

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 2019

SESSION OF 2019

203D OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 21

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

**THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI)
PRESIDING**

PRAYER

HON. RUSS DIAMOND, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Good morning, colleagues. Please bow your heads and join me in communication with the Creator.

Almighty Father in heaven, Lord of Lords, King of Kings, your flawed and humble servants stand before You now in gratitude. We thank You for the blessings You have bestowed upon us; for the fertility of the ground that nourishes us; for the industriousness of those who have built the world we live in; and for the blessings of the pursuit of both liberty and happiness.

We ask, Good Shepherd, for Your guidance as we tend to the affairs of a Commonwealth founded on the precept of religious freedom. We seek Your wisdom in balancing the wants and needs of our own constituents with those of over 12 million other Pennsylvanians. Shine Your light upon this body so we see others in this hallowed hall not as our enemies, but as Your children and our brethren. Remind us that You are not some majestic figure off in the distance, but a constant companion who lives within each and every one of us.

We especially ask Your blessing upon our legislative leaders, our Governor, our judges, and other elected servants. We seek the protection and comfort only You can offer to Pennsylvania's children, elderly, infirm, disabled, and all who suffer pain or anguish in silence. Show us that we are one – not one party, not one race, not one religion, not one special interest, but one people who, bound together, can accomplish wonderful things in Your name and for Your glory. We ask that You hear our prayer as we strive to hear Your message to us.

And all God's people said, 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 Tuesday, March 26, 2019, will be postponed until printed.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

HB 223, PN 193

By Rep. EVERETT

An Act authorizing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission and the Governor, to grant and convey to French Azilum, Inc., certain lands situate in Asylum Township, Bradford County.

STATE GOVERNMENT.

HB 375, PN 348

By Rep. MURT

An Act amending the act of August 26, 1971 (P.L.351, No.91), known as the State Lottery Law, in pharmaceutical assistance for the elderly, further providing for definitions.

AGING AND OLDER ADULT SERVICES.

HB 633, PN 628

By Rep. EVERETT

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in primary and election expenses, further providing for reporting by candidate and political committees and other persons, for late contributions and independent expenditures, for place of filing and for additional powers and duties of the Secretary of the Commonwealth.

STATE GOVERNMENT.

HB 684, PN 697

By Rep. MURT

An Act amending the act of August 26, 1971 (P.L.351, No.91), known as the State Lottery Law, in pharmaceutical assistance for the elderly, further providing for the definition of "income."

AGING AND OLDER ADULT SERVICES.

HB 754, PN 804

By Rep. MURT

An Act amending the act of August 26, 1971 (P.L.351, No.91), known as the State Lottery Law, in pharmaceutical assistance for the elderly, further providing for determination of eligibility.

AGING AND OLDER ADULT SERVICES.

HB 775, PN 848

By Rep. MURT

An Act amending the act of August 26, 1971 (P.L.351, No.91), known as the State Lottery Law, in pharmaceutical assistance for the elderly, further providing for income verification.

AGING AND OLDER ADULT SERVICES.

HB 826, PN 1128 (Amended)

By Rep. MARSHALL

An Act providing for sports raffles for charity; and making related repeals.

GAMING OVERSIGHT.

HB 860, PN 1127 (Amended)

By Rep. EVERETT

An Act amending the act of February 14, 2008 (P.L.6, No.3), known as the Right-to-Know Law, in preliminary provisions, further providing for definitions; and, in procedure, further providing for exceptions for public records.

STATE GOVERNMENT.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 985 By Representatives RYAN, DUSH, GABLER, GROVE, HILL-EVANS and STAATS

An Act providing for auditor qualifications for the Department of the Auditor General, for new department employees, for current department employees, for employee certification, for forensic audits, for fraud audits and for committee standards.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, March 27, 2019.

No. 987 By Representatives SCHEMEL, RYAN, KAUFFMAN, EVERETT, BERNSTINE, ZIMMERMAN, MULLINS, PYLE, MOUL and KEEFER

An Act amending Title 20 (Decedents, Estates and Fiduciaries) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in general provisions relating to health care, further providing for applicability, for definitions and for criminal penalties; in living wills, further providing for emergency medical services; in out-of-hospital nonresuscitation, further providing for definitions, for orders, bracelets and necklaces, for revocation, for absence of order, bracelet or necklace and for emergency medical services, repealing provisions relating to advisory committee and providing for discontinuance; providing for Pennsylvania orders for life-sustaining treatment; and making editorial changes.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, March 27, 2019.

No. 988 By Representatives DIAMOND, DUSH, EVERETT, MILLARD, RYAN and KEEFER

An Act amending the act of February 14, 2008 (P.L.6, No.3), known as the Right-to-Know Law, in procedure, further providing for exceptions for public records.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, March 27, 2019.

No. 989 By Representatives KORTZ, MURT and McNEILL

An Act amending Title 34 (Game) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in game or wildlife protection, further providing for regulations.

Referred to Committee on GAME AND FISHERIES, March 27, 2019.

No. 990 By Representatives O'NEAL, TOPPER, BARRAR, KAIL, WALSH, RYAN, POLINCHOCK, ROTHMAN, STRUZZI, READSHAW, SAINATO, BERNSTINE, KAUFFMAN, MACKENZIE and SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in professional and occupational licenses, providing for military medical personnel pilot program.

Referred to Committee on VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, March 27, 2019.

No. 991 By Representatives THOMAS, TOEPEL, ROTHMAN, BARRAR, MILLARD, MURT, OBERLANDER, BERNSTINE, B. MILLER, KEEFER, MASSER, GROVE, WARREN and MOUL

An Act amending the act of July 8, 1978 (P.L.752, No.140), known as the Public Employee Pension Forfeiture Act, further providing for definitions.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, March 27, 2019.

No. 992 By Representatives BRIGGS, READSHAW, WILLIAMS, KINSEY, HILL-EVANS, MURT, DeLUCA, KENYATTA, MULLINS, KORTZ, MARKOSEK and DALEY

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, providing for media literacy education.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, March 27, 2019.

No. 993 By Representatives BRIGGS, ROEBUCK, HILL-EVANS, KINSEY, CALTAGIRONE, SCHLOSSBERG, SOLOMON, T. DAVIS, FREEMAN, ZABEL, DeLUCA, MULLINS, CIRESI, WARREN, MURT, KORTZ and STURLA

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, establishing the Higher Education Funding Commission and providing for its powers and duties.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, March 27, 2019.

No. 994 By Representatives FEE, McCLINTON, KINSEY, PICKETT, BROWN, IRVIN, FREEMAN, HILL-EVANS, MILLARD, ZIMMERMAN, MENTZER, NEILSON, MULLINS, MURT, TOPPER, DeLUCA, B. MILLER, LEWIS, SAYLOR, TOOHL, OBERLANDER, HICKERNELL, DIAMOND, SNYDER, CEPHAS, RADER, M. K. KELLER, HELM, DONATUCCI, SCHLOSSBERG, KORTZ, DAVIDSON, GLEIM and STURLA

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, further providing for dental examinations and dental hygiene services.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, March 27, 2019.

No. 1001 By Representatives OBERLANDER, YOUNGBLOOD, TOEPEL, KINSEY, SCHLOSSBERG, KAUFFMAN, SCHLEGEL CULVER, SIMMONS, OTTEN, SIMS, HILL-EVANS, STRUZZI, T. DAVIS, MULLINS, MARKOSEK, TOOHL, FITZGERALD, ULLMAN, DONATUCCI, SNYDER, DALEY, KIM, KLUNK, ECKER, BROWN, FEE, MALAGARI and DUSH

An Act regulating milk banks that provide donor human milk in this Commonwealth.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, March 27, 2019.

SENATE BILLS FOR CONCURRENCE

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

SB 86, PN 485

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, March 27, 2019.

SB 127, PN 419

Referred to Committee on VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, March 27, 2019.

SENATE MESSAGE

AMENDED HOUSE BILL RETURNED FOR CONCURRENCE AND REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 18, PN 1001**, with information that the Senate has passed the same with amendment in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives is requested.

The SPEAKER. The Local Government Committee is still meeting, so we are not going to take the master roll at this time.

Leader Dermody, I think you have a longtime staff member – are you prepared at this time? Yes. Okay.

Members, please take your seats. The Sergeants at Arms will close the doors of the House. If members wish to come on, please let them on, but we are going to honor two long-serving staff members who have given so much to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and its constituents. We are going to begin with the retirement recognition for Sharon McKee of the House Democratic Ethics Committee, and I am going to turn it over first to Democratic Leader Dermody.

SHARON MCKEE PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. Leader Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the retirement of caucus employee Sharon McKee. Sharon has been an invaluable member of the Democratic Caucus family. During her long career, she has worked in a variety of positions in the caucus: the

Legislative Research Office, the House Finance Committee, and the special committee to investigate industrial plant closings. And in her most recent role as senior research analyst to the Ethics Committee, it was her job to ensure that every one of our staff got their mandatory ethics training. She has faithfully carried out that responsibility year after year.

She will be missed by her many friends and colleagues in the caucus, and as you mentioned, Mr. Speaker, Sharon is here today with her husband, Dwight McKee, also a recent retiree from State government. I would ask them both to stand and be recognized.

Thank you for all your help.

So, Sharon, I join all the members of the House in wishing you and Dwight good luck in your retirement. Thank you for all your help over the years.

The SPEAKER. Sharon, such an honor to recognize your 35 years of service with the House Ethics Committee. A graduate of Cumberland Valley High School and the Harrisburg Area Community College and then Penn State University – and we know how rabid those alumni are – and the various positions that you held with the caucus and the House of Representatives, but certainly your important work with the House Ethics Committee. Thank you so much for that service. And to you and Dwight, we wish you just outstanding years ahead. Please come back and visit this chamber any time.

The great thing about the Pennsylvania House of Representatives – and, Sharon, you are emblematic of this – is that staff members for both the Republican and the Democratic Caucuses have always had a professional relationship and have always been able to work together, and it really is because of professionals like you. Thank you very, very much for all the years that you gave to the citizens of Pennsylvania.

And what we will do at the first break, if you do not mind, we will take some photos. I am sure Leader Dermody will want some photos with you and your husband. Thank you for being with us.

PAUL BALDARI PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. Representative Matt Bradford is recognized with respect to a staff retirement recognition for Paul Baldari, who has given 31 years of service to the House Democratic Caucus and to this august body and to the citizens of Pennsylvania.

Representative Matt Bradford, sir, the floor is yours.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Representative Delozier, for joining me today.

We are obviously here to recognize Paul Baldari, who is a resident of Representative Delozier's district and a longtime employee of the Pennsylvania House Democratic Caucus. As anyone will tell you, the first person you meet when you walk into the Appropriations office is Paul. You can stay and chat with him. He will tell you how much he loves and cares for his wife, Ruthie, his kids, his grandkids, and he will help you with any need you may have.

Paul is, in many ways, the face of the House Democratic Appropriations Committee. He is the one who sets the tone in every way. His joy and happiness – sometimes with a smile, sometimes with a sarcastic comment – but he is truly one of the good people, and anyone who has been in room 512 on the E floor of our Capitol knows Paul very well.

When he started working for the Commonwealth in 1987, Paul was a messenger and House page. Like so many of our workforce, they work their way up and have done great things not only for our Commonwealth, but for their family, and we are so appreciative. We know there was no e-mail or Facebook or Twitter back then, but Paul was the one who got word out for everything that needed to get done. He has worked for many chairmen: Representative Markosek, Representative Evans, and I believe he started under Max Pievsky. I think any long-term serving member knows that Paul has been around pretty much longer than any of us, and he has always done it with a smile in the best way.

So I want to wish him good health and best retirement. I know he is joined here today with Ruthie, I believe some family as well, and I just want to thank him for all his long service, not only to the Appropriations Office, but to the Commonwealth, on behalf of myself and Representative Delozier, thank you so much, Paul. We really appreciate it.

The SPEAKER. Paul, I understand your wife, Ruth, is with us today – will she please stand with you – and your mother, Nancy Nelson – Nancy, please stand – and stepfather, William Nelson. Ruth, Nancy, and William, thank you so much for joining your husband for Ruth, and son for Nancy and William. It is really a special day for us to honor his years of service to the House of Representatives and to the Democratic Caucus and to the citizens of Pennsylvania.

First of all, it is not often said that the roles of messenger, and certainly, receptionist are key in terms of interacting with the public and making sure communication occurs. You cannot have political discourse if there is not open communication and if you do not have a friendly face. The fact of the matter is that no matter who wants to come and speak to us, they ought to have an opportunity to come speak to us, because we are elected officials representing all the people. If we do not have good people like yourself, Paul, then we are not doing a great job. We are doing, actually, a disservice.

So thank you so much for the important roles that you held in the House of Representatives, and Godspeed to you and your lovely wife as you enjoy the years ahead. Thank you for being here.

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

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. We are going to do some recognitions of guests that are here.

In the rear of the House, we are pleased to welcome students from the Keith Valley Middle School Student Council. Please stand. They have traveled a long distance, from Montgomery County, and they are the guests of Representative Todd Stephens. Representative Stephens, thank you for bringing these student council members with us today. Thank you, sir.

Very special guests, Representative Curt Sonney has his mother and stepfather here, Shirley and Joe O'Neal. And, Shirley and Joe, will you please stand. Also, Representative Sonney's brother, Miles Sonney, please stand. Thanks so much for being with us, Shirley and Joe and Miles. We are really honored that you would take the time to be with us today.

Representative Chris Rabb has brought to us today Sgt. Kathryn Thompson. Where is Sgt. Kathryn Thompson? Please stand. There she is; please stand. Thanks so much. She is waving to us. Let me tell you about her. She retired from the Philadelphia Police Department after 30 years of service in the police force. Congratulations and best wishes. She is here today with her daughter, Sharrae Thompson, and granddaughter, Khayla Gambrel. Would they please stand, and then I am going to recognize Representative Rabb.

STATEMENT BY MR. RABB

The SPEAKER. Representative Rabb, on unanimous consent, sir.

You may proceed.

Mr. RABB. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am delighted to speak on behalf of just a wonderful person and proud to represent her in the 200th Legislative District, Sgt. Kathryn Thompson, who has worked in law enforcement for nearly 30 years. She began her professional career by working as a licensed practical nurse at Albert Einstein Hospital for 10 years. She then decided to serve her community in a different capacity by becoming a Philadelphia police officer. After graduating from the police academy, Kathryn was assigned to the 33d Police District, where she worked as a patrol officer, and her duties included radio calls and protecting and serving her community at large. She was instrumental in providing support and training to the 35th District town watch groups and many of the organized block captains residing within the northwest section of the city. In 2007 Kathryn was promoted to the rank of sergeant, where she became a role model, confidante, counselor, teacher, and advocate. Four years later, Kathryn took on another role, becoming a member of the Philadelphia Mounted Police. She is credited with becoming the first Black female sergeant assigned to this unit. Kathryn was instrumental in reorganizing that unit, which was disbanded in March of 2004.

After nearly 30 years of service, Sergeant Thompson retired from the Mounted Patrol Unit, and the Philadelphia Police Department on March 16, 2019. She looks back on a career dedicated to aiding, assisting, and providing services to the communities and the residents she vowed to protect and serve.

Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to Sgt. Kathryn Thompson and all of her amazing accomplishments.

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Rabb, and thank you, Sergeant Thompson. Congratulations to you.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. Located in the gallery, we are pleased to welcome representatives from Allegheny Partners for Out-of-School Time. Please stand. All the students with that organization, please stand. And this organization provides support for multiple after-school programs in Representative Jake Wheatley's district in Pittsburgh.

Joining us today are leaders from these organizations – if you will stand – Venture Outdoors, Providence Family Support Center, and One Northside Afterschool Collaboration. Thanks so much for being with us. We really appreciate your taking the time to come watch our proceedings.

Now Representative Tarah Toohil, will you come up to the rostrum, please, and I would like to have with us Representative Carroll and Representative O'Mara, if you will come up to the rostrum with Representative Toohil and myself. Thank you, Tarah. And she has some very special guests.

I would ask the Sergeants at Arms to please close the doors of the House and have everybody please take their seats. These young ladies have traveled some distance to be with us. And did Charlie Kasko come up too? Charlie, please feel free to come on up, and Dawn Cinti, I believe, right? Yes. Thank you. Please come up.

STATEMENT BY MS. TOOHL

The SPEAKER. Representative Toohil, you may proceed. Thank you.

Ms. TOOHL. Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker.

Today we are proud to have the northeastern Pennsylvania scholarship winners, hailing from three different parts of the State. Many years ago we did not have a scholarship pageant competition in northeastern Pennsylvania, and now we actually have – this is one of the ones that was started. And the competitors, these women are highly competitive, highly intelligent, and confident, and they all went forth with policy platforms.

We would like to introduce a guest of the gentleman from Luzerne County, Marina Maida. If you would raise your hand. And Marina's policy platform was called "It's My Own Opportunity," encouraging young adults to make their own career opportunities out of the resources available to them. We also have with us, as another titleholder and scholarship winner, Robyn Kass-Gerji, and Robyn is actually the constituent of the Speaker of the House, and her policy platform was "Ending Human Trafficking and Sexual Assault." We also have with us, with the gentledady from Delaware County, Miss Valerie West, who was Miss Wilkes-Barre/Scranton's Outstanding Teen, and her policy platform is one called "The Music: The Fabric of Life." So these are policy platforms that touch us throughout the State of Pennsylvania and that our legislators, many of them, have the same type of policies and beliefs. So we are glad that you are here with us today to share that and we are proud of you as scholarship recipients.

And we have Charlie Kasko – if you would give us a wave, Charlie – and he is the executive director of the NEPA Scholarship Pageant Association, with Dawn Cinti, the teen director.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing these fine, accomplished women today.

The SPEAKER. Thank you so much, Tarah.

Representative Toohil, thanks for bringing Marina, Valerie, and Robyn here. Congratulations, ladies; just outstanding work. And Charlie and Dawn, thank you for the great work that you do.

The Sergeants at Arms will open the doors of the House. Please open the doors of the House. The students are going over to the Governor's Office. Thanks for being with us. Thanks, Representative Stephens.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. Members, I have two very esteemed guests here with us from the Greater Pittsburgh Jewish Federation, leaders who have dealt with the tragedy at the Tree of Life Synagogue, but they do so much beyond that in terms of service to the community at large in the Pittsburgh region, not only the 50,000 Jewish citizens in the region, but to many others. I am going to have them stand. Josh Sayles and Brad Orsini, please stand. If everybody could please give them a round of applause. Thank you so much for being with us and for all your great work. Thank you.

Brad was formerly with the FBI for many years of service, too, and has taken over the security role with respect to the Greater Pittsburgh Jewish Federation. Josh, outstanding young man. Myself and the leader, the Auditor General, Representative Kaufer, and Representative Carroll, we all traveled with Josh recently to Israel in January, and really, just an outstanding young man. Thank you so much for being with us. We will see you at the break too.

At this time I believe Local Government – I see the chair is here and so the committee meeting is done and we will take the master roll.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Representative Jim RIGBY of Cambria County has requested to be on leave for the day. Representative Martin CAUSER of McKean County has requested to be on leave for the day. Without objection, those will be granted.

There are no members of the Democratic Caucus requesting leave for the day.

MASTER ROLL CALL

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

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—195

Barrar	Fitzgerald	Lewis	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Flynn	Longiotti	Reese
Bernstine	Frankel	Mackenzie	Roae
Bizzarro	Freeman	Madden	Roebuck
Boback	Fritz	Mako	Rothman
Borowicz	Gainey	Malagari	Rozzi
Boyle	Galloway	Maloney	Ryan
Bradford	Gaydos	Markosek	Sainato
Briggs	Gillen	Marshall	Samuelson
Brooks	Gillespie	Masser	Sanchez
Brown	Gleim	Matzie	Sankey
Bullock	Goodman	McCarter	Sappery
Burgos	Gregory	McClinton	Saylor
Burns	Greiner	McNeill	Schemel
Caltagirone	Grove	Mehaffie	Schlossberg
Carroll	Hahn	Mentzer	Schmitt
Cephas	Hanbidge	Merski	Schroeder

Ciresi	Harkins	Metcalf	Schweyer
Comitta	Harrell	Metzgar	Shusterman
Conklin	Harris	Mihalek	Simmons
Cook	Heffley	Millard	Sims
Cox	Helm	Miller, B.	Snyder
Culver	Hennessey	Miller, D.	Solomon
Cutler	Hershey	Mizgorski	Sonney
Daley	Hickernell	Moul	Staats
Davidson	Hohenstein	Mullery	Stephens
Davis, A.	Howard	Mullins	Struzzi
Davis, T.	Innamorato	Murt	Sturla
Dawkins	Irvin	Neilson	Thomas
Day	Isaacson	Nelson	Tobash
Deasy	James	Nesbit	Toepel
DeLissio	Jones	O'Mara	Toohil
Deloso	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Topper
Delozier	Kail	Oberlander	Ullman
DeLuca	Kaufer	Ortitay	Vitali
Dermody	Kauffman	Otten	Walsh
Diamond	Keefer	Owlett	Warner
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Pashinski	Warren
Donatucci	Kenyatta	Peifer	Webster
Dowling	Kim	Petrarca	Wentling
Driscoll	Kinsey	Pickett	Wheatley
Dunbar	Kirkland	Polinchock	Wheeland
Dush	Klunk	Puskaric	White
Ecker	Knowles	Pyle	Williams
Emrick	Kortz	Quinn	Zabel
Evans	Krueger	Rabb	Zimmerman
Everett	Kulik	Rader	
Farry	Lawrence	Rapp	Turzai,
Fee	Lee	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Fiedler			

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—6

Causser	Gabler	Rigby	Youngblood
Cruz	Keller, F.		

LEAVES ADDED—4

Comitta	DeLuca	Hennessey	Kinsey
---------	--------	-----------	--------

The SPEAKER. There are 195 members on the House floor. We have a quorum.

UNCONTESTED CALENDAR

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. KAUFFMAN called up HR 95, PN 546, entitled:

A Resolution honoring Wilson College as it celebrates the 150th anniversary of its founding.

* * *

Mr. LONGIETTI called up HR 161, PN 1007, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing April 4, 2019, as "National Walking Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. LONGIETTI called up HR 162, PN 1008, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing April 2, 2019, as "National Healthy Schools Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. STURLA called up HR 164, PN 1009, entitled:

A Resolution designating April 4, 2019, as "Thaddeus Stevens Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. STURLA called up HR 165, PN 1010, entitled:

A Resolution designating April 3, 2019, as "Boys and Girls Clubs Youth of the Year Day" in Pennsylvania in recognition of the role Boys and Girls Clubs of America has played in the nation and in this Commonwealth.

* * *

Mr. STEPHENS called up HR 172, PN 1044, entitled:

A Resolution commemorating the centennial of the March First Movement and First Korean Congress and noting their historic roles in Korea's nationwide resistance against imperial Japan.

* * *

Mr. MURT called up HR 173, PN 1045, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of March 2019 as "Deep Vein Thrombosis Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Ms. BOBACK called up HR 174, PN 1046, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the 4-H organization and annual 4-H Capital Days in Pennsylvania.

On the question, Will the House adopt the resolutions?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—195

Barrar	Fitzgerald	Lewis	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Flynn	Longietti	Reese
Bernstine	Frankel	Mackenzie	Roae
Bizzarro	Freeman	Madden	Roebuck
Boback	Fritz	Mako	Rothman
Borowicz	Gainey	Malagari	Rozzi
Boyle	Galloway	Maloney	Ryan
Bradford	Gaydos	Markosek	Sainato
Briggs	Gillen	Marshall	Samuelson
Brooks	Gillespie	Masser	Sanchez
Brown	Gleim	Matzie	Sankey
Bullock	Goodman	McCarter	Sappey
Burgos	Gregory	McClinton	Saylor
Burns	Greiner	McNeill	Schemel
Caltagirone	Grove	Mehaffie	Schlossberg
Carroll	Hahn	Mentzer	Schmitt
Cephas	Hanbidge	Merski	Schroeder
Ciresi	Harkins	Metcalf	Schweyer
Comitta	Harrell	Metzgar	Shusterman
Conklin	Harris	Mihalek	Simmons

Cook	Heffley	Millard	Sims
Cox	Helm	Miller, B.	Snyder
Culver	Hennessey	Miller, D.	Solomon
Cutler	Hershey	Mizgorski	Sonney
Daley	Hickernell	Moul	Staats
Davidson	Hohenstein	Mullery	Stephens
Davis, A.	Howard	Mullins	Struzzi
Davis, T.	Innamorato	Murt	Sturla
Dawkins	Irvin	Neilson	Thomas
Day	Isaacson	Nelson	Tobash
Deasy	James	Nesbit	Toepel
DeLissio	Jones	O'Mara	Toohil
Deloso	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Topper
Delozier	Kail	Oberlander	Ullman
DeLuca	Kaufner	Ortitay	Vitali
Dermody	Kauffman	Otten	Walsh
Diamond	Keefer	Owlett	Warner
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Pashinski	Warren
Donatucci	Kenyatta	Peifer	Webster
Dowling	Kim	Petrarca	Wentling
Driscoll	Kinsey	Pickett	Wheatley
Dunbar	Kirkland	Polinchock	Wheeland
Dush	Klunk	Puskaric	White
Ecker	Knowles	Pyle	Williams
Emrick	Kortz	Quinn	Zabel
Evans	Krueger	Rabb	Zimmerman
Everett	Kulik	Rader	
Farry	Lawrence	Rapp	Turzai,
Fee	Lee	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Fiedler			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—6

Causer	Gabler	Rigby	Youngblood
Cruz	Keller, F.		

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls upon Representative Rob Kauffman to speak on HR 95.

Members, I am going to ask you to take your seats. He does have guests with him. The Sergeants at Arms will close the doors of the House. The guests have traveled far to be with us today. Thank you.

STATEMENT BY MR. KAUFFMAN

The SPEAKER. Representative Kauffman, you may proceed. Mr. KAUFFMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This year marks the 150th anniversary of Wilson College, a small private college in the historic and picturesque north end of the Borough of Chambersburg. What makes Wilson College so special is its esteemed history and ability to adapt to the changing educational and cultural climates. Wilson was founded as a college for women in 1869, one of the first in the United States. It had great success for many decades, providing women with an exceptional education in a variety of career fields. Then, recognizing a growing population of adults seeking continuing education, in 1982 the college was one of the first in the region to begin offering a continuing studies program, and in 1996 the college became one of the first in the country to offer an on-campus residential education for single mothers with children.

Since the program began, it has won national attention, and Wilson has become the national center for single mothers in higher education.

The 2018-19 academic year marked the eighth year in a row for no tuition increase at Wilson College. In fact, for the 2014-15 academic year, the college reduced tuition by \$5,000 as part of the Wilson Today plan. With this student-centered approach, Wilson is bucking national enrollment trends, seeing a 44.6-percent increase in traditional undergraduate enrollment since 2013, and an 83.6-percent increase overall. These are just a couple of examples of how Wilson has always striven to address the needs of its students.

Today the college admits both men and women and the academic programming has continued to expand and intensify. Although small in size, Wilson has proven to be an enormous asset to Franklin County and all of Pennsylvania. It sets a high bar for how colleges need to reinvent themselves and respond to student needs in order to succeed and grow.

With us today to help us celebrate Wilson's 150th anniversary, I want to recognize the president of the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Pennsylvania, Tom Foley. I believe he is in the balcony. Tom. Thank you. And most importantly, with us today in the chamber is Wilson College President, Dr. Barbara Mistick. She has been the leader that has propelled this college forward since 2011. She has continued Wilson's proud academic traditions and has succeeded in increasing enrollment during a difficult season in higher education.

I want to congratulate Dr. Mistick on her leadership and ask everyone in the chamber to join me in recognizing the 150th anniversary of Wilson College and all of its many contributions and accomplishments.

Dr. Mistick, would you please stand.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Chairman Kauffman, and thank you – how are you, President? Good to see you. Thank you for being with us today and for your leadership at Wilson College and throughout your service to Pennsylvania.

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

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

HB 24, PN 341

By Rep. PEIFER

An Act amending the act of February 9, 1999 (P.L.1, No.1), known as the Capital Facilities Debt Enabling Act, in capital facilities, further providing for bonds, issue of bonds and notes, maturity and interest.

FINANCE.

HB 262, PN 233

By Rep. PEIFER

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, in inheritance tax, further providing for inheritance tax rate.

FINANCE.

HB 706, PN 731

By Rep. PEIFER

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, in personal income tax, providing for revocable trusts treated as part of estate.

FINANCE.

**RESOLUTION REPORTED
FROM COMMITTEE**

HR 104, PN 578

By Rep. PEIFER

A Resolution directing the Secretary of Revenue and the Governor to commence negotiations with the State of New York's Governor and Commissioner of the Department of Taxation and Finance to effectuate an income tax reciprocity agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New York.

FINANCE.

The SPEAKER. We have some additional guests that we are awaiting, but we will do that when we come back to the floor. So at this time I will take committee and caucus announcements.

RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Leader Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there will be an immediate meeting of the Rules Committee in the Appropriations conference room.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

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

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The majority Appropriations chair, Stan Saylor, for an Appropriations Committee announcement.

Mr. SAYLOR. There will be a meeting of the Appropriations Committee in the majority caucus room at 11:50. Again, there will be an Appropriations Committee meeting in the majority caucus room at 11:50.

The SPEAKER. There will be a meeting of the Appropriations Committee in the majority caucus room at 11:50.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

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

Mrs. TOEPEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. The Democratic caucus chair, Joanna McClinton, for a caucus announcement.

Ms. McCLINTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

House Democrats, we will caucus at 12:30. We will caucus at 12:30 and return to this floor at 2 p.m. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you very much, Representative McClinton.

I know that the Appropriations Committee meeting is, I believe, immediate and the Rules Committee meeting is immediate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. I would also ask that everybody please be back at 2 p.m.; everybody please be back at 2 p.m.

The House will stand in recess until 2 p.m. Thank you.

RECESS EXTENDED

The time of recess was extended until 2:30 p.m.; further extended until 2:45 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HB 30, PN 365

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 20 (Decedents, Estates and Fiduciaries) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in anatomical gifts, further providing for The Governor Robert P. Casey Memorial Organ and Tissue Donation Awareness Trust Fund contributions.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 328, PN 952

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act establishing the Flood Insurance Premium Assistance Task Force.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 351, PN 327

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of June 25, 1931 (P.L.1352, No.332), referred to as the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Compact, providing for veto power by the Governor over certain actions; further providing for audits; and providing the Governor of each state with power to ratify or veto certain actions taken by commissioners.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 447, PN 1116

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of June 1, 1945 (P.L.1242, No.428), known as the State Highway Law, in construction, improvement, maintenance and repair of State highways, providing for native vegetation along highways.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 538, PN 529

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 personal income tax, further providing for classes of income.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE
REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE****HB 18, PN 1001**

By Rep. CUTLER

An Act authorizing the release of Project 70 restrictions on certain lands owned by the Borough of Topton, Berks County, in exchange for the imposition of Project 70 restrictions on other lands to be acquired by the Borough of Topton, Berks County; authorizing the transfer of title for certain Project 70 lands owned by Lehigh County to Whitehall Township, Lehigh County; authorizing the release of Project 70 restrictions on certain lands owned by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, acting by and through the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, in exchange for the imposition of Project 70 restrictions on other lands to be acquired by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, acting by and through the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources; authorizing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Department of Military and Veterans Affairs and the Governor, to grant and convey to Monroe County Municipal Waste Management Authority, or its successors or assigns, certain lands, buildings and improvements situate in Stroud Township, Monroe County; and authorizing the Department of General Services and East Stroudsburg University of the State System of Higher Education, with the approval of the Governor, to grant and convey to East Stroudsburg Borough, a certain permanent public sanitary sewer easement and certain permanent public water supply system easements situate in East Stroudsburg Borough, Monroe County.

RULES.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Representative COMITTA and Representative KINSEY have requested to be placed on leave. Without objection, those will be granted.

I would like everybody to take their seats. We have some special guests with us. The Sergeants at Arms will close the doors of the House.

Members, please come onto the House floor. I am going to ask everybody to please take their seats. We have some special guests who have traveled half a globe away to be with us.

Representative Todd Stephens is recognized to speak on HR 172. I believe Representative Kim, Representative Quinn, and Representative Malagari will be joining him. Members, please take your seats. These guests have traveled some distance to be with us.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. Representative Stephens, the floor is yours.
Mr. STEPHENS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We are honored to have some very esteemed guests joining us over here, and we just ask you to rise as I read your name and title.

We have Ambassador Hyo-Sung Park, New York Consul General from the Republic of Korea; George Choe, cochair of the First Korean Congress Centennial Celebration; Sungho Kim, General Secretary; Judy Yoo, Philip Jaisohn board member; Kyunghee Seo; Grace Park; Master Bong Pil Yang; Consul Chung; Sung Kim; and Yong Chae.

Mr. Speaker, may I speak on HR 172?

STATEMENT BY MR. STEPHENS

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. Please proceed.

Mr. STEPHENS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to rise and thank the members for their unanimous support of HR 172. I learned a great deal in this subject and I was really surprised to learn some salient facts that I was unaware before and maybe many of the members know. But we all know that Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, played a pivotal role in American independence and our fight for freedom and democracy and independence as a whole. What I did not know is that Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, played a pivotal role in Korean independence, and it was brought to my attention that back in March of 1919, some activists in Korea met at a restaurant in Seoul to draft a Korean Declaration of Independence. The declaration was publicly read that day in Seoul and at other places throughout Korea. As translated, the declaration begins, "We hereby declare that Korea is an independent state and that Koreans are a self-governing people. We proclaim it to the nations of the world in affirmation of the principle of the equality of all nations, and we proclaim it to our posterity, preserving in perpetuity the right of national survival."

Ultimately, 2 million Koreans joined in widespread nonviolent mass demonstrations supporting the effort for independence. Throughout the time period, more than 7,000 demonstrators were killed, 16,000 wounded, and 46,000 arrested during this period of Korean resistance. Notably, from April 14 through April 16, 1919, the First Korean Congress convened in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to broadly declare Korean nationalism and activate supporters in the United States. Dr. Philip Jaisohn, a Korean political refugee who settled in Delaware County in the 1880s, worked to establish Philadelphia as a central overseas base. Dr. Jaisohn and other activists recognized Philadelphia as a symbol of freedom for oppressed people and a site where founding transformational documents for the United States of America were drafted.

So this year from April 12 through 14, 2019, the Korean-American community is coming together in Philadelphia to celebrate the centennial of the March First Movement and the first Korean Congress, again held in the city of Philadelphia.

So I want to thank my colleagues for their support unanimously of the resolution earlier which expresses our sincere appreciation for the acts of nonviolent resistance and the ideals of independence associated with the rise of Korean nationalism, and further recognize the contribution of Korean-Americans in our Commonwealth and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, thank you so much for the opportunity, and special thanks to our guests for joining us from various parts of the United States and abroad in support of this effort. Thank you so much.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to join my colleagues to mark these important anniversaries – 100 years since the March First Movement in Korea and the formation of the First Korean Congress, which took place in Philadelphia. It is important that we remember and recognize the bravery of those who stand up for freedom and independence.

And I am proud that we can also mark Pennsylvania's connection to these historic events. It is fitting that 100 years ago, the movement for Korean independence followed our path and then 1 month later found support in the same city where our nation's own independence was forged. Our histories for freedom and independence are forever intertwined.

I am honored to help welcome our guests today and to be one of the sponsors of HR 172. I appreciate my colleagues supporting this resolution, and thank you for the opportunity to speak.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

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

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

CALENDAR

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 86, PN 88**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1970 (P.L.128, No.49), entitled "An act granting to the Governor of the Commonwealth the sole authority for regulating the display of the flag of the United States from any public ground or building and from any ground or building of certain other institutions," further providing for the display of the official POW/MIA flag on Commonwealth grounds or buildings.

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 739, PN 769**, entitled:

An Act authorizing the transfer of title for certain Project 70 lands owned by Lehigh County to Whitehall Township, Lehigh County.

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 529, PN 522**, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 51 (Military Affairs) and 74 (Transportation) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Department of Military Affairs, providing for Civil Air Patrol; and, in authority of Department of Transportation, further providing for authority of department.

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 807, PN 900**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Pennsylvania National Guard, further providing for compensation of division commander or equivalent; and making a related repeal.

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 859, PN 973**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 35 (Health and Safety) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in 911 emergency communication services, further providing for counties, for inventory and for termination.

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

The SPEAKER. My understanding is that the Moul amendment and the Grove amendment, 521 and 526, have been withdrawn. I do not see any other amendments.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 349, PN 1087**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of November 10, 1999 (P.L.491, No.45), known as the Pennsylvania Construction Code Act, in adoption and enforcement by municipalities, further providing for administration and enforcement.

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

The SPEAKER. There are two amendments. We are going to take up Representative Heffley's amendment, amendment 538.

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

Mr. **HEFFLEY** offered the following amendment
No. **A00538**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 27, by striking out "INTERMUNICIPAL" and inserting

Intergovernmental cooperation

Amend Bill, page 3, line 6, by striking out "INTERMUNICIPAL" and inserting

intergovernmental cooperation

Amend Bill, page 3, line 19, by striking out "under" and inserting on or after the effective date of

Amend Bill, page 4, lines 11 through 16, by striking out all of said lines

Amend Bill, page 4, line 17, by striking out "(5)" and inserting (4)
 Amend Bill, page 4, line 21, by striking out "(6)" and inserting (5)

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

The SPEAKER. On the question of the amendment, Representative Heffley, any comments on the amendment?

Mr. HEFFLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a technical amendment and I would ask for an affirmative vote.

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—191

Barrar	Flynn	Mackenzie	Reese
Benninghoff	Frankel	Madden	Roae
Bernstine	Freeman	Mako	Roebuck
Bizzarro	Fritz	Malagari	Rothman
Boback	Gainey	Maloney	Rozzi
Borowicz	Galloway	Markosek	Ryan
Boyle	Gaydos	Marshall	Sainato
Bradford	Gillen	Masser	Samuelson
Briggs	Gillespie	Matzie	Sanchez
Brooks	Gleim	McCarter	Sankey
Brown	Goodman	McClinton	Sappey
Bullock	Gregory	McNeill	Saylor
Burgos	Greiner	Mehaffie	Schemel
Burns	Grove	Mentzer	Schlossberg
Caltagirone	Hahn	Merski	Schmitt
Carroll	Hanbidge	Metcalfe	Schroeder
Cephas	Harkins	Metzgar	Schweyer
Ciresi	Harrell	Mihalek	Shusterman
Conklin	Harris	Millard	Simmons
Cook	Heffley	Miller, B.	Sims
Cox	Helm	Miller, D.	Snyder
Culver	Hershey	Mizgorski	Solomon
Cutler	Hickernell	Moul	Sonney
Daley	Hohenstein	Mullery	Staats
Davidson	Howard	Mullins	Stephens
Davis, A.	Innamorato	Murt	Struzzi
Davis, T.	Irvin	Neilson	Sturla
Dawkins	Isaacson	Nelson	Thomas
Day	James	Nesbit	Tobash
Deasy	Jones	O'Mara	Toepel
DeLissio	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Toohil
Delloso	Kail	Oberlander	Topper
Delozier	Kaufer	Ortitay	Ullman
Dermody	Kauffman	Otten	Vitali
Diamond	Keefer	Owlett	Walsh
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Pashinski	Warner
Donatucci	Kenyatta	Peifer	Warren
Dowling	Kim	Petrarca	Webster
Driscoll	Kirkland	Pickett	Wentling
Dunbar	Klunk	Polinchock	Wheatley
Dush	Knowles	Puskaric	Wheeland
Ecker	Kortz	Pyle	White
Emrick	Krueger	Quinn	Williams
Evans	Kulik	Rabb	Zabel
Everett	Lawrence	Rader	Zimmerman
Farry	Lee	Rapp	
Fee	Lewis	Ravenstahl	Turzai, Speaker
Fiedler	Longietti	Readshaw	
Fitzgerald			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Causer	DeLuca	Keller, F.	Rigby
Comitta	Gabler	Kinsey	Youngblood
Cruz	Hennessey		

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

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

Mr. FREEMAN offered the following amendment
 No. A00541:

Amend Bill, page 2, lines 14 through 18, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

(2.1) For municipalities that administer and enforce this act utilizing paragraph (2) on and after January 1, 2020, the following apply:

(i) Where the department has reviewed a third-party agency as a result of a complaint, as provided for in section 105, has found in favor of the complainant and determines a pattern of incompetence or gross negligence, fraud, deceit, acts of moral turpitude, a failure to abide by a time period specified under this act, unprofessional behavior or discrimination based on personal bias against the applicant by the third-party agency, the municipality shall retain two or more third-party agencies to act on behalf of the municipality for administration and enforcement of this act.

(ii) After a period of three years, the municipality may request from the department the ability to revert to paragraph (2). The department shall notify the municipality of its decision in a timely manner.

Amend Bill, page 3, line 11, by striking out "opting" and inserting

required

Amend Bill, page 4, line 27, by striking out "opts" and inserting is required

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls upon Representative Freeman.

Members, I am going to ask you to please take your seats. Representative Freeman is entitled to be heard. Obviously, Representative Heffley, as the prime sponsor, will be entitled to be heard, but I am going to ask everybody to please take their seats, staff included. Both individuals are entitled to be heard.

Representative Freeman, on the amendment, sir.

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Carbon County's bill, HB 349, is pretty much predicated upon the notion that there have been a series of complaints by developers about the way in which third-party agencies or inspectors have handled the review process for their permits and for their plans. The reality is that this has not been the case, if you look at the number of complaints

that have been filed under the UCC, the Uniform Construction Code, procedure dealing with complaints. On average, according to Labor and Industry, there are only 15 to 20 complaints that are filed a year, and of those complaints, typically, only 1 to 2 end up resulting in the third-party inspector being decertified. So this is really a solution in search of a problem.

My amendment, amendment A00541, would limit the requirement for municipalities to have to have two or more third-party inspectors, as opposed to the current one third-party inspector. It would limit the requirement for municipalities to have to retain two or more third-party inspectors to those municipalities where a complaint has been filed with the Department of Labor and Industry and where Labor and Industry has found in favor of the complainant. Instead of imposing the bill's requirements for all municipalities to have to retain two or more third-party inspectors, which if passed would pose a host of problems for our municipalities in terms of with regard to cost, in terms of consistency of inspections, in terms of interpretations of the code, and problems associated with the errors and omissions of insurance coverage for third parties due to the way in which the bill sets up the review process by a designated official who is not actually doing the inspections. These are all problems that would manifest themselves for municipalities if all of our municipalities were required to have to have two or more third-party agencies involved.

Instead of doing that, why do we not zero our attention in where the problem is, and that is what my amendment does. By limiting this remedy solely to those municipalities where there has been a problem, where a complaint has been filed under the UCC complaint process, where L&I does a review process and they find in favor of the complainant, and therefore, that municipality would have to have two or more third-party inspectors. That is how you solve the problem. But to saddle all of our municipalities, all 2,560 municipalities with the requirement to have to have more than one third-party agency is unnecessary, costly, and would lead to a lot of confusion in terms of inspections and rulings.

My amendment offers a real compromise, a fair approach to dealing with the limited problem that we have in this Commonwealth about third-party inspectors not doing their job properly, and it would tie back to the language within the bill as to what the offenses of that third-party inspector would have to be in order to lodge a complaint and to have L&I rule in the complainant's favor. Why penalize municipalities where there are no problems by saddling them with this unnecessary mandate to retain two or more third-party inspectors. Let us apply it to only those bad actors who are a problem in this issue.

I should note that my amendment is supported by Labor and Industry, it is supported by the Pennsylvania Association of Township Commissioners, it is supported by the Pennsylvania Association of Building Code Officials, and it is supported by the Boroughs Association, all of which are groups that deal with this issue on a regular basis and whom we should listen to.

So I urge the members to please support this amendment. It is a nice compromise. It is where the focus should be. Let us not saddle all of our municipalities with the responsibility to have to have two or more third-party agencies. I urge a "yes" vote.

The SPEAKER. Representative Mackenzie.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would encourage members to vote "no" on this amendment. This amendment actually makes the problem even worse than it currently is. You will now be creating a system whereby

individual property owners will be beholden to an inspector that they have now filed a complaint against. I cannot think of a worse situation for an individual to be in than to be beholden to one monopoly who now has control over their lives and for an extended period of time – it is not spelled out in this legislation over what period of time this appeals process will play out – they are going to be beholden to somebody that they have just filed a complaint against. So for that reason I think this amendment is a disaster. It makes the situation much worse than current practice.

I would also say that the gentleman spoke about the reasons for opposing the bill, I will speak on that later, but I think all of those are flawed logic as well, so I would encourage a "no" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Heffley, on the amendment, and then I certainly will give Representative Freeman another opportunity too.

Mr. HEFFLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment, as highlighted by the good gentleman from Lehigh County, really would put homeowners – I mean, and we are not talking about big corporations; we are talking about somebody that is just putting a porch roof on the back of their house who has somebody that comes out and drives up the cost and harasses them. And this happens. But if you go complain, you still have to use that person, so most people do not complain. And I have had somebody come to my office and tell me that their third-party UCC inspector on a project for them said, go ahead and complain and then find out how you get the rest of your permits. So people do not complain because it is a monopoly and they use bullying techniques, and we have all seen the e-mails flying about here with a lot of misinformation on the bill.

I would say this would be a terrible situation. I mean, to put somebody who has a complaint against somebody and say they have to use them for the next year or 2 years. These projects could drag on forever. I really do not see the logic in this amendment and would definitely say that it would put residents across this State at a deficit when trying to get a simple, small project done at their house. It kind of baffles me why we would even go down this road.

This bill has passed the House last session. It did pass the Senate last session. We worked on language over the last 6 years on this bill. This was compromise language that we moved out of the Senate last session, working with PSATS (Pennsylvania State Association of Township Supervisors), and I would certainly ask for a "no" vote on this amendment. It will exacerbate the problem to make it far worse.

But I would say one thing, that the prime sponsor of this amendment, I guess he agrees with me that there is a problem and that is why he wants to create this investigation. The investigation process is already there, but it can take years. I mean, if you want to spend a lot of money and have your project delayed for years and not get things done – and this has happened throughout the Commonwealth. We have had two hearings in the L&I Committee on this, and we have had folks, both Democrats and Republicans, come to my office complaining about this issue when we have one third-party monopoly. The underlying bill allows the townships to select from two. If they are telling me that they cannot find two certified PABCO inspection agencies across this State, then I think PABCO has a problem.

And also, I would like to highlight, in the hearing that we just held this past Monday, PABCO themselves said that they know that there are bad actors out there among them, and we all know that. And they admitted it right in their testimony at the hearing.

So then why would they want to subject more people through this type of amendment, and they would support it when they know that there are bad actors out there.

This is for the people in the district. This is not a problem that I went and sought out. This is a problem that came to me because people were in tears in my office because they were going to be going bankrupt because they could not get projects completed in a timely manner because we had overzealous inspectors who were not enforcing the code to the standard – they were going above and beyond just to be spiteful.

I would ask for a "no" vote on amendment A00541 because it will definitely set the State back.

The SPEAKER. So we have Representative Pashinski, and then that will be followed by Representative Benninghoff, and then Representative Freeman, you will close. If anybody else wishes to speak before the sponsor of the amendment, please let me know, because I will call on Representative Freeman last.

Representative Pashinski.

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

Just a clarification, please, on behalf of the sponsor of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Yes. Representative Freeman, will you stand for interrogation? He will.

You may proceed.

Mr. PASHINSKI. Thank you very much, sir.

Would you just please list the authorities and associations, organizations that are supporting your amendment.

Mr. FREEMAN. Surely. Mr. Speaker, the Pennsylvania Association of Building Code Officials, the ones who are the professionals who actually do the inspections, they support this amendment. The Boroughs Association supports this amendment. The Department of Labor and Industry, which oversees commercial inspections if a municipality is not a participant in the UCC process. The Pennsylvania State Association of Township Commissioners supports this amendment. And I neglected to mention that the Pennsylvania Municipal League, which represents most cities of the third class in our Commonwealth, also supports this amendment.

Mr. PASHINSKI. Thank you very much, sir.

And on the amendment, I asked the question because it seems odd that all of these reputable, respected organizations would support your amendment, and yet there is opposition to it.

Mr. FREEMAN. I think that speaks to the fact that this bill really is a solution in search of a problem, that there is not a problem out there despite the comments of the gentleman from Carbon County. It has been very limited as to the number of complaints that have been filed. Under the current UCC procedure for filing a complaint, roughly about 15 to 20 every year, according to L&I, and of those, if any, maybe 1 or 2 results in a decertification of an inspector because they had not found the problems that this bill says exist out there.

Mr. PASHINSKI. And if this were to pass, would there be a financial burden to our communities?

Mr. FREEMAN. If anything, my amendment would reduce that financial burden—

Mr. PASHINSKI. Your amendment.

Mr. FREEMAN. —by limiting it to the problem municipalities where there has been a persistent pattern of a problem and where complaints have been filed. If, however, this is to be applied to all municipalities, there will be problems that they will have to deal with in terms of potential costs, because now you have two third-party agencies that have to be hired and

kept for the municipality. You would also have problems relating to a host of other matters. When you have two third-party agencies doing the inspection, you are going to have inconsistencies within the municipality as to how the inspections are carried out and how the determinations are made because there will be different interpretations, possibly, on how the UCC code should be interpreted, so that will pose a problem.

And one of the major problems that has been outlined by the Pennsylvania Association of Building Code Officials is the fact that because the legislation would require the designation of one individual to review all the plans that are inspected by other third-party agencies, the insurance coverage for that may not be forthcoming. They cannot possibly make a judgment on an inspection carried out by another third party and verify it to meet the standards of the insurance that is required. That poses a very serious problem, if this legislation were to take effect without my amendment.

Mr. PASHINSKI. So it appears that these organizations obviously—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Mr. Speaker, point of order?

The SPEAKER. Representative Benninghoff, for what point do you rise?

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Respectfully, it seems like we have strayed far off the amendment and we are now speaking on the bill. I would appreciate if the member would stay specifically to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. I would just say— Representative Pashinski, do you want to speak on the bill?

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

The SPEAKER. On the amendment; I apologize.

Mr. PASHINSKI. On the amendment.

After hearing the Representative that is sponsoring this amendment clarify all the respected organizations that represent our communities that support that amendment, it would seem pretty much likely that we should support that amendment, or reconsider this bill and put it back to the drawing board.

Under these circumstances, I would like to show support for that amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Heffley, before I call on—I am going to call on you and Representative Freeman second to last and last.

Representative Benninghoff, on the amendment.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to remind the members that we are looking at a bill with an amendment that is to be addressing our constituents. It was said a little bit earlier that they do not get a lot of complaints at L&I. If you only have one inspector, who stands up and speaks against the king who will be the inspector the next time you need him over and over and over?

I would respectfully ask our members to vote "no" to the amendment.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you to the majority whip, Kerry Benninghoff.

Does anybody else wish to speak before I call on Representative Heffley?

Representative Curt Sonney.

Mr. SONNEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, what this amendment is saying is that the current system is fine, and so by adopting this amendment under the current system, you are going to prove that whoever is doing the inspections or administering this work in your municipality, this amendment says you must prove that they are a bad actor. And it really strikes a nerve in me because under the legislation where we are trying to allow more than one – in other words, to end the monopoly that is currently in place – those same people will argue that all of the rest of the inspectors are somehow no good and they are not qualified when in reality they are.

Again to remind all of the members – it is a simple argument, but it absolutely holds true – the State says you must get your car inspected and you must take it to an official inspection station. We do not force you to take it to a specific station. And under construction laws today, our residents are forced – and not to have a choice, they are forced – to use only the one inspection agency that is in place in that municipality, and that is wrong. It is absolutely wrong. Our constituents should have a choice in who does that work as long as they are a qualified licensed inspector.

So I would ask for a "no" vote on this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dan Moul, on the amendment. Waives off.

I think we just have Representative Heffley and Representative Freeman.

Does anybody else wish to speak?

Representative Heffley, on the amendment.

Mr. HEFFLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just say, one comment that was made, and it was a false comment that was put about in an e-mail today, that this would cause insurance problems; it would not. And this was gone over in the hearing that we held and it was well stated and it is in the legislation that each agency that does the inspection would have their own BCO (building code official) to sign off. So that is a false argument and more false information put out and bullying techniques by these agencies because they like the monopoly.

This amendment is flawed. The practical application is unrealistic and the language is technically flawed.

It could be argued that investigations of complaints by L&I can take months. A person complaining would have to do business with the TPA (third-party agency) in question while the complaint is moving forward. Even more troubling, the amendment states that the department must determine a pattern of incompetence. So now we are setting standards far above when somebody has a complaint and indicates actions would be dependent on a higher legal standard approving many incidences of complaints. The same standard does not reflect standards in the current regulation on the subject.

There is no antiretaliation language, and I believe the maker of this amendment voted for antiretaliation language in the previous version of this bill and amendment that had gone into HB 1469, so he also knows that there is an issue because he voted for the antiretaliation language last session on the floor when that language went into HB 1469. With respect to the number two thing, that the bill does not apply the same standards to intergovernmental cooperation agreements, that, too, is inconsistent.

At the end of the day, this is an issue that affects the residents of this Commonwealth that are trying to do small projects, and just put yourself in their shoes for one minute. This is not about special interests or anything else, and there are a lot of special interests that we can list here today who support it and a lot of them who are opposed to it, but this is really about the people that came to my office in tears that were going to go bankrupt because you had a rogue third-party agent who was harassing them, and when they filed complaints, nobody responded to them. We have small businesses who are trying to put an expansion on their business, and the township supervisors did not particularly like this business owner although he was doing everything legal, and he could not get the permit done. They drug it out for a year.

This is not a solution in need of a problem. This is not something that we wanted to address but is something that is crying out across this Commonwealth, when we give these one third-party for-profit agencies this enormous power and then when they act unprofessional and abuse their power, we are now going to make the person who is being victimized, we are going make the victims of these monopolies have to go and spend money and come to Harrisburg from Erie and everywhere else to appeal to L&I, who this time they will meet with this deputy secretary and 2 months later when they have their next meeting, there will be another deputy secretary and they will start all over. I have gone through this process and it still does not change because the people that have the complaints are still acting. What is so bad about choosing two? Is PABCO—

The SPEAKER. Sir, on the amendment, okay? And then we will get to the bill, but on the amendment.

Mr. HEFFLEY. Land the plane, right?

You can vote with the special interests and put this amendment in or you can vote for the residents of this Commonwealth that are being abused by this process. Thank you.

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

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is sad the way in which this amendment has been portrayed by the opponents who have spoken this afternoon. We are talking about trying to get after the bad actors, where there are instances where complaints have been filed with L&I under the current procedures to be utilized by the Uniform Construction Code and to zero in where there is a problem.

Look at the record. There are only 15 to 20 complaints ever filed a year with L&I about inappropriate inspections by those third-party inspectors, out of 2,560 municipalities. That is a minuscule number. And of those, typically no more than one or two inspectors are ever decertified for their inspections.

Now, we can demonize these inspectors. Keep in mind, they are the ones who are the guardians of making sure that construction problems are done according to the Uniform Construction Code, which this General Assembly adopted many years ago for safer buildings, whether they are residential, commercial, or industrial. We should not be undercutting those people who guarantee that when a public school is built, it is built safely, because our children will be going to that public school. We should not be undercutting the people who ensure that proper inspections occur when you build a commercial mall that everyday customers go to on a regular basis, or when homes are built that people will live in and expect to be safe and properly constructed.

The gentleman from Carbon seeks to frame all the organizations that I mentioned are supportive of my amendment as special interests. Well, we have gone to a sorry state if those organizations which represent our municipalities, who represent the people of their municipalities are perceived as special interests. How is it that the Pennsylvania Municipal League, which speaks on behalf of cities; the Boroughs Association, which speaks on behalf of boroughs; the Pennsylvania State Association of Township Commissioners, which speaks on behalf of our first-class townships; the fact that you have PABCO, which is a very professional organization, which speaks on behalf of the professional standards who are inspectors – how are they special interests when they are all looking out for the best welfare of their citizens and their clients?

If there is a complaint, file it. There is a process in place. The UCC provides for it. The lack of any meaningful complaints being filed shows that this whole issue is a solution in search of a problem. Let us not burden our local municipalities by requiring them to have to have two or more third parties when in fact one is doing the job. Let us not burden them in terms of the problems that will emanate from the fact that more than one third-party will lead to misinterpretations as to what the standard is, misinterpretations of the UCC code, and application of inspection. This is a solution in search of a problem.

I urge the members to support my amendment, make this a better bill, make this a bill that zeros in where the problem is and ensures that we stand behind the professionals who make our construction safe here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—88

Bizzarro	Driscoll	Krueger	Ravenstahl
Boyle	Evans	Kulik	Readshaw
Bradford	Fiedler	Lee	Roebuck
Briggs	Fitzgerald	Longietti	Rozzi
Bullock	Flynn	Madden	Sainato
Burgos	Frankel	Malagari	Samuelson
Burns	Freeman	Markosek	Sanchez
Caltagirone	Gainey	Matzie	Sappey
Carroll	Galloway	McCarter	Schlossberg
Cephas	Goodman	McClinton	Schweyer
Ciresi	Hanbidge	McNeill	Shusterman
Conklin	Harkins	Merski	Sims
Daley	Harrell	Miller, D.	Snyder
Davidson	Harris	Mullery	Solomon
Davis, A.	Hohenstein	Mullins	Sturla
Davis, T.	Howard	Murt	Ullman
Dawkins	Innamorato	Neilson	Vitali
Deasy	Isaacson	O'Mara	Warren
DeLissio	Kenyatta	Otten	Webster
Deloso	Kim	Pashinski	Wheatley
Dermody	Kirkland	Petrarca	Williams
Donatucci	Kortz	Rabb	Zabel

NAYS—103

Barrar	Gleim	Masser	Rothman
Benninghoff	Gregory	Mehaffie	Ryan
Bernstine	Greiner	Mentzer	Sankey
Boback	Grove	Metcalfe	Saylor

Borowicz	Hahn	Metzgar	Schemel
Brooks	Heffley	Mihalek	Schmitt
Brown	Helm	Millard	Schroeder
Cook	Hershey	Miller, B.	Simmons
Cox	Hickernell	Mizgorski	Sonney
Culver	Irvin	Moul	Staats
Cutler	James	Nelson	Stephens
Day	Jones	Nesbit	Struzzi
Delozier	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Thomas
Diamond	Kail	Oberlander	Tobash
DiGirolamo	Kaufner	Ortitay	Toepel
Dowling	Kauffman	Owlett	Toohil
Dunbar	Keefer	Peifer	Topper
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Walsh
Ecker	Klunk	Polinchock	Warner
Emrick	Knowles	Puskaric	Wentling
Everett	Lawrence	Pyle	Wheeland
Farry	Lewis	Quinn	White
Fee	Mackenzie	Rader	Zimmerman
Fritz	Mako	Rapp	
Gaydos	Maloney	Reese	Turzai,
Gillen	Marshall	Roae	Speaker
Gillespie			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Causer	DeLuca	Keller, F.	Rigby
Comitta	Gabler	Kinsey	Youngblood
Cruz	Hennessey		

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

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

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS**

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 18, PN 1001**, entitled:

An Act authorizing the release of Project 70 restrictions on certain lands owned by the Borough of Topton, Berks County, in exchange for the imposition of Project 70 restrictions on other lands to be acquired by the Borough of Topton, Berks County; authorizing the transfer of title for certain Project 70 lands owned by Lehigh County to Whitehall Township, Lehigh County; authorizing the release of Project 70 restrictions on certain lands owned by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, acting by and through the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, in exchange for the imposition of Project 70 restrictions on other lands to be acquired by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, acting by and through the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources; authorizing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Department of Military and Veterans Affairs and the Governor, to grant and convey to Monroe County Municipal Waste Management Authority, or its successors or assigns, certain lands, buildings and improvements situate in Stroud Township, Monroe County; and authorizing the Department of General Services and East

Stroudsburg University of the State System of Higher Education, with the approval of the Governor, to grant and convey to East Stroudsburg Borough, a certain permanent public sanitary sewer easement and certain permanent public water supply system easements situate in East Stroudsburg Borough, Monroe County.

On the question,
Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

The SPEAKER. On that, the motion to concur in the amendments is moved by Representative Ryan Mackenzie, the prime sponsor of the bill. The Chair recognizes him to talk about the underlying bill and the Senate amendments.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The underlying bill, HB 18, that passed through the House has not changed. That still relates to an important land conveyance that will take place in Tipton in Berks County. The Senate added four additional Project 70 conveyances, or land transfers, to the bill – one in Chester County, one in Lehigh County, and two in Monroe County. I believe that these are acceptable and additionally beneficial transfers and conveyances that have been added by the Senate, so I would support a "yes" vote on the concurrence motion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does anybody else wish to speak on this?

On the question recurring,
Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—191

Barrar	Flynn	Mackenzie	Reese
Benninghoff	Frankel	Madden	Roae
Bernstine	Freeman	Mako	Roebuck
Bizzarro	Fritz	Malagari	Rothman
Boback	Gainey	Maloney	Rozzi
Borowicz	Galloway	Markosek	Ryan
Boyle	Gaydos	Marshall	Sainato
Bradford	Gillen	Masser	Samuelson
Briggs	Gillespie	Matzie	Sanchez
Brooks	Gleim	McCarte	Sankey
Brown	Goodman	McClinton	Sappey
Bullock	Gregory	McNeill	Saylor
Burgos	Greiner	Mehaffie	Schemel
Burns	Grove	Mentzer	Schlossberg
Caltagirone	Hahn	Merski	Schmitt
Carroll	Hanbidge	Metcalfe	Schroeder
Cephas	Harkins	Metzgar	Schweyer
Ciresi	Harrell	Mihalek	Shusterman
Conklin	Harris	Millard	Simmons
Cook	Heffley	Miller, B.	Sims
Cox	Helm	Miller, D.	Snyder
Culver	Hershey	Mizgorski	Solomon
Cutler	Hickernell	Moul	Sonney
Daley	Hohenstein	Mullery	Staats
Davidson	Howard	Mullins	Stephens
Davis, A.	Innamorato	Murt	Struzzi
Davis, T.	Irvin	Neilson	Sturla
Dawkins	Isaacson	Nelson	Thomas
Day	James	Nesbit	Tobash
Deasy	Jones	O'Mara	Toepel
DeLissio	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Toohil

Delloso	Kail	Oberlander	Topper
Delozier	Kaufert	Ortitay	Ullman
Dermody	Kauffman	Otten	Vitali
Diamond	Keefe	Owlett	Walsh
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Pashinski	Warner
Donatucci	Kenyatta	Peifer	Warren
Dowling	Kim	Petrarca	Webster
Driscoll	Kirkland	Pickett	Wentling
Dunbar	Klunk	Polinchock	Wheatley
Dush	Knowles	Puskaric	Wheeland
Ecker	Kortz	Pyle	White
Emrick	Krueger	Quinn	Williams
Evans	Kulik	Rabb	Zabel
Everett	Lawrence	Rader	Zimmerman
Farry	Lee	Rapp	
Fee	Lewis	Ravenstahl	Turzai,
Fiedler	Longiatti	Readshaw	Speaker
Fitzgerald			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Causer	DeLuca	Keller, F.	Rigby
Comitta	Gabler	Kinsey	Youngblood
Cruz	Hennessey		

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

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

BILL SIGNED BY SPEAKER

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

HB 18, PN 1001

An Act authorizing the release of Project 70 restrictions on certain lands owned by the Borough of Tipton, Berks County, in exchange for the imposition of Project 70 restrictions on other lands to be acquired by the Borough of Tipton, Berks County; authorizing the transfer of title for certain Project 70 lands owned by Lehigh County to Whitehall Township, Lehigh County; authorizing the release of Project 70 restrictions on certain lands owned by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, acting by and through the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, in exchange for the imposition of Project 70 restrictions on other lands to be acquired by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, acting by and through the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources; authorizing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Department of Military and Veterans Affairs and the Governor, to grant and convey to Monroe County Municipal Waste Management Authority, or its successors or assigns, certain lands, buildings and improvements situate in Stroud Township, Monroe County; and authorizing the Department of General Services and East Stroudsburg University of the State System of Higher Education, with the approval of the Governor, to grant and convey to East Stroudsburg Borough, a certain permanent public sanitary sewer easement and certain permanent public water supply system easements situate in East Stroudsburg Borough, Monroe County.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

BILLS PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. HB 538 is over for the day.
 HB 328 is over for the day.
 HB 30 is over for the day.

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 351, PN 327**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 25, 1931 (P.L.1352, No.332), referred to as the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Compact, providing for veto power by the Governor over certain actions; further providing for audits; and providing the Governor of each state with power to ratify or veto certain actions taken by commissioners.

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—175

Barrar	Frankel	Lewis	Ravenstahl
Benninghoff	Freeman	Longietti	Readshaw
Bernstine	Fritz	Mackenzie	Reese
Bizzarro	Gainey	Madden	Roae
Boback	Gaydos	Mako	Roebuck
Borowicz	Gillen	Malagari	Rothman
Boyle	Gillespie	Maloney	Rozzi
Bradford	Gleim	Markosek	Ryan
Brooks	Goodman	Marshall	Sainato
Brown	Gregory	Masser	Samuelson
Bullock	Greiner	Matzie	Sanchez
Burgos	Grove	McClinton	Sankey
Burns	Hahn	McNeill	Sappey
Caltagirone	Hanbidge	Mehaffie	Saylor
Carroll	Harkins	Mentzer	Schemel
Ciresi	Harrell	Merski	Schlossberg
Conklin	Harris	Metcalfe	Schmitt
Cook	Heffley	Metzgar	Schweyer
Cox	Helm	Mihalek	Shusterman
Culver	Hershey	Millard	Simmons
Cutler	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Sims
Daley	Hohenstein	Mizgorski	Snyder
Davidson	Howard	Moul	Solomon
Davis, A.	Innamorato	Mullery	Sonney
Dawkins	Irvin	Mullins	Stephens
Day	Isaacson	Murt	Struzzi
Deasy	James	Neilson	Sturla
DeLissio	Jones	Nelson	Tobash
Dellosso	Jozwiak	Nesbit	Toepel

Delozier	Kail	O'Mara	Toohil
Dermody	Kaufner	O'Neal	Topper
Diamond	Kauffman	Oberlander	Walsh
Donatucci	Keefe	Ortitay	Warner
Dowling	Keller, M.K.	Otten	Webster
Driscoll	Kenyatta	Owlett	Wentling
Dunbar	Kim	Pashinski	Wheatley
Dush	Kirkland	Peifer	Wheeland
Ecker	Klunk	Petrarca	White
Emrick	Knowles	Pickett	Williams
Evans	Kortz	Puskaric	Zabel
Everett	Krueger	Pyle	Zimmerman
Fee	Kulik	Quinn	
Fiedler	Lawrence	Rader	Turzai,
Fitzgerald	Lee	Rapp	Speaker
Flynn			

NAYS—16

Briggs	Farry	Polinchock	Thomas
Cephas	Galloway	Rabb	Ullman
Davis, T.	McCarter	Schroeder	Vitali
DiGirolamo	Miller, D.	Staats	Warren

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Causer	DeLuca	Keller, F.	Rigby
Comitta	Gabler	Kinsey	Youngblood
Cruz	Hennessey		

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 447, PN 1116**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 1, 1945 (P.L.1242, No.428), known as the State Highway Law, in construction, improvement, maintenance and repair of State highways, providing for native vegetation along highways.

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?

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. Representative Brett Miller is recognized.
 Mr. B. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to ask the members for their support for HB 447, and I would like to submit the rest of my comments for the record. Thank you.

Mr. B. MILLER submitted the following remarks for the Legislative Journal:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of HB 447, a bill which amends the State Highway Law to require PennDOT to plant native species of vegetation along highways in Pennsylvania, wherever feasible.

Mr. Speaker, we are all becoming more aware of the problems associated with certain nonnative species and noxious weeds which have had and are having a negative impact on native plant species as well as the wildlife here in Pennsylvania. One of the recent notable plants which fit this category is the Ailanthus altissima, or, as we most commonly know it, the tree of heaven. This plant was introduced in the United States in the late 1700s and has spread widely in Pennsylvania through the years, including along our State's highways. This particular plant is the favorite of the spotted lanternfly, which can be extremely detrimental to Pennsylvania's agriculture industry. One step we can take to protect our agricultural industry here in Pennsylvania is to prevent this particular species from being planted by PennDOT, which oversees the planting of a significant amount of vegetation in the work that it does along our State's highways. While this bill is not to going to solve every aspect of this problem, it will be a key component in helping to solve it, and in helping to prevent future problems like it.

By using native plants that are more adapted to Pennsylvania, plants which have been here for millennia, the native plants are more likely to survive and thrive in local conditions which would prevent the need for replanting, and thus, save on unnecessary expenses. Additionally, native vegetation is more likely to support local wildlife which have been accustomed to the natural vegetative foods which have been here for many years. Simultaneously, the planting of native species will assist in preventing and/or discouraging invasive plants from being established or spreading any further.

Although PennDOT will be required to have a general policy for using native species, understanding that not every plant is suitable for every condition, this bill will allow PennDOT to have flexibility in determining which plant species is best suited for the conditions of a particular highway.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill, which encourages the use of native vegetative species along the highways and roadways of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, will be both cost-effective and also encourage a thriving roadside environment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the members for their affirmative support for HB 447.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—191

Barrar	Flynn	Mackenzie	Reese
Benninghoff	Frankel	Madden	Roae
Bernstine	Freeman	Mako	Roebuck
Bizzarro	Fritz	Malagari	Rothman
Boback	Gainey	Maloney	Rozzi
Borowicz	Galloway	Markosek	Ryan
Boyle	Gaydos	Marshall	Sainato
Bradford	Gillen	Masser	Samuelson
Briggs	Gillespie	Matzie	Sanchez
Brooks	Gleim	McCarter	Sankey
Brown	Goodman	McClinton	Sappey
Bullock	Gregory	McNeill	Saylor
Burgos	Greiner	Mehaffie	Schemel

Burns	Grove	Mentzer	Schlossberg
Caltagirone	Hahn	Merski	Schmitt
Carroll	Hanbidge	Metcalfe	Schroeder
Cephas	Harkins	Metzgar	Schweyer
Ciresi	Harrell	Mihalek	Shusterman
Conklin	Harris	Millard	Simmons
Cook	Heffley	Miller, B.	Sims
Cox	Helm	Miller, D.	Snyder
Culver	Hershey	Mizgorski	Solomon
Cutler	Hickernell	Moul	Sonney
Daley	Hohenstein	Mullery	Staats
Davidson	Howard	Mullins	Stephens
Davis, A.	Innamorato	Murt	Struzzi
Davis, T.	Irvin	Neilson	Sturla
Dawkins	Isaacson	Nelson	Thomas
Day	James	Nesbit	Tobash
Deasy	Jones	O'Mara	Toepel
DeLissio	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Toohil
Delloso	Kail	Oberlander	Topper
Delozier	Kaufner	Ortitay	Ullman
Dermody	Kauffman	Otten	Vitali
Diamond	Keefer	Owlett	Walsh
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Pashinski	Warner
Donatucci	Kenyatta	Peifer	Warren
Dowling	Kim	Petrarca	Webster
Driscoll	Kirkland	Pickett	Wentling
Dunbar	Klunk	Polinchock	Wheatley
Dush	Knowles	Puskaric	Wheeland
Ecker	Kortz	Pyle	White
Emrick	Krueger	Quinn	Williams
Evans	Kulik	Rabb	Zabel
Everett	Lawrence	Rader	Zimmerman
Farry	Lee	Rapp	
Fee	Lewis	Ravenstahl	Turzai,
Fiedler	Longietti	Readshaw	Speaker
Fitzgerald			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Causer	DeLuca	Keller, F.	Rigby
Comitta	Gabler	Kinsey	Youngblood
Cruz	Hennessey		

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 CONTINUED

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 33, PN 47**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Human Services Code, in public assistance, further providing for definitions, for general assistance-related categorically needy and medically needy only medical assistance programs and for the medically needy and determination of eligibility.

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

The SPEAKER. Now, there are a number of amendments. No amendment has been ruled out of order. All the amendments are in order.

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

Mr. **KENYATTA** offered the following amendment No. **A00543**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 13, by striking out "July 1, 2019" and inserting
July 1, 2024

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

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, Representative Kenyatta is recognized.

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

Mr. **KENYATTA**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The least of these. That is what we are called to this body to do. To legislate, to fight for, and to work for the least of these. This amendment is about expanding a program that has been a lifeline, that has been a lifeline for the least of these. Let us be very clear about what this program is and let us be very clear about what all of our votes will mean.

How many days do we sit on this floor and the needs of those who are well-off and well-connected are prioritized, often at the expense of those who cannot afford to have a lobbyist come to our offices? That is what we are talking about with this amendment and expanding this program: ensuring that it continues for future years, ensuring that those that are struggling with addiction can stay in their halfway homes, ensuring that those who are disabled and waiting to get Social Security, that they can have money to have such luxuries as tokens for transportation, such luxuries as being able to wash their clothes.

This is what we are talking about: \$200 a month, a rug that we want to rip out from under those that are in most need. I do not think that is why we are called to this House. That is not why I ran, and I do not think that is why many people in this House ran.

We have spent a lot of time this week, a lot of time this week talking about Jesus. I think we ought to do what His message was all about and help those who need it the most.

And so I ask, Mr. Speaker, for an affirmative vote. I ask for everybody of conscience to vote for those that need you, to vote for your constituents, to vote for veterans, to vote for pregnant women.

The SPEAKER. Sir, please, Representative, please suspend. Just on the amendment, okay? On the amendment is about an extension of the deadline to July 1, 2024. Thank you.

I know Representative Diamond was on the— Okay. Who else? I know Representative Dunbar; but wait, Representative Dunbar. Who else wishes to speak so I can just get folks down? Okay. So I have Representative Dunbar, Representative Lawrence, Representative Saylor, Representative Diamond. Anybody else wish to? And then, of course, the leader. And if the minority leader wishes to speak too, that is fine.

Representative Dunbar, on the amendment.

Mr. **DUNBAR**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I thank the maker of the amendment for his impassioned plea. The cash assistance program stopped in 2012. It ceased to exist in 2012. It just was reinstated last year by the Governor without any consultation to this General Assembly. That is what this is about, that the Governor reinstated a plan without consulting us at all.

As far as the amendment, to continue to extend this is just to exacerbate a plan that was already flawed to begin with. It violates all the processes that we are supposed to follow here, and I ask for a negative vote. Thank you.

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

Mr. **SAYLOR**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I again rise to oppose this amendment. As the previous speaker mentioned, this is a bill that the Budget Secretary promised the leaders of the House that before the Governor would implement such a cash program again, which this House had eliminated over 7 years ago, he would come and consult with the General Assembly before spending any money. This Governor now, without approval of the House leadership or the members of this General Assembly, has committed this year \$50 million in the budget that was not approved – \$50 million. Now, I always thought that the purse strings belonged to us, that we decided what programs were to be accomplished and spent and how many dollars were to be spent on those programs.

Over the last many years since 2017, not one Democrat, not one Democrat has proposed a bill to reinstitute this program. Not one. Why? Because everybody knows this is the most abused, corrupt program that this State ever had. It was used to purchase drugs, alcohol, and tobacco across this State.

The SPEAKER. Sir, on the amendment. On the amendment, please. On the amendment, please.

Mr. **SAYLOR**. So, Mr. Speaker, the amendment that now extends this for another 5 years truly is extending a program that is not one that is accountable to the taxpayers of Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Russ Diamond, on the amendment.

Mr. **DIAMOND**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to oppose this amendment. This program, as the previous speaker said, has not been in existence for 6 years, was only rebrought into existence by a Governor who had no appropriation to pay for it.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, when the maker of the amendment talks about Jesus, he should remember that Jesus never recommended that we use the authority or sword of Herod to commit charity.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative John Lawrence.

Mr. **LAWRENCE**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

That is a tough act to follow.

Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman stand for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Representative, will you stand for interrogation?

Mr. **KENYATTA**. That is why I am here.

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

Mr. **LAWRENCE**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. No one – I think somebody yelled from the back – remember that no member has to stand for interrogation. They have to agree to stand for interrogation. There is no right to interrogation with respect to any discussion on the floor, and it is not, obviously, a cross-exam. It is an opportunity to ask questions about a bill for points that the person does not understand. Thank you.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the date that you have extended to in this amendment, what was the thinking behind extending to that particular date?

Mr. KENYATTA. So I think that one of the first things that needs to be corrected, Mr. Speaker, and I do hear your question, is that this program was not reinstated by the Governor. The Supreme Court struck down the last bill that got rid of this program a number of years ago. And so to your question of why we need to extend it to 2024, I hope there will be a period of contemplation where we can recognize the benefit that this program has had for our communities.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So is there a fiscal note attached to this amendment?

Mr. KENYATTA. There is not.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Do you have any estimate or guesstimate of the cost that might be associated with this amendment?

Mr. KENYATTA. So there would not be a fiscal note in large part because the program is already operating, and there is \$56 million in the budget for this program.

Mr. LAWRENCE. When you say there is \$56 million in the budget, Mr. Speaker, I do not recall that being in last year's budget. Did I miss that in last year's budget?

Mr. KENYATTA. So there is \$56 million that the Governor came to this chamber and put in his budget for next year. Also, the court ordered the Governor to reinstate this program, and that is what he has done.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I realize interrogation is not a cross-examination, and it is not an argument either, but that is not my understanding, and I do not know that there was any money— Let me ask this question, Mr. Speaker, because I do not know the answer to this question. Was there a single dollar appropriated to general assistance in the fiscal year 2018-19 budget that passed this General Assembly and was signed into law by His Excellency?

Mr. KENYATTA. So lucky enough for me, I was actually not in the House at the time, but I also do not understand what that has to do with my amendment right now.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you.

Mr. LAWRENCE. So back to specifically your amendment, which proposes extending a program that I do not recall a dollar being appropriated to in the 2018-19 budget cycle, but yet money is being expended at this time. Let me ask you this question, because I think this is a question that would be relevant for today. Is money currently being expended by the Commonwealth for general assistance today?

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you so much. So the exact number is a little over – am I right? – \$17 million has been expended for the program. And I believe as I stated before, the program is currently operating because the court issued a ruling, and golly, do I love living in a democracy.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Under what authority is that \$17 million, Mr. Speaker? Was that the number?

Mr. KENYATTA. \$17 million, right. \$17 million.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Under what authority has that \$17 million been spent, because I do not recall that it has ever been appropriated by the General Assembly?

Mr. KENYATTA. So there was already money that was appropriated, but also to the point of this interrogation, I believe we are talking about my amendment, 543, and I do not know, again, what that question has to do with amendment 543.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the amendment?

The SPEAKER. Sir, on the amendment.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposes extending a program that the Supreme Court struck down not on the merit of the underlying legislation, but on a technicality, that according to their interpretation, the bill was not read three times in both chambers. And good people—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Yes. Leader, go ahead.

Mr. DERMODY. I do not believe the argument that is being made right now has anything to do with the amendment to extend the—

The SPEAKER. No, I think it did, but let me hear from the majority leader as well.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think any fundamental question regarding an extension of a program that was not appropriately authorized does in fact deal with the tenets of the program, and I believe that is what the good gentleman was after.

The SPEAKER. Yeah; to the Democratic leader, that is how I would see it too. The issue is, what is there to extend? That is the question that is being raised and being addressed. It is an extension.

And you may proceed, Representative Lawrence.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the amendment, the amendment proposes extending a program that was struck down by the Supreme Court on a technicality, whether the bill was read three times in the House and the Senate, not on the underlying material in the legislation. The Supreme Court struck that down. My line of questioning had to do with under what authority any money is being expended on this program, because none was ever approved by this body to expend on this program. This amendment in front of us proposes extending this program to July 1, 2024, a program that has no authority to begin with and it does not include any information whatsoever about the anticipated cost to the Commonwealth.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I suggest a "no" vote on amendment 543.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Does anybody else wish to speak before the maker of the amendment and the leaders? I will go to the maker of the amendment, and then I will go to the leaders, but does anybody else wish to speak beforehand on the amendment? Okay.

So, Representative Kenyatta, you will go first, then Representative Dermody, and then Representative Cutler.

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And it is important for those who are watching back at home to understand exactly what this program is going to. I think one of my colleagues said this is not general assistance, this is emergency assistance. This is a small, \$200 monthly cash support that is going to people who are disabled who cannot work. It is going to people who are in treatment for substance abuse. It is going to those who are caring for children. It is going to those who are fleeing domestic violence. This is a program that helps folks who are dealing with cancer and HIV (human immunodeficiency virus) and people that are waiting to find out whether or not they will be eligible for disability under Social Security.

And so every vote is a choice, and I hope that we make the right one and stand up for Pennsylvanians, particularly those that need us the most.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dermody. No? Okay.

Representative Cutler, the majority leader, on the amendment.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to recognize several of the facts that were omitted leading up to the submission of this amendment, as well as the actual impact of the court decision. As the good gentleman from Chester County outlined, while the Supreme Court said that the cessation of the program failed for a technical reason, they did not address the underlying issue of the policy.

The other stark reality is, Mr. Speaker, when you contrast all of the programs that also assist these very same individuals that the good gentleman seeks to assist with this, when you look at them – and I will read some of the numbers into the record, because they are not small. When you look at the total TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) payments for 2017-18 between State and Federal dollars, you are looking at over \$182 million. LIHEAP (Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program), which pays heating bills, is over \$155 million. Child-care supplements, \$848 million. SNAP (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program), or food stamps, 2.5 billion – with a "b" – dollars. Women, infants, and children program, some of the very same individuals highlighted by the supporter of the amendment, \$278 million. And for the CHIP program (Children's Health Insurance Program), insurance for young individuals, \$484 million combined between State and Federal funding. Mr. Speaker, when you look at medical assistance again, State and Federal spending is \$28 billion. What does that mean? That means that \$32.5 billion is spent on these individuals to assist them, to help them through life's difficult times.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, this is \$2.4 billion more than in prior years. When you go back to 2012 when the original program was repealed, that money was reallocated into the programs that had greater oversight. Mr. Speaker, for a total of 6 years, no alternatives were offered and the increased appropriations in those programs were gladly accepted.

What this seeks to do now is expand a program that has not been constitutionally authorized and push it beyond even the timeframe that the Governor proposed. We have discussed with the Governor other ways, at his request, to look at these funding streams and decide which direction these moneys would be better spent in. One of the proposals was housing. We were willing to have that discussion, but instead, what we have before us today

is an extension of a program not authorized, not currently funded, and would essentially be an open bill as it were handed to us.

Mr. Speaker, the Governor has asked for about a \$17 million supplement to fund the partial annual amount that would go toward this. And the reality is, if we are having the discussions about this money and about the increases in all these other lines, why would we pull that money away from those lines with this amendment? I believe the appropriate place to have this discussion is during the budget, and prior to replacing this funding with anything else, you first have to repeal it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the unnecessary extension of the program that was never authorized.

The SPEAKER. The protocol, which is why I ask everybody if they want to speak before either of the leaders speak, is that the leaders go last. I always give the opportunity to the Democratic leader and then to the majority leader. In this instance, I am being requested by the Democratic Appropriations chair, Matt Bradford, to go after the leader; that is not the protocol. I am going to, obviously, allow it. But I am asking everybody, when I ask you over and over again if you wish to speak, to please avail yourself of that opportunity so that we can continue to adhere to the protocol. I am going to let the leader, of course, respond to the Appropriations chair, and I will also let the majority Appropriations chair respond as well after the Democratic Appropriations chair speaks. So the majority leader and the Republican majority Appropriations chair will be able to respond to Representative Bradford.

You may proceed, sir.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I appreciate the willingness of the Speaker to let me have this short time just to correct the record a little bit.

Sometimes it is good in one of these debates to actually look at the Governor's executive budget. It can be a big book and it can be a boring book. And I have heard a lot about appropriation and authorization and where this comes from. But if anyone wants to take a look at E26-5 of the Governor's executive budget, you would find that there is a line item that has always been there. It is the cash grants line item. It is the same line that these funds have been pulled for for the general assistance fund when this legislature failed to appropriately rescind this program.

Now, we can argue about the merits of the program, and some have done that, but I do not think we should go down the road of acting as though our Governor is acting outside of law. The Governor is actually following an entitlement, a mandated spend that he is required. He is pulling it from a line item that has always been the line from which this program has been funded.

And I feel compelled to correct the record a little bit, Mr. Speaker, so I apologize. I appreciate your giving me this opportunity, but again, I think it is good to actually look at the budget and figure out where that appropriation lies.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The majority leader, Bryan Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the gentleman's counsel. That was in fact the specific line item that I was referencing in my comments regarding the – I said \$17 million; I stand corrected. It was \$17.8 million of an increase to that line, and in fact it was there.

The fact which I believe was missed in the gentleman's statement was the fact that the administration had approached us about possibly reallocating that money for other programs. And while we were in those discussions, the truth of the matter

remains: the court order only invalidated the repeal of the old program. It did not say in it that it was required to be restarted immediately. In fact, after that court order was issued, we did approach the Governor to discuss the program and we were assured at that time that it would come before the General Assembly again and we would work together in order to overcome the statutory problems with it.

Specific to this amendment, this is an unnecessary extension of a program that has already been challenged, and I ask the chamber to give us the time to work through it in the appropriate place with the appropriations process. Again, please vote "no."

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—87

Bizzarro	Driscoll	Krueger	Readshaw
Boyle	Evans	Kulik	Roebuck
Bradford	Fiedler	Lee	Rozzi
Briggs	Fitzgerald	Longietti	Sainato
Bullock	Flynn	Madden	Samuelson
Burgos	Frankel	Malagari	Sanchez
Burns	Freeman	Markosek	Sappey
Caltagirone	Gainey	Matzie	Schlossberg
Carroll	Galloway	McCarter	Schweyer
Cephas	Goodman	McClinton	Shusterman
Ciresi	Hanbidge	McNeill	Sims
Conklin	Harkins	Merski	Snyder
Daley	Harrell	Miller, D.	Solomon
Davidson	Harris	Mullery	Sturla
Davis, A.	Hohenstein	Mullins	Ullman
Davis, T.	Howard	Neilson	Vitali
Dawkins	Innamorato	O'Mara	Warren
Deasy	Isaacson	Otten	Webster
DeLissio	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Wheatley
Delloso	Kim	Petrarca	Williams
Dermody	Kirkland	Rabb	Zabel
Donatucci	Kortz	Ravenstahl	

NAYS—104

Barrar	Gleim	Mehaffie	Rothman
Benninghoff	Gregory	Mentzer	Ryan
Bernstine	Greiner	Metcalfe	Sankey
Boback	Grove	Metzgar	Saylor
Borowicz	Hahn	Mihalek	Schemel
Brooks	Heffley	Millard	Schmitt
Brown	Helm	Miller, B.	Schroeder
Cook	Hershey	Mizgorski	Simmons
Cox	Hickernell	Moul	Sonney
Culver	Irvin	Murt	Staats
Cutler	James	Nelson	Stephens
Day	Jones	Nesbit	Struzzi
Delozier	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Thomas
Diamond	Kail	Oberlander	Tobash
DiGirolamo	Kaufer	Ortitay	Toepel
Dowling	Kauffman	Owlett	Toohil
Dunbar	Keefer	Peifer	Topper
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Walsh
Ecker	Klunk	Polinchock	Warner
Emrick	Knowles	Puskaric	Wentling
Everett	Lawrence	Pyle	Wheeland
Farry	Lewis	Quinn	White
Fee	Mackenzie	Rader	Zimmerman
Fritz	Mako	Rapp	
Gaydos	Maloney	Reese	Turzai,
Gillen	Marshall	Roae	Speaker
Gillespie	Masser		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Causar	DeLuca	Keller, F.	Rigby
Comitta	Gabler	Kinsey	Youngblood
Cruz	Hennessey		

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

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Kenyatta calls up amendment 614, which I think is a redraft. It is a redraft. So it is amendment 614, which is a redraft of amendment 544.

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

Mr. **KENYATTA** offered the following amendment
No. **A00614**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 13, by striking out "July 1, 2019" and inserting
six months after the study is submitted under subsection (c)
Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 19 and 20
(c) The department shall conduct a study on the impact of ending the general assistance cash assistance program under subsection (a). The study shall be submitted to the chairman and minority chairman of the Health and Human Services Committee of the Senate and the chairman and minority chairman of the Health Committee of the House of Representatives within one year of the effective date of this subsection.

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

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. Representative Kenyatta. Withdraws that amendment? Yes. Thank you. So amendment 614, which is a redraft of 544, has been withdrawn.

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

Mr. **FRANKEL** offered the following amendment
No. **A00533**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 19, by striking out the bracket before
""General"
Amend Bill, page 2, line 1, by inserting a bracket before "432(3)"
Amend Bill, page 2, line 1, by inserting after "432(3)"
] 432(3)(i)(D)
Amend Bill, page 2, line 1, by striking out the bracket after "act."
Amend Bill, page 2, line 13, by striking out "July 1, 2019" and inserting
September 30, 2019, except for assistance granted under provisions of section 432(3)(i)(D)

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Frankel, on the amendment.
Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Very simply, this amendment protects general assistance cash assistance for people who are nonparental caretakers of children under 18 and caretakers of a person with an illness or a disability.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

On the amendment, Representative George Dunbar.

Mr. DUNBAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As we have discussed, the cash assistance program ceased in 2012. Since then there have been 6 years where those that would like to see it could have introduced legislation to reinstitute it and not one single piece of legislation has been introduced to do so. Now when we have this bill, we have over 20 amendments, all with some different exemption that they want to add, they want to include, all with the intent to undermine the original purpose of the bill. They had ample opportunity to do that over the last 7 years.

And I would respectfully ask for a "no" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Does anybody else wish to be recognized on the amendment before I call on the sponsor of the amendment and then the leaders? Anybody else wish to speak on the amendment?

So, Representative Frankel, do you want to speak again on the amendment? No. Okay.

Does the Democratic leader wish to speak on it?

The majority leader, on the amendment.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the key words on this amendment are the "nonparental caretakers" because these individuals are actually outside the current foster-care system and therefore not subject to health and safety checks or even background checks prior to entrusting the child with these individuals. And I would argue that it would unintentionally create a financial incentive to individuals to go actively around the current foster-care system.

Additionally, as in the prior amendments, we highlighted the funding that was available to all of these individuals, and by creating a new class or expanding a program that was not authorized in the first place I believe is inappropriate and we should vote "no." I urge the members to do so.

The SPEAKER. Representative Frankel, on the amendment.

Mr. FRANKEL. Very briefly, in order to, you know, counter my colleague's comments here.

People really want to keep their children out of the foster-care system and they want to protect their parental rights, and I think this helps facilitate that. So I would disagree with the majority leader's take on this and ask my colleagues to support this amendment. Thank you.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—87

Bizzarro	Driscoll	Krueger	Readshaw
Boyle	Evans	Kulik	Roebuck
Bradford	Fiedler	Lee	Rozzi
Briggs	Fitzgerald	Longietti	Sainato
Bullock	Flynn	Madden	Samuelson
Burgos	Frankel	Malagari	Sanchez
Burns	Freeman	Markosek	Sappey
Caltagirone	Gainey	Matzie	Schlossberg
Carroll	Galloway	McCarter	Schweyer
Cephas	Goodman	McClinton	Shusterman
Ciresi	Hanbidge	McNeill	Sims
Conklin	Harkins	Merski	Snyder
Daley	Harrell	Miller, D.	Solomon
Davidson	Harris	Mullery	Sturla
Davis, A.	Hohenstein	Mullins	Ullman
Davis, T.	Howard	Neilson	Vitali
Dawkins	Innamorato	O'Mara	Warren
Deasy	Isaacson	Otten	Webster
DeLissio	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Wheatley
Delloso	Kim	Petrarca	Williams
Dermody	Kirkland	Rabb	Zabel
Donatucci	Kortz	Ravenstahl	

NAYS—104

Barrar	Gleim	Mehaffie	Rothman
Benninghoff	Gregory	Mentzer	Ryan
Bernstine	Greiner	Metcalf	Sankey
Boback	Grove	Metzgar	Saylor
Borowicz	Hahn	Mihalek	Schemel
Brooks	Heffley	Millard	Schmitt
Brown	Helm	Miller, B.	Schroeder
Cook	Hershey	Mizgorski	Simmons
Cox	Hickernell	Moul	Sonney
Culver	Irvin	Murt	Staats
Cutler	James	Nelson	Stephens
Day	Jones	Nesbit	Struzzi
DeLozier	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Thomas
Diamond	Kail	Oberlander	Tobash
DiGirolamo	Kaufman	Ortitay	Toepel
Dowling	Kauffman	Owlett	Toohil
Dunbar	Keefer	Peifer	Topper
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Walsh
Ecker	Klunk	Polinchock	Warner
Emrick	Knowles	Puskaric	Wentling
Everett	Lawrence	Pyle	Wheeland
Farry	Lewis	Quinn	White
Fee	Mackenzie	Rader	Zimmerman
Fritz	Mako	Rapp	
Gaydos	Maloney	Reese	Turzai,
Gillen	Marshall	Roae	Speaker
Gillespie	Masser		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Causar	DeLuca	Keller, F.	Rigby
Comitta	Gabler	Kinsey	Youngblood
Cruz	Hennessey		

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

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

The SPEAKER. Amendment 621 is offered by Representative Kenyatta. It is a redraft of amendment 556. Amendment 621, which is a redraft of amendment 556.

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

Mr. **KENYATTA** offered the following amendment No. **A00621**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 10, by inserting after "Programs.–(a)"

(1)

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 13 and 14

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to individuals participating in the Keystone Education Yields Success (KEYS) program under section 405.1B who are eligible for assistance under section 432.

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

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. Representative Kenyatta, on the amendment. Withdrawn.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls up amendment 622, which is a redraft of amendment 557. That is offered by Representative Kenyatta.

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

Mr. **KENYATTA** offered the following amendment No. **A00622**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 10, by inserting after "Programs.–(a)"

(1)

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 13 and 14

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to general assistance cash assistance recipients who are temporarily hospitalized and who are eligible for assistance under section 432.

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

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. Representative Kenyatta, on the amendment. Withdrawn.

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Ullman is called for amendment 624; a redraft of 548 is Representative Ullman's amendment.

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

Ms. **ULLMAN** offered the following amendment No. **A00624**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 10, by inserting after "Programs.–(a)"

(1)

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 13 and 14

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to individuals with Lyme disease who are eligible for assistance under section 432.

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

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, Representative Ullman.

Ms. ULLMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In brief, this amendment provides an exception for people who are suffering from Lyme disease, which is a disabling disability, and it would enable victims to have a modest sum of \$200, which would enable them to get transportation, copayments for numerous prescriptions, and healthy foods to manage symptoms.

I urge that you support this amendment.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dunbar, on the amendment.

Mr. DUNBAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And like the previous amendment, there have been years that legislation could have been introduced to reinstitute this program. Any of these amendments, any of these exceptions do nothing more than reduce the purpose of what the original intent of this bill was, and I ask for a negative vote. Thank you.

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

Representative Sturla, on the amendment.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, very quickly, the maker of this amendment was not here 6 years ago. I believe this is her first opportunity to offer this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Ullman, do you wish to speak again on the amendment? Representative Ullman, do you wish to speak again on the amendment?

Ms. ULLMAN. No, thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Greg Rothman, on the amendment.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the maker of the amendment stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Representative Ullman, would you stand for interrogation?

Ms. ULLMAN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Representative Rothman, you may proceed.

Mr. ROTHMAN. The subject of Lyme disease is very near and dear to my heart. It is a horrible, debilitating disease. Does the cash assistance right now— Are people who suffer from Lyme disease eligible for the cash assistance now?

Ms. ULLMAN. If these people are designated as having a short-term disability, the answer is yes.

Mr. ROTHMAN. On the amendment, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Yes, you may proceed.

Mr. ROTHMAN. It is my understanding that they are not, there is no eligibility, that this would not help people with Lyme disease necessarily. So I believe this amendment is just – I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Does anybody else wish to speak?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—87

Bizzarro	Driscoll	Krueger	Readshaw
Boyle	Evans	Kulik	Roebuck
Bradford	Fiedler	Lee	Rozzi
Briggs	Fitzgerald	Longietti	Sainato
Bullock	Flynn	Madden	Samuelson
Burgos	Frankel	Malagari	Sanchez
Burns	Freeman	Markosek	Sappey
Caltagirone	Gainey	Matzie	Schlossberg
Carroll	Galloway	McCarter	Schweyer
Cephas	Goodman	McClinton	Shusterman
Ciresi	Hanbidge	McNeill	Sims
Conklin	Harkins	Merski	Snyder
Daley	Harrell	Miller, D.	Solomon
Davidson	Harris	Mullery	Sturla
Davis, A.	Hohenstein	Mullins	Ullman
Davis, T.	Howard	Neilson	Vitali
Dawkins	Innamorato	O'Mara	Warren
Deasy	Isaacson	Otten	Webster
DeLissio	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Wheatley
Delloso	Kim	Petrarca	Williams
Dermody	Kirkland	Rabb	Zabel
Donatucci	Kortz	Ravenstahl	

NAYS—104

Barrar	Gleim	Mehaffie	Rothman
Benninghoff	Gregory	Mentzer	Ryan
Bernstine	Greiner	Metcalfe	Sankey
Boback	Grove	Metzgar	Saylor
Borowicz	Hahn	Mihalek	Schemel
Brooks	Heffley	Millard	Schmitt
Brown	Helm	Miller, B.	Schroeder
Cook	Hershey	Mizgorski	Simmons
Cox	Hickernell	Moul	Sonney
Culver	Irvin	Murt	Staats
Cutler	James	Nelson	Stephens
Day	Jones	Nesbit	Struzzi
Delozier	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Thomas
Diamond	Kail	Oberlander	Tobash
DiGiolamo	Kaufer	Ortitay	Toepel
Dowling	Kauffman	Owlett	Toohil
Dunbar	Keefer	Peifer	Topper
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Walsh
Ecker	Klunk	Polinchock	Warner
Emrick	Knowles	Puskaric	Wentling
Everett	Lawrence	Pyle	Wheeland
Farry	Lewis	Quinn	White
Fee	Mackenzie	Rader	Zimmerman
Fritz	Mako	Rapp	
Gaydos	Maloney	Reese	Turzai,
Gillen	Marshall	Roae	Speaker
Gillespie	Masser		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Causar	DeLuca	Keller, F.	Rigby
Comitta	Gabler	Kinsey	Youngblood
Cruz	Hennessey		

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

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Kenyatta calls up amendment 618, which is a redraft of 554; amendment 618, which is a redraft of 554.

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

Mr. **KENYATTA** offered the following amendment
No. **A00618**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 10, by inserting after "Programs.-(a)"

(1)

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 13 and 14

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to individuals who have been displaced due to flood, landslide, fire or other natural disaster and who are eligible for assistance under section 432.

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

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. Representative Kenyatta, on that amendment. Withdrawn. So amendment 618, formerly 554, is withdrawn.

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Kenyatta calls up amendment 620, formerly amendment 555.

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

Mr. **KENYATTA** offered the following amendment
No. **A00620**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 10, by inserting after "Programs.-(a)"

(1)

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 13 and 14

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to individuals participating in the RESET program under section 405.1 who are eligible for assistance under section 432.

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

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. Representative Kenyatta, on amendment 620, which was formerly 555. Is that withdrawn? Yes. Well, it was formerly 555 and now it is redrawn and it is 620. Withdrawn. Okay. That is withdrawn.

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

Mr. DAWKINS offered the following amendment No. A00535:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 19, by striking out the bracket before ""General"

Amend Bill, page 2, line 1, by inserting a bracket before "432(3)" Amend Bill, page 2, line 1, by inserting after "432(3)"] 432(3)(i)(A)

Amend Bill, page 2, line 1, by striking out the bracket after "act." Amend Bill, page 2, line 13, by striking out "July 1, 2019" and inserting

September 30, 2019, except for assistance granted under the provisions of section 432(3)(i)(A).

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Dawkins, on the amendment. Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I ask all our members to vote in the affirmative. We have seen, since the program has been taken away in 2012, there has been a direct correlation between the increase of opioids in a lot of these communities that young folks have been susceptible to be addicted to. So I would like to make sure we have small funds, what I call emergency assistance, so those young people can get to their potential vo-tech jobs using these funds, to get bus fare and other small toiletries they may need considering they may not have the support system around.

And before the maker even mentions why we did not introduce this bill prior to, we were waiting for the court's decision. Thank you.

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

Representative George Dunbar, on the amendment. Mr. DUNBAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Not to belabor the point and repeat myself, but it is the same argument. And there are funding streams available elsewhere for these programs. I ask for a negative vote. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-87

Table listing names of members who voted 'Yeas' (87 total): Bizzarro, Boyle, Bradford, Briggs, Bullock, Burgos, Burns, Caltagirone, Carroll, Cephas, Ciresi, Conklin, Daley, Davidson, Davis, A., Davis, T., Dawkins, Deasy, DeLissio, Driscoll, Evans, Fiedler, Fitzgerald, Flynn, Frankel, Freeman, Gaine, Galloway, Goodman, Hanbidge, Harkins, Harrell, Harris, Hohenstein, Howard, Innamorato, Isaacson, Kenyatta, Krueger, Kulik, Lee, Longietti, Madden, Malagari, Markosek, Matzie, McCarter, McClinton, McNeill, Merski, Miller, D., Mullery, Mullins, Neilson, O'Mara, Otten, Pashinski, Readshaw, Roebuck, Rozzi, Sainato, Samuelson, Sanchez, Sapp, Schlossberg, Schweyer, Shusterman, Sims, Snyder, Solomon, Sturla, Ullman, Vitali, Warren, Webster, Wheatley.

Table listing names of members who voted 'Nays' (104 total): Delloso, Dermody, Donatucci, Kim, Kirkland, Kortz, Petrarca, Rabb, Ravenstahl, Williams, Zabel.

NAYS-104

Table listing names of members who voted 'Nays' (104 total): Barrar, Benninghoff, Bernstine, Boback, Borowicz, Brooks, Brown, Cook, Cox, Culver, Cutler, Day, Delozier, Diamond, DiGirolamo, Dowling, Dunbar, Dush, Ecker, Emrick, Everett, Farry, Fee, Fritz, Gaydos, Gillen, Gillespie, Gleim, Gregory, Greiner, Grove, Hahn, Heffley, Helm, Hershey, Hickernell, Irvin, James, Jones, Jozwiak, Kail, Kaufer, Kauffman, Keefer, Keller, M.K., Klunk, Knowles, Lawrence, Lewis, Mackenzie, Mako, Maloney, Marshall, Masser, Mehaffie, Mentzer, Metcalfe, Metzgar, Mihalek, Millard, Miller, B., Mizgorski, Moul, Murt, Nelson, Nesbit, O'Neal, Oberlander, Ortity, Owlett, Peifer, Pickett, Polinchock, Puskaric, Pyle, Quinn, Rader, Rapp, Reese, Roae, Rothman, Ryan, Sankey, Saylor, Schemel, Schmitt, Schroeder, Simmons, Sonney, Staats, Stephens, Struzzi, Thomas, Tobash, Toepel, Toohil, Topper, Walsh, Warner, Wentling, Wheeland, White, Zimmerman, Turzai, Speaker.

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-10

Table listing names of members who were excused (10 total): Causer, Comitta, Cruz, DeLuca, Gabler, Hennessey, Keller, F., Kinsey, Rigby, Youngblood.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Kenyatta calls up amendment 617, which is a redraft of 553.

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

Mr. KENYATTA offered the following amendment No. A00617:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 10, by inserting after "Programs.-(a)"

(1)

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 13 and 14

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to individuals who volunteer twenty hours per week and who are eligible for assistance under section 432.

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

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. Representative Kenyatta withdraws that amendment. So amendment 617, formerly 553, is withdrawn.

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Kenyatta calls up amendment 629, which is a redraft of 545.

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

Mr. **KENYATTA** offered the following amendment No. **A00629**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 10, by inserting after "Programs.—(a)"
(1)

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 13 and 14

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to caregivers of individuals with disabilities who are eligible for assistance under section 432.

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

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. Representative Kenyatta, is that amendment withdrawn? That is withdrawn.

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Kenyatta calls up amendment 628. It is amendment 628, and it is a redraft of amendment 546.

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

Mr. **KENYATTA** offered the following amendment No. **A00628**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 10, by inserting after "Programs.—(a)"
(1)

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 13 and 14

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to victims of human trafficking who are eligible for assistance under section 432.

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

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, Representative Kenyatta. Mr. **KENYATTA**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This provides an exception for those who are victims of human trafficking.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dunbar, on the amendment.

Mr. **DUNBAR**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, the same reasons I have stated before. This is doing nothing more than trying to undermine the original bill. And on top of that, human trafficking is not defined in the Welfare Code. I ask for a negative vote. Thank you.

AMENDMENT PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. At this time we are just going to go over, briefly over this amendment because the two leaders are talking to go over the remainder of the amendments. So we are going to go over this amendment briefly. We are going to stand at ease for the leaders just to continue to go through the amendments and then we will get direction from them, as many of the amendments have been withdrawn.

The House will come to order.

CONSIDERATION OF
AMENDMENT A00628 CONTINUED

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. All right. Thank you. Amendment 628, 546, which we had in front of us, has been withdrawn.

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

The SPEAKER. Thank you, everybody. Members, please take your seats. Members, please take your seats.

Amendment 627, which is a redraft of amendment 547, has been withdrawn.

Amendment 626, which is a redraft of amendment 549, has been withdrawn.

Amendment 623, which is a redraft of amendment 550, has been withdrawn.

Amendment 619, which is a redraft of amendment 551, has been withdrawn.

Amendment 625, which is a redraft of amendment 558, has been withdrawn.

Amendment 530 has been withdrawn.

Amendment 537 has been withdrawn.

Amendment 559 has been withdrawn.

Amendment 560 has been withdrawn.

Amendment 561 has been withdrawn.

Amendment 616 has been withdrawn.

Amendment 532 has been withdrawn.

And amendment 534 has been withdrawn.

If I said your amendment was withdrawn and I said it incorrectly, please raise your hand at this time. If I have incorrectly stated what has been withdrawn, please let me know at this time.

Okay, we have two amendments left.

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

Ms. **DeLISSIO** offered the following amendment No. **A00536**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 6, by inserting after "programs"
, for eligibility

Amend Bill, page 1, line 19, by striking out the bracket before
""General"

Amend Bill, page 2, line 1, by inserting a bracket before "432(3)"

Amend Bill, page 2, line 1, by inserting after "432(3)"

] 432(3)(i)(C)

Amend Bill, page 2, line 1, by striking out the bracket after "act."

Amend Bill, page 2, line 13, by striking out "July 1" and inserting September 30

Amend Bill, page 2, line 13, by inserting after "2019"

, except for assistance granted under the provisions of section 432(3)(i)(C)

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 19 and 20

Section 3. Section 432(3)(i)(C) of the act is amended to read:

Section 432. Eligibility.—Except as hereinafter otherwise provided, and subject to the rules, regulations, and standards established by the department, both as to eligibility for assistance and as to its nature and extent, needy persons of the classes defined in clauses (1), (2), and (3) shall be eligible for assistance:

* * *

(3) Other persons who are citizens of the United States, or lawfully admitted aliens who are eligible for general assistance.

(i) Persons who may be eligible for general assistance for an indeterminate period as a result of medical, social or related circumstances shall be limited to:

* * *

(C) A person who has been assessed by a physician or psychologist as having a verified physical or mental disability, including a person who is a veteran with an illness or injury caused by or exacerbated by active military service, which temporarily or permanently precludes him or her from any gainful employment. The verification of the physical or mental disability must be established by written documentation in a form prescribed by the department and must be based on acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques, rather than a statement of symptoms by the applicant or recipient[.]; except that, in the case of a veteran, the verification of an illness or injury resulting from active military service may be established by a statement from the veteran's physician, psychologist or from the proper military authority that has actual documented knowledge of the veteran's illness or injury. The department may also require the applicant or recipient to submit to an independent examination as a condition of receiving assistance. An applicant or recipient with a verified physical or mental disability which is temporary in nature shall pursue appropriate treatment as a condition of receiving assistance.

* * *

Amend Bill, page 2, line 20, by striking out "3" where it occurs the first time and inserting

4

Amend Bill, page 3, line 2, by striking out "4" and inserting

5

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. I need everybody to take their seats. Members, please take your seats before I call on Representative DeLissio. Members, please take your seats. Sergeants at Arms, please ask members to take their seats. Staff, please take your seats. Members, please take your seats. Sergeants at Arms, if you could please just ask members to take their seats.

Representative Pam DeLissio has the floor. On the amendment, Representative.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I do believe in the benefits of the program of general cash assistance, and with that in mind, it is my honor and my privilege to offer an amendment that in fact would aid and assist our military veterans, those who have an injury or illness that was caused or exacerbated as a result of active military service.

We offered a resolution just yesterday that had to do with our veterans. We do that quite often here in this chamber. And this is a small way to also ensure that they are as – to help to ensure their well-being, and I appreciate everybody's consideration.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Members who wish to speak – I see Chairman Barrar wishes to speak, Representative Dunbar wishes to speak, Representative Eric Nelson wishes to speak, and then, of course, the leader.

Does anybody else wish to speak? Anybody wish to be listed as speaking?

So we will start with Chairman Barrar. Representative Barrar, on the amendment.

Mr. BARRAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As the chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee, I have to tell you, I think it is unnecessary to adopt this amendment. There are more than enough programs at the State and the Federal level to take care of any veteran that may fall into this category that you are trying to lump them into. And we all know the veteran is really the responsibility of the Federal government. The State supplements a lot of that with the – I think the majority leader is going to read off a half of dozen programs or more that are out there to help our veterans, so I think we are grasping at straws to try to lump in a group in here to try to save this program or give this program some additional meaning I think is wrong, and I would ask the members to vote "no" on it.

The SPEAKER. Representative Eric Nelson, on the amendment.

Mr. NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I do appreciate the passion of my colleague and her goal to be able to help veterans, whether they are disabled or not disabled, which another amendment infers. But what we have to realize in this situation, Mr. Speaker, is these dollars in the cash assistance program are unaccountable. We have existing pathways, legitimate pathways and successful pathways to be able to help our veterans.

So I agree with the effort and the bipartisan spirit to be able to help our veterans and our disabled veterans at all methods and means, but this particular program, I hope the members support what Representative Dunbar is attempting to do, and that is keep transparent, legitimate, and proven programs in place. There is no need to erode all the good work we are doing with a simple cash payout that is unaccountable and cannot really be defined.

So I back the chairman, I back the maker of the bill, and I respectfully ask both sides of the aisle to vote against this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative O'Mara.

Ms. O'MARA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to address the idea that there are plenty of benefits and coverage for disabled veterans. That is a misnomer. That is not true. I am married to a veteran that has two Purple Hearts, received multiple gunshot wounds in Afghanistan, and before I met him, he had zero support from the Federal government and from the State government.

It is a very difficult process for a veteran to go through the disability pension process at the VA (Veterans' Administration), and there are many, many obstacles put in front of our veterans. And many of the times when they apply for a pension to get coverage and benefits for their disability, they are granted a percentage that is far lower than how their lives are being impacted.

So I just want to put on the record that a vote against this amendment is a vote against our disabled veterans, and I expect this chamber to do better when it comes to protecting our veterans.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Nelson, for the second time.

Mr. NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And once again, I salute the service of the Representative's husband, and I, too, am a veteran, and I, too, support the efforts of this chamber to have transparent, accountable supports. I do not dispute the Federal roadblocks that stand in front of our veterans and people who served – again, disabled or prior service – but this program is not the place for it. This is an unaccountable program, and personally, Mr. Speaker, it is offensive to me that there are a series of amendments that are designed to create painful votes for the members of this body. We are to be moving beyond divisive behavior and I would ask for a bigger vision, Mr. Speaker.

If we want to whine and we want to moan, it is interesting—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker? Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Leader Dermody is recognized.

Mr. DERMODY. My point is, I believe they are speaking as to the motive of our member, as to introducing this amendment and speaking on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. He did not ascribe to the motive. He in fact applauded her amendment. He applauded her amendment. He pointed out that he himself is a veteran – I think a veteran of 9 years – and he did not ascribe motive to the maker of the amendment; in fact, he applauded her good intentions.

Mr. DERMODY. He questioned her motive for introducing and debating the amendment; yes, he did.

The SPEAKER. He specifically applauded her good intentions.

Representative Nelson, will you please finish your remarks.

Mr. NELSON. Indeed, Mr. Speaker.

And I do applaud the intentions. I think there is a very strong intention to be able to help our veterans and our disabled veterans and we have existing channels both in our offices and in our counties to be able to help those veterans. This program is not one of those channels and we are not standing against the opportunity to assist veterans and disabled veterans, but what I stand against in this amendment is to be coupled into a program that does not have accountability, and instead, I recommend, in a bipartisan manner, we contribute and continue to contribute to proven programs in effective existing lines. There was not money in last year's budget for this requested service. There has not been money in the last several years' budget for this service, and each year we strive to do the best for our veterans.

So, Mr. Speaker, bottom line: This amendment should be voted down and we should continue to use the successful and proven streams to be able to help our veterans across the board.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Ullman.

Ms. ULLMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to address a budgetary angle that perhaps people are overlooking. The amendment provides a very important stopgap measure as many of these veterans are awaiting

determinations of disability. When this is in play, they are without the cash funds to do some of the things that give a degree of dignity to their lives. These cash funds in this transitional point in time allow them to take care of hygiene matters, transportation, prescription matters. But the budgetary point that I wanted to speak to is the fact that once they are given a determination of disability, the Federal government reimburses the Commonwealth for the total amount of those general assistance payments.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Representative Dan Frankel.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Very briefly, I know the majority leader is going to read off a list of programs that address veterans' needs that we have at the State level, but I want people to understand that many of those programs take time to be able to qualify for, and they have restricted ways to spend the benefits that come with those funds. So this is a small amount of discretionary money, \$200 a month, to be used for things, basic necessities that are not covered under those other programs, you know, things like transportation, things like hygiene, important things that they have the opportunity to – and while they are waiting to qualify for benefits. So this is an important program that gives our veterans a small amount of discretionary money, understanding that there is a robust set of programs available to them, but they are not always immediately available to them and they do not always address all of their needs.

So this is an important piece of discretionary funding for our veterans. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Frank Ryan.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, thank you so much. If I could address the amendment.

First of all, the intent behind this I think is absolutely admirable. I am a veteran of 41 years in the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve, and I am honored to have served. There are an unbelievable number of programs that have been sponsored by the House of Representatives in Pennsylvania, as well as by the Senate, that have provided for this. There is a book that has been put out. We received a report on it today in which almost, of the 700,000-plus veterans in the Commonwealth, about 17,000 have stood up. I would absolutely welcome getting together with the dear Representative, who she and I have become friends, to provide means of getting that word out to other people.

I am working extensively right now with the Veterans' Administration because parts of the VBA, the Veterans Benefits Administration, are in fact broken. But rather than breaking another system in order to do it when we have an Auditor General report that has already questioned the validity of this is absolutely problematic. You know, I ran for office from the intent of trying to fix things so Pennsylvanians have the dollars spent and the dollars taken from taxpayers being provided for a better use for those in need. These veterans have served their nation admirably. They deserve to be taken care of. By the same token, it is important to us that we do whatever we can, as Chairman Barrar has done and Chairman Sainato has done, to make certain that we hold those agencies accountable rather than creating another Band-Aid approach that hurts more and more people by allowing these nonfunctioning agencies to continue to be nonfunctioning.

I have had marines, soldiers, sailors, and airmen who have become disabled. I want them to get the assistance that they need, and I would work with any member in this chamber, that this nation finally honors the commitment that they have made, and at the same time that we demand that the Veterans' Administration in DC be held accountable for what is clearly a Federal issue.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Cris Dush.

Mr. DUSH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to echo the sentiments of the gentleman from Lebanon County, as well as being a 24-year military veteran and having to deal with the folks that have come into my office, both those who have been addicted and still addicted and some who have not. The last thing I want to do is put cash in the hands of somebody who is addicted to opioids and have them go straight to their dealer. But by the same token, what I do want to see is, I want to see if we are going to have that kind of additional money, which I am not opposed to if it is done in the proper way where there is accountability. Putting cash in the hands of somebody who has an opioid addiction as a result of what happened to them in battle does not help them, and I actually see this as a detriment to those soldiers, airmen, sailors, and marines.

For that reason I think if we are going to work on something that will get the additional assistance, because I admit as well that we have got some problems with getting the benefits to our wounded. But on the other hand, I am not looking to exacerbate a problem for some of the people who have come into my office, who have talked to me, who have an opioid addiction problem and could end up making it worse. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dunbar, Representative Polinchock is going to come up to that podium. Representative Polinchock of Bucks County.

Mr. POLINCHOCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am a disabled veteran and I just want to take a minute just to thank everybody in this chamber for your passion and for how you are supporting veterans and my fellow disabled veterans. It is really humbling to hear all your comments.

I stand opposed to the amendment simply on one point: we have a lot of programs out there and they do sometimes take time to get there, but the issue here is the accountability and the dollars. The dollars in this are not guaranteed to get to disabled veterans, and for that I stand against the amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Ed Gainey.

Mr. GAINNEY. I just wanted to say that, you know, sometimes in this great General Assembly, you hear some things that really make you say, "Wow." And when we talk about people that have opioids coming out of jail, need some help, need a little bit of assistance to get their lives straight, the first thing we tell the families is, we are going to do everything for you to try to help you stabilize your life. We are going to try to do everything. And today we are talking about a small amount of general assistance to help people get stable, and all I hear is every excuse why we should not do it even though when they come to us and we are talking to the families, the first thing we begin to talk to them about is how much we want to help them, how much we want to help them get back on their feet, but every time we get an opportunity to do this, we slam them.

We cannot continue to do that. We cannot justify saying, yeah, I want to help you, but then come to this great General Assembly and vote against something that could help stabilize their life. We cannot continue to do that. And for anybody in this General Assembly to stand up and use that as a reason why you should vote against it, it is a statement to the rest of Pennsylvania of just how you see this whole addiction thing. You really want to talk about it, but you do not want to be about it. Walk it like you talk it and we will be a better General Assembly.

The SPEAKER. I have these members who still want to speak: Representative O'Mara for the second time, followed by Representative, Chairman Barrar, for the second time, then Representative Wheatley, and then of course last will be— Yes, Representative DeLissio; you, Representative Dunbar, and the leader will be last because you are the prime sponsor of the amendment, prime sponsor of the bill, the leader.

So Representative O'Mara, for the second time.

Ms. O'MARA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to address the comments that were made from the gentleman from Jefferson County about veterans and opioids. First of all, the inclination that all veterans are addicted to opioids is insulting and offensive to many of our veterans.

Mr. CUTLER. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Please, please suspend.

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order.

The SPEAKER. Both members please suspend. Members, you can take issue with the substance, everybody on both sides of the aisle. And you can take issue with the substance. You cannot go after anybody personally at all. Please stick to the substance of the argument. No, you cannot ascribe anything personal to another member who has spoken.

Representative O'Mara, please go right to the substance of your remarks. I understand. And you may proceed, but you cannot go to anybody personally or ascribe any motive. Everybody.

Ms. O'MARA. Okay.

The SPEAKER. There are different policy perspectives on this. We are covering them in a professional manner. We are going to continue to do so. Representative O'Mara, please continue.

Ms. O'MARA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My point is that we cannot take away benefits from veterans because some veterans have issues with opioids. The fact is, many of our veterans while they were in service, active duty military, were wounded. They were then put on opioids by the military, and then when they leave the military, they are now left to deal with this issue. I believe that it is our job to support all veterans regardless of what issues they may be struggling with, because many of them are only struggling because of their service and it is our job to protect them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Chairman Barrar, for the second time.

Mr. BARRAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Every year, at the beginning of the year, our committee, the Veterans Affairs Committee, meets with the Pennsylvania War Veterans Council. They present to us a list of their priorities, sometimes 10, 15 priorities long. First of all, this issue has never been identified by that council. These are the people who care the most about our veterans in this State, okay? It is comprised of

organizations from every war from World War II up to today and they have never identified this as being a big issue for our veterans.

But what I will offer to the maker of the amendment is a chance to sit down, maybe identify what you think is a good number to create a program under the Department of Veterans Affairs, not into the welfare – Department of Human Services, and look at a number that may be acceptable – if it is two, three, four million dollars – that would be set aside, or a new program that we could create within the Department of Veterans Affairs that would assist these veterans that you are trying to identify as being in need of this help. I would be more than glad to work with you, write up some legislation, and try to move it out of my committee and get it to the House floor to pass.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Representative Wheatley.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I was not planning to speak today, but I thought it was important for me to address a couple of things.

First of all, I try not to wear my veteran status on my sleeve, and I try not to promote it as if it is something that I am going to use in a time of getting sympathy or to change someone's opinion about what I am saying. But as a disabled veteran – which I lost 40 percent of the functioning of my lungs on behalf of this country in a foreign war – I do find certain things that were said here today offensive to me, because I also, as a service, I see a lot of the veterans that do not make it through the process. They do not go through the departments, necessarily, all of these official departments, but they come in my office and they are looking for immediate ways to help themselves, and I do not ask them if they are necessarily struggling with a drug addiction or if they are struggling with homelessness. I say, "What can I do to help you right now?" because that is what they deserve. And then I will deal with whatever comes behind that when we can connect them to some people who can work with them to get them what they need, if it is an addiction problem or if it is a housing problem. And the reason I am saying that is because sometimes I think we lose sight. We start fighting about our particular partisan issues and we are forgetting that all of what we are doing is for people. Right now we are talking about veterans, but there are some other people behind here that we need to be fighting for. And I understand if you think something is unaccountable or not accountable, but we should be very careful in what we say and how we say it on this floor, because there are some veterans, many of them black and brown ones, that they are not being supported by a whole bunch of official programs. And I am seeing them every day on the streets of Pittsburgh.

And so what I am saying is, whatever we do here, we can do it, but respect the fact that there are men and women who are struggling who gave all they could for this country and they deserve for us to act on their best interest. And if giving them \$200 a month – and again, I am not, my perspective is that I think they should have the cash assistance and we should help move that along, but at the end of the day, we should not characterize them as if they are not deserving, or if they are drug addicted that somehow something is wrong with them, when it is not them, it is the system. And our system really has to be flexible to deal with the multitude of a lot of issues that many of our men and women come back from wars and damage of the military service on behalf of all of us.

So we need to be very sensitive to that as we discuss this issue.

The SPEAKER. Okay. I have Representative Dush, for the second time. Let me see who else. Does anybody else wish to speak? Representative Kortz, Representative Dush, for the second time. Anybody else before I go to Representatives Dunbar, DeLissio, and then the leader? Anybody else?

Representative Dush, for the second time, followed by Representative Kortz.

Mr. DUSH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to correct the record of the member who actually ascribed something completely opposite of my intent.

The SPEAKER. I addressed that, good gentleman—

Mr. DUSH. All right.

The SPEAKER. —and the gentelady went right to the substance. I addressed it, and very professionally, everybody has gotten back to the substance. There is nobody – everybody is doing their best to stick to the substance of the policy argument. If you wish to speak a second time on the policy, you may proceed.

Mr. DUSH. I just want it to be very plain that when I got up and spoke, I said that we have people who need the assistance, that it has to be accountable, and that we have people—

The SPEAKER. Please. There are no interruptions from the floor. Please. Everybody is entitled to be heard. Everybody got elected in their districts. Representative Dush is entitled to be heard. Members, please show respect to everybody.

Representative Dush, you may proceed with your policy argument.

Mr. DUSH. Certainly. Thank you.

As I was saying, we all have military members who have come into our offices. They have got different things going on in their life. Those members have medical issues that arise from their service; I have my own. But what I will tell you is that there is a reason why we need accountability for the dollars that are going out, and if we want to create a program that will directly address that and get the money in an accountable way or get the resources in an accountable way to our veterans, we need to do that. But that small portion of members of military servicemen who come out, and again, as the gentelady indicated, it is the military that got them addicted. When I got the steel plate in my leg, the military doctors gave me a great big bottle of horse pills, codeine. I refused to take them, when I flew back from Fort Lewis.

But the thing is, we have to take a look at everything. We cannot just look at one element of what we are doing. We have to look at the possible unintended consequences, and in fact, when it comes to putting money into the hands – cash – into the hands of those few – and I will say again, few – who have the addiction and would use it to go straight to a dealer, we have to take that into consideration. This amendment does not do that. We need to have proper accountability.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Bill Kortz.

Mr. KORTZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I also have a lot of veterans that come in my office all the time and they need help right away. Just as my colleague from Allegheny County mentioned, I have the same issue. What we are talking about today with this amendment is \$6.57 a day. That is what we are voting on, Mr. Speaker. We are going to give our veterans \$6.57 a day. It is a shame if we cannot vote "yes" to that. They deserve so much more.

I urge a "yes" vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Okay. Unless I am mistaken, we are going to have Representative Dunbar, the sponsor of the bill, followed by Representative DeLissio, the sponsor of the amendment, followed by the majority leader. Does anybody else wish to be recognized to speak before I call on Representatives Dunbar, DeLissio, and the leader? Now is the time.

Representative Dunbar, on the amendment.

Mr. DUNBAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be brief.

I certainly empathize with the needs of our veterans as well as the needs of those suffering through the problems of opioid addiction, but the point remains that every dollar we spend here, which was \$150 million in 2012, is one less dollar we have to spend on programs that could work to help these individuals, to help these veterans, to help those suffering with opioid addiction.

I also wanted to briefly correct some misinformation that the gentelady had talked about as far as budgetary concerns. Certainly, this program does have a reimbursement part to it, but in 2010, 2011, 2012 when the program was up and running, on average it was about 17 percent of the dollars that we had spent were reimbursed. So it is not a dollar-for-dollar reimbursement.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative DeLissio.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I certainly am appreciative of all the comments of my colleagues over this particular amendment. This morning in the Aging Committee, we learned that a couple of years ago the General Assembly required a registry to be created of veterans. And about 800,000 veterans currently reside in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and of those 800,000 veterans, approximately 17,000 are currently registered. And I was surprised, and I think many of my colleagues were surprised to learn that a lot of the veterans did not want to be registered, and it is in fact very difficult to have veterans enroll in various programs for I am sure a variety of reasons that we do not understand. But this information came from the Department of Aging this morning.

So I think that by making sure and ensuring that all the programmatic opportunities, whether we think it is primarily the responsibility of the Federal government and the Veterans' Administration or not, we have a responsibility there; our constituents there, they are our citizens, and if we need to take up a fight with the VA, we can do that separately, but we cannot put their needs on a shelf while we do that. I do not think we want to do that. I know we do not want to do that.

So the fact that so few veterans are registered tells me that making sure there are sufficient programs out there, and that word was used previously. As many programs as possible does not diminish the opportunity for veterans to get services and care, it enhances them. And I think when the word "unaccountable" is used, and I am making an assumption here, because I have not had a chance to talk one on one with the folks who have used that word, that there is no accountability for this program. If we are referring to the fact that this is flexible money, then in fact I prefer the use of the word "flexible," because we cannot possibly legislate for every single last item and need that is out there, and without that flexibility, I will say, for that last mile, it would not be possible to have the needs of these folks met. And this is further reinforced, this is further reinforced, Mr. Speaker, by the fact that there are well over 150 different agencies and organizations who have weighed in on this issue, who in fact serve our citizens day in and day out, hour by hour, who have

asked us not to do away with this program and in fact keep it in place.

I have the confidence to think and to know that they must know what they are talking about. So I encourage a "yes" vote for this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. And the majority leader, on the amendment.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, since it was referenced, I will quickly read through many of the programs that are already included in the budget, both in past budgets as well as the Governor's current proposal.

Under the Department of Military and Veterans Affairs, we have the Veterans Homes, the behavioral health support for veterans, the education for veterans' children, transfer to the educational assistance program fund, Blind Veterans Pension, Amputee and Paralyzed Veterans Pension, and the Disabled American Veterans Transportation, in addition to all of the Federal programs that were alluded to earlier.

Mr. Speaker, I do enjoy passionate debates, and we have certainly had one here. But I think it is also worth noting, unfortunately, what this amendment does not address, which I will get to shortly. Mr. Speaker, obviously everyone is very passionate about the issues surrounding veterans; that is why I myself had volunteered in the veterans clinic, where we helped veterans do their appeals when I was in law school. I did so for more than a year, and I would agree with the gentleman from Lebanon County that I think the Federal program could certainly be run better. We have spent the vast majority of our time collecting what we call buddy statements, which are individuals who can attest to what occurred to the veteran. It might be somebody who served with them in their unit, could be somebody that was in their specific vehicle, or literally in the foxhole with them. That is, I believe, what the gentelady is trying to set up here in the amendment she proposes, is essentially a duplication of that system, of the current Federal law system where you could allow a statement to be submitted on a veteran's behalf.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the gentelady did not distinguish between honorably discharged veterans and dishonorably discharged veterans, and in light of the chairman agreeing to work on the issue, I think that is an important component that we must consider. I will read from the amendment, Mr. Speaker, lines 9 and 10, followed by 17 through 21. It says "...including a person who is a veteran with an illness or injury caused by or exacerbated by active military service...." Additionally, it says "...except that, in the case of a veteran, the verification of an illness or injury resulting from active military service may be established..." and it goes on to outline the buddy statement process.

Mr. Speaker, I know that we are not supposed to question motives, and I certainly will not, but I certainly do not believe it was the gentelady's intention to include those who are dishonorably discharged. So I would much rather work on – and I got a thumbs-up, so I think that assumption is correct – I would much rather work in this process during the committee, as the chairman has offered, and should the gentelady still wish to vote the amendment and support those individuals, I would prefer she would pull it and work with the chairman because I think that is in the interest and the best resolution of all involved. Because while this vote has been characterized a lot of different ways, the one thing I do think that is necessary is the fact that it only says "veteran" and it does not make that distinction.

So thank you, Mr. Speaker. Absent the gentledady readdressing the amendment via the committee process, I reluctantly must urge a "no" vote on the underlying amendment.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—88

Bizzarro	Driscoll	Krueger	Ravenstahl
Boyle	Evans	Kulik	Readshaw
Bradford	Fiedler	Lee	Roebuck
Briggs	Fitzgerald	Longietti	Rozzi
Bullock	Flynn	Madden	Sainato
Burgos	Frankel	Malagari	Samuelson
Burns	Freeman	Markosek	Sanchez
Caltagirone	Gainey	Matzie	Sappey
Carroll	Galloway	McCarter	Schlossberg
Cephas	Goodman	McClinton	Schweyer
Ciresi	Hanbidge	McNeill	Shusterman
Conklin	Harkins	Merski	Sims
Daley	Harrell	Miller, D.	Snyder
Davidson	Harris	Mullery	Solomon
Davis, A.	Hohenstein	Mullins	Sturla
Davis, T.	Howard	Murt	Ullman
Dawkins	Innamorato	Neilson	Vitali
Deasy	Isaacson	O'Mara	Warren
DeLissio	Kenyatta	Otten	Webster
Delloso	Kim	Pashinski	Wheatley
Dermody	Kirkland	Petrarca	Williams
Donatucci	Kortz	Rabb	Zabel

NAYS—103

Barrar	Gleim	Masser	Rothman
Benninghoff	Gregory	Mehaffie	Ryan
Bernstine	Greiner	Mentzer	Sankey
Boback	Grove	Metcalfe	Saylor
Borowicz	Hahn	Metzgar	Schemel
Brooks	Heffley	Mihalek	Schmitt
Brown	Helm	Millard	Schroeder
Cook	Hershey	Miller, B.	Simmons
Cox	Hickernell	Mizgorski	Sonney
Culver	Irvin	Moul	Staats
Cutler	James	Nelson	Stephens
Day	Jones	Nesbit	Struzzi
Delozier	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Thomas
Diamond	Kail	Oberlander	Tobash
DiGirolamo	Kauffer	Ortitay	Toepel
Dowling	Kauffman	Owlett	Toohil
Dunbar	Keefer	Peifer	Topper
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Walsh
Ecker	Klunk	Polinchock	Warner
Emrick	Knowles	Puskaric	Wentling
Everett	Lawrence	Pyle	Wheeland
Farry	Lewis	Quinn	White
Fee	Mackenzie	Rader	Zimmerman
Fritz	Mako	Rapp	
Gaydos	Maloney	Reese	Turzai,
Gillen	Marshall	Roae	Speaker
Gillespie			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Causar	DeLuca	Keller, F.	Rigby
Comitta	Gabler	Kinsey	Youngblood
Cruz	Hennessey		

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

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

Ms. **FIEDLER** offered the following amendment
No. **A00531**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 19, by striking out the bracket before
""General"

Amend Bill, page 2, line 1, by inserting a bracket before "432(3)"

Amend Bill, page 2, line 1, by inserting after "432(3)"

] 432(3)(i)(F)

Amend Bill, page 2, line 1, by striking out the bracket after "act."

Amend Bill, page 2, line 13, by striking out "July 1, 2019" and
inserting

September 30, 2019, except for assistance granted under the
provisions of section 432(3)(i)(F)

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

The **SPEAKER**. Representative Fiedler is recognized on the
amendment, and you may proceed.

Ms. **FIEDLER**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My amendment will preserve general assistance for one of the
most vulnerable populations: pregnant women. I know many of
my colleagues here join me in caring a great deal about pregnant
women and their unborn children, and I think it is so important
that we make sure that those pregnant women are able to buy
essential items like soap, toilet paper, and a winter coat.

With that, I call on my colleagues to support pregnant women
and vote "yes."

The **SPEAKER**. On the amendment, Representative Donna
Oberlander.

Ms. **OBERLANDER**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The gentledady is correct in that this General Assembly does
care for children and pregnant women; however, you cannot be
dual-eligible for general assistance and TANF, and for that
reason I stand in opposition to this amendment and request a "no"
vote. Thank you.

The **SPEAKER**. Does anybody else wish to speak on the
amendment? Does anybody else wish to speak on the amendment
other than the maker of the amendment?

Representative Fiedler, for the second time.

Ms. **FIEDLER**. Thank you.

And I thank my colleague for that. So the TANF Program has
a 60-month limit, and my amendment ensures that we care for a
woman and her unborn child. We live in uncertain times, and
there is really no guarantee that the extension will continue.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—87

Bizzarro	Driscoll	Krueger	Readshaw
Boyle	Evans	Kulik	Roebuck
Bradford	Fiedler	Lee	Rozzi
Briggs	Fitzgerald	Longietti	Sainato
Bullock	Flynn	Madden	Samuelson
Burgos	Frankel	Malagari	Sanchez
Burns	Freeman	Markosek	Sappey
Caltagirone	Gainey	Matzie	Schlossberg
Carroll	Galloway	McCarter	Schweyer
Cephas	Goodman	McClinton	Shusterman
Ciresi	Hanbidge	McNeill	Sims
Conklin	Harkins	Merski	Snyder
Daley	Harrell	Miller, D.	Solomon
Davidson	Harris	Mullery	Sturla
Davis, A.	Hohenstein	Mullins	Ullman
Davis, T.	Howard	Neilson	Vitali
Dawkins	Innamorato	O'Mara	Warren
Deasy	Isaacson	Otten	Webster
DeLissio	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Wheatley
Deloso	Kim	Petrarca	Williams
Dermody	Kirkland	Rabb	Zabel
Donatucci	Kortz	Ravenstahl	

NAYS—104

Barrar	Gleim	Mehaffie	Rothman
Benninghoff	Gregory	Mentzer	Ryan
Bernstine	Greiner	Metcalfe	Sankey
Boback	Grove	Metzgar	Saylor
Borowicz	Hahn	Mihalek	Schemel
Brooks	Heffley	Millard	Schmitt
Brown	Helm	Miller, B.	Schroeder
Cook	Hershey	Mizgorski	Simmons
Cox	Hickemell	Moul	Sonney
Culver	Irvin	Murt	Staats
Cutler	James	Nelson	Stephens
Day	Jones	Nesbit	Struzzi
Delozier	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Thomas
Diamond	Kail	Oberlander	Tobash
DiGirolamo	Kaufer	Ortitay	Toepel
Dowling	Kauffman	Owlett	Toohil
Dunbar	Keefer	Peifer	Topper
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Walsh
Ecker	Klunk	Polinchock	Warner
Emrick	Knowles	Puskaric	Wentling
Everett	Lawrence	Pyle	Wheeland
Farry	Lewis	Quinn	White
Fee	Mackenzie	Rader	Zimmerman
Fritz	Mako	Rapp	
Gaydos	Maloney	Reese	Turzai,
Gillen	Marshall	Roae	Speaker
Gillespie	Masser		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—10

Causar	DeLuca	Keller, F.	Rigby
Comitta	Gabler	Kinsey	Youngblood
Cruz	Hennessey		

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

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

**HOUSE BILLS
INTRODUCED AND REFERRED**

No. 962 By Representatives ROZZI and GREGORY

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in limitation of time, further providing for six months limitation, for infancy, insanity or imprisonment, for no limitation applicable and for other offenses; and, in matters affecting government units, further providing for exceptions to sovereign immunity, for limitations on damages in actions against Commonwealth parties, for exceptions to governmental immunity and for limitations on damages in actions against local parties.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, March 27, 2019.

No. 963 By Representatives GREGORY and ROZZI

A Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, further providing for courts to be open and suits against the Commonwealth.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, March 27, 2019.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. Representative Mullery, I apologize, sir.
Mr. MULLERY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to correct the record.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir, you may proceed.

Mr. MULLERY. On March 11, HB 284, I was recorded in the affirmative. I would like to be recorded in the negative.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir.

Housekeeping, please.

BILLS RECOMMITTED

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

HB 33;
HB 86;
HB 349;
HB 529;
HB 739;
HB 807; and
HB 859.

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

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

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

HB 223;
HB 279;
HB 288;
HB 315;

HB 422; and
HB 427.

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

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. Representative Chris Quinn moves that the House be adjourned until Monday, April 8, 2019, at 1 p.m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the motion?
Motion was agreed to, and at 5:21 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.