

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

MONDAY, APRIL 16, 2018

SESSION OF 2018

202D OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 13

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 Laura Minnella of the Hope United Methodist Church in Mechanicsburg, and she is here as the guest of our friend and colleague, Representative Greg Rothman.

PASTOR LAURA MINNELLA, Guest Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Holy One, the lunch hour has passed on a cloudy and rainy Monday, and we find ourselves perhaps wishing we could have remained in bed this day, yet we are gathered in this place for a purpose that is greater than ourselves. We gather because we are filled with desire and passion to make a difference and to better our community through government. We gather because we are stirred by ideals and visions that are greater than ourselves, and we are elected by those who share in our dreams.

As we gather for this necessary and precious work of great importance, renew and awaken the passion within us. Fill us with a sense of joy, and remind us of our responsibility to those who share in our dreams. Infuse this space, our hearts, and our minds with wisdom to discern what is right, and to govern for the greater good, so we can lead with grace and set an example that boasts the triumph of unity over divisiveness. 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 Wednesday, April 11, 2018, will be postponed until printed.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

HB 1800, PN 3224

By Rep. PICKETT

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

INSURANCE.

HB 2155, PN 3276

By Rep. HICKERNELL

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in certification of teachers, further providing for provisional vocational education certificate.

EDUCATION.

HB 2156, PN 3277

By Rep. HICKERNELL

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

EDUCATION.

HB 2157, PN 3278

By Rep. HICKERNELL

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in terms and courses of study, further providing for Commission for Agricultural Education Excellence; in vocational education, providing for utilization of credits; and providing for classification of program code.

EDUCATION.

HB 2158, PN 3285

By Rep. HICKERNELL

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, providing for career information and recruitment.

EDUCATION.

HB 2159, PN 3279

By Rep. HICKERNELL

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in transfers of credits between institutions of higher education, further providing for definitions, for duties of public institutions of higher education and State-related institutions, for Transfer and Articulation Oversight Committee and for duties of department.

EDUCATION.

HB 2203, PN 3286

By Rep. HICKERNELL

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in vocational education, providing for an online career resource center.

EDUCATION.

HB 2204, PN 3252

By Rep. HICKERNELL

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in vocational education, providing for a workforce development program clearinghouse.

EDUCATION.

HB 2205, PN 3330

By Rep. HICKERNELL

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in vocational education, further providing for advisory committees.

EDUCATION.

HB 2206, PN 3331

By Rep. HICKERNELL

An Act amending the act of December 18, 2001 (P.L.949, No.114), known as the Workforce Development Act, in local workforce investment areas and boards, further providing for membership.

EDUCATION.

HOUSE RESOLUTION INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 837 By Representatives GAINY, DAVIS, DEAN, STEPHENS, MURT, SCHLOSSBERG, A. DAVIS, KINSEY, MENTZER, FRANKEL, WHEATLEY, P. COSTA, NEILSON, YOUNGBLOOD, KIRKLAND, DRISCOLL, HILL-EVANS, CALTAGIRONE, WATSON and DONATUCCI

A Resolution directing the Joint State Government Commission to establish an advisory committee to conduct a study on gun violence as a public health crisis and issue a report of its findings and recommendations to the House of Representatives.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, April 16, 2018.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 2205 By Representatives ROEBUCK, HICKERNELL, READSHAW, DAVIS, KINSEY, THOMAS, LONGIETTI, YOUNGBLOOD, SCHLOSSBERG, QUIGLEY, FEE, LEWIS, McGINNIS, NEILSON, MARSHALL, MULLERY, PHILLIPS-HILL, PASHINSKI, DERMODY, J. McNEILL, HANNA, D. MILLER, RAPP, GOODMAN, DONATUCCI and ENGLISH

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in vocational education, further providing for advisory committees.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, April 12, 2018.

No. 2206 By Representatives ROEBUCK, HICKERNELL, READSHAW, MURT, LONGIETTI, YOUNGBLOOD, SCHLOSSBERG, QUIGLEY, FEE, LEWIS, McGINNIS, NEILSON, WHEATLEY, MULLERY, PHILLIPS-HILL, PASHINSKI, DERMODY, J. McNEILL, McCLINTON, HANNA, D. MILLER, RAPP, GOODMAN, DONATUCCI, ENGLISH and MICCARELLI

An Act amending the act of December 18, 2001 (P.L.949, No.114), known as the Workforce Development Act, in local workforce investment areas and boards, further providing for membership.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, April 12, 2018.

No. 2227 By Representatives STEPHENS, CHARLTON, KULIK, SCHLOSSBERG, DEAN, TOEPEL, FRANKEL, KORTZ, STURLA, YOUNGBLOOD, HILL-EVANS, MURT, HARPER, MARSICO, WATSON, NEILSON, CALTAGIRONE, ROE, NELSON, EVERETT and TOOHL

An Act amending Titles 18 (Crimes and Offenses) and 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in firearms and other dangerous articles, further providing for persons not to possess, use, manufacture, control, sell or transfer firearms; in community and municipal courts, further providing for masters; and adding provisions relating to extreme risk protection orders.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, April 16, 2018.

No. 2259 By Representatives DeLUCA, J. McNEILL and HILL-EVANS

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in terms and courses of study, further providing for fire and emergency evacuation drills.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, April 16, 2018.

No. 2260 By Representatives SNYDER, READSHAW, WATSON and ROZZI

An Act amending the act of July 19, 1979 (P.L.130, No.48), known as the Health Care Facilities Act, in licensing of health care facilities, further providing for photo identification tag regulations.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, April 16, 2018.

No. 2261 By Representatives SNYDER and MADDEN

An Act providing for supplemental State-funded tax relief; establishing the Personal Income Tax Property Tax Reduction Fund; and providing for distributions from fund.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, April 16, 2018.

No. 2262 By Representatives DeLUCA, MILLARD, YOUNGBLOOD, DAVIS, SCHLOSSBERG, J. McNEILL and WATSON

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Human Services Code, providing for departmental powers and duties as to small personal care homes.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, April 16, 2018.

No. 2263 By Representatives TOPPER, DUNBAR, ELLIS, GROVE, REESE, WARD, BERNSTINE, WALSH, WARNER, MUSTIO and SANKEY

An Act amending the act of April 12, 1951 (P.L.90, No.21), known as the Liquor Code, in Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board, further providing for general powers of board.

Referred to Committee on LIQUOR CONTROL, April 16, 2018.

No. 2264 By Representatives HANNA, O'NEILL, READSHAW, KINSEY, SONNEY, DUSH, BURNS, CONKLIN, MILLARD, RYAN, LONGIETTI, COX, DAVIS, THOMAS, DONATUCCI, BARBIN, CAUSER, NEILSON, CALTAGIRONE, MURT, HAHN, WARD, DiGIROLAMO, MARSICO, J. McNEILL, SCHWEYER, WATSON, WARNER, BRADFORD and GILLEN

An Act designating the portion of State Route 2024 and State Route 1016, also known as Monument Orviston Road, from the intersection of State Route 2024 and Main Street in Beech Creek Borough, Clinton County, to the intersection of State Route 1016 and Kato Orviston Road in Curtin Township, Centre County, as the CPL Milford H. Wensel Memorial Highway.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, April 16, 2018.

The SPEAKER. All members, please report to the House floor. We are about to take the master roll.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The majority whip requests leave of absence for Representative Michael CORR of Montgomery County for the day. Without objection, that will be granted.

The minority whip requests leaves of absence for the following members: Representative Madeleine DEAN of Montgomery County for the day, Representative Flo FABRIZIO of Erie County for the day, Representative Mark ROZZI of Berks County for the day, Representative Greg VITALI of Delaware County for the day, and Representative Carolyn COMITTA of Chester County for the day. Without objection, all of those will be granted.

MASTER ROLL CALL

The SPEAKER. At this time we will proceed to vote on the master roll.

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—193

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

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

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Comitta	Dean	Gabler	Vitali
Corr	Fabrizio	Rozzi	

LEAVES ADDED—2

Christiana	Davidson
------------	----------

LEAVES CANCELED—2

Comitta	Corr
---------	------

The SPEAKER. There are 193 members having voted on the master roll. We have a quorum.

STATEMENT BY MR. ROTHMAN

The SPEAKER. Representative Rothman is invited to speak at this time – we are going to be voting on it shortly – on HR 680. We will go right here. I would ask all members to please take your seats. As you know, you have already been

introduced to the pastor with respect to this resolution at Hope United Methodist. So I would ask everybody to please take your seats. The Sergeants at Arms will close the doors of the House at this time. Thank you.

Representative Rothman, you may proceed. Thank you, sir.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to vote on a resolution to honor the 200th anniversary of the Hope United Methodist Church, formerly known as the Salem Chapel. The history of the Hope United Methodist Church can be traced back to 1818, when the Salem Meeting House was erected on land that was previously known as the Stayman Farm. Salem Chapel was deeded to the Methodist Episcopal Church for \$100 in 1882, making Salem Chapel the oldest Methodist church building in regular use in Cumberland Valley. Historical records show that the Confederate Army fired artillery from the churchyard in 1863, likely during the Skirmish of Sporting Hill.

Please join me, Mr. Speaker and members, my colleagues, in recognizing Hope United Methodist Church, formerly the Salem Chapel in Cumberland County, on their 200th anniversary.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you very much, and as you know, our pastor is from that church, Hope United Methodist Church. We are going to take a photo, and then we are going to proceed to the uncontested House calendar.

UNCONTESTED CALENDAR

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. ROTHMAN called up **HR 680, PN 2982**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the 200th anniversary of Hope United Methodist Church, formerly known as Salem Chapel.

* * *

Mr. READSHAW called up **HR 696, PN 3030**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing April 17, 2018, as "Architects Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. MURT called up **HR 714, PN 3067**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing April 15, 2018, as a day to honor the lifetime achievements and lasting influence of Jackie Robinson in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Ms. McCLINTON called up **HR 812, PN 3270**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing April 19, 2018, as "National D.A.R.E. Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Ms. TOOHL called up **HR 821, PN 3301**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of April 2018 as "National Donate Life Month" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolutions?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Comitta	Dean	Gabler	Vitali
Corr	Fabrizio	Rozzi	

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

UNCONTESTED SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A**RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35**

Mr. HEFFLEY called up **HR 830, PN 3333**, entitled:

A Resolution commemorating the 200th anniversary of the founding of the Borough of Jim Thorpe, formerly known as Mauch Chunk.

* * *

Mr. MALONEY called up **HR 833, PN 3334**, entitled:

A Resolution designating April 16, 2018, as "Pocono Raceway Day" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolutions?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

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

NAYS—0**NOT VOTING—0****EXCUSED—7**

Comitta
Corr

Dean
Fabrizio

Gabler
Rozzi

Vitali

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

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONEY

The SPEAKER. Representative Maloney is recognized to speak on HR 833. We do have guests who have traveled some distance to be with us for this resolution. So I am going to ask everybody to please take your seats. Members, please take your seats. We have some guests that have traveled some distance to be with us. Representative Maloney, on the resolution, sir, and now Representative Carroll and Representative Fritz are joining him at the rostrum.

Mr. MALONEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand here today and thank you for your support for HR 833, and as you see, I have some of my colleagues up here from the Motorsports Caucus, and we would just like to bring the attention to those that are here with what an impact our special gem to Pennsylvania is and that crown jewel would be the Pocono Raceway.

And so for today as a resolution recognizing this gem, we have in the back of the floor – we did have three of the guests – but right now we have Ben May, president of the raceway. If he would stand, we could recognize him in the back. Also with us today, but having to step out for a little bit, is Nick Idalsky, this is the CEO (chief executive officer) of the racetrack, and Ricky Durst, the senior manager of marketing and communications. They both had to step out for a few minutes and will be back with us for the rest of the day. So if you do get an opportunity to speak with them, they would appreciate it.

And just to give you a couple quick facts about the raceway and what it means to Pennsylvania and especially the trickle-down effect of the impact. The raceway has contributed \$257 million to the income of the northeast region of Pennsylvania, creating 2700 jobs, generating \$23 million in local and State revenue just in 1 year alone. An estimated 215,000 racing fans attend the races at Pocono each and every year, and one of my colleagues is going to step up here and speak just for a little bit with respect to his experience, and please welcome Representative Fritz.

STATEMENT BY MR. FRITZ

The SPEAKER. Representative Fritz, on the resolution, HR 833.

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

More than happy to stand before you to recognize our friends from the Tricky Triangle. I am proud to mention that I have attended Pocono races for 19 consecutive years, and my wife, my wife prior to our courtship was not a fan. Well, I introduced

her to racing. I brought her to Pocono. Yeah, she is hooked. My experience underscores the fact that NASCAR (National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing) and racing at Pocono is a one-of-a-kind family outing. Honestly, the best fans in the world. And then, friends, then there is the experience: the roar of the massive horsepower engines; the smell, the smell, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing like it, the burnt rubber; the personalities; the speed; the competition. It is the real deal.

Catch the thrill. I will see you at Pocono.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Do any of the other members wish to speak? Okay. Thank you.

Representative Jack Rader, Representative Sid Kavulich, Representative Mike Carroll, all were joining Representative Maloney and Representative Fritz.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

HB 1659, PN 3351 (Amended)

By Rep. RAPP

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

HEALTH.

HB 1997, PN 3352 (Amended)

By Rep. RAPP

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

HEALTH.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. Also with respect to HR 680, we have another guest from the Hope United Methodist Church. Janet Harmen, please stand. We did not introduce her earlier, but she is up here with the pastor. Janet, thanks for being with us today. Thank you, dear.

Representative John Lawrence has in the well of the House these guest pages, and if they will stand as I call up their name: Daniel and Matthew Sisson. They attend Linville Hill Christian School. And to my left are their parents, Mike and Lisa, and their brother, Andrew. Please stand. Thank you for joining us today.

Representative Zimmerman and Representative Brett Miller have as guests today to my left, Gary and Jane Heckman. Please stand. They are with their granddaughter, Kaylee McCabe. Thanks so much for joining us here today. We are honored that you could be with us.

To the left of the rostrum, a guest of Representative Aaron Kaufer and a friend to many here on both sides of the aisle, Robert Tamburro. How are you, sir? Great to see you.

I believe this person is to my left; I am not sure. It is a guest of Representative Tina Davis. Oh, in the rear of the House. I am sorry. In the rear of the House, John Breslin. John is in the back

waving at us, and a graduate of St. Joseph's University. Great to have you here, John.

Right now Chairman Ron Marsico is here to introduce a State champion, and, sir, if I could have you move here to our clerk. If you could move, Chairman Marsico will be joining us here at the rostrum. Members, I am going to ask everybody to please take your seats. Members, please take your seats. If you have a conversation, please take it off the House floor. We are going to close the doors of the House. We have a State champion with us. So I am just going to put everything on hold here just for a second while all the members please take their seats.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

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

All members, please take your seats. The Sergeants at Arms are going to close the doors of the House until we are all seated. Please take your seats. We have a State champ with us this afternoon. All members, please take your seats.

JOSIAH LAUVER PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. And, Chairman Marsico, you may proceed, sir.

Mr. MARSICO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Members of the House, thank you.

I would like to welcome Josiah Lauver to the House chamber. He is joining us today so that we may honor him for capturing the first place in the Class AA boys 100-yard backstroke event and also the 200-yard freestyle event during the 2017-18 State swimming and diving championships.

Josiah is a junior at Bishop McDevitt High School and is the first State swimming champion in school history. How about a big congratulations and applause for Josiah Lauver. That Bishop McDevitt is in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, not the one in Philadelphia, just so you all know that. Because of his achievements also during the State championships, Josiah was named as the PIAA Class Swimmer of the Meet. So he was also recognized as the outstanding swimmer of the entire meet.

With us today are: Josiah; head coach, Kurt Sprows; assistant coach and his father, Doug Lauver; and athletic director, Tommy Mealy. Please help us once again to recognize Josiah, his family, his coaches, and his athletic director and his teammates and school, Bishop McDevitt.

Thank you very much, members, and Josiah says he will be back here next year as well.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and congratulations, Josiah. All the best to you.

The Sergeants at Arms will open the doors of the House. I do have two members without guests on resolutions. I think there are two. Oh, Representative Toohil will actually be speaking tomorrow on her resolution. So I just have Representative Murt on the Jackie Robinson Day, HR 714.

STATEMENT BY MR. MURT

The SPEAKER. Representative Murt, you may proceed.

Mr. MURT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague, Representative Vanessa Brown, to please join me down here in the well.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we celebrated the 71st anniversary of the integration of Major League Baseball. There was a ceremony in West Philadelphia in Representative Brown's district at the intersection of Parkside and Belmont Avenue in Fairmount Park, which was the original location of Philadelphia's team in what is called the old Negro Leagues. And I would like to make some remarks relative to HR 714.

Mr. Speaker, 71 years ago this month Major League Baseball took a historic stand against inequality when Brooklyn Dodgers President Branch Rickey approached a young athlete from Cairo, Georgia, about joining the team. He was no ordinary player. At UCLA (University of California, Los Angeles) this young man became the first athlete to win varsity letters in four sports in the same school year: baseball, basketball, football, and track. In 1941 he was named to the All-American football team, but this would not be the last time that Jackie Robinson would make history.

The major leagues had never had a Black player. When Jackie Robinson first donned a Brooklyn Dodger uniform, he pioneered the integration of professional athletics in America. By shattering segregation in baseball, the nation's preeminent sport, the national pastime, he courageously challenged the deeply rooted custom of racial segregation in both the North and the South. The major leagues and their affiliated minor leagues were racially segregated for more than half a century, from 1889 until Jackie Robinson broke the color line, first in the minor leagues in 1946 and then in the majors in 1947 in his Dodgers debut. In pioneering the integration of baseball, Jackie Robinson became the target of institutionalized racism and of white individuals who supported and benefited from its segregated culture. This is 82 years after the end of the Civil War, Mr. Speaker. In accepting this challenge, Jackie Robinson accepted a request by Dodgers President and General Manager Branch Rickey to not respond to the racist taunts of opponents and fans. What many people do not know is that Robinson was frequently targeted by opposing white pitchers, and he actually led the league in being hit by a pitch in 1947, his rookie year.

By the season's end, Mr. Speaker, Jackie Robinson had become a hero to millions of Americans from all racial and ethnic backgrounds who saw a strength of character in his response to this trial by fire, by refusing to allow himself to be humiliated through bigotry, racism, prejudice, and discrimination. To our nation Jackie Robinson represented the fulfillment of the American dream. He showed that anyone could succeed if given the opportunity when he led the Dodgers to the National League pennant and a World Series appearance in his rookie year. Robinson's victory also opened the door of opportunity for all Latino players. While the major leagues allowed lighter skinned Hispanic players to join teams, those with darker skin were exiled to the so-called Negro Leagues. Jackie Robinson is a monument to freedom and achievement.

Mr. Speaker, Jackie Robinson's contributions to our country were not limited to professional sports. He was an officer in the United States Army during World War II and was a successful

corporate executive after his retirement from professional baseball. He also introduced civil rights as a political issue and challenged candidates for elected office to state their position on civil rights and related issues. Jackie Robinson also had a son who served in Vietnam and was decorated for his service and combat.

I want to thank my colleagues for their support of this resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir. The macebearer and I were just discussing – we both watch some major league baseball games – and both of us were there, like, oh, I did not know he was 42, and then I was there, like, of course it is for Jackie Robinson, everybody is wearing 42. So I just wanted to say, obviously a great hero in this country and just a class gentleman, not only breaking the barrier in Major League Baseball but the manner in which he did it. And I am sure – I have seen the movie and I have read a book – I am sure it was not easy. Believe me, I understand completely how difficult – not really because I could never fill his shoes in terms of his background and being raised in a segregated society and breaking that barrier. I could never fill his shoes or certainly the talent that he had, none of us could, but just the strength of character that he must have had and, you know, changed the United States on so many fronts. When people get to interact with people of all different colors, faiths, backgrounds, cultures, you begin to see the world as other people have to live it as well.

Thank you so much to Representative Murt and Representative Brown in honoring Number 42.

STATEMENT BY MR. PETRARCA

The SPEAKER. Representative Joe Petrarca would like to speak under unanimous consent. I believe that Representative Petrarca is going to introduce the guests. If not, I can. I do not want to take that away from him. So, Representative Petrarca, you are recognized on unanimous consent.

Mr. PETRARCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have taken tremendous strides in Pennsylvania in the last year to protect animals. In that vein, I would like to introduce recipients of this year's Humane Society of the United States Humane Law Enforcement Awards. Joining us today from the Humane Society Team of the Year: Humane Society Police Officer Jennifer Nields and Site Manager Rachel Golub, sister of Democratic executive director of the Judiciary Committee, Sarah Speed, from the Pennsylvania SPCA (Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals) Lancaster Center; and Humane Officer of the Year, Humane Society Police Officer Ron Hollister. And also with us for his work as district attorney in Lancaster County is the Humane Law Enforcement Official of the Year, Craig Stedman. I would like to also recognize the achievements of Kristen Tullo and Heidi Prescott and all of the attendees at the 11th Annual Humane Society Day in Pennsylvania, many of whom are in the gallery.

These officers are charged with protecting Pennsylvania's animals and the people who love them. Since this body passed the comprehensive animal cruelty law last year known as Libre's Law, these people have led the way in training their fellow officers in implementing this new law to make Pennsylvania a better place for all of our animal friends. Please

join me in recognizing their efforts and congratulating them on their achievements, and they are behind the rail at the back of the House.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Petrarca. Representative Petrarca, if our guests could join us up here at the rostrum, we would like you to come up for photos. All you have to do is just come down the side, right over here, and Representative Petrarca will join us as well. To our guests who are the award winners from the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, if you could just come up here, we will be glad to get a photo. Representative Petrarca, who had asked us to do the photo, we are honored.

Representative Brett Miller and Representative Bryan Barbin have a very special guest for us today, and this good individual has traveled some distance to be with us. So I am going to ask everybody to please take their seats. We are going to do this photo very quickly, Brett and Bryan, Representatives; we will do this so that you get full attention and then I will make sure the doors are closed. Okay. Please come on up.

Members, I would ask that you please take your seats at this time. If you have to have a conversation, I am going to ask you to please go off the House floor. Sergeants at Arms, if you could ask the members, actually, to please be seated, and if they need to carry on the conversation off the floor, just ask them to go to the anteroom. We have a guest that has traveled an entire ocean to be with us today, and he will be viewing our democracy in action. Many of us get to view his democracy in action, if you watch C-SPAN, but I would ask everybody to please take your seats at this time.

Thank you. If all members could please take their seats and the Sergeants at Arms please close the doors of the House at this time. I think they are going to take a photo here in the back and then we will begin. Go ahead; if you want to just get the photo in, that would be great. Thank you. Everybody, please take your seats. Our guests can exit to my right in the back, the guests can exit to my right in the back.

STATEMENT BY MR. MILLER

The SPEAKER. Representative Brett Miller, the floor is yours.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am joined by my colleague, Representative Bryan Barbin, in welcoming three special guests to the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. Both Representative Barbin and I are privileged to serve as the House Prayer Caucus leaders of our respective caucuses and it is in this capacity that we introduce our four guests.

First, with us today are Dr. Jim and Abby Abildness, who live in Middletown. Will you please stand.

Jim is a dentist who serves as codirector along with his wife, Abby, of Healing Tree International. Abby also serves as the State Director of the Pennsylvania Legislative Prayer Caucus Network. Many here know Abby for giving the Penn's Sacred Challenge Tour of our beautiful and historic State Capitol, during which she points out the rich spiritual heritage of our State which is so beautifully inscribed on the walls and paintings and incorporated in our founding documents. Abby travels extensively in her role as codirector of Healing Tree

International, and our next guests are here as a result of Abby's travels to Great Britain where she met both Dr. Tranter and Lord Wei. Abby and Jim, thank you for your work in keeping us connected to our spiritual roots and always advocating for our spiritual well-being.

Next we have Dr. Sheena Tranter, who hails from Great Britain where she has been employed as an abdominal laparoscopic specialist surgeon at the Bristol Royal Infirmary since 2003. She was Deputy Dean at the Medical School Academy there for 6 years. Dr. Tranter travels internationally and meets with government leaders and as well speaks to various groups in order to seek solutions to the major issues and challenges facing society. Dr. Tranter is deeply interested in bringing healing to the physical and spiritual needs of individuals, communities, and countries, and she is here to learn of Pennsylvania's rich spiritual heritage. Dr. Tranter, thank you for being here with us today.

And lastly, we have the Right Honorable, the Lord Nathaniel Wei. Lord Nat Wei, as he is known, is a member of the House of Lords in Great Britain. He is the first British-born person of Chinese origin to have become a member of the House of Lords.

Lord Nat Wei has an extensive background in business, social enterprise, venture capital, trade, and investment, and has pursued a career in public policy to benefit the people of his country by using his knowledge and background to bring about positive social reform. His trip here is a reflection of his desire to continue to expand his knowledge and ability to serve his people by pursuing the historical and spiritual connection between our two countries and, in particular, to our Keystone State, Pennsylvania. And this is fitting because this is the place where William Penn, having emigrated from the United Kingdom, established the "Holy Experiment," which was the "Seed of a Nation" that became the United States of America, an "example" and "a precedent" to all the nations, to quote some of the words of the vision of William Penn that are emblazoned in our rotunda.

Throughout his visit, whether to see a number of the important historical sites in Pennsylvania, among which were a visit to see the Quaker Meeting House in Philadelphia, the Liberty Bell, Independence Hall, Pennsbury Manor, and of course our beautiful Capitol here in Harrisburg, he has been able to see the blessings that have come upon our land because of the faith and deeds of William Penn and so many who have followed him. We hope and pray that your trip has been deeply meaningful and impactful.

Lord Wei was just introduced to and recognized by the Senate and it is now our privilege to do the same. Lord Wei, the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, on behalf of the 12.8 million people of Pennsylvania, extends a warm Pennsylvania welcome to you. We are grateful for your interest in our State and the principles of religious liberty which serve as the core of our Commonwealth. May the friendship between Great Britain and our great State be ever strengthened, and may the seed that was birthed in your country, which then became Pennsylvania and then the United States, may that seed of religious liberty and the covenants which were made at the founding be renewed, strengthened, expanded, and multiplied between Great Britain and Pennsylvania, and may you be blessed as you work toward this end in your country.

I ask my colleagues to give a round of applause as we welcome Dr. Jim and Abby Abildness, Dr. Sheena Tranter, and the Right Honorable Lord Nathaniel Wei to the Pennsylvania House of Representatives.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Lord Wei, I was thinking you were with the House of Commons as I read this, not the House of Lords. So I am not sure that that is on C-SPAN or that you have the raucous debates that the Commons has, but we are so glad that you would be with us here today. We are very, very honored by your presence, and thank you for continuing to work towards making the relations between the United Kingdom, the United States, and in particular, our Commonwealth always on such a positive note. Thank you so much for being with us.

At this time I do not believe anybody else wishes to be recognized other than we will have some committee meetings.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. We will begin with Chairman Saylor of the Appropriations Committee for a committee announcement.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We will have an immediate meeting of the Appropriations Committee in the majority caucus room.

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

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

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

Mrs. TOEPEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Republicans will caucus at 2 o' clock. We would be prepared to return to the floor at 2:45.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Madam Chair.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

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

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Democrats will caucus at 2 o'clock. Democrats will caucus at 2 o' clock.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. At this time, members, the House will stand in recess until 2:45 p.m. At 2:45 p.m. we will return to the floor. Thank you.

AFTER RECESS

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

BILLS REREPORTE FROM COMMITTEE

HB 25, PN 188

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act providing for school-to-work pilot programs; establishing the CareerBound Program; providing for a tax credit; and imposing powers and duties on the Department of Labor and Industry.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 163, PN 3327

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Titles 4 (Amusements), 18 (Crimes and Offenses), 23 (Domestic Relations) and 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for suspension of operating privileges of licensed drivers.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 564, PN 3298

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 high schools, providing for assessment of civic knowledge.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 645, PN 1695

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, in neighborhood assistance tax credit, further providing for tax credit and for grant of tax credit and providing for reporting.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1228, PN 3299

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 school health services, providing for sun protection of students, including the application of nonprescription sunscreen.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1240, PN 3329

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in certificate of title and security interests, further providing for content and effect of certificate of title and for theft vehicles; and making an editorial change.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2030, PN 3009

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 8 (Boroughs and Incorporated Towns) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in manufacture and supply of electricity, further providing for specific powers and providing for security deposits, for payment agreements and for restrictions on termination; and making an editorial change.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2050, PN 3034

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in abortion, further providing for definitions and for medical consultation and judgment.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2138, PN 3328

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Human Services Code, in public assistance, providing for work requirements.

APPROPRIATIONS.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. All members, please come to the House floor. Members, please come to the House floor. All members, please come to the House floor. We have some guests who have traveled some distance to be with us. I would like to introduce them. I brought them up to the floor, but I would ask everybody to please take your seats. All members, please come in and take your seats. Please come to the House floor. Please come onto the House floor.

I was blessed to have a meeting today with some good friends and I said, "Well, you have got to come up to the House floor and say hello to everybody." And the City of Philadelphia Council President, the esteemed Darrell Clarke. Darrell, thank you so much for visiting the House of Representatives today. And if you have not had an opportunity to meet with the council president, please avail yourself of that opportunity.

And then as with all members who come back, we are so glad to welcome back all of our past members, including one of my close friends, Representative and now City Council Member Cherelle Parker. Cherelle, great to see you, dear. We are so glad to have you here. Very, very, honored to have both Council President Clark and Council Member Cherelle Parker.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 564, PN 3298**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in high schools, providing for assessment of civic knowledge.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

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

CONSIDERATION OF HB 564 CONTINUED

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 Mike Carroll and Representative Karen Boback. Representative Carroll wishes to be recognized. You may proceed. Representative Boback, you may want to come up with staff.

Go ahead, Mike, or Representative Carroll. I apologize, sir.

Mr. CARROLL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the efforts of the gentlelady from Luzerne, but, Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that all of us in this chamber have some ideas on how we can cure the ills of our public schools in our 500 school districts, and for me, nowhere on that list is more testing, and for me, nowhere on that list is more reporting by school districts to the Department of Education.

So, Mr. Speaker, I find it a little bit odd that at this moment in time we are going to advance a bill that requires even more testing at a time when we should be dialing testing back and more reporting to the Department of Education when we should be reporting less.

So, Mr. Speaker, although I do appreciate the idea and the thoughts behind the legislation by the gentlelady, the school districts that I represent have no interest in more testing and they have no interest in more reporting and I hope that you can join me in putting the brakes on this idea so that we can get past more testing and more reporting.

The SPEAKER. Representative Karen Boback, on HB 564, PN 3298.

Ms. BOBACK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is such a very important piece of legislation. This is something that my colleague, Representative Kortz, and I have worked on for over 5 years. We talk about testing. This is not a test. This is an expectation that our students should know about civics and being a part of democracy. It could be a part of the testing system, the existing curriculum in any school system in Pennsylvania. It did pass unanimously out of the House Education Committee because it had been vetted for so many years. We got it to the point now where even PSEA (Pennsylvania State Education Association), our honored colleagues in that organization, support this bill.

Once again, you can call it what you want – a test, a mandate. I call it an expectation. We should expect our students to know basic civic standards. We expect people who come to our country who want to become citizens to pass the same type of a test to become a citizen of the United States of America, and yet we do not require our students to know the basics. I ask for your support of this very important bill.

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Bill Kortz, on the bill, please.

Mr. KORTZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Obviously I rise in strong support of this bill. Representative Boback and I have been working on this for many years, and as Karen said, it is an expectation. We want our students to know, for example, who George Washington was. We want them to know who the current President of the United States is. This is basic knowledge about our democracy, our representative republic, because at the end of the day I think we all agree we

want our students when they graduate to be able and to have the basic knowledge to become engaged citizens in this great country. So I would urge everybody's support.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does anybody else wish to be recognized on the bill?

Representative Chris Sainato, on the bill, sir.

Mr. SAINATO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to support this legislation. I know that both Representatives Boback and Kortz worked so hard. This bill was in my Committee on Veterans Affairs and Emergency Preparedness. We have had extensive – some hearings on this legislation, and it is basically saying that students should know civics. Not all schools throughout this Commonwealth are teaching civics today. I know in my district I have asked and most of my schools still do. It is not that hard, Mr. Speaker. We are not asking our students to do any more than just understand our government, to understand basic civics, to be good citizens. That is what we are talking about here today.

So I want to commend both of these fine legislators for this piece of legislation. When people come to our country, they pass an immigration test. Are we asking that much that our own citizens, our own citizens cannot pass a test understanding civics? I do not think this is unreasonable. I think this is fair. I think this is something that needs to be done. Support this legislation. It is time our students learn and understand civics. They are going to be much better citizens, and we will be a much better country for this. Thank you.

On the question recurring,

Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—191

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

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

NAYS—4

Carroll	Irvin	Schlossberg	Wheatley
---------	-------	-------------	----------

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Dean	Gabler	Rozzi	Vitali
Fabrizio			

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 1228, PN 3299**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in school health services, providing for sun protection of students, including the application of nonprescription sunscreen.

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—195

Barbin	Emrick	Krueger	Rapp
Barrar	English	Kulik	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Evankovich	Lawrence	Readshaw
Bernstine	Evans	Lewis	Reed
Bizzarro	Everett	Longietti	Reese

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Dean	Gabler	Rozzi	Vitali
Fabrizio			

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 645, PN 1695**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, in neighborhood assistance tax credit, further providing for tax credit and for grant of tax credit and providing for reporting.

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—188

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

NAYS—7

Carroll	McGinnis	Rothman	
Keefer	Peifer	Schemel	Tobash

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED-5

Dean	Gabler	Rozzi	Vitali
Fabrizio			

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 25, PN 188**, entitled:

An Act providing for school-to-work pilot programs; establishing the CareerBound Program; providing for a tax credit; and imposing powers and duties on the Department of Labor and Industry.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-194

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

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

NAYS-1

McGinnis

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-5

Dean	Gabler	Rozzi	Vitali
Fabrizio			

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 2030, PN 3009**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 8 (Boroughs and Incorporated Towns) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in manufacture and supply of electricity, further providing for specific powers and providing for security deposits, for payment agreements and for restrictions on termination; and making an editorial change.

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?

I see Representative Harper, Representative Freeman; I know the maker of the bill wishes to speak. We will begin with Representative Harper followed by Representative Freeman.

Ms. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to point out to the members that the way this bill is drafted, boroughs who currently sell electricity and use that money to pay for police, fire, roads, and other essential services will not be allowed to do it.

The bill itself speaks in terms of only one borough in the entire Commonwealth, but many of us have boroughs in our counties who routinely use revenues from their electric sales to help pay for general fund expenses. If they are not allowed to use electric revenues to help pay general fund expenses like police, fire, roads, parks, recreation, if they are not allowed to use their electric revenues for this purpose, they will have to raise other taxes. Unfortunately, there are not too many taxes they are authorized to raise. Most likely, the property tax.

So in view of the fact that the bill is currently drafted in a way that would legitimize limiting electric revenues only to electric services and the result could be devastating to communities that depend on those revenues, I would ask for a "no" vote. If it is necessary to pass statewide standards regarding billing practices, we could certainly do that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

BILL PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. At this time we are going to go over the bill, briefly. It will come back onto the calendar. Representative Freeman, I will definitely call you at that time, but we are going to go over the bill right now. Thank you.

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 163**, PN 3327, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 4 (Amusements), 18 (Crimes and Offenses), 23 (Domestic Relations) and 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for suspension of operating privileges of licensed drivers.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—192

Barbin	Ellis	Kortz	Rapp
Barrar	Emrick	Krueger	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	English	Kulik	Readshaw
Bernstine	Evankovich	Lawrence	Reed
Bizzarro	Evans	Lewis	Reese
Bloom	Everett	Longietti	Roae
Boback	Farry	Mackenzie	Roe
Boyle	Fee	Madden	Roebuck
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Maher	Rothman
Briggs	Flynn	Mako	Ryan
Brown, R.	Frankel	Maloney	Saccone
Brown, V.	Freeman	Markosek	Sainato
Bullock	Fritz	Marshall	Samuelson
Burns	Gainey	Marsico	Sankey

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

NAYS—3

McGinnis Metcalfe Tallman

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Dean Gabler Rozzi Vitali
Fabrizio

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 1240**, PN 3329, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in certificate of title and security interests, further providing for content and effect of certificate of title and for theft vehicles; and making an editorial change.

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—195

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Dean
Fabrizio

Gabler Rozzi Vitali

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

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

CALENDAR

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1539, PN 3311**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in standby guardianship, further providing for definitions and for scope and providing for temporary guardianship; in child protective services, further providing for release of information in confidential reports; and making editorial changes.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

The SPEAKER. There is one amendment. The amendment is filed by Representative Tarah Toohil.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Ms. **TOOHIL** offered the following amendment No. **A06458**:

Amend Bill, page 15, line 8, by inserting after "GUARDIAN."

The petition, which shall require the notarized signature of the petitioner, shall be provided by the court in the following form:

Petition for Temporary Guardianship without Consent of Parent

I.....(Insert Name, Address and

Telephone Number of Family Member Petitioning for Temporary

Guardianship and Relationship to Minor), HEREBY DECLARE MY

INTENT TO BE APPOINTED TEMPORARY GUARDIAN

OF.....(Insert Name(s), Address(es) and

Telephone Number(s) of Minor(s) for whom the appointment of

temporary guardian is being sought) AS A RESULT OF

EMERGENCY MEDICAL INTERVENTION RESULTING FROM

ABUSE OF DRUGS OR ALCOHOL BY

(Insert Name, Address and Telephone Number), FATHER/MOTHER

TO.....(Insert Name(s) of Minor(s)),

ON.....(Insert approximate date of the event).

I HAVE NOTIFIED THE CHILD(REN)'S OTHER

PARENT.....(Insert Name, Address

and Telephone Number), OF MY INTENT TO PETITION THIS

COURT FOR TEMPORARY GUARDIANSHIP.

I UNDERSTAND THAT FILING THIS PETITION DOES NOT

REVOKE THE PARENTAL RIGHTS OF THE MINOR'S

PARENT(S) NOR DOES IT GRANT ME ANY PARENTAL

RIGHTS.

I UNDERSTAND THAT MY RIGHTS AND

RESPONSIBILITIES AS A TEMPORARY GUARDIAN TOWARD

THE MINOR CHILD(REN) NAMED ABOVE WILL BECOME

EFFECTIVE UPON THE COMPLETION OF A HEARING AND

RENDERING OF A DECISION BY THE COURT.

I UNDERSTAND THAT FILING FEES AND OTHER COSTS

ASSOCIATED WITH THESE PROCEEDINGS MAY BE WAIVED

IF I DEMONSTRATE THE FEES AND OTHER COSTS WOULD

CONSTITUTE A FINANCIAL BURDEN TO ME AND MY

FAMILY.

I HEREBY SWEAR OR AFFIRM THAT THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE.

.....
 (DATE) (SIGNATURE OF PETITIONER)

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Toohil, on the amendment.

Ms. TOOHL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is important language that will strengthen access to the courts for families in crisis. Families in crisis cannot always get consent from a parent for guardianship, temporary guardianship. This language will apply to drug or alcohol use that results in emergency medical intervention, and it should have a plain interpretation that that would include an overdose or the use of Narcan or hospitalization, calling EMTs (emergency medical technicians), or receiving medical treatment.

Right now families looking for temporary guardianship have to spend money to obtain a lawyer. Sometimes they spend up to \$4,000 for cases like this to go into a custody battle, and this form will provide a free and easy-to-read method for people to get in front of a judge and to get temporary help that their family deserves.

The SPEAKER. Representative Pashinski, on the amendment, and then Representative Barbin. Representative Pashinski.

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

I would like to thank the Representative for her good work. It has really helped the bill. I appreciate it very much. This is an agreed-to amendment and certainly well needed.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Barbin, on the amendment, sir.

Mr. BARBIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of the amendment as well. This will help us get through the opioid epidemic. In Johnstown last year we had two parents that were both addicted to heroin. Because no one stepped in, the child that was 3 years old died of malnutrition. So this allows for a family member to step in without serious legal expense and take care of children of parents who may be addicted.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Barbin.

Does anybody else wish to speak on the amendment?

Representative Rosita Youngblood, on the amendment.

Ms. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I might have a hard time speaking because I have acute sinusitis, plus laryngitis.

I worked on Kinship Care from 1994 to 2003, when it was passed. The issues that we are discussing today were all part of the bill. You can have easy access to the court system by applying for an emergency custody order. The emergency custody order will last for 60 days until you appear before the judge again. Kinship Care allows any relative to take responsibility, and it is unfortunate that our Children and Youth and departments did not want to enforce. They were supposed to allow anybody that came in or was given a child the opportunity to apply for Kinship foster care. It never, ever happened.

And now all of a sudden we are faced because of an alleged opioid addiction. This goes back to crack, and because it was the minority population on crack, they decided not to do anything and let it languish. Now, all of a sudden, we are being presented that heroin and opioids – look at the records. I can give you concrete proof that it was all over this country and our State, but we had blinders on and chose not to help that particular population. Nothing was ever done for the children that were born of crack, cocaine, and alcohol. I bet you could find them now. Because they did not get services, they are probably all sitting in our penal system.

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—195

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

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-5

Dean
Fabrizio

Gabler

Rozzi

Vitali

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

On the question,

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

The SPEAKER. I do not see any other amendments on this bill. If I am mistaken, please correct me.

On the question recurring,

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 2133, PN 3107**, entitled:

An Act establishing the Kinship Caregiver Navigator Program in the Department of Human Services; and providing for kinship caregiver navigator website and for kinship caregiver navigators.

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 504, PN 3297**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 17, 1921 (P.L.789, No.285), known as The Insurance Department Act of 1921, in insurance producers, further providing for definitions and providing for self-service storage insurance.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. For the time being, we are going to return to supplemental B House Calendar, third consideration. Representative Maher is going to be the Speaker pro tem. We call up HB 2050, PN 3034, and I will step off the rostrum at this time.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (JOHN MAHER) PRESIDING

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B CONTINUED

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2050, PN 3034**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in abortion, further providing for definitions and for medical consultation and judgment.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentlelady, Representative Ward.

Mrs. WARD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is unfathomable to me that we are debating this bill today. Most of my colleagues would say that they are supportive of those with disabilities. This is why I cannot wrap my brain around the objections to this bill.

Let me share with you some quotes that parents and grandparents had given me about their Down syndrome child or grandchild.

Alyssa, the mother of a 3-year-old Down syndrome daughter, says, "Trying to make a 'perfect' race through abortion has led to millions of hearts losing out on amazing children and the opportunity for love and personal growth. Our family believes wholeheartedly that God has gifted Raena to us."

"I'm sad for those who aborted due to a Down syndrome diagnosis. I recognize that it is intimidating and scary...because it feels foreign, but that doesn't mean the life is disposable; instead, we are presented with an opportunity to enhance our own life experiences by embracing it."

"Our Raena has made us a better family! Her positive attitude, determination, and unconditional love teaches us all to have a better outlook on life when faced with challenges. In my opinion, her quality of life far surpasses our own."

Jason, the father of a 5-year-old Down syndrome daughter, says, "McKenna has made us all better people, including our family, friends, and neighbors. She is such a joy and her heart is pure."

McKenna's grandparents told me, "She has taught us a level of love that is incomprehensible. It is unconditional love."

"Her love is different love than any other grandchild. It has brought our family so much closer together."

A life of a child born with Down syndrome today is a much different life than someone born with Down syndrome in 1964. There are early interventional programs and so many opportunities with far better outcomes. I do not know about all of you, but I think this world could use just a little bit more love. Please allow these beautiful children a chance to live. Please vote "yes" on HB 2050.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentlelady and on the question recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Representative Frankel.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition, and while I appreciate the comments of the gentlelady who just spoke—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentleman suspend.

This is an important conversation that is under way. I would ask members either to provide their attention or to take their conversations outside the chamber. If you were speaking too loud to hear that announcement, please suspend your conversation.

The gentleman, Mr. Frankel, may proceed.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you.

As I was saying, respectfully, listening to the gentlelady's opening remarks with respect to some stories from constituents and folks in our community, I would say that there are certainly many perspectives that ought to have been part of this discussion. But like all the other pieces of legislation that seek to restrict women's reproductive rights, this bill had no hearings, no opportunity for public input, no opportunity for stakeholders, for the women of Pennsylvania, for doctors, physicians, health-care providers, to weigh in. It is outrageous that we proceed this way routinely, time after time, to attack Pennsylvania's women and their reproductive rights without allowing them to come to the Capitol and voice their opinions in a committee hearing, in a due process that everybody thinks would be reasonable, particularly when you are trying to talk about changing access to health care.

CONSTITUTIONAL POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRANKEL. But, Mr. Speaker, I rise now to make a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is in order to make a motion.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you.

I make a motion that HB 2050 is unconstitutional pursuant to the 14th Amendment of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Frankel, raises a point of order that HB 2050, PN 3034, is unconstitutional. The Speaker, under rule 4, is required to submit questions affecting constitutionality of a bill to the House for decision, which the Chair now does.

On the question,

Will the House sustain the constitutionality of the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes, on that question, the gentleman, Mr. Frankel.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Simply put, the passage of HB 2050 would eviscerate 45 years of United States Supreme Court precedent and the protections granted under the due process clause of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution. Regardless of any one person's view of the issue, previability abortions are unequivocally and constitutionally protected, period.

Roe v. Wade held that a woman's decision whether or not to terminate her pregnancy is a component of the liberty protected under the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution.

The Supreme Court expanded upon this ruling in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* when it stated that prior to viability, women may choose whether to terminate or continue their pregnancy.

Yes, States do have the right to regulate abortion so long as those regulations do not impose an undue burden on the woman's right to choose. But we know that an abortion regulation is seen as unduly burdensome if its purpose or effect is to place a substantial obstacle in the path of a woman seeking an abortion of a nonviable fetus.

Let us be clear here, when we say "nonviable," we are saying that the fetus is not capable of surviving outside of the womb. A diagnosis of Down syndrome has nothing to do with viability. I want to be clear about that. Mr. Speaker, there has not been a single decision of the U.S. Supreme Court since *Roe* that has upheld a flat ban on previability abortions or the imposition of criminal liability on medical providers for performing them. Not one decision.

If HB 2050 becomes law, it is very likely that the abortion providers in Pennsylvania will obey it and that the personal decision to end a previability pregnancy will be taken from the hands of women and given solely to the State. This is a substantial obstacle. We know that courts in Indiana and Ohio have stopped the enactment of very similar bans based on the diagnosis of Down syndrome, and I believe that the courts will do the same here if 2050 becomes law.

The United States Supreme Court has had the opportunity to revisit and reverse the core holding of *Roe v. Wade* but has declined to do so. As a member of this chamber, I am compelled by my oath of office to uphold and defend the Constitutions of both this Commonwealth and of the United States. To me, there is no exception to this oath for abortion or any other right one may not personally value. The ability of a woman to obtain a previability abortion is, like all other constitutional rights, inviolate.

Mr. Speaker, it is critical to the legitimacy of the chamber and the legitimacy of the court's precedent that this bill be ruled unconstitutional. I urge the members of the House to vote that it is unconstitutional. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question of the constitutionality, the Chair recognizes the gentlelady, Representative Klunk.

Ms. KLUNK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The entire chain of United States Supreme Court cases with respect to abortion, has had one consistent and overriding opinion, and that is that the State has the power to restrict abortions after fetal viability. This holding was contained within *Roe v. Wade* in 1973 and upheld throughout the line of cases, including the challenge to our very own Abortion Control Act in 1992. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that: the State has the power to restrict abortions after fetal viability.

Further, the United States Supreme Court in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* reviewed the Pennsylvania Abortion Control Act, the same Abortion Control Act which in section 3204 has a prohibition on gender selection at all stages of pregnancy. The Court upheld the provisions as constitutional. To now attempt to overturn 25 years of settled case law simply because we are dealing with a different genetic gene is just nonsensical.

And Pennsylvania is not alone in its prohibition of the use of abortion to operate as a means to gender selection. Seven other States have standing statutes which allow prohibitions on abortion for public policy concerns with gender selection. One State in particular, Illinois, admittedly has part of their gender selection statutes enjoined. However, the Federal court interceded and segmented their statute to reflect pre- and post-viability standards supported in other cases.

To that end, now let us turn to the facts with respect to abortions on children with Down syndrome. Down syndrome is a genetic anomaly where a whole or a part of the 21st chromosome is found in triplicate. This genetic anomaly is typically found as part of a 20-week biophysical profile—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the lady suspend, please.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose is the gentleman, Representative Frankel, seeking recognition?

Mr. FRANKEL. Just that I think the lady is speaking on the bill and not on the issue of constitutionality.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I would disagree, but I would urge the lady to be mindful of that and make sure we are talking about the constitutionality and not the underlying bill. But as is similar to a circumstance we ran into last week, you have to discuss the attributes of the bill in order to deal with the constitutionality of the bill.

The lady may proceed.

Ms. KLUNK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So this chamber has discussed the detection of Down syndrome and many other fetal anomalies at length this session. Twenty weeks, the very stage most States in this country have in their statute, if they list a set week of gestation, as the delineation between viability and nonviability.

According to Guttmacher Institute's April 2018 overview of State laws, 19 States prohibit all abortions after 20 weeks – not just those where the unborn child has Down syndrome, but all abortions after 20 weeks. Here we are being even less restrictive.

Finally, as always, we must look to the balancing test which has been established by the Supreme Court through the entire chain of abortion cases. First stated in *Roe v. Wade*, a woman's ability to obtain an abortion is balanced against the State's two legitimate interests in regulating abortion. Those legitimate interests are protecting women's health, and two, protecting the potentiality of human life. Recent decisions have allowed the State to intercede when facilities do not meet basic health and safety standards, when the procedure used is barbaric, and when the underlying purpose for the abortion is so abhorrent that it is just against public policy. The present push for the termination of children with Down syndrome is nothing short of eugenics, a cleansing of the genetic pool in order to eliminate those who are

not wanted in our population. Iceland has been very proud of this fact, and the United States is not far behind with statistics showing that anywhere from 85 to 92 percent of children diagnosed with Down syndrome prenatally are terminated.

Pennsylvania has a compelling, a very compelling State interest to prevent eugenics in this Commonwealth. This bill is narrowly tailored to address only the compelling State interest. So for these reasons, Mr. Speaker – the constitutionality of statutes to prohibit gender selection; the constitutionality of bans on abortion after viability which are what is addressed here; and the application of the balancing test where the State's legitimate interest in preventing selective eugenics all make it very, very clear that this bill is indeed constitutional, and I ask my colleagues to vote accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady and, on the question of constitutionality, recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Representative Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentleman's motion to declare this bill unconstitutional. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to cause a paralysis of analysis, because we can stand here today and offer lengthy analysis of why this is constitutional. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it is extremely important for us to keep in mind that this bill would interfere with a woman's fundamental right to choose. A fundamental right to choose. A fundamental right to choose.

The law is clear on the period in which a woman is able to make a decision about whether or not she wants to go through the pregnancy or call for some other medical care. But, Mr. Speaker, if we vote "yes" and why this bill is unconstitutional, because if we vote on this bill, then we will, in effect, disrupt that timetable that the court has made very clear, along with interfering with the woman's right to choose.

So I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand firm, stand tall, and stand ready to support the gentleman's motion to declare this unconstitutional and move on forward.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and, on the question of constitutionality, recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Representative DeLissio.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this topic could not be of more import to myself personally as well as to the constituents that I represent in the 194th. I stand today in support of the Representative's motion for unconstitutionality. The State cannot be the arbiter of whether a woman's reasons for seeking previability abortion are worthy or justified. The reasons why a woman may seek a previability abortion involve intimate views with infinite variations. So this bill not only would dictate that a postviability ban would be in place, but it would indeed – it would indeed dictate that a previability decision would also be in place and that woman would have to carry a pregnancy to term.

In the States that have passed any number of bans that we have heard mentioned, some of those bans have been overturned, other bans are experiencing a stay. So with that, I will be voting in favor of this motion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady and sees no other members seeking recognition.

Representative Frankel, for what purpose are you seeking recognition? On the question? I am sorry, but the rules clearly provide members may only speak once on a question of constitutionality.

Those voting "aye" will vote to declare the bill to be constitutional; those voting "nay" will vote to declare the bill to be unconstitutional.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—135

Barbin	Gillen	Mako	Reed
Barrar	Gillespie	Maloney	Reese
Benninghoff	Godshall	Markosek	Roaе
Bernstine	Goodman	Marshall	Roe
Bloom	Greiner	Marsico	Rothman
Boback	Grove	Masser	Ryan
Brown, R.	Haggerty	Matzie	Saccone
Burns	Hahn	McGinnis	Sainato
Caltagirone	Hanna	Mehaffie	Samuelson
Causer	Harper	Mentzer	Sankey
Charlton	Harris, A.	Metcalfe	Santora
Christiana	Heffley	Metzgar	Saylor
Cook	Helm	Miccarelli	Schemel
Corbin	Hennessey	Millard	Simmons
Corr	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Snyder
Cox	Hill	Milne	Sonney
Culver	Irvin	Moul	Staats
Cutler	James	Murt	Tallman
Day	Jozwiak	Mustio	Taylor
Delozier	Kampf	Nelson	Tobash
DeLuca	Kaufer	Nesbit	Toepel
Diamond	Kauffman	O'Neill	Toohil
DiGirolamo	Kavulich	Oberlander	Topper
Dowling	Keeler	Ortitay	Walsh
Dunbar	Keller, F.	Peifer	Ward
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Warner
Ellis	Klunk	Pickett	Watson
Emrick	Knowles	Pyle	Wentling
English	Kulik	Quigley	Wheeland
Evankovich	Lawrence	Quinn, C.	White
Everett	Lewis	Quinn, M.	Zimmerman
Farry	Longietti	Rader	Turzai,
Fee	Mackenzie	Rapp	Speaker
Fritz	Maher	Readshaw	

NAYS—60

Bizzarro	Davis, A.	Harris, J.	Pashinski
Boyle	Davis, T.	Keller, W.	Rabb
Bradford	Dawkins	Kim	Ravenstahl
Briggs	Deasy	Kinsey	Roebuck
Brown, V.	DeLissio	Kirkland	Schlossberg
Bullock	Dermody	Kortz	Schweyer
Carroll	Donatucci	Krueger	Sims
Cephas	Driscoll	Madden	Solomon
Comitta	Evans	McCarter	Stephens
Conklin	Fitzgerald	McClinton	Sturla
Costa, D.	Flynn	McNeill	Thomas
Costa, P.	Frankel	Miller, D.	Vazquez
Cruz	Freeman	Mullery	Warren
Daley	Gainey	Neilson	Wheatley
Davidson	Harkins	O'Brien	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Dean	Gabler	Rozzi	Vitali
Fabrizio			

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

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman, Representative Frankel, wish to continue his remarks?

Mr. FRANKEL. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the bill, you are in order.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to your bill, HB 2050. This legislation is another blatantly unconstitutional legislative power grab with one goal: to infringe upon the protected rights of women in the Commonwealth to make their own health-care decisions. We find ourselves in a very familiar scenario today. Year after year, session after session, we find ourselves faced with new ways for the legislature to play doctor and to intrude into the deeply personal and confidential relationship between women and their health-care providers.

I offered an amendment last week that would have at least ensured that doctors would not be required to practice bad medicine if 2050 passes. I wanted to protect the trust between a provider and a patient. I want to protect both so the doctor is not forced to practice in a way that contradicts the expertise of the medical field. Unfortunately, that amendment did not pass. What that leaves us with is this bill, one that should give pause to all physicians and health-care providers as well as their patients. If this bill becomes law, we must assume providers are supposed to find out and then judge a patient's motivations for terminating a pregnancy. Providers will be put in the position of trying to figure out whether or not they will be criminally charged for doing something their patient is requesting.

I spoke to a neonatologist today, one that we should have heard from if we had had hearings, by the way. He described the pain of sitting with families in the neonatal intensive care unit, discussing the prognosis and potential for survival of a newborn. He told me this, "Every case is individual." A fetus may have the potential for Down syndrome and corresponding severe congenital heart disease, or not. Diagnosis may correspond with other severe life-limiting illnesses. Which health-care provider is going to risk making the decision and becoming a criminal? As I said last week, doctors should not be forced to become inquisitors. But we are left with a bill that does just that, one I hope the Governor will be quick to veto.

I will try to keep this brief, Mr. Speaker. HB 2050, at its essence, is unconstitutional, it is unpopular, and it is untenable. Legislation similar to this has passed in other States and already courts in two of those States have blocked implementation of the bill. Indiana and Ohio have both been prohibited from enacting their version of HB 2050 because two separate Federal courts intervened to say that this legislation clearly violates the ruling of *Roe v. Wade*.

Mr. Speaker, whether one likes it or not, we cannot ban abortion previability, period. This legislation is unconstitutional and the courts here in Pennsylvania will inevitably agree. HB 2050 is also unpopular. The PA Department of Health opposes. The PA Chapter of American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists opposes. The PA Chapter of the American College of Nurse-Midwives opposes. Planned Parenthood, the Women's Law Project, the ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union) all oppose. We have a letter signed by more than 80 physicians, nurses, and other health-care providers from across the State who strongly oppose. And advocates for people with disabilities do not want this done in their name. We do not have any organized disability advocacy groups supporting this. While we do not have a single – exactly, not one. What we have heard throughout this conversation from advocates, families, and community members is that people with disabilities want respect and the services that make it possible to live full, rich lives. Nobody is fooled that HB 2050 accomplishes that.

Finally, as I have noted, Mr. Speaker, this bill is untenable. Under the provisions of HB 2050, penalties could be levied against the health-care provider and even possibly the woman who chooses to terminate her pregnancy. However, given the confidential nature of the relationship between a patient and provider, how would the reasons for the abortion ever even be known? Lie detector tests are not included in most examination rooms. How are patients supposed to trust their providers at all, knowing the provider is also an informer, monitoring their concerns and their decisionmaking? Will doctors be forced to betray their patients if charges are filed against the physician under this bill? Mr. Speaker, how in the world do supporters of this bill think this is an enforceable law?

I wish I could say it was all a bad dream or that I do not understand what we are doing here, but I get it, and the women of Pennsylvania get it too. We have a State House that is more concerned with pretending to be medical experts than they are with addressing the very real problems facing women in the Commonwealth today. We are not here debating equal pay for equal work; we are not here debating paid leave for working families; we are not even here debating the most basic accommodations for pregnant or nursing women who are in the workplace—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. You are correct. We are not discussing any of those subjects. Would you please return to the bill.

Mr. FRANKEL. Instead, Mr. Speaker, we are here in an election year trying to appeal to some people's misguided belief that women are not capable of or smart enough to make their own health-care decisions—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Frankel—

Mr. FRANKEL. That is on topic, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It goes—

Mr. FRANKEL. That is on topic, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Frankel, I am not debating you. I am alerting you that you are speaking as to the motives of the members, which is clearly out of order. So please be mindful.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am nearly concluded.

Women, under this legislation, are no longer entitled to confidential, trusted exchanges with their own health-care providers, and that women are less under this bill. This is

wrong. Please vote "no" on HB 2050.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and, on the question of final passage of the bill, recognizes the lady from Warren County, Representative Rapp.

Ms. RAPP. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As a cosponsor of 2050, I find it absolutely tragic to review statistics such as many as 9 out of 10 children, unborn children diagnosed in utero with Down syndrome are aborted in the United States. It is especially troubling that there are so many among us who speak so casually about advising, almost forcing women to have abortions if they are told they are carrying a child with a disability. In Iceland, abortion supporters callously brag about eliminating children with Down syndrome, and mothers from around the world are being directly pressured or advised to make this decision by genetic counselors and the culture.

Final passage of HB 2050 would bring an end to the implementation of this genocidal philosophy in Pennsylvania, which is unconscionably being advanced by Planned Parenthood, the world's largest abortion provider. Under current Pennsylvania law, a woman can obtain an abortion prior to 24 weeks gestational age for any reason, except if the woman's sole reason is to select the sex of the child. Any reason. Any reason. And 30,000 abortions last year speak to that any reason. That was 30,000 here in Pennsylvania; to date, 60 million since 1973, since *Roe v. Wade*. Half, by the way, would be little girls having been aborted from those 60 million. We can easily say that 30 million would have been grown women, some of them, today.

HB 2050 would expand that exception to prohibit aborting a child due solely to a prenatal diagnosis that the unborn child has Down syndrome. The legislation contains no restrictions on a mother obtaining an abortion in cases of rape, incest, or personal endangerment. Other States, including North Dakota, Ohio, Indiana, and Louisiana, have already taken steps to protect these children by passing similar laws prohibiting abortions because of a Down syndrome diagnosis.

Ironically, on almost any given session day, like today, State lawmakers recognize entire groups of people with disabilities, as we legitimately should. In doing so, we must always keep in mind that recent medical, scientific, and technology advances are constantly changing what it means to live with Down syndrome and other disabilities for the better. What should never be denied is the fact that people with Down syndrome and other disabilities have contributed much to our society, and they will continue to do so when we finally recognize that each of their precious lives is worth living. There is simply no justifiable or convenient excuse for aborting an unborn child simply because they are diagnosed with Down syndrome. Their lives are worth living. Please vote for life. Please vote for HB 2050.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentlelady from Montgomery County, Representative Daley.

Ms. DALEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On Friday afternoon I received a letter of opposition to HB 2050 and I would like to share that letter with you, because it represents, I believe, the Catholic Church that I grew up in and the Catholic training that I received, and I think it makes some very important points.

"On behalf of Catholics for Choice, I strongly urge you to oppose HB 2050 and its restrictions on women's access to safe, legal abortion. Catholics for Choice serves as the voice of the majority of the 70 million Catholics in the United States – nearly two million of whom call Pennsylvania home – who support access to comprehensive reproductive healthcare. Throughout the world, we strive to be an expression of Catholicism as it is lived by ordinary people and to advance sound public policy, rooted in true religious liberty.

"Catholic teaching regards conscience as the final moral arbiter. It is both a gift and a responsibility that in all matters of decision-making, we are called upon to follow our consciences and to respect the rights of others to do the same. It is not our place to supplant the choices of our neighbor with our own, regardless of whether we would come to the same conclusion ourselves, but to support and care for her whatever decision she makes.

"The proposal before you today seeks to do just that. Bans on abortion for a particular reason – due to fetal diagnosis of Down Syndrome, as in HB 2050, or any other proposed restriction – only serve to shame, judge and punish women for their deeply personal decisions. Women are moral agents, and they alone know their unique circumstances. When a woman is hindered from pursuing the healthcare that is right for her, the consequences on her life and her family can be far-reaching. It is not the role of our lawmakers to assign value to her choices, but instead to grant each woman the dignity and respect to follow her conscience when deciding whether and when to become a parent.

"Catholics support policies that enable people to make decisions about their future and the future of their families. This legislation will unjustly hinder the consciences of women who seek reproductive health services while doing nothing" – nothing – "to actually improve the lives of Pennsylvania residents living with disabilities. Instead, it would negatively affect women with few resources to access safe care elsewhere, such as those with lower income and those living in rural areas.

"Our faith calls upon us to advocate for policies that empower the most marginalized in our communities. We stand with women in difficult situations, and therefore must oppose policies, such as reason-specific abortion bans, that will disproportionately and unjustly compound the difficulties of families in our communities that are already struggling to make ends meet.

"Finally, freedom of belief is a core principle of our American democracy. Religious freedom is an expansive rather than restrictive idea, encompassing both the freedom of and freedom from religion. It is not about telling people what they can and cannot believe or practice, but rather about respecting each person's right to live according to their own values and precepts. True religious freedom requires us to respect all people's reproductive health decisions, Catholic and non-Catholic alike, based on their religious beliefs and moral convictions.

"Legislation such as HB 2050 that would limit access to abortion care has the practical effect of imposing one particular religious belief on all people, which does not reflect the religious freedom protections that are guaranteed to every individual by the Constitution. The proper role of government in the United States is not to privilege one set of religious views over others, but to protect each person's right and ability to make decisions according to their own beliefs and values.

"Again, I urge you to oppose extreme proposals, like HB 2050, and any similar reason-specific bans on abortion. Such legislation blocks a woman's access to safe healthcare options and unjustly denies her the freedom to make decisions according to her own beliefs and conscience. Instead, we ask that you support policies that show compassion for women and families, no matter their circumstances, and respect for every individual's moral decision-making.

"Sincerely, Jon O'Brien, President," Catholics for Choice.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentlelady from Delaware County, Representative Krueger-Braneky.

Ms. KRUEGER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, rise to oppose this bill.

Last week on the House floor we attempted to amend the bill to provide real support for families who have a child with Down syndrome. First, we attempted to delay the implementation until the Department of Human Services implements a Medicaid home and community-based services waiver, to serve all eligible individuals with Down syndrome. As of the end of last year, Pennsylvania had 13,614 people with intellectual disabilities on the waiting list, and they are still waiting. We attempted to amend the bill until there is additional funding for foster care and orphanages for children with Down syndrome. We attempted to amend the bill to provide more early intervention services for children with Down syndrome. We attempted to amend it to provide prenatal and postnatal care for women carrying individuals with Down syndrome. We attempted to amend it to provide paid sick leave for family members caring for someone with Down syndrome. We attempted to amend it until paid maternity leave is provided for women carrying individuals with Down syndrome. But every single one of those amendments was either voted down on this House floor or ruled out of order or threatened to be ruled out of order. This proves that this bill is not about protecting people with intellectual disabilities or special needs or Down syndrome. If it was, all of those amendments would have passed to ensure that families with special needs kids have the resources they need.

This bill is just another unconstitutional abortion ban from the same legislators who attempt to roll back the right to a safe, legal abortion every single chance they get. I support advancing good legislation to support people with special needs and their families. Let us get people off the waiting list. But this bill is not the way to do it. I ask my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question of final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Representative Gainey.

Mr. GAINY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to oppose HB 2050, and again, I see we are here trying to do what we should not be doing and that is regulating the body of a woman. I believe, as I have always said in the past, that we need to leave it to the doctor, her faith, and her family and close friends to decide situations like this. If you have a child and you know that that child has been diagnosed with a condition such as Down syndrome, I do not think we, as a body, play a role in trying to tell somebody what they should do to make a decision. I am saying, when we think about it from the emotional, the physical, the mental, who are we to regulate that? We know how sensitive of an issue this is. I mean, we know, we

have been here before, and we know that those decisions need to be made by those that know how to make the right choice for their family. But we should not be legislating something that takes away somebody's advantage to have a choice about what is right for their family. What we should be doing is making sure that we are providing safe health care to everybody, and we are not doing that. We want to continue to take away people's rights to choose what is best for their families, and I do not know one disability group yet that has come out in favor of this. Not one. That should tell you something.

If we really want to do something for the disabled community, let us make sure we deal with the waiting list. Let us make sure we do the things that we know help people and not try to regulate what people can do, as if we know what is in the best interest of their family. We do not. We do not. And so I stand today to oppose HB 2050, and I am asking my colleagues to do the same. If we want to make legislation that helps people, as we have been elected to do, then let us make sure that we are working with the disability community to do things that help make people with Down syndrome make their lives better. But let us not continue to tell women what they should do with their lives. Believe me, it is their body, it is their family, it is their preacher, it is their God that can give them the best direction.

So I hope that we can put this to rest, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to introduce and pass legislation that empowers the residents and citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Please join me in voting "no" on HB 2050. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and, on the question of final passage, recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland County, Representative Bloom.

Mr. BLOOM. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have an eloquent speech to give in favor of this bill today, but I stand in support of HB 2050 and as a cosponsor of HB 2050 on behalf of my friend, Justin. Justin is a young man in my community that I had the pleasure of knowing when I used to be a senior high Sunday school teacher at my church, and for 4 years Justin was a student in my senior high Sunday school class. And Justin is a young man with Down syndrome, and in all those years that I spent teaching Sunday school with the kids, I never met anyone as joyful, as appreciative of the little things in life, as kind, as loving, and with such a vigorous, energetic sense of humor than Justin.

And Justin, for whatever reason, he especially enjoyed the old black-and-white "I Love Lucy" show reruns and he would watch those and he had an encyclopedic knowledge of all the episodes of "I Love Lucy" and he just loved to talk about them and watch them, but with such enthusiasm that it was just infectious. And when he would walk – you would run into him in the hallway and give him a high five, he would be so excited to see you and so joyful, that it was just contagious. You could not help but be happy when you were around Justin.

He taught me – and as so often happens when you are attempting to teach others, they actually teach you – Justin taught me the value of every human life and that God created – we do not understand why God creates each of us the way he does – but He creates people especially the way He wants them, and Justin was created exactly how God wanted him, a child with Down syndrome, a young man now with Down syndrome.

And so when I cast my vote "yes" today for this bill, it is to protect kids like Justin so they have that same opportunity he had to experience and share the joys of life. So I would ask my colleagues to please join me in supporting HB 2050 and voting "yes" for Justin.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and, on the question of final passage, recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster County, Representative Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to HB 2050, for many of the reasons that have been stated here. Not only do I believe that it is extreme, but I believe it is unconstitutional. But I took note of some of the comments that were made about pregnancies where the fetus is identified as having Down syndrome, and it was pointed out by those that favor this bill that 90 percent of those pregnancies are currently terminated. Now, unless 90 percent of all women are pro-choice, that means that 90 percent of women that identify as pro-life are also choosing to terminate a pregnancy under these circumstances.

This is not a pro-life versus pro-choice issue. This is an anti-woman issue. That is why I oppose HB 2050, because women, no matter how they identify, still want that right, given certain circumstances, to terminate a pregnancy, as is lawful and constitutionally protected in the United States.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and, on the question of final passage, recognizes the gentlelady from Philadelphia, Representative Bullock.

Mrs. BULLOCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today in opposition to HB 2050, the abortion ban for women because of a diagnosis of Down syndrome. This ban fails to do several things. First, it fails to provide services and resources for families or for those children to be born, and it fails to increase resources for health, educational, and vocational programs to support people with developmental disabilities. As we mentioned last week, we tried to introduce several amendments to provide those resources and services to our families.

Last week was also Black Maternal Health Week, a week in which we were recognized and brings awareness about the health of Black moms-to-be and their infants. Black women are three to four times likely to die from pregnancy-related causes than their White counterparts. Black babies are twice as likely to die as White babies, and according to the CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention), even with all of the advancements in health and medicine, Black infants with Down syndrome have a lower chance of survival within their first year of life than White babies. The problem is not that we are encouraging women to actually have an abortion because of these diagnoses; the problem is that we are not giving women the freedom to choose with the resources that they need to make that choice, that we are not giving them the resources to choose what is right for her and her family and her health. We are not giving women the freedom to consult with their family, to consult with their medical professionals, and more importantly, regardless of the decision that they make, we are not giving them the resources to care for this child, to care for their own maternal health. So I find it very hypocritical that when we introduce this kind of legislation and say that we are doing it for

the life of a child, but then we do not care for that child once it is born, we do not provide resources to those families, that it is very hypocritical for us to do that. And for those reasons I stand in opposition to this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentlelady and, on the question of final passage, recognizes the gentleman from Franklin County, Representative Schemel.

Mr. SCHEMEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in law school you learn that if you cannot argue the facts, argue the law; if you cannot argue the law, argue the facts; and if you cannot argue the law or facts, then pound the table. Time magazine reports that 38 percent of all children diagnosed in this country with Down syndrome are aborted. Their lives are prematurely snuffed out. The BBC (British Broadcasting Corporation) recently reported that in Great Britain 49 percent – that is statistically half – of all children diagnosed with Down syndrome are terminated; they are killed in their mother's womb. And of course, we all know the now infamous report from Iceland, which reported that it has eradicated Down syndrome. That is a chromosomal malady. You cannot eradicate it. You can only eradicate people with this particular affliction.

Mr. Speaker, this bill prevents the disparate impact on this small group of handicapped individuals that is occurring under our current law. I would encourage swift passage of this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman, and as is the custom of the House, the maker of the bill will be allowed the final slot in debate. We have one other member who has sought recognition. Is there anybody else seeking recognition before – thank you very much.

Representative DeLissio, you may proceed on final passage.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, quite a few of our colleagues were not here in 2014. They were elected subsequently. In 2014 the legislature passed and the Governor signed Act 130, the Down Syndrome Prenatal Education Act, also known as Chloe's Law. That act, Mr. Speaker, endeavored to inform a woman and her family about – if the pregnancy was diagnosed with Down syndrome – about what the syndrome was about, the options, the resources, a hotline number, support groups, etc.

Mr. Speaker, here we are today, 4 years later, saying that, as far as we are concerned, those women and their families are not smart enough to have absorbed that information, thought about it, and can reach a decision of their own accord. The legislature is now saying to that same group of people, "We don't trust that you can make the best decision on your own behalf. We are going to dictate that decision." I think that is unconscionable, and because this affects both previability as well as postviability and because we have already passed legislation to ensure that our citizens are making the most knowledgeable decision possible, I will be a "no" vote for this and urge my colleagues to think carefully about the message they are sending to our citizens who are, theoretically, informed on the subject before they reach a decision. We are actually saying, "Nope, whatever decision you reach, if it's not the decision we think you should reach, it's a bad decision."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady and, on the question of final passage, recognizes the lady from York County, Representative Kristin Hill.

Mrs. HILL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As the chair of the House Cystic Fibrosis Caucus, I often monitor what is going on in other States and at the Federal level with regard to cystic fibrosis research and funding. In October of 2017, I had the opportunity to tune into a U.S. House of Representatives Appropriations subcommittee hearing on Federal funding for medical research, and I happened to catch the testimony of Mr. Frank Stephens. Mr. Stephens is a Global Down Syndrome Foundation board member, and he was testifying about the paltry sum of money that goes into research at the Federal level with regard to Down syndrome. And as I thought about what I could share with you today as the aunt and godmother of a very dear, precious, tenacious, beautiful, and intelligent young lady, I thought that perhaps the words of someone with Down syndrome would be most appropriate.

In his testimony he said, "...no one...knows more about life with Down syndrome than I do." He said, "If you take nothing else away from today's hearing, please remember this, I AM A MAN WITH DOWN SYNDROME AND MY LIFE IS WORTH LIVING."

He then posited, "Why do I feel the need to make that point?" And he said it is because "Across the world, a notion is being sold that maybe we don't need to continue to do research concerning Down syndrome. Why? Because there are pre-natal screens that will identify Down syndrome in the womb, and we can just terminate those pregnancies. In places as wide-spread as Iceland, Denmark and South Korea, government officials have proclaimed that these government encouraged terminations will make them 'Down syndrome free by 2030.'"

And he said, you know, "It is hard for me to sit here and say those words." He said he completely understands that there are people pushing this solution and people saying "that people like me should not exist. They are saying we have too little value to exist."

He said, "...I don't feel I should have to justify my existence," but to those who question the value of people with Down syndrome, he made these three important points.

He said they are a medical gift to society. The extra chromosome makes them a blueprint for medical research that may reveal answers to things like cancer and Alzheimer's and immune system disorders.

He said we are an unusual source of happiness. A Harvard-based study has discovered that people with Down syndrome, their parents, their families, their siblings are happier than society at large.

And he said, "Finally, we are the canary in the eugenics coal mine. Genomic research isn't going to stop at screening for Down syndrome. It won't be long before we can identify all manner of potentially expensive medical or personality 'deviations' in the womb. As a society, we have an opportunity to slow down and think about the ethics of choosing which humans get a chance at life."

He goes on to make many more important points, but in the end he concludes that we need to be America, not Iceland or Denmark. We need to pursue answers and not final solutions. We need to pursue inclusion and not termination. Let us be America. Let us not be Down syndrome free.

And as the aunt and the godmother of that dear, precious child with mosaic Down syndrome, I wanted to share his words with you and I want you to know how incredibly precious she is to our family and the many lives that she has touched. We

cannot imagine the world without her or any of the other people in this world with Down syndrome who have so much to contribute to all of us, and that is why I urge you all to vote in support of HB 2050.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentlelady and recognizes the gentlelady from Luzerne County, Representative Boback.

Ms. BOBACK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am going to make a simple but profound statement. Life is life. That is indisputable. I will be supporting this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady and appreciates her brevity.

On the question of final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentlelady from Lehigh County, Representative McNeill.

Mrs. MCNEILL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to say "no" to HB 2050, dangerous legislation that makes it more difficult for women to access the care they need. These personal decisions should be left up to a woman's conscience, not obstructed by political agendas. It is an obstructive and unconstitutional bill that shames and judges a woman for seeking out health care she has deemed best for herself, her health, and her family.

I am called to stand with women and my fellow women as they make deeply personal decisions about their own reproductive life. We do not have the right to stand in judgment of what is or is not an appropriate reason for a woman to get an abortion. She deserves our compassion and our support, nothing less.

I worked in special education for 16 years and I loved every one of my students and I could not imagine not having one of them in my life. They all were special to all of us. But I and none of us have a right to tell a woman whether she can end a pregnancy. It is her own personal choice.

It is essential that we protect the freedom of each woman to make the decision that is right for her, whether that is to become pregnant or remain pregnant. Laws like this imperil women's lives, run contrary to respect for conscience, and disregard our call to uphold social justice.

I ask you to say "no" to this bill. In the future I implore you to support a woman's moral and legal right to follow her own conscience and decide what health care is best for her.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady and, on the question of final passage, recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster County, Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of discussion about the bill here today and I would like to provide some further clarifications specific to the facts about what we do for those individuals with intellectual disabilities.

It was offered earlier that the reason to be "no" is because some amendments did not go into this bill because it did not adequately address the resources that are being used in this realm. Mr. Speaker, I will speak personally, that is the reason that I supported the #IWantToWork bill offered by our former chairlady from Lebanon County of the Labor Committee. It is the same reason that I have worked with my counterpart on the Democratic side of the aisle on the #IWantToWork 2.0 bill,

HB 1641, because I believe that all individuals have value and individuals that want to work should have that opportunity regardless of whatever issues that they may have.

Mr. Speaker, to say that we have not done anything else regarding this area of the law and how we care for these individuals is simply not accurate. Our own Policy chairman here in the House with bipartisan support passed bills that changed the adoptions laws. Mr. Speaker, I recognize while not everybody votes for the budget, the fact is, the funding went up for these line items as well, and that is an important distinction. Specifically, the community waiver program currently spends over \$3 billion in this program. That is a 70.8-percent increase since 2010. Overall the budget for intellectual disabilities went up 37.1 percent because this is a priority. This money is being spent in services in the homes, State centers, group homes, and private homes. Not to mention the large investment that we put into the capitated rates for individuals with disabilities. And finally, Mr. Speaker, we value the education of these individuals: zero to 21, \$1.1 billion put in to fund these programs; early intervention and recognition, ages zero to 3, \$263 million; and services offered in nonpublic schools, \$87 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is simply not accurate to say these individuals are overlooked or not cared for once they are born. I made the argument during the debate on the adoption bills that I personally believe that being pro-life meant more than just a debate on abortion. It meant we cover the issues for these individuals once they are born. The budget has covered the resources. We have made additional changes in other areas of the law to recognize this. And, Mr. Speaker, for all of those reasons, I would urge a "yes" vote on HB 2050.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and, on the question of final passage, recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Representative Frankel, for the second time.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Listening to the debate today and many of the personal stories that people offered about family, friends, relatives either with Down syndrome or raising children with Down syndrome, I mean, I note I have a cousin with Down syndrome and his mother had the resources to be able to do everything possible – take him to doctors, jet him around, give him the kind of care he needed. She did not have to go to work. That is not the case with everybody who has a child with a disability, and I think it is important that we recognize this.

There was a guest editorial in PennLive just this week by a gentleman by the name of Michael Berube, who is the parent of a Down's child. He also has two other children, an architect who lives in Boston and a child who lives with them in State College, their Down's child. And I wanted to read part of this. I will submit the entire letter for the record because I think it is helpful for everybody, but I do want, because we have heard some of these personal stories, to hear this one as well.

"...Twenty-seven years ago" – and I am quoting here – "Janet and I decided to forego amniocentesis during her pregnancy, because the risk of miscarriage was too high and we didn't think Down syndrome was something worth screening for anyway."

"In the grand scheme of things, among all the varieties of intraspecies difference, we decided Down syndrome wasn't that big a deal."

"Guess what? We were right.

"In our family, Down syndrome isn't a big deal. Jamie's a wonderful young man, warm and gregarious and charming.

"Jamie has enriched our lives, and Nick's life" – their son – "more than we can say, and we will always be grateful that he is our son.

"But we made that choice freely. No one forced us to have Jamie. And as much as we love him, we would never want to force anyone else to have a child with Down syndrome. We know their family circumstances might be vastly different from ours.

"Instead, we would like to *persuade* people – especially OB/GYN doctors and genetic counselors – that although Down syndrome is a developmental disability, people with Down syndrome can lead rich, fulfilling lives. And so can their families.

"But forcing prospective parents to bear children with Down syndrome is repugnant to us.

"Every child should be a wanted child: that is a truism. How much more true it is when the child in question is a child with disability.

"Some prospective parents might be terribly disability-phobic. Where is the moral benefit in compelling them to have a child they may very well resent and mistreat?

"Some prospective parents might already have as many children as they can handle. Who are you to tell them they must have one more, but only if it is a child with Down syndrome?

"Some prospective parents might worry who will take care of their child with Down syndrome after they are gone. Who are you to tell them that that is not a legitimate question?..."

"Janet and I believe strongly that prospective parents should be able to terminate pregnancies for any reason.

"We also believe strongly that too many people are misinformed about Down syndrome – that they are told that children with Down syndrome cannot lead meaningful or joyful lives. We suspect that some people terminate pregnancies on that basis.

"We will spend our lives doing everything we can to combat that misinformation, and to tell the world about our fabulous Jamie. But we will never support a law that robs prospective parents of the right to make difficult decisions about such matters....

"If they cared about" those of us, talking about us, "if they cared about the well-being of people with Down syndrome, they would be stumping for increases in...educational, and vocational programs that support people with developmental disabilities. Instead, they're using Down syndrome as an excuse to roll back reproductive rights – and to divide pro-life and pro-choice families of people with Down syndrome.

"If you're a parent in one those families, don't be fooled for an instant. The supporters of HB 2050 aren't supporters of your child. They will dedicate their careers to cutting the safety net your child needs.

"But if you're really interested in improving the lives of people with Down syndrome, work to improve the lives of people with Down syndrome.

"And help us defeat divisive, deceptive bills like..." HB 2050.

I think it is instructive that we hear from all perspectives, and this one was shut out. Deliberately, this chamber chose to bring this bill to the House floor without hearing the voices of these parents and some of the parents you quoted or the health-care

providers that we are going to make criminals of. It is no way to proceed. It is really an embarrassment that we are sitting here passing judgment on the women and the families of Pennsylvania without their input. We are making criminals out of physicians without their input. We should be ashamed of ourselves. Vote "no" on HB 2050. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

LETTER SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mr. FRANKEL submitted the following letter for the Legislative Journal.

(For letter, see Appendix.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question of final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Blair County, Representative McGinnis.

Mr. McGINNIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, it amazes me sometimes just how great this institution is in its reverence for human life, and I will give you some examples from the floor in a second, but I had my own personal example last year. My brother died, cancer, and when he got that diagnosis, we not only did not value his life less, we valued it more. And if you think about that, you think about the number of people in this room who have had their own battles against life's challenges, and we rejoice when we see the victory and we cry when it goes the other way. Why? Because we understand human life is something very special.

But it is also a continuum. It does not start when you are 60 or 55 or 3 or 2 or 1. It starts at conception. And if we can value people's lives when they have cancer, why cannot we value a person's life when they simply have a genetic anomaly? That is all it is, is a different set of genes.

And if I can ask the Speaker to allow me to break a House rule. Just an exception, we are—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. With all due respect, I cannot offer carte blanche on a blank check like that one.

Mr. McGINNIS. I am not only prepared for the reprimand, I would welcome it.

I am about to speak ill of a House member. There is a member in Blair County—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No.

Mr. McGINNIS. —who is cynical, morose, and most of the time a jerk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. With unanimous consent, the gentleman may proceed in disregard of the rules.

Mr. McGINNIS. And some people might say his genes are fine, but I marvel at those people like Justin, who Representative Bloom alluded to earlier, who are never cynical, they are never morose, and they are always full of life and bring it to all of us. Please support HB 2050.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

I am sorry. Are you seeking recognition? All right.

Representative Comitta, you will be able to proceed in just a moment.

I will remind the members as the custom on our legislation, last time I said there was 1 member remaining and then we got about 10 more. Now there is no members remaining, so you are

welcome to go ahead, but if there is anybody else, this really is your last fair-ball opportunity. Thank you very much.

Please proceed.

Mrs. COMITTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to HB 2050.

Mr. Speaker, I was a special education teacher. We have a precious child with Down syndrome in our extended family.

Mr. Speaker, rather than limiting the constitutionally protected health-care choices of women in the Commonwealth, why are we not doing everything we can to ensure that people with Down syndrome in Pennsylvania have the resources, all the resources they need to enrich their lives? I have visited classrooms and schools that serve children with Down syndrome and many other disabilities. I care about the needs of children and certainly those with extra special needs.

Those of us who oppose HB 2050 have heard from teachers and schools that they desperately need more support for day programs, afterschool and weekend programs, and respite care. We need funding to ensure that more adults are served and then ultimately removed from the waiver waiting list. Let us remember there are almost 14,000 people waiting for the services they need today. We need to do much more to help.

It is important to note also that not one single disabilities rights organization has come out in support of HB 2050. Mr. Speaker, we should be doing everything we can to expand programs and increase funding that are dedicated to taking good care of our children, our adults, and families with Down syndrome and all disabilities.

As we cast this vote today, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but wonder what has prevented this legislative body from holding fact-finding hearings on HB 2050. Why are we not curious about the unintended consequences of this bill? Why are we not asking for input from health-care providers, women, families, and other professionals who devote their lives to caring for people with disabilities? Why are we afraid to have these critical conversations?

I have a degree in special education; this certainly does not make me an expert on medical or health-care issues regarding people with disabilities. I will always seek the input of experts on each bill before me. I will never rely solely on my feelings or my personal experience.

Again, what is clear, Mr. Speaker, is that this legislation does nothing to help our precious children and adults with Down syndrome. I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on HB 2050.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentlelady and, if no one else is seeking recognition, recognizes the prime sponsor of the legislation, Representative Turzai, on the question of final passage.

Mr. TURZAI. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I rise in support of HB 2050.

We held a press event with respect to the bill, the Down Syndrome Protection Act, in the rotunda. A number of Down syndrome individuals were present with us. Karen Gaffney, who has received an honorary Ph.D. (doctor of philosophy), was our keynote speaker. I would like to actually take verbatim some of her remarks.

"It's ok. I know I am different than you. I look differently. I talk differently. I walk differently. I don't hear as well as most of you do, and I don't see as well either. And sometimes, it takes me longer to learn things." She also made a point, "But, I can

swim longer and farther than anyone in this room." She swam the English Channel amongst other great swims.

She goes on to say this: "Those of us with Down syndrome and our families face a very difficult future. We face a possibility of wiping out all of the tremendous progress we have made. Just as we are making so much progress, a whole industry has grown up focused on prenatal screening – screening that would end our lives before we take our first breath. Now that you can test for Down syndrome before birth, there are many experts in the medical community that say this extra chromosome we carry around is not compatible with life. Not compatible with life?" she asked. "After everything we have done, I would say we are more than compatible. We are what life is all about. Our lives are worth living and our lives are worth learning about."

This is an existential question put forth before good people, policymakers, elected to address these issues. I hear the value judgments in some of the earlier remarks. What is a good life? What is not a good life? Karen Gaffney certainly understood her life to be a good life and understood that the mere existence of that life was wondrous. I think, I think sometimes, oh my goodness, what if my parents for some reason did not think I was good enough as an unborn child, I was somehow not perfect enough as a human being.

Right now you can test for Down syndrome, and it has become the reason that some abortion providers suggest you probably do not want to have that child. Who is the victim here? Not just, not just the unborn child with Down syndrome, but maybe that mom who is feeling vulnerable and pressured who might have come to love that child.

Now, what is Down syndrome? "In every cell in the human body there is a nucleus, where genetic material is stored in genes. Genes carry the codes responsible for all of our inherited traits.... Typically, the nucleus of each cell contains 23 pairs of chromosomes, half of which are inherited from each parent. Down syndrome occurs when an individual has a full or partial extra copy of chromosome 21."

The testing does not allow for somebody to fix that. The testing is being used to just eradicate or eliminate that person, and that is that person. That person with that extra copy of chromosome 21 is that person, just like I am the person who I am or you are the person who you are – none of us perfect, none of us without our own disability of some sort given a Vogue magazine type of a world.

A mother wrote this. She considered herself to be, quote, unquote, "pro-choice" until she had the choice of carrying her son with Down syndrome, and these are her words in support of the Down Syndrome Protection Act: "As a mother to a 12 year old son prenatally diagnosed with Down syndrome, I proudly defend the value of his life as equal to any other. But as a pro-choice supporter, it became difficult for me to assert the absolute worth of that life while simultaneously conceding that prospective parents should decide if that life was worthy of being their child. The cognitive dissonance became too great to defend. Either Down syndrome is a life worth living or it isn't. One look at my son's joyous face confirms without question that his is a large, beautiful life that is more fulfilling than most....

"Opponents" to this legislation "...attempt to deny that this is a disability rights law." I disagree.

"An argument is...made that more disability services are needed. The way to solve that need isn't for people with Down syndrome to not be born at all. In fact, a true disability advocate

would support both the protection of people with Down syndrome at diagnosis and throughout their lifetime.

"Why not entertain the possibility that the parents will learn a love and compassion unlike any they've...experienced from raising this child? Further, adoption" has been "left out of the conversation completely. I was fortunate that my doctor informed me about a registry of families waiting to adopt a baby specifically with Down syndrome. Not one or two waiting families, but 150."

I think it is important also to think back to 1992. It was a seminal year in some of the discussion with respect to the pro-life movement. A Democratic Governor, Governor Casey of Pennsylvania, was not able to speak at a particular convention. Shortly thereafter, an ad was taken out, a long ad – it was really a statement – as a full-page advertisement in the New York Times in July of 1992 around that timeframe, and it said that those that signed it, including Governor Casey, a Democrat; including Governor Carey, a Democrat from New York; including Sargent Shriver and Eunice Kennedy Shriver, who founded Special Olympics, Democrats; and this is what they said about themselves, "We are public officials, medical professionals, scholars, and feminists; we are liberals and conservatives; Democrats, Republicans, and Independents; Catholics, Jews, Protestants, and agnostics. We have sought to reflect carefully on the abortion controversy. We are making our reflections public in the hope that they will help all Americans cut through the static of the sound bites and discuss the linked questions of abortion, human dignity, and American freedom with the moral seriousness demanded of citizens of a democratic republic." And that includes its representative body like us.

"...The abortion issue raises the most fundamental questions of justice – questions that cannot be avoided, and that cannot be resolved by judicial fiat. Who belongs to the community of the commonly protected? Whose rights will we acknowledge? Whose...dignity will we respect? For whose wellbeing will we, as a people, assume responsibility?"

It goes on, "Without a Doubt," this section is called, "a Human Life," including the baby, the unborn baby diagnosed with Down syndrome. "Those who approve of our current abortion regime sometimes claim that the child in the womb is simply an undifferentiated mass of tissue, an appendage to a woman's body. But modern embryology and fetology" – this is 1992 – "exploded such pseudoscience.... Today, the sonogram has given us a veritable window into the womb and has enabled us to observe, in detail, the complex life of the child prior to birth.

"From the beginning" – and this is so crucial to the discussion in front of us today – "from the beginning, each human embryo has its own unique genetic identity. Three and a half weeks after conception, its heart starts beating. At six weeks, brain activity can be detected. At the end of two months the limbs, fingers, and toes are complete. By three months, the baby is quite active, forming fists, bending arms, and curling toes."

Unfortunately, "advocates of unrestricted abortion do not want the public to focus on these undeniable facts of fetal development, but the facts cannot be ignored." In the end, "...abortion is a violent act, not against 'potential life,' but against a living, growing human being, a life with potential."

Yes, this is one small step. It is a step because science has allowed people to say maybe you should not have a child with Down syndrome. My good friend from Lancaster County made clear that in budget-related bills we have increased and continue to increase funding for individuals with disabilities, including those with Down syndrome – records levels. Community service, for in-house services, well over \$3 billion in State and Federal money comes through our budget – \$3 billion – with respect to those in State centers or private centers, those in community-based group homes. In education we will once again for the eighth straight year, under both Governors Corbett and Wolf, have increased special education funding well over a billion dollars annually. And our Medicaid assistance, both fee-for-service and capitation, absolutely covers health-care provision with respect to individuals with disability. This body has been a champion of those levels of funding, and we will have robust discussions in the coming months with respect to how we prioritize those dollars.

It is not an either-or, Mr. Speaker. Again, this is an existential question. Who amongst us gets to decide that the dignity of that child, that unborn child with Down syndrome, is not the first level of protection for individuals with disabilities?

I would urge a "yes" vote.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS–139

Barbin	Galloway	Mackenzie	Readshaw
Barrar	Gillen	Maher	Reed
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Mako	Reese
Bernstine	Godshall	Maloney	Roae
Bloom	Goodman	Markosek	Roe
Boback	Greiner	Marshall	Rothman
Brown, R.	Grove	Marsico	Ryan
Burns	Haggerty	Masser	Saccone
Caltagirone	Hahn	Matzie	Sainato
Causer	Hanna	McGinnis	Samuelson
Charlton	Harkins	Mehaffie	Sankey
Christiana	Harper	Mentzer	Santora
Conklin	Harris, A.	Metcalfe	Saylor
Cook	Heffley	Metzgar	Schemel
Corbin	Helm	Miccarelli	Simmons
Corr	Hennessey	Millard	Snyder
Cox	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Sonney
Culver	Hill	Moul	Staats
Cutler	Irvin	Mullery	Tallman
Day	James	Murt	Taylor
Deasy	Jozwiak	Mustio	Tobash
Delozier	Kampf	Nelson	Toepel
DeLuca	Kaufer	Nesbit	Toohil
Diamond	Kauffman	O'Neill	Topper
DiGirolamo	Kavulich	Oberlander	Walsh
Dowling	Keefer	Ortitay	Ward
Driscoll	Keller, F.	Peifer	Warner
Dunbar	Keller, M.K.	Petrarca	Watson
Dush	Klunk	Pickett	Wentling
Ellis	Knowles	Pyle	Wheeland
Emrick	Kortz	Quigley	White
English	Kulik	Quinn, C.	Zimmerman
Evankovich	Lawrence	Quinn, M.	
Everett	Lewis	Rader	Turzai,
Fee	Longietti	Rapp	Speaker
Fritz			

NAYS-56

Bizzarro	Davis, A.	Keller, W.	Rabb
Boyle	Davis, T.	Kim	Ravenstahl
Bradford	Dawkins	Kinsey	Roebuck
Briggs	DeLissio	Kirkland	Schlossberg
Brown, V.	Dermody	Krueger	Schweyer
Bullock	Donatucci	Madden	Sims
Carroll	Evans	McCarter	Solomon
Cephas	Farry	McClinton	Stephens
Comitta	Fitzgerald	McNeill	Sturla
Costa, D.	Flynn	Miller, D.	Thomas
Costa, P.	Frankel	Milne	Vazquez
Cruz	Freeman	Neilson	Warren
Daley	Gainey	O'Brien	Wheatley
Davidson	Harris, J.	Pashinski	Youngblood

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-5

Dean	Gabler	Rozzi	Vitali
Fabrizio			

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 (MIKE TURZAI)
PRESIDING**

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2138, PN 3328**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Human Services Code, in public assistance, providing for work requirements.

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

The SPEAKER. There are two amendments that are filed. Now, remember, this is on third consideration, so you would have to have a motion to suspend to be able to vote on an amendment on third consideration as we do not have amendments on third consideration. They are offered by Representative DiGirolamo. They are amendments 6674 and 6675.

And the Chair will call on Representative DiGirolamo to make a motion to suspend on amendment 6674, and then if it would pass, then we would be able to go to that amendment. It does require two-thirds, two-thirds of the body.

So you may proceed, Representative DiGirolamo.

Mr. DIGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had two amendments drafted and I realize we need a suspension of the rules. The one amendment, Mr. Speaker, would have taken out the traditional Medicaid population – that is over 2 million people – would have taken them out of the work requirement, Mr. Speaker, and as everyone realizes, those

are our most vulnerable citizens. And the second amendment, Mr. Speaker, would have directed the Department of Human Services to do a cost-benefit analysis on the bill.

But realizing that the hurdle of the suspension is too difficult to overcome today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to withdraw both amendments.

But I would also like at the appropriate time to be recognized on the bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Both amendments have been withdrawn by Representative DiGirolamo.

So we do not have any amendments in front of us 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?

I know Representative Dawkins wishes to be recognized, Representative Markosek, and Representative Frankel. But we are going to start with Representative Dawkins. And Representative DiGirolamo I know wants to be recognized as well, so I have him down as well. So right now I have Representative Dawkins; I have Representative Markosek; Representative Frankel; Representative DiGirolamo; I know Representative Dowling, the prime sponsor; Representative Gainey.

Representative Dawkins, you may proceed, sir.

And, members, could you please take your seats. I would ask everybody to please take your seats.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to ask if the gentleman would stand for brief interrogation.

The SPEAKER. I am sorry, sir. Did you want to interrogate the maker of the legislation?

Mr. DAWKINS. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Okay. The good gentleman has agreed to so stand, and you may proceed.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So some of these questions we asked in committee, and we did not have all the information at the time, so I wanted to see if I could put them record. I will start with my first question. How many individuals currently are enrolled in the MA (Medical Assistance) Program currently in the State?

Mr. DOWLING. Sir, are you asking for the total enrollees or the enrollees that are eligible under the expansion of the Affordable Care Act?

Mr. DAWKINS. So, Mr. Speaker, it is really hard for me to hear the gentleman's question.

The SPEAKER. Members, please. Please, members, please take your seats. The good gentleman has asked to proceed with interrogation. The maker has agreed to participate in interrogation. So they should be able to have the opportunity to ask questions and answer questions.

Representative Dawkins, will you just restate your question. My apologies.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So I am asking, how many folks are currently enrolled in the MA Program? What is that total number of enrollees?

Mr. DOWLING. 2.7 million is the total number of enrollees, sir.

Mr. DAWKINS. 2.7. Out of that 2.7 million, how many folks are currently unemployed?

Mr. DOWLING. Right now it is over 450,000, and as reported by the Secretary of DHS (Department of Human Services) at Appropriations hearings, 495,719 individuals reported zero income last year while on Medicaid, between the ages of 19 and 64.

Mr. DAWKINS. Do we know if that number represents folks who may be disabled or folks who may have a young child? Do we have breakdown of those individuals who are reporting zero income of their current status?

Mr. DOWLING. I do not know that we have a number for that question, sir.

Mr. DAWKINS. So there is a possibility that all 450,000 individuals may be disabled – or permanently disabled whereas they are unable to generate any income on record?

Mr. DOWLING. There would be a possibility. That would be highly unlikely.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you.

So another question that was brought up in committee, is it true that most folks who are currently receiving this benefit either did not make enough money for the full benefit or made too much – excuse me; let me say it again. They either made too much money for the State's benefit or not enough money. They were kind of in the middle area of their income which allowed them to be eligible for this particular benefit. Either they made too less or too much. They were kind of in that gray area. Is that correct, from my understanding? We had posed this question in committee.

Mr. DOWLING. I apologize, sir. I do not understand the question that you are asking.

Mr. DAWKINS. I will get clarity on that particular one.

Another question. In terms of the work requirement – and the reason I ask this question about the numbers of folks who are currently unemployed or showing zero income is, to have that real benefit we brought— Let me rephrase. Do we know exact costs with this system, to track this information, what it will cost the Commonwealth?

Mr. DOWLING. It is addressed in the bill. It does mirror systems that are already in place to track work requirements on other social programs that we have within the State.

Mr. DAWKINS. So we are saying it is going to have a zero-percent fiscal impact on the State?

Mr. DOWLING. We do not know what the fiscal impact would be.

Mr. DAWKINS. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. DOWLING. Sir, just as a follow-up on that. One of the issues with providing a fiscal on that is we do not have a clear number of how many people we would continue to be providing services for, so it would be hard to calculate that data.

Mr. DAWKINS. Would you be willing to table the bill until we have that information, and my caution is that we may be passing a bill that we do not know what it is going to cost the State of Pennsylvania. We do not have an accurate number of who all may not be employed. It may cost, again, as we used the reference in committee, I would hate for us to have the taxpayers foot a bill for a dollar for us to save a penny.

Mr. DOWLING. I do completely understand your point of view. I would not be interested in tabling the bill because I do not feel that we will ever have accurate numbers for something like that until implementation because we would not know about transportation, health care, other services that would be necessary to implement.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you very much.

On the bill, Mr. Speaker?

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

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

I stand today in opposition of HB 2138 for several reasons. One, I do not believe we have all the information to make an informed decision on this piece of legislation. There is a discrepancy in terms of how many folks may or may not be currently employed and if those individuals currently have some other disability or some other reason why they are reporting a zero income. I am also very concerned that we do not know the costs that are going to be associated to implementing this system because we currently do not have a system that will be able to track it at this detail currently on the rolls. So I would ask all my colleagues to oppose HB 2138 for the reasons I laid out.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Joe Markosek.

Mr. MARKOSEK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, HB 2138 is offered as a way to put individuals receiving health care through the Medicaid program to work, while providing cost savings to the Commonwealth. That is the intent: get people to work, save money for the Commonwealth. The reality is quite different. The bill targets many of our most vulnerable citizens and makes their health care conditional on work.

Further, the Department of Human Services has provided a fiscal analysis that shows that implementation, implementation of this legislation would cost, would cost the Commonwealth hundreds of millions of dollars, hundreds of millions of dollars. Specifically, in year 1, in year 1 if this would pass, the total State costs are upwards of \$800 million, \$800 million from providing employment services and child-care services for those required to participate, \$800 million in new costs. And these costs are almost entirely borne by the Commonwealth, the State, as the guidance for the 1115 waiver from CMS (Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services) does not allow for Federal matching dollars to assist States with these programs.

So we cannot use Federal money to help us with that huge, huge cost. We get stuck here in Pennsylvania with that cost. In fact, while the Federal government may see savings in future years, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will continue to see hundreds of millions of dollars in additional costs to administer this program with no estimated cost savings in future years. I repeat, while the Federal government may see savings in future years, the State will continue to see hundreds of millions of dollars in additional costs to administer this program with no estimated cost savings in future years.

The department estimates that upwards of 438,000 Pennsylvanians would be subject to these requirements, 438,000 Pennsylvanians would be subject to these requirements to maintain their vital health care. The aim of this bill is to strip health care from many of these individuals to save costs. However, as I said earlier, there are no net State savings from this bill. So why are we even doing this? Really?

Instead, if this bill passes, we as a Commonwealth will be spending more money to provide less health care to fewer people. We will be spending more money to provide less health care to fewer people. That, Mr. Speaker, is very bad policy, and worse still, it does not make fiscal sense.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask all members, both sides of the aisle, to reject this. It is way too costly for our Commonwealth. We do not get Federal reimbursements for those additional costs. Vote "no" on HB 2138.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The majority Appropriations chair, Representative Stan Saylor, on the bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have a choice here today. We can promote a pathway to a better life for Pennsylvanians or we can simply keep the status quo of keeping individuals locked into a cycle of poverty.

This bill helps create a better life for people in Pennsylvania. While there may be a cost in setting up this new system as there is in any new system that comes before the General Assembly or one of the Governor's agencies, it is impossible to quantify that cost. It is very clear the administration has – it is laughable, it is actually laughable the figures they have come up with, so untruthful that it is unbelievable, to try and set up this program. The bottom line is that they are trying to score political points and scare people, scare people.

This is very clearly a bill that only takes those who are able to work, not people who are handicapped, not pregnant women, not those children or individuals with autism or special needs, it is simply people between the ages of 18 and 55 who should be working to get the benefits they have. There are so many people in Pennsylvania today who are making \$35,000, \$45,000 a year out there working every day to pay these benefits that these individuals are getting sitting at home.

Now, we know, we talk about this all the time about how do we create a better life for Pennsylvanians, our senior citizens. We know for a fact that getting senior citizens to stay in their home instead of a nursing home is better for them. We know giving people a sense of pride makes them healthier, makes them more viable; it improves their mental health ability. But no, we want to scare people who have real physical disabilities, pregnant women, that we are going to force them to work. This is absurd, and the numbers that this administration has come up with are absolutely laughable and unbelievable.

It is time for us to do the right thing here to get people out of a cycle of poverty and get them back to being working and viable people here in Pennsylvania. This is not a punishment. This is something that is going to help and improve the lives of individuals who need to be out there working and have a pride in what they are doing.

So I ask for a positive vote on this bill because this definitely moves Pennsylvania further ahead and it improves the mental health of these individuals as well. Just put yourself in their place – sitting at home every day, you are healthy, you can work, but you are sitting at home every day. I do not know about you, but when I am off and I am sick and I am sitting at home, I cannot wait to get out of the house and get to do something. And I think that is true of this, but you have to create a situation that gives these people that opportunity. Job training and child care are the things we can do to improve these people's lives.

I ask for a positive vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dan Frankel.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to HB 2138.

The most important thing to remember when talking about changes to Medicaid in Pennsylvania is that the Medicaid program is a critical building block for Pennsylvania families working to create strong, stable families. A large percentage of Medicaid beneficiaries are children, seniors, or people with disabilities. Families need Medicaid for immunizations, insulin, and early intervention. They need it to live independently and to ensure older adults can receive nursing home care.

Importantly, right now, Pennsylvanians need Medicaid to get the mental health care that they need. In the midst of the opioid epidemic, we know that a huge percentage of Medicaid beneficiaries are able to access the care needed to treat their addictions as they seek to rebuild their lives. We do not want to yank that building block out from under them. In my county, Allegheny County, a report from last year found that 42 percent of people seeking mental health services were beneficiaries of Medicaid just due to income alone. It makes no sense to pretend minds are not part of our bodies and to try to cut Medicaid for people seeking behavioral help.

This legislation does not work to strengthen Medicaid and build lives; it simply creates more red tape for hardworking families. Pennsylvanians already do work. Sometimes they work low-wage jobs with inconsistent work hours. Sometimes they work for large companies that do not provide family health insurance or for small businesses that cannot afford it. They work taking care of their children or their grandchildren or their sick parents. They work getting GEDs (general equivalency diplomas) or at community college, gaining skills to find a better paying job. This legislation just gives working families more work, more forms, more documents to pull together, more pay stubs to collect, more headaches.

What this legislation does not do is provide those jobs that it promises, and that is a big deal, particularly for rural communities because we know that rural communities have not yet recovered from the Great Recession almost a decade ago. Analysis from the Center for Rural Pennsylvania, released just last month, found that employment and new construction on businesses and homes in rural Pennsylvania are still lower than they were before the Great Recession. According to that report, in the decade since 2007, rural Pennsylvania lost almost 100,000 jobs, 17 rural counties lost 10 percent or more of their jobs. This legislation punishes those rural counties struggling the most, yanking away key services to help people improve their lives while providing nothing in return.

Pennsylvanians are not convinced that cutting Medicaid, the way our residents get their basic health care, will make their lives better. They do not believe that new red tape and complex forms will make their lives better. But they know that access to mental health and substance abuse treatment will make life better for them and their families.

Let us provide Pennsylvanians what they need and want, not take away the building blocks helping them get it. Let us vote "no" on HB 2138.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Members, I just want to for business, in terms of who has requested to speak, Representative DiGirolamo will be next – and as you know, we try to balance, those in opposition, those in favor – I have Representative Keefer, Representative Gainey,

Representative Rothman, Representative Daley, Representative Kaufer, Representative Barbin, and Representative Grove. That is who I have. So it would be Representative DiGirolamo followed by Representative Keefer, then Representative Gainey, Representative Rothman, Representative Daley, Representative Kaufer, Representative Barbin, Representative Grove, and Representative Sturla. The prime sponsor will be last.

So, Representative DiGirolamo, you are recognized.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think before we vote on this bill it is really important to understand the populations of Medicaid and how the programs work, Mr. Speaker. There are two distinct programs in Medicaid. The first one is the traditional Medicaid that has been in place for a long time, and the second part of Medicaid is the expanded Medicaid, which has been in place now in Pennsylvania for 3 years. And you have heard the totals of the total population in Medicaid, approximately 2.7 to 2.8 million people here in Pennsylvania.

So let us take first the expanded Medicaid population. The expanded Medicaid population, Mr. Speaker, is around 700,000 people, a little bit more than that, here in Pennsylvania, and those people were added on to Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act. And for the first time, Mr. Speaker, adults with no disabilities and no dependents were able to qualify for Medicaid not only here in Pennsylvania but in other States across the country. And the way that program worked financially was that the Federal government for the first 3 years of the program paid for 100 percent of the costs and after that the State started to pick up a little bit until we get to the year 2020 when the split or the match would be 90 percent paid by the Federal government and 10 percent paid by the State. So that is the expanded Medicaid program.

On that population if we want to have a discussion or a bill about work requirement, let us have the debate because I think that makes some sense on the expanded Medicaid program. Remember, able-bodied adults with no dependents, that is the expanded Medicaid program.

Now, let us move over to the traditional Medicaid program where there are approximately 2.1 million people on that program, and those people, Mr. Speaker, are our most vulnerable citizens, our most vulnerable. And as chairman of the Human Services Committee for a number of years, I have had a large number of public hearings where the people and the groups that represent this population have testified. Now, as far as how the program works, it is also a match between the Federal government and the State, and that changes from year to year. And right now, for this discussion, it is probably about a 50-50 match. The State pays 50 percent and the Federal government pays 50 percent.

Now, who makes up that 2.1 million people, Mr. Speaker? And listen to who they are. Almost half, or over a million, are children; over 500,000 are disabled adults and they are disabled for a variety of reasons: mental health reasons, people in drug and alcohol treatment, people who have physical disabilities; over 350,000 – and again, these numbers are not exact – are elderly who are in long-term care. And let us remember, Mr. Speaker, that it is Medicaid, not Medicare, that pays for most of our seniors here in Pennsylvania that are in long-term care. Another 100,000 or so, Mr. Speaker, are adults who are chronically ill. So there is the population of the traditional Medicaid, Mr. Speaker.

And I know the maker of the amendment has taken great pains to make sure that there are a number of exceptions for the traditional Medicaid population, and I think that is a good thing. But here is what we have to be concerned about, Mr. Speaker, the verification process and how this verification process is going to work, because I guarantee you, on the traditional Medicaid, even though there are exemptions, that these people are going to receive letters in the mail and they are going to have to somehow verify their disability. And then at a later date, I would imagine 6 months or so down the road, they are going to have to reverify what their disability is.

And I will tell you why that is a problem, Mr. Speaker. I will tell you why that is a problem, because many of these people – and we have heard it from the public hearings that I have had of my committee – do not have stable living conditions. They are moving, they live with a family member, then they move to an apartment, then they get married and move again, and then maybe they go into a drug and alcohol halfway house. So these letters are going to be coming to these addresses and I am worried that a lot of these people are not going to receive their letter and then they are going to try to go to their doctor or a hospital for medical services that they really need and they are going to find out that their Medicaid was turned off through no fault of their own, only that they did not receive that letter that came in the mail, and their health care is going to be terminated. Mr. Speaker, that is a big concern of mine and I think it should be a concern of every member in this chamber. Remember, our most vulnerable citizens who need Medicaid desperately.

And the second reason, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to end with this, if you look at the bill, it is going to require the administration to apply for an 1115 waiver with the Federal government, CMS, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, Mr. Speaker, and it is not clear how that waiver is going to work or what it is going to look like.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of concerns. I respect the maker of the bill. I realize that he thinks he is doing the right thing. But I have a lot of concerns, Mr. Speaker, and for those reasons, I am going to be voting "no" on this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Keefer.

Mrs. KEEFER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The issue here is that we have got to stop the bleeding. We currently cannot sustain the system as it exists. So we currently have a total number of nondisabled 19- to 64-year-old individuals that are on medical assistance of almost 1 million people, almost 1 million we have, and that number of nondisabled 19- to 64-year-old individuals that report zero dollars in income is 495,719 people; that is 51 percent, 51 percent. And we have had plenty of exemptions on here. So if you are pregnant, if you are the primary caretaker of an individual who is disabled, there are plenty of exemptions, so we capture. We are talking about able-bodied individuals here, working ages that have exemptions on here. This is reasonable. This is absolutely reasonable and we need this. Every dollar that we spend on an able-bodied individual is a dollar in resources that we are taking away from our most vulnerable that we are trying to protect here.

I have listened to a lot of concerns about the cost savings and how much this is going to cost taxpayers. Well, the taxpayers cannot afford it right now. The budget is growing at 6 to 7 percent a year. It is not sustainable. We have to be judicious with our resources, and this bill will allow us to start that process.

I encourage you all to vote "yes" on this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Ed Gainey.

Members, I should have actually spoken before the good lady from York County to ask members to please take their seats. I apologize to her. I was going to interrupt, but she was in the middle of an important point and I did not want to interrupt. But, members, please take your seats. I would appreciate it if everybody could please take their seats. We have members speaking on both sides of this particular issue. I want to give everybody an opportunity to be heard, so please take your seats right now. If you have a discussion that is necessary, can you go, please, to the anteroom right off the House floor. I am asking all members to please be seated. Please be seated.

Representative Gainey.

Mr. GAINY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand to oppose HB 2138, and I oppose it with 100 other organizations throughout this Commonwealth that believe that this is a bad bill. This is not a workforce-development bill, this is not a community-development bill; this is a bill that provides us the opportunity to put people off of health coverage, and I think that is a problem. I think when we discuss health coverage and what we need to do to improve health coverage, it is not about how we make it more difficult like we have a serious issue in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. And the Health Committee, when we talked about this, we talked about the fact that there was not a major issue, but it just seems like we always want to punish the poor in a way that we do not have to.

We do not even know how much this is going to cost us. We are always talking about we want to budget as we go, but we always want to introduce something and we do not even know the cost to it. So the fact that we do not know the cost to it, the fact that we have no safety nets in order to help the people that really need help, and the fact that we are saying that this is workforce-development situation, which it is not, work requirements have never demonstrated that it worked in this Commonwealth. It has been a bigger problem than what we perceived it to be. So again, I am kind of confused why we continue to go down the same road that demonstrates to us that we are not doing something to help the people of this Commonwealth.

So as we go forward, I am asking all of my colleagues, let us stop. Enough is enough. Let us make sure we oppose HB 2138, because work regulations have never worked in the past and they are not going to work now. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Greg Rothman.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On August 22, 1996, then President Bill Clinton stood in the Rose Garden and signed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act, and he said the famous words, we are ending welfare as we know it. By 2010 more than half the people on the welfare rolls had gotten off with jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we talk a lot about money and I understand there is a lot of discussion about money, but I am concerned more about the human dignity that comes from a job. The greatest social program that we could possibly do to eliminate poverty in America is to give someone a job.

Mr. Speaker, Benjamin Franklin, who served as Speaker of this august body in 1764, wrote a book in 1750 called "The Way to Wealth." Benjamin Franklin is probably one of the greatest Americans who ever lived, and he believed that there is dignity

in all work. Benjamin Franklin started working when he was 12 years old. He was on his own by the time he was 17 years old. Benjamin Franklin believed that the way to wealth was to work. It is the dignity that comes from having a job. My 16-year-old daughter a few weeks ago got her first job. You should see the pride on her face when she shows me her paycheck, the shoes she bought with her tips. There is dignity in all work. We are robbing people of their souls when we tell them that they do not have to work when they are able to work, and instead, making them dependent on government.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that when you give someone a fish, you feed them for a day. If you teach them how to fish, you feed them for a lifetime. I urge my colleagues to support HB 2138. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Mary Jo Daley.

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

You may proceed, Representative.

Ms. DALEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So today in the Appropriations Committee we voted on HB 2138 based on the fiscal impact, and the vote was a party-line vote, but looking at the notes from the Appropriations Committee, it is really clear that there is a fiscal impact to the State if HB 2138 is enacted. And that fiscal impact, the estimate – I think it was explained before – of people who would be required to work would be 438,000 MA enrollees subject to the work requirements.

So I just want to spell out what the cost would be of this and let you know that the CMS guidance to States regarding waivers for MA work requirements requires a State to implement strategies to assist beneficiaries in meeting work requirements, and to link individuals to additional resources for job training or other employment services – child-care assistance, transportation, or other work supports – to help beneficiaries prepare for work or increased earnings. CMS also indicates that these waivers cannot utilize Federal Medicaid funds for work-support activities, and DHS is estimating an annual cost per enrollee for services at \$4,497 for employment and training and \$1,140 for transportation, and that actually is not eligible for matching and would carry a cost of \$691,904 million to the State – no additional cost to the Federal government because there is no matching. And then the child-care services at \$6300 per individual, or per enrollee, would carry a price tag to the State of \$80,595 million, and that makes up that \$799,655 million, so almost \$800 million additional cost to the State.

And the other part of it is that the counties would be required to hire about 250 additional caseworkers and 15 additional administration staff. That is covered by matching cost but would still incur an additional \$27 million in State funds. So I think we recognize that when we hear that we wanted to save the State money, we are not actually saving the State money; these are additional moneys that we would need to spend on this program.

I think it is a great privilege to serve on the House Appropriations Committee, and sometimes we have really good information – actually, we always have very good information – and I thought I would share that with you at this point because I think it is really important for us to know what the estimates of the costs are going to be.

So thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you all.

The SPEAKER. Representative Aaron Kaufer.

Mr. KAUFER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the maker of the bill please stand for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. He has indicated that he will so stand.

Mr. KAUFER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have heard a lot of what has been discussed here on the floor today – and I am not sure if I am reading a different piece of legislation than some of the members who have described the bill today – but my understanding is that there are a number of exemptions in this bill, and if you would be able to tell me what they are.

Mr. DOWLING. Yes, Mr. Speaker. The exemptions in this bill would cover, first, high school students; those with temporary or long-term disability benefits; those 19 years of age or younger; those who are 65 years of age or older; pregnant women; those receiving SSI (supplemental security income) benefits; a resident of a mental health institution or a correctional institution; an individual who is experiencing a crisis, serious medical condition, or temporary condition which prevents them from seeking employment, including, but not limited to, domestic violence or substance use disorders; the primary caregiver of a child 6 years of age or younger; or an individual who is permanently disabled. And under our amendment, that would also include individuals who were the primary caregiver for those who are terminally ill on hospice.

Mr. KAUFER. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes my interrogation.

The SPEAKER. On the bill, sir.

Mr. KAUFER. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You may proceed.

Mr. KAUFER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The maker of the bill has laid out several of the exemptions that there are out there, including for people who are disabled, people under the age of 19, over the age of 65. It is a narrowly tailored bill. It does not cover people who are in need of help from domestic violence or substance use disorder, if they are a primary caregiver to a child under the age of 6, primary caregiver to an individual who is permanently disabled or during hospice care, an individual receiving supplemental security income benefits, somebody residing in a mental health institution or a correctional institution, experiencing a crisis or serious medical condition, a pregnant woman, anybody receiving temporary or permanent long-term disability benefits, and anybody who is a full-time high school student.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman, the maker of this bill, has put a lot of time and effort into finding the proper balance in creating this legislation, and I would urge a "yes" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Bryan Barbin.

Mr. BARBIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to this bill not because work requirements are not a reasonable expectation for a fully able adult, I rise in opposition because our— And I would say that our flag, and we just looked at it, has three symbols on it. The three county symbols are: welcome – people; work, which is the plow for Chester County; and the three sheaves of wheat, which is what happens if people work. It is abundance.

We face bigger problems than the ones we have today. And Franklin Delano Roosevelt was not afraid to put people to work, but that is not what this bill does. This bill has no method for the 400,000 people that you want to establish a work

requirement for to have a job. What you want to do instead is to say, if they cannot get a job and they get fouled up in any of this additional paperwork, they are going to lose their health care. That is not an appropriate response if you want people to do the right thing. If you want them to work, give them a job. The answer is right in the Bible. The most prosperous nation that ever existed was Solomon's nation of Israel, and in chapter 2 of 2 Chronicles, it tells you just what to do. He had 153,000 foreigners when he took a census. He put 80,000 of them to work as woodcutters, he put 70,000 to work as stonemasons. What we do not have in this bill, and why I will not go along with this bill until it is changed to provide the work, is we do not have jobs for any of these people. We are going to take away some of their benefits without telling them what you do to meet this work requirement.

We could do this right. This bill could be a great bill and we could lead the nation in making people who are able to work, work, but that is not what this bill does. This bill just says, if you cannot find a job you are out of health care, and I object to that because we can do better.

The SPEAKER. Representative Seth Grove.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This bill is about our Commonwealth – the future and the potential of its citizens. I feel every citizen has a potential to be as great as they want to be. Sometimes government needs to get out of the way to make that happen.

Before I dive into the data behind this, I think it is imperative that we go over the exemptions, the exemptions.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the Health Committee, but I attended this voting hearing. There was a group of individuals in wheelchairs that were attending that meeting. I think the chairman of the committee went over the exemptions. A gentleman in the wheelchair looked over at the individual that brought him and said, "I don't think these apply to me. I don't think this applies to me at all." The lady in the blue shirt with the white hair then turned to him and said, "Yes, yes, it does. You sit here and we need to fight this."

Mr. Speaker, those simple exemptions, which are pretty broad-based, are as follows: an enrollee who is attending high school full-time, an individual who is receiving temporary or permanent long-term disability benefits, an individual who is under 16 years of age or those who are 65 and older, pregnant women, SSI beneficiaries, an individual residing in a mental health institution or correctional institution, an individual experiencing a crisis, serious medical condition, or temporary condition which prohibits employment, including, but not limited to, domestic violence or a substance abuse disorder – Mr. Speaker, that is a very, very broad exemption – those who are a primary caregiver to a dependent under 6 years of age, those who are the primary caregiver for a person who is permanently disabled or in hospice. Mr. Speaker, whom are we talking about? How many people? According to the Department of Health and Human Services, the total number of nondisabled medical assistance enrollees between the ages of 19 and 64 is 965,410. The total number of nondisabled medical assistance enrollees between the ages of 19 and 64 reporting zero, zero in earned income, is 495,719 individuals. So we are talking about 495,719 individuals out of over 2 million individuals who are on medical assistance, Mr. Speaker. Nondisabled, as the Department of Revenue portrays, between the ages of 19 and 64, those who are exempted.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a moment and think, what if 490,000 people go from zero income to just \$10 an hour at 20 hours a week? That has the economic potential of \$5.1 billion in economic activity. Just income tax alone, \$158 million in PIT (personal income tax) revenue collections. Mr. Speaker, that is recurring revenue. It does not affect negatively our economy, does not require more money into State government. That is real economic activity. It is empowering, Mr. Speaker, giving people new jobs, new economic opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, Kansas started work requirements, broad-based work requirements in TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.) What are the results? They actually tracked individuals for 4 years. What are the results? Their baseline annual wages for families leaving TANF after work requirements – baseline – \$19.5 million. They are earning \$19.5 million. One year later, Mr. Speaker, they are earning \$39.8 million; \$39.8. Two years later, \$48 million. Three years, \$52.2. Four years later, a huge jump to \$67.6 million. New revenue into the State of Kansas. That is economic opportunity. That is providing new revenue, new money into your families to take care of them, higher income to offset lost welfare benefits. Job gains were diverse.

What it also does is make sure we can take care of the truly needy. We have had many budget-breakers that are crowding out our line items, and pensions is one of them. Work requirements allow us to take money and direct it to the most needy to take care of the most needy. Mr. Speaker, I think that is very, very responsible.

Mr. Speaker, what we learned through other work requirement mechanisms in Maine, what we are going to see in Kentucky, what we are going to see in Pennsylvania is a better economy, less costs, and more money for those most needy Pennsylvanians who deserve it the most, those who have been exempted from work requirements, those lists that I have already read, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity to unleash great economic opportunity for Pennsylvanians. It is going to create some work, but, Mr. Speaker, I think together we can get there.

A vote for HB 2138 will provide our Pennsylvania residents the opportunity for success, and the thought, Mr. Speaker, of bipartisan broad-based support for the #IWantToWork program that says, yes, we want disabled individuals to work and they want to work too. And to think that we are exempting them from this work requirement, but we have them beating down the halls of this House saying, I want an opportunity to work in this Commonwealth because I am a valuable member and I deserve the ability to be a productive, independent member of society, Mr. Speaker.

I think it sends a message to Pennsylvania and to the world that we are open for work and we have great employees who are capable of that work, Mr. Speaker. Let us vote for this. Let us send it to the Governor's desk – or over to the Senate, and make sure we have the best Commonwealth we can.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Mike Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, just to get a few of the facts straight. We have heard about all the exceptions that there are in this bill, and so really what we are talking about is expanded Medicaid recipients, and of all the people that receive medical assistance

in the State of Pennsylvania, 27 percent are newly eligible under Medicaid. Sounds like a big number, sounds like there is a lot of room to save a lot of money there. The only problem is, that 27 percent only accounts for 3 percent of the total medical assistance payments made in the State of Pennsylvania.

So now we are talking about trying to find the few individuals in that 3 percent of cost that are not currently working. So let us talk about the scenarios of who those people are. I know in my district, and I believe in every district in the State of Pennsylvania, there are families where one provider, one parent goes to work every day, and if they are lucky enough to be making the \$10 an hour that was referred to by the previous speaker, they are still only bringing home \$20,000 a year for the family. And they have got two kids that are not below the age of 6, they are 7 and 8, and during the summer months in particular, if the other parent is not home, those kids need full-time day care times two for 3 months out of the year. And so even if the second parent finds gainful employment just for the summer months, they cannot afford the day care. If they have gainful employment all year long and have to have day care for those kids after they get out of school, or heaven forbid, the parents are actually homeschooling their children, one of those parents gives up health-care benefits in order to make that happen under this piece of legislation.

There is no exception for a person who, as was previously stated, wants to live to their fullest potential of being a full-time mother. There is no exemption in this bill for that medical assistance recipient, and that medical assistance recipient now has to go without health care because this bill does not allow them to say, "But I actually do something important in society," because they did not take a minimum-wage job for some employer. This is not about saving money in medical assistance; this is about providing cheap subsidized labor, forced cheap subsidized labor to businesses and punishing the working poor. This bill has little or nothing to do with saving money. It has to do with saying to someone who works those minimum-wage jobs, that is not good enough; you both need to work, you both need to be working two and three jobs because you will not be able to afford medical assistance because we are shutting you out.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is mean-spirited and I urge a "no" vote.

BILL PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. At this time we are going to go over the bill. We will be back. I think there are two more, two or three more speakers who have requested, including the maker of the bill.

SB 936 RECONSIDERED

The SPEAKER. There was a motion for reconsideration, a motion to reconsider a bill that was filed by Representative Rob Kauffman and Representative Ryan Mackenzie on February 6, a move that the vote by which SB 936 was defeated on February 6. We are going to call up that motion to reconsider, and on the reconsideration motion I have Representative Bryan Cutler, on the motion to reconsider, SB 936. And it was filed by Representatives Kauffman and Mackenzie.

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

The SPEAKER. And then I think Representative DiGirolamo wishes to—

Representative DiGirolamo, you may proceed.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, on reconsideration of SB 936.

And I think it is important as we decide whether to reconsider that we go back a little bit on the history of this bill and how we got to the place here that we are now trying to reconsider this bill, because, Mr. Speaker, this is the third time that we are going to vote on this bill, the third time.

The first time, if you recall, Mr. Speaker, it was HB 18, and a motion was made on the floor to move that bill to a committee and that motion passed by a pretty wide margin. The second time we voted on this bill, it came over from the Senate as SB 936, and not too long ago, Mr. Speaker, a vote was put up right here on the House floor, and it was a 98-98 vote, which means that this bill was defeated.

So here we are now, Mr. Speaker, we are here for the third time to vote on this bill, the very, very similar bill – and why, why did this bill fail two times that we have to be back here and reconsider? I will tell you why it failed, Mr. Speaker, because it goes way, way too far in one direction and away from protecting our constituents who are injured in each and every one of our districts, Mr. Speaker.

I will tell you what we ought to be doing right now instead of reconsidering this bill: we ought to be telling the people on both sides of this issue to get together in the room and work out the differences on this bill and come back on the floor with a bill that is fair and that is compromising. That is what we ought to be telling them to do, to go in a room and come back with a compromise bill that all of us can vote for. This has nothing to do with the opiate problem, Mr. Speaker, nothing to do at all, because if it did—

The SPEAKER. Representative, could you just please suspend. Sir, this is on the motion to reconsider. I presume you are opposed to it. If it passes, you will be able to speak on the substance of the bill. If it does not pass, then obviously, we will not be getting to the substance of the bill.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for pointing that out. I appreciate that. I will stick to reconsideration.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we are here to reconsider. I am going to ask everybody to vote "no" on reconsideration. This is just a wrong— This bill failed two times for a reason. This is not a procedural vote today, Mr. Speaker, this is not a procedural vote. Please vote "no" on reconsideration for SB 936. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On the motion for reconsideration, the majority leader, on the motion to reconsider motion filed by Representatives Kauffman and Mackenzie.

I apologize. I will hold off on the majority leader. The minority leader, Representative Frank Dermody, on the motion to reconsider. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as we have just heard, we have voted this issue and we voted this issue down twice. There is absolutely no reason for us to have to vote it down a third time. We should vote "no" on the motion to reconsider.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you. And Representative Tim Hennessey I see wishes to speak on the motion to reconsider. Representative Hennessey, we have that on. You may proceed.

Mr. HENNESSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I agree with the gentleman from Bucks County. Just as a recollection, HB 18 was shelved, sent back to committee back in June of 2017, 10 months ago, and it was sent back largely because people pointed out that it violates the rules sent down in the *Protz* decision by our own Supreme Court. Now, I know we have had some difficulties with our own Supreme Court on other issues recently, but the bottom line is, they are still the ones that are going to have to pass judgment on our actions with regard to SB 936.

Five weeks ago we had this discussion and the vote failed largely for the same reasons. But the point that I tried to make is that in the 10 months since HB 18 and the 2 months since SB 936 were turned down by this House, nothing has happened to make that bill – in this case, SB 936 – meet the requirements of our Pennsylvania Supreme Court. In basic terms, what our court said was, if we are going to make major changes in public policy – in that case, they were dealing with another medical issue – but if we were going to make major changes in public policy, we have to do it by a vote of the House and the Senate and it has to go to the Governor to become law. What SB 936 does is empower the Department of Labor to appoint someone to pick a formulary, and there are many formularies out there.

The SPEAKER. Representative, again, if you will please suspend.

Mr. HENNESSEY. Okay.

The SPEAKER. I know I spoke to the good gentleman from Bucks. This is the motion to reconsider. If the bill is moved to be reconsidered by a vote of this chamber, we will then be on the substance of SB 936. Obviously, if the motion to reconsider fails, we will not be on the substance of SB 936 as it came over. This bill, on February 6 of 2018, had a 98-98 vote; that was not enough to pass it. Representatives Kauffman and Mackenzie filed a motion to reconsider and that is what we have in front of us right now. If we get to the bill, I certainly will give you much more leeway.

Mr. HENNESSEY. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, just to sum up very quickly, there is nothing that changed in this bill that would bring it into compliance with the rules that have been sent down by our Supreme Court. Without that, we are probably going to be voting an unconstitutional bill, or something that will be turned down by our Supreme Court. Since there have been no changes, I suggest that we stay with our original decision, and I would ask you to vote not to reconsider this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Does anybody else wish to speak on the motion to reconsider the bill?

Representative Rob Kauffman, who filed the motion.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This bill has not been voted on on three separate occasions. It was sidetracked on a procedural motion one time as HB 18, and SB 936 came up a tie vote, so it seems like a perfect conclusion to allow this tiebreaker to happen this evening and we allow this vote to come up again and get an up-or-down vote. There were folks who were not in the chamber at that point, and I would appreciate your positive vote for reconsideration. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Galloway, on the motion to reconsider, sir.

Mr. GALLOWAY. I just would like to correct the record. For the record, Mr. Speaker, that is incorrect. HB 18 was defeated in our committee before you became the chairman. Actually, it was defeated with Republican votes. This was a bad bill then; it is bad bill now. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Does anybody else wish to be recognized on the motion to reconsider the bill?

Anybody else before I call on the leader? Is there anybody else?

The majority leader, on the motion to reconsider the bill.

Mr. REED. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would respectfully ask the members to vote in favor of the motion to reconsider SB 936. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Members, to be able to take a vote on SB 936, including debate – so to have debate, further debate and a vote on SB 936, you would be voting in favor of the motion to reconsider, that is an "aye" vote. If you do not want to have the debate and the vote on SB 936 reconsidered, you would be voting "no."

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

SB 936 RECONSIDERATION MOTION CONTINUED

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—98

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

NAYS—96

Barbin	Dawkins	Kaufer	Pashinski
Barrar	Deasy	Kavulich	Petrarca
Bizzarro	DeLissio	Keller, W.	Quinn, C.
Boback	DeLuca	Kim	Rabb
Boyle	Dermody	Kinsey	Rader
Bradford	DiGirolamo	Kirkland	Ravenstahl

Briggs	Donatucci	Kortz	Readshaw
Brown, R.	Driscoll	Krueger	Roebuck
Brown, V.	Evans	Kulik	Sainato
Bullock	Farry	Longietti	Samuelson
Burns	Fitzgerald	Madden	Santora
Caltagirone	Flynn	Markosek	Schlossberg
Carroll	Frankel	Matzie	Schweyer
Cephas	Freeman	McCarter	Sims
Charlton	Fritz	McClinton	Snyder
Comitta	Gainey	McNeill	Solomon
Conklin	Galloway	Metzgar	Stephens
Costa, D.	Goodman	Miccarelli	Sturla
Costa, P.	Haggerty	Millard	Thomas
Cruz	Hanna	Miller, D.	Vazquez
Daley	Harkins	Mullery	Warren
Davidson	Harris, J.	Murt	Wheatley
Davis, A.	Hennessey	Neilson	White
Davis, T.	Jozwiak	O'Brien	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—6

Christiana Dean	Fabrizio Gabler	Rozzi	Vitali
--------------------	--------------------	-------	--------

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

The SPEAKER. So the motion to reconsider passes, and we now have in front of us SB 936. Members, in consultation with the Parliamentarian SB 936, PN 1281; SB 936, PN 1281.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR C

BILL ON FINAL PASSAGE

The House proceeded to consideration on final passage of **SB 936, PN 1281**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 2, 1915 (P.L.736, No.338), known as the Workers' Compensation Act, in liability and compensation, further providing for prescription drugs and the treatment of work-related injuries; and, in procedure, further providing for peer review.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The SPEAKER. Members are permitted to debate SB 936, PN 1281. And I know Representative DiGirolamo wanted to continue to speak on the substance of the bill, so, Representative DiGirolamo, I call upon you. Representative Mullery, you will be next.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I think when I got up on reconsideration, I gave a brief history of how we got to this point on SB 936. And I know there is a lot of talk about this being mainly about the opiate problem and the opiate epidemic that we have, and I am going to address that a little bit later. But I am going to start out, Mr. Speaker, and I know many of you have gotten a lot of e-mails from groups that oppose and support this bill, and on most of the e-mails that you have gotten from the groups that support this bill, Mr. Speaker, I just want to briefly read who some of them are: builders and contractors, insurance, independent businesses, business officials, Builders Association, Business and Industry,

and it goes on and on and on and on. And I get it, Mr. Speaker, I get it. These groups are very worried about the balance for workers' compensation and the cost of it and how it is going to affect their businesses. But I ask the question, Mr. Speaker, who is going to stand up for the injured workers in each and every one of our districts? Who is going to stand up for the injured workers in each and every one of our districts, Mr. Speaker?

I talked a short time ago to a constituent of mine, an injured worker. His name was Shawn, and he came specifically to talk to me about this bill and he had just a heartbreaking story, Mr. Speaker. He was injured in June of 2013. He was in a coma. He was unable to walk. He had some brain damage, Mr. Speaker, and after 2 years of litigation, he was finally able to get the benefits that he should have gotten; 2 years of litigation. And it is a sad story, Mr. Speaker: because of his disabilities, he had to leave his home, wife, and kids and go live with his parents because they were more able to take care of him, Mr. Speaker. Who is going to stand up for the injured workers?

And one of the groups that opposes this legislation, Mr. Speaker, familiar to all of us, is the Pennsylvania State Troopers Association, the State Troopers Association, and I am going to read one sentence from their letter; it says that this is a thinly veiled effort to use the opiate crisis to justify a dramatic shift in our current workers' compensation program that will be detrimental to all workers here in Pennsylvania. And about the opiate crisis, Mr. Speaker, when you look at the list of people that support this bill, there is only one organization on that list, Pyramid, that does drug and alcohol rehabilitation here in Pennsylvania. And you know how many licensed facilities there are here in Pennsylvania that do drug and alcohol treatment? Almost 1,000. Where are the other 990-some groups and organizations that deal with drug and alcohol treatment? How come they are not on this list of supporters of this bill? And I will tell you what, they tried. They tried to get them and they would not go on.

So just in closing, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the question one more time, who is going to watch out for the injured workers in the State of Pennsylvania, to find that right balance between what is right for the businesses and what is right for the injured workers? And I am going to answer that question, Mr. Speaker. We have to look out for the injured workers. The members here in the General Assembly have to watch out and make sure workers' compensation is fair, not only for businesses, but for injured workers.

So I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, when you push that button, to think of your injured workers and that this bill goes way, way too far in one direction and does not protect our injured workers who need their health care and their benefits, and I ask for a negative vote on 936.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative John Maher, followed by Representative Mullery.

Mr. MAHER. If you are a union worker employed by the State of Pennsylvania, your health care includes a drug formulary. If you are a nonunion worker employed by the State of Pennsylvania, your health insurance includes a drug formulary. If you are a member of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania, your health insurance includes a drug formulary. If you are employed just about anywhere in Pennsylvania — anywhere — your health insurance includes a drug formulary. Now, why is that?

You know, when drug formularies were first suggested, I do not know, 15 years ago in this General Assembly, I was not excited about them. In fact, I think I may have spoken against them because I had the kinds of concerns that I am hearing from the other side of the aisle. But what has happened is that drug formularies have become the standard of good care. If someone covered by any of these insurance policies is injured outside of the workplace, they have that protection of that standard, but if they get injured at work — poof — that standard of care is not there.

This bill seeks to bring that standard of care so that individuals in Pennsylvania receive the same quality of care whether they are hurt on the job or off the job. I believe they should have the same quality of care when they are hurt on the job as they do when they are off the job. Now, there has been chatter about who would be this drug formulary, and I will remind you that the Governor will choose who the drug formulary is. Now, if you think this Governor is going to pick a drug formulary that is contrary to the interest of organized labor, well, then I guess you would want to oppose the bill. If you think this Governor has the happy thoughts about organized labor and would pick a formulary accordingly, then I think you ought to trust the Governor and vote in favor of the bill.

I do not understand all the fuss. Workers deserve the same standard of care whether they are hurt on the job or off the job, and unless you distrust this Governor's attitude towards employed people, I would say, trust his judgment, pass the bill, let them select a formulary.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Mullery, sir.

Mr. MULLERY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, absolutely nothing in SB 936 has changed since this legislation was last before the House and defeated on February 6. This bill still leaves many important unanswered questions and contains multiple integral inconsistencies. We still do not know what criteria the department will utilize in selecting a drug formulary. We still do not know if the drug formulary contemplated in this bill is open or closed. We still do not know what level of oversight will be provided or who will be charged with oversight of the drug formulary. We still do not know which out-of-State, for-profit, third-party company will be chosen to create the formulary.

It could be the Work-Loss Data Institute that was recently purchased by the Hearst Corporation, which if you do not know is one of the nation's largest diversified media, information, and services company with more than 360 businesses. Its major interests include ownership in cable television networks such as A&E, HISTORY, Lifetime, ESPN; 30 television stations; newspapers; magazines; and digital and video companies such as BuzzFeed and VICE. Or it could be the ReedGroup out of Colorado, which is now owned and operated by Guardian Insurance Company — an insurance company limiting insurance exposure; that is convenient.

We still do not know and have not discussed here on the House floor or in committee what provisions will be put in place in this legislation to protect against pay-to-play. We still do not know how this new law would protect those legacy claims to protect injured Pennsylvanians who are currently receiving "N" drugs as part of their treatment protocol. Practically speaking, we still do not know what documentation an injured Pennsylvanian can utilize to request medical

necessity of an "N" drug from his primary treating physician. We do not know what the procedure would be for an injured Pennsylvanian and his doctor to follow to secure an "N" drug.

But there are some things we do know. There are certainties contained in this legislation. We know SB 936 cares more about calculating the expected savings achieved through passage of this legislation than it does about measuring the quality of care received by injured Pennsylvanians. We know that because it is specifically listed within the legislation; calculating savings is explicitly mandated in the legislation while it remains silent on the issue of quality of care.

We know SB 936 will deny injured Pennsylvanians the right to reasonable, necessary, and causally related medical treatment. We know SB 936 creates a one-size-fits-all system of prescription care as opposed to the individualized care currently received by injured Pennsylvanians. We know SB 936 is antiworker legislation that will further limit the benefits available to injured Pennsylvanians who have already given up substantial rights in exchange for the protections afforded under the PA workers' compensation law. And we know SB 936 will drive a wedge between injured workers and their treating physicians. Mr. Speaker, of all of these issues, that is my biggest concern with this legislation.

I remember back in February hearing a few of my colleagues stand and speak about how medical professionals had not weighed in on this bill. Then on March 12 I received a letter from the Pennsylvania Medical Society asking me to support HB 1293, introduced by the good lady from Bucks County, and as I do with all correspondence, I read it.

In case you are not aware, the Pennsylvania Medical Society is a physician-led, member-driven organization representing all physicians and medical students throughout the Commonwealth. They advocate for physicians and their patients, they educate physicians through continuing medical education, and they provide expert resources and guidance to help physicians and their organizations navigate the challenges in today's ever-evolving health-care system.

Allow me to share a few remarks from that March letter that are relevant to SB 936. Quote, "During the course of patient care, a physician's moral and ethical obligation is to treat a patient in a manner that is clinically appropriate and in the best interest of that individual's well-being. These decisions come with immense personal and professional responsibility...a responsibility that physicians take very seriously."

We "believe very strongly that determining how a patient is treated, and what treatment protocol is best, should be decided by a patient's physician, not by an insurance company algorithm designed only to reduce costs and ration care...." And most importantly, the president of the Pennsylvania Medical Society says, quote, "...the bedrock of medical practice remains the physician-patient relationship. Unfortunately, health insurers continue to strain this relationship by dictating treatment protocols without ever having the benefit of examining the patient themselves...." If you still believe that our physicians have not staked a claim on this legislation, you are burying your head in the sand.

For these reasons I ask you to oppose SB 936, as you did on February 6, and stand up for and with our injured Pennsylvanians. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative John Lawrence, on the bill. Waives off.

Representative Hennessey is waving. Representative Hennessey, you may; please go right ahead. I did not see you and I apologize.

Representative Hennessey.

Mr. HENNESSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I promise I will not be long.

Our Pennsylvania Supreme Court, in the *Protz* decision from a year ago, said that fundamental changes in public policy are decisions for the legislature to make. SB 936 delegates that decision to the Department of Labor. They are to choose a formulary from the various formularies that are out here, and I can tell you that some of the formularies – the most restrictive one I think has 150 drugs, medications that are approved in the formulary. Capital BlueCross has 1500; some others have over 3,000. So it is a major decision, all right?

Adopting a formulary shifts the burden from the patient and his doctor and puts the burden on the patient and the doctor that they have to convince a review committee that this is a proper medication. That is not the way the system has existed for 100 years. Up until, well, currently, a doctor and the patient decide on the medicine and it is given to the person until such time as the insurance company or the employer takes it for review.

The SPEAKER. Representative Hennessey.

Mr. HENNESSEY. Yes.

The SPEAKER. You had indicated, I know you wanted to be brief, and you are going afield with the legislation. Can you please just stick to the bill itself?

Mr. HENNESSEY. Mr. Speaker, I think I have spoken for maybe 2 minutes, but I will try to be brief.

The SPEAKER. It is longer than that.

Mr. HENNESSEY. I mean, the bottom line is, this is a major decision. It is a public policy decision. Our court tells us that we have to make it. If we pass SB 936 – you take a look on page 2 – the Department of Labor will make a decision as far as what the formulary is, it will hold the public hearing, and it will go into effect 180 days later. We will never see it. The House will never see that decision of the Department of Labor, nor will the Senate. It is clearly a violation of the separation of powers. We have a job to do. If we are going to change to a formulary, we ought to have the courage to put that vote up ourselves and not delegate it to someone else who does not have legislative authority. We are just inviting a reversal by the Supreme Court if we pass this.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Snyder, who is our last speaker.

Mrs. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to SB 936, and I would like you to indulge me to tell you why. Back in 1979 when I was a young wife and mother, my child was not out of bed yet one morning and there was knock on our door, and when I looked out, I saw my husband's boss staring back at me. After a 16-hour workday in one of the worst ice storms in southwestern Pennsylvania history, my husband, who was a lineman for the power company, was strapped to the pole and the pole broke at ground level and he fell 40 feet strapped to the pole. Needless to say, that was a not a good day in our household, and needless to say, as a young wife and mother, I had no clue what his health care would be like. But we were fortunate that the company doctor that was assigned to him was someone we knew, and

after multiple surgeries and a very long recovery, my husband went back to climbing poles and we continued to be able to raise our children and educate them on his salary.

I think I have heard it said here today that why should injured workers' prescription drug formularies be any different than anyone else, and I will tell you why I think that is: because under the workers' compensation system, an injured worker gives up his right to file a lawsuit. That is what makes it different. That injured worker deserves to be treated differently, not as a cookie-cutter approach on a drug formulary.

So I would ask all my colleagues to vote "no" on SB 936.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

CONSIDERATION OF SB 936 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The SPEAKER. Have all the members voted?
I think all the members are still contemplating their vote.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Nothing is in order but the taking of the roll.

Mr. DERMODY. No, I believe there are 10 minutes to record a vote, Mr. Speaker, and I think you are 5 or 6 minutes in.

The SPEAKER. In consultation with the Parliamentarian, there are, obviously, 10 minutes, and we still have about 3 minutes to go.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The clerk will record the vote.

Mr. DERMODY. I believe that—

The SPEAKER. The clerk will record the vote.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—101

Benninghoff	Gillespie	Marshall	Roe
Bernstine	Godshall	Marsico	Rothman
Bloom	Greiner	Masser	Ryan
Boback	Grove	McGinnis	Saccone
Brown, R.	Hahn	Mehaffie	Sankey
Causer	Harper	Mentzer	Saylor
Cook	Harris, A.	Metcalfe	Schemel
Corbin	Heffley	Millard	Simmons
Corr	Helm	Miller, B.	Sonney
Cox	Hickernell	Milne	Staats
Culver	Hill	Moul	Tallman
Cutler	Irvin	Mustio	Tobash
Day	James	Nelson	Toepel
Delozier	Kampf	Nesbit	Toohil

Diamond	Kauffman	Oberlander	Topper
Dowling	Keeler	Ortitay	Walsh
Dunbar	Keller, F.	Peifer	Ward
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Warner
Ellis	Klunk	Pyle	Watson
Emrick	Knowles	Quigley	Wentling
English	Lawrence	Quinn, C.	Wheeland
Evankovich	Lewis	Quinn, M.	Zimmerman
Everett	Mackenzie	Rapp	
Fee	Maher	Reed	Turzai,
Fritz	Mako	Reese	Speaker
Gillen	Maloney	Roae	

NAYS—92

Barbin	DeLissio	Keller, W.	Petrarca
Barrar	DeLuca	Kim	Rabb
Bizzarro	Dermody	Kinsey	Rader
Boyle	DiGirolamo	Kirkland	Ravenstahl
Bradford	Donatucci	Kortz	Readshaw
Briggs	Driscoll	Krueger	Roebuck
Brown, V.	Evans	Kulik	Sainato
Bullock	Farry	Longietti	Samuelson
Burns	Fitzgerald	Madden	Santora
Caltagirone	Flynn	Markosek	Schlossberg
Carroll	Frankel	Matzie	Schweyer
Cephas	Freeman	McCarter	Sims
Charlton	Gainey	McClinton	Snyder
Comitta	Galloway	McNeill	Solomon
Conklin	Goodman	Metzgar	Stephens
Costa, D.	Haggerty	Miccarelli	Sturla
Costa, P.	Hanna	Miller, D.	Taylor
Cruz	Harkins	Mullery	Thomas
Daley	Harris, J.	Murt	Vazquez
Davis, A.	Hennessey	Neilson	Warren
Davis, T.	Jozwiak	O'Brien	Wheatley
Dawkins	Kaufer	O'Neill	White
Deasy	Kavulich	Pashinski	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Christiana	Dean	Gabler	Vitali
Davidson	Fabrizio	Rozzi	

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 without amendment.

The SPEAKER. There are not going to be any further votes today. We will take up some of the other bills tomorrow. We are going to do some housekeeping issues.

BILLS RECOMMITTED

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

HB 504;
HB 1539; and
HB 2133.

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 209;
HB 638;
HB 1237;
HB 1792;
HB 1959;
HB 1960;
HB 2078;
HB 2079;
HB 2080;
HB 2081;
HB 2082;
HB 2083;
HB 2084;
HB 2085;
HB 2086;
HB 2242;
HB 2243;
HB 2244;
HB 2245; and
HB 2246.

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 1553 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.

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 1553 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.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1142, PN 1365**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 18, 1984 (P.L.1005, No.205), known as the Municipal Pension Plan Funding Standard and Recovery Act, in standards for municipal pension systems, further providing for definitions and providing for special procedures for certain professional services contracts.

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 1142 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 1142 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 403, PN 1228**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 53 (Municipalities Generally) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in employees, further providing for commission members.

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 SB 403 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 SB 403 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 284, PN 1556**, entitled:

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

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HR 284 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 284 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.

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. At this time Representative Mindy Fee moves that the House be adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 17, 2018, 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 6:41 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.