

# COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

## LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 2020

SESSION OF 2020

204TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 32

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

**THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI)  
PRESIDING**

#### PRAYER

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

Members, this is National EMS Week; EMS, emergency medical services, and our EMTs, emergency medical technicians, and we have the paramedics. These folks you know have been on the front line of our country's battle with the COVID-19 pandemic, and this week, May 17-23, 2020, is "National EMS Week." As paramedics and EMTs have responded to calls related to COVID-19, but to many other of the maladies that confront us as human beings – severe injuries, illness – we want to thank them. Some have died in their service.

There is a prayer, a published prayer, with respect to those who do work in the emergency medical services, and I am going to read that to you today:

Mighty God, we pray for all of those who make up the ranks of our emergency medical services. We ask that they feel Your loving presence, especially during this public health emergency. For those at work today, we pray that You would keep them safe in times of trouble, give them strength in times of weariness, joy in times of sorrow, and hope in times of despair.

Lord, surround them with Your protection during every emergency call. We pray that they are safely returned home to their families after each shift. God, we know that this virus has taken the lives of many who protect our communities; today we honor those sacrifices and remember the families who have been left behind. May they know that the lives of their loved ones have not been in vain. Keep these family members in Your loving care and grant them peace, knowing that those they loved did not back away from service when their communities needed them most.

In Your name we pray. Amen.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

### JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Tuesday, May 19, 2020, will be postponed until printed.

### HOUSE RESOLUTION INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

**No. 880** By Representatives OWLETT, CAUSER, PICKETT, BROWN, T. DAVIS, DONATUCCI, READSHAW, SCHMITT, DELLOSO, LEE, MILLARD, SCHLEGEL CULVER, HENNESSEY and WHEELAND

A Resolution directing the Joint State Government Commission to conduct a thorough and comprehensive analysis of the current school bus driver industry and provide recommendations as to how the Commonwealth can effectively address the shortage of school bus drivers.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, May 20, 2020.

The SPEAKER. We are going to take the master roll early today, earlier in the day than we typically do.

### LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. There are no requests for leaves of absence. Representative Zach MAKO is on military leave serving our country.

### MASTER ROLL CALL

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic voting board is correct for the majority party on the master roll call.

The SPEAKER. And the minority whip.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—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
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

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Mako

The SPEAKER. There are 202 members voting on the master roll. We have a quorum for today, May 20, 2020.

At this time we will take committee announcements.

**FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING**

The SPEAKER. Chairman Mike Peifer of the Finance Committee is recognized for a Finance Committee announcement.

Mr. PEIFER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, at the break we will have a voting meeting of the House Finance Committee in 205 Ryan Office Building to consider HBs 2422 and 2484, as well as any other business brought before the committee; immediately at the break, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, and good morning.

The SPEAKER. At the break there will be an immediate meeting of the House Finance Committee in 205 Ryan Office Building.

Any other committee announcements?

**APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING**

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

**REPUBLICAN CAUCUS**

The SPEAKER. And to our caucus leaders; the majority caucus chair, Marcy Toepel, for a Republican caucus announcement.

Mrs. TOEPEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Republicans will caucus virtually at 12:10. We would be prepared to return to the floor at 1:30. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

**DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS**

The SPEAKER. To the minority leader, Frank Dermody, for a Democratic caucus announcement.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats will caucus at 12 noon; at noon. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

**RECESS**

The SPEAKER. So, members, we will be prepared to return to the floor at 1:30 p.m.

**RECESS EXTENDED**

The time of recess was extended until 1:45 p.m.; further extended until 2 p.m.; further extended until 2:15 p.m.

**AFTER RECESS**

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

**BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**

**HB 1827, PN 3802** By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in criminal homicide, further providing for the offense of causing or aiding suicide.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**HB 2016, PN 2830** By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in assault, providing for the offense of harassment of law enforcement officer; and imposing penalties.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**HB 2056, PN 3800** By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in assault, further providing for the offense of aggravated assault.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**HB 2171, PN 3801** By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in the State System of Higher Education, further providing for establishment of the State System of Higher Education and its institutions, for board of governors, for the chancellor, for powers and duties of the board of governors, for councils of trustees, for powers and duties of councils of trustees and for power and duties of institution presidents.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**HB 2173, PN 3203** By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in the State System of Higher Education, further providing for purposes and general powers, for rental fees and other charges and for annual report and providing for student records.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**HB 2477, PN 3798** By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of July 10, 1981 (P.L.234, No.76), known as the Donated Food Limited Liability Act, further providing for donor immunity.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**HB 2510, PN 3799** By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act providing for regional response health collaborations to promote health in facilities by supporting COVID-19 readiness and response and improving the quality of infection prevention; and making emergency appropriations for human services.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**HB 2517, PN 3758**

By Rep. SAYLOR

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.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**SB 863, PN 1660**

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 48 (Lodging and Housing) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in hotels, further providing for definitions, for hotelkeepers, for notice to boarders to lock rooms, for lien, warrant, sale and right of redemption, for liability for property loss or damage, for special arrangements for safe deposit of valuables, for duty of guest, for other liability, for exemption from levy or sale, for baggage, for baggage sale requirements, for sale proceeds, providing for abandoned property and further providing for tourist camp heater safety.

APPROPRIATIONS.

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

**HB 2484, PN 3804** (Amended)

By Rep. PEIFER

An Act amending Titles 15 (Corporations and Unincorporated Associations) and 20 (Decedents, Estates and Fiduciaries) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, establishing financial restrictions related to the COVID-19 emergency: in financial matters of domestic nonprofit corporations, further providing for investment of trust funds; and in principal and income, further providing for charitable trusts.

FINANCE.

**SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A****BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2477, PN 3798**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of July 10, 1981 (P.L.234, No.76), known as the Donated Food Limited Liability Act, further providing for donor immunity.

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. The majority whip.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic voting board is correct for HB 2477 for the majority party.

The SPEAKER. And the minority whip.  
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	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	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 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 2510, PN 3799**, entitled:

An Act providing for regional response health collaborations to promote health in facilities by supporting COVID-19 readiness and response and improving the quality of infection prevention; and making emergency appropriations for human services.

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?

We have a number of members that have asked to speak. Let me just make sure I have those folks: Representative Wendi Thomas, Representative Russ Diamond, Representative Eric Nelson, Representative Bill Kortz, Representative Harry Readshaw, and Representative Pam DeLissio. So of course, I will go back and forth amongst the caucuses. I will start off with Representative Wendi Thomas. Representative Wendi Thomas. And, Representative, if you will just give me a second, please.

Members, if you could, please take your seats. Every member is entitled to be heard. Can we please extend courtesy to each of the members that are speaking. We have members of both sides of the aisle who are going to be speaking. We are going to start it off with Representative Wendi Thomas.

Members in the back, if you could just step off the floor for your conversations, we would greatly appreciate it. I do not mind the conversations, but just please take them off the floor. All members, please. Sergeants at Arms, if you could just ask members to either take their seats or to go off the floor. Thank you.

Representative Thomas, the floor is yours.

Mrs. THOMAS. For many weeks now, even months – for most of us in here, it probably feels like years – I, like many people in our district, have been distressed over the struggle the coronavirus pandemic has taken on all of us, from the tragic loss of life, to the toll it has taken on our essential workers, and finally to the economic struggles that our communities face that have been caused by the shutdown.

There are many issues this chamber will deal with, both now and in the future, but today we must focus on where the greatest devastation and loss of life has been, and that would be in our long-term-care facilities. They have become deathtraps for our most vulnerable. We should have known to focus on these facilities from the beginning. I hope this body will dedicate itself to lessons learned and what could have been done better.

However, today HB 2510 is not about looking back; it is about looking forward. How do we do a better job for our vulnerable citizens? Well, we all know that COVID-19 is particularly lethal to the elderly and those with underlying medical conditions.

What I heard recently at the House Aging and Adult Services Committee meeting is shocking and should cause us to reevaluate how we care for those in nursing homes.

On Thursday, May 7, we heard testimony from the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, UPMC, their representative. They care for 3500 seniors in long-term living communities in western Pennsylvania. Deborah Brodine, president of UPMC Senior Services, testified on May 7 that UPMC Senior Communities had zero COVID-19 cases across 29 facilities. When I tell people in Bucks County that, they do not believe me. I have to send out the testimony from Aging to get a local physician to understand that there could be a group that had 29 senior facilities and zero COVID cases. Why has not the rest of the State followed UPMC's example? With almost 70 percent of the State's COVID deaths occurring in long-term-care facilities, why not use them as an example of how to protect our defenseless through testing, through PPE (personal protective equipment), through education?

If this is not shocking enough, the very next day, in a continuation of the Aging and Older Adult Services Committee, I had the opportunity to question Secretary of Health Dr. Rachel Levine about this, and she said that the State was making PPE deliveries to our long-term-care facilities that day, May 8. We have been in lockdown since March 17. Sending PPE out a full 2 months later is a problem.

On to testing. A week after Rite Aid announced it would perform COVID tests to 10,000 customers a day across this State, including customers that do not have symptoms, the State announced testing in long-term-care facilities a week later. Let us partner with Rite Aid. We should have been testing our most vulnerable. If teaching hospitals can act swiftly and operate with zero COVID-19 cases, we owe it to our families to place these experts in charge of helping with our COVID response at the State's long-term facilities.

They are the Super Bowl champs. In this case, the lower score wins. UPMC, zero; the rest of the State of Pennsylvania, over 3,000 deaths. Just like sports, everyone wants the coach from the winning team. If we get this legislation done quickly and we can get it signed by the Governor – through the Senate and signed by the Governor – we will bring our best and brightest and most successful and help our long-term-care facilities do better.

If you are contemplating voting against HB 2510, I urge you to reconsider. Stand up for our most vulnerable. Stand up for our parents and our grandparents. Allow our teaching hospitals to do what they do best. Just think, if you are going to put your relative in a facility, where would you go? UPMC, or somewhere else in the State? Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Harry Readshaw, Chairman Harry Readshaw.

Mr. READSHAW. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I had received an e-mail from the office of the president of the Presbyterian SeniorCare Network, and I am not sure how many of my colleagues have received it, but I would like to share a few excerpts from it, which say: "As leader of Presbyterian SeniorCare Network, a diverse organization comprised of an array of Supportive Housing for Low-Income Seniors, Retirement Communities, Care Communities, and programs to support seniors to remain independent in the community, I am profoundly concerned" – and that is the president of the Presbyterian SeniorCare Network saying this – "I am profoundly concerned that we need to evolve from the

traditional fragmented silo structure to a more public health/population health approach to effectively serve seniors with multiple chronic conditions.

"I am hugely encouraged and completely supportive of The Senior Protection Act (HB 2510) as a data-driven, collaborative response to the COVID-19 crisis. Long-term care providers are sorely in need of real-time access to specialized Infection Control resources, on-site testing for residents and staff, and advanced clinical management assistance, as well as tangible things such as Personal Protective Equipment and supplemental staff, if necessary, in order to adequately respond to the presence of COVID-19 in a residential/long-term care setting.

"We are fortunate that western PA has such a collaborative culture and Presbyterian SeniorCare Network has been blessed with longstanding, strong relationships with acute care providers, in particular, UPMC Health System. We wholeheartedly support the proposal of UPMC, in conjunction with the other partners of the regional Educational Support and Clinical Consultation Program, for funding for the outreach services described within The Senior Protection Act. We also stand ready to be active partners in this endeavor to create a comprehensive continuum of care model for older adults."

Mr. Speaker, we have experienced medical professionals collaborate and develop this legislation, and the leader of the supportive housing for low-income seniors, retirement communities, care communities, and programs to support seniors, endorses this legislation. Mr. Speaker, with those words of encouragement from the office of the president of the Presbyterian SeniorCare Network, I urge an affirmative vote for HB 2510.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Russ Diamond.

Mr. DIAMOND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of HB 2510. This bill is a \$500 million investment of Federal funds to focus on what clearly are Pennsylvania's major COVID-19 hotspots, our nursing homes and related facilities. We will do this by helping them with the aid of these hospital systems: Temple, Penn, Jefferson, Geisinger, Penn State Health, St. Luke's, Lehigh Valley, UPMC, Allegheny Health Network, and Lake Erie LECOM (Lake Erie College of Osteopathic Medicine).

Mr. Speaker, our nursing homes and related facilities are where our most vulnerable citizens reside. Now, let us just state for the record who these vulnerable citizens are. Mr. Speaker, in my 5 years as a member of this august body, we have celebrated the lives of many members of the Greatest Generation, who either fought or sacrificed during our country's greatest conflict. That is who we will be protecting with this bill. They are a generation of heroes to this country and our Commonwealth, but more importantly, Mr. Speaker, they are our mothers, our fathers, and our grandparents.

As of Friday, over 2 months into this disaster emergency, the number of COVID deaths in nursing homes and related facilities has surpassed the number of victims killed in the September 11 terrorist attacks in 2001. That is almost 70 percent of Pennsylvania's entire fatality count from COVID-19. Compare that to New York State, where it is under 20 percent; Maryland, where it is under 50 percent; Delaware, where it is under 60 percent; and New Jersey, where it is right around 40 percent. Pennsylvania's death toll in nursing homes represents 70 percent, almost 70 percent of our entire fatalities.

These are the places, again, where our Greatest Generation – our mothers, our fathers, and our grandparents – reside, specifically because they are the most vulnerable. And, Mr. Speaker, although he was referring to a different group of vulnerable individuals, I am reminded of a quotation from the late Robert P. Casey, Sr., former Democratic Governor of this Commonwealth and the father of our senior United States Senator. He said, "Whose rights will we acknowledge? Whose human dignity will we respect? For whose well-being will we, as a people, assume responsibility?"

Mr. Speaker, the need for this bill is painfully clear. The official policy of Pennsylvania's government ought to be acknowledging, respecting, and assuming responsibility for our most vulnerable citizens in nursing homes and similar facilities. Mr. Speaker, I urge an affirmative vote on HB 2510.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Bill Kortz, Chairman Bill Kortz.

Mr. KORTZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of HB 2510, the Senior Protection Act, and I want to thank the Speaker himself for personally bringing this measure forward.

Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I had the privilege and the opportunity to participate in a conference call with UPMC experts Dr. Nace and Dr. Gladwin and their medical team. They were very concerned about the nearly 68-percent mortality rate among seniors in the nursing homes and the long-term-care facilities. These medical experts developed a plan to address the crisis, and let us face it, Mr. Speaker, this is a crisis all over this State in these long-term-care facilities. And I want to point out one that is happening back in our area, a very bad case in Beaver County, the Brighton nursing home. We have a disaster there, Mr. Speaker, and God bless Representative Matzie for standing up and trying to defend those residents that are in that home. We have a disaster there. It is so bad that the Governor has sent out the National Guard, but I am sure you have seen that on the news.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the plan that was developed by this UPMC team is a data-driven direct response to address the crisis. It is a coordinated, collaborative, public-private partnership approach by regional health systems: UPMC, Allegheny Health Network, Geisinger, Penn. Temple, Penn State, and others. These health systems will do the intense surveillance that is needed, the testing strategy, data collection, and the quarantining necessary. The health collaboration will be overseen by the Department of Human Services in consultation with the Department of Health.

Mr. Speaker, this bill appropriates \$500 million that is coming from the Feds to address the COVID-19, and as amended yesterday, it will put in another \$767 million that will go directly to these long-term-care facilities. Mr. Speaker, UPMC medical experts developed this plan. It is a good plan to protect our seniors, and I would urge an affirmative vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Eric Nelson.

Mr. NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today in support of HB 2510, creating a regional health-care collaborative. This is the right way to go, and I do have to say, I applaud both the maker of the bill and the members of the Appropriations staff for their work in developing this process.

In addition, this bill also contains additional financial support for our individuals with intellectual disabilities and autism as it relates to the COVID response. So we are helping multiple

groups because one of our greatest losses of life through this crisis was in our senior facilities. Over 70 percent of lives lost in the State of Pennsylvania were in this small subset, while at the same time we have heard testimony from other members that both large facilities, and even a gentleman a few miles from my house, his several-hundred facility, no cases.

This bill creates an opportunity for the State to implement best practices across the board and will create a lifeline so that we do not return to what we are just coming out of, because unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this is a stark contrast to what our facilities experienced over these last several months. We heard very disturbing testimony on the Aging Committee where some facilities said that they did not feel they were forgotten, they felt they were abandoned.

Our own Westmoreland County Department of Public Safety sent an e-mail on April 10, when we had 10 deaths at senior facilities in the county, asking for a response, asking for the team to be able to come, asking for guidance; that letter was unanswered. Over 40 days, Mr. Speaker, a second request was sent to the department, no response. Ironically, today, as we debate this bill, an e-mail arrived. We are now at over 32 deaths in 9 nursing homes.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the work that you put into this product. I thank all members for being able to support this bill, and more importantly, I thank the facilities that have done a great job for how they are going to help others learn and respond in the future. So let us all support HB 2510, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Pam DeLissio.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, please know that I have an appreciation for the effort here in HB 2510, but today I will be a "no" vote for that bill.

I have been close to this particular sector and this particular industry for probably close to 40 years, most of my professional career, and as much as the amendments yesterday helped to get some of that money directly to the skilled nursing homes and other health-care facilities that are within the long-term-care services and support system, we have done barely any due diligence as to how this situation occurred. It is not unique to Pennsylvania, it is not unique to the United States, and it is not unique to other countries in the world. It is easy to see that this situation has happened time and time again in a variety of places.

I appreciated the effort of the Aging Committee last week, but, Mr. Speaker, on 2 different days there were barely 2 hours' worth of hearings, barely any time to really get into any detail as to what the situation is. And here we have identified some dollars that are available to the Commonwealth, and these dollars total \$1.2 billion. And with not a lot more consideration than— And yes, we have heard extremely disturbing numbers and extremely disturbing information on the radio, on the television. Sound bites when they are put out that way without context are meant to get attention, and they have certainly gotten our attention. But I certainly see the path forward very differently, and with this kind of significant, meaningful substantive resource, I would like to see those resources applied in the most effective way possible.

There is nothing in here that says what the qualifications of an academic medical center are, whether or not they have to have any experience or expertise as it pertains to the operation of long-term care. In fact, I do not even see any limitation as you would in a private grant foundation, that no more than X percentage of dollars can be used for administrative support.

I can tell you personally that the long-term-care continuum could desperately use \$1.2 billion, and I think we should put that out in the most responsible way possible and I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to participate with the Aging Committee, and again, I appreciate the Speaker's effort, but today with this bill in front of me, unfortunately I will be a "no" vote. And if anybody doubts my compassion, my passion for this sector, they would be grossly mistaken.

I also would like to include that our look-back and look-see and look-forward absolutely, positively needs to include acute-care systems. I have participated on quite a number of calls over the last couple of months with frontline health-care workers in the acute-care world who have been extremely critical of acute-care systems.

So we have landed and focused on numbers in long-term care only. We have not even looked at acute-care systems or acute-care numbers or what some of those challenges might be. In fact, I just looked at my RecBox and I see yet again a new influx of, "our hospitals need help." I have gotten hundreds of e-mails, as I imagine most of us have, about helping our hospitals. And, Mr. Speaker, I think this has been the problem over the last three and four decades that I have been involved in this sector, that nobody has really been a champion for long-term care, but we have certainly been a champion for acute care over the years.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to be a champion for long-term care, and I look forward to working with the body, just not quite this way. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Does anybody else wish to speak before the leaders or— Do either of the leaders wish to speak?

The majority leader, Representative Bryan Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, to the residents and staff of the long-term-care facilities, we have heard your cries, and thanks to the leadership of the Speaker, we have got this proposal now before us to vote. Unlike Florida, which immediately implemented a nursing home protection plan, we were slightly behind as a Commonwealth with a similar effort. Their first two Executive orders in fact limited visitors to nursing homes, as well as prevented the transfer of COVID-19-positive patients back to the same nursing homes. And it was with a heavy heart that we learned that there was in fact a more comprehensive plan made here, but simply not implemented.

So the Speaker, in conjunction with the health experts, designed the Senior Protection Act, HB 2510, which we now have before us. It is data-driven. It is collaborative. It is everything that it should be in this crisis. To date, more than two-thirds of the 3,731 deaths are directly related to nursing homes and long-term-care facilities and residents who live there. The impact for this will last for years, but if passed and signed into law, this bill would do several things. It would leverage an existing coordinated collaborative public-private partnership that includes multiple stakeholders to provide protections to seniors and health-care professionals.

Mr. Speaker, if we are able to protect these high-risk individuals in their home setting, they never get to the hospitals, and the hospitals are never overwhelmed. Through a collaborative review of the clinical situations within the facilities identified as having unmet needs, a health collaborative shall formulate an action plan tailored to the facility, identifying specific resources or tactical actions to implement to assist these facilities.

Mr. Speaker, this is the exact same plan that was implemented in Florida. They identified those high-risk facilities, those with a history of prior infections that were higher than the statewide averages, and they put appropriate protections in place. These initial efforts contained in this bill will focus in three areas: enhanced testing, infection control and consultation, and advanced clinical management assistance. And we do this with over \$500 million of funding out of Pennsylvania's allotment of \$3.9 billion of COVID-19 money from the Federal government and the Federal CARES (Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security) Act.

This money is to be distributed by the Department of Human Services thanks to an amendment that was previously accepted, and to work in conjunction with the long-term-care facilities and the regional health collaboratives. Back to the three components: the testing would be responsive, it would be on-site, it would be thorough, and most importantly, similar to what Lancaster County has already adopted through their own actions, it would establish a surveillance testing strategy as well.

The infection control they would have, facilities could fund specific deployment of infection control nurses to observe on-site conditions, on-site observations, consultations with mobile teams; implement infection control practices such as cohorting, PPE, case detection, staffing practices; and facilitate the completion of tracing exposure studies, enabling an accurate and thorough picture of frontline conditions essential to formulating further action plans. This management in conjunction with the local health systems is vital because it is those health systems that will in fact get those patients should they have issues.

For all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this bill so that we can protect our senior citizens, those who are most vulnerable to the COVID-19 crisis. Thank you.

On the question recurring,  
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic voting board is correct, a unanimous vote by the majority party on HB 2510.

The SPEAKER. And the minority whip.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sirs.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—201

Barrar	Fiedler	Lee	Rigby
Benninghoff	Fitzgerald	Lewis	Roae
Bernstine	Flynn	Longietti	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	McCarter	Sappey
Bullock	Gleim	McClinton	Saylor
Burgos	Goodman	McNeill	Schemel
Burns	Green	Mehaffie	Schlossberg
Caltagirone	Gregory	Mentzer	Schmitt
Carroll	Greiner	Merski	Schroeder
Causar	Grove	Metcalfe	Schweyer
Cephas	Hahn	Metzgar	Shusterman
Ciresi	Hanbidge	Mihalek	Simmons
Comitta	Harkins	Millard	Sims
Conklin	Harris	Miller, B.	Snyder
Cook	Heffley	Miller, D.	Solomon
Cox	Helm	Mizgorski	Sonney
Cruz	Hennessey	Moul	Staats
Culver	Hershey	Mullery	Stephens
Cutler	Hickernell	Mullins	Struzzi
Daley	Hohenstein	Murt	Sturla
Davanzo	Howard	Mustello	Thomas
Davidson	Innamorato	Neilson	Tobash
Davis, A.	Irvin	Nelson	Toepel
Davis, T.	Isaacson	O'Mara	Tomlinson
Dawkins	James	O'Neal	Toohil
Day	Jones	Oberlander	Topper
Deasy	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	

## NAYS—1

DeLissio

## 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 2173, PN 3203**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in the State System of Higher Education, further providing for purposes and general powers, for rental fees and other charges and for annual report and providing for student records.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On the bill, the Chair calls upon Representative Meghan Schroeder.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When we originally were working on drafting these pieces of reform for the PASSHE (Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education) system, it was pre-COVID-19. Now with all of the hurdles that we see since the pandemic, we understand that now more than ever this is needed to help our system continue to be the place where students go for an affordable and excellent higher education opportunity. I am a proud graduate of the PASSHE system, and this bill will work at making it even better, and here is how.

HB 2173 is designed to update and modernize Act 188. The State System was established in 1982 by Act 188, but since its passage, there has been no significant attempt to update or modernize this law. First, the bill will ease redundant reporting requirements by eliminating PASSHE's requirement to submit the Snyder Report to the Pennsylvania Department of Education and Joint State Government Commission. To fulfill these requirements of this report, each of the 14 universities within our State System invests approximately 140 hours each year, totaling 1900 hours annually.

Additionally, much of the same data is already reported and publicly available through the Federal Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. HB 2173 will also clarify language in Act 188 regarding cooperative use or purchasing agreements, and it would remove outdated language regarding student rental fees. Finally, this legislation will add language to Act 188 which would exempt student records and e-mails in the State's Right-to-Know Law.

Please join me in supporting this reform and vote "yes" on HB 2173. Go Marauders.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The chair, Representative Curt Sonney, on HB 2173, PN 3203; sir.

Mr. SONNEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of HB 2173. This is one of the bills in the PASSHE package. It is the bill that has, as far as I know, no controversy attached to it. I do not believe there are any outside organizations that are opposed to this one, and I would encourage the members to vote in the affirmative on HB 2173.

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 majority whip.  
 Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
 The electronic voting board is correct with a unanimous vote by the majority party on HB 2173.  
 The SPEAKER. And the minority whip.  
 Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
 This Millersville Marauder sees a unanimous vote.

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.

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2016, PN 2830**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in assault, providing for the offense of harassment of law enforcement officer; and imposing penalties.

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?

The Chair recognizes Representative Lou Schmitt on the bill.  
 Mr. SCHMITT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just respectfully request for the votes of my colleagues.  
 Thank you.

On the question recurring,  
 Shall the bill pass finally?

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip.  
 Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
 Another unanimous vote by the majority party on HB 2016.  
 The SPEAKER. And the minority whip.  
 Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
 The electronic board is accurate.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—170

Barrar	Fee	Malagari	Rigby
Benninghoff	Flynn	Maloney	Roae
Bernstine	Freeman	Markosek	Rothman
Bizzarro	Fritz	Marshall	Rowe
Boback	Gabler	Masser	Rozzi
Bonner	Galloway	Matzie	Ryan
Borowicz	Gaydos	McNeill	Sainato
Boyle	Gillen	Mehaffie	Samuelson
Bradford	Gillespie	Mentzer	Sankey
Briggs	Gleim	Merski	Sappey
Brooks	Goodman	Metcalfe	Saylor
Brown	Gregory	Metzgar	Schemel
Burns	Greiner	Mihalek	Schlossberg
Caltagirone	Grove	Millard	Schmitt
Carroll	Hahn	Miller, B.	Schroeder
Causer	Hanbidge	Miller, D.	Schweyer

Ciresi	Harkins	Mizgorski	Shusterman
Comitta	Heffley	Moul	Simmons
Conklin	Helm	Mullery	Snyder
Cook	Hennessey	Mullins	Solomon
Cox	Hershey	Murt	Sonney
Culver	Hickernell	Mustello	Staats
Cutler	Hohenstein	Neilson	Stephens
Davanzo	Irvin	Nelson	Struzzi
Davis, A.	James	O'Mara	Thomas
Davis, T.	Jones	O'Neal	Tobash
Day	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Toepel
Deasy	Kail	Ortitay	Tomlinson
DeLissio	Kaufer	Otten	Toohil
Deloso	Kauffman	Owlett	Topper
Delozier	Keefer	Pashinski	Ullman
DeLuca	Keller	Peifer	Warner
Dermody	Klunk	Petrarca	Warren
Diamond	Knowles	Pickett	Webster
Donatucci	Kortz	Polinchock	Wentling
Dowling	Kosierowski	Puskaric	Wheeland
Driscoll	Krueger	Pyle	White
Dunbar	Kulik	Quinn	Williams
Dush	Lawrence	Rader	Zabel
Ecker	Lewis	Rapp	Zimmerman
Emrick	Longietti	Ravenstahl	
Everett	Mackenzie	Readshaw	Turzai,
Farry	Madden	Reese	Speaker

NAYS—32

Bullock	Fiedler	Isaacson	Rabb
Burgos	Fitzgerald	Kenyatta	Roebuck
Cephas	Frankel	Kim	Sanchez
Cruz	Gainey	Kinsey	Sims
Daley	Green	Kirkland	Sturla
Davidson	Harris	Lee	Vitali
Dawkins	Howard	McCarter	Wheatley
Evans	Innamorato	McClinton	Youngblood

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 1827, PN 3802**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in criminal homicide, further providing for the offense of causing or aiding suicide.

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

The SPEAKER. There is an amendment that is sought to be addressed on third consideration. It is offered by Representative Dan Miller. It is 05801. He will need to make a motion to suspend.

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

Mr. D. MILLER offered the following amendment  
No. **A05801**:

Amend Bill, page 2, lines 1 through 19, by striking out the period in line 1 and all of lines 2 through 19 and inserting

or autism spectrum disorder.  
(2) As used in this subsection, the following words and phrases shall have the meanings given to them in this paragraph unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

"Autism spectrum disorder." As defined under 42 Pa.C.S. § 5992 (relating to definitions), regardless of the age of the individual.

"Intellectual disability." Regardless of the age of the person, significantly subaverage general intellectual functioning that is accompanied by significant limitations in adaptive functioning in at least two of the following skill areas:

- (i) Communication.
- (ii) Self-care.
- (iii) Home living.
- (iv) Social and interpersonal skills.
- (v) Use of community resources.
- (vi) Self-direction.
- (vii) Functional academic skills.
- (viii) Work.
- (ix) Health.
- (x) Safety.

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

**RULES SUSPENDED**

The SPEAKER. There has to be a motion to suspend. Please speak just on the motion. I recognize you have to just tell us a little bit about the amendment to get the motion to suspend, but it is not a belabored motion. I understand, I think, Representative Frank Ryan, are you going to be responding to the motion or— Oh, you are going to speak on it. Okay.

Representative Dan Miller.

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

Mr. Speaker, yesterday this body recognized that there is a difference between an intellectual disability and autism in a similar nature type of bill. I definitely respected that and appreciated that as we kind of referenced, those are important distinctions. This amendment here, as referenced, is seeking to be brought up here on third, and what it would do is just be sure that we have intellectual disability and autism referenced as they are, which is two separate distinctions, not the same thing.

So that is all it would do, and I would be asking for an affirmative vote so that we can correct this part of the legislation.

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, I want to ask the members to also please support the motion to suspend. I know the good gentleman and I have worked on some other issues regarding intellectual disabilities,

autism, and physical disabilities, and I think this is a good amendment that makes the bill stronger. I urge a "yes" vote.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Unanimous vote by the majority party on the Miller amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. And the minority whip.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—201

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

NAYS—1

Mullery

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Mako

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

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

The SPEAKER. We will now take up the amendment, 05801. That has already been read to us. Does anybody wish to speak on the amendment? Representative Miller? Okay. And Representative Ryan, do you want to speak on the amendment, sir? No.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic voting board is correct for a unanimous vote by the majority party.

The SPEAKER. And the minority whip.

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	Solomon
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	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 amendment was agreed to.

On the question,

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?

We will now proceed to final passage of this bill. It is HB 1827. Keep in mind, it has been amended by amendment 05801, so the language on the screen does not reflect the addition of the amendment, but we are still going to be able to vote it on third.

The Chair calls upon Representative Frank Ryan.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

It is sad day that we have to vote on a measure like this, and in tremendous love and honor and respect to Shawn and to Shawn's family, I want to just have all of us think what it would be like to realize that you have a child that is in great pain. As we are all experiencing what is going on with COVID-19 now and the isolation that many people may feel, the mental health anguish that could exist for so many people, to think that there would actually be people in our society that would encourage someone to commit suicide, and actually assist them in doing it, is inconceivable to me in every possible way.

I remember the day I first heard it. Valerie Pritchett posted something on Facebook and both Dawn Keefer and I talked, and this bill is a reflection of the tremendous leadership from Representative Dawn Keefer, and I am so thankful that she is letting me speak on this today. Imagine a situation where someone is crying out for help, and Shawn actually had second thoughts, and instead of encouraging her to get help, they gave her the prescription on how to make the poison, how to do it, how to make sure that her parents were not at home when this happened.

Our society lost what I believe would have been an incredibly wonderful human being, a wonderful woman, and we have all been denied that because of the selfishness of certain people. I would ask today that when you do this, imagine it could be a member of your own family.

I would ask for an affirmative vote, and please just remember her and keep her and her entire family in your prayers. And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to also ask if I could introduce into the record for Representative Dawn Keefer her written remarks.

### REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. Yes, the remarks certainly will be accepted.

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

Increasing criminal penalties for people convicted of aiding or encouraging another person to commit suicide adds an additional tool for our judges to attack yet another evil preying upon our children and individuals with special needs. Aiding or encouraging someone to take his or her own life is nothing more than murder by proxy, not to mention a shameful and cowardly act that should certainly carry substantial penalty.

There have been numerous instances across the country of individuals guiding and encouraging others to commit suicide. One such case happened in my district in York County. Shawn Shatto, for whom Shawn's Law is named, took her life in her parent's Newberry Township home after receiving step-by-step instructions from an online chat forum. Chat forum participants led her through the entire process, from preparing poison, to proper timing, to making sure her parents were not home – explaining if they found her in the midst of the act they would intervene and/or resuscitate her. As Shawn began the process, she contacted the chat forum explaining she was scared and was having second thoughts. More than one person on the forum told her that suicide was the best route and wished Shawn well on her journey instead of encouraging her to seek help.

As a parent, could you imagine? My heart breaks for Shawn and her family. In Shawn's hour of need, she was met by predators leading her down a path from which there was no return. The depravity is incomprehensible.

HB 1827 provides a much-needed sentencing enhancement for the crime of encouraging or aiding another person – under the age of 18 or with an intellectual disability – to commit suicide. While grading this crime as a felony of the second degree certainly will not bring back our loved ones, it will levy a harsher consequence for such a horrendous act. I ask all of my colleagues for a positive vote on HB 1827.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kerry Benninghoff.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I also want to compliment the maker of this. As Representative Ryan said, it is sad that we have to talk about these types of issues, but I think it is also important to do so, and I cannot think of anything that is more sad, and maybe the word "ignorant," that

someone would try to encourage someone to take their own life when they should really be trying to provide hope and love and support, especially these young individuals that are less than 18 years old. That is a confusing time in your life as it is. It is a very fragile time. Unfortunately, I saw too many losses of life when I served as coroner when I worked in the emergency room.

This is a good bill. I hope all of our members can support it. When we lose these young people who are physically healthy otherwise, it is a tragic loss of life and many years of life not only to the family, but to their communities and the futures that they hold. Lord only knows what they could have been, and to think that someone else could be encouraging them and giving them that kind of negative guidance is irresponsible and reprehensible. And I think that we all need to be supportive of this, and again, I ask for a unanimous vote. Thank you.

On the question recurring,  
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip.  
Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
Unanimous vote by the majority party on HB 1827.  
The SPEAKER. And the minority whip.  
Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
The electronic board is accurate.  
The SPEAKER. Thank you, sirs.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—188

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

Deasy	Kail	Otten	Ullman
Delloso	Kaufar	Owlett	Warner
DeLozier	Kauffman	Pashinski	Warren
DeLuca	Keefe	Peifer	Webster
Dermody	Keller	Petrarca	Wentling
Diamond	Kenyatta	Pickett	Wheeland
Donatucci	Kim	Polinchock	White
Dowling	Kirkland	Puskaric	Williams
Driscoll	Klunk	Pyle	Youngblood
Dunbar	Knowles	Quinn	Zimmerman
Dush	Kortz	Rader	
Ecker	Kosierowski	Rapp	Turzai,
Emrick	Krueger	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Evans	Kulik		

NAYS—14

DeLissio	Isaacson	Rabb	Vitali
Gainey	Kinsey	Sims	Wheatley
Hohenstein	Lee	Solomon	Zabel
Innamorato	Miller, D.		

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 2056, PN 3800**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in assault, further providing for the offense of aggravated assault.

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?

The Chair calls upon Representative Struzzi.  
Mr. STRUZZI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand today to ask for your support for HB 2056, but I also stand today to ask for your support for those people who suffer from disabilities that have also been victims of crimes. This bill today is named for a young man in my district. His name is Cody Overdorff. When it passes, and I hope it passes with strong support, it will be called Cody's Law.

I would like to give you a little bit of background on how this bill came to me and why I introduced it. It was August of last year, and I was watching the news. And in Indiana County, we get a little dose of Pittsburgh news and we get some Johnstown and Altoona news, and I saw a horrific video of a young man

being assaulted on the Hoodlebug Trail, which is a trail that runs through Indiana County, a very nice recreational trail. This young man sat on a bench while four individuals took turns assaulting him.

The SPEAKER. Representative, if you will just suspend for a moment.

Members, if we could, please give the good gentleman an opportunity to be heard. He is particularly talking about a particular incident that underlies this particular legislation. So please, as we will with every member, give him some respect to be heard.

Mr. STRUZZI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So watching this video is painful enough, but when you find out – to back it up, they videotaped it, right? And they put it on Facebook, which is why it was on the news. So thankfully, the culprits were dumb enough to videotape it, but that is how we learned about it. But what I have learned since introducing this bill is these types of assaults happen all the time to people who are disabled, and according to the way the law is written currently, because of the nature of this assault, they were only charged with misdemeanors. So people like Cody do not see justice. So this bill was introduced to change that so that any assault on someone with a disability moves from a simple assault to an aggravated assault. We need to do this for people like Cody, for all the families that have come to me after this to ask for this bill to move forward.

So I am asking for your support today. I do want to thank the district attorney in Indiana County, Patrick Dougherty at the time, who helped me craft the language for this bill, and then the current district attorney, Bob Manzi, who helped me work through the amendments. I want to thank Chairman Kauffman for moving this bill forward, and I want to thank all the families that have shown their support for this.

But please, I urge you to vote in the affirmative for this bill. Young men like Cody need this, their families need this, and we need to protect those people who cannot protect themselves. So again I ask for your support for HB 2056. Thank you.

On the question recurring,  
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Unanimous vote by the majority party on HB 2056.

The SPEAKER. And the minority whip.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—167

Barrar	Freeman	Malagari	Rigby
Benninghoff	Fritz	Maloney	Roae
Bernstine	Gabler	Markosek	Rothman
Bizzarro	Galloway	Marshall	Rowe
Boback	Gaydos	Masser	Rozzi
Bonner	Gillen	Matzie	Ryan

Borowicz	Gillespie	McNeill	Sainato
Boyle	Gleim	Mehaffie	Samuelson
Bradford	Goodman	Mentzer	Sankey
Briggs	Gregory	Merski	Sappay
Brooks	Greiner	Metcalfe	Saylor
Brown	Grove	Metzgar	Schemel
Burns	Hahn	Mihalek	Schlossberg
Caltagirone	Hanbidge	Millard	Schmitt
Carroll	Harkins	Miller, B.	Schroeder
Causar	Heffley	Mizgorski	Schweyer
Ciresi	Helm	Moul	Shusterman
Comitta	Hennessey	Mullery	Simmons
Conklin	Hershey	Mullins	Snyder
Cook	Hickernell	Murt	Solomon
Cox	Howard	Mustello	Sonney
Culver	Irvin	Neilson	Staats
Cutler	James	Nelson	Stephens
Davanzo	Jones	O'Mara	Struzzi
Davis, T.	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Thomas
Day	Kail	Oberlander	Tobash
Deasy	Kauffer	Ortitay	Toepel
Delloso	Kauffman	Otten	Tomlinson
Delozier	Keefer	Owlett	Toohil
DeLuca	Keller	Pashinski	Topper
Dermody	Kinsey	Peifer	Ullman
Diamond	Klunk	Petrarca	Warner
Donatucci	Knowles	Pickett	Warren
Dowling	Kortz	Polinchock	Webster
Driscoll	Kosierowski	Puskaric	Wentling
Dunbar	Krueger	Pyle	Wheeland
Dush	Kulik	Quinn	White
Ecker	Lawrence	Rader	Williams
Emrick	Lewis	Rapp	Zimmerman
Everett	Longietti	Ravenstahl	
Farry	Mackenzie	Readshaw	Turzai,
Fee	Madden	Reese	Speaker
Flynn			

NAYS—35

Bullock	Evans	Isaacson	Roebuck
Burgos	Fiedler	Kenyatta	Sanchez
Cephas	Fitzgerald	Kim	Sims
Cruz	Frankel	Kirkland	Sturla
Daley	Gainey	Lee	Vitali
Davidson	Green	McCarter	Wheatley
Davis, A.	Harris	McClinton	Youngblood
Dawkins	Hohenstein	Miller, D.	Zabel
DeLissio	Innamorato	Rabb	

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 **HB 2517, PN 3758**, 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 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?

The Chair calls upon the good gentleman, Representative Craig Staats, on HB 2517.

Mr. STAATS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Several weeks ago when the COVID-19 pandemic led the Governor to shut down nonessential businesses, residential cleaning services were among those closed. Mr. Speaker, the timing could not be worse. With so many of us ordered to stay home, our houses have become offices and classrooms, the family restaurant, and a place for entertainment. We need residential cleaning services now more than ever.

Of particular concern are those who for age, disabilities, failing health, or other reasons, rely on these services to clean their homes. A cleaning company in my legislative district has received numerous calls from senior citizens who have gone without cleaning services for months, raising health and safety concerns. Keep in mind—

The SPEAKER. Sir, please just suspend for a moment. Members, please, the gentleman is entitled to be heard, an important public policy point with respect to what we are facing. Everybody who wishes to speak is entitled to be heard. I would ask everybody to please give your undivided attention.

Representative Staats.

Mr. STAATS. Keep in mind, these cleaning companies can service commercial establishments, but not residential establishments. They can clean and sanitize your business, but not your home.

I am sponsoring HB 2517 to permit residential cleaning businesses to clean and maintain private homes while adhering to CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) health and safety protocols to avoid the spread of COVID-19. I believe they can operate safely, as they often work individually or in groups of two. Reopening these businesses not only contributes to safer, healthier homes and occupants, but it enables Pennsylvania residents to safely get back to work.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill that keeps our citizens safe, and I ask for an affirmative vote on HB 2517.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kevin Boyle.

Mr. BOYLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have a responsibility to get it right. Contrary to what the good gentleman from Bucks County just said, right now under Governor Wolf's emergency shutdown orders, residential cleaning is allowed for. Specifically, in the orders, under remediation and waste management, there is a reference to services to buildings and dwellings. So we believe, in the Democratic Caucus, that residential cleaning is already covered, and then furthermore, we got confirmation on this from the Wolf administration.

So I would like to motion to table this bill, Mr. Speaker.

## MOTION TO TABLE

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. Representative Boyle, you may make such motion. Please state the motion, sir, and then just your reasoning for it.

Mr. BOYLE. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to make a motion to table this bill because what it is trying to do is already law already.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. On this motion, I have been informed by the Parliamentarian – and I have to remind myself, despite the many years, that on this type of a motion, only the leaders and then the maker of the motion and the maker of the bill can speak on this particular motion.

So at this time, Representative Staats, do you wish to speak on this? And then I will call on the leaders. And then Representative Boyle, if you want a second opportunity, that is appropriate.

Mr. STAATS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What I do know is that I have a large cleaning service company in my district that is currently shut down. Again, they can come to your business and clean your business, but they cannot come to your home and clean and sanitize your home.

It is for that reason I introduced this bill. We did some research and they are not currently operating, so we need to get them operating like many other businesses, and I would ask for, again, a negative vote on the motion.

The SPEAKER. Leader Dermody, on the motion, sir.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it must be a voluntary closing. The order is clear and it mentions dwellings, and all I know is that where I live, they have been cleaning and working in dwellings – houses, residential, commercial – since the beginning of all of this. This is absolutely unnecessary.

The member from Philadelphia has pointed out that the administration has always said they were an essential service, so houses and homes and buildings are being cleaned and sanitized as we speak. Now, I guess if you want to close down on your own, you can, but the Wolf administration has not closed residential cleaning.

I support the motion to table.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

The majority leader, on the motion.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the motion to table for the following reasons. First of all, what the Governor is executing are Executive orders, not laws. While they may have the force of law, the chair of the State Government Committee would be incorrect. They are not laws.

Furthermore, we are legislators and speak through legislation, and if it was so clear and so apparent that this was allowed under the existing order prior to today, I simply ask why this was not raised during second consideration by the Democrats through the amendment process? So obviously, it was not so clear or they would have raised it much sooner. And furthermore, we do not live in a police State. We do not operate under orders that exist in perpetuity; we exist as a nation of laws.

I would encourage us to defeat this motion and pass this bill immediately, because by the gentleman's own admission, the prime sponsor, there are clearly businesses that have not gotten answers or clarity, and it was not raised previously by the other party through the amendment process or anywhere prior to this debate. So if there is a question, we should fix it and be crystal clear. I, for one, am tired of the ambiguity. I am tired of the backdoor letters that bypass the legislative cycle and I am tired of individuals getting preferential treatment through the waiver process. This needs to end. Let us pass this bill.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kevin Boyle, on the motion.

Mr. BOYLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I give kudos to the majority leader for championing the rights of businesses that can already open. So the proof of what I said earlier in relation to residential cleaners being available to operate is literally right here. You can actually – I know we are not supposed to use props – but I will give you the Web site and you can actually go and download it and see what I am referring to. And I would appreciate support for this motion to table.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip, sir.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic voting board is correct, an enthusiastic unanimous vote by the majority party.

The SPEAKER. And the minority whip.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The following roll call was recorded:

#### YEAS—90

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

#### NAYS—112

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

#### NOT VOTING—0

#### EXCUSED—1

Mako

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

On the question recurring,  
Shall the bill pass finally?

The SPEAKER. We will proceed to vote on HB 2517, PN 3758.

Representative Boyle, you may speak on the bill.

Mr. BOYLE. Like the majority leader said, we are still in the legislative process. We can correct a mistake. This bill is a mistake. We are about to enact a bill to correct a problem that does not exist. So why do we not exercise some caution and let us do the right thing and either vote "no" or go over this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The prime sponsor of the bill, Representative Craig Staats, for the second time.

Mr. STAATS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For all of the reasons I stated, and in the interest of clarity, I would ask for an affirmative vote on HB 2517.

The SPEAKER. The minority Appropriations chair, Representative Bradford.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And thank you for the opportunity to speak on this legislation. I know that the gentleman cares deeply about the business in his district, and I will not talk about the substance other than to say

that I recognize that this process over several months has been daunting and challenging, and there are those, going back to the March 6, 2020, declaration of the Governor, who have found this a very difficult period.

My concern is with a process that has led us to this bill and how we wound up here. I recognize nobody wants to get up and say that we should keep any business – any small business, any big business, any business – closed. This is a tough time for all of us. But I do think that this bill offers us an opportunity, a necessary opportunity, frankly, to reflect on how we wound up here over several months and how it plays into this bill.

March 6, 2020, I mentioned the Governor offers the disaster declaration; March 16, the Governor closes schools statewide; March 16, restaurants are closed. I believe on March 16 the President of the United States issues an order, and I believe at that point, it was 15 days to stop the spread; March 17, one of our colleagues offered a motion to terminate the disaster emergency declaration, which would have the effect of stopping all of these closures. I believe on March 19 the Governor issues a statewide closure of all non-life-sustaining businesses; March 21, the President notably talks about the opportunity to use hydroxychloroquine as a potential cure; March 27, the first bill is offered to reopen construction, HB 2400, the same day to reopen car dealers; March 31, the President of the United States approves a disaster declaration, and in that same conversation, also recognizes that we are going to need another 30 days to stop the spread, for the entire month of April leading up to May 1.

During that time period, we have had numerous bills, reopener bills like this – and again, I do not want to get into whether this is necessary at this time. I just wonder about the futility of this whole process. Our caucus on many occasions has offered worker-protection amendments, has talked about the inequality that so many members feel at this time, and it is a difficult time for so many.

The good majority leader has often talked about the inequality about what businesses got closed, as he did in his remarks a second ago, but I think we have not spent enough time, as much time as we have spent on these issues, we have not talked about how this country's deep-seated inequalities of economic inequality—

The SPEAKER. Please. Majority leader, do you have a point or order?

### POINT OF ORDER

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

I certainly appreciate the recitation of the timeline, and I will be adding some other data points that I think are pertinent, but I think now the gentleman's dive into other policy area is beyond the underlying bill.

The SPEAKER. Sir, certainly the timeline was broad. You are in leadership; we gave leeway, certainly, in response to what the majority leader raised, but moving into a public policy or philosophical approach does seem to the Speaker to be out of line with respect to a reflection on the bill. I would appreciate if you would stick to the bill, and I understand the context in which you had provided it, but please, on the bill.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, and I do appreciate the latitude, Mr. Speaker.

So obviously, with the President's expiration of the 30-day closure, this Commonwealth had a difficult decision and has over the last, I guess, 19 days about how to appropriately and safely reopen our economy and how housecleaning businesses fall into that. I recognize that how we go about doing that is something that requires great thought and great safety. I believe worker protections need to be a part of that, and that is not in this bill. I believe the inequalities that we have in all of these challenging times have been drawn out more so than normal, and we need to talk about that.

I know that the gentleman has talked about, the majority leader, about the personal choice of whether you choose to have a cleaning person come to your home or in other businesses that that is personal to the individual, but obviously, when you are dealing with a pandemic, the choices that every one of us makes reverberates like a rock thrown into a lake, and we all recognize there is a ripple effect to all of our health. So the idea that we would go about that, we should do smartly, and that is why the administration I believe has already allowed this, because they recognize that there is a certain level of risk that we all must accept.

So again, I do not want to argue against the gentleman's bill. I think it is already law, and again I say that from a good place. But I think we have to talk about how we wound up here, and again, I do not want to go through the recitation, Mr. Speaker, I want to say it to say I think this process has become chaotic. I think it is no longer serving any purpose. I respect the gentleman's good intentions. I do. I think he knows that. But this process is no longer serving a valid purpose for the people of Pennsylvania. The Governor has vetoed numerous of these bills, and I am sure if this one was to reach his desk, he would do that, because as I have said through all of these declarations, the administration has made clear that it will use its emergency powers to manage this struggle, and I worry that if good people do not start speaking up and saying that this has become a parody in a time of tremendous concern in our Commonwealth when we should be doing good things for people, I fear as though this process is hollow and it does serve no purpose at all. These votes have become nothing but political theater. And again, I do not want to question the motives or the intent of anyone; I want to recognize that there is much to be done, as we begin to reopen this economy, to do so safely and to protect people.

Giving people these votes and the false hope and the rhetoric and the false Internet memes of what we should do I think does us a disservice to a population that is often scared. We need to be providing leadership, as I have said several times over the past few weeks, and I do not think continuing to talk about bills that are, frankly, already allowed and giving people this false choice and having us vote on these things as if somehow they are meaningful in this process, I think it does us a disservice.

I recently read a quote from a former President. I previously had the opportunity to quote President Bush, and I will quote President Obama, who said recently in a speech: "Doing what feels good, what's convenient, what's easy, that's how little kids think. Unfortunately, a lot of so-called grownups, including some with fancy titles, important jobs, still think that way, which is why things are so screwed up."

I say that not as an indictment, but I say that when I look back at this timeline of bills that will never become law and theater that has no purpose, I worry that instead of— To the majority leader's point on the motion to recommit this bill, instead of talking with the administration, we talk at each other in a process that is not worthy of the challenge upon this Commonwealth. If the gentleman is accurate that such a conversation would have borne fruit and that was the easiest way, then why are we not doing that? I think the administration has moved on many of these bills and in a timely way – maybe not in the timeline that this political process would like, but in a timeline that the data and the health professionals have said is right.

So again, I think this bill is probably unnecessary; in fact, I am confident it is unnecessary. And I recognize that people want to feel like they are doing something, but when I look through this list, a Republican President and a Democratic Governor have both requested these closure orders, and in the last 18 days, as we have begun this reopening and this administration has moved forward, this body, instead of engaging in clear leadership and giving out honest answers and direction, I believe that this bill and this process today is emblematic of a system that has gone completely off the rails, that has become, frankly, a mockery and a comedy. And that is not to indict anyone. It is to say that we need to lift this body up and provide leadership, and I know that that is hard, right? People are scared and people are angry, but declaring victory and jumping out in front of those who have the pitchforks and the torches, that is not leadership at all. It is a form of demagoguery and it does us no good.

So again, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the motive behind the bill. I recognize the confusion that many people feel during this time, but I think this is the appropriate time to point out in the darkness a little bit of light, that we need to engage in an honest discussion about the real challenges of our Commonwealth and not to continue to go down this rabbit hole, this bad Groundhog Day of a comedy that this has become day after day, week after week, for too long when people need real help and real information in a real timely manner.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Greg Rothman.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A couple of issues I wanted to address. I do not think any of the nearly 2 million Pennsylvanians that are on unemployment think that this is a game or this is theater. I just want to explain why, at least from my standpoint, it is important that we pass laws.

The Governor's orders – and the good gentleman from Montgomery County was right in the timeline – the Governor's first order that came out at 5 o'clock included things like hotels and laundromats. After some discussions, and I know respectful conversations with the administration, respectful letters that I think all of us wrote to the Governor's administration asking for clarification, there were some changes made a couple times to that list that the chairman spoke about. But there is still confusion. There is still chaos. There are reports that people are not going to visit their doctors even for their chemotherapy treatments because they are not sure they are supposed to leave their house. They wonder what shelter in place means or what a stay-at-home-order means. There is a difference between laws and the Governor's Executive orders, and as our leader said, this is the Governor's Executive order. That can change tonight. It can

change, while I am speaking it can change. We have seen since the beginning when we passed a bill that would have covered all of the CISA (Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency) occupations that would have created a big opening, that we have had to do this in piecemeal or whack-a-mole, as it has been said. We have had to do one at a time as those issues came up because the people are asking for clarification. And so as long as there are, I think autos were first, auto sales. We wrote respectful letters to the Governor saying that we think these can be done without, you know, safely, and then we had to introduce a bill that passed, and then before it became law, the Governor announced almost within hours that they were going to open up auto sales and then construction, and I just think that the way that things become law that are semipermanent – right? – that become law, is that the House or Senate passes them and the Governor signs it. And instead, the way that policies are being changed is, we pass a law or the Senate passes a law or we both pass a law, and then the Governor changed it. He did it with real estate earlier this week. He has done it with numerous things.

Look, we want to work with the Governor. I know I personally have written respectful letters about a tragedy that AA (Alcoholics Anonymous) meetings were being canceled, and the administration responded and I am grateful. And it was not a political issue, it was a simple phone call saying, do you know that we have people that get treatment at AA that need part of the 12 steps? They need that, and they do not know that they can do this. And I am grateful that the administration responded and they put out guidance. But the confusion is clear. If there is one person out there that does not think or does not know that they can go to the doctor because they think there is a shelter-in-place, we should clarify it. And an order is only as good as until the Governor changes it, and I actually have good news for the good gentleman from Montgomery County. We passed HB 2489 about outdoor recreation a little while ago, and the Governor has just announced while we have been debating this that they are talking with professional sports to bring back sports to Pennsylvania.

So I think it is time for us to start dealing with this in whole and return this State and get people back to work safely, and we think it can be done.

So I urge you to support this motion and allow people to get back to work also. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Mike Carroll.

Mr. CARROLL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I do not recall passing HB 2489. I think the gentleman may be mistaken on that. I do not recall the vote on that bill.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the gentleman from Bucks will stand for one quick question in interrogation?

The SPEAKER. As indicated, he will so stand.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I have residential cleaning service folks back in my area and none of them are aware of the license to practice that profession, and in your bill, you are granting a waiver to those who hold a license to practice this business. Can you share with me exactly what license that is?

Mr. STAATS. It is a business license. I do not know specifically. I know that the business that I have been dealing with back in Bucks County in my district, they have a license.

Mr. CARROLL. A license from whom?

Mr. STAATS. I am not sure.

Mr. CARROLL. The Commonwealth issues plenty of licenses.

Mr. STAATS. Yes, they do.

Mr. CARROLL. And I checked quickly with the Department of State and their Web site and I see no license issued by the Department of State. I see no board that exists that oversees the issuance of those licenses, and if the waiver is being granted to a business that holds that license, then I would suggest you are going to grant the waiver to exactly no one.

Mr. STAATS. And what we were trying to do with that is differentiate a cleaning service company, like the one that I am dealing with, versus the individual, the mom-and-pop that is coming into your home to clean. That is what we were trying to differentiate.

Mr. CARROLL. And, Mr. Speaker, I accept that. I am just fearful that the way this bill is written, you will grant a waiver to only those businesses that have a license and there is no license.

The SPEAKER. Representative Carroll, please suspend.

You can speak on the bill and cite whatever facts you want to state, but this is not interrogation.

Mr. CARROLL. I was giving him a chance to answer, Mr. Speaker. He seemed willing.

The SPEAKER. I am sorry. It is not interrogation and we are going to stop it at this time. You can speak on the bill, though.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I would offer that this bill will grant a waiver to license holders that do not exist, and if the gentleman truly wants to issue a waiver to people who do residential cleaning, I would offer that the reference to a license should be eliminated, because absent that license, you are granting a waiver to no one.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should be rejected simply because if we sincerely want to grant this opportunity for home residential cleaning services to continue their business, this bill does not do it. And so I would offer, Mr. Speaker, that it is the smart thing to do – if you are sincerely interested in doing this – to correct this flaw, because there is no license.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Yes, you may proceed. The minority leader, Frank Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, just a few things. Look, it is clear that the Commonwealth does not license residential cleaners and cleaning, and the gentleman mentioned that he was looking for the corporations, not the mom-and-pops. Well, Stanley Steemer is out working across the Commonwealth. They do not need a license. They are not licensed, and they are working. They are in homes right now and they are in homes across the Commonwealth. That is not part of it. And as the gentleman from Montgomery pointed out, we have spent weeks here and weeks doing these bills, passing these bills in this House, sending them over to the Senate, knowing full well, and everyone in this room knew, they would never become law.

So instead of working with the Governor, instead of working with the administration, instead of trying to do this in an orderly fashion based on the facts and the evidence when it would be proper and healthy and safe to do so, we have just been sending bills trying to encourage every special interest that is out there that this is what we are going to do for you. And when it really— And we all knew it was never going to happen.

So here we are, here we are today with a bill trying to open something that is open. They have been working, they are working, and we do not even license them and it only takes care of licenses. I think the gentleman from Luzerne County accurately pointed out that you will be opening nothing because

we do not license these residential cleaners who have been held to the essential and have been working from day one.

There were no amendments filed to a bill that we do not need. That is why. So here we are once again working on a bill that will never become law, working on a bill where the workers are working right now, and all the people we all care about. They are able to go to work and have been working for the past several weeks. So the bill is not necessary. Here we are spending hours debating it here on a day we do not need to be here. We do not need to be doing this bill at all, so let us not do the bill. Let us work on some legislation that is meaningful. Let us help people in the Commonwealth get back to work. Let us help people in the Commonwealth survive this virus and move this Commonwealth forward. It certainly is not with HB 2517, and that is why we should vote "no."

The SPEAKER. The majority leader, on HB 2517.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that both the minority leader and the previous speaker were wrong regarding licenses. I will read directly from the bill to provide some further clarity. The bill, page 2, line 26, specifically refers to residential cleaning services. "A person licensed to do business in this Commonwealth that provides cleaning services in the homes of individuals." That license is presumably the one issued by the Department of Revenue because they collect sales tax when they provide this service, if they do so in a corporate way. Mr. Speaker, those are the very same licenses that the Governor threatened if individuals defied his order – business licenses, professional licenses, and a whole host of other ones.

The good gentleman from Montgomery County argued and said that when we reopen the economy; quite frankly, to his use of the word "we," so far it has only been "I" – the Governor. I, the Governor; I, the Governor; and I issue orders.

Mr. Speaker, again, we do not live in a police State. We live under laws. We provide laws so they provide clarity. Regarding the inconsistency and the idea that we should allow businesses to rely on a waiver list that changed – actually, let me back up – a waiver list that was created out of thin air with requirements that came and went. And to the good gentleman from Cumberland County as he pointed out, as I am sure we all did, we tried to get information on behalf of our businesses so that they could have accurate information to operate under. The problem is, prior to disclosure of that list in a public manner, many waivers were rescinded at the eleventh hour. I have seen several stories in the local press about that.

So let us be clear: If it is not in the law, what the good gentleman from Montgomery County is hoping you do is rely on a list or a standard that arbitrarily changes from time to time as issued by the Governor. I do not know how comfortable that makes everyone else feel, but I would like to have some clarity. The good gentleman also mentioned the substance of the bills, the idea that, you know, why are we doing this? We are doing this because the overall approach – and these are the important components of the timeline that were left out that I will now ask for your indulgence for me to fill in.

SB 613 was the uniform approach that treated every business the same, that treated every waiver consistently amongst competitors. Just again today I saw a post of someone who has a waiver in Lancaster County – and of course it was forwarded in a complaint form or a message, complaint message to one of our elected officials because they were in a business that was in the exact same line of business and did not have the waiver. So why

do we do this? We do this for consistency. Why do we engage in the legislative process? That is because I think what was a reasonable offer was refused. The offer was fair, it was transparent, it was open, and most importantly, it was consistent.

So the good gentleman says this is political theater, that we are going through these movements to move bills. I would simply point out, while he may believe it is political theater, members of his own party have consistently voted with us to open up these individual businesses. So this is not a one-party solution; it is a bipartisan solution. Furthermore, he referenced, I believe, "fancy titles and important jobs." This is not about any of that. This is about people who are trying to make a living, people who want clarity, and people who want their lives back. It is people like cleaners and masons; the surveyor that I talked about in the opening weeks that was told he could walk in the woods alone, but he could not work in the woods alone. The absurdity of some of these standards pales in comparison to the ridiculous nature at which they are applied.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at this, we are trying to reopen certain segments, and I hope that this one also has a bipartisan vote because I believe it sends a clear message, because every time that we have had a bipartisan vote, we have seen action. I referenced it yesterday when we did the restaurant bill, that maybe just like the real estate bill, we will finally see action once it reaches the Governor's desk.

So back to that timeline, because I think it is important. April 10, there were orders and provisions regarding real estate transactions that were issued that were specified by certain dates. April 27, we were advancing a real estate bill here in this chamber, and a motion to suspend the rules to offer an amendment by the prime sponsor to allow for the prohibition of open houses was offered. The good gentleman from Montgomery County and 76 of his colleagues voted "no."

On the 17th of May, after the real estate bill had passed, a letter was penned by the Democratic leader in both chambers and sent to the Governor. I certainly appreciate the advocacy on behalf of the profession. It mirrored the bills that we sent, and then finally, on May 19, 4 hours, approximately, after a veto, new orders are issued regarding the real estate industry. The good gentleman referenced "data and science." I would love to know what data and science was discovered in those intervening hours. The truth is, the good gentleman's pleas to work together in a collaborative way, I agree. I simply wish that 11 more of his members had joined us in prohibiting open houses, because then maybe the bill could be signed.

One of the unanswered questions I have is about this entire process and the way that we are engaging in this. The good gentleman brought that up. What I have found, and what I have observed as we move through the different bills and the components, is this: Once we get bipartisan support for something, sometimes it moves from the chamber, sometimes it is on the verge of moving, then we see executive action modifying the order. Or we will see a cleverly drafted letter – artfully drafted, I might say – to try to find a distinction between the bill that we had passed previously with bipartisan support to somehow advocate for a similar result. I agree. Rather than wait until after the bill passes, let us see the amendments ahead of time. Let us work together. I would welcome that rather than the dozens of amendments that are filed of questionable origin or importance. Mr. Speaker, I think—

## POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. DERMODY. Question on motive, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. Point of order.

Mr. DERMODY. First of all, we are way far afield about anything to do with 2517, but we are also questioning motive here that is improper here, and I believe that is the case.

The SPEAKER. Leader Dermody, with respect to the timeline, I provided leeway to the Democratic Appropriations chair on a timeline. I afforded that. You could argue that that was not on the bill. The majority leader is responding to a timeline.

Mr. DERMODY. No, he is doing more than responding to a timeline. He is questioning the motive of both of us here today.

The SPEAKER. Everybody knows that no one can ascribe or question the integrity or motive of another member. We are just hearing additional recitation with respect to a timeline. Both individuals talked about – the entire President Obama quote was a quote that one could argue attacked others' integrity or motive, but it was put in a context of the timeline and what the approach is. Leeway was granted. The good gentleman wanted to be heard. Both of you have spoken as leaders on this particular – and were given quite a bit of latitude. That same latitude is going to be afforded to the majority leader.

You may proceed, sir.

Mr. CUTLER. And, Mr. Speaker, just for a further point of clarification, what I was questioning was the origin and purpose of some of the amendments, not the motivation. Motivation would be questioning the moral character of individuals. That would impugn the honor and motives of an individual, not the underlying bill or the purpose. The reason I raise that, Mr. Speaker, is because the good gentleman from Montgomery County referenced personal protective gear, which we have voted in support of one of his amendments after we had bifurcated it. But then he consistently pulled it on three subsequent bills. My question, quite simply in terms of the purpose of the amendment, was it to protect the workers? Because if so, they should have been in and we would have supported it. That is simply the question.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Point of order. You may state it.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, he is questioning motive right there, right in those remarks. Now, you go back, reread them, have them read to you, you will see, and that is exactly what happened right there.

The SPEAKER. Leader, Democratic leader, this is how I heard it. We can read it back, but it is just stating within a timeline these points: that amendments were offered, and then amendments were withdrawn, and that if they were left in, they would have been supported. That is just a fact-based observation with respect to a timeline. People can draw whatever inferences they want from facts. That is where we are, but they are facts.

Mr. DERMODY. Maybe they are alternative facts, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Leader, you may proceed.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the one thing I am certain of, back to the earlier point, is every time we move a bill – to the good gentleman's question as to why we do this – the Governor responds. Now, maybe that will stop at some point in the future, but that has been the past history, and past history is the best indicator of future

action. And, Mr. Speaker, for anybody who believes I was questioning their motive, that was not the case. It simply is an open question of why did we pull the amendments, because we were willing to support them.

So to somehow imply that workers were not protected on other bills or were not protected appropriately simply is inaccurate, and I believe the record needed corrected. Perhaps what we will do is begin filing mirror amendments in our own members' names so that we are not denied the opportunity to vote on some of these amendments. But in an effort to try to better utilize the staff and resources in LRB (Legislative Reference Bureau), which are doing a yeoman's job of keeping up with the bills and the amendments that we are drafting, we simply had assumed, and incorrectly, that the good gentleman would offer them.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite clear that the clarity that is alleged to have existed on cleaning services is not quite so clear. More importantly, we have consistently seen time and time again where the Executive order can change. And, Mr. Speaker, this bill would provide certainty to all of our workers – not the workers with fancy titles or jobs, as was alluded to earlier, but the workers that live in my district and in your district that want to go back to work and can safely do so. This is about the workers, this is about the people, this is about providing them clarity. I 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. The majority whip.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic voting board is correct for a unanimous vote on HB 2517.

The SPEAKER. The minority whip, sir.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, gentlemen.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—119

Barrar	Gleim	Masser	Roae
Benninghoff	Gregory	Mehaffie	Rothman
Bernstine	Greiner	Mentzer	Rowe
Boback	Grove	Metcalfe	Ryan
Bonner	Hahn	Metzgar	Sainato
Borowicz	Heffley	Mihalek	Sankey
Brooks	Helm	Millard	Saylor
Brown	Hennessey	Miller, B.	Schemel
Burns	Hershey	Mizgorski	Schmitt
Causar	Hickernell	Moul	Schroeder
Cook	Irvin	Mullery	Simmons
Cox	James	Murt	Snyder
Culver	Jones	Mustello	Sonney
Cutler	Jozwiak	Nelson	Staats
Davanzo	Kail	O'Neal	Stephens
Day	Kaufer	Oberlander	Struzzi
Delozier	Kauffman	Ortitay	Thomas
Diamond	Keefer	Owlett	Tobash
Dowling	Keller	Peifer	Toepel

Dunbar	Klunk	Petrarca	Tomlinson
Dush	Knowles	Pickett	Toohil
Ecker	Kortz	Polinchock	Topper
Emrick	Kulik	Puskaric	Warner
Everett	Lawrence	Pyle	Wentling
Farry	Lewis	Quinn	Wheeland
Fee	Longiitti	Rader	White
Fritz	Mackenzie	Rapp	Zimmerman
Gabler	Maloney	Readshaw	
Gaydos	Markosek	Reese	Turzai,
Gillen	Marshall	Rigby	Speaker
Gillespie			

NAYS—83

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

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 **SB 863, PN 1660**, entitled

An Act amending Title 48 (Lodging and Housing) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in hotels, further providing for definitions, for hotelkeepers, for notice to boarders to lock rooms, for lien, warrant, sale and right of redemption, for liability for property loss or damage, for special arrangements for safe deposit of valuables, for duty of guest, for other liability, for exemption from levy or sale, for baggage, for baggage sale requirements, for sale proceeds, providing for abandoned property and further providing for tourist camp heater safety.

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. The majority whip.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic voting board is correct on SB 863, unanimous vote.

The SPEAKER. Sir, the minority whip.

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	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 return the same to the Senate with the information that the House has passed the same without amendment.

## CALENDAR

### BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2440, PN 3776**, entitled:

An Act providing for the designation of shooting ranges, sportsman clubs, hunting facilities and business relating to the sale and production of firearms and ammunition as life-sustaining.

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?

The Chair calls upon Democratic chair, Bill Kortz, of Game and Fish.

Mr. KORTZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer HB 2440 to this chamber for their consideration. Mr. Speaker, the original intent of this bill was to reopen the sportsmen's clubs so that the members could use the outdoor ranges. Mr. Speaker, most of the sportsmen's clubs in the State are designated as 501(c)(7)s, which puts them in the category of "social clubs," and when the Governor closed down the State because of the pandemic crisis that we faced, social clubs were not designated as life-essential.

Mr. Speaker, the president of my sportsmen's club sent in a waiver and that waiver was denied. Mr. Speaker, on May 1 the Governor opened up some outdoor activities such as golf courses, marinas, and camping – even in the red zone, Mr. Speaker. These outdoor activities were allowed even in the red zone, but he excluded outdoor ranges at the sportsmen's clubs.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was amended, and the language added recently designated sportsmen's clubs – the ranges, hunting facilities, firearm and ammunition manufacturers and retailers – as life-sustaining entities, which they are. Mr. Speaker, I am respectfully requesting a bipartisan affirmative vote, and I would really like to see green on all of those names up there.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The minority leader, Frank Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

This bill now goes way beyond any COVID-related opening or closing bill. What the bill says is that "SHOOTING RANGES, SPORTSMAN CLUBS, HUNTING FACILITIES AND FIREARM AND AMMUNITION PRODUCT MANUFACTURERS, RETAILERS, IMPORTERS AND DISTRIBUTORS, INCLUSIVE OF THEIR EMPLOYEES AND AGENTS, SHALL ALWAYS BE CONSTITUTED AS LIFE-SUSTAINING BUSINESSES IN THIS COMMONWEALTH, WHICH SHALL NEVER BE SHUTTERED OR LIMITED IN THEIR ABILITY TO PRODUCE, PROVIDE, SELL OR OTHERWISE OFFER FIREARMS, AMMUNITION, FIREARM ACCESSORIES, COMPONENT PARTS OF FIREARMS, AMMUNITION AND FIREARM ACCESSORIES, AND ALL SERVICES, TRAINING, SAFETY AND PRACTICE RELATED TO FIREARMS AND HUNTING."

Now, what that means— No, no. Okay. Go ahead, you can clap. But what that means is that they can never be closed for any reason whatsoever – not by this Governor, not by any Governor, not by an Attorney General, not by a D.A. Okay? You guys are something, really. For whatever reason they want, no matter what. Now—

The SPEAKER. Members—

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

Mr. DERMODY. Right-thinking people might suggest—

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order.

The SPEAKER. Leader, just for a second. This is not— Members, please, the good gentleman is entitled to be heard on the bill.

Mr. DERMODY. Scoff all you want.

The SPEAKER. All members are entitled to be heard.

Mr. DERMODY. The language does not allow for any reason whatsoever, any reason whatsoever – law enforcement, judges, you name it, a Governor, any Governor, this Governor – whatsoever for any reason at all. So it is irresponsible to pass a bill like this with this broad language at this time or any time. All right?

Now, I know you all are having fun, think it is great to do all these things. There may be a reason sometime, when it may be a very compelling reason, when we need to do something about some of the actions, some of these groups, some of these manufacturers. God only knows they may have done something that they need closure, they need to step down. Now, this prevents that from ever, ever happening again. It is a mistake, Mr. Speaker, and we should vote "no."

The SPEAKER. The majority leader, on the bill.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your restoring order as well. That was simply my point of order that I wished to raise, because while I may disagree with the good gentleman on the underlying bill, I do believe he has the right to voice his opinion on the bill.

I do not agree with him for the following reasons. This overly broad reading of the bill would be inconsistent with other areas of our law and Constitution. For example, and I fielded some of these calls myself over the weekend, you know, does this in any way eliminate background checks or any other firearm-related issues? And the answer quite simply is no.

This bill simply ensures that the firearm businesses can operate as life-sustaining businesses during an emergency, and it is consistent with the actions of numerous other States, the Federal government, and most importantly, the opinion of three Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justices. And I will quote from Justice Wecht.

"In light of the regulatory framework attending the sale and transfer of firearms, the inability of licensed firearm dealers to conduct any physical operations amounts to a complete prohibition upon the retail sale of firearms an activity... guaranteed by both the United States Constitution and the Constitution of this Commonwealth...."

"This amounts to an absolute and indefinite prohibition upon the acquisition of firearms by the citizens...a result in clear tension with the Second Amendment... and Article I, Section 21, of the Pennsylvania Constitution...."

Furthermore, when you look elsewhere in our statutory law, the notwithstanding language that is contained under sections 21 and 25 of our own Constitution does in fact have limits. For example, those rights have never been construed to allow felons to buy guns or to eliminate the instant background check for gun purchasers. So there are still reasonable limits in place, and I think that that needs read for the record. Nothing in HB 2440 interferes with the current constitutionally sound gun laws, whether it be statute which prohibits convicted domestic abusers from purchasing guns, or a law that requires handgun sales to go through the licensed firearm dealer.

And finally, nothing in HB 2440 prohibits the Commonwealth from adopting future constitutional goals. What this speaks to is, during the throes of an emergency, one with changing standards, it simply says that they must be included on the life-sustaining businesses if that is in fact a designation that we would use again in the future. While I believe that we can have an ample and robust debate about how to handle future emergencies or pandemics, I believe at a minimum, this is required now for this one because the original list did not anticipate or include this. It was correctly pointed out by the Supreme Court and the list was accordingly modified. We now need to put this into statute. I would urge a "yes" 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.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic voting board on HB 2440 is correct for the majority party.

The SPEAKER. And the minority whip, sir.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, gentlemen.

The following roll call was recorded:

## YEAS—124

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

## NAYS—78

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

## 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.

## BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 2467, PN 3680**, entitled:

An Act making appropriations from the Professional Licensure Augmentation Account and from restricted revenue accounts within the General Fund to the Department of State for use by the Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs in support of the professional licensure boards assigned thereto.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Mr. **ROAE** offered the following amendment No. **A05757**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 9, by striking out "\$55,525,000" and inserting  
2¢

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The **SPEAKER**. On the amendment, Representative Roae is recognized.

Mr. **ROAE**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs, they work with 29 different licensing boards and commissions. As many people are aware, probably everybody is aware, in a lot of different parts of Pennsylvania, different companies want to get opened up to do business. In my area, the big part of my district is in Crawford County, Mr. Speaker, and we have one active case of COVID-19. We have had zero deaths, nobody is in the hospital now, and we have not had any new cases in 3 weeks. My business owners want to open up, Mr. Speaker. We all heard what the Governor said a few days ago, that if a business did open up, even in a county that should be green, even though there has not been any guidance, there has not been any guidance at all what a county actually has to do to get to green. I would think having 1 active case out of 85,000 people would be enough, no new cases in 3 weeks. A lot of business owners in Crawford County and the other 66 counties are talking about opening up even though the Governor said they have to stay closed.

Mr. Speaker, a small penalty for being open, people can absorb, but what the Governor is talking about is actually revoking licenses. The Governor actually said that if somebody opens up against his order, they would lose their license. Mr. Speaker, that could literally be a fine of millions of dollars if somebody lost their livelihood. If somebody loses their license and they are making, you know, \$50,000 a year and they are going to work another, you know, 40 years, that is a \$2 million fine for being open.

So the point of my amendment was, if they are going to use licensing to threaten our business owners, especially in areas where there are no cases of COVID-19 and it would be safe to open – right across the State line in Ohio, they are opening up all kinds of stuff – my constituents are going to be driving to Ohio, spending their money there to do things they cannot do in Pennsylvania.

So the intent of my amendment was to not give them \$55 million to make life a living you know what for my constituents. Now, upon further review, as I worked with the chair of the committee and the executive director, I have learned more about this. It is actually the Bureau of Enforcement and Investigation that does what I am trying to stop, so if I withhold funding from the Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs, that will not accomplish the goal that I am trying to do. It is the Bureau of Enforcement and Investigation that we need to defund so the Governor cannot weaponize licenses.

#### AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Mr. ROAE. So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to withdraw this amendment because it does not do what I am trying to do. But I do just want to say one more time that I think it is so wrong that the Governor is threatening to make a permanent lifetime ban on somebody's livelihood because they wanted to run their business when there are virtually no cases of COVID-19 in an area. And Pennsylvania taxpayers, Mr. Speaker, we pay to create jobs. Taxpayers all pay. We fund the Department of Community and Economic Development. They use tax money to try to create jobs, and then a block away at the Department of State, the Bureau of Enforcement Investigation, they are going to destroy jobs, Mr. Speaker, when they take away licenses from people that are trying to earn a living.

So I really do think that we need to address this, but unfortunately, my amendment will not do what I wanted it to do, so I am withdrawing it. Thank you.

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 **SB 1030, PN 1489**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of January 24, 1966 (1965 P.L.1535, No.537), known as the Pennsylvania Sewage Facilities Act, further providing for official plans.

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

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 777, PN 3631**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 19, 1988 (P.L.1262, No.156), known as the Local Option Small Games of Chance Act, in club licensees, further providing for report and for distribution of proceeds.

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

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 320, PN 324**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 20 (Decedents, Estates and Fiduciaries) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, enacting the Revised Uniform Fiduciary Access to Digital Assets Act; providing for user direction and agreements, for disclosure of digital assets and electronic communications, for functions of fiduciaries and for compliance and immunity for custodians of digital assets and electronic communications; and making conforming amendments.

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

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 902, PN 1315**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of August 9, 1955 (P.L.323, No.130), known as The County Code, in district attorney, assistants and detectives, further providing for filling of vacancies.

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

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 2487, PN 3772**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of September 30, 1983 (P.L.160, No.39), known as the Public Official Compensation Law, further providing for judicial salaries, for compensation of Governor and Lieutenant Governor, State Treasurer, Auditor General, Attorney General, Commissioners of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission and heads of departments and for members of the General Assembly; providing for cost-of-living adjustment hiatus; and making a repeal.

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

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 2496, PN 3726**, 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?

The SPEAKER. My understanding is that the amendments have been withdrawn. I have it marked as withdrawn. It is HB 2496, PN 3726. Okay. Thank you, Representative Kenyatta. The amendment is withdrawn.

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

The SPEAKER. Before we take up second amendment bills that have amendments on them, just a few pieces of housekeeping that we need to cover.

### HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

#### No. 2540 By Representative LAWRENCE

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.177, No.175), known as The Administrative Code of 1929, establishing the State Epidemiology Advisory Council; and making an appropriation.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, May 20, 2020.

#### No. 2541 By Representatives FARRY, THOMAS, SCHROEDER, TOMLINSON, STAATS, POLINCHOCK, WHITE and HENNESSEY

An Act amending Title 35 (Health and Safety) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for countywide reopening plan for businesses.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, May 20, 2020.

### HOUSE RESOLUTION INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

#### No. 884 By Representatives WENTLING, DAY, HICKERNELL, SONNEY, LONGIETTI, B. MILLER, KORTZ, SCHLEGEL CULVER, MILLARD, MURT, DRISCOLL, YOUNGBLOOD, KAUFFMAN, BIZZARRO, BERNSTINE, McNEILL, BROWN, RYAN, ULLMAN, SCHMITT, HILL-EVANS, SCHWEYER, DELLOSO, EMRICK, ZABEL, NEILSON, HOHENSTEIN, READSHAW, ISAACSON, ZIMMERMAN, MACKENZIE, THOMAS, MENTZER, POLINCHOCK, BURNS, STRUZZI, ORTITAY and WARREN

A Resolution recognizing the week of May 10 through 16, 2020, as "National Skilled Nursing Care Week" in Pennsylvania.

Referred to Committee on AGING AND OLDER ADULT SERVICES, May 20, 2020.

### COMMUNICATIONS FROM GOVERNOR

#### VETO OF HOUSE BILLS

The Speaker laid before the House a communication in writing from the office of His Excellency, the Governor of the Commonwealth, advising that the following House bills had been vetoed by the Governor:

#### HB 2388, PN 3719, and HB 2412, PN 3720.

Said bills having been returned with the following messages:

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
Office of the Governor  
Harrisburg

May 19, 2020

TO THE HONORABLE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE  
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Pursuant to Article IV, Section 15 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, I am returning herewith, without my approval, House Bill 2388, Printer's Number 3719.

Over the past two months we have made very difficult but necessary sacrifices in order to combat this pandemic and to protect the life and health of all Pennsylvanians. To reopen our Commonwealth, I have instituted a measured, phased-in approach so as not to undo our hard work.

Since the beginning of this month, my administration has been gradually transitioning counties from the restrictive red phase to an intermediate yellow phase. The decisions to move counties from the red phase to the yellow phase are based on the advice of expert epidemiologists and public health officials. These decisions are not based just on the number of cases of COVID-19, but are also based on other critical factors, such as how community members interact, the county's number of potential transmission points, a county's geographic location, the capacity to undertake contact tracing, and testing availability.

I have made these tough choices during this disaster emergency in order to protect the public safety and welfare of the people of Pennsylvania in accordance with the Emergency Management Services Code and our Constitution. This legislation is an infringement on the authority and responsibility of the executive and violates the separation of powers which is critical to the proper functioning of our democracy.

For the reasons set forth above, I must withhold my signature from House Bill 2388, Printer's Number 3719.

Sincerely,  
Tom Wolf  
Governor

\* \* \*

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
Office of the Governor  
Harrisburg

May 19, 2020

TO THE HONORABLE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE  
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Pursuant to Article IV, Section 15 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, I am returning herewith, without my approval, House Bill 2412, Printer's Number 3720.

Over the past two months we have made very difficult but necessary sacrifices in order to combat this pandemic and to protect the life and health of all Pennsylvanians. To reopen our Commonwealth, I have instituted a measured, phased-in approach so as not to undo our hard work.

Since the beginning of this month, my administration has been gradually transitioning counties from the restrictive red phase to an intermediate yellow phase. The decisions to move counties from the red phase to the yellow phase are based on the advice of expert epidemiologists and public health officials. These decisions are not based just on the number of cases of COVID-19, but are also based on other critical factors, such as how community members interact, the county's number of potential transmission points, a county's geographic location, the capacity to undertake contact tracing, and testing availability.

I have made these tough choices during this disaster emergency in order to protect the public safety and welfare of the people of Pennsylvania in accordance with the Emergency Management Services Code and our Constitution. This legislation is an infringement on the authority and responsibility of the executive and violates the separation of powers which is critical to the proper functioning of our democracy.

For the reasons set forth above, I must withhold my signature from House Bill 2412, Printer's Number 3720.

Sincerely,  
Tom Wolf  
Governor

### BILLS AND VETO MESSAGES PLACED ON CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. Without objection, HB 2388 and HB 2412, along with the veto messages that are attached thereto, will be immediately placed on the House calendar.

### VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls upon Chairman Barrar, Chairman Stephen Barrar, who has a committee announcement, and he is chair of Emergency Preparedness and Veterans Affairs.

Mr. BARRAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce a committee meeting for tomorrow. The Veterans Affairs and Emergency Preparedness Committee will meet at 9:15 in room G-50 to take up HR 836 and other resolutions.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you very much, sir.

The Veterans Affairs and Emergency Preparedness Committee will meet at 9:15 in room G-50 tomorrow morning.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. MALAGARI

The SPEAKER. Representative Malagari is recognized on I believe unanimous consent, and if members could please give him attention. Thank you.

Mr. MALAGARI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to give notice of my intent to call up House Discharge Resolution No. 5. It is a resolution that would discharge HB 1082 from the Labor and Industry Committee, a bill that would extend OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health

Administration) protections to public-sector workers in Pennsylvania on Wednesday, May 27, or any day thereafter.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Malagari.

### VOTE CORRECTIONS

The SPEAKER. The minority whip, Representative Jordan Harris, you wanted to correct something on the record?

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On HB 1827 please put Representatives Daley and Briggs in the negative.

The SPEAKER. Thank you. Yes. To our court reporter and to the team, please make sure that is reflected in the voting record.

### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. And the majority leader, Representative Bryan Cutler, is recognized on unanimous consent.

Mr. CUTLER. Actually, parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Oh, yes. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. CUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I believe I heard you read those two veto messages across the desk. I would simply like to inquire to the process to initiate a veto override.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir.

Sir, the majority leader, and actually any member of the House of Representatives, may call up a bill for a veto override, and you can do so on the floor. It does not have to go on a voting schedule for the House. You can call it up right now.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will consult with the members.

### BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 2172**, **PN 3202**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in the State System of Higher Education, further providing for definitions, for establishment of the State System of Higher Education and its institutions, for purposes and general powers, for project contracts, for method of disposition and consideration by the General Assembly and for campus police powers and duties.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Mr. **TOPPER** offered the following amendment No. **A05793**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 6, by striking out "further providing for definitions,"

Amend Bill, page 1, line 9, by striking out "for power and duties of institution presidents,"

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 14 through 21; page 2, lines 1 through 12; by striking out all of said lines on said pages and inserting

Section 1. Section 2002-A of the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, is amended to read:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 19, by inserting after "suit"

except

Amend Bill, page 3, line 30; page 4, lines 1 through 8; by striking out all of line 30 on page 3, all of lines 1 through 7 and "(d)" in line 8 on page 4 and inserting

(c)

Amend Bill, page 4, line 13, by striking out "3" where it occurs the first time and inserting

2

Amend Bill, page 6, lines 16 and 17, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

Section 3. Sections 2003-A.1(d) and (f) and 2018-A of the act are amended to read:

Amend Bill, page 6, lines 19 through 30; page 7, lines 1 through 29; by striking out all of said lines on said pages

Amend Bill, page 8, lines 6 through 14, by striking out all of said lines

Amend Bill, page 8, lines 18 through 30; page 9, lines 1 through 3; by striking out all of said lines on said pages

Amend Bill, page 10, line 26, by striking out "7" and inserting

4

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

5

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

6

Amend Bill, page 11, line 13, by striking out "10" and inserting

7

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, Representative Jesse Topper.

Mr. TOPPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In consultation with stakeholder groups, and as we work through this process of this PASSHE reform package, we did restore the current statutory language regarding the Separations Act, so that will not be affected per this amendment, as well as eliminating the separation of funds between State-appropriated and non-State-appropriated; that will also revert back to the previous act.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask for a "yes" vote.

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

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic voting board is correct on that amendment, unanimous vote by the majority party.

The SPEAKER. And the minority whip.

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	Sappey
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	Whealand
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 agree to the bill on second consideration as amended?

Mr. KELLER offered the following amendment No. A05786:

Amend Bill, page 2, lines 3 and 4, by striking out "the system or an institution receives or are generated from other sources." and inserting

are titled to or received by the system or an institution from any source other than through appropriation from the General Assembly.

Amend Bill, page 2, line 7, by inserting after "source."

The term does not include funds titled now or in the future to any other organization or affiliated entity.

Amend Bill, page 6, line 3, by inserting after "manner," to take, demand or possess any property titled now or in the future to an affiliated entity or organization.

Amend Bill, page 7, line 11, by inserting after "contracts" where it occurs the first time  
procured with State-appropriated funds  
 Amend Bill, page 7, lines 12 and 13, by striking out "or contracts  
procured with non-State-appropriated funds"

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

**PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY**

**AMENDMENT DIVIDED**

The SPEAKER. Representative Seth Grove is recognized.  
 Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The purpose of amendment A05786 was to protect the assets of PASSHE schools and their affiliate nonprofits that they created. With the adoption of A05793, there are provisions of this amendment that we do not need anymore.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to divide amendment A05786 with lines 10 through 12.

The SPEAKER. It is divisible on those lines. Yes, the Speaker has ruled that it can be divisible. So do you want to take out lines 9—

Mr. GROVE. Remove lines 1 through 9, and then 13 through 17, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Okay. So you want to vote just on 10 through 12?

Mr. GROVE. Yes.

The SPEAKER. It is divisible, and we will vote first on lines 10 through 12.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. So, members, if you look at amendment 5786, we will in the first instance be voting lines 10 through 12. We will not be voting lines 1 through 9 or 13 through 17.

On the question,  
 Will the House agree to part 1 of the amendment?

The SPEAKER. Representative Topper, on the amendment, which sets forth lines 10, 11, and 12 of 5786.

Mr. TOPPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With the division of this amendment, I support amendment A05786.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

On the question recurring,  
 Will the House agree to part 1 of the amendment?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic voting board is correct on this amendment, a unanimous vote by the majority party.

The SPEAKER. And the minority whip.

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	Sappery
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 having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and part 1 of the amendment was agreed to.

On the question recurring,

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

## PART 2 OF AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. Lines 1 through 9 and lines 13 through 17 of amendment 5786 have been withdrawn.

On the question recurring,

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

Mrs. ISAACSON offered the following amendment No. A05319:

Amend Bill, page 6, line 16, by striking out "(d),"

Amend Bill, page 7, line 30; page 8, lines 1 through 5; by striking out all of said lines on said pages

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes Representative Isaacson.

Mrs. ISAACSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My amendment is strictly to put back notification to DGS (Department of General Services) with regard to the property that is owned by the Commonwealth. We have had a lot of talk about making sure we keep records and making sure that there are proper records with regard to the operations of our government, and this would simply make it so that there would be written notification with regard to modifications, repairs, or any other construction with regard to properties that are owned by the Commonwealth. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Representative Jesse Topper, on the amendment.

Mr. TOPPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the bill, the language that we have actually codifies an interagency agreement that has been in place from 2002, and this agreement gives PASSHE the control, but not the title to PASSHE property, which already gives them the authority to modify, repair, or renovate these facilities. So I would ask for a "no" vote on this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Isaacson, do you wish to speak a second time? No.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic voting board is correct on the amendment for the majority party.

The SPEAKER. And the minority whip.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

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
Delloso	Kinsey	Petrarca	Youngblood
DeLuca	Kirkland	Rabb	Zabel
Dermodity			

## 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	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	Roae	

## NOT VOTING—0

## EXCUSED—1

Mako

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

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

Mrs. **ISAACSON** offered the following amendment No. **A05385**:

Amend Bill, page 4, lines 8 through 12, by striking out all of said lines

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

The **SPEAKER**. Representative Isaacson is recognized on the amendment.

Mrs. **ISAACSON**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My amendment is to remove the language relating to the immunity of taxation and regulations for properties that are operating for profit on these **PASSHE** institutions. The Pennsylvania Municipal League is supportive of this because the way we have this currently, without my amendment, is that we are having local regulations for real property, including public health safety laws and code enforcements, public health and various service fees are charged and benefits provided to all of the properties.

These for-profit properties will be immune from local property tax; for example, restaurants and coffee shops. So the municipal leagues are asking to make sure that these for-profit entities are subject to the local property tax and the local regulations of their municipalities. I ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The **SPEAKER**. Representative Topper, on the amendment.

Mr. **TOPPER**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is a needed legal clarification that became evident in 2012. Currently **PASSHE** schools, like all other Commonwealth institutions, already have sovereign immunity when it comes to this issue. So what some local municipalities were doing was applying certain fees to try and get around that issue. **PASSHE** has taken them to court. **PASSHE** has won, but in the meantime, they are spending thousands upon thousands of much-needed dollars that we need to keep our tuition low, that we need to make sure that these universities are accessible to our students here in the Commonwealth, on something that we now need to clarify in terms of law and prevent that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would be asking for a "no" vote on this amendment. Thank you.

The **SPEAKER**. Representative Isaacson, for the second time.

Mrs. **ISAACSON**. And while I appreciate our efforts here to try and support **PASSHE**, we do need to note that these for-profit entities that are not paying property tax or abiding by the local regulations, using this immunity to circumvent the municipality's authority. Thank you.

The **SPEAKER**. Representative Topper, for the second time.

Mr. **TOPPER**. To be clear, Mr. Speaker, the **PASSHE** schools are Commonwealth entities. They already enjoy the same sovereign immunity as other Commonwealth entities.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The **SPEAKER**. The majority whip.  
Mr. **BENNINGHOFF**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
The electronic voting board is accurate and reflects the vote of the majority party.

The **SPEAKER**. And the minority whip.

Mr. **HARRIS**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

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
Delloso	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
Causser	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	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, Speaker
Gabler	Maloney	Rigby	
Gaydos	Marshall	Roae	

**NOT VOTING—0**

**EXCUSED—1**

Mako

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

On the question recurring,

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

The SPEAKER. I do not see any other amendments. The ones that have been filed have been withdrawn or voted upon. If I am mistaken— Oh, I apologize. There is a late-filed amendment; 05811 is a late-filed amendment filed by Representative John Lawrence.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. **LAWRENCE** offered the following amendment No. **A05811**:

Amend Bill, page 8, lines 18 and 19, by striking out "a paragraph" and inserting paragraphs  
Amend Bill, page 9, by inserting between lines 2 and 3  
(15.1) To declare, upon receipt of a resolution passed a unanimous vote of the local council, that the institution will exit the system on a date certain as determined by the local council, provided that the institution may not leave the system prior to December 31, 2023, or after December 31, 2024. An institution that exits the system shall be subject to an exit charge as determined by the chancellor.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. So we will need a motion to suspend.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

#### AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative John Lawrence, on a motion to suspend.

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

In light of the fact that this amendment has been late-filed earlier today, I am going to pull it, but I appreciate the opportunity to offer it to the Assembly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir. There are no other amendments.

On the question recurring,

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 2342**, **PN 3447**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in depositions and witnesses, further providing for admissibility of certain statements.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Mr. **RABB** offered the following amendment No. **A05761**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 13, by striking out "16" and inserting 14

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

#### AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. The amendment has been withdrawn. There are no further amendments that are offered to this bill.

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 2489**, **PN 3773**, 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 relating to extension of waiver provisions for outdoor recreational activities.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Mr. **QUINN** offered the following amendment No. **A05792**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 17, by inserting after "to," arboretums and botanical gardens,

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. **MALONEY**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will let the maker of the amendment speak if he would like to, but this is agreed to. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Quinn, are you offering the amendment?

Mr. **QUINN**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just would like to ask that everyone support this. As we all struggle with the idea of getting out and spending time, we are all having issues, and I just want to ask that everyone support this amendment. I appreciate it.

The SPEAKER. Thank you both.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip.  
Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
The electronic voting board is correct on HB 2489 and the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The minority whip.  
Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
The electronic board is accurate.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—128

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

NAYS—74

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

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?

Mr. **MILLARD** offered the following amendment No. **A05794**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 17, by inserting after "to,"  
fairs and amusement parks.

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

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. Representative Millard is recognized on the amendment.

Mr. **MILLARD**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to withdraw that amendment and offer amendment 5795.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir; that amendment is withdrawn.

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

Mr. **MILLARD** offered the following amendment No. **A05795**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 17, by inserting after "to,"  
fairs, amusement parks and outdoor water parks.

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

The SPEAKER. You may proceed, Representative Millard, on the amendment, sir.

Mr. **MILLARD**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
Amendment 5795—

The SPEAKER. Please suspend. The good gentleman is entitled to be heard on his amendment. I know, although if you were here in the years past that I was here, this was not considered late; 4 in the morning would have been considered late, but we changed that some time ago.

At this time could we please hear Representative Millard. Thank you. You may proceed.

Mr. **MILLARD**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Amendment A05795 would add fairs, amusement parks, and outdoor water parks to the definition of "outdoor recreational activities."

In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, there are over 100 fairs. There are 21 amusement and water parks. For the most part, fairs are all nonprofit, but they add value to the local community. They add economic value to all those business entities contained within those local communities. They pay real estate taxes. They pay amusement taxes. They support agriculture – 4-H, FFA (Future Farmers of America), the Farm Show, and the Pennsylvania Preferred. They support families. They encourage families to attend the fair for family gatherings and family fun. They support mom-and-pop-businesses. They support the showmen who provide the rides. They support the churches who do a lot of fundraising at our local fairs. They support the benevolent groups like the Lions, the Rotary, the Kiwanis. And all of their programs, they keep those dollars in their community. These are benevolent groups that identify a need in each individual community, and those dollars stay local.

Amusement parks and fairs are typically on large acreage, so there is an ability for social distancing according to the CDC. The amusement parks and water parks have even developed their own safe play plan, and contained within that safe play plan are the following: guidelines that they would adhere to are to communicate those guidelines, control the capacity, frequent handwashing stations, hand sanitizer, face masks, plexiglass barriers, social distancing, first-aid stations – just to give you an idea of some of the ideas and some of the amenities that these parks would offer. They would make every effort to keep families safe and active while they are together. And we all know that kids need an opportunity to be active.

We understand that there are different phases – red, yellow, green – but what we do not understand is what it takes. Where is the goalpost to move into the green phase? We are at a point in time right now that executive decisions are affecting all of our fairs and amusement parks. Contracts have to be signed. There is no advertising being done. Those contracts have not been signed because of the delay of moving through the various colors to get to green where these facilities can be open for business. And understand that this is not a cookie-cutter approach. A lot of these fairs are all different. A lot of the amusement parks are different in the way that they conduct business.

So we need to have a measured opening, a measured performance factor for these fairs, for these amusement parks to open, again stressing safety with CDC guidelines. And in the absence of the Governor's Office coming out with what constitutes green, the fairs have come out, the amusement parks have come out with their own rules and regulations to safely open and operate their businesses. So I would ask you, for this commonsense amendment, for an affirmative vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kevin Boyle is recognized on the amendment.

Mr. BOYLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have to be very careful about large gatherings. In 1918, the onset of the Spanish flu for the second season was attributed to a very large gathering in the city of Philadelphia to mark American victory in World War I. So I believe that this amendment to this bill would not be a good passage of legislation. So I ask for a "no" vote on this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Millard, for the second time. Mr. MILLARD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again I want to point out the largesse of the acreage of these facilities that can facilitate safe distancing, social distancing according to all the CDC protocols.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Bradford, the minority Appropriations chair.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I truly appreciate the gentleman's passion for his local fair, and I know this is a heartbreaking time, but I think someone needs to interject some reality as a father of four small children myself. The idea of people from all over the tri-State area crowded, in many cases, in confined areas, often we know there is questionable sanitation – that is not in any way a shot at any organization, public or private fair, amusement park, or waterpark. Mr. Speaker, this is not a good idea. And I have said all along, we should put off to professionals and medical experts, but when I go down this rabbit hole myself of could this even be remotely done safely? I do not know how we get there, and that is why I come back to this idea, this legislative process, this political process where we treat each one of these bills as though, do we love our fair? And we do. Do we love Hersheypark? And we do. This is a bad, bad idea, and I think we all know it if we are thinking about it. And I know that the good majority leader will say it is the people's choice, but if we have an outbreak and it gets out of control, you do need a medical professional to make these calls, and the idea that we are going to do by legislative fiat what feels good because we do not want to – or if, frankly, we have created this distrust of those that have to make these choices, I think we just know these are bad ideas as parents, as leaders in our community.

It does not feel good to tell people no on things that are important to all of us that make us happy and bring enjoyment and amusement in the summer. But water parks? I have a zoo in my district that I love dearly. I tell them the bad news as well, which is I do not think that legislators should be making these decisions. They are simply bad ideas to have this body replace its judgment versus medical professionals. I respect those who have to advocate for their local business and amusement, but I think if we are thinking sanely for a second and get away from the politics of this, it is apparent that this process – and not just this bill – this entire process has gotten completely out of control. It is doing a disservice. It is creating disinformation and distrust and it is not worthy of the position of trust that we are put in.

For that reason and so many more, I ask that we vote "no" on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. Representative Barb Gleim.

Mrs. GLEIM. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Unfortunately, legislators do have to stand up for their communities in times like these because that is whom we represent. Some amusements support entire communities. In other words, if they do not get started, the entire community is going to fall into poverty. Carlisle Events in Cumberland County has the car show. This event has an \$80 million economic impact on my community and region. It is not being allowed to operate even at 50-percent capacity. We need it to start operating in the near future; otherwise, we will have a ghost town in Carlisle as our restaurants, retail locations, the turnpike, just to name a few,

will cease to incur the much-needed revenue that this ongoing event has provided our community for over 50 years. This is more than just a one-time fair or a daily amusement. This is a community event that needs to start as soon as possible. It is on 150 acres. It has an excellent plan, and we would like to present it and have this bill passed.

Please, please vote for this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Hohenstein.

Mr. HOHENSTEIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to make a point, because we have been hearing a lot about CDC protocols, CDC guidelines, and what we are doing when we put those things into our legislation is essentially giving up power. We are giving the Federal government, Federal bureaucrats the power to say what we should do, and that is not a lawful designation of our power. A CDC official, regardless of what position they have, is not an elected official, and the guidelines that they issue do not go through the regulatory process that makes sure that the U.S. Congress actually affirms its validity, that would make sure that this body affirms the validity of those guidelines or protocols.

So I am very leery, in this legislation and much of the legislation that we have been seeing, that the CDC protocols or guidelines that are being referred to are not actual documents that we can point to and say, this is exactly what we mean when we vote on this legislation. It is the ultimate moving target. And we can talk about what the Governor has been doing and what the Health Department in Pennsylvania has been doing, but the CDC is not even within the scope of our authority, and we are just simply giving away the power to a Federal bureaucrat.

The SPEAKER. Representative Bill Kortz.

Mr. KORTZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of this amendment, and I want to thank the good gentleman from Columbia County for bringing it forward. Mr. Speaker, I have a number of volunteer fire departments, a number of municipalities, and a number of churches that have outdoor fairs. They start around mid to late June and it goes all the way through July into August. And, Mr. Speaker, it is a hot time of the year. It is outdoors. And these groups, these municipalities depend on that little bit of money to help them, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a good amendment, and they can practice social distancing. We also have some municipalities that have the "Fun To Be A Kid" Day, and I have a number of those coming up, and I sure hope that we can let some kids be kids this summer. Let us open up the fairs. Please vote for this amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Seth Grove.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A couple of fairs that happen in my district are fundraisers for my local fire department. These men and women volunteer their lives every single day to protect property and their fellow citizens every single day. Unfortunately, under the Governor's orders, these heroes cannot fundraise for their – maintain their service and their harms. Those whom we expect to be there for us when we hit 911 may not be there, Mr. Speaker.

This legislation, this amendment would allow the continuation of our heroes to continue to fundraise and to continue to raise dollars for a much-needed service in our communities, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the fire departments in

my district that hold community events such as carnivals as a fundraiser, I would ask for an affirmative vote on this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic voting board is correct. It reflects the vote of the majority party as unanimous.

The SPEAKER. And the minority whip.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic voting board is accurate.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—118

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

NAYS—84

Boyle	DeLuca	Kenyatta	Rabb
Bradford	Dermody	Kim	Ravenstahl
Briggs	Donatucci	Kinsey	Roebuck
Bullock	Driscoll	Kirkland	Rozzi
Burgos	Evans	Kosierowski	Samuelson
Burns	Fiedler	Krueger	Sanchez
Caltagirone	Fitzgerald	Lee	Sapprey
Carroll	Flynn	Madden	Schlossberg
Cephas	Frankel	Malagari	Schweyer
Ciresi	Freeman	Markosek	Shusterman
Comitta	Gainey	Matzie	Sims
Conklin	Galloway	McCarter	Solomon
Cruz	Goodman	McClinton	Sturla
Daley	Green	McNeill	Ullman

Davidson	Hanbidge	Merski	Vitali
Davis, A.	Harkins	Miller, D.	Warren
Davis, T.	Harris	Mullins	Webster
Dawkins	Hohenstein	Neilson	Wheatley
Deasy	Howard	O'Mara	Williams
DeLissio	Innamorato	Otten	Youngblood
Dellosso	Isaacson	Pashinski	Zabel

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?

Mr. **KENYATTA** offered the following amendment No. **A05798**.

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

(b) Discrimination prohibited.—No person, business or organization operating pursuant to a waiver issued under subsection (a) may discriminate against employees, customers, participants or spectators on the basis of age, race, sex, religion, ethnic origin, economic status, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression or disability. A violation of this subsection shall invalidate the waiver issued under subsection (a).

Amend Bill, page 2, line 14, by striking out "(b)" and inserting (c)

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The **SPEAKER**. Representative Kenyatta.

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

I have offered this amendment on other bills, and I am offering it today and I plan to do so in the future, and I just wanted to talk a little bit about why this is so critical. Like so many people in my neighborhood, and maybe some of my colleagues had a same experience, I grew up in an incredibly religious household, and so going to church on Sunday for multiple services from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m., that was the norm. And going to Bible study on Wednesday and then on Friday, that was also very common in my house.

At the age of 13, Mr. Speaker, my pastor and congregation acknowledged the call of God on my life and I was actually ordained to preach and lead services, and church meant so much to me. But at every service and at my school and on TV and in the law, I was always told implicitly and explicitly that who I was was not an option, that who I was was unacceptable, and those messages caused a deep depression that a lot of young people across Pennsylvania know and understand and are experiencing right now. And in those messages, they left me feeling powerless to muster the courage, Mr. Speaker, to ever say publicly that I was gay.

And at the age of 16, Mr. Speaker, after coming home from one of those services, my mom stopped me at the door and she asked, "Malcolm, are you gay?" And I do not know what was preached about that day, but somehow I found the strength to say yes. My mom, who had always been my protector and my hero, slammed me with some of the same vicious slurs that I have combated well before I came into this chamber. She told me I was going to hell, told me to get out of her house. And what followed was a deep depression and a fractured relationship with my mom for many years.

Now, over time – God rest her soul, we lost my mom 3 years ago in July – over time we rebuilt our relationship, and with a lot of prayer and with a lot of reflection on her part, she came to understand what we need to understand in this body and what this amendment is all about, that who I was should not determine how I am treated, and did not determine whether or not she loved me.

So this amendment is just about fairs or arboretums, but it is really about the message that we are sending to young people from this body about whether or not who they are is acceptable or whether or not who they are is worthy of shame and whether or not they should just come to accept as normal the discrimination that LGBTQ folks so often feel in the Commonwealth. So we are telling them that in America, that in the Commonwealth, that is supposed to be a beacon of fairness and a freedom, that who they are makes them less than, and that if they become a target of discrimination, oh well. That is what we are saying to them. And so it should come as no surprise that LGBTQ youth face death by suicide at 57 percent of the rate of straight young people. It should come as no surprise that LGBTQ youth constitute the largest group of our homeless youth all across the Commonwealth. It should come as no surprise that many of them are kicked out just like I was told to leave.

Now, it is crazy to believe that in 2020, you can still not go to a fair and not be worried about whether or not you are going to be discriminated against; that in 2020, you can still lose your home or your job simply because of who you are; you can still be removed from other public accommodations and the other outside recreational activities that this bill seeks to open.

So I introduced this amendment yesterday and I am doing it today because we have to send a message that in 2020 – in 2020, Mr. Speaker – that in Pennsylvania, everybody is going to get a fair shot to pursue their dream or to go outside and have a good time, they are going to get a fair shot to be treated fairly. And it is downright heartbreaking to watch a majority, and I saw the other day it was a slim majority, but a majority of my colleagues, some of whom I have come to call friends, vote against my right to be treated fairly in the same body in which I serve with you. You are saying we do not have a right to be treated fairly, and it breaks my heart that I even have to offer this amendment. And I know that there are young people at home who are like me – are weird and watching PCN (Pennsylvania Cable Network) for some reason – who are hearing a stark message that they are different and that they have to relegate their lives to what is so often uneven and unfair, and I believe that we are better than this. I must believe that we are better this, and it is why I will keep trying. It is why that I have no doubt that one day we will make real in Pennsylvania those famous words, that "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal..."

Mr. Speaker, we can make sure that that is true today by voting for this amendment, and I would appreciate an affirmative vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The good gentleman has indicated that the amendment has already been voted upon. The Parliamentarian is just checking what bill that was on, and my understanding is that once language has been voted upon and voted down, then you do not get to vote it again. But we are checking on that right now.

At this time the context in which it was offered under rule 27 seems to allow the proffering of such amendment. The issue is now, I am going to call on the majority leader.

### GERMANENESS QUESTIONED

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, to the sponsor of the amendment, I am sorry. I am sorry that you had that experience early in your life, and I am sorry that it was difficult, as was evidenced by your impassioned speech. I can tell you that that is not how people are treated in my home or most of the homes that I have been in, but, Mr. Speaker, I think that one of the things that we have to do and we have to recognize is, when drafting laws, it is important to stay within the context of the laws, and looking at the amendment as it is drafted, as paired with this bill, 2489, 2489 actually does not provide the protections that the good gentleman is actually seeking. It would only apply in those cases regarding the outdoor activities, and the Human Relations Act, which is the proper place for such an amendment, is actually a freestanding act. It was Act 222 of 1955.

As such, I cannot think of any other example of inequality where you would be granting rights in one place but not another because you did not amend the proper underlying act. I would simply urge the gentleman to offer this amendment to Act 222 of 1955, also known as the Human Relations Act, because when you look at this underlying amendment and the bill, it suffers a fatal constitutional flaw as the amendment is not germane to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has been very clear regarding the single subject and whether or not an amendment is germane. In the *City of Philadelphia*, they adopted a practical germaneness test where the single-subject requirement is satisfied so long as the legislation at issue possesses some single unifying subject to which all of the provisions of the act are relevant.

In this case, the underlying bill concerns outdoor recreational activities, as modified by some of the amendments here during the COVID-19 disaster. What the gentleman I believe intends to do is to provide further protections under the Human Relations Act, not ones that would go away with the passage of the emergency or not ones that would simply be limited in their scope. The underlying amendment is not germane because it deals with changes in the Commonwealth law concerning discrimination, Act 222 of 1955.

For that reason, and understanding the gentleman's passion and the underlying issue, I would make the motion that it is not germane to the underlying bill and encourage the good gentleman to work through the appropriate committee and the appropriate process to amend the correct law, Act 222 of 1955. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. So the motion in front of us is the question to whether the amendment is germane. Under House rule 27, questions involving whether an amendment is germane to the subject shall be decided by the House.

On the question,

Will the House sustain the germaneness of the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the majority leader, and now I recognize Representative Kenyatta. It is the question of germaneness. Sir, before you proceed, just so that everybody knows how they would be voting and how you want to advocate voting, and that is true for the leader and anybody else who wishes to speak, if you vote "aye," then you are voting that the amendment is germane. If you vote "nay," you are voting that the amendment is not germane. So if you believe the amendment is germane, you will be voting "aye." If you believe the amendment is not germane, you will be voting "nay."

Representative Kenyatta, you may proceed.

Mr. KENYATTA. So listen, I have been here long enough to know how this goes, and there is an unwritten rule called the rule of 103, so I guess if you have the votes, you can say it is not germane. But for the folks watching, they know that it is germane. And a lot of times progress happens slow and it happens in one area and not in others, and so we can say to folks today that if you go to these fairs that we want to open, you are going to be treated fairly there. We are going to ensure in law that it happens, and if not, what my amendment would do is take away the waiver, and so what I am calling for in this moment is actually not to amend the Human Relations Code, but to the majority leader, I would ask: I can withdraw this amendment right now if you agree to allow a vote on a bill that does address the broader question, and I would ask the leader if you would agree to do that right now, so that we have no more amendments, no more votes, no more games.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kenyatta, you can certainly, with all due respect, this is on the motion of germaneness. You certainly can have that discussion with the leader, but you do not have that on the floor, and your leadership and our leadership can have that discussion, but it is not proper discussion for the floor or the motion for germaneness. You made your point and I am not going to push it any further, but we just cannot engage in a dialogue right here on that, but you certainly are entitled as a legislator to have those discussions.

On the issue of germaneness, I believe the Democratic leader wishes to speak. Oh, I am sorry. Representative DeLissio, I apologize. Representative DeLissio, and then I will go to the leader. You may proceed.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the issue of germaneness, the very first time I ever spoke on the floor was to offer an amendment, and before I could barely start, there was a motion as to whether or not the amendment was germane, and in this particular instance, it was indeed pertinent to the underlying bill. And this was my first experience as to this world where the rules are a little different and the definitions were certainly very different, that the body decides at the end of the day – or the middle of the day or whatever part of the day we are in – what is in fact germane, and it may have nothing to do with the reality of the situation.

So to my colleague from Philadelphia, my condolences. I have been there, done that. To the rest of the colleagues in the room, there is a pathway so we are not having this discussion time and again. I have been involved for the 9 1/2 years I have been a member of the body, and trying to put forward this legislation appropriately under the proper code, etc., etc. Personally, one June I got 25 cosponsors by going desk to desk on this floor explaining exactly what the bill meant and what the bill did. It is 2020, I am struck by that, and let me just share with you on behalf of my Kenny, my Christopher, my Joseph, my Robert, and my Vincent, I will continue to work with the gentleman from Philadelphia to ensure this session that that bill becomes law. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. On the issue of germaneness, Leader Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Over the many years and the discerned history of this country and this Commonwealth with regards to discrimination, people have used many ways and avenues to get at the problem. Historically, to end discrimination in this country – the interstate commerce clause, all kinds of ways they can get at to end discrimination in this country. Now, to suggest that this is not germane makes no sense when you read the amendment itself, and apparently it was germane the other day because we had a vote.

Now, what this amendment says, it says, "Discrimination prohibited – No person, business or organization operating pursuant to a waiver issued under subsection (a)....," operating under a waiver that we are talking about today with this bill. So you get this waiver, you cannot discriminate. It is germane, Mr. Speaker.

We can stop and take a step. We can take a step today to stop discrimination. Look, this all begins – right? – this all happens, when beginning, a small step. This is one small step to stop it. We have the opportunity to do it with an amendment that is germane, and if we do not take that step, shame on us. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Majority Leader.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, specific to the underlying amendment, again I do not believe it actually does what the good gentleman intends it to do. He mentioned the revocation of the waiver in the amendment, but neither the process nor the standards are listed in the underlying amendment. I understand this is a deeply personal issue for him, and I understand the good lady from Philadelphia, whom I have worked with multiple times on other issues, it is also personal to her. My point is simply that there is a proper way to do this. I would encourage the prime sponsors to do that and work that through the system, because the Human Relations Act is a freestanding act, and therefore, does not belong on this bill as drafted.

Thank you. Please support the motion.

On the question recurring,  
Will the House sustain the germaneness of the amendment?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic voting board is correct on this motion.

The SPEAKER. And the minority whip.

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

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	Samuelson
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			

#### 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
Causser	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	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	Roae	

#### NOT VOTING—0

#### EXCUSED—1

Mako

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

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.

**RESOLUTION**

Ms. PICKETT called up **HR 718, PN 3262**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of March 2020 as "Brain Injury Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolution?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic voting board is correct, unanimous vote by the majority party on HR 718.

The SPEAKER. The minority whip.

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

**REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD**

The SPEAKER. Representative Tina Pickett, chair of the Insurance Committee, submits floor remarks for HR 718, Brain Injury Awareness Month, and I will submit those to the clerk.

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thanks to my House colleagues for your unanimous support of HR 718, which designates March as "Brain Injury Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

Unfortunately, brain injury is a condition that is increasingly affecting State residents of all ages. From a professional athlete getting knocked around on a football or soccer field to a young child fighting a high fever, to an adolescent falling off a bicycle or someone of any age suffering a stroke, the injuries suffered from these situations can have lifelong and life-altering consequences.

An estimated 3.5 million children and adults sustain an acquired brain injury (ABI) each year, and more than 13.5 million Americans are currently living with an ABI. That is in addition to the nearly 2.8 million children and adults who suffer traumatic brain injuries (TBI) in the United States each year, and approximately 5.3 million Americans currently living with TBI-related disabilities.

The Brain Injury Association of Pennsylvania tells us that more than 2,000 Pennsylvanians die each year from brain-related injury. In addition, nearly 19,000 people are hospitalized annually, with more than 8,600 suffering long-term or lifelong disability, and more than 529,000 State residents are currently living with a brain injury. Every one of us, every one of our families has the potential to suffer brain injury, and it can be frightening. That is why it is so important to raise awareness, and our hope is that this resolution helps in that regard. Raising awareness about acquired or traumatic brain injury can help prevent them by encouraging people to protect themselves with helmets and by knowing what to do when brain injury occurs. Without prompt and proper treatment of brain injuries, symptoms easily can be missed. A person can be underdiagnosed or misdiagnosed, resulting sometimes in even greater injury.

I am asking each of you to do your part and raise awareness with your families, friends, and loved ones. Let them know how serious traumatic brain injury is and take steps every day to protect yourself.

Thanks again for your support of HR 718.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. STAATS called up **HR 730, PN 3286**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of March 2020 as "Endometriosis Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolution?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic voting board is correct, unanimous vote by the majority party on HR 730.

The SPEAKER. And the minority whip.

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

\* \* \*

Mr. CUTLER called up **HR 737, PN 3308**, entitled:

A Resolution designating May 6, 2020, as "Pennsylvania Health Care Information Technology Awareness Day."

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolution?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic voting board is correct, unanimous vote by the majority party.

The SPEAKER. And the minority whip.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic voting 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	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 resolution was adopted.

## SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

### BILL VETOED BY GOVERNOR

The House proceeded to consideration of the veto message on **HB 2388, PN 3719**, 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,

Shall the bill become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

The SPEAKER. This is a veto override vote. When we will be voting, if you are voting to override the Governor's veto in favor of the bill becoming law, you will be voting "aye." If you are voting in favor of sustaining the Governor's veto, you will be voting "nay."

We have 203 elected members of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. All members are here for the vote with the exception of Representative Zach Mako, who is on military leave serving our country abroad.

The Chair calls upon the majority leader with respect to the veto override vote.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the parliamentary clarification that you provided earlier regarding the procedures for this. I was glad that this is timely. I think it is important, because we ran through the timeline earlier, to run through the timeline once again regarding where and how we got here.

Mr. Speaker, we started with SB 613, which was a comprehensive and transparent and equal approach; that ultimately was vetoed, but that override will have to start in our sister chamber. This bill, however, which is more of an omnibus – it is a combination of multiple bills that we had passed previously that all had varying degrees of bipartisan support – is now before us, the Governor having vetoed HB 2388.

Mr. Speaker, understanding that 2412, which is also on the supplemental calendar for a veto override, deals with real estate, this one dealt with all of the other businesses: vehicle dealers, lawn and garden centers, cosmetology, salons and barbershops, messenger services, animal grooming services, and manufacturing operations. You may ask, why are we doing this? There may be some who say that this is a political or legislative process. Mr. Speaker, as legislators, we speak when we vote and we vote on what is important to us, and for the 1.8 million Pennsylvanians who are unemployed through no fault of their own, many of whom work at these kinds of facilities that have been safely opened in multiple other States, we should give our own citizens that same opportunity. And as the Speaker outlined, it will require a supermajority in order for us to get there. However, I am heartened by the approach that many of my colleagues have taken in the intervening days since we last voted this bill, because we did have a bipartisan vote on this bill when it left, 123-79, which by my math says we need to pick up 13 more. Forty individuals from varying parts of the Commonwealth had previously signed a letter to the Governor asking us to move faster from red to yellow. I think that this is that opportunity.

Now, we may not win the vote tonight, but I assure you, we will not lose the argument. The overwhelming majority of the people are behind us and they want the option for those who want to and can safely reopen their businesses to do so. And please remember, a reopening of the business does not mean that everyone will. Some people will choose, and that is their right, to not reopen, but what we should not limit is their option.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to note that there are two voluntary acts involved in every transaction. One is for the business to choose to be open, and the other is for us as customers to decide if we wish to frequent that business. Mr. Speaker, like many folks, I am frustrated with the current process – the lack of transparency, the bypassing of the legislative process, letters that are sent, bills that are sent, statements that are made, and then to see course corrections at a later time.

Mr. Speaker, this could be the biggest course correction of them all, and I urge a "yes" vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The minority leader, Frank Dermody, on the veto override.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, you heard the list of the businesses that will be opened – car dealers, barbershops, messenger services, lawn and garden centers, and the list goes on and on and on. And we have spent the last several weeks talking about how this opening ought to be measured, ought to be phased in, and ought to be done safely. Once again we have an absolutely reckless procedure to override a Governor's veto when he is taking the steps statewide to open this State in a safe, reasonable manner that protects the lives of Pennsylvanians, and in a fair and in a safe way gets people back to work in a way that will help a resurgence of this virus.

Overriding this veto is a huge mistake. It is a huge mistake for the public health, it is a huge mistake for the livelihood, and it is a huge mistake for our health-care workers and our frontline workers in this Commonwealth, and you are putting them at risk, unnecessarily so, recklessly you are putting them at risk. We cannot override the Governor's veto. We should not do it. It is against the public health. It is against the best interest of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and Pennsylvanians who live here.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The majority leader, Bryan Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a simple question, and consistent with our rules, it is one that I do not know the answer to and one that I do not believe that anybody in this chamber knows the answer to. How low does the infection rate have to go in order for these businesses to be blessed with reopening? What is the infection rate from yellow to green? We are midway in the implementation of the current plan and we do not know. What is the rate? What is the plan? Absent this override, Mr. Speaker, absent this veto override, we are left wondering and guessing what the proposal is in the future.

I know for my constituents that have contacted my office that cannot get unemployment, they have not gotten answers or they went through a confusing waiver process where their competitors were allowed to work and they were not. Again and again we see a lack of clarity, a lack of communication, and Executive orders that sometimes themselves change from day to day. Our people deserve to have clarity in our laws. They deserve to have the options to do this. Now, if you agree with the Governor's approach, a haphazard approach when it comes to making these goals – because please remember, as we went from red to yellow, that goal and its explanation I believe changed a minimum of three times based on whom you spoke with.

We need clarity, our constituents need clarity, and most of all they need government that works, and this unemployment system is not delivering for them. They need government that works that allows them to return to their lives, and I know that a majority supported this bill on original passage and even more have signed a letter since then. I encourage you to join with us and override this veto.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Yes, the Democratic leader for the second time.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The majority leader knows full well what the numbers are across the Commonwealth, knows full well what the numbers of deaths, the number of infections, and the number that has happened daily. He knows that they have improved over time because we have taken the steps and made the sacrifices that Pennsylvania has had to make. He knows full well that those steps have worked because we have taken into consideration what those rates were, where they are happening.

Now, here we are today suggesting that it is going to be okay to put all these businesses back to work right now without regard to where they are located, what the infection rates are, and whether there is going to be a resurgence. Overriding this veto is irresponsible. To suggest that the Governor has not given information about all of those things is simply inaccurate.

Now, look, we are here about making progress on dealing with this virus and putting Pennsylvanians back to work in a safe way. This is not the way to do it. The leader knows that. You vote "no" to overriding the Governor's veto. Let us keep Pennsylvanians healthy and then get them back to work. We can stay here all night going back and forth.

The SPEAKER. Representative Vitali I see wishes to speak on the veto override.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, I have been in this chamber a long time and this is probably one of the most appalling, reckless acts I think I have ever witnessed.

The SPEAKER. Sir, please suspend.

Chairman Vitali, chapter 13, Decorum In Debate, section 120: "The language used by members during debate should be temperate, decorous and respectful." "Reckless," I know the minority leader already used it, but "appalling"? Please, I do not think it fits the definition of temperate, decorous, and respectful.

In addition, section 123, again under chapter 13, Decorum in Debate, "Use of Disorderly Words In Debate. No person may indulge in personalities, impugn motives of members, or use indecent or profane language."

You are certainly not profane, you are not indecent, but it does by its very nature indulge in personalities and impugn motives of members. Please, just get to the substance of the bill and why you do not think it should be overridden.

Mr. VITALI. If you believe in science—

The SPEAKER. Excuse me for a second. Please, staff members, please.

Sir, you may proceed.

Mr. VITALI. If you believe in science, the logical consequence of the actions about to be taken, if successful, will result in many, many deaths in Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is a global pandemic. We are in a situation unique to our lifetime. There is no playbook to this. To criticize the Governor, to call his actions "haphazard" does him a disservice. Mr. Speaker, have his actions been perfect? Of course not. Have the actions of any world leader, any governmental leader been perfect? No. We do not have time for perfection in these dire circumstances. He saw a dangerous, extremely dangerous situation coming. He had to act immediately. He had to, by nature, act with a blunt instrument, and he did.

Mr. Speaker, yes, as time has gone by, he and his staff have been educated to some of the things that can be tempered, and over time he has done that. Neither the Governor or his staff or any of us start out with perfect knowledge. He is doing the best he can. He is taking an approach that is logical, that differentiates between different areas, that differentiates between different occupations. He is doing the best he can, but for us to, in one fell swoop, open up all of these areas – no disrespect to animal grooming, no disrespect to cosmetology, but really? Really?

The SPEAKER. Representative Grove, do you have a point of order?

Okay, you may proceed.

Mr. VITALI. Mr. Speaker, I just am going to ask in just the most respectful way I can that the majority leader, whom I deeply respect and whose logic is very effective in almost everything he does, I fear he is about to make a terrible mistake, and I would ask that maybe he just pause and just take a little more time to think about what he is about to do.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Seth Grove, on the veto override.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We often talk about data and science here. Today is unique for data day because we did not get any, because the entire computer system for the Department of Health crashed. We have had, every data release we have gotten has had flaws. The recent release from nursing homes, the actual nursing homes when they reviewed their data basically said a lot of flawed numbers. We are calculating deaths that were not there. We have had days where we had negative deaths. I think in particular one day had 201 negative deaths because the department decided to calculate presumed cases and not actual cases. We have had coroners – coroners – question the data from our Department of Health.

When we talk about science, Mr. Speaker, a recent study from MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), the Governor's alma mater, discusses the spread on mass transit in New York City. Not one mass transit entity was shut down during this entire epidemic, cramming individuals on a cattle car, close proximity day after day. Mr. Speaker, there are ways to be safe. There are ways to manage risk. Most people who are open have done that because they understand they want to protect their valuable resources – their employees. They want to protect their valuable resources – their customers. We have allowed big chain box stores to operate in this Commonwealth without any protections for weeks, weeks, Mr. Speaker. I have said it before on this floor, we have allowed individuals to cram into big buildings on top of each other, picking up product, putting it down, touching screens to check out, touching credit card buttons time and time again. Did we see a mass of overrunning our hospitals? No, we did not. We took corrective action. They were limited. They started following guidance, but it took weeks, a month, and thousands of people, thousands of people, Pennsylvanians, went through this.

Mr. Speaker, you can protect livelihoods and lives. We can open up these businesses. It has been proven, Mr. Speaker. The data shows it. We have been reopening Pennsylvania whether upon the Governor's edict or upon our constituent's own will, because let me tell you, 83 in the morning is getting a heck of a lot busier and I am pretty sure that Dauphin County is still red. Where are those people going, Mr. Speaker? My neighbors are having picnics, they are starting to socialize, they are close to each other, and that is a fact.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about the health-care industry and the lack of PPE. Our pharmacists, our pharmacists, Mr. Speaker, pharmacy techs, those who have worked in the thousands of pharmacies where usually sick people go, they did not have protection for weeks. They were exposed. I do not know a lot of cases in those pharmacies of employees actually getting sick, getting fevers. I know that personally, Mr. Speaker. It is a reality: you can be safe.

It is a virus, Mr. Speaker. What does science say about viruses? It is going to be here forever – forever. The only way to take care of a virus is herd immunity and immunizations. The whole purpose of the quarantine was to flatten the curve, and the leader has said it many, many times, it is temporary – temporary. Science says that, science, proven over a number of years. And as we look at pandemics and epidemics – you know, I enjoy reading about it now – we have had many, many, many, many different ones in the United States. In 1918; there was one during Woodstock. There was a flu pandemic during Woodstock, Mr. Speaker. People in this room may have gone there. I do not know. I was not alive. I do not know, but it happened,

Mr. Speaker. There was a flu pandemic during Woodstock. It did not stop life. We continue to live our lives like we do every day.

Mr. Speaker, the reality is, we are going to have to deal with this long-term. The short-term was here and now it worked. We did not have our hospitals overwhelmed. We reached our goals. It is time to move forward and start reopening Pennsylvania, and we have been and the data continues to show a decline. Yesterday, very low count day, and we had a lot, I think yesterday was the most number of people tested in the entire Commonwealth, and by the way, we are only testing sick people. Negative tests are up, Mr. Speaker. Those who are getting tested are testing negative. These are all good data points, and as we open, they continue to say the same thing: good news.

Mr. Speaker, this is not going to lead to an overwhelming number of individuals being hospitalized, as hospitalization rates continue to drop even as we are testing more, even as we are seeing more individuals come in contact with COVID. And by the way, there is no guarantee that you are not going to get it. You could wear a complete bubble suit for 23 hours a day. It is virus. You could pick it up from a blade of grass. It is a random occurrence. You cannot guarantee that you will not catch it. We as a government cannot guarantee that through any policy we enact, we will never guarantee that every citizen will be safe. We cannot do it. It is impossible. It is impossible, Mr. Speaker.

We are going to do the best job we can to protect our citizens, and that is what we have been doing. We have been focusing on where the most harm is. Our crisis is in long-term care, Mr. Speaker. We have enacted this week to move forward with the Speaker's bill to protect those individuals, to put money into those institutions to make sure we protect them. That is a responsible thing. That is what the data and the science say we should be doing. When the data and science say we act, that is what we do, and we have done it in a bipartisan fashion many, many times.

Mr. Speaker, these amendments, this override, these are individuals, these are our neighbors, these are our friends that want to take care of their families. They are struggling. They are not getting unemployment. I still have constituents 10, 11 weeks in that have not received an unemployment check. I have people back to work that still have not received their unemployment check from when they were not working.

The institution of government here in Pennsylvania has failed them. They are looking to take care of their families. They are looking to take care of their employees. They are looking to take care of their consumers. Mr. Speaker, it comes down to trust. Do you trust your fellow citizen to do the right things or do you not? Do you trust that they will follow the CDC guidelines and other precautions we put in here to protect themselves, their employees, and their customers? Or do you think that the government is the only solution for those individuals and we have to dictate every aspect of their life because we know best, we know best?

Mr. Speaker, I will put it into the hands of my constituents every single time because I think they will do the right thing. There is no need to continue to pretend that we cannot have businesses that will not do the right thing. It has been proven time and time again. Every time that the Governor has issued a new edict to allow a new business to operate, we do not see a spike because they are doing the right thing time and time again, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time to move forward with Pennsylvania. Our sister States are opening up more rapidly. They are not seeing a mass in fluctuations. With anything, as you

open, you should see some increases, and that will happen because, Mr. Speaker, it is a virus and the science says, with a viral infection, if you do not have herd immunity, you will see increases. That is science. We have to accept it. We need to make sure we are prepared. We are doing the right thing and we do not cower. We take this on the forehead and keep moving forward because that is what is expected of us, Mr. Speaker. We are expected to make the tough decisions on behalf of our constituents. We did the right thing. None of us really critiqued the initial shutdown orders because we saw what was happening in Italy. We understood that we did not want doctors making the decision, do I help this COVID patient or do I help the heart attack victim? That did not happen. Data shows it, Mr. Speaker. Let us let the science and data dictate our decisions, and that science and data says this override is proper, Mr. Speaker.

I hope my colleagues will join me in voting affirmative for this so we can move Pennsylvania forward in a safe and responsible way that allows our citizens to do what they do best and protect their communities and their citizens.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The majority leader.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, to the good gentleman from Delaware County, thank you for the compliment, and please let me clarify. What I was referring to as "haphazard" was the application of the standards, certainly not the actions, because I myself have publicly praised both the Secretary and the Governor in the early days of the pandemic. But at that same time I also said then that the quarantine and the stay-at-home order is not a long-term solution. I believe that the good gentleman from Delaware County indicated it was a blunt instrument and I would agree, which is why we need a finer surgical approach.

Mr. Speaker, when I was in high school, the saying went, "garbage in, garbage out" in computer class. Some of the members here might remember learning something similar. If you do not have good data, you cannot make good decisions, and as the good gentleman from York County pointed out, we did not get any data today. We were told that if we believe in data and science that we should oppose this bill. Mr. Speaker, we peaked on the top number of cases on April 9, just under 2,000 tragic cases. Yes, the death toll will continue to go up. My good friend, the minority leader, said, of course the majority leader knows that. Yes, I do, and it is sad, but that is the outcome of a normal disease run such as this, a disease run that I think could have been better prevented. We will get to that in a little bit, but nonetheless, we are focusing on the wrong data points. The deaths will always go up. What we should be focusing on is the number of individuals tested. How many of those are negative? How many of those are positive? And as we are increasing testing, the negatives are staying constant or declining; that is an important data point.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate held a hearing. The chief medical officer of UPMC came and testified to the values of reopening, not based solely on the health reasons related to the virus, but rather the other health problems that are being caused by it now. I have said this many times, but I think it is worth repeating. There are several crises occurring right now, and it is entirely possible for individuals who live in larger urban centers to be experiencing this very differently than our friends in the northern tier who live in less dense areas. A physician from CHOP (Children's Hospital of Philadelphia) – I quoted the op-ed here before – population density is one of the number one drivers. But

despite that, and we heard – and this is important, because on the restaurant bill debate yesterday, we heard from my good friend, the Democratic chair of State Government, the length of time that the virus could survive outside on steel, on glass, and a variety of other surfaces – despite that, SEPTA (Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority) is still running a limited schedule.

To the good gentleman from York County pointing out about the New York transportation system, we have corollaries here. Data and science say that the infections have been declining since the 9th, and they are continued to project like that into the future. You heard that we do not have time for perfection. I would hope that after 8 to 10 weeks, we could have a better plan. But we cannot afford to get this wrong. We have repeatedly indicated – and I will say it here again – it is a voluntary opening with voluntary customers that will hopefully be following those safety guidelines, the CDC standards that we have all heard on daily briefings. I encourage people to be safe and to be responsible.

Mr. Speaker, if you review the veto message that attended this bill, as well as several others, you will notice lots of references to executive power, infringing constitutionally on executive power. Well, what have we heard from the Executive over the last several weeks? Multiple times, Mr. Speaker, we have heard, "The virus is in charge," and that is simply not true. We as the elected officials are in charge. The legislators, the Governor, and the judiciary when they are asked to intervene, because, Mr. Speaker, if the virus is truly in charge, why did the Governor even reference executive powers and the ability to go forward? No one elected the virus; they elected us to manage the situation with the data that is before us, and that is our duty.

I said it earlier, we may not win this vote, although I think we should, but I believe the people agree with the argument and I do not believe that our people should lose their voice in this chamber, which is exactly what has happened under this current process of ruling by executive fiat. We have been told to listen to the data and the science. I think the data and the science supports our position.

I also would encourage the members to take a look at the Constitution that says that there are three coequal branches of government. I recognize that some of these decisions are not easy and they are not made lightly, and I know that from firsthand conversations with members on both sides of the aisle. But we need to decide right here today if we are employees of the Governor or Representatives of the people. I vote to override.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Hohenstein.

Mr. HOHENSTEIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had risen before the majority leader and I appreciate you allowing me the time to speak now.

We have been hearing a lot about the will of the people. The majority leader just spoke about that. And just this past week we passed some resolutions honoring Jimmy Stewart, and one of my favorite lines from "It's a Wonderful Life," which is one of my favorite movies, is when George Bailey is confronting Mr. Potter, the greedy banker, and he is talking about the rabble, the normal, everyday people, and he says to Mr. Potter, those people "you're talking about, they do most of the working and paying and living and dying in this community."

Again, I said this last week when we first argued this bill, the reopening bills that are being presented have a fatal flaw. They do not consider the workers. We are giving lip service to safety and to standards. We are allowing the CDC guidelines, which none of us actually knows what they are, to guide legislation. To

me, I am representing the will and the interests of my constituents, who are the people doing most of the working, the paying, the living, and dying, and they are the ones who are going to die when this virus makes its return.

And if we move with haste to reopen, we will find ourselves in worse economic shape, not only worse public health shape, and so I am going to urge a "no" vote on this override because we do need to move with urgency, we do need to press our Governor for greater clarity, but we do not need to move with haste.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question before us is, shall HB 2388, PN 3719, become law, the objections of the Governor in his veto message to the contrary notwithstanding? So it is a veto override vote.

Those in favor of the bill becoming law and overriding the veto will be voting "aye"; those in favor of sustaining the Governor's veto with vote "nay."

On the question recurring,

Shall the bill become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The majority whip.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The majority party's vote is correct on the electronic voting board on the override.

The SPEAKER. The minority whip. Sir, you may proceed.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The following roll call was recorded:

#### YEAS—115

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

#### NAYS—87

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

#### NOT VOTING—0

#### EXCUSED—1

Mako

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of the bill becoming law, voting "yea," were 115, so those were those who were voting to override the veto. Those voting to sustain the Governor's veto who voted "no" were 87.

Less than two-thirds of all the members of the House voting in the affirmative – needed is 136; the number was 115 – the veto override fails.

#### RECONSIDERATION MOTION FILED

The SPEAKER. At this time the majority leader and the majority whip, Representatives Cutler and Benninghoff, move that the vote by which the veto override to this HB 2388, PN 3719, was defeated on this May 20 date, be reconsidered. That is on file.

#### BILLS RECOMMENDED

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

HB 777;  
 HB 2172;  
 HB 2342;  
 HB 2467;  
 HB 2487;  
 HB 2489;  
 HB 2496;  
 SB 320;  
 SB 902; and  
 SB 1030.

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

**BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE**

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

- HB 110;
- HB 1647;
- HB 2179;
- HB 2452;
- HB 2460;
- HB 2491;
- HB 2497;
- SB 309; and
- SB 842.

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

**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 HB 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 HB 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.

### REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. Representative Staats is submitting remarks on HR 730. They will be accepted.

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Endometriosis affects roughly 200 million women throughout the world, including an estimated 15.5 million women in the United States. It is an often painful disorder in which the endometrial tissue that lines the inside of the uterus inexplicably grows on the outside. It can also grow on fallopian tubes, ovaries, and other female reproductive tissue, as well as on the bowel, bladder, and rectum. While these growths are typically noncancerous, endometriosis is a common cause of infertility in women.

Endometriosis can occur in any female who has menstrual periods, but it is most common in women in their thirties and forties. It is known to cause severe pelvic, abdominal, and lower back pain, as well as scarring, swelling, and bleeding that can interfere with normal daily activities. Endometriosis can be a painful and debilitating condition, but not all women exhibit symptoms, which is why it is important for women to have annual Pap tests.

The cause of endometriosis is not known, but researchers are studying possible causes including hormones, genetics, disorders of the immune system, and more. It is believed women may be more susceptible to endometriosis if they have never had children, have periods that exceed 7 days or cycles shorter than 27, or have a family member with endometriosis. While a specific cause has not yet been identified, pain medications and hormones can help, and surgery can bring some relief in severe cases.

To call attention to endometriosis and urge women to get regular Pap tests, I am sponsoring HR 730 to designate March 2020 as "Endometriosis Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania. Thank you.

### VOTE CORRECTIONS

The SPEAKER. Representative Bradford. The Democratic Appropriations chair is recognized.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On HB 2489 Representatives O'Mara and Sappey should be recorded in the affirmative. On amendment A5792. Sorry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, and the record will so reflect.

### 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. At this time we will be on a 12-hour call of the Chair. Please check your e-mails for notices. They will come from the Chief Clerk's Office. We are scheduled to be in on Tuesday, May 26, at 1 p.m.; that is at 1 p.m., Tuesday, May 26. We are also scheduled to be in Wednesday, May 27, at 11 a.m., but we will be on a 12-hour call of the Chair. Thank you.