

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 2019

SESSION OF 2019

203D OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 52

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 9 a.m., e.d.t.

THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI) PRESIDING

PRAYER

HON. ROBERT F. MATZIE, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thought it was appropriate to reflect before prayer in rather a psalm, a lyric, "All You Need Is Love."

There's nothing you can do that can't be done.
Nothing you can sing that can't be sung.
Nothing you can say but you can learn how to play the game.
It's easy.

All you need is love.

Nothing you can make that can't be made.
No one you can save that can't be saved.
Nothing you can do but you can learn how to be you in time.
It's easy.

All you need is love.

Nothing you can know that isn't known.
Nothing you can see that isn't shown.
Nowhere you can be that isn't where you're meant to be.
It is easy.

All you need is love.

Let us now bow our heads:

Dear Lord, lead me from death to life, from falsehood to truth.
Lead me from despair to hope, fear to trust. Lead me from hate to love, from war to peace. Let peace fill our heart, our world, and our universe. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Wednesday, June 26, 2019, will be postponed until printed.

Some housekeeping.

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 518 and HB 881 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

HOUSE RESOLUTION INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 433 By Representatives YOUNGBLOOD, CRUZ, McCLINTON, STURLA, DONATUCCI, KINSEY, SAMUELSON, CALTAGIRONE, HILL-EVANS, RABB, KIRKLAND, WEBSTER, D. MILLER, SCHLOSSBERG, MADDEN, KENYATTA and JOHNSON-HARRELL

A Resolution urging President Donald Trump, the Congress of the United States and United States Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin to honor the pledge made to place Harriet Tubman's image on the \$20 bill by 2020.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, June 27, 2019.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 1680 By Representatives KORTZ, DALEY and McCLINTON

An Act establishing the Physician Retention Loan Forgiveness Program in the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency; and providing for powers and duties of the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, June 27, 2019.

No. 1681 By Representatives KORTZ, JAMES, SAYLOR and McCLINTON

An Act establishing the Loan Forgiveness for Dentists Program in the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency; and providing for powers and duties of the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, June 27, 2019.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. At this time the House is going to stand in recess until 10 a.m. Members will be reporting to the floor at 10 a.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

INSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Representative Tina Pickett, chair of the Insurance Committee, has a committee announcement.

Ms. PICKETT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to say that the House Insurance Committee will meet at 10:30 to consider HB 564. We will be in B-31. That is 10:30, House Insurance Committee, HB 564, B-31.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Madam Chair.

The House Insurance Committee will meet at 10:30 to consider HB 564 in B-31.

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

SB 48, PN 1080 (Amended) By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in ballots, further providing for form of official election ballot and for number of ballots to be printed and specimen ballots; in voting machines, further providing for requirements of voting machines and for form of ballot labels on voting machines; in electronic voting systems, further providing for requirements of electronic voting systems, for forms and for election day procedures and the process of voting; providing for voting systems and for voting systems bonds; establishing the County Voting System Reimbursement Account; in preparation for and conduct of primaries and elections, further providing for instructions of voters and manner of voting in districts in which voting machines are used, for count and return of votes in districts in which ballots are used and for what ballots shall be counted, manner of counting and defective ballots; and, in voting by qualified absentee electors, further providing for date of application for absentee ballot, for approval of application for absentee ballot, for voting by absentee electors, for canvassing of official absentee ballots and for public records.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 621, PN 1081 (Amended) By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, amending provisions relating to school police officers, school resource officers and school security guards; and imposing powers and duties on the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 712, PN 1085 (Amended) By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in Treasury Department, further providing for investment of moneys; in oil and gas wells, further providing for Oil and Gas Lease Fund; in transportation network companies, motor carrier companies and parking authority of a city of the first class, providing for transportation network company extension; in special funds, further providing for funding, for State Workers' Insurance Board, for expiration, for definitions, for other grants and for Commonwealth indebtedness; in additional special funds, further providing for definitions, for establishment of special fund and account, for use of fund, for distributions from Pennsylvania Race Horse Development Fund, for Workers' Compensation Security Fund, for definitions, for use of funds, for amount of grant and for guidelines for applications and providing for Enhanced Revenue Collection Account, Environmental Stewardship Fund and Recycling Fund; in general budget implementation, providing for block grants and for reports to General Assembly, further providing for Department of General Services, for Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board, for Department of Human Services, for Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency, for surcharges, for Multimodal Transportation Fund, for State Gaming Fund and providing for Joint Legislative Air and Water Pollution Control and Conservation Committee; in 2018-2019 budget implementation, further providing for Department of Revenue; adding provisions relating to 2019-2020 budget implementation; making related repeals; and making editorial changes.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 733, PN 1083 (Amended) By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act providing for the Pennsylvania Gaming Economic Development and Tourism Fund Capital Budget for 2019; itemizing projects to be assisted by the Department of Community and Economic Development, together with their estimated financial costs; authorizing recurring payments for certain projects; making appropriations; providing for reports relating to projects authorized from the Pennsylvania Gaming Economic Development and Tourism Fund through capital budget itemization acts for years prior to 2019; and making a conforming amendment to Title 4 (Amusements) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in gaming revenues, further providing for the Pennsylvania Gaming Economic Development and Tourism Fund.

APPROPRIATIONS.

GUEST INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. To the left of the rostrum, I would like to introduce Austin Plotica. Austin is an intern with Representative Torren Ecker and is going to be going to the University of Pennsylvania this fall. Thank you, Austin.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 1682 By Representatives KORTZ, BARRAR, HILL-EVANS, MILLARD, READSHAW, SAINATO, SAYLOR, IRVIN and MASSER

An Act amending Title 4 (Amusements) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in general provisions relating to video gaming, further providing for definitions; in application and licensure, further providing for establishment licenses and for issuance and renewal; and, in operation, further providing for video gaming limitations, for hours of operation and for terminal placement agreements.

Referred to Committee on GAMING OVERSIGHT, June 27, 2019.

No. 1684 By Representatives KORTZ, CONKLIN, HILL-EVANS and NEILSON

An Act declaring and adopting the poem "Pennsylvania," by Rich Saporito, as the State poem of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

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

No. 1685 By Representatives KORTZ, HILL-EVANS, MURT, NEILSON, READSHAW, CIRESI and McCLINTON

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in rules of the road in general, further providing for following too closely; and, in other required equipment, further providing for general requirements for school buses.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, June 27, 2019.

No. 1686 By Representatives MEHAFFIE, GREINER, BARRAR, STEPHENS, CAUSER, SCHLOSSBERG, STAATS, SANCHEZ, RIGBY, CIRESI, DeLUCA, FREEMAN, READSHAW, HICKERNELL, HILL-EVANS and BRIGGS

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in rules of the road in general, further providing for speed timing devices.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, June 27, 2019.

No. 1689 By Representatives SCHMITT, GREGORY, MOUL, JAMES, DUNBAR, PYLE, JOZWIAK and ZIMMERMAN

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in duties and powers of boards of school directors, providing for notice of school building construction and reconstruction projects.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, June 27, 2019.

No. 1690 By Representatives HARKINS, BURGOS, BIZZARRO, FREEMAN, HILL-EVANS and NEILSON

An Act amending the act of July 10, 2008 (P.L.1009, No.78), known as the Biofuel Development and In-State Production Incentive Act, further providing for definitions, for biodiesel content in diesel fuel sold for on-road use, for blending, registration and other requirements and for department authority and responsibility.

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, June 27, 2019.

No. 1691 By Representatives HARKINS, ZABEL, MURT, READSHAW, FREEMAN, McNEILL, HILL-EVANS, DEASY, OTTEN, MULLINS, MARKOSEK, DALEY, PASHINSKI and GALLOWAY

An Act amending the act of November 22, 1978 (P.L.1166, No.274), referred to as the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency Law, further providing for Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency; and establishing the Mental Health and Justice Advisory Committee and the Mental Health and Justice Grant Program.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, June 27, 2019.

No. 1692 By Representatives HARKINS, BERNSTINE, MURT, READSHAW, FREEMAN, McNEILL, JAMES, CONKLIN, HILL-EVANS, CIRESI, SCHLEGEL CULVER, MASSER, SNYDER, GOODMAN, SAINATO, MULLINS, DeLUCA and GILLEN

An Act amending Title 34 (Game) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in hunting and furtaking licenses, further providing for resident license and fee exemptions and for license costs and fees.

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

No. 1693 By Representatives HARKINS, DONATUCCI, SCHLOSSBERG, CALTAGIRONE, RABB, ISAACSON, FREEMAN, PYLE, CIRESI, HILL-EVANS, DEASY, NEILSON and PASHINSKI

An Act providing for legal protections from abusive work environments and for remedies.

Referred to Committee on LABOR AND INDUSTRY, June 27, 2019.

No. 1694 By Representatives HARKINS, MURT and GILLEN

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

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, June 27, 2019.

No. 1695 By Representatives HARKINS, CONKLIN, KIRKLAND, SCHLOSSBERG, BROWN, KINSEY, MILLARD, A. DAVIS, MACKENZIE, YOUNGBLOOD, READSHAW, HILL-EVANS, CIRESI, RABB, NEILSON, GILLEN and SCHWEYER

An Act amending the act of August 26, 1971 (P.L.351, No.91), known as the State Lottery Law, in State lottery, further providing for definitions and providing for disclosure of certain prizewinner identities.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, June 27, 2019.

SENATE BILLS FOR CONCURRENCE

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

SB 147, PN 1066

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

SB 619, PN 857

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, June 27, 2019.

SB 778, PN 1064

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, June 27, 2019.

BILLS RECOMMITTED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves to recommit SB 695 and SB 712 to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

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:

SB 241, PN 1016

An Act making appropriations from the Philadelphia Taxicab and Limousine Regulatory Fund and the Philadelphia Taxicab Medallion Fund to the Philadelphia Parking Authority for the fiscal year July 1, 2019, to June 30, 2020.

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

The SPEAKER. Members, we are going to take the master roll a little bit later. There is going to be an Appropriations Committee announcement and caucus announcements, but we are going to stand at ease for the time being.

APPROPRIATIONS AND RULES COMMITTEE MEETINGS

The SPEAKER. The majority Appropriations chair for a committee announcement with respect to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There will be an Appropriations Committee meeting at 11 o'clock in the majority caucus room, and there will be a Rules Committee meeting at 10:45 in the Appropriations caucus room.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

There will be an Appropriations Committee meeting at 11 o'clock in the majority caucus room, and there will be a Rules Committee meeting at 10:45 in the Appropriations caucus room.

RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The majority leader, Bryan Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we will actually meet with the Rules Committee immediately in the majority Appropriations conference room. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Mr. Leader.

So the Rules Committee is going to meet immediately in the Appropriations Committee caucus room, and then Appropriations Committee will be meeting at 11 a.m. in the majority caucus room.

Representative McClinton, do you have a caucus announcement?

Ms. McCLINTON. Not yet, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Okay.

I think what we are going to do is we are going to stand at ease. We are going to stand at ease, and then we will have some caucus announcements shortly.

But the Rules Committee is going to meet right now in the Appropriations caucus room. So all Rules Committee members should head to the Appropriations caucus room.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

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

Mrs. TOEPEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Republicans will caucus at 12 o'clock. We would be prepared to return to the floor at 1:30. Thank you.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. Representative Joanna McClinton, for a caucus announcement.

Ms. McCLINTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

House Democrats, we will caucus at 12 noon.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, both chairs.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Okay. So, members, we will not be returning to the floor until 1:30 p.m., until 1:30 p.m. There are caucuses scheduled for the majority and the minority caucuses, and there is a Rules Committee meeting now and then an Appropriations Committee meeting at 11. Thank you.

AFTER RECESS

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

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEES**HB 49, PN 1972** By Rep. SAYLOR

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

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 239, PN 209 By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of June 27, 1991 (P.L.70, No.10), entitled "An act requiring the superintendent of every public school district to make available, upon request, lists of graduating seniors to armed forces recruiters; and providing a penalty for the misuse of any such lists," further providing for title and for legislative intent; providing for short title and for definitions; and further providing for list of seniors to be compiled, for optional compliance by nonpublic schools and for reimbursement of costs.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 241, PN 211 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 resource enhancement and protection tax credit, further providing for definitions and for Resource Enhancement and Protection Tax Credit Program.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 295, PN 268 By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act establishing the Advisory Council on PANDAS and PANS; and providing for the duties of the Advisory Council on PANDAS and PANS.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 296, PN 269 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, providing for adoption and foster care tax credit.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1203, PN 1738 By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 53 (Municipalities Generally) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in municipal authorities, further providing for money of authority.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1380, PN 1671 By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Titles 30 (Fish) and 34 (Game) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in fishing licenses, providing for active duty military fishing reciprocity and for disabled veteran annual fishing license reciprocity; and, in hunting and furtaking licenses, providing for active duty military hunting reciprocity and for disabled veteran annual hunting license reciprocity.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1502, PN 1879 By Rep. SAYLOR

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

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1595, PN 2054 By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act designating a bridge, identified by Bridge Key 8671, on that portion of Washington Street over the Conemaugh River in Johnstown City, Cambria County, as the SFC Raymond R. Buchan Memorial Bridge.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1671, PN 2229 By Rep. CUTLER

An Act amending the act of April 3, 1992 (P.L.28, No.11), known as the Tuition Account Programs and College Savings Bond Act, in tuition account program, further providing for declaration of policy, for definitions, for Tuition Account Programs Bureau, for powers of department, for Tuition Account Guaranteed Savings Program, for Tuition Account Investment Program, for general provisions governing both tuition account programs, for State tax exemption and for Federal taxation; establishing the Keystone Scholars Grant Program and the Keystone Scholars Grant Program Account; and making a related repeal.

RULES.

SB 695, PN 1084 (Amended) By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Human Services Code, in public assistance, further providing for medical assistance payments for institutional care and for nonemergency medical transportation services and providing for uniform Statewide preferred drug list; in nursing facility assessments, further providing for definitions, for calculation, for remedies, for repayment and for time periods; in intermediate care facilities for persons with an intellectual disability assessments, further providing for definitions and for time periods; and making a related repeal.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 712, PN 1085 (Amended) By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in Treasury Department, further providing for investment of moneys; in oil and gas wells, further providing for Oil and Gas Lease Fund; in transportation network companies, motor carrier companies and parking authority of a city of the first class, providing for transportation network company extension; in special funds, further providing for funding, for State Workers' Insurance Board, for expiration, for definitions, for other grants and for Commonwealth indebtedness; in additional special funds, further providing for definitions, for establishment of special fund and account, for use of fund, for distributions from Pennsylvania Race Horse Development Fund, for Workers' Compensation Security Fund, for definitions, for use of funds, for amount of grant and for guidelines for applications and providing for Enhanced Revenue Collection Account, Environmental Stewardship Fund and Recycling Fund; in general budget implementation, providing for block grants and for reports to General Assembly, further providing for Department of General Services, for Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board, for Department of Human Services, for Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency, for surcharges, for Multimodal Transportation Fund, for State Gaming Fund and providing for Joint Legislative Air and Water Pollution Control and

Conservation Committee; in 2018-2019 budget implementation, further providing for Department of Revenue; adding provisions relating to 2019-2020 budget implementation; making related repeals; and making editorial changes.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**BILLS ON CONCURRENCE
REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**

HB 786, PN 2242 By Rep. CUTLER

An Act amending Title 35 (Health and Safety) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in emergency medical services system, further providing for definitions and for Pennsylvania Trauma Systems Foundation, providing for accreditation of trauma centers, for submission of list, for funding, for notification of trauma center closure, for reporting and for certification and financial report; and making a related repeal.

RULES.

HB 1520, PN 2212 By Rep. CUTLER

An Act amending Title 3 (Agriculture) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Pennsylvania Preferred® Trademark, further providing for Pennsylvania Preferred® Trademark Licensing Fund and providing for military veterans; providing for grant programs; and making editorial changes.

RULES.

HB 1590, PN 2213 By Rep. CUTLER

An Act amending Title 64 (Public Authorities and Quasi-Public Corporations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Commonwealth Financing Authority, establishing the Dairy Investment Program and Dairy Investment Program Account.

RULES.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The majority whip requests a leave of absence for Aaron BERNSTINE of Lawrence and Beaver Counties for the day. Without objection, that will be granted.

The minority whip requests leave of absence for Representative Mark ROZZI of Berks County for the day. Without objection, that will be granted.

MASTER ROLL CALL

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

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—200

Barrar	Fitzgerald	Lewis	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Flynn	Longiotti	Reese
Bizzarro	Frankel	Mackenzie	Rigby
Boback	Freeman	Madden	Roae
Borowicz	Fritz	Mako	Roebuck
Boyle	Gabler	Malagari	Rothman
Bradford	Gainey	Maloney	Ryan
Briggs	Galloway	Markosek	Sainato
Brooks	Gaydos	Marshall	Samuelson

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

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Bernstine Rozzi

LEAVES ADDED—2

Brooks Evans

The SPEAKER. Two hundred members having voted on the master roll, a quorum is present.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 733, PN 1083**, entitled:

An Act providing for the Pennsylvania Gaming Economic Development and Tourism Fund Capital Budget for 2019; itemizing projects to be assisted by the Department of Community and Economic Development, together with their estimated financial costs; authorizing recurring payments for certain projects; making appropriations; providing for reports relating to projects authorized from the Pennsylvania Gaming Economic Development and Tourism Fund

through capital budget itemization acts for years prior to 2019; and making a conforming amendment to Title 4 (Amusements) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in gaming revenues, further providing for the Pennsylvania Gaming Economic Development and Tourism Fund.

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—200

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Bernstine Rozzi

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 49, PN 1972**, entitled:

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

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—200

Barrar	Fitzgerald	Lewis	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Flynn	Longietti	Reese
Bizzarro	Frankel	Mackenzie	Rigby
Boback	Freeman	Madden	Roae
Borowicz	Fritz	Mako	Roebuck
Boyle	Gabler	Malagari	Rothman
Bradford	Gainey	Maloney	Ryan
Briggs	Galloway	Markosek	Sainato
Brooks	Gaydos	Marshall	Samuelson
Brown	Gillen	Masser	Sanchez
Bullock	Gillespie	Matzie	Sankey
Burgos	Gleim	McCarter	Sappery
Burns	Goodman	McClinton	Saylor
Caltagirone	Gregory	McNeill	Schemel
Carroll	Greiner	Mehaffie	Schlossberg
Causar	Grove	Mentzer	Schmitt
Cephas	Hahn	Merski	Schroeder
Ciresi	Hanbidge	Metcalfe	Schweyer
Comitta	Harkins	Metzgar	Shusterman
Conklin	Harrell	Mihalek	Simmons
Cook	Harris	Millard	Sims
Cox	Heffley	Miller, B.	Snyder
Cruz	Helm	Miller, D.	Solomon
Culver	Hennessey	Mizgorski	Sonney
Cutler	Hershey	Moul	Staats
Daley	Hickernell	Mullery	Stephens
Davidson	Hohenstein	Mullins	Struzzi

Davis, A.	Howard	Murt	Sturla
Davis, T.	Innamorato	Mustello	Thomas
Dawkins	Irvin	Neilson	Tobash
Day	Isaacson	Nelson	Toepel
Deasy	James	Nesbit	Toohil
DeLissio	Jones	O'Mara	Topper
Delloso	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Ullman
Delozier	Kail	Oberlander	Vitali
DeLuca	Kaufer	Ortitay	Walsh
Dermody	Kauffman	Otten	Warner
Diamond	Keefer	Owlett	Warren
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Pashinski	Webster
Donatucci	Kenyatta	Peifer	Wentling
Dowling	Kim	Petrarca	Wheatley
Driscoll	Kinsey	Pickett	Wheeland
Dunbar	Kirkland	Polinchock	White
Dush	Klunk	Puskaric	Williams
Ecker	Knowles	Pyle	Youngblood
Emrick	Kortz	Quinn	Zabel
Evans	Kosierowski	Rabb	Zimmerman
Everett	Krueger	Rader	
Farry	Kulik	Rapp	Turzai,
Fee	Lawrence	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Fiedler	Lee		

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-2

Bernstine Rozzi

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 239, PN 209**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 27, 1991 (P.L.70, No.10), entitled "An act requiring the superintendent of every public school district to make available, upon request, lists of graduating seniors to armed forces recruiters; and providing a penalty for the misuse of any such lists," further providing for title and for legislative intent; providing for short title and for definitions; and further providing for list of seniors to be compiled, for optional compliance by nonpublic schools and for reimbursement of costs.

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-170

Barrar	Fee	Mackenzie	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Flynn	Madden	Reese
Bizzarro	Freeman	Mako	Rigby
Boback	Fritz	Malagari	Roae
Borowicz	Gabler	Maloney	Roebuck
Boyle	Galloway	Markosek	Rothman
Bradford	Gaydos	Marshall	Ryan
Brooks	Gillen	Masser	Sainato
Brown	Gillespie	Matzie	Samuelson
Burgos	Gleim	McNeill	Sanchez
Burns	Goodman	Mehaffie	Sankey
Caltagirone	Gregory	Mentzer	Sapppey
Carroll	Greiner	Merski	Saylor
Causer	Grove	Metcalfe	Schemel
Ciresi	Hahn	Metzgar	Schlossberg
Comitta	Harkins	Mihalek	Schmitt
Conklin	Heffley	Millard	Schroeder
Cook	Helm	Miller, B.	Schweyer
Cox	Hennessey	Miller, D.	Simmons
Cruz	Hershey	Mizgorski	Snyder
Culver	Hickernell	Moul	Solomon
Cutler	Irvin	Mullery	Sonney
Daley	Isaacson	Mullins	Staats
Davis, T.	James	Murt	Stephens
Day	Jones	Mustello	Struzzi
Deasy	Jozwiak	Neilson	Sturla
DeLissio	Kail	Nelson	Thomas
Delloso	Kaufer	Nesbit	Tobash
Delozier	Kauffman	O'Neal	Toepel
DeLuca	Keefer	Oberlander	Toohil
Dermody	Keller, M.K.	Ortitay	Topper
Diamond	Kenyatta	Owlett	Walsh
DiGirolamo	Kim	Pashinski	Warner
Donatucci	Kinsey	Peifer	Warren
Dowling	Kirkland	Petrarca	Webster
Driscoll	Klunk	Pickett	Wentling
Dunbar	Knowles	Polinchock	Wheeland
Dush	Kortz	Puskaric	White
Ecker	Kosierowski	Pyle	Williams
Emrick	Kulik	Quinn	Zimmerman
Evans	Lawrence	Rader	
Everett	Lewis	Rapp	Turzai,
Farry	Longiatti	Ravenstahl	Speaker

NAYS-30

Briggs	Frankel	Krueger	Shusterman
Bullock	Gainey	Lee	Sims
Cephas	Hanbidge	McCarter	Ullman
Davidson	Harrell	McClinton	Vitali
Davis, A.	Harris	O'Mara	Wheatley
Dawkins	Hohenstein	Otten	Youngblood
Fiedler	Howard	Rabb	Zabel
Fitzgerald	Innamorato		

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-2

Bernstine Rozzi

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

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

VOTE CORRECTIONS

The SPEAKER. Representative Comitta is recognized.
 Mrs. COMMITTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
 My button malfunctioned. I should be recorded as a "no" on the last vote. Thank you.
 The SPEAKER. Representative Comitta – that was HB 239, PN 209 – wishes to be recorded as a "no."
 Representative Steve Kinsey, sir, is recognized.
 Mr. KINSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
 My button also jammed and I want to be recorded in the negative. It was, unfortunately, recorded in the positive. I want to change that to the negative.
 The SPEAKER. Yes. So for the record, HB 239, PN 209, page 2 of today's supplemental B calendar, Representative Kinsey wants to be recorded in the negative.
 Thank you, sir.

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 241, PN 211**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, in resource enhancement and protection tax credit, further providing for definitions and for Resource Enhancement and Protection Tax Credit Program.

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—200

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

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Bernstine Rozzi

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 296, PN 269**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, providing for adoption and foster care tax credit.

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—200

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Bernstine Rozzi

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1502, PN 1879**, entitled:

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

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—200

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

Everett	Krueger	Rader	
Farry	Kulik	Rapp	Turzai,
Fee	Lawrence	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Fiedler	Lee		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Bernstine Rozzi

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

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

* * *

BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. SB 712. That is over.

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1380, PN 1671**, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 30 (Fish) and 34 (Game) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in fishing licenses, providing for active duty military fishing reciprocity and for disabled veteran annual fishing license reciprocity; and, in hunting and furtaking licenses, providing for active duty military hunting reciprocity and for disabled veteran annual hunting license reciprocity.

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—200

Barrar	Fitzgerald	Lewis	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Flynn	Longietti	Reese
Bizzarro	Frankel	Mackenzie	Rigby
Boback	Freeman	Madden	Roae
Borowicz	Fritz	Mako	Roebuck
Boyle	Gabler	Malagari	Rothman
Bradford	Gainey	Maloney	Ryan
Briggs	Galloway	Markosek	Sainato
Brooks	Gaydos	Marshall	Samuelson
Brown	Gillen	Masser	Sanchez
Bullock	Gillespie	Matzie	Sankey

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Bernstine Rozzi

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 295, PN 268**, entitled:

An Act establishing the Advisory Council on PANDAS and PANS; and providing for the duties of the Advisory Council on PANDAS and PANS.

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?

At this time the Chair calls on Representative Dan Frankel.

Members, please be seated. Members, please be seated. Please be seated. We are covering much ground here, and everyone is entitled to be heard.

Representative Frankel, on the bill, sir.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today I stand here, reluctantly, to oppose this piece of legislation. Certainly, as an advocate for quality health care and access, I want to make sure that we pay close attention to critical issues like PANS

(Pediatric Acute-onset Neuropsychiatric Syndrome) and PANDAS (Pediatric Autoimmune Neuropsychiatric Disorders Associated with Streptococcal Infections). But I also believe that we should do so in a way that is expeditious and appropriate. PANS and PANDAS are complex illnesses that deserve serious evaluation. We do not have the evidence that shows there is one way to treat this, and at times even the studies that have been done conflict. In fact, the American Academy of Pediatrics has commissioned the development of a national policy statement to address the lack of clear evidence. In fact, the PA Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics is opposed to forming an advisory council on PANS and PANDAS right now because there is so much uncertainty.

I believe that we should support research on rare diseases like this one. We should connect patients to treatment. We should provide information to try to better understand these illnesses. And we should do all that through the rare disease council we already have. We do not need a new council to create a statewide advisory on how to treat a rare disease, especially when the medical community is still divided on how best to do so.

Sometimes I get exhausted saying it, but I feel it is important to do so: Let us leave the practice of medicine to those with degrees and keep our politics out of this.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Barry Jozwiak, on the bill, please.

Mr. JOZWIAK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like everyone – I am requesting everyone to vote "yes" on this bill. We talked about – my colleague from Allegheny County talked about the Rare Disease Advisory Council, and I can tell you this: PANDAS is not a disease listed on the Rare Disease Advisory Council's list of rare diseases. In addition, the council just recently held a meeting and they did not add this disease to the council, knowing that this bill was coming through the House.

Also, my bill requires that a school psychologist and a child psychologist who has experience in treating PANDAS be on this advisory council. There is no one on the Rare Disease Advisory Council that fits that description. There is no psychologist, and it is a neurological disease.

So I would ask everyone, please, for an affirmative vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kerry Benninghoff, on the bill, please.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of this piece of legislation, and I think the maker has put a lot of time and energy into trying to assist

families, and that is what we speak about, what we want to do as a Commonwealth. If anyone has talked to any of the families that have children that battle PANDAS or PANS, it is not very easy. It is not easy to diagnose, and many medical professionals will tell you that. I think having an advisory panel, especially with some of the high-caliber individuals that are to be part of this panel, would be a great assistance to us. It really does not cost us much of anything, other than some cost reimbursements for travel for these individuals. But why would we not want to have this opportunity to try to serve our citizens, especially those younger ones? Oftentimes they are misdiagnosed. A lot of these are associated with some psychiatric disorders subsequent to some streptococcus infections, much beyond what some of us know. Putting an advisory council together will help us better learn and provide better services to our communities. A friend of mine who has this situation with his own daughter provided educational materials to his schools, and the schools have been so appreciative because they themselves do not totally understand that, and I think this advisory council would be a good tool for us to do this. I commend Representative Jozwiak for wanting to do this.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the members to truly think about this and consider supporting this endeavor. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dan Frankel, for the second time.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want everybody to know we have contacted the director of the Rare Disease Council, Tomas Aguilar, and he has responded to us in a letter, which I would be glad to share, that they are very interested in taking a look at PANS and PANDAS, as an issue, a disease that they want to investigate and they are excited to do so and work with us. But I think you have to take a look. I mean, if we are going to end up setting up a rare disease council, and then every time we have a disease or constituency that comes to us to talk about it and wants to set up a separate panel to look at that, it kind of undermines the whole purpose of why we set up a rare disease council. So just imagine if we end up doing a separate council for each one of these, a separate panel for every rare disease. I think it defeats the purpose, it makes it inefficient, and it is going to be a waste of resources.

So with that, I would suggest that we use the opportunity and the facility that we established in this General Assembly to follow through with the mission that we gave it, and that is to investigate and to provide resources to those people who suffer from these rare diseases and give them a sense of hope. We have that facility now. There is no reason to set up a separate panel to do this. So I would, again, urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Barry Jozwiak, for the second time.

Mr. JOZWIAK. Again, colleagues, you have this legislation before you. If you had a child that had this disease, you would want this legislation passed. This is legislation that absolutely helps these kids. This disease affects children, and it is a neurological disease; their brains swell. If this gets misdiagnosed, that is why we need a psychologist from the schools and a professional psychologist that treats PANS and PANDAS and autism.

This is a very important bill. I would ask you all for a positive vote on this. Thank you.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—142

Barrar	Gabler	Mako	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Gaydos	Malagari	Reese
Bizzarro	Gillen	Maloney	Rigby
Boback	Gillespie	Marshall	Roae
Borowicz	Gleim	Masser	Rothman
Briggs	Goodman	Matzie	Ryan
Brooks	Gregory	Mehaffie	Sainato
Brown	Greiner	Mentzer	Samuelson
Burns	Grove	Metcalfe	Sanchez
Caltagirone	Hahn	Metzgar	Sankey
Causar	Harkins	Mihalek	Saylor
Conklin	Heffley	Millard	Schemel
Cook	Helm	Miller, B.	Schmitt
Cox	Hennessey	Miller, D.	Schroeder
Culver	Hershey	Mizgorski	Schweyer
Cutler	Hickernell	Moul	Simmons
Davidson	Howard	Murt	Snyder
Davis, T.	Irvin	Mustello	Sonney
Day	James	Neilson	Staats
Delozier	Jones	Nelson	Stephens
DeLuca	Jozwiak	Nesbit	Struzzi
Diamond	Kail	O'Mara	Thomas
DiGirolamo	Kaufar	O'Neal	Tobash
Donatucci	Kauffman	Oberlander	Toepel
Dowling	Keefer	Ortitay	Toohil
Driscoll	Keller, M.K.	Otten	Topper
Dunbar	Kim	Owlett	Walsh
Dush	Klunk	Peifer	Warner
Ecker	Knowles	Petrarca	Warren
Emrick	Kortz	Pickett	Wentling
Everett	Krueger	Polinchock	Wheeland
Farry	Kulik	Puskaric	White
Fee	Lawrence	Pyle	Zimmerman
Flynn	Lewis	Quinn	
Freeman	Longietti	Rader	Turzai,
Fritz	Mackenzie	Rapp	Speaker

NAYS—58

Boyle	Dermody	Kirkland	Roebuck
Bradford	Evans	Kosierowski	Sappey
Bullock	Fiedler	Lee	Schlossberg
Burgos	Fitzgerald	Madden	Shusterman
Carroll	Frankel	Markosek	Sims
Cephas	Gainey	McCarter	Solomon
Ciresi	Galloway	McClinton	Sturla
Comitta	Hanbidge	McNeill	Ullman
Cruz	Harrell	Merski	Vitali
Daley	Harris	Mullery	Webster
Davis, A.	Hohenstein	Mullins	Wheatley
Dawkins	Innamorato	Pashinski	Williams
Deasy	Isaacson	Rabb	Youngblood
DeLissio	Kenyatta	Ravenstahl	Zabel
Delloso	Kinsey		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Bernstine	Rozzi
-----------	-------

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1203, PN 1738**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 53 (Municipalities Generally) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in municipal authorities, further providing for money of authority.

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—200

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

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

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-2

Bernstine Rozzi

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1595, PN 2054**, entitled:

An Act designating a bridge, identified by Bridge Key 8671, on that portion of Washington Street over the Conemaugh River in Johnstown City, Cambria County, as the SFC Raymond R. Buchan Memorial Bridge.

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-200

Barrar	Fitzgerald	Lewis	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Flynn	Longietti	Reese
Bizzarro	Frankel	Mackenzie	Rigby
Boback	Freeman	Madden	Roae
Borowicz	Fritz	Mako	Roebuck
Boyle	Gabler	Malagari	Rothman
Bradford	Gainey	Maloney	Ryan
Briggs	Galloway	Markosek	Sainato
Brooks	Gaydos	Marshall	Samuelson
Brown	Gillen	Masser	Sanchez

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

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-2

Bernstine Rozzi

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 48, PN 1080**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in ballots, further providing for form of official election ballot and for number of ballots to be printed and specimen ballots; in voting machines, further providing for requirements of voting machines and for form of ballot labels on voting machines; in electronic voting systems, further providing for requirements of electronic voting systems, for forms and for election day procedures and the process of voting; providing for voting systems and for voting systems bonds; establishing the County Voting System Reimbursement Account; in preparation for and conduct of primaries and elections, further providing for instructions of voters and manner of

voting in districts in which voting machines are used, for count and return of votes in districts in which ballots are used and for what ballots shall be counted, manner of counting and defective ballots; and, in voting by qualified absentee electors, further providing for date of application for absentee ballot, for approval of application for absentee ballot, for voting by absentee electors, for canvassing of official absentee ballots and for public records.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

Representative Boyle has already requested to speak.
Representative Everett, do you wish to go?
Representative Boyle, you may proceed.
Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

I rise to oppose SB 48. I primarily rise to oppose SB 48 because it eliminates the straight-party button for voting machines. This, in 2019, simply does not make any sense. With every passing election in this Commonwealth this decade, more and more voters have chosen to vote using the straight-party button. So I ask all members to oppose this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Okay. Right now here is who we have that have requested to speak: Representative Boyle, who spoke; Representative Shusterman; Representative Kinsey; Representative Bullock; Representative Gainey; Representative Williams; Representative Hohenstein; and Representative Ciresi.

Representative Garth Everett is the prime sponsor – Oh no, I am sorry; it is a Senate bill. He is the chair of the State Government Committee. It is a Senate bill.

But, Chairman, do you wish to go now or do you wish to—
Chairman Everett, on the bill.

Mr. EVERETT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before I get into the guts of SB 48, I just thought I would sort of refresh our memory on how we got here. On February 9 of 2018, the administration issued a directive requiring that all voting systems purchased by counties after that date had to have a voter-verifiable, paper-ballot capability and a paper-ballot recount capability. At the time that directive did not cause a lot of consternation because all it required was going forward that any new systems would have to have a paper, a piece of paper that a voter could verify, and then a ballot cast that could be recounted, in the necessity of a recount. So nobody paid much attention at that time.

However, on April 12 of 2018, the administration issued another directive stating that counties must select new voting systems – no matter what system they had in place – had to select new voting systems no later than December 31, 2019, and have those systems in place for the 2020 primary election. Well, this did cause a lot of consternation to a lot of our counties, because a lot of our counties already had a paper-verifiable ballot and a system that was in place, but they were being required to replace their systems no matter what. This was a unilateral decision, no consultation with the counties, no consultation with the General Assembly, just an Executive order.

In response to that, the Senate came up with SB 48, which they originally intended to intercede in this replacement of all the voting machines. As time went by, it became apparent that right now, today, we have – I think there are 50-some of our counties that have already made decisions to move forward with new systems that are compliant, and so the train has pretty much left the station on stopping this particular decertification. But SB 48 does go forward to deal with this issue going forward should another administration choose to decertify more than 50 percent of the machines in Pennsylvania.

But the most important thing that it does – and I think this is very important to everybody in the chamber – is that it provides funding to our counties to meet this unfunded mandate that was levied on the counties unilaterally by the administration. The bill as amended will provide 60 percent of the cost of replacing these machines to our counties. That is a 20-percent increase over what the Governor put in his budget for this year, and I had personally wanted to reimburse our counties even more than that, but you know, I am willing to settle for what we can get here.

The second thing that I believe is important that SB 48 does, going forward should any administration choose to decertify machines again, as I said, it allows time for the General Assembly to intervene and provides a process that has to be followed to decertify more than 50 percent of the voting machines, rather than that just being able to be done unilaterally by the administration. I believe this to be a reasonable check on the executive branch's unilateral power to issue blanket decertifications without having to explain its rationale or its motivations.

In addition to the voting machine funding and replacement issues, SB 48 contains a few election reform issues. It updates the number of paper ballots that are required to be on hand for an election. Right now we are requiring our counties to have 110 percent of the amount of ballots on hand for registered voters. Our counties know how many people come out to vote in various elections, and SB 48 allows them to make those decisions based on the past three type elections that are coming up.

It also updates the dates and requirements for absentee ballots. Our postal system has changed and it has made it difficult for people to request ballots on time, get them on time, get them back in on time, and get them counted. SB 48 accounts for that for both absentee ballots and emergency ballots.

Voters in a number of our counties have complained that there seems to be a disparity in the time that it takes for absentee ballots to get out to folks who have requested them. To ensure that all counties are following the prescribed absentee ballot timelines for all voters, SB 48 requires counties to keep and maintain a log of absentee ballots to include the date of receipt by the county, the date the ballot was mailed to the voter, the date of the postmark on the ballot that it came back from the voter, and the date the ballot was received by the county. And this is to ensure that all absentee ballot requests and ballots get treated equally. There may be a suspicion out there that some ballots, depending on whether they may be from one party to the other, may move a little faster than another ballot, and this is to make sure that all ballots are treated equally. CCAP (County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania) has ensured us that they have a system in place – most counties do – that already tracks most of this information and it will be little difficulty to put a system like this in place.

As was mentioned by Chairman Boyle, last but not least SB 48 does away with straight-party voting in Pennsylvania. I am sure we may hear a little pro and con on that today, but from my point of view, this is a good-government issue. From the beginning of our great Commonwealth and country we have voted for individual candidates, not for parties, and it has only been in the 20th century that we instituted straight-party voting, and I can guarantee you, at the time it was instituted it was not for good-government purposes, it was to allow parties to control voters and voting, and that is not what voting is about. Voting is possibly our most important right, and it is my opinion, if you do not have the time to go into your polling place and go down through your ballot individually and vote for each candidate, and you do not have the time to familiarize yourself with the candidates that are on the ballot, then maybe you should not be voting in the first place.

It also gives you the opportunity to go down, and if you are not familiar with the candidates that are on the ballot, that you can skip that, you can skip that particular office and go down to the ones with which you are familiar. Also, from a practical point of view, the counties tell us that the purchase and certification of election systems in Pennsylvania has been very complicated for them to do historically because of the unique requirements that Pennsylvania has with straight-party voting. This means that any system that we purchase has to have special requirements built into it and has to be separately certified, which, of course, makes those systems cost more than those that are procured for other States.

One thing that I was unaware of, until we entered into this discussion, is that Pennsylvania is one of only eight States in the United States – I will say that again – one of eight States in the United States that has some form of straight-party voting. I wonder why the other ones do not. Well, let us just think about that. I will allow you to think about that.

Finally, our boots-on-the-ground pollworkers tell us that, historically, straight-party voting has caused more confusion than any other issue. People check that at the top. They think because they are of one party or the other, they need to check what party they are, and then from there on down they are not able to select, they have to ask questions, they mark their ballot, it goes to the optical scanner, it gets kicked out. So just from a practical point of view, it is difficult to enforce, it is unnecessary, it is bad policy, and it is bad government.

In conclusion, I will stress the most important part of SB 48, in my opinion, is the funding that is going to go out to our counties to implement this unfunded mandate of replacing machines, about half of which, by the way, already meet the requirement, again, of having a paper trail and having a recount capability. We owe it to our counties to make sure that they are at least made partially whole for this unfunded mandate that is being foisted on them by this Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Shusterman.

Ms. SHUSTERMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand here against SB 48. I cannot get behind a piece of legislation that is unnecessary and makes voting lines longer. A similar bill was passed in Michigan and they encountered longer voting lines. And in my district, we pride ourselves on our efficient voting experience. I cannot bring this mandate back to them. Why? Because no one likes longer lines or unfunded mandates or unanswered questions such as, how will this be implemented? And who is paying for that implementation? My

county's voting machines allow for a straight-ticket voting option. Where is the money or staff to block or dismantle this option and, more importantly, why? Slowing down voting lines, excluding an option for voters, without making voting easier, is a firm "no" from me.

I look forward to standing here in support of a voting bill that allows early voting, that allows all of us to vote via mail, or actually creates for my seniors and those with physical disabilities—

POINT OF ORDER

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

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CUTLER. I believe the gentlelady is a little far afield—

The SPEAKER. Representative—

Ms. SHUSTERMAN. —a piece of legislation—

The SPEAKER. Representative, just one second. There is a point of order being raised. I apologize.

First of all, members, if everybody could take their seats. Representative Shusterman is entitled to be heard, first of all, so everybody needs to take their seats. And then, Leader, I will be with you in one minute. Everybody, please take your seats. It is an important debate. Everybody is entitled to be heard. Please take your seats. If you have conversations, please take them off to the anterooms. The leader has raised a point of order.

Leader Cutler.

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

I would simply inquire of the Chair, I believe it is the position that we can only debate what is in the underlying bill in order to limit debate and make sure that we do not go too far afield from that process. I understand the gentlelady desires to have an additional debate, but that would be appropriate on those underlying bills.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Leader.

Representative Shusterman, you are covering ground with respect to the bill. If you could cite aspects of the bill, but we understand where you are headed. Please continue. And I will make sure that everybody is heard and I apologize for that. And, Leader, the debate, just if we can get to the details of the bill and the issues surrounding it.

But Representative Shusterman is fine. Please continue to move forward.

Ms. SHUSTERMAN. Look, I look forward to a day where we make it easier for my seniors and people with physical disabilities to vote. Let us make voting easier. There is nothing to be afraid of with strengthening that liberty for all.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kinsey, you are next. You probably want to just use that right there.

Yes, sir. Representative Steve Kinsey.

Mr. KINSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I am not normally one that will question the motives of our members here, but I have to admit—

The SPEAKER. Representative Kinsey; Representative Kinsey, please. Please, with all due respect, to lead off with that— But the only thing, I would just direct you, sir, it is in one of our rules that you cannot get to motive, and I apologize, but you cannot get to motive. Please just go to the merits of the bill and what you see positive and negative and what you would have liked to have had included versus what might be there.

Unless you are for the bill – I am teasing you; I am teasing.

But, Representative Kinsey, just be careful on the motive. Okay. You cannot go there and I apologize. Thank you.

Mr. KINSEY. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, the original – my interpretation of the original intent of this piece of legislation was to prohibit the Commonwealth from disapproving of or decertifying voting apparatuses in 50 percent or more counties until the following requirements have been met. And as I read the bill analysis, Mr. Speaker, it reads: "If the Commonwealth intends to disapprove or decertify voting apparatuses in 50% or more counties, the Department of State would be required to submit a written plan to the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives at least 180 days prior to the effective date of replacement containing each of the following: the reason for disapproval or decertification; the estimated cost to replace the disapproved or decertified voting apparatuses, and the plan for how funding is anticipated to be obtained; a plan for replacing the disapproved or decertified voting apparatuses; and the effective date of replacement." So, Mr. Speaker, that is how I interpreted this particular bill to be.

But then, Mr. Speaker, there was another portion of this bill that states "straight-party voting," and, Mr. Speaker, as I interpret straight-party voting, I believe that straight-party voting would eliminate a voter's right, a voter's option, and the convenience of that voter to vote straight party with a single selection that many of us in Pennsylvania have been used to for decades.

Mr. Speaker, I share this concern because I think back to my grandparents, Mr. Speaker. My grandparents were dissuaded from voting; even though they had the right to vote, they were dissuaded from voting, and, Mr. Speaker, when I think about my parents, just one generation removed, Mr. Speaker, my parents encountered ploys at the voting booth simply because of the color of their skin.

So, Mr. Speaker, when I think about we here, as legislators, I also think about the folks that I represent back home in the city of Philadelphia. I think about how far my grandparents have come, my parents have come, and the convenience that we are now afforded, based on what they had to go through, Mr. Speaker. And so, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering, should we not be focusing our attention on ways to encourage citizens of this Commonwealth in every possible way to get out and vote? If we truly want to assist and encourage the people of this Commonwealth, Mr. Speaker, then I think we need to focus on early voting. I think we need to focus on voting on weekends, Mr. Speaker. I think that we need to focus on pushing for true convenience for every Pennsylvanian and allowing for every voter to have the convenience and the option to vote straight party, if they so choose.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to conclude my comments with if we care about our citizens and if we are talking about making it convenient for our voters, then let us continue and allow them the option, if they so choose, to vote straight party, as opposed to taking away that right that they now have.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Donna Bullock.

Mrs. BULLOCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition of this bill today.

On Monday we celebrated the 100th anniversary of Pennsylvania's ratification of the right of women to vote. Nine Black women in this House debated whether we would even wear white and whether we should stand with our female colleagues

and share in that celebration; a celebration that, honestly, did not include us, because 100 years ago Black women, our vote was stifled, because of the barriers that blocked and diluted the voting power of Black and Brown communities that remained for another 50 years.

Today Black women voters are the most reliable voters in this country. We vote every time, all the time, in record numbers. So on Monday we stood in our white and we shared in that celebration of our sisters' right to vote. We stood in solidarity. We stood in spirit.

But this bill, this bill takes a step back. This bill holds the purchase of new voting machines hostage to regressive voting or election reform. This bill, among other things, will prohibit straight-ticket voting in Pennsylvania. This bill will restrict, distort, and constrain Black voters, Latino voters, disabled voters, poor voters, elderly voters, those with limited literacy, and many others who choose and rely on straight-ticket voting. This bill does nothing to cut down on wait times, especially in heavily trafficked voting polls in urban and densely populated communities. This bill does nothing to address the many voting reforms my constituents are asking for, such as early voting, voting by mail, or no-excuse absentee voting. This bill does nothing, it does nothing to make voting easier in Pennsylvania. This bill would instead feed into partisan politics at the expense of voters.

Mr. Speaker, a similar attempt to ban straight-ticket voting in Michigan was found to violate both the equal protection clause and the Voting Rights Act. The court determined in that State that the elimination of straight-ticket voting would disproportionately and negatively impact African-American voters. I have no doubt it would do the same in Pennsylvania; again, keeping Black and Brown communities from participating in the political process that determines who represents them, how they represent them, and essentially determines the policies and distribution of resources that impact their own inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

So this is what I am asking: I am asking the 52 women of this chamber, on both sides of the aisle, to stand with Black women and Black voters today. I am asking those of you who ask me every single week to wear every single color of the rainbow and take a picture for your own particular cause to stand with me today. I am asking those men and those women who count on the work and the votes of Black women; I am counting on and asking those who have relied on Black and Brown voters in your district; I am asking those who believe that voters, regardless of the color of their skin, regardless of their economic status, regardless of their political party, that they should be able to vote without any obstacle and in any manner in which they most feel empowered, I am asking you to stand and to vote "no" today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Ed Gainey.

Mr. GAINNEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There is not really too much I could add to that. I mean, she is – she is right. I mean, I am not even going to try to stand up here and talk about it, because she answered all the questions that can truly be answered. I just want to say thank you, because she is right. We all stand up here for everybody else's interest— Hello? All right. Yes. Right. She will stand – we will stand up here for everybody else's right, because we believe that if we stand up for each other, we are standing up for humanity and we are making a better day. And there is no question what the Representative from Philadelphia said is true. Listen, we have had a long fight

when it comes to civil rights and our ability to vote, and we can talk about what each voter should know, how educated they should be, how they should study the candidates, but everybody in here knows that does not happen, and there is a backup button to that if you believe in the principles that a party has. And there is no question that my grandmothers, my senior citizens, they are going to push the Democratic button, and in urban areas that are dense, that is what we do, and so when you talk about doing something that it hurts the vote, what we are really saying is something that hurts senior citizens, we are really saying something that hurts African-American and Latino communities, and we fought too hard from a civil rights standpoint to make sure that we had the type of system that allows us to vote with no problems. And not only that, let us be honest, we all know what happened in Michigan. We all know what the court said in Michigan, that it would definitely have an impact on African-American voting. If we know that, and I hear my colleagues say this all the time, "Hey, it's not about race. It's not about nothing like that," I think today we have got that opportunity to prove it. See, if you really want to prove it, when it comes to saying "yea" or "nay," vote this down and help us stand with — help stand with us like we have stood with you to ensure that we have a healthy voting system, and if we do that today, it will send the message to Pennsylvania that there is cooperation. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dan Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, African-American and minority voter disenfranchisement is well documented at this point empirically and experientially. A study done by the Public Religion Research Institute, in July of last year, found that just about every issue identified as a common barrier to voting had African-American and Hispanic voters being twice as likely to have experienced that issue. And so much like the poll taxes and the literacy tests, these policies, like the elimination of straight-ticket voting, appear racially neutral, but over time the results clearly indicate a racial bias in those areas affected, and a resuscitation of such practices, we should all hope, would be ended on a day like today.

In the 2016 Presidential election, the Wisconsin voter ID law kept Democrats away from polls in numbers larger than our elected President's margin of victory. The biggest decreases in turnout were in African-American neighborhoods, an obvious signal that minority voters were disproportionately hurt by the voter ID law. And again, policies that appear racially neutral but overwhelmingly impact minorities are not racially neutral and should be seen for what they are, detrimental.

Regardless of its form, regardless of its intent, voter suppression tactics have been successful in preventing and discouraging minorities from voting. Disenfranchising minorities has a long history in America and it continues to take on a different form while continuing to suppress minority votes. And so, I believe, a "no" vote on this day is a step towards its final burial, and it is why I will be voting "no" and asking my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in voting "no" to SB 48. Thank you so much.

The SPEAKER. Representative Hohenstein.

Mr. HOHENSTEIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to SB 48 because it is a missed opportunity to add to Pennsylvania's legacy of contributions to the progress, the arc of progress for human rights throughout the world. From the Great Law of William Penn in 1682, the Charter of Privileges in 1701, those were documents that provided the foundation and the blueprint for the principles

of equality for all people, freedoms of speech and religion, and our conception of ourselves as individuals possessed of individual liberties.

At the core of our identity as a democratic republic is the right to vote. As a public official elected by the votes of my neighbors and my fellow citizens, I consider it my obligation to use the power that they have given to me to give back to them the complete and unfettered access to their vote. SB 48 is a missed opportunity to provide that access. It could have included, and was designed to include, expansions to rights of absentee voters, improving access for voters with disabilities, and voting at different times other than the first Tuesday in November, which is an archaic process that is impractical for the rhythm and flow of today's working citizens. SB 48 was an opportunity for us to include more voices in the democratic debate that affects our republic and that is essential to the preservation of that republic.

Mr. Speaker, in just the last few days, I have been concerned that at times in our own chamber and in our sister chamber we are not always engaging in full debate. We close our eyes and ears and minds to the opposing voices. But full and complete debate is at the core of our freedom of speech, and the right to vote represents the most powerful exercise of that freedom. One of my constituents has a favorite phrase that she will use to motivate me when I go astray. She said, "We can do better." SB 48 was a missed opportunity for us to do better, and for that reason I will be voting "no."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Patty Kim.

Ms. KIM. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose SB 48. What this bill would do is unnecessary and takes away the perfectly legal option of straight-ticket voting. Why do we need to change the system? This bill feels like politicians trying to change things up in order to control the outcome of elections. We are commemorating the 150th anniversary of the 15th Amendment and the 100th anniversary of the 19th Amendment. These amendments of the U.S. Constitution secured the voting rights of African-American men and women. A century later, we need to stay vigilant. The current system is fine, allows people to vote efficiently, and again, this change would be unnecessary.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on SB 48.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kirkland.

Mr. KIRKLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to declare my opposition to SB 48 that would eliminate straight-party voting. Efforts to eliminate the straight-ticket option when voting are often veiled attempts at voter suppression, especially in communities like mine. Abolishing straight-ticket voting disenfranchises voters of color and voters in more densely populated areas. Studies have found that African-Americans vote straight-party lines at vastly higher rates, and much of that voting is done in heavily trafficked polling locations.

There are already too many instances of voter suppression in our Commonwealth and nationwide. More than 15,000, 15,000 polling places have been closed across this country since President Obama was elected in 2008, many of those in minority neighborhoods, in low-income districts and on college campuses. As legislators, we should be encouraging all who are eligible to express their desires at the polls to act on their inalienable right to vote. Elimination of the straight-ticket voting option muddies that process and makes it more difficult to participate. That is

why I adamantly oppose this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Aaron Kaufer.

Mr. KAUFER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I listen to this debate, I had to say a few words because I did get frustrated over what some of us believe our constitutional values are.

When George Washington left the Presidency in 1796, he gave one the greatest speeches ever given in American political thought in the history of our country. And his farewell address is considered one of the top three works, alongside our Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of our United States. Now, maybe not many of you have read it. I have worked quite extensively academically in this, and I actually have an original print of this hanging at home in my house. It is probably my most prized possession of anything I own, and something that sits right alongside my office.

Now, the first half of his speech does not really touch on the subject today, but it is about his patriotism, and people were questioning him for not being willing to be dragged into war in a war we could not win after the Revolutionary War. It was a war over shipping routes with the British. But people considered him unpatriotic. So the first half of his speech is all about George Washington defending his own patriotism.

The second half, though, is very important to the debate at hand today. And in the second half, he says, I am leaving the Presidency and all I am going to do is go home to die peacefully on my farm. And since I have no political ambition, I have one piece of advice for our country. That piece of advice was: beware political factions.

In that speech, George Washington actually talked about the unity of government. He talked about the idea of a House divided, something I see here today – a House divided. Now, will getting rid of straight-party balloting solve all the problems of a House divided? It certainly will not. But I think it is a step, that we can start thinking of ourselves as Representatives; not as Representatives of a particular party, but as Representatives of our districts and of this institution of people electing people, not people electing parties electing people. If we are to stand up for the Democratic principles, those Republican Democratic principles that our country is founded upon, it comes back to this, and there is nothing, nothing more fundamental to our American thought than our party system and the system that was not supposed to exist.

Now, a lot of you get a chuckle as you see me wear my orange tie around here every day, and I know that when I wear my orange tie here every day that I was elected to represent all the people – not to represent the Republicans, not to represent the Democrats, but to represent the people – and if we could talk about getting away from a party mentality and actually doing our jobs outside of a party lens, that is a step closer to republican democracy as it was envisioned.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am here to ask my colleagues to support this. I would actually go much further in our election reforms. I think we should take parties off the ballot entirely. That is personally what I believe. But I do not think we have the support here. And I will be introducing a bill here soon to do that. But this is what is on the table today, and this is a step towards people electing people as opposed to people electing parties to represent people. That is what we need here: people representing people.

And, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes." Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Webster.

Mr. WEBSTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am standing here at this podium to make sure people know that I stand with the people who stood at this podium previously and argued for our vital rights to vote. And one other thing, because I think we need to really evaluate this bill and what it does with voting machines in counties across Pennsylvania. So we need to get this straight. If we do not replace these machines, we will face the 2020 presidential election and an inability to audit our votes. We will not have a paper trail to do a recount. We will go into the 2020 presidential election with a mess right in front of us in Pennsylvania. If you do not know what has happened in the country with the last two elections and the way our systems were attacked, you are not paying attention. These machines have to go. They have to be replaced with modern, safe, auditable machines, and then we practice every one of those voting rights for every citizen and resident of Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Jake Wheatley.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Mr. Speaker, I know that this is a Senate bill, but I wanted to interrogate the—

The SPEAKER. It would be, if somebody wanted to stand for interrogation, it would have to be the State Government chair, Representative Garth Everett, who is the State Government chair. I think he will stand for interrogation.

Mr. WHEATLEY. I just have a few questions for him.

The SPEAKER. Yeah, no problem.

Mr. WHEATLEY. Mr. Speaker, seeing that I am not a member of the State Government Committee, were there any hearings on this bill, and particularly, on the straight-party ticketing elimination?

Mr. EVERETT. Not in the House, sir.

Mr. WHEATLEY. All right. Are you aware of any negative, potential negative impacts that doing away with straight-party ticketing may have on citizens of Pennsylvania one way or another?

Mr. EVERETT. No, sir.

Mr. WHEATLEY. When we talk about the election and protecting citizens' right to vote and making sure every vote is counted and has a validity to it, do you know of any research that may say one way or the other how straight-party ticketing elimination helps or hinders in either protecting or securing or making sure individual citizens votes are counted?

Mr. EVERETT. I am not personally aware, sir.

Mr. WHEATLEY. All right. Thank you. Thank you.

On the bill, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Yes; on the bill, sir.

Mr. WHEATLEY. One of the things that I think – and I think the prior speaker spoke to George Washington and his patriotism and the belief that he had as citizens in this country and the threat to our country and parties and what it meant. I can be for all of that. You know, I can definitely see how that could be a problem and a challenge to our system moving the country forward. I think if this was a part of reforms that allow for access to be open – meaning, you know, same-day registration, same-day voting, making sure we were doing all we can to make sure every vote and every voter had the ability to cast and be heard in every election – I could be supportive of this type of reform.

I think part of my challenge to this, though, is from what I was able to gather in just a limited amount of time, because there were not a lot of hearings. I did not have a chance to delve into any of the specificities for Pennsylvanians, but from what I can see, this has a negative implication to certain communities and certain groups of our citizenry. And I think if our goal is to make sure our elections and our citizens are secure in the process, I think we want to do everything we can to make sure, in every election, that every citizen is treated equally, with equal access to have their voice heard. I do not think that we would want to rush into doing something that is a part of a last-minute budgetary process that could have major implications negatively to groups and citizens of our various districts.

So I would really encourage us – I know what it is; I know we are in this process, people are trying to get out of here. This is, in some ways, agreed to by principles, and, you know, people come on this floor and their minds are made up. They are going to push a "yes" or they are going to push a "no." But I do think that we should be on record in letting people know that this is potentially a devastating blow to groups of Pennsylvanians who, quite frankly, are used to going into a polling place in a general election and pushing the party of their choice. They have had a primary where they only could vote inside of a Republican or Democratic primary, which we do not allow Independents to play in. So they have had a competition, some of them have had a competition, and then they get into a general election where they are used to continuing their party-of-choice voting. We are now changing that, potentially, without any information of what that might mean to our citizens, what that may do to our citizens, how they may impact how people come to our cycles, how we educate them. I am not even sure how we will make sure voters who show up understand that this option is no longer there.

So I just think we have to be very careful when we do these types of things, that we do them intentionally and with all of the knowledge. And clearly, at least on one side of our chamber, not all of that was laid out. And so I would just encourage us – again, I doubt if I have changed a vote on this floor, but certainly we are changing voters and votes out in our population if we pass this bill. And I would encourage us to vote against SB 48 and allow for us to really have a deep dive and understand all of our electoral processes to make sure we are making sure every vote counts and every citizen has the capacity to cast their vote the way that they want to.

So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Tarah Toohil.

Ms. TOOHIL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I had to rise today. This bill does a lot of things, but I was not expecting this room and the thoughts that we are sharing with each other and the speeches that we are giving, I was not expecting it to take a racial turn. I just was not, so maybe I am naive.

But we should be in a place where we do not judge each other by the color of our skin. And some of you – maybe we do, maybe some of you are judging me right now and what I am saying, right, based upon the color of my skin. Listen, I am not saying – listen. You are going to hear me out. This is a bill, SB 48, that was not supposed to take a racial turn, and some of my dear friends have spoken today and I did not think that this was going to take a racial turn.

And I am saddened by the racial stereotyping of the Black and Brown people in my district and the way that they are being said that you are saying that they are voting a certain way and that they want to vote straight ticket. You are going to have to be respectful to me, Mr. Speaker.

POINT OF ORDER

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

Ms. TOOHIL. Mr. Speaker?

Mr. CUTLER. I believe the gentlelady is entitled to be heard.

The SPEAKER. Yeah. Members, please, I have always stated, please, give everybody an opportunity. We have had leeway here for everybody. And it is actually addressing many of the remarks that have already been made on the floor. This is a response to many of the remarks that have already been made on the floor.

If you have a point of order to raise, I recommend that you discuss it with your leadership. And typically, a point of order is best raised by either the majority leader or the minority leader.

But this is in direct response to much of the debate today.

With that, Representative Tarah Toohil.

Ms. TOOHIL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Regardless of race, I do not know why we are having a conversation judging whether our constituents would want to straight ticket, that they would want to straight ticket at all. This bill simply releases Democrat and Republican controls, the party controls of Democrat control and Republican control on those buttons, and it creates a real choice. That real choice is voting.

So all of our constituents, regardless of race, can go in and they can choose to vote however they want. They are still going to choose. You can still go into the booth and vote straight Republican if you wish and you can vote straight Democrat if you wish. This bill impacts every voter, regardless of race.

This bill is strengthening our machines here in Pennsylvania, which is something that we knew that we needed to improve the machines, and it is funding it with \$90 million to improve voting in Pennsylvania for everyone.

And I just wanted to tell the members – and I do not want to offend anyone – I just want to speak freely in this chamber. We are all duly elected, and all of us have buttons right in front of us. All of us, duly elected, have that privilege that there is a button right in front of us. And sometimes people do vote along party lines, and it is a "yes" and a "no" button, but you could look at it and you could envision it as a Democrat or a Republican button, sometimes, in this House, and you are entrusted with that choice. And all I am asking for is that you would entrust the same to all of our constituents, regardless of race, in this great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Representative Tim O'Neal.

Mr. O'NEAL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in 2005 I deployed to Afghanistan to defend our rights as American citizens. One of our fundamental rights as an American citizen is the right to vote. While I was in Afghanistan in 2005, I also defended the Afghans' right to vote. This right is absolutely important in today's day and age, and this bill, SB 48, provides for three separate measures of election reform – excuse me, two separate measures of election reform.

The very first thing that it does, which is done in combination with the counties, is it improves the timelines for absentee voting. In addition to the improvement of the absentee voting process,

this provides for \$90 million worth of funding to replace and to secure our election voting machines. Let us not forget that these are the fundamental aspects of SB 48.

In addition to that, and the third thing I would like to discuss, is actually a report issued by the Department of Political Science at the University of Pittsburgh that actually talks specifically about straight-ticket voting. As a matter of fact, the report quotes that the presence of a straight-ticket voting option has effects on voter participation. In fact, it goes on to say that a straight-ticket voting option will lead to lower levels of voter participation.

SB 48 and the election reforms that are involved in it absolutely matter. It is our fundamental right to ensure we ensure that voting is effective throughout our Commonwealth.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Jordan Harris.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I count it an honor and a privilege to serve in this House of Representatives. I have friends on both sides of the aisle. I have folks who are Democrat and Republican whom I have spent significant amounts of time with, and I think that we built a true and meaningful friendship.

Mr. Speaker, I rise because I wanted to clarify and try to educate those who may not understand why there is a racial undertone to this legislation. Now, the good gentleman stood and he talked about three of the speeches that he believed to be powerful. He talked about the Declaration of Independence. He talked about the Constitution. He talked about George Washington. But I must remind you, when we talk about voting, we talk about the Constitution, we also must remember that in that Constitution, people that look like me were three-fifths of a person. We have to remember that when those speeches were written, when those documents were written, people that look like me were in chains; we were enslaved in this country. It took a war to liberate the people in this country that have my ancestry, but even after that liberation, after amendment after amendment after amendment was passed to our Constitution, still we went through Jim Crow, we went through segregation, and we had to have a Voting Rights Act to even level the playing field for people who have African descent.

So it is not that we are trying to call anyone a racist with this legislation; we are doing no such thing. And it is not that we are questioning the intent of the legislation; we are doing no such thing. But when anything comes up in this chamber that reminds me of the times when my people were disenfranchised from this process, I have to stand up and I have to speak about it to remind us of where we have come from, because even if this is an unintended consequence, it is a consequence.

The fact of the matter is that there is a troubled history in this country when it comes to people of color. So no, while we do not intend the racial undertones, we want you to understand that there is a racial undertone because it could affect people of color who have already fought with blood, sweat, and tears just to go to the ballot box.

My great-great-grandmother could not vote in this country. She did not have the right to do that. She was a former slave. When I went and voted at 18 years old, my grandmother and my mother cooked dinner for me. We had mashed potatoes, greens, and steak – eating steak in my family was a big deal when Grandmom cooked it – but my grandmother did that for me because it was a celebration. It was something that many of her ancestors did not have the right to do.

So I ask my friends who may not have the same heritage or lineage to understand that when these types of bills come up, and they have the opportunity to disenfranchise Black and Brown people, that you do not question our intent, that you do not question our motive, but that you please try to understand that at one day and time, we were not able to go to the poll and push a button for a person that we chose to vote for. So we will do everything that we can to stand up and fight and ensure that everybody that wants to vote – black, brown, white, yellow, or indifferent – has an opportunity to do so in this Commonwealth. And that is why we are voting "no" on SB 48, because it is important to us to protect the right that many of our ancestors died for.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Matt Gabler.

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

I rise in favor of SB 48. I think it is important that we take an accurate look at what this bill contains, and the most important aspect of this bill is the fact that it contains the funding necessary to replace the election machines in each of our counties. Voting this bill down would leave our counties holding the bag for an unfunded mandate that was foisted upon them by the administration in this Commonwealth. But beyond that, voting in favor of this bill is very important because it will facilitate the transition to a verifiable paper trail vote-counting process, and that is something that we can all agree on.

This bill also contains a number of good election reforms, including a streamlined process for the distribution, tally, and counting of absentee votes, and including a more permissive timeline for the return of ballots. That is something we can all agree on.

This bill contains election reforms proposed by members of both parties and it contains election reforms that were requested by our county election officials, and we had these discussions in our State Government Committee. One of those reforms that this bill contains is a good-government reform that strengthens the relationship between voters and elected officials. The elimination of the one-button, straight-ticket option on the ballot provides for a system by which elected officials are incentivized to serve their constituents, not their political party.

This is not a debate about race or gender; it is about the fact that the American system of government provides for elected individuals, not party lists like we see in other parts of the world.

Think about this: A voter voting a straight-ticket ballot on a multipage selection may never even see the names of the elected officials or candidates that they are voting for or against. Does that make any sense in this system of government?

Finally, think about this: As we hear about some of the debate over whether or not this is a racial or a gender or a partisan issue, the underlying stand-alone bill that provides for this good-government reform was actually introduced in our State Senate by a female Democratic Senator. This is a bipartisan, good-government reform that we can all get behind.

So please, do not believe the partisan rhetoric; please do not believe the scare tactics. This is a proposal that I believe will reduce partisanship. I believe it will put government and society back on a better path. So let us stand with our counties, let us stand in favor of confidence and integrity in our election process, and let us vote "yes" on SB 48. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. Representative Schlossberg, and thank you.

Mr. SCHLOSSBERG. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I begin my speech with those, those famous words that some of us sometimes say, those that cause us to cringe: "I did not plan on speaking today on this bill," but I was inspired to do so based on the remarks of some of the previous speakers. And I do so from what I think is a little bit of a different tack than other speakers have done. I rise today to speak in defense of political parties.

I believe that at least a portion of the debate on both sides of the aisle on this bill has been disingenuous because I think it is foolish for us to sit here and act as if political parties have nothing to with the way citizens go to vote. I am a Democrat because I believe in the values of the Democratic Party. I believe that being a Democrat is the best way in which I can serve the residents of the 132d District, and I have no doubt that all of my colleagues – on the Democratic side of the aisle and my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle – feel the exact same way. I am a Democrat because I believe that we are the party which can best serve everyone.

But I have to ask, why is it so hard for people to accept that when somebody goes to vote, they vote for us based on our party? Are we naive enough to assume that people vote without consideration of the party ideals that they vote? And that leads to me a different question, why are we making it harder for people to vote their ideals, Democrat or Republican? If parties mean so little to all of us, then we should all just stand up right now and move around the room, because the last time I looked, Democrats are on this side of the chamber and Republicans are on this side of the chamber. If parties mean so little, then every one of us should go to our voter registration office today and unaffiliate, though none of us will because the political party to which we belong says something deeply about our philosophy of governance. It means something to who we are as a person.

And I do not understand why we would vote for a piece of legislation which would make it harder for citizens to vote their ideals, and it is for that reason that I urge a "no" vote on SB 48.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kenyatta.

Mr. KENYATTA. Mr. Speaker, those sound like grumbles of joy, and I appreciate it.

But I would actually ask if the chairman of the State Government Committee would stand for interrogation on this bill? I know, surprising.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. He will so stand.

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Everett, thank you.

Representative Kenyatta, you may ask questions.

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

So I think aside from the remarks that have been made about straight-party voting, a big part of this bill is about funding the voting machines, and so I did have a couple of questions about how we are going to do that. If I am reading this correctly, there is a process, Mr. Speaker, by which counties would have to go through to get this money. It is not just a general appropriation for them to get this money. Is that correct?

Mr. EVERETT. Correct.

Mr. KENYATTA. And in that process, at least as I understand it and as it is read here, for each year for which a county is eligible to receive reimbursement of funding, a county would only receive the reimbursement of funding after making a certification

to the Department of State and to specified leaders of the General Assembly that the county has completed a voter removal program, including notices to inactive voters within the prior 12 months. Do you know why a voter removal program is a part of the funding for these new machines?

Mr. EVERETT. I believe it is just an effort to clean up our voter rolls.

Mr. KENYATTA. Are you familiar with voter removal and the impact that that has been said by multiple courts across this country how that negatively impacts students, seniors, people of color, the poor, folks with—

The SPEAKER. Representative. Representative.

Mr. EVERETT. Ask a question.

Mr. KENYATTA. Yeah. That is my question. Are you familiar—

The SPEAKER. No. No. Sir—

Mr. KENYATTA. —that could have that impact?

Okay, sure. I can rephrase that.

The SPEAKER. Sir, please, please hold. You cannot— Interrogation is really just, hey, does the bill do this? Does the bill do that? It is not about— If you have evidence to that effect or a report to cite, you can give that in your remarks. Do you know what I mean? On the bill. You definitely can do that in your remarks, but it is not really part of interrogation.

Mr. KENYATTA. Understood, Mr. Speaker.

I do have a couple of other questions.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I would just add to your previous question that the maintenance of voter rolls is already a Federal and State law and that we are just reiterating that and linking the funding to actually doing what is already required.

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My other question is about the absentee ballots. Currently it says, for each election, the county board will be required to maintain a record of the following information, some of that information would include the elector's name and voter registration address. It would also include the date that the county board mailed out or delivered the absentee ballot, and that information would be public. Would that be public just to the Department of State or would individual citizens be able to see that information about electors who are requesting absentee ballots?

Mr. EVERETT. Yes. Currently all absentee voter information is already accessible to public knowledge, and this information would just be the same.

Mr. KENYATTA. So, and this is my last question, Mr. Speaker. So currently anybody in Pennsylvania can get the address and name of somebody who— Yes? Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Yes; sure.

Mr. KENYATTA. I think that, putting aside for a second the very real concerns about the straight-ticket party voting, I have a lot of concerns about how this bill was amended. When we were discussing this bill in committee, there were a number of things in this bill that folks who want good government, folks who want to make voting easier and accessible, that was initially included. As this bill has been amended and as we have gone through this process, it is clear that there may be an attempt – intentionally or otherwise – in this bill to disenfranchise—

POINT OF ORDER

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

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CUTLER. I believe the gentleman is going to—

Mr. KENYATTA. Well, excuse— I was going—

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

I believe I—

The SPEAKER. Yes, Leader, you may proceed.

Mr. CUTLER. —should be recognized.

The SPEAKER. You may proceed.

Mr. CUTLER. I believe the gentleman is going to the underlying intent, which I believe by our rules is not permitted. I would encourage him to stay on topic regarding the fundamentals of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kenyatta, the leader is correct. You cannot ascribe motive, you cannot get to the intention. You can talk about the bill, but you are afield there. Please. I think a number of members have gone out of their way, on both sides of the aisle, to say we are not questioning motives, we are not questioning intentions. They are just getting to the bill.

Mr. KENYATTA. The impact, Mr. Speaker, of having a voter removal process, the impact of that will be that folks who are students and may have changed their address, people who are seniors, people who are low-income who have to move, may be removed from the voter rolls and that would put them in a process where they are not able to exercise their fundamental right to vote.

And so I think that at this point, this is a bill that really has a lot of questions. And I do not think we need to tie the funding for these new voting machines – which I would add are not an unfunded mandate by the administration, but are a part of a court case and a requirement that the administration is leading up to, a requirement that they had. I think that this bill has a lot of questions, a lot of challenges, a lot of things that we need to further interrogate more. And I think for that reason my colleagues should vote "no," and when we are back, we should talk about real commonsense voter reform. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Scott Conklin.

Mr. CONKLIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I, like the previous speaker from the Lehigh Valley, was not planning on speaking today, but I found amusement with some of the speakers, that they were very inclined to do what they feel was right, but sometimes when we do what is right, we get a little lost with history.

I know many of us like to go back to the golden years when we considered America great, and we like to consider things that we thought the way it was. But history has a habit of being truthful without alternative facts. History has a habit of giving us the facts if we read them. Clearly, George Washington was our first President. George Washington was not elected by the people. He was done by an electoral college of 60 White men. It was not until 1824 that we decided that we would have the population have an opportunity to vote for President; of course, they were rich White men who had to own property. So we got this bright idea that, you know, we are going to let poor people vote, and we are going to let folks of color and those darn Irish – which I happen to be – vote who did not have property, so in 1828 we decided to let those folks vote.

Well, you know what happens when poor people vote? They do not vote the way maybe rich White men wanted them to vote in history. So they came up with this thing called the poll tax, basically to keep the Irish and those folks of other ethnicities to keep them from voting. It was not until the mid-1900s, 1910 that we said, you know what? This is not working either. If we are truly going have a nation, we cannot discriminate against people. Then we began to let women vote. Then we began to let women get elected.

See, Mr. Speaker, there is good we have done in the past, but there is also history that repeats itself. And every time history has repeated itself, whether it is for only White men with property that got to vote or whether it was the poll tax to keep the poor and ethnicities and other folks from voting, we have done it with the remarks of "doing it for the best."

Mr. Speaker, I will be honest with you, if I really thought that this bill would encourage and help those folks of lesser means be more acquainted with the voting process, I would be for it 100 percent. But in a case like this, there is no doubt in my mind that it may not be intentional, but this is definitely a voter suppression bill. This is a bill that unintentionally will actually turn some people away from the polls—

The SPEAKER. Sir—

Mr. CONKLIN. —on the facts.

The SPEAKER. Sir, please suspend.

Mr. CONKLIN. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. If you want to have a conversation, Leader, please come on up, but we are not having a conversation like this. So if you want to talk to the rostrum, come on up.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

The SPEAKER. Representative Conklin.

Mr. CONKLIN. I apologize, Mr. Speaker. In no way did I ever try to say anybody did it intentionally. I was just giving my view on this bill. And I do apologize to the Speaker.

But at the end of the day, this is not going to work. Or it may work for some, but there are still those folks that it will not work for. And that is what the election process is about: it is about everybody. And when you come to a point to where you are doing something that you find out that there is a large segment, and I feel that it may not be a large percentage, but it is still a large number of individuals within our State could be, in their opinion – I am trying to use my words correctly – may not be to their best interest, Mr. Speaker, I feel that we should not go forward and do such things.

So I am asking my colleagues – in no way did I mean to diminish anybody and in no way did I mean to use history to hurt anybody's feelings – but this bill will not be for the best interest of many of our residents in the State, so please vote "no."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Marty Flynn.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to SB 48. I know one thing, today in this chamber we have about 199 members, and I will put my paycheck up today that every single one of you voted straight party in the last election cycle. Everyone.

The SPEAKER. Representative. Representative. Representative. Representative.

Members, if you will please wait.

This is not a wagering hall. And please, you do not want to take bets on anything here. So what I would like you to do is just speak to not what people might have done or what their motives or intentions are or how they acted in the past – if we are going to go down that road, we are going to be here a lot of years – so let us just get to the bill and we can get to a vote.

Mr. FLYNN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point taken.

But I have also picked up on a few things since I have been here, and one thing is, in the final hour of budget season, we see this bill come up not properly vetted. I begin to think there may be political overtones to it; maybe it helps one party more than another. I have seen some things like a Rasmussen poll that shows it benefits Republicans by about 4 percent. So for that reason I am against this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Flynn, I will in no way question your motive whatsoever.

Representative Margo Davidson.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. "Ain't I a Woman?" In the famous speech by a slave, Sojourner Truth, in the 1800s, when the country was raging about whether or not women should have the right to vote and whether or not slaves should be free from their shackles, at the women's convention that was deciding that very question, a slave by the name of Sojourner Truth spoke to that convention. And she said not only "Ain't I a woman?" but she said there is a great stir about colored men getting their rights but not a word about the colored women. And at that same time, the great suffragette, Cady Stanton, was asking women to decide between the suffragettes and the abolitionists. At the time when George Washington was making what some feel was his greatest speech, at the end of that speech, he did not say that when he went back to his farm, he would free his slaves. They were still in shackles.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot deny the racial undertones of this country from the first day to this day. And, Mr. Speaker, we have research, statistics from the poll that my colleague just cited, to evidence in other States that eliminating straight-party tickets will disadvantage Democrats in most districts and will disenfranchise people of color, senior citizens, and the disabled. To deny that, Mr. Speaker, is to deny reality.

And although I am the cochair of the bipartisan women Ladies of the House Caucus and I have beloved colleagues on both sides of the aisle – one of my friends is from Butler County, who people are amazed I get along with, but we do – but the point here today, Mr. Speaker, is not whether or not we care for each other as human beings in this chamber, because I believe that we do. The question before us on the floor today is, how does this legislation affect Pennsylvanians in every town and hamlet, Mr. Speaker? And when you talk about disenfranchising my people, I am going to be a firm "no," and it does not matter if you do not understand the discrimination that I have faced throughout my entire life, both as an African-American and as a woman. It is the same discrimination that Sojourner Truth talked about, and it is the same discrimination that Fannie Lou Hamer talked about. Whether the party was Democrat or Republican, African-Americans have suffered at everyone's hand.

And so when we get up to defend who we are and what we have suffered, we will do so with passion and we will do so with righteous indignation and we will do so regardless of your feelings.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. We have four speakers left – I hope. But those are Representative Diamond, followed by Representative O'Mara, followed by Representative Lewis, followed by Representative Hanbidge. Those are the four that I— Oh, I am sorry. Yes, Representative McNeill, I apologize. She had asked me to, or had asked us to be on the list. So five speakers are left and those were the order. So Representative Diamond and then followed by Representative O'Mara will be next, then Representative Lewis, then Representative Hanbidge, and then Representative McNeill.

Mr. DIAMOND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of SB 48 for various reasons. First of all, this helps our counties pay for these new voting machines. My gosh, we are offering our counties more than what the Governor asked for – more than what the Governor asked for. We have cleaned up absentee ballot provisions and streamlined it and made it more sensible.

But, Mr. Speaker, on SB 48, frankly, I cannot believe some of the things I have heard today in opposition to its provision to eliminate straight-party voting. And, Mr. Speaker, I come to this with a different perspective than most people in this room, because I do not know if anybody is aware of this, but I lost seven elections before I won the one that landed me that seat on this floor – seven elections. High-profile elections; I ran for Lieutenant Governor in 2010. I lost that race. I ran for low-profile elections, township supervisor. I lost that race, too, before I won this race. The reason I say that is, I know how hard it is and I know what respect we ought to offer to every single candidate who puts their name out on the ballot. I learned that when I was the guy who tried to run for Governor in 2006, needed 67,000 signatures and I only managed to get 38,320. So I know what it means to respect the hard work that any candidate in any position puts into putting their name on the ballot.

Eliminating straight-party voting shows those candidates who may appear on a second or a third or a fourth or even a fifth screen on the voting machine the respect they deserve for the hard work they have put into getting their name on the ballot. And, Mr. Speaker, sometimes we in this very room, we are those tickets, we are those candidates on the down-ballot on the second page. Sometimes we are the ones who are the last one listed on the ballot. And quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, sometimes those people who are listed last on the ballot are in fact women, they are in fact people of color, and they deserve our respect as voters.

My good friend, the minority whip, made an impassioned and very inspiring speech about earning equality for folks that look like him in this country. I have great respect for him. The problem is, in advocating to vote against this bill, he made the very argument to vote for it, because he said they earned the right to vote for the person they want to vote for on the ballot, not the party; not the party, the person. Again, that person could be a woman, that person could be a person of color, could be everybody. We do not vote for parties in America, we vote for people.

Mr. Speaker, voting is a right. It is one of our most critical rights, but as with every other right, it comes with a responsibility to show up and know what the heck you are voting for. You can still vote straight party even without this option, you just have to go down and look at everybody's name and show them the respect they have earned by putting their name on that ballot, Mr. Speaker.

I have heard talk about long waits at the polls. Mr. Speaker, I would walk 10 miles barefooted over broken glass to wait 4 hours to cast my vote because it is that important to me. I do not care how long it is going to take. I do not care how long I have to wait. I will cast my vote. I will cast an informed vote by examining every single candidate's name on the ballot. They deserve our respect.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on SB 48.

The SPEAKER. Representative O'Mara.

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

I want to start by thanking every single member of this chamber who has served our country and for acknowledging my husband, Brad, last week for his service. Many of you heard Brad's story about receiving two Purple Hearts and an Army Commendation with "V" device for valor. But there is more to that story. Brad fought for the right for us to vote and for the rights of citizens of Afghanistan to vote every single day during his first tour. His multiple injuries were sustained living on top of a police roof which served as a polling place in northern Afghanistan for 10 months of his life. He did this because he and the other members of 101st Airborne believed they were doing what was right – ensuring democracy and suffrage for every citizen, no matter what.

I believe wholeheartedly in the right to vote. That is our most cherished and coveted right in our country. There is no right I hold more dear, and my family has paid for this with their blood.

I rise today because I do not believe that SB 48 is truly doing this. There is research in States with outdated election laws like ours, like Michigan, which has proven that this will likely disenfranchise minorities and people of color. And if our Black and Brown members are standing before us and telling us that they feel this will hurt them, I am standing here for them in solidarity to oppose SB 48. If this chamber wants to continue to ensure our right to vote – which I hope it does; I have legislation out there to do so – we should be removing straight-party voting in addition to adding early voting, no-excuse absentee, and mail-in voting. That is when we will truly protect the right to vote for every citizen in Pennsylvania.

I oppose SB 48, and I implore my colleagues to vote "no."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Lewis.

Mr. LEWIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I will keep this brief. And first, before I express the two main reasons I support SB 48, I want to also express my gratitude and even admiration for every single person who delivered an argument here today as part of this debate, because I recognize that the passion comes from a place of wanting to protect and improve our democracy, regardless of which side of the aisle you are on.

So the big reason for me – SB 48 does a number of things – but the one thing that it does that I appreciate is it extends the deadline for turning in absentee ballots. And this is important to me because the first election I voted in, before I was able to vote I was near Baghdad and I was sitting in the food court, when we were able to come back from patrols, and I was able to see the primary election going on the TV screens, but I was not anywhere near home where I was really able to vote. And so shortly after I returned from Iraq, I was not able to get home in time, but I filled out an absentee ballot and was able to get it in the mail. But this extension helps service members who are deployed, and it also is extended to citizens, where anybody has a little bit more time to get their absentee ballot in. So that is number one.

Number two, this is very good because it does not continue this unfunded mandate to counties like mine, because I have municipal leaders coming to me and saying this is going to be a severe burden for us to fund these new voting machines. And so the dollars appropriated here will help these municipalities and counties.

And finally, I will say, with respect to the straight-ticket voting, and I appreciate the debate on both sides, but I would just note that we are one of only nine States left that still has straight-ticket voting. California does not have it. New Jersey does not have it. The deep red State of New York does not have it. So when we want to talk about regressive voting, I would note that Pennsylvania remains one of the regressive States left of the nine that still has straight-ticket voting.

Thank you so much. Have a great day. Looking forward to getting the budget done. Thanks.

The SPEAKER. Representative Hanbidge.

Ms. HANBIDGE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

One of the things that I have heard this week that really sort of resonated with me was what Representative Innamorato said when she talked about the interconnectedness of the decisions we make on this floor. Oh, I am sorry. That was Representative Lee. Okay. She clarified. Same person; it is the front row, they burned it. They are great. But the interconnectedness of the decisions we have made. And Representative Davidson said how these rules affect people.

When we talk about things that we look at on this floor, we often talk about the cost in terms of human capital. And I think it is really important that we talk about the direct effect of this on minimum-wage workers. We made a choice on this floor this week not to take up the issue of raising the minimum wage. The people most affected in terms of cost with respect to—

POINT OF ORDER

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

Ms. HANBIDGE. —straight-ticket voting—

The SPEAKER. Yes; Representative, please suspend.

Leader, you may proceed.

Mr. CUTLER. For the benefit of the members, I would simply refer to rule 10. I believe the gentelady is far afield again from the underlying issues that are before us. We have got a very busy day lined up from a legislative calendar standpoint. Rule 10 is quite clear that "Upon being recognized, the member may speak, and shall be confined to the question under consideration and avoiding personal reflections." Additionally, deferring to Mason's Manual, no persons, and it goes through a series of other, what is described as to speak beside or superfluously or tediously beyond the question.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have a lot of very important issues before us. I would appreciate it if she would stay on point with the bill.

I would also respectfully remind the gentelady that we are not to refer to one another by direct name and should instead refer to our place of origin.

The SPEAKER. Representative Hanbidge, we are not on the minimum wage. I know, but if we could, just if we could speak to just the SB 48 and topics within SB 48. Thank you. The leader has raised the appropriate rules from both our rules and Mason's.

You may proceed.

Ms. HANBIDGE. Thank you. I understand that the leader does not think that people's wages reflect—

The SPEAKER. No, please. No. No.

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

The SPEAKER. No. No. I have got it. Thank you, Leader.

Representative Hanbidge, please. Right to the bill. Thank you.

Ms. HANBIDGE. If you have to work more than one job, you do not have the time to get to the polls if it is taking longer for you to vote. If you have to stand in line for a longer period of time and you cannot afford to take that time, you are not going to vote. That is the direct impact of this bill.

One in five Hispanics are paid poverty wage. One in seven African-American workers are paid poverty wage. This has a direct effect and it is interconnected to other things we look at.

So I am opposed to this bill and I thank you for your opposition in solidarity.

The SPEAKER. Representative McNeill.

Mrs. McNEILL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am here today to oppose SB 48. I thank my colleagues for all the valid reasons to oppose this and I want to add a different take. I worked with people with disabilities and seniors for many years before I came here. Sometimes that one button is all they have in them to vote. It is difficult for them to get there, let alone stand in line. They already know whom they are voting for when they walk in that door. They do not need to stand there and make their choice and look at every name. They just need the easiest option to press whom they want to vote for and leave.

There is a mother with a child crying on her hip. There are people that work long hours, as my previous colleague said. Let us not take away their option to get in and vote quickly. Every one of you probably has a family member, neighbor, or friend that has one of these problems or issues, whether it is a disability, a small child, limited work hours. Please do not take this easier option to vote away from them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Two other members have added on: Representative Samuelson followed Representative Lawrence. And those will be the last two speakers as I see it. Representative Samuelson and Representative Lawrence.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

May I interrogate the chairperson of the State Government Committee?

The SPEAKER. He will come down the aisle and take questions.

Mr. SAMUELSON. And I know a couple of speakers have talked about absentee ballots and the deadlines for absentee ballots. So I am looking at page 36 of the bill, which talks about when you have to apply for an absentee ballot. I am down at line 24 to 26. Now, on the face of it, it looks like this is preserving current law – you have to sign up for an absentee ballot 7 days before the election, the Tuesday 1 week prior – but I have got a concern about the way this is worded here: "APPLICATIONS FOR ABSENTEE BALLOTS MAY BE PROCESSED IF RECEIVED NOT LATER THAN FIVE O'CLOCK...OF THE FIRST TUESDAY PRIOR TO THE DAY OF...ELECTION." So the language that is being added by this bill, SB 48, uses the word "may." My understanding of current law is that counties shall process absentee ballots. If you sign up for an absentee ballot 7 days in advance, follow the rules and turn in your absentee ballot application by 5 o'clock on the Tuesday before, that county better well process your ballot. You have the right to vote by absentee ballot.

Why does this bill use the word "may" instead of "shall"?

Mr. EVERETT. I believe the intent of that is to provide that there is a window of days in which they can process the ballots, not an individual date on which they have to process the ballots. There is a start time and an end time.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, on the bill?

The SPEAKER. Yes, you may proceed.

Mr. SAMUELSON. I appreciate the response. I remain concerned about the use of that word. If we are giving the 67 counties – maybe this is unintentional – but if we are giving the 67 counties discretion on whether or not they are going to process absentee ballots, that is a whole new realm in election law. So I believe that that section, page 36, line 24, should say "shall" to preserve the current situation where absentee ballots are processed.

I do have a concern with the other part of the bill that takes away a person's option to vote if they choose to vote with a straight-ticket option. Why are we limiting the options that voters have? Why not let the voter go in and vote how they choose to vote? They may want to choose to vote for individual candidates; they may want to vote for individual candidates as part of a ticket. They have that option now, and this bill seeks to take that option away. To me, that is a very slippery slope.

If we start telling people— We have talked a lot on this floor today about the right to vote and the suffrage that has come to citizens across our country over the centuries, but if we start taking away people's options on how they can vote, that is a slippery slope. Just imagine future bills that might come to this floor. What if somebody said we should list the political parties in a certain order? Perhaps somebody might suggest reverse alphabetical order to have one party listed before the other. What if somebody suggests that we start changing the font on the names of the candidates—

The SPEAKER. Representative Samuelson, please. Those are not in front of us.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Okay. On this floor today folks said that we should have voters who have read up on the candidates. Well, we have many citizens in our State who have issues with literacy, and I would direct you to our history books to find folks who thought that we should have a literacy test for whether or not you should be able to vote.

So I am just saying this is a slippery slope when we start telling people how they can vote. What is the problem with letting people have the options, let them go into the polling place, and continue to be able to make their own choices of whether they want to vote for individual candidates or candidates that are grouped as part of a party? Let the people have that vote.

Finally, I want to talk about the funding for this bill. I know some of the speakers have talked about the funding; we are giving money to counties. Somebody was saying that we gave more money than the Governor asked for. Well, I would direct you to page 29 of this bill, which talks about how the money rolls out.

Now, the way this bill is written on page 29 – I know the Representative from the 181st District spoke about this – the only way that a county can get this money is if they certify to the State – and there is a list of about 10 people they have to certify to – but the only way, line 15, you shall only receive the reimbursement if you certify that you have completed a program under Title 25 of the Pennsylvania Code relating to removal of electors and you have mailed notices within the last 12 months.

So this bill prescribes that the only way a county can get the money is if they have purged voters within the last 12 months.

I know "purge" might be a very strong word. Let me use the words that are written in this bill, page 29, line 25 and line 26, a program relating to the "removal of electors." "Removal of electors" is what the Senate chose to call the necessary process, the necessary step to get this money. In order to apply for this money, you have to remove electors from your rolls.

Now, I know some folks have said, that is required under current law, but it is not required every 12 months. If you pass a bill that says the only way that you can get the money to have voting machines for the spring of 2020 is the removal of electors, you are basically giving an incentive to all 67 counties to start removing electors, to start setting up that purge, and that is a disincentive – that is a very powerful part of this bill that has not gotten a lot of attention today, but it is not correct to say that counties can just apply for money. You are asking them to apply for money with conditions, and that condition is spelled out, a program for the "removal of electors." I do not think we should be encouraging counties to remove electors in order to be applying for voting machines, which people are saying would encourage people to vote. I urge a "no" vote on this bill. Thank you.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. Representative Lawrence.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

While I certainly would love to go on for a long time about this, I am just going to submit my remarks for the record. Thank you.

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There has been a great deal of conversation on the floor here today regarding this Election Code legislation. It is clear that the unifying theme of this legislation is to improve and secure election procedures in this Commonwealth. While all the parts of this bill work together and are equally important, I would like to focus my remarks on straight-party voting.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some conversation on the floor today that the proposal to remove straight-party ticket voting is somehow an effort to disenfranchise voters, and perhaps even specifically Democratic voters. But, Mr. Speaker, let us note for the record that only a few other States offer straight-ticket voting – Alabama, Kentucky, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, and West Virginia. And while I abhor the terms "red State" and "blue State" when describing the States that make up our great Union, let us note that these States that permit straight-ticket voting are hardly bastions of Democratic power – they are typically described as "red States" and maybe even "deep red States." Every one of them easily went for the Republican candidate in the last Presidential race. All but one have two Republican U.S. Senators.

One would think that if straight-party ticket voting was a major plank of Democratic success, we would see it implemented in Massachusetts, Illinois, and Rhode Island. However, this is not the case.

Mr. Speaker, it is critical that each person casting each vote for each elected position take the time to read each name standing for election. I encourage a positive vote on SB 48.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Boyle, for the second time. Sir, were you going to submit or—

Mr. BOYLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Make no mistake, this bill will stifle the votes of traditionally Democratic groups, particularly African-Americans. Eight years ago before President Obama's 2012 reelection, it was voter ID which this body passed which would have prevented people from voting. Now in 2019, 1 year before the 2020 Presidential election, it is SB 48 which will do the same thing. I urge all members to vote "no." Thank you.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

CONSIDERATION OF SB 48 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. We have in front of us the leader's opportunity to speak. I know that the Democratic leader has requested to speak on the bill. So Representative Dermody followed by Representative Cutler. So the Democratic leader followed by the majority leader.

MOTION TO STRIKE

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule 63, I rise to strike out page 2, line 631, through page 17, line 30, and page 30, lines 5 through 30, through page 55, line 29.

Mr. Speaker the effect of this motion will be to eliminate most of the controversial aspects of the bill. It will remove the language that eliminates the straight-party voting, and it continues the language regarding the county funding for voting machines and the process for decertification of voter machines. This improves the bill. It brings it back to its original purpose and provides the counties with the money they need to get the new voting machines.

The SPEAKER. Sir, the rules— If you will take a look at rule 63, the Parliamentarian pointed out that— Read the second paragraph, "A motion to strike out and insert..."— Or excuse me let me just see here. Oh, no; first paragraph, last sentence: "Bills and resolutions shall not be subject to division." An amendment you can, but bills and resolutions shall not be subject to division. So I am sorry but the—

Mr. DERMODY. Well, we are not trying to divide; we are moving to strike the language.

The SPEAKER. The effect is the same. No matter how you call it, it is a division.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, Mason's Manual has them as two separate motions.

The SPEAKER. Yes, but you only go to Mason's if our rules are not explicit with respect to the issue at hand, and our rule is explicit.

Mr. DERMODY. Well, I would submit that they are not explicit, Mr. Speaker, because we are having this discussion.

The SPEAKER. I know— This good man who has served for many Speakers on both sides of the aisle has pointed this out, and it is quite clear, "Bills and resolutions shall not be subject to division." You cannot make that motion.

Mr. DERMODY. We are not seeking to divide; we are seeking to strike the language.

The SPEAKER. It is the same thing.

Mr. DERMODY. Well—

POINT OF ORDER

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

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CUTLER. Respectfully, I believe I understand the gentleman's intention, but I would offer that I think it is twice flawed.

First, Mr. Speaker, I believe the rules are very clear that you shall not – House resolutions and bills are not subject to division, as the Chair has appropriately said. But in addition to that, the motion to strike is really just a motion to divide by subtracting the underlying language. I would simply offer that that would have been more appropriate during the amendatory process and we are beyond that.

MOTION RULED OUT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. Sir, it is the ruling of the Chair you cannot do this motion.

Mr. DERMODY. Well, just in response, Mr. Speaker, a motion to divide creates two bills. This motion to strike will result in one bill with less language.

The SPEAKER. The ruling stands.

Leader, Democratic leader, do you wish to speak on the bill, sir? Okay. Waives off.

The majority leader.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we heard very passionate speeches here on the floor. I want to thank each and every member for their input on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have some of the same concerns that my colleagues have expressed about the bill because I believe in the people. Our foundational documents are quite clear, we are to be a government of the people, for the people, by the people. It does not say political affiliation.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of guessing as to what the potential impact could be of this underlying bill, but I think that it would benefit all of us to review the facts as they are contained in the bill. It contains absentee ballot reforms; reforms that would have disenfranchised voters in some of our counties by missing the deadlines that were previously imposed. It provides transparency and accountability for that same absentee ballot process. It provides for an orderly decertification process. It also reduces the cost for the counties and provides several major county reforms that the counties have specifically asked for.

Additionally, we are funding the counties that now must purchase these machines, these vital machines that everyone pointed to as to the reason as to why the funding was needed. And additionally, we limit the borrowing in a responsible manner as we go forward to help offset those costs. But, Mr. Speaker, the lion's share of the debate has been about the straight-party component.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply offer that the gentlelady, the Democratic Senator from Northampton County, was quoted yesterday. I would offer her words of wisdom: "In my opinion, straight ticket voting promotes the election of a party, not the election of a candidate," she said. "Straight ticket voting makes it more difficult for individuals and minor-party candidates to compete against major parties, and I think that's bad for democracy."

Mr. Speaker, I actually know a little bit about running against the party. While my good colleague from Lebanon County rattled off some of his less than successful electoral efforts, the truth is I ran against my own party in my own county, and I would offer, very humbly, that I believe that I was selected because of the qualities that I brought forth in that debate. It was not the party that selected the candidate because they did not select me. It was the people.

Mr. Speaker, by eliminating partisan politics in this manner we can elect candidates, not the parties. The truth is, and the good gentleman that made probably an illegal wager a little earlier this afternoon should be politely reminded, that none of us voted straight party in the last election; it was a primary.

Mr. Speaker, furthermore, furthermore, we trust – think about this for a minute given the debate that we heard this afternoon – we trust individuals to select their candidates in the primary, but from the time that we move from May to November, that suddenly does not work.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is, the fastest growing segment of the voting population are voters that are not identified with either major party. It is time that we end that benefit and that disenfranchising of those voters. I have faith, I have faith in the people because of the makeup of our government, because this bill has accountability, it has transparency, it has efficiency, and promotes freedom of democracy. We should all be a "yes" vote for that, 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—111

Barrar	Gregory	Mentzer	Roae
Benninghoff	Greiner	Metcalfe	Rothman
Boback	Grove	Metzgar	Ryan
Borowicz	Hahn	Mihalek	Sainato
Brown	Heffley	Millard	Sankey
Burns	Helm	Miller, B.	Saylor
Causer	Hennessey	Mizgorski	Schemel
Cook	Hershey	Moul	Schmitt
Cox	Hickernell	Mullery	Schroeder
Culver	Irvin	Murt	Simmons
Cutler	James	Mustello	Sonney
Day	Jones	Nelson	Staats
Delozier	Jozwiak	Nesbit	Stephens
Diamond	Kail	O'Neal	Struzzi
DiGirolamo	Kaufner	Oberlander	Thomas
Dowling	Kauffman	Ortitay	Tobash
Dunbar	Keefer	Owlett	Toepel
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Toohil

Ecker	Klunk	Petrarca	Topper
Emrick	Knowles	Pickett	Walsh
Everett	Lawrence	Polinchock	Warner
Farry	Lewis	Puskaric	Wentling
Fee	Mackenzie	Pyle	Wheeland
Fritz	Mako	Quinn	White
Gabler	Maloney	Rader	Zimmerman
Gaydos	Marshall	Rapp	
Gillen	Masser	Reese	Turzai,
Gillespie	Mehaffie	Rigby	Speaker
Gleim			

NAYS—88

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Bernstine	Brooks	Rozzi
-----------	--------	-------

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

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR C

**BILLS ON CONCURRENCE
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS**

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 786, PN 2242**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 35 (Health and Safety) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in emergency medical services system, further providing for definitions and for Pennsylvania Trauma Systems Foundation, providing for accreditation of trauma centers, for submission of list, for funding, for notification of trauma center closure, for reporting and for certification and financial report; and making a related repeal.

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

The SPEAKER. Moved by the gentleman from Lancaster County that the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate.

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—199

Barrar	Flynn	Lewis	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Frankel	Longietti	Reese
Bizzarro	Freeman	Mackenzie	Rigby
Boback	Fritz	Madden	Roae
Borowicz	Gabler	Mako	Roebuck
Boyle	Gainey	Malagari	Rothman
Bradford	Galloway	Maloney	Ryan
Briggs	Gaydos	Markosek	Sainato
Brown	Gillen	Marshall	Samuelson
Bullock	Gillespie	Masser	Sanchez
Burgos	Gleim	Matzie	Sankey
Burns	Goodman	McCarter	Sappery
Caltagirone	Gregory	McClinton	Saylor
Carroll	Greiner	McNeill	Schemel
Causar	Grove	Mehaffie	Schlossberg
Cephas	Hahn	Mentzer	Schmitt
Ciresi	Hanbidge	Merski	Schroeder
Comitta	Harkins	Metcalfe	Schweyer
Conklin	Harrell	Metzgar	Shusterman
Cook	Harris	Mihalek	Simmons
Cox	Heffley	Millard	Sims
Cruz	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	Mustello	Thomas
Day	Isaacson	Neilson	Tobash
Deasy	James	Nelson	Toepel
DeLissio	Jones	Nesbit	Toohil
Delloso	Jozwiak	O'Mara	Topper
Delozier	Kail	O'Neal	Ullman
DeLuca	Kaufner	Oberlander	Vitali
Dermody	Kauffman	Ortitay	Walsh
Diamond	Keefer	Otten	Warner
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Owlett	Warren
Donatucci	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Webster
Dowling	Kim	Peifer	Wentling
Driscoll	Kinsey	Petrarca	Wheatley
Dunbar	Kirkland	Pickett	Wheeland
Dush	Klunk	Polinchock	White
Ecker	Knowles	Puskaric	Williams
Emrick	Kortz	Pyle	Youngblood
Evans	Kosierowski	Quinn	Zabel
Everett	Krueger	Rabb	Zimmerman
Farry	Kulik	Rader	
Fee	Lawrence	Rapp	Turzai,
Fiedler	Lee	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Fitzgerald			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Bernstine	Brooks	Rozzi
-----------	--------	-------

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.

* * *

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 1520, PN 2212**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 3 (Agriculture) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Pennsylvania Preferred® Trademark, further providing for Pennsylvania Preferred® Trademark Licensing Fund and providing for military veterans; providing for grant programs; and making editorial changes.

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

The SPEAKER. So moved by Representative Pam Snyder that the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate.

On the question of concurrence in the amendments inserted by the Senate, the Chair calls on Representative Pam Snyder.

Mrs. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HB 1520 was amended in the Senate by incorporating HB 1521 into it, which will provide for participation in a Pennsylvania Preferred Homegrown by Heroes program. This is part of the Farm Bill package, and I would ask for an affirmative vote.

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—199

Barrar	Flynn	Lewis	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Frankel	Longiotti	Reese
Bizzarro	Freeman	Mackenzie	Rigby
Boback	Fritz	Madden	Roae
Borowicz	Gabler	Mako	Roebuck
Boyle	Gainey	Malagari	Rothman
Bradford	Galloway	Maloney	Ryan
Briggs	Gaydos	Markosek	Sainato
Brown	Gillen	Marshall	Samuelson
Bullock	Gillespie	Masser	Sanchez
Burgos	Gleim	Matzie	Sankey
Burns	Goodman	McCarter	Sappay
Caltagirone	Gregory	McClinton	Saylor
Carroll	Greiner	McNeill	Schemel
Causar	Grove	Mehaffie	Schlossberg
Cephas	Hahn	Mentzer	Schmitt
Ciresi	Hanbidge	Merski	Schroeder
Comitta	Harkins	Metcalfe	Schweyer
Conklin	Harrell	Metzgar	Shusterman
Cook	Harris	Mihalek	Simmons
Cox	Heffley	Millard	Sims
Cruz	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	Mustello	Thomas
Day	Isaacson	Neilson	Tobash
Deasy	James	Nelson	Toepel
DeLissio	Jones	Nesbit	Toohil
Delloso	Jozwiak	O'Mara	Topper
Delozier	Kail	O'Neal	Ullman
DeLuca	Kaufner	Oberlander	Vitali
Dermody	Kauffman	Ortitay	Walsh
Diamond	Keefer	Otten	Warner
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Owlett	Warren
Donatucci	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Webster
Dowling	Kim	Peifer	Wentling
Driscoll	Kinsey	Petrarca	Wheatley
Dunbar	Kirkland	Pickett	Wheeland
Dush	Klunk	Polinchock	White
Ecker	Knowles	Puskaric	Williams
Emrick	Kortz	Pyle	Youngblood
Evans	Kosierowski	Quinn	Zabel
Everett	Krueger	Rabb	Zimmerman
Farry	Kulik	Rader	
Fee	Lawrence	Rapp	Turzai,
Fiedler	Lee	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Fitzgerald			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Bernstine	Brooks	Rozzi
-----------	--------	-------

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.

* * *

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 1590, PN 2213**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 64 (Public Authorities and Quasi-Public Corporations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Commonwealth Financing Authority, establishing the Dairy Investment Program and Dairy Investment Program Account.

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

The SPEAKER. Moved by the gentleman, Representative Clint Owlett, that the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate, and on the bill and the amendments, Representative Owlett.

Mr. OWLETT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

An amendment was adopted in the Senate Agriculture Committee to make technical changes and to provide for the CFA (Commonwealth Financing Authority) to consider additional types of projects and other grant amounts. These changes are agreed to, and I would ask the members for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

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—199

Barrar	Flynn	Lewis	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Frankel	Longietti	Reese
Bizzarro	Freeman	Mackenzie	Rigby
Boback	Fritz	Madden	Roae
Borowicz	Gabler	Mako	Roebuck
Boyle	Gainey	Malagari	Rothman
Bradford	Galloway	Maloney	Ryan
Briggs	Gaydos	Markosek	Sainato
Brown	Gillen	Marshall	Samuelson
Bullock	Gillespie	Masser	Sanchez
Burgos	Gleim	Matzie	Sankey
Burns	Goodman	McCarter	Sappay
Caltagirone	Gregory	McClinton	Saylor
Carroll	Greiner	McNeill	Schemel
Causser	Grove	Mehaffie	Schlossberg
Cephas	Hahn	Mentzer	Schmitt
Ciresi	Hanbidge	Merski	Schroeder
Comitta	Harkins	Metcalfe	Schweyer
Conklin	Harrell	Metzgar	Shusterman
Cook	Harris	Mihalek	Simmons
Cox	Heffley	Millard	Sims
Cruz	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	Mustello	Thomas
Day	Isaacson	Neilson	Tobash
Deasy	James	Nelson	Toepel
DeLissio	Jones	Nesbit	Toohil
Delloso	Jozwiak	O'Mara	Topper
Delozier	Kail	O'Neal	Ullman
DeLuca	Kaufner	Oberlander	Vitali
Dermody	Kauffman	Ortitay	Walsh
Diamond	Keefer	Otten	Warner
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Owlett	Warren
Donatucci	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Webster
Dowling	Kim	Peifer	Wentling
Driscoll	Kinsey	Petrarca	Wheatley
Dunbar	Kirkland	Pickett	Wheeland
Dush	Klunk	Polinchock	White
Ecker	Knowles	Puskaric	Williams
Emrick	Kortz	Pyle	Youngblood
Evans	Kosierowski	Quinn	Zabel
Everett	Krueger	Rabb	Zimmerman
Farry	Kulik	Rader	
Fee	Lawrence	Rapp	Turzai,
Fiedler	Lee	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Fitzgerald			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Bernstine	Brooks	Rozzi
-----------	--------	-------

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.

SENATE MESSAGE

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

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, informed that the Senate has concurred in the amendments made by the House of Representatives by amending said amendments to **SB 144, PN 1078**.

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the House of Representatives for its concurrence.

SENATE MESSAGE

HOUSE AMENDMENTS
CONCURRED IN BY SENATE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, informed that the Senate has concurred in the amendments made by the House of Representatives to **SB 700, PN 1074, and SB 724, PN 1046**.

BILLS SIGNED BY SPEAKER

Bills numbered and entitled as follows having been prepared for presentation to the Governor, and the same being correct, the titles were publicly read as follows:

HB 786, PN 2242

An Act amending Title 35 (Health and Safety) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in emergency medical services system, further providing for definitions and for Pennsylvania Trauma Systems Foundation, providing for accreditation of trauma centers, for submission of list, for funding, for notification of trauma center closure, for reporting and for certification and financial report; and making a related repeal.

HB 1520, PN 2212

An Act amending Title 3 (Agriculture) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Pennsylvania Preferred® Trademark, further providing for Pennsylvania Preferred® Trademark Licensing Fund and providing for military veterans; providing for grant programs; and making editorial changes.

HB 1590, PN 2213

An Act amending Title 64 (Public Authorities and Quasi-Public Corporations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Commonwealth Financing Authority, establishing the Dairy Investment Program and Dairy Investment Program Account.

SB 700, PN 1074

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, establishing the Public Higher Education Funding Commission; providing for construction and renovation of buildings by school entities; and establishing a grant program for maintenance projects.

SB 724, PN 1046

An Act amending Titles 24 (Education) and 71 (State Government) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes as follows: In Title 24: for retirement for school employees, in preliminary provisions, further providing for definitions; in membership, contributions and benefits, further providing for payments by employers and providing for nonparticipating employer withdrawal liability and further providing for actuarial cost method; in School Employees' Defined Contribution Plan, further providing for vesting; in administration and miscellaneous provisions, further providing for Public School Employees Retirement Board; in administration and miscellaneous provisions, providing for the establishment of the Public Markets Emerging Investment Manager Program; and, in preliminary provisions, further providing for definitions. In Title 71: for retirement for State employees and officers, in preliminary provisions relating to retirement for State employees and officers, further providing for definitions; in membership, credited service, classes of service and eligibility for benefits regarding administration of the State Employees' Retirement Fund, further providing for election to become a Class A-6 member or solely a participant in the plan and for eligibility for death benefits; and, in benefits, further providing for maximum single life annuity.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B CONTINUED**BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 695, PN 1084**, 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 medical assistance payments for institutional care and for nonemergency medical transportation services and providing for uniform Statewide preferred drug list; in nursing facility assessments, further providing for definitions, for calculation, for remedies, for repayment and for time periods; in intermediate care facilities for persons with an intellectual disability assessments, further providing for definitions and for time periods; and making a related repeal.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

In terms of time, we cannot vote it immediately, but we could begin debate on it if there is any debate. Okay. So there is no debate. So what we are going to do is just wait till we could have a motion to proceed. Representative Dermody, the Democratic leader, a motion to proceed on SB 695, PN 1084.

**MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION
UNDER RULE 24**

Mr. CUTLER. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Yes, leader, majority leader. Okay. The majority leader will make the motion to proceed on SB 695, PN 1084, page 4 of supplemental B.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, respectfully, since the bill is now before us and the debate has concluded on SB 695, I would make a motion to proceed for immediate consideration of this bill so we can send it back to the Senate on concurrence.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Dermody, the Democratic leader, on the motion to proceed, sir.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker, I would urge the members to support the motion to proceed.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

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

NAYS—6

Gillen Miller, D. Rabb Samuelson
 Miller, B. Mullery

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Bernstine Brooks Rozzi

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

On the question recurring,
 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—198

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

Fee Kulik Rapp Turzai,
 Fiedler Lawrence Ravenstahl Speaker

NAYS—1

Puskaric

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Bernstine Brooks Rozzi

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 712, PN 1085**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in Treasury Department, further providing for investment of moneys; in oil and gas wells, further providing for Oil and Gas Lease Fund; in transportation network companies, motor carrier companies and parking authority of a city of the first class, providing for transportation network company extension; in special funds, further providing for funding, for State Workers' Insurance Board, for expiration, for definitions, for other grants and for Commonwealth indebtedness; in additional special funds, further providing for definitions, for establishment of special fund and account, for use of fund, for distributions from Pennsylvania Race Horse Development Fund, for Workers' Compensation Security Fund, for definitions, for use of funds, for amount of grant and for guidelines for applications and providing for Enhanced Revenue Collection Account, Environmental Stewardship Fund and Recycling Fund; in general budget implementation, providing for block grants and for reports to General Assembly, further providing for Department of General Services, for Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board, for Department of Human Services, for Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency, for surcharges, for Multimodal Transportation Fund, for State Gaming Fund and providing for Joint Legislative Air and Water Pollution Control and Conservation Committee; in 2018-2019 budget implementation, further providing for Department of Revenue; adding provisions relating to 2019-2020 budget implementation; making related repeals; and making editorial changes.

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

The SPEAKER. Okay. There are two amendments. Now, this is on third consideration, so you would have to make a motion to suspend. One, I understand, is Representative Bradford. One is Representative DiGirolamo. Okay. Representative Bradford is recognized.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had filed an amendment to the Fiscal Code. Obviously, I want to begin by thanking Chairman Saylor for a fun budget season, but I want to particularly thank him on a personal level for his help in regards to this amendment. Obviously, we all remember with tremendous sadness October 27, 2018, a morning where we saw one of the deadliest acts of anti-Semitism in United States history. Eleven of our fellow Pennsylvanians were killed

in Squirrel Hill, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. And we all promised that day that we would be vigilant and work together in a bipartisan way to make sure that such acts of hate, to the extent we can, are minimized.

And I want to thank Chairman Saylor for recognizing the need that we have and the commitments we made to make sure that we do the right thing. I also want to recognize Representative Frankel for his support of HR 214, which he authored, which in a joint session of this body with the Senate and the Governor and in our presence on April 10, 2019, where we declared "Stronger Than Hate Day" here in Pennsylvania. We have obviously made tremendous commitments, that we are going to set up a grant program for nonprofit security at things like JCCs (Jewish community centers) and those who would attack Christian places of worship – or nonprofits, Christian, Muslim, Jewish; we are all in this together.

Unfortunately, with any budget there are certain time constraints and things that we cannot get done on the deadline we need to, but I want to sincerely and personally again, and I said this in committee and I mean it here on the floor, Chairman Saylor has been just unbelievably supportive. I am pulling down this amendment because I do not think it serves our purpose, but I want to thank him for his commitment that he has made in committee and making here now that we will have a vote. Obviously, this resolution called for \$10 million of the security grants. We obviously wanted that done today.

We realize that that needs to get done, but I want to work with the chairman over the next couple months, and when we come back in September, we look forward to a vote, and I know the chairman has made assurances that we will have a vote in Appropriations on making these grants available for every Pennsylvanian and for all these nonprofits, for those individuals, groups, or communities with the highest rates of victimization of single-bias hate crime incidents. Again, my only regret is that we cannot do this today, but with the assurances and words of the chairman, I look forward to doing this very soon. Thank you again, chairman.

The SPEAKER. Chairman Saylor.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, want to start out by thanking Chairman Bradford, but also, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you and Representative Frankel for the joint session that we had on the Tree of Life catastrophe. I think that we all as a body here prefer to stamp out hate in this Commonwealth and will not stand for it. So I am looking forward to having hearings across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the coming months to hear input on this legislation and coming back here in the fall and doing something about it and committing a vote on this piece of legislation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank you and I thank Representative Frankel and Representative Bradford for bringing this legislation and the joint session together for us and making all of us aware of how important it is for us all to stand up against hate.

Mr. Speaker, thank you so much.

The SPEAKER. So amendment 02618 has been withdrawn.

Representative DiGirolamo is hoping to have the bill amended, but it is on third consideration so he has to move to suspend.

Representative DiGirolamo.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have filed an amendment to this Fiscal Code on what I consider a really, really important issue that I have heard from many of the members on both sides of the aisle, and that is this issue of sheltered workshops. And this amendment would allow the families who have adult children with disabilities, whether they are physical disabilities, intellectual disabilities, there are these workshops for people who are blind, workshops for people who have hearing disabilities, this would allow the families to continue to make the decision of whether or not they want to leave their adult children, their loved ones in the sheltered workshop. I have tried for the last 3 or 4 months—

The SPEAKER. Representative, this is just a motion to suspend. Until you win the motion to suspend, we cannot go into further detail. So you want to suspend to add this language on amendment 02617. Is that correct?

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

POINT OF ORDER

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

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman before me, my friend, the minority Appropriations chairman, did not make a motion to suspend, and I mean, it appeared that he was allowed to speak for a while on the amendment and what it would have done, and I would just hope that I would have the same opportunity to take another minute or two to explain what my amendment would do.

The SPEAKER. Sir, my apologies. I have just been informed by the whip. You are withdrawing this?

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Okay, because the other person had withdrawn and wanted to speak and sometimes we do that. He is also the Appropriations chair and this is an Appropriations bill, the Fiscal Code, because it implements the general appropriations budget that we passed yesterday. Please, you have some leeway since it is being withdrawn. Go ahead, please. Proceed.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. I promise to be very short, Mr. Speaker. And again, I have tried for the last 3 or 4 months to negotiate with the Office of Developmental Disabilities and the Department of Human Services to come up to an agreement that everybody could live with – the providers, the department, and these families. I have not been able to do so. This amendment would have stopped them, these rates of going into effect. I guess I am hoping I am going to withdraw the amendment today, but I hope in the next coming few days that we can get together and find a compromise so these families can make the decisions of where their loved ones need to be.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Members, as you know, this is typically known as the Fiscal Code. It is SB 712, 1085. There is a 5-minute time limit with respect to discussion on this bill. Does anybody wish to speak?

Representative Vitali.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to this bill, which is part of a package which has had a very damaging effect on the environment and something none of us should be proud of. I just wanted to point out a couple of things.

We saw in the general appropriations bill how it diverted \$16 million from the Environmental Stewardship Fund, \$10 million from the Recycling Fund, \$70 million from the Marcellus Fund, and so forth. I think with regard to this bill the important thing to note is the language in this bill authorizes the legislature to do that year after year after year. It is not limited to 1 year. And regrettably, as we have done with the Marcellus Oil and Gas Lease Fund, this has become a way to move more money off of the General Fund and use these special funds to fund government. That is a bad idea.

The second point here is this bill blocks a \$20 million transfer from the Marcellus Legacy Fund to the Environmental Stewardship Fund. It takes \$20 million that would have gone – which we passed in Act 13 – to the Environmental Stewardship Fund. That is another \$20 million the Environmental Stewardship Fund will not have. But perhaps the most appalling late arrival to this bill is the preemption of local municipalities to regulate single-use plastic bags, something that has had a devastating effect on the environment.

If you will recall that the legislature beat back this several years ago, in fact, the Governor vetoed this type of preemptive legislation calling it violative of the environmental rights amendment to our Constitution. This special interest legislation is being driven by a powerful company, Novolex, who has a Hilex Poly plant in Milesburg, PA, which just coincidentally is in the district of the Senate majority leader.

It is appalling that we can put political clout above good public policy, Mr. Speaker. It just speaks poorly. It sends the wrong message to the public, that good public policy can be thwarted by political clout.

Mr. Speaker, the budget is also disappointing in many other ways. This was the bill that was supposed to deal with climate change through RGGI (Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative). It is apparent this will not be in this year's budget. It also eliminates a long-standing environmental committee, the Joint Conservation Committee. It is, to me, very disappointing that frankly Democrats would support this, but I will not. I ask for a "no" vote.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (JOHN A. LAWRENCE) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The lady from Chester County, Representative Comitta, is recognized.

Mrs. COMMITTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I understand that a budget is built on compromises, but I will never agree to compromise the future of our children. This Fiscal Code eliminates too many environmental safeguards and does compromise the future of our children. Therefore, I am a strong "no."

Of particular concern, as you heard articulated a moment ago, is the banning of local plastic bags and the elimination of the impactful 51-year-old Joint Legislative Conservation Committee, of which I am a member.

Did you know that the joint legislative environmental committee was instrumental in passing the 1971 Environmental Rights Amendment and has been advising the legislature and the citizens of Pennsylvania on environmental stewardship since 1968? I ask, what are we afraid of? Why do we not respect and support the actions of local citizens to do what is right for their communities, like banning single-use plastic bags? Why would we ever want to stop communities from taking important action to protect their environment and their citizens? I also ask regarding the joint legislative environmental committee that is being eliminated, who will make recommendations to the custodianship and care of our land, our water, and our air?

Mr. Speaker, we will move forward this bill, this code bill will pass, even though I am a "no" vote and many of my colleagues will be as well, but it will pass. We will move forward with a stronger resolve to fight for a healthy future for our children, and in honor of the 100th anniversary of Pennsylvania allowing women to vote, I repeat the motto of the League of Women Voters, for anyone who feels that your voices are not being heard, the League of Women Voters say, "Your Vote is Your Voice." I urge you to speak out twice a year every year for a healthy future for our children. Today I will vote "no" on SB 712. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER. Representative Freeman.

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose SB 712. I realize this legislation is important to the process of budgeting as it pertains to the Fiscal Code. However, I am deeply concerned about various provisions that are in this bill, which, in my opinion, undermine good environmental policy here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and hold the real potential to cripple good environmental programs that all of our communities benefit from.

Within this bill is contained a provision to terminate the Joint Legislative Air and Water Pollution Conservation Committee, a body that has done much good over the years to facilitate good dialogue between environmental groups, industry, and government, and to seek out good solutions to the problems of air and water pollution. The interests of this Commonwealth are not served by abolishing such a body, and yet this bill does that.

This legislation also contains language to place a moratorium on the ability of local governments to ban the use of plastic bags and to ban the use of other unenvironmentally friendly containers such as Styrofoam. We should not be curtailing the ability of local governments to deal with these issues if they so choose. We should not be telling local governments that they are prohibited from addressing an environmental concern with these items in their community. That is simply wrong.

And the third point that I take issue with deals with the legislation in terms of authorizing the General Assembly to continue year after year after year to be able to transfer funds out of the Environmental Stewardship Fund and the Recycling Fund.

Those two funds provide a myriad of grants to our communities to address environmental concerns, environmental issues, and to promote sustainability within our communities. They are good programs, they are successful programs, and by robbing the environmental programs of recycling and of the Environmental Stewardship Fund, we do a disservice to our communities.

Now, no one is questioning that from time to time the General Assembly will look at transfers from other funds in order to meet budgetary needs. What is egregious about this legislation is it sets in place the ability of the legislature to do this on and on and on again in every session because it authorizes them to be allowed to divert those funds year after year. That is simply wrong.

I urge my colleagues to join me in a "no" vote on SB 712 to stand up for the environment, to stand up for our communities, to stand up for our local governments, and to say that we believe that these environmental policies are truly critical and important to our communities. Please vote "no" on 712.

The SPEAKER. We have to have a motion to proceed. There are no further members who wish to speak, but our timing requires a motion to proceed.

MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION UNDER RULE 24

The SPEAKER. The majority leader is recognized. Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, understanding that the debate on SB 712 has concluded, I would urge the members to support a motion to proceed for immediate consideration of the bill so that we can continue with closing out the budget proposal for this financial year. Thank you.

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

The SPEAKER. The Democratic leader, on the motion to proceed.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would also urge the members to vote for the motion to proceed. It is important, that this Fiscal Code is an important part of the budget to implement the budget, and we need to proceed to make that happen.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—175

Barrar	Fiedler	Lawrence	Roae
Benninghoff	Fitzgerald	Lewis	Rothman
Bizzarro	Flynn	Longietti	Ryan
Boback	Frankel	Mackenzie	Sainato
Borowicz	Fritz	Madden	Sanchez
Boyle	Gabler	Mako	Sankey
Bradford	Gainey	Malagari	Sappey
Briggs	Galloway	Maloney	Saylor
Brown	Gaydos	Markosek	Schemel
Bullock	Gillespie	Marshall	Schlossberg
Burgos	Gleim	Masser	Schmitt
Burns	Goodman	Matzie	Schroeder
Caltagirone	Gregory	McClinton	Schweyer
Carroll	Greiner	McNeill	Shusterman

Causer	Grove	Mehaffie	Simmons
Ciresi	Hahn	Mentzer	Sims
Comitta	Hanbidge	Merski	Snyder
Conklin	Harkins	Metcalfe	Solomon
Cook	Harrell	Metzgar	Sonney
Cox	Harris	Mihalek	Staats
Culver	Heffley	Millard	Stephens
Cutler	Helm	Mizgorski	Struzio
Davidson	Hennessey	Moul	Sturla
Davis, A.	Hershey	Mullins	Thomas
Davis, T.	Hickernell	Murt	Tobash
Dawkins	Hohenstein	Mustello	Toepel
Day	Howard	Nelson	Toohil
Deasy	Irvin	Nesbit	Topper
Delloso	Isaacson	O'Mara	Ullman
DeLozier	James	O'Neal	Walsh
DeLuca	Jones	Oberlander	Warner
Dermody	Jozwiak	Ortitay	Warren
Diamond	Kail	Otten	Webster
DiGirolamo	Kaufner	Owlett	Wentling
Donatucci	Kauffman	Pashinski	Wheatley
Dowling	Keefer	Peifer	Wheeland
Driscoll	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	White
Dunbar	Kinsey	Polinchock	Williams
Dush	Kirkland	Puskaric	Youngblood
Ecker	Klunk	Pyle	Zabel
Emrick	Knowles	Rader	Zimmerman
Evans	Kortz	Rapp	
Everett	Kosierowski	Reese	Turzai,
Farry	Kulik	Rigby	Speaker
Fee			

NAYS—23

Cephas	Innamorato	Miller, B.	Ravenstahl
Cruz	Kenyatta	Miller, D.	Readshaw
Daley	Kim	Mullery	Roebuck
DeLissio	Krueger	Petrarca	Samuelson
Freeman	Lee	Quinn	Vitali
Gillen	McCarter	Rabb	

NOT VOTING—1

Neilson

EXCUSED—3

Bernstine	Brooks	Rozzi
-----------	--------	-------

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

On the question recurring, 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—125

Barrar	Gaydos	Masser	Roae
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Matzie	Rothman
Bizzarro	Gleim	McClinton	Ryan
Borowicz	Goodman	Mehaffie	Sankey
Bradford	Gregory	Mentzer	Saylor
Brown	Greiner	Merski	Schemel
Caltagirone	Grove	Metcalfe	Schmitt
Carroll	Hahn	Metzgar	Schroeder
Causer	Harkins	Mihalek	Schweyer
Conklin	Harrell	Millard	Simmons

Cook	Harris	Miller, B.	Snyder
Cox	Heffley	Mizgorski	Sonney
Culver	Helm	Moul	Staats
Cutler	Hennessey	Mullins	Stephens
Day	Hershey	Mustello	Struzzi
Deloso	Hickernell	Neilson	Sturla
Delozier	Irvin	Nelson	Thomas
DeLuca	James	Nesbit	Tobash
Dermody	Jones	O'Neal	Toepel
Diamond	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Toohil
Dowling	Kail	Ortitay	Topper
Driscoll	Kaufner	Owlett	Walsh
Dunbar	Kauffman	Pashinski	Warner
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Wentling
Ecker	Klunk	Pickett	Wheatley
Emrick	Kulik	Polinchock	Wheeland
Everett	Lawrence	Puskaric	Williams
Farry	Lewis	Pyle	Zimmerman
Fee	Mackenzie	Rader	
Flynn	Mako	Rapp	Turzai, Speaker
Fritz	Maloney	Reese	
Gabler	Marshall	Rigby	

NAYS—74

Boback	Evans	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Boyle	Fiedler	Kosierowski	Readshaw
Briggs	Fitzgerald	Krueger	Roebuck
Bullock	Frankel	Lee	Sainato
Burgos	Freeman	Longietti	Samuelson
Burns	Gainey	Madden	Sanchez
Cephas	Galloway	Malagari	Sappey
Ciresi	Gillen	Markosek	Schlusserberg
Comitta	Hanbidge	McCarter	Shusterman
Cruz	Hohenstein	McNeill	Sims
Daley	Howard	Miller, D.	Solomon
Davidson	Innamorato	Mullery	Ullman
Davis, A.	Isaacson	Murt	Vitali
Davis, T.	Keefer	O'Mara	Warren
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Otten	Webster
Deasy	Kim	Petrarca	White
DeLissio	Kinsey	Quinn	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Kirkland	Rabb	Zabel
Donatucci	Knowles		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Bernstine	Brooks	Rozzi
-----------	--------	-------

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

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1671, PN 2229**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 3, 1992 (P.L.28, No.11), known as the Tuition Account Programs and College Savings Bond Act, in tuition account program, further providing for declaration of policy, for definitions, for Tuition Account Programs Bureau, for powers of department, for Tuition Account Guaranteed Savings Program, for Tuition Account Investment Program, for general provisions governing

both tuition account programs, for State tax exemption and for Federal taxation; establishing the Keystone Scholars Grant Program and the Keystone Scholars Grant Program Account; and making a related repeal.

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

Mr. **PEIFER** offered the following amendment No. **A02501**:

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 15 and 16, by striking out "for State tax exemption and"

Amend Bill, page 6, lines 17 through 28, by striking out all of said lines

Amend Bill, page 6, line 29, by striking out "7" and inserting 6

Amend Bill, page 7, line 11, by striking out "8" and inserting 7

Amend Bill, page 11, line 19, by striking out "9" and inserting 8

Amend Bill, page 11, line 25, by striking out "10" and inserting 9

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

The **SPEAKER**. Representative Mike Peifer.
Mr. **PEIFER**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Very simply, amendment 02501 simply removes a provision relating to the taxation of distributions for non-Pennsylvania 529 plans. It basically dovetails now off the Federal Tax Cuts and Jobs Act passed in Washington, and I would ask the members for an affirmative vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—199

Barrar	Flynn	Lewis	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Frankel	Longietti	Reese
Bizzarro	Freeman	Mackenzie	Rigby
Boback	Fritz	Madden	Roae
Borowicz	Gabler	Mako	Roebuck
Boyle	Gainey	Malagari	Rothman
Bradford	Galloway	Maloney	Ryan
Briggs	Gaydos	Markosek	Sainato
Brown	Gillen	Marshall	Samuelson
Bullock	Gillespie	Masser	Sanchez
Burgos	Gleim	Matzie	Sankey
Burns	Goodman	McCarter	Sappey
Caltagirone	Gregory	McClinton	Saylor
Carroll	Greiner	McNeill	Schemel
Causar	Grove	Mehaffie	Schlusserberg
Cephas	Hahn	Mentzer	Schmitt
Ciresi	Hanbidge	Merski	Schroeder
Comitta	Harkins	Metcalfe	Schweyer
Conklin	Harrell	Metzgar	Shusterman
Cook	Harris	Mihalek	Simmons
Cox	Heffley	Millard	Sims
Cruz	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	Mustello	Thomas
Day	Isaacson	Neilson	Tobash
Deasy	James	Nelson	Toepel
DeLissio	Jones	Nesbit	Toohil
Delloso	Jozwiak	O'Mara	Topper
Delozier	Kail	O'Neal	Ullman
DeLuca	Kaufer	Oberlander	Vitali
Dermody	Kauffman	Ortitay	Walsh
Diamond	Keefer	Otten	Warner
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Owlett	Warren
Donatucci	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Webster
Dowling	Kim	Peifer	Wentling
Driscoll	Kinsey	Petrarca	Wheatley
Dunbar	Kirkland	Pickett	Wheeland
Dush	Klunk	Polinchock	White
Ecker	Knowles	Puskaric	Williams
Emrick	Kortz	Pyle	Youngblood
Evans	Kosierowski	Quinn	Zabel
Everett	Krueger	Rabb	Zimmerman
Farry	Kulik	Rader	
Fee	Lawrence	Rapp	Turzai,
Fiedler	Lee	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Fitzgerald			

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-3

Bernstine	Brooks	Rozzi
-----------	--------	-------

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

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

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B CONTINUED

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 621, PN 1081**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, amending provisions relating to school police officers, school resource officers and school security guards; and imposing powers and duties on the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency.

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-116

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

NAYS-83

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

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-3

Bernstine	Brooks	Rozzi
-----------	--------	-------

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

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

**HOUSE RESOLUTION
INTRODUCED AND REFERRED**

No. 438 By Representatives TOOHIL, BOBACK, MILLARD, JOHNSON-HARRELL, SCHLOSSBERG, BERNSTINE, YOUNGBLOOD, CALTAGIRONE and MOUL

A Resolution directing the Joint State Government Commission to study the fiscal impact of a timely and expeditious versus a delayed implementation of the Family First Prevention Services Act on the Commonwealth's funding under Part E of Title IV of the Social Security Act.

Referred to Committee on CHILDREN AND YOUTH, June 27, 2019.

**BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE,
CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND
RECOMMITTED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES**

HB 564, PN 2284 (Amended) By Rep. PICKETT

An Act amending the act of May 17, 1921 (P.L.682, No.284), known as The Insurance Company Law of 1921, in quality health care accountability and protection, further providing for prompt payment of claims.

INSURANCE.

SENATE MESSAGE

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

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 131, PN 2264; HB 235, PN 2265; HB 262, PN 2266; HB 265, PN 2241; HB 423, PN 2175; HB 1324, PN 2179; HB 1461, PN 2267; HB 1614, PN 2214; and HB 1615, PN 2268**, with information that the Senate has passed the same with amendment in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives is requested.

SENATE MESSAGE

HOUSE BILLS
CONCURRED IN BY SENATE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 195, PN 167; HB 790, PN 2215; HB 1350, PN 2233; HB 1351, PN 2234; HB 1352, PN 2235; HB 1353, PN 2236; and HB 1354, PN 2237**, with information that the Senate has passed the same without amendment.

BILLS SIGNED BY SPEAKER

Bills numbered and entitled as follows having been prepared for presentation to the Governor, and the same being correct, the titles were publicly read as follows:

HB 195, PN 167

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

HB 790, PN 2215

An act to provide appropriations from the General Fund for the expenses of the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Departments of the Commonwealth, the public debt and the public schools for the fiscal year July 1, 2019, to June 30, 2020, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2019; to provide appropriations from special funds and accounts to the Executive and Judicial Departments for the fiscal year July 1, 2019, to June 30, 2020, and for the payment of bills remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2019; to provide for the appropriation of Federal funds to the Executive and Judicial Departments for the fiscal year July 1, 2019, to June 30, 2020, and for the payment of bills remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2019; and to provide for the additional appropriation of Federal and State funds to the Executive and Judicial Departments for the fiscal year July 1, 2018, to June 30, 2019, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2018.

HB 1350, PN 2233

A Supplement to the act of April 1, 1863 (P.L.213, No.227), entitled "An act to accept the grant of Public Lands, by the United States, to the several states, for the endowment of Agricultural Colleges," making appropriations for carrying the same into effect; providing for a basis for payments of such appropriations, for a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure; and making an appropriation from a restricted account within the Agricultural College Land Scrip Fund.

HB 1351, PN 2234

A Supplement to the act of July 28, 1966 (3rd Sp.Sess., P.L.87, No.3), known as the University of Pittsburgh—Commonwealth Act, making appropriations for carrying the same into effect; and providing for a basis for payments of such appropriations, for a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure.

HB 1352, PN 2235

A Supplement to the act of November 30, 1965 (P.L.843, No.355), known as the Temple University—Commonwealth Act, making an appropriation for carrying the same into effect; providing for a basis for payments of such appropriation; and providing a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure.

HB 1353, PN 2236

A Supplement to the act of July 7, 1972 (P.L.743, No.176), known as the Lincoln University-Commonwealth Act, making an appropriation for carrying the same into effect; providing for a basis for payments of the appropriation; providing for a method of accounting for the funds appropriated; and providing for certain fiscal information disclosure.

HB 1354, PN 2237

An Act making appropriations to the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania.

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

CHILDREN AND YOUTH COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Representative Karen Boback is recognized. She is the chair of the Children and Youth Committee and has a committee announcement.

Ms. BOBACK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The House Children and Youth Committee will conduct an immediate voting meeting, that is an immediate voting meeting today in room B-31, that is right underneath where we are, Main Capitol Building. We will consider HR 438 and any other business to come before the committee. So that is as soon we recess, adjourn, Mr. Speaker, we will meet in B-31. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The House Children and Youth Committee will conduct an immediate voting meeting in room B-31.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Members, as you know, these days where we are addressing quite a few bills, the staff here gladly stays for the long hours that we put in in representing our constituents all across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. One of these good staff— First, we are going to give them all a round of applause. That is fair. Please, let us give them all a round of applause.

In particular, our calendar clerk, Jordan Davis, we wish him a happy birthday. Jordan, please stand up.

The macebearer, James Fata, has indicated that he will have cake and ice cream later for us.

Representatives Toepel and McClinton, are we having caucuses? Leader, do you want to announce committees? Okay.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

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

Mrs. TOEPEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Republicans will caucus at 5:15. We would be prepared to return to the floor – I am sorry– at 6:30.

The SPEAKER. Okay.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

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

Ms. McCLINTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

House Democrats, we will caucus at 5:15; that is 5:15.

The SPEAKER. Members, please know we are going to be back on the floor at 6:30.

RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. At this time the majority leader, for committee announcements.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, upon conclusion of the caucus or at 6:15, we will be calling a Rules Committee meeting in the majority

Appropriations conference room. So 6:15 or the conclusion of caucus.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Upon conclusion of the caucus or at 6:15, there will be a Rules Committee meeting in the majority Appropriations conference room.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. At this time the Speaker adjourns – no, not adjourns – although I am ready to. We are going to be back here at 6:30 or we may call us back sooner, but for everybody on the floor for voting purposes 6:30. We may have to come back earlier to do some housekeeping, but back for the floor activity, 6:30 p.m.

We are in recess until 6:30 p.m., or unless sooner recalled by the Speaker. However, you do not need to come back to the floor until 6:30 p.m.

RECESS EXTENDED

The time of recess was extended until 7:15 p.m.; further extended until 7:30 p.m.; further extended until 7:45 p.m.; further extended until 8 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

RESOLUTION REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HR 438, PN 2285

By Rep. BOBACK

A Resolution directing the Joint State Government Commission to study the fiscal impact of a timely and expeditious versus a delayed implementation of the Family First Prevention Services Act on the Commonwealth's funding under Part E of Title IV of the Social Security Act.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH.

SENATE MESSAGE

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

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 3, PN 2211**, with information that the Senate has passed the same with amendment in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives is requested.

SENATE MESSAGE**HOUSE BILL
CONCURRED IN BY SENATE**

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 24, PN 1735**, with information that the Senate has passed the same without amendment.

SENATE MESSAGE**HOUSE AMENDMENTS
CONCURRED IN BY SENATE**

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, informed that the Senate has concurred in the amendments made by the House of Representatives to **SB 48, PN 1080; SB 621, PN 1081; SB 695, PN 1084; and SB 712, PN 1085**.

RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. At this time the Chair recognizes the majority leader for a Rules Committee announcement.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate everyone's patience. I would like to call an immediate meeting of the Rules Committee in the majority caucus Appropriations room.

The SPEAKER. So, members, the Rules Committee is going to proceed to the Appropriations conference room. We are going to continue to do items from the desk until the Rules Committee returns.

We are not in recess. We are still on the floor. We are just going to be at ease, but we are going to still – actually, we are not even at ease. We are going to conduct some business.

BILLS SIGNED BY SPEAKER

Bills numbered and entitled as follows having been prepared for presentation to the Governor, and the same being correct, the titles were publicly read as follows:

HB 24, PN 1735

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.

SB 48, PN 1080

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in ballots, further providing for form of official election ballot and for number of ballots to be printed and specimen ballots; in voting machines, further providing for requirements of voting machines and for form of ballot labels on voting machines; in electronic voting systems, further providing for requirements of electronic voting systems, for forms and for election day procedures and the process of voting; providing for voting systems and for voting systems bonds; establishing the County Voting System Reimbursement Account; in preparation for and conduct of primaries and elections, further providing for instructions of voters and manner of voting in districts in which voting machines are used, for count and return of votes in districts in which ballots are used and for what ballots

shall be counted, manner of counting and defective ballots; and, in voting by qualified absentee electors, further providing for date of application for absentee ballot, for approval of application for absentee ballot, for voting by absentee electors, for canvassing of official absentee ballots and for public records.

SB 621, PN 1081

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, amending provisions relating to school police officers, school resource officers and school security guards; and imposing powers and duties on the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency.

SB 695, PN 1084

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 medical assistance payments for institutional care and for nonemergency medical transportation services and providing for uniform Statewide preferred drug list; in nursing facility assessments, further providing for definitions, for calculation, for remedies, for repayment and for time periods; in intermediate care facilities for persons with an intellectual disability assessments, further providing for definitions and for time periods; and making a related repeal.

SB 712, PN 1085

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as the Fiscal Code, in Treasury Department, further providing for investment of moneys; in oil and gas wells, further providing for Oil and Gas Lease Fund; in transportation network companies, motor carrier companies and parking authority of a city of the first class, providing for transportation network company extension; in special funds, further providing for funding, for State Workers' Insurance Board, for expiration, for definitions, for other grants and for Commonwealth indebtedness; in additional special funds, further providing for definitions, for establishment of special fund and account, for use of fund, for distributions from Pennsylvania Race Horse Development Fund, for Workers' Compensation Security Fund, for definitions, for use of funds, for amount of grant and for guidelines for applications and providing for Enhanced Revenue Collection Account, Environmental Stewardship Fund and Recycling Fund; in general budget implementation, providing for block grants and for reports to General Assembly, further providing for Department of General Services, for Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board, for Department of Human Services, for Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency, for surcharges, for Multimodal Transportation Fund, for State Gaming Fund and providing for Joint Legislative Air and Water Pollution Control and Conservation Committee; in 2018-2019 budget implementation, further providing for Department of Revenue; adding provisions relating to 2019-2020 budget implementation; making related repeals; and making editorial changes.

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

SENATE BILL FOR CONCURRENCE

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

SB 575, PN 930

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

VOTE CORRECTIONS

The SPEAKER. Representative Ed Neilson – where is the good gentleman? Representative Neilson. Sir, you want to, I believe, correct the record for a particular bill?

Mr. NEILSON. That is correct.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It seems my button did not record an affirmative vote for the motion. I ask that you could correct that record, please.

The SPEAKER. Representative Johnson-Harrell is recognized, on unanimous consent.

Mrs. HARRELL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My button malfunctioned, and for SB 712 I should have been a negative vote.

The SPEAKER. The record will reflect.

Mrs. HARRELL. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Margo Davidson, on unanimous consent.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. My button did not malfunction, but I would like to be recorded as a "nay" on SB 695, motion to proceed, and also on SB 712, motion to proceed. I would like to be recorded as a "no" on both.

The SPEAKER. Thank you. The record will so reflect.

Representative Neilson now, we are going to strike your previous remarks, just because now you have the vote in front of you?

Mr. NEILSON. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. NEILSON. Mr. Speaker, my button did not record. I would like to record it in a positive manner on the motion to proceed for SB 712.

The SPEAKER. The record will so reflect.

**BILLS ON CONCURRENCE
REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE****HB 3, PN 2211**

By Rep. CUTLER

An Act amending Title 40 (Insurance) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for health insurance markets oversight; and establishing the Pennsylvania Health Insurance Exchange Fund.

RULES.

HB 131, PN 2264

By Rep. CUTLER

An Act amending the act of April 12, 1951 (P.L.90, No.21), known as the Liquor Code, in preliminary provisions, further providing for definitions; in licenses and regulations and liquor, alcohol and malt and brewed beverages, further providing for wine and spirits auction permits, for malt and brewed beverages manufacturers', distributors' and importing distributors' licenses, for breweries and for rights of municipalities preserved; in distilleries, wineries, bonded warehouses, bailees for hire and transporters for hire, further providing for limited wineries, for distilleries and for records to be kept; in miscellaneous provisions, further providing for construction and applicability; and abrogating regulations.

RULES.

HB 235, PN 2265

By Rep. CUTLER

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in petition for adoption, further providing for consents necessary to adoption; in support matters generally, further providing for costs and fees and for State disbursement unit; and, in child

protective services, further proving for employees having contact with children, adoptive and foster parents and for volunteers having contact with children.

RULES.

HB 262, PN 2266

By Rep. CUTLER

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, in sales and use tax, further providing for definitions, for imposition of tax, for exclusions from tax, for licenses, for persons required to make returns, for tax held in trust for the Commonwealth, for assessment, for collection of tax and for crimes and providing for class actions; in personal income tax, further providing for classes of income, providing for contributions for Veterans' Trust Fund, further providing for returns of married individuals, deceased or disabled individuals and fiduciaries and providing for paid tax return preparers and required information on personal income tax returns; in corporate net income tax, further providing for manufacturing innovation and reinvestment deduction; in realty transfer tax, further providing for definitions and for excluded transactions and providing for transfer of tax; in entertainment production tax credit, further providing for definitions, for carryover, carryback and assignment of credit, for limitations, for film production tax credit districts, for definitions, for carryover, carryback and assignment of tax credit and for limitations; in resource enhancement and protection tax credit, further providing for definitions, for Resource Enhancement and Protection Tax Credit Program, for tax credits, for project certification and for annual tax credits; in historic preservation incentive tax credit, further providing for definitions and for tax credit certificates, establishing the Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit Administration Account, further providing for carryover, carryback and assignment of credit, for pass-through entity, providing for annual report to General Assembly, further providing for application of Internal Revenue Code and for limitation and providing for recapture; in coal refuse energy and reclamation tax credit, further providing for definitions, for application and approval of tax credit and for limitation on tax credits; in tax credit for new jobs, further providing for application process; in city revitalization and improvement zones, further providing for definitions and for restrictions; in manufacturing and investment tax credit, further providing for definitions, for rural growth funds, for requirements, for rural growth fund failure to comply, for reporting obligations, for business firms, for tax credit certificates, for claiming the tax credit, for prohibitions, for revocation of tax credit certificates and for exit; in neighborhood assistance tax credit, further providing for definitions, for public policy and for tax credit; in keystone opportunity zones, keystone opportunity expansion zones and keystone opportunity improvement zones, providing for additional designations; in mixed-use development tax credit, further providing for mixed-use development tax credits; in inheritance tax, further providing for inheritance tax; in table game taxes, reenacting provisions relating to table game taxes and further providing for expiration; in strategic development areas, further providing for sales and use tax and for local sales and use tax; in computer data center equipment incentive program, further providing for limitations; providing for independent public schools; and making a related repeal.

RULES.

HB 265, PN 2241

By Rep. CUTLER

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in preliminary provisions, providing for career information and recruitment; in terms and courses of study, further providing for Commission for Agricultural Education Excellence; in vocational education, further providing for career and technical education equipment grants and providing for utilization of credits; providing for classification of program code; in transfers of credits between institutions of higher education, further providing for definitions, for duties of public institutions of higher education and State-related institutions, for Transfer and Articulation Oversight Committee and for duties of department; and providing for references to "area vocational-technical school" in statute or regulation.

RULES.

HB 423, PN 2175

By Rep. CUTLER

An Act amending the act of April 12, 1951 (P.L.90, No.21), known as the Liquor Code, in general provisions applying to both liquor and malt and brewed beverages, further providing for local option.

RULES.

HB 1324, PN 2179

By Rep. CUTLER

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in military educational programs, further providing for definitions, for eligibility, for grants, for amount of grants, for limitations, for recoupment of grant payments, for regulations, for administration and for Educational Assistance Program Fund and providing for a military family education program; and making editorial changes.

RULES.

HB 1461, PN 2267

By Rep. CUTLER

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.177, No.175), known as The Administrative Code of 1929, in administrative organization, repealing provisions relating to employees with access to Federal tax information and providing for criminal history background checks of employees and contractors with access to Federal tax information; in organization of independent administrative boards and commissions, providing for Center for Rural Pennsylvania; in Office of State Inspector General, further providing for powers, purpose and duties and for criminal charges; in Commonwealth budget procedures, further providing for submission of budget to General Assembly; in Commonwealth agency fees, further providing for Department of State; in Independent Fiscal Office, further providing for revenue estimates; providing for Joint Underwriting Association accountability; in powers and duties of the Department of Labor and Industry, its departmental administrative and advisory boards and departmental administrative officers, providing for Bureau of Occupational and Industrial Safety; providing for legislative agencies and the continuation of Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing; and making editorial changes and related repeals.

RULES.

HB 1614, PN 2214

By Rep. CUTLER

An Act amending Titles 18 (Crimes and Offenses) and 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in firearms and other dangerous articles, further providing for persons not to possess, use, manufacture, control, sell or transfer firearms and for sale or transfer of firearms; and, in commencement of proceedings, further providing for Statewide municipal police jurisdiction, for nonmunicipal police extraterritorial jurisdiction and for agents of the Office of Attorney General and providing for interpretation.

RULES.

SB 144, PN 1078

By Rep. CUTLER

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in preliminary provisions, further providing for definitions; in school directors, further providing for school director training programs; in intermediate units, providing for school safety and security enhancements; in certification of teachers, further providing for continuing professional development, providing for trauma-informed education and further providing for postbaccalaureate certification and for Pennsylvania school leadership standards; in safe schools, further providing for Office for Safe Schools; in school safety and security, further providing for definitions, for School Safety and Security Committee, for survey of school safety and security, for School Safety and Security Grant Program, for Risk and Vulnerability Assessment Teams, for school safety and security coordinator and for school safety and security training and providing for

trauma-informed approach; in Safe2Say Program, further providing for judicial proceeding and for annual report; providing for threat assessment; in school health services, further providing for confidentiality, transference and removal of health records; in early learning programs, further providing for duties of department; providing for the Keystone Telepresence Education Grant Program; in the State Board of Education, further providing for powers and duties of the board and for powers and duties of Council of Basic Education and Council of Higher Education; and providing for references to area career and technical school in statute and regulation.

RULES.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR D**BILLS ON CONCURRENCE
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS**

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 131, PN 2264**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 12, 1951 (P.L.90, No.21), known as the Liquor Code, in preliminary provisions, further providing for definitions; in licenses and regulations and liquor, alcohol and malt and brewed beverages, further providing for wine and spirits auction permits, for malt and brewed beverages manufacturers', distributors' and importing distributors' licenses, for breweries and for rights of municipalities preserved; in distilleries, wineries, bonded warehouses, bailees for hire and transporters for hire, further providing for limited wineries, for distilleries and for records to be kept; in miscellaneous provisions, further providing for construction and applicability; and abrogating regulations.

On the question,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

The SPEAKER. Moved by Representative Jozwiak, Representative Jozwiak, the floor is yours.

Mr. JOZWIAK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This bill originally passed the House unanimously. The legislation was amended by the Senate to include changes regarding noise amplification and limited wineries, as well as sale invoices for limited wineries. They also included language permitting liquor from out of State for using wine and spirits auction permits. I request a "yes" vote. Thank you.

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—199

Barrar	Flynn	Lewis	Readshaw
Benninghoff	Frankel	Longietti	Reese
Bizzarro	Freeman	Mackenzie	Rigby
Boback	Fritz	Madden	Roae
Borowicz	Gabler	Mako	Roebuck
Boyle	Gainey	Malagari	Rothman
Bradford	Galloway	Maloney	Ryan
Briggs	Gaydos	Markosek	Sainato
Brown	Gillen	Marshall	Samuelson
Bullock	Gillespie	Masser	Sanchez
Burgos	Gleim	Matzie	Sankey
Burns	Goodman	McCarter	Sappay
Caltagirone	Gregory	McClinton	Saylor

Carroll	Greiner	McNeill	Schemel
Causar	Grove	Mehaffie	Schlossberg
Cephas	Hahn	Mentzer	Schmitt
Ciresi	Hanbidge	Merski	Schroeder
Comitta	Harkins	Metcalfe	Schweyer
Conklin	Harrell	Metzgar	Shusterman
Cook	Harris	Mihalek	Simmons
Cox	Heffley	Millard	Sims
Cruz	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	Mustello	Thomas
Day	Isaacson	Neilson	Tobash
Deasy	James	Nelson	Toepel
DeLissio	Jones	Nesbit	Toohil
Delloso	Jozwiak	O'Mara	Topper
Delozier	Kail	O'Neal	Ullman
DeLuca	Kaufer	Oberlander	Vitali
Dermody	Kauffman	Ortitay	Walsh
Diamond	Keefer	Otten	Warner
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Owlett	Warren
Donatucci	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Webster
Dowling	Kim	Peifer	Wentling
Driscoll	Kinsey	Petrarca	Wheatley
Dunbar	Kirkland	Pickett	Wheeland
Dush	Klunk	Polinchock	White
Ecker	Knowles	Puskaric	Williams
Emrick	Kortz	Pyle	Youngblood
Evans	Kosierowski	Quinn	Zabel
Everett	Krueger	Rabb	Zimmerman
Farry	Kulik	Rader	
Fee	Lawrence	Rapp	Turzai,
Fiedler	Lee	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Fitzgerald			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Bernstine	Brooks	Rozzi
-----------	--------	-------

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.

The SPEAKER. The House is going to stand at ease.

RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. At this time the majority leader is recognized. Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call an immediate meeting of the Rules Committee for consideration of the one remaining bill we have on concurrence.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. At this time the House will stand in recess for the Rules Committee to meet. It is meeting right now in the Appropriations Committee conference room. All members of the Rules Committee, please proceed to the Appropriations Committee conference room.

AFTER RECESS

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

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE
REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**

HB 1615, PN 2268

By Rep. CUTLER

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in preliminary provisions, further providing for Special Education Funding Commission; in school districts, providing for full academic year requirements; in school finances, further providing for annual budget, additional or increased appropriations and transfer of funds; in grounds and buildings, further providing for limitation on new applications for Department of Education approval of public school building projects; in district superintendents and assistant district superintendents, further providing for eligibility; in pupils and attendance, further providing for definitions and for nonprofit school food program; in Drug and Alcohol Recovery High School Pilot Program, further providing for audit required; establishing the Innovation Schools Program; in community colleges, further providing for financial program and reimbursement of payments; in educational tax credits, further providing for definitions, for qualification and application by organizations, for application by business firms, for tax credits, for limitations and for opportunity scholarships; adding provisions relating to postsecondary institution sexual harassment and sexual violence policy and online reporting system; in school districts of the first class, further providing for board of public education and additional duties; in ready-to-succeed scholarship, further providing for agency duties relating to eligibility criteria; in funding for public libraries, providing for State aid for fiscal year 2019-2020; in reimbursements by Commonwealth and between school districts, further providing for payments on account of pupils enrolled in vocational curriculums, for student-weighted basic education funding, for payments to intermediate units, for assistance to school districts declared to be in financial recovery status or identified for financial watch status, for Ready-to-Learn Block Grant and for payment of required contribution for public school employees' social security and providing for advanced placement and International Baccalaureate exam fees; providing for fostering independence through education; and providing for references to "area vocational-technical school" and "vocational curriculums" in statute or regulation.

RULES.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR E

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS**

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 1615, PN 2268**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in preliminary provisions, further providing for Special Education Funding Commission; in school districts, providing for full academic year requirements; in school

finances, further providing for annual budget, additional or increased appropriations and transfer of funds; in grounds and buildings, further providing for limitation on new applications for Department of Education approval of public school building projects; in district superintendents and assistant district superintendents, further providing for eligibility; in pupils and attendance, further providing for definitions and for nonprofit school food program; in Drug and Alcohol Recovery High School Pilot Program, further providing for audit required; establishing the Innovation Schools Program; in community colleges, further providing for financial program and reimbursement of payments; in educational tax credits, further providing for definitions, for qualification and application by organizations, for application by business firms, for tax credits, for limitations and for opportunity scholarships; adding provisions relating to postsecondary institution sexual harassment and sexual violence policy and online reporting system; in school districts of the first class, further providing for board of public education and additional duties; in ready-to-succeed scholarship, further providing for agency duties relating to eligibility criteria; in funding for public libraries, providing for State aid for fiscal year 2019-2020; in reimbursements by Commonwealth and between school districts, further providing for payments on account of pupils enrolled in vocational curriculums, for student-weighted basic education funding, for payments to intermediate units, for assistance to school districts declared to be in financial recovery status or identified for financial watch status, for Ready-to-Learn Block Grant and for payment of required contribution for public school employees' social security and providing for advanced placement and International Baccalaureate exam fees; providing for fostering independence through education; and providing for references to "area vocational-technical school" and "vocational curriculums" in statute or regulation.

On the question,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

The SPEAKER. At this time I am going to be coming down to the floor and I am going to call up Representative Zach Mako to manage the rostrum here, as the pro tem.

As many of you know, Representative Mako is a chief warrant officer. He flies CH-47 Chinooks. He is with Bravo Company. Representative Mako has never been pro tem, but he is going to get an opportunity here.

Representative Mako, the rostrum is yours.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (ZACHARY MAKO) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes Representative Turzai for a brief description of the Senate amendments.

Mr. TURZAI. Members, thank you.

The hour is late and right before us is an opportunity to complete the budget for this upcoming fiscal year 2019-2020. The bill that we have in front of us is the quote, unquote, "Education Code," HB 1615, PN 2268.

Now, many of you know we have already voted on a General Fund appropriations bill. In that General Fund appropriations bill— Just one moment. Boy, you know the macebearer can get back at you every now and then. My apologies. In this budget, which we passed – but which requires the Education Code to pass for there to be the distribution of the education dollars that we appropriated in the General Fund budget, we have basic education funding at \$6.7 billion – a record number – an increase of \$160 million over last year's budget, and the special education line, which is merely \$1.2 billion, we have increased special education funding by \$50 million, as requested by the Governor; we have increased the contributions to the school employment retirement by almost \$150 million, taking that up to \$2.6 billion

annually in a contribution, in a contribution to the teachers' pensions, putting us at, by the way, our actuarially required contribution, thank goodness, and we are definitely on route to make this whole, which is our objective. We have also increased, of course, other areas with respect to education.

Now, many of you may know that we passed HB 800 with bipartisan support, which increased EITC (educational improvement tax credit) tax credit scholarships and it also increased income limits and it did have an escalator and it passed both chambers, but the Governor vetoed it. As the prime sponsor of that bill, I was very disappointed. But in this particular bill there is an increase of \$25 million in scholarships for the educational improvement tax credit. That is significant and I am grateful for the agreement with the Governor with respect to that amount, and there is a lesser increase in income limits, but there is an increase of \$5,000.

In addition, there are other pieces of legislation that members from both chambers, both sides of the aisle, have worked upon. They include many important pieces of legislation with respect to improving education in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Also, crucial in this legislation is the enactment of reporting systems of sexual harassment, sexual violence, for all of our schools, all of our schools in public education, which we have not had before. We call it "It's On Us."

Now, I know that there are some component parts that some object to; some that were included by our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol, that we were not all aware of. I recognize one of them, at least with respect to some members, has been this notion of compulsory education ages 6 through 18. I would only say this: Many of us in a negotiated product might not have everything we want in it and there may be some things in it that we are not particularly out front on, but when you have a negotiated budget with the Governor and we have divided government – a Democratic Governor who has a particular perspective, a House Republican majority, Senate Republican majority – you have to find common ground and compromise to move forward. All four caucuses – the House Republicans, the Senate Republicans, the House Democrats, the Senate Democrats – everybody had perspectives that were placed into this Education Code bill that was amended over in the Senate. Given that it was a compromise, it is never perfect from any of our perspectives. It certainly is not perfect from my perspective, but it is certainly an important step forward with respect to investments in our children – no matter how you see it – it is important with respect to the investments in good education for each and every child in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

We all agree on the most significant component parts with respect to HB 1615. I want to commend our majority leader and our majority Appropriations chair, who have done the significant work in terms of the detail. I also want to commend the House Democratic leader and the House Democratic Appropriations chair for finding opportunity to get common ground to move Pennsylvania forward and to find perspectives, to find perspectives that we could work together on an educational policy in Pennsylvania for each and every one of our kids.

Now, here is the last point: We could be here all summer, I guess, if we do not have the votes for the Education Code bill that distributes the money that we have allocated in the General Fund bill – we can do that – to get to perfect from our perspective in a democracy where it is about a lot of different strokes on a painting; that is how it works. We could all say, let us get to

perfect from our world view, or we can say, let us take this budget, which has made significant investments in public education, in school choice opportunities, and, in fact, does not raise taxes, and we can finish that right now, this evening, with the completion of these bills, or we can, if we do not pass this bill, sit and argue which days we are going to come in and try to start the whole thing over again with our Senate colleagues, the Governor, and ourselves.

I would advocate, let us pass 1615 unanimously. Let us go out there and say, this one is for the kids; this one is for a great educational opportunity; this is for a balanced budget; this is for a better Pennsylvania.

Please vote "yes."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the minority whip, who requests Representative HILL-EVANS be placed on leave, and she will be placed on leave.

THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER. Representative Mako, thank you for your service to our community and thank you for giving this an opportunity here today.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 1615 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Representative Mark Gillen is recognized.

Mr. GILLEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a number of pictures that I keep on my desk. I do not parade them around. Usually one of my five daughters' pictures is at the top of the pile. The picture that I have out tonight is a picture of my 6-year-old daughter with David Tuck. He wrote a story of Holocaust survival. Under this particular piece of legislation, we had placed in it over in the Senate a component that forced 6- and 7-year-olds into compulsory education and then it had a piece at the other end of the spectrum, but let me just focus for a moment on 6- and 7-year-olds. My 6-year-old and I spend a substantial amount of time together, and I took her one day to visit with David Tuck, and the picture that I have on my desk is with a Holocaust survivor and he has his sleeve rolled up and it actually has the number that was tattooed on him at Auschwitz.

Parents are in the best position to make educational decisions for their own children, and I believe the good Speaker said that we could be here all summer, and I certainly would not be standing here if I thought a recalibration of a bill which would be minor, if I thought for a moment that that minor change, in taking that out, that the Senate, surprisingly, put in and I believe I just also heard a few moments ago we were not aware of this. This is about process. I voted for early childhood education, Pre-K Counts. I was recently in a public school and spent time with those that were in the Pre-K Counts program. I believe it is not inconsistent to advocate for early childhood education and then also recognize that some 6- and 7-year-olds are not quite ready for that and they are gaining enormous benefits like our own homeschooled children.

There were no Education Committee votes, either on this side or on the Senate side. This was not vetted. I arrived today and I found out in the hallway that this element had been added. I am concerned from the perspective of religious freedom, and people of faith are deeply concerned about this bill.

In *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, the Amish community successfully argued that the State – the judge indicated that the State had provided no evidence showing that there was a great benefit in the Amish community in terms of forcing them into additional years of education. I think it is perfectly consistent – as an educator, I am certified and have an advanced degree in education; my wife has an advanced degree in education – I think it is perfectly consistent to embrace religious freedom and educational freedom and freedom of choice in the Commonwealth, and then meet our constitutional responsibility to public education. I think that we can do both.

If you are looking for evidence in terms of the efficacy of how things are working out relative to 6-year-olds and compulsory education, you need go no further than the city of Philadelphia, who has a compulsory program in place already for 6-year-olds. As a consequence of *Wisconsin v. Yoder* back in 1972, it was noted that the traditional Amish model, hardworking people of faith, had brought economic prosperity, letting them make decisions for themselves in their own religious community and their own religious order. If you go to Lancaster County, you are going to find some of the most productive farmland in the United States of America and, indeed, the world, and they have offered us a model.

And so in terms of compulsory, I think the government should be very hesitant and I think we, as a body, based on the process of the Senate at the eleventh hour pushing this to our side of the building, I think we should be very hesitant, whatever the content is of the bill, and I would recommend a "no" vote and redeliberate on this particular piece of legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative.

At this time the Democratic leader and the majority leader, I think, are the last two.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

The SPEAKER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a motion.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DERMODY. I would like to make a motion to rerefer the bill to the Rules Committee, HB 1615.

The SPEAKER. The committee that just unanimously passed the bill out about 10 minutes ago?

Mr. DERMODY. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Okay.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. The majority leader, on the motion.

Leader, you may speak on your motion. I just thought you were done. I apologize.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, the reason we want to rerefer it was we had a series of bills that we all agreed on in this room regarding career technical education. Those amendments were agreed here, we had a great bipartisan effort to get that done, and those bills were stripped out in the Senate. We would like to have the opportunity now to have amendments drawn that would re-create, that would have those career technical education amendments put back in the bill via the amendment route in the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER. The leader, on the motion.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman's concerns regarding the package of bills that was not returned that we – obviously, both caucuses had a strong interest in that. I think that we have demonstrated here that we are willing to work across the aisle in terms of the calendar and the items that we are working on. So regrettably, I must oppose the motion, because as the Speaker outlined previously in providing the summary of the bill, it is budget season, this is a budget-related bill. I would urge the members to stick with us in this procedural vote so that we can ensure that this debate can continue.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Please oppose the motion.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—93

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

NAYS—105

Barrar	Greiner	Mentzer	Rothman
Benninghoff	Grove	Metcalfe	Ryan
Boback	Hahn	Metzgar	Sankey
Borowicz	Heffley	Mihalek	Saylor
Brown	Helm	Millard	Schemel
Causar	Hennessey	Miller, B.	Schmitt
Cook	Hershey	Mizgorski	Schroeder
Culver	Hickernell	Moul	Simmons
Cutler	Irvin	Murt	Sonney
Day	James	Mustello	Staats
Delozier	Jones	Nelson	Stephens

Diamond	Jozwiak	Nesbit	Struzzi
DiGirolamo	Kail	O'Neal	Thomas
Dowling	Kaufner	Oberlander	Tobash
Dunbar	Kauffman	Ortitay	Toepel
Dush	Keefer	Owlett	Toohil
Ecker	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Topper
Emrick	Klunk	Pickett	Walsh
Everett	Knowles	Polinchock	Warner
Farry	Lawrence	Puskaric	Wentling
Fee	Lewis	Pyle	Wheeland
Fritz	Mackenzie	Quinn	White
Gabler	Mako	Rader	Zimmerman
Gaydos	Maloney	Rapp	
Gillespie	Marshall	Reese	Turzai,
Gleim	Masser	Rigby	Speaker
Gregory	Mehaffie	Roae	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Bernstine	Brooks	Evans	Rozzi
-----------	--------	-------	-------

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

On the question recurring,
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—77

Barrar	Gregory	Mentzer	Rigby
Benninghoff	Greiner	Metzgar	Rothman
Boback	Grove	Mihalek	Sankey
Brown	Hahn	Millard	Saylor
Causar	Heffley	Mizgorski	Schemel
Culver	Helm	Moul	Schmitt
Cutler	Hennessey	Murt	Simmons
Day	Hickernell	Mustello	Sonney
Delozier	Irvin	Nesbit	Struzzi
DeLuca	James	O'Neal	Tobash
Dowling	Kail	Oberlander	Toepel
Dunbar	Kaufner	Ortitay	Toohil
Ecker	Kauffman	Owlett	Topper
Everett	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Walsh
Fee	Klunk	Pickett	Wheeland
Fritz	Lawrence	Puskaric	White
Gabler	Mako	Pyle	
Gaydos	Marshall	Quinn	Turzai,
Gillespie	Masser	Rader	Speaker
Gleim	Mehaffie	Reese	

NAYS—121

Bizzarro	Emrick	Krueger	Readshaw
Borowicz	Farry	Kulik	Roae
Boyle	Fiedler	Lee	Roebuck
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Lewis	Ryan
Briggs	Flynn	Longiatti	Sainato
Bullock	Frankel	Mackenzie	Samuelson
Burgos	Freeman	Madden	Sanchez
Burns	Gainey	Malagari	Sappey
Caltagirone	Galloway	Maloney	Schlossberg
Carroll	Gillen	Markosek	Schroeder
Cephas	Goodman	Matzie	Schweyer
Ciresi	Hanbidge	McCarter	Shusterman
Comitta	Harkins	McClinton	Sims

Conklin	Harrell	McNeill	Snyder
Cook	Harris	Merski	Solomon
Cox	Hershey	Metcalfe	Staats
Cruz	Hohenstein	Miller, B.	Stephens
Daley	Howard	Miller, D.	Sturla
Davidson	Innamorato	Mullery	Thomas
Davis, A.	Isaacson	Mullins	Ullman
Davis, T.	Jones	Neilson	Vitali
Dawkins	Jozwiak	Nelson	Warner
Deasy	Keefer	O'Mara	Warren
DeLissio	Kenyatta	Otten	Webster
Delloso	Kim	Pashinski	Wentling
Dermody	Kinsey	Petrarca	Wheatley
Diamond	Kirkland	Polinchock	Williams
DiGirolamo	Knowles	Rabb	Youngblood
Donatucci	Kortz	Rapp	Zabel
Driscoll	Kosierowski	Ravenstahl	Zimmerman
Dush			

NOT VOTING—0**EXCUSED—4**

Bernstine Brooks Evans Rozzi

Less than the majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the amendments were not concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Members, there will be no further votes this evening. We will be back at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. Representative Marcy Toepel is recognized for a caucus announcement.

Mrs. TOEPEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Republicans will caucus immediately.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. Representative Joanna McClinton.
Ms. McCLINTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
House Democrats, we will caucus immediately.

The SPEAKER. So the House Republicans and the House Democrats will caucus immediately, and we will report back to the floor tomorrow at 9 a.m.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. Representative Martina White is recognized.
Ms. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was marked in the negative on SB 712; I would like to be marked in the affirmative. Thank you.

RECONSIDERATION MOTION FILED

The SPEAKER. We are in receipt of a motion to reconsider filed on HB 1615, filed by Representative Bradford and Representative Harris. Okay. So Representative Harris and Representative Bradford have filed, "Pursuant to rule 26, we, the

undersigned, move that the vote by which the House nonconcurred in HB 1615 on June 27 be reconsidered."

My goodness, 18 years ago I was elected in a special election on this date, and boy, what a great anniversary.

Everybody, 9 a.m. tomorrow on the House floor. We will be prompt.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. The leader, the Democratic leader.

Ms. McCLINTON. House Democrats, we are going to caucus now. House Democrats, we are going to caucus right now.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 365 be removed from the table calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

BILL RECOMMITTED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 1671 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

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 Martin Causer moves that the House be adjourned until Friday, June 28, 2019, at 9 a.m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

Please pay attention, we could be here at 5 in the morning – 9 a.m., 9 a.m.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the motion?
Motion was agreed to, and at 9:21 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.