

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 2020

SESSION OF 2020

204TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 17

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI) PRESIDING

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. For those members that need to or wish to vote from their Capitol office, my understanding is, at least with respect to the majority caucus, you can put your name on a list.

As you know, the permanent rule provides, and the leader and Parliamentarian, correct me if I am wrong, but my understanding is that our permanent rule provides that someone, a colleague, can vote for you on the House floor if you are in your Capitol office as long as you have appeared on the floor and that you are available if the other side of the aisle wishes to challenge your presence in the Capitol. So you are able to vote from your Capitol office if you so choose. And I know that the majority whip has undertaken a process by which he can ensure that votes are, in fact, on the floor who decide to go to their Capitol offices.

PRAYER

HON. MIKE TURZAI, Speaker of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

I am going to read from the Book of Psalms in the Old Testament, Psalm 100: "A Hymn of Praise."

"Sing for joy to the Lord, all the world. Worship the Lord gladly, and come before Him with joyful songs. Never forget that the Lord is God. He made us, and we belong to Him; we together are His people, we are His flock. Enter His temple with thanksgiving. Go into His sanctuary with praise. Give thanks to Him and praise Him. The Lord is good; His love lasts forever, and His faithfulness for all time."

Dear Lord God, please bless each and every one of the members here today, here voting in her or his Capitol office, voting in her or his district office or her or his home. May You provide each of them and myself with wisdom, as we go about dealing with the issues in front of us today. Have mercy on us all. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal of Monday, April 13, 2020, will be postponed until printed. The Chair hears no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM DELAWARE RIVER PORT AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER. The Speaker acknowledges receipt of the report from the Delaware River Port Authority of Pennsylvania and New Jersey by State compact for 2019.

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

The SPEAKER. At this time I am going to call upon the leaders for committee and caucus announcements.

We are going to caucus announcements and the majority caucus chair, Representative Marcy Toepel—

Yes, I apologize. The Appropriations chair, the majority Appropriations chair, I will recognize first.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Representative Stan Saylor from York County, the majority Appropriations chair, is recognized.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Appropriations Committee will meet immediately in the majority caucus room at the recess.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Appropriations Committee will meet immediately in the majority caucus room at the recess.

REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC CAUCUSES

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls upon the majority caucus chair, Representative Marcy Toepel, from Montgomery County.

Mrs. TOEPEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Toepel, the majority caucus chair, will that be done by—

Mrs. TOEPEL. By remote caucus only.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

The Democratic leader, Representative Frank Dermody, is recognized.

Mr. DERMODY. The Democrats will also caucus at noon, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Marcy Toepel, the majority caucus chair, is recognized.

Mrs. TOEPEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Republicans will still caucus at 12, but we would be prepared to return to the floor at 1 o'clock. Thank you.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 1 p.m.; 1 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HB 896, PN 2087 By Rep. SAYLOR

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

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2233, PN 3276 By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in liquid fuels and fuels tax, providing for political subdivision and volunteer service use of tax-free motor fuels and further providing for examination of records and equipment.

APPROPRIATIONS.

BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

HB 2387, PN 3527 By Rep. SAYLOR

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, 2020, to June 30, 2021, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2020; to provide appropriations from special funds and accounts to the Executive and Judicial Departments for the fiscal year July 1, 2020, to June 30, 2021, and for the payment of bills remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2020; to provide for the appropriation of Federal funds to the Executive and Judicial Departments for the fiscal year July 1, 2020, to June 30, 2021, and for the payment of bills remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2020.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HOUSE RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 843 By Representatives DERMODY, ULLMAN, HOHENSTEIN, SOLOMON, DELLOSO, RAVENSTAHL, SCHLOSSBERG, KOSIEROWSKI, WILLIAMS, McCARTER, MERSKI, KINSEY, KULIK, MALAGARI, CONKLIN, D. MILLER, RABB, HARRIS, YOUNGBLOOD, BOYLE, LONGIETTI, A. DAVIS, BRADFORD, GREEN, ISAACSON, SANCHEZ, HANBIDGE, SCHWEYER, NEILSON, HILL-

EVANS, FIEDLER, DONATUCCI, CIRESI, McNEILL, HOWARD, FRANKEL, DeLUCA, PASHINSKI, CALTAGIRONE, O'MARA, BRIGGS, McCLINTON, GALLOWAY, SIMS, SHUSTERMAN, READSHAW and WARREN

A Resolution urging the Department of Human Services to submit a request to the United States Department of Agriculture to participate in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Online Purchasing Pilot.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, April 14, 2020.

No. 844 By Representatives DONATUCCI, MURT, KINSEY, YOUNGBLOOD, SCHLOSSBERG, MALAGARI, HOWARD, SANCHEZ, HILL-EVANS, KORTZ, NEILSON, SCHWEYER, DeLUCA and READSHAW

A Resolution recognizing the month of May 2020 as "Rainforest Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania and urging residents of this Commonwealth to become aware of the disappearance of rainforests worldwide and make choices that can lead to protection of those remaining areas.

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, April 14, 2020.

No. 845 By Representatives ISAACSON, BOYLE, MURT, FRANKEL, DeLUCA, KORTZ, MALAGARI, MILLARD and READSHAW

A Resolution recognizing the month of May 2020 as "National Moving Month" in Pennsylvania.

Referred to Committee on COMMERCE, April 14, 2020.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 2391 By Representatives HOHENSTEIN, ISAACSON, FRANKEL, NEILSON, BRIGGS, BURGOS, DALEY, A. DAVIS, DELLOSO, DeLUCA, DONATUCCI, GALLOWAY, HANBIDGE, HILL-EVANS, HOWARD, KENYATTA, KIM, MALAGARI, MERSKI, O'MARA, ROZZI, SANCHEZ, SCHLOSSBERG, SCHWEYER, ULLMAN, WEBSTER, WILLIAMS, ZABEL, GREEN, KRUEGER, MULLINS, RAVENSTAHL and DERMODY

An Act establishing public health emergency leave.

Referred to Committee on LABOR AND INDUSTRY, April 14, 2020.

No. 2401 By Representatives KULIK, SCHLOSSBERG, KINSEY, MARKOSEK, BARRAR, SOLOMON, McNEILL, HOHENSTEIN, MURT, SANCHEZ, RYAN, ULLMAN, STEPHENS, HILL-EVANS, MALAGARI, ROZZI, READSHAW, HEFFLEY, DONATUCCI, KEEFER, FRANKEL, GALLOWAY and GAYDOS

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 time for filing returns.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, April 14, 2020.

No. 2402 By Representatives CEPHAS, ISAACSON, FREEMAN, SCHLOSSBERG, McCARTER, HOHENSTEIN, ULLMAN, HILL-EVANS, MARKOSEK, MURT, KOSIEROWSKI, HARRIS, CIRESI, SCHWEYER, BURGOS, KENYATTA, GALLOWAY, DeLUCA, WILLIAMS, STURLA, MALAGARI, DEASY, CONKLIN, ROZZI, NEILSON, READSHAW, FRANKEL, DERMODY and GAINNEY

An Act amending the act of December 3, 1959 (P.L.1688, No.621), known as the Housing Finance Agency Law, in general provisions, providing for suspension of interest payment collection.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, April 14, 2020.

No. 2403 By Representatives CEPHAS, ISAACSON, FREEMAN, SCHLOSSBERG, McCARTER, HOHENSTEIN, ULLMAN, HILL-EVANS, MARKOSEK, MURT, KOSIEROWSKI, HARRIS, CIRESI, O'MARA, SCHWEYER, SANCHEZ, BURGOS, KENYATTA, GALLOWAY, DeLUCA, WILLIAMS, STURLA, MALAGARI, DEASY, CONKLIN, WARREN, ROZZI, NEILSON, HOWARD, READSHAW, FRANKEL, DERMODY and GAINNEY

An Act amending the act of August 7, 1963 (P.L.549, No.290), referred to as the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency Act, providing for suspension of interest payment collection.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, April 14, 2020.

No. 2404 By Representatives ISAACSON, LEE, MURT, HOHENSTEIN, BRIGGS, DALEY, A. DAVIS, DEASY, DELLOSO, DONATUCCI, FRANKEL, GALLOWAY, HANBIDGE, HILL-EVANS, KENYATTA, KIM, MARKOSEK, McCLINTON, MERSKI, OTTEN, RABB, RAVENSTAHL, ROZZI, SANCHEZ, SCHWEYER, WEBSTER, WILLIAMS and GAINNEY

An Act amending the act of April 6, 1951 (P.L.69, No.20), known as The Landlord and Tenant Act of 1951, in preliminary provisions, providing for effect of declaration of disaster emergency.

Referred to Committee on URBAN AFFAIRS, April 14, 2020.

No. 2405 By Representative DUSH

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.177, No.175), known as The Administrative Code of 1929, in Commonwealth budget procedures, providing for report of appropriated funds.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, April 14, 2020.

No. 2406 By Representatives ORTITAY, ROTHMAN, MIHALEK, JAMES, TURZAI, DONATUCCI, ROZZI, CIRESI, DeLUCA, FRANKEL and READSHAW

An Act amending the act of April 12, 1951 (P.L.90, No.21), known as the Liquor Code, in licenses and regulations and liquor, alcohol and malt and brewed beverages, further providing for sale of malt or brewed beverages by liquor licensees, for wine expanded permits and for retail dispensers' restrictions on purchases and sales.

Referred to Committee on LIQUOR CONTROL, April 14, 2020.

No. 2407 By Representatives EVERETT, RYAN, ZABEL, SCHMITT, ULLMAN, WEBSTER, BOBACK, JAMES, MILLARD, PICKETT, STAATS, MENTZER, SCHWEYER, DONATUCCI, DeLUCA and ROZZI

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in voting by qualified absentee electors, further providing for official absentee voters ballots; and, in voting by qualified mail-in electors, further providing for official mail-in elector ballots.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, April 14, 2020.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. At this time leaves of absence will be taken. There are no members that request leaves of absence.

Representative MAKO is already on record given his service with the Army National Guard.

MASTER ROLL CALL

The SPEAKER. We will proceed to take the master roll. Members may proceed to vote.

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. I need to speak with – before I close the master roll, I am going to turn to the two whips, and the majority whip, perhaps what we should do, Mr. Whip, if this is appropriate, announce the number of members voting on the floor or in their Capitol offices and then the numbers voting from the remote office. Do you have that breakdown?

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Collectively.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls upon the majority whip.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I want to put Representative BOBACK on leave.

The SPEAKER. So Representative Boback has been placed on leave, without objection.

MASTER ROLL CALL CONTINUED

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. And the House Republicans have 107 members here to vote.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. And the minority whip, Representative Jordan Harris.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—201

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

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Boback Mako

LEAVES CANCELED—1

Boback

The SPEAKER. There are 201 members voting on the master roll call. We have a quorum.

RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. At this time we are going to break, I believe, Leader, break for Rules at this time.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we would like to call an immediate meeting of the Rules Committee in the majority caucus room; immediate meeting of the Rules Committee in the majority caucus room.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Leader and the chair of the Rules Committee.

So all of those members on the Rules Committee can report to the majority caucus room. It is a large room. You can have safe social distance there. And in addition, you can vote remotely as well for the Rules Committee vote. You can vote remotely for the Rules Committee vote.

So we are at ease as we await the Rules Committee to vote.

The House will come to order.

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE
REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**

SB 841, PN 1623

By Rep. CUTLER

An Act amending Titles 35 (Health and Safety) and 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the Health Care Cost Containment Council, for its powers and duties, for health care cost containment through the collection and dissemination of data, for public accountability of health care costs and for health care for the indigent; providing for COVID-19 disaster emergency; in local organizations and services, further providing for general authority of political subdivisions; and, in Uniform Unsworn Foreign Declarations Act, further providing for heading of chapter, for short title of chapter, for definitions, for applicability and for form of unsworn declaration.

RULES.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Members, Representative Karen Boback was not available earlier to vote remotely under the temporary rule but Representative Karen Boback is now available to vote remotely. She has informed the majority whip. So Representative Karen Boback will now be placed on the master roll. Representative Karen Boback will be placed on the master roll.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. My understanding is that the minority caucus wishes to caucus briefly on a technical amendment. Am I correct on that, Representative Harris, the Democratic whip? The Republican Caucus is not going to caucus at this time. We are going to stand at ease, and we are going to give the Democratic Caucus leeway. We will allow for 20 minutes at this time – you want 30 minutes? So the Democratic whip is asking for 30 minutes to caucus this technical amendment.

We are going to stay at ease. My understanding is, there is not a Republican Caucus. There is going to be a Democratic Caucus. So Representative Harris, if the Democratic Caucus could be back to the floor at 1:55 – it is 1:25 now; that clock is not correct – it will be 1:55 p.m. Thank you.

We will stand at ease, and I do understand that the Democrats will be caucusing remotely or virtually, so please, you know the process, so please use the appropriate process.

Representative Nelson, can you approach the rostrum, please.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. We are asking all members to please either come to the floor using masks and safe distancing or to go to your Capitol offices to vote. You will just need to inform the whip or a colleague on the House floor to vote for you. And then I know that there are some members who are voting remotely through the temporary rule. I know that our colleagues – the Democratic Caucus is caucusing until 1:55 p.m. We have reached that hour. Obviously, if they could just report to the floor by 2 p.m., that would be appreciated.

So the House is back in session. Of course we will wait for our colleagues.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 2375 By Representatives WHEATLEY, HILL-EVANS, A. DAVIS, HARRIS, JONES, KINSEY, SANCHEZ, STURLA, DeLUCA and DONATUCCI

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in terms and courses of study, further providing for pandemic of 2020.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, April 14, 2020.

No. 2408 By Representatives MARKOSEK, BURGOS, ULLMAN, SANCHEZ, WEBSTER, RAVENSTAHL, CALTAGIRONE, HANBIDGE, T. DAVIS, McNEILL, DELLOSO, O'MARA, HARKINS, HILL-EVANS, READSHAW, MULLINS, DONATUCCI, WARREN, BURNS, BOYLE, HOHENSTEIN, KORTZ, KOSIEROWSKI, BIZZARRO, KINSEY, GALLOWAY, SCHWEYER, SHUSTERMAN, HOWARD, GREEN, FRANKEL, CIRESI and HELM

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in emergency finance and tax provisions, providing for exemption from taxation.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, April 14, 2020.

No. 2410 By Representatives McNEILL, FREEMAN, WILLIAMS, GALLOWAY, DELLOSO, SCHLOSSBERG, KINSEY, T. DAVIS, NEILSON, SCHWEYER, YOUNGBLOOD, DRISCOLL, SANCHEZ, CIRESI and READSHAW

An Act prohibiting termination of cable and Internet service during a disaster emergency.

Referred to Committee on CONSUMER AFFAIRS, April 14, 2020.

No. 2411 By Representatives A. DAVIS, MERSKI, HILL-EVANS, WEBSTER, ZABEL, HANBIDGE, SCHLOSSBERG, HOHENSTEIN, BURGOS, KOSIEROWSKI, SANCHEZ,

RAVENSTAHL, YOUNGBLOOD, HARRIS, FREEMAN, CIRESI, BIZZARRO, CALTAGIRONE, DELLOSO, BRIGGS, McCLINTON, CEPHAS, GALLOWAY, WILLIAMS, DERMODY, DONATUCCI, O'MARA, GREEN, READSHAW, ROZZI, SCHWEYER, HOWARD, FRANKEL and McCARTER

An Act establishing the Child Care Grant Program for Front Line Medical Facility Personnel; providing for duties of the Department of Community and Economic Development; establishing the Child Care Grant Program for Front Line Medical Facility Personnel Fund; and making an appropriation.

Referred to Committee on CHILDREN AND YOUTH, April 14, 2020.

The SPEAKER. Well, we have on the floor at this time the majority leader, Representative Bryan Cutler, and the minority leader, Representative Frank Dermody. We will now call up legislation for votes.

We were intending to run SB 613 first, but there is a technical amendment that needs to be filed, so that is going to get done right now. So we are going to just proceed with some other bills while we are waiting for that.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2233, PN 3276**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in liquid fuels and fuels tax, providing for political subdivision and volunteer service use of tax-free motor fuels and further providing for examination of records and equipment.

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.

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. And at this time the Chair calls upon the majority whip, with respect to the vote on HB 2233. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to let you know that the board does reflect the vote of the majority party. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Jordan Harris, the Democratic whip, on HB 2233.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the board does reflect the Democratic vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—202

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Mako

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 896, PN 2087**, entitled:

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. To the majority whip, on HB 896.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The board does reflect the vote of the majority party. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Democrat whip, Representative Jordan Harris, on HB 896.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the electronic board is accurate.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—202

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

Deasy	Jones	Oberlander	Topper
DeLissio	Jozwiak	Ortitay	Ullman
Delloso	Kail	Otten	Vitali
Delozier	Kaufer	Owlett	Warner
DeLuca	Kauffman	Pashinski	Warren
Dermody	Keefer	Peifer	Webster
Diamond	Keller	Petrarca	Wentling
Donatucci	Kenyatta	Pickett	Wheatley
Dowling	Kim	Polinchock	Wheeland
Driscoll	Kinsey	Puskaric	White
Dunbar	Kirkland	Pyle	Williams
Dush	Klunk	Quinn	Youngblood
Ecker	Knowles	Rabb	Zabel
Emrick	Kortz	Rader	Zimmerman
Evans	Kosierowski	Rapp	
Everett	Krueger	Ravenstahl	Turzai,
Farry	Kulik	Readshaw	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Mako

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

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

CALENDAR

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 613, PN 1629**, entitled:

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 reenacting provisions relating to criminal history background checks of employees and contractors with access to Federal tax information; and providing for COVID-19 emergency mitigation plan for businesses.

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

The SPEAKER. And as amended, further concerns with the ability to work under CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) and CISA (Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency) requirements.

At this time we have a technical amendment that can be voted. It does not need a motion to suspend.

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

Mr. **CUTLER** offered the following amendment
No. **A05070**:

Amend Bill, page 11, line 15, by striking out "ADDITION OF ARTICLE XXI-C OF" and inserting

amendment of sections 225 and 226 of
Amend Bill, page 11, line 16, by striking out "IMMEDIATELY" and inserting

in 60 days

Amend Bill, page 11, lines 17 and 18, by striking out "IN 60 DAYS" and inserting
immediately

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls upon the majority leader with respect to amendment 05070, and it has been filed.

Yes, thank you.

Leader, any comment on the technical amendment, sir?

Mr. **CUTLER**. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

This simply clarifies that the original bill would be effective in 60 days, the underlying provisions regarding the businesses would be effective immediately. I would urge the members' support. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Longiotti is recognized on the technical amendment, 05070, and you may proceed, sir.

Mr. **LONGIETTI**. Would the gentleman stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Leader? Yes.

You may proceed, sir.

Mr. **LONGIETTI**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am just trying to clarify the substance of the amendment. We had a virtual caucus. There seemed to be some conflicting information about what this amendment actually does. I heard a little bit of what the gentleman had to say, but I am trying to understand: is it 60 days, is it not 60 days, what are we looking at?

Mr. **CUTLER**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, for the members' clarification, I will read directly from the bill. It would be on page 11, lines 14 through 18, subsection (1) says, "Amendment of sections 225 and 226..., the act shall take effect in 60 days."

Starting on line 17, "The remainder of this act shall take effect immediately."

Mr. **LONGIETTI**. Okay. So just as a point of further clarification, so does that mean that businesses would not be able to open for at least 60 days?

Mr. **CUTLER**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may?

The SPEAKER. Yes. You may proceed.

Mr. **CUTLER**. The "60 days" provision was in regards to the original underlying bill. While the bill says that the businesses would be open immediately, obviously, this bill needs to continue through the rest of the legislative process. Should it pass this chamber today, it will return to the Senate. The Senate will have time to act, as well as the Governor will have up to 10 days to make a decision on whether to sign, veto, or allow the bill to lapse into law.

Whenever one of those issues occurs, whether it lapses into law or is signed at the end of 10 days, it would be immediately at the cessation of that 10-day window or whenever the Governor signs it, should he do it sooner.

Mr. LONGIETTI. I am honestly confused, Mr. Speaker. So the only way I think I can try to discern an answer is to use a hypothetical. So if it were passed by the House today and if the Senate were to pass it tomorrow and the Governor were to sign it into law immediately, does that mean from the signing by the Governor that it would be 60 days before a business could open?

The SPEAKER. Leader, you may proceed.

Mr. CUTLER. Mr. Speaker, no. I believe the gentleman is confused with the underlying provisions of the bill. The "60 days" provision refers to the original components of 613. The immediate opening would be upon the effective or effectuation of the bill at the conclusion of the legislative process, whenever that is. We routinely, as a matter of legislative practice, will pass bills that have immediate, 30, 60, 90, or even 120 or 180 days sometimes contained in them, but that does not go into effect until such time the bill is signed or it lapses into law, which has happened on occasion.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I think it is worth pointing out that it would initiate the beginning of the process that is outlined for the business provisions. It would not immediately happen. The bill and its underlying language directs the Governor, according to the CISA list and the CDC requirements, to open businesses consistent with that. I am sure we will get into that broader debate on SB 613 at that time. But the technical amendment, as was discussed, is bifurcated in terms of its effective date in that way.

And I do need to correct for the record, it is not section 228, it was 226. I apologize.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe I understand then that the original bill would have a 60-day effective date, but the provisions relating to businesses and CISA would be immediately.

Somebody, if that is incorrect, then I certainly would invite an answer to that.

The SPEAKER. Leader.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For the matter of record and to be clear, this was an LRB-initiated request because of the order in which these different components appeared in the bill. We took that under advisement, and we offered it accordingly. Thank you.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Yes, you may.

The Democratic leader, Representative Frank Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker. I urge our members to oppose this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip, on this amendment, 05070.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The board is correct, 107 majority voted "yes" and 1 "no." Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Jordan Harris, the Democratic whip, on this vote on 05070.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that is a unanimous "no" vote from the Democratic Party. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you very much, sir.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—108

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

NAYS—94

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Mako

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 third consideration as amended?

The SPEAKER. We do have three amendments that would need a suspension motion, because this is third consideration and they are substantive amendments. Two are offered by Representative Bradford, 04993, 04997, and one by Representative Harris, 0500. We will call up Representative Harris' first, 0500.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. **HARRIS** offered the following amendment No. **A05000**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 27, by inserting after "BUSINESSES" and for COVID-19 hazardous duty work

Amend Bill, page 10, line 13, by striking out "AN ARTICLE" and inserting articles

Amend Bill, page 11, by inserting between lines 13 and 14

ARTICLE XXI-D

COVID-19 HAZARDOUS DUTY WORK

Section 2102-D. Work-related hazardous duty.

(a) Presumption of work-related hazardous duty.—

Notwithstanding any other provision of this act or any other law or regulation to the contrary, an individual employed by a life-sustaining business or occupation who contracts, has symptoms of or is otherwise exposed to an infectious disease, including COVID-19 (coronavirus) or any other novel virus or infectious disease during the declaration of a disaster emergency under 35 Pa.C.S. § 7301 (relating to general authority of Governor), the declaration of an epidemic or a public health emergency in this Commonwealth by the Governor or a pandemic, which results in a period of hospitalization, quarantine, isolation or other control measures due to such infection or exposure, shall establish a presumption that the individual's medical condition or inability to work is work-related hazardous duty.

(b) Hazardous duty deemed on-duty time.—An individual with an established presumption of work-related hazardous duty under subsection (a) may not be required to use sick time, vacation time, personal time or any other accrued paid time off or contractual time off to cover the period of incapacitation or inability to work.

(c) Eligibility and qualification; unemployment and workers' compensation.—

(1) Notwithstanding any provision of the act of December 5, 1936 (2nd Sp.Sess., 1937 P.L.2897, No.1), known as the Unemployment Compensation Law, an individual with an established presumption of work-related hazardous duty under subsection (a) shall be eligible and qualified for unemployment compensation for the duration of the period of incapacitation or inability to work.

(2) Notwithstanding any provision of the act of June 2, 1915 (P.L.736, No.338), known as the Workers' Compensation Act, an individual with an established presumption of work-

related hazardous duty under subsection (a) shall be eligible and qualified for workers' compensation for all medical costs related to such infection or exposure.

(d) Applicability.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), this section shall apply to individuals who work for a non-life-sustaining business or occupation that receives a waiver from the Department of Community and Economic Development authorizing the non-life-sustaining business or occupation to continue business operations during the period of time that a declaration of a disaster or public health emergency is effective.

Section 2102-D. Definitions.

For the purpose of this section, the following words and phrases when used in this section shall have the meanings given to them in this subsection, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

"COVID-19." The term shall have the meaning given to it in section 2101-C(d).

"Infectious disease." A disease which is caused by a microorganism, such as a bacterium, virus, or protozoan, which is not normally found in the human body, and which is capable of causing infection. Some, but not all, infectious diseases are contagious, meaning they can spread from person to person, including COVID-19 or the coronavirus. Other infectious diseases can spread from animals or insects to humans, but not from person to person.

"Life-sustaining business or occupation." A list of businesses or occupations, as designated by the Governor, which performs or conducts a range of vital operations, functions and services that are essential to assisting the Commonwealth and its political subdivisions in protecting people and their communities while ensuring continuity of functions critical and essential to public health and safety, as well as economic and homeland security, and which should continue normal operations, appropriately modified to account for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Department of Health workforce and customer protection guidance, during the declaration of a disaster or public health emergency.

"Public health emergency." An emergency declaration by the Governor of an occurrence or imminent threat of a disease or condition of critical public health importance with the following characteristics:

(1) Is believed to be caused by any of the following:

- (i) the emergence and spread of a novel or previously controlled or eradicated infectious disease; or
- (ii) an infectious disease epidemic in this Commonwealth or a pandemic.

(2) Poses a high probability of any of the following in the affected population:

- (i) Death.
- (ii) Serious or long-term disabilities.
- (iii) Widespread exposure to an infectious disease, which poses a significant risk of substantial present or future harm to the public health and safety.

"Individual employed by a life-sustaining business or occupation." Front-line employees and other individuals employed by or under contract with a life-sustaining business or entity who work during the declaration of a disaster emergency or a public health emergency. The term shall include, but not limited to:

(1) First responders, including law enforcement officers, firefighters, emergency medical technicians and other individuals who are considered to be first responders.

(2) Corrections officers.

(3) Emergency services dispatchers.

(4) Ambulance drivers.

(5) Retail workers, including restaurant, food services and grocery store workers, cashiers and other support staff.

(6) Food and agriculture workers.

(7) Medical, health care and public health workers, including doctors, nursing professionals, physician assistants and paramedics, and other support staff.

(8) Pharmacists and any cashiers and other pharmacy support staff.

- (9) Home healthcare workers.
- (10) Public utility workers, including workers engaged in providing telecommunications, energy, water and wastewater services and public works.
- (11) Any employee of State or local government.
- (12) Trash collectors.
- (13) Warehouse workers.
- (14) Any other individual employed by a life-sustaining business or occupation who is required to work during the declaration of a disaster emergency or public health emergency.

Amend Bill, page 11, line 15, by striking out "ARTICLE XXI-C" and inserting
Articles XXI-C and XXI-D

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

The SPEAKER. So we would have a motion to suspend.
Keep in mind that this is not on the underlying amendment. That discussion would occur if there is a suspension by this body, which requires a two-thirds vote, which is 135 votes – 136 votes; I will get it right. I forgot we just swore in 3 new members, so our number for two-thirds has increased to 136.

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

The SPEAKER. Representative Harris, do you want to do a motion to suspend, sir? You do not need to. It is up to you.

Okay. You may proceed, sir.
Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer a motion to suspend the rules for the immediate consideration of amendment 05000 to SB 613. Thank you.

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

The SPEAKER. Do you wish any comments on the motion to suspend?

Mr. HARRIS. It is extremely important that we take up this amendment to look at hazard pay for all of our folks who are out there working right now with regards to COVID-19. So I think it is prudent for this body to suspend the rules so we can take up this very important amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.
And the majority whip, Representative Kerry Benninghoff, on the motion to suspend.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
I would ask our members to respectfully vote "no" on this. These issues will be taken up in subsequent bills by the legislature. Thank you.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. To the majority whip first, on the vote, on the motion to suspend.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
The board does reflect the vote of the majority party. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. And the minority whip, Representative Jordan Harris, on the vote.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. Speaker, the electronic board is accurate.
The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—92

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

NAYS—110

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Mako

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

On the question recurring,

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Bradford offers amendment 04993. It is a late-filed amendment.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. **BRADFORD** offered the following amendment No. **A04993**:

Amend Bill, page 11, line 2, by inserting after "(CISA)." Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the plan shall

include, at a minimum, all of the following protections for an essential employee:

(1) The minimum wage for an essential employee shall be \$15 per hour.

(2) All essential employees shall be entitled to additional hazard pay, relative to the employee's risk of exposure.

(3) All essential employees shall be provided appropriate new personal protective equipment at the start of every shift. Personal protective equipment shall include, but not be limited to, gloves and a mask.

(4) All essential employees shall work in a manner, and businesses shall provide an environment, that maximizes the safety of an employee and the public, including, but not limited to, the use of social distancing and barriers.

(5) All essential employees shall be provided employee cleaning areas with adequate soap and water and breaks to frequently engage in hand washing.

(6) All essential employees shall have access to hand sanitizer between hand-washing breaks.

(7) All essential employees shall be granted leave for sickness and shall be compensated at the same rate.

(8) All essential employees shall be informed by the employer if a coworker has been tested for COVID-19 and the results of those tests when available.

Amend Bill, page 11, line 5, by inserting after

"COMMONWEALTH."

A business operating in this Commonwealth that violates any requirement of the mitigation plan shall be immediately closed and may not be permitted to reopen until the business is in compliance.

(c.1) Applicability.—The contraction of the COVID-19 virus by an essential employee shall be considered a personal injury to the employee under the act of June 2, 1915 (P.L.736, No.338), known as the Workers' Compensation Act. The fact that the essential employee contracted the COVID-19 virus shall establish a presumption that the injury arose in the course of the employee's employment within the meaning of the Workers' Compensation Act. The presumption shall not be conclusive but may be rebutted if the employer establishes that the employee contracted the COVID-19 virus prior to any job-related exposure.

Amend Bill, page 11, by inserting between lines 13 and 14

"Essential employee." An employee of a business who is required by the employee's employer to report to work at a physical location.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

The SPEAKER. Representative Bradford is going to be making a motion to suspend.

You may proceed, sir.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With the technical amendment that we just recently saw, we now realize that essential employees could be put in the frontlines within just hours of signature of such bill that is in front of us. It is imperative if we are worried about our businesses, that we also be worried about the workers whom they employ. They are our frontline in this war that we are fighting.

The majority whip said that these worker protections will be brought up in subsequent bills. I know he is a man of his word and I look forward to having a debate so that all workers will receive workers' comp, because whether you make \$9 at the grocery store, \$95,000 as one of our great law enforcement officers, every employee who is in the frontlines of this battle should receive workers' comp if they fall in that battle providing for Pennsylvania.

I would ask for a suspension of the rules to provide for our frontline employees, because we cannot have a strong business climate if we do not have strong workers and strong consumers and a strong Pennsylvania.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls upon the majority leader, on the motion to suspend.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would respectfully urge the members to oppose the suspension of the rules and would simply point out, as answered during the Q&A regarding the technical amendment, that the immediacy is in the start of the process for the CDC and the CISA requirements, not significant in terms of the actual signature, because that merely starts the process. That is what is immediate. I am sure that the Governor will take some time to become consistent with those guidelines, and while I understand the gentleman's passion, I respectfully urge a "no" vote at this time.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls upon the majority whip.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The board does reflect the vote of the majority party. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. And the Chair calls upon the minority whip, with respect to the motion to suspend.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, gentlemen.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—92

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

NAYS—110

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Mako

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

On the question recurring,

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Bradford offers amendment 04997. It requires a suspension motion. But please read a summary of the amendment.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. **BRADFORD** offered the following amendment No. **A04997**:

Amend Bill, page 11, line 2, by inserting after "(CISA),"
Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the plan shall include, at a minimum, all of the following protections for an essential employee:

(1) The minimum wage for an essential employee shall be \$15 per hour.

(2) All essential employees shall be entitled to additional hazard pay, relative to the employee's risk of exposure.

(3) All essential employees shall be provided appropriate new personal protective equipment at the start of every shift. Personal protective equipment shall include, but not be limited to, gloves and a mask.

(4) All essential employees shall work in a manner, and businesses shall provide an environment, that maximizes the safety of an employee and the public, including, but not limited to, the use of social distancing and barriers.

(5) All essential employees shall be provided employee cleaning areas with adequate soap and water and breaks to frequently engage in hand washing.

(6) All essential employees shall have access to hand sanitizer between hand-washing breaks.

(7) All essential employees shall be granted leave for sickness and shall be compensated at the same rate.

(8) All essential employees shall be informed by the employer if a coworker has been tested for COVID-19 and the results of those tests when available.

Amend Bill, page 11, line 5, by inserting after "COMMONWEALTH,"

A business operating in this Commonwealth that violates any requirement of the mitigation plan shall be immediately closed and may not be permitted to reopen until the business is in compliance.

Amend Bill, page 11, by inserting between lines 13 and 14 "Essential employee." An employee of a business who is required by the employee's employer to report to work at a physical location.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

The SPEAKER. At this time the Chair calls upon Representative Bradford, on the motion to suspend.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Speaker.

And again, I rise for a suspension because if these workers are on the frontlines, then maybe hazard pay or maybe the availability of PPE (personal protective equipment) or hand sanitizer or sick leave, maybe they are the ammunition that they need to fight this battle.

We once went to war not that long ago and we said that our soldiers went to battle with the armor we had available. We all know that that was a tragic mistake for our heroes in uniform, some of whom are our colleagues today. We promised ourselves

we would never make that mistake again. Today we are fighting on the homeland a contagion, and we should make sure that our workers, our frontline fighters, have the protection they need.

I would also say, based on the response of the majority leader to the last suspension, it is a process. This is the beginning of a process that is urgent; a process that, if the members of the majority have their way, will get zoomed over to the Senate, and with virtual voting, they can pass it, as they claim they will in short order, and it will go to the Governor. And you are right, it is a process. He has 7 days, 7 days to come up with a PPE that our medical workers do not already have.

I do not know what the gentleman is talking about a process. What you are seeing in this chaotic political process is something that should not make Pennsylvania's workers very comfortable—

The SPEAKER. Please suspend. Please suspend.

Mr. BRADFORD. —with the process to protect them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The SPEAKER. And at this time the majority leader.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, I understand and appreciate the gentleman's passion. I would simply remind the members that we did, in fact, begin to address that process for PPE for workers. That is why we worked to appropriate \$50 million in an emergency fund. I am sure that that process will be ongoing. I had a personal conversation with the Governor earlier today regarding the PPE and the ventilator situation as well, and that has been a challenging process because of the intervention of FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) and some of the other resources that are needed all across the State.

It is a process, the gentleman is right. Part of the legislative process is having bills and amendments prepared in order to move them. I would urge a "no" vote in order to continue this bill through that process to the Senate for their consideration and to see what amendments that they may or may not offer as well.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. For the second time, on the motion to suspend.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Speaker.

Just to correct the record, the gentleman is right, in a bipartisan fashion this body came together to appropriate \$50 million for our frontline medical workers. They are essential and we appropriately protected them.

Today this body wants to put more workers at the frontline. They want to put golf courses and essential businesses—

The SPEAKER. Please suspend.

Mr. BRADFORD. Sir, I believe that is in the CISA—

The SPEAKER. Sir, but we are only on a motion to suspend.

When we are on the bill, you will be able to make any argument on the bill itself. The only thing in front of us is the motion to suspend. That is it.

Mr. BRADFORD. And we should suspend because new workers, whom I cannot name, but they will be put on the frontlines and we have not appropriated \$50 million for them. So let us suspend the rules and protect the very workers that you would throw into the way of this pandemic.

The SPEAKER. At this time we will vote on the motion to suspend.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip is recognized.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The board does reflect the vote of the majority party. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. And the minority whip, please.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—92

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

NAYS—110

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Mako

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

The SPEAKER. There are no further motions to suspend.

On the question recurring,

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

Bill as amended 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?

Go ahead, I am sorry, Representative Longietti wants to be recognized.

Hold on just a second, sir. I am just going to see who all wants to be recognized: Representative Dawn Keefer, the majority leader, Representative Kosierowski, Representative Otten— Oh, please hold on one second. I apologize to all the members.

BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. I apologize. We are going to go over SB 613 just briefly here. My apologies.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls upon the majority Appropriations chair, Representative Stan Saylor, for a committee announcement.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Appropriations Committee will meet immediately in the majority caucus room, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. So we are going to stand at ease while the majority Appropriations chair has just announced that there is going to be an immediate meeting of the Appropriations Committee in the majority caucus room.

The House will come to order. Members, I see the Appropriations members are starting to return to the floor.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 613 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. I have Representative Otten, Representative Longietti, and Representative Kosierowski listed; I have Representative Dawn Keefer. Obviously, we will have the majority leader, and if the Democratic leader wishes to speak as well.

Does anybody else wish to speak on SB 613?

Okay. We will start then – Representative Williams. Yes. Thank you very much.

Representative Keefer, if you will come up to the well of the House.

What I am going to do is I will go back and forth, those in favor and those opposed, and we will start with Representative Dawn Keefer.

We are calling up SB 613. Please proceed.

Mrs. KEEFER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me start by saying that my heart goes out to all those who are directly battling this virus – those individuals and communities infected, families that have suffered a loss, and all of our first responders and health-care workers who daily report to the frontlines to fight the virus on our behalf. Further, I am truly grateful for the sacrifices being made by so many in an effort to mitigate the impact of the virus so that our health systems do not get overwhelmed.

My day-to-day frustrations are extensive, but the humanitarian responses that I have witnessed from our community businesses and resourceful entrepreneurs have been inspiring. Despite the challenges leveled against our small businesses, they continue to innovate, engage, and contribute to the welfare of their communities.

Mr. Speaker, my drive for this issue stems from a call I received on the Friday after non-life-sustaining businesses were abruptly ordered to close, with less than 4 hours' notice. I spent nearly an hour on the phone with just one small business owner who was contemplating suicide. Where are my employees – what are my employees supposed to do? he asked. How am I supposed to go home and tell my family I can no longer feed them? I do not qualify for unemployment compensation. How can the government do this to me?

There are no standards in the current waiver system. I have a constituent who works in a hospital who had totaled her car in early March. Her car rental benefits expired 2 weeks ago. She has a check from the insurance company, but she cannot buy a car in Pennsylvania. Understand that my district is suburban and rural. On average, my constituents must drive 7 miles just to access public transportation. What are they supposed to do? I have a woman who works for a bank and is deemed an essential employee. She must continue to live with her vulnerable in-laws as she did not yet have an occupancy permit for her home that is being built and the contractors are neither permitted to install the final electrical line nor hook up the septic without a waiver.

As my contractors and would-be homeowners continue to chant, "You can't shelter in place if you don't have shelter." I am able to purchase vegetable plants at Lowes and Home Depot, but for almost a month my local garden center was not permitted to conduct any type of sales and had been denied waivers for delivery or curbside pickup.

Construction of a warehouse for Chewy in my district was shut down and the contracted construction company has been denied a waiver, despite Chewy being deemed a life-sustaining business, and yet construction for a casino project in Philadelphia was deemed life-sustaining and received a waiver.

Two identical general contractors in my district applied for waivers with near identical applications. One was awarded a waiver and the other denied, with no rationale from the administration despite numerous requests. Several car dealerships were awarded waivers initially to sell vehicles, only to have them rescinded a week later by the Governor, after the inequity of the decision was challenged by the General Assembly.

My local one-man bicycle shop is forbidden to sell bicycles. He is only permitted to repair them right now, but I can purchase a bicycle at Walmart, Target, or any other retail stores permitted to continue operations.

So I question, Mr. Speaker, how is this about safety? The daily number of customers frequenting these small businesses are far less than the big-box retail chains permitted to continue operations by the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I, like my colleagues, could go on and on with similar stories. Unlike some members, I do not have a direct conduit into the administration's office approving waiver requests and answering questions, so I have gone weeks with no answers for some constituents and no acknowledgement of waiver status for others. At the end of the day, it appears this administration has sided with corporate America, allowing continued operation of big-box retail and corporate construction at the expense of our local community businesses.

My amendment to SB 613 simply requires the Governor to utilize the Essential Critical Infrastructure Workforce advisory list developed by the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency of the United States Department of Homeland Security when determining whether a business is life-sustaining during emergency disaster declarations.

Mr. Speaker, the current process put in place by the administration for the closure of non-life-sustaining businesses has been chaotic and confusing at best.

Let us start with the release of the administration's initial Industry Operations Guidance. The list failed to take supply chain businesses into consideration. My colleagues and I spent countless hours fighting to open businesses in the direct supply chain for businesses identified by the administration as life-sustaining; truly a wasteful use of our time and the administration's, given the demands of our current crisis.

I have been asked, or we have been asking for the metrics by which life-sustaining and non-life-sustaining determinations are being made with no response from the administration. Requests for the list of waivers, granted and denied, were denied by the administration, yet they were able to upload that list into the State Police electronic JNET (Justice Network) system so law enforcement are more easily able to penalize noncompliant businesses.

The General Assembly has made request after request to the Governor for a plan, with no response. Despite our efforts, the Governor's communication with the General Assembly has been minimal and his collaboration nonexistent. The Governor renders unilateral decisions and levies orders in a vacuum, leaving legislators to aid desperate Pennsylvanians, while his public phone lines go unanswered.

The lack of transparency, clarity, and consistency with the Governor's business closure order is unacceptable and is crippling our small businesses that have served as the backbone of our communities for generations. Requiring the utilization of nationally recognized metrics for life-sustaining businesses simply establishes desperately needed standards and should serve as a foundation of any government plan that dares to dictate business operations. But that has been the problem since the onset of this entire crisis – the lack of a plan. Managing in the moment and the current approach of "one day at a time" is not a plan. "Wait and see" is not a plan. It has been almost 30 days since the Governor's business closure order, and he is still making substantial changes and clarifications to the life-sustaining industry guidelines. This crisis will be over and there will still

continue to be changes and no consistent understanding of what constitutes a life-sustaining business.

I have heard the audacious argument that passing this bill puts profits over people. But let us be clear, that is what the Governor's current business closure process is doing, putting big-box retail and large corporate construction operations over the welfare and livelihood of our hometown communities by suffocating the generational small businesses on which they depend. Make no mistake, if we continue down this unplanned path, we will most certainly face a much larger catastrophe than we face now. More than 1.4 million Pennsylvanians are without jobs and it will not be long before they reach the end of their financial ropes. What will they do to support their families? What would any of us here do to support our families? The long-term systemic impacts of poverty will far exceed the impacts of COVID-19. We should all be concerned about the approach that is being taken where we are swapping one crisis for another.

Putting all businesses on equal footing within their industry, as well as with all of our bordering States, who, by the way, allow some form of car sales, real estate transactions, and construction, is about equity and consistency. This legislation supports workers and protects the health of our citizens. These should not be mutually exclusive objectives.

Misrepresenting the intent of this legislation with propaganda about profits is absolutely shameful.

Time and again, Mr. Speaker, the Governor's actions contradict his proclaimed mission of ensuring safety and controlling disease spread. At a time when the Governor is ordering all Pennsylvanians to hunker down and stay at home and shuttering our businesses, he is releasing State prison inmates into a world he says is too unsafe for law-abiding people to work in.

It is time to put a stop to the Governor's shoot-from-the-hip crisis governing approach. We need a better plan and we need a better plan today. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in laying the foundation of that plan and vote "yes" for SB 613.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Longietti.

Representative Neilson, do you wish to be put on the list?

Mr. NEILSON. Yes, sir.

The text still is not on the computer, Mr. Speaker. I thought you might want to know that.

The SPEAKER. Yes, please.

Mr. NEILSON. Representative Samuelson always seems to point that out, but he is working at home today, so I thought I would do my duty to let you know that the text is still not on the screen.

The SPEAKER. It is up, sir. Representative Neilson, it should be on. Do you want to check your computer screen? Will you just check your computer screen to see if you have it? Okay. Thank you.

Representative Longietti, just give me a moment and I apologize.

So at this time I am going to call on Representative Longietti. Then I have Representative Rothman, and then Representative Kosierowski, and then Representative Otten, Representative Davidson, Representative Williams, Representative Bradford, Representative Harris, and then the Democratic leader and then the majority leader. Representative Hohenstein, yes, sir. And then, Representative Neilson, you as well? Okay. So Representative Hohenstein and Representative Neilson, I will make sure to have you on the list. The last two on the Democratic

side will be the whip and the leader. And Representative DeLissio? Yes. Thank you.

So, folks, I think I have everybody at this time. We are going to proceed with Representative Longietti. If any others do wish to speak, just get my attention; I will make sure.

And, Representative Longietti, you may proceed.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, none of us want to see businesses closed and large sectors of our economy shut down. This is particularly true of small businesses, which are the lifeblood of our local communities and which are least able to weather this storm. I have spoken with small business owners in my community, and it is truly heartbreaking to hear their concern in their voices about the future. But that is a circumstance that requires a Federal response. The Federal Small Business Administration loans and forgivable loans are helpful, but more needs to be done to sustain small businesses which are facing tragic circumstances through no fault of their own.

We can all find fault with a classification of essential and nonessential businesses in the waiver process. Anything new like this will have flaws, especially when it is done quickly in a time of crisis. There are things that I would do differently if it were my decision, particularly with the benefit of hindsight. While we would all like to see all businesses reopened and the economy restarted, it is simply premature to move in that direction. While well-intentioned, this measure goes too far. It would risk all of the sacrifice and the pain endured to date and would likely lead to a prolonging of a misery. We cannot allow the virus to wreak vengeance on us due to our lack of resolve.

A week ago Sunday, I listened to Nobel Prize-winning economist Paul Krugman answer the question about whether to reopen businesses now. In response, he said that there is a huge danger if we reopen too soon. He also said, and I quote, "Everybody wants a return to the life we had. But trying to do that prematurely is a recipe not just for a lot more people dying but also a recipe for...a much longer economic slump." You see, making the right decision for public health is also making the right decision for the economy, and this measure is the wrong decision for both. As Krugman put it, better to err on the side of staying shut down longer than to err on the side of starting up too soon.

I hope that we do not experiment on the wrong side of that equation, as history and our fellow citizens will judge us harshly. Krugman also recounted the lessons of the great influenza pandemic of 1918. Back then, similar social distancing and mitigation measures were taken but decisions were largely made by cities. He said that the cities that used more of these measures and that stuck with it longer not only had lower death rates but they actually did better economically. We need to pay attention to that history now.

Finally, Krugman said that now is not the time to worry about gross domestic product and dollars. We can address those problems through disaster relief and aid to workers and businesses at the Federal level. Our focus needs to be on meeting the public health crisis. This measure fails to adequately meet that crisis.

So I will vote "no" on this measure, but not, not with any sense of joy or elation because I want to see businesses reopen and I want to have the economy restarted, but I also know that we must first stop the deadly virus in its tracks. And here is the ultimate irony, Mr. Speaker: There are lawmakers who will not come to the Capitol or to this floor due to concerns over the

coronavirus but who would vote by proxy to force workers to return to nonessential businesses before the deadly virus is contained. That is not fair, that is not right, and we deserve to be safe.

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

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative.

Representative Greg Rothman.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, we do not need to choose between lives and livelihood. We do not need to choose between a healthy community and a healthy economy. We do not need to choose between money and lives or profit over people.

I trust the people of Pennsylvania. I trust them to protect themselves, their loved ones, their family, their neighbors.

I trust the businesses of Pennsylvania to protect their employees, their associates, their clients, their customers, and their supply chains.

The list that the Governor put out at first was flawed and illogical. If you remember, hotels and laundromats were on the list to be closed. A little close to 7 hours later, hotels and laundromats were put back on. And to be clear, there was no waiver process in place when the list first came out. It was as a result of calls from members of this General Assembly that the Governor and the administration decided to create a waiver process—a waiver process that is clearly capricious and arbitrary.

Mr. Speaker, I have businesses in my district, competitors, one granted a waiver, one denied a waiver. In fact, we have learned stories this week about businesses that accidentally hit the waiver process question button twice and received both a waiver and a denial. Mr. Speaker, we have stories of politically connected donor companies receiving waivers, while as the gentlelady from York County said, Main Street Pennsylvania denied; some that are completely illogical, some that are soul-crushing.

There is a national company, Carvana, that is advertising with our local television companies that you can buy their car and have it delivered to your house and test drive it for 7 days, and if you do not like it, return it. Meanwhile, the auto dealerships in our State are closed for business.

Mr. Speaker, who decides what is life sustaining? Who decides what is essential and nonessential? Can you imagine spending your entire life in a career and vocation, paying your taxes to this Commonwealth, contributing to charities, doing a service or providing a product or a good or helping your customers, to be told that what you do is not essential?

Mr. Speaker, someone smarter than me said every job is life-sustaining, and this morning I heard a doctor who said physicians do not just treat the body, they treat the body, mind and spirit. A job, a job is about how you feel, and right now we have created a situation in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania where people are feeling hopeless. Let them open, let them do it safely, let them follow all the protocols that the CDC and even our Department of Health has suggested. Let them stay 6 feet for social distance or 13 feet. Let them clean and wash their hands and social distance.

Mr. Speaker, we are still a government of, for, and by the people. We get our ability to govern from the consent of the governed. We do not have a king. We are not governed from on high. We are governed from the people up. And we are losing the faith of the people of this State because they see the inconsistencies, they see the capricious and arbitrary manner. Mr. Speaker, the Governor's family business is allowed to stay open while your family businesses are closed.

Mr. Speaker, I have faith in the people of Pennsylvania. Our ancestors came here to escape religious persecution. Our forefathers declared independence from the monarchy just 100 miles from here in Philadelphia. Our mines and mills, our plants and our farms have built America and continue to feed her. Our relatives fought and died for the cause of freedom in Gettysburg, and as recently as the beginning of this century, passengers on Flight 93 risked their lives to protect the ideals of freedom and liberty.

We will defeat this pandemic. But let us do it on our terms. Let us not make the cure worse than the disease. Doing nothing is not an option. Let our people innovate, let them adapt, and let them overcome. Wash your hands, social distance, stay home, work from home, but let the people be free to do their jobs and run their lives. Have faith in the people of Pennsylvania. I sure do.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kosierowski.

Mrs. KOSIEROWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to share with you our Secretary of Health's thoughts on SB 613, Dr. Rachel Levine:

"Members of the General Assembly:

"I write today to alert you about the devastating impact... SB 613 would have on the public health of Pennsylvanians. There is no doubt that this legislation would lead to more Pennsylvanians infected with COVID-19, as it undermines the integrity and effectiveness of the Commonwealth's collective response to this novel coronavirus. The health and safety of the public is our deepest and most serious responsibility as public servants. With respect, and with that responsibility in mind, I urge you and your colleagues to consider the impact SB 613 will have on the pandemic response and associated loss of human life.

"The peak of COVID-19 cases has not yet been reached in this Commonwealth. The healthcare system has not yet been tested. The next few weeks are expected to be very difficult for all Pennsylvanians – for essential employees, for families, for older Pennsylvanians, for business owners and for healthcare workers. The only way to shorten the length of time we need to weather these conditions is through aggressive social distancing. That is to say, in order to bend the curve and ensure we can adequately and equitably care for our friends and neighbors during this pandemic, people need to stay home.

"Encouraging increased social movement of Pennsylvanians at this time by reopening a significant amount of businesses would be reckless and irresponsible. Since Senate Bill 613 mandates the Commonwealth conform to the March 28th United States Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) advisory memorandum, a significant amount of businesses would likely reopen. In fact, there are very few industries outside of retail (which would also see large exemptions) that wouldn't be able to make an argument that they could open under this legislation. While the Governor and I are as eager as anyone to begin getting people back to work, doing so prematurely will only increase the spread of the virus, further lengthening associated economic challenges, while also placing more lives at risk.

"As the Governor has said, these are unprecedented times, with no easy choices. The decision to shutter non-life sustaining businesses that support families across this Commonwealth was a painful one, but before we can save livelihoods, we need to save lives. I ask, therefore, in the best interest of the public health, that you do not support this proposal.

"I deeply appreciate your consideration and your dedication to your constituents through this crisis.

"Sincerely, Dr. Rachel Levine, Secretary of Health."

And in closing, I stand here before the House delegation today not only as a legislator whose sole focus is based solely on the health and safety of my constituents, but as a registered nurse for 26 years. I am advocating for the health and safety of our heroic health-care workers, my former colleagues who are at the front battle lines of this pandemic. I understand the health and economic hardships so many people face at this critical time. Health experts are insisting it is too soon at this time to reopen all businesses, as there is no certainty yet our hospitals are protected from a wave of patients. I feel compelled to err on the side of our health-care providers and emergency responders.

Again, at this moment in time, I much prefer a more guarded approach built on consensus that balances health outcome and economic outcome.

Seldom do members, such as myself, cast votes that result in life-and-death outcomes. I honestly believe a vote on SB 613 is such a life-or-death vote. Today I choose the cautious approach and I believe that it is the right choice. I ask for a "no" vote on SB 613. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Daryl Metcalfe.

Mr. METCALFE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am really kind of shocked from some of the responses I have heard from the other side of the aisle on this legislation that would move us in a better direction of enabling our citizens to get back to work, where they can afford to put bread on their table again and keep a roof over their head. I am shocked when I hear those responses from the other side of the aisle, because I just cannot believe they are not hearing some of the same heartbreaking stories that so many on my side of the aisle have shared, both here at the microphone and in personal conversations, during the course of the last few weeks – messages on Facebook, e-mails, calls to our offices. I know one of my colleagues was expressing earlier today the tears that were being shed by one of their staff members as a result of taking some of these heartbreaking stories, and my staff is in the same predicament. When I met with them yesterday before I traveled down to the Capitol, seeing the looks on my staff's faces, as they have been dealing with one call after another of people that are in situations that the virus has not put them, but that Wolf has put them, but that their government has put them. To tell them that they cannot go to work, to tell their employers that they cannot open their doors, this is a ludicrous position to stake out and one that the populace is not embracing as much as you want to try and fool yourselves to think that they are. People know that they have to work to eat. People know that they have to work to put clothes on their children's backs and food on the table. People know that they have to work in order to keep a residence, to keep a home, to keep a roof over their head.

I mean, some of the stories that have been shared today, with the arbitrary and capricious nature of this waiver process that was created, during a backlash for the thoughtless, callous disregard for human life when this Executive order was put out to shut down the economy in Pennsylvania as much as it has. People understand that they are supposed to keep social distance, people understand that they have to wash their hands, but people do not understand that they are not allowed to go to work to make enough money to eat. I got an e-mail from a single mom the other day who told me she had been working two jobs to provide for

her kids and herself. She has now lost both of them, and she is waiting on that Federal promise of money that is supposed to be coming in the checking account and some weeks or months later may be in the form of a check, if you do not have direct deposit.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Pennsylvania are hurting, the masses of Pennsylvania's population are hurting, and it is not because of the virus. They are not sick with the virus. They are sick and losing sleep at night because they do not know how they are going to make it through next week without an income, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have legislation before us today that would move our State in a better direction than what has been staked out by the Governor. It will move us in a better direction than would be staked out by this Northeastern gubernatorial compact that he seems to have entered, when he will not even talk to employers in the State that are trying to provide the necessary personal protection equipment that our health-care workers need that are switching their product lines over to produce that. He is not consulting with them or talking with them about these arbitrary and capricious decisions that he is making, one Executive order after another, that we see that are harming the people of Pennsylvania more than the virus. The majority of people recover from the virus. The majority of Pennsylvanians are not recovering from Wolf's dictate to shut down the ability for people to go to work, Mr. Speaker.

This legislation is needed. Actually, we need more than just this legislation. We need to make sure that we can chart a course for Pennsylvania that Pennsylvanians believed was already there. I do not think there is a business owner out there, whether they have been in business for a year or two, as I have heard from some folks back home that are really, really harmed in their business activities now, or if they have been out there for decades, as some of my businesses have been, there is not a business owner out there that would have ever believed that we, through our Constitution and our law, would have empowered one man to make such arbitrary and capricious decisions that would have the potential of destroying and collapsing our economy and damaging and harming so many lives of the citizens that we have been elected to represent.

Mr. Speaker, this is something that we can take action on today, that we can move in a better direction by passing this legislation today; that we can send the message loud and clear to this Governor that we stand with the people, that we want our citizens to be able to have that balance in life where they can get back to work, put bread on the table, keep a roof over their homes, keep a roof over their kids, over their families, and at the same time they can do what has been recommended to try and protect themselves and be safe and healthy, Mr. Speaker.

All of life needs to be balanced, and we are out of balance. The balances have tipped in the wrong direction. It is harming a lot of lives in Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker. We need to get that balance back. We need people to be able to balance their behavior to have safe and healthy activities with the ability to work and make sure that they can provide for their families and for themselves, Mr. Speaker.

I stand in support of SB 613.

The SPEAKER. Representative Otten.

Ms. OTTEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have been thinking a lot about my dad recently. He was killed in a motorcycle accident, on his way to take an overtime shift at work, at the young age of 47. I am not too far off from that time, and it blows my mind to think that he died so young. But

something that happened at his funeral is what really sits with me over the last few weeks. His funeral was filled with so many people that the line wrapped around the corner and down the street and they had to extend his viewing from 9 p.m. to 1 o'clock in the morning. My dad was the kind of person that paid attention to people, he noticed them. He was the guy that when somebody was going through a hard time, was planning a beef-and-beer, even though he did not drink. And one of the people that came up to us at his funeral, his name was Glen, introduced himself to us, and we knew who he was because my dad talked about him a lot. He was the toll booth worker at the Morgantown exit of the turnpike. My dad worked for the Philadelphia Inquirer. He was a machine operator on the presses at the newspaper. I at the time worked in the advertising department at the same newspaper, and every morning he would come home at 5 a.m. and he would bring the newspaper to Glen and they had that special relationship, and to this day, taking this job was the first time I got an E-ZPass, because he taught me that it was really important, that those people's jobs mattered and those people who do those jobs matter, and Glen showing up to say his final farewells to my dad really has sat with me for the last almost 20 years of my life.

Two weeks ago I was on nextdoor.com for some random reason and I saw a post from a local neighbor who was asking for local people to sew because our senior living community in West Brandywine Township, which houses over 500 seniors and has over 400 staff, has run out of personal protective equipment. As a primary caregiver for senior living and assisted living, that kept me up at night knowing that a case in a location like that could mean a lot of families who would be losing their grandmoms and grandpops and their nanas and their poppies and their opas that they love. So my staff began to organize local sewers in the community to try and get them up to speed and get them some local resources to protect their staff and to protect their residents, but we knew that it was only a matter of time.

In the meantime, on Facebook, on our neighborhood Facebook page, the news started blowing up of our local feed and farm owner, Jim. He was placed on a ventilator. I have gotten to know Jim over the years because I buy my pet food at his store, and his family is really nice and they have always been great to our family. But it really struck me how many people were checking in every single day to see how Jim was doing, how many lives in our community he had touched. Thankfully, Jim was taken off the ventilator this weekend and he is doing well and he is on his road to recovery.

But in our neighborhood, the mail has not been delivered recently. It has been 2 to 3 weeks of inconsistency. People are waiting for their unemployment PINs (personal identification numbers), so everybody has been checking the mail lately. One of my last stops before I started to stay home was at the post office, and one of the workers peaked through the window to wish me a good day when I was checking my P.O. box, and I noticed that the post office was closed, but I did not stop to know why. What I found out was that at least four of the postal workers at our local post office had been infected with COVID-19, and just this weekend one of my favorite postal workers at that location, his name was Jagdish, lost his life to COVID-19. And even though the post office is back to work, nobody is getting mail because if the workers go down, the business goes down.

And so yesterday on my staff call we got an update that – we knew that the time would eventually come – an elderly couple at that senior living facility that we were getting masks sewn for, two of them fell ill. One of them has lost their life to COVID-19.

And as I was looking on our county Web site to see if that had been registered yet, I noticed a very alarming number: 6 deaths out of 16 diagnoses in East Vincent Township, just next to my district. So I picked up my phone and I called my Senator and I said, "What's going on in East Vincent Township?" She advised me that the veterans home had been hit with COVID-19: 11 veterans have been diagnosed, 6 veterans are dead, and 14 of their caregivers are sick.

That does not take away the pain that people are feeling for the loss of their livelihood. I understand what it is like to be a small business owner in economic crisis. In 2008 my entire life came crashing down during the recession. I was a small business owner on Main Street. I was young, I was in my early thirties. I did not have much of a safety net to fall back on, and my business did not survive that time. I have been that small business owner.

I have lost both my livelihood and people that I love in my life. I can tell you one thing that is true: Losing everything is not losing your money. Losing everything is when you lose people you love. I have rebuilt my financial life. I have rebuilt my career. Here I stand in the Pennsylvania State House of Representatives. Life has never been the same for me since the day I lost my father, and if my dad taught me anything in his life, he taught me that people like Glen and Jagdish and those six veterans and their caregivers, they matter. He taught me that acknowledging them, respecting them, and protecting them is one of the most important things we can do in this life. I just want to remind everybody in this room that someone's mother, father, sister, brother, cousin, friend, spouse, is on the other side of each one of your buttons and tomorrow may never be the same for them. Please vote "no" on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Representative Valerie Gaydos.

Ms. GAYDOS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of SB 613, and I echo the sentiments of many of my colleagues who are up here representing, you know, the people who elect them. I know that my phone has been ringing off the hook with people wanting to get back to work. They recognize the risk. They care for their fellow man, but employees and employers across the Commonwealth found themselves scrambling to keep both their businesses and their personal lives afloat amidst the mitigation efforts which seemed to be more confusing, contradictory, and arbitrary than they were helpful. I understand that we are in unprecedented times, and I applaud our frontline workers and our staff, our staff here in the Capitol and even in the Governor's Office, trying to keep things afloat.

But we have problems here. Mr. Speaker, people want to work and they want their government to work for them and the government that promised to work for them. I have received calls and e-mails from people who, for example, a single mother who had filed for UC (unemployment compensation), and after checking back a week later, finding that the system never even captured her application and now she has to wait another week; then dispassionately told that, oh, it is 2 or 3 more weeks. This is somebody who cannot put food on the table.

I have another gentleman who was laid off from work and days later found out his child, age 18 months, was diagnosed with cancer, sitting in the ER wondering how he is going to pay his mortgage. Again, the UC office is not even answering the phones.

This is a government that has let people down. They have been thrust into this unemployment. They are begging to take care of themselves. They want to work and especially if they can work safely.

Despite stay-at-home orders, our First Lady, Frances Wolf, urged people to volunteer their time to help others while also following necessary safety precautions, and I think that is great. I think people who are in a position to help others and volunteer, they should, absolutely, but if they can do it safely, what about people who can safely work? They should be allowed to work, and I found that that was a very contradictory statement: let people work for free, but you cannot allow people to safely work for pay. If people can figure out a way to volunteer their time for free, they should be able to figure out how to volunteer or work for pay.

This pandemic is not going to go away abruptly. So we must work to find solutions now. We must find a balanced path to recovery. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on SB 613, because it develops and implements a plan while simultaneously allowing businesses to comply with that plan in the Commonwealth with guidelines.

This is about consistency, this is about predictability, and it is about recovery, which we need to start working on now.

This is a balanced approach, and I will be supporting SB 613.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Margo Davidson.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have asthma and seasonal allergies, which puts me at greater risk for respiratory infection. In fact, Mr. Speaker, 1.4 million Pennsylvanians have allergies and seasonal asthma. I have done a lot to stay safe, like staying in my home, wearing double gloves, wearing double masks, carrying around spray bottles, holding them up as a sign to ask people to stay 6 feet away from me at the supermarket. That is what I have done to be safe. That is what people in Pennsylvania are doing to be safe.

Twenty-five thousand people have tested positive with this condition, this deadly disease. That is six times more deadly than the flu, than anything that we have ever seen before. People are trying to stay safe.

Mr. Speaker, my mother was in a nursing home. I took her out so she could get specialized care at home, because even before this pandemic, nursing home workers were understaffed and having to take care of far too many patients for far too little money, and so patients are already at risk at our nursing homes. But now those workers and those patients are getting sick at alarming rates.

Eighty percent of the people that are hospitalized from this disease are 50 years old and older; 80 percent. Hospitalized COVID sufferers are at the severest levels and the greatest risk of death. What is SB 613 doing for those workers, doing for those asthma sufferers, doing for Pennsylvanians who are just trying to stay alive?

My mother now receives 24-hour care at home because of the severity of her condition. I have wept for her home health-care workers who I now have to pay for them to get back and forth to my mother's home, because they get paid so little, as the gentleman from Montgomery stated, that they cannot afford a car. But now those workers have to get on a bus, if there is a bus available, because bus workers are dying of the disease, and so in the southeast, bus routes have been slowed down because bus workers are dying. Bus workers are dying, home health-care aides are dying, nursing home workers are dying. People are dying: mothers, fathers, grandmothers, grandpas, uncles, aunties. At the rate of infection, almost everyone knows someone who knows someone who is suffering with this disease. But this bill, Mr. Speaker, will expose many more people to that virus.

As the delegation chair, I took the risk of coming here today with my allergies and with my asthma, putting myself on the frontlines for 35 Democratic members representing 2.1 million people in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in the hardest hit counties: Montgomery, Delaware, Bucks, Chester, Philadelphia. Mothers in nursing homes, allergy sufferers, asthma sufferers, nurses, aides, bus drivers, grocery store workers, on the frontlines of this pandemic, and what are we doing for them today? Forty-one percent of deaths are happening in the southeast of this Commonwealth, but the plague is not subject to boundaries and it is beginning to creep into less populated areas, which have less access to big hospitals and hospital beds at a time when the big hospitals are struggling to find more ICU (intensive care unit) beds to take care of patients. What does this bill do for them?

With all that is going on here, Mr. Speaker, why are we here? I am here to say no to death. I am here to limit the exposure to the worst pandemic that the world has seen since the Spanish flu in 1918 that killed 50 million people and 675,000 Americans when they failed to social distance, when they failed to take the time to do what was necessary to safeguard life. Mr. Speaker, this is our example of what can happen without mitigation and without the reduction of mitigation, being led solely by medical science.

Who among us, as legislators, are epidemiologists? Where are the epidemiologists in the room? What kind of arrogance and pride, I wonder, would cause someone to think that they know more about this silent killer than the people that have spent years, decades of training and experience studying this very thing? Decades of experience, decades of medical school. Decades. I would rather trust at least Dr. Levine, who said that if these businesses are relaxed in too quick a way, in a way that is random and not coordinated, then we will see a significant rise, not just a wave, but a tsunami of cases that will overwhelm our health-care system. If those businesses are relaxed in too quick a way, in a way that is random and not coordinated, we will see a significant rise, a tsunami.

Now is not the time to relent. Now is the time to say no to death. Businesses are suffering, yes; there is no question about that. People are struggling to put food on the table; there is no question about that. We also live in the greatest country on earth – few of you would question that – which has just released \$2 trillion, an unheard of sum, \$2 trillion passed by a bipartisan Congress, to relieve the suffering of business owners, of individuals, of people in the gig economy, and those dollars, Mr. Speaker, are just beginning to hit the street. This bill does not even allow those dollars to begin to work – \$2 trillion.

We need science to dictate how we preserve life and to stay imminent death. This bill does not rely on science. It relies on arbitrary deadlines: 60 days, 7 days, 10 days, 1 day after this or after that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close with a Scripture for those who are led by such edicts as am I: "No one is willing to die for another person, but for a good man someone might be willing to die." For those of you who believe in Scripture, what sacrifice are we making on behalf of our constituents? Are we sentencing them to go back to work to expose them to a silent killer that will surely wreak havoc on their lives when health-care workers are dying, when our seniors are dying, when our grocery store workers are dying, when our bus drivers are dying? Should they die for us, or will we do what is right in serving them? I vote today to serve them, Mr. Speaker. I vote today to preserve their lives. I sacrificed my life today to vote for their lives. I urge my colleagues today to protect them, their life, not just their

livelihood, which can be recouped. But once they die, they are dead. I say vote today, Mr. Speaker, I say vote "no" to death, and let us stop death in its tracks.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Cris Dush.

Representative Dush.

Mr. DUSH. I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I want to thank the two Representatives from Cumberland County for their comments about how we need to protect our fellow citizens through science and the use of the guidelines from the CDC and the level of trust that we have in our constituents to do the right thing and our business owners who are trying to take care of their own livelihoods, as well as their lives and the lives and livelihoods of the people who work for them.

Mr. Speaker, my father invested 30 years in helping people with disabilities, helping them find meaningful work. It was work he was proud of and all of us in his family are proud of still today. Meaningful work is important to all of us. There is something inside all of us that makes us want to be productive, to be contributors to society. It is especially meaningful to those in whom society often sees and has little faith that they can be productive in any way.

Goodwill Industries helps provide that meaningful work to so many of those people in the Commonwealth. The brightness in their eyes when they find themselves working and collecting that first check, it is amazing. Every one of us in this body should be fighting for these people and every worker in the Commonwealth. As Representatives, we should be advocating for them. So when one of us is able to effectively advocate for our constituents, that is what we do. But organizations like Goodwill should not be political pawns for our Governor's Office to selectively provide and withhold help.

Goodwill's corporate headquarters is in my district. They applied for a waiver for the donation dropoff locations around the State, because things which should never be dropped off at these locations were being left and the Goodwill team was facing a serious and growing health and safety problem. They were denied. They subsequently received word that one of their districts had been awarded a waiver by the Governor after the House minority leader had intervened on their behalf. Now, that is not to say that it is not something that the minority leader or any member of this body should be ashamed of. We should be advocating for our people. But it was not until I intervened and pointed out the appearance of impropriety or favoritism that the corporate office of Goodwill received notification that the waiver would be good now for all of the Goodwill collection points in the Commonwealth. While the Governor may have the ability to close a business for health concerns, what he cannot do is make arbitrary and capricious decisions about which businesses stay open and which must close.

The use of force is being applied here – force against the citizens of this Commonwealth. For that reason there must be written guidance that must be easily understandable and uniformly applied across the Commonwealth. That is not being done in the Commonwealth right now. We cannot stand idly by while the use of force against the people of Pennsylvania is being done in an arbitrary and capricious manner. This is just one example among many, some of which you have heard and probably will hear about from other members on the floor today.

This type of action never stays secret. This type of action hurts not only members of our disabled community who are trying to support themselves, but every Pennsylvanian who has had this

type of arbitrary and capricious action taken against their business and their employer. This type of action does not stand in the face of science that our CDC has put forth or the Federal government has put forth with the CISA guidelines. This type of action should never happen. This type of action needs to be called out and stopped, and that, Mr. Speaker, is why we are here at this moment, taking our actions to hold this and any other administration to account.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to speak. I stand here today proudly representing Chester County, specifically the 74th District in Chester County. I have here in my hand a letter that comes from the public health director there in Chester County and would ask your indulgence while I read this appeal that comes from our public health director. It simply says:

"Dear Chester County Legislative Delegation,

"I write to you today urging you to resist any and all attempts to lift the drastic COVID-19 mitigation measures by anyone other than Pennsylvania. This includes ceding authority to the Federal government.

"Chester County, and Southeast Pennsylvania, remains in the thick of battle with COVID-19. The drastic actions taken by the Governor to mitigate the spread of COVID-19, at our collective requests, are working. We are 'flattening the curve.' In order to keep the 'curve flat,' we must continue these drastic measures and only re-open when the time is right. The only people qualified to decide when the time is right to lift the COVID-19 mitigation measures for Chester County is Chester County, working with the Pennsylvania Department of Health, the Governor's Office, our municipalities, businesses, and you.

"Please defend our right to protect the health, safety, and welfare of our residents by retaining all authority and control to do so."

Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me that some of the smartest people in the world and in our Commonwealth, the ones that have expertise on these issues, are telling us to stay home and stay the course. I appreciate the respect that is given in this body for passion, and admittedly, that was the printed letter of our health director. The passion you hear now is my own. I am the husband of a nurse, the father of three, and what we have come to recognize by way of where we stand today is that in no small measure, by ignoring the advice of experts, some might agree we have come to this place. Ignoring the advice of experts and forcing people back to work now is a direct threat to our public health. It has already been quoted, Dr. Levine has said to us that if those business closures are relaxed in too quick a way, in a way that is random and not coordinated, then we will see a significant rise, not just a wave, but a tsunami of cases that will overwhelm our health-care system.

Now is the time for this body to heed the advice of the experts, now is the time for this body to be prudent and to protect the men and women of the Commonwealth, and now is the time to heed the voices of those muted and now unmuted experts who say this is not the time to go back to work.

For those reasons I stand with my colleagues to oppose SB 613. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Representative Eric Nelson.

Mr. NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today I rise to support the amendment that rests before each of us. I rise as a Representative of a district in Westmoreland

County, and today we have citizens in all of our counties that are unduly suffering as a result of our current situation.

I rise and stand for a husband and father in Latrobe who totaled their car during this shutdown and they were forced to drive across the border into Ohio to purchase a car. In order to get there, Mr. Speaker, they had to pass dozens of Pennsylvania dealerships which have been forced to close. Ohio is following the CDC guidelines, just like Pennsylvania could follow CDC guidelines. We have technology. We have processes and we have the means that our businesses can also supply a car for somebody who needs it.

I also rise today, Mr. Speaker, for the single person contractor who was told by State Police that he was not allowed to work on a home, a home that he is repairing for an individual who is trying to get home from the hospital and those repairs need to be complete in order for the person to get back into their home.

Today I rise, Mr. Speaker, for a constituent who has been fortunate to make it through our unemployment system, definitely overburdened with over 1,400,000 people. For 3 weeks now with his approved claim, he has not received one penny. He is not allowed to work. He has two kids and no way to legally provide for them. They are not a family that has deep pockets and can ride out for much longer, Mr. Speaker.

And then I also rise to represent one of our State's largest producers of asphalt with 1200 employees and only a handful of them left.

As we approach this construction season, Mr. Speaker, if we do not take reasonable measures to follow safe work guidelines, we are going to find ourselves behind an eight ball we will not be able to recover from, but yet this administration has approved other jobs and road construction projects in different areas of the State. These inconsistencies are substantially disturbing. Mr. Speaker, I hold two waivers for similar businesses. One waiver which is a denial comes from a business in Cambria County. The exact same wording of the exact application process was also submitted from a business type in Allegheny County. The Allegheny County says that it has been determined business operation above must remain open at this time. The Cambria County says that the identified above must remain closed. Same businesses, same application, two different counties.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of the process, I think both sides of the aisle recognize that our citizens deserve to be treated equally, as do our businesses. We all want to be able to move forward. And a last note, Mr. Speaker, we have to move forward with data-driven decisions. If we go to our very own hospital preparedness dashboard with data, actual data, it shows our citizens: 42 percent medical beds available; 53 percent isolation rooms available; 0 percent ventilators in the State, Mr. Speaker, just under 5,000 ventilators, 70 percent available; under 1,500 are actually in use. And we do not want any citizen to fall prey to this virus, but we also need to realize that all citizens need to be able to move forward in a reasonable and safe manner.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all our colleagues to please support a federally recognized CDC process to allow each of us to equally and transparently move forward.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Matt Bradford.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to SB 613.

I would begin by reading a letter from my local hospital: "Since the beginning of the public health emergency and pandemic, each morning clinical and administrative leaders are

updated on how the Einstein Healthcare Network is dealing with the impact of COVID-19. These leaders share information on the number of patients being admitted, the availability of ICU beds and the status of staff health and wellbeing. In addition, the challenges of securing supplies and PPEs required to keep our patients and employees safe are discussed.

"As the COVID-19 pandemic reaches its peak, hospitals across southeastern Pennsylvania are being stressed. Capacity is stretched beyond current resources and while we are holding our own, we are very concerned governmental decisions need to follow public health guidance and not rush to implement business openings which could do more harm than good.

"While we greatly appreciate the desire of getting business opened, we believe such decisions need to be based upon sound public health data." I believe that was the point, parenthetically, of Representative Nelson.

"On behalf of the nearly 9,000 employees of the Einstein Healthcare Network, we urge opposition to the amended version of SB613.

"As amended, SB 613 references guidance from the *United States Department of Homeland Security Cybersecurity & Infrastructure Security Agency* which clearly states" – and by the way, parenthetically, it is in bold; it is the only thing on the front page that is in bold – " '...This list is advisory in nature. It is not, nor should it be considered, a federal directive or standard. Additionally, this advisory list is not intended to be the exclusive list of critical infrastructure sectors, workers, and functions that should continue during the COVID-19 response across all jurisdictions.' " Pointedly, it goes on, " 'Individual jurisdictions should add or subtract essential workforce categories based on their own requirements and discretion...'

"SB 613 would lock into statute guidance issued on March 28. As you know, our understanding of this virus continues to evolve as this pandemic unfolds. In short, codifying into law advisory guidance issued last month on what is safe or not safe does not make sense and is potentially dangerous.

"As healthcare experts project the Philadelphia region to be a national hotspot, Einstein has seen a steady increase of COVID-19 patients. We believe now is not the time to change course. Einstein Healthcare Network has hundreds of employees serving on the front line of this pandemic and their safety is paramount. We therefore urge a no vote on SB 613 as amended."

Now, I can see from how this played out today that a political process is probably not a substitute that Einstein or any of our health systems should take great comfort in. For a while we talked about delaying implementation 60 days, then immediately, then maybe not. I have got to tell you, that political process, that legislative process, that process that was clear to everyone who was here today, is one that I do not think Pennsylvanians should take great heart in. We need confidence in our institutions. We need bipartisan leadership. We need to recognize that there is not your Governor and my Governor. We have one Governor and he has an impossible job. I am not going to lie to you. There is not every part of the waiver process or the UC backlog that any of us love. There is no constituency for folks having to drive across State lines to buy a car or whatever other challenge there may be. But in my part of Pennsylvania that has already seen the peak of this pandemic and in many ways could be a preview of what is to come to other parts of Pennsylvania, do you really want to second-guess epidemiologists, the Governor, the Executive, those who are put in power to make these choices? Or would those – there has been one person with a medical degree that

I can tell who spoke today, a nurse. But now, I have a history degree from Villanova University. I am very proud of it. I am confident I am not an epidemiologist. I am confident these challenges are best confronted by medical professionals. Politicians dithering on 60-day delays or immediate implementation does not give Pennsylvania much confidence.

We had this political food fight last week, and in that time let me tell you what has changed: the numbers. So I am going to read a little bit from the COVID-19 update that we have been getting every day for about the last month. I have good news. In our 67 counties, as I can tell, the curve has receded in 2. But I think, and I am not a statistician either, but when Mifflin County goes from 17 cases to 16 and when Wyoming goes from 12 to 11, statistically that is kind of outnumbered when Delaware goes from 1,712 yesterday to another 1,806 today, when Berks goes from 1,150 yesterday to 1,247 today, when Bucks goes from 1,177 yesterday, to 1,222 today, and my home county of Montgomery where yesterday a new 2,285 were reported, today another 2,354. And it is not just county by county. Pennsylvania has now crossed over 25,000 total cases, 2,200 hospitalizations, just today 60 new deaths, and now we stand at 584.

I know that in politics it is easy to throw mud at the other side and the other party. It is hard to come together in difficult times. I read an article about Louisiana, which has been hard hit, as we all know. Their Lieutenant Governor – and again, it does not matter their party, but they were of different parties – their Lieutenant Governor found great fault with the Governor of New Orleans. You know what? The other day that Lieutenant Governor had the courage to say, I was wrong to advocate to continue parades and conventions amid the coronavirus. "So the mayor did the right thing. In hindsight, I was wrong and she was right. I was looking at the tourism aspect of it and not knowing what was to come in the weeks to follow...." I did not understand.

What I do not understand is unlike that gentleman, who now admits he was wrong, the CISA guidance that everyone speaks about could not be more clear. The only part that is in bold, the only part that is highlighted, the part that is right in the middle of the page says, this is not the guidance you are looking for. The guidance I have is from my home county of Montgomery, which, again, was a leading indicator. My Office of Public Health writes to our Montgomery County delegation to oppose SB 613. To do otherwise would be dangerous and irresponsible. But I know some want to continue to view this through a political prism and I think we need to avoid that, because even our President's Surgeon General says there is every chance we could be Italy.

Again, I do not think we should be alarmists. I think our elected officials – Democrat, Republican, Federal and State – are doing their darnedest to make sure we are not. But when a vice admiral in our Navy, a gentleman who wears the uniform of our nation, says that this week and next could be our Pearl Harbor, our 9/11, in fact, I will quote, "This is going to be our Pearl Harbor moment, our 9/11 moment, only it's not going to be localized. It's going to be happening all over the country. And I want America to understand that," Vice Admiral Jerome Adams said on Fox News Sunday. Adams continued, "...I want Americans to understand that, as hard as this week is going to be, there is a light at the end of the tunnel...." And it is not just the Trump administration's Surgeon General; it is also Dr. Fauci, Ambassador Birx, and the leading minds in epidemiology.

And I pointed this out the other day, about what it looks like to have essential employees in your county, and I am actually going to speak about something that is in Representative Ciresi's

district, but again, it is close to home, about 10 miles from my house in Montgomery County. We had a nuclear outage, a regular outage every year or every other year, I believe, we have in Montgomery County in our Limerick generating system, and because of the nature of the work and the importance of keeping essential infrastructure online, workers have to work together in very close proximity. They are essential and we need to keep our grid lit. But because of the nature of the work and the controversy and because, obviously, a pandemic dealing with such a skilled workforce, there was great concern that this would get inside the walls and we would lose workers who would not easily be replaced. And let us be clear, no worker is ever replaceable. But because Limerick and Exelon, the owner of that station, wanted to be hypercautious, there was a set of parameters put in. There was testing on the front end, daily screenings, there was social distancing, and the best experts available said this was the best anyone could hope for. This is an essential job, it had to be done, and we would go at it. And so every day of it they provided us elected officials who were in the 10-mile EPZ, which is basically the response zone, they would give us this daily report. This was the last one I found when I just looked through my e-mail: Monday, April 6:

"[1065] contract workers supported the outage on Sunday, April 5.

"All outage workers (inclusive of both contract workers and Exelon employees) were screened prior to entering the plant yesterday. The current status is as follows:"

No "...outage workers were turned away yesterday as a result of onsite screening with instructions to self-quarantine.

"[3] outage workers to date have a positive test for COVID-19.

"[18] contract workers to date have been directed not to return to site for the remainder of the outage and instructed to self-quarantine: 13 due to exhibiting symptoms or receiving positive diagnosis of COVID-19; 4 due to personal exposure to a potentially positive COVID-19 individual; 1 due to identifying a household member that was potentially exposed to a COVID-19 individual.

"[20] Exelon employees are currently at home in self-quarantine: 15 due to exhibiting symptoms or receiving a positive diagnosis of COVID-19; 2 due to personal exposure to a potentially positive COVID-19 individual; 3 due to identifying a household member that was potentially exposed to a COVID-19 individual."

Now, again, there is no way to know if all these folks were exposed within that close quarters of that work that they had to do, but I think it gives an indication that even with the best intent, and let us be clear, there is no bad employer that wants to see their worker get sick, and no one is going to be foolish, but I think this shows, while anecdotal, that folks will get sick, and in a county like ours, where this is truly at the door, I think we understand that more people infected leads to more people getting infected.

Now, I have spoken long enough, but I recognize that this vote will probably go in a different direction. But there have been a few things said that I think need to be addressed. The good gentleman from Cumberland found fault with parts of the waiver system. I started my comments by agreeing. I do not believe he meant to insinuate ill towards our current Governor or some corrupt intent. I actually enjoy my Republican colleagues very much. I believe we have a very different opinion on many of these issues. But we have a real challenge right now in our Commonwealth, and whose advice do we want to take, medical

professionals or politicians who wants to get into the gutter and do the partisan game? I am convinced now more than ever, after the actions of today and of the last week, that a political process that does not respond to public health officials, that engages in the absolute worst type of demonization – I know – I worry that those who would go down that road would be poorly led at a time when we need real leaders. I would hope that we would lead and support our Governor and this administration and, yes, this President. You may have not voted for this Governor, I certainly did not vote for this President, but I pray that they are successful now, because we are in this together. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Mike Tobash.

Mr. TOBASH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will try and be brief.

I rise and I appreciate the ability to rise today. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if you know a gentleman by the name of Ralph Jaeger, you might know him. He worked for a former Representative that held my seat, 125th, but Ralph was a good friend and he is the guy that kind of everybody knows. He lives two doors down from me or at least he lived two doors down from me until Friday; he passed away of COVID-19. On the way to work today, I got a call from a family friend and they indicated that his wife, Peggy, had also passed away just this morning; COVID-19. So I understand what we are going through as a Commonwealth. I understand what it is like when you have got a friend and a neighbor who passes away. I will tell you something about Peggy. I think the first year that I ran for election, she got more signatures than anybody for me except for my dad. They were great family friends.

But today I rise in favor of SB 613, because it is not about one thing or the other, it is not about putting Pennsylvania out of business and being safe. See, Pennsylvanians and Pennsylvania can do both. They can work and they can be safe. You know, life is not without risk and Pennsylvania workers and employers and Pennsylvanians, they take risk every day. They take and they mitigate risk. We have got contractors that get high on ladders, they operate heavy equipment, they weld bridges; there is risk. But Pennsylvania should not be leading in unemployment. We should not be the highest unemployed State in the United States. We should be leading in working safely. In a process that is transparent, that is consistent, we can lead in recovery. You see, this vote today is not only about today, it is about Pennsylvania's future. We should make a vote in favor of SB 613 for Pennsylvania's future, and we should allow Pennsylvanians to work safely, but they should work and they should be safe, and this bill empowers them to do that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the opportunity to get up today and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of SB 613. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Hohenstein.

Mr. HOHENSTEIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I also will be brief. I recognize there have been a number of speakers already. I will be voting "no" on SB 613 because I believe it makes a fundamental choice that places a higher value on company profits than on human life, and I am compelled to call that out for what it is.

We are all in this together. One example of this is that so many of us are wearing masks today, and I am going to be clear: I am wearing a mask not to protect myself, because it does nothing to protect me from this virus. It protects other people from the possibility that I have it and could spread it to you. So I appreciate all of my colleagues who are wearing their masks today.

I believe the scientists and health officials who are telling us that this public health threat will continue for several months. The experts tell us to expect a second and possibly even a third wave before the end of this year, and that the earliest we can expect a vaccine is 2021. Public health experts are actually requesting that we expand testing so that we can assess the risk that is posed by this appropriately, because without adequate testing, without adequate assessment, any legislation that we pass will be inadequate.

So I believe also the economists like Paul Krugman, who has identified three things that we need to do at this time to alleviate the immediate financial impact on individuals and corporations: one, expand and improve access to unemployment; two, provide direct cash to families; and three, loans and other small business supports that will allow them to restart their operations. And I will note a number of people have complained that we actually have too many people on unemployment. I would actually say that the use of unemployment and the ability of people to have a steady income – and I will grant that we have not gotten that income to them quickly enough and we need to improve that – but access to unemployment means people have less incentive to have to leave their home and stay-at-home orders and social distancing are much more effective.

So neither health officials nor economists are telling us to reopen the economy, and we gain nothing if we simply open the floodgates to commercial activity that cannot be conducted safely.

One thing I will also note, and an earlier speaker referred to the March 26 CDC advisory. We are tying ourselves to that specific advisory, and that advisory may actually already be out of date, and doing so will possibly tie the government's hands when we need the time and the space to be nimble after this crisis passes.

Now, when it comes forward, I will support bipartisan legislation that supports businesses that are affected by COVID, and I want that legislation to ensure that they can reopen and restart their activities, but not until the crisis has passed. The measures that I would support would include paycheck protection; forbearance on tax burdens, which is actually something that the Governor has already done with the prepayment of sales tax that he just announced; and protecting businesses that have to pay rent or a mortgage. And in truth, we can actually do well to support individuals who need to stay in their homes by giving them mortgage and rental protection as well.

Now, there will be a time for us to loosen restrictions for commercial and economic activity in a controlled environment. This is not that time. The means for any emergency legislation that we should have in terms of short-term impact should mean that the short-term impact lowers public health risk. This proposed legislation actually does the opposite. So when I am looking at SB 613, it is a bill that places profits over people, and as a representative of the people in my district, what I have to do is value the lives of my constituents over the short-term ledger sheets of corporations.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Matt Gabler.

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

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak because I know that many constituents are asking for a voice. We are a nation in pain. Pennsylvania is struggling. And we in this room, we are the

leaders who are called to offer the path forward. As Representatives, it is our constitutional duty to speak about solutions and look to the future. As an institution, the way we speak is to write solutions into bills and vote on them, and that is precisely what we are here to do.

COVID-19 is a significant threat to our public health. Social distancing, mitigation measures, handwashing – these are all things that we must follow and these are all things that we must urge those around us to follow. Of course, we all know that business as usual is not an option. The question that we as leaders are called to answer is this: What is the proper path forward?

We have all spent countless hours over the course of the past month on the phone with our constituents, and it has been heartbreaking. People are asking how are they going to pay their bills. They are asking, "How am I going to take care of my employees?" They are asking, "How do I adjust to a new normal when I cannot see the light at the end of the tunnel?"

There are unavoidable truths. We know that there are operations that must continue for the good of society, and we need to do them safely. I will give you an example: I have a company headquartered in my district that provides clean linens to major hospital systems across our Commonwealth and beyond. The Governor's original list would have shut them down. Fortunately, a subsequent list kept them open.

I have powdered metal factories in my district who manufacture components for medical equipment manufacturers. Without their parts, the companies that make ventilators and hospital beds, for example, would not be assembling the equipment we need for this crisis. But powdered metal has had to navigate the waiver process, which has lacked uniformity and transparency. The conversations that I have had with these factory managers, they have been heartening. They want to protect their employees. They want to implement mitigation measures. They know that they cannot do business as usual, but they want to do their part to keep the supply chain moving for the good of society. They can do so while mitigating the risk of spread.

Our neighboring States have kept certain industries open that Pennsylvania has shut down. The calculation that we need to consider is, can it be done safely? Once this health crisis has passed, the economic fallout will remain. Let us not make it harder on ourselves by implementing needless economic damage on industries in Pennsylvania whose counterparts continue to operate in neighboring States.

I recently talked to a gentleman whose company is permitted to continue operating, but one of his largest customers is shut down. His customer's competitors in neighboring States are still operating, putting him at risk of losing contracts not just during this crisis, but permanently. What should we tell the workers at that company? Where will their jobs be when this is over? The economic situation is becoming desperate.

If we do nothing, more and more people will find themselves in despair, and despair leads to many other problems. I will give you an example: drug abuse. Does anybody remember the other disaster declaration that is still in effect in this State? That is right, we have an opioid crisis. I am afraid of what is happening to people who are waiting anxiously at home with nothing to do but worry about their future. How about alcoholism? How about depression? Now would be a great time for us to find a way to provide hope. Giving hope is exactly what we are here to do today.

That is why we need to speak up in this chamber. We have the opportunity to support SB 613 as amended and allow a uniform, transparent measure for essential job creators. This legislation is our opportunity as legislators to represent our constituents and call for transparency, uniformity, and most importantly, hope. This is not business as usual. This is the right response at the right time. I urge my colleagues, please vote "yes."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Pam DeLissio.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Timing is everything and I will be a "no" vote on SB 613 today. I do not think that is a surprise to anybody in this chamber. But I think that part of our role as State Representatives is that we have a bigger picture and access to more information than many of our constituents. I know myself I have read hundreds of e-mails, if not maybe thousands in the last month. I have witnessed press conferences almost daily with the Secretary of Health, in particular, as well as with Governor Wolf. I have participated on two White House conferences that have helped to update State and local elected officials in order to help us to develop the best policy and understand what is happening at the Federal level of government. And having continued to absorb and assimilate and disseminate much of that information, I am very clear that the bill in front of us today, this is not the right time. We have invested almost a month into the path that we are headed down. And Secretary Levine on a daily basis refers to this as the novel coronavirus, and the word "novel" is in there because it is without precedent. So when we say that the Governor does not have a plan or did not have a plan, I am a little baffled by that, because when something is without precedent, you are forced to react to the situation and you are forced to act. You are forced to call on protocols that have been in place in other emergencies that may or may not pertain to this particular emergency. In fact, I believe I have heard the Governor say more than once, have they done everything perfectly? No. I mean, it is very easy to Monday morning quarterback. It is very easy to critique the plays that happened in the game on Sunday night the next morning. It is a little easier to do that sometimes than actually playing the game, being in the moment, and having to call those plays based on the information and the facts that are before us. But I have no doubt that the safety of the citizens of the Commonwealth have been preeminent throughout this entire process. I have no doubt that the safety of the citizens is what is foremost in everybody's mind today.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, timing is everything. It is not time for SB 613 today. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The remaining three speakers include the Democratic whip, Representative Harris; the Democratic leader, Representative Frank Dermody; and the majority leader, Representative Bryan Cutler.

The Chair calls upon Representative Harris at this time.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First, let me thank our first responders, those who through this crisis, through this pandemic, have put their lives on the line, have put the lives of their family members on the line, by going to work every day for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, these are unprecedented times, situations that we have never been in before. I mean, I am standing before you with a mask and gloves on and many of you have masks on yourselves. That has never happened, to my knowledge, in this chamber.

Mr. Speaker, back on March 6, Pennsylvania had two confirmed cases of COVID-19. Today a little over 5 weeks later, that number is above 25,000 of our citizens. Sadly, Mr. Speaker, we have already lost 584 of our citizens. In the last 24 hours, more than 60 of our citizens have lost their lives. The coronavirus has permeated every county in our Commonwealth.

Now, Mr. Speaker, no one here is a doctor. We heard from our one medical professional from Lackawanna County, and do not take it from us; it is not our responsibility, in my view, to make medical decisions. My colleague told you about his history degree. I am a proud graduate of Millersville University with a degree in government and political affairs, so if you want to talk about how many members are in the United States Congress, I have got you. If you want to talk about how a bill becomes a law, I can let you know that as well. But when it comes to talking about the COVID-19 virus, I, as many of us in this room, am at a loss for knowledge. So do not take it from me. Let us take it from our medical professionals. Dr. Rachel Levine said that opening businesses prematurely will only increase the spread of the virus, further lengthening our economic challenges, while also placing many lives at risk. Okay; you do not want to take Dr. – Doctor – Rachel Levine's word for it, take Dr. Fauci's word for it. Just this morning he said that the U.S. simply does not have the testing or tracing ability to begin reopening the nation's economy. Two medical professionals, State level and Federal level, and I would assume probably two different political parties.

Mr. Speaker, oftentimes we talk about our first responders and we praise them for their heroics, but passing this legislation will put those first responders in jeopardy. Passing this legislation may cause harm to those first responders' families, because our health-care system cannot take the overwhelming bodies that will be built up in our counties. Mr. Speaker, according to our very own Department of Health, Clinton County has no ICU beds available, Fulton County has no ICU beds available, Susquehanna County has no ICU beds available. In the city of Philadelphia, Temple University had to loan us the Liacouras Center, one of our entertainment facilities, to put beds in there for people to be quarantined. Our health-care system cannot handle the type of carnage that we would see should our businesses reopen.

Listen, I understand small businesses are the economic engine of this State. I get it. But the truth is, we can revive our economy, but we cannot revive lives. We cannot bring people back, and at the end of the day, that is what this is about. This is determining what is more important. Is it more important that we keep folks home so that they stay safe or that we send folks back to work, understanding that medical professionals have told us that we would be putting them in jeopardy, that we would be putting their lives on the line?

Now, I ask you today, Mr. Speaker, if we want to make that decision, I ask you to also make the decision of whose lives are you willing to risk? Call them out. Enumerate them. Let the world know whose lives are we willing to sacrifice. Are we willing to sacrifice those low-wage workers that are going out making \$8, \$9, \$10 an hour, that cannot afford health care? Are we willing to sacrifice them? Is that the population that we are willing to sacrifice? Because if the medical professionals have told us that lives will be lost, let us begin to count who we are willing to sacrifice.

Serious times call for serious leadership. Mr. Speaker, this does not have to be a partisan issue. Quite honestly, it should not be. Our constituents are not looking for us to be Democrat or Republican. They are looking for us to be leaders. Across this Commonwealth they are scared; folks are scared about what can happen to them. They are scared about what may happen to their mothers and fathers, to their grandparents. They are scared because this is serious. Mr. Speaker, in Philadelphia, sadly, Philadelphia police officer, police Lt. James Walker lost his life to the coronavirus. My high school classmate had to bury her grandmother and her aunt because of the coronavirus. They lived together, mother and daughter; like many of us in this chamber know, close-knit families. Well, that family just lost two people, Miss Frances and Miss Linda. One of my other friends, her mother, Miss Sandy, is still in the ICU. Just a few minutes ago I was sitting at my desk texting; I was texting my godson's mother, Lynnette, who right now told me, I asked her, "How do you feel?" and she said, "About 30 percent." She is sitting in a chair because she is very weak, because just a few days ago she tested positive for the coronavirus.

These are not just simple decisions that we have to make. This is not just about pushing a button. These are lives. You know, one of my colleagues, she gave a Scripture, and you know, this past Sunday was Easter and many of us who are of the Christian faith celebrated this Easter Sunday. Well, I am reminded of the Book of Hosea, the fourth chapter, the beginning of the sixth verse where it says, "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge...." Simply put, my people die for the lack of knowledge, because they do not want to listen to the knowledge. We have the knowledge. We have it from our Secretary of Health. We have it from the United States Surgeon General. Quite honestly, we have it from medical professionals across this Commonwealth and this country. Will we be destroyed because we refuse to listen to the lack of knowledge, or will we listen and take heed of the word and vote "no" on this bill, and let the experts, the ones who went to school for this, let them decide.

I choose not to die for the lack of knowledge, because I choose to take heed, and that is why I will be voting "no" on SB 613 and I ask you to do the same, because at the end of the day, lives actually are on the line.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The final two speakers on SB 613.

Representative Gleim, for what purpose do you rise?

Mrs. GLEIM. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to submit my comments for the record, please.

The SPEAKER. Yes. Please do. Thank you.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in favor of SB 613 as amended. I believe it is time. There is no scientific data that exists that concludes that by conforming to the latest version of the Federal CISA guidelines, the amount of COVID-19 cases within the State will increase. In fact, there are many States, such as Maryland, West Virginia, and Virginia, that are conforming to the latest version of CISA, in the construction industry in particular, that have a lower incident rate (cases per 100,000) of COVID-19 than Pennsylvania.

There is no correlation between the increased COVID incidents and being able to operate safely in these industries that are included in the latest version of the CISA guidelines.

Aside from any statement from those opposed, I say we need to take a data-driven, balanced approach as to what is safe and what is unsafe. Pennsylvanians have been stellar, they have persevered, but doing nothing at a time like this will exacerbate homelessness, drug abuse, mental health issues, domestic violence, and suicides. How can we stand here and say that COVID is more devastating than any of these from a health perspective? The hundreds of calls I am receiving in my district are desperate, many not having received any funds for 4 to 5 weeks now, not being able to get a life-sustaining job due to car trouble, not being able to afford prescription medications for children. The food bank has tripled the families it is helping in just 2 weeks. I could go on. I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on SB 613.

The SPEAKER. The minority leader, Representative Frank Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we are being asked today to vote on a bill that, if signed by the Governor, would put thousands, maybe tens of thousands – employers would put tens of thousands of Pennsylvania workers back to work, a fact that every public health professional in the Commonwealth and nationally every doctor who has any sense will tell you could be a disaster in the Commonwealth for the families of those workers and for every citizen of this Commonwealth. So clap all you want. You know, everybody in this room wants to put Pennsylvania workers back to work. We want to restart the economy. That needs to happen, but it needs to happen in an organized way. It needs to happen in a way that makes sense, probably should be phased in over time, and it needs to be done based on science; on science, right, not conjecture. It needs to be based on facts, not wishful thinking.

The Governor and his Health Secretary have done a good job with their mitigation strategy. Finally, we are seeing a flattening of the curve, and yet when we see this happening, every health-care professional and every public health professional in this country says we have got to stay the course. We have got to make sure that we keep people at home. We have got to make sure that those sacrifices continue to be made so we can prevent people from getting sick, we can prevent people from dying, because let us make it clear, we put people back to work, you pass SB 613, those thousands and tens of thousands of people are going to go to work, they are going to get sick. Many of them are going to die.

Look, we have a virus here today, Mr. Speaker, that there is no treatment. We have a virus here today where there is no vaccine. People are trying to still figure out what it is, what the symptoms are, how they can deal with it, how we can treat it. Yet we think here in this House that we can put people back to work, we know what is best for them, we know how to protect their health. Mr. Speaker, we do not. We need to be responsible. We need to open up this economy responsibly with the way we have already discussed, in phases, when we are ready, when we know that we have the testing we can do and it makes sense to put people back to work, when we know who has it and who does not, and we are not there. You want to put people back to work when we are struggling to find protective equipment for our health-care workers, for our doctors, our nurses, our health-care professionals. There is no way you are going to provide health-care equipment, even hand sanitizer for the thousands of people that are going to go back to work. That is not going to happen, yet it appears to me you are willing to risk that.

In closing, I have here a statement from the Labor Council president in western Pennsylvania, Darrin Kelly. He says, "No one wants to go back to work more than the men and women of organized labor. We also know that reopening our economy has to be done in a smart and responsible way, and has to be informed by science, data, and the advice of public health experts. Senate Bill 613 is not smart, it's not responsible, ...it's not informed by science – it is absolute lunacy.

"Our members...who have been laid off and those who continue to work – have made tremendous sacrifices to help flatten the curve, slow the spread of the virus, and prevent our health care system from being overwhelmed. Those sacrifices will be meaningless if we allow politicians in Harrisburg to ignore public health experts and rush to reopen our economy too soon.

"Those politicians need to wake...up and recognize the magnitude of this crisis. People are dying. Our frontline workers are risking their lives to save others. More than a million Pennsylvanians have been laid off. This is not a time to play games with our lives and livelihoods.

"We will get through this together. We will rebuild and recover no matter how long it takes. Throughout this process, organized labor will remain committed above all else to the health and safety of our members, their families, and everyone in our communities, and we will never waver from that."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The majority leader, Representative Bryan Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you to the members. Thank you to the members that are here. Thank you to the members that are in their offices and those who are voting remotely by proxy. I certainly appreciate the debate and would like to try to wrap it up as best as I can.

I, too, want to thank our frontline workers, the individuals taking care of the patients on a daily basis, whether it be at hospitals, in homes, or at the nursing homes, one of whom happens to be my wife who works at a hospital. I shared earlier that I spent 13 years behind a mask, most of the time in an operating room, some time inside an angiography room doing invasive procedures. So it is important that we all lean on our own experiences to understand what we are dealing with here today.

Mr. Speaker, like many Pennsylvanians last evening, we listened to the Governor, and he said, to the people of our Commonwealth, we share your fears and frustrations – fears for your health and the health of your loved ones, fears your job may not be there when this is over, fears what the impact will be to your children's education, and your fears for what your future in this Commonwealth will look like.

Mr. Speaker, I agree. That is a lot of what I heard in my own district office for the last half-dozen weeks. In fact, that is exactly why we are here today. That is why we are working every day, to find a path forward, to work together, and to find the best path forward for all of Pennsylvania. I know we have quoted Scripture, and I will throw out my own: "When there is no vision, the people will perish."

This is really about planning for the future, having a vision of where we can go and not just the immediate moment or the crisis. And I think this is important, Mr. Speaker, because the timing of this bill, as I will get to later, will be built on. This is about understanding what this disease has done. The statistics are terrifying and I understand that, and they will continue to get

worse in the coming months, but we need clearly defined goals of what is success. At what point does the data turn and at what point are we able to move forward? It is also recognizing that with another surge or possible seasonality of this disease, we could be living with COVID-19 for months or even years to come. My friend, the minority whip, pointed out and he is correct, we are potentially months or years away from a vaccine.

So it is important that we have a vision, it is important that we have a plan in order to get back to work. I think if you listen to the debate here today, we are not disagreeing on the end goal. We might disagree some of how we get there, and that is okay. And that is not, to borrow from my friend, the Appropriations chairman, a political process; that is the legislative process and that is why we are all here. It is the legislative process so that we can talk about different ideas; some amendments get accepted, some get voted down. Some of the bills that we put on the calendar do not pass. Some never come to be. That is all part of the legislative process because we are the people assembled and that is our job.

I truly believe we must hope for the best but we have to prepare for the worst. That is part of having the plan. It is recognizing that the citizens of the Commonwealth have great resilience and strength, that we will go to great lengths to do what is necessary to fight against this invisible virus, while responding and being empathetic to the very real human suffering, fears, and illness that we have all fielded in our district offices over the past few weeks. However, it is also about recognizing that the quarantine is a limited tool, and when it is lifted, we must discuss the fact that there will be additional cases. It is also recognizing that the first peak could be days or even weeks away. But we will only have the advantage of retrospective review to know when that moment has already passed.

So now is the time to plan, plan for the future, and we should do so today. We have seen the results, as was pointed out by prior speakers and I agree, this is a novel virus. It is new. There is no playbook for this, as we are working through it. But what has happened, as other speakers have pointed out, is that you have got a wide swath, 1.4 million individuals on unemployment, relying on a system that, because of, quite frankly, the volume that has been dumped so suddenly and abruptly into it, simply cannot handle. So yes, that is stressing the system, but that is also not having a plan. Managing the moment is important, but that cannot be our only focus.

In deploying the quarantines and closing business, I understood the urgency and why it needed to be done. I personally conveyed that to the Governor. It bought us time – time for hospitals, PPE supplies, and ventilators to be made available and sought after. It opened up hospital beds, as they deferred nonemergency surgeries. Many hospitals are operating at roughly a 50-percent vacancy rate, which in regular times would be good, but it is because they are waiting for what will come, and unfortunately, because of the current way that our health system is constructed, that means significant cash flow problems and access to services that our constituents and our residents are suffering through. In that regard the quarantine was successful, and I am grateful for the Governor's swift actions, even though we may have disagreed on some of the process. We have spoken about those, and I appreciate the changes that were made in response to our input. But I also know that we both – in fact, all of us here today have the best interest of the Commonwealth and its citizens at the center of our decisionmaking process.

However, we have to plan for the future. If we are to face another surge, whether it be in a couple months or it turns into a seasonal event, as some have predicted it could, the people need to know that we have a plan where we have considered all the options, a plan that will, unfortunately, return us to what someone called this morning the "new normal." I think that is important, Mr. Speaker.

The reason is very simple, and it is centered on my biggest fear. My biggest fear and the one I am most worried about is this: If we do not start talking about the future, specifically what the effects of the quarantine have done and what their limited purpose was supposed to be – and this is very important – the quarantine worked, but it can only work in the short term, and if we were successful, that means there are more individuals who have not been exposed than those who were. So whenever the quarantine is lifted, that means we will have more cases. So my good friend, the Democratic leader, is correct, I do think that we can do this in stages. I do think we can approach this in a slightly different way. My fear is this: that when the cases increase, people will mistakenly believe that the quarantine somehow failed. They need to understand its original purpose. They need to understand that it was meant to buy time, and we need to understand and, most importantly, have people believe that if there is another increase in cases, there is another surge or there is another need for a quarantine, what the value in the quarantine is. What we cannot risk is having people simply saying, the quarantine did not work last time, so why should we listen this time?

Part of that plan, quite honestly, is recognizing the difference between the short-term and the long-term goals that have been set out, which I think we could all articulate better. The quarantine was an immediate short-term and successful goal, but it severely impacted everyone's daily lives. But it is not a long-term solution. If we, like the experts, believe that this could go on into the summer or resurface in the fall, then the answer cannot simply be that we will wait until it is over. Our people cannot survive that length of uncertainty or lack of long-term plans. That is why we need a long-term plan and process by which to operate as a society again and to do so safely. This reserves a complete quarantine option again for the future, because we have had time to prepare and have people understand what is actually happening. The complete quarantine option, while effective in the immediate short term, is not sustainable over the long term. For me, I think the distinction is for businesses, and we used the terms today during the debate of "essential" and "nonessential." I believe that is incomplete. We also need to discuss about "safe" and "unsafe." Grocery stores and hospitals are very essential, and I thank the employees for their efforts who work in both of them. But they are also not the safest places to be. That is why we have seen the measures taken. My own grocery store has gone and made certain aisles one way; they stagger the registers; they determine, you know, what the spacing will be. It is clearly marked on the floor. The hospitals obviously have PPE, and we need to get more. We know that this is a reality of these places, and we should also enter those two terms into the discussion. We have passed legislation, as was mentioned earlier, securing PPE supplies for hospitals and frontline workers weeks ago. Businesses, like grocery stores and hospitals, have made changes in how they operate to lessen the risk, just like we have made changes here as a chamber to allow for proxy voting and social distancing. We do so because, as a society, we recognize the needs that each of these places addresses and we take the steps

necessary to continue accessing them and their services. If we know we may have a second surge or additional seasons of this, we need to have a plan. We need to have that vision and be ready to act when the data says it is time to act.

The jobs portion of this bill, which was spent – really, the lion's share of the debate today – for me is quite simple. It is about transparency and consistency. We recognize these choices will be made when the data says the time is right. The timing of this proposal is very important, and we actually opened up with some questions regarding the technical amendment on this, and I would like to lay it out before you. Assuming it passes today, assuming it goes to the Senate, you are still potentially 18 days away from this actually being implemented. If the current downward trend continues, we will have the act in place that we can operate from, because here is the timing: While it becomes effective immediately, the Governor has 7 days from signature to post the proposal that is consistent with CISA and the CDC. He has 10 days to decide if he wants to act on it or not constitutionally, and I think that is important because this is about positioning the plan so we can have the discussions. And that means that the immediate decision will not be made today, but rather, it could be slowly reopened over time. It is laying out a plan by which it can be done in the coming weeks. This will ensure that similarly situated businesses will be in a position to continue operating with the CDC recommendations that its competitors are also following.

We have heard stories about inconsistencies. This would address that, Mr. Speaker. And there were questions about which medical professionals should we trust. Mr. Speaker, I would argue that the CDC is really the highest experts in the land. That is how they got there. Forty-two other States currently follow these guidelines that we are looking to implement; some of the same States that the Governor is currently working on a reopening plan with. I think that is important, Mr. Speaker. And this has been said from the beginning, but I believe it is worth saying again: This involves people who want to and can safely do so, they can return to work. This enables us to save both lives and livelihoods.

We have all spoken with constituents, friends, neighbors who are in situations that, quite frankly, look like they are no-win. I mentioned the surveyor who lives in my district last week that I am privileged to represent, but today I will share a story about a friend; it is a friend who is a stone mason who works with his son and his father. The three of them are a multigenerational business. My friend is the fourth-generation owner of the business and he is the sixth member of the generations in terms of being in the trade. He is faced with an impossible predicament, Mr. Speaker. As we see the Federal money – and I heard some say, well, we just need to wait for the Federal government – the Federal government is busy arguing over whether or not they wish to release additional funds to the program that has already been tapped out. Mr. Speaker, he was politely told that there were no additional funds available, and he is now left with this impossible choice: he can try to work in a limited fashion, or he could go bankrupt. He texted that to me just this week. The irony here, Mr. Speaker, is these three individuals – my friend, his son, his father – they are quarantining together. They eat dinner together every night, but the nature of some of their work they do is nonessential, and the waiver they received said you can do essential work as defined by the government, but not nonessential work at this time. That is why I believe that the current "essential" and "nonessential" designations are incomplete and we should

look beyond that and ask, "Can it safely be done?" In their case, they are oftentimes the only workers on the job site by the very nature of what they do.

We, as a society, accept risk as a portion of our lives all the time. In fact, the Governor's own waiver process itself does a cost-benefit analysis of what safeguards should be put in place and what businesses can continue to operate. We have all highlighted where things could have been better, and I understand that. But in the case of the individuals that I am talking about today, they work locally and with the very same people they live with. We have to have a purposeful plan to survive the current situation, but most importantly, simultaneously be looking to the future in the event that this happens again. We need to look at work that can be safely done if they so choose. Those individuals should be included. I understand that not everyone wants to do so. That is okay. Remember, that was the opening point: Those who want to do so and can safely do so, that is what we should be focusing on.

The Governor's own waiver process, as I mentioned before, proves that some jobs with certain restrictions can continue. We should allow businesses to adapt to the current environment just like we have, find ways to limit interactions and promote safe transactions, just like 42 other States, Mr. Speaker. Some people, I would offer – in fact, probably many people – could modify their work environment to safely work alone or with limited contact. These should be the very first people we try to get back to work, and this bill does that.

We need a long-term plan. We need to communicate it and understand what is coming in terms of additional patients. The task force we passed last week provides the forum that this employment bill envisions. The citizens also need to know that this fight against COVID-19 could be a very long fight, one that will require interbranch cooperation and coordination. We understand, I think, as legislators, because we have both spoken about it, the enormous weight that comes with the power of the Executive and the emergency powers that are being exercised. We stand here today as willing partners looking for solutions with other branches of government so we can solve this crisis and the short- and the long-term challenges together.

This is about planning for the future and not just the immediate moment. This is about understanding what this disease has and can do in the coming months. It is recognizing that with another surge or seasonal swing, we could be living with COVID-19 for months to come. But that future must have the structure and consideration it deserves, and this bill takes one of the many needed steps.

Our process should be dictated by data, it should be coordinated between all branches of government, and it should return those who can safely do so and want to do so to work. Return them to their jobs so that they can keep their health insurance, the ability to earn a living, and pay their bills.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this bill is about. I would urge a "yes" vote.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. I need to hear from the Democratic whip and the majority whip

The majority whip, please, on SB 613.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The board is correct, 107 votes from the majority party. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. And to the minority whip, Representative Jordan Harris.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There is a unanimous "no" vote from the Democratic Party. Thank you.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—107

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

NAYS—95

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Mako

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.

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 2400, PN 3520**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.177, No.175), known as The Administrative Code of 1929, providing for emergency COVID-19 provisions.

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

AMENDMENTS RULED OUT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. There are a number of amendments that are offered. Representative Bradford's amendments 04992 and 04995, after consultation with the Parliamentarian, have been ruled out of order.

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

Mr. **CIRESI** offered the following amendment No. **A04950**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 10, by inserting before "The"

(a) General rule.—

Amend Bill, page 2, line 12, by striking out "all public and private" and inserting

essential

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

. Waivers shall only be issued to essential construction activities

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 16 and 17

(b) Definition.—As used in this section, the term "essential construction activities" means all of the following:

(1) Road, bridge, transit facility, hospital and health care facility, homeless shelter, public school and State facility construction activity.

(2) Emergency construction activities to prevent spoliation and avoid damage or unsafe conditions.

(3) Construction work with only a single worker who is the sole employee or worker on a job site.

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

AMENDMENTS WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. That is pulled; that amendment is pulled.

And then Representative Ciresi offers 05003. Oh, that is also pulled. My apologies. So both of Representative Ciresi's amendments are pulled.

Representative Ullman offers 049— And that is pulled. So Representative Ullman's amendment and Representative Ciresi's two amendments are all withdrawn.

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

The SPEAKER. At this time there are no further amendments on— Yes, you may proceed. Yes, sir. Yes, please.

RULING OF CHAIR APPEALED

The SPEAKER. The good gentleman, Representative Bradford, is going to object to the ruling of the Chair on amendments 04992 and 04995. You can do them both at – I think that can be done at the same time, right? Yes. You can do them both at the same time, sir.

And so we are going to turn to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The Chair recognizes Representative Matt Bradford.

You may proceed, sir. Yes, sir; you may proceed.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for the latitude in the interest of moving things along and keeping folks here in as limited amount of time as possible.

Both of these amendments, one in construction, one in retail, in both cases, obviously, are germane. They are about providing workers protection and safety. If we are going to find these to be essential businesses, it would seem to be essential that we protect workers with such minimal things as PPE, which we realize is hard to get, but if we are going to put people and force them back to work, we should provide them with that. Essential employees should get hazard pay, they should get a \$15 minimum wage. They should have access to hand sanitizer. These are the most basic protections. While I have heard much about risk is assumed, risk without any protection seems foolhardy, and I would ask for a motion to suspend so that these amendments can protect Pennsylvania workers.

The SPEAKER. Yes. Sir, I think what you are doing is, you are appealing the ruling of the Chair, which you have stated the basis for. So when an appeal is taken, which is being done here, the question before us is this: Shall the decision of the Speaker stand as the judgment of the House? Those in favor of sustaining the Chair's decision will be voting "aye"; those opposed, "nay."

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls upon the majority leader, on the appeal by Representative Bradford.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, very simply, regarding both of these amendments, the underlying bill is an Admin Code; this amendment as proposed would deal with the Minimum Wage

Act. I would urge the members to uphold the ruling of the Chair because I do not believe the amendments are appropriate as drafted.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. So if you are in favor of sustaining the Chair's decision, the Speaker's decision, you will be voting "yes," voting "aye"; if you are opposed to the Chair's decision, the Speaker's decision, you will be voting "nay."

On the question recurring,

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. At this time I would like to check in with the majority whip and the minority whip.

Let me first call on Kerry Benninghoff, Representative Kerry Benninghoff, the majority whip, with respect to the vote here on the appeal of the Chair.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The board does sustain that at 109 votes by the majority party.

The SPEAKER. Representative Jordan Harris, the minority whip, on the vote with respect to the appeal of the Chair.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—109

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

NAYS—93

Bizzarro	Donatucci	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Boyle	Driscoll	Kosierowski	Readshaw
Bradford	Evans	Krueger	Roebuck
Briggs	Fiedler	Kulik	Rozzi
Bullock	Fitzgerald	Lee	Sainato
Burgos	Flynn	Longietti	Samuelson
Burns	Frankel	Madden	Sanchez

Caltagirone	Freeman	Malagari	Sappey
Carroll	Gainey	Markosek	Schlossberg
Cephas	Galloway	Matzie	Schweyer
Ciresi	Goodman	McCarter	Shusterman
Comitta	Green	McClinton	Sims
Conklin	Hanbidge	McNeill	Snyder
Cruz	Harkins	Merski	Solomon
Daley	Harris	Miller, D.	Sturla
Davidson	Hohenstein	Mullery	Ullman
Davis, A.	Howard	Mullins	Vitali
Davis, T.	Innamorato	Neilson	Warren
Dawkins	Isaacson	O'Mara	Webster
Deasy	Kenyatta	Otten	Wheatley
DeLissio	Kim	Pashinski	Williams
Delloso	Kinsey	Petrarca	Youngblood
DeLuca	Kirkland	Rabb	Zabel
Dermody			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Mako

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

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

The SPEAKER. Members, there are no other amendments on HB 2400, PN 3520, page 8 of today's House calendar.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 2376, PN 3514**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 35 (Health and Safety) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Commonwealth services, providing for retail store closure during declaration of disaster emergency.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

AMENDMENTS RULED OUT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. At this time there are three amendments that are filed. Representative Bradford's amendments, 04994 and 04999, after consulting with the Parliamentarian, have been ruled out of order by the Speaker.

We also have an amendment offered by Representative Everett, 04942.

RULING OF CHAIR APPEALED

The SPEAKER. Representative Bradford, do you wish to appeal the rulings of the Chair on those? And please feel free; we will take up the appeal.

Mr. BRADFORD. For the same reasons already stated, obviously we should be putting workers in as safe a position as possible. If we are going to force workers back, and that is exactly what the intent of this body has been shown to be, then we should put safeties and precautions for those workers, so I would ask for an appealing of the ruling of the Chair.

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Bryan Cutler, the majority leader, on the appeal of the Chair's decision with respect to two amendments, 04994 and 04999.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the same reasons as discussed last time, I would urge the members to support the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Members, please proceed to vote in this fashion: Shall the decision of the Speaker stand as the judgment of the House? Those in favor of sustaining the Speaker's decision, you will vote "aye"; if you are opposed, you will vote "nay."

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip is recognized, Representative Kerry Benninghoff, with respect to the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The board is correct; it does reflect the unanimous vote by the majority party. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Jordan Harris, the minority whip, is recognized on the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The electronic board is correct.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—109

Table listing names of members who voted 'Yeas' (109 total). Includes Barrar, Benninghoff, Bernstein, Boback, Bonner, Borowicz, Brooks, Brown, Causer, Cook, Cox, Culver, Cutler, Davanzo, Day, Delozier, Diamond, Dowling, Dunbar, Dush, Ecker, Emrick, Everett, Farry, Gillen, Gillespie, Gleim, Gregory, Greiner, Grove, Hahn, Heffley, Helm, Hennessey, Hershey, Hickernell, Irvin, James, Jones, Jozwiak, Kail, Kaufer, Kauffman, Keefer, Keller, Klunk, Knowles, Lawrence, Masser, Mehaffie, Mentzer, Metcalfe, Metzgar, Mihalek, Millard, Miller, B. Mizgorski, Moul, Murt, Mustello, Nelson, O'Neal, Oberlander, Ortitay, Owlett, Peifer, Pickett, Polinchock, Puskaric, Pyle, Quinn, Rader, Rothman, Rowe, Ryan, Sankey, Saylor, Schemel, Schmitt, Schroeder, Simmons, Sonney, Staats, Stephens, Struzzi, Thomas, Tobash, Toepel, Tomlinson, Toohil, Topper, Warner, Wentling, Wheeland, White, Zimmerman.

Table listing names of members who were absent or on leave. Includes Fee, Fritz, Gabler, Gaydos, Lewis, Mackenzie, Maloney, Marshall, Rapp, Reese, Rigby, Roae, Turzai, Speaker.

NAYS—93

Table listing names of members who voted 'Nays' (93 total). Includes Bizzarro, Boyle, Bradford, Briggs, Bullock, Burgos, Burns, Caltagirone, Carroll, Cephas, Ciresi, Comitta, Conklin, Cruz, Daley, Davidson, Davis, A., Davis, T., Dawkins, Deasy, DeLissio, Dellosa, DeLuca, Dermody, Donatucci, Driscoll, Evans, Fiedler, Fitzgerald, Flynn, Frankel, Freeman, Gainey, Galloway, Goodman, Green, Hanbidge, Harkins, Harris, Hohenstein, Howard, Innamorato, Isaacson, Kenyatta, Kim, Kinsey, Kirkland, Kortz, Kosierowski, Krueger, Kulik, Lee, Longietti, Madden, Malagari, Markosek, Matzie, McCarter, McClinton, McNeill, Merski, Miller, D., Mullery, Mullins, Neilson, O'Mara, Otten, Pashinski, Petrarca, Rabb, Ravenstahl, Readshaw, Roebuck, Rozzi, Sainato, Samuelson, Sanchez, Sappery, Schlossberg, Shusterman, Sims, Snyder, Solomon, Sturla, Ullman, Vitali, Warren, Webster, Wheatley, Williams, Youngblood, Zabel.

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Mako

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

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

Mr. EVERETT offered the following amendment No. A04942:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 4, by inserting after "emergency" and for contactless and curbside business operations during declaration of disaster emergency

Amend Bill, page 1, line 8, by striking out "a section" and inserting sections

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 2 and 3 Section 7310. Contactless and curbside business operations during declaration of disaster emergency.

(a) General rule.—A corporation for profit and a corporation not-for-profit shall be permitted, under a declaration by the Governor of disaster emergency under 35 Pa.C.S. § 7301(c) (relating to general authority of Governor) on or before March 6, 2020, to transition to contactless and curbside business operations for the duration of the declaration of disaster emergency. The following shall apply:

(1) A corporation for profit and corporation not-for-profit shall:

(i) Comply with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Interim Guidance for Businesses and Employers to Plan and Respond to Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19), promulgated under the Federal public health emergency declared on January 31, 2020, under

section 319 of the Public Health Service Act (58 Stat. 682, 42 U.S.C. § 201 et seq.) in relation to social distancing and sanitation protocols.

(ii) Maintain employees necessary to support taking of orders through online, telephone or other means when personal interaction is limited during a transaction if employees adhere to social distancing and appropriate sanitation protocols.

(iii) Provide contactless local delivery and curbside pick-up service of online or telephone orders.

(iv) Prohibit cash payments for transactions.

(2) Any violation of paragraph (1) shall result in the immediate suspension of business operations.

(b) Definitions.—As used in this section, the following words and phrases shall have the meanings given to them in this subsection unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

"Corporation for profit." As defined in 15 Pa.C.S. § 102 (relating to definitions).

"Corporation not-for-profit." As defined in 15 Pa.C.S. § 102.

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

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

Mr. EVERETT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This just adds a provision to the bill which would allow for curbside pickup in retail operations, and I understand it is an agreed-to amendment.

The SPEAKER. Representative Brad Roae, and I will call on the Democratic leader too, but Representative Brad Roae, on the amendment.

Mr. ROAE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is correct, this is an agreed-to amendment and I encourage all the members to please vote "yes." Thank you.

The SPEAKER. And Representative Frank Dermody, the Democratic leader, on the amendment, sir.

Mr. DERMODY. I guess you agreed to it amongst yourselves because we have not. I would urge the Democrats to vote "no."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Leader.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls upon the majority whip with respect to this amendment offered by Representative Everett to 2376.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The board does reflect the unanimous vote by the majority party on this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. And Representative Jordan Harris, the minority whip, on this amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—121

Barrar	Gillen	Marshall	Rothman
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Masser	Rowe
Bernstine	Gleim	Mehaffie	Ryan
Boback	Gregory	Mentzer	Sainato
Bonner	Greiner	Metcalfe	Sankey
Borowicz	Grove	Metzgar	Saylor
Brooks	Hahn	Mihalek	Schemel
Brown	Heffley	Millard	Schmitt
Burns	Helm	Miller, B.	Schroeder
Caltagirone	Hennessey	Mizgorski	Simmons
Causer	Hershey	Moul	Snyder
Conklin	Hickernell	Murt	Sonney
Cook	Irvin	Mustello	Staats
Cox	James	Nelson	Stephens
Culver	Jones	O'Neal	Struzzi
Cutler	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Thomas
Davanzo	Kail	Ortitay	Tobash
Day	Kaufman	Owlett	Toepel
DeLozier	Kauffman	Peifer	Tomlinson
Diamond	Keefer	Petrarca	Toohil
Dowling	Keller	Pickett	Topper
Dunbar	Klunk	Polinchock	Vitali
Dush	Knowles	Puskaric	Warner
Ecker	Kortz	Pyle	Wentling
Emrick	Kulik	Quinn	Wheeland
Everett	Lawrence	Rader	White
Farry	Lewis	Rapp	Zimmerman
Fee	Longiotti	Readshaw	
Fritz	Mackenzie	Reese	Turzai,
Gabler	Malagari	Rigby	Speaker
Gaydos	Maloney	Roae	

NAYS—81

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Mako

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.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1076, PN 2120**, entitled:

An Act authorizing public school districts to implement a senior tax reduction incentive volunteer exchange program.

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

The SPEAKER. There are some amendments that are filed. I do understand that Representative McCarter's have been withdrawn and Representative Malagari's have been withdrawn. Thank you, sir.

Representative Otten, I believe, has withdrawn 02011 but still offers amendment 02013.

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

Ms. **OTTEN** offered the following amendment No. **A02013**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 30, by inserting after "owed."

Each volunteer service hour provided by a participant shall be compensated with a real property tax credit the value of which shall be no less than the minimum hourly wage required by the act of January 17, 1968 (P.L.11, No.5), known as The Minimum Wage Act of 1968.

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Otten is recognized on the amendment, 02013.

Ms. OTTEN. This is an agreed-to amendment, and I thank my colleague from Chester County.

The SPEAKER. And Representative Tim Hennessey, on that amendment, sir.

Mr. HENNESSEY. This is an agreed-to amendment, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip, on the vote on this amendment, Representative Otten's amendment.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The board does reflect the vote of the majority party. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The minority whip, Representative Jordan Harris.

The minority whip, Representative Jordan Harris, on the Representative Otten amendment, amendment 02013.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—202

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Mako

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?

Ms. **WHITE** offered the following amendment No. **A05009**:

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 1 and 2, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

Amending the act of June 27, 2006 (1st Sp.Sess., P.L.1873, No.1), entitled "An act providing for taxation by school districts, for the State funds formula, for tax relief in first class cities, for school district choice and voter participation, for other school district options and for a task force on school cost reduction; making an appropriation; prohibiting prior authorized taxation; providing for installment payment of taxes; restricting the power of certain school districts to levy, assess and collect taxes; and making related repeals," in senior citizens property tax and rent rebate assistance, further providing for filing of claim; and authorizing public school districts to implement a senior tax reduction incentive volunteer exchange program.

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 5 through 16; page 2, lines 1 through 30; page 3, lines 1 through 25; by striking out all of said lines on said pages and inserting

Section 1. Section 1305(c) of the act of June 27, 2006 (1st Sp.Sess., P.L.1873, No.1), known as the Taxpayer Relief Act, is amended and the section is amended by adding a subsection to read: Section 1305. Filing of claim.

* * *

(c) Payments from State Lottery Fund.—[No] Except as provided under subsection (e)(3), no reimbursement on a claim shall be made from the State Lottery Fund earlier than the day following the 30th day of June provided in this chapter on which that claim may be filed with the department.

* * *

(e) Claim for calendar year 2019.—

(1) Except as provided under subsection (b) and paragraph (2), a claim for property tax or rent rebate for calendar year 2019 may be filed with the department on or before June 30, 2020.

(2) If a claim filed for property tax or rent rebate for calendar year 2018 received a reimbursement by the department, the secretary shall also consider the claim filed for calendar year 2019.

(3) If funds are available, a reimbursement on a claim for calendar year 2019 may be made from the State Lottery Fund immediately.

Section 2. The act is amended by adding a chapter to read:

CHAPTER 19

SENIOR TAX REDUCTION INCENTIVE VOLUNTEER EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Section 1901. Legislative intent.

It is the intent of the General Assembly to authorize all public school districts in this Commonwealth to establish a program to allow older residents to volunteer in the school district and receive a real property tax credit in exchange for volunteer service. While there are school districts across this Commonwealth that provide certain property tax relief to seniors, the purpose of this chapter is to grant explicit legislative authorization to allow all school districts to implement volunteer exchange programs. It has been shown that senior tax reduction volunteer exchange programs provide much needed relief to senior citizens, who often struggle to meet the rising cost of property taxes, and helps schools meet an increasing demand for a variety of human skills and services. Both senior citizens and children benefit from establishing a relationship where they interact with one another in a positive learning environment.

Section 1902. Definitions.

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

clearly indicates otherwise:

"Participant." An individual at least 60 years of age who has been a resident of this Commonwealth for at least 90 days, owns real property located in a participating school district and participates in the school district's program.

"Program." A Senior Tax Reduction Incentive Volunteer Exchange Program authorized by this chapter.

Section 1903. Program guidelines.

(a) Local guidelines.—A school district may establish a program. A school district which establishes a program shall adopt specific guidelines regarding the program, including the acceptance of participants. The program shall provide real property tax credits to participants with no other compensation. The guidelines shall include a criminal background check for each individual seeking to participate in the program.

(b) Value of tax credit.—The rate of a real property tax credit for a senior volunteer shall be established by the school district and may not exceed the total amount of real property taxes that are owed.

(c) Services.—The types of services that participants provide through a program must enhance the academic program of the school district and provide a direct public benefit to the academic program of the school district.

(d) Discrimination prohibited.—This section shall be enforced without discrimination based on race, color, marital status, religious creed, ancestry, handicap or disability, age, sex, national origin, the use of a guide or support animal because of the blindness, deafness or physical handicap of the user or because the user is a handler or trainer of support or guide animals under the act of October 27, 1955 (P.L.744, No.222), known as the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act.
Section 1904. Personal income tax levied by the Commonwealth.

A real property tax credit received by a participant shall not be subject to the tax imposed under Article III of the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971.

Section 1905. Existing job positions.

A program may not replace or supplant existing job positions in a school district.

Section 1906. Funding.

School districts may seek private and public funding sources to support a program.

Section 3. This act shall take effect immediately.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. Representative Hennessey, on the amendment.

Mr. HENNESSEY. This is an agreed-to amendment, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

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

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The SPEAKER. She is in her district – or not her district office, her Capitol office.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Would the chairman of the committee be able to stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Yes. Representative Hennessey, who is the prime sponsor of the bill, will stand for interrogation.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the amendment is that for somebody who filed a property tax/rent rebate application in the previous year, they would receive a check immediately without filing a return for this year. My question is, the check that they receive, is it going to be the same amount as what they received last year?

The SPEAKER. Representative Hennessey, thank you. You may proceed.

Mr. HENNESSEY. Thank you.

I think your understanding of the amendment is wrong. The person who is applying this year based on last year's taxes would still have to apply this year but under normal circumstances would have to wait until after July 1 to receive the check from the Department of Revenue. What this would do is would allow the Department of Revenue, once they reviewed the application against last year's paid taxes, it would allow the Department of Revenue to issue the check prior to July 1 so they would receive the check even quicker.

The SPEAKER. At this time the Speaker recognizes Representative Martina White, on the amendment.

Ms. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is my understanding with regards to your question that in 2018 the people who were recipients of the rent rebate checks, they would now receive that same amount from the time that they had previously applied. They would just receive it this year as well, even though they did not apply during this year. Okay?

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a follow-up question to that.

Is there any mechanism in the amendment that would provide, for example, let us say somebody received \$250 last year, but this year they would be due \$500 or \$650, is there any mechanism in the amendment to recognize that?

Ms. WHITE. If the individual had applied for a property tax/rent rebate for this year, then they would receive that amount this year.

Mr. LONGIETTI. So they would receive the same amount that they received the previous year, even though this year based on this year's—

Ms. WHITE. No. They would receive this year's amount.

Mr. LONGIETTI. I am confused, Mr. Speaker. If you could clarify, I thought you had said that they would receive the same amount this year as they had in the previous year, and so my question is, if they are receiving the same amount this year that they had in previous year, but this year's facts and circumstances would actually drive out a higher rebate, is there a mechanism to take care of that?

Ms. WHITE. So the application, if the applicant has applied for this year, then they would receive this year's amount.

Mr. LONGIETTI. I understand, Mr. Speaker, but the question is, if they did not apply for this year, so if I understand the amendment language correctly, they are to be paid out immediately based on last year, so if they did not apply this year and they get a check in the mail for \$250, is there any mechanism in the amendment to take care of the situation where they are actually due maybe \$500 or \$650?

Ms. WHITE. Sure. Now I understand your question and I apologize. So what we would recommend is for those people to apply for this year's property tax/rent rebate and then the difference between the two would be able to be made up for on their behalf.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Is there any language in the amendment, Mr. Speaker, that provides for that?

Ms. WHITE. There is no language necessary. Those people can just go ahead and do that.

Mr. LONGIETTI. If I could speak on the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir.

Representative Longietti, on the amendment.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think we all, you know, would like to provide for our seniors and others that qualify for the property tax/rent rebate in the most expeditious fashion. My concern is that we are going to have a lot of confusion.

First of all, my sense is that a good number of people are not going to understand what they are receiving a check for because they have not applied. In fact, folks have been calling my district office on a regular basis wanting to find out when they can file their property tax/rent rebate. They are used to coming to us for that, and we have been advising them consistently we are closed to foot traffic, the deadline has been extended to December 31, and when we reopen and that will come at some point, we will be able to take care of you and fill those out and get those filed. My sense is that people are going to get a check in the mail before our offices are reopened. They are not going to understand what that is. I will give you an example. A little bit different than this, but yesterday I had a call in my district office; a lady thought that she got too little in her Federal tax refund for her income taxes. She was due about \$5400; she got a check for \$2400. I told her that is your stimulus check. She did not even know what a stimulus check is – hard to believe, but she did not. So she had no idea why she was getting that money. She thought that they had shortchanged her on her income tax refund. I am afraid that we are going to get folks that the stimulus is out there, they do not know the difference – quite honestly, a lot of people in my district, they think I work in Washington, DC. They do not understand the difference between State and Federal governments. All they know is that a check came in the mail, that must be the stimulus check or something else that I am due, and in some cases, maybe not in a lot, but in some cases people are going to get less or more than they should, because last year they had – maybe they took more money out of their IRA (individual retirement account), maybe they had an event like they got an inheritance, and maybe they only got \$250, but this year they are due \$650 or vice versa. They got more in their check than they should have gotten, and you know, they are going to spend that money and somebody is going to come knocking on the door via a letter saying you owe money back to the State of Pennsylvania.

So I think it is a well-intentioned amendment, but I am concerned that there is going to be confusion and in the end too many people are not going to be served by this. And I would make this observation, and I am not saying it is not, you know, benevolent to give these checks early, but I really do not think that the bulk of these people are in a position that they are cash-starved right now, if you think about it. Most of them are senior citizens. They are still getting their Social Security every month. Nothing has changed there. On top of that, most of them are getting a stimulus check, too, that could be \$1200 or \$2400. Now, you do have some disabled people that qualify for this, but they are getting their disability check; nothing has been interrupted there. They are going to get a stimulus check. The last category you have some widows or widowers who are 50 or older, but if they are out of work, if they are in the workforce and they are out of work, they are going to qualify for unemployment and they are going to get their State benefit and they are going to get \$600 a week on top of that from the Federal government. So my sense is that for all the people I can think of, this really is not necessary.

And then on the other side of it is that we are going to have situations like I talked about where they do not understand why they are getting this money. They maybe were due more or due less. Now somebody is going to want money back. They are going to be confused by this whole process, and I think in the end when we are all said and done with this, we are going to say, we regret that we did this. That is my sense of it. I reluctantly am going to cast a "no" vote on it. I thank the sponsors for it, but I just think we are going down the wrong path here.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Solomon, on the amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the gentleman from Mercer's comments, and I want to try and address them in order.

First of all, I think the people in Mercer County are going to love these checks. We send these checks out anyway. Under the statute – so this comes from the 2006 Taxpayer Relief Act – the Governor/Treasurer can send these out anyway beginning July 1. So what we are saying is in a time of need, and I do not know about the seniors in your district, the seniors in my district are hurting. They are sheltering in place; they have increased prescription drug costs, grocery costs. Some of the family members that they might be reaching out to, they cannot see them to help with payments. There is a whole lot of hurt going on, and we need to get these checks to our seniors as quickly as possible.

Now, to your point about any type of mix-up with the checks. There again, and I refer the gentleman from Mercer to the 2006 Taxpayer Relief Act, in that act there is an audit provision; the audit provision clearly states that when an audit of a claim occurs and is incorrectly determined, "it shall redetermine the correct amount of the claim and notify the claimant of a reason for the redetermination..." We do not need a further amendment to deal with that because in the underlying bill there is an audit provision.

Now let us just step back again. We are in a very tumultuous time right now. Not only our seniors are hurting, but folks throughout our districts, the most needy are hurting in trying to combat COVID-19. Specifically, when it comes to the rent rebate program, we are truly talking about those in need, those who are dealing with permanent disability, those in our districts who are our senior citizens. In this crisis time we need to use every lever of government to deliver for folks, and that is why this amendment is so important.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Martina White, on the amendment.

Ms. WHITE. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to echo the sentiments of my colleague. In Philadelphia we are faced with food lines and many seniors who are suffering from a number of ailments, whether it be having to pay for their prescription medications, having to try to find the means in order to get food to their house as they are being confined to their home. They have also had to purchase additional goods because they need to stay confined to their home, because they are concerned about their own health and well-being during this crisis. I think it is utterly important that we pass this legislation today and ensure that the amendment is included in it, because without it, I know that these seniors are going to be suffering for an even more extensive period of time without having these additional funds made available to them.

I urge everyone to vote in favor of this amendment, and again, it is an agreed-to amendment by the maker of the bill, and I just want to say thank you very much for the work that we have been doing over these past few weeks to try to expedite these checks to these seniors who are in deep, deep need.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. At this time the Chair calls upon the majority whip, Representative Kerry Benninghoff, with respect to the vote on this amendment.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The board does reflect accurately the unanimous vote by the majority party. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls upon the minority whip, Representative Jordan Harris, on the vote.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—199

Barrar	Fiedler	Lawrence	Rigby
Benninghoff	Fitzgerald	Lee	Roae
Bernstine	Flynn	Lewis	Roebuck
Bizzarro	Frankel	Mackenzie	Rothman
Boback	Freeman	Madden	Rowe
Bonner	Fritz	Malagari	Rozzi
Borowicz	Gabler	Maloney	Ryan
Boyle	Gainey	Markosek	Sainato
Bradford	Galloway	Marshall	Samuelson
Briggs	Gaydos	Masser	Sanchez
Brooks	Gillen	Matzie	Sankey
Brown	Gillespie	McClinton	Sappey
Bullock	Gleim	McNeill	Saylor
Burgos	Goodman	Mehaffie	Schemel
Burns	Green	Mentzer	Schlossberg
Caltagirone	Gregory	Merski	Schmitt
Causar	Greiner	Metcalfe	Schroeder
Cephas	Grove	Metzgar	Schweyer
Ciresi	Hahn	Mihalek	Shusterman
Comitta	Hanbidge	Millard	Simmons
Conklin	Harkins	Miller, B.	Sims
Cook	Harris	Miller, D.	Snyder
Cox	Heffley	Mizgorski	Solomon
Cruz	Helm	Moul	Sonney
Culver	Hennessey	Mullery	Staats
Cutler	Hershey	Mullins	Stephens
Daley	Hickernell	Murt	Struzzi
Davanzo	Hohenstein	Mustello	Sturla
Davidson	Howard	Neilson	Thomas
Davis, A.	Innamorato	Nelson	Tobash
Davis, T.	Irvin	O'Mara	Toepel
Dawkins	Isaacson	O'Neal	Tomlinson
Day	James	Oberlander	Toohil
Deasy	Jones	Ortitay	Topper
DeLissio	Jozwiak	Otten	Ullman
Delloso	Kail	Owlett	Vitali
Delozier	Kaufner	Pashinski	Warner
DeLuca	Kauffman	Peifer	Warren
Dermody	Keefer	Petrarca	Webster
Diamond	Keller	Pickett	Wentling
Donatucci	Kenyatta	Polinchock	Wheatley

Dowling	Kim	Puskaric	Wheeland
Driscoll	Kinsey	Pyle	White
Dunbar	Kirkland	Quinn	Williams
Dush	Klunk	Rabb	Youngblood
Ecker	Knowles	Rader	Zabel
Emrick	Kortz	Rapp	Zimmerman
Evans	Kosierowski	Ravenstahl	
Everett	Krueger	Readshaw	Turzai,
Farry	Kulik	Reese	Speaker
Fee			

NAYS—3

Carroll	Longietti	McCarter
---------	-----------	----------

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Mako

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

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

The SPEAKER. We have two amendments offered by Representative Solomon. They are late-filed amendments. We need a motion to suspend. They are both waived off. Thank you, Representative Solomon. They are both waived off.
There are no further amendments on HB 1076.

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

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

BILL REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HB 1189, PN 3565 (Amended) By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Titles 35 (Health and Safety) and 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for COVID-19 enforcement officer disability benefits, for COVID-19 health care professionals reporting and for volunteer emergency responders employer tax credit; and, in general provisions, providing for extensions for COVID-19 disaster emergency.

APPROPRIATIONS.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

RESOLUTIONS

Ms. HANBIDGE called up **HR 628, PN 2988**, entitled:

A Resolution urging the Congress of the United States to take action on legislation that would expand Medicare coverage to include hearing aids.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. Members, we will be hearing an amendment offered. We are going to call up an amendment to the resolution filed by the Democratic leader, Representative Frank Dermody. It is amendment 05020.

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

Mr. **DERMODY** offered the following amendment No. **A05020**:

Amend Resolution, page 1, line 3, by striking out the period after "aids" and inserting
; and urging the Congress of the United States to approve the Protecting Our Pharmaceutical Supply Chain From China Act, which would ensure that the United States is not dependent on foreign countries for pharmaceutical manufacturing.

Amend Resolution, page 3, line 7, by striking out "therefore be it" and inserting
and

WHEREAS, Protecting the health and safety of Americans is the primary job of elected officials at all times, but especially so during the worldwide COVID-19 pandemic; and

WHEREAS, Domestic production of life-sustaining drugs and medical equipment will ensure that these vital products meet the stringent standards of the United States; and

WHEREAS, The United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has warned that systemic problems at drug manufacturing facilities overseas, particularly in China and India, have led to tainted medication circulating in the United States; and

WHEREAS, The FDA estimates that roughly 85% of the facilities that manufacture ingredients in American drugs are located overseas; and

WHEREAS, In 2019, millions of Americans ingested a contaminant formerly used in the production of rocket fuel through tainted blood pressure drugs produced in China; and

WHEREAS, As much as 95% of ibuprofen, 70% of acetaminophen and 45% of penicillin is made in China; and

WHEREAS, An over-reliance on foreign production of pharmaceuticals affects the health of Americans and also the health of America's economy; and

WHEREAS, The United States should not be dependent on foreign countries to supply vital drugs during a global pandemic; and

WHEREAS, Lawmakers are worried about drug shortages amid the COVID-19 outbreak and have taken action to aid American manufacturers in reclaiming pharmaceutical production; and

WHEREAS, The Protecting Our Pharmaceutical Supply Chain From China Act would phase in a ban on United States agencies purchasing pharmaceuticals with active ingredients produced in China; and

WHEREAS, The bill would increase transparency by requiring the FDA to create a registry of all drugs and by requiring drug companies to list active ingredients and their countries of origin on labels; and

WHEREAS, The measure would provide crucial incentives to ramp up United States manufacturing of pharmaceutical drugs and medical devices; therefore be it

Amend Resolution, page 3, lines 12 through 14, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

RESOLVED, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania urge the Congress of the United States to approve the Protecting Our Pharmaceutical Supply Chain From China Act, which would ensure that the United States is not dependent on foreign countries for pharmaceutical manufacturing; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of each house of Congress and to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls upon the majority whip, Representative Kerry Benninghoff, with respect to the vote on the Dermody amendment.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic voting board does reflect the wishes of the majority party.

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls upon the minority whip, Representative Jordan Harris, on the vote on Representative Dermody's amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is correct on Representative Dermody's amendment.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—202

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

DeLuca	Kauffman	Pashinski	Warren
Dermody	Keefer	Peifer	Webster
Diamond	Keller	Petrarca	Wentling
Donatucci	Kenyatta	Pickett	Wheatley
Dowling	Kim	Polinchock	Wheeland
Driscoll	Kinsey	Puskaric	White
Dunbar	Kirkland	Pyle	Williams
Dush	Klunk	Quinn	Youngblood
Ecker	Knowles	Rabb	Zabel
Emrick	Kortz	Rader	Zimmerman
Evans	Kosierowski	Rapp	
Everett	Krueger	Ravenstahl	Turzai,
Farry	Kulik	Readshaw	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Mako

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 adopt the resolution as amended?

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak on a topic that is important to me on a personal level. I stand in the place of Representative Hanbidge, who has done the good work of pressing this issue forward, providing access to hearing aids by insuring them under Medicare – potentially reaching up to 48 million kids and numerous more adults across the country.

I rise today because I was one of those kids. I was diagnosed with a hearing loss at an early age. My first principal wanted me to go to the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf because he simply did not know how to accommodate for my moderate hearing loss. My mother had to advocate for me to stay in school, and getting me a hearing aid was one of the ways she was able to convince the principal to let me stay. That first hearing aid was a monstrosity – a machine strapped to my chest – a 5-year-old's worst nightmare. I was an active little kid, and I broke a lot of hearing aids. I did not know it at the time, but each time I needed a new one, my family received help from someone to pay for it. Once I even got a hearing aid from a local news reporter. That is how so many kids who need aids and cannot afford them have to do it – rely on small foundations and generous donors who recognize the value of aids in connecting people with hearing loss to the broader world.

If not for the kindness of strangers, I would not have had access to educational and social opportunities. I would not have had the quality of life that put me in the position that I am in now. My support for this resolution is a way for me to recognize the generosity of those who helped me. Along with my colleague from Montgomery County, I will continue to work for greater access to hearing aids so that people with hearing loss can have access to the opportunities with which I have been blessed.

The SPEAKER. Members, we are going to proceed to vote on HR 628. You will not have on your screens the resolution as amended because it is amended right now, but we can proceed to a final vote on this resolution as amended.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The Speaker calls upon the majority whip, Representative Kerry Benninghoff, with respect to the vote on HR 628.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The board does reflect the majority vote of "yes" on HR 628. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. And the minority whip, Representative Jordan Harris.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—202

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Mako

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS
TO HOUSE AMENDMENTS**

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to House amendments to **SB 841, PN 1623**, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 35 (Health and Safety) and 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the Health Care Cost Containment Council, for its powers and duties, for health care cost containment through the collection and dissemination of data, for public accountability of health care costs and for health care for the indigent; providing for COVID-19 disaster emergency; in local organizations and services, further providing for general authority of political subdivisions; and, in Uniform Unsworn Foreign Declarations Act, further providing for heading of chapter, for short title of chapter, for definitions, for applicability and for form of unsworn declaration.

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

The SPEAKER. Moved by the leader that the House concur in the amendments.

Will somebody stand for a brief description of the amendments? And the leader will be taking that for us. It is on page 1 of today's supplemental B House calendar.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, as amended by the Senate, made several changes. The underlying bill itself started with the Pennsylvania Health Care Cost Containment Council, or the PHC4. It is an issue that I think is very timely given the fact that they manage much of our health-care data here in the Commonwealth. The Senate amended it to add a reporting requirement that contains information specific to the COVID-19 response, a new Chapter 57 issue pertaining to the COVID-19 disaster emergency, and also amended the Uniform Unsworn Declarations Act, which I think we locally here have been calling the e-notary bill, and I certainly would urge the members' support. I know myself as well as many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle have received e-mails from our local officials who need the same flexibility that we have given ourselves through our rules to conduct meetings remotely.

I would urge a "yes" vote.

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

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. At this time the Chair calls upon the majority whip, Representative Kerry Benninghoff, on this concurrence vote.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The board does reflect a unanimous vote by the majority party on SB 841.

The SPEAKER. And the Democratic whip, Representative Jordan Harris, is called upon.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—202

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

Everett
Farry

Krueger
Kulik

Ravenstahl
Readshaw

Turzai,
Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Mako

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

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR C

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1189, PN 3565**, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 35 (Health and Safety) and 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for COVID-19 enforcement officer disability benefits, for COVID-19 health care professionals reporting and for volunteer emergency responders employer tax credit; and, in general provisions, providing for extensions for COVID-19 disaster emergency.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

The SPEAKER. Representative Bradford has filed a late-filed amendment, 05076. We would need a motion to suspend for that amendment to be offered.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. **BRADFORD** offered the following amendment
No. **A05076**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 14, by striking out "ENFORCEMENT OFFICER"

Amend Bill, page 6, lines 6 through 27, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

CHAPTER 57 COVID-19 DISABILITY BENEFITS

Sec.

5701. Definitions.

5702. Employee protections.

§ 5701. Definitions.

"COVID-19." The novel coronavirus as identified in the proclamation.

"Enforcement Officer Disability Benefits Law." The act of June 28, 1935 (P.L.477, No.193), referred to as the Enforcement Officer Disability Benefits Law.

"Employee of a life-sustaining business." An employee actively engaged in a task at the direction of an employer designated as a life-sustaining business or occupation during the proclamation. The term shall not include an employee on leave for the entire duration of the proclamation.

"Life-sustaining business." A business or occupation, as designated by the Governor to maintain operations during the

proclamation, which performs or conducts a range of vital operations, functions and services that are essential to assisting the Commonwealth and its political subdivisions in protecting people and their communities while ensuring continuity of functions critical and essential to public health and safety, and economic and homeland security, and which continues to be operational and appropriately modified to account for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Department of Health workforce and customer protection guidance during the proclamation.

"Proclamation." The proclamation of disaster emergency issued by the Governor on March 6, 2020, published at 50 Pa.B. 1644 (March 21, 2020), and any renewal of the state of disaster emergency. § 5702. Employee protections.

(a) Enforcement officer.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person covered under section 1(a) of the Enforcement Officer Disability Benefits Law who contracts or is diagnosed with COVID-19 or is subject to quarantine resulting from exposure to COVID-19 and because of the contraction, diagnosis or quarantine is temporarily incapacitated from performing the person's duties shall be compensated in accordance with section 1(a) of the Enforcement Officer Disability Benefits Law.

(b) Life-sustaining business.—

(1) An employee of a life-sustaining business who contracts or is diagnosed with COVID-19 or is subject to quarantine resulting from exposure to COVID-19 and because of the contraction, diagnosis or quarantine is temporarily incapacitated from performing the person's duties shall be paid the person's full rate of salary by the life-sustaining business until the disability arising because of the contraction, diagnosis or quarantine has ceased.

(2) Each medical and hospital bill incurred in connection with an incapacitation under paragraph (1) shall be paid by the life-sustaining business. During the time a salary for temporary incapacity shall be paid by the life-sustaining business, any workmen's compensation benefits, received or collected by the employee for the period shall be turned over to the life-sustaining business and if the payment is not made by the employee, the amount owed the life-sustaining business shall be deducted from any salary owed to the employee.

Amend Bill, page 14, by inserting between lines 3 and 4

Section 2.1. The addition of 35 Pa.C.S. Ch. 57 shall apply retroactively to March 6, 2020.

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

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

The SPEAKER. Representative Matt Bradford is called upon for a motion to suspend.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment would provide the same protections that are being proposed for our first responders in the uniform variety for those that are not wearing uniform. Simply put, this would extend heart and lung protections that we already have for our – that we would propose for our law enforcement officers for COVID-19 and provide those for those who are our first responders in this unique challenge: those that are our grocery store workers, our people in nursing homes, working in nursing homes. When you think about it, an East Norriton police officer in my district is worth every dollar of it and makes right around six figures and I have no problem defending that. What I do have a problem, and I know some members have talked about the inequities between

big-box and small mom-and-pop stores, the inequity between those and largely people of color and women who are in the frontlines of the service industry that are responding at this time of challenge. This amendment would simply provide that those workers would get the same protections that this bill proposes to do for uniformed workers – frankly, uniformed workers that, in many cases, are making five-, six-, seven-, and eight-fold the type of salaries. We should be – if equality is the word of the day today, let us bring some equality to this and protect all of our workers that are responding to this tragedy in Pennsylvania.

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

The SPEAKER. The majority leader, on the motion to suspend.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the members, a change of this magnitude is a substantial departure from the current heart and lung funds. I would like to read who it currently includes, as the good gentleman listed, but I think it is important: "any member of the State Police Force, any enforcement officer or investigator employed by the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board; the parole agents, enforcement officers and investigators of the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole; Capitol Police officers; correction employees employed by the Department of Corrections...; psychiatric security aides employed by the Department of Human Services...; drug enforcement agents of the Office of Attorney General...; special agents of the Office of Attorney General...; any member of the Delaware River Port Authority Police; any policeman, fireman or park guard of any county, city, borough, town or township; firemen employed by the Commonwealth; any sheriff or deputy sheriff;" as well as "any enforcement officer or investigator for the Pennsylvania Game Commission or Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission."

Mr. Speaker, I ran through that list very quickly because the gentleman's proposal expands this far into the private world and is beyond the original scope and intent of the legislation as it was originally enacted. I would urge an opposition to the suspension of the rules and encourage the gentleman to put this idea in a separate bill. Please vote "no." Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On the motion to suspend, if you are in favor of the motion to suspend, vote "aye"; if you are opposed, vote "nay." Please proceed to vote. It does require 136 votes.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip is recognized on this vote. Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The board does reflect the votes of the majority party accurately.

The SPEAKER. And the minority whip is recognized on this vote.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—93

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

NAYS—109

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Mako

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

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

The SPEAKER. There are no other amendments on this particular bill. So we will just cover it on third consideration.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

On that, the Chair recognizes Representative Jerry Knowles.
Mr. KNOWLES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I do realize that there are a number of you who have a long ride ahead of you tonight, so I think the way the Speaker puts it is I will give you a 30,000-foot view of this bill.

So HB 1189, the volunteer emergency responder employer tax credit, is pretty simple in terms of the initial bill. Basically, if you as an employer have employees who are volunteer firefighters, ambulance people, or people who deal with hazmat situations, you would leave work and you would not lose any pay. Now, the way we would pay your employer back is that he would get tax credits. He would get tax credits and this would be very helpful in terms of particularly with the fire service, because as many of you may know, in 1976 we had 300,000 volunteer firefighters and today we have somewhere around 37,000. So I think that you will agree that our firefighters can use all the help that they can get. So when I laid my head on the pillow last night, that was pretty much the bill. But I am happy to say that I think that as a result of some of you here in this room, we made a good bill better.

Let me talk about the second element of the bill, and I can tell you that Representative Jake Wheatley as well as Representative Doyle Heffley and I have been asking for something from the Department of Health for some time. This bill will require the Department of Health to make public and provide to the counties the ZIP Codes (Zone Improvement Plan Codes) of people who have positive cases, people who have been positive for COVID-19. Now, it is just going to be ZIP Codes. It is not going to get into specific information in terms of addresses or anything like that.

The third element of the bill, I can thank Representative Eric Nelson as well as Representative Jim Rigby. This is an expansion of the Heart and Lung Act, and the leader had earlier read off the various people who would benefit, and what this would say is that police officers as well as other first responders, if they were found to have COVID-19, test positive, and they had to go into quarantine, it would not go against their sick time, it would not go against their vacation. So again, I think we owe that to the people that are out there on the frontline protecting us.

And the fourth element of the bill, and this is thanks to Representative Steve Kinsey, and I thank him for his input, we all know that currently driver's licenses, handicap placards, and vehicle registrations have been extended. Well, what this would do, this would extend 60 days after the end of the declaration by the Governor – 60 days – you would have 60 days more to take care of the business that had to be taken care of.

So again, I am happy to be the prime of this. I thank all the members who have helped me with amendments that we have worked into the bill, and I would ask for an affirmative vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls upon the majority whip with respect to HB 1189.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic voting board does reflect the vote of the majority party on HB 1189. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. And the Chair calls upon the minority whip for the vote with respect to HB 1189.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is correct.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—202

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

Diamond	Keller	Petrarca	Wentling
Donatucci	Kenyatta	Pickett	Wheatley
Dowling	Kim	Polinchock	Wheeland
Driscoll	Kinsey	Puskaric	White
Dunbar	Kirkland	Pyle	Williams
Dush	Klunk	Quinn	Youngblood
Ecker	Knowles	Rabb	Zabel
Emrick	Kortz	Rader	Zimmerman
Evans	Kosierowski	Rapp	
Everett	Krueger	Ravenstahl	Turzai,
Farry	Kulik	Readshaw	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Mako

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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Members, we will recess at this time, after I do some housekeeping business here, to a 12-hour call of the Chair. So we are recessing to a 12-hour call of the Chair. I want everybody to please recognize – those that are here, those that are in their Capitol offices, those that are in their district offices, those that are in their homes – we very likely could be called back this week; not tomorrow, but we could very likely be called back this week to vote. We are at a 12-hour call of the Chair.

BILLS RECOMMITTED

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

- HB 1076;
- HB 2376; and
- HB 2400.

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

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 2387 and HB 2388 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.

CALENDAR CONTINUED**BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 564, PN 2284**, entitled:

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.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 564 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 564 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 432, PN 2568**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 2, 1915 (P.L.736, No.338), known as the Workers' Compensation Act, in interpretation and definitions, further providing for definitions; and, in liability and compensation, further providing for compensation for post-traumatic stress injury.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 432 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 432 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 759, PN 2508**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 35 (Health and Safety) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in emergency management services, providing for emergency response payment.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 759 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 759 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1347, PN 2149**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 17, 1921 (P.L.682, No.284), known as The Insurance Company Law of 1921, in casualty insurance, further providing for billing.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 1347 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 1347 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.

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CUTLER called up **HR 531, PN 2608**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of October 2019 as "Lifesharing Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 531 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

RESOLUTION REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 531 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.

* * *

Mr. CUTLER called up **HR 532, PN 2609**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of October 2019 as "Blindness Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 532 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

RESOLUTION REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 532 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.

* * *

Mr. CUTLER called up **HR 533, PN 2610**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of October 2019 as "National Disability Employment Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 533 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

RESOLUTION REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 533 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.

* * *

Mr. CUTLER called up **HR 576, PN 2722**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of November 2019 as "Assistive Technology Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 576 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

RESOLUTION REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 576 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.

* * *

Mr. CUTLER called up **HR 407, PN 2146**, entitled:

A Resolution designating June 19, 2019, as "World Sickle Cell Day" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION RECOMMITTED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 407 be removed from the active calendar and recommitted to the Rules Committee.

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

* * *

Mr. CUTLER called up **HR 440, PN 2398**, entitled:

A Resolution honoring African-American World War II Army Staff Sergeant Waverly Woodson, Jr., on the 75th anniversary of D-Day for his heroic actions as a corporal and combat medic on Omaha Beach on June 6, 1944.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION RECOMMITTED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 440 be removed from the active calendar and recommitted to the Rules Committee.

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

* * *

Mr. CUTLER called up **HR 447, PN 2405**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the harmful effects of adverse childhood experiences on individuals in this Commonwealth.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION RECOMMITTED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 447 be removed from the active calendar and recommitted to the Rules Committee.

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

REFERRAL PURSUANT TO RULE 45(A) TO GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to rule 45A, the Speaker submits a referral to the House Government Oversight Committee. That is so referred.

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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. We have no further business before us today. We are at recess – we are not adjourned – and it is on a 12-hour call of the Speaker. Thank you.