

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 2020

SESSION OF 2020

204TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 50

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 10 a.m., e.d.t.

**THE SPEAKER (BRYAN CUTLER)
PRESIDING**

PRAYER

HON. ANITA KULIK, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to give the prayer today, because this is a special day for me and my husband. Today we are celebrating our 25th wedding anniversary. Thank you.

And on that note, I would like to offer a prayer for our families:

Father, we have lived through these very uncertain times only by Your grace. You have challenged us in so many ways. What we have found though, through the turbulence, is the blessings of our families. We have reconnected in ways that we may have forgotten and through You we have found a calm peace and comfort that only family can bring.

Our families come in all shapes and sizes, and the love in our homes defines what family truly means. Please bless all of us: fathers, mothers, husbands, wives, children, grandparents, and all those we welcome into our lives as family. Keep us in Your grace and loving care. Bless us here today in the Capitol, and help us to keep in mind that the work we do today is for the benefit and betterment of our families and all the families across the Commonwealth. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

The SPEAKER. Congratulations to the Representative. I just shared – my wife and I celebrated 25 years last week. So it was certainly a joyous occasion, and I will remember Anita's, Representative Kulik's, anniversary now, knowing that it is in close proximity to my own. So congratulations.

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Tuesday, September 1, 2020, will be postponed until printed.

RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HR 459, PN 2394

By Rep. RAPP

A Resolution urging the United States Food and Drug Administration to promptly consider guidelines and protocols for the approval of cannabidiol as a product which is legally available for resale.

HEALTH.

HR 460, PN 2395

By Rep. RAPP

A Resolution urging the United States Food and Drug Administration to recognize this Commonwealth's concern with the safety of kratom and the current distribution and sale of kratom as a drug replacement, supplement or food and to promptly consider guidelines and protocols for the safe use of kratom.

HEALTH.

HR 625, PN 2964

By Rep. RAPP

A Resolution directing the Joint State Government Commission to conduct a study on medical student choice in primary care and issue a report.

HEALTH.

HR 741, PN 3312

By Rep. RAPP

A Resolution designating the week of October 25 through 31, 2020, as "Respiratory Care Week" in Pennsylvania and commending respiratory therapists for their outstanding contributions to health care.

HEALTH.

HR 749, PN 3320

By Rep. RAPP

A Resolution recognizing the week of October 25 through 31, 2020, as "National Massage Therapy Awareness Week" in Pennsylvania to honor the more than 7,900 licensed massage therapists in this Commonwealth.

HEALTH.

HR 763, PN 3334

By Rep. RAPP

A Resolution recognizing the month of July 2020 as "Juvenile Idiopathic Arthritis Month" in Pennsylvania.

HEALTH.

HR 773, PN 3382

By Rep. RAPP

A Resolution recognizing the week of August 1 through 7, 2020, as "World Breastfeeding Week" in Pennsylvania and supporting breastfeeding as a way to enhance the well-being of all individuals worldwide.

HEALTH.

HR 809, PN 3467

By Rep. RAPP

A Resolution designating the month of October 2020 as "Sudden Cardiac Arrest Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

HEALTH.

HR 810, PN 3468

By Rep. RAPP

A Resolution recognizing the month of September 2020 as "Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

HEALTH.

HR 820, PN 3478

By Rep. RAPP

A Resolution recognizing the month of November 2020 as "Carbon Monoxide Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

HEALTH.

HR 899, PN 3985

By Rep. RAPP

A Resolution designating the month of October 2020 as "Pennsylvania Pharmacists and Pharmacy Month" in Pennsylvania.

HEALTH.

HR 910, PN 3994

By Rep. RAPP

A Resolution designating the week of September 6 through 12, 2020, as "Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis Research and Awareness Week" in Pennsylvania to increase awareness and understanding of idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis.

HEALTH.

HR 912, PN 3996

By Rep. RAPP

A Resolution recognizing November 19, 2020, as "The Great American Smokeout Day" in Pennsylvania.

HEALTH.

HR 914, PN 3998

By Rep. RAPP

A Resolution designating the week of September 20 through 26, 2020, as "Surgical Technologists Week" in Pennsylvania.

HEALTH.

HR 917, PN 4001

By Rep. RAPP

A Resolution designating the month of July 2020 as "MECP2 Duplication Syndrome Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

HEALTH.

HR 937, PN 4106

By Rep. RAPP

A Resolution recognizing the month of September 2020 as "Histiocytosis Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

HEALTH.

HR 950, PN 4146

By Rep. RAPP

A Resolution recognizing the month of September 2020 as "Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

HEALTH.

HR 951, PN 4147

By Rep. RAPP

A Resolution designating the month of September 2020 as "Hirschsprung's Disease Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania to coincide with a global initiative in Australia.

HEALTH.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Moving to leaves of absence. Are there requests for leaves of absence?

The Chair recognizes the majority whip, who indicates that there are none.

The Chair now recognizes the minority whip, who also indicates that there are none.

MASTER ROLL CALL

The SPEAKER. Without objection, we will now proceed to the master roll call. Members will proceed to vote.

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—202

Barrar	Fiedler	Lee	Reese
Benninghoff	Fitzgerald	Lewis	Rigby
Bernstine	Flynn	Longietti	Roae
Bizzarro	Frankel	Mackenzie	Roebuck
Boback	Freeman	Madden	Rothman
Bonner	Fritz	Mako	Rowe
Borowicz	Gabler	Malagari	Rozzi
Boyle	Gainey	Maloney	Ryan
Bradford	Galloway	Markosek	Sainato
Briggs	Gaydos	Marshall	Samuelson
Brooks	Gillen	Masser	Sanchez
Brown	Gillespie	Matzie	Sankey
Bullock	Gleim	McCarter	Sappay
Burgos	Goodman	McClinton	Saylor
Burns	Green	McNeill	Schemel
Caltagirone	Gregory	Mehaffie	Schlossberg
Carroll	Greiner	Mentzer	Schmitt
Causar	Grove	Merski	Schroeder

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

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

As previously indicated, we are looking to make the most efficient use of our floor time, so at this point the Chair will turn today's uncontested calendar.

UNCONTESTED CALENDAR

RESOLUTIONS

Ms. O'MARA called up **HR 965, PN 4325**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of September 2020 as "National Suicide Prevention Awareness Month" and September 10, 2020, as "World Suicide Prevention Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. SAYLOR called up **HR 968, PN 4270**, entitled:

A Resolution designating October 10, 2020, as "Put the Brakes on Fatalities Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. MACKENZIE called up **HR 981, PN 4300**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the week of October 4 through 10, 2020, as "National Midwifery Week" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. SONNEY called up **HR 984, PN 4302**, entitled:

A Resolution designating September 7, 2020, as "Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Appreciation Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Ms. BOBACK called up **HR 988, PN 4318**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing August 11, 2020, as "National Sons and Daughters Day" in Pennsylvania to encourage outdoor activities and the use of parks and recreational facilities throughout this Commonwealth.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolutions?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Harris.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—202

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

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

The SPEAKER. As has become our practice and as mentioned in the memo yesterday, we will ask all the speakers to wait until the first break and we will manage the speaking time thereafter.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Saylor, for a committee announcement.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Appropriations Committee will meet at 11:15 in the majority caucus room, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Appropriations Committee will meet at 11:15 in the majority caucus room.

TOURISM AND RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Millard, for a committee announcement.

Mr. MILLARD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The House Recreation and Tourism Committee will meet immediately at the break, B-31 Main Capitol. That is B-31, immediately at the break. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The House Tourism and Recreational Development Committee will meet immediately at the break in B-31 Main Capitol.

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Peifer, for a committee announcement.

Mr. PEIFER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there will be an immediate voting meeting of the House Finance Committee in 205 Ryan Office Building to consider HBs 2420, 2598, and 2599, as well as HR 819 and any other business before the committee. Again, Mr. Speaker, immediately in room 205 there will be a House Finance voting meeting.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

There will be an immediate voting meeting of the House Finance Committee in 205 Ryan Office Building.

STATEMENT BY MR. SONNEY

The SPEAKER. The Chair now recognizes Representative Sonney, who is recognized to speak on HR 984.

Mr. SONNEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Colleagues, today I rise to thank all of you for your unanimous vote designating September 7, 2020, the "Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Appreciation Day" in Pennsylvania. As a member of the Great Lakes Legislative Caucus, my fellow caucus members, Representatives Keith Gillespie, Pat Harkins, and Parke Wentling, and I all want the Commonwealth residents to learn about the economic and environmental importance of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River. As I am sure you all know, the Great Lakes includes Lake Erie, Lake Huron, Lake Michigan, Lake Ontario, and Lake Superior. It reaches all the way from Minnesota to the Cabot Strait, leading to the Atlantic Ocean on the east coast of Canada.

Especially during COVID-19, nearby spots to relax and take a break have become vital to the mental and physical health of our Commonwealth residents and those who live near each of the waterways in this region. Normally, we know that Presque Isle State Park and Lake Erie attract about 4 million visitors annually, who spend an estimated \$76.9 million on a variety of tourist activities. While summer is just winding down and only 4 months still remain in 2020, I know the area has been a popular destination. I live across the street from Lake Erie, and I can see the activity happening on a daily basis.

While recreation is important, the lakes and the St. Lawrence River also provide vital drinking water to 48 million Americans and Canadians. In addition, these water sources supply 56 billion gallons per day for municipal, agricultural, and industrial use. Eight years ago, on September 7, 2012, a revised Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement was signed, reaffirming the United States and Canada's commitment to restore, protect, and enhance the water quality of the Great Lakes in order to promote the ecological health of the basin. While there is always room for improvement, this agreement has set the stage to ensuring the economic and environmental health of the region for years to come.

Again, colleagues, I appreciate the unanimous vote on designating September 7 as "Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Appreciation Day."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

STATEMENT BY MS. O'MARA

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative O'Mara, for comments on HR 965.

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

And thank you to Representative Benninghoff for allowing me to be the prime sponsor of HR 965 this year.

The SPEAKER. Will the lady please suspend.

Will the House please come to order. Please move your conversations off to the rear of the House. It is a very important issue and the lady deserves to be heard.

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

Our resolution recognizes September as "National Suicide Prevention Awareness Month," and September 10 as "World Suicide Prevention Day." Suicide is the 11th leading cause of death in Pennsylvania and the 10th leading cause nationwide. For Pennsylvanians aged 10 to 34, it is the second leading cause of death.

As many of you know, this is personal for me. My dad, a career firefighter in Philadelphia, died by gun suicide when I was just 13 years old. He left behind me, my mom, and my two younger brothers. But what many of you do not know is that it is a small miracle that I am standing in front of you and sharing this story. For so long I hid the truth about what happened to my dad. I was ashamed, I felt guilty, and I did not want people to judge me, and for too many people, that is the reality they face if they have suicide ideations or they lose someone they love to suicide. It was not until just 2 years ago when I decided to run for office that I started openly sharing my story because I want to help others, even if I just save one more life. I do not want more families to suffer the way that I did and the way that we did.

And my dad is not alone. Firefighters and police officers are five times more likely than the general population to develop PTSD (post-traumatic stress disorder) and depression. According to a study funded by the Ruderman Foundation, it was revealed that police officers and firefighters are more likely to die by suicide than they are to die in the line of duty.

So today I challenge all of you, my esteemed colleagues in the House of Representatives, to help me change the conversation around mental health. So many of you have already done this even before I was here, and I thank you for your work. But we still have so much to do.

Today more than ever, as our nation deals with more crises than I could even begin to count, so many people are suffering, and this virus has affected each and every one of us in different ways. But one thing remains the same for all of us: It is more important than ever that we communicate with one another and that we listen to each other when we do. We have to spread the message that your mental health is just as important as your physical health. We have to normalize asking for help so that we do not see more Pennsylvanians die by suicide this year than we did last year. We have to lead with caring and with empathy, and it starts today with all of us here on the House floor.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Toepel, for a caucus announcement.

Mrs. TOEPEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Republicans will caucus virtually and in person at 11:30 in the majority caucus room. We would be prepared to return to the floor at 12:30. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Leader Dermody for a caucus announcement.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Democrats will also caucus at 11:30.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. This House will be in recess until 12:30, unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

RECESS EXTENDED

The time of recess was extended until 12:45 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. If I could please have the members' attention. I wanted to briefly make an announcement that was requested by some members as well as some staff.

Just a reminder that here in the House chamber our management arm, the Bipartisan Management Committee, has adopted a mask policy, and some members and staff have expressed that this reminder be given to everyone – both members and staff – regarding the wearing of masks. It is a policy that is currently in place, and as I mentioned yesterday, the viewpoint from up here certainly is very different than when I was previously leader and in the rostrum.

Those two viewpoints are very different, and what I have observed from being up here in my very short time is that some individuals perhaps do not always wear a mask as often as other people would request and/or be comfortable with. So I was asked if I could politely remind everyone: Those who are willing and able to wear a mask and able to – and please remember that there is an exception under the ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) regarding medical exemptions – so those who can and are willing to do so and able to do so, I would simply remind everybody to keep it handy. I recognize that there are times when we are speaking at the microphone, eating, or drinking, there are exceptions that are in place, but I was simply asked to please remind all members and staff to do so.

If there are concerns, I would encourage the members to please contact their respective leaders, because ultimately, it would be addressed at the BMC level, which is the same place that the policy came from. Thank you.

STATEMENT BY MS. BOBACK

The SPEAKER. The Speaker would like to briefly recognize Representative Boback, under unanimous consent.

Ms. BOBACK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Personal privilege, please.

The SPEAKER. The lady is in order and may proceed.

Ms. BOBACK. Thank you.

I am just wanting to wish my husband of 46 years a very happy wedding anniversary. Happy anniversary, Buzz.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**HB 1566, PN 4336**

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 63 (Professions and Occupations (State Licensed)) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in powers and duties of the Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs, further providing for civil penalties.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2123, PN 3149

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act designating the Faxon Interchange of Interstate 180 at Northway Road in Loyalsock Township, Lycoming County, as the Sgt. Thomas Woodruff, Sr., and Sgt. Hamilton Woodruff Memorial Interchange.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2579, PN 3918

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act designating a bridge, identified as Bridge Key 43976, on that portion of Pennsylvania Route 1010 over Chatham Run, Pine Creek Township, Clinton County, as the Tech. Corporal Lee R. Phillips Memorial Bridge.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2626, PN 4335

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in preliminary provisions, further providing for definitions; in Secretary of the Commonwealth, providing for reports on implementation of elections; in county boards of elections, further providing for powers and duties of county boards, for records and documents to be open to public inspection and proviso, for preservation of records and for watchers or attorneys at sessions of county board and candidates may be present; in district election officers, further providing for qualifications of election officers and for appointment of watchers; in voting by qualified absentee electors, further providing for applications for official absentee ballots, for date of application for absentee ballot, for official absentee voters ballots, for delivering or mailing ballots, for voting by absentee electors and for canvassing of official absentee ballots and mail-in ballots; in Statewide Uniform Registry of Electors Advisory Board, providing for SURE requirements; in voting by qualified mail-in electors, further providing for applications for official mail-in ballots, for date of application for mail-in ballot, for official mail-in elector ballots, for delivering or mailing ballots and for voting by mail-in electors; in penalties, providing for an enhancement of penalties for certain violations; and making an editorial change.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2787, PN 4334

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in school health services, providing for precautions against spread of COVID-19; and, in terms and courses of study, providing for sports and extracurricular activities during the COVID-19 pandemic.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2788, PN 4333

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 pupils and attendance, providing for extended special education enrollment due to COVID-19; and, in terms and courses of study, providing for option year of education due to COVID-19.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES,
CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND
RECOMMITTED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES****HB 2420, PN 4338 (Amended)**

By Rep. PEIFER

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

FINANCE.

HB 2598, PN 3928

By Rep. PEIFER

An Act repealing the act of February 27, 1868 (P.L.43, No.9), entitled "An act to declare the true intent and meaning of the eleventh section of an act to provide for the reduction of the public debt, approved April twenty-second, Anno Domini one thousand eight hundred and forty-six."

FINANCE.

HB 2599, PN 3929

By Rep. PEIFER

An Act repealing the act of April 9, 1870 (P.L.59, No.38), entitled "A supplement to an act, entitled 'An Act to provide for the reduction of the public debt,' approved the twenty-second April, Anno Domini one thousand eight hundred and forty-six."

FINANCE.

HB 2724, PN 4197

By Rep. MILLARD

An Act amending the act of February 2, 1966 (1965 P.L.1860, No.586), entitled "An act encouraging landowners to make land and water areas available to the public for recreational purposes by limiting liability in connection therewith, and repealing certain acts," further providing for definitions; and providing for recreational user's claim for property rights and for the substitution of the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources for a party in litigation.

TOURISM AND RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

**RESOLUTION REPORTED
FROM COMMITTEE**

HR 819, PN 3477

By Rep. PEIFER

A Resolution recognizing the week of September 7 through 11, 2020, as "National Payroll Week" in Pennsylvania.

FINANCE.

**UNCONTESTED SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A
RESOLUTION**

Mr. BARRAR called up **HR 990, PN 4337**, entitled:

A Resolution designating September 14, 2020, as "EMS Memorial Day" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognize the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is correct.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Harris.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—202

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

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

CALENDAR

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 2548, PN 3832**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of July 10, 1987 (P.L.246, No.47), known as the Municipalities Financial Recovery Act, in municipal financial distress, providing for emergency plan extension.

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

Mr. **FREEMAN** offered the following amendment
No. **A06841**:

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 20 through 23; page 2, lines 1 through 14; by striking out "Notwithstanding any other provision of this" in line 20, all of lines 21 through 23 on page 1 and all of lines 1 through 14 on page 2 and inserting

The plan extension authorized by section 1604-D.1 of the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as the Fiscal Code, shall apply to any deadline to terminate the distressed status of a municipality in this subchapter.

(b) Applicability.—This section shall:

(1) Not apply to a plan adopted by a municipality which was not distressed under this act on the effective date of this section.

(2) Apply retroactively to the extension of a plan on or after July 1, 2020.

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Freeman.

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And for the record, I am withdrawing the other two amendments that were filed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. FREEMAN. This will be the only amendment I will offer today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

By way of background for the members, the COVID-19 pandemic has posed a challenge to municipal fiscal operations. I am sure we are all aware of that, having heard from our own municipalities in our districts. But for Act 47 distressed municipalities, ongoing efforts to achieve recovery objectives are frustrated even more by these challenges. Current recovery plan deadlines would prove to be arbitrary if they were required to be enforced and would probably compromise the recovery efforts, setting back those communities that are trying to exit Act 47 distressed status.

To provide relief and breathing room for Act 47 municipalities, the Local Government Commission drafted HB 2548 to provide an 18-month extension on plan deadlines. This spring the Senate included amendatory language into the Fiscal Code bill that sought to provide the relief intended in HB 2548 through section 1604-D.1 of the Fiscal Code. However, due to the ambiguity in the language and its reference to section 254 in Act 47, the Fiscal Code language inadvertently created uncertainty as to the scope of the relief sought, which was intended to cover all 16 of the Act 47 distressed municipalities. However, only the 3 communities that are in a 5-year recovery plan are clearly covered by the Fiscal Code language, while the remaining 13—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman please suspend. I apologize.

Will the members please take their seats and remove any conversations off to the back of the House. The gentleman is discussing a very important issue and deserves to be heard. Thank you.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for bringing order to the House.

Again, only the 3 communities that are in the 5-year recovery plan are clearly covered by the Fiscal Code language that was adopted this spring, while the remaining 13 distressed municipalities under Act 47, the vast majority of which are under 3-year exit plans, may be open to dispute as to being covered by the Fiscal Code language because of its ambiguity.

My amendment, amendment 6841, which was drafted by the Local Government Commission staff, clarifies that the Fiscal Code provision authorization for an extension to Act 47 communities facing a deadline to terminate distressed status under Act 47 will apply to all 16 Act 47 municipalities that are currently with recovery plans. This is particularly important for the city of Scranton, which faced a deadline at the end of June of this year. While the Department of Community and Economic Development interpreted the Fiscal Code language as also covering or including Scranton, my amendment removes all doubt that they are not covered and clarifies that in fact they are, as are all other Act 47 municipalities, and that the language would apply to all of them and also apply retroactively to the extension of a plan on or before July 1 of 2020. That is particularly important in the case of Scranton.

The language in my amendment would not apply to a plan adopted by a municipality that was not distressed under the act on the effective date of this section of the Fiscal Code. So it is only the existing 16 communities we are talking about. My amendment provides express clarification on the comprehensive nature of the Fiscal Code language, ensuring that all Act 47 municipalities are granted the 18-month extension that they need as was originally intended in HB 2548.

I urge the House to vote "yes" on amendment 6841.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Moul.

Mr. MOUL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As majority chair of the Local Government Committee, I want to thank the fine gentleman for bringing this amendment forward to clean up the language in the bill and it is an agreed-to amendment. So thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Harris.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—202

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

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

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-0

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

On the question,

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2123, PN 3149**, entitled:

An Act designating the Faxon Interchange of Interstate 180 at Northway Road in Loysock Township, Lycoming County, as the Sgt. Thomas Woodruff, Sr., and Sgt. Hamilton Woodruff Memorial Interchange.

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 Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Harris.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-202

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

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-0

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 2579, PN 3918**, entitled:

An Act designating a bridge, identified as Bridge Key 43976, on that portion of Pennsylvania Route 1010 over Chatham Run, Pine Creek Township, Clinton County, as the Tech. Corporal Lee R. Phillips Memorial Bridge.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

It is the Chair's understanding that the Representative wishes to speak at the conclusion of session. The Chair thanks the lady.

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 recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Harris.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—202

Barrar	Fiedler	Lee	Reese
Benninghoff	Fitzgerald	Lewis	Rigby
Bernstine	Flynn	Longietti	Roae
Bizzarro	Frankel	Mackenzie	Roebuck
Boback	Freeman	Madden	Rothman
Bonner	Fritz	Mako	Rowe
Borowicz	Gabler	Malagari	Rozzi
Boyle	Gainey	Maloney	Ryan
Bradford	Galloway	Markosek	Sainato
Briggs	Gaydos	Marshall	Samuelson
Brooks	Gillen	Masser	Sanchez
Brown	Gillespie	Matzie	Sankey
Bullock	Gleim	McCarter	Sappery
Burgos	Goodman	McClinton	Saylor
Burns	Green	McNeill	Schemel
Caltagirone	Gregory	Mehaffie	Schlossberg

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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 1566, PN 4336**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 63 (Professions and Occupations (State Licensed)) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in powers and duties of the Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs, further providing for civil 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?

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

VOTE STRICKEN

The SPEAKER. The clerk will please strike the vote.

The minority leader was seeking recognition, and I failed to see him. I apologize. The gentleman wishes to speak on the bill and is recognized.

For the benefit of the members, it typically is past protocol and by rule, once a vote is in process, the only thing that is in order is taking of the vote, but since it was my mistake, I will recognize the minority leader at this time.

The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this was a good bill and, obviously, would have our support, but it has just been I think today amended with language that was an amendment yesterday that would not allow the bureau of professional and occupational safety to issue fines for not complying with the safety orders and the orders of the Department of Health and the Governor's declarations. That is a mistake, Mr. Speaker. It is reckless and it was stated yesterday on the record all the reasons why this is a bad idea, and while the underlying bill is a good one, the fact that it is amended with this language is a problem, it is dangerous, and we ought to be a "no" vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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 recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Harris.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—115

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

Delozier	Kaufer	Oberlander	Thomas
Diamond	Kauffman	Ortitay	Tobash
Dowling	Keefer	Owlett	Toepel
Dunbar	Keller	Peifer	Tomlinson
Dush	Klunk	Petrarca	Toohil
Ecker	Knowles	Pickett	Topper
Emrick	Kortz	Polinchock	Warner
Everett	Kulik	Puskaric	Wentling
Farry	Lawrence	Pyle	Wheeland
Fee	Lewis	Quinn	White
Fritz	Mackenzie	Rader	Zimmerman
Gabler	Mako	Rapp	
Gaydos	Maloney	Reese	Cutler,
Gillen	Marshall	Rigby	Speaker
Gillespie			

NAYS—87

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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 2626, PN 4335**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in preliminary provisions, further providing for definitions; in Secretary of the Commonwealth, providing for reports on implementation of elections; in county boards of elections, further providing for powers and duties of county boards, for records and documents to be open to public inspection and proviso, for preservation of records and for watchers or attorneys at sessions of county board and candidates may be present; in district election officers, further providing for qualifications of election officers and for appointment of watchers; in voting by qualified absentee electors, further providing for applications for official absentee ballots, for date of application for absentee ballot, for official absentee voters ballots, for delivering or mailing ballots, for voting by absentee electors and for canvassing of official absentee ballots and mail-in ballots; in Statewide Uniform Registry of Electors Advisory Board, providing for SURE requirements; in voting by qualified mail-in electors, further providing

for applications for official mail-in ballots, for date of application for mail-in ballot, for official mail-in elector ballots, for delivering or mailing ballots and for voting by mail-in electors; in penalties, providing for an enhancement of penalties for certain violations; and making an editorial change.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Moul.
Mr. MOUL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today I ask for a "yes" vote on HB 2626, as we amended it yesterday. This bill represents the culmination of several months' work to prepare for the coming election in November. I originally introduced this bill in June in response to problems that were encountered by counties in the primary and in preparation for problems that we expect in the November election. Since then, this proposal has been refined and amended and it addresses the major issues that we know the Commonwealth will face in November. It reduces the number of late-arriving and, therefore, uncounted ballots; it helps us get results on election day or as soon thereafter as possible; and it addresses concerns about security of the election.

I believe that this is a balanced approach. While it might not make everyone happy, it is a significant improvement over current election law.

We all received very recently an e-mail from CCAP (County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania), CCAP's comments on HB 2626, and it says, "On behalf of the County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania, representing all 67 counties in the commonwealth, I write to share our comments on HB 2626..., which provides for a number of election procedure reforms to be implemented in advance of the 2020 General Election." Although they would like to see some more changes, they stand behind this bill.

One of the things that we heard on the House floor yesterday, which really caught my attention, was when a member of this body stood up and said that there is no election fraud in Pennsylvania, not one case. And that kind of bothered me. I knew better, but I wanted to make sure. And he is right, there is not one. With one click of the mouse I printed out two full pages – just a cursory review, without going in depth – of conviction after conviction after conviction of election fraud here in Pennsylvania. So to say that we do not have problems and that we do not have election fraud is very, very much a mistruth.

I would like to read something that I think is very telling as to how important it is for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to try and do our very, very best to make the most sacred thing that we do in our democracy as pure as it can possibly be made, and this kind of puts an emphasis on why we need to make this the cleanest that we possibly can. And I am going to quote a dear friend of mine who is now in the Senate but sat on this House floor with us just a few years ago. I quote:

"Mr. Speaker, 9 years ago this summer I was a captain serving with the 4th Infantry Division in central Iraq. The young men I served with fought not just for the rights, our rights, as citizens of this country, but to extend the right to vote to Iraqis who did not previously have the privilege to choose their leaders. In June of 2003, I was in Tuz, Iraq. Tuz was a small Kurdish village on the outskirts of Kirkuk. The Kurds were a people brutally terrorized by Saddam Hussein's regime. The young men in my infantry company, engaged in a war from the borders of their own country, fought to ensure those people were able to vote in a local town council election for the...first time in the summer of 2003. Those young men I served with fought for the right to vote, but for the integrity of that young system as well. Remember the purple-stained finger.

"Some have used the term 'fought and shed blood' rather casually. I do not. I can still hear the call of the wounded. I can close my eyes and still see the wounded soldiers evacuated from the field of battle. The 'shedding of blood' is not a casual term for me. It is very, very real. The idea that my support of this bill would somehow constitute voter suppression is personally offensive and it is wrong.

"I utterly reject the notion that insisting on one person, one vote; insisting on integrity; and insisting that voter confidence is somehow misguided will suppress turnout. Turnout is suppressed when political leaders engage in heated, heated negative rhetoric that has no relation to fact," end of quote, from now Senator Ryan Aument, who served this country and helped other countries make sure that they have the right to do what we take for granted and it is up to us to make sure that our elections are as pure as they possibly can be.

We all know that this Election Code is not perfect. We know that this bill is not perfect. But there are very few bills that ever leave this body that you could call perfect. But it is definitely a step forward. It is a step forward to make sure, to ensure that our election with this mail-in voting is done as clean and pure as possible.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Webster.

Mr. WEBSTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may make a motion.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a motion to rerefer HB 2626 to committee, please, to the State Government Committee, as original.

The SPEAKER. The question before the House on the motion made by Representative Webster is, shall HB 2626 be rereferred to State Government?

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order. The motion is on the board, and you may speak on the motion.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, when HB 2626 first came to the floor, it went through a very normal process. It was available for public review. It came to a committee where it was debated and voted on and could be amended in committee. It then came to the floor where numerous amendments were offered and voted on, on the floor of the House. After that occurred, what was then referred to as an omnibus amendment replaced all of that process with language that was a 100 percent change. So HB 2626 as it stands did not go through any public review time. HB 2626 as it stands did not go through a committee review, where it could be assessed and voted on by the members of that committee. And then HB 2626 as it stands now did not stand for second consideration on the floor of the House. So we have completely usurped the normal processes of parliamentary procedure in the Pennsylvania General Assembly.

And for these reasons I believe HB 2626 should go back and be accomplished correctly. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative Dan Moul on the motion.

Mr. MOUL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have been conducting this business as long as I have been here with amendments. That is why we have the amendment phase. Everybody had the amendment in their caucus. Everybody had the right to express their viewpoints, which we spent quite a bit of time yesterday expressing those viewpoints on the amendment. So we are doing everything as we always have done, and I would recommend a "no" vote on the motion to recommit.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Toohil, on the motion.

Ms. TOOHL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I also would recommend that the members have a "no" vote on this motion. You know, we could strive for perfection. I had amendments that I wanted to be included on this, where party affiliation would not be listed on the outside of an envelope for the world to see. We had amendments of all different kinds that we wished were in this product, something perhaps that would say to the Governor that he shall not use the COVID-19 disaster declaration to create election week for seven counties, while the rest of our counties only got election day. So there are things that are not in here. However, election day is 62 days from today, and I would request that the members vote that we would proceed today with the reforms that are included herein.

So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Ciresi, on the motion.

Mr. CIRESI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask for an affirmative vote on this. While I respect the committee chair and what he is trying to do, what we just heard from the gentelady about amendments that she would like to see on this only reinforces what Representative Webster is looking to do. This is an extremely important bill that we are looking to put forth today. And like I said yesterday and I am going to reiterate it, we are less than, I guess we are 59 days or 60 days from this election where we are looking to make major changes. If we are going to do this, let us do it right. And again, it was just reinforced by what was said that there are other amendments that we would like to see in this. So let us meet right away. Let us come back to this floor. Let us make the changes we need to make. Let us do it right and not have to come back six or seven other times. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Neilson, on the motion.

Mr. NEILSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand in support of this motion. Coming from the county of Philadelphia, the largest county in the State of Pennsylvania, and for our county commissioners not to have a seat at the table or even be asked for input for this legislation, I think it has to go back to committee. I think it is the right move. We need to get it back into committee so there can be some real solid discussions.

Now, I understand I am in the minority in the House here, but still, we should still have a seat at the table. We have Democrats, Republicans, and Independents in Philadelphia, if anybody did not notice. They are all there.

I wish all the members would support this motion, get it back into committee so we can have a real discussion. We cannot be making these changes 60 days out, as the Representative from the Valley said. These major changes 60 days out, scary for all of us.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Benninghoff, on the motion.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I think it was stated earlier that this bill had not been considered on second consideration. That is what we spent a good amount of time doing yesterday. And I speak on behalf of the committee chair in the committee that has spent hours and hours and hours working on this, in direct consultation with CCAP that represents all county commissioners' offices across this great Commonwealth. This issue has been discussed for almost most of this year. There was discussion on many of these very same issues regarding election law when we passed the previous bill, of which we are making some revisions to today with the hopes of giving the people of Pennsylvania what they want: a safe, secure election process.

Amendments were offered yesterday, probably again in committee, and they were either adopted or were defeated on their merit, and they were either adopted or defeated by the very people sitting in this room elected by their constituency. So I do not understand why anybody would want to recommit a bill that has spent hours; months; many, many days of work to the same committee that helped to draft this bill, after consultation with many different entities and many of you in this chamber to come up with this well-crafted, well-thought-out piece of legislation to move Pennsylvania forward, and I would ask our members to vote "no" to recommitting this bill back to the same committee that did this yeoman's job work.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Boyle.

Mr. BOYLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the motion, I just want to make it clear because yet again it has been asserted that CCAP, the County Commissioners Association, is supportive of this bill. That is not true. They are neutral on it. So I just wanted to correct the record before we vote on this motion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

For clarification for the members, those in favor of rereferral will vote "aye"; those opposed, "no."

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Harris.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

NAYS—109

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Boyle.

Mr. BOYLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

One of the greatest myths in American politics and something that I consistently hear on the floor of the Pennsylvania House since I began my career here in 2011 is this phenomenon of voter fraud. Specifically, there are often allegations that there is mass voter fraud in my home city of Philadelphia. The facts, though, tell a different story. I actually have data here from The Heritage Foundation. I think probably most people know The Heritage Foundation is not exactly a progressive think tank. According to The Heritage Foundation, in the last 40 years – my entire lifetime – in the United States, there have been 1,296 proven instances of voter fraud; there have been 1,119 criminal convictions; there have been 48 civil penalties; and 95 people entered a diversion program related to voter fraud. Also, according to The Heritage Foundation, in Pennsylvania in 2016, which would be the last Presidential election year, there were just three instances of voter fraud. So I hope all members keep this in mind the next time a Republican member begins talking about voter fraud in Pennsylvania and also in Philadelphia.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Saylor.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today in support of HB 2626. This legislation will ensure safe and secure elections here in Pennsylvania, which is the cornerstone of our American democracy. This legislation ensures security and integrity of our election process, one, by creating clear and consistent standards for where voters may cast mail-in ballots; two, it provides for more reasonable deadlines for applying for mail-in ballots; three, it extends timelines for counties to begin the process of tabulating mail-in ballots so that they can actually know the election results on the night of an election; and number four, it increases the penalties for voter fraud and violation of the Election Code.

You know, I have to say it is extremely critical that we have a Governor who just last year unilaterally decertified every election machine in Pennsylvania, without consulting any of the county commissioners, without consulting any of them or this General Assembly, by the way. We were forced to appropriate \$90 million to assist the counties in purchasing new machines because the Governor determined the machines were not secure. Yet this same Governor now argues that paper ballots should be sent all over the Commonwealth willy-nilly, without a commonsense security or integrity process and measures in place.

You heard earlier the Representative from Philadelphia talk about the convictions and the amount of criminal fraud in the election process all across the country, but let me be more specific about Pennsylvania. In July of this year, July of this year, former Congressman Michael Myers of Philadelphia was indicted in a ballot-stuffing scheme that spanned several elections. And in 2018 Harry Maxwell of Delaware County admitted to charges of absentee ballot fraud. He admitted that he would pick up girls, get them to sign absentee ballots in the name of deceased individuals. And of course, then there is 2015 when Richard Toney, a former police chief in Allegheny County, pleaded guilty to illegally soliciting absentee ballots for other people to help his wife win a seat on town council. In 1999 former Congressman Austin Murphy was convicted in Fayette County of forging absentee ballots for senior citizens living in nursing homes. And perhaps the most consequential example was in 1993 in a special election for the State Senate in Philadelphia, which was invalidated by a Federal judge after a Democratic campaign staffer was found to have stolen the election by forging absentee ballots, including casting votes for people who were in jail and deceased.

But these are just a few examples. There are more out there, by the way. So when people say there is no fraud, when they say that, I cannot believe them because they know better. They read the same headlines in the newspapers and the TVs and the radio stations that I see. You are not fooling the voters of Pennsylvania by saying there is no fraud. They have seen it in other States and they have seen it here.

So I urge the members of both sides of the aisle to make sure that every vote in Pennsylvania means something, that somebody else cannot cast their ballot. Nobody else can cast a ballot of somebody who is dead or somebody who should not be voting. I ask for an affirmative vote today for HB 2626 to make sure that every Pennsylvania vote cast is an honest vote and a sincere vote, and that we can all believe in our democracy again because we have fair elections.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and calls on the gentlewoman, Representative O'Mara, on the bill.

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

I rise in opposition to this bill today for a few reasons. First, I want to mention that here in Pennsylvania we do not opt to send ballots willy-nilly; you have to request a ballot; it is why it is called a no-excuse absentee, which is different from other States opting to send out a ballot to any registered voter.

I also want to point out that the AARP has put out language that if we pass this bill, we are going to disenfranchise seniors by taking away the ability of counties to set up secure drop boxes. Each and every day I receive dozens of phone calls from constituents – and I know they are registered Democrats, Republicans, and Independents – who want drop boxes because in Delaware County we have people who are still afraid of community spread. Just last week a firefighter in my district called our office to get paperwork notarized because his mother, Barbara, died from COVID-19. He asked me to ensure that his mother is not just a data point but we need to remember that we are trying to ensure the right of people to vote during a global pandemic.

Last week Delaware County voted to have drop boxes, one in each municipality. Our municipalities are now working to ensure they are in secure locations, at police stations or municipal

buildings where they will be under constant supervision. And before this meeting could begin, they had to read comments for 4 hours from residents of Delaware County who submitted feedback asking for drop boxes.

This should not be a partisan issue. We are trying to ensure that every Pennsylvanian has the right to vote and has the right to do it safely. And with the problems going on right now with the post office, drop boxes make that right much easier.

And so I urge all of my colleagues to listen to the constituents who are calling all of our offices and asking for this right and please vote "no."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Kenyatta, on the bill.

Mr. KENYATTA. You know, this debate that we are having right now, Mr. Speaker, is absurd, but in my first term here I have come to expect the absurd.

So let us have a conversation about voter fraud. There is actually a lawsuit filed by the Republican Presidential nominee in Federal court right now on voter fraud. That campaign was ordered by a Pennsylvania judge to back up the claims of voter fraud. That campaign responded with a 524-page document, which showed no, zero instances of mail-in voter fraud.

So this idea of voter fraud is nonsense, and we need to call it that, nonsense. And frankly, it is a slap in the face to all the county commissioners that have been hailed as supporting this bill even though they do not; a slap in their face because in Pennsylvania we conduct good, free, and fair elections and this amendment and this bill would actually take us in the opposite direction.

I will tell you what the real voter fraud is. The real voter fraud is the voter suppression and intimidation that is in this bill. That is voter fraud. And when you look at some of the statistics that were brought up by the chair of the Appropriations Committee, pulling out a couple of articles that he fished out from Google, if you look at the math of it, it is less than a tenth of a percent of all votes cast; less than a tenth of a percent. I was not that good in math class, but that means not even 1 percent of votes. And if you dig into the details a little further, you find that of those cases of voter fraud, most of those cases involved voter intimidation, which this bill would allow to run rampant. [Remarks were stricken from the record.]

So listen, we are not trying to send out votes willy-nilly; we are trying to make sure everybody can vote. And if you are afraid of people voting, then you are afraid of people being able to make a choice about your record. So if you do not want people to vote, vote differently, vote better.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. It seems that the gentleman is kind of defining the character of Republicans when he is giving percentage that parallels with the backbones of our members. I do not think that is appropriate being said on the House floor, and I ask that it be scratched from the record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. The Parliamentarian and I were reviewing some other matters up here.

As a general reminder, recognizing how heated the debate was yesterday on this particular issue and the passions on both sides for this issue, please as members refrain from assigning motive to one another and stay confined to the underlying aspects of the bill.

The Chair thanks the gentleman for raising that parliamentary inquiry.

The Chair recognizes the lady, Representative Davidson, on the bill.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am sure this bill has been debated, both yesterday and today, and so we have heard many of the points, but I just want to go on the record today, Mr. Speaker, to really illuminate what is at stake. We are talking about here today, Mr. Speaker, the difference between voter containment and voter suppression, containing the numbers of voters that have access to the ballot box versus an almost nonexistent voter fraud and the myth of maintaining a secure election, which is already abundantly secure.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at a few historical facts as we debate and as we look at this issue. In the 1700s voting was primarily limited to White men who owned property. Those are the only folks that were allowed to vote. Women were not allowed to vote. People of color were not allowed to vote. And so from that horrendous past, Mr. Speaker, the country rightfully began to correct that wrong, beginning in the 1800s with the ratification of women being allowed to vote, then African-Americans being allowed to vote, and then there was another movement of suppression. So whenever access is increased, there is an equal measure to contain and suppress under whatever guise and whatever disguise you want to put it. And that is why the Supreme Court in 1966, jumping ahead a century, had to determine that it was unconstitutional the way that they were applying poll taxes and signature taxes and literacy tests under the disguise and under the fraudulent claim that they wanted to maintain fair and secure elections. It was bogus, Mr. Speaker. It was bogus then and it is bogus now.

In 1971 we began to allow younger people to vote. And in 1975 we enacted the Voting Rights Act. After Barack Hussein Obama was elected twice to the White House in a movement that claimed an enormous amount of new voters that changed the electoral maps by the sheer volume of people that voted, once again the bogus claims and the bogus fears began to arise again. So the U.S. Supreme Court gutted the Voting Rights Act in 2013 after the reelection of Barack Obama. This cleared the way for several States to begin creating barriers once again to the access to voting.

In 2016 our current President created the Presidential Commission on Election Integrity. This commission disbanded in January of 2018 – I want you to hear me – without presenting any evidence or findings of voter fraud or that our elections were not secure. With all the power of the President's Office, they were not able to present any findings, no evidence of rampant voter fraud.

Sadly today, Mr. Speaker, a 2018 analysis found that election officials have closed thousands of polling places, the majority of which are in urban areas where minority voters are affected, and

these closings have disproportionately impacted communities of color. Recent reports even said, quoting our elected officials saying that if more people vote, Republicans will lose.

Mr. Speaker, the claim that our elections are insecure is bogus. It was bogus in the 1800s. It was bogus in the 1960s. It was bogus at the turn of the century. It was bogus in 2008. It was bogus in 2012. It was bogus in 2016. It was bogus in 2018. And it is bogus in 2020. It is time for us to call out a spade as a spade, and this is nothing but a veiled attempt to suppress and contain the vote, and I will be a "no" and I would hope that those of conscience would also be a "no."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Lawrence, on the bill.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just have a question for the maker of the bill if he will stand for interrogation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates that he will stand for interrogation.

The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I was a "yes" vote on the bill that we had last year that created the mail-in voting system. We have heard a lot of rhetoric on the floor today, and I appreciate the impassioned debate. There were a number of members who voted against the creation of mail-in voting in Pennsylvania, which I think is interesting. I certainly am in support of it. I want to make sure people are able to vote, and particularly, I might add that we moved that legislation before anyone had ever heard of COVID-19. So I would like to think for once the legislature was a little bit ahead of the game and we were a little bit forward thinking to put in place mail-in voting so that now with this unexpected challenge with COVID-19, people can exercise the right to vote through the mail for any reason.

Mr. Speaker, my question has to do very specifically with when a ballot is received by the county board of elections. So that ballot is inside of a secrecy envelope and then that secrecy envelope is put inside of an outer envelope, which is signed by the elector. So my question is, when can those outer envelopes be opened? When can those outer envelopes be opened, the outer envelopes that have the declaration of the elector on the outside of them?

Mr. MOUL. Those, Mr. Speaker, those outer envelopes can only be opened during a pre-canvassing or canvassing meeting. Those meetings are under high security. They are videotaped meetings. Only during those times can they be opened. Those times are set by the county elections. And you know, there are authorized representatives there to view the opening of those ballots and oversee it to make sure everything is kept on the up-and-up.

And to follow-up with one thing that you just mentioned prior to you getting into the question, I, too, find it very rich that two of the previous speakers who are up here defending not voting for this, defending mail-in balloting the way it is, also voted "no" against it. I just wanted to throw that in there.

But to answer your question, only during those meetings, sir.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may proceed on final passage of the bill.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate being given the opportunity to speak on the bill on final passage. The bill as I see it, Mr. Speaker, is not perfect. There are some things I would like to see changed a little bit in it. But I do think it is an improvement. It does include some of the concerns that were brought to me by the Chester County Commissioners, who also serve as the county election board in Chester County. So I will be a "yes" vote on the bill today, and I would encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Isaacson, on final passage of the bill.

Mrs. ISAACSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have heard a lot of rhetoric and a lot of statements being made in support of this bill and against it. Yesterday I heard all that the gut-and-replace amendment was going to grant us. And in the amendment, the changes that they were granting us were nothing more than restricting voting rights and restricting access.

Last week we were here celebrating the 100th anniversary of women's suffrage and the passing of the 19th Amendment where women won the right to vote. Women were not granted the right to vote, we won it, and we won it into our Constitution and we fought for that right.

I will never vote to support restrictions on voting rights, and that is what this bill is doing. We are 60 days out from election. Counties are trying to get prepared to put on an election in the middle of a pandemic, and we are going to pass laws and push procedures that are going to restrict voting rights? I think that with a pandemic everybody needs something to believe in, and that is our right to vote, and we should be making it easier, not harder.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Diamond, on final passage.

Mr. DIAMOND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I believe a lot of people have gotten far afield of the entire point of this bill. This bill is in response to a report from the Department of State on how to clean up the logistics of mail-in voting. Now, just a brief history lesson. We approved mail-in voting last year, long before anybody ever heard of the coronavirus. So this year when we got to the primary, the first time to try mail-in voting, we all knew that our county boards of elections may trip, may get hung up over some of the little details of how this was carried out, so we asked for a report. We got the report and this is simply the logistical response to that report.

I have no idea why everybody wants to get into voter fraud, voter suppression. This is not what this is about. Look, let me put it in very, very simple terms. We created mail-in voting for the convenience of the voters. As a result, I believe the voters owe our boards of election the convenience of being able to handle their mail-in votes long before they have to deal with in-person voting on election day. That is exactly what this bill does. We moved the application date back to 15 days before the election because we heard from the post office that 7 days probably is not enough to guarantee that they get there. So now it is 15 days.

We created, we allowed at the behest of our boards of election, we are allowing them in this bill to pre-canvass – that does not mean counting; it does not mean tabulating; it does not mean scanning – pre-canvass, do the logistical work to get the ballots ready to be counted and tabulated and scanned before the election

happens, so that before election day comes when people who do not want to vote by mail and they want to show up at the polls, so that our boards of election can focus on that. It is a degree of separation, and we have to do that because, quite frankly, our boards of election are not fully staffed with hundreds and hundreds of workers, at least not in Lebanon County. We have three people who work in our election office. And we have, you know, people who volunteer to be judges, you know, or get elected to be judges of elections. We have people who volunteer to help out at the polls. It is a logistical nightmare, especially during COVID, to get people to go out and help with the poll work. So what we have created here is a logistical fix so that the convenience of the voters does not inconvenience our boards of election.

This is a simple bill. We are not denying anybody the right to vote. We never legalized drop boxes. And quite frankly, if you have a mailing address, you have a drop box. I got one hanging right on the front of my house. I put all my mail there for the mailman to pick up. If you have a mailing address, you have a drop box. And by the way, postage is free thanks to the Governor. Postage is free. Nobody's vote is going to be suppressed here. Everybody can vote in the manner you choose. And with that mail-in ballot, you have four different ways to turn that in. You can drop it in a mailbox – it is a mail-in ballot – you can drop it in a mailbox. You can take it in person to your board of elections. We have four different ways to turn in this mail-in ballot. We have done this for the convenience of the voter. The voters owe it to our boards of election not to inconvenience them by sending their ballots in late. No. Order early, vote early, get it in early; let us get it out of the way so that we can deal with in-person voting.

Mr. Speaker, let me put this in a parlance that may be more familiar with everybody seeing what we are going through now. Your early mail or our early mail protects you and your early mail protects us.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative McClinton, on final passage.

Ms. McCLINTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And thank you to our colleagues for such a heated debate and different exchanges, a variety of expressions of opinions and perspectives.

I am standing today for my neighbors in Southwest Philly who had a very difficult time turning in mail-in ballots in the primary, and because of that challenge, not just my neighbors in Southwest Philly but also my neighbors in Delaware County, they need to have what every person across the entire United States of America deserves and that is unfettered access to the ballot. That is what they deserve. They deserve to be able to vote, to make sure that their voices are heard, and to make sure that there are no impediments.

When we left here in July, me being the optimist I am, I was certain we would get back here before the end of August and early September so that we could tighten the measures needed in the Election Code to provide clarity to the 67 counties who have an important job to do and now what is just 60 days away. But here we are with this 60-day goal trying to fix things, and the current proposals are not sufficient. These current proposals will in fact make it harder for many of our neighbors across the Commonwealth, some of whom who do not have a traditional mailbox at their home, to be able to cast their votes.

It is critically important that people can cast their votes and not be bullied by poll watchers from out of county. It is important that people be able to cast their votes and be able to drop them off safely and securely in drop boxes across our legislative districts. People are calling my office saying they have not received medication because the mail is delayed and slow. So now is the time for us to take really serious, bold action that will not limit people's voices, that will not fetter their opportunity to let their voices be heard, but will ensure that they can all vote, Mr. Speaker.

For those of you who are paying any attention to what I am saying, the mask I have on has a quote from the late, great Congressman John Lewis, who certainly could teach us so much about when there was not real access to the ballot when he was almost killed on the Edmund Pettus Bridge in the sixties marching for people in Alabama to have the right to vote. And here we are in 2020 when we have a decision to make on whether or not we will make it easier or harder for people across the Commonwealth of all backgrounds, all ethnicities, all faiths, all religions, all races to be able to vote.

Everybody agrees that this is the most important election of our lifetime, so I am asking everyone to vote "no" because we have not fixed the issues that need to be resolved with our mail-in ballots.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and shares the optimism.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Everett, on final passage.

Mr. EVERETT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was not going to rise today and I will be very brief. I was going to cover what my good friend, Representative Diamond, just covered, that this bill is about fine-tuning the mail-in procedures that we put into effect in Act 77 in 2019. We have got lessons learned from the primary election. We have had the report from the Department of State. We have had input from CCAP.

And I just wanted to clarify for the gentleman from the fine city of Philadelphia, our first-class city, that I received no less than three letters from the commissioners of election in the great city of Philadelphia as to their recommendations on what we were to do to help them. We have incorporated many of those. I received I do not even know how many inputs from election directors from across the State, and we tried to hit the sweet spot between the large cities, the counties like Philadelphia and Allegheny, and the small counties like Elk and Lycoming like I represent. There is not a — and as the good gentleman from Perry County in front of me reminds me, Perry County. So we tried to hit the sweet spot.

And again, this is not about erecting barriers; this is about allowing more people to vote more conveniently through the mail and the other ways that we have provided to cast their mail-in ballots. So I respect the debate. I do not think — I was up in my office watching the proceedings and missed the debate on whether it should come back to committee or not. This bill was vetted in committee. This bill went through second consideration on the floor. Amendments were adopted from both parties. It is ready to go. And I look forward to final passage of this bill and getting it over to the Senate so we can get it to our election directors, so we can help them with this election in November.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative Boyle on final passage.

Mr. BOYLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The member from York quite a few minutes ago had a rather long litany of voting irregularities in the city of Philadelphia, but he did omit one instance. There was an audit of polling places in the city of Philadelphia in 2013 by City Commissioner Al Schmidt, who is a Republican, and he actually found, the only place in the entire city of Philadelphia he found voter fraud was actually in my district, in the 55th Ward, 29th Division. It just so happened that the voter fraud was being committed by the GOP committeeperson. So I thought it was interesting that the member from York did not mention that, so I figured that I would.

But on the substance of the bill, Mr. Speaker. It is remarkable that the timely counting of votes is now a partisan issue. However, that is a reality in Pennsylvania in 2020. Democrats believe the efficient and speedy tabulation of ballots is a core function of government. The GOP, however, as evidenced by this bill, are demanding that we roll back important provisions from Act 77. Specifically, this bill seeks to prohibit drop boxes. We on the Democratic side cannot accept that because we see what is happening in Washington, DC, with the Trump administration's efforts to try to sabotage the postal service. The drop boxes are vital because they are our insurance that we can still utilize the expanded vote-by-mail system that was established in Act 77.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would urge members to reject this bill, and I would furthermore urge my Republican colleagues to please come and work with us in good faith. We only have a little over 10 days to actually have a deal on this absolutely vital issue, and let us try to make something work.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative DeLissio, on final passage of the bill.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, will the prime sponsor stand for brief interrogation, please?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates he is willing, and you are in order and may proceed.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, how was the pre-canvass window of about 72 hours, give or take, previous to election day arrived at? It is currently, I believe, at 7 a.m. on election day so that has now been taken back to Saturday, if I recall.

Mr. MOUL. Well, Mr. Speaker, the motive for those that put the amendment together, I cannot tell you how they came to it because I was not in that meeting. Remember, the amendment was not mine; the amendment changed my bill, so I cannot tell you how it was arrived at. I can tell you that my original bill was 21 days, 3 weeks out —

Ms. DeLISSIO. I thought so.

Mr. MOUL. —that they could start. Whoever the negotiating people were with the amendment decided they were going to move it to the Saturday, Sunday, Monday prior to election, and why they did it, that I do not know.

Okay. I am being advised that Saturday is the day after the deadline in which challenges can be submitted.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Saturday is the day after the deadline for which challenges to what can be submitted, please, Mr. Speaker? I am not sure which challenges are being referred to.

Mr. MOUL. Challenges back to the ballot is what I am being told.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Could you please —

Mr. MOUL. Challenges back to the ballot is what I am being told.

Ms. DeLISSIO. So that if somehow those ballots were pre-canvassed previous to that time, they would somehow be invalid? To me, if they are turned in, the ballot is the ballot whether those envelopes are opened and ready to be counted, which is the intent, as I understand it, of pre-canvassing, because those ballots, whether they are opened or closed, I do not think there is a mechanism to return them to the voter if a challenge is filed. So I am trying to understand—

Mr. MOUL. In my original bill – and I think you are on the committee, correct?

Ms. DeLISSIO. I am.

Mr. MOUL. Okay. If you remember when I testified at your voting meeting on the original bill, my 21 days out only allowed pre-canvassing but not to be put into the machine—

Ms. DeLISSIO. Correct.

Mr. MOUL. —that they were prepared and then they could actually, I guess, be challenged prior to that or they could be challenged after that as long as they were not put into the machine. But once they are put into the machine, there is no way to get it back.

Ms. DeLISSIO. So you are saying the ballot itself can be challenged?

Mr. MOUL. I am sorry. Can you repeat that question?

Ms. DeLISSIO. Certainly. And I do remember our conversation, the committee conversation. I do remember the 21 days, which I believed at the time was absolutely in line with the suggestions of the recommendations of folks like CCAP, with folks like the Committee of Seventy due to the experience in the primary. So I am not sure what is being challenged up to and including the day before that Saturday before the election.

Mr. MOUL. The application for the ballot.

Ms. DeLISSIO. The application for the ballot. So if somebody has executed a ballot, they have returned it, that is what is being pre-canvassed. What about that application— What about that ballot is being challenged? Nothing. So I am not sure how that is related to the pre-canvass.

Mr. MOUL. It would be the challenge to the person that applied for the ballot. Okay? That is the challenge, not the ballot itself; not the printing of the ballot, not how the ballot was voted, but the person that applied for it. If there was a challenge to that, that challenge ends on the Friday before election, and that is why they moved the date to Saturday, Sunday, Monday prior to the election.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Okay. And I hope we recognize, though, that that does not really— We needed then to identify a different solution because making this pre-canvass occur – I am sure we have looked at the data, and the volume of mail-in ballots was pretty, voters took advantage of that, particularly due to COVID. So when we looked at the volume – and I believe we had this discussion in committee – that volume is what needs to be accommodated. And I am sure the election boards on the Saturday, Sunday, and Monday before election day already have a fairly extensive list of tasks to do and to complete, so how they are going to incorporate this new opportunity in addition to what they were already doing, this is the reason that this solution is not working.

So I will, if I could ask the next question, Mr. Speaker. That new cutoff date for requesting either a referred to— That new cutoff date for requesting an application, for requesting the mail-in or absentee ballot, backing it up that additional week,

does that preclude somebody from going in person to their county election board and requesting an absentee or a mail-in ballot as well, or do they still have that option to go personally?

Mr. MOUL. Give me one minute on that one. That is a little legal – a little over my head with legal. I want to make sure I get you the right answer.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you.

Mr. MOUL. Mr. Speaker, can you ask that question one more time? I have four different conversations going on at the same time down here. I want you to have the right answer to this. And I am not an expert; I want to be the first one to tell you that.

Ms. DeLISSIO. I appreciate it. So right now somebody can apply for an absentee or a mail-in ballot—

The SPEAKER. Will the lady please suspend.

I will ask the members of the House to take any conversations to the back of the House and off the floor. The gentleman is having some difficulty hearing, and the lady is asking an appropriate question that deserves to be answered.

Mr. MOUL. Go ahead, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Currently an eligible voter can apply for an absentee or a mail-in ballot up to 7 days before election day. Under the amended HB 2626, that 7 days has been moved back a week. So then if somebody wants to go in person to apply, I think we have all made the assumption that those applications would be submitted via mail if not electronically. So I believe that, I want to ensure that somebody can still go in person. Thank you. I want to ensure that somebody can still go in person in that 15 days to the countdown of election day to their election board and in person say, "Here I am. Where's an application to apply?" and then be handed the ballot and vote.

Mr. MOUL. The answer is no.

Ms. DeLISSIO. The answer is no. Okay. So that is a total cutoff so that—

Mr. MOUL. That was the cutoff date that was chosen, no different than the cutoff time to walk into your election poll on election day and vote – 8 o'clock is it. You come at 9, you cannot vote. Deadlines are deadlines. That is what I am understanding.

Ms. DeLISSIO. So then that individual would have no choice, so we are—

Mr. MOUL. That individual could still vote on election day.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Understood, but perhaps they have discovered they need to go out of town for some reason. This is why, you know, the idea would be to ensure that somebody can vote and that was the intent of Act 77, and not just sort of say, "Tough turtles" or "Oh well," "You know, sorry life happened and you're now disenfranchised."

Mr. MOUL. There is such a thing in our Election Code as an emergency absentee ballot that they could apply for, so that part of it is covered.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Say that again, at the polls—

Mr. MOUL. In the Election Code there is an emergency absentee ballot, so your concern is already covered.

Ms. DeLISSIO. I have actually been through that, or as I understand that process, to say it is onerous is an understatement. But thank you for reminding me that is there.

The other question has to do with mailboxes. And perhaps the colleague who was suggesting that, you know, we all have drop boxes outside our house, I know a lot of newer developments the post office has precluded them from having mailboxes affiliated with their individual residences. You actually have to go to someplace in the development where the mailperson is delivering the mail en masse, if you will. I do not know that there is an

opportunity for mail to be left for the mailperson to pick it up. Do you happen to know if that opportunity exists?

Mr. MOUL. Yes, Mr. Speaker. What you are referring to is called cluster boxes. They are put in developments so that it saves the post office time, money, where everyone has their own little box. And in those cluster boxes are slots just like a regular post office box where only the mailman can access to get mail out of and you can drop your outgoing mail through that slot, and it is no different than dropping it in a U.S. postal box that you would see along the street so that—

Ms. DeLISSIO. So that option, they do have that option.

Mr. MOUL. Yes, they do.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you. I appreciate it.

And the very last question, and I realize the omnibus was not your amendment but you seem to be producing answers. I appreciate it.

Mr. MOUL. I am trying, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Is there a particular reason why drop boxes, since they did work in the primary election, is there a particular reason why drop boxes were excluded from the discussion?

Mr. MOUL. To tell you the truth, they were never discussed with my original bill. Whether they were discussed with the group that put the omnibus amendment together, I could not tell you; I was not part of that discussion. I will tell you, though, that drop boxes are not in the Election Code, so technically speaking, any drop boxes that anyone put out there have been illegal. They are not approved in our Election Code. So it is not like we are taking something away from you in this bill. Nobody asked us that I know of and said, "Hey, you need to add drop boxes." Now all of a sudden it is a big issue because it does say that there are four separate ways in which you can turn in your ballot. But drop boxes were never mentioned. They are not in the code. So if you have used them, hey, they might have worked. I am not here to tell you that they do not work. I am just telling you they are not in the Election Code, so therefore, whatever counties or municipalities that have used them kind of did it illegally.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, my interrogation is over.

Comment on the bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady, and you are in order and may proceed on final passage comments.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the patience and the responses from the prime sponsor, truly.

In reference to the drop boxes, they may not have been part of the Election Code but there is certainly nothing to have precluded those being included in as an amendment in this bill, in the omnibus amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I do sit on the State Government Committee. I have enjoyed that engagement in particular and that particular committee assignment. You know, I have commented before publicly, the minority party represents 46 percent of the citizens of this Commonwealth; 46 percent, Mr. Speaker. And my guess is, certainly if any of the Representatives of that 46 percent had been actively included in any discussions that produced this omnibus amendment, drop boxes would have been part of the conversation, Mr. Speaker. And I sincerely hope going forward that 46 percent of the citizens of the Commonwealth who are represented here by my colleagues will be included in the discussions that I suspect are yet to happen for this bill.

I am a "no" vote today, and I would encourage everybody to be very thoughtful about their vote today. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Ecker, on final passage.

Mr. ECKER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

One person—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman please suspend.

For what purpose does the gentleman rise, Representative Dawkins?

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you. A parliamentary inquiry, please.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dawkins, I had previously recognized Representative Ecker and you would be in order for the inquiry upon conclusion of his comments.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Ecker, you are in order and may proceed.

Mr. ECKER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

One person, one vote: the most central concept of our election process. So we have heard a lot of speech today about a variety of things as it pertains to this particular provision in front of us today. But I think it is important to start with that: one person, one vote.

Now, looking to the mail-in-voting provision here, my good friend from Lebanon County raised the issue, it is called mail-in voting. It is the central term of this. This amendment that we offered yesterday, which is now part of this bill, moves the absentee deadline or absentee request date back a week. One of the central issues that we dealt with in the primary, having experienced it, was that there were some delays in the mail so that people had to go to their election office or could not turn in their ballots on time that they had to mail. We are fixing that today. We are helping people being able to mail in their ballots safely. We are giving them a whole extra week to do so. Even still, we have options other than just putting our envelope in the mail. We can take that mail-in ballot to the poll and hand it to the judge of elections; we can go to our county board of election office, we can drop it off there; we can go to our county courthouse and drop our ballot off there as well – all very accessible ways for folks to be able to cast their ballot. One person, one vote.

Now, we have talked a lot about drop boxes today and whether they are permissible or not permissible. Well, let me read the operative language in Act 77 that we are relying upon here. Within Act 77, "Such envelope shall then be securely sealed and the elector shall send same by mail, postage prepaid, except" – except – "where franked, or deliver it in person to said county board of election." Now, let us look at that. The key there is the last couple of words there: "...deliver it in person" – in person – "to said county board of election." Again, one person, one vote. That means you, you the elector, need to drop off your ballot. That is what that means. These ballot boxes that were, you know, just out in the open where anybody could drop off their ballot, my wife cannot take my ballot to the drop box. That is not permitted currently under law. And this particular provision, this particular legislation that we are here for today, further clarifies that.

Now, the last thing I want to talk about here again is we have talked a lot about election fraud and whether it is this mythical unicorn that exists or not. Well, it exists, Mr. Speaker. Election fraud is real, and it is not something we should be proud of. That is why we do not want to get up here and advocate, "Oh, election fraud is rampant." You know, election fraud is something that exists, but we need to be real. This is something that does exist. In fact, one of my good colleagues on the other side even

acknowledged that the GOP had engaged in election fraud. And you know what, that individual should have been prosecuted and may have well been prosecuted. In fact, in this very body, some time ago, before my time, even before I was on this earth, somebody in this body was convicted of registering people falsely to vote. And you know what happened? He resigned. So election fraud happened within this own body, somebody who sat amongst our ranks. So election fraud is real.

And we can talk about whether election fraud, you know, happens widespread or, you know, if it is a couple votes here, a couple votes there. Well, let me tell you, a lot of folks know my story – one person, one vote. Let me tell you, that one vote, that one, one fraudulent vote, I would not be standing here today, because when you win an election – actually, when you lose an election by one vote on election night, you know what that feeling is, you know that you want those results to be accurate, you want the integrity of that election to matter, you want every vote to be counted and to be counted correctly and not be fraudulent or improper. Every vote matters in that case, which is why even small fraud is important that we prevent. This bill does that. This bill makes our elections secure. This bill makes our elections efficient. This bill makes our elections count. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this bill having won an election by one vote. I will vote in the affirmative.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Representative Dawkins, is now in order.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Parliamentary inquiry. If we pass legislation through both chambers and it is signed by the Governor and we make any amendments to any codes, is the information outlined in that said bill, is that now a part of those codes?

The SPEAKER. Representative Dawkins, I just want to make sure I understand your question so that it can be accurately answered. I believe what you are asking is, should legislation move through the legislative process, will the law be appropriately updated upon signature or enactment?

Mr. DAWKINS. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Okay. Thank you. Thank you for that clarification. That is really more of a legislative process question. It is not a parliamentary inquiry. But for the benefit of the members, it would be the responsibility of the respective department – in this case, Department of State – to appropriately update the laws and provide notice as required under our legislative process upon signature or enactment, and they assign the act numbers and they would effectively manage that process. But that is really more of a legislative process question, not an inquiry as it was posed here today.

Mr. DAWKINS. So as it relates, I guess, to get clarity on that, if we enacted certain measures to change the Election Code, is it my understanding that that has not been done as it relates to this issue around drop boxes?

The SPEAKER. I need some further clarification from the gentleman's question. Are you asking if the department has given prior guidance or enactment in prior acts, or would do so under this act?

Mr. DAWKINS. Under Act 77, is it the understanding that the drop boxes are now a part of the Election Code?

The SPEAKER. Again, I do not believe that is the proper province of a parliamentary inquiry. That is a question about existing law that is actually being currently litigated on multiple fronts here in the Commonwealth.

Mr. DAWKINS. Okay. Thank you.

Quick question. And whom would I be able to interrogate to get any clarity on that question? Would it be the maker of the bill or—

The SPEAKER. To the Representative's question of who could be interrogated, that is not a proper subject matter of interrogation given the fact that we currently have HB 2626 ahead or in front of the chamber at this time.

Additionally, I believe that multiple outside groups are engaged in that litigation, and they would be the appropriate individuals to direct that question to as the cases are resolved and the opinions are issued.

Mr. DAWKINS. Okay.

The SPEAKER. Or your caucus leadership, who I believe is also in some of the cases potentially named parties, just as we are as well.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

I know this has been a long debate, and I appreciate the members' assistance. At this time seeing no further speakers requesting, the Chair will recognize the prime sponsor of the bill followed by the two leaders.

Representative Moul, you are in order and may speak for the second time.

Mr. MOUL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I know as the hour is getting late here on this one, I will be very, very brief.

After our primary election, my county called me and said, "We've got a problem. You need to give us more time. You need to fix these things." I wrote a bill; I got it started; I got it out of committee. It has been refined. Like I said when we first started, there is no such thing as a perfect bill that comes out of here, but this bill moves the ball forward.

You have also heard today on multiple occasions that your County Commissioners Association supports moving the ball forward. My question to all of you is, and forget the drop box thing because that is in litigation. It is not in the code. We are not going to discuss it. But as far as the bill is concerned, does it move the ball forward to help get these elections done timely? Does it help our county elections bureaus? Does it help the county commissioners? The answer is yes.

So my question is, why would you not want to help your counties? Whether you are from a Democrat county or Republican county, they all suffer the same fate of trying to do this all on election day and they cannot get it done. So why would you not want to help your counties, especially with an election coming up in just a couple of months? Why would you vote "no" to try to fix things to help your own county? All I can do is say, I hope you think about that before you press your button. I am going to ask you for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Leader Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, many members have eloquently stated why we should vote "no" on this legislation, but there are just a few points that I would like to make.

First, on drop boxes. Drop boxes are absolutely legal.

Mr. Speaker, there are no restrictions in the Election Code requiring the board to operate in just one location in the county. To the contrary, the Election Code authorizes the county board of elections to operate or perform its functions in multiple locations throughout the county as may be necessary. The logical interpretation of the statutory provision is that the county board of elections is authorized to operate in multiple locations as the board deems necessary for performance of their duties under the Election Code. There is no prohibition on the use of official drop boxes as an extension of the county board of elections for the collection of absentee or mail-in ballots.

The changes made by the General Assembly concerning mail-in ballots taken with the current interpretation and understanding of the Election Code clearly authorize the boards of election to use official drop boxes for the collection and eventual canvassing and tabulation of mail-in ballots as well as traditional absentee ballots.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear, according to our Election Code, that the county board of elections can set up secure drop boxes to collect the absentee ballots if they deem it is necessary for them to be able to do their jobs. That is clear.

And there is one other point that was made yesterday that I think I would like to remind the members about, and that is the changes that they made with regards to poll workers in the State. Currently poll workers have to come from the county in which they reside. This bill allows poll workers to come from all 67 counties. Make no mistake about it, that contributes to voter suppression and absolutely contributes to the potential of violence in our elections. That is another reason why this ballot, or this vote, this bill is a bad idea, and we should vote "no."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Leader Benninghoff.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, this is what the democratic process is all about, sharing of ideas, which has been done on this bill multiple times and throughout the committee process, and I thank the members for doing so.

Today we have a responsibility to Pennsylvanians to make sure that they have a safe and secure election. Pennsylvanians want and deserve to know that their ballot will be received, that their vote will be counted, and that the election process is ethical and left beyond reproach. As has been stated, and I will repeat, we have created four additional ways to get your ballot in, including sitting in your living room, mailing it back out, with the postage paid for, compliments of the government. That is pretty simple.

We have an opportunity to make these revisions to the original law, and I think it is important that we do that. It has been stated that the drop boxes are not currently legal or part of the Election Code. That is correct. What this bill does do is provides access while ensuring the integrity and the privacy of the voting process; very, very important fundamental right of Americans that we all desire. It increases penalties for those who would attempt to defraud it in any way possible, and as I said, we have simplified the ability for people, whether in a pandemic or not, to have additional ways to make sure that their ballots are securely mailed or delivered back into the process.

This is not a partisan bill. It is a commonsense bill that protects the vote of every Pennsylvanian, and I ask all members, both Republicans and Democrats, to join in supporting HB 2626 on final passage.

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 recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Harris.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—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
Burns	Hennessey	Moul	Schroeder
Causer	Hershey	Mullery	Simmons
Cook	Hickernell	Murt	Snyder
Cox	Irvin	Mustello	Sonney
Culver	James	Nelson	Staats
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	Lawrence	Pyle	Wheeland
Farry	Lewis	Quinn	White
Fee	Mackenzie	Rader	Zimmerman
Fritz	Mako	Rapp	
Gabler	Maloney	Reese	Cutler,
Gaydos	Marshall	Rigby	Speaker
Gillen	Masser		

NAYS—90

Bizzarro	Donatucci	Kortz	Readshaw
Boyle	Driscoll	Kosierowski	Roebuck
Bradford	Evans	Krueger	Rozzi
Briggs	Fiedler	Kulik	Sainato
Bullock	Fitzgerald	Lee	Samuelson
Burgos	Flynn	Longietti	Sanchez
Caltagirone	Frankel	Madden	Sapprey
Carroll	Freeman	Malagari	Schlossberg
Cephas	Gainey	Markosek	Schweyer

Ciresi	Galloway	Matzie	Shusterman
Comitta	Goodman	McCarter	Sims
Conklin	Green	McClinton	Solomon
Cruz	Hanbidge	McNeill	Stephens
Daley	Harkins	Merski	Sturla
Davidson	Harris	Miller, D.	Ullman
Davis, A.	Hohenstein	Mullins	Vitali
Davis, T.	Howard	Neilson	Warren
Dawkins	Innamorato	O'Mara	Webster
Deasy	Isaacson	Otten	Wheatley
DeLissio	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Williams
Deloso	Kim	Rabb	Youngblood
DeLuca	Kinsey	Ravenstahl	Zabel
Dermody	Kirkland		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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 2788, PN 4333**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in pupils and attendance, providing for extended special education enrollment due to COVID-19; and, in terms and courses of study, providing for option year of education due to COVID-19.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair is in receipt of a late-filed amendment and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Bradford.

The Chair thanks the gentleman. The indication is, that amendment has been withdrawn.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Topper.

Mr. TOPPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I once again want to thank the chair of our Education Committee, Chairman Sonney, as well as Representative Dan Miller from Allegheny County, who also helped in this legislation, in ensuring that our children have the opportunity to receive a high-quality, successful education that may or may not be available to them this year. We are very early on in this school session. I do not think any of us can predict how

this is going to go, but I know for me as a public policy maker, I feel far better trusting our parents to determine how their kids are doing since most of them are in the process of helping to educate them at home through either an all-virtual system or a hybrid system.

I would also call to the attention of the members of what we did yesterday in terms of an amendment removing interscholastic athletics due to some negotiations with the PIAA, so this bill is completely focused on academics and also those extracurriculars that do not involve athletic competition, and I would urge a "yes" vote on HB 2788.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Schweyer, on final passage.

Mr. SCHWEYER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of HB 2788, but, sir, I do so with a warning to all of our colleagues here in the General Assembly. I completely agree with the gentleman from Bedford that this gives and this empowers our parents to make decisions for our children that are in the best interest of them. For those students who are struggling or feel that they have lost a significant part of the school year as a result of school districts that have gone to a hybrid model or school districts like mine that are 100 percent virtual for the first quarter, it does give our parents flexibility, and I think that is a good thing and it is an appropriate thing.

But, Mr. Speaker, we must bear in mind that our school districts still being constantly underfunded are potentially facing additional financial strains next academic year if a portion of parents, even a small portion of parents, 1 or 2 percent of parents in all schools make the decision. We are going to see more children in the classroom next year. We are going to see more needs in our classrooms.

So whereas this is the right thing to do for our parents in empowering our parents, hence my support for 2788, I do want to provide a warning once again that our General Assembly needs to step up and make sure that we adequately fund our school districts knowing that next year this could actually increase the number of students in each and every school district in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

So whereas I support this, we need to make sure that we are constantly and consistently partnering with our public school districts to make sure that they have the financial needs to meet the needs of their communities.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Ciresi, on final passage.

Mr. CIRESI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a quick question. Would the gentleman stand for interrogation quickly?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates he will stand for interrogation. You are in order and may proceed.

Mr. CIRESI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the same line as the last speaker, my question is, have we gotten a fiscal note on how this will affect our districts and how we will fund them for the difference?

Mr. TOPPER. There is no fiscal note due to the idea that we do not have an idea of exactly how many parents might opt in. We do anticipate that if a number of parents would opt in, that number would be quite high for the school districts.

Mr. CIRESI. Okay. Thank you.

On the bill itself?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may proceed on final passage comments.

Mr. CIRESI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do support this bill, but with the same apprehension that our districts are burdened as it is. I have gotten up at this podium multiple times and spoken about the districts in my area, one in particular, which is our Pottstown School District, which is the fifth most underfunded in the State, almost \$14 million a year, and by doing this, we are going to add an extra burden onto that district. But I agree that our students do need every opportunity we can possibly give them for a quality education and to make up what our parents feel that they need and what our students feel that they need.

Again, I agree with the former speaker that we need to make sure that we fund education when it comes November in our next budget the proper way and add extra money in for this.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Saylor.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have heard the gentleman questioning how much the cost will be for this. My hope is nothing, and that is based upon whether our school boards and our superintendents of this Commonwealth do the job that they are supposed to do. They have had 6 months to get ready for this, and I remind you as the former chairman of the Education Committee that when I was Education Committee chairman 6 years ago, the public schools said to me they wanted to ban cyber charter schools. They thought if you went to public school and decided you wanted to do charter school, that you should have to use their charter school. Well, they have had 6 years, 6 years to get their virtual schools, their charter schools, ready for this day, unknowingly of course, but they had an opportunity. Many of you know they were not ready in March. A lot of parents complained, students complained, even kids who did not even want to be in school complained about the quality of education that came through.

I am hoping our school boards, I am hoping our superintendents have done a better job in preparing for this day as they start school, whether it is virtual or in person. Somebody needs – and it is us because we appropriate the dollars – to hold everybody in education accountable, and that includes our public schools. I believe some of our public schools have done a great job of preparing for this day, but as we move forward, we will be able to determine which school districts, which superintendents did their job.

So I would say to you, my hope is they have done their job and there will not be a need for parents to request to have their son or daughter repeat a grade level, but if they fail our students in this Commonwealth, we need to hold them accountable because it is unacceptable.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Carroll.

Mr. CARROLL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, I stand today on behalf of the superintendents of this Commonwealth and the 9 school board members in the 500 school districts. Mr. Speaker, they have worked tirelessly since March to try and get this right, and despite the proclamations of the gentleman from York, I have every confidence that they will do everything possible to bring our

children back to school in a virtual, a hybrid, or full return-to-school model consistent with what they can deliver safely in a community.

Mr. Speaker, to suggest for a minute that school boards and superintendents in this State do not have the very most sincere interests of the children that are being educated in their schools is beyond the pale. Mr. Speaker, I know for certain the superintendents and the members of the school boards in my part of the State, and I am certain across this State, have done everything in their power— I will remind the gentleman from York that those members that serve on school boards in our State do so voluntarily. They do not get paid to serve on a school board, Mr. Speaker. They do it because they have an interest in their community and their community elects those nine folks to try and get it right when it comes to public education.

Mr. Speaker, I had no choice but to stand today on this after that declaration from the gentleman from York. I am certain, I am beyond certain, that North Pocono and Pittston Area and Wilkes-Barre and Crestwood, and all the other districts in this State have taken every step possible to get it right. They will get it right. It does not mean nobody will get sick. It does not mean the people will not be infected with the coronavirus, and if that happens, it does not mean they got it wrong. Mr. Speaker, we have had tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of people die in this country. To suggest that the standard is going to be that they have to have perfection, if they have to deliver perfection, by gosh, I hope we do not have to deliver perfection in this room. We do not do it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative O'Mara, on final passage comments.

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

I am actually rising to see if the maker of the bill would stand for brief interrogation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates he will. You are in order and may proceed.

Ms. O'MARA. Okay. Thank you. And I just have a couple clarifying questions.

First, does this bill address whether one parent can unilaterally make a decision regarding holding a child back? How does the process deal with separated parents who disagree on whether to hold a child back, and will the court be their only remedy?

Mr. TOPPER. It will be as any other custodial matters are determined by the school districts. So as of now, every district has those situations, unfortunately, in them, and it will be the same determination processes they have now.

Ms. O'MARA. Okay.

And then my second question is, child support obligations last either through a child's 18th birthday or high school graduation, whichever occurs later. Does this legislation impact that obligation?

Mr. TOPPER. It does not.

Ms. O'MARA. Okay. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Snyder.

Mrs. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am in support of this bill, but I, too, feel the need to talk a little bit about my eight public school districts and the superintendents and how hard they have worked to make sure our kids can get back in school. Most of mine are back in school, and yes, they have been challenged and they do want the students in

our home districts to go to their cyber school and they have worked hard to make that happen, but let me remind this body, it might be easy to stand on this House floor if you come from an urban area that does not have any problem getting broadband services so their students can go to cyber school, but that is not the reality in my world. I got a text message from a school director today asking how I can help them get funding so that they can get broadband to students' homes because the hotspots do not work and the companies that provide it do not want to invest.

So I think if we all care about public education and our students, this body needs to make sure that we get broadband for all as we are moving forward through this process.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Kenyatta.

The gentleman waives off. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Madden.

Ms. MADDEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of HB 2788, but I sincerely hope that we will address if we see next year that many students are repeating grades, that we address the unequitable funding. I represent one of the 185 school districts who are underfunded, and we just had a county assessment, so every day I get calls from seniors and people who cannot afford their property taxes. So certainly if people are going to be left, students are going to be repeating grades, it is going to require more education funding.

I would also like to echo the comments of my colleagues, one of the glaring things that have been pointed out from the COVID is how we have not done our jobs in this body. The gentlelady from Greene County spoke about the fact that they do not have broadband. We also do not have broadband in many spots in Monroe County, and I represent three school districts.

And then lastly, I would like to disagree wholeheartedly with the Appropriations chairman. Myself or every one of my legislative assistants has been on every single school board meeting throughout the summer since we got shut down in the springtime, and they have worked tirelessly, and when the spike happened or the Governor, you know, had to change the recommendations due to spikes, they went back to square one and they started all over again, and Pocono Mountain School District decided that it was not safe, so they went completely virtual. They have worked tirelessly – teachers, superintendents, assistant superintendents, everyone – to deal with this, and to say that they are not doing their job, personally I think it is disrespectful to people who work so hard to educate our children.

So yes, I am standing up for this bill, but I sincerely hope this body does what it needs to to address the inadequacies in education, the inadequacies in education funding, and let us get everybody on an even funding stream. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Kenyatta.

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the maker stand for very brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates he will. You are in order and may proceed.

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you.

Does this bill – would this apply to private schools? Would this apply to students who are in private schools?

Mr. TOPPER. There we go. I had to also make sure my mike was on, Representative.

Yes, as it is currently written, it would.

Mr. KENYATTA. It would?

Mr. TOPPER. Yes.

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

Just very quickly on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may make comments on final passage.

Mr. KENYATTA. You know, I am going to support this bill, and I think in this body we ought to work just as passionately on the areas where we agree as the areas on which we disagree, and I thought that it was pretty – I do not know – I thought it was a mistake for the gentleman from York to make the comments that he made because there is bipartisan support for this bill. I think the point that my colleagues are making is that there is going to be a need for funding, and for our chair of Appropriations to think that more students will not require more funding, that is deeply concerning to me from a mathematical perspective.

So my hope is that we do increase the funding. I will be voting for this bill, and I want to thank the maker for bringing this up because a lot of our young people are going to be left behind because of lack of broadband, because of a number of different issues happening at home, and we want to make sure that they get the education they deserve.

So thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you again to the maker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Topper, for the second time.

Mr. TOPPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I supported Act 13, which was the emergency School Code provision that finished out last school year. I actively supported it. I spoke on this floor, at this podium, in favor of it because I believed it was the right thing to do. We were at a time of crisis. Our school districts had no guidance. We ourselves were not sure what we were dealing with. The pandemic had just begun to occur in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. We needed to make sure that we provided a continuity of education as best as we could, and I truly believe that our school districts, the lady from Greene I think referenced her 8 school districts, I made sure that my 10 public school districts all were on as much of the same page as we could be in ensuring that, and they worked hard and we strived to get it right.

But simply what we saw was just not something that we are accustomed to seeing in public education, and so there were struggles, and the concern from all of our constituents – parents, administrators, educators alike – is what will this year bring? And I think one thing that our school districts need and I think ultimately our parents and their students need is some kind of clarity. Will there be something – will there be options out there for me if I look at my second grader and think maybe she is not ready for third grade? But the school district is under pressure to try and move as many through as they can. That is simply what we are trying to address in this bill, and I know there will be questions moving forward. We have discussed, I have been on the phone with Secretary Rivera, we have talked to the Department of Education, I know that a lot of options need to be on the table. What happens if schools are once again through Executive order closed? Where will we go at that point?

So I think what this bill does, very simply, it gives our parents options to monitor their own children's education, and we have to remember in all of these debates when we talk about education, there is really only one stakeholder group that matters, and those are the children who through our Constitution we are responsible to educate, and I urge a "yes" vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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 recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Harris.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—197

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

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

NAYS—5

DeLissio	Rabb	Roebuck	Sims
Isaacson			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Parliamentary inquiry, please.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. There is interest to have a vote today, and I just want to know the exact procedure for pulling up HR 836 for a veto override.

The SPEAKER. After consulting with the Parliamentarian, it is currently on the House calendar. For the information of the members, it is on page 33, top of the page, HR 836. It was put on the calendar upon receipt of the veto notice. I can have the clerk read that notice if you so desire and wish to proceed.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we do desire that and do wish to proceed.

The SPEAKER. The majority leader wishes to call up the veto override of HR 836.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

RESOLUTION VETOED BY GOVERNOR

The House proceeded to consideration of the veto message on **HR 836, PN 3910**, entitled:

A Concurrent Resolution terminating the March 6, 2020, Proclamation of Disaster Emergency issued under the hand and Seal of the Governor, Thomas Westerman Wolf.

On the question,

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes Leader Benninghoff.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today is the 6-month anniversary since the Governor first issued this COVID-19 emergency declaration. While in the early days of this pandemic swift action from the Executive Office and our chamber was warranted, but at this point as the curve has bent and numbers are reduced, we believe that powers of the Governor are now going far beyond those emergency powers. From the beginning of this pandemic, we have sought to work with the administration much closer than what has happened in response to COVID-19 in ways that we believe make sense and represent the various regional differences here in Pennsylvania.

The other day's extension, a day or two ago in the dark of night, is not a cooperative arrangement between the General Assembly and the Governor's Office. A lot of our other efforts have been ignored and as many of you know have been vetoed, including this resolution.

We believe that the administration has continued to act alone, issuing confusing and inconsistent orders, guidance, recommendations, and mandates in some cases. Many of these, as you know, lacked data, while the word "science" gets thrown around. When the Right-to-Know request asked what information – pardon me – what is that data and what statistics were used to eliminate extracurricular activities for K through 12 by the administration and by the Department of Health, we eventually received notice that there was none.

We believe it is time to get Pennsylvania, good citizens, back to work; get things opened up; and allow people to live their lives as best as they can in a normal atmosphere, considering that we have much more medical provisions available and many other assets that we did not have at the beginning of this, including additional ventilators and hospital services.

We saw that the predictions of the rush on our hospitals did not come to fruition, and we think it is time to override this veto and not let it get extended for another 3, 6, or however many months longer and work together with the administration to getting businesses back open and more importantly getting people employed. With 3 1/2 million people applying for unemployment in this Commonwealth, many of those millions are still unemployed. Every day we hear about it, and we hear from our members that many of their constituents are not sure how they are financially going to make it and many businesses are hanging onto strings and have borrowed all that they can borrow, and even with some of the governmental supplements that we were able to provide both on the Federal and State level, it simply is not enough, and there is great concern where our economy is and where it may go if we let this disaster declaration continue. Keep in mind, this disaster declaration is on top of another one known as the opioid addiction issue, which was just renewed for the eleventh time last week. We need people back to work. We need children in school. We need children and youth agencies and others to be able to check on our children to make sure that they are safe in many different atmospheres, and oftentimes the classrooms are where that occurs.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the members to join us, both Republicans and Democrats, because these issues are not partisan. They are occurring all across the Commonwealth. We live in a great State with great people that are very smart that can make good decisions best for their families, best for their

communities, and I think the infrastructure is in place that we can operate and both protect people from COVID and any other problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the members to join us in a unanimous vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Leader Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, 836 was a bad idea the last time we voted it and now we have to have it here on a veto override while we are still in the midst of a pandemic, where we still have an emergency, and overriding this veto, we would be the only State in the country without a disaster declaration, and there is a reason for that, because the pandemic is still here, because COVID-19 is still out of control. We need to be able to protect our citizens. The Governor has to have the options to make sure that we open properly, we open safely, and we open based on the science, the data, and the facts. That is what we are risking here by taking those powers away from the Governor.

Look, this could cost us almost \$2 billion in aid from the Federal government for all kinds of areas and issues that we have here in the Commonwealth. Reimbursements to the State, local municipalities for protective equipment, for all kinds of issues, almost equaling \$2 billion would be eliminated, for education, for health care for every one of our citizens, not having a disaster declaration in place.

In short, overriding a veto of this bill would be a disaster for this Commonwealth financially, for the health and well-being of our citizens, and that is why we cannot override this. This should not become law. It is a mistake. We would be a leader in the United States for putting our people at risk.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask for a "no" vote because it is the right thing to do. It is the right thing to do to protect the citizens of the Commonwealth, protect our children. Let us move forward in the same methodical way based on the facts, based on the evidence, based on the science, and open responsibly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Knowles.

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

Earlier our leader indicated that we were – I do not know whether – did he say celebrating the 180-day anniversary of the Governor's emergency order? I would say that it is not something that I am celebrating. I would say that it is something that I am grieving, it is something that I am mourning, and it needs to come to an end.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues from across the aisle to really think about this vote. The part of this whole pandemic in terms of who it hurts, the one that I am most concerned about – and I am certainly concerned about education, I am concerned about big business – but the area that genuinely concerns me is the restaurant and hospitality area as well as bars.

I have a friend who runs a restaurant. He and his dad established this restaurant 45 years ago. He has been closed since March and he has been closed because he really does not have the ability to do what has to be done in terms of outside. He just does not have the ability to do it. My friend explained to me that operating at 25 percent is worse than being closed. It is worse than being closed. So he is closed and he remains closed. He told me that if he could operate at 50 percent, he would still lose

money, he would still lose money, and that he would need to be operating at 75 percent to break even.

My wife and I – since it is only she and I living at home – we go out to eat. We go out to eat quite a bit. We enjoy it. I have gone to restaurants in the Lehigh Valley. I have gone to restaurants in Berks County. I have gone to restaurants in Montgomery County. I have gone to restaurants in Schuylkill County. These people know what they are doing. We go into one restaurant and they actually take our temperature when we walk in. They ask us, do you mind if we take your temperature? "Certainly not. Go right ahead." Everywhere that you look there is hand sanitizer. They do social distancing. They do cleaning. Nobody, but nobody knows how to run that business better than they do. They do not want to get their customers sick. They do not want to get their employees sick. They are doing things the right way. So let us give them that opportunity to do what they can do best in operating their businesses.

In closing, I would just mention that the President of the Pennsylvania Restaurants & Lodging Association was quoted – I think it was KDKA – as saying that if things do not change, that it is his opinion that by the end of the year, 60 percent of the restaurants will be closing. Think about what that will do to our economy. Think about what that will do to the poor guy who for many, many years built up his business to be what it is.

So I would ask you to really think about what you are doing here. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle, think about what you are doing to business, think about what you are doing to people who run businesses, and I would encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on HR 836.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Flynn.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to overriding the Governor's veto. Everybody forgets, we are looking back in the rearview mirror here. We lead the nation in flattening the curve in Pennsylvania, and how do you think we did that? By making hard choices and shutting our economy down and slowly reopening it.

We need to take a smart approach and listen to the people who know what they are talking about. We can rebuild businesses, but we cannot rebuild lives, and that is what my colleagues seem to be forgetting. One hundred and eighty thousand deaths in this country. We need to look at the facts here – okay? – and we need to slowly reopen our economy, which the Governor is doing and we will do, and we need to stay in our lane like the Supreme Court showed us.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Lebanon County, Representative Diamond.

Mr. DIAMOND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of the override vote of the Governor's veto on HR 836. It is kind of a unique opportunity; many of us never get to speak on a final vote three times on a bill that they were a prime sponsor on, but I have. And we take some ownership over our legislation, but I want to tell you I am relinquishing ownership over this particular legislation today because it is not my bill anymore. This bill belongs to the people of Pennsylvania, and we are acting on their behalf. We are acting on behalf of the waiters and waitresses who at 25 percent cannot make a living and, you know, the people who own those restaurants and bars who cannot make a living at 25 percent.

More than the concrete things I believe, Mr. Speaker, that overriding this veto would accomplish, I think it would actually do something that is far more important, because let us face it, I mean, you all have seen the curves. We flattened the curve. The crisis part of the coronavirus is behind us. It is in our rearview mirror. But there is still a crisis in Pennsylvania, and we are going to see it play out over the opening of the school year in the coming weeks, and that is the crisis of fear. Pennsylvanians are living in fear, and an override vote, an affirmative vote today, would help to alleviate that fear and get Pennsylvanians to start understanding that, in fact, it is true that the crisis, the emergency portion of the coronavirus, is behind us, and that it is time to start thinking about really getting back to life without fear.

"We have nothing to fear but fear itself." It was not a Republican who said that. That was a Democrat who a lot of people have a lot of respect for over the years. My grandfather was an F.D.R. fan like you would not believe. "We have nothing to fear but fear itself." This vote will help to allay the fear in Pennsylvania. This is not my bill anymore. This is the bill of hardworking Pennsylvanians who countless times and in overwhelming numbers have called my office and have said, "This needs to end." This bill is not my bill anymore. This bill belongs to the people who have called my office countless times to ask, "Where is my unemployment compensation?"

And I would be remiss if I did not include my friend Kevin in that. You may remember Kevin. Kevin and Lauren and their five children and their house burned down on March 11, 5 days after the emergency declaration was declared. They are still in fact living in a camper down by the river. But I visited Kevin the other night, and I will tell you why I visited Kevin, because Kevin is rebuilding his house that burned down all by himself. He sat for weeks and weeks and weeks waiting on unemployment with nothing. He had to wait for the insurance money to come back, and they dripped and drabbed it out to a point where he has to do this work all by himself, and I was honored, honored to take a big glass or a plastic tub that one of our local restaurants had on their counter for people to put cash in for his family, for him and Lauren and their five children, and I took that thing and it was full of cash. They dropped it off to me; I ran it right down – Kevin lives right across town from me – I ran it right over to his house and I said, "Kevin, this restaurant wanted you to have this to help your family so you can rebuild your house." Kevin looked at me, and Kevin is a man's man, but I could see it in his eyes.

This bill is for Kevin and Lauren and their five children. This bill is for every waiter and waitress out there, every business owner. It is not my bill anymore.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote to override the Governor's veto on HR 836 and put an end to the crisis of fear in Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Hohenstein.

Mr. HOHENSTEIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to make a real quick comment to correct the record. The maker of the resolution just referenced being able to speak three times on this bill, but he actually has only spoken twice. He was not here the first time because he was in quarantine. So—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Mr. Speaker?

Mr. HOHENSTEIN. I am just simply stating that—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HOHENSTEIN. To correct the record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Lebanon County, for what purpose do you rise?

Mr. DIAMOND. Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. There is not a point of personal privilege. It would be a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DIAMOND. Mr. Speaker, I believe I was—

The SPEAKER. Or a point of order perhaps.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAMOND. Point of order. Thank you.

I believe there was an underlying insult in the previous gentleman's—I believe I am allowed to at least respond to that in some way.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Mr. Speaker?

Mr. DIAMOND. To correct the record.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman will please respond. I do believe that the gentleman's insinuations are inappropriate according to our rules. Furthermore, I would point the gentleman to the transcript of that day when I actually read the good gentleman's comments into the record.

Mr. DIAMOND. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. So he was formally recognized on that day. As I specifically said, I read his comments into the record.

I will urge the gentleman to stay consistent with the rules, but prior to re-recognizing you, the majority leader has risen.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I think you covered it, but I do think it warrants that we should not be attacking somebody if they are out on some medical leave.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise from Allegheny County, Representative Dermody?

Mr. DERMODY. For a point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Philadelphia did not attack anybody, he just stated a fact, and I believe it was not a personal attack.

The SPEAKER. Respectfully, Mr. Leader, I do not believe it was categorized as a personal attack. I categorized it as being inconsistent with our rules.

Does the leader have a further question?

Mr. DERMODY. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am just wondering what rule that he may have violated.

The SPEAKER. After consultation with the Parliamentarian, I believe that it is inconsistent with the rules because it implies the truthfulness of the member in terms of how the debate was carried out. I would simply remind all of the members that we do have a rule in place that allows members to vote remotely. Many members have submitted comments remotely, and for the purposes of the master roll call as well as our votes, we have recognized their presence in that debate and in that manner. And consistent with Mason's section 121 of chapter 13, I believe the gentleman was dangerously close to indulging in personalities, impugning the motives of members, or using, and it goes on to say, "indecent or profane language, or participate in conduct that disrupts or disturbs the orderly proceedings of the body." And it

was the ruling of the Chair— Excuse me; it was not a ruling. It was the perception of the Chair that it was inconsistent with both our House rules as well as Mason's.

I would ask the gentleman to stay confined to the merits of the debate.

The Chair thanks the gentleman for raising the point.

The House will please come to order. I know we were a couple layers down there in terms of members and recognition. For what purpose does the gentelady rise?

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. That is not in order. Representative Hohenstein has previously been recognized and he has the floor. We can return to you upon his conclusion.

Representative Hohenstein, you are in order and may proceed.

Mr. HOHENSTEIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I would say I would support the gentelady when she has her inquiry to present. I did not intend to make any personal aspersion or comment, but rather to state what I thought was the physical record, because to me, it is important that the members of this body observe the types of actions, the types of practices that we know keep the spread of COVID down—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

Mr. HOHENSTEIN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. I believe the gentleman is far afield from the underlying resolution regarding the emergency orders. As instructed previously this afternoon, any questions regarding internal policies should be directed to the leaders and the members of the BMC (Bipartisan Management Committee). Does the gentleman have any further comments on the underlying resolution?

Mr. HOHENSTEIN. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. HOHENSTEIN. Thank you.

My point in bringing up our own personal practices is that we have to be examples in the broader—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend. I believe that he has already been counseled by the Chair to be consistent with the rules.

I once again encourage the gentleman to confine the remarks to the underlying debate. I believe that everyone wants to get through this as quickly as possible and in an efficient manner. I would ask the gentleman to respect the rules and the other members of the House.

Mr. HOHENSTEIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have just one final comment, which is the same comment I made when we had this bill in front of us for the second time a few months ago, and that is on unemployment compensation. We have been talking about unemployment compensation as if it is a pariah. It is a lifeline to our constituents. It is in danger because the system has been crippled administratively, not because it is being overused. It is being used for what it needs to be used and—

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. TOOHL. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

Mr. HOHENSTEIN. At this point in time, Mr. Speaker, I am just finishing up my comments, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

For what purpose does the gentelady rise? The rules are very—

Ms. TOOHIL. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The lady is in order and may proceed.

Ms. TOOHIL. I am not sure what the record would reflect, if it is two times or three times that he has gone far afield, but he is discussing unemployment compensation, which is not the subject of HR 836.

The SPEAKER. The lady will please suspend. We have already addressed that issue with the gentleman, and he indicated he was— The House will come to order, please. Representative Toohil, I have already addressed that with the member. He had indicated he is wrapping up his comments. I would once again encourage all of the members to be consistent with the rules.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker, as we have heard earlier, the gentleman from Lebanon, I believe, talked at length about the unemployment compensation system, some relationship to this override vote. Yes, he did. Were my ears deceiving me?

The SPEAKER. Mr. Leader, respectfully, I would encourage you to listen to the direction I gave both the lady and the member. We did not cut him off on the unemployment debate. She raised a point regarding the rules and going far afield. I have not indicated that that was in fact far afield regarding the unemployment piece. You are correct. The gentleman from Lebanon County did bring that up previously. So that ruling is consistent. It is within the debate that is now before us. What was at issue was the rules of the House and Mason's that I believe that the gentleman has already been counseled on, he understands those rules, and I believe it was the gentleman's desire to quickly wrap up his comments.

Thank you, Mr. Leader.

Representative, you may proceed.

Mr. HOHENSTEIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just to conclude, we place our constituents' access to unemployment compensation and that lifeline at risk by passing this resolution and that is why we cannot do it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the lady, Representative Davidson, rise? She had indicated previously she had a parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Yes, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The lady is in order and may proceed.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Is it true that under our rules we are not to ascribe motives to the debate, when a member is speaking, we are not to ascribe a motive to his remarks, his or her remarks?

The SPEAKER. That is consistent with what I just read from Mason's, yes.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. In this case, Mr. Speaker, a statement of fact was made that the gentleman was quarantined at the time of the debate. Were you ascribing a motive in saying or was someone ascribing a motive in saying that the gentleman was attacked or besmirched in some way?

The SPEAKER. What was read into the record was Mason's Manual, chapter 13, 121, regarding the personalities and impugning the motives of members. It was a reminder to all members regarding the comments.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. But a statement of fact is not impugning the integrity or the character of a member, correct?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not subject to debate.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. I am just asking.

The SPEAKER. I have made the statement regarding the belief of the boundaries of the debate and the applications of the rules. As I indicated yesterday, it is always my goal to get it correct.

As I indicated to three of the members, as we discussed postsession yesterday, that ultimately were gavelled down, members on both sides of the aisle, for going far afield, I recognize that we may not always get it correct from up here, because I may not hear every comment, but I also am equally confident of the leaders to raise their parliamentary inquiries, just as they have today, to keep us focused and consistent with the rules.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

That concludes my parliamentary inquiry.

I would like to speak on the bill in turn.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady, and you are in order to speak on the bill, or the resolution rather; excuse me.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. At a time when many citizens in the Commonwealth are still contracting the disease, still dying from the disease, and still being quarantined from the disease, this is absolutely the wrong time. We know that because even one of our members contracted the disease and one of our members was quarantined during the disease at the time of the last debate, we now know that the virus is very real. It is not, in fact, a hoax. It is real, it is continuing to rage, it is not contained, and we continue to see cases skyrocket. This is not the time to deprioritize life in this Commonwealth. If we hold life as sacrosanct, then we should make sure that we ensure that the lives of our citizens, the lives of members of this House, and the lives of every boy, girl, man, and woman is upheld. This is the absolute wrong time to override the Governor's emergency declaration powers, and we know firsthand from our own member's infection and our own member's quarantine – one during this last debate – that this is the wrong time, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Neilson.

Mr. NEILSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise for a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. NEILSON. Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that the rule – first off, I appreciate you – I know you are new to this seat here and we are trying to figure stuff out. We just want to make sure we are staying consistent. Since the gentleman from Philadelphia mentioned – wanted to correct the record of the gentleman from the other county, Lebanon, is that no longer valid to say on the floor under what you quoted under Mason's, because I hear the leaders at the end, after every member speaks on the floor, they say, we just want to correct the record, what was said by the previous speakers. Are you saying that is not allowed to be done on the House floor? Because I want to make sure we are all consistent here, Mr. Speaker.

Just trying to stay consistent, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already addressed this issue, but we will raise it again, that that is not where we were going. In fact, we have had that discussion before. When there are different viewpoints of particular situations, that is certainly within the realm of legitimate debate. But the issue that was raised, it was

the perception of the Chair in the manner in which it was raised, that it bordered on impugning the member, the motive, or the character of the individual who made a prior statement. Had it been contained just to the underlying factual matter, that would have been different, which I think is what you are getting to, Representative Neilson.

Mr. NEILSON. Yes. So what I am trying to think, Mr. Speaker, so if someone, if one of our leaders at the end of this – at the end of all this discussion and debate between us, the members down here, us little people over here in the nosebleeds up here – if someone was to say "I correct the record" and I believed me personally who said that, so what do I do at that time? Do I raise a point of order? Because if they are going to correct something that I said and I do not believe that to be true, do I stand up and I demand a point of order and bring that to your attention, just in case you missed it? Because it happens often to us on the Democratic side. That is why I wanted to make sure that we point this out. Is that how I would address that, sir, by raising a point of order?

The SPEAKER. No. The gentleman could simply seek recognition to speak on the bill or the subject matter that was there. The issue becomes the other inconsistencies that exist with the rules that potentially border on motive and character, as previously discussed and referenced. It certainly is a discernment call and I have done it, unfortunately, more than I care to already, because members tend to really press the outer envelope of the rules.

The goal is to stay confined to the facts, which you can certainly always debate, but we need to make sure that the facts and format of the debate are always consistent with respecting and honoring one another as elected Representatives of their respective districts.

Mr. NEILSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, I have one last inquiry not related to that subject and I guess we will work on that again as we go through this new session. We did a motion now to override the Governor's veto. After we vote to sustain the Governor's veto, is that the last time we are going to have to vote on this or is there going to be like – is it in order for people to put up motions to reconsider and all that other stuff, because I hear that is already in the making, Mr. Speaker? So I mean, is this the last time we see this legislation?

The SPEAKER. No. There is past precedent of multiple veto overrides. Actually, I had the Parliamentarian pull – and reconsideration and a whole host of other legislative or—

Mr. NEILSON. So we could actually do this again tomorrow. Is that what you are saying?

The SPEAKER. We are not currently scheduled to be in tomorrow, Representative Neilson, but if we go much longer, we might be.

Mr. NEILSON. I appreciate it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Bradford, on the motion.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I want to respond, if I could just briefly, to the good gentleman from Lebanon. I think he is too kind when he humbly says it is not his bill; he should be proud to take credit for it. And I want to let everyone be assured who may vote for this, the same assurance that he gave, and draw attention to the fact that he told

us that the peak, the worst, the crisis, the emergency is over. That was from the good gentleman from Lebanon, and if you agree with that, then I would suggest you follow his lead and vote to override the Governor's veto. I would. Because I think it is questionable, though, to follow politicians when it comes to those who give out public health advice. So I want to read a couple quotes that I think might put this in context.

From our Commander in Chief, our Chief Executive, the President of the United States, on January 22, 2020 – one case in the United States, zero deaths: "We have it totally under control. It's one person coming in from China, and we have it under control. It's going to be just fine." Remember that reassurance when you hear from the good gentleman from Lebanon.

January 24, 2020 – two U.S. cases, no deaths: "China has been working very hard to contain the Coronavirus. The United States greatly appreciates their efforts and transparency. It will all work out well. In particular, on behalf of the American People, I want to thank President Xi!"

January 30, 2020, Donald J. Trump; five U.S. cases, no deaths: "We only have five people. Hopefully, everything's going to be great. They have somewhat of a problem, but hopefully, it's all going to be great. But we're working with China, just so you know, and other countries very, very closely. So it doesn't get out of hand. But it's, you know, it's something that we have to be very, very careful with, right? We have to be very careful."

February 2, 2020 – eight U.S. cases, not a single death: "We pretty much shut it down...from China," President Trump said, reassuring us; not that different than what the good gentleman from Lebanon did today.

February 4, 2020 – 11 U.S. cases, not a single death: "We are coordinating with the Chinese government and working closely together on the coronavirus outbreak in China. My administration will take...necessary steps to safeguard our citizens from this threat."

February 10, 2020 – 11 U.S. cases, not a single death—

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Mr. Speaker, respectfully—

Mr. BRADFORD. —"Looks like by April, you know—"

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the majority leader rise?

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. I do not think we are really on the resolution itself at this point.

Mr. BRADFORD. We are. We are. We are talking about—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend. The majority leader has the floor.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. It just seems we are talking about a lot of things other than the resolution itself, and I would just ask the gentleman who is speaking to contain it to the facts of the resolution. Thank you.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Yes, Mr. Leader.

Mr. DERMODY. I believe that is exactly what the gentleman is doing right now, addressing the problems with this resolution. That is proper debate, and we just went through it, as he stated several times – that is, the gentleman from Montgomery—

The SPEAKER. Yes. I understand, I think, where the gentleman is going, but I think the majority leader raises an appropriate point, that we should try to stay confined to the matter

before us, which is the veto override today. I recognize you are pulling some historical quotes. If you could wrap those up and get to that, the Chair would certainly appreciate it.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you for the latitude, Mr. Speaker.

February 10, 2020 – 11 U.S. cases, not a single death: "Looks like by April, you know, in theory, when it gets a little warmer, it miraculously goes away. I hope that's true. But we're doing great in our country. China, I spoke with President Xi, they're working very...hard. And I think it's going to...work out fine."

February 11 – and I only have 2 more – 12 U.S. cases, "In our country, we only have, basically, 12 cases, and most of those people are recovering and some cases fully recovered. So it's actually less."

February 24 – 51 U.S. cases, still not a single death: "The Coronavirus is very much under control in the USA. We are in contact with everyone and all relevant countries. CDC & World Health have been working hard and very smart." Parenthetically, good advice here: "Stock Market starting to look very good to me!"

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

I believe – I have been keeping track here – you had indicated two quotes. You went over that request. I would ask the gentleman to confine his remarks to the underlying issue, which is the veto override of the current emergency declaration made by the Governor.

Mr. BRADFORD. "We have nothing to fear but fear itself." "We have nothing to fear but fear itself." If you take public health advice from politicians without medical degrees or a clue as to what they are saying – and I do not mean that about the gentleman; I mean that about a view that has overtaken this country for almost 6 months while 185,000 people are dead.

The good gentleman from Schuylkill reminds us, and he is so sincere and he is so good-hearted, and he reminds us that people are doing the cleaning and some are taking temps and some are reminding people who may or may not wear masks that they should do so. But 185,000 people are dead, and taking public health advice from politicians who clearly, clearly have vacated the moral leadership of this country and this Commonwealth is a dangerous, dangerous undertaking. There are too many people dead.

These quotes from another politician in higher office with the best experts in the world should scare the [word stricken] out of us. We should not politicize this—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

I actually referenced the use of profanity on the House floor previously under chapter 13, section 121, I believe it was, in addressing the other gentleman's comments. It was the fourth item that was listed in that list. I would encourage the gentleman to restate his phrasing, and that word will be stricken from the record.

Mr. BRADFORD. I apologize for the use of that word. Thank you.

It should scare us very much. It should scare us that politicians believe that they should be giving public health advice, that they should believe that best intentions will overcome a pandemic that has killed 185,000 Americans. It is not whether people want to spread the virus. They do not. That is not Democrat, that is not Republican; that is not east/west, blue State/red State. We are all Americans and we are in this together. And what the

demagoguery and the sowing of division that has happened at all levels of government across this great country has done is put us in a position where every other country has been able to open more safely with fewer deaths and less cases. But this country, and in this Commonwealth with this leadership in this body, has continued to push down the same dangerous road, failing to see what is so obvious to the rest of the world that we have become a laughing stock; that we are unable to come together, we are unable to mask up, we are unable to depress this pandemic.

Now, again, I would just say to the architect of this bill, you are too humble; this is your bill. And everyone should remember his advice and those of other political leaders who would tell you how to deal with a pandemic. I think we have 185,000 exhibits in why we should not go down that road.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative Zabel.

Mr. ZABEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had heard it said today that the crisis portion of COVID-19 is over, so I just want to speak on behalf of the families of literally dozens of my constituents who have died from COVID-19. And I would like to speak on behalf of the 526 or 528 – sorry – Pennsylvanians who are currently in the hospital fighting COVID-19, and the 816 Pennsylvanians whose cases were reported yesterday. I want to speak on behalf of them and on behalf of the 7,700 Pennsylvanians who have died from COVID and the 187,000 Americans who have died from this virus, that I and the people who vote "no" today on this motion to override recognize that this is very real and it is a danger and we will put your safety first and foremost in making a responsible choice.

And to the 1100 people who died yesterday, to their families, I am sorry that you have to hear in the legislature someone tell you that this crisis is over. It is very much not and it is our responsibility as the legislature to help keep Pennsylvanians safe. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

It is the Chair's understanding that the other speakers have withdrawn their requests to speak.

The question is, shall HR 836, the motion to override the Governor's veto, become law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

Those in favor of the resolution becoming law will vote "aye"; those in favor of sustaining the Governor's veto will vote "no."

On the question recurring,

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognize the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Harris.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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
Burns	Hershey	Moul	Schroeder
Causser	Hickernell	Mullery	Simmons
Cook	Irvin	Murt	Snyder
Cox	James	Mustello	Sonney
Culver	Jones	Nelson	Staats
Davanzo	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Stephens
Day	Kail	Oberlander	Struzzi
Delozier	Kaufer	Ortitay	Thomas
Diamond	Kauffman	Owlett	Tobash
Dowling	Keefer	Peifer	Toepel
Dunbar	Keller	Petrarca	Tomlinson
Dush	Klunk	Pickett	Toohil
Ecker	Knowles	Polinchock	Topper
Emrick	Kortz	Puskaric	Warner
Everett	Kulik	Pyle	Wentling
Farry	Lawrence	Quinn	Wheeland
Fee	Lewis	Rader	White
Fritz	Mackenzie	Rapp	Zimmerman
Gabler	Mako	Readshaw	
Gaydos	Maloney	Reese	Cutler,
Gillen	Marshall	Rigby	Speaker

NAYS—84

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

The SPEAKER. On the question of the resolution becoming law, the objections of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding, the "ayes" are 118, the "nays" are 84, and the veto of the Governor is sustained.

ETHICS COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT

The SPEAKER. The Speaker is in receipt of the following message and will state for the record that Representative Ravenstahl resigns as a member of the Ethics Committee and Representative Mullery is appointed a member of the Ethics Committee and will serve as vice chairman.

RECONSIDERATION MOTION FILED

The SPEAKER. The Chair is also in receipt of a motion to reconsider the resolution by Representatives Oberlander and Benninghoff, who move that the vote by which HR 836 was defeated on the 2d day of September be reconsidered.

For the information of the members – and it was a parliamentary inquiry previously – the veto message will remain on the calendar.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A CONTINUED

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2787, PN 4334**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in school health services, providing for precautions against spread of COVID-19; and, in terms and courses of study, providing for sports and extracurricular activities during the COVID-19 pandemic.

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 that question, the Chair recognize Representative Reese.

Mr. REESE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of HB 2787 and I humbly ask for my colleagues to consider doing the same.

Mr. Speaker, I will be the first person to point out that we are a very diverse State. We are diverse in our people, we are diverse in our backgrounds, and we are most certainly diverse in our communities. With this in mind, the administration has wisely left the decision as to whether or not to return to face-to-face instruction in our schools to our locally elected officials. To me, that makes a lot of sense. But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, on August 6 the Governor made a one-size-fits-all recommendation when it comes to school sports and extracurricular activities, and it was then that he stated that those activities should not occur until at least January 1. Mr. Speaker, that recommendation simply does not make any sense to me. Therefore, many of us in this chamber began working on HB 2787. This legislation would guarantee, would guarantee that that decision remains with our locally elected officials.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman, Representative—

Mr. DERMODY. To correct the record.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. DERMODY. I believe what the administration did, what the Governor said, he recommended that they do not do sports in the fall but left that decision up to the school districts, and there was no order for sports in the fall.

The SPEAKER. Respectfully, I am not sure that that is the purview of a parliamentary inquiry or point of order. I know that I myself was corrected by you on the record previously for making such an effort. I believe the gentleman's comments would, in fact, be in order in response to during the comment period.

Mr. DERMODY. Fine.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman. Representative Reese, you may continue.

Mr. REESE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the good gentleman from Allegheny County for pointing that out, as I did just previous to his question, that it was a recommendation, and what I said was, Mr. Speaker, that recommendation did not make any sense, but it certainly scared every single one of our school districts, and because of that, many of us in this chamber began working on HB 2787. This legislation would guarantee that the decision remains with our locally elected officials and not out here in Harrisburg with the Governor. It would also empower our school board members to allow spectators, families, moms, dads, grandmas, grandpaps, brothers, and sisters to attend events that their family members were participating in.

Look, make no mistake about it, school activities like football, soccer, band, cheerleading, debate, volleyball, drama club, they all work hand in hand with education. The reason for that is that students who participate in school activities are better motivated in the classroom. Study after study has shown that they earn higher GPAs (grade point averages) and higher standardized test scores, more often leading to greater higher education opportunities. These are very positive things, and they are absolutely an integral part of our public education system.

But on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, let us be very, very clear about this: When students are denied the avenues to interact with their peers and with positive role models in a meaningful way, there is a very negative impact. We see increases in depression. We see increases in drug use, overdoses, and unfortunately, we have seen increases in suicides and attempted suicides. Now, look, maybe you think I am blowing things out of proportion. Maybe some of my colleagues and maybe even some folks back home are watching this and they are thinking, Mike, the risk is just too great. To that, my response is, look at the numbers; understand the data; the risks are too great to not allow these activities to occur this fall.

Look, let us be honest. This decision is not ours. It is the family's decision. It is up to our locally elected school board members. The decision is not ours. All we are doing is trying to empower school boards. HB 2787 keeps decisionmaking at the local level of government where it belongs, and it provides certainty and clarity in how our school districts should move forward with fall activities. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of HB 2787.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative Hohenstein.

Mr. HOHENSTEIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I want to genuinely thank the maker of the bill for the nonopposition on the amendment that I presented yesterday on this bill. But as I have told a lot of people whenever I have spoken about reopening and especially the reopening of our schools, there are no good choices and I have to rise in opposition, because I still feel, as it is currently structured, this bill does not provide sufficient protection for the health and safety of the entire community.

And I want to talk first about what has been the fight against COVID in this chamber and it is a challenge every day for all of us to do our best to prevent other people in their jobs, in their families, in their schools, in their communities from getting sick. It is the reason that we wear our masks. It is the reason that we have hand washing and other commonsense, factually and science-based practices until we get control of the virus.

On the other hand, everyone wants to get back to normal. Our lives and our kids' lives have to be normal again. But this is not a battle that we can win in one day or with one bill. If you do not have any cases today in your school, on your job, or in your town, you cannot simply say to those of us that do, that we have the responsibility to make those hard choices. Everyone has to make the hard choices, because the real threat of illness and death is tomorrow or next week, and it is real, whether we live in densely populated areas, rural communities, suburban communities. We cannot afford to take shortcuts, Mr. Speaker, but that is what we do when we do not follow the best practices to stop the spread of the disease.

Now, we know that people who have no symptoms, people who are presymptomatic, they can spread it, and if we do not follow those practices of social distancing, hand washing, and mask wearing, we are not going to beat this disease back.

Now, shortcuts to normal do not actually get us to normal. They get us more sickness, more hospitalization, more deaths. Mr. Speaker, there are examples of those shortcuts leading to higher caseloads and deaths from many of the other States that have reopened early – States like Florida, Texas, and the top three States, all with mostly rural populations, Iowa, South Dakota, and North Dakota. These States provide not role models, but rather cautionary tales of the danger of rushing to return.

Now, yesterday every single member of this House voted on my amendment to say that we do not want our teachers or support staff or students who already have COVID to pass it on, and I thank everyone for voting on that, but, Mr. Speaker, we voted on that but did not pass other very commonsense measures and amendments, such as mask wearing. And the bottom line in this is that we are not going to get to the goal of controlling this disease on the first day after we pass this bill or any other bill, or the second day, or the first weekend after the first game or the concert. We are not going to get control until we actually have a vaccine, and until then, we have to control ourselves.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I am grateful that my amendment passed and that it made this bill a bit better, but it still does not go far enough to make and ensure that the public safety for my community and for communities around the Commonwealth are going to be assured. So I am asking for a "no" vote on this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Struzzi, on final passage.

Mr. STRUZZI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand today to support HB 2787 and all those families and student athletes and students who have been put through incredible hardships during this pandemic response at no fault of their own. Representative Reese mentioned the mental struggles that have been occurring, the mental health issues that many students are facing, and quite frankly, by not allowing spectators to attend sporting events, it only creates additional hardship for these young people. Imagine scoring a touchdown and looking into the stands and not being able to see the faces of your parents. To me, as a father of four, it is unconscionable that we are not allowing spectators to attend sporting events, spectators that maybe want to watch the band play or watch cheerleaders or watch their children perform athletic competitions.

Now, I understand that today the Governor did allow some flexibility, so I applaud everyone who reached out to the Governor's Office, to the Department of Health, and I applaud the PIAA for voting to allow school sports to happen, but 25 people at an indoor event as spectators and 250 at an outdoor event is simply not enough. That does not even account for the parents of these children. And who is going to monitor that? I spoke with one of our superintendents just an hour or so ago, after the Governor rereleased his guidelines, his sporting event guidelines, and he said exactly that to me: are we going to decide who gets into the fence and who has to watch from the hillside overlooking, because that is occurring right now. I saw a photo on Facebook yesterday from one of my friends, parents forced to watch from a hillside outside of the fence, their students playing a soccer game, their children. To me, that is simply not acceptable.

This bill allows school districts, who are responsible for the safety of our children, to make those decisions, much like we allowed them to make the decisions on getting children back into schools. They know what is best. They know how to handle this with proper CDC guidelines. They can have more than 250 people at a football field. Break them into pods, as the superintendent that I spoke with said. The field is one group of 250; the stands on the visitors' side, another group of 250; the fans on the home side. We simply must make concessions to allow these sporting events to occur with as many spectators that are needed, you know, to make sure these kids know that what they are doing, these monumental moments in life, are being appreciated. We can do that. Following CDC guidelines, following all the safety protocols, the superintendents, the school boards know they can do that. We must allow this to occur. We must allow these decisions to be made at the local level for the health and safety and the future of our young people. These moments in life cannot be repeated.

So let us vote "yes" on this today. Let us stand with these families, let us stand with these students, and let us pass some commonsense legislation today. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Madden.

Ms. MADDEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am going to rise in opposition to HB 2787 because the Governor, while he said he would not recommend sports until the beginning of the year, he was allowing the school districts to make that decision. So they already have the power to make that decision, and as the gentleman who just spoke mentioned, he also came out with new guidelines: 50 spectators indoors,

250 spectators outdoors. So since the Governor, using science and data and medicine, has made this recommendation, I do not see any reason to override the Governor's decision. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Davanzo.

Mr. DAVANZO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to submit my remarks for the record, in favor of HB 2787. I stand with all the parents, the students, and the grandparents. Let us go watch our kids play. Let them play. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of HB 2787. In my humble opinion, the problem with some far, overreaching regulations, recommendations, and mandates is that sometimes they defy some basic common sense. Let us take, for example, a girls volleyball game. Between players, coaches, and officials, a volleyball contest may come really close or possibly exceed 25 people, which is the maximum amount of people allowed to attend an indoor event according to the administration. And regarding spectators, Mr. Speaker, guidance provided by the Pennsylvania Department of Education dictates that rules for spectators must adhere to the original mandate of 25 people for indoor events and 250 people for outdoor events.

So that volleyball game, being held in a school gymnasium that may have seating for 1,000 people, can only be open to some parents, grandparents, and students that may want to attend. That same parent or grandparent who drove that student athlete to school may not be allowed to go in and watch that student play their sport. They live in the same household, but may not be able to attend the same sporting event. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the administration, that clearly defies common sense. Therefore, local school district officials who know their students and their facilities should be making these decisions.

I will be in favor of HB 2787 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Heffley.

Mr. HEFFLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this. As somebody who loved playing high school football back in the day, I think it is important that we take every opportunity to allow children to participate in all sports, whether it be cross country, wrestling, football, and do it in a sense of safety and following the CDC guidelines.

I think it is important that as I listen to some of the debate, I just wanted to just, you know, kind of give my thoughts on it. And I heard some people say we should wait for a vaccine. I heard some say follow the CDC guidelines. I have spoken to the doctors in my district. I have spoken to the health-care professionals at the two health-care networks in my district on numerous occasions, before I make these decisions to vote on the House floor. I spoke to my family doctor, who is a good friend, and when you talk to doctors, you get a lot of different opinions. And his thoughts are COVID-19 is going to be with us forever. It is not going to magically disappear and go away. So we need to learn to manage it and live with it, and we can get on to some type of normalcy and we can continue to have our children participate in

sports, get to school, go out and live our lives in a way that we need to manage the risk.

Hopefully someday there is going to be a vaccine. I think they are making great strides on different treatments for COVID-19, but until that day comes, it might be a month, it might be 2 years, it might be 5 years. We cannot shut down this State for 5 years. So I think it is important that we allow our children to have some type of normalcy and responsibly manage the risk and participate in these athletic activities.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative Owlett.

Mr. OWLETT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of HB 2787. It is so important for our kids to play. It is so important for our parents and grandparents to be able to be there to support them. I find it a little bit ironic that a few hours before we vote this that the Governor moves on this, but hey, we will take it. So there is more that we can do to make sure that our parents and grandparents can be there. I did receive a call from a constituent just a few minutes ago sharing some health concerns his son has and he needs to be there to help his son through those, if an issue arises, and for him not to be able to be there is insane.

So hopefully we can use some common sense, let our school districts make some choices. Each venue is different and I think they will make the right call and allow our parents and grandparents to watch their kids.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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 recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Harris, in a moment.

The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

The Chair recognizes Representative Harris.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—155

Barrar	Galloway	Marshall	Rigby
Benninghoff	Gaydos	Masser	Roae
Bernstine	Gillen	Matzie	Rothman
Bizzarro	Gillespie	McNeill	Rowe
Boback	Gleim	Mehaffie	Rozzi
Bonner	Goodman	Mentzer	Ryan
Borowicz	Gregory	Merski	Sainato
Brooks	Greiner	Metcalfe	Samuelson
Brown	Grove	Metzgar	Sankey
Burns	Hahn	Mihalek	Saylor
Carroll	Harkins	Millard	Schemel

Causer	Heffley	Miller, B.	Schlossberg
Ciresi	Helm	Miller, D.	Schmitt
Conklin	Hennessey	Mizgorski	Schroeder
Cook	Hershey	Moul	Schweyer
Cox	Hickernell	Mullery	Shusterman
Culver	Irvin	Mullins	Simmons
Davanzo	James	Murt	Snyder
Davis, A.	Jones	Mustello	Sonney
Davis, T.	Jozwiak	Neilson	Staats
Day	Kail	Nelson	Stephens
Deasy	Kaufner	O'Mara	Struzzi
Delloso	Kauffman	O'Neal	Thomas
Delozier	Keefer	Oberlander	Tobash
Dermody	Keller	Ortitay	Toepel
Diamond	Kim	Owlett	Tomlinson
Dowling	Klunk	Pashinski	Toohil
Driscoll	Knowles	Peifer	Topper
Dunbar	Kortz	Petrarca	Ullman
Dush	Kosierowski	Pickett	Warner
Ecker	Kulik	Polinchock	Wentling
Emrick	Lawrence	Puskaric	Wheeland
Evans	Lewis	Pyle	White
Everett	Longietti	Quinn	Williams
Farry	Mackenzie	Rader	Zabel
Fee	Mako	Rapp	Zimmerman
Flynn	Malagari	Ravenstahl	
Freeman	Maloney	Readshaw	Cutler,
Fritz	Markosek	Reese	Speaker
Gabler			

NAYS—47

Boyle	DeLissio	Innamorato	Roebuck
Bradford	DeLuca	Isaacson	Sanchez
Briggs	Donatucci	Kenyatta	Sappey
Bullock	Fiedler	Kinsey	Sims
Burgos	Fitzgerald	Kirkland	Solomon
Caltagirone	Frankel	Krueger	Sturla
Cephas	Gainey	Lee	Vitali
Comitta	Green	Madden	Warren
Cruz	Hanbidge	McCarter	Webster
Daley	Harris	McClinton	Wheatley
Davidson	Hohenstein	Otten	Youngblood
Dawkins	Howard	Rabb	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

The SPEAKER. For the information of the members, there will be no further votes this evening. There are some additional housekeeping measures and comments from a member on a previously passed bill, so I will be here for a little bit longer.

STATEMENT BY MRS. BOROWICZ

The SPEAKER. At this time the Chair recognizes Representative Borowicz on HB 2579 that was passed earlier today.

Mrs. BOROWICZ. HB 2579 designates a portion of PA Route 1010 in Clinton County as the Tech. Corporal Lee Phillips Memorial Bridge. A native of Clinton County, Phillips served in the United States Army as a tank driver in Company A,

787th Battalion, during World War II. Phillips received the Good Conduct Medal, World War II Victory Medal, and AME Medal with one Bronze Service Star.

Lee would be so upset that a bridge would be named after him. He was a gentle, humble, kind, unsung hero of World War II that left before his graduating ceremony of high school to fight a World War. That generation is almost gone, and I knew our country would change when that generation would be gone. They represented everything that is good about America: a love for God, country, and family. Now it is up to us to stand for those principles that they stood for.

So I appreciate your support on this important legislation that honors a hero and all of the unsung heroes and the reason we have freedom today. Thank you so much.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and the hero for his service.

BILL RECOMMITTED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 2548 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

CALENDAR CONTINUED

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1718, PN 2310**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 66 (Public Utilities) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in service and facilities, further providing for definitions.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 1718 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 1718 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 1862, PN 2795**, 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, providing for protections for consumers receiving surprise balance bills for health care services from out-of-network providers.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 1862 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 1862 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 2039, PN 2866**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 20, 2015 (P.L.497, No.90), known as the Taxpayer-Funded Advertising Transparency Act, further providing for definitions and for advertising notification; and making a related repeal.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 2039 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 2039 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 1236, PN 3130**, entitled:

An Act regulating certain smoke alarms; providing for dwelling unit owner and tenant responsibilities; and prescribing penalties.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 1236 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 1236 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1279, PN 3058**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 12, 1951 (P.L.90, No.21), known as the Liquor Code, in licenses and regulations, liquor, alcohol and malt and brewed beverages, further providing for wine expanded permits.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 1279 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 1279 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

BILL ON FINAL PASSAGE

The House proceeded to consideration on final passage of **HB 827, PN 928**, entitled:

An Act designating certain activity by the Delaware River Basin Commission as the exercise of the power of eminent domain that entitles the owners of the property in question to appropriate and just compensation.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 827 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 827 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. BENNINGHOFF called up **HR 344, PN 3193**, entitled:

A Resolution urging pharmaceutical companies, manufacturers and distributors of prescription opioid drugs to fully cooperate with the Pennsylvania Office of Attorney General in reaching financial settlements and legal resolutions that reflect the severe, irreversible harm suffered by tens of thousands of Pennsylvania families who have lost loved ones to the opioid crisis and to substance use disorder.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 344 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 344 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. BENNINGHOFF called up **HR 586, PN 2754**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of October 2019 as "Cybersecurity Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 586 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 586 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. BENNINGHOFF called up **HR 646, PN 3059**, entitled:

A Resolution urging Major League Baseball to revise its plan to eliminate affiliation with three Minor League Baseball teams in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 646 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 646 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. BENNINGHOFF called up **HR 647, PN 3060**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of February 2020 as "Esports Month" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 647 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 647 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. BENNINGHOFF called up **HR 673, PN 3157**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the week of February 2 through 8, 2020, as "National Future Business Leaders of America-Phi Beta Lambda Week" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 673 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 673 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. BENNINGHOFF called up **HR 747, PN 3318**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing May 5, 2020, as "Architects Action Day" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 747 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 747 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. BENNINGHOFF called up **HR 805, PN 3430**, entitled:

A Resolution designating April 26, 2020, as "Pretzel Day" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 805 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 805 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. BENNINGHOFF called up **HR 837, PN 3522**, entitled:

A Resolution designating October 4, 2020, as "Truck Driver Appreciation Day" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 837 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 837 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. BENNINGHOFF called up **HR 845, PN 3560**, entitled:

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

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

RESOLUTION TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 845 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 845 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Speaker is in receipt of a motion made by Representative Ryan, who moves that this House do adjourn until Tuesday, September 15, 2020, at 1 p.m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the motion?
Motion was agreed to, and at 4:50 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.