, "...shall immediately report the individual to..." USICE (United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement).

Mr. Speaker, my first question is, what is the definition of "reasonable cause" an officer should use when enforcing this legislation?

Ms. WHITE. It is very typical for officers to use reasonable cause during enforcement of laws.

Mr. SIMS. I am very aware of that. What is the definition of "reasonable cause" included in this legislation, please?

Ms. WHITE. It is comparable to reasonable suspicion.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, is the maker of the bill aware that there is no definition in law for "reasonable cause"?

The SPEAKER. Please suspend.

Just before we proceed down here with interrogation, the purpose of interrogation, citing House precedent, is to elicit information and answers to which the interrogator is not privy and does not know the answer.

If the argument is, if the argument is that given a review of case law in Federal and State jurisprudence, that the interrogator here does not believe that "reasonable cause" is defined, that is something that you would make in your remarks. That is not an issue for interrogation.

Mr. SIMS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am doing my best to understand this legislation, because there are very colorful terms of art in here that are being used, and frankly, as terms of law that do not exist in law. So I will move on.

My question was, what is "reasonable cause" under this bill? My question, Mr. Speaker, is how will an undocumented immigrant be identified using reasonable cause?

Ms. WHITE. First and foremost, I would just like to bring to the attention of the maker of the question that this legislation pertains to those individuals who have already been arrested for potentially having committed a crime, and then the officer finds that there is reasonable suspicion that they are here illegally.

Mr. SIMS. Thank you.

What factors would cause one to believe that there is reasonable suspicion?

Ms. WHITE. That would be determined by case law in the past.

Mr. SIMS. I am sorry; I did not hear that answer.

Ms. WHITE. As I previously stated, that would be determined via case law in the past and—

Mr. SIMS. Which case law could you point to that would give us a determination of which reasonable cause an officer would use, please?

Ms. WHITE. It is not a question on the bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SIMS. My question, Mr. Speaker, is, how will an officer— You are putting in place legislation that says that if an officer has a reasonable cause, that he therefore has to take a particular action. My question to you is, how would an officer determine if he has reasonable cause?

The SPEAKER. Sir, will you please suspend; please suspend.

Again, with respect to the definition, if you yourself believe that there is a concern with that definition and what import a law enforcement officer might have with that, you certainly may state that in your remarks, but that is not the point of interrogation. First of all—

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Please suspend.

Representative, no member has to be subject to interrogation; no member has to agree to interrogation. Those are the rules in the House. Those have always been the rules.

You may move on to another question.

Mr. SIMS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, is an accent a sufficient provocation, sufficient reasonable cause?

## POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CUTLER. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Representative Cutler, please state your point of order.

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

I believe that the gentleman's questions will be slightly off-line in terms of the underlying statute. As we learned in law school, anytime that you are talking about reasonable suspicion, you have a premise of reasonable and the ability to articulate specific facts to support the conclusion that are you in, and to get into specific hypotheses at this time is inappropriate.

Specifically, when you look at the gentleman's case, that is something that the officer will make an individual determination on at the time of the occurrence, and there is a substantial body of case law that is already in place supporting what is and what is not reasonable suspicion and probable cause.

The SPEAKER. I think the point of order is that we need to move on from the issue of reasonable cause.

At this time, if you have any other questions; if not, you certainly may state remarks for the record.

Mr. SIMS. I do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SIMS. Thank you.

This is a very short bill—

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SIMS. —that uses very specific language.

I will move off the "reasonable cause" language, and I want to move to the next part of this language, and that is "under arrest." Can an officer ask an individual for their immigration information when they have simply been detained?

Ms. WHITE. If they are under arrest, then yes, the officer is able to ask the question if they find that there is reasonable suspicion that they are here illegally.

Mr. SIMS. Which, of course, we are not going to determine what qualifies as "reasonable suspicion."

Ms. WHITE. You know, reasonable suspicion is actually – it just basically means that there has been a standard established in the Supreme Court, a case back in 1968 that ruled that "...police officers should be allowed to stop and briefly detain a person if, based upon the officer's training and experience, there is reason to believe that the individual is engaging in criminal activity."

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, (remarks in Spanish) reasonable suspicion (remarks in Spanish)?

The SPEAKER. Please, please, sir.

Mr. SIMS. Is asking you a question—

The SPEAKER. Please stop, sir.

Interrogation is designed to elicit information and answers to which the interrogator is not privy. If you wish to make a statement in your remarks, you may feel free to do so. In all earnestness, I am not sure that there is any point in continuing with this interrogation.

Please proceed at this time to state your remarks on the bill.

Mr. SIMS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My problem here, as you can see, is that there is so much information about this legislation that we as a body do not know and that it appears that the maker of this legislation herself simply does not know.

Mr. Speaker, this is not—

The SPEAKER. Stop.

Mr. SIMS. I have only one way of determining that, and that is that—

The SPEAKER. Please suspend; please suspend.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Please suspend.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. To the leader, please suspend until I cite a rule.

There are many policy issues that come before our body upon which people have many divergent perspectives, but here is the one thing that we do not do in this body. We do not try to make another member – to hold them to question their motive

or to in any way impugn their integrity or to demean their position. The fact of the matter is, you can state your perspective, but we are going to show each and every member respect. And the fact is, with all due respect here, I do not believe you are adhering to either the letter or the spirit of that perspective in the rules.

Representative Martina White has put forth serious legislation that needs to be contemplated by the members of this body. I understand you may have a different perspective, and you have the right and the opportunity to present that perspective, but our goal here is not to put people on the witness stand. We do not do that. We let people set forth their perspectives and let this body know and the public know, because these are televised.

You may proceed with your remarks in the spirit of that respect.

### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The leader, your point of order, please.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker, the House rules provide for interrogation. The gentleman agreed to answer questions, and I believe the gentleman from Philadelphia was asking questions that were relevant on very important issues with this legislation. Now, he was interrupted constantly while he was trying to ask those questions.

The SPEAKER. Yes. This is the Speaker speaking. You are not in my position. I am in it.

Mr. DERMODY. They were on point.

The SPEAKER. And here is the point.

Mr. DERMODY. I know where you are, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Right. And here is the ruling: Representative Sims has a perspective. He may set that forth to this body.

Mr. DERMODY. He never questioned anybody's motives. He was asking questions that are relevant to this legislation on issues that are—

The SPEAKER. Please suspend.

Mr. DERMODY. —important to this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Please suspend.

I made the ruling. Representative Sims—

Mr. DERMODY. What was your ruling?

The SPEAKER. That the interrogation was astray from the letter and the spirit of the rules. That is the ruling. Representative Sims is exceptionally bright, and he can put forth his perspective to this body and to the public.

Mr. DERMODY. I would suggest—

The SPEAKER. We do not put another member on the witness stand. Those are the rules, and it applies to Republicans and Democrats alike.

Mr. DERMODY. He should be allowed—

The SPEAKER. Please proceed, Representative Sims.

Mr. DERMODY. —he should be allowed to follow the rules and ask his questions, and he ought to be allowed to interrogate absent interruption when he was acting in a proper way. That is what should be happening in this House.

**POINT OF ORDER**

The SPEAKER. Representative Sims, you may proceed.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Which types of questions would I be allowed to ask under interrogation if these types of questions I cannot?

The SPEAKER. Information about the bill itself.

**POINT OF ORDER**

The SPEAKER. Representative Neilson, you may proceed.

Mr. NEILSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Is it my understanding what you just said was that we are not, under the rule, allowed to interrogate, or when someone says they will stand for interrogation, you as the Speaker are allowed to cut that individual off as you did to Representative Sims?

The SPEAKER. If the interrogation—

Mr. NEILSON. Is that the rule?

The SPEAKER. Representative Neilson, here is the rule.

Mr. NEILSON. I am just trying to understand.

The SPEAKER. Interrogation is permitted if the person has agreed to stand for interrogation.

Mr. NEILSON. And that was done, right?

The SPEAKER. Correct; correct.

Mr. NEILSON. I want to be honest. I want to make sure I am paying attention.

The SPEAKER. Without a doubt.

But if the interrogation is astray from the purpose of interrogation, which is defined in past precedent to elicit information and answers to which the interrogator is not privy, that is very fact specific, very definitional specific. If there is a different perspective on what the meaning of that statute is, that is something to be set forth in the remarks to the body and to the public.

Mr. NEILSON. All right. So the personal comments that he wants, but, Mr. Speaker, if I am not mistaken, you asked him to defer those remarks to his personal comments; however, at the same time you said you can no longer interrogate. I just want to make certain that Representative Sims, who is asking for interrogation, still has that opportunity to interrogate as agreed as long as he does not go off that—

The SPEAKER. Yes. Let me make this clear, when you lead off with a question, just by way of example, "Are you aware," are you aware, that means you know the answer to the question.

Mr. NEILSON. Okay. I disagree, respectfully, Mr. Speaker, because what we do as legislators, just as you, we get a lot of information fed to us. We get a lot, thousands of e-mails every day. However, we respect each other, our colleagues, in more ways than one. So we just want to make certain that we know, prior to putting such an important vote up today, that we are correct and we want to check to make certain that the e-mails and all the information that is fed to us is the same intention of the maker of the legislation, and I think it is like a checks and balance. So if we have a number of "are you aware," that might be wrong, that might be wrong.

So to clarify that, I mean, "are you aware," that is just a phrase that people use, I am sure. But to stop someone from interrogating and stopping them right in the interrogation, I just thought that was incorrect, Mr. Speaker, and I will leave it at that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Representative Sims.

Mr. SIMS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question about it that this sanctuary cities bill is in fact a spending bill, and that is the amount of money that municipalities are going to be spending to defend this lousy law in court.

Let me tell you what we do not know about this legislation, and we know very, very little. We do not know what "reasonable cause" means. We do not know how an officer should determine who is or is not undocumented. We do not know how a person has to look or sound in order for a police officer to ask them for their papers or to let them go. We do not know what type of detention or involvement with the police constitutes an arrest that would trigger this law. We do not know if it applies to detainees. We do not know if this law applies to witnesses. We do not know if this law applies to victims. We do not know if it applies to traffic stops. We do not know how much State funding would be cut. We do not know when that State funding would be cut. We do not know who will pay the legal bills. What we do know is that there are 50 million foreign-born American citizens in the United States; 45 million people in this country speak Spanish. What we are talking about is the unfettered and oftentimes illegal detentions by the ICE.

No State has ever passed legislation like this, and the only State that ever tried was Arizona, and after 6 years and millions of dollars, they finally gave up.

This is unprecedented. This is about attacking people in Philadelphia whom we do not like. This is not a solution in search of the problem. The problem here is animosity. The problem here is a lack of understanding. It is not illegal immigrants.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Representative Greg Vitali. Representative Vitali waives off.

Representative Daryl Metcalfe.

Mr. METCALFE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I, of course, stand in support of HB 1885.

Mr. Speaker, this is what we do know, that Pennsylvanians do not support sanctuary city policies that will ultimately aid and abet foreign nationals who are here illegally, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is what we know. Pennsylvanians do not support illegal aliens taking American jobs. Mr. Speaker, this is what we know. Pennsylvanians do not believe that illegal aliens should be benefiting from their tax dollars through public benefits or through accessing those illegally, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is what we do know. Pennsylvanians want their interests protected over the interests of foreign nationals who are here illegally, and they do not want sanctuary cities or officials in those cities attracting illegals here by instituting policies that will become a magnet for illegal aliens to come into Pennsylvania and tap our jobs, tap our benefits, and violate the rights of our citizens, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we do know, and that is why we should all vote for this bill.

The SPEAKER. Representative Angel Cruz and then followed by Representative Mike Sturla and—

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. Speaker, may I interrogate the Representative?

The SPEAKER. Representative Cruz, you may proceed.

Mr. CRUZ. May I interrogate the maker of the bill, please?

The SPEAKER. Representative White, will you stand for interrogation?

Mr. CRUZ. I am just wondering, and maybe you could clarify, what I am understanding is, if I were to speak my language, which is Spanish, and because you cannot understand it, is it probable cause that I may be an illegal alien?

Ms. WHITE. No, sir. I said, no, sir.

Mr. CRUZ. You said no.

Do I have to carry an interpreter with me everywhere I go to make sure that I can translate what I need to when I am ready to speak or ask any questions in society today?

Ms. WHITE. That is off topic of the legislation.

Mr. CRUZ. Okay. Do you know – and I hate to point this out to you, but I am going to point it out to you – that 80 percent of your district is Russian and you are going to violate their civil rights? Did you take that into account?

The SPEAKER. Sir, Representative Cruz.

Mr. CRUZ. So I will not— This chamber and this Commonwealth would not—

The SPEAKER. Representative Cruz, are you finished with interrogation and now want to speak on the bill?

Mr. CRUZ. As I am going through, Mr. Speaker, more things keep popping in my mind, because this is a horrible bill. This will—

The SPEAKER. Sir, just please suspend.

You may proceed with speaking on the bill. At this time, go ahead. Please speak on the bill.

Mr. CRUZ. Well, I ask both sides of the aisle— In fact, I will do a step further than that. Mr. Speaker, I want to put a motion to table this bill until we do more studies so we do not disenfranchise with racism in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a motion to table this bill.

The SPEAKER. Representative Cruz has put a motion to table the legislation, HB 1885.

The only members that can speak on the motion to table would be Representative Cruz, Representative White, and the respective floor leaders.

Does Representative—

Mr. CRUZ. November 16, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Okay. Sir, you may proceed on the motion to table. It is on the motion to table, not the underlying bill.

Mr. CRUZ. I am asking to table this bill until November 15, therefore we can study further and have all the questions that we need to be answered. So I am asking for November 15 to table this bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Sir, given the rules, I know this is being very precise, you can do a motion to postpone to a defined date. To table, you do not put a date on that. So if you want to move to postpone to November 15, that would be appropriate.

### MOTION TO POSTPONE

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to postpone until November 15, with a fiscal note, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The motion in front of us is to postpone until November 15.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. Does anybody wish to speak on the motion to postpone?

The majority leader, Dave Reed.

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

This bill was introduced on April 5 of this year, so it has been hanging out there for 5 or 6 months now for folks to have ample time to evaluate the proposal. It came out of committee and received first consideration on September 20, so we are talking almost a month since it actually came out of committee. I believe members have had ample time to evaluate this proposal and the policy involved with this proposal and would ask the members to oppose the motion to postpone. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dermody, on the motion to postpone to November 15.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we should support the motion to postpone. As we have heard clearly throughout the debate here today, the most important definition of this bill is "reasonable cause." We still do not know what the definition is. This would give us some opportunity to make sure we know what that definition is so we can make sure that nobody is discriminated against.

We should support the motion to postpone. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make sure with the postponement that we do further research even though the leader said that it was out there since April. Not everybody has all the information, and we are legislators to do the people's business in this institution. So what is the rush of not waiting until the 15th of November to make sure that we are doing the correct thing and we are not violating anyone's civil rights or any rights here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania? That is all I ask, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

### YEAS—67

Artis	Deasy	Keller, W.	Ravenstahl
Bizzarro	DeLissio	Kim	Readshaw
Bradford	Dermody	Kinsey	Roebuck
Briggs	Donatucci	Kirkland	Rozzi
Brown, V.	Driscoll	Kortz	Samuelson
Bullock	Fabrizio	Kotik	Savage
Caltagirone	Farina	Krueger	Schlossberg
Carroll	Flynn	Longietti	Schreiber
Conklin	Frankel	Markosek	Schweyer
Costa, D.	Freeman	Matzie	Sims
Costa, P.	Gainey	McCarter	Snyder
Cruz	Galloway	McClinton	Sturla
Daley, M.	Gergely	Miller, D.	Thomas
Daley, P.	Goodman	Neilson	Vitali
Davis	Harkins	Neuman	Wheatley
Dawkins	Harris, J.	O'Brien	Youngblood
Dean	Kavulich	Pashinski	

## NAYS—125

Adolph	Gingrich	Masser	Roae
Baker	Godshall	McGinnis	Ross
Barbin	Greiner	Mentzer	Rothman
Barrar	Grove	Metcalfe	Saccone
Benninghoff	Hahn	Metzgar	Sainato
Bloom	Harhai	Miccarelli	Sankey
Boback	Harhart	Millard	Santora
Brown, R.	Harper	Miller, B.	Saylor
Burns	Harris, A.	Moul	Schemel
Causser	Heffley	Mullery	Simmons
Christiana	Helm	Murt	Sonney
Corbin	Hickernell	Mustio	Staats
Cox	Hill	Nelson	Stephens
Culver	Irvin	Nesbit	Tallman
Cutler	James	O'Neill	Taylor
Day	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Tobash
Delozier	Kampf	Ortitay	Toepel
Diamond	Kaufner	Parker, D.	Toohil
DiGiolamo	Kauffman	Payne	Topper
Dunbar	Keller, F.	Peifer	Truitt
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Vereb
Ellis	Klunk	Petri	Ward
Emrick	Knowles	Pickett	Warner
English	Lawrence	Pyle	Watson
Evankovich	Lewis	Quigley	Wentling
Everett	Mackenzie	Quinn, C.	Wheeland
Farry	Maher	Quinn, M.	White
Fee	Mahoney	Rader	Zimmerman
Gabler	Major	Rapp	
Gibbons	Maloney	Reed	Turzai,
Gillen	Marshall	Reese	Speaker
Gillespie	Marsico	Regan	

## NOT VOTING—0

## EXCUSED—11

Acosta	Davidson	Hanna	Milne
Boyle	DeLuca	Hennessey	Santarsiero
Cohen	Evans	McNeill	

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

On the question recurring,  
Shall the bill pass finally?

The SPEAKER. Representative Bullock is recognized.  
Mrs. BULLOCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today I really want to talk about what this bill really is about. It is not about sanctuary cities and immigration. It is about putting our counties and our municipalities at risk. It poses a financial risk to many of your counties.

Let us go back to the history of this bill – well, where it comes from. In November 2008 there was a gentleman in Allentown named Ernesto Galarza, who was mistakenly arrested during a drug sweep. He worked as a contractor in Allentown. He was later to be found to have no involvement in the drug activity and was found innocent, and although he showed his Pennsylvania driver's license, his Social Security card, and informed police that he was born in my mother's hometown of Perth Amboy, New Jersey, a police investigator suspected that he may be an illegal immigrant because of his

race. And so that police investigator contacted ICE and they detained Mr. Galarza for 4 additional days after he posted bail. This gentleman then sued Allentown and the county of Lehigh and won that lawsuit. Because of that lawsuit, 32 county prisons, 32 counties in this Commonwealth now have some policy, whether written or not, not to detain individuals for ICE detainees. Thirty-two counties that you represent will be at risk of being sued and financially liable if we pass this bill.

Those counties, the ones with a written policy, there are 17: Erie, Clarion, Butler, Westmoreland, Bedford, Perry, Lycoming, Montour, Bradford, Lebanon, Lehigh, Pike, Bucks, Montgomery, Chester, Delaware, and finally, Philadelphia. Those with an unwritten policy: Washington, Armstrong, Fayette, Somerset, Blair, Jefferson, Elk, Mifflin, Tioga, Columbia, Carbon, Susquehanna, Lackawanna, Wayne, and York. If you heard a county that you represent, they are a sanctuary municipality. They would be subject to this bill. And if someone were arrested in that municipality, whether the municipality knew of their existence or not in that county, whether they were ever arrested before in the past, if they are arrested in that county today and convicted of a crime and later determined to be an undocumented individual in that county, your county can be sued. I just want to make sure you understand what risk you are putting your county in today.

Now, if your county decides, we are no longer going to be a sanctuary city, they are still at risk of being sued, just like Mr. Galarza sued the county, in Lehigh County, for holding him even though he was a U.S. citizen, holding him without an arrest warrant, without a court order, because an ICE detainee is neither of those. It is not mandatory.

So make sure you understand the fiscal risk that we are taking here today if we vote "yes" on this bill. If you understand that and you are willing to put your taxpayers' money on the table, then go ahead and vote "yes." If you are as fiscally conservative as I think you are and your county is one of those 32 that I mentioned, I hope you can explain that to your voters and your residents back home.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your time.

The SPEAKER. Representative Cris Dush.

Mr. DUSH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As a soon-to-be retired law enforcement professional with the Air Force, I have to tell you, the biggest conversation that has been going on here has been about probable cause. Let me give you a couple minor versions. I see somebody walking around behind a building in the middle of the night. He is out of place. As a law enforcement officer, I have got a reasonable suspicion at the beginning that he might be a prowler, but I go up to him. I have detained him—

**POINT OF ORDER**

The SPEAKER. Representative Jordan Harris, your point of order, sir.

Mr. J. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is giving an example, and I am trying to understand what does "out of place" mean? The gentleman just said, "out of place"; a person at night is out of place. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted clarification of what does "out of place" mean?

The SPEAKER. Representative Harris, at this time Representative Dush is free to set forth his remarks.

Now, listen, everybody has an opportunity to speak or provide their remarks, but he is going to provide his remarks with respect to his understanding of the underlying legislation, and I am glad to put you on the list to speak on the record.

Mr. DUSH. My simple point is, whenever an officer stops an individual for one thing that the court has determined could be, in prior precedent, under probable cause – a good stop – and then you subsequently find something else – for instance, in that case, a guy is publicly intoxicated – and the court would end up having to throw out the second charge, and basically, that is what those that have been opposed to this are asking us to do. Once a person is already detained or arrested and something else pops up and the suspicion and probable cause, that you would be expected to throw that out.

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage members to vote for this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Mike Carroll, then Representative Sturla, then Representative Sims.

Representative Carroll waives off.

Representative Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So a kid driving a Mercedes in a poor neighborhood certainly sounds to me like someone out of place, maybe a reason to stop them and find out that they are a Canadian citizen and they just bought drugs down the street. I do not think that is what everybody has in mind, but it certainly would fit any of the descriptions that were given today. But that is not my point.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Butler said people are tired of having undocumented workers take their jobs. I had tried to offer an amendment that would have put the employers that give those undocumented workers a job at risk of being liable should that undocumented worker commit a crime. The gentleman from Butler, along with the majority of members in the House, decided that they were not concerned about the employers that employ those illegal aliens. They were concerned about whether or not when the police pick someone up, whether they can determine whether or not they are an unauthorized alien somehow by osmosis, because I, quite frankly, do not know how to determine someone's nation of origin simply by looking at them or listening to them. Now, we have tried to determine through the interrogation process today exactly how you do that and we have not gotten a reasonable answer, but if somebody is willing to stand up and explain to me how you determine someone's nation of origin and their citizenship status simply by looking at someone, which would then cause reason to suspect someone, or simply by listening to someone, which might cause reason to suspect someone, I am not sure how that occurs.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, like so many others that pass through this House, many of which have been found to be unconstitutional, did not even have a public hearing. Now, if this bill was as good as some people claim it is, it should certainly be able to withstand the scrutiny of a public hearing.

We have been told that this bill has been around for a while. Well, guess what? There are about 4,000 bills in this House that have been around for a while. It is not how long the bill has been around since it was introduced; it is whether or not the public is aware that it is moving through the process, whether or not the public gets to hear the arguments on one side or the other – not 10 seconds before a vote; maybe 10 days before a vote.

This legislation is bad legislation. It does nothing to do anything about people that employ unauthorized aliens. We could do something about that. We could work on E-Verify legislation. We could do a whole lot of things that would actually get to the root of what this bill claims to be getting at. This bill does nothing to protect anyone. It actually puts people at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. Representative Sims, for a second time, and then he is followed by Representative Conklin and Representative Vanessa Brown and Representative Dan Frankel.

Mr. SIMS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I both want to reiterate my colleague's opposition to this legislation, but I also want to say that while I do not want to discount any individual member's personal experience, I am not sure how many undocumented workers make it onto Air Force bases, and I am not sure what any discussion about probable cause has to do with the reasonable cause standard that we are talking about here. And that is the problem that people are guessing about the language in here. We are guessing about how many people it will impact. We are guessing about the number of municipalities it will impact, and I am guessing that a lot of people in here are doing it out of personal animosity. Calling someone an illegal alien versus an undocumented immigrant is a really great example of the personal animosity that we are seeing in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as we have heard, there are 32 counties in Pennsylvania—

The SPEAKER. Sir, please suspend.

### POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. Representative Evankovich, your point of order, sir.

Mr. EVANKOVICH. Mr. Speaker, would a motion under rule 61 be in order at this time?

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

The SPEAKER. Under rule 61 and under rule 11, you would be able to move the previous question at this time.

Mr. EVANKOVICH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. I take it he is not making that motion at this time.

Representative Sims, you may proceed.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, all the things that I want to say about that kind of a maneuver, you just told me I should not. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. Representative Conklin.

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

Would the maker of the bill stand for just a quick question?

The SPEAKER. I am sorry, sir. You may proceed.

Representative Thomas, Representative Conklin has the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not take too lightly to threats. We went through this one time before. We do not need to do that again. I respect you; do not threaten me.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. Members, we are going to go over the bill for a second.

I would ask everybody to please take their seats.

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1968, PN 3964**, entitled:

An Act authorizing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission and the Governor, to grant and convey to the Bradford House Historical Association certain lands situate in the City of Washington, Washington County; and to grant and convey, at a price to be determined through a competitive bid process, certain lands, buildings and improvements situate in South Strabane Township, Washington County; and authorizing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Department of Military and Veterans Affairs and the Governor, to grant and convey to the Salvation Army, or its successors or assigns, certain lands, buildings and improvements situate in the Borough of East Stroudsburg, Monroe County.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—192

Table listing names of members who voted 'YEAS' for the bill, including Adolph, Artis, Baker, Barbin, Barrar, Benninghoff, Bizzarro, Bloom, Boback, Bradford, Briggs, Brown, R., Brown, V., Bullock, Burns, Caltagirone, Carroll, Causer, Christiana, Conklin, Corbin, Costa, D., Costa, P., Cox, Cruz, Culver, Cutler, Daley, M., Daley, P., and Davis.

Table listing names of members who were present but did not vote, including Dawkins, Day, Dean, Deasy, DeLissio, Delozier, Dermody, Diamond, DiGirolamo, Donatucci, Driscoll, Dunbar, Dush, Ellis, Emrick, English, Evankovich, Everett, Fabrizio, James, Jozwiak, Kampf, Kaufner, Kauffman, Kavulich, Keller, F., Keller, M.K., Keller, W., Kim, Kinsey, Kirkland, Klunk, Knowles, Kortz, Kotik, Krueger, Lawrence, Lewis, O'Neill, Oberlander, Ortitay, Parker, D., Pashinski, Payne, Peifer, Petrarca, Petri, Pickett, Pyle, Quigley, Quinn, C., Quinn, M., Rader, Rapp, Ravenstahl, Readshaw, Toepel, Toohil, Topper, Truitt, Vereb, Vitali, Ward, Warner, Watson, Wentling, Wheatley, Wheeland, White, Youngblood, and Zimmerman.

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—11

Table listing names of members who were excused from voting, including Acosta, Boyle, Cohen, Davidson, DeLuca, Evans, Hanna, Hennessey, McNeill, and Milne Santarsiero.

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 **SB 1311, PN 2061**, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 23 (Domestic Relations) and 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in adoption, further providing for grounds for involuntary termination; in child protective services, further providing for definitions and for release of information in confidential reports; and, in juvenile matters, further providing for definitions.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

Table listing names of members who voted 'YEAS' for the bill, including Adolph, Artis, Baker, Barbin, Farina, Farry, Fee, Flynn, Longietti, Mackenzie, Maher, Mahoney, Reed, Reese, Regan, and Roae.



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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—11

Acosta	Davidson	Hanna	Milne
Boyle	DeLuca	Hennessey	Santarsiero
Cohen	Evans	McNeill	

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.

**CALENDAR CONTINUED**

**BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 889, PN 1519**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 28, 1935 (P.L.477, No.193), referred to as the Enforcement Officer Disability Benefits Law, extending benefits to certain employees of the Pennsylvania Game Commission and the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission; and making editorial changes.

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

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

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

**SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A CONTINUED**

**CONSIDERATION OF HB 1885 CONTINUED**

The SPEAKER. We will now go back to HB 1885, PN 3075. As with every piece of legislation, this bill is of a serious nature. Let us please extend to each other the level of respect and the opportunity to speak on the bill.

These are the members that are left to speak: Representative Conklin, Representative Frankel, and Representative Vanessa Brown; Representative Jordan Harris. My apologies, Representative Harris. I was not sure that you had asked to be placed back on. My apologies.

So Representative Conklin, Representative Frankel, Representative Brown, Representative Harris, and now Representative McCarter.

At this time, Representative Conklin, you have the floor and you may speak on the bill.

Mr. CONKLIN. Questions for the maker, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. She has agreed to stand for interrogation.

Mr. CONKLIN. Thank you.

I want to thank the Representative.

Just a quick question; it is actually an easier one. Can you give me a list of the law enforcement agencies that are backing your bill?

Ms. WHITE. Law enforcement is neutral on this issue. Law enforcement is neutral on this issue.

Mr. CONKLIN. I am sorry. I have not heard; sorry.

Ms. WHITE. That is okay. I understand.

Law enforcement is neutral on this issue.

Mr. CONKLIN. So there is no one— And the reason I ask, this bill – and it is not to lead you – I am just—

The SPEAKER. Representative, has your interrogation concluded and you wish to now speak on the bill?

Mr. CONKLIN. Yes, that is fine, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You may proceed with speaking on the bill.

Mr. CONKLIN. It was very simple. The reason I asked if any law enforcement was backing this bill, because those will be – the men and women who protect us are the ones that will be responsible for making sure that this bill is done correctly. These are the individuals that are going to go out, have to stop, have to question individuals, have to use their excellent judgment, and I was just wondering if this, in light of what is happening within our nation, what is happening within many of

our cities today, I was wondering how they stood on this, because this is one more layer of, I do not want to say pressure, but this is one more job that they are going to have to use decisions that may be questioned by individuals along the way, and that is my reason for it. I was hoping that there would be some law enforcement backing the good lady's bill, and to be honest with you, I am quite disappointed to find out that there is no law enforcement. I will be honest with you, I was leaning to vote for this today, but now knowing that law enforcement is not backing this, it does disturb me just a little bit, Mr. Speaker.

I want to thank the lady for giving me that time. But again, my colleagues can vote how they wish, but just think about this, a bill of this magnitude, one that when you look at our brothers and sisters who protect us today, the stress that they are put under today, and to have one more layer that they have to be responsible for, I am not really sure about that at this point.

I know what the good lady is trying to do, but again, this is a bill that I was actually supporting clear up until now, and now I am beginning to very much question the fact that the people that protect me who should be involved in this, who should be warranted in this, individuals who are the ones who are going to implement this bill are not backing this bill. That is very troubling, Mr. Speaker.

I want to thank the lady.

The SPEAKER. Representative Frankel.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I also rise in opposition to HB 1885, because this bill, as was noted by my colleague from Philadelphia earlier, tells our local governments to do the work of the Federal immigration offices, and in the process, uses extremely harsh and divisive language to label individuals who may already be upstanding members of our communities.

Now, I think it is important to note that backing up the comments of my colleague from Philadelphia is the County Commissioners Association of the State of Pennsylvania. They are in strong opposition because they recognize the potential negative financial impact that this piece of legislation will have. So she was not just talking about something that we are making up here. Local governments across this State are opposed to this piece of legislation. And there is a good reason that no other State has passed this. There are many good reasons, but at a minimum, the thing that you ought to be concerned about is the fiscal impact.

Now, I think it is also important to notice that there is a broad coalition, a long-standing broad coalition of organizations, faith-based groups that have opposed and continue to oppose this legislation, organizations that I think are very important to many of us. Let me just list you a few: the Catholic Conference, Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, the Lutheran Advocacy Ministry of Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Council of Churches, the Anti-Defamation League, Sisters of St. Joseph, Jewish Employment and Vocational Services, PA Immigration and Citizenship Coalition, the PA Bar Association, Service Employees International Union, the Community Legal Services – it goes on and on. They must know something that the sponsors of this legislation do not know.

This is a bad idea, and it has not had a reasonable hearing to let these stakeholders who are opposed to it voice their opposition in this process. I guess we have a pattern here: passing legislation without adequate transparency and hearings. There may have been a hearing a dozen years ago, but there has

not been one this year, and to freeze again advocates who are in opposition to have their voices heard on this piece of legislation is outrageous.

So I think it is reasonable to vote "no" here. It should have been tabled, but if we are not going to table it, this ought to be opposed and we ought to be in sync with these organizations that believe we are going down the wrong path. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Vanessa Brown.

Ms. V. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the gentelady please stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. She has indicated that she will so stand. You may proceed.

Ms. V. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am still kind of not clear on probable cause, and I am sorry to go back to it, but just to help clear things up for me. The probable cause is if there is a crime. I am not clear, how do we get from the crime element to identifying whether or not someone is an illegal or undocumented person? Could you help me get from where we are, from when you pick somebody up because you think that they have done criminal activity to how we actually identify that they are an undocumented person?

Ms. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, reasonable cause in this legislation merely means reasonable suspicion, and it is "a standard" that has been "established by the Supreme Court in a 1968 case in which it ruled that police officers should be allowed to stop and briefly detain a person if, based upon the officer's training and experience, there is reason to believe that the individual is engaging in criminal activity."

Now, in this legislation, it does not change that. It does not require a crime for there to be reasonable cause. The intent of the legislation is, if the person has already been arrested for some other act that they committed that was a crime, then if there is additional reasonable cause for an officer to suspect that the individual could be here illegally, then that would rise to that level.

Ms. V. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, could I get an example, because I am still not clear? I understand that reasonable cause allowed the person to be detained or either arrested, but I am still not quite clear, how do we get to reasonable cause that someone is an undocumented person? I mean could— I do not understand how we actually do that. What gives you reasonable cause, because any— I mean, if you look at anybody in this body, who would be reasonable cause here? Is it everyone? Are there certain individuals? I am still not clear with that, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. WHITE. You know, it is going to depend on each case individually.

Ms. V. BROWN. Could you give me an example, ma'am?

Ms. WHITE. It would be to the discretion of the officer during their investigation.

Ms. V. BROWN. The discretion meaning? I still do not understand, how is that discretion implemented?

Mr. Speaker, let me ask another question. In this legislation, could you explain the type of training that law enforcement officers would obtain to be able to utilize that discretion?

Ms. WHITE. It is the same that police officers use. They go through a police academy, they go through training, and they have the ability to use reasonable suspicion during an investigation if they come across something that triggers, you know, something that they need to, that needs to be looked into further.

Ms. V. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, could I get a couple of examples of those triggers?

Ms. WHITE. It depends. It is on a case-by-case basis. I am not going to go through—

The SPEAKER. Please suspend.

### POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The majority leader, on a point of order.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out, we have gone back and forth a number of times today on the use of hypotheticals throughout the legislative process. I think it is probably something we should stick away from.

But in general regard to that particular question, it is probably the same procedures every single municipality in this State except for 33 use to cooperate with the Federal government to make sure people who are committing crimes who are in this county illegally no longer remain in this country. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Representative Brown, you may proceed with respect to questions that ask specifics about the bill, but to use the majority leader's phrase of hypotheticals, if you believe that a particular example or hypothetical is how it would be carried out under this legislation, you may state that in your remarks. But you may proceed with asking specifics about the bill itself.

Ms. V. BROWN. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think you might be giving me too much credit, because I honestly have no idea. This is the first time I am dealing with this. And I understand that our majority leader gave an example or gave a definition from the Federal perspective, but I still, to be able to vote and represent the people that I represent, I do not understand what those triggers would be. I am not trying to be facetious or smart, but honestly, I do not understand how I could look at you, Mr. Speaker, or I could look at someone else in here and identify between one person or another whether or not I would have a suspicion of whether you were an undocumented person or someone else would be. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I do not understand that.

The SPEAKER. You may proceed with your questions if you are still on interrogation. If you wish to speak on the bill, you may do so as well.

Ms. V. BROWN. I would just like someone—

The SPEAKER. Do you want to proceed with interrogation?

Ms. V. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I would just like someone to answer that particular question, that what would identify the difference between a person who— If it was you or someone else standing next to you, say you and Mr. Clancy, what would be the difference? How would I know?

The SPEAKER. Representative White, on the question.

Ms. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, once again, it is to the discretion of the officer at the time if he or she feels that there is reasonable cause or reasonable suspicion that this person is here illegally and committing a crime. They have already been previously arrested, and then during their investigation they find out additional information that constitutes them being able to, you know, find out that there is reasonable cause that the person is here illegally, then they have an obligation to enforce our laws of our country.

Ms. V. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill, please?

The SPEAKER. Representative Brown, you may speak on the bill.

Ms. V. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, on HB 1885, I have some real serious concerns that I believe that my questions have not been thoroughly answered as far as how do we actually identify from one individual in this country to another individual in this country exactly what would constitute me being suspicious of whether or not they were an undocumented person here.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at the measure of many standards that we have in this country, it is a measurement from a White male-dominated measurement. This is a colonized country, and as we look, even what I look at every day, this beautiful portrait in front of me is dominated by White male. So if I use that as my measurement for undocumented, then anyone who does not fall into that category is potentially at risk for me thinking that they could possibly not be a documented person.

I believe that this is unconstitutional. I believe that it has an unintentional consequences of this legislation. And I would like all the members of this House to consider that we are isolating a certain type of class of person if we are going by the standard that we normally use here in this United States of America.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Jordan Harris. And Representative Harris is our last speaker on the bill that has requested to talk. Oh, I am sorry, Representative McCarter; I do apologize. Your name was not listed and we should have had it listed. So it will be Representative Harris and Representative McCarter.

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

Will the maker of the bill stand for brief interrogation?

I promise it will not be as interesting as the other ones.

The SPEAKER. Representative White has indicated she will stand, and you may proceed.

Mr. J. HARRIS. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, my question is, after the person is arrested, they committed a crime, okay? After the person is arrested, the person goes through the process of giving their name and whatnot. At that point, what determines for the officer to ask if they are an undocumented person or not?

Ms. WHITE. After a person is arrested—

Mr. J. HARRIS. I cannot hear you.

Ms. WHITE. Sorry. After an individual has been arrested, that means that they potentially committed a crime in our State, the officer does an investigation. They obtain more facts, and based upon their investigation, if they feel that there is reasonable cause or reasonable suspicion that this person is here illegally, then it is— That is what reasonable cause or reasonable suspicion is.

Mr. J. HARRIS. Okay.

Ms. WHITE. So I think that is what you are getting at.

Mr. J. HARRIS. Thank you for that answer.

If I may ask a follow-up question. So the person is arrested, the officer does their investigation, you ask their name, where they live, you know, their date of birth, you get all of that information, general information, right? Even maybe fingerprinting. What then prompts that officer to say to a person – whom you got all of the answers from about the crime, about where they live; they have a house, they have a job, all of those things – but what actually prompts them to ask that question?

Ms. WHITE. So every case is different. It is to the discretion of the officer. And, you know, I have repeated this over and over again, but it depends on the incident. It depends on the

facts and the investigation that is taking place. And if they, if the officer has, you know, like I said, come across reasonable suspicion that they see that this person is here illegally, then they have the ability to act on that.

Mr. J. HARRIS. Okay. Two more questions, Mr. Speaker.

If the person is undocumented but the police officer does not ask the question, does this law take any effect?

Ms. WHITE. The person would have to have been arrested and there would have to have been reasonable suspicion that the officer sees during their investigation that the person is here undocumented.

Mr. J. HARRIS. Okay. My last question. If there were two children, let us say, middle school students who get into an altercation at school, okay? One child, because of the altercation, gets injured, has to go to the hospital. There are medical bills. Mom, Dad, whoever, presses charges. The young person, the young person who does not have any physical damage is an undocumented child. Go to court. There is a conviction; simple assault, let us say. Would, under this bill, would the parents then be able to sue one of those 32 counties for that altercation between two young people in school?

### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. You may proceed.

Mr. REED. Just a point of order.

I believe we have talked about hypothetical situations. The lady is not a police officer, and as she has stated many, many times, it is at the discretion of the officer based upon reasonable suspicion, so I would just ask that the members please stay away from hypothetical situations. Thank you.

Mr. J. HARRIS. Right. Respectfully, Mr. Speaker, this has nothing to do with whether you are a police officer or not. And all due respect to the leader, this is an actual question. My question is, if children get into a fight in school and they go to court, and one of the children is found guilty of a charge, would, because of a child altercation – I am talking about age, kids in school – would the municipality be able to be sued under this law? This has nothing to do with what a police officer believes. This is after the dispensation of justice. Could the municipality be sued for two kids fighting in school?

Ms. WHITE. Immigration does not determine whether they are legal or not until they have turned 18, so in that instance, it sounds as though that would be no. However, just so you know, the legislation for any other particular instances you are planning on asking about, a sanctuary municipality is to be held liable for damages due to an injury to persons or property as a result of criminal activity by unauthorized aliens. And there is a variety of items that are applicable to that that I would like to make sure that you are aware of, and that means that it has to be determined by Federal immigration officials that the person who engaged in the criminal activity is actually an unauthorized alien. The unauthorized alien is a resident of the sanctuary municipality. The unauthorized alien is convicted of the crime and the criminal activity is a proximate cause of the injury. Okay?

Mr. J. HARRIS. On the bill?

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. On the bill, Representative Harris.

Mr. J. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I understand that this is a bill that has a lot of emotion and tension into it. While I am an emotional person, I try to come to this chamber to ask serious questions about serious situations that happen every day in our Commonwealth. Here is where I have a problem.

First problem: When a person is arrested, under this bill, it is up to the officer to decide whether they ask if the person is undocumented or not, so that means that there could be many undocumented citizens or undocumented folks in our Commonwealth who, because they do not look a certain way or do not have a certain dialect, will never be asked the question of if they are undocumented or not. That is the classic example of racial profiling. There is no way around it. For you to look at a person and because of an accent, because of a skin tone you determine to ask them a question of whether they are documented or not, that is the clear-cut example of racial profiling. That is the first thing, Mr. Speaker.

The second thing, Mr. Speaker, is we are going to put 32 of our State's counties at liability to be sued. So I want my colleagues to understand that they again are about to vote on a bill that could possibly raise taxes on their constituents to pay not only the damages but to pay for increased legal costs.

Mr. Speaker, I saw the movie "E.T." That is the last time I saw an alien, and for the life of me, I cannot understand why we continue to use that discriminatory term in the House of Representatives.

We are here to protect people. This bill does not do that. Let me explain why it does not. There is an incident that happens; the police go out and get witnesses. I am undocumented. I am not talking to the police even though I saw the crime, even though I saw what happened, because I am now afraid of what might happen to me or what might happen to my family. So I am no longer going to be a witness to protect our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I do not question the motives of the gentlelady. I do not question the motives of any of our members. We all come from different places, different backgrounds, and represent different constituencies. But, Mr. Speaker, in some counties in this Commonwealth I would be looked at as if I am out of place, and that is fearful, and that is frightening, and this is why people should vote "no" on this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative McCarter.

Mr. McCARTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today in vehement opposition to HB 1885, which would hold any municipality in the Commonwealth that has deemed itself a sanctuary city liable for damages to persons or property as a result of criminal activity by an undocumented immigrant. But more critically, if the bill passes and the city does not comply, the bill would allow the State to withhold any State funds to the city until it comes into compliance with the bill.

The question at the core of the issue is an admittedly complicated one. Should cities be in the business of reporting undocumented immigrants to Federal officials just because those men and women were stopped or otherwise discovered by police for potentially even a minor offense? And I think it goes to the core of how we see ourselves here in the Commonwealth and nationwide. Personally, I see myself often in an undocumented immigrant's shoes, and I think we should all do well to do so once in a while, to look with care and compassion

on the plight of a young mother who could be brutally separated from her children following something as seemingly benign or ordinary as a routine traffic stop. HB 1885, which incidentally proposes to reduce violence, could tear apart families.

Mr. Speaker, like most of my colleagues in this room, I entered the legislature with a desire to improve, as best I could, the common good. HB 1885 does nothing to further it. It would not, as its proponents seem to claim, reduce violent crime; in fact, there is evidence to the contrary. A report conducted by the American Immigration Council revealed that while the number of undocumented immigrants rose from 3.5 million to 11.2 million from 1990 to 2013, violent crime fell 48 percent and property crime 41 percent. A University of Massachusetts study released last year found that foreign-born individuals exhibit remarkably low levels of involvement in crime across their life course. Another study conducted by the Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy found that many undocumented immigrants pay taxes to the tune of roughly \$11.8 billion in State and local taxes every year nationwide; \$150 million of that comes from undocumented immigrants in Pennsylvania.

You can see, Mr. Speaker, HB 1885 does not do much good. It represents bad policy. It represents bad economic policy. It represents bad social policy. So whom does it serve? Well, some of us might come to the conclusion that it only serves a particular presidential candidate and his fearmongering campaign, but I will leave that to you to draw your own conclusions.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dan Miller.

Mr. D. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, will the maker stand for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Representative White has indicated she will stand for interrogation. You may proceed.

Mr. D. MILLER. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to draw your attention in particular to, I am looking at page 4, lines starting at 28 and down, "Penalty for noncompliance." My question is, obviously the language you wrote says that "the State Treasurer shall withhold the payment of Commonwealth funds to any municipality." You have defined that obviously to include counties and every other form of government. What I wonder about that is, how does that apply to federally mandated human services funding that we are required by law in a variety of senior-based, disability-related funding that needs to be done?

Ms. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, it is regarding only Commonwealth funds.

Mr. D. MILLER. Right, but—

Ms. WHITE. Not Federal funds.

Mr. D. MILLER. Right, but the Federal funds do not just appear to say Mount Lebanon, my hometown, which would be nice. They are usually passed through, at least in some way, the State in some way or another. So the name on the check for a variety of these funds would come through the State, but we are under requirement to pass them on. So is it your intention then that we should violate our Federal responsibilities and withhold the funds because somebody spray-painted on somebody's property, and that—

Ms. WHITE. Again—

Mr. D. MILLER. —summary— I am not— I am sorry; I am not done with my question.

Ms. WHITE. Oh, I am sorry; go ahead.

Mr. D. MILLER. If I can finish. Let me give you an example.

The SPEAKER. Representative—

Mr. D. MILLER. I did not—

The SPEAKER. You are in interrogation. Please just state your question—

Mr. D. MILLER. I was hoping to, Mr. Speaker. I got interrupted with it, but I will. Let me try it again. If, let us give the example that a kid goes who spray-paints something, gets caught. The kid lives in the area with it. He is undocumented. He gets charged with a summary offense, therefore would be convicted, and therefore, would, let us just say in our typical parlance, owe \$100 to repaint the building that he spray-painted. So he is convicted. But let us just say they do not pay the fine or they do not want to act upon that conviction or they do not want to say that the \$100 is worth it. Is it your idea then that we should withhold funding for people with disabilities, mental health, and every other human services funding that we are mandated by the Feds to provide?

Ms. WHITE. Are you finished?

Mr. D. MILLER. Well, that is what the pause is.

Ms. WHITE. Oh, good.

Mr. D. MILLER. So yeah.

Ms. WHITE. Okay. Just checking.

Sir, again, the legislation pertains specifically to Commonwealth funds not Federal funds. Those would be passed through.

Mr. D. MILLER. Okay. So is it then your position that when you wrote "Commonwealth funds," it applies only to dollars that are generated by Pennsylvania taxpayers because of State law and not Federal, not Pennsylvania taxpayers that otherwise would have been paid to the Federal government and that we are mandated to do?

The SPEAKER. Representative Miller, she has already answered the question.

Mr. D. MILLER. With respect, Mr. Speaker, I would disagree.

But I will move on to another question. On your responsibilities of law enforcement, there is a section here where the Federal government has to certify that the individual is an – to use your words – "an unauthorized alien." So the Federal immigration officials have determined that the person who has engaged in the criminal activity is an unauthorized alien. I am wondering if you have determined how long that would take?

Ms. WHITE. That is the Federal government who would be responsible for determining whether someone is here illegally or not.

Mr. D. MILLER. I am sorry; I apologize. I did not ask for a recitation of it. What I was trying to say was, you wrote down it would take a time period— They have to do an act. They have to figure out if the person who engaged in the criminal activity is an actual unauthorized alien, so what I am trying to get to is, do you know how long it would take the Federal government to act? And the reason why I am asking that question is because I have come across months and months of people in the Allegheny County Jail, for example, who are waiting for Federal action—

The SPEAKER. Representative—

Mr. D. MILLER. —that never came.

The SPEAKER. Representative—

Mr. D. MILLER. So—

The SPEAKER. Representative, the language was given to you. If you have concerns with what that timeframe might be, you certainly may speak on that to the House.

Mr. D. MILLER. Okay. Let me ask it this way with it.

The SPEAKER. Sir, just state very specific questions. They can be answered. If not, you are more than entitled to address these issues to the body and to the public.

Mr. D. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With all respect, I am telling her where I am reading from.

So let me just try it a different way. In here there seems to be what I read to be no timeframes of action, which means that the Federal government could be taking several months to reach a determination about someone's status, or perhaps not. But in my experience, I have come across months and months of people waiting in jail for Federal action. Is there anything that you have here that is to address the cost of incarceration while we wait for Federal action?

Ms. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there is something called a notice to appear that would be issued, and at that point, that can take a couple of days.

Mr. D. MILLER. All right. Let me go to the mandate that you have for local law enforcement, and I am looking at page 3; to be specific, page 3, line 22. So the mandate that you have for local officials says that notice has to be provided by the town for public officials, employees, and law enforcement officers. Now, obviously, I am imagining that this is something that would have to be done every time you have a new employee in any one of those arenas. Is that right? Well, let me try a different way. Allegheny County has roughly 1,000 employees. Philadelphia, I am not even sure how many thousands of employees Philadelphia has. So when it comes to your mandate here that notification has to be done for each employee, is there any concern or anything in here that would have, perhaps, how the cost would be covered for that notification?

Ms. WHITE. Law enforcement departments have their own methodologies in terms of notifying their officers and other law enforcement agents to make sure that they are up-to-date on various laws, legislation that changes over time, and this would be merely consistent with that notification.

Mr. D. MILLER. Okay. And I appreciate the issue on law enforcement. That is just one of the subsections on page 3, line 22, that you reference. So you say employees. So you say public officials, employees, and law enforcement officers. So my question actually goes beyond, again I will use my hometown, the 45 police officers or so that we have going. It instead goes to the employees of the municipality or town or county that your bill covers. So my question is, is it your anticipation that every employee of Allegheny County or every employee of Philadelphia would therefore be notified of this requirement no matter what their job requirement was?

Ms. WHITE. Just as a reference point, even in our own positions as legislators, we are given a handbook in terms of our roles and responsibilities and what we are supposed to be abiding by, and I imagine that this could be included in that, and therefore, the fiscal note on this particular piece of legislation is zero.

Mr. D. MILLER. Well, the fiscal note of course says to the State—

Ms. WHITE. That is correct.

Mr. D. MILLER. —which is great, but the mandate, of course, is to the municipalities as defined in your bill. So the fiscal note information is irrelevant to my question.

The SPEAKER. Sir, please suspend. You can ask questions. I understand that you are making, you are arguing right now, which is fine if you want to speak on the bill. Do you want to speak on the bill? You are more than entitled to do so.

Mr. D. MILLER. Mr. Speaker – and I appreciate it, Mr. Speaker – I know that you are a man who pays attention to words. And, Mr. Speaker, all I am trying to do is go from the line that is there in reference to employees, and I appreciate that there are employee manuals, Mr. Speaker. My question is in relation to the hundreds, if not thousands, of employees that this bill would have ramifications for, the cost of which could be high. So my question only is, is the intention that that handbook, supposedly that would be created, would therefore have to be given to every employee of every municipality or borough or county that your bill supposedly references?

Ms. WHITE. There are many State and Federal laws that require notification to employees, etc., such as the Whistleblower Law, and this is merely the same thing to provide access to this information. So I think that that is pretty simple and can be done.

The SPEAKER. Sir—

Mr. D. MILLER. Just one final question, if I may?

Ms. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I am finished standing for interrogation. Thank you.

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

Mr. D. MILLER. I will. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I want to thank the Speaker for his courtesy.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about this bill and its ramifications and what seems to be a very harsh penalty for the people who live in a county or borough to which they disagree with what seemingly may be the majority will of this body.

The reality is, this has massive implications for larger towns and communities and counties for them to be able to comply with. So they are saying, listen – and by the way, I am pretty sure a bunch of us are for local control issues – but they are saying, hey, listen, we are going to tell you that every employee in your town, whether they work at PENNDOT, for the State, or whether they work at the public works or whether they work at your town library, has to have some sort of manual provided to them as to what supposedly the law enforcement officials are supposed to do, even though those people do not work in your law enforcement branch. So even though the administrative assistant in your library has nothing to do with law enforcement, we are going to pass a mandate for every one of them so that they somehow may have some knowledge of a thing that is irrelevant to their work.

The bill is so broad. The bill is a mandate that is passed down to towns and communities throughout. This is an overreach and an issue for funding. Let us think about what could be affected. So if a township disagrees with us, if a township has the audacity to disagree on what, by the way, seems to be a Federal requirement rather than a State issue, so if they have the audacity to disagree, we are going to penalize everyone in Allegheny County who wants drug and alcohol treatment and receives State funds. We are sorry, because of one person's actions, we are going to take away your funding for your drug and alcohol treatment. And if you are someone who, by the way, needs disability services or MH (mental health) services, we are sorry, we are going to take all your funding away because one person spray-painted something.

This in reality is an attack on the most needy of people. Now, there were more creative ways it could be done. If someone wanted to go down this path, they could have found an appropriate remedy. Here they are threatening to take away the money from, by the way, I guess school systems, so all your school systems are going to lose your money.

So here is the magic of the bill. Every State dollar – and we got into some debate as to what that is. If you do not want your schools to get money, hey, well, keep in mind, they are actually putting you guys all in the position on an issue to which you do not control, meaning that some of us maybe in Allegheny County and some of us may disagree with an action in Allegheny County. You cannot vote on that. You cannot change it. But you are going to vote today to say that oh, I am sorry; if, in my example, County Executive Rich Fitzgerald disagrees, there is going to be no money going to Allegheny County for human services. There is going to be no money going to your school districts. I have never seen a more hateful penalty written into law in America than this.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. We, at the end of the debate, typically or by pattern and practice, allow the leaders and the maker of the bill to speak.

Representative Sturla, for the second time.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the maker of the bill rise for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The maker has indicated she will not stand for interrogation.

Mr. STURLA. May I be recognized to make comments, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Yes; you may proceed.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, I find it very unfortunate that a bill that now has not had a public hearing cannot even get a public discourse as it relates to questions pertaining to the bill, but that being said, I guess then I will make my own interpretations and guess at what the answers might have been to my questions.

As I understand it, this would only apply to the 32 counties and municipalities that are considered sanctuary municipalities, and therefore, the 35 counties that are not considered sanctuary municipalities in this State do not have to ask any of the questions and they are not liable for anybody that is undocumented – or as the bill refers to them, as an "unauthorized alien" – if they commit any actions.

So I am assuming that the intent of the bill is to simply get municipalities to not declare themselves as "sanctuaries," and then once they do that, they are off the hook in terms of liability or in terms of anybody having to go without any funds. That still does absolutely nothing to take care of employees, take care of protecting any citizen; in fact, it probably does less. So I am assuming that that is what the bill applies to, although I still do not know.

I do not think the bill mandates that any municipality actually determine whether or not somebody is undocumented – or as the bill refers to them, as an "unauthorized alien" – because we have determined that the municipality cannot actually do that. The Feds do that.

So this is really just about a name. We are going to penalize a municipality, or in this case, 32 counties and multiple cities throughout this State, for calling themselves a sanctuary municipality, because a municipality that does not call itself a sanctuary municipality and still takes the same actions as a

sanctuary municipality has no liability under this legislation. So this is really about penalizing somebody for a name.

Now, beyond that, it says that the municipality, if they are a sanctuary municipality, would have to pay damages, but the bill does not state what damages are. And so if an undocumented person – or as this bill refers to them, as an "unauthorized alien" – commits a crime in a municipality that is a sanctuary municipality and the person that the crime was committed against says, "I was traumatized," I am not sure what the damages are. Is that \$1 million, \$10 million, is it 10 cents? And who determines that? And how long does that get tied up in court determining what is a reasonable damage? That is not discussed anywhere in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is woefully inadequate in terms of doing any of the things it is purported to do. It simply leaves things in limbo and requires that in order to avoid the possibility of losing State funds, municipalities simply undo their sanctuary city or sanctuary municipality legislation and then everything is kosher again.

Mr. Speaker, again, given that there was no public hearing on this and that members are not even permitted to ask questions about what the intent of this bill was, I would urge a "no" vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Cris Dush.

Mr. DUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am only rising in response to slight on the Air Force law enforcement that was given earlier, and I will tell you why. He called into question what we do, the military police and security forces of the Air Force. Let me tell you, 29 miles of the Pacific Coast Highway at Vandenberg Air Force Base is concurrent jurisdiction with the California Highway Patrol, the Santa Barbara County Sheriff's, and Vandenberg Air Force Base law enforcement.

I have detained illegal aliens. I also was in charge of a 70-square-mile area of the border in support of the border security efforts. Fort Huachuca in Texas has concurrent jurisdiction. Air Force bases around the world and around this country, and Army as well, have concurrent jurisdiction locations. To call into question the people who serve in law enforcement in the military I think is unconscionable to do that on the floor of this House.

Secondly, when I first rose to speak I was interrupted, and the thing that comes back and what I was going to get to was the phrase that the Supreme Court comes down with every single time when it is making the determinations and the lower courts. It is called "education, experience, and training." That is what helps determine what is probable cause.

We should support this bill, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Reed.

Representative Dermody, do you wish to be recognized?

Representative Reed, on the bill.

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

I just want to make one point and leave members to ponder this point as we go to the final vote on this bill. We have had an awful lot of discussion on what triggers law enforcement to ask somebody who has been accused and detained for committing a crime if they are in the United States legally. I would just like to point out that of the 33 sanctuary cities in this State, I took the opportunity to go online to the city of Philadelphia's human resources Web site, and if you wish to apply for a job within the city of Philadelphia government, they ask you whether you are here legally. And not only that, they have a residency requirement that you live within the city of Philadelphia for

employment. So our largest sanctuary city in this State feels the need to ask any law-abiding citizen whether they are here illegally in order to apply for employment. I do not think it is that much to ask folks who have been accused and detained for committing a crime if they are here in our country legally as well.

Thank you very much, 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—136

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

#### NAYS—55

Artis	Deasy	Keller, W.	Ross
Bradford	DeLissio	Kim	Rozzi
Briggs	Dermody	Kinsey	Samuelson
Brown, V.	Donatucci	Kirkland	Savage
Bullock	Fabrizio	Krueger	Schlossberg
Caltagirone	Farina	Lewis	Schreiber
Carroll	Flynn	Matzie	Schweyer
Conklin	Frankel	McCarter	Sims
Costa, P.	Freeman	McClinton	Sturla
Cruz	Gainey	Miller, D.	Thomas
Daley, M.	Gergely	O'Brien	Vitali
Davis	Harkins	Pashinski	Wheatley
Dawkins	Harris, J.	Ravenstahl	Youngblood
Dean	Kavulich	Roebuck	

#### NOT VOTING—0

#### EXCUSED—12

Acosta	Davidson	Hanna	McNeill
Boyle	DeLuca	Harper	Milne
Cohen	Evans	Hennessey	Santarsiero

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

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

The SPEAKER. There are no further bills.

### GAMING OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Representative Payne, for a committee announcement.

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

Mr. Speaker, reminder that the Gaming Oversight Committee will have a hearing tomorrow at 9 o'clock, 205 Ryan. That is the Gaming Committee, tomorrow, 9 o'clock, 205 Ryan.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Tomorrow the Gaming Oversight Committee will have a meeting in 205 Ryan at 9 o'clock.

### BILLS RECOMMITTED

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

HB 564;  
HB 1473;  
HB 1516;  
HB 1525;  
HB 2293;  
HB 2304; and  
SB 889.

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 1280;  
HB 2222;  
HB 2232;  
HB 2342;  
HB 2359;  
HB 2370;  
HB 2375;  
HB 2381;



HB 2382;  
SB 984;  
SB 1018; and  
SB 1265.

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

### CALENDAR CONTINUED

#### BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 649, PN 2574**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 4 (Amusements) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in general provisions, further providing for legislative intent and for definitions; in Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board, further providing for general and specific powers, for licensed gaming entity application appeals from board, for board minutes and records, for regulatory authority of board, for slot machine license fee and for reports of board, providing for fantasy sports report and further providing for diversity goals of board; in licensees, further providing for Category 3 slot machine license, for slot machine license application, for supplier licenses, for manufacturer licenses, for slot machine testing and certification standards and for license renewals; in table games, further providing for authorization to conduct table games, for table game tournaments, for other financial transactions, for table game device and associated equipment testing and certification standards and for local share assessment; providing for interactive gaming, for casino simulcasting and for slot machines at nonprimary locations; in revenues, further providing for establishment of State Gaming Fund and net slot machine revenue distribution; in administration and enforcement, further providing for responsibility and authority of the Department of Revenue, for wagering on credit, for compulsive and problem gambling program, providing for child endangerment protection, further providing for financial and employment interests, for regulation requiring exclusion or ejection of certain persons, for repeat offenders excludable from licensed gaming facility, for list of persons self excluded from gaming activities, for investigations and enforcement, for prohibited acts and penalties and for liquor licenses at licensed facilities and providing for casino liquor license; in miscellaneous provisions, further providing for appropriations; making an editorial change; and making a related repeal.

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

#### BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that **HB 649** be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

#### BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that **HB 649** be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

#### RESOLUTION

Mr. REED called up **HR 264, PN 1254**, entitled:

A Resolution urging the Congress of the United States to expeditiously address the health, social and economic needs of our female veterans.

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolution?

#### RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that **HR 264** be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

#### RESOLUTION REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that **HR 264** be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

#### REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. Representative Martina White is recognized on unanimous consent.

Ms. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit my remarks for the record of final passage of **HB 1885**. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Yes; those will be accepted.

Ms. WHITE submitted the following remarks for the Legislative Journal:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

One of the most basic responsibilities we have as representatives of the people is to protect the citizens of Pennsylvania. Tragically, across our Commonwealth citizens have been suffering at the hands of illegal immigrants who commit crimes in our communities. We have sanctuary municipalities that have overstepped their bounds and have created policies that are equivalent to their own immigration laws that prevent cooperation with our Federal authorities.

It is time to take a hard stand to prevent this lack of cooperation between our local law enforcement and our Federal authorities. We must uphold Federal law. We are a nation of laws, and when local government ignores and violates them, we at the State level have an obligation to hold our local governments accountable.

For the full definition of "sanctuary municipalities" I direct you to my legislation. But in brief, sanctuary municipalities blatantly disregard Federal law in matters of illegal immigration through either written policies or a pattern of willful noncompliance. For example,

Philadelphia, a declared "sanctuary city" by Mayor Jim Kenney, is in clear violation of Title 8 of the United States Code § 1373(a)-(b); § 1644 in which Congress has specifically prohibited State or local governments from restricting communication with the Federal government regarding immigration status of individuals.

There is no debate that illegal aliens have harmed Americans. In 2011 the Government Accountability Office released a study on approximately 250,000 illegal aliens in Federal, State, and local prisons. Those prisoners had been arrested nearly 1.7 million times and committed 3 million offenses, averaging about 7 arrests and 12 offenses each. Let me emphasize that: Illegal aliens were convicted of 3 million offenses as of 2011 against our citizens. These are just the offenses that were successfully prosecuted. It troubles me to think of all the other families who were devastated because an illegal alien harmed their family. I am confident that number has grown as more and more municipalities have offered sanctuary for illegal immigrants.

This sanctioned lack of cooperation has resulted in the following local incidents as well. Last month Federal authorities arrested three at-large criminal aliens after they were released from custody in Philadelphia. These men have previous convictions including assault, DUI (driving under the influence), and narcotics manufacturing. In 2015 Ramon Aguirre-Ochoa, an illegal alien, was released from police custody when Philadelphia authorities refused to work with Federal immigration authorities. He has now been charged with raping a child. In 2013 Jose Palermo-Ramirez, a 43-year-old illegal immigrant, was convicted of indecent assault on a 7-year-old girl. These heinous crimes are just a small sample of what happens when local officials offer sanctuary to illegal aliens.

Nationally, Juan Francisco Lopez-Sanchez, the confessed killer of Kathryn Steinle, said he knew he was safe in San Francisco because it was a sanctuary city. That case shows illegal immigrants feel safe when States have sanctuary municipalities. This influx of population puts a strain on our taxpayer-funded resources including health care, education, city services, and undercutting wages. Illegal immigrants who commit additional crimes are putting a strain on our legal and prison systems.

To illustrate how illegal immigration can negatively affect a small town in Pennsylvania, I would like to recount the personal experience of Congressman Lou Barletta: "...this issue wasn't something that I dreamt up while I was mayor. I experienced the problem of illegal immigration firsthand. And I think it's more obvious in a small town like Hazleton, which was a population of 30,000, because you can see the changes in the community and how illegal immigration actually affects a city such as ours.

"For example, the wait time in the emergency room grew to seven, eight, nine hours as illegal aliens are using the emergency room for primary health care.

"Our population in Hazleton grew by 50 percent, which is a huge growth of a – of a city, but yet our tax revenue remained the same. So it became very difficult for us in trying to provide services to the people in the city without the revenue growth that was growing with the population. So it affects the quality of life in our city.

"And then May 10th, 2006, a day I'll never forget. Derek Kichline, a 29-year-old father of three young children, while working on his pickup truck in Hazleton had some words with Pedro Cabrera. Pedro Cabrera was in the country illegally, arrested six times in New York cities and other cities before he came to Hazleton, New York City being another sanctuary city. Cabrera didn't like what Kichline had to say – went into his car, got a gun, stuck it in Derek's face, and shot and killed him, point blank.

"We spent half of our yearly budget in overtime in the police department in finding and catching Cabrera and his buddy. Our police department worked 36 straight hours...until we got him.

"I sat with Mr. and Mrs. Kichline and tried to answer the question as why was this man still in the country when he had been arrested before. Derek Kichline should have been alive today and Pedro Cabrera should not have been in the country had it not been for a sanctuary city not enforcing the law.

"...I began speaking around Pennsylvania. And I remember going to central Pennsylvania at a town hall meeting, and at the end of the meeting a young couple came up to me and they said that they drove an hour to hear me speak. They wanted to tell me about their daughter. Her name was Carly Snyder. She was 20 years old, studying to be a veterinarian. Her next-door neighbor was in the country illegally from Honduras. He had been arrested in Houston prior to coming to Pennsylvania, another sanctuary city. The man broke into Carly's house, as the father told me – a tear was coming down his cheek. He stabbed his daughter 37 times. Carly had knife wounds in the palms of her hand and she had knife wounds in her back as she bled to death on the kitchen floor. He told me that I'm speaking for Carly now, and that's why he wanted to come to see me.

"I can't forget that. I can't forget the time with Derek Kichline's family and the story of Carly Snyder."

After hearing Congressman Lou Barletta's personal experience, I also cannot forget stories like Derek Kichline and Carly Snyder. I hope these incidents that occurred open your eyes to the dire need to rid our State of these unlawful sanctuary policies.

Common sense tells us that when an illegal immigrant has been convicted of a crime in our State and has served their sentence, our Federal government should be informed of the illegal immigrant's release date so deportation can be arranged in a timeframe consistent with the Federal government's guidelines. This does not happen in sanctuary municipalities, and Federal law clearly indicates that when State and local laws or actions are not responsive to Federal control or direction, or categorically demand enforcement in such a way as to deprive the Federal government – and State and local officers – of the flexibility and discretion that animates the Federal government's ability to globally supervise immigration enforcement, do not constitute the requisite "cooperation" within the meaning of the law. This is why we need HB 1885.

In contrast to sanctuary municipalities, HB 1885 does not create new immigration law. It simply mandates the cooperation of local municipalities with the Federal government. As Federal immigration law enforcement continues to evolve, this legislation allows for the continued cooperation with Federal authorities in perpetuity.

It is a simple fact: Local municipalities cannot create their own de facto immigration laws, nor can they create policies that actively violate Federal law. Our Federal government demands cooperation in illegal immigration matters.

I know there are strong feelings on both sides of this issue; however, this is an issue that has bipartisan support. The Obama administration is opposed to sanctuary cities, as are other prominent Pennsylvania Democrats including Mayor Nutter and Gov. Ed Rendell, who, as you know, are both former mayors of Philadelphia, PA's largest sanctuary city. When leaders from both parties stand up and say sanctuary municipalities are wrong, we must do so as well.

Many who oppose this legislation call it anti-immigrant and denigrate its supporters. This is simply not true. It is a straw man argument. I support legal immigration and welcome immigrants with open arms. Immigration is part of our history and part of what has made America great. Immigration brings diversity, culture, and more to our society.

Further, this legislation does not even address the broader issue of illegal immigration. This legislation deals with one point only – following the law for those who are here illegally and have committed a crime against our community. Anyone who says otherwise has not read the bill or simply does not care to learn the truth. For the safety of our citizens, we must utilize the rights granted to the States by the Federal government to cooperate with their authorities to help end sanctuary cities.

Today you have an important decision to make, colleagues. Will you stand with citizens of Pennsylvania or will you stand with the extreme policies that have served to shield even the most violent illegal immigrants who have committed crimes against our citizens?

Thank you, and I urge a "yes" vote.

**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 Bryan Cutler moves that the House be adjourned until Tuesday, October 18, 2016, at 11 a.m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to, and at 6:30 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.