

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

TUESDAY, JUNE 22, 2021

SESSION OF 2021

205TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 40

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

**THE SPEAKER (BRYAN CUTLER)
PRESIDING**

PRAYER

HON. SHERYL M. DELOZIER, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, we come before You today to seek guidance through Your Holy Word. Your teachings provide us with strength, wisdom, and understanding – all characteristics we will need as the day unfolds.

We recognize You are the God of all resources. Everything is at Your disposal. We ask Your provision to help us take care of all of the needs of our constituents.

Today we pray for our members and the citizens of the Commonwealth. Grant us faith that we need to live each day, the strength to believe in our fellow man, and the dedication to leave our communities and our State better for future generations. Thank You for providing us another day full of opportunity: an opportunity to do better, an opportunity to be a better person, an opportunity to show kindness to someone in need.

God, please put Your supportive hand on the shoulder of all those who stand to defend us in our military here and abroad, as well as with those who respond to our calls as first responders.

For all these things we ask in Your loving name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Monday, June 21, 2021, will be postponed until printed.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND RECOMMITTED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES

HB 1410, PN 1883 (Amended) By Rep. HENNESSEY

An Act establishing the Weigh Station Preclearance Program; and providing for criteria for preclearance system and devices and for data access.

TRANSPORTATION.

HB 1446, PN 1880 (Amended) By Rep. SONNEY

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

EDUCATION.

HB 1533, PN 1881 (Amended) By Rep. SONNEY

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in terms and courses of study, providing for program of accelerated learning following COVID-19 pandemic.

EDUCATION.

HB 1534, PN 1879 (Amended) By Rep. KAUFFMAN

An Act amending Title 20 (Decedents, Estates and Fiduciaries) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in dispositions independent of letters, family exemption, probate of wills and grant of letters, further providing for payments to family and funeral directors.

JUDICIARY.

HB 1639, PN 1814 By Rep. HENNESSEY

An Act designating a portion of Pennsylvania Route 113 from its intersection with Schoolhouse Road, in Franconia Township, Montgomery County, and State Route 4027, also known as County Line Road, in Souderton Borough, Montgomery County, as the Honorable Robert W. Godshall Memorial Highway.

TRANSPORTATION.

HB 1650, PN 1837

By Rep. DELOZIER

An Act amending Title 67 (Public Welfare) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in human services generally, reorganizing provisions relating to adoption opportunities and to family finding and kinship care; and making editorial changes.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH.

HB 1653, PN 1840

By Rep. HENNESSEY

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in fees, further providing for exemption of persons, entities and vehicles from fees.

TRANSPORTATION.

HB 1657, PN 1849

By Rep. DELOZIER

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in child protective services, further providing for definitions.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH.

HB 1658, PN 1857

By Rep. HENNESSEY

An Act amending Title 74 (Transportation) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in public utility facilities, further providing for adjustment.

TRANSPORTATION.

HB 1660, PN 1882 (Amended)

By Rep. SONEY

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in duties and powers of boards of school directors, further providing for temporary emergency provisions.

EDUCATION.

**BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES,
CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED****SB 81, PN 59**

By Rep. KAUFFMAN

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

JUDICIARY.

SB 147, PN 685

By Rep. COX

An Act amending the act of June 2, 1915 (P.L.736, No.338), known as the Workers' Compensation Act, in health and safety, further providing for certification of safety committee.

LABOR AND INDUSTRY.

SB 411, PN 937 (Amended)

By Rep. KAUFFMAN

An Act amending Titles 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure), 61 (Prisons and Parole) and 71 (State Government) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in judicial boards and commissions, further providing for definitions and for publication of guidelines for

sentencing, resentencing and parole, risk assessment instrument and recommitment ranges following revocation; in depositions and witnesses, further providing for confidential communications involving law enforcement officers and for confidential communications to peer support members; in juvenile matters, further providing for inspection of court files and records; in particular rights and immunities, further providing for immunity of State parole officers and for immunity of program administrators and supervisors; in post-trial matters, further providing for postconviction DNA testing; in sentencing, further providing for mandatory period of probation for certain sexual offenders, for disposition of persons found guilty but mentally ill, for information required upon commitment and subsequent disposition, for judicial power to release inmates, for transfer of inmates in need of medical treatment, for applicability, for registry, for initial registration, for duty to inform, for enforcement, for assessments, for verification by sexual offenders and Pennsylvania State Police, for administration, for global positioning system technology, for immunity for good faith conduct, for Pennsylvania State Police, for duties of probation and parole officials, for board, for annual performance audit, for applicability, for registration, for registration procedures and applicability, for assessments, for administration, for global positioning system technology, for immunity for good faith conduct, for duties of Pennsylvania State Police, for duties of Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole, for board and for annual performance audit; in other criminal provisions, further providing for supervisory relationship to offenders; in preliminary provisions, further providing for definitions; in general administration, providing for powers of peace officers; in community corrections centers and community corrections facilities, further providing for definitions, for department, for offenders who may be housed, for authority of Commonwealth employees, for authority of chairman and for escape and providing for certain offenders residing in group-based homes and for reporting; in Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole, further providing for definitions, for operation of parole system generally, for Pennsylvania Parole Board, for board chairperson, for board action, for meetings and for offices, repealing provisions relating to district directors, to district office employees, to disciplinary action and to certain offenders residing in group-based homes, further providing for general powers of board and for specific powers of board involving parolees, repealing provisions relating to probation services, further providing for sentencing court to transmit records to board, for general criteria for parole by court, for right of access to inmates, for parole power, for violation of terms of parole, for parole procedure, for victim statements, testimony and participation in hearing, for general rules and special regulations and for early parole of inmates subject to Federal removal order and repealing provisions relating to definitions, to status as peace officers and to supervisory relationship to offenders; providing for supervision of offenders and for agents; in county probation officers' firearm education and training, further providing for definitions; in Interstate Compacts, further providing for Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Adult Offenders application fee, for deputization and for supervision of persons paroled by other states; providing for Board of Pardons; in preliminary provisions relating to retirement for State employees and officers, further providing for definitions; conferring powers and imposing duties on the Department of Corrections; providing for the transfer of functions, powers and duties of the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole and for appropriations for the Office of Victim Advocate; making related repeals; and making editorial changes.

JUDICIARY.

SB 516, PN 802

By Rep. KAUFFMAN

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in sentencing, further providing for payment of court costs, restitution and fines.

JUDICIARY.

**HOUSE RESOLUTION
INTRODUCED AND REFERRED**

No. 117 By Representative SCHEMEL

A Resolution appointing and empowering the Judiciary Committee to conduct an investigation.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, June 22, 2021.

**HOUSE BILLS
INTRODUCED AND REFERRED**

No. 32 By Representatives DAY, HAMM, JAMES, MILLARD, MOUL and ROWE

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in preparation for and conduct of primaries and elections, providing for poll watchers.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, June 22, 2021.

No. 33 By Representatives DAY and HAMM

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in preliminary provisions, providing for election monitoring and imposing duties on the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, June 22, 2021.

No. 34 By Representatives DAY, R. BROWN, HAMM and MOUL

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in preparation for and conduct of primaries and elections, providing for cargo securement.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, June 22, 2021.

No. 1416 By Representatives STURLA, McNEILL, SCHLOSSBERG, HILL-EVANS, D. WILLIAMS, ROZZI, SANCHEZ, WEBSTER, MERSKI, CIRESI, O'MARA, N. NELSON, MALAGARI and GUZMAN

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in reimbursements by Commonwealth and between school districts, providing for accelerated fair funding.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, June 22, 2021.

No. 1671 By Representatives B. MILLER, RYAN, SCHMITT, FEE, STAMBAUGH, HAMM, JONES, PICKETT, METCALFE, GLEIM, GROVE, MILLARD, ZIMMERMAN, ROTHMAN, JAMES, KAUFFMAN, DRISCOLL, HERSHEY, MOUL, JOZWIAK, WHEELAND, ECKER, RADER, GREINER, O'NEAL, FREEMAN, R. MACKENZIE, HICKERNELL, STAATS, KNOWLES, DIAMOND,

GAYDOS, DAY, KEEFER, FRITZ, LEWIS, COX, SCHEMEL, OWLETT, ROWE, KLUNK, SOLOMON, GILLEN, MENTZER, ROAE, COOK, E. NELSON, RAPP, EMRICK, WARNER, KAUFER, DOWLING, SCHLEGEL CULVER, IRVIN, SMITH, THOMAS and BONNER

An Act amending Titles 24 (Education) and 71 (State Government) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in administration and miscellaneous provisions, further providing for administrative duties of the Public School Employees' Retirement Board; and, in administration, funds, accounts and general provisions, further providing for administrative duties of the State Employees' Retirement Board.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, June 22, 2021.

No. 1672 By Representatives DAY and CIRESI

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, providing for Congressional district standards.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, June 22, 2021.

No. 1673 By Representatives DAY and CIRESI

A Joint Resolution proposing integrated amendments to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, further providing for legislative districts and for Legislative Reapportionment Commission.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, June 22, 2021.

No. 1674 By Representative LAWRENCE

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 imposition of tax.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, June 22, 2021.

SENATE BILLS FOR CONCURRENCE

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

SB 324, PN 850

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, June 22, 2021.

SB 439, PN 457

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, June 22, 2021.

SB 559, PN 738

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, June 22, 2021.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Turning to leaves of absence, are there requests?

The Chair recognizes the majority whip, who indicates that the gentleman, Representative MALONEY, wishes to be placed on leave. Without objection, the leave will be granted.

The Chair now recognizes the Democratic whip, who indicates that there are no leaves.

MASTER ROLL CALL

The SPEAKER. The Chair is about to take the master roll call. Members will proceed to vote.

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—201

Armanini	Frankel	Lewis	Roae
Benham	Freeman	Longietti	Rossi
Benninghoff	Fritz	Mackenzie, M.	Rothman
Bernstine	Gainey	Mackenzie, R.	Rowe
Bizzarro	Galloway	Madden	Rozzi
Boback	Gaydos	Major	Ryan
Bonner	Gillen	Mako	Sainato
Borowicz	Gillespie	Malagari	Samuelson
Boyle	Gleim	Markosek	Sanchez
Bradford	Gregory	Marshall	Sankey
Briggs	Greiner	Masser	Sappey
Brooks	Grove	Matzie	Saylor
Brown, A.	Guenst	McClinton	Schemel
Brown, R.	Guzman	McNeill	Schlossberg
Bullock	Hamm	Mehaffie	Schmitt
Burgos	Hanbidge	Mentzer	Schroeder
Burns	Harkins	Mercuri	Schweyer
Carroll	Harris	Merski	Shusterman
Causser	Heffley	Metcalfe	Silvis
Cephas	Helm	Metzgar	Sims
Ciresi	Hennessey	Mihalek	Smith
Conklin	Herrin	Millard	Snyder
Cook	Hershey	Miller, B.	Solomon
Cox	Hickernell	Miller, D.	Sonney
Cruz	Hohenstein	Mizgorski	Staats
Culver	Howard	Moul	Stambaugh
Daley	Innamorato	Mullery	Stephens
Davanzo	Irvin	Mullins	Struzzi
Davidson	Isaacson	Mustello	Sturla
Davis, A.	James	Neilson	Thomas
Davis, T.	Jones	Nelson, E.	Tomlinson
Dawkins	Jozwiak	Nelson, N.	Toohil
Day	Kail	O'Mara	Topper
Deasy	Kaufner	O'Neal	Twardzik
DeLissio	Kauffman	Oberlander	Vitali
Delloso	Keefer	Ortitay	Warner
Delozier	Kenyatta	Otten	Warren
DelRosso	Kerwin	Owlett	Webster
DeLuca	Kim	Parker	Wentling
Diamond	Kinkead	Pashinski	Wheatley
Dowling	Kinsey	Peifer	Wheeland
Driscoll	Kirkland	Pennycuik	White
Dunbar	Klunk	Pickett	Williams, C.
Ecker	Knowles	Pisciottano	Williams, D.
Emrick	Kosierowski	Polinchock	Young
Evans	Krajewski	Puskaric	Zabel
Farry	Krueger	Quinn	Zimmerman
Fee	Kulik	Rabb	
Fiedler	Labs	Rader	Cutler,
Fitzgerald	Lawrence	Rapp	Speaker
Flood	Lee	Rigby	

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. Turning to visitor recognition, located in the gallery the Chair is pleased to welcome Anders Thoman. He is a senior at the University of Alabama in Huntsville and is currently working in Representative Grove's district office. Welcome, Anders.

Also located in the gallery, the Chair is pleased to welcome Micah LaBarre. He will be a senior at Lycoming College and is majoring in political science. He is the guest of Representative Borowicz.

Located in the gallery, the Chair is pleased to welcome Jamilyn Nimo. She recently graduated from Penn State University and is currently interning in Representative Hickernell's office. Welcome.

Located in the gallery, the Chair is pleased to welcome Maddie Early. She will be a sophomore at Waynesburg Area High School and is here today shadowing Representative Schemel.

Located in the gallery, the Chair is pleased to welcome Sean, Robin, and Asa Adams. Robin is the founder of I'mPACT, which is an organization that seeks to protect against childhood trauma, and they are the guests of Representative Owlett, and I had the privilege of spending some time with Asa earlier today. So welcome, Asa.

Located in the gallery, the Chair is pleased to welcome Abbey Hengst, who won the PIAA Class AAA State Javelin Championship. She attends the Hazleton Area High School, and she and her mother are the guests of Representative Toohil.

Located in the gallery, the Chair is pleased to welcome the following guests of Representative Snyder: Luca Augustine is the PIAA Class AAA State Wrestling Champion in the 172-pound weight class. He attends Waynesburg Central High School, and he helped the school's wrestling team win their first State championship. With Luca is Taylor Shriver, also from Waynesburg Central High School, who is the PIAA Class AA State Pole Vault Champion. We also welcome the family and coaches that are here with these champions today. Congratulations, Taylor and Luca.

Located to the left of the rostrum, the Chair is pleased to welcome Representative Herrin's son, Ethan, whom I had the privilege of meeting earlier. Ethan is a senior at American University, majoring in international relations and economics. Welcome.

Located to the left of the rostrum, the Chair is pleased to welcome the family of Representative George Dunbar: his wife, Sandy; his daughter, Alex; his daughter, Erin, and her friend, Greg Gismondi; his daughter, Stephanie; her husband, Jake; and children, Avery and Everett. Welcome all.

PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Turning to committee announcements.

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

Mr. HICKERNELL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Professional Licensure Committee will meet immediately at the break in room 523, Irvis Office, to consider one bill, SB 416. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Professional Licensure Committee will meet immediately at the break in room 523, Irvis Office Building.

RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, the majority leader, for a Rules Committee announcement.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Rules Committee will meet at 11:20 in the majority caucus room downstairs. Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Rules Committee will meet at 11:20 in the majority caucus room downstairs.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Saylor, for an Appropriations Committee announcement.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Appropriations Committee will meet in the majority caucus room immediately following the Rules Committee meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MS. O'MARA

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognize the gentlewoman, Representative O'Mara, for a regional caucus announcement.

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

Members of the southeast delegation, we are taking our photo very, very quickly at first break, right here in the well of the House. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

STATE GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

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

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to announce the State Government Committee voting meeting in room G-50 at the first break. We will be taking up HB 1651 and SB 554 and making referrals to subcommittees.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The State Government Committee will have a voting meeting in room G-50 at the first break.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. Moving to caucus announcements.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Dunbar, for a caucus announcement.

Mr. DUNBAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Republicans will caucus at 12 o'clock in the majority caucus room as well as virtually; that is 12 o'clock in the majority caucus room. We will be prepared to be back on the floor at 1 o'clock.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Dan Miller, for a caucus announcement.

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

Democrats will caucus in person and virtually at 12 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Is the gentlewoman, Representative DeLissio, seeking recognition? She indicates not. The Chair thanks the lady.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. This House will stand in recess until 1 p.m., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

AFTER RECESS

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

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEES

HB 591, PN 560

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of June 22, 1937 (P.L.1987, No.394), known as The Clean Streams Law, in other pollutions and potential pollution, further providing for potential pollution.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1300, PN 1869

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, as follows: in preliminary provisions, further providing for definitions, providing for legislative authority over elections, establishing the Bureau of Election Audits and providing for special standing in challenges to the Election Code; in the Secretary of the Commonwealth, further providing for powers and duties of the Secretary of the Commonwealth and providing for reports on implementation of elections; in county boards of elections, further providing for powers and duties of county boards and providing for county boards of elections and satellite offices; in district election officers, further providing for qualifications of election officers, for compensation of district election officers and for appointment of watchers; providing for registration of electors; in ballots, further providing for form of official election ballot and for number of ballots

to be printed and specimen ballots; in voting machines, further providing for examination and approval of voting machines by the Secretary of the Commonwealth, for requirements of voting machines, for preparation of voting machines by county election boards and for delivery of voting machines and supplies by county election boards to election officers; in electronic voting systems, further providing for experimental use of electronic voting systems and for statistical sample and providing for requirements of accessible voting machines; in voting apparatus bonds, providing for voting system defects, disclosure, investigations and penalties; in preparation for and conduct of primaries and elections, providing for voter's bill of rights, for senior voter's bill of rights, for disabled voter's bill of rights and further providing for time for opening and closing polls, for manner of applying to vote, persons entitled to vote, voter's certificates, entries to be made in district register, numbered lists of voters and challenges and for deadline for receipt of valid voter registration application; in voting by qualified absentee electors, further providing for applications for official absentee ballots, for date of application for absentee ballot, for delivering or mailing ballots, for voting by absentee electors, providing for supervised voting by qualified absentee electors in certain facilities and further providing for canvassing of official absentee ballots and mail-in ballots; 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 delivering or mailing ballots and for voting by mail-in electors; in Pennsylvania Election Law Advisory Board, further providing for Pennsylvania Election Law Advisory Board; providing for early voting by qualified electors; in returns of primaries and elections, further providing for returns to be open to public inspection and exceptions and for computation of returns by county board, certification and issuance of certificates of election; in recounts and contest, providing for powers and duties of the Attorney General relating to elections; in penalties, further providing for disobeying lawful instructions, for perjury, for false affidavits of candidates, for refusal to permit inspection of papers, destruction or removal and Secretary of the Commonwealth, for refusal to permit inspection of papers, destruction or removal and county boards of elections, for insertion and alteration of entries in documents, removal and refusal to deliver, for refusal to permit overseers, watchers, attorneys or candidates to act, for driving away watchers, attorneys, candidates or overseers, for refusal to permit election officers, clerks and machine inspectors to act and driving away said persons, for refusal to administer oath and acting without being sworn, for violation of oath of office by election officers, for peace officers, failure to render assistance and hindering or delaying county board members and others, for nomination petitions and papers and offenses by signers, for false signatures and statements in nomination petitions and papers, for nomination petitions, certificates and papers, destruction, fraudulent filing and suppression, for offenses by printers of ballots, for unlawful possession of ballots and counterfeiting ballots, for forging and destroying ballots, for tampering with voting machines, for destroying, defacing or removing notices, et cetera, for police officers at polling places and for peace officer, failure to quell disturbances at polls, hindering or delaying election officers and others, for election officers permitting unregistered electors to vote, challenges and refusing to permit qualified electors to vote, for election officers refusing to permit elector to vote in proper party at primaries, for frauds by election officers, for prying into ballots, for interference with primaries and elections, frauds and conspiracy, for persons interfering in other districts, for assault and battery at polls, for unlawful assistance in voting, for election officers permitting unlawful assistance, for failure to keep and return record of assisted voters, for unlawful voting, for elector voting ballot of wrong party at primary, for repeat voting at elections, for removing ballots, for commissioners to take soldiers' votes, for fraudulent voting by soldiers, for bribery at elections, for receipts and disbursements of primary and election expenses by persons other than candidates and treasurers, for receipts of primary and election expenses by unauthorized persons, for contributions by corporations or unincorporated associations, for failure to file expense account, for prohibiting duress and intimidation of voters and interference with the free exercise of the elective franchise, for failure to perform duty, for hindering or delaying performance of duty, for violation of any provision of act, for violations of provisions relating to absentee and mail-in ballots and providing for unlawful collection of ballots and prohibiting duress and intimidation of elections officials; providing for reimbursements and withholding; and making a related repeal.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1302, PN 1826

By Rep. BENNINGHOFF

An Act amending the act of July 7, 1980 (P.L.380, No.97), known as the Solid Waste Management Act, in general provisions, further providing for powers and duties of the department.

RULES.

HB 1377, PN 1820

By Rep. BENNINGHOFF

An Act amending the act of October 6, 1998 (P.L.705, No.92), known as the Keystone Opportunity Zone, Keystone Opportunity Expansion Zone and Keystone Opportunity Improvement Zone Act, in keystone opportunity zones, providing for zone relocation.

RULES.

HB 1452, PN 1573

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Titles 44 (Law and Justice) and 45 (Legal Notices) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for flexibility in emergency publication of the Pennsylvania Bulletin: in Uniform Electronic Legal Material Act, further providing for definitions; and, in codification and publication of documents, further providing for preliminary publication in Pennsylvania Bulletin.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1588, PN 1821

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 7 (Banks and Banking) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in mortgage loan industry licensing and consumer protection, further providing for definitions, for license requirements, for exceptions to license requirements, for general requirements, for powers conferred on certain licensees engaged in the mortgage loan business, for mortgage loan business prohibitions, for application for license, for prelicensing and continuing education, for license fees, for licensee requirements, for suspension, revocation or refusal and for mortgage servicers.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1621, PN 1797

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act providing for small wireless facilities deployment.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 89, PN 179

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 74 (Transportation) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Multimodal Fund, repealing provisions relating to Balanced Multimodal Transportation Policy Commission.

APPROPRIATIONS.

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

HB 1651, PN 1838

By Rep. GROVE

An Act authorizing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Pennsylvania State Police and the Governor, to grant and convey to Robert Swingle, certain lands and improvements situate in the Township of Richmond, Tioga County.

STATE GOVERNMENT.

**BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES,
CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED**

SB 416, PN 910

By Rep. HICKERNELL

An Act amending the act of May 22, 1951 (P.L.317, No.69), known as The Professional Nursing Law, further providing for definitions and for registered nurse, clinical nurse specialist, use of title and abbreviation "R.N." or "C.N.S." and credentials and fraud; and providing for certified registered nurse anesthetist and qualifications and for scope of practice for certified registered nurse anesthetists.

PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE.

SB 554, PN 875

By Rep. GROVE

An Act amending Title 65 (Public Officers) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in open meetings, further providing for public notice and providing for notification of agency business required and exceptions.

STATE GOVERNMENT.

The SPEAKER. The House will be temporarily at ease while we await the arrival of leaders from both sides.

The House will return to order.

CALENDAR

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 381, PN 367**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in certification of teachers, further providing for substitute teaching permit for prospective teachers.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 664, PN 815**, 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 optional year of education due to COVID-19.

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

Mr. **D. MILLER** offered the following amendment
No. **A01399**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 2, by inserting after "the"
2019-2020 or

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Dan Miller, on the amendment.

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

Mr. Speaker, the intent of my bill was to correct where I thought the House had drawn some attention to last year, which is, of course, those children and young people who stay in a transition program through the age of 21, to work with businesses and a variety of services to be sure that they are transitioning to adulthood in a strong way. I would acknowledge, in further deliberation of the amendment, that I do run into issues of what happens when children or young people have already graduated from high school. I stumble to find the answer legally as to how to meld the two. Unfortunately, I believe that means that I should withdraw the amendment. I would just note that it is unfortunate that I think, again, the House tried to deal with this issue before. Unfortunately, it was not advanced in the Senate, and I believe that this small population of students with exceptional needs were not well advanced or protected by that decision.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Mr. D. MILLER. But at this time I feel there is no other choice but to withdraw the amendment, so thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman for withdrawing the amendment.

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

Mrs. **PENNYCUICK** offered the following amendment
No. **A01425**:

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 22 and 23
(d) This section shall not apply to a school entity that provided in-person instruction, and did not close a school building to in-person instruction for more than two weeks due to COVID-19 mitigation efforts, during the 2020-2021 school year.

Amend Bill, page 2, line 23, by striking out "(D)" and inserting
(e)

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

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Pennycuick.

Mrs. PENNYCUICK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to withdraw my amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

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

Mr. **SONNEY** offered the following amendment
No. **A01447**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 8, by inserting after "2021."
The Department of Education shall develop a standard election form for a parent or guardian to elect to enroll the student and the form shall be made available on its publicly accessible Internet website.

Amend Bill, page 3, line 25, by striking out "A school entity" and inserting

The Department of Education

Amend Bill, page 3, line 25, by striking out "an online application" and inserting
a standard election form

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Sonney, on the amendment.

Mr. SONNEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is an agreed-to amendment, and I would encourage a positive vote from all the members. Thank you.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. On that question, 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—201

Armanini	Frankel	Lewis	Roae
Benham	Freeman	Longiotti	Rossi
Benninghoff	Fritz	Mackenzie, M.	Rothman
Bernstine	Gainey	Mackenzie, R.	Rowe
Bizzarro	Galloway	Madden	Rozzi
Boback	Gaydos	Major	Ryan
Bonner	Gillen	Mako	Sainato
Borowicz	Gillespie	Malagari	Samuelson
Boyle	Gleim	Markosek	Sanchez
Bradford	Gregory	Marshall	Sankey
Briggs	Greiner	Masser	Sappey
Brooks	Grove	Matzie	Saylor
Brown, A.	Guenst	McClinton	Schemel
Brown, R.	Guzman	McNeill	Schlossberg
Bullock	Hamm	Mehaffie	Schmitt
Burgos	Hanbidge	Mentzer	Schroeder
Burns	Harkins	Mercuri	Schweyer
Carroll	Harris	Merski	Shusterman
Causser	Heffley	Metcalfe	Silvis
Cephas	Helm	Metzgar	Sims
Ciresi	Hennessey	Mihalek	Smith
Conklin	Herrin	Millard	Snyder
Cook	Hershey	Miller, B.	Solomon
Cox	Hickernell	Miller, D.	Sonney
Cruz	Hohenstein	Mizgorski	Staats
Culver	Howard	Moul	Stambaugh
Daley	Innamorato	Mullery	Stephens
Davanzo	Irvin	Mullins	Struzzi
Davidson	Isaacson	Mustello	Sturla
Davis, A.	James	Neilson	Thomas
Davis, T.	Jones	Nelson, E.	Tomlinson
Dawkins	Jozwiak	Nelson, N.	Toohil
Day	Kail	O'Mara	Topper
Deasy	Kaufner	O'Neal	Twardzik
DeLissio	Kauffman	Oberlander	Vitali

Delloso	Keefer	Ortitay	Warner
Delozier	Kenyatta	Otten	Warren
DelRosso	Kerwin	Owlett	Webster
DeLuca	Kim	Parker	Wentling
Diamond	Kinthead	Pashinski	Wheatley
Dowling	Kinsey	Peifer	Wheeland
Driscoll	Kirkland	Pennyquick	White
Dunbar	Klunk	Pickett	Williams, C.
Ecker	Knowles	Pisciottano	Williams, D.
Emrick	Kosierowski	Polinchock	Young
Evans	Krajewski	Puskaric	Zabel
Farry	Krueger	Quinn	Zimmerman
Fee	Kulik	Rabb	
Fiedler	Labs	Rader	Cutler,
Fitzgerald	Lawrence	Rapp	Speaker
Flood	Lee	Rigby	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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

On the question,

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

Mr. **SAYLOR** offered the following amendment No. **A01469**:

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 29 and 30
(c.1) This section shall not apply to a school entity that provided in-person instruction for at least one hundred fifty (150) days during the 2020-2021 school year.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates he is withdrawing the amendment. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. **CIRESI** offered the following amendment No. **A01516**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 30, by striking out the comma after "school" where it occurs the second time and inserting

or

Amend Bill, page 3, line 1, by striking out "cyber charter school, including an"

Amend Bill, page 4, lines 7 and 8, by striking out "cyber charter school."

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Ciresi.

Mr. CIRESI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as we have seen over the last year, we saw regression in all of our students throughout the Commonwealth and we worked hard to make sure that each student will have what they need moving forward. And we heard from some of our online schools that their children did not miss a beat, that their children had everything they needed. But we also heard from our sending districts about the issues they had with money to get computers, to make sure they had what they needed and how important it was to the Commonwealth. Now, I agree with this bill that we need to do what we need to do for our students. Our students should not suffer for a corporation or an industry.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Mr. CIRESI. So with that, I am going to remove my amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman. The amendment is withdrawn.

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

Mrs. ISAACSON offered the following amendment No. **A01524**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 11, by striking out "(a)" and inserting
(b)

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 29 and 30

(d) Student graduation rate data that would negatively affect a professional employe's performance rating under section 1123(b)(1)(ii) may not be included in a professional employe's performance rating under section 1123 for any student that elected an optional year of education due to COVID-19 under subsection (b).

Amend Bill, page 3, line 30, by striking out "(d) Definitions.—" and inserting

(e)

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Isaacson.

Mrs. ISAACSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My amendment simply takes care of an issue that has presented itself in this bill, and that is that our teachers may be adversely affected by this bill unless we adopt my amendment. Because of evaluations and students being held back, their being held back may be used against them as part of their evaluation process. While we dealt with a similar issue in a similar bill that I appreciated the majority chairman amending in the Education Committee today, since we are addressing this bill, I would hope that you would all join me in making sure that our teachers are not adversely affected should this legislation be passed. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Sonney, on the amendment.

Mr. SONNEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

While I appreciate the gentlelady's concerns, it is not an agreed-to amendment and I would appreciate a "no" vote on this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Representative Longietti, is recognized to speak on the amendment.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentlelady's amendment. We have to remember that under this bill – without the amendment – under the bill, even if a child meets all the standards to advance to a higher grade, under the bill they can be held back, and why would we make judgments on schools and teachers in an evaluation process because a kid is no longer in her cohort for graduation, because under the current evaluation system, if they are not in their cohort for graduation, that is a black mark on the school and on the teacher, and so this amendment attempts to correct that. This amendment says that it will not be a black mark. After all, they are being held back, not because they did not meet academic standards, not because they are not ready in the eyes of the way we judge student achievement, but they are not ready to advance because, understandably, a parent or a guardian decides that it would be best if they be held back. And what caused all this? The pandemic.

So it is imperative that we adopt this amendment and say if we are going to have an evaluation system, it is an evaluation system that makes sense. Yes, one that holds schools and teachers accountable and administrators accountable, but let us not judge them based upon a decision made due to a pandemic for a child to be held back and now they are not in their cohort for graduation. It does not make sense to do that, and so it is imperative that we adopt this amendment and keep a clean evaluation system.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Topper, on the amendment.

Mr. TOPPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just a reminder that the latest iteration of the teacher evaluation system places far less emphasis on both standardized testing as well as the graduation rate and puts more emphasis on the ability of administrators to observe the work of the teachers in the classroom. So that is why I believe that this amendment is unnecessary, but I also wanted to remind our members of what we voted on as we changed the teacher evaluation system last session, to make it more about the observations of the people in the boots on the ground in each building, which still holds.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. CARROLL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment really is quite simple, and if you adopt the position suggested by the majority chair of the Education Committee that this is not an agreed-to amendment, what you are agreeing to then is to penalizing teachers with their evaluation because a family chooses to exercise this option. If you think that is a good idea, then you should embrace the objection and the rejection of this amendment. But if you believe

teachers should be fairly treated because a family chooses to exercise the smart option presented by this bill, then this amendment is one that should be wildly embraced by this chamber. Otherwise, I can come to no other conclusion other than the rejection of this amendment is the rejection of the fair evaluation of teachers.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Seeing no one else seeking recognition, we will return to the prime sponsor of the amendment for the second time, recognized on the amendment.

Mrs. ISAACSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I appreciate the comments that have been made both on behalf of this and, unfortunately, for those that cannot support it. To talk about the teacher evaluation system and the newly adopted regs that we passed last session is exactly why we should make sure, in an amendment such as this, that we are not taking any negative issues that can affect the teacher. Even if we have taken away some of the weight, it does not mean that it takes it all away, and I do not really understand why anyone in this room, after a pandemic and everything that our teachers have been through, does not want to make sure that they are not penalized because of a decision that is made due to this pandemic. The teachers should not have to have any mark against them because a parent makes a decision on behalf of their child, and simply just adopting this amendment would make sure that that would not happen to them.

So I, again, would ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. On that question, 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. You still have time.

All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-100

Benham	Evans	Kosierowski	Pisciottano
Bizzarro	Farry	Krajewski	Rabb
Boyle	Fiedler	Krueger	Rozzi
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Kulik	Sainato
Briggs	Frankel	Labs	Samuelson
Brown, A.	Freeman	Lee	Sanchez
Brown, R.	Gainey	Longietti	Sappey
Bullock	Galloway	Madden	Schlossberg
Burgos	Gillen	Malagari	Schroeder
Burns	Guenst	Markosek	Schweyer
Carroll	Guzman	Matzie	Shusterman
Cephas	Hanbidge	McClinton	Sims
Ciresi	Harkins	McNeill	Snyder
Conklin	Harris	Mehaffie	Solomon
Cruz	Hennessey	Merski	Stephens

Daley	Herrin	Miller, D.	Sturla
Davidson	Hohenstein	Mullery	Thomas
Davis, A.	Howard	Mullins	Tomlinson
Davis, T.	Innamorato	Neilson	Vitali
Dawkins	Isaacson	Nelson, N.	Warren
Deasy	Kenyatta	O'Mara	Webster
DeLissio	Kim	Otten	Wheatley
Delloso	Kinhead	Parker	Williams, D.
DeLuca	Kinsey	Pashinski	Young
Driscoll	Kirkland	Peifer	Zabel

NAYS-101

Armanini	Gregory	Masser	Rothman
Benninghoff	Greiner	Mentzer	Rowe
Bernstine	Grove	Mercuri	Ryan
Boback	Hamm	Metcalfe	Sankey
Bonner	Heffley	Metzgar	Saylor
Borowicz	Helm	Mihalek	Schemel
Brooks	Hershey	Millard	Schmitt
Causar	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Silvis
Cook	Irvin	Mizgorski	Smith
Cox	James	Moul	Sonney
Culver	Jones	Mustello	Staats
Davanzo	Jozwiak	Nelson, E.	Stambaugh
Day	Kail	O'Neal	Struzzi
Delozier	Kaufer	Oberlander	Toohil
DelRosso	Kauffman	Ortitay	Topper
Diamond	Keefer	Owlett	Twardzik
Dowling	Kerwin	Pennycuick	Warner
Dunbar	Klunk	Pickett	Wentling
Ecker	Knowles	Polinchock	Wheeland
Emrick	Lawrence	Puskaric	White
Fee	Lewis	Quinn	Williams, C.
Flood	Mackenzie, M.	Rader	Zimmerman
Fritz	Mackenzie, R.	Rapp	
Gaydos	Major	Rigby	Cutler,
Gillespie	Mako	Roae	Speaker
Gleim	Marshall	Rossi	

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-1

Maloney

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

The SPEAKER. As we said yesterday, Mr. Whip, we all believe in second chances.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. SONNEY offered the following amendment No. A01614:

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 22 and 23 (5) A student older than twenty-one (21) years of age with an active IEP who is enrolled in a school entity during the 2021-2022 school year shall not become ineligible for continued service under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act during the entire 2021-2022 school year.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Sonney.

Mr. SONNEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is an agreed-to amendment, and I would ask for all of the members' support. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. On that question, 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—201

Armanini	Frankel	Lewis	Roae
Benham	Freeman	Longiatti	Rossi
Benninghoff	Fritz	Mackenzie, M.	Rothman
Bernstine	Gainey	Mackenzie, R.	Rowe
Bizzarro	Galloway	Madden	Rozzi
Boback	Gaydos	Major	Ryan
Bonner	Gillen	Mako	Sainato
Borowicz	Gillespie	Malagari	Samuelson
Boyle	Gleim	Markosek	Sanchez
Bradford	Gregory	Marshall	Sankey
Briggs	Greiner	Masser	Sappey
Brooks	Grove	Matzie	Saylor
Brown, A.	Guenst	McClinton	Schemel
Brown, R.	Guzman	McNeill	Schlossberg
Bullock	Hamm	Mehaffie	Schmitt
Burgos	Hanbidge	Mentzer	Schroeder
Burns	Harkins	Mercuri	Schweyer
Carroll	Harris	Merski	Shusterman
Causer	Heffley	Metcalfe	Silvis
Cephas	Helm	Metzgar	Sims
Ciresi	Hennessey	Mihalek	Smith
Conklin	Herrin	Millard	Snyder
Cook	Hershey	Miller, B.	Solomon
Cox	Hickernell	Miller, D.	Sonney
Cruz	Hohenstein	Mizgorski	Staats
Culver	Howard	Moul	Stambaugh
Daley	Innamorato	Mullery	Stephens
Davanzo	Irvin	Mullins	Struzzi
Davidson	Isaacson	Mustello	Sturla
Davis, A.	James	Neilson	Thomas
Davis, T.	Jones	Nelson, E.	Tomlinson
Dawkins	Jozwiak	Nelson, N.	Toohil
Day	Kail	O'Mara	Topper
Deasy	Kaufer	O'Neal	Twardzik
DeLissio	Kauffman	Oberlander	Vitali
Delloso	Keefer	Ortitay	Warner
Delozier	Kenyatta	Otten	Warren
DelRosso	Kerwin	Owlett	Webster
DeLuca	Kim	Parker	Wentling
Diamond	Kinthead	Pashinski	Wheatley
Dowling	Kinsey	Peifer	Wheeland
Driscoll	Kirkland	Pennyquick	White
Dunbar	Klunk	Pickett	Williams, C.

Ecker	Knowles	Pisciottano	Williams, D.
Emrick	Kosierowski	Polinchock	Young
Evans	Krajewski	Puskaric	Zabel
Farry	Krueger	Quinn	Zimmerman
Fee	Kulik	Rabb	
Fiedler	Labs	Rader	Cutler,
Fitzgerald	Lawrence	Rapp	Speaker
Flood	Lee	Rigby	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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

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

Mrs. PENNYCUICK offered the following amendment No. **A01617**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 19, by striking out "A" and inserting Except as provided under subsection (c.1), a
Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 22 and 23 (c.1) A parent or guardian and the student may not elect to enroll the student under subsection (b) if any of the following apply:

(1) The school in which the student is enrolled provided in-person instruction for at least one hundred fifty (150) days during the 2020-2021 school year.

(2) The parent or guardian elected virtual learning for the student instead of in-person instruction when provided during the 2020-2021 school year.

Amend Bill, page 3, line 9, by inserting after "law" and except as provided under subsection (c.1)
Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 29 and 30 (c.1) A parent or guardian or a child at or over eighteen (18) years of age may not make the election under subsection (b) if any of the following apply:

(1) The school in which the student is enrolled provided in-person instruction for at least one hundred fifty (150) days during the 2020-2021 school year.

(2) The parent or guardian or child elected virtual learning for the student instead of in-person instruction when provided during the 2020-2021 school year.

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Pennyquick.

Mrs. PENNYCUICK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My amendment would exempt schools that were in-person learning for the last school year for over 150 days. It would also exempt schools of parents that had elected virtual learning. This is important for school districts that were very careful and very thoughtful in their educational plans for their students and making sure that they had in-person learning safely and effectively.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Mrs. PENNYCUICK. With all due respect, I would like to withdraw my amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

On the question recurring,

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. Located in the gallery, the Chair is pleased to welcome guests of Representative Kinsey. Please rise and be welcomed. We have Shanee Bryant, Anitra and Aaron Meredith. Welcome. Thanks for joining us today.

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 618, PN 876**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 35 (Health and Safety) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for vaccinations and for disease prevention and control.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Mr. **LAWRENCE** offered the following amendment No. **A01717**:

Amend Bill, page 2, lines 25 through 27, by striking out "The novel coronavirus as identified in the" in line 25 and all of lines 26 and 27 and inserting

A respiratory disease caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus discovered in 2019.

Amend Bill, page 3, lines 1 and 2, by striking out "RECEIVING STATE FUNDING THROUGH" in line 1 and all of line 2 and inserting

that receives State funds to provide education and training, regardless of whether or not a bachelor's degree or an associate's degree is offered by the institution. The term includes an institution that accepts grants from the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency.

Amend Bill, page 3, lines 9 through 12, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

(a) Government entities.—No government entity shall require proof of vaccination against COVID-19 to use any service, enter any building or undertake any activity within the territorial limits or the jurisdiction of the government entity.

(b) Institutions of higher education.—No institution of higher education shall require proof of vaccination against COVID-19 to use any service, enter any building or undertake any activity, including attending class in-person, in a facility within the control or ownership of the institution of higher education.

Amend Bill, page 3, lines 26 and 27, by striking out all of line 26 and "(4)" in line 27 and inserting

(3)

Amend Bill, page 3, line 29, by striking out "(5)" and inserting

(4)

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Lawrence.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment clarifies the intent of the bill and I would encourage an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. On that question, 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 and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—108

Armanini	Gregory	Masser	Rothman
Benninghoff	Greiner	Mehaffie	Rowe
Bernstine	Grove	Mentzer	Ryan
Bonner	Hamm	Mercuri	Sankey
Borowicz	Heffley	Metcalfe	Saylor
Brooks	Helm	Metzgar	Schmitt
Brown, R.	Hennessey	Mihalek	Schroeder
Causar	Hershey	Millard	Silvis
Cook	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Smith
Cox	Irvin	Moul	Sonney
Culver	James	Mustello	Staats
Davanzo	Jones	Nelson, E.	Stambaugh
Day	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Struzzi
Delozier	Kail	Oberlander	Thomas
DelRosso	Kaufers	Ortitay	Tomlinson
Diamond	Kauffman	Owlett	Toohil
Dowling	Keefer	Peifer	Topper
Dunbar	Kerwin	Pennycuick	Twardzik
Ecker	Klunk	Pickett	Warner
Emrick	Knowles	Polinchock	Wentling
Farry	Labs	Puskaric	Wheeland
Fee	Lawrence	Quinn	White
Flood	Lewis	Rader	Williams, C.
Fritz	Mackenzie, M.	Rapp	Zimmerman
Gaydos	Mackenzie, R.	Rigby	
Gillen	Major	Roae	Cutler,
Gillespie	Mako	Rossi	Speaker
Gleim	Marshall		

NAYS—93

Benham	Driscoll	Kosierowski	Pisciottano
Bizzarro	Evans	Krajewski	Rabb
Boback	Fiedler	Krueger	Rozzi
Boyle	Fitzgerald	Kulik	Sainato
Bradford	Frankel	Lee	Samuelson
Briggs	Freeman	Longietti	Sanchez
Brown, A.	Gainey	Madden	Sappey
Bullock	Galloway	Malagari	Schemel

Burgos	Guent	Markosek	Schlossberg
Burns	Guzman	Matzie	Schweyer
Carroll	Hanbidge	McClinton	Shusterman
Cephas	Harkins	McNeill	Sims
Ciresi	Harris	Merski	Snyder
Conklin	Herrin	Miller, D.	Solomon
Cruz	Hohenstein	Mizgorski	Stephens
Daley	Howard	Mullery	Sturla
Davidson	Innamorato	Mullins	Vitali
Davis, A.	Isaacson	Neilson	Warren
Davis, T.	Kenyatta	Nelson, N.	Webster
Dawkins	Kim	O'Mara	Wheatley
Deasy	Kinthead	Otten	Williams, D.
DeLissio	Kinsey	Parker	Young
Deloso	Kirkland	Pashinski	Zabel
DeLuca			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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

On the question,

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

Mr. **ROAE** offered the following amendment No. **A01723**:

Amend Bill, page 1, by inserting between lines 13 and 14 5903. COVID-19 vaccine information on identification cards prohibited.

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 12 and 13 § 5903. COVID-19 vaccine information on identification cards prohibited.

A government entity or political subdivision may not do any of the following:

(1) Include information on an identification card or electronic tracking system regarding whether the holder of the identification card has received a vaccination against COVID-19.

(2) Expend funds to develop an electronic tracking system for an individual who has or has not received a vaccination against COVID-19.

Amend Bill, page 3, lines 18 through 29, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including the act of April 23, 1956 (1955 P.L.1510, No.500), known as the Disease Prevention and Control Law of 1955, the Secretary of Health may not do any of the following:

(1) Order or otherwise require a closure.

(2) Order or otherwise require an individual that has not been exposed or potentially exposed to a contagious disease to do any of the following:

(i) Physically distance from other individuals.

(ii) Wear a universal face covering.

(iii) Conduct a specific hygienic practice.

(iv) Shelter in place, quarantine or isolate from other individuals.

(v) Restrict travel.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Roae.

Mr. ROAE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I urge a "yes" vote on amendment A01723. It would ban COVID-19 vaccine information on identification cards, it would ban the government from spending money to set up a tracking system, and I urge members to vote "yes" on the amendment. The amendment also states in better terms what the Secretary of Health cannot do, such as ordering businesses to close and ordering people to, you know, stay home and things like that; and restricting travel, things like that.

So I urge the members to please vote "yes."

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. On that question, 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 and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—118

Armanini	Gregory	Masser	Rowe
Benninghoff	Greiner	Mehaffie	Ryan
Bernstine	Grove	Mentzer	Sainato
Boback	Hamm	Mercuri	Sankey
Bonner	Heffley	Metcalfe	Saylor
Borowicz	Helm	Metzgar	Schemel
Brooks	Hennessey	Mihalek	Schmitt
Brown, R.	Hershey	Millard	Schroeder
Burns	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Silvis
Causer	Irvin	Mizgorski	Smith
Cook	James	Moul	Snyder
Cox	Jones	Mullery	Sonney
Culver	Jozwiak	Mustello	Staats
Davanzo	Kail	Nelson, E.	Stambaugh
Day	Kaufner	O'Neal	Stephens
Delozier	Kauffman	Oberlander	Struzzi
DelRosso	Keefer	Ortitay	Thomas
Diamond	Kerwin	Owlett	Tomlinson
Dowling	Klunk	Peifer	Toohil
Dunbar	Knowles	Pennycuik	Topper
Ecker	Kulik	Pickett	Twardzik
Emrick	Labs	Polinchock	Warner
Farry	Lawrence	Puskaric	Wentling
Fee	Lewis	Quinn	Wheeland
Flood	Longietti	Rader	White
Fritz	Mackenzie, M.	Rapp	Williams, C.
Gaydos	Mackenzie, R.	Rigby	Zimmerman
Gillen	Major	Roae	
Gillespie	Mako	Rossi	Cutler,
Gleim	Marshall	Rothman	Speaker

NAYS—83

Benham	DeLuca	Kinkead	Pashinski
Bizzarro	Driscoll	Kinsey	Pisciottano
Boyle	Evans	Kirkland	Rabb
Bradford	Fiedler	Kosierowski	Rozzi
Briggs	Fitzgerald	Krajewski	Samuelson
Brown, A.	Frankel	Krueger	Sanchez
Bullock	Freeman	Lee	Sappey
Burgos	Gainey	Madden	Schlossberg
Carroll	Galloway	Malagari	Schweyer
Cephas	Guenst	Markosek	Shusterman
Ciresi	Guzman	Matzie	Sims
Conklin	Hanbidge	McClinton	Solomon
Cruz	Harkins	McNeill	Sturla
Daley	Harris	Merski	Vitali
Davidson	Herrin	Miller, D.	Warren
Davis, A.	Hohenstein	Mullins	Webster
Davis, T.	Howard	Neilson	Wheatley
Dawkins	Innamorato	Nelson, N.	Williams, D.
Deasy	Isaacson	O'Mara	Young
DeLissio	Kenyatta	Otten	Zabel
Delloso	Kim	Parker	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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

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

Mr. **SCHEMEL** offered the following amendment
No. **A01719**:

Amend Bill, page 3, lines 1 and 2, by striking out "RECEIVING STATE FUNDING THROUGH THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS" and inserting
identified as a university within the State System of Higher Education

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Schemel.

Mr. SCHEMEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a grave error for the government to exercise its power to tell private industry what it should do.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Mr. SCHEMEL. However, since I understand that a majority of my caucus does not support that, I am going to withdraw the amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

The SPEAKER. It is the Chair's understanding that the gentleman, Representative Roae, had amendment 1716, which will also be withdrawn, since the prior amendment was. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

It is also the Chair's understanding that the gentlewoman, Representative Isaacson, has withdrawn amendment 1722. The Chair thanks the lady.

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

Mr. **KRAJEWSKI** offered the following amendment
No. **A01636**:

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 24 and 25
"Correctional institution." A State correctional institution or a county correctional institution.

Amend Bill, page 3, line 9, by inserting before "No"
(a) Prohibition.—

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 12 and 13
(b) Applicability.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a correctional institution.

Amend Bill, page 3, line 18, by inserting before
"NOTWITHSTANDING"

(a) Prohibition.—

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 29 and 30

(b) Applicability.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a correctional institution.

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Krajewski.

Mr. KRAJEWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer amendment A01636 to SB 618. My amendment would address a very critical issue when it comes to COVID-19 and other infectious diseases, which is the well-being and safety of our incarcerated loved ones. I have received several letters from friends inside describing the endless panic they have felt during this pandemic; stories of prison guards not wearing masks, not enforcing safety precautions amongst their coworkers or inmates, and inconsistent treatment and reporting of people infected with COVID-19.

The chaos inside the walls was paired with an initially haphazard reporting of COVID-19 numbers from the DOC (Department of Corrections). For months we had no idea how many people inside were sick from COVID, how many were tested, how many were vaccinated, and how many have died. Imagine having a loved one inside a prison during a pandemic and having no idea whether they were safe. Worse yet, imagine learning that they had died weeks prior, quarantined in a cell, without any opportunity to have a last word with you.

The truth is this: The conditions in our State and county prisons are ripe for an infectious outbreak. Inmates are in close quarters with each other. Their cells are incredibly small, and during lockdown their movement is severely restricted. Many are geriatric and vulnerable, and this is coupled with an understaffing of medical staff in these facilities. Visitors from across the Commonwealth move in and out. That is why we have had over 11,000 cases in a population of 40,000 and 138 deaths.

Our prisons should not be held to the same health safety standard as a college or our Capitol Building. We do not have a curfew at the Capitol Building. We are not confined to the perimeter of the Capitol Building. We do not have to spend hours of every single day in an enclosed space with poor circulation alongside people who may or may not have been infected with a contagious disease in the Capitol Building. That is why I am offering this amendment, to illustrate that our prisons must be held to a higher standard of care than any other government or public entity. This is not just an issue of public health; it is an issue of compassion. It is about saying that our vulnerable people inside should have access to protections necessary to ensure they come home alive. Those 138 people deserve to be alive today. I ask that you think about them when you vote on this amendment and hope that you vote "yes." Thank you.

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

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The SPEAKER. The good gentleman indicates that he is willing to be interrogated. You are in order and may proceed.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, would this amendment apply to employees, inmates, and visitors to a correctional institution?

Mr. KRAJEWSKI. It is my understanding, yes.

Mr. LAWRENCE. So employees, inmates, and visitors could be required to show proof of vaccination?

Mr. KRAJEWSKI. This amendment exempts them from the language in the current bill. It does not require that they have to show proof of vaccination.

Mr. LAWRENCE. So could the correctional facility deny admitting a visitor based on their vaccination status?

Mr. KRAJEWSKI. It is my understanding, as the bill is currently written, no; it just allows the Department of Health to have the ability to set safety guidelines in regards to correctional facilities.

Mr. LAWRENCE. So the Department of Health, if your amendment were added to the bill, would be able to implement language preventing visitors from entering a correctional facility unless they showed proof of vaccination?

Mr. KRAJEWSKI. I am sorry. Can you repeat that?

Mr. LAWRENCE. So if your amendment were added to the bill, the Secretary of Health could implement regulations that would prevent a visitor from entering a correctional facility unless they provided proof of vaccination?

Mr. KRAJEWSKI. So the bill does not require that someone is vaccinated; it just requires that if they do not have proof, they can still wear a mask or the facility can have them take other precautions, such as mask wearing, quarantining, etc., but it does not require someone to be vaccinated.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Could the correctional – let me just be clear – could the correctional facility, under your amendment, deny a visitor from outside the correctional facility from entering into the correctional facility if they refuse to show proof of vaccination against COVID-19?

Mr. KRAJEWSKI. There is nothing in the bill that would require that. They would not be required or refused entry. It would allow the facility to implement other guidelines, such as mask wearing.

Mr. LAWRENCE. So, Mr. Speaker, I am looking in the underlying bill, page 3, line 9, "No government entity...shall require proof of vaccination against COVID-19 to...enter any building..." Now, your amendment creates an exception to that statement, so if it is an exception – the clear language of the bill says, "No government entity...shall require proof of vaccination against COVID-19 to...enter any building..." Your amendment creates an exception to that, saying correctional institutions do not have to abide by that statement. So if the underlying bill says, "No government entity...shall require proof of vaccination against COVID-19..." your amendment saying correctional facilities are exempt from that, by definition, would say they can, in fact, require that. Am I missing something?

Mr. KRAJEWSKI. No; no. There is no language in the bill that says if an institution is exempted, that that means they have to refuse someone's entry because they have or have not been vaccinated. It exempts them from the other piece in the legislation, but the institution can still, if someone does not have proof they are vaccinated, they can institute other guidelines to allow that person entry – for example, wearing a mask, quarantining, other things – things that other private entities are actually able to do right now, and we are just saying to hold this public institution of our prisons and jails to the same standard.

Mr. LAWRENCE. So I apologize if I am misunderstanding, but the bill as drafted says, "No government entity." Now, your amendment contemplates "correctional institutions," so I will just put that in for "government entity." No correctional institution "...shall require proof of vaccination against COVID-19 to...enter any building..." Your amendment is creating an exception to that. So a correctional facility could require proof of vaccination to enter the building.

Mr. KRAJEWSKI. If so, it can require that the institution have the information about whether a person is or is not vaccinated, and then based on that, it can make a decision about what guidelines to implement so that person can enter.

Mr. LAWRENCE. All right. So we have established that the correctional institution could implement a policy saying that a visitor would have to be – could have to show proof of vaccination to enter the facility.

Mr. KRAJEWSKI. No. Right now, the current CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) guidelines say that if someone does not provide proof, they can still enter based on the guidelines of that institution.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Right, and that is well and good, but that is not what the amendment says. Your amendment, as drafted, says correctional institutions – this does not apply to them. All right. The underlying bill – again, just putting in "correctional institution" for "government entity" – no correctional facility "...shall require proof of vaccination against COVID-19 to...enter any building..." Your amendment says, no, that actually we are going to take out correctional facilities, so they could require proof of vaccination. We have established that; you mentioned that earlier.

Mr. KRAJEWSKI. But there is no line in the bill that says this institution must refuse entry if a person does not show proof. All it allows is flexibility around setting their health safety guidelines. So if you are saying that because they are exempted that that means they can refuse entry, but there is no language in the bill that actually says that anyone would be refused entry with this exemption.

Mr. LAWRENCE. So, Mr. Speaker, I think where we are having a bit of a – where there is a bit of distance between us here is that I think what you are saying is that there is nothing in the bill that says they "must," but my question is, could they? And I think the answer to my question is yes, but I want to know, if that – the very clear language of your amendment is that a correctional institution, in fact, could require proof – I am not saying "must" – but they could require proof of vaccination against COVID-19 to enter the building.

Mr. KRAJEWSKI. I am sorry. Can you repeat that last bit again?

Mr. LAWRENCE. So again, I think where we are maybe having some question here is I am not suggesting that the language says they "must," I am suggesting that the underlying bill says no correctional institution – for "government entity" – "...shall require proof of vaccination..." Your amendment says we are going to take correctional institutions out of that. I am not suggesting that your amendment would suggest that correctional institutions must require, but under your amendment, they could require it. Is that correct?

Mr. KRAJEWSKI. It is providing flexibility around safety guidelines for the institutions exempted.

Mr. LAWRENCE. So, and I appreciate flexibility—

Mr. KRAJEWSKI. It is providing flexibility around guidelines in regards to people's vaccination.

Mr. LAWRENCE. So maybe I will just ask one more time: Could a correctional institution—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend. I believe the good gentleman has attempted to answer his question previously. Do you wish to interrogate on another line? You are certainly free to do so, but I believe that one has been asked and answered.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Very good. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That concludes my interrogation.

On the amendment?

The SPEAKER. You are in order to speak on the amendment, sir.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the intent of the good gentleman's amendment and I think the intent behind it is good, but as drafted, it does not contemplate a number of situations. We have seen over the past year and a half a number of very unusual circumstances play themselves out. I mean, I am sure everyone in this room remembers there was an order put down that people who had not even been exposed to COVID-19 could not travel – I mean, things that a couple of years ago we would not even have imagined possible. So the idea that a correctional institution could say, you know what, as a visitor you are not allowed in here unless you show me proof of vaccination, well, where does that begin and end? Would an inmate who has legal counsel who is coming to visit them, who does not have proof with them of vaccination, be denied admission to see their client? Would a child who cannot even be vaccinated under the age of 12 be prevented if there was a policy of mandatory identification showing that you have proven that you have gotten the vaccination? Would that child be admitted to see a loved one who is incarcerated?

Again, Mr. Speaker, I do not doubt the intent of the amendment, but as drafted, I do not think it fully comports with – the actual language of the amendment does not fully comport with the intent, I believe, behind it. With that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a "no" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. On that question, 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 and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—91

Benham	Delloso	Kinsey	Pashinski
Bizzarro	DeLuca	Kirkland	Pisciottano
Boback	Driscoll	Kosierowski	Rabb
Boyle	Evans	Krajewski	Rozzi
Bradford	Fiedler	Krueger	Sainato
Briggs	Fitzgerald	Kulik	Samuelson
Brooks	Frankel	Lee	Sanchez
Brown, A.	Freeman	Longietti	Sappay
Bullock	Gainey	Madden	Schlossberg
Burgos	Galloway	Malagari	Schweyer
Burns	Guenst	Markosek	Shusterman
Carroll	Guzman	Matzie	Sims
Cephas	Hanbidge	McClinton	Snyder
Ciresi	Harkins	McNeill	Solomon
Conklin	Harris	Merski	Sturla
Cruz	Herrin	Miller, D.	Vitali
Daley	Hohenstein	Mullery	Warren
Davidson	Howard	Mullins	Webster
Davis, A.	Innamorato	Neilson	Wheatley
Davis, T.	Isaacson	Nelson, N.	Williams, D.
Dawkins	Kenyatta	O'Mara	Young
Deasy	Kim	Otten	Zabel
DeLissio	Kinlead	Parker	

NAYS—110

Armanini	Greiner	Mehaffie	Rowe
Benninghoff	Grove	Mentzer	Ryan
Bernstine	Hamm	Mercuri	Sankey
Bonner	Heffley	Metcalfe	Saylor
Borowicz	Helm	Metzgar	Schemel
Brown, R.	Hennessey	Mihalek	Schmitt
Causar	Hershey	Millard	Schroeder
Cook	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Silvis
Cox	Irvin	Mizgorski	Smith
Culver	James	Moul	Sonney
Davanzo	Jones	Mustello	Staats
Day	Jozwiak	Nelson, E.	Stambaugh
Delozier	Kail	O'Neal	Stephens
DelRosso	Kaufer	Oberlander	Struzzi
Diamond	Kauffman	Ortitay	Thomas
Dowling	Keefer	Owlett	Tomlinson
Dunbar	Kerwin	Peifer	Toohil
Ecker	Klunk	Pennycuick	Topper
Emrick	Knowles	Pickett	Twardzik
Farry	Labs	Polinchock	Warner
Fee	Lawrence	Puskaric	Wentling
Flood	Lewis	Quinn	Wheeland
Fritz	Mackenzie, M.	Rader	White
Gaydos	Mackenzie, R.	Rapp	Williams, C.
Gillen	Major	Rigby	Zimmerman

Gillespie	Mako	Roae	
Gleim	Marshall	Rossi	Cutler,
Gregory	Masser	Rothman	Speaker

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. **FRANKEL** offered the following amendment No. **A01603**:

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 29 and 30 "Health care facility." As defined in section 103 of the act of July 19, 1979 (P.L.130, No.48), known as the Health Care Facilities Act.

Amend Bill, page 3, line 9, by inserting before "No"

(a) Prohibition.—

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 12 and 13

(b) Applicability.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a health care facility administered by a government entity.

Amend Bill, page 3, line 18, by inserting before "NOTWITHSTANDING"

(a) Prohibition.—

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 29 and 30

(b) Applicability.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to an order or a requirement imposed on a health care facility administered by a government entity.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Frankel.

Mr. **FRANKEL**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

COVID-19 is not going away. Just because things are better right now in Pennsylvania, thanks to the work of our Health Department, that is not true everywhere. In several States with low vaccination rates, COVID-19 rates are actually increasing. England, facing yet another variant, just extended its mitigation measures one more month, and those of us who are lucky enough to be vaccinated understand that we may well have to get vaccinated again next year and the year after that potentially.

COVID-19 has not been conquered. It has been managed and it is going to have to continue to be managed, like the flu or the measles, and that is why we must make sure our government-run health-care facilities have all the tools they need to protect their staff and residents from deadly illnesses. We have 20 health-care facilities run by counties, and we have 6 State-run hospitals. If you are a patient in one of those facilities, you will be less safe than a patient in a private facility, where they are allowed to continue using research-backed public health measures to protect their residents. If we, as the State of Pennsylvania, take away the tools those facilities need to keep their residents safe, we are no

longer talking about differences in comfort or luxuries; now we are talking about survival rates. If you cannot afford a private facility, your risk goes up.

In committee, the comment was made of residents, quote, "nothing is stopping people from choosing to wear masks." But of course, this is not about people choosing to keep themselves safe; this is about a reasonable requirement for people who are dependent on public care to be kept safe by us. I urge a "yes" vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Lewis, on the amendment.

Mr. LEWIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the gentleman, the good chairman, stand for brief interrogation?

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

Mr. LEWIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Sir, just in trying to understand the intent behind the amendment here, can you clarify, health-care facility—

Mr. **FRANKEL**. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to hear the interrogation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

The House will please come to order. The gentleman is trying to interrogate regarding the intent and the language of the amendment. He deserves not only to have his questions answered, but the good gentleman who is answering deserves to be able to hear the question to answer accurately.

The gentleman, Representative Lewis, you are in order and may proceed.

Mr. LEWIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Chairman, thank you.

Can you, in trying to understand the intent behind your amendment, can you explain and clarify the health-care facilities you intend for the amendment to apply to?

Mr. **FRANKEL**. So the State-run—

Mr. LEWIS. So with your answer, and reading your amendment correctly, the amendment would allow health-care facilities that are owned by a government entity to require proof of a vaccine prior to an individual utilizing a service, entering a building, or undertaking any activity. Is that correct?

Mr. **FRANKEL**. It does not require it, but it does insist that people have the information about what the vaccine status is, and if there is an unvaccinated person, he is going to have to take other mitigation efforts in order to do — but there is no requirement for vaccine. We are going to take somebody at their word, actually.

Mr. LEWIS. Thank you, sir.

So just kind of — the underlying bill would ensure that these facilities could not require it, but your amendment would exempt that requirement, but in effect, permitting a government-run health-care facility to prevent someone from utilizing their services, entering their building, or undertaking any activity if they do not yet have the vaccine. That could happen. Is that not correct?

Mr. **FRANKEL**. What this amendment does is, basically, give these facilities the ability to ask the question, and without a requirement, rely on the response, you know, which may or may not be factual, but at least have the opportunity to insist that there are other mitigations that would be required, not necessarily

vaccination, so to understand the person coming into the facility, what their vaccination status is so that other mitigation might be required.

Mr. LEWIS. So my understanding – thank you – from the answer is that they could, in effect, prohibit someone who has not had the vaccine from utilizing services, entering a building, or undertaking any activity.

My question then would be, does your amendment have any exceptions for those with a disability or a medical condition that would prohibit that individual from getting the vaccine?

Mr. FRANKEL. Mr. Speaker, our current law says you need to have a flu vaccine for health-care facilities, and if you cannot, for some reason, a medical reason, philosophical reason, it requires that you have to take other precautions in order to visit those facilities. This simply, basically, mirrors what is already going on with respect to, for instance, flu vaccines.

Mr. LEWIS. I appreciate the answer. The question before us, obviously, does not have to do with the flu vaccine specifically. It specifically concerns the COVID-19 vaccine, and I think we could make a number of cases as to why they are different situations. In essence, then the amendment which exempts government-run health-care facilities – which would include nursing homes – would prohibit a family member who is medically fragile or a child who is ineligible for the vaccine from visiting a family member in a county-owned nursing facility. Is that not correct?

Mr. FRANKEL. This amendment simply says they will not be blocked from taking simple precautions at the end of the day. It is really a pretty simple amendment.

Mr. LEWIS. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, on the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and you may proceed to speak on the amendment.

Mr. LEWIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the good chairman. I have the privilege of serving with him on the Health Committee, but I think the answers are clear that this, by exempting taxpayer-funded health-care facilities, this would enable them to prohibit Pennsylvanians from taking use of those facilities and there is no exemption in here, if they are medically fragile, if they are unable to have the vaccine, or any other number of reasons they may be unable to get this vaccine, and I do not think that is fair. I think this would further restrict visitation to State hospitals and county-owned nursing homes to only those who are vaccinated.

Just a few weeks ago this House voted unanimously on HB 649, the essential caregivers legislation, to require a process and procedure for nursing homes to allow visitations. Ultimately, this amendment would further the unnecessary isolation of the residents of these facilities. Additionally, it would further limit the choices of those who are poor and must utilize the county nursing homes, requiring them to receive medical treatment to remain in these county nursing homes. It is clearly within the facility's purview to take the steps necessary to protect their residents and their loved ones without imposing an unnecessary violation of one's rights to select their medical care and keep their medical care private.

It is for this reason I respectfully ask the members for a "no" vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Seeing no one else seeking recognition, the Chair will recognize the prime sponsor of the amendment for the second time, on the amendment.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me emphasize, there is nothing in this amendment that requires vaccination. This is basically, simply, what these facilities are already doing with respect to something like the flu. We are just extending it here to basically comply with the COVID-19 vaccine.

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. On that question, 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 and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—91

Benham	DeLuca	Kirkland	Pisciottano
Bizzarro	Driscoll	Kosierowski	Rabb
Boback	Evans	Krajewski	Rozzi
Boyle	Fiedler	Krueger	Sainato
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Kulik	Samuelson
Briggs	Frankel	Lee	Sanchez
Brown, A.	Freeman	Longietti	Sappay
Bullock	Gainey	Madden	Schlossberg
Burgos	Galloway	Malagari	Schweyer
Burns	Guenst	Markosek	Shusterman
Carroll	Guzman	Matzie	Sims
Cephas	Hanbidge	McClinton	Snyder
Ciresi	Harkins	McNeill	Solomon
Conklin	Harris	Merski	Stephens
Cruz	Herrin	Miller, D.	Sturla
Daley	Hohenstein	Mullery	Vitali
Davidson	Howard	Mullins	Warren
Davis, A.	Innamorato	Neilson	Webster
Davis, T.	Isaacson	Nelson, N.	Wheatley
Dawkins	Kenyatta	O'Mara	Williams, D.
Deasy	Kim	Otten	Young
DeLissio	Kinkead	Parker	Zabel
Delloso	Kinsey	Pashinski	

NAYS—110

Armanini	Gregory	Masser	Rothman
Benninghoff	Greiner	Mehaffie	Rowe
Bernstine	Grove	Mentzer	Ryan
Bonner	Hamm	Mercuri	Sankey
Borowicz	Heffley	Metcalfe	Saylor
Brooks	Helm	Metzgar	Schemel
Brown, R.	Hennessey	Mihalek	Schmitt
Causer	Hershey	Millard	Schroeder
Cook	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Silvis
Cox	Irvin	Mizgorski	Smith
Culver	James	Moul	Sonney
Davanzo	Jones	Mustello	Staats
Day	Jozwiak	Nelson, E.	Stambaugh
Delozier	Kail	O'Neal	Struzzi
DelRosso	Kaufer	Oberlander	Thomas
Diamond	Kauffman	Ortitay	Tomlinson
Dowling	Keefer	Owlett	Toohil

Dunbar	Kerwin	Peifer	Topper
Ecker	Klunk	Pennycuik	Twardzik
Emrick	Knowles	Pickett	Warner
Farry	Labs	Polinchock	Wentling
Fee	Lawrence	Puskaric	Wheeland
Flood	Lewis	Quinn	White
Fritz	Mackenzie, M.	Rader	Williams, C.
Gaydos	Mackenzie, R.	Rapp	Zimmerman
Gillen	Major	Rigby	
Gillespie	Mako	Roae	Cutler,
Gleim	Marshall	Rossi	Speaker

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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

On the question recurring,

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

Ms. **BENHAM** offered the following amendment No. **A01721**:

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 29 and 30 "Immunocompromised individual." An individual with weakened immune system due to disease, health condition, medication or treatment. The term includes, but is not limited to, an individual with AIDS, cancer, diabetes, malnutrition, lupus or Down syndrome, or who has received or is receiving anticancer drugs, radiation therapy or a stem cell or organ transplant.

Amend Bill, page 3, line 9, by inserting before "No"

(a) Prohibition.—

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 12 and 13

(b) Applicability.—Subsection (a) does not apply to any service, building or activity that serves immunocompromised individuals.

Amend Bill, page 3, line 18, by inserting before "NOTWITHSTANDING"

(a) Prohibition.—

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 29 and 30

(b) Applicability.—Subsection (a) does not apply to any service, building or activity that serves immunocompromised individuals.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Benham.

Ms. BENHAM. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As a person with a disability and a medical ethicist, I remain concerned about the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on vulnerable populations, including older adults and disabled people. This afternoon, I am thinking particularly about those who have compromised immune systems, who tend to be at much higher risk of serious health impacts from COVID-19. This includes, but is not limited to, those with AIDS (acquired immunodeficiency syndrome), cancer, diabetes, malnutrition, lupus, or Down syndrome, and would also include those who are receiving anticancer drugs, radiation therapy, or a stem cell or

organ transplant. It is our duty as legislators to ensure that we continue to protect immune-compromised individuals during this public health crisis.

But I want to speak specifically about people with Down syndrome, who tend to have co-occurring conditions. A research study published in mid-2020 about COVID-19 and Down syndrome, by Dr. Espinosa, from the Linda Crnic Institute for Down Syndrome, noted that people with Down syndrome experience a higher prevalence of autoimmune disorders and increased rates of hospitalizations during respiratory viral infections.

Carrie MacMillan wrote for Yale Medicine that people with Down syndrome who get COVID-19 are 4 times more likely to be hospitalized and 10 times more likely to die than the general population. A resource guide by the National Down Syndrome Society noted that people with Down syndrome seem more likely to have breathing and respiratory-related complications and may also experience mental confusion.

I know that all of us believe that the lives of people with Down syndrome are valuable. In fact, I heard many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle argue just that during our conversations about reproductive justice and Down syndrome throughout the spring.

Because people with Down syndrome are more susceptible to poor health outcomes as a result of COVID-19, government entities and educational facilities should be allowed to require vaccination if they serve people with Down syndrome or those with compromised immune systems. Note that this amendment itself does not require vaccination, just allows for that potentially in the future.

I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support this amendment. [Remarks deleted.]

The SPEAKER. The gentlelady will please suspend.

She has moved well beyond the context of the amendment, and I would encourage her to stay on the amendment as it interacts with vaccines and not prior issues that were raised in other debates on other items.

For what purpose does the gentleman – the gentleman waives off.

If the gentlewoman can abide by that, you are in order and may proceed.

Ms. BENHAM. I would encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work to provide a supportive, safe world for people to raise their children in, not simply force pregnant people to make the choice that you would want them to make. So I suppose it remains to be seen if all of us can do that.

The SPEAKER. The gentlelady will please suspend.

The House will be at ease and the leaders will please approach the rostrum.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

The SPEAKER. The House will return to order.

The gentlewoman indicates she has concluded her remarks. The Chair thanks the lady.

However, as a general reminder to all the members, as we not only finish this debate but head into some other bills as well as budget bills, it is important – and I will repeat the guidance from yesterday – the rules will be uniformly applied regarding discussing motives to vote on individual amendments or bills that are before the chamber.

I thought that the chamber overwhelmingly did an outstanding job yesterday on a series of very contentious issues and amendments, and it is the expectation of the Chair that the same issues and the same guidance will be followed today.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Schroeder, on the amendment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the maker of the amendment stand for interrogation?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentlelady indicated she was willing to stand for interrogation, but do you wish to withdraw the interrogation?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You are in order to speak on the amendment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the amendment, knowing that we have individuals who are 12 years old and under that are not able to get the vaccination, specifically for our children that might have autoimmune diseases and different things that they have to go into a facility or a building to get services, I feel like this amendment would actually hurt those who are in need of those services, that they could not have access to that building, let us say if there is a specialist or a certain type of medical need that they have. Also, if there is a parent that is assisting the child at the building, for the service that they need, that is not vaccinated – if the parent is not vaccinated, but the child, let us say, the minor is under 18 years old, that child would not be able to have their parent with them for the exam or different types of procedures that they would need, and I feel as a parent that I would feel parents in that situation would be upset, but also we have to look out for our children that are under 12 years old that need certain types of specialists, specifically, let us say, in the medical realm, that they would not have access to a building that would do that.

So I just want to have the body aware of that concern and to think of that when they vote for this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Frankel, on the amendment. The gentleman waives off.

We will recognize the gentleman, Representative Dan Miller, then on the amendment. The gentleman waives off.

Seeing no one else seeking recognition, the Chair will recognize the prime sponsor of the amendment for the second time on the amendment.

Ms. BENHAM. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to offer a few points of clarification about this amendment. The goal of this amendment is to ensure that we are protecting people who either may not be able to get vaccinated because of their immunocompromised status or for whom the vaccine may be less effective because of the way that their immune system responds to it. What this amendment does is allow facilities the flexibility to implement public health measures by saying that if you are not vaccinated, you should wear a mask. It does not require that; it just simply allows for that flexibility.

And so what I am asking my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do is to say that we are consistent in fighting for vulnerable people in Pennsylvania and making sure that during a public health crisis we are protecting those who are most

vulnerable to the negative impacts of COVID-19. So with that, again I would ask for a "yes" vote on this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. On that question, 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—89

Benham	Driscoll	Kirkland	Pashinski
Bizzarro	Evans	Kosierowski	Pisciottano
Boyle	Fiedler	Krajewski	Rabb
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Krueger	Rozzi
Briggs	Frankel	Kulik	Sainato
Brown, A.	Freeman	Lee	Samuelson
Bullock	Gainey	Longietti	Sanchez
Burgos	Galloway	Madden	Sappey
Burns	Guenst	Malagari	Schlossberg
Carroll	Guzman	Markosek	Schweyer
Cephas	Hanbidge	Matzie	Shusterman
Ciresi	Harkins	McClinton	Sims
Conklin	Harris	McNeill	Snyder
Cruz	Herrin	Merski	Solomon
Daley	Hohenstein	Miller, D.	Sturla
Davidson	Howard	Mullery	Vitali
Davis, A.	Innamorato	Mullins	Warren
Davis, T.	Isaacson	Neilson	Webster
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Nelson, N.	Wheatley
Deasy	Kim	O'Mara	Williams, D.
DeLissio	Kinhead	Otten	Young
Delloso	Kinsey	Parker	Zabel
DeLuca			

NAYS—112

Armanini	Gregory	Mehaffie	Rowe
Benninghoff	Greiner	Mentzer	Ryan
Bernstine	Grove	Mercuri	Sankey
Boback	Hamm	Metcalfe	Saylor
Bonner	Heffley	Metzgar	Schemel
Borowicz	Helm	Mihalek	Schmitt
Brooks	Hennessey	Millard	Schroeder
Brown, R.	Hershey	Miller, B.	Silvis
Causer	Hickernell	Mizgorski	Smith
Cook	Irvin	Moul	Sonney
Cox	James	Mustello	Staats
Culver	Jones	Nelson, E.	Stambaugh
Davanzo	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Stephens
Day	Kail	Oberlander	Struzzi
Delozier	Kaufman	Ortitay	Thomas
DelRosso	Kauffman	Owlett	Tomlinson
Diamond	Keefer	Peifer	Toohil
Dowling	Kerwin	Pennycuick	Topper
Dunbar	Klunk	Pickett	Twardzik

Ecker	Knowles	Polinchock	Warner
Emrick	Labs	Puskaric	Wentling
Farry	Lawrence	Quinn	Wheeland
Fee	Lewis	Rader	White
Flood	Mackenzie, M.	Rapp	Williams, C.
Fritz	Mackenzie, R.	Rigby	Zimmerman
Gaydos	Major	Roae	
Gillen	Mako	Rossi	Cutler,
Gillespie	Marshall	Rothman	Speaker
Gleim	Masser		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. **D. MILLER** offered the following amendment No. **A01640**:

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 6 and 7 "State center." A State-operated facility, licensed by the Department of Human Services, to provide a level of care specially designed to meet the needs of persons who have an intellectual disability or persons with related conditions who require specialized health and rehabilitative services.

Amend Bill, page 3, line 9, by inserting before "No"

(a) Prohibition.

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 12 and 13

(b) Applicability.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a State center.

Amend Bill, page 3, line 18, by inserting before

"NOTWITHSTANDING"

(a) Prohibition.

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 29 and 30

(b) Applicability.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a State center.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Dan Miller.

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

Mr. Speaker, in brief, what this amendment does is it recognizes the vulnerable population that makes up our State centers that we have a unique responsibility to care for. It also recognizes the challenges that many have seen in relation to COVID for some of these populations in particular. Obviously, we know that some of the responses continue to need to develop over time, to take information and learn from it, and that would include making sure that some of our vulnerable population in particular, like those in the State centers, are cared for appropriately with the proper guidelines that could be of assistance. This amendment here would allow that to occur.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Rowe, on the amendment.

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

This amendment would unfortunately undo the fine work done by this body when we unanimously passed HB 649 to allow essential caregivers to visit their loved ones. Mr. Speaker, this amendment does not make an exception, especially for children who may be unable to be immunized, to enter the building of a State center to visit a family member or a loved one. Mr. Speaker, this amendment does not have an exemption for those who have complex medical conditions and may not be able to receive the immunization. It does not permit them to utilize the services that these State centers offer. This amendment does not offer any further protection for our State centers like the ones in my district, and it unnecessarily excludes the loved ones of those who reside there and their former caregivers from entering those facilities.

Mr. Speaker, it is for these reasons that I respectfully ask my colleagues for a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Seeing no one else seeking recognition, the Chair will recognize the prime sponsor of the amendment again for the second time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the comments regarding the emergency caregiver language. I would just note that in that bill that we passed, it is incredibly broad with application. This amendment here requires no such restriction. It does not address the issue that the gentleman brought up, it does not limit the ability of those caregivers, and the language that is in that bill itself allows for their protection. That bill itself is broad. It does not provide anything but discretion in relation to who those people are and how you can bring them in. There is flexibility designed in that bill.

This thing here is just the natural progression to not just those who would qualify under emergency caregivers, but all those who are more regularly in those buildings. The reality of it is that no matter how many times an emergency caregiver may go to those facilities, the greater risk is not going to be posed by just them. The reality is that there are many people who are in those buildings and out on a day-to-day, hour-to-hour basis, and the protection of those in those facilities should be our highest priority – the highest priority.

So if we care so much about those people who are in there with it, then let us pause, let us allow that opportunity, let us find those guidelines that will keep them safe. Instead of saying no guidelines, let us say that some guidelines may end up being what we need to protect that population. The caregiver law stands on its own. This does not infringe. Let us stand up for those people who need us the most and not abandon them in a time of need. Let us vote "yes" on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. On that question, 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—90

Benham	Driscoll	Kirkland	Pashinski
Bizzarro	Evans	Kosierowski	Pisciottano
Boyle	Fiedler	Krajewski	Rabb
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Krueger	Rozzi
Briggs	Frankel	Kulik	Sainato
Brown, A.	Freeman	Lee	Samuelson
Bullock	Gainey	Longiatti	Sanchez
Burgos	Galloway	Madden	Sappey
Burns	Guenst	Malagari	Schlossberg
Carroll	Guzman	Markosek	Schweyer
Cephas	Hanbidge	Matzie	Shusterman
Ciresi	Harkins	McClinton	Sims
Conklin	Harris	McNeill	Snyder
Cruz	Herrin	Merski	Solomon
Daley	Hohenstein	Miller, D.	Sturla
Davidson	Howard	Mullery	Vitali
Davis, A.	Innamorato	Mullins	Warren
Davis, T.	Isaacson	Neilson	Webster
Dawkins	James	Nelson, N.	Wheatley
Deasy	Kenyatta	O'Mara	Williams, D.
DeLissio	Kim	Otten	Young
Delloso	Kinthead	Parker	Zabel
DeLuca	Kinsey		

NAYS—111

Armanini	Gregory	Mehaffie	Rowe
Benninghoff	Greiner	Mentzer	Ryan
Bernstine	Grove	Mercuri	Sankey
Boback	Hamm	Metcalfe	Saylor
Bonner	Heffley	Metzgar	Schemel
Borowicz	Helm	Mihalek	Schmitt
Brooks	Hennessey	Millard	Schroeder
Brown, R.	Hershey	Miller, B.	Silvis
Causser	Hickernell	Mizgorski	Smith
Cook	Irvin	Moul	Sonney
Cox	Jones	Mustello	Staats
Culver	Jozwiak	Nelson, E.	Stambaugh
Davanzo	Kail	O'Neal	Stephens
Day	Kaufer	Oberlander	Struzzi
Delozier	Kauffman	Ortitay	Thomas
DelRosso	Keefer	Owlett	Tomlinson
Diamond	Kerwin	Peifer	Toohil
Dowling	Klunk	Pennycuick	Topper
Dunbar	Knowles	Pickett	Twardzik
Ecker	Labs	Polinchock	Warner
Emrick	Lawrence	Puskaric	Wentling
Farry	Lewis	Quinn	Wheeland
Fee	Mackenzie, M.	Rader	White
Flood	Mackenzie, R.	Rapp	Williams, C.
Fritz	Major	Rigby	Zimmerman
Gaydos	Mako	Roae	
Gillen	Marshall	Rossi	Cutler,
Gillespie	Masser	Rothman	Speaker
Gleim			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. SANCHEZ offered the following amendment No. **A01644**:

Amend Bill, page 3, line 9, by inserting before "**No**"

(a) Prohibition.—

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 12 and 13

(b) Applicability.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a State veterans' home operated by the Commonwealth.

Amend Bill, page 3, line 18, by inserting before "**NOTWITHSTANDING**"

(a) Prohibition.—

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 29 and 30

(b) Applicability.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a State veterans' home operated by the Commonwealth.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Sanchez.

Mr. SANCHEZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment would exempt our State veterans' homes from the underlying bill. As you may know, we have six State veterans' homes in the Commonwealth that provide long-term care and skilled nursing to those who served our country and their spouses. The age and health conditions of the veterans, combined with the nature of congregate living, make these veterans extremely vulnerable to infectious viruses, most notably COVID. We saw the risk of COVID in these homes where at the Southeastern Veterans' Center at least 42 people died of COVID-19.

Mr. Speaker, it makes no sense to tie the administrator's hands to implement mitigation efforts that would save lives and it makes no sense to limit the Secretary of Health from instituting mitigation efforts if administrators fail to protect residents. And let me be clear, this amendment does not require vaccines. It simply leaves that option open if determined by health experts, as an evidence-based solution to save lives of residents, that a vaccine is necessary to conduct certain services or activities.

The veterans in these homes served and protected us. We, at the very least, need to ensure the tools and strategies remain available to protect them. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Rowe, on the amendment.

Mr. ROWE. Thank you again, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment will continue the unnecessary isolation of those loved ones who have been in a State veterans' home since March of 2020. They have been unable to see their family and their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment would restrict those undergoing cancer treatments that do not allow them to be immunized for COVID-19 from visiting their loved ones in a State veterans' home. This amendment does not have an exception for end-of-life visits, and this amendment stands in direct conflict with legislation before it that initially opened long-term-care homes in a way that is safe for both the residents and the family members.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, this amendment would limit the help that is offered to our veterans by mandating a one-size-fits-all approach. If you chose not to be immunized yourself due to health reasons or the fact that you simply do not want to share your health information, you will now be prohibited from using the services of a veterans' home. Mr. Speaker, this is the choice that I am not willing to take away from those like my father and my grandfather who have served our country so faithfully, and it is for this reason that I respectfully ask my colleagues for a "no" vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Boback, on the amendment.

Ms. BOBACK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

May I interrogate the maker of the amendment?

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

Ms. BOBACK. For clarification, is it strictly a shot, an immunization, an inoculation, or is it that or a mask? Supposing somebody cannot get inoculated, would you require a mask?

Mr. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, there is no requirement for vaccination. This amendment is about saving lives, simply allowing the Secretary of Health to make reasonable regulations if needed, evidence-based and science-based.

Ms. BOBACK. So then it is not a regulation, but it would be up to the Secretary of Health to determine whether it be an inoculation or a mask?

Mr. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I answered. It does not require that.

The SPEAKER. Representative Boback, I believe the good gentleman has already answered that question.

Ms. BOBACK. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. If you wish to speak on the bill or ask another question, you are in order and may do so.

Ms. BOBACK. Thank you.

According to the verbiage that I have read, it sounds as if they would be mandated to have an inoculation before they would go into the veterans' home. That is why I wanted clarification. So you are just saying it would be left up to the Secretary of Health?

The SPEAKER. The lady will please suspend. Respectfully, the gentleman has answered that question previously.

Ms. BOBACK. Okay. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. You are free to speak on the bill if you would like.

Ms. BOBACK. No. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you, Representative.

Mr. SANCHEZ. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

The gentleman, Representative Sanchez, is recognized for the second time on the amendment.

Mr. SANCHEZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Briefly, again, this is about saving lives. On the contrary to some of the comments that were said, this allows flexibility and nimbleness for these homes to address a crisis situation. So I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. On that question, 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—91

Benham	DeLuca	Kirkland	Pisciottano
Bizzarro	Driscoll	Kosierowski	Rabb
Boback	Evans	Krajewski	Rozzi
Boyle	Fiedler	Krueger	Sainato
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Kulik	Samuelson
Briggs	Frankel	Lee	Sanchez
Brown, A.	Freeman	Longietti	Sappay
Bullock	Gainey	Madden	Schlossberg
Burgos	Galloway	Malagari	Schweyer
Burns	Guenst	Markosek	Shusterman
Carroll	Guzman	Matzie	Sims
Cephas	Hanbidge	McClinton	Snyder
Ciresi	Harkins	McNeill	Solomon
Conklin	Harris	Merski	Stephens
Cruz	Herrin	Miller, D.	Sturla
Daley	Hohenstein	Mullery	Vitali
Davidson	Howard	Mullins	Warren
Davis, A.	Innamorato	Neilson	Webster
Davis, T.	Isaacson	Nelson, N.	Wheatley
Dawkins	Kenyatta	O'Mara	Williams, D.
Deasy	Kim	Otten	Young
DeLissio	Kinhead	Parker	Zabel
Delloso	Kinsey	Pashinski	

NAYS—110

Armanini	Gregory	Masser	Rothman
Benninghoff	Greiner	Mehaffie	Rowe
Bernstine	Grove	Mentzer	Ryan
Bonner	Hamm	Mercuri	Sankey
Borowicz	Heffley	Metcalfe	Saylor
Brooks	Helm	Metzgar	Schemel
Brown, R.	Hennessey	Mihalek	Schmitt
Causar	Hershey	Millard	Schroeder
Cook	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Silvis
Cox	Irvin	Mizgorski	Smith
Culver	James	Moul	Sonney
Davanzo	Jones	Mustello	Staats
Day	Jozwiak	Nelson, E.	Stambaugh
Delozier	Kail	O'Neal	Struzzi
DelRosso	Kaufner	Oberlander	Thomas
Diamond	Kauffman	Ortitay	Tomlinson

Dowling	Keefer	Owlett	Toohil
Dunbar	Kerwin	Peifer	Topper
Ecker	Klunk	Pennycuick	Twardzik
Emrick	Knowles	Pickett	Warner
Farry	Labs	Polinchock	Wentling
Fee	Lawrence	Puskaric	Wheeland
Flood	Lewis	Quinn	White
Fritz	Mackenzie, M.	Rader	Williams, C.
Gaydos	Mackenzie, R.	Rapp	Zimmerman
Gillen	Major	Rigby	
Gillespie	Mako	Roae	Cutler,
Gleim	Marshall	Rossi	Speaker

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. **D. MILLER** offered the following amendment No. **A01697**:

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 2 and 3, by striking out "AND FOR DISEASE PREVENTION AND CONTROL"

Amend Bill, page 1, line 7, by striking out "a chapter CHAPTERS" and inserting
a chapter

Amend Bill, page 3, lines 13 through 29, by striking out all of said lines

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has indicated he wishes to offer amendment 1701 and will be withdrawing the other two. Is that correct?

Mr. D. MILLER. That is my anticipation.

The SPEAKER. All right. Very good. In that case, amendment 1697 will be withdrawn.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. **D. MILLER** offered the following amendment No. **A01701**:

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 27 and 28
"Emergency use authorization." A mechanism to facilitate the availability and use of medical countermeasures, including vaccines, during COVID-19.

Amend Bill, page 3, line 10, by inserting after "COVID-19"
, for any vaccine that has only received an emergency use authorization.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Dan Miller.

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

Mr. Speaker, the summary was quite apt, it is a small change that I am suggesting, one to which that we draw a distinction between the vaccines that reach full approval from the FDA (Food and Drug Administration), the FDA and those to which are given emergency authorization. This in here would establish the threshold that it would apply to emergency authorizations only.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Those in favor of the amendment— I apologize. I did not see the majority leader seeking recognition. The gentleman, Leader Benninghoff, is recognized to speak on the amendment.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just a couple of points. This amendment simply delays the implementation of the vaccine mandate by governmental entities and institutions of higher education. There are at least 16 States that have already enacted, either by Executive order or by enacting legislation, to ban vaccine passports; several more with other limitations; and a handful of other legislatures are pending. But even if the FDA approves a COVID vaccine, there is no other vaccine requirement in the Commonwealth that does not provide for circumstances which an individual chooses not to receive or is unable to obtain the vaccine. This amendment does not speak to either of those instances, and it is for those reasons and many others mentioned here early today that I ask our colleagues to vote "no" on amendment A01701.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the prime sponsor for the second time on the amendment.

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

You know, the issue with it is that an emergency authorization and a full authorization are so distinctly different. The analysis that is done, there is a reason why it comes across differently, there is a reason why it is not granted full approval at one time. That means the scientific and the medical community looks at data, looks at science, listens to doctors and patients alike, and then helps to come across whether or not to grant something a full approval. Those things they are so distinctly different that they should be worthy of this body's consideration when it comes to how we decide to limit or allow for certain things to be done. To be honest, I think it is a distinction to which we have largely missed in relation to discussion between options. This amendment here I think is very well tailored to push us almost to recognize the distinction and to analyze the differences and to put a thoughtful understanding as to what should happen if any vaccine gets full approval and when. And then you get into the question about how far should or when should government requirements come into play based on whether or not different steps are met. I think it is an important analysis, an important distinction. I would ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. On that question, 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—89

Benham	Driscoll	Kirkland	Pashinski
Bizzarro	Evans	Kosierowski	Pisciottano
Boyle	Fiedler	Krajewski	Rabb
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Krueger	Rozzi
Briggs	Frankel	Kulik	Sainato
Brown, A.	Freeman	Lee	Samuelson
Bullock	Gainey	Longietti	Sanchez
Burgos	Galloway	Madden	Sappey
Burns	Guenst	Malagari	Schlossberg
Carroll	Guzman	Markosek	Schweyer
Cephas	Hanbidge	Matzie	Shusterman
Ciresi	Harkins	McClinton	Sims
Conklin	Harris	McNeill	Snyder
Cruz	Herrin	Merski	Solomon
Daley	Hohenstein	Miller, D.	Sturla
Davidson	Howard	Mullery	Vitali
Davis, A.	Innamorato	Mullins	Warren
Davis, T.	Isaacson	Neilson	Webster
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Nelson, N.	Wheatley
Deasy	Kim	O'Mara	Williams, D.
DeLissio	Kinkead	Otten	Young
Deloso	Kinsey	Parker	Zabel
DeLuca			

NAYS—112

Armanini	Gregory	Mehaffie	Rowe
Benninghoff	Greiner	Mentzer	Ryan
Bernstine	Grove	Mercuri	Sankey
Boback	Hamm	Metcalfe	Saylor
Bonner	Heffley	Metzgar	Schemel
Borowicz	Helm	Mihalek	Schmitt
Brooks	Hennessey	Millard	Schroeder
Brown, R.	Hershey	Miller, B.	Silvis
Causser	Hickernell	Mizgorski	Smith
Cook	Irvin	Moul	Sonney
Cox	James	Mustello	Staats
Culver	Jones	Nelson, E.	Stambaugh
Davanzo	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Stephens
Day	Kail	Oberlander	Struzzi
Delozier	Kaufer	Ortitay	Thomas
DelRosso	Kauffman	Owlett	Tomlinson
Diamond	Keefer	Peifer	Toohil
Dowling	Kerwin	Pennycuik	Topper
Dunbar	Klunk	Pickett	Twardzik
Ecker	Knowles	Polinchock	Warner
Emrick	Labs	Puskaric	Wentling
Farry	Lawrence	Quinn	Wheeland
Fee	Lewis	Rader	White
Flood	Mackenzie, M.	Rapp	Williams, C.
Fritz	Mackenzie, R.	Rigby	Zimmerman
Gaydos	Major	Roae	
Gillen	Mako	Rossi	Cutler,
Gillespie	Marshall	Rothman	Speaker
Gleim	Masser		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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

On the question recurring,

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Dan Miller, indicates he is withdrawing amendment 1702. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

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

Mrs. **KOSIEROWSKI** offered the following amendment No. **A01712**:

Amend Bill, page 3, line 18, by inserting before "NOTWITHSTANDING"

(a) Prohibition.—

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 29 and 30

(b) Applicability.—The provisions of this section shall not apply if a proclamation of a national emergency related to public health and safety is declared by the President of the United States pursuant to the authority vested to the President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including sections 201 and 301 of the National Emergencies Act (Public Law 94-412, 90 Stat. 1255).

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Kosierowski.

Mrs. KOSIEROWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My amendment simply would allow the Secretary of Health to act swiftly and appropriately to respond to a pandemic during a national emergency. On March 13 of 2020, our former President declared a national emergency concerning the coronavirus pandemic and the current President has since renewed it. The consideration of this bill comes at a time when our death toll has hit 600,000; 27,000 of them being Pennsylvanians. The number of lives lost would be dramatically higher had we not been able to mask, social distance, wash hands, and quarantine, and other mitigation efforts recommended by the CDC and implemented by public health officials.

I understand life is starting to look more normal due to the efficiency and the safety of vaccines, but in no way does that mean the pandemic is over and it does not mean future pandemics will not occur. The underlying bill handcuffs the Commonwealth's top health expert when rapid response is needed to address a public health crisis. Left without this ability, we would simply give away our power to the Federal government in hopes that they will save us when we need it. So my

amendment would allow our top expert to do their job of protecting citizens and enacting mitigation strategies in a way that is best fit for Pennsylvania. So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment states that the provisions of this legislation, this section, the bill before us, the underlying bill, SB 618, "...shall not apply if a proclamation of a national emergency related to public health and safety is declared by the President of the United States..." And I appreciate the intent behind this amendment. I think the intent is – and I do not want to speak for the gentelady, but I think the intent is that if there were some sort of, for example, COVID-19 or some sort of contagious epidemic like unknown new issue, we have seen all sorts of declarations of public health and safety in the Commonwealth here. The Commonwealth, under His Excellency, the Governor, has had a public health emergency with regard to the opioid epidemic for years. And I am not diminishing the severity of the opioid epidemic – that is a serious issue. But I think the text of the underlying bill and the text of the amendment really matters.

What are we talking about here? The underlying bill, which this amendment proposes to jettison if a declaration of health and safety is made by the President – I will just read it right out of the bill: "...THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH MAY NOT ORDER OR OTHERWISE REQUIRE...AN INDIVIDUAL THAT HAS NOT BEEN EXPOSED...TO A CONTAGIOUS DISEASE...." So this is a healthy person we are talking about. This bill is saying the Secretary of Health cannot say to a healthy person, restrict travel; we are going to restrict your travel; we are going to restrict your ability to drive an automobile down the road. I cannot believe we are even having this conversation, but it happened, it happened in the Commonwealth. People were pulled over by the State Police: "Well, you can't drive— Your freedom of movement has been withdrawn. Don't you know?"

I do not support this amendment, Mr. Speaker. The underlying bill, as I have said, would prohibit the Secretary of Health from restricting the travel of individuals who have not been exposed to a contagious disease. It is amazing to me, again, that we are even having to put this into law – the executive branch cannot restrict healthy people from driving down the road, healthy people. This amendment would authorize the executive branch with that expansive authority if the President of the United States issues any proclamation having to deal with public health. It could be on the ills of smoking. It could be on the dangers of e-cigarettes. And again, I am not suggesting that I think that this makes sense; I am suggesting that that is the way this amendment is drafted. And it is important that we look at the language that is in front of us.

With that in mind, I would ask for a "no" vote on amendment 1712.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Seeing no one else seeking recognition, the Chair will recognize the prime sponsor of the amendment for the second time.

Mrs. KOSIEROWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, this amendment would just simply allow the Secretary of Health to act swiftly and appropriately to respond to a pandemic during a national emergency. When you talk about an opioid crisis, that did not require wearing of masks. It is important that our Secretary of Health here in Pennsylvania has the ability to mandate mask wearing during a contagious virus, and that is what this amendment is going to be able to do.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. On that question, 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—90

Benham	DeLuca	Kirkland	Pashinski
Bizzarro	Driscoll	Kosierowski	Pisciottano
Boback	Evans	Krajewski	Rabb
Boyle	Fiedler	Krueger	Rozzi
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Kulik	Sainato
Briggs	Frankel	Lee	Samuelson
Brown, A.	Freeman	Longietti	Sanchez
Bullock	Gainey	Madden	Sappery
Burgos	Galloway	Malagari	Schlossberg
Burns	Guenst	Markosek	Schweyer
Carroll	Guzman	Matzie	Shusterman
Cephas	Hanbidge	McClinton	Sims
Ciresi	Harkins	McNeill	Snyder
Conklin	Harris	Merski	Solomon
Cruz	Herrin	Miller, D.	Sturla
Daley	Hohenstein	Mullery	Vitali
Davidson	Howard	Mullins	Warren
Davis, A.	Innamorato	Neilson	Webster
Davis, T.	Isaacson	Nelson, N.	Wheatley
Dawkins	Kenyatta	O'Mara	Williams, D.
Deasy	Kim	Otten	Young
DeLissio	Kinhead	Parker	Zabel
Delloso	Kinsey		

NAYS—111

Armanini	Greiner	Mehaffie	Rowe
Benninghoff	Grove	Mentzer	Ryan
Bernstine	Hamm	Mercuri	Sankey
Bonner	Heffley	Metcalfe	Saylor
Borowicz	Helm	Metzgar	Schemel
Brooks	Hennessey	Mihalek	Schmitt
Brown, R.	Hershey	Millard	Schroeder
Causar	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Silvis
Cook	Irvin	Mizgorski	Smith
Cox	James	Moul	Sonney
Culver	Jones	Mustello	Staats

Davanzo	Jozwiak	Nelson, E.	Stambaugh
Day	Kail	O'Neal	Stephens
Delozier	Kaufer	Oberlander	Struzzi
DelRosso	Kauffman	Ortitay	Thomas
Diamond	Keefer	Owlett	Tomlinson
Dowling	Kerwin	Peifer	Toohil
Dunbar	Klunk	Pennycuick	Topper
Ecker	Knowles	Pickett	Twardzik
Emrick	Labs	Polinchock	Warner
Farry	Lawrence	Puskaric	Wentling
Fee	Lewis	Quinn	Wheeland
Flood	Mackenzie, M.	Rader	White
Fritz	Mackenzie, R.	Rapp	Williams, C.
Gaydos	Major	Rigby	Zimmerman
Gillen	Mako	Roae	
Gillespie	Marshall	Rossi	Cutler,
Gleim	Masser	Rothman	Speaker
Gregory			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. **FRANKEL** offered the following amendment No. **A01725**:

Amend Bill, page 1, by inserting between lines 13 and 14 5903. Age of consent for vaccinations.

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 18 and 19 "ACIP." The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices.

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 12 and 13 § 5903. Age of consent for vaccinations.

The following shall apply to the consent by a minor to receive a vaccination:

(1) A minor who is 14 years of age or older may give effective consent to receive a vaccination if the vaccination is recommended by the ACIP and the vaccination will be provided in accordance with ACIP's recommended immunization schedule.

(2) The consent by a minor's parent or legal guardian shall not be necessary to receive a vaccination under paragraph (1). A minor's parent or legal guardian may not abrogate the consent given by the minor to receive a vaccination under paragraph (1) on the minor's behalf.

(3) A minor or another parent or legal guardian may not abrogate the consent provided by a parent or legal guardian on the minor's behalf for a vaccination under paragraph (1).

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Frankel.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment would allow young people, age 14 and up, to consent to CDC recommended immunizations. Pennsylvania's

ability to fully move on from the pandemic, keeping infection rates low enough that our residents feel safe and comfortable returning to their work, school, and leisure routines, depends entirely on our success with the vaccine program. Teenagers can tend to favor congregate activities at summer camps, youth groups, sports teams, and social events, which will leave them at an increased risk of catching or spreading this very communicable disease. They are also more likely to fill jobs with high exposure to the public in grocery stores, movie theaters, and retail establishments.

As young people begin to transition to adulthood, my amendment would empower them to make the best decision for themselves and their communities. We do not want our young people to miss out on the experiences that prepare them for the next chapter due to disease outbreaks or fear of disease outbreaks. Children do not suddenly become adults at age 18. That is why Pennsylvania's current law allows them to seek mental health treatment, including mental health medications, at age 14. My amendment would simply allow this very socially active group to choose whether to get fully vetted, safe vaccines without extra red tape and without parental permission. I ask for a "yes" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Davidson, on the amendment. She waives off.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Leader Benninghoff, on the amendment.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am a little surprised that we are going down this path, but that is all right. For months we have heard about following the science, we need to follow the science. Ironically for those who have been to any of our vaccination clinics, you see that you have to sign a permission slip, signature of yourself or a guardian and/or a parent, and today we are going to reverse that.

I rise to oppose this for two reasons. Number one, this amendment removes parental consent provisions for the vaccine. It also eliminates a parent's ability to even know if their children have received a vaccination. And I think that that is wrong and could be medically threatening if a child has other issues. There have been some who have not necessarily had good reactions, and nonetheless, as parents we need to know what our children are doing along those lines and any adverse problems that it could cause considering other preexisting medical conditions that they have and/or just their overall reaction. I think we need to be thinking about whether or not we really want to be taking away from the parents the authority of their authorization, more – not more importantly, but in additionally when it is being required by the very manufacturers that produce these vaccines to get consent.

I would ask our members to not support the Frankel amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Seeing no one else seeking recognition, the Chair will recognize the prime sponsor of the amendment for the second time.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to again remind the majority leader that under current law a minor can seek mental health treatment, as I said, including psychotropic medications, without parental consent. Unfortunately, we know not every family is functional or

competent and that sometimes young people know what is in their self-interest in spite of that environment.

Now, let me also say that there are a number of other States that allow minors to consent to getting vaccinated without parental consent. And by the way, it is quite a combination of blue and red States. So let me tell you, in four States and the District of Columbia – Rhode Island, South Carolina, Oregon, and Alabama – at different ages minors can consent to being vaccinated. And in Arizona, Idaho, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Washington State, there is what is known as the mature minor doctrine, which gives no age cutoff for consent. It must be done with the consent of a physician, a provider, but not necessarily a parent. So sometimes our children, particularly those who may not come from families that are intact or competent, know what is in their best self-interest. We do that here in Pennsylvania with children who may be undergoing a mental health crisis, and we should be letting them do it in order to protect themselves in their communities by being able to be vaccinated for COVID-19.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. On that question, 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—73

Benham	Driscoll	Kenyatta	Otten
Bizzarro	Evans	Kim	Parker
Boyle	Fiedler	Kinkead	Pisciottano
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Kinsey	Rabb
Briggs	Frankel	Kirkland	Rozzi
Brown, A.	Freeman	Kosierowski	Samuelson
Bullock	Gainey	Krajewski	Sanchez
Burgos	Galloway	Krueger	Schlossberg
Cephas	Guenst	Lee	Schweyer
Conklin	Guzman	Madden	Shusterman
Cruz	Hanbidge	Markosek	Sims
Daley	Harkins	McClinton	Solomon
Davidson	Harris	McNeill	Sturla
Davis, T.	Herrin	Merski	Webster
Dawkins	Hohenstein	Mullery	Wheatley
Deasy	Howard	Mullins	Williams, D.
DeLissio	Innamorato	Neilson	Young
Deloso	Isaacson	Nelson, N.	Zabel
DeLuca			

NAYS—128

Armanini	Gregory	Mehaffie	Ryan
Benninghoff	Greiner	Mentzer	Sainato
Bernstine	Grove	Mercuri	Sankey
Boback	Hamm	Metcalfe	Sappery
Bonner	Heffley	Metzgar	Saylor
Borowicz	Helm	Mihalek	Schemel
Brooks	Hennessey	Millard	Schmitt
Brown, R.	Hershey	Miller, B.	Schroeder
Burns	Hickernell	Miller, D.	Silvis
Carroll	Irvin	Mizgorski	Smith
Causer	James	Moul	Snyder
Ciresi	Jones	Mustello	Sonney
Cook	Jozwiak	Nelson, E.	Staats
Cox	Kail	O'Mara	Stambaugh
Culver	Kaufner	O'Neal	Stephens
Davanzo	Kauffman	Oberlander	Struzzi
Davis, A.	Keefer	Ortitay	Thomas
Day	Kerwin	Owlett	Tomlinson
DeLozier	Klunk	Pashinski	Toohil
DelRosso	Knowles	Peifer	Topper
Diamond	Kulik	Pennycuick	Twardzik
Dowling	Labs	Pickett	Vitali
Dunbar	Lawrence	Polinchock	Warner
Ecker	Lewis	Puskaric	Warren
Emrick	Longietti	Quinn	Wentling
Farry	Mackenzie, M.	Rader	Wheeland
Fee	Mackenzie, R.	Rapp	White
Flood	Major	Rigby	Williams, C.
Fritz	Mako	Roae	Zimmerman
Gaydos	Malagari	Rossi	
Gillen	Marshall	Rothman	Cutler,
Gillespie	Masser	Rowe	Speaker
Gleim	Matzie		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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

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

The SPEAKER. It is the Chair's understanding that the gentleman, Representative Schlossberg, who had amendments 1634 and 1732, is withdrawing those amendments. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1302, PN 1826**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of July 7, 1980 (P.L.380, No.97), known as the Solid Waste Management Act, in general provisions, further providing for powers and duties of the department.

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

Mr. **VITALI** offered the following amendment No. **A01800**:

Amend Bill, page 4, line 4, by striking out "14" and inserting
30

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

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The **SPEAKER**. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Vitali.

Mr. **VITALI**. Mr. Speaker, after discussing this with the maker of the bill, it is my understanding that all other amendments will be withdrawn. And if that is the case, I will be withdrawing this also.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair appreciates the gentleman withdrawing your amendment. Thank you.

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

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman, Representative Metcalfe, who offers amendment 1924. The gentleman I see is seeking recognition. For what purpose do you rise?

Mr. **METCALFE**. Regarding the amendments that I have on this bill, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**. Does the gentleman wish to withdraw those?

Mr. **METCALFE**. The gentleman would wish to withdraw these if the previous gentleman that spoke is legitimately withdrawing his, then I will withdraw mine, Mr. Speaker. I was told it was a matter of who was going to withdraw first. Trust but verify. So if he is withdrawing his, I will withdraw mine.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair appreciates the bilateral withdrawal.

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

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair thanks both gentlemen for coming to that agreement.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1588, PN 1821**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 7 (Banks and Banking) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in mortgage loan industry licensing and consumer protection, further providing for definitions, for license requirements, for exceptions to license requirements, for general requirements, for powers conferred on certain licensees engaged in the mortgage loan business, for mortgage loan business prohibitions, for application for license, for prelicensing and continuing education, for license fees, for licensee requirements, for suspension, revocation or refusal and for mortgage servicers.

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?

And on that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Mercuri.

Mr. **MERCURI**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My remote mortgage banking bill, HB 1588, updates Pennsylvania's Banking Code to no longer restrict mortgage originations to within 100 miles of physical branch locations. It will modernize and open up the Pennsylvania home lending market to remote work across the Commonwealth.

Nearly half of our Commonwealth citizens live in suburban and rural areas, and many urban communities do not have access to a physical branch to originate their home loans. In passing this bill, mortgage originators will no longer be confined to the physical branch location. Not only is this bill the first to accomplish the goal of making certain parts of the pandemic waiver program permanent, it also improves the working environment for mortgage bankers and consumers borrowing to fund their homes, making Pennsylvania more competitive in this space, a better place to do business, and a better place to purchase a home. Doing what is best for Pennsylvania consumers and the industry is what is best for the Commonwealth. We will modernize and open up the home lending market in Pennsylvania to remote work. Done well with commonsense guidelines and protections, this bill will benefit Pennsylvania's economy. I ask for your support with a "yes" vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
(JOHN A. LAWRENCE) PRESIDING**

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Are there any other speakers looking for recognition?

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the lady, Representative Oberlander, is recognized.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. And the gentleman from Philadelphia, Representative Harris, is recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—200

Armanini	Freeman	Longiotti	Roae
Benham	Fritz	Mackenzie, M.	Rossi
Benninghoff	Gainey	Mackenzie, R.	Rothman
Bernstine	Galloway	Madden	Rowe
Bizzarro	Gaydos	Major	Rozzi
Boback	Gillen	Mako	Ryan
Bonner	Gillespie	Malagari	Sainato
Borowicz	Gleim	Markosek	Samuelson
Bradford	Gregory	Marshall	Sanchez
Briggs	Greiner	Masser	Sankey
Brooks	Grove	Matzie	Sappey
Brown, A.	Guenst	McClinton	Saylor
Brown, R.	Guzman	McNeill	Schemel
Bullock	Hamm	Mehaffie	Schlossberg
Burgos	Hanbidge	Mentzer	Schmitt
Burns	Harkins	Mercuri	Schroeder
Carroll	Harris	Merski	Schweyer
Causar	Heffley	Metcalfe	Shusterman
Cephas	Helm	Metzgar	Silvis
Ciresi	Hennessey	Mihalek	Sims
Conklin	Herrin	Millard	Smith
Cook	Hershey	Miller, B.	Snyder
Cox	Hickernell	Miller, D.	Solomon
Cruz	Hohenstein	Mizgorski	Sonney
Culver	Howard	Moul	Staats
Daley	Innamorato	Mullery	Stambaugh
Davanzo	Irvin	Mullins	Stephens
Davidson	Isaacson	Mustello	Struzzi
Davis, A.	James	Neilson	Sturla
Davis, T.	Jones	Nelson, E.	Thomas
Dawkins	Jozwiak	Nelson, N.	Tomlinson
Day	Kail	O'Mara	Toohil
Deasy	Kaufer	O'Neal	Topper
DeLissio	Kauffman	Oberlander	Twardzik
Delloso	Keefer	Ortitay	Vitali
Delozier	Kenyatta	Otten	Warner
DelRosso	Kerwin	Owlett	Warren
DeLuca	Kim	Parker	Webster
Diamond	Kinthead	Pashinski	Wentling
Dowling	Kinsey	Peifer	Wheatley
Driscoll	Kirkland	Pennycuik	Wheeland
Dunbar	Klunk	Pickett	White
Ecker	Knowles	Pisciottano	Williams, C.
Emrick	Kosierowski	Polinchock	Williams, D.
Evans	Krajewski	Puskaric	Young
Farry	Krueger	Quinn	Zabel
Fee	Kulik	Rabb	Zimmerman
Fiedler	Labs	Rader	
Fitzgerald	Lawrence	Rapp	Cutler,
Flood	Lee	Rigby	Speaker
Frankel	Lewis		

NAYS—1

Boyle

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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 1621, PN 1797**, entitled:

An Act providing for small wireless facilities deployment.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. On that question, the lady from Clarion, the majority whip, Representative Oberlander, is recognized.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board the accurate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker thanks the lady and the gentleman from Philadelphia, Representative Harris, is recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—198

Armanini	Frankel	Lee	Roae
Benham	Freeman	Lewis	Rossi
Benninghoff	Fritz	Longiotti	Rothman
Bernstine	Gainey	Mackenzie, M.	Rowe
Bizzarro	Galloway	Mackenzie, R.	Rozzi
Boback	Gaydos	Madden	Ryan
Bonner	Gillen	Major	Sainato
Borowicz	Gillespie	Mako	Samuelson
Bradford	Gleim	Malagari	Sanchez
Briggs	Gregory	Markosek	Sankey
Brooks	Greiner	Marshall	Sappey
Brown, A.	Grove	Masser	Saylor
Brown, R.	Guenst	Matzie	Schemel
Bullock	Guzman	McClinton	Schlossberg
Burgos	Hamm	McNeill	Schmitt
Burns	Hanbidge	Mehaffie	Schroeder
Carroll	Harkins	Mentzer	Schweyer

Causser	Harris	Mercuri	Shusterman
Cephas	Heffley	Merski	Silvis
Ciresi	Helm	Metcalfe	Sims
Conklin	Hennessey	Mihalek	Smith
Cook	Herrin	Millard	Snyder
Cox	Hershey	Miller, D.	Solomon
Cruz	Hickernell	Mizgorski	Sonney
Culver	Hohenstein	Moul	Staats
Daley	Howard	Mullery	Stambaugh
Davanzo	Innamorato	Mullins	Stephens
Davidson	Irvin	Mustello	Struzzi
Davis, A.	Isaacson	Neilson	Sturla
Davis, T.	James	Nelson, E.	Thomas
Dawkins	Jones	Nelson, N.	Tomlinson
Day	Jozwiak	O'Mara	Toohil
Deasy	Kail	O'Neal	Topper
DeLissio	Kaufer	Oberlander	Twardzik
Delloso	Kauffman	Ortitay	Vitali
Delozier	Keefer	Otten	Warner
DelRosso	Kenyatta	Owlett	Warren
DeLuca	Kerwin	Parker	Webster
Diamond	Kim	Pashinski	Wentling
Dowling	Kinthead	Peifer	Wheatley
Driscoll	Kinsey	Pennycuick	Wheeland
Dunbar	Kirkland	Pickett	White
Ecker	Klunk	Pisciottano	Williams, C.
Emrick	Knowles	Polinchock	Williams, D.
Evans	Kosierowski	Puskaric	Young
Farry	Krajewski	Quinn	Zabel
Fee	Krueger	Rabb	Zimmerman
Fiedler	Kulik	Rader	
Fitzgerald	Labs	Rapp	Cutler,
Flood	Lawrence	Rigby	Speaker

NAYS—3

Boyle	Metzgar	Miller, B.
-------	---------	------------

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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 pro tempore. The House will be at ease for a moment.

**THE SPEAKER (BRYAN CUTLER)
PRESIDING**

The SPEAKER. The House will come to order.

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1300, PN 1869**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, as follows: in preliminary provisions, further providing for definitions, providing for legislative authority over elections, establishing the Bureau of Election Audits and providing for special standing in challenges to the Election Code; in the Secretary of the Commonwealth, further providing for powers and duties of the Secretary of the Commonwealth and providing for reports on

implementation of elections; in county boards of elections, further providing for powers and duties of county boards and providing for county boards of elections and satellite offices; in district election officers, further providing for qualifications of election officers, for compensation of district election officers and for appointment of watchers; providing for registration of electors; in ballots, further providing for form of official election ballot and for number of ballots to be printed and specimen ballots; in voting machines, further providing for examination and approval of voting machines by the Secretary of the Commonwealth, for requirements of voting machines, for preparation of voting machines by county election boards and for delivery of voting machines and supplies by county election boards to election officers; in electronic voting systems, further providing for experimental use of electronic voting systems and for statistical sample and providing for requirements of accessible voting machines; in voting apparatus bonds, providing for voting system defects, disclosure, investigations and penalties; in preparation for and conduct of primaries and elections, providing for voter's bill of rights, for senior voter's bill of rights, for disabled voter's bill of rights and further providing for time for opening and closing polls, for manner of applying to vote, persons entitled to vote, voter's certificates, entries to be made in district register, numbered lists of voters and challenges and for deadline for receipt of valid voter registration application; in voting by qualified absentee electors, further providing for applications for official absentee ballots, for date of application for absentee ballot, for delivering or mailing ballots, for voting by absentee electors, providing for supervised voting by qualified absentee electors in certain facilities and further providing for canvassing of official absentee ballots and mail-in ballots; 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 delivering or mailing ballots and for voting by mail-in electors; in Pennsylvania Election Law Advisory Board, further providing for Pennsylvania Election Law Advisory Board; providing for early voting by qualified electors; in returns of primaries and elections, further providing for returns to be open to public inspection and exceptions and for computation of returns by county board, certification and issuance of certificates of election; in recounts and contest, providing for powers and duties of the Attorney General relating to elections; in penalties, further providing for disobeying lawful instructions, for perjury, for false affidavits of candidates, for refusal to permit inspection of papers, destruction or removal and Secretary of the Commonwealth, for refusal to permit inspection of papers, destruction or removal and county boards of elections, for insertion and alteration of entries in documents, removal and refusal to deliver, for refusal to permit overseers, watchers, attorneys or candidates to act, for driving away watchers, attorneys, candidates or overseers, for refusal to permit election officers, clerks and machine inspectors to act and driving away said persons, for refusal to administer oath and acting without being sworn, for violation of oath of office by election officers, for peace officers, failure to render assistance and hindering or delaying county board members and others, for nomination petitions and papers and offenses by signers, for false signatures and statements in nomination petitions and papers, for nomination petitions, certificates and papers, destruction, fraudulent filing and suppression, for offenses by printers of ballots, for unlawful possession of ballots and counterfeiting ballots, for forging and destroying ballots, for tampering with voting machines, for destroying, defacing or removing notices, et cetera, for police officers at polling places and for peace officer, failure to quell disturbances at polls, hindering or delaying election officers and others, for election officers permitting unregistered electors to vote, challenges and refusing to permit qualified electors to vote, for election officers refusing to permit elector to vote in proper party at primaries, for frauds by election officers, for prying into ballots, for interference with primaries and elections, frauds and conspiracy, for persons interfering in other districts, for assault and battery at polls, for unlawful assistance in voting, for election officers permitting unlawful assistance, for failure to keep and return record of assisted voters, for unlawful voting, for elector voting ballot of wrong party at primary, for repeat voting at elections, for removing ballots, for commissioners to take soldiers' votes, for fraudulent voting by soldiers, for bribery at elections, for receipts and disbursements of primary and election expenses by persons other than candidates and treasurers, for receipts of primary and election expenses by unauthorized persons, for contributions by corporations or unincorporated associations, for failure to file expense account, for prohibiting duress and intimidation of voters and interference with the free exercise of the elective franchise, for failure to perform duty, for hindering or delaying performance of duty, for violation of any provision of act, for violations of provisions relating to

absentee and mail-in ballots and providing for unlawful collection of ballots and prohibiting duress and intimidation of elections officials; providing for reimbursements and withholding; and making a related repeal.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Grove, on final passage.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today I would like to talk about facts. One, no one, no one can get turned away at any polling location in the United States. This is a requirement under Federal law. Two, HB 1300 is solely predicated on the House State Government Committee's extensive election oversight hearings, the most extensive election oversight work in the entire country – 10 comprehensive election oversight hearings; 52 testifiers, including Pennsylvania elections directors; other State election experts; national election experts; left-leaning and right-leaning election policy advocacy groups; the Pennsylvania Department of State, which participated in 6 out of the 10 hearings. HB 1300 is the largest election reform legislation in the country, the largest election reform in the country since Florida 2001, and the largest election reform legislation in the Commonwealth since the Pennsylvania Election Code of 1937.

The Pennsylvania Voting Rights Protection Act protects our voting rights through three broad concepts: increased access, increased security, and modernization. We know access and security are not mutually exclusive. The Voting Rights Protection Act continues the work of the House Republican Caucus to expand voter access under no-excuse mail-in ballots.

HB 1300 will do the following: in-person early voting. Recent polling shows broad support by Pennsylvanians and Americans. Curbside voting. We have many polling locations in the Commonwealth which are not ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act)-accessible. This ensures all in-person voting locations are in fact ADA-accessible and assist our most vulnerable with voting. Electronic poll books. Requirement to reduce line waiting times. The largest disenfranchisement of Pennsylvania voters is long lines. We have seen that last election. Supposed to be the smallest, least participated election in the country – post-Presidential election municipal primaries. We had almost 4-hour waits in some places in York County.

Pre-canvassing and curing. Recent polling shows broad support by Pennsylvanians and Americans. Supervised absentee voting to assist long-term care and nursing home residents. Voter's bill of rights, senior citizen's bill of rights, disabled voter's bill of rights. Minimum ballot printing requirement so polling precincts do not run out of ballots. Rigorous accessibility requirements to help disabled voters. Uniform election Web sites designed to help disabled voters. Internet voting to help disabled voters. Allows family members to drop off ballots. Voter convenience. Codifies mail-in ballot return receptacles and

satellite election offices. Recent polling shows broad support by Pennsylvanians and Americans.

The Voting Rights Protection Act ensures security and rebuilds trusts in our elections after voters questioned the outcomes of the 2016 and 2020 Presidential elections. Enhanced voter identification. Recent polling shows broad support by Pennsylvanians and Americans for enhanced voter identification. More secure mail-in and absentee voting. Signature verification with artificial intelligence assisting. Recent polling shows broad support by Pennsylvanians and Americans for signature verification. Two unique identifiers on applications. Watermarks on ballots. Bans prefilled applications. Verified list of eligible voters before an election and certified list after so we know who is eligible to vote and who actually votes in Commonwealth elections.

Meaningful access for observers. Enhanced voter registration safeguards. Ends Web API (application programming interface). Updates the motor-voter law. Requires ongoing list maintenance. Fully utilizes ERIC (Electronic Registration Information Center). Requires notification of new voters who move into Pennsylvania from other States to notify their previous State. Purging of deceased individuals. Data analytics. Citizenship verifications. Increased new penalties for violations of the Election Code. Includes two provisions: ballot harvesting and intimidating or harassing election officials. Limits third-party interference through funding bans and limitations on mailings. Investigates returned mail from the U.S. Postal Service.

The Voting Rights Protection Act modernizes our elections in many ways.

Mr. Speaker, may I have decorum?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

The gentleman is trying to describe what is contained within the bill. He deserves to be heard. I ask members to please move any conversations off the back of the House.

You are in order and may proceed.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I think it is important for people to hear actually what is in the bill, not what is purported to be in the bill or all the misinformation about what may be in the bill. This is actually what is in this bill.

The Voting Rights Protection Act modernizes our elections in many ways. The administrative and financial relief for counties. Recent polling shows broad support from Pennsylvanians and Americans for helping our counties administer elections and fund them. Cost-sharing for elections for administration and equipment – \$91.6 million of funding for counties – \$79 million one time for equipment and \$11.9 million for election operations. We currently do not fund elections from the State. It is a burden on the counties. This adjusts that and makes it a cost-sharing, so counties will get \$11.9 million for election operations moving forward.

County-requested timeline, moving the voter registration deadline to 30 days prior to an election. That is a county request to help them administer elections because they have administrative issues with the current 15-day requirement. Moving absentee deadline to 15 days prior to an election because we need to ensure people can actually get their ballots back in time. The 7-day election – the 7-day deadline does not allow for that. That is a county request. Uniform dates for counties to start mailing out ballots.

Training for election officials, elections directors, judge of elections, poll workers, and observers. We currently do not train them. We currently do not have a uniform system of elections because we do not do these things that other States do. These are all best practices we heard about in our election hearings. Uniform satellite and ballot return receptacle policies to assist voters. Recent polling shows broad support by Pennsylvanians and Americans for these policies. Please note, a majority of Republicans were willing to expand the drop box provisions just yesterday.

Independent and extensive election audit process. The whole purpose of getting new elections machines is paper ballots are auditable along with the machines. Let us provide this new national model and truly independent and extensive election audits. Enhanced election machine certification processes. Increased and uniform transparency. Voter list maintenance requirements. Postelection ballot public inspection. Collaboration for small counties to help provide economies of scale. Data analytics to assist Department of State and counties perform list maintenance requirements.

Significant increases to poll worker pay from a minimum of \$75 to \$175, and a maximum of \$200 to \$300, which recognizes their dedication. After all, do we not want to raise the wage?

The Voting Rights Protection Act is a comprehensive bill, which addresses the multitude of issues we uncovered during this committee's extensive hearing. It perfectly weighs the balances of access and security to ensure every legal voter can and has access to voting, while it ensures bad actors, which include foreign governments, international syndicates, or even individuals who make bad decisions cannot manipulate our election system.

The Voting Rights Protection Act expands voter access and ensures our most vulnerable have the needed access to our election system. The Voting Rights Protection Act uses best practices modeled from our sister States from signature verification to election machine security, from in-person early voting to curbside voting. This takes best practices from other States and either uses their same methods or improves upon them. The Voting Rights Protection Act is commonsense legislation, which has many provisions which recent polling data shows are broadly supported. This is a solid election reform bill, which simply ensures that it is easier to vote and harder to cheat. After all, Pennsylvanians expect an election system which is acceptable and keeps out bad actors. This is what the Voting Rights Protection Act delivers.

I would ask my colleagues for an affirmative vote on HB 1300, the Pennsylvania Voting Rights Protection Act.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Davidson, on the bill.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think that we can all agree that voting is the cornerstone and the core of our democracy. Unfortunately, for us today, Mr. Speaker, many of the provisions in HB 1300 will make it in fact easier for certain individuals to cheat and harder for voters to vote. It will make it easier for the GOP to cheat and harder for voters to vote.

This bill, which had no bipartisan input, will rightfully be vetoed by our Governor, is another step, another sad step in the march that is dismantling our democracy. As if the bloody coup on January 6 was not enough, now the losers of—

The SPEAKER. The gentlelady will please suspend.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. —the 2020 national election—

The SPEAKER. The gentlelady will please suspend.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. —want to legislate suppression.

The SPEAKER. The good lady is out of order. She has moved beyond the subject of the bill.

The House will be at ease, and I will ask the leaders to please approach the rostrum.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

The SPEAKER. The House will please return to order.

The Chair appreciates the consultation with the leaders.

For the information of the members, we will once again refer to Jefferson's Manual, section 370, regarding the freedom of speech in debate. It says, "It is, however, the duty of the House to require its Members in speech or debate to preserve that proper restraint which will permit the House to conduct its business in an orderly manner and without unnecessarily and unduly exciting animosity among its Members or antagonism from those other branches of the Government with which the House is correlated."

Consistent with the guidance given yesterday, the Chair is requesting that as we discuss and debate the bill, that we contain that debate to what is in the bill or perhaps if the speaker wishes something were included in the bill but was not, but it is all policy-driven. What is not to be impugned is the motives of the members. Their individual reasons, as a diverse body, may vary for their interests in this particular area. Repeated disregard of the rules will result in your recognition being rescinded and the next speaker will be called.

Most importantly, as the presiding officer, and for the information of the members, it is never appropriate to continue speaking once you have been requested to suspend. Additionally, it is improper to continue speaking over the presiding officer when that request has been made.

The rules will be uniformly enforced on all members regarding the order of the debate. I recognize that this can be a very emotional topic. It is one that I believe as a chamber that we can enter into a very civil debate on just as we did yesterday regarding the roughly 18 to 20 amendments that were considered in an orderly fashion.

With that, the gentlewoman from Delaware County had the floor and she will again be recognized for a discussion on final passage of the policies contained within the bill.

POINT OF ORDER

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order, but really, just a point of clarification.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman may state your point of order.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. I just want to be clear so I do not stray afield, are we not allowed to reference the January 6 coup in the House?

The SPEAKER. That subject matter is not contained within the bill and therefore would not be a proper item of debate. If there were a bill that specifically referenced that, it would be proper at that time. The gentlewoman should confine her comments to those policy items contained in the bill or the ones that she wished were included in the bill.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. McCLINTON. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

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

Ms. McCLINTON. To appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The subject matter is the same—

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will please suspend.

There was not a ruling of the Chair. There was a point of order requested by the gentlewoman from Delaware County as to what was contained in the debate and what would be the proper debate, and the Chair gave that recommendation as it was contained in the underlying bill.

Ms. McCLINTON. Mr. Speaker, I understood the ruling was that she could not talk about the January 6 incident and I thought undermining an election was something that was relevant to an Election Code.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman asked a question regarding what would be an item of proper debate. I answered the gentlewoman's question, and that is not a ruling.

The gentlewoman may proceed on the bill on final passage.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. During the hearings we did discuss January 6 and how it applied to the development of HB 1300. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, many of the provisions in HB 1300 fly in the very face of the very hearings from which they are purported to have been derived. Testifiers gave their time and energy and expertise in those cases, and those testimonies were largely ignored in HB 1300.

As my colleague and fellow chairman stated, after 10 hours, on average of 3 hours per hearing; 52 unique, unduplicated testifiers, let us look at two main thrusts of this bill: voter access and election security. This bill limits voter access; that is a fact, Mr. Speaker. The bill restricts voting by demanding that voters show additional ID of beyond what is already law. The Supreme Court has already stated how these two types – this type of provision adversely affects women, people of color, and the poor. The only 2 testifiers of the 52 testifiers, only 2 of them, the most hyperpartisan of them, asked for voter ID. The other 50 testifiers did not. So we ignored 50 testifiers to do what only 2 of them apparently wanted and to do apparently what we planned on doing anyway before we had one second of hearing testimony.

This bill dramatically rolls back the timeline to request a mail-in ballot, again, making it harder to vote, which is the very definition of "voter suppression." This is beyond the timeline that even the testifiers and county officials called for and asked for way back to 30 days.

Thirdly, this bill dramatically rolls back satellite offices, drop boxes. And let me just address why this particular provision in HB 1300 is so egregious. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to talk about limited government, government run amok, and government that is not trustworthy. Well, one government entity that we agree was very poorly managed was the postal service. I voted in part against Act 77 because I knew that there were many older Pennsylvanians in my district that did not want to trust their vote that their ancestors, their sisters, and even some of them themselves had fought and died for and bled – I mean literally bled; this is not an analogy – literally bled for the right to vote. They did not want to trust their ballot to the postal service. I knew that Black and Brown people had been subject to Jim Crow, Ku Klux Klan violence during Reconstruction, and that they were the victims of actual

massacres in America and they would not trust the postal service. Drop boxes was an answer to that, and we saw people voting and using those drop boxes in record numbers. It was an answer to that mistrust. And the restriction of these drop boxes is a violation of the civil rights of our voters.

Each county and each county official revealed that they had equal and uniform opportunity to provide for drop boxes in every county; every county had the same equal opportunity. That is the definition of "uniformity." They could do it, drop boxes or not, in accordance to their own population size, their own understanding, their own culture, and the preferences of their local official. Maintain local control. That is what we like to say as another mantra. But not having those drop boxes, Mr. Speaker, makes it absolutely harder for people to vote.

Let us move on to the so-called election security. I cannot even say it with a straight face. What a farce. We are advancing election security measures, so we say, by ignoring the facts and embracing actual fantasies. Trump's own Justice Department concluded that there was no widespread election fraud. Trump's administration also declared that it was the most secure election in modern history. At the PA House hearings that we held—

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker?

Mrs. DAVIDSON. —both security experts—

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will please suspend.

POINT OF ORDER

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

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Point of order. I believe the speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may state your point of order.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Pardon me, sir. Several times— We do not generally use people's names on the floor and/or impugn people's motives or directions. I would encourage you to try to stay on the topic of what the bill is specifically.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker understands the gentleman's point of order. However, I do not believe she was impugning the motives; I believe she was giving the history regarding the election integrity components regarding the process. But the gentleman is correct. As contained in the rule that I referenced, we are not to impugn the other members of other branches of government, but I do not believe that the gentlewoman was doing that. She was simply referencing the integrity of the election.

The gentlewoman is in order and you may proceed.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker.

At the PA House hearings, we had two cybersecurity experts, two experts at the hearings agreed also, at the hearings held by the PA House State Committee, that the election was free, fair, and accurate. But Dr. Clifford Neuman added something that I want us to hear because I think it is extremely important. He said that attacks outside of the election infrastructure were mostly through campaigners. He clarified that there was disinformation, which was the biggest security threat that threatened our democracy. He explained that disinformation about candidates, changes in people's votes; disinformation about election procedures prevents people from voting and it undermines our democracy. He stated it is difficult to fix disinformation and that candidates and members of this legislature should be able to

refute this disinformation in their own districts. What are we saying here?

Dr. Adler, the other specialist, security specialist, said that we in this legislature have a really important role to play in fighting against the disinformation about voting in our elections. Wow. Disinformation is the biggest security threat to this election. Over 60 judges said that there was no widespread voter fraud.

So what this bill does not address is the ways that increasing chaotic security functions and having ballots go out to curbsides without anybody saying the chain of custody of those ballots sows additional chaos. Who is carrying the ballots? Who has the chain of custody? Who is overlooking this stuff? We make our elections less secure, easier to cheat when we are filtering ballots from one place to another unfettered.

Finally, let us talk about the unfunded mandates that will cripple our counties. Our counties testified that they are asking for some very simple fixes. My colleague from the west yesterday tried to include those simple fixes into the bill. Yes, we would like to have election poll books. Yes, we would like to have more automated systems. But who is going to pay for that? Is it the property tax owners? Property taxes? Our taxpayers?

Mr. Speaker, let us get real. This bill is going to be vetoed and it should rightfully be vetoed because it makes it harder for people to vote and easier to cheat. And I want to say even though I have been jovial in this discussion, voting rights is serious and it is deadly. This country is ripe with examples about when we do not get this right, and HB 1300 does not get this right. So before I am gavelled down, I want you to look up the Colfax Massacre. I want you to look up the other massacre, the Opelousas Massacre, O-p-e-l-o-u-s-a-s, when people challenged the validity of an election and whole towns of African-Americans were massacred. That is what happens when we do not get this right. Vote this down and stop playing games.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative White, on final passage.

Ms. WHITE. Talking about disinformation, interesting that so many of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle voted against drop boxes just yesterday. We offered it up and you said "no."

But regarding HB 1300, it is the most comprehensive election security and accountability measure being taken up in the nation today. For Pennsylvanians, it is the measure that will help bridge the partisan divide over election integrity by bringing confidence and certainty fairly back to the election process and its results.

Voting is the most precious right that we have in a free nation. Our Republic can only exist if we have free and fair elections that the people trust. Trust means that the integrity of the election process from start to finish is beyond reproach, that no aspect can even be called into question because it has already been proven to be impermeable.

In 2020 what we witnessed was an epic failure of any semblance of trust in our election system. The process allowed for far too many Pennsylvanians and Americans to question the integrity of their most prized possession – their absolute right to vote that, yes, so many people died to protect. And unfortunately, the people, they did not receive sufficient answers over their concerns about the elections.

The reason HB 1300 is so utterly important right now is because it addresses the lack of security and transparency in critical parts of the election process – things that could have and should have been prevented.

In Philadelphia it started when someone stole the voting machine programming USB (universal serial bus) thumb drives and a laptop computer from the warehouse where election machines were being stored. Like me, most people would have expected their voting machines to be stored in high-security facilities. After this incident, the local government promised 24/7 surveillance of the facility by local police, so you can imagine the distrust and concern that erupted when just a few days later a reporter walked right inside that very same facility without being approached or stopped as he livestreamed for several minutes the unsecured election machines that would be used on election day while yelling for someone to come and greet him. As you can see, this was the beginning of the end in Philadelphia of trust in the security and integrity of the process.

Unfortunately, things only started to spiral downward from that point as new drop boxes bought and paid for by third-party special interests appeared in neighborhoods and on street corners. Some of these interests have become known for highly partisan leaning activities, such as billionaire Mark Zuckerberg, who has become known for his silencing of conservative voices on his social media platform. Again, another chip in the people's confidence—

The SPEAKER. The gentlelady will please suspend.

I will give the gentlewoman the same guidance that I gave the prior speaker: to please stay on topic regarding the policies contained within the bill. And while you were referring to drop boxes – that was appropriate – I would also, for the information of the members, refrain from referring to people on the outside by name. For example, the prior speaker mentioned the former President. The proper way to address both, either the former or the current President, would simply be to refer to them in that manner, not specifically by name.

So the gentlewoman is in order and may proceed on final passage of the bill so long as she can stay within the guidelines of the policies contained in the bill.

Ms. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Unfortunately, in Philadelphia, you know, we watched a lot of different things take place that I think that HB 1300 will help prevent moving forward. Particularly on election day in Philadelphia, when the public had expected to find out who was the winner, they instead had to wait 3 more days for mail-in ballots to be counted, as the Governor had extended his authority over that part; but luckily, recently that emergency declaration order has been revoked.

So in terms of HB 1300, we know that it is important for access, access when it comes to counting the mail-in ballots to ensure their accuracy and to identify any improprieties. But unfortunately, in Philadelphia, even with a court order, our local sheriff's office would not even enforce those very things that were ordered to take place, and it really prompted many people to ask, what are people trying to hide? Why will they not allow the election counting process to be observed in a meaningful way? And I think HB 1300 is the way that that is going to take place.

It allows further access for both parties, Democrat and Republican, to review this process, to review mail-in ballots. But when you take all of these events in their entirety and you do put away the partisan blinders, anyone can see why people are so upset and frustrated. They just want answers. They want the truth, and that is regardless of election results. They want to know that the process is fair, but unfortunately, no one took the time to show them what happened to their votes and to show them that those talks of a stolen election were wrong. No one disproved it.

So they just want to make sure that as we move forward that the election process is fair, that it is free for people to access what they truly deserve, which is a fair election. Safety and security of our election process is absolutely critical. We have to be realistic about what can actually get done in this chamber. I know many people would like to repeal Act 77, but if we are honest with our constituents, we have to recognize that HB 1300 is likely to be not only the election reform bill we get to vote on this year, but the most important thing we can do for Pennsylvanians.

We cannot live in the past, but we certainly cannot allow the issues pertaining to past elections to persist, which is why we must work together to achieve real election reform. With HB 1300, the people of Pennsylvania are getting several critical election improvements. One major upgrade is that it gives our counties the option to use secure mail-in drop boxes during specific times and at secure locations. Anyplace where a ballot is being cast would be treated as a polling place, with meaningful access for bipartisan observers as well as consistent accessibility requirements. In addition, all places where voting occurs would be subject to the same regulations regarding accessibility, transparency, electioneering, and security – that includes polling places on election day and ballot drop-off locations.

Voters want the election process to be conducted with uniformity – with technology that has been vetted, can be verified, and is free from third-party intervention. Under this bill, election machine certification requirements would be extended to all devices used in the casting, processing, or tabulation of ballots, or in the recording of electors. It would also require that certified equipment be manufactured in the United States of America and sold by a vendor with a primary place of business within the United States.

There are also provisions to increase voter access. So when you hear all the talks of voter suppression, voter access is what this bill does by allowing for early in-person voting. And those with disabilities will have the opportunity to move to the front of the line to vote on a machine or to have a ballot brought to their car.

It has provisions for voter ID, including the very voter registration card people receive from their counties when they register – could not be easier. And for those who cannot provide acceptable identification when they cast their ballot, they will have the option to sign an affidavit and swear to their eligibility under penalty of law.

To ensure accurate returns, there will be a process- and results-confirming audit every single election. There will be a stronger signature verification process by collecting and storing multiple samples over a long period of time. It also allows for correcting nonfatal defects on mail-in ballots, such as unsigned or undated ballots, provided those corrections are made by 8 o'clock on election day.

And as elected officials, and in closing, we have to be diligent in safeguarding the election process to provide the people of Pennsylvania with a system that improves access, transparency, one that has integrity, and is most definitely accessible. HB 1300 does exactly that, and I urge all members to vote "yes."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A free and fair election, an electoral process that is above reproach is the bedrock of democracy. Errors, omissions, and careless mistakes have occurred in elections, and the public must

have trust in the process regardless of the outcome. HB 1300 has three provisions that I think are very important to protecting democracy.

Number one, it cleans up voter registration lists. Just recently in this week, Luzerne County was found to have 15,000-plus voters on their rolls that no longer lived. Look, I know there is a joke about having my body moved to Illinois so I can stay active politically after I die, but this is serious. We need to know what is on the list. We need to know who is eligible to vote.

Look, I have never understood the concept of anybody, of any of my friends on the other side of the aisle objecting to voter ID. My 6-year-old has to show her library card to check out a book from our public library. Each and every one of us has to show an ID to get into this building. This is a sacred, sacred fundamental bedrock of democracy. Why cannot we show our ID? Even Stacey Abrams— I am sorry. Even the Democratic candidate for Governor from Georgia supports voter ID.

Also, this HB 1300 includes election observers. If I can go on my computer and watch the falcon nest, the falcon cam on the Rachel Carson Building, I should be able to observe the counting of votes. Why would anybody object to having observers? Why would anybody involved in this process – we all put our names on the ballots. We all put our names on signs. We all campaign – everybody who participates in the democratic process. Why would anybody object to fair observers – both sides, all sides, all parties – and this bill will do that.

And fourthly, the fourth thing is a counting process that does not have delays. This bill requires that counties continue counting until we have the results. Anybody who would attend a sporting event, you would not go to a Penn State game and watch the game and leave Beaver Stadium and drive home, and then 3 days later find out who won the game. The voters deserve this.

You know, the fourth President, a gentleman from Virginia, said, "If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls... would be necessary." But as the previous speaker from Philadelphia said, people do try to cheat, things do go wrong – omissions, commissions, errors – and the problem is, there is little recourse to a fraudulent election. What do you do after there is voter fraud? Elections are not overturned. And free and fair elections are a fundamental component of the political freedom. There may be more to democracy than just elections – of course, freedom of speech and assembly and petitioning government – but there cannot be a democracy without free and fair elections, and we require to consent to the governed, and the governed must have faith in the process. Constant vigilance is necessary to protect this process.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to come together with mutual respect and civility to promote and protect democracy. The 47th Governor of Pennsylvania said, at the signing of Act 77, that this is the most significant improvement in PA elections in 80 years. And many of my friends from the other side of the aisle said that Act 77 would be bad. They voted against it. They said that it would repress voting, suppress voting, and that was not true; we had the highest voter turnout in the history of Pennsylvania in 2020.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and I urge my colleagues to vote for 1300. We know that democracy dies in darkness, and democracy will die without trust in the process. Thank you.

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

Ms. MADDEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Presidential election of 2020 was one of the most exciting elections of our lifetime, not because the candidate from my party won or because the people of the 115th Legislative District saw fit to reelect me to a third term with nearly 65 percent of the vote. It was a huge election because so many people came out to vote. As the gentleman just said, record numbers in the Commonwealth.

Now, when I taught at East Stroudsburg University, and before that, Northampton Community College, I preached several times a semester to my students that being between the ages of 18 and 24, you represented the largest demographic of people eligible to vote and the smallest demographic of people who actually come out to vote, and I would tell them that if you people would get out and vote, you could rule the world.

Well, you know what? For decades we have argued: what will it take to get 18- to 24-year-olds out to vote? And the answer is, no-excuse mail-in voting. They can register online, they can apply for their ballot online, they can fill out their ballot and send it in, or at their leisure, they can go to a drop box and they can turn it in. Problem solved.

Now, in my district, the 115th Legislative District in the Poconos, we are known as what is called a bedroom community. That means a large number of my constituents get up at 5 o'clock in the morning and either drive to New York or New Jersey, or they get on the Martz bus and they travel 3 hours, sometimes, depending upon traffic, to get out and vote. No-excuse mail-in voting solved that problem for the people in the bedroom communities.

Mr. Speaker, when I was on the campaign trail, I cannot tell you how many senior citizens I spoke to who said how lengthy the absentee ballot process was. You need to get a note from your doctor. You need to tell them where your doctor was, where his office was, what his phone number was, right? You needed to give a reason why you could not get there to the polls that day. No-excuse mail-in voting changed all of that, and we saw the overwhelming number of people who participated in their democracy by getting out and voting.

I am so concerned, Mr. Speaker, that many of the provisions in this bill will once again suppress the vote, will once again prohibit people from getting out to vote who have legitimate reasons why they cannot be at the polls on election day, and I am, quite frankly, about voter turnout in future elections if HB 1300 is passed.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by saying that I look forward to His Excellency, the Governor, vetoing this bill, and I look forward to coming back to the table in a bipartisan way, because there may be 15 members of State Government on this side of the aisle, but there are also 10 members of State Government on this side of the aisle, and nobody asked us for any input on this bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us veto this bill, let us come back to the table in a bipartisan way, and let us create a voter bill that works for all the people of the Commonwealth. Thank you so much.

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

Mr. SCHEMEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The 1937 election law predates the jet engine and the electric typewriter. It comes from an era when sliced bread actually was the latest thing. And after 75 years, it is time for a comprehensive upgrade. I would like to focus on the controversial issue of voter ID; although much maligned by some, actual data from the 2016 and subsequent elections demonstrates that minority participation

in elections increased in jurisdictions which implemented stronger voter ID requirements.

HB 1300 addresses concerns laid out by the State Supreme Court by making State-issued ID free to any who cannot afford it. In addition, every registered voter will receive a free registration card which can be used in lieu of ID at the poll. Finally, for those who cannot locate their ID or registration card on election day, they will still be provided unfettered access to the ballot by signing an affidavit verifying their identity. This last provision, like many others within HB 1300, is based on best practices already in place in other States. In the immediate case, the affidavit has been used successfully in Michigan.

How can anyone make a credible claim that voter ID requirements in HB 1300 prevent voting? What registered voter would be in any way prevented from voting under this bill? Anyone can make blanket claims that the voter ID provisions of this bill are tantamount to suppression, but nobody has clearly articulated what exactly could possibly cause anyone's vote to be suppressed by the provisions of this bill. When you cannot make an argument, Mr. Speaker, you make a fuss. When the rhetorical flourishes of opponents of this bill are through, there remains no genuine argument against this needed comprehensive reform. I fully support HB 1300.

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

Mr. BONNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand before you today to support the Voting Rights Protection Act not because of what has happened in the past, but rather to enhance our democracy in the future.

Our Election Code is 85 years old and it needs to be brought into the 21st century, not to restrict voting rights, but to expand voting rights, particularly for the elderly, for the disabled, for the working class, and for those who have struggled in life for much of our nation's history. Many of these reforms found in the Voting Rights Protection Act actually come from this side of the aisle where our good friends from the Democratic Party sit. They should find much to please them within this act.

For example, canvassing of ballots is prohibited in the 1937 Election Code, but under HB 1300, canvassing would be allowed to be started 4 days before election day, a request made to this body by the county commissioners – and which has had the support, even though for a longer period of canvassing, by the Governor's Office – to allow for more efficient and effective use of mail-in ballots.

The Democratic Party and the Governor, in the fall of 2020, also sought approval to correct defects in mail-in ballots so that they could be cured before they were counted. This act allows for the curing of mail-in ballots when they are sent in with mistakes contained thereon – a practice supported by the Governor's administration. Early voting for 6 days starting in 2025 will better serve the needs of all citizens of this great Commonwealth and will significantly increase voter participation and eliminate the long lines on election day. There will be increased assistance for voters who reside in nursing homes and retirement facilities, for the elderly and the disabled. And there will be priority voting for the elderly and disabled as they appear at the polls to move them to the front of the lines, and if necessary, to allow them to vote from their vehicles. Many of the reforms, then, found in the Voting Rights Protection Act have actually come from this side of the aisle, and you should be very proud of the fact that they are now being set in law. The legislation contains minimal voter

identification requirements; 35 other States require identification from voters before they can cast a ballot.

A University of Monmouth poll issued today shows that 80 percent of all Americans support voter identification as part of the voting process. These restrictions are so minimal that if anyone appears at the polling place on election day, they do not need to have any identification on them. They can simply sign a piece of paper saying they are who they say they are. This is not a burden and this in no way suppresses anyone's right to vote. In the practice of law, attorneys have a saying that if none of the clients are happy with the settlement, then it must be a fair deal. I know that many people in this chamber today are not happy with this particular legislation. That is probably a sign that this is a very fair deal.

For the sake of our country, for our State, and for our democracy, we need to come together in this great chamber, and we can find common good in this act even if we cannot agree on all provisions contained within the legislation. Our country cannot go through another election that it experienced in 2020. We must do better for this nation and for this State. We need to show our people that democracy can work and will work, particularly as we set the ground rules for the selection of the leaders of this country and this State. I would ask, then, that for the sake of this country and for this State that you find common ground within this legislation. It is there if you look for it.

This is a very fair and bipartisan bill, and I request your support for it. Thank you.

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

The House will please come to order.

The gentleman deserves to be heard. Move any side conversations off the back of the House.

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I sure think so.

You know, the eyes of the country are on what we do here in Pennsylvania in large part because we are the birthplace of this experiment in democracy. And make no mistake, this is an experiment, the outcome of which is yet to be seen. An experiment that each and every one of us, when we stand in this chamber in January every 2 years and raise our hand to uphold the Constitution of this Commonwealth and of the United States, an experiment that we have an added responsibility as elected officials to protect.

You know, it is a story that I have often told and that has often been told about Benjamin Franklin, one of the greatest Pennsylvanians, who after emerging from the Constitutional Convention over 234 years ago, a group of folks walked up to him and they said, what is it going to be, Mr. Franklin? What is it going to be, a monarchy or a republic? And he said, in a brief way that has throughout the course of this history stood the test of time, he said, "A republic...if you can keep it." If you can keep it.

We have heard over and over again today during this debate about how bipartisan this bill is. Clearly, that is false. I sat through the hearings that were referenced multiple times today. To my understanding, House Democrats were not allowed to bring our own series of testifiers. I read through the almost 150-page bill that we are voting on today, and unless I missed an e-mail, we were not invited to be a part of the crafting of this legislation. It has been said over and over again that there is a

drastic need for us to reform and to, frankly, radically reform our elections. Where does that need come from? That need has been, as has been said, has been precipitated by the fact that there are a bunch of people who have said they do not have faith in the election, that they do not have faith in the process.

I have gotten so many e-mails talking about folks' lack of faith in the process, and yet during this debate we have been requested to act as if this lack of faith happened in a vacuum, that the lack of faith was somehow connected to a flash drive in Philadelphia. That lack of faith actually came from repeated, repeated, repeated lies. Just lies. Saying that because we had a bunch of hearings that this product is a good product does not make sense. Just because you call a bill voter protection does not mean that is what it does. This bill is really nothing more than voter suppression in bad drag. It pretends to protect voters while actually restricting voting. How does it do that?

Folks have said that we need additional protection at drop boxes. I would like to let folks know that any mailbox in the Commonwealth is a drop box, and unless I missed a provision, we are not going to have State Police standing outside of every mailbox, and I assume that we will count those ballots that are delivered in the mail.

People have opined over the fact that nonprofits had to give money to counties to execute and administer the election. If you are upset about that, then I hope before this budget is done we allocate some of the \$10 billion that we have in surplus funds to actually fund the administration of our elections.

Over and over again we have heard how this bill is supposed to help disabled Pennsylvanians, but yet Disability Rights Pennsylvania actually opposes this bill. And so if the people you purport to help are saying that they do not feel helped by this legislation, then you ought to reconsider what you are doing.

What we have done in this body on this legislation is deeply, deeply unfortunate. It is deeply unfortunate, because here is the toxic thing about lies and about when you tell a lie: when you tell a lie, you cannot stop lying. And what happened was is that folks started telling a lie, and now we are moving forward a bill to look like we are fixing a problem that was predicated on that very lie. We do not have one of the worst election systems in Pennsylvania. That is not true. What we had was a free and fair election, where millions of Pennsylvanians trying to take part in their most important civic responsibility showed up to vote. They voted by mail. They voted at drop boxes. They went to their polling places on election day and voted. They voted like never before because they remember that democracy is a fragile thing, that we have to take care of it.

On December 4 of 2020, a majority of the majority party signed a letter that ended by saying, for the reasons above—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

That is not currently the subject of the debate. I would encourage the gentleman to confine his remarks to the underlying debate.

Mr. KENYATTA. Mr. Speaker, if I could—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend. As was advised to both, or multiple prior speakers, we are trying to confine the debate to the issues that are currently before us. The issue is HB 1300 and the underlying policy items that are contained within it, or if you so choose, something that perhaps was not and you are noting its deficiency; that is confined in the debate.

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. McCLINTON. Mr. Speaker?

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

Ms. McCLINTON. Point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentledady is in order and you may state your point of order.

Ms. McCLINTON. It is unclear what letter he is even referencing. How can it be ruled out of order?

The SPEAKER. The good gentleman referenced not only the signers, but where it came from, and I believe that, given the media coverage, that it was appropriately identified, and we are asking the gentleman to stay on the content of HB 1300 and not any other item.

Mr. KENYATTA. Mr. Speaker, if I could be allowed to finish.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not in order. You have not been rerecognized, and the Chair will not engage in a debate.

Ms. McCLINTON. I am informed that all this gentleman said is the majority of the majority. That is all he said thus far about a letter. No other details are on the record.

The SPEAKER. The House will go at ease and we will check the transcript.

The House will return to order.

For the information of the members, the stenographer did in fact confirm the gentleman referenced the date, which was omitted in the previous point of order.

If the good gentleman can stay on topic regarding the final passage of the bill, and if the Democratic leader has concluded her points of order, I will return to him to finish and wrap up his comments.

The gentledady indicates she has.

The Chair thanks the lady and will rerecognize the gentleman, Representative Kenyatta, on final passage.

For what purpose does the gentlewoman rise?

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Point of order.

The SPEAKER. You may state your point of order.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, a previous speaker referenced an incident that was not contained in the bill but was used as an example, an analogy as a reference to the bill. I am trying to clarify when an analogy is appropriate or when an example is appropriate and when an example is not appropriate.

The SPEAKER. The gentledady will please suspend.

I have not heard a point of order. If the gentlewoman wishes to ask—

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentledady is appropriate to state a parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. I am trying to discern, Mr. Speaker, from your rulings what is an appropriate analogy or an example as we are referencing the components of the bill that has been affected by such an example.

For instance, a Philadelphia example was referenced that was not contained in the bill and the gentleman is about to reference a letter not contained in the bill as it relates to the bill.

So when is a reference appropriate and when is it not?

The SPEAKER. For the information of the members and to answer the good lady's parliamentary inquiry, there was not a ruling of the Chair. The issue that I believe the gentlewoman is raising dealt with the general issue of election security. The good lady was giving an example of election security and where they felt that it failed. The good gentleman is referencing a letter that was previously sent that is not contained in the bill. So the direction remains the same: to please stay on topic.

Does that conclude the gentlewoman's parliamentary inquiry?

Mrs. DAVIDSON. The letter has to do with the integrity of the election.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman is not recognized.

Do you have another parliamentary inquiry?

Mrs. DAVIDSON. I believe the Speaker's question to me was, had I concluded my parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. That is correct. Do you have additional parliamentary inquiry?

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. You are in order, and then you may proceed.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. The letter that he is referencing has to do with election integrity that we are talking about and the time that he feels that – and we do not know what else he is going to say because he was cut off before he had a chance to say it. But I believe he was referencing election integrity and security.

The SPEAKER. The good gentleman's reference is outside of the point of the bill, which is why he was asked to suspend, and I appreciate his willingness to do so while we discuss the points of order and the parliamentary inquiries.

The gentledady indicates she is finished. The Chair thanks the lady.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Thank you.

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

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The reason I referenced the letter was because there was a piece of it that speaks to defective absentee ballots and mail-in ballots, and now HB 1300 seeks to change the way absentee ballots and mail-in ballots are utilized in the Commonwealth, and I feel like that is absolutely within the realm of this debate and that is the reason in which I reference it.

So as I was saying, on December 4, there was a letter that was sent that talked about absentee ballots and deadlines not being followed, and now what this bill does is seek to make the timeline by which people can apply and how people can drop off those ballots, it seeks to put that in the bill, and so that is further evidence that when folks say everything that we are doing is about 10 hearings, there is other evidence that proves that there are other moments outside of those hearings when concerns were brought up that are now in this piece of legislation.

[Remarks deleted.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

Those remarks were well far afield from the underlying debate on the bill. They will be stricken from the record because they go to motive.

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

Mr. SCHMITT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the State Government Committee, I have heard and read many of the attacks upon HB 1300. These attacks, of course, always include those tired, typical, tried-and-true, poll-tested phrases: "voter suppression,"

"barriers to voting"; the specter of Jim Crow has even been resurrected here today to criticize this bill. We have heard it all before, Mr. Speaker. We have heard it all before. We hear it again today.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

The House will come to order.

Members, please take your seats. I understand the emotion on the issue; however, I wish to encourage the good gentleman to please stay on topic regarding the policy items that are contained within the bill and not to use language, tone, or tenor that would incite the membership.

You are in order and may proceed.

Mr. SCHMITT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have heard that this bill makes it harder to vote. We have heard it all before and we hear it all again today. None of these attacks are original. More importantly, Mr. Speaker, none of these attacks take into account the monumental and historical voter access provisions of HB 1300 that I am about to address.

Mr. Speaker, HB 1300 would, for the first time in the history of this Commonwealth, establish a voter's bill of rights. This would provide that every registered voter in this Commonwealth has the legal right to vote and have his or her vote accurately counted. Mr. Speaker, does that sound like voter suppression to you? Does that sound like something that makes it harder to vote? Mr. Speaker, the voter's bill of rights would go on to provide that every registered voter has a legal right to cast a vote if he or she is in line at the time of the closing of polls. Does that sound like voter suppression, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

I will recognize the good lady in just one moment.

This is the chamber of the House. This is not a responsive reading where— I understand the value of rhetorical questions; however, the good gentleman needs to stay on topic, succinctly wrap up his points, and then move on to the underlying policy objectives in the bill.

For what purpose does the good woman, Representative Parker, rise?

Mrs. PARKER. Hi, Mr. Speaker.

In reference to what the gentleman was saying, I would like the part that he is making reference – which is really disrespectful, Jim Crow – I want that to be removed from his comments from the record.

The SPEAKER. For the information of the member, we will review the record, although several other members have also made reference to that and I understand the concerns, but we will review and edit the record appropriately.

Mrs. PARKER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You are welcome.

The Chair thanks the gentlewoman and recognizes the good gentleman on final passage again.

Mr. SCHMITT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HB 1300, the voter's bills of rights, would also provide that every registered voter could ask for and receive assistance in voting. Every registered voter can receive up to two replacement ballots if he or she makes a mistake prior to the ballot being cast. So if a mistake is made, another ballot is given to the voter; if a second mistake is made, another ballot is given to the voter. The voter's bill of rights would also provide that every registered voter has a legal right to receive an explanation if his or her registration or identity is in question. Every registered voter would have the legal right to cast a provisional ballot if his or her registration or

identity is in question. Every registered voter would have the right to receive written instructions to use when voting, and upon request, oral instruction from elections officers to use when voting. Every registered voter would have the right to vote free from coercion or intimidation by elections officers or any other person. Every registered voter would have the right to vote on a voting system that is in working condition and that will allow votes to be accurately cast and accurately counted.

And this bill goes beyond the voter's bill of rights, because for the first time in the history of our Commonwealth, this bill provides for a senior voter's bill of rights. In addition to all of these rights that I just enumerated, those who are 70 or older would have the right to receive any assistance necessary to successfully cast a ballot. Senior voters would have the right to move to the front of the line upon arrival at a polling place. Senior voters would have the right to receive assistance through supervised voting.

And it does not end there, Mr. Speaker. In addition to the voter's bill of rights, in addition to the senior voter's bill of rights, HB 1300 includes a disabled voter's bill of rights for the first time in the history of our Commonwealth. And under the disabled voter's bill of rights, Mr. Speaker, a disabled voter would have the right to receive any assistance necessary to successfully cast a ballot. They would have the right to move to the front of the line upon arrival at a polling place. They would have the right to bring into a polling place or an elections office a service animal qualified under the Americans with Disabilities Act. They would have the right to vote using an accessible voting machine approved under this act. They would have the right to have all polling places in this Commonwealth meet accessibility requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act. And they would have the right to request that a ballot be brought by election officials outside the polling place. They would have curbside voting, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what is voter suppression – and I have heard this from across the board and from across the Commonwealth, and I believe that this can disproportionately affect minority communities and communities of color – when a voter arrives at a polling place and is forced to wait in line for hour after hour in order to vote, that suppresses votes. When a voter arrives at a polling place and sees a line that comes out the door, down the sidewalk, and around the corner, that suppresses votes, Mr. Speaker. Well, HB 1300, for the first time in history, would establish a standard that no voter in Pennsylvania should wait longer than 30 minutes, half an hour, to cast a vote.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing provisions of HB 1300 will ensure unprecedented voting access by all voters, including our most senior and the physically challenged. It will limit waiting times to vote, thus removing a true barrier to casting a ballot. Mr. Speaker, now is the time to put these monumental and historical voting access provisions into the law of this great Commonwealth. I ask my colleagues to support that effort. I ask the members of our sister chamber to support that effort. I appeal to our Governor, do not turn your back on these historical enhanced access provisions for our senior voters, for our handicapped voters, and for all of our voters. Governor, sign the Voting Rights Protection Act now.

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

Mr. BOYLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This bill unfortunately does not recognize the threat to our electoral system from foreign intelligence agencies, namely Russia and China. Somehow with the ever-present news coverage in relation to efforts of foreign countries to disrupt our election, included in this bill is the following language: "EXPERIMENTAL USE OF ELECTRONIC VOTING SYSTEMS. THE COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS OF ANY COUNTY MAY PROVIDE FOR EXPERIMENTAL USE AT ANY PRIMARY OR ELECTION IN ONE OR MORE ELECTION DISTRICTS OF SAID COUNTY, OF AN ELECTRONIC VOTING SYSTEM, AND THE USE OF SUCH SYSTEM SHALL BE AS VALID FOR ALL PURPOSES AS IF THE ELECTRONIC VOTING SYSTEM HAD BEEN ADOPTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THIS ACT."

So we are doing nothing to get rid of an experimental use of electronic voting. We should all know that the biggest threat to the actual tabulation of votes is through a hacking of computer systems. Furthermore, this bill has language that says: "THE SECRETARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH SHALL INVESTIGATE THE USE AND VIABILITY OF BLOCKCHAIN TECHNOLOGY FOR THE PURPOSES OF ELECTRONIC VOTING BY DISABLED VOTERS AND ABSENTEE VOTERS...."

MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) just last year determined that there has been \$2 billion of fraud from basically hackers going into blockchain technology. So this is not a secure system of voting. This bill is absolutely reckless. It is irresponsible and it would be a delight to the foreign intelligence agencies who want to topple our democracy in places like Russia and China. It deserves a "no" vote.

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

Mr. STAATS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to share a few things that we learned from our counties during our State Government hearings, and the message from counties throughout the past year was very clear: the system does not work and they need help.

This bill, HB 1300, provides that help. Moving back the deadline to request a ballot, as well as the deadline to register to vote, were both clear priorities of the counties, as is the establishment of pre-canvassing, which will be permitted for long enough that no county would need any additional days. The bill establishes a new timeline for elections administration so that the counties can focus on one major piece of an election at a time – first voter registration, then mail-in ballot requests, then mailing out the ballots, then early voting, pre-canvassing, then election day. Right now they have often said they have to run two elections at once.

Lastly, the bill provides for substantial cost-sharing between the State and counties, recognizing the decisions made here in Harrisburg place burdens on those counties and that the cost should not be borne entirely out of local property taxes.

Mr. Speaker, HB 1300 is a good bill and I ask my colleagues for a "yes" vote. Thank you very much.

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

Mr. RABB. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was not sure if I was going to speak today. I have no prepared remarks, and so many of my colleagues have done such a

masterful job talking about this issue and this bill in particular. And I should say, I was one of those Democrats who did not vote for what would be Act 77, a bill that was supported by the majority of the majority, but that did not mean I did not appreciate substantive improvements to our Election Code. We needed those improvements. And with the majority of the majority, and a number of my Democratic colleagues and signed by the Governor, it was enacted into law, and I think that moved us in this right direction. And as we often do as legislators, we course-correct somewhat. We could say, oh, this could be improved. Maybe we can tweak this, maybe we can do that, and that is reasonable, particularly when it happens on a bipartisan basis when we confer and collaborate.

I am glad that Act 77 was enacted, despite its imperfections. We know a little bit about being imperfect as human beings, living in an imperfect union. Sometimes, though, we do not talk about some of those more pervasive imperfections that infect institutions and society at large because they are difficult conversations to have, and so we chase the symptoms. It is easier trying to address the symptoms than root causes.

The reason I felt I should say something is because the good gentleman from Blair County mentioned something that is very rarely mentioned in this body: the specter of Jim Crow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend. A prior member objected to that term. I would just caution the gentleman to please be respectful of the issues that she raised, as well as try not to incite members on your side or our side of the aisle.

Mr. RABB. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER. The Democratic leader may state your point or order.

Ms. McCLINTON. Or parliamentary inquiry, rather.

The SPEAKER. That is fine. Parliamentary inquiry is also in order. You may proceed.

Ms. McCLINTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I understand the gentlelady objected to the way it was used – the description, not the term; that is what she stated.

The SPEAKER. We will be at ease while we check the transcript.

The House will return to order.

We did review the transcript with the parties involved, and the good woman, gentlewoman, Representative Parker, has withdrawn her request to have those comments stricken from the record. I appreciate the good woman's issues that were raised, and would also, however, encourage the good gentleman to stay confined to the debate, which we had a previous discussion about and he assured me he would.

So with that, I will return to recognition of Representative Rabb on final passage.

Mr. RABB. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I also would like to thank the gentlewoman from Philadelphia for her indulgence, and again, I would like to thank the gentleman from Blair County for raising this issue, because as I said previously, what he raised is something that we do not speak of much in this body because it is a difficult conversation, but highly relevant to what we are talking about today when we talk about the institutions we seek to reform. And oftentimes we talk about

the lofty values of our Founding Fathers – most notably, Ben Franklin. We claim him, as we should. But a lot of time has passed between his tenure here and where we are today.

We had a poll tax in this State until the 1930s; a poll tax, that is supposed to be in the Deep South. That is where Jim Crow was born, in the Deep South. But we did not have that era in Pennsylvania, but that did not mean we did not have systemic issues that made some of our citizenship less holistic, less meaningful than others.

In this State, where slavery was a State law. In this State, where after it was formed, decades after we became a Commonwealth, this body saw fit to strip free Black men of their right to vote.

Now, how is this related to HB 1300? We are talking about sins of omission, the stories we do not tell that lead to policies that have transgenerational impact that build distrust, inequity, in terms of resources. So in my legislative district, that had the highest voter turnout in the entire Commonwealth and its majority Black, we had lines around the satellite election office, and people were proud of coming out early because of Act 77, a bill that was supported by virtually every Republican in this chamber last term and 100 percent of Senate Republicans, many of whom are now experiencing buyer's remorse. We were celebrating that so many people were exercising their right to vote and doing so early, peacefully, regardless of whom they were voting for. People were communing and celebrating our democracy. But the lines were long, and they are longest in some of the most vulnerable communities. Why is that? Well, it has something to do with some inherent defects of HB 1300, because I do not know how many millions are going to be put into a bill to allow to expand our electorate and our voting rights so that you do not have to wait in line. Do we get more satellite election offices and more drop boxes as a result of this or fewer? These are important questions.

But here is the other thing that I am somewhat encouraged by, because there is a lot of divisiveness right now. We know that this bill is not going anywhere. We know the Governor is going to veto it. But there are genuine concerns on both sides of the aisle. I get that. So in this moment, I want to thank everyone who has affirmed some of the things that were brought up based on my colleague from Blair County talking about a time in our history after the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution were passed and enacted into law and were ratified here in Pennsylvania. We had a resolution to honor Emancipation Day – 150 years later – last term. We had my colleague from Dauphin County speak after me last term talking about Juneteenth, which talks about freedom inclusive of our right to vote, all citizens, highly related to HB 1300; highly related. It was a bipartisan effort that allowed us to recognize Juneteenth, inclusive of the right to franchise, to suffrage, in a State that stripped free Black men from it in 1838. We also passed a resolution honoring Octavius Catto—

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Mr. Speaker?

Mr. RABB. —who was killed—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend. For what purpose does the majority leader rise?

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. We are trying very hard to be patient and have a discussion here—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. I apologize.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. Do you have a parliamentary inquiry or point of order?

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Point of order.

The SPEAKER. You are in order and may state your point of order.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. It was my thought I had a little while ago; I apologize.

Respectfully, we are trying to give latitude, obviously. There is a lot of interest in this issue – both sides of the aisle – but we are talking about a multitude of issues currently with the current speaker. It would just be nice to keep focused on HB 1300, final passage. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has raised a point of order regarding the underlying subject and I understand the gentleman's point of order; however, aside from the brief reference there to the resolution at the end, I think the gentleman was staying on topic. The Parliamentarian and I were both listening to him.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Harris. For what purpose do you rise?

Mr. HARRIS. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You are in order and may state your point of order, sir.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was talking about Octavius Catto, who was actually killed in the city of Philadelphia registering people to vote. That is very much on the topic to talk about Octavius Catto, who died fighting against voter suppression, and that is what this bill is about. I think the gentleman should be able to continue.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appreciates the advocacy that the good gentleman was on point. I would just simply encourage the gentleman to stay on the underlying policy item of the bill. We are hopefully nearing the end of all the speakers and can move on to the other business before the House.

The good gentleman, Representative Rabb, is recognized, and you may continue, sir.

Mr. RABB. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just think this is an important moment when we talk rhetorically about things we believe and values, individuals, prized Pennsylvanians, things that we care about that we reference that we connect to – Ben Franklin, the Founders, our Keystone State, all these wonderful things – and connect it to specific policy, to a specific bill, HB 1300. Octavius Catto was killed, was murdered by vigilantes on election day in Philadelphia in our Commonwealth because he was exercising his right to vote, and just because of the body he inhabited, he was less of a citizen in this State, not in the Deep South; not in the Deep South, but in this Commonwealth.

The sins of prior generations haunt us today when we do not speak truth in these moments, when we had the ability to move to a more perfect union. In this Commonwealth, where we can believe that there is reform that can help strengthen our democracy and our elections, we have the vast majority of Republicans in this body who supported Act 77, and the irony is, I did not. Congratulations, you had the enlightenment to support

something that actually helped move things along. I had some philosophical issues to it, but I supported a number of the things that moved us forward. I have no buyer's remorse.

But when we talk about these issues and we cast aspersions about poll-tested terms and such, it does dishonor to the legacy of systemic oppression against folks who were never meant to be full citizens. How do I know? Because it was actually State law. They had to go to the State Supreme Court to decide if even free Black men, who had already exercised the right to vote, were full citizens, and that coequal body of government back then said, do not be silly. They are Black. Of course they cannot be full citizens. These legacies haunt us. They haunt us.

And so while I understand that the gentleman from Blair County did not mean for this to go down this way, I appreciate him referencing something that deeply impacts everything that we have to consider here. This is not a vacuum. Every single thing we do is influenced by the decisions of those who came before us, and the resources we seek to apply to address them are equally important, like the \$10 billion that we should be stewards of in this moment, as we come out of a pandemic, and how we fund the type of reforms that are actually going to expand and strengthen our electorate. This is what we need to do and we can do it together.

And the reason I have confidence, Mr. Speaker, is because there are rhetorical things, there are things that we have done in terms of resolutions that honor the best of HB 1300, the best of Act 77, when we honored Octavius Catto unanimously last term, when we honor Emancipation Day and the 150th anniversary of the 15th Amendment, we honor the franchise. So if you supported that – which you did, because it was unanimous – please understand, this context is so rife for discussion, and it is important that we have these difficult conversations. And we do not need to have potshots against one another. Why do we not do this when the cameras are off and be allowed to use our First Amendment rights to engage in difficult conversation to move our Commonwealth forward?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. FRITZ. Thank you kindly, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of HB 1300: legislation that is necessary, legislation that is corrective, legislation that restores confidence in elections. Now, let us just try this. Let us be intellectually honest with one another. To assert that the 2020 election played out without unscrupulous behavior, without any involvement by bad actors is simply unrealistic, and the denial of the significance of that election outcome. Now, am I asserting that the election outcome is not correct? No; no, I am not. But what I am asserting is that there is a level of political frenzy, of political emotion – and that passion that we are seeing manifest right now here today during this debate – that frenzy, that emotion, and grassroots engagement that would drive some to use questionable methods to help impact the outcome.

Mr. Speaker, it is human nature. To deny that the November 2020 election rose to that level is simply less than rational. In citing an example, a Northampton County drop box video surveillance shows, on multiple occasions, voters placing more than one ballot in a ballot drop box. In one instance, the individual actually used his cell phone to take snapshots of each ballot before he placed them in the box. That behavior begs suspicion. Ballot harvesting has and does occur; let us not pretend it does not.

Pennsylvanians deserve, and so many demand, the highest level of integrity in a function that is so fundamentally essential to our democracy: elections. HB 1300 safeguards and goes a long way in restoring faith in Pennsylvania's elections.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. DeLUCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I was not going to speak on this bill, because I think a lot was said on it, but hearing everybody talk, and we are on the television all over, and hopefully, a lot of people watch it. I certainly do not want the people in the Commonwealth to go away thinking that the election – all our elections were not fair and free. They were. And if we are going to lose democracy, it is going to be because of misinformation coming from elected officials not only here, but throughout this nation.

Now, let us start thinking about the next generation, Mr. Speaker. You know, I start to wonder, maybe the Democrats are doing something wrong. The Senate has never been in the Democratic hands. The Republicans have been in the majority most of the time. In the House here, they have been in the majority for 11 years, since the last time I was in there. So maybe the elections have not been fair. Maybe they have not been fair.

Mr. GROVE. Mr. Speaker?

Mr. DeLUCA. I am starting to wonder; I am starting to wonder, maybe they have not been fair.

Mr. GROVE. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

Mr. DeLUCA. Wait a minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

Mr. DeLUCA. I am not off the subject now. I am not off the subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman, Representative Grove, rise?

Mr. GROVE. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You may state your point of order. You are in order.

Mr. GROVE. Mr. Speaker, the speaker's comments are far afield of anything actually contained in HB 1300. I would ask the speaker to contain his remarks to actual policies enshrined in the bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has raised a point of order regarding the underlying bill and the subject matter. The Speaker has tried very diligently to make sure that individuals stay on task today. I appreciate the good gentleman's humor—

Mr. DeLUCA. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. —but I would encourage him to stay on the policies of the bill, please.

Mr. DeLUCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You are in order and may proceed, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DeLUCA. I thought I was on this bill. I hear a lot of free – I certainly do not want the public to think that we did not have in the past free and fair elections. That is ridiculous. I hear some of the stuff about – it is the same way that I have here – and I am not going to support 1300, not because it is a bad bill, but because

of the fact that there are a lot of things in there I would like to vote for, but there are a lot of things that I do not want to vote for. I am for ID and I am for a lot of other things in that 1300.

The same way that I introduced early voting 8 years ago, which never came out of the committee, and the fact is that we need to think about what we are doing here as elected officials, because a lot of times, what we say, social media blows it up, out of whack, all we get are the sound bites, and we are not doing the citizens of Pennsylvania any favor, whether we adopt 1300 or we adopt any other legislation. So please, when we talk about— There are naturally, we knew – anybody with common sense would know that no election is perfect, but the fact is, we had people all over the country, Republicans and Democrats, who said there was no fraud or anything like that that affects the election. What we had in 2020 was the greatest turnout in this century, the greatest turnout in this century, and we should keep it going like that with the mail-in votes, and there is something else in 1300, but let us not send a message out to the public out there that we have not had free and fair elections over the years. That is very condescending to this body. Thank you.

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

Mr. RYAN. That will be an interesting one to follow, Mr. Speaker.

The act of 2019, Act 77 of 2019, that I have heard mentioned so frequently in this chamber today, is not the Act 77 that we are currently living under. It has been altered significantly, substantially, to where it is not recognizable, and the people in this chamber most likely would not have voted for the Act 77 that is currently in place.

That brings us to the current position we are in. The Auditor General, in December of 2019, issued a report in which he said that the significant deficiencies that existed in his attempt to provide and perform a performance audit of the system were so profound, he could not render an opinion in accordance with generally accepted governmental auditing standards, the governing body under which most governmental entities operate. This bill, HB 1300, seeks to fix those issues.

But this bill, HB 1300, is significantly more important to me than just those two issues. I spent a career in the United States Marine Corps Reserves in the Active Component. I have had an opportunity, when I took an oath of office – and I was a draft-motivated Marine, because we had the draft back then, and I was not voluntarily, necessarily, brought into service, as were many of our fellow service members, unlike today where we have a voluntary military service. I did enlist. But I took an oath of office to support and defend the Constitution of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic. And in doing so, I surrendered a great deal of the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights that you all have been so graciously given and that I now am honored so much to live under as well. I gave up a freedom of speech during my time of duty in the military, when I would accept the orders of those appointed over me according to regulations in the rules of the oath that I took.

There is an article in the First Amendment to seek redress. I keep hearing the discussion here that the Governor will veto the bill. We are coequal branches of government. One of the hallmarks of the Republic and the liberties under which we live – that marines, soldiers, sailors, and airmen gave their lives for so that we could continue to survive under this mantle of freedom and liberty – is the fact that we understood that we could seek redress from our government with the three coequal branches of

government, and HB 1300 is seeking that redress. It is providing the opportunity to significantly expand the voting opportunities for all Pennsylvanians. It is designed to provide a system of internal control, and I am intimately familiar with the audit aspects of this bill and the office of the Auditor General to having the cognizance of the Bureau of Elections that provides that system of controls to ensure that this very robust bill that needs to be provided for, to ensure the safety and the protection of all elections going forward, is enshrined in the liberties that Benjamin Franklin, whose name has been brought up so frequently today, would be proud of.

When you look at the service organization-type of system of internal control, we have just put that in under a bill, sponsored by my good friend from Cumberland County last year, for the pension systems. We have required that the system of elections be done in accordance with generally accepted governmental auditing standards, which is second to none in terms of protecting the freedoms and liberties of all Pennsylvanians to ensure that their right to vote is protected. This bill makes absolutely certain, despite some of the commentary that has been made elsewhere, that it is easier for people to vote and almost impossible for someone to cheat.

I have to just conclude with this one comment. One of the greatest things that has happened in my lifetime is that I have seen the changes in our culture. I lived in Baltimore, Maryland, in a single-parent home because my dad died when I was 3 1/2. And my mom was a great lady. But the Baltimore, Maryland, that I lived in in the 1950s was a segregated city, and my mom and my family was at the forefront of ending that travesty. We did so because it is the right thing to do.

When I swore an oath to the United States government, the United States military, and our Constitution, I swore to defend you, and I will defend you on either side of the aisle, regardless of whether or not you agree with me or not, because that is our responsibility to allow for free and open debate as you have seen here today. I ask you to vote for HB 1300 because it will ensure that Pennsylvanians have an easier time to vote, it is almost impossible to cheat, and it provides for an incredibly robust system to ensure that it is perpetually audited to protect all Pennsylvanians, and I ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman for his comments and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Bullock, on final passage.

Mrs. BULLOCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Earlier I heard one of my colleagues say that none of the attacks on HB 1300 are original, and I would say that he is correct, because none of the trickery or underlying policies that are in HB 1300 are original. We have seen these before. As chair of the Pennsylvania Legislative Black Caucus, I am asking for our members to oppose this bill. Every time we have seen Black and Brown voters stand up and exercise their right to vote, we have seen the rules get changed. I will borrow from the newly elected Senator from Georgia in his first speech on the Senate floor. He stated, "We are witnessing right now a massive and unabashed assault on voting rights unlike anything we have" ever "seen since the Jim Crow era. This is Jim Crow in new clothes."

I want to thank my colleague from Philadelphia for the history lesson about voting rights and voter disenfranchisement and suppression here in the Commonwealth and throughout our country. Yes, even during the Reconstruction era, after the ratification of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments, when Black men gained the right to vote, that right to vote, when they went

to the polls and elected folks to represent them, that act was met with violence and policy and legislation that suppressed their votes, violence like the Opelousas Massacre of 1868; the Colfax Massacre of 1873; and the Wilmington, North Carolina, massacre of 1898 – and yes, the murder of Octavius Catto in Philadelphia. When Black folk go to the polls, it is met with violence and voter suppression legislation. And yes, the reign of Jim Crow from after the Reconstruction era and through the 1960s. And as the Voter Registration Act was making its way through Congress and to the President's desk, it, too, was met with violence, on that spring day in the 1960s that we refer to as "Bloody Sunday."

When Black folks go to the polls, they are met with new voter registration requirements, poll taxes, literacy tests, and even the grandfather clause, which are all intended to suppress the Black vote. That is the history of Black voter suppression, and I will tell you that what we are seeing here today is no different. When we saw Black and Brown voters go to the polls in November, and we sat at our homes and we watched the votes of Black people in the city of Philadelphia, the city of Detroit, the city of Atlanta be counted, the response was to come back and introduce bills like HB 1300 to suppress Black votes.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will please suspend. I believe the gentlewoman has moved beyond policy and is now impugning the motives of members regarding their potential support or their opposition to the underlying bill.

Mrs. BULLOCK. The timeline— I am sorry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlelady will suspend. She is not yet rerecognized.

That is in direct violation of our House rules and I would encourage the gentlewoman to please stay on the policy issues contained in the bill and not to question the motives of our fellow colleagues.

You are in order and may proceed on the bill.

Mrs. BULLOCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HB 1300 was introduced this year, along with several other similar bills throughout our country in other States. HB 1300 suppresses Black and Brown voters. HB 1300 makes it more difficult for communities like mine to vote. HB 1300 reduces access to mail-in ballots, reduces access to dropoff boxes, and all of these are no different than other voter suppression tactics we have seen in the past.

As I mentioned before, when we see Black and Brown voters show up at the polls, it is met with violence, and it is met with legislation intended to suppress their votes. HB 1300 is no different, and I ask for a "no" vote on HB 1300. Thank you.

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

Mr. E. NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A lot of emotion on the floor today; history lessons, and unfortunately at times, the casting of aspersions. But, Mr. Speaker, part of that history lesson that was failed to be mentioned, which was agreed is terrible, was that yes, there was a Republican who was killed by Democrats in Philadelphia trying to register people to vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend. I recognize it is a very emotional issue and you are responding with historical facts; however, I would not engage in the debate in a manner so as to incite our fellow colleagues. I urge the gentleman to stick to the underlying policies of the bill, and you are recognized and may continue.

Mr. E. NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, HB 1300 is considerably more than watermarks and enhanced election security. It does improve access to vote. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, if we allowed weeks of early voting in the seven largest red counties in the State of Pennsylvania – the outcry, the public outcry for the voters on TV. But, Mr. Speaker, the reality of the situation was that seven blue counties did vote for weeks in advance of the election. That is fact. HB 1300 establishes equal voting rights, equal access, 6 days in advance, everyone treated the same way. Mr. Speaker, that is the goal. It is a shared policy goal.

We had speakers earlier who talked about a secure system of voting and that aspects in 1300 put the State at risk. Mr. Speaker, I attended every one of those hearings in State Government, and I have to say, some of it was shocking, like the actual cybersecurity threat that was acknowledged in advance of this election due to third-party entities uploading electronic batches of voters through the Department of State, that were then plugged into the SURE (Statewide Uniform Registry of Electors) system. Mr. Speaker, following the election, the State of Pennsylvania lost a lawsuit and was forced to remove 21,000 dead people off the rolls. Mr. Speaker, the ERIC (Electronic Registration Information Center) system that we participated in, but did not actually implement, that is the interstate connection so that voters cannot be double registered, it is in this bill. And the important part, Mr. Speaker, not about the third-party access, not about recognized dead people on the rolls, but that during our third hearing, Mr. Speaker, the Department of State confirmed that our SURE system was so old and so outdated that it was going to be scrapped, eliminating the ability to actually take a look at what is going on in that system.

Mr. Speaker, earlier Representatives on both sides of the aisle talked about voting rights – voter's bill of rights, senior voting rights, and disabled voter rights – and we do not need to get into those – 30-minute voting, curbside voting – all of those things increase access. But the terms "misinformation" or "disinformation" were repeatedly cast. Mr. Speaker, misinformation is dangerous, and the reality that during those State Government hearings, April 15, 2021, our CCAP (County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania), our counties said that they wanted pre-canvassing, 15 days deadline for sending in votes, and financial relief. Mr. Speaker, this is a letter from the Post Office that specifically says where votes will both receive and send ballot by mail, voters should submit their ballot requests early enough that they will be received by election officials and returned 15 days before election at a minimum. Mr. Speaker, this was an ask, the top three asks of these counties were included in this bill, and, Mr. Speaker, if we move on to the very important aspect of voter ID, six different forms of ID, actually six-plus – a free ID sent and mailed to every registered voter, a military ID, a driver's license, the Secretary can issue an ID, any other ID, Mr. Speaker, that has a picture, a name, and an expiration date, any other ID. This is not suppression, Mr. Speaker. This is equal treatment. So when we look into the details of the bill, we look at the reality, we look at the history lesson. HB 1300 goes a long way to ensure that our voters in all 67 counties are treated the same way, whether it is mandating that the private money, tens of millions of dollars in big-tech private money gets evenly distributed across all counties. It requires that election advertising be equally distributed. Mr. Speaker, in the county beside mine,

Allegheny County, they actually had government funding for airplanes to fly banners on election day. That is not equal treatment.

HB 1300 allows our State to move forward. I urge a "yes" vote, I urge facts to be reviewed, and I hope that our colleagues will be able to support this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the other Representative Nelson, Representative Napoleon Nelson, on final passage.

Mr. N. NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Voting good, cheating bad – we get it. You know, it is interesting; we do actually have free and fair elections. What we are lacking, really, is trust. The beauty of our system right now – and folks have been voting for hundreds of years. Some of us have not had that same opportunity, but what we know we do have, to go along with this wonderful building, this great legislature, the elected officials that are here working today, is a court system right across the street, because if there are concerns about the elections, we have a court system. There are court systems spread out in municipalities throughout this entire Commonwealth, throughout the nation. We all saw them get used heavily in this last election, and when I had my constituents come to my office and say, "Why are they doing this? Why are we doing this? What's happening in the courts right now?" I said, it is the appropriate thing. This is what our country relies on. This is the beauty of our system of government, is not only do we have general bodies like ourselves that are elected, but we have Governors that are there to provide administration, Presidents advise national administrations, and then we have a court system that is there to say, hey, if something is not going right, let us make sure we understand. If somebody feels like they are not being heard, we have courts. If there is evidence of massive fraud, we have courts. What we are lacking, really, is trust. What our communities are lacking is trust.

I am getting a lot of flack in my district, even in my own district office by the folks that I have selected to work alongside me, because my community is really [word deleted]. They do not like HB 1300 at all. At least 70-plus percent of my community is [word deleted]. But I am going to go and talk to them tomorrow night and I am going to talk to them about all of the benefits in the bill. I am going to talk to them about the drawbacks in the bill. I am going to do it in as fair and impartial a way as I can, because that is what I believe is needed to earn the trust of not just the 70 percent of them that are [word deleted], but the 30 percent of them that are really hoping that I am going to vote for this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend. I understand the gentleman's and the voters' frustration; however, that term is not proper and should not be used on the House floor and will be stricken from the record. You are in order and may proceed.

Mr. N. NELSON. They are upset. However each of you vote, I ask that you do it in a way that will hopefully engender trust of all of the members of your communities. See, I look at it this way. I have got a daughter, she is 14 as of Sunday this past, but when she was 2 – and I do not know if you all that have children have had similar experiences – when she was 2, she would call me into her room at night because she felt there were monsters in the closet, and it was adorable and she is 2, and I would come and

I would go and I would look and then I would say, "Nope, there are no monsters in the closet. It's okay. You can go to sleep." And the next night she would call me and she thinks there is a monster under the bed, and I would look and I would say, "There are no monsters. You can go to sleep now." We have got folks in our communities who feel like there are monsters in our election system. Somebody has to tell them now there are no monsters.

The author of the bill, in his introduction, talked about all of the poll numbers that suggest that there is a lack of trust in our election system. There is a lack of trust in our election system because we keep telling them, wait, there might be monsters in their closet or under the bed. However you vote, we all know there are no monsters here. We all know that there are free and fair elections – there have been for hundreds of years. We all know that there is a court system that is here to protect not only our votes, but the folks who voted against us, not only in our communities, in our districts, in our State, and the States all around. And in fact, we go, God forbid, we go to wars in other countries to make sure that they have similar experiences and eradicate monsters throughout the world. There are no monsters in our closet.

I am going to vote "no." I am going to go to my community and I am going to talk tomorrow about the importance of fair elections, the importance of, for some, many of the articles in this bill. I am going to talk about the importance of claiming bipartisan bills, once we actually have those bipartisan bills. But I ask us all: Tell your girls, tell your baby boys that there are no monsters in their closets. Thank you.

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

Mr. GUZMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that I am addressing this body here on the floor, and I have really reserved that because throughout my first 6 months here in office, I wanted to be not seen and not heard. I wanted to learn what Harrisburg was all about. And so I have spent the last 6 months learning. But the tenor of this conversation today has really led me to have this – to come up here and speak my truth. And I have been one of those Democrats, Mr. Speaker, who has gone out of his way to try to be bipartisan in many ways. Just yesterday on one of the amendments on this bill, I was one of two Democrats who joined the majority party in voting for an amendment that I thought did some good for the community. I have even taken votes in committee that have gotten some of my caucus members upset with me because of how I voted, and so I hope that I have shown you all that I am here in a bipartisan way to get to work and to get things done.

But as was mentioned earlier, there was a comment made by the good gentlewoman from Philadelphia who said that this bill could be one of the most important things that we do for our constituents here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. And let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker, I highly, highly disagree with that. How about here is a fact for you: how about raising the minimum wage? We had a comment earlier—

The SPEAKER. Please suspend. The policy issue of minimum wage is not in the bill and I would encourage the good gentleman to please stay on point on the bill.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. McCLINTON. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Democratic leader is recognized. You may state your parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. McCLINTON. The maker of the bill, many hours ago, referenced raising the minimum wage in his underlying statement.

The SPEAKER. Members will please suspend. The House will come to order.

I believe the good gentleman was referring to the poll-working wages that you and I had discussed up here in a sidebar as well. I understand the gentleman has other policy objectives that are to be addressed in the appropriate manner and time when those bills or those topics are in front of us – not HB 1300, where it is not contained. If he wishes to discuss poll worker wages, I suppose that would be tangentially in order, but I would just encourage the gentleman, who was our last speaker prior to the prime sponsor and the leaders, to be succinct and stay on topic.

You are in order and may proceed, sir.

Mr. GUZMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, if we are willing and we are able to raise the wage for poll workers, why can we not do that for all Pennsylvanians? That is number one.

Number two, how about fully funding our school systems. I represent the city of Reading, Mr. Speaker, one of the most underfunded school districts in the entire Commonwealth.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

The gentleman is once again off topic. Happy to discuss the issues that the gentleman is advocating for outside of the debate of HB 1300, and I do recognize, as the gentleman pointed out, this is your first time speaking. I am just trying to make sure that I apply the same rules to you that we have applied to everybody else in regards to the topics that were contained in the debate thus far, which I believe is wrapping up here soon.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, and you may proceed.

Mr. GUZMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will do my best to stay on the bill at hand. But again, Mr. Speaker, my frustration here is that we spent 3 hours having this debate about free and fair elections, and yet the people in my district are continually suffering. Mr. Speaker, I have people in my district who cannot pay their rent, who cannot pay their water bills, who send their children to schools with lead pipes in their schools. So this is personal for me, Mr. Speaker, and instead of us spending time talking about whether or not our elections were free and fair, I want to spend the time doing the business of the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

MOTION TO POSTPONE

Mr. GUZMAN. And so with that being said, I move to postpone this vote until July 16 – you can tell I am a freshman, right? – until July 16, because I believe that our priorities should be, in this budget week, discussing how do we help everyday Pennsylvanians come out of this pandemic, fully fund our schools, and increasing the minimum wage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Guzman, has made the motion to postpone to date certain – I believe the gentleman said, just for clarification, July 16 – to postpone final consideration until July 16. The Speaker will put that motion before the House.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman conclude his remarks on why he believed that should be such?

At that point, we will move to the debate of the underlying motion. And for the information of the members, according to Mason's Manual, section 369, we can discuss the postponement of the bill to date certain, as made by the good Representative; however, we cannot discuss the actual underlying merits of the bill. The debate must be confined to the merits of postponement, and I believe the gentleman, the majority leader, was seeking recognition on the motion.

The gentleman, the majority leader, is in order, and you may proceed.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Very quickly, the motion is on postponement. Should we postpone something that has been debated and argued and talked about for 4 months, 10 hearings, and if so, to what avail? At the end of the day, I think many Pennsylvania voters are frustrated and would like to see some changes, including our bipartisan County Commissioners Association, all across Pennsylvania, have given some good suggestions, which I think the good chairman and the bipartisan State Government Committee has tried to include some of those suggestions and provided funding accordingly to follow that up, and therefore, what are we to gain by postponing or delaying this further?

I would ask our members to vote "no" on postponing, put the vote up, speak for the people, and correct this Election Code that is so antiquated and outdated.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Those in favor of the motion will vote "aye"; those opposed to the motion of postponement— I did not see the gentlewoman seeking recognition. You may speak on the motion to postpone.

The gentlewoman, Representative Kinkead, is recognized to speak on the motion.

For the information of the members, if you are seeking recognition, please get to a microphone prior to us moving further down the list so that you can be appropriately recognized.

The gentlewoman is in order, and you may proceed.

Ms. KINKEAD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of this motion because we should be postponing this. This is something that we can take up at a later date and time, but right now what we should be focusing on are the Pennsylvanians who are struggling and suffering and they do not have to be. We have \$10 billion to be able to help them.

POINT OF ORDER

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

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will suspend.

For what purpose does the majority leader rise?

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER. You may state your point of order.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. I thought you very clearly stated that the discussion would be strictly on postponement and the motion to postpone only. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. I appreciate the gentleman's point of order; however, I do believe the gentlewoman was explaining as to why this should not be considered now and why postponement was in

order. Rather than go through a litany of other policy objectives that I am sure both sides would like to discuss, I would simply encourage the gentlewoman to confine her remarks to the reasons to postpone this particular bill.

Ms. KINKEAD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have very serious problems in this Commonwealth to solve. We have generational change money to solve them and we should be focusing on using that money to do it. What we are doing right now wastes taxpayer time and money when we should be addressing the underlying issues. The people in my district believe that we had fair elections. What they do not believe is that we are here helping them keep roofs over their head and food on the table, and we need to be focusing on those very serious issues.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will please suspend.

I appreciate the attempt to bring it back at the end of the debate, but again, please confine the debate to the reasons to postpone this particular bill and not the underlying substance of the bill or other policy objectives.

You are in order and may proceed.

Ms. KINKEAD. Thank you.

The simple fact of the matter is that this – I support postponing this bill, the consideration of this bill, because we have other far more pressing issues to solve and they need to be solved more immediately than this. We can postpone this until after we have put together a moral and compassionate budget, and that should be the focus of each and every person in this room, and if it is not, then we are failing the people of Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Rabb, on the motion to postpone.

Mr. RABB. Hello again, Mr. Speaker.

I support this motion to postpone because I agree with the good gentleman from Berks County that we have other priorities, priorities that are intensely critical in this moment given the influx of revenue we have; perhaps it is once in a lifetime, once in a generation. By postponing this, we can talk about other issues, inclusive of full and fair funding of public education in a Commonwealth where we have the greatest disparities, where we only have 11 cents of every dollar of education money from the State going through the fair-funding formula. Where we have rural – yeah, I said it – rural school districts that are underfunded and inequitably funded, rural—

Mr. GROVE. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend. I am consulting with the majority leader.

The House will be at ease.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The House will please return to order.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Rabb, had the floor, but I believe the gentleman, Representative Grove, was seeking recognition for what purpose?

Mr. GROVE. Point of order.

The SPEAKER. You may state your point of order.

Mr. GROVE. Rule 55 states, quote, "Debate on the motion to postpone shall be confined to the question of the postponement and shall not include discussion of the main question" or anything

else. The speaker was far afield, and I would appreciate the debate being to why this bill should be postponed. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The good gentleman does raise the point of order according to rule 55. As other members were encouraged, you need to stay on the underlying issue, which is the motion to postpone and solely the motion to postpone. That is the only matter before the House, not the policy matters contained in the bill or any other policy matters that we would entertain in the remainder of this session.

The good gentleman, Representative Rabb, is recognized, and you may proceed on the motion to postpone.

Mr. RABB. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate that guidance.

The reason I am supporting this motion to postpone is because I see the interconnectedness of talking about voting rights and election reforms, specifically HB 1300 and what is related to civic literacy and education and how we decide what our electorate looks like and what they learn and how we are engaged in our society. We cannot have an informed electorate and understand what is going on with elections and candidates and campaigns if our children are not well educated, do not have access to the resources they all deserve, irrespective of the bodies they inhabit or what ZIP (Zoning Improvement Plan) Codes they live in, and right now we suffer from educational apartheid.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend. The gentleman has been warned on multiple occasions regarding the substance of the motion.

The House will be at ease and the leaders will please approach the rostrum.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

The SPEAKER. The House will please return to order.

The gentleman, Representative Rabb, had the floor previously on the motion to postpone. I believe the good gentleman was wrapping up his comments and I will recognize him to do so.

Mr. RABB. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I support this motion to postpone because I do not believe that spending hours talking about HB 1300 is the right use of our resources right now, given what we have. We have an opportunity to focus on budget priorities that can be reflective of the \$10 billion that are coming to our Commonwealth. And I understand that I got caught up in my passion and I began to talk about things that perhaps some believe are far afield from the motion, but the reason I am speaking up in support of this motion to postpone is because I see the connection in what we have been talking about now with even bigger issues around what will actually inform the literacy and education of our young people, and that is a budget priority that has been ignored term after term after term, and this is the moment where we can recast our focus and postpone consideration of this bill to address far more critical budget priorities.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Shusterman, on the motion to postpone.

Ms. SHUSTERMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I support this motion to postpone. I used to work in business and tech and we often debated, but when we knew we hit a wall, like we know that the bill is not going to pass or we know that we

are not going to get anywhere today, we would move in a different direction, and our voters have asked us to bring solutions that will bring the economy back. Our small businesses, our downtowns and boroughs need help, and we need to set an example to our children and jockey, be nimble, and move towards solutions that will help our downtowns, our boroughs, our farmers, and our children so we can get Pennsylvania and the Commonwealth back.

This bill is not going anywhere. Let us move together to postpone it and find solutions, because we are here to pass a budget. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

MOTION FOR PREVIOUS QUESTION

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Topper, on the motion to postpone.

Mr. TOPPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have certainly had an extensive debate on the underlying bill, but, Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a motion on the motion to postpone. I rise to move the previous question. I believe that this debate is no longer about postponement but is about other policy issues, so I believe that we need to move the previous question on this motion to postpone.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Topper, moves the previous question on the motion to postpone on HB 1300.

For the information of the members, because I realize this is a provision that is covered in the rules, rule 61 outlines the process for moving the previous question. Those who second this motion will rise and remain standing until their names are recorded. For the information of the members, 20 total seconds are required. The Speaker will list the series of names until that number is attained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Masser – I will ask members that once you are recognized, please be seated so that we can maintain the count – I recognize the gentleman, Representative Causer; I recognize the gentleman, Representative Grove; the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander; the gentleman, Majority Leader Benninghoff; the gentleman, Representative Dunbar; the gentleman, Representative Sonney; the gentleman, Representative Wheeland; the gentlewoman, Representative White; the gentleman, Representative Knowles; the gentleman, Representative Kauffman; the gentlewoman, Representative Sheryl Delozier; the gentleman, Representative Ryan; the gentleman, Representative Puskaric; the gentleman, Representative Fritz; the gentleman, Representative Metcalfe; the gentleman, Representative Roae; the gentlewoman, Representative Rapp. We have reached— We will add two more: the gentleman, Representative Eric Nelson, and the gentleman, Representative Millard.

The motion for the previous question having been made and seconded, those in favor of the motion for the previous question will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "no," and—

For what purpose does the gentlewoman rise?

Ms. McCLINTON. To speak on the motion.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker was asked, and for the benefit of the members I will restate it. The motion that the good gentleman made and was appropriately seconded was simply on the postponement motion itself. So depending on the outcome of this vote, we will then pick up debate where we were, for the information of the members.

Also for the information of the members, an "aye" vote is a vote to end all debate and bring the House to an immediate vote. There are past precedents in our House Journals on both sides of the issue regarding leader recognition on the motion to move the previous question. This Speaker has previously allowed for a brief statement made by both leaders, either in favor of or against their respective positions on the previous question and will do so again today.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman is recognized to speak briefly on the motion.

Ms. McCLINTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And for the benefit of those watching, I am getting some communication from my constituents who are tuned in to this evening, curious to know what is happening now. Just to make it very clear, HB 1300 makes efforts to silence voters, and this motion is now silencing House Democratic members. So I am asking for a "no" vote. The same way we want 13 million Pennsylvanians to be able to voice who they want to serve and represent them, this caucus deserves to be heard in this chamber. We also were duly elected on November 3, 2020.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Leader Benninghoff, for a brief statement on the motion to move the previous question on the motion to postpone.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to support the motion to move the previous question so that we can get back to the work of the people's business, finish the bill that we have now been talking and debating for 3 1/2 hours, and more specifically, get to subsequent meetings that some of us have to do with the budget yet tonight so that we can delegate the money out to the people of Pennsylvania and get the budget completed on time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

An "aye" vote is a vote to end all debate on the underlying motion to postpone and bring the House back to the underlying business.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. On that question, 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 and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—112

Armanini	Gregory	Mehaffie	Rowe
Benninghoff	Greiner	Mentzer	Ryan
Bernstine	Grove	Mercuri	Sankey
Boback	Hamm	Metcalfe	Saylor
Bonner	Heffley	Metzgar	Schemel
Borowicz	Helm	Mihalek	Schmitt
Brooks	Hennessey	Millard	Schroeder
Brown, R.	Hershey	Miller, B.	Silvis
Causer	Hickernell	Mizgorski	Smith
Cook	Irvin	Moul	Sonney
Cox	James	Mustello	Staats
Culver	Jones	Nelson, E.	Stambaugh
Davanzo	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Stephens
Day	Kail	Oberlander	Struzzi
Delozier	Kaufner	Ortitay	Thomas
DelRosso	Kauffman	Owlett	Tomlinson
Diamond	Keefer	Peifer	Toohil
Dowling	Kerwin	Pennycuik	Topper
Dunbar	Klunk	Pickett	Twardzik
Ecker	Knowles	Polinchock	Warner
Emrick	Labs	Puskaric	Wentling
Farry	Lawrence	Quinn	Wheeland
Fee	Lewis	Rader	White
Flood	Mackenzie, M.	Rapp	Williams, C.
Fritz	Mackenzie, R.	Rigby	Zimmerman
Gaydos	Major	Roae	
Gillen	Mako	Rossi	Cutler,
Gillespie	Marshall	Rothman	Speaker
Gleim	Masser		

NAYS—89

Benham	Driscoll	Kirkland	Pashinski
Bizzarro	Evans	Kosierowski	Pisciottano
Boyle	Fiedler	Krajewski	Rabb
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Krueger	Rozzi
Briggs	Frankel	Kulik	Sainato
Brown, A.	Freeman	Lee	Samuelson
Bullock	Gainey	Longietti	Sanchez
Burgos	Galloway	Madden	Sappey
Burns	Guenst	Malagari	Schlossberg
Carroll	Guzman	Markosek	Schweyer
Cephas	Hanbidge	Matzie	Shusterman
Ciresi	Harkins	McClinton	Sims
Conklin	Harris	McNeill	Snyder
Cruz	Herrin	Merski	Solomon
Daley	Hohenstein	Miller, D.	Sturla
Davidson	Howard	Mullery	Vitali
Davis, A.	Innamorato	Mullins	Warren
Davis, T.	Isaacson	Neilson	Webster
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Nelson, N.	Wheatley
Deasy	Kim	O'Mara	Williams, D.
DeLissio	Kinkead	Otten	Young
Delloso	Kinsey	Parker	Zabel
DeLuca			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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

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

The SPEAKER. We will now move immediately to the vote on the postponement motion.

Those in favor of postponement will vote "aye"; those opposed, vote "no."

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. On that question, 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—89

Benham	Driscoll	Kirkland	Pashinski
Bizzarro	Evans	Kosierowski	Pisciottano
Boyle	Fiedler	Krajewski	Rabb
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Krueger	Rozzi
Briggs	Frankel	Kulik	Sainato
Brown, A.	Freeman	Lee	Samuelson
Bullock	Gainey	Longietti	Sanchez
Burgos	Galloway	Madden	Sappey
Burns	Guenst	Malagari	Schlossberg
Carroll	Guzman	Markosek	Schweyer
Cephas	Hanbidge	Matzie	Shusterman
Ciresi	Harkins	McClinton	Sims
Conklin	Harris	McNeill	Snyder
Cruz	Herrin	Merski	Solomon
Daley	Hohenstein	Miller, D.	Sturla
Davidson	Howard	Mullery	Vitali
Davis, A.	Innamorato	Mullins	Warren
Davis, T.	Isaacson	Neilson	Webster
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Nelson, N.	Wheatley
Deasy	Kim	O'Mara	Williams, D.
DeLissio	Kinkead	Otten	Young
Delloso	Kinsey	Parker	Zabel
DeLuca			

NAYS—112

Armanini	Gregory	Mehaffie	Rowe
Benninghoff	Greiner	Mentzer	Ryan
Bernstine	Grove	Mercuri	Sankey
Boback	Hamm	Metcalfe	Saylor
Bonner	Heffley	Metzgar	Schemel
Borowicz	Helm	Mihalek	Schmitt
Brooks	Hennessey	Millard	Schroeder
Brown, R.	Hershey	Miller, B.	Silvis
Causer	Hickernell	Mizgorski	Smith
Cook	Irvin	Moul	Sonney
Cox	James	Mustello	Staats
Culver	Jones	Nelson, E.	Stambaugh
Davanzo	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Stephens
Day	Kail	Oberlander	Struzzi
Delozier	Kaufner	Ortitay	Thomas
DelRosso	Kauffman	Owlett	Tomlinson
Diamond	Keefer	Peifer	Toohil
Dowling	Kerwin	Pennycuik	Topper
Dunbar	Klunk	Pickett	Twardzik
Ecker	Knowles	Polinchock	Warner
Emrick	Labs	Puskaric	Wentling

Farry	Lawrence	Quinn	Wheeland
Fee	Lewis	Rader	White
Flood	Mackenzie, M.	Rapp	Williams, C.
Fritz	Mackenzie, R.	Rigby	Zimmerman
Gaydos	Major	Roae	
Gillen	Mako	Rossi	Cutler,
Gillespie	Marshall	Rothman	Speaker
Gleim	Masser		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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. For the information of the members, the gentleman, Representative Guzman, had the floor previously.

Does the Democratic leader wish to seek recognition prior to him being recognized again?

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. McCLINTON. That is correct, Mr. Speaker. I have a motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentlelady will please state your motion.

Ms. McCLINTON. Given the significant fiscal impacts of this bill, I have a motion to commit this bill to the Appropriations Committee immediately.

The SPEAKER. For the benefit of the members, I just wish to restate the gentlewoman's motion for— The gentlewoman, the Democratic leader, has made the motion to recommit to the Appropriations Committee.

The Democratic leader has made the motion to recommit HB 1300 to the Appropriations Committee. We will put that motion on the board.

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

The SPEAKER. And the Democratic leader is in order. You may speak on your motion, or unless you had already concluded. The gentlewoman indicates she had concluded.

The Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Representative Grove, on the motion to recommit to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. GROVE. Recommit for financial issues because it has tremendous financial issues to the Commonwealth. Earlier today I heard this bill does not fund the counties at all. Amazing how that misinformation gets around.

Mr. Speaker, this does have a financial impact. I am glad it was recognized. It is around \$90 million; \$90 million we are funding counties for the first time for operational costs of their elections. It is a 50-50 split between the Commonwealth and the counties. We fund equipment for the counties so they can better operate their elections.

Mr. Speaker, we are putting our money where our mouth is and we want to make sure we have the best election systems in the Commonwealth. Funding is a realization. It is a request of the County Commissioners Association. In January of 2021 the County Commissioners Association submitted an extensive report to the General Assembly outlining their needs, one of which was permanent long-term funding of election machines. That is included in HB 1300, operational costs for county election operations, which does not happen today. Look for a line item in county election operations in our budget. It does not exist. This bill creates it, Mr. Speaker.

I am glad we are having a discussion about what is actually in the merits of this [word deleted] bill because all day and all afternoon—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend. He is getting dangerously close to inflammatory language and should stay on point and do so in a professional manner.

Mr. GROVE. My apologies. Would you restrict that word from my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

We have heard a lot of stuff; unfortunately, a lot of unfactual information to the tune of someone literally saying there is no money in this budget. It has come from Appropriations. The Appropriations Committee had their debate. That happens after second consideration, before third consideration. That is the process we are all aware of, Mr. Speaker. That already occurred. We have a fiscal note; we have a fiscal note that says this spends money exactly where the counties want it.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need to do this motion. We already know the fiscal impact. [Remarks deleted.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman—

Ms. McCLINTON. Point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentlelady will please suspend.

The gentleman's comments were inflammatory in nature and will be stricken from the record.

POINT OF ORDER

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

Ms. McCLINTON. Impugning my motive—

The SPEAKER. The Speaker has already addressed—

Ms. McCLINTON. —and apparently intelligence.

The SPEAKER. The gentlelady will suspend.

That issue has already been addressed with the member. His comments will be stricken from the record. The Chair encourages the gentleman to wrap up the discussion on the motion—

Mr. GROVE. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. —so we can get to the issue.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, we do not need to return this to the Appropriations Committee. We are well aware of the policies enclosed in this bill. We are well aware that it provides critical funding to our counties for elections.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair will once again take the opportunity to remind the members, while we are engaged in the debate on not just the underlying bills and the amendments but also the motions, it is

important to restrict that underlying debate to the substances of the bills, or in this case, the motion. Language should not be inflammatory or meant to impugn the honor or integrity of any of our colleagues. We can have a respectful disagreement on how to best solve problems.

With that, the Chair recognizes the Democratic leader, Leader McClinton, on the motion.

Ms. McCLINTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And in speaking of honest conversations, this bill would spend \$90 million. We are in a budget season. A fiscal note was prepared, yet this bill does not appropriate any funding. It does not say how we are going to spend this money. We have a recurring cost of at least \$11 million to support the counties, yet there has been no conversation in the context of this budget on, of course, funding our schools fairly, getting people back to work, creating jobs, workforce development, so much, so forth, and so on. None of that has been discussed whatsoever. We have no way or no information on how this money is coming. Where is it coming from? How is it going to be spent? What is the source? I am waiting for that honest conversation in the larger budget context, and so are the rest of the people across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. On that question, 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—89

Benham	Driscoll	Kirkland	Pashinski
Bizzarro	Evans	Kosierowski	Pisciottano
Boyle	Fiedler	Krajewski	Rabb
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Krueger	Rozzi
Briggs	Frankel	Kulik	Sainato
Brown, A.	Freeman	Lee	Samuelson
Bullock	Gainey	Longiatti	Sanchez
Burgos	Galloway	Madden	Sappey
Burns	Guenst	Malagari	Schlossberg
Carroll	Guzman	Markosek	Schweyer
Cephas	Hanbidge	Matzie	Shusterman
Ciresi	Harkins	McClinton	Sims
Conklin	Harris	McNeill	Snyder
Cruz	Herrin	Merski	Solomon
Daley	Hohenstein	Miller, D.	Sturla
Davidson	Howard	Mullery	Vitali
Davis, A.	Innamorato	Mullins	Warren
Davis, T.	Isaacson	Neilson	Webster
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Nelson, N.	Wheatley
Deasy	Kim	O'Mara	Williams, D.
DeLissio	Kinhead	Otten	Young
Delloso	Kinsey	Parker	Zabel
DeLuca			

NAYS—112

Armanini	Gregory	Mehaffie	Rowe
Benninghoff	Greiner	Mentzer	Ryan
Bernstine	Grove	Mercuri	Sankey
Boback	Hamm	Metcalfe	Saylor
Bonner	Heffley	Metzgar	Schemel
Borowicz	Helm	Mihalek	Schmitt
Brooks	Hennessey	Millard	Schroeder
Brown, R.	Hershey	Miller, B.	Silvis
Causar	Hickernell	Mizgorski	Smith
Cook	Irvin	Moul	Sonney
Cox	James	Mustello	Staats
Culver	Jones	Nelson, E.	Stambaugh
Davanzo	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Stephens
Day	Kail	Oberlander	Struzzi
Delozier	Kaufner	Ortitay	Thomas
DelRosso	Kauffman	Owlett	Tomlinson
Diamond	Keefer	Peifer	Toohil
Dowling	Kerwin	Pennycuick	Topper
Dunbar	Klunk	Pickett	Twardzik
Ecker	Knowles	Polinchock	Warner
Emrick	Labs	Puskaric	Wentling
Farry	Lawrence	Quinn	Wheeland
Fee	Lewis	Rader	White
Flood	Mackenzie, M.	Rapp	Williams, C.
Fritz	Mackenzie, R.	Rigby	Zimmerman
Gaydos	Major	Roae	
Gillen	Mako	Rossi	Cutler,
Gillespie	Marshall	Rothman	Speaker
Gleim	Masser		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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. The Chair apologizes to the gentleman. After both of those motions, we are now to the point in the debate where you once again have the floor and may be recognized to wrap up your comments. The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. GUZMAN. Thank you again, Mr. Speaker.

And again, apologies to my colleagues across both sides of the aisle, but again, this is such an important topic that I want to be sure that we are 100 percent sure, that we just spent almost 4 hours talking about fair and free elections.

And I guess I want to end my comments like this: If this is how this General Assembly wants to spend its time, no wonder we are polling so low with favorability numbers across the Commonwealth. We are not getting anything done, Mr. Speaker. So if the majority party thinks that this is something that they can take back home to their constituents and say, look, we did this, I will invite you all to come to the city of Reading and let me show you exactly what this bill actually does, which is absolutely nothing.

So if you all want to have a serious conversation about how do we end poverty, how do we increase educational funding within our school districts, how do we end institutional racism, let us have that conversation and let us have that debate. Cover

your ears all you want, good gentleman, but you know what? This is a conversation that needs to be had. And just like all of you, I was democratically elected and I will not be silenced by you or by anybody else. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Seeing no one else seeking recognition on the underlying bill, the Chair will now move to the prime sponsor and both leaders.

The gentleman, Representative Grove, is recognized.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It has been a long afternoon. Actually, we have not had one of these big debates in a while. It is a big bill. It is an important bill.

There are many Pennsylvanians that have asked for election reform. We heard it in our committees, the Department of State, the Governor's Office – numerous bills sitting in the House State Government Committee, discussing – Republicans and Democrats alike – discussing how to reform our election system, but this is what we have in front of us. It is a comprehensive bill. It increases access. Factually, it increases access. We have heard, we have heard accusations of suppression. Never really pointed to a simple policy in here that actually does that.

And I will read a quick quote. Quote, "I have never been opposed to voter ID. And in fact, I don't know anybody who is – who believes people shouldn't have to prove that they are who they say they are." That was the good Senator, freshman Senator, U.S. Senator, from Georgia, who recently just said that. There is a change in the ideology of voters. Overwhelmingly polling has consistently come back that supports election security as well as increased access. That is a fact. We see it from Republicans, we see it from Democrats, we see it from Independents. This bill weaves all that together to put best practices from States like Colorado and signature verification, election machines and how to deal with them from Florida. We heard from national experts. We heard from other States. This bill builds on that. It provides a comprehensive look at how we do our elections and improves it for the betterment of voters, regardless who you are, where you are from. Those are the facts, Mr. Speaker.

HB 1300, the Pennsylvania Voting Rights Protection Act, protects voters. For the first time in Pennsylvania history, it actually provides a voter's bill of rights to protect voters regardless of where they are from, regardless of their identity. It provides equal treatment under the law for every single eligible voter to have access to a polling location. And it expands, it provides early in-person voting for the first time in Pennsylvania. It ensures – and we have said it many times – disabled voters have access to the ballots.

It is a good bill. It provides those security measures that are best practices in other States, Mr. Speaker. It is a good bill. I urge my colleagues to support it. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair will now move to the leaders.

Leader McClinton, you are recognized on final passage and you may proceed.

Ms. McCLINTON. Am I intelligent enough to proceed, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will suspend. Those comments are not in order, but you made speak on final passage.

Ms. McCLINTON. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

We have been here, happy to be at work, thrilled. I mean, we all won our elections. We should be happy. We all won, right? November 3, 2020; certified; came in here January 5, put a hand up saying we would uphold and defend the Constitution of the

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, each and every one of us. Yet we cannot get past November's election. It is unbelievable and a ridiculous amount of wasting taxpayer dollars and time because we have priorities to talk about tonight and we have not been able to talk about any of them.

And if you want to talk about protecting voters, you cannot do that with one caucus when the same voters that sent all 113 of you here sent all 90 of us. Let us work on the election together, let us improve access together – the same way we were all elected, and apparently, we all won. Let us work on making this bill correct and ensure that it does not disenfranchise anyone; that it does not remove drop boxes, which those of us in populated, dense areas need. We need to have access to these things for both convenience and safety measures.

I saw cameras in Delaware County protecting the drop boxes. The only case of election fraud was in Delaware County where a Republican tried to register someone to vote and get a mail-in ballot for two people that were deceased, but the district attorney, he is handling that because the courts, they are working. There were lawsuits and one lawsuit after the next lawsuit. And here we are more than 6 months later with the same nonsense – circular discussions that are not productive when people voted for us to come out here and lead. Let us get started with the leadership.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes Leader Benninghoff on final passage.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There has been a lot of discussion, and some things that we agree on, some that we do not. But one point of clarification. I will give a couple remarks, and then we will go on to vote. It has been said many times that this bill is suppressing votes, but I want to remind people, yesterday the amendment A01826 actually increased the number of drop boxes to a ratio of 1 to 50,000 and yet we only got one vote in the minority party. I believe that we are trying very hard as the majority party and in HB 1300 to expand access, and that was just one example.

But, Mr. Speaker, to begin, this legislation before us did not appear out of nowhere. It is truly a culmination of over 4 months of work, 10 hearings, and reviews of the Pennsylvania election law, done by the State House bipartisan committee. As a former chairman, I know the tremendous work put into this, and I commend both chairmen, majority and minority, and both the Republican and Democrat members of that committee for their hard work.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, the Voting Rights Protection Act reflects much of what was discussed and testified to in those hearings and, frankly, reflects a lot of questions and things that were raised by our constituents of many different parties. It also reflects the priorities of our duly elected county commissioners, which also are of both parties. Without all willing parties coming to the table in good faith, we would not have this bill and maybe no bill. But today on June 22 at almost 7 o'clock tonight, this is the bill before us to try to help restore Pennsylvania's faith in the election process and hopefully in their State government.

There is lots we can say, but I think we need to be honest with ourselves. I do not think there is a single person that says the Election Code is perfect, I do not think anyone here can say that the Election Code is conducted uniformly across the Commonwealth, and I doubt anyone can sit there and say that there are not improvements necessarily needed in this Election Code in an update. At the end of the day, HB 1300 serves as that tool, known as the Pennsylvania Voting Rights Protection Act.

I am not going to debate the details of that. It has been talked about a lot. But for me, at the end of the day, it boils down to the fact that we all should want fair, easy access and a transparent and truly secure election process for all Pennsylvanians, regardless of where you live and how you get to vote, whether in person or by mail. At the end of the day, this should not be a partisan issue, it should be a bill that we can all support and get done on behalf of the people of Pennsylvania. If you have confusion about that or concerns, please read the bill in its entirety. We would be glad to discuss it. But at this point, we have discussed it plenty. It is time to put the vote down, be the voice of the people, and get 203 votes. Please join us on a unanimous vote for HB 1300 for the people of Pennsylvania.

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. On that question, 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—110

Armanini	Gillespie	Marshall	Rothman
Benninghoff	Gleim	Masser	Rowe
Bernstine	Gregory	Mehaffie	Ryan
Boback	Greiner	Mentzer	Sankey
Bonner	Grove	Mercuri	Saylor
Borowicz	Hamm	Metcalfe	Schemel
Brooks	Heffley	Metzgar	Schmitt
Brown, R.	Helm	Mihalek	Schroeder
Burns	Hennessey	Millard	Silvis
Causser	Hershey	Miller, B.	Smith
Cook	Hickernell	Mizgorski	Sonney
Cox	Irvin	Moul	Staats
Culver	James	Mustello	Stambaugh
Davanzo	Jozwiak	Nelson, E.	Stephens
Day	Kail	O'Neal	Struzzi
Delozier	Kaufer	Oberlander	Thomas
DelRosso	Kauffman	Ortitay	Tomlinson
Diamond	Keefer	Owlett	Toohil
Dowling	Kerwin	Peifer	Topper
Dunbar	Klunk	Pennycuick	Twardzik
Ecker	Knowles	Pickett	Warner
Emrick	Labs	Polinchock	Wentling
Farry	Lawrence	Quinn	Wheeland
Fee	Lewis	Rader	White
Flood	Mackenzie, M.	Rapp	Williams, C.
Fritz	Mackenzie, R.	Rigby	
Gaydos	Major	Roe	Cutler,
Gillen	Mako	Rossi	Speaker

NAYS—91

Benham	Evans	Kosierowski	Puskaric
Bizzarro	Fiedler	Krajewski	Rabb
Boyle	Fitzgerald	Krueger	Rozzi
Bradford	Frankel	Kulik	Sainato
Briggs	Freeman	Lee	Samuelson
Brown, A.	Gainey	Longietti	Sanchez
Bullock	Galloway	Madden	Sappey
Burgos	Guenst	Malagari	Schlossberg
Carroll	Guzman	Markosek	Schweyer
Cephas	Hanbidge	Matzie	Shusterman
Ciresi	Harkins	McClinton	Sims
Conklin	Harris	McNeill	Snyder
Cruz	Herrin	Merski	Solomon
Daley	Hohenstein	Miller, D.	Sturla
Davidson	Howard	Mullery	Vitali
Davis, A.	Innamorato	Mullins	Warren
Davis, T.	Isaacson	Neilson	Webster
Dawkins	Jones	Nelson, N.	Wheatley
Deasy	Kenyatta	O'Mara	Williams, D.
DeLissio	Kim	Otten	Young
Delloso	Kinhead	Parker	Zabel
DeLuca	Kinsey	Pashinski	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Kirkland	Pisciottano	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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 1452, PN 1573**, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 44 (Law and Justice) and 45 (Legal Notices) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for flexibility in emergency publication of the Pennsylvania Bulletin: in Uniform Electronic Legal Material Act, further providing for definitions; and, in codification and publication of documents, further providing for preliminary publication in Pennsylvania Bulletin.

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. On that question, 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—201

Armanini	Frankel	Lewis	Roae
Benham	Freeman	Longietti	Rossi
Benninghoff	Fritz	Mackenzie, M.	Rothman
Bernstine	Gainey	Mackenzie, R.	Rowe
Bizzarro	Galloway	Madden	Rozzi
Boback	Gaydos	Major	Ryan
Bonner	Gillen	Mako	Sainato
Borowicz	Gillespie	Malagari	Samuelson
Boyle	Gleim	Markosek	Sanchez
Bradford	Gregory	Marshall	Sankey
Briggs	Greiner	Masser	Sappey
Brooks	Grove	Matzie	Saylor
Brown, A.	Guenst	McClinton	Schemel
Brown, R.	Guzman	McNeill	Schlossberg
Bullock	Hamm	Mehaffie	Schmitt
Burgos	Hanbidge	Mentzer	Schroeder
Burns	Harkins	Mercuri	Schweyer
Carroll	Harris	Merski	Shusterman
Causer	Heffley	Metcalfe	Silvis
Cephas	Helm	Metzgar	Sims
Ciresi	Hennessey	Mihalek	Smith
Conklin	Herrin	Millard	Snyder
Cook	Hershey	Miller, B.	Solomon
Cox	Hickernell	Miller, D.	Sonney
Cruz	Hohenstein	Mizgorski	Staats
Culver	Howard	Moul	Stambaugh
Daley	Innamorato	Mullery	Stephens
Davanzo	Irvin	Mullins	Struzzi
Davidson	Isaacson	Mustello	Sturla
Davis, A.	James	Neilson	Thomas
Davis, T.	Jones	Nelson, E.	Tomlinson
Dawkins	Jozwiak	Nelson, N.	Toohil
Day	Kail	O'Mara	Topper
Deasy	Kaufer	O'Neal	Twardzik
DeLissio	Kauffman	Oberlander	Vitali
Deloso	Keefer	Ortitay	Warner
Delozier	Kenyatta	Otten	Warren
DelRosso	Kerwin	Owlett	Webster
DeLuca	Kim	Parker	Wentling
Diamond	Kinlead	Pashinski	Wheatley
Dowling	Kinsey	Peifer	Wheeland
Driscoll	Kirkland	Pennycuik	White
Dunbar	Klunk	Pickett	Williams, C.
Ecker	Knowles	Pisciottano	Williams, D.
Emrick	Kosierowski	Polinchock	Young
Evans	Krajewski	Puskaric	Zabel
Farry	Krueger	Quinn	Zimmerman
Fee	Kulik	Rabb	
Fiedler	Labs	Rader	Cutler,
Fitzgerald	Lawrence	Rapp	Speaker
Flood	Lee	Rigby	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 89, PN 179**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 74 (Transportation) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Multimodal Fund, repealing provisions relating to Balanced Multimodal Transportation Policy Commission.

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. On that question, 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—201

Armanini	Frankel	Lewis	Roae
Benham	Freeman	Longietti	Rossi
Benninghoff	Fritz	Mackenzie, M.	Rothman
Bernstine	Gainey	Mackenzie, R.	Rowe
Bizzarro	Galloway	Madden	Rozzi
Boback	Gaydos	Major	Ryan
Bonner	Gillen	Mako	Sainato
Borowicz	Gillespie	Malagari	Samuelson
Boyle	Gleim	Markosek	Sanchez
Bradford	Gregory	Marshall	Sankey
Briggs	Greiner	Masser	Sappey
Brooks	Grove	Matzie	Saylor
Brown, A.	Guenst	McClinton	Schemel
Brown, R.	Guzman	McNeill	Schlossberg
Bullock	Hamm	Mehaffie	Schmitt
Burgos	Hanbidge	Mentzer	Schroeder
Burns	Harkins	Mercuri	Schweyer
Carroll	Harris	Merski	Shusterman
Causer	Heffley	Metcalfe	Silvis
Cephas	Helm	Metzgar	Sims
Ciresi	Hennessey	Mihalek	Smith

Conklin	Herrin	Millard	Snyder
Cook	Hershey	Miller, B.	Solomon
Cox	Hickernell	Miller, D.	Sonney
Cruz	Hohenstein	Mizgorski	Staats
Culver	Howard	Moul	Stambaugh
Daley	Innamorato	Mullery	Stephens
Davanzo	Irvin	Mullins	Struzzi
Davidson	Isaacson	Mustello	Sturla
Davis, A.	James	Neilson	Thomas
Davis, T.	Jones	Nelson, E.	Tomlinson
Dawkins	Jozwiak	Nelson, N.	Toohil
Day	Kail	O'Mara	Topper
Deasy	Kaufer	O'Neal	Twardzik
DeLissio	Kauffman	Oberlander	Vitali
Deloso	Keefer	Ortitay	Warner
Delozier	Kenyatta	Otten	Warren
DelRosso	Kerwin	Owlett	Webster
DeLuca	Kim	Parker	Wentling
Diamond	Kinhead	Pashinski	Wheatley
Dowling	Kinsey	Peifer	Wheatley
Driscoll	Kirkland	Pennycuik	White
Dunbar	Klunk	Pickett	Williams, C.
Ecker	Knowles	Pisciottano	Williams, D.
Emrick	Kosierowski	Polinchock	Young
Evans	Krajewski	Puskaric	Zabel
Farry	Krueger	Quinn	Zimmerman
Fee	Kulik	Rabb	
Fiedler	Labs	Rader	Cutler,
Fitzgerald	Lawrence	Rapp	Speaker
Flood	Lee	Rigby	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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

Ordered, That the clerk return the same to the Senate with the information that the House has passed the same without amendment.

BILL SIGNED BY SPEAKER

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

SB 96, PN 229

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in registration of vehicles, further providing for contributions to Veterans' Trust Fund.

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

VOTE CORRECTIONS

The SPEAKER. The Speaker is in receipt of several members who wish to correct the record.

The Chair will first recognize the gentleman, Representative Brooks, for a correction of the record on amendment A01717, I believe.

Mr. BROOKS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
For the record, on SB 618, amendment 1717, I would like my vote to be a "no."

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman. Your remarks will be spread upon the record.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Boback, also for a record correction.

Ms. BOBACK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you. To correct the record on SB 618, on amendment 1723, I was registered as "yea." I would like to please be registered as a "no." Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady. Your comments will be spread upon the record.

For the information of the members, there will be no further votes this evening on the House floor; there will be some housekeeping, however.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman, Representative Briggs, seek recognition? I apologize; I did not see the gentleman. We will do it before housekeeping.

For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BRIGGS. To correct the record, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. BRIGGS. On HB 975 I had voted "yes" and I should have been a "no." Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman. Your comments will be spread upon the record.

BILLS RECOMMENDED

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

- HB 1302;
- SB 381;
- SB 618; and
- SB 664.

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

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

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

- HB 69;
- SB 115;
- SB 265;
- SB 266;
- SB 267;
- SB 268;
- SB 269;
- SB 282;

SB 484; and
SB 532.

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

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 121 and HB 1108 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 TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 121 and HB 1108 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.

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 the gentleman, Representative Jones, who so moves that this House do now adjourn until Wednesday, June 23, 2021, at 11 a.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 6:58 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.