

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2021

SESSION OF 2021

205TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 53

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

THE SPEAKER (BRYAN CUTLER) PRESIDING

PRAYER

HON. RYAN WARNER, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Father, we come to You today asking for Your guidance, wisdom, and support as we begin today's session. Help us engage in meaningful discussion and allow us to grow closer as a group. Fill us with Your grace as we make decisions that affect the residents of our great Commonwealth and of our great nation. We ask for Your guidance in the matters at hand, and we ask that You would clearly show us how to conduct our work with a spirit of joy and enthusiasm. Let us release the bind of blame in exchange for accord. Help us to endure disagreement and strife with courage and compassion.

As we conduct today's business, we ask that You help us find balance within. We ask that You bring us closer together. Grant us the ability to understand our differences. Guide us in our cooperation with each other as we carry out the business of all Pennsylvanians.

We ask this in Your gracious 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 Tuesday, October 5, 2021, will be postponed until printed.

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER. For the information of the members, the Speaker is permitting Steve Cowan and Barry Schienberg from PBS-Habitat Media to be on the floor and recording for 10 minutes to get some general video of floor proceedings.

HOUSE RESOLUTION INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 147 By Representatives WHEATLEY, LEWIS DELROSSO, SCHMITT, SANCHEZ, LONGIETTI, FREEMAN, McNEILL, MILLARD, M. MACKENZIE, BROOKS, A. DAVIS, HOHENSTEIN, HOWARD and KIM

A Concurrent Resolution designating October 28, 2021, as "Lights On Afterschool Day" in Pennsylvania.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, October 6, 2021.

HOUSE BILL INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 1957 By Representatives IRVIN, BERNSTINE, BURNS, COOK, COX, HENNESSEY, HILL-EVANS, JAMES, MILLARD, NEILSON, RIGBY, ROTHMAN, ROWE, RYAN, SCHMITT, SONNEY and STRUZZI

An Act designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 994 over the Blacklog Creek, Cromwell Township, Huntingdon County, as the Lieutenant Joseph O. Stevens Memorial Bridge.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, October 5, 2021.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Speaker has been notified that the Consumer Affairs Committee is continuing to meet, so we will temporarily hold off on the master roll call while they conclude their business.

The Speaker has been notified that Consumer Affairs has just concluded. The Chair thanks the gentleman, Representative Matzie.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. In that case, we will turn to leaves of absence. Are there requests for leaves of absence?

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

The Chair recognizes the Democratic whip, who indicates that the gentleman, Representative GAINEY, from Allegheny County wishes to be placed on leave for the day. Without objection, the leave of absence is granted.

MASTER ROLL CALL

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

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—199

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

ADDITIONS—0**NOT VOTING—0****EXCUSED—2**

Boyle Gainey

The SPEAKER. One hundred and ninety-nine 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 Tevye Johnson, who is interning with Representative Krajewski. He is majoring in political science and philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania. Rise and be welcomed.

With Tevye is the legislative director for Representative Krajewski as well, Lena Smith. Please rise and be welcomed.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Turning to committee announcements. The Chair recognizes the vice chair of Appropriations, the gentleman, Representative Topper.

Mr. TOPPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Appropriations Committee of the House will meet immediately at the break in the majority caucus room; Appropriations Committee, immediately at the break in the majority caucus room.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

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

Mr. DUNBAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Republicans will caucus at 11:30 in the majority caucus room. We will be prepared to be back on the floor at 12 o'clock. That is 11:30 in the majority caucus room; back on the floor at 12 noon.

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 hybrid at 11:30.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. This House will stand in recess until 12 noon, unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

AFTER RECESS

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

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**HB 488, PN 2239** By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in offenses against the family, further providing for the offense of endangering welfare of children.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 930, PN 2240 By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Titles 18 (Crimes and Offenses) and 44 (Law and Justice) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in kidnapping, further providing for missing children; and, in DNA data and testing, further providing for policy, for definitions and for State DNA Data Base, providing for collection of DNA in investigations of high-risk missing persons and missing children, for collection of DNA in investigations of missing persons and for collection of DNA in investigations of unidentified decedents and further providing for DNA data base exchange.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1196, PN 2199 By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in matters affecting government units, providing for special standing in constitutional challenges.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1332, PN 2241 By Rep. SAYLOR

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

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1829, PN 2072 By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of October 24, 2012 (P.L.1209, No.151), known as the Child Labor Act, further providing for work permit.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 859, PN 1052 By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in rules of the road in general, further providing for enforcement of failure to stop for school bus with flashing red lights.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE,
CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED****HB 397, PN 371** By Rep. BOBACK

An Act amending Title 35 (Health and Safety) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in incentives for municipal volunteers of fire companies and nonprofit emergency medical services agencies, further providing for rejection and appeal.

VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS.

HB 1451, PN 1583

By Rep. BOBACK

An Act amending the act of June 24, 1976 (P.L.424, No.101), referred to as the Emergency and Law Enforcement Personnel Death Benefits Act, further providing for title of act; and adding provisions relating to coroners.

VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS.

HB 1612, PN 2245 (Amended)

By Rep. BOBACK

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Pennsylvania National Guard, further providing for association group life insurance for Pennsylvania National Guard.

VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS.

SB 248, PN 1128 (Amended)

By Rep. BOBACK

An Act amending Title 38 (Holidays and Observances) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for holidays and observances.

VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS.

SB 550, PN 686

By Rep. BOBACK

An Act amending the act of July 28, 1953 (P.L.723, No.230), known as the Second Class County Code, in special powers and duties of the county, further providing for flags to decorate graves.

VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS.

CALENDAR**BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1819, PN 2204**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 5, 1936 (2nd Sp.Sess., 1937 P.L.2897, No.1), known as the Unemployment Compensation Law, in compensation, further providing for qualifications required to secure compensation.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Ms. LABS offered the following amendment No. **A02534**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 20, by inserting after "participate"
, without good cause,

Amend Bill, page 2, line 22, by striking out "without good cause"

On the question,

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—199

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Boyle	Gainey
-------	--------

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

On the question,

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1837, PN 2203**, entitled:

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

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 880, PN 1091**, entitled:

An Act designating the portion of State Route 2014/Washington Street beginning at the intersection of South Courtland Street and Day Street at segment 0011 offset 1858 and ending at the intersection of Brown Street at segment 0011 offset 0000 in East Stroudsburg Borough, Monroe County, as the Samuel Newman Way; and making a repeal.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 488, PN 2239**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in offenses against the family, further providing for the offense of endangering welfare of children.

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 Vitali, on final passage.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to bring to the attention of the members that this legislation is opposed by the ACLU (American Civil Liberties

Union) for numerous reasons. They say it "creates a new, duplicative offense nearly indistinguishable from current statute." They say the bill raises numerous troubling questions, particularly related to the 24-hour requirement.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlewoman, the prime sponsor, Representative Boback, on final passage.

Ms. BOBACK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With all due respect, those people who are opposed to this bill, in my humble opinion, are ignoring a very important element of the offense: a parent or guardian must recklessly – and I repeat that – recklessly disregard the risk of harm to a child. A person acts recklessly when they consciously, consciously disregard a substantial and unjustifiable risk that their conduct or inaction will produce a certain result. Further, further, Mr. Speaker, a prosecutor would be required to show that the defendant grossly deviated from the standard of care that a reasonable person would observe in the defendant's situation.

I happen to believe that it is a fairly significant stretch to envision this being applied to domestic violence victims who withhold reporting violence to their child – if they intentionally withhold information to the police as a fear of harm to themselves or children. Also, D.A.s will also have and always have discretion when considering whether charges are warranted.

I do not know about you, Mr. Speaker, but with due respect, Mr. Speaker, I am sick and tired of babies and children being used as pawns. The whole idea before this legislation, which came up for at least three sessions, is to protect children, protect babies' lives, and I do appreciate your support. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. 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—155

Armanini	Gregory	Matzie	Ryan
Benninghoff	Greiner	McNeill	Sainato
Bernstine	Grove	Mehaffie	Samuelson
Bizzarro	Guenst	Mentzer	Sanchez
Boback	Hamm	Mercuri	Sankey
Bonner	Harkins	Merski	Sappey
Borowicz	Heffley	Metcalfe	Saylor
Bradford	Helm	Metzgar	Schemel
Brown, R.	Hennessey	Mihalek	Schlossberg
Burns	Hershey	Millard	Schmitt

Carroll	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Schroeder
Causer	Howard	Mizgorski	Schweyer
Ciresi	Irvin	Moul	Silvis
Conklin	James	Mullery	Smith
Cook	Jones	Mullins	Snyder
Cox	Jozwiak	Mustello	Solomon
Culver	Kail	Neilson	Sonney
Davanzo	Kaufers	Nelson, E.	Staats
Davis, T.	Kauffman	O'Mara	Stambaugh
Day	Keefer	O'Neal	Stephens
Deasy	Kerwin	Oberlander	Struzzi
Dellosso	Kim	Ortitay	Thomas
Delozier	Klunk	Owlett	Tomlinson
DelRosso	Knowles	Pashinski	Toohil
DeLuca	Kosierowski	Peifer	Topper
Diamond	Kulik	Pennycuick	Twardzik
Dowling	Labs	Pickett	Warner
Dunbar	Lawrence	Pisciottano	Warren
Ecker	Lewis	Polinchock	Webster
Emrick	Longietti	Puskaric	Wentling
Farry	Mackenzie, M.	Quinn	Wheeland
Fee	Mackenzie, R.	Rader	White
Flood	Major	Rapp	Williams, C.
Freeman	Mako	Rigby	Williams, D.
Fritz	Malagari	Roae	Young
Galloway	Maloney	Rossi	Zimmerman
Gaydos	Markosek	Rothman	
Gillen	Marshall	Rowe	Cutler,
Gillespie	Masser	Rozi	Speaker
Gleim			

NAYS—44

Benham	DeLissio	Innamorato	Miller, D.
Briggs	Driscoll	Isaacson	Nelson, N.
Brooks	Evans	Kenyatta	Otten
Brown, A.	Fiedler	Kinhead	Parker
Bullock	Fitzgerald	Kinsey	Rabb
Burgos	Frankel	Kirkland	Shusterman
Cephas	Guzman	Krajewski	Sims
Cruz	Hanbidge	Krueger	Sturla
Daley	Harris	Lee	Vitali
Davis, A.	Herrin	Madden	Wheatley
Dawkins	Hohenstein	McClinton	Zabel

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Boyle	Gainey
-------	--------

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 930, PN 2240**, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 18 (Crimes and Offenses) and 44 (Law and Justice) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in kidnapping, further providing for missing children; and, in DNA data and testing, further providing for policy, for definitions and for State DNA Data Base, providing for collection of DNA in investigations of high-risk missing persons and missing children, for collection of DNA in investigations of missing persons and for collection of DNA in investigations of unidentified decedents and further providing for DNA data base exchange.

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 Millard, to speak on final passage.

Mr. MILLARD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It has been my pleasure to work the past couple years with Representative Culver on this legislation. This legislation was introduced to help resolve the hundreds of missing person cases that are active in this Commonwealth through DNA collection and the services offered by NamUs (National Missing and Unidentified Persons System). This will allow families to take an active role. NamUs offers a unique feature that allows family members of missing persons to play a valuable, active role in the process of searching for their loved one at no cost. This is a wonderful tool to reunite and provide closure to families of missing persons.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Ms. CULVER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, every week in communities across the Commonwealth, we hear and see headlines that indicate an elderly person with dementia is missing, a high school student thought to be at a friend's house studying is missing, and the Amber Alerts blowing up our phones indicating that someone is missing. Fortunately, many missing person cases get resolved rather quickly, but currently, here in our home State of Pennsylvania, we have 401 missing person cases. We rank ninth in the United States for the amount of people that are missing. The toll on the missing person's family and the loved ones is unimaginable. The terror they feel at hearing the news that someone they love is missing is horrific. Always wondering what happened, how did it happen, and where are they now, haunt these families. When the idea of requiring the State Police to register any personal and identifying information in a central database called NamUs, that assists in efforts to identify these persons and would be available to all law enforcement and all families involved, I, frankly, had never heard of NamUs and did not quite understand how it worked or why it worked. But I quickly got caught up, with my good colleague here from Columbia County.

We quickly began to be contacted by families across the Commonwealth on the importance of this database in locating missing persons. They generously shared their stories with us, which I know could not have been easy for them. I am forever grateful to these families and sincerely thank them for sharing their stories. A few common themes that were expressed through these stories were people felt like they needed to take action to keep their loved one's memory alive so people would not forget about them. They would create walks and runs named after them, scholarship funds – anything they could do to feel useful, helpful, and hopeful.

HB 930 creates a powerful tool for criminal justice agencies for resolving missing, unidentified, and unclaimed person cases. By reporting information to NamUs we bring people, information, forensic science, and technology together. We provide families with some control by allowing them to report important personal information about their missing loved ones themselves.

I would like to thank the chairmen, staff, and members of the Judiciary Committee for working with us to improve this bill and for having it be considered here today. I also want to thank the Pennsylvania State Police for working with us over these last 2 years on the bill and offering their expertise, and the many other stakeholders who shared their thoughts and knowledge.

Maybe not today, maybe not tomorrow will we solve the case of a missing person, but perhaps someday we will, and that is the hope we all need to cling to. I humbly ask my colleagues for an affirmative vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. KRAJEWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise because while I understand the need to use innovation and technology in aiding finding missing persons, I have serious concerns about the expansiveness and potential violations of information privacy in this proposed bill. In today's information age, our rights of privacy, particularly when it comes to government surveillance, have been so infringed upon that we no longer give it a second thought. This bill suggests that for any missing person, we collect their DNA, submit that DNA to law enforcement, and then also submit that DNA to a national public database.

My concerns about this process are twofold. Firstly, I believe the 30-day timeline is far too short. Many of us have had a rebellious phase as teenagers. There are countless stories of young people running away from home, whether it be due to a bad argument, a traumatic event, or just wanting to test their freedom—

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I am having a hard time being able to hear myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend. We actually just turned your microphone up, sir.

Mr. KRAJEWSKI. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. You may go ahead and proceed.

Mr. KRAJEWSKI. —and safely returning without being harmed. Now, imagine if that young person's DNA was permanently submitted to law enforcement and anyone wishing to could acquire their information on a public database. What happens when the search is called off? Is their DNA still in this database? I see no provisions in this bill for removing the DNA if the search is called off. This leads to my second concern, which is that there is no option to opt out of having the DNA of the missing person be collected. If someone wishes to collaborate with law enforcement by submitting their DNA of the missing person, that is their prerogative; however, to obligate someone to do so without any option to refuse is another invasion of personal rights.

I am very concerned about the countless people missing in our Commonwealth and beyond. In Philadelphia we have a particular issue with young Black girls and women going missing; however, I do not think that enforcement agencies, that can barely keep up

with the forensic workload they already have, should be granted access to our genetic information. So I will be a "no" on HB 930, and I ask my colleagues to do the same. Thank you.

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

Mr. BRIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand to rise in support of HB 930. I understand some of the concerns that were just raised, and I feel confident that if it continues to be worked on in the Senate, we might be able to make this even better. But the ACLU is neutral on 930 as we stand here today. And I just want to rise to thank the maker of the bill for working in a collaborative manner to address the concerns that I had in committee, and I am happy to stand here in support of HB 930. I encourage all the members to vote affirmative. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Speaker recognizes the gentleman, the majority leader, on final passage.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There is probably nothing more heart-wrenching, disturbing, and challenging for families than to not know where one of their children are. As someone who has served as county coroner many years ago when some of this technology was not available and had to use some other rudimentary-type techniques in order to try to identify unidentifiable remains that we would have located to us, either through fires or other types of situations, the utilization of DNA, and how that technology has even improved since it first came on the scene, and this very minute amount that can now help solve cold cases and provide those answers is paramount. I rise to support the Representative for her hard work on this. I do not know many that are more thoughtful and deliberative in the work and investigation that they do, and I know this is important to her, as she puts much passion in it, and it should be important to all of us as those Representatives and those voices for those people and those families.

I first ran for the House because, as coroner, I always felt like I was dealing with bad situations at the end of the equation. What impact was I able to have to prevent these things from happening? Well, legislation like this provides that tool, especially in the case if somebody's disappearance is from someone else's malicious behavior and one who does not stop at the first victim. It is through DNA availability, and I should remind you that the family would voluntarily provide this information. But this allows us to provide another great tool to help not only take these individuals off the street who may commit a crime, but to provide the long-awaited information for people that disappear and for families that wait endlessly. Losing a child, losing a friend, a brother, husband, whomever, is never easy no matter what the circumstances, but to not know what happened is even more devastating.

I rise to support this. As it was said earlier, when the case is over, that information is removed. These data banks get a ton of information, and obviously, if we can clear a case, we try to remove that information to provide room for others. I would ask you to be the voice for the voiceless and support HB 930.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Shall the bill pass finally?

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. 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—190

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

NAYS—9

Benham	Kenyatta	Krajewski	Miller, D.
Burgos	Kinsey	Lee	Rabb
Fiedler			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Boyle	Gainey
-------	--------

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 1196, PN 2199**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in matters affecting government units, providing for special standing in constitutional challenges.

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 Vitali.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to this bill. I would note that HB 1196 is opposed by the Governor, the Public Defender Association of Pennsylvania, and the Allegheny Office of Public Defender. I would also suspect it would be opposed by certain environmental groups were they aware of its content.

This essentially gives the House or Senate standing in court cases where a law of the Commonwealth is alleged to be unconstitutional. The Public Defender Association of Pennsylvania says, and I will quote, "HB 1196 erodes the autonomy of courts by permitting the legislature to enter a court case..." They also say, "The judiciary is the appropriate body to review the constitutionality of statutes, and should not be subject to the attendant political pressures..." and intent. This is what the Allegheny Office of Public Defender says.

Additionally, there is concern about the separation of powers. They say that "It is also worth noting that if the General Assembly or individual legislators wish to step into ongoing court cases, they already can appear before the courts as *amicus curiae*." It is also important to note that the Attorney General and the Governor already have standing needed to defend these statutes.

And finally, from an environmental perspective, the case against the Delaware River Basin Commission, brought by the Senate, was dismissed by lack of standing. If this bill would be

passed, this would give the Senate and House standing to challenge on very important environmental issues.

Also is the concern that this could be very expensive to taxpayers, those who care about our fiscal dollars. Allowing the legislature on its whim, perhaps for political purposes, to weigh in on suits on the taxpayer dime could be very costly to our citizens, and this is not something we want.

So I would ask for a "no" vote on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Speaker recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Kinkead, on final passage.

Ms. KINKEAD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As my colleague noted, this bill is a classic example of legislative overreach. It bends backwards to erode the barrier between the executive and legislative branches. What is even more concerning, though, is that it makes this effort without actually achieving its stated goal. As the only legislator in this room with experience on the Commonwealth Court, I can tell you that nothing that we as legislators would offer to the court pursuant to this legislation would have legitimate evidentiary value, at least not without opening dozens of troubling legal proceedings and rulings.

As we are very much aware, the legislation that we pass in the House is passed by a majority vote of 203 members, not by single legislators or small subgroups of legislators. This is important for a couple of reasons. First, everything that we consider as a legislative body before passing legislation is already part of the preserved legislative record, and that is the only substantive evidence that the court could or would review. Any other testimony provided by one of us after the fact would not be part of the official record and would either not be considered by the court or would be, at best, viewed with great skepticism. Courts will only accept evidence if there is a witness that is willing and capable of providing sworn testimony. If one of us would make an in-court statement about the intent of the General Assembly, then that legislator would be subject to deposition and cross-examination as per the constitutional right of confrontation.

Since the only additional testimony that we could provide about the origin and intent of a law would be based on off-the-record, informal conversations and bargaining, the court would then need to determine what other evidence would need to be sought and considered when verifying this testimony or it would be impermissible as hearsay. There is also a real question about whether a legislator offering such testimony could be impeached based on public statements about the law that could be construed by the court or the public as conflicting with the law's stated purpose. Further, it could open any conversations that we have had with lobbyists or stakeholders regarding the law to discovery, and any and all campaign donations made to a testifying legislator could be used to impeach their credibility in the court. It would be messy, time-consuming, and costly to taxpayers, while risking unfairly and inaccurately distorting public and legal perception of the legislative process at a time when public confidence in our commitment to the public is at an all-time low.

But this also assumes that the court would put any weight on a single legislator or group of legislators' interpretation of the law and it cannot. Because legislation is not passed by a single member or group of the General Assembly, laws cannot be interpreted on the view of a single or group of legislators. A small group of us cannot speak for the rest of us who might have

different or competing ideas about why we passed a given law or what language contained in the law means. Floor debate earlier this week clearly demonstrates how differing our views are with regards to the meaning of legislation. With that in mind, if only a portion of the General Assembly becomes a party to an action, courts do not have to give any weight to the claim or any evidence presented in support of it. Moreover, there is considerable court precedent across the nation – including from the U.S. Supreme Court – that states that one chamber of a bicameral legislature lacks capacity to assert interests belonging to the legislature as a whole.

Finally, HB 1196 fails to require that a legislator or legislators seeking to enter a case were actually part of the original passing of the law. Without active participation, legislators would only be capable of presenting their own after-the-fact assessment as to what the law's intent was supposed to have been at the time of passage. Courts have never given weight to this kind of opinion evidence.

We already have a system in place in which the constitutionality of our actions in here can be assessed. It works. We can elect to proceed amicus or to allow the Office of the Attorney General to zealously represent the interests of the Commonwealth, as they have been elected to do, or we could pass HB 1196 and open a Pandora's box of legal questions, along with years of potential litigation, to solve a problem that does not exist. I vote for the first option, and I urge my colleagues to do the same by voting "no" on HB 1196. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

The Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Representative Ecker, on final passage.

Mr. ECKER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would agree with my colleagues that the court does in fact determine constitutionality of things. What we are missing here is that we as the legislative body have something to offer to that conversation, and right now, unless a judge grants us permission to intervene in one of those cases, we cannot achieve party status. We can file amicus briefs and friend-of-the-court briefs and somewhat give our opinion, but the court does not have to accept that. That is just a brief that gets filed, much like any other private group can file those things. We are talking about becoming parties to the matter. And look, whenever the constitutionality of something that we pass in this body is challenged, why should we not have our perspective defended? Again, we are talking about defending the constitutionality of an argument. We are not trying to decide it.

Now, I also want to correct that I in fact did argue some cases before the Commonwealth Court, so I am sure there are a few other members in this body that have. So, you know, I do believe that we are in a position in this body to provide some arguments and defend. Let me use a brief example. Two parties in a case, private parties; they are litigating constitutionality of a case. They decide to settle that case. We do not like that outcome; we do not like the outcome. If we are not a party to that suit, we do not get to file an appeal. We are out. Per example, simple example of where we, the legislature would decide that we want to contest a constitutionality decision by the litigants.

Look, this is not for partisan matters. This is not for – it requires a four vote from the BMC (Bipartisan Management Committee). This is not so we can litigate controversial decisions. This is so that we can defend the constitutionality of bills or things that become law and offer our perspective. Now, we can go down the evidentiary rabbit hole and parse out when things

can be authenticated, but the fact of the matter is, when you are a party to the case, you have the ability to control the procedure of the case, have a say in a case; that is why this bill is important. This is another check on the other branches of government. We need to support this bill. I would ask for an affirmative vote.

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—113

Armanini	Gregory	Masser	Rowe
Benninghoff	Greiner	Mehaffie	Ryan
Bernstine	Grove	Mentzer	Sankey
Boback	Hamm	Mercuri	Saylor
Bonner	Heffley	Metcalfe	Schemel
Borowicz	Helm	Metzgar	Schmitt
Brooks	Hennessey	Mihalek	Schroeder
Brown, R.	Hershey	Millard	Silvis
Causar	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Smith
Cook	Irvin	Mizgorski	Sonney
Cox	James	Moul	Staats
Culver	Jones	Mustello	Stambaugh
Davanzo	Jozwiak	Nelson, E.	Stephens
Day	Kail	O'Neal	Struzzi
Delozier	Kaufner	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	Puskaric	Wheeland
Fee	Lewis	Quinn	White
Flood	Mackenzie, M.	Rader	Williams, C.
Fritz	Mackenzie, R.	Rapp	Zimmerman
Gaydos	Major	Rigby	
Gillen	Mako	Roae	Cutler,
Gillespie	Maloney	Rossi	Speaker
Gleim	Marshall	Rothman	

NAYS—86

Benham	Evans	Krajewski	Pisciottano
Bizzarro	Fiedler	Krueger	Rabb
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Kulik	Rozzi
Briggs	Frankel	Lee	Sainato
Brown, A.	Freeman	Longietti	Samuelson
Bullock	Galloway	Madden	Sanchez
Burgos	Guenst	Malagari	Sapprey
Burns	Guzman	Markosek	Schlossberg
Carroll	Hanbidge	Matzie	Schweyer
Cephas	Harkins	McClinton	Shusterman

Ciresi	Harris	McNeill	Sims
Conklin	Herrin	Merski	Snyder
Cruz	Hohenstein	Miller, D.	Solomon
Daley	Howard	Mullery	Sturla
Davis, A.	Innamorato	Mullins	Vitali
Davis, T.	Isaacson	Neilson	Warren
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Nelson, N.	Webster
Deasy	Kim	O'Mara	Wheatley
DeLissio	Kinthead	Otten	Williams, D.
Delloso	Kinsey	Parker	Young
DeLuca	Kirkland	Pashinski	Zabel
Driscoll	Kosierowski		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Boyle Gainey

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 1829, PN 2072**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of October 24, 2012 (P.L.1209, No.151), known as the Child Labor Act, further providing for work permit.

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 Ecker, on final passage.

Mr. ECKER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is about getting our young folks in jobs quicker. This is a bill that came from the Department of Labor and Industry in response to a regulation that was waived or relaxed during the pandemic. This again is a perfect example of where good-government reform or less regulations are helpful to our workforce.

I started my career, or my job life, at age 14 when you had to get a work permit. I worked at Clair's Family Restaurant, which has now been closed because of the pandemic. But I am guessing that relaxing the ability for young people and relaxing the barriers that it is to get work permits and get them notarized or signed in front of folks – let us make this easier for people to get into the workforce. Let us make these regulations, which are superficial and exhaustive, relax them. That is a good-government policy. There are a lot of bills that we are trying to advance. This is just one of those bills, and I appreciate an affirmative vote.

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—198

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

NAYS—1

Miller, D.

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Boyle

Gaine

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 859, PN 1052**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in rules of the road in general, further providing for enforcement of failure to stop for school bus with flashing red lights.

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 Vitali, on final passage.

Mr. VITALI. Mr. Speaker, is there anyone who could stand for interrogation on this?

The SPEAKER. I will check for you, sir.

Mr. VITALI. Maybe the chairman of the appropriate committee where this came through.

The SPEAKER. It appears that the chairman of the committee will acknowledge your interrogation. You are in order and may proceed, sir.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you very much. I do appreciate it.

I am just trying to understand what the bill does. I personally have reservations about things like any sort of automated system that imposes fines or penalties on the Commonwealth, things like red light cameras and the, you know, speed things. And could you tell me what this bill does as it relates to school buses in that context.

Mr. HENNESSEY. Yes, I can, Mr. Speaker. Act 159 of 2018 established the authority for policing authorities to enforce side stop signs on the side of buses. All right? PennDOT was given 3 years to come up with permanent regulations. They first developed temporary regulations; they are currently in effect. The permanent regulations have not been developed yet, probably because of the delays that have occurred with regard to the pandemic. This bill does not change anything in existing law. It simply gives PennDOT 2 extra years to come up and offer permanent regulations.

Mr. VITALI. Does this have anything to do with a school bus taking pictures of motorists automatically?

Mr. HENNESSEY. Mr. Speaker, there have been occasions – and that is part of the enforcement. There will be pictures taken of the license plate of a violator. That is the way the prohibition against passing school buses, which are stopped, is effective. All right? Again, this does not change any of that. It simply says that they have 2 more years to come up with permanent regulations. Nothing else in the law changes.

Mr. VITALI. With regard to a picture that was taken of a license plate, could that – I know that generally this infraction has a substantial license suspension implication. In the situation where the infraction is taken, where the picture is taken only, automatically, could this result in a substantial license suspension?

Mr. HENNESSEY. Mr. Speaker, the picture would be part of the evidence that would be entered in terms of convicting someone if they contested the violation, but again, this does not change any existing law. It simply gives PennDOT 2 more years to develop a permanent regulation.

Mr. VITALI. But again, not to beat a dead horse, but I know like, for example, with red light cameras, for example, the penalty is not as severe because there is this issue of proof of the driver is not the person who may be the car owner. I am just, I am just trying to understand if this is extending regulations which could result in a person's license suspended for a substantial period of time due to passing a school bus where there was not any human observation of the driver of the car.

Mr. HENNESSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am not so sure there is a question there.

Mr. VITALI. I can restate it. And if you do not know, you just do not know, and that is okay. But I am trying to get at, are we involving, is this subject matter with regard to taking pictures from school buses, could this result in people, you know, the owner of a vehicle getting a license suspension for a substantial period of time when the only proof here was a photograph as opposed to more?

Mr. HENNESSEY. Again, this does not change the evidentiary rules. It does not change anything at all except extend PennDOT's temporary regulations for 2 additional years because they have not gotten around yet to developing permanent regulations. It would keep the temporary rules in place for another 2 years.

Mr. VITALI. Okay. So— Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HENNESSEY. You are welcome.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (JOHN A. LAWRENCE) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the gentleman from Luzerne, Representative Carroll, is recognized.

Mr. CARROLL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Chester highlighted, this bill is really important in the effort to try and prevent people from going past the school bus with the flashing arm. And HB 364 of 2020 was unanimously passed in this chamber – unanimously – that set this in motion. And so, Mr. Speaker, this bill simply gives

PennDOT the additional time necessary to do the regulations to allow the continued use of an automated camera to capture the license plate of vehicles that blow past a school bus with the flashing arm. I do not think there is a member in this chamber that is eager to see a child get hit with a car as a result of blowing past a school bus with the flashing arm. The bill passed unanimously in 2020. It ought to pass unanimously today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Are there any other members seeking recognition on the bill?

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 (BRYAN CUTLER)
PRESIDING**

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—199

Armanini	Fritz	Mackenzie, M.	Roae
Benham	Galloway	Mackenzie, R.	Rossi
Benninghoff	Gaydos	Madden	Rothman
Bernstine	Gillen	Major	Rowe
Bizzarro	Gillespie	Mako	Rozzi
Boback	Gleim	Malagari	Ryan
Bonner	Gregory	Maloney	Sainato
Borowicz	Greiner	Markosek	Samuelson
Bradford	Grove	Marshall	Sanchez
Briggs	Guenst	Masser	Sankey
Brooks	Guzman	Matzie	Sappey
Brown, A.	Hamm	McClinton	Saylor
Brown, R.	Hanbidge	McNeill	Schemel
Bullock	Harkins	Mehaffie	Schlossberg
Burgos	Harris	Mentzer	Schmitt
Burns	Heffley	Mercuri	Schroeder
Carroll	Helm	Merski	Schweyer
Causser	Hennessey	Metcalfe	Shusterman
Cephas	Herrin	Metzgar	Silvis
Ciresi	Hershey	Mihalek	Sims
Conklin	Hickernell	Millard	Smith
Cook	Hohenstein	Miller, B.	Snyder
Cox	Howard	Miller, D.	Solomon
Cruz	Innamorato	Mizgorski	Staats
Culver	Irvin	Moul	Stambaugh
Daley	Isaacson	Mullery	Stambaus
Davanzo	James	Mullins	Stephens
Davis, A.	Jones	Mustello	Struzzi
Davis, T.	Jozwiak	Neilson	Sturla
Dawkins	Kail	Nelson, E.	Thomas
Day	Kaufer	Nelson, N.	Tomlinson

Deasy	Kauffman	O'Mara	Toohil
DeLissio	Keefer	O'Neal	Topper
Delloso	Kenyatta	Oberlander	Twardzik
Delozier	Kerwin	Ortitay	Vitali
DelRosso	Kim	Otten	Warner
DeLuca	Kinhead	Owlett	Warren
Diamond	Kinsey	Parker	Webster
Dowling	Kirkland	Pashinski	Wentling
Driscoll	Klunk	Peifer	Wheatley
Dunbar	Knowles	Pennycuick	Wheeland
Ecker	Kosierowski	Pickett	White
Emrick	Krajewski	Pisciottano	Williams, C.
Evans	Krueger	Polinchock	Williams, D.
Farry	Kulik	Puskaric	Young
Fee	Labs	Quinn	Zabel
Fiedler	Lawrence	Rabb	Zimmerman
Fitzgerald	Lee	Rader	
Flood	Lewis	Rapp	Cutler,
Frankel	Longietti	Rigby	Speaker
Freeman			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Boyle Gainey

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 859, PN 1052

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in rules of the road in general, further providing for enforcement of failure to stop for school bus with flashing red lights.

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

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1332, PN 2241**, entitled:

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 online curriculum availability.

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 Lewis.

Mr. LEWIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage and ask for your support for HB 1332. In a world that increasingly relies on electronic communication, remote learning, getting things done through the Internet, it is important that we update all of our policies and transparency laws to be consistent with that. And so in keeping with that, we encourage a positive vote on HB 1332, which will ensure that parents always have the ability to see what their kids are learning in school.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a notion that, based on the amendment that was adopted yesterday, there would not be a burden on our classroom teachers, and I want to dispel that notion. And so the amendment that was adopted does say that "The chief school administrator or a designee shall be responsible for implementing the requirements under subsection (a)," but we know what implementation looks like. That looks like that chief school administrator bothering teachers, classroom teachers, to find out, okay, what material, what instructional material have you utilized? And you need to marshal that up, gather that up and get that to us so that we can put it on a Web site. And we know how expansive that instructional material is; we talked about that yesterday. And we talked about the fact that it changes all the time, and so this is an ongoing burden. And so that is why the School Boards Association, in opposing this bill, specifically talked about the untold hours of administrators and teachers in order to comply. Now, why should we be concerned about those untold hours of teachers? Because they are the ones that provide classroom instruction. So when something impacts them, it directly impacts the students that they teach.

I want to read an e-mail that I received from a classroom teacher last night. It was not a form e-mail. This was one that this teacher wrote and I talked to her husband. She says, "This bill is impossible for teachers! We are working full time and we do not have time to post every assignment that we do just because. I worked AROUND the clock last year and we were given an hour every morning to create and post assignments. Then we also did meetings with our virtual students. Even with that time built in I was going to bed with my computer. Now the hour is taken away and people want even more from us. This HAS to stop. We already have a teacher shortage, no subs, and our kids aren't getting specials because there are no subs for the arts...."

And so this is what we are talking about here. I get the intent. I get the purpose. I think, you know, I think virtually everyone agrees with transparency, but what is the burden, and are we really effectuating the result that is desired?

And I just want to pick up again with the School Boards Association, because some of the things that I talked about yesterday, they also warn about. First of all, they warn about the lack of what they call zero clarity because we do not have a definition of "instructional materials." "...zero clarity or

limitation regarding what information and materials must be posted on public websites." They talk about "...substantial administrative burden and financial cost...." They talk about the fact that because it is not defined, we are going to leave it "...to the courts, at taxpayers' expense, to determine how to...comply with the law." And they talk about, as I did yesterday, this expansive term: "instructional materials." "The sheer volume of the materials that could fit into the mandate to post 'curriculum' and 'instructional materials' on school district websites is incredible...." They talk about some of the things that it could include – worksheets, class notes, science labs, physical learning objects, computer programs. They talk about the issue that I warned about yesterday: likely to "create issues related to copyright law for published works and proprietary materials which under current law can simply be shown to individuals rather than published on public websites."

And so in the end of their e-mail, they indicate that they are willing, you know, they are willing to be at the table here. They say, "Additional transparency via electronic access is achievable through a thoughtful approach that includes stakeholders in a process of developing a viable proposal...." And so unfortunately, that is where we are at today is that we do not have a viable proposal on the floor. We have a problematic proposal.

It is going to bleed precious time from our already stressed classroom teachers. They are trying to make up for learning loss. They are trying to deal with where we are at in the school system right now. They do not need another burden placed at their doorstep, because they are going to be hearing from their administrators. Their administrators are going to be coming around, if we adopt this into law, saying, you better get everything together, and every time it changes, you better get it to me so we can comply with the law and post it on a Web site. We do not need that.

We have not heard – at least I have not heard – from folks who are saying that the current system is not working for them. I have not heard of that in 15 years. Nevertheless, it is a new era. We do have things available on computer access. And I think the School Boards Association has it right. Let us sit down and actually get this right, get something that is viable and workable. Unfortunately, this is not the product, and I ask my colleagues to vote "no." Thank you.

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

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I really appreciate my colleague from Mercer County's perspective about the burden that this presents to school districts, but let me give you a little bit of a different perspective that also, I think, justifies opposing this bill.

This bill will drag education right into the middle of the culture wars so that your neighbor, her grandfather in Florida, your crazy uncle, and his best friend in California, can all weigh in on what the schools are teaching your child. Let us be clear: nobody is hiding school curricula right now. If anything, as anyone who has attended a parent-teacher conference knows, teachers are all too delighted to explain what our children are supposed to be learning in the classroom. Parents who do not get enough information from teachers can review the history books that come home every day or simply ask their children about their day and what they learned in school. The truth is, if parents do not have good communication with their own children, this legislation will not help.

As a last resort, as the prime sponsor read to us on the floor yesterday, Pennsylvania Code already allows parents access to any of the materials they want. Every single pamphlet, book, wall poster, handout, video, and chalkboard lesson are considered instructional material that must be available to parents. Our educational system is already just about as transparent as you can get.

So if this bill is not about transparency for parents, what is it about? It is about bringing the fights that get started on Fox News to the kindergarten classroom near you. It is about forcing our overburdened school districts to post every single thing they do online so that right-wing muckrakers, or for that matter, left-wing muckrakers can waste precious educational resources fighting these battles. This legislation is an invitation to the book burners and the antimaskers to harass our schools and our teachers.

As a Jewish-American, I know very well how vital it is that children have access to an unvarnished version of history. It has always been excruciating to watch Holocaust deniers pretend that genocidal Nazis were just misunderstood. And in recent years I have seen those same deniers of the Holocaust joined by those who deny the massacre of kindergartners of Sandy Hook Elementary, the September 11 terrorist attacks, and the racism of the Jim Crow era. Just recently they have been joined by those who would deny the truth of slavery in the United States and its devastating legacy at all.

If we must have ugly battles about whether racism exists, let us have them. But please, not in our children's classrooms. If parents really want access to their children's schoolbooks, they already can. And if they want to protest the bravery of Rosa Parks and Ruby Bridges, they can already do so. But if parents are not dissatisfied and are not protesting, then there is no reason to invite QAnon supporters from around the country to weigh in on our teachers' choices and our children's education.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend. The gentleman was dancing on the line for quite some time in terms of the underlying premise of the bill. I would encourage you to come back to the curriculum requirements that are outlined in the bill and not use general classifications to describe essentially the reasons to support or not support the bill, which goes to a member's motives. You are in order if you can do so, sir.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If this General Assembly starts interfering in classrooms the same way it has been trying to interfere in elections and doctor's offices, every system we hold dear will be in peril. Let our teachers teach so our children can learn.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I am— It is a little shocking to hear so many people offended by the idea that we would not want QAnon coming down to classrooms.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

Mr. KENYATTA. That is what just happened, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend. You are not in order. The gentleman was corrected for going outside the bounds of the bill. That particular assertion has already been addressed. I would ask the current speaker to please abide by the same rules. If you can do so, you are in order and may proceed.

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This bill is not about transparency at all. This bill is about adding more flames to a fire that is currently burning. We see right now historic levels of threatened violence against teachers and against school administrators. If this bill is to become law, I think there is no doubt that we would see those threats intensify.

This is a moment for us right now where we can focus on serious things that help our kids. This proposal does not do that. This proposal does not do a lot of what the good gentleman and maker of this bill says it would do. This proposal does exactly what the Speaker admonished me to not talk about, but it encourages certain factions in our country to be emboldened and to continue to spread lies about what is happening in our classrooms.

Our kids have missed a year and a half, 2 years of in-person instruction, and anything we do in this body should be about ensuring that they get to where they need to be so that they can leave school and follow whatever their dreams are. To have bills that are labeled as transparency when they do nothing more than foster conspiracy is wrong. And this bill should be soundly defeated, and I will be an absolute "no."

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

Mr. N. NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the opportunity.

It is interesting: right above me it says, etched on the ceiling here, "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall set you free," which is a wonderful thought that we all must continue to recognize that this is how we serve in this House. And I would love it if the notion of this bill were solely focused on what we are learning in our classrooms. If all we were thinking about when we approached this bill is if our students and our young people are coming home with an understanding of the truth in American history, but unfortunately, I do not think this bill is about that.

This bill, sadly, in my mind must be voted down because we are not teaching our children enough of anything because we have a significant funding shortage for education right now. Our educators are not in support of this bill because they have already got too much to do. This bill is an unfunded mandate to not only try and continue to provide information on Web sites that would track what is happening in the classroom on a regular basis, but in some of our classrooms – my wife is middle school teacher – they do not have substitutes. In many of our classrooms, our teachers who are teaching the histories that we are hoping will set our children free, those teachers right now are gym teachers, they are art teachers because we do not have enough educators in the classroom to begin with. And sadly, in my district, and maybe some of yours, our students are not in the buildings to learn because there was no bus driver to come and pick them up, Mr. Speaker. So right now we have an unfunded mandate, and that mandate is to educate our children. So before we think about adding yet another requirement to our school districts to post all of this information online, let us make sure that our school districts are actually teaching lesson plans to students in their classrooms.

Mr. Speaker, we know that we have a \$4 billion shortfall from adequate education. This bill does not address a \$4 billion shortfall. Mr. Speaker, we know we have a \$1 billion adequacy

gap just from level funding of school districts. This bill does not do anything to address that. So if your school district, Mr. Speaker, is adequately funded; if you know that all of your classrooms have the materials they need, have the teachers that they need that are certified, and have all of the students with transportation to and from school – if all of those things are met in your school district and the last cog in adequate education for you is the fact that you do not have the materials on the Web site, I ask you to vote for this bill. But if you are missing teachers, if you do not have nurses and counselors, if you do not have the textbooks that will teach our students the truth so that they can be set free, I ask for a "no" vote. Thank you.

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

Mr. BERNSTINE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is really important legislation, and I would like to thank our colleagues on the other side of the aisle for talking about why it is so important. And the reason it is so important is that we hear about fostering conspiracy. Well, if everything is online and people can see it, that is transparent. There will be no conspiracy. We talk about making sure that they receive an adequate education. Well, if everything is online and transparent, we will make sure that they are receiving an adequate education. We will talk about spreading lies, but there will be no lies because the information will specifically be online so people can see it.

But one of the other things that was talked about is parents being able to see it online. And no doubt about that, that is important. But remember, there are many other taxpayers that pay a great deal of money that should also be seeing what their taxpayer dollars are actually going for. And not just within that district, because in Bucks County, people spend their tax money and it goes to pay for Mohawk School District in Lawrence County, and people in Butler County pay State taxes that then go to Wilson in Berks County.

This is simply a transparency bill, a transparency bill that too far and too often in our education system, people are hiding, and there is no reason to hide if there is nothing to be scared of. What are they scared of when the PSEA (Pennsylvania State Education Association) sends out information and asks us to vote against this? When the Pennsylvania School Boards Association sends an e-mail out – which, by the way, is taxpayer-funded lobbying – that says, hey, we do not want to be posting what curriculum students are learning. My question to those groups is, what are you scared of? We are scared of nothing, and we should be making this transparent for students and taxpayers across the entire Commonwealth.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of points. I believe there is a lack of broadband in a large portion of this State, and so even if some school districts do put all this online, the only people that are going to be able to view it are people that do not live in that school district.

Secondly, this bill only applies to public schools, not any school that receives public funding. So any private school that receives State dollars for transportation, State dollars for books,

State dollars for education grants, State dollars for EITC (educational improvement tax credit) scholarships, State dollars for anything is not required to post that. So what happens to all the taxpayers that fund those programs? How comes they do not get to see where their dollars are going when it goes into private hands in private schools?

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill even if it did include those things, but it does not. This is simply an attack on public education, plain and simple. I encourage a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair has been notified that the last two speakers have waived off.

Seeing no one else seeking recognition, the Chair will return to the prime sponsor of the bill for recognition on the second time for final passage.

Mr. LEWIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And thank you, colleagues, for weighing in and for a robust conversation.

I want to address a couple of the concerns and then urge a "yes" vote on final passage; first and foremost, the concern about the burden on teachers. So just to reiterate, with the passage of yesterday's amendment, the bill was amended to ensure that the school administrator or a designee would be responsible for implementing this – certainly not a teacher. So it would not be an additional burden on teachers. By the way, I would note, many schools in the Commonwealth already meet the requirement. This simply standardizes it and makes it consistent across the Commonwealth. These provisions are already required for under the Pennsylvania Code. It simply brings our State into the 21st century by making sure that, especially in an environment of remote learning, parents can access the information that they are already entitled to by code online.

I would also note, with respect to the concern that this is an unfunded mandate, every district has an IT (information technology) budget. And I want to just point out, there is a school district in Pennsylvania that the IT budget is \$10 million. There is another school district that just noninstructional information systems are \$4 1/2 million. So the IT budget is going to cover making sure this information gets on the Web site.

This is a transparency bill. It brings current regulations into the 21st century. Mr. Speaker, I would urge a "yes" vote, and I thank you for your consideration today for HB 1332. Thank you.

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

NAYS—89

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Boyle Gainey

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.

GUEST INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pleased to welcome, in the gallery, the chairman of PSERS (Public School Employees' Retirement System), Chris SantaMaria, who is the guest of Representatives Ryan and Bradford. Welcome.

For the information of the members, there will be no further floor votes this afternoon. Those individuals who have requested to speak by rule 17 can proceed to the well of the House and you will be recognized upon conclusion of regular housekeeping.

BILLS RECOMMENDED

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

HB 1819;
HB 1837; and
SB 880.

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 598;
HB 889;
HB 1615;
HB 1641;
HB 1727;
HB 1801;
HB 1830;
HB 1868; and
SB 420.

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

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
(JESSE TOPPER) PRESIDING

STATEMENT BY MR. TWARDZIK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceeding now with rule 17 speakers, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Schuylkill, Mr. Twardzik.

Mr. TWARDZIK. Good morning.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration to honor National Pierogy Day this Friday, October 8. In 1952 my father, Ted, started our family business, Mrs. T's Pierogies, which he named after his mother, my grandmother, Mary Twardzik. Today, nearly

70 years later, the company offers 13 varieties of pierogies and is the number one producer of frozen pierogies in the country. While our delicious pierogies have been the staple on dinner tables across America for many years, people can also see our pierogies running during the fifth inning at the Pittsburgh Pirates games.

No matter what your favorite flavor, if you boil or sauté them, we hope that everyone will join us this Friday in celebrating National Pierogy Day and wishing my mother a happy 90th birthday. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

STATEMENT BY MR. CRUZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the subject of Hispanic Heritage Month, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Cruz.

Mr. CRUZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we celebrate Hispanic Heritage Month to honor our Costa Rican, El Salvadoran, Guatemalan, Honduran, Nicaraguan, Mexican, and Chileno ancestors who gained independence for their people. As chair of the Latino Affairs Caucus, I thought it was so important for us to come here and talk about those dynamic youth that are carrying our nation into the future. This is why I have placed this resolution on our legislative agenda since 2013, and why this body has unanimously adopted it every session since.

On August 31 of this year I introduced HR 134, honoring Hispanic Heritage Month. It has been celebrated as a national holiday since 1988. I introduced HR 134 ahead of the holiday on September 15 because my community is not an afterthought, but because it comes first. Despite celebrating a national holiday in compliance with House rules, HR 134 has been sitting in the State Government Committee since it was referred. But I wanted to reiterate: this holiday is about respect for those people who came before us and our unity in the face of historical forces that make an effort to tear us apart. I am urging my colleagues, and I know because of the House change in House rules that we can visit and change the House rules so that we can be acceptive of this resolution honoring a national holiday as Hispanic Heritage Month.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

STATEMENT BY MRS. SCHROEDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the subject of National Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Day, the Chair recognizes the lady from Bucks, Mrs. Schroeder.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my fellow members for recognizing October 8, 2021, as "National Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Day" in Pennsylvania.

Recognizing National Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Day in Pennsylvania will draw attention to the benefits fuel cells and hydrogen technologies provide in generating reliable and resilient power, while increasing America's energy, environmental, and economic security. These efficient, clean, and quiet fuel cells generate electricity through a chemical reaction of hydrogen and oxygen, without combustion.

Zero-emission fuel cell vehicles and fuel cells for power generation are dramatically reducing emissions compared to combustion technologies, and offer a range of other benefits, helping lead our country to a more environmentally friendly and secure future. One hydrogen-powered fuel cell electric passenger vehicle prevents the emission of about 4.6 metric tons of carbon dioxide per year.

Today the fuel cell and hydrogen footprint is making an impact for a long list of customers in many applications and markets. Consumers are driving their choice of several fuel cell vehicles from major automakers; fuel cell buses are in revenue service in several States; a growing network of hydrogen fueling stations are under development; tens of thousands of fuel cell-powered forklifts are working around the clock in America's warehouses and factories; and hundreds of megawatts of fuel cells are powering data centers, communications networks, retail sites, and municipal facilities across the country.

Pennsylvania is experiencing a growth in hydrogen as an energy carrier and a pathway to good environmental stewardship.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For a motion to adjourn, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fayette, Mr. Warner, who moves that the House do adjourn until Monday, October 25, 2021, at 12 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 1:25 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.