

# COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

## LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 29, 2022

SESSION OF 2022

206TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 33

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

#### AFTER RECESS

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

#### THE SPEAKER (BRYAN CUTLER) PRESIDING

#### ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Speaker is in receipt of a motion made by the gentleman, Representative Staats, who moves that this House do now adjourn until Wednesday, June 29, 2022, at 11 a.m., e.d.t.

On the question,  
Will the House agree to the motion?  
Motion was agreed to, and at 10:59 a.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.

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

#### PRAYER

HON. GREG ROTHMAN, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

This is a prayer from "The Valley of Vision," a collection of Puritan prayers and devotions.

Lord Jesus,  
I am blind, be thou my light,  
ignorant, be thou my wisdom,  
self-willed, be thou my mind.  
Open my ear to grasp quickly thy Spirit's voice,  
and delightfully run after his beckoning hand;  
Melt my conscience that no hardness remain,  
make it alive to evil's slightest touch;  
When Satan approaches may I flee to thy wounds,  
and there cease to tremble at all alarms.  
Be my good shepherd to lead me into the green pastures of thy Word,  
and cause me to lie down beside the rivers of its comforts.  
Fill me with peace, that no disquieting worldly gales  
may ruffle the calm surface of my soul.  
Thy cross was upraised to be my refuge,  
Thy blood streamed forth to wash me clean,  
Thy death occurred to give me a surety,  
Thy name is my property to save me,

By thee all heaven is poured into my heart,  
but it is too narrow to comprehend thy love.

I was a stranger, an outcast, a slave, a rebel,  
but thy cross has brought me near,  
has softened my heart,  
has made me thy Father's child,  
has admitted me to thy family,  
has made me joint-heir with thyself.

O that I may love thee as thou lovest me,  
that I may walk worthy of thee, my Lord,  
that I may reflect the image of heaven's first-born.  
May I always see thy beauty with the clear eye of faith,  
and feel the power of thy Spirit in my heart,  
for unless he move mightily in me  
no inward fire will be kindled.

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 from Tuesday, June 28, 2022, will be postponed until printed.

#### HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

**No. 2712** By Representatives KRUEGER, MADDEN, ZABEL, DELLOSO, O'MARA, D. WILLIAMS, CURRY, SAPPEY, BRADFORD, LEE, DALEY and KINKEAD

An Act providing for limitations on capital distributions after certain acquisitions of target firm health systems.

Referred to Committee on COMMERCE, June 28, 2022.

**No. 2727** By Representatives MEHAFFIE, HELM, KEEFER and MILLARD

An Act amending the act of May 3, 1933 (P.L.242, No.86), referred to as the Cosmetology Law, providing for salon area requirements and further providing for temporary licenses.

Referred to Committee on PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE, June 28, 2022.

**SENATE MESSAGE**

AMENDED HOUSE BILLS RETURNED  
FOR CONCURRENCE AND  
REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 1780, PN 3274**, and **HB 1868, PN 2652**, with information that the Senate has passed the same with amendment in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives is requested.

**SENATE MESSAGE**

HOUSE BILL  
CONCURRED IN BY SENATE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 2420, PN 2831**, with information that the Senate has passed the same without amendment.

**SENATE MESSAGE**

HOUSE AMENDMENTS  
CONCURRED IN BY SENATE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, informed that the Senate has concurred in the amendments made by the House of Representatives to **SB 563, PN 1588**, and **SB 1236, PN 1777**.

**BILLS SIGNED BY SPEAKER**

Bills numbered and entitled as follows having been prepared for presentation to the Governor, and the same being correct, the titles were publicly read as follows:

**HB 2420, PN 2831**

An Act amending the act of May 11, 1889 (P.L.188, No.210), entitled "An act entitled 'An act to establish a board of wardens for the Port of Philadelphia, and for the regulation of pilots and pilotage, and for other purposes,' approved March twenty-ninth, one thousand eight hundred and three, and for regulating the rates of pilotage and number of pilots," further providing for rates of pilotage and computation, for pilotage fees and unit charge and for charges for services.

**SB 155, PN 227**

An Act amending Title 12 (Commerce and Trade) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Pennsylvania Military Community Enhancement Commission, further providing for establishment and membership.

**SB 563, PN 1588**

An Act amending the act of April 27, 1927 (P.L.465, No.299), referred to as the Fire and Panic Act, further providing for standards for Class VI buildings.

**SB 573, PN 1712**

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in district election officers, further providing for appointment of watchers; in voting by qualified absentee electors, further providing for canvassing of official absentee ballots and mail-in ballots; and, in penalties, further providing for refusal

to permit overseers, watchers, attorneys or candidates to act, for prohibiting duress and intimidation of voters and interference with the free exercise of the elective franchise and for hindering or delaying performance of duty.

**SB 861, PN 1072**

An Act making the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania a party to the Recognition Of Emergency Medical Services Personnel Licensure Interstate Compact; and providing for the form of the compact.

**SB 1186, PN 1544**

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in registration plates, further providing for USA semiquincentennial registration plates and establishing the Semiquincentennial Restricted Account.

**SB 1236, PN 1777**

An Act amending Title 3 (Agriculture) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for extensive amendments to the very small meat processor Federal inspection reimbursement grant program; in agriculture and youth development, further providing for definitions and for grants; in Commonwealth Specialty Crop Block Grant Program, further providing for Commonwealth Specialty Crop Block Grant Fund; in Urban Agricultural Infrastructure Grant Program, further providing for legislative intent, for definitions, for grant program and for distribution of grant money; and, in Farm-to-School Program, further providing for findings and declarations, for grant program and for applications and review of applications.

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

**LEAVES OF ABSENCE**

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, the Democratic whip, who also indicates that there are no additional leaves.

**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—200**

Abney	Frankel	Mackenzie, M.	Roae
Armanini	Freeman	Mackenzie, R.	Rossi
Benham	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
Boyle	Greiner	Masser	Sankey
Bradford	Grove	Matzie	Sappety
Briggs	Guent	McClinton	Saylor
Brooks	Guzman	McNeill	Schemel
Brown, A.	Hamm	Mehaffie	Schlossberg
Brown, R.	Hanbidge	Mentzer	Schmitt
Bullock	Harkins	Mercuri	Schnee

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

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

Dowling                      Kerwin

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

**GUESTS INTRODUCED**

The SPEAKER. Turning to visitor recognition.

Located to the left of the rostrum, the Chair welcomes the many family members of Representative Josh Kail: Pamela Karnes, his aunt; Abby Kail, his wife; and their children, Solomon, Emmanuel, Annika, Elias, Petra, Cleopatra, and Evangelina. Welcome.

Located in the gallery, the Chair is pleased to welcome Nathan Madden, the guest of Representative Masser. Nathan is an intern for the legal department.

Also located in the gallery, the Chair is pleased to welcome Sam and Ellen Ryan. They are the guests of Representative Twardzik. Welcome.

Also located in the gallery, the Chair is pleased to welcome the guests of Representative Carroll: Jasmine Mathis and Kyle Rossi, who are interns with the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission. Jasmine has graduated from Lincoln University and Kyle is attending West Virginia University.

Turning to committee and caucus announcements.

**RULES AND APPROPRIATIONS  
COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

The SPEAKER. The Speaker will recognize the vice-chairman of the Appropriations Committee for an Appropriations Committee announcement and Rules Committee announcement.

Mr. TOPPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There will be an immediate meeting of the House Rules Committee in the majority caucus room, followed by an immediate meeting of the Appropriations Committee in the majority caucus room. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

There will be an immediate meeting of the House Rules Committee in the majority caucus room, followed by an immediate meeting of the Appropriations Committee 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 12:15 in the majority caucus room; that is 12:15 in the majority caucus room. We will be prepared to be back on the floor at 1:15.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

**DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS**

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

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On behalf of Chairman Dan Miller, Democrats will caucus at the same time. I believe it was 12:15? 12:15. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. That is correct.

**RECESS**

The SPEAKER. This House will stand in recess until 1:15, unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

**RECESS EXTENDED**

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

**AFTER RECESS**

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

**BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEES****HB 1813, PN 3321**

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in pupils and attendance, providing for military child advance enrollment.

**APPROPRIATIONS.**

**HB 2331, PN 3312**

By Rep. BENNINGHOFF

An Act amending the act of October 4, 1978 (P.L.864, No.167), known as the Storm Water Management Act, further providing for powers and duties of the Department of Environmental Resources; and making editorial changes.

RULES.

**HB 2619, PN 3270**

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, providing for State-related university performance-based funding incentive.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**HB 2667, PN 3226**

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 7 (Banks and Banking) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in preliminary provisions, further providing for definitions.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**HB 2702, PN 3322**

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act providing for the highway capital budget project itemization for the fiscal year 2022-2023 to be financed from current revenue or by the incurring of debt.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**SB 635, PN 1125**

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 12 (Commerce and Trade) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in property assessed clean energy program, further providing for purpose, for definitions, for establishment of a program, for notice to lien holder required for participation, for scope of work, for lien and for collection of assessments.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**SB 818, PN 1833**

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending the act of July 19, 1979 (P.L.130, No.48), known as the Health Care Facilities Act, in licensing of health care facilities, providing for ambulatory surgical facility permitted surgical procedures; and abrogating regulations.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**SB 1094, PN 1806**

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in registration of vehicles, providing for apportioned registration renewal; in commercial drivers, further providing for commercial driver's license; in miscellaneous provisions, repealing provisions relating to snow and ice dislodged or falling from moving vehicle and providing for snow and ice; and, in motor carrier safety, repealing provisions relating to findings and declaration of policy and further providing for definitions and for Motor Carrier Safety Advisory Committee.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**ACTUARIAL NOTE**

The SPEAKER. The Speaker acknowledges receipt of a letter from the Independent Fiscal Office regarding an actuarial note for SB 1251, PN 1710.

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

**CALENDAR****BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 904, PN 1140**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in other criminal provisions, further providing for definitions and providing for meetings.

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 905, PN 1141**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of November 22, 1978 (P.L.1166, No.274), referred to as the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency Law, further providing for County Adult Probation and Parole Advisory Committee.

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 1179, PN 1580**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in domestic and sexual violence victim address confidentiality, further providing for definitions, for persons eligible to apply and for application and certification process.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

**SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A****BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 2331, PN 3312**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of October 4, 1978 (P.L.864, No.167), known as the Storm Water Management Act, further providing for powers and duties of the Department of Environmental Resources; and making editorial changes.

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

**CALENDAR CONTINUED**

**BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 814, PN 1822**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in obstructing governmental operations, providing for the offense of evading arrest or detention on foot and for the offense of harming a police animal while evading arrest or detention.

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

Ms. **KINKEAD** offered the following amendment No. **A05191**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 17, by striking out "or misdemeanor"  
Amend Bill, page 2, line 4, by striking out "or misdemeanor"

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

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

Ms. **KINKEAD**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment really just clarifies the underlying bill. There is a lot of language in this bill that can be open to interpretation, and it is important for us to make sure that when our prosecutors and our defense attorneys are acting in relation to this bill that we can actually – that they actually know what the specific language of it is and what they are doing.

So I would ask for a "yes" vote because I think that ultimately our body here is supposed to act in a way that we are making sure that those who are executing the laws are understanding what it is that they are supposed to be doing.

So I would ask for a "yes" vote. Thank you.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair thanks the lady.

The Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Representative Kauffman, to speak on the amendment. And I apologize to the good gentleman about the communications mistake there. Go ahead.

Mr. **KAUFFMAN**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment is unnecessary and I encourage the members to vote it down. 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—89**

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

**NAYS—111**

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

**NOT VOTING—0**

**EXCUSED—2**

Dowling	Kerwin
---------	--------

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?

Ms. **KINKEAD** offered the following amendment No. **A05197**:

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 17 and 18; page 2, line 1; by striking out "another" in line 17, all of line 18 on page 1 and "violation of this section" in line 1 on page 2 and inserting

intentionally, knowingly or recklessly causes serious bodily injury to another person

Amend Bill, page 2, lines 4 through 6, by striking out "another" in line 4, all of line 5 and "this section" in line 6 and inserting  
intentionally, knowingly or recklessly causes death to another person

Amend Bill, page 2, lines 24 and 25, by striking out "police animal suffers death or serious bodily injury" and inserting  
person intentionally, knowingly or recklessly causes death or serious bodily injury to the police animal

Amend Bill, page 2, lines 26 and 27, by striking out "police animal suffers bodily injury" and inserting  
person intentionally, knowingly or recklessly causes bodily injury to the police animal

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

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

Ms. KINKEAD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Once again this is language that just clarifies and specifies what the intention of this act is. Originally, where we are – where I am proposing that we make alterations to the language today, the word used was "suffers," which is not defined in the act, and this merely specifies what it is that a person would have to do in order to be charged under this act.

Again, as legislators, I believe that it is our duty to make sure that those who are executing the laws can understand specifically what it is that they are supposed to be executing, and we must be very particular in our language.

So I would ask for a "yes" vote. Thank you.

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

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Once again this amendment is unnecessary and I would encourage members to vote the amendment down. 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—85

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

#### NAYS—115

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

#### NOT VOTING—0

#### EXCUSED—2

Dowling	Kerwin
---------	--------

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?

Ms. **KINKEAD** offered the following amendment No. **A05214**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 30, by inserting after "RESTITUTION" ,not to exceed \$5,000.

Amend Bill, page 3, line 1, by striking out the comma after "BILLS" and inserting or

Amend Bill, page 3, lines 2 through 4, by striking out "AND FOR THE SALARY OF THE" in line 2, all of line 3 and "ARE LOST TO THE AGENCY" in line 4

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

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

Ms. **KINKEAD**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Once again we are just trying to make sure that this bill is clear and well understood by the people who are executing the laws. So I would ask for a "yes" vote. Thank you.

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

Mr. **KAUFFMAN**. Once again, number three, let us vote it down.

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—77**

Abney	DeLissio	Kim	Parker
Benham	Delloso	Kinkead	Pashinski
Bizzarro	DeLuca	Kinsey	Pisciottano
Bradford	Evans	Kirkland	Rabb
Briggs	Fiedler	Kosierowski	Rozzi
Brown, A.	Fitzgerald	Krajewski	Sanchez
Bullock	Frankel	Krueger	Sappey
Burgos	Freeman	Lee	Schlossberg
Carroll	Guenst	Madden	Schweyer
Cephas	Guzman	Malagari	Shusterman
Ciresi	Hanbidge	Markosek	Sims
Conklin	Harkins	Matzie	Solomon

Covington	Harris	McClinton	Sturla
Cruz	Herrin	McNeill	Vitali
Curry	Hohenstein	Merski	Warren
Daley	Howard	Miller, D.	Webster
Davis, A.	Innamorato	Nelson, N.	Williams, D.
Davis, T.	Isaacson	O'Mara	Young
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Otten	Zabel
Deasy			

**NAYS—123**

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

**NOT VOTING—0**

**EXCUSED—2**

Dowling	Kerwin
---------	--------

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?

The **SPEAKER**. It is the Chair's understanding that the gentleman, Representative Rabb, has withdrawn amendment 5192. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. **ZABEL** offered the following amendment No. **A05195**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 15, by striking out "felony of the third" and inserting misdeemeanor of the first  
Amend Bill, page 2, line 2, by striking out "second" and inserting

third

Amend Bill, page 2, line 24, by striking out "felony of the third" and inserting

misdemeanor of the first

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

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

Mr. ZABEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment does not fundamentally alter the purpose of the bill. What it is trying to do is bring some consistency to how we grade these offenses. When we first did the modern iteration of the Crimes Code, we had about 280 or so offenses. It has since grown to about 1500, and when we do that, as we accumulate, sometimes within our own statutes how we grade criminal penalties is inconsistent.

So for example, we have a current statute right now for fleeing or evading arrest from a police officer. It only applies to people who are operating motor vehicles. However, the penalties in this bill for fleeing on foot are more severe, in many instances, than the penalties for fleeing in an automobile, which I would posit, Mr. Speaker, is inherently more dangerous.

So what my amendment does is bring the grading of the offenses within this statute, fleeing on foot, to be more aligned with the penalties for fleeing via an automobile. I believe the automobile penalties are appropriately severe, given the nature of the potential danger that it causes, and I believe this gradation accomplishes that purpose.

So I ask for a "yes" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Kauffman, on the amendment. I apologize. The gentleman, Representative Kauffman, waives off.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Craig Williams, on the amendment.

Mr. C. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to the amendment, and let me tell you why. As constructed, the bill would make it a second-class felony for you to evade a police officer or animal and kill anyone in the process of doing do. It would establish a third-class felony for causing serious bodily injury for evading arrest and causing serious bodily injury to another animal or another person.

The amendment here downgrades serious bodily injury or death to a misdemeanor, and for that reason I think we should vote down this amendment. Thank you.

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

Ms. KINKEAD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Given that we voted down my previous amendment to specify what we were actually causing, I would take issue with the previous speaker's characterization of the bill that it charges people for causing. What it charges people is for suffering. If an animal or a person suffers these injuries – which means that you do not actually have to be the cause of these injuries; they just happen in the course of it – and you would still be charged.

So I absolutely think that we should put this in line with other offenses that are similar if we are going to have such broad language to allow people to be charged under this. If you are

charged under this law, you can be charged with a more severe felony than if you are evading arrest in a car, and that is a problem.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

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

Mr. ZABEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I certainly share my colleague from Delaware County's concern about appropriate consequences for someone who is involved with injuring a law enforcement officer. What I would say is the reason the fleeing-on-automobile statute does not have these enhancements is because there is no need. This is what aggravated assault, the aggravated assault statute already encompasses these consequences. This is essentially a bootstrapping or a doubling down, I think, in order to maintain consistency within our laws. There is still ample opportunity to prosecute under a number of offenses, including aggravated assault, reckless endangerment of another person, and prosecutors do.

This, again, is not trying to weaken or dilute the effect of the bill. It is just trying to be consistent with the other statutes that we have, and that is why I ask for an affirmative 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 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—83

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

## NAYS—117

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

## NOT VOTING—0

## EXCUSED—2

Dowling Kerwin

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?

Ms. **SHUSTERMAN** offered the following amendment  
No. **A05196**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 12, by inserting after "flees"  
a substantial distance

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

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

Ms. **SHUSTERMAN**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment has to do with fleeing on foot. The word "flee" is defined as "running away from danger," and to many people who are stopped by a police person, a police person who is on a horse or escorted by several dogs, might have the reaction to turn around and flee.

This amendment defines how far someone can go before they are stopped. If your natural reaction is to go ahead and run away from danger – let us say you are scared of horses; you have never been exposed to being near a horse – you are going to turn around and step away.

So my amendment allows it to say "a substantial distance" is the definition of "fleeing." Thank you.

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

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

Will the maker of the amendment stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The Representative indicates she will.

You are in order and may proceed.

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

As was mentioned, on page 1, line 12, the term "substantial distance" is introduced in the underlying bill. Is that a defined term?

Ms. **SHUSTERMAN**. Yes. It is about as defined as the word "flee."

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

On the amendment?

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

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

This amendment introduces uncertainty into the underlying bill, and frankly, I believe it will lead to endless litigation to determine what is or is not the standard contemplated. Certainty in the law is important, and certainty in the Crimes Code is particularly important, so I would encourage a negative vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Ms. **KINKEAD**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I find it ironic that we are talking about introducing unclear terminology into this bill, because we just voted down three amendments that would have further defined things within the bill. We absolutely need to have certainty about what the language of a bill is, whether it is about restitution or about the underlying specific crime and what can be charged and what the elements are.

So we absolutely should know how far somebody can flee and whether or not one step back is enough to charge somebody with this. A substantial distance is a reasonable standard that is understood within the law.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

The question is, will the House agree to the amendment? On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Rabb, on the amendment.

Mr. **RABB**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The previous speaker talked about certainty, and I agree with that. When we look at the Crimes Code – I direct my colleagues to section 5104 of the Pennsylvania Crimes Code, defining "Resisting arrest or other law enforcement. A person commits a misdemeanor of the second degree if, with the intent of preventing a public servant from effecting a lawful arrest or discharging any other duty, the person creates a substantial risk of bodily injury to the public servant or anyone else, or employs means justifying or requiring substantial force to overcome the resistance." Where is the certainty there?

There seems to be inherent vagaries baked into this criminal offense that gives a wide array of options for law enforcement to decide who has indeed resisted arrest and who is just mouthing off, perhaps, and can walk away. Where is the specificity? Where is the certainty in this criminal offense? This is the opening of a

rabbit hole in the criminal legal system that puts so many people into the system because of inherent vagaries.

So I ask and implore my colleagues who demand certainty and specificity to look at some of the most fundamental criminal offenses that we all talk about, we all reference, that do not really mean that much. It is a jackpot for anyone who is out of line with any individual law enforcement officer who says, I do not like your attitude. What does it mean, justified? Who gets to determine what is justified? It falls under this nebulous category of discretion. And I am pro-discretion, do not get me wrong, when there is a level playing field.

In this body, for instance, perhaps it sounds a bit like sycophancy, Mr. Speaker, but I find that you are a fair and impartial Speaker. When you decide who has more leeway on speaking on a particular amendment or a motion or what have you, I find that you tend to rule in a fair and honest way. That is my perspective. But in other institutions where that trust has not been earned, where in fact the public trust has been eroded for very good reasons, who has the discretion to determine what justified substantial force looks like?

This is a vagary intentionally baked into the Crimes Code to allow prosecutors and law enforcement to do what they seek to do. So if you have concerns about the vagaries of my colleagues' amendments here – all of which I support – I encourage you to do a deep dive into the Crimes Code.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Speaker was going to rule him out of order since he strayed a little far afield of the bill, but appreciated the compliment nevertheless, so we did not.

The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

Seeing no one else seeking recognition, the Chair will recognize Representative Shusterman for the second time on her amendment

Ms. SHUSTERMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to clarify my remarks to the fine man from – Representative from Chester County. And where "substantial distance" is defined is in Title 18, section 2901, and it is in the definition in regards to kidnapping.

So that is setting the precedent for "substantial distance" for 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 the 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—85

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

#### NAYS—115

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

#### NOT VOTING—0

#### EXCUSED—2

Dowling	Kerwin
---------	--------

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

**BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 764, PN 1780**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.177, No.175), known as The Administrative Code of 1929, in powers and duties of the Department of State and its departmental administrative board, further providing for powers and duties in general.

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 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—200**

Abney	Frankel	Mackenzie, M.	Roae
Armanini	Freeman	Mackenzie, R.	Rossi
Benham	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
Boyle	Greiner	Masser	Sankey
Bradford	Grove	Matzie	Sappey
Briggs	Guenst	McClinton	Saylor
Brooks	Guzman	McNeill	Schemel
Brown, A.	Hamm	Mehaffie	Schlossberg
Brown, R.	Hanbidge	Mentzer	Schmitt
Bullock	Harkins	Mercuri	Schnee
Burgos	Harris	Merski	Schroeder
Burns	Heffley	Metcalfe	Schweyer
Carroll	Helm	Metzgar	Shusterman
Causser	Hennessey	Mihalek	Silvis
Cephas	Herrin	Millard	Sims
Ciresi	Hershey	Miller, B.	Smith
Conklin	Hickernell	Miller, D.	Snyder
Cook	Hohenstein	Mizgorski	Solomon
Covington	Howard	Moul	Sonney
Cox	Innamorato	Mullery	Staats

Cruz	Irvin	Mullins	Stambaugh
Culver	Isaacson	Mustello	Stephens
Curry	James	Neilson	Struzzi
Daley	Jones	Nelson, E.	Sturla
Davanzo	Jozwiak	Nelson, N.	Thomas
Davis, A.	Kail	O'Mara	Tomlinson
Davis, T.	Kaufner	O'Neal	Topper
Dawkins	Kauffman	Oberlander	Twardzik
Day	Keefer	Ortitay	Vitali
Deasy	Kenyatta	Otten	Warner
DeLissio	Kim	Owlett	Warren
Delloso	Kinhead	Parker	Webster
Delozier	Kinsey	Pashinski	Welby
DelRosso	Kirkland	Peifer	Wentling
DeLuca	Klunk	Pennycuick	Wheeland
Diamond	Knowles	Pickett	White
Dunbar	Kosierowski	Pisciottano	Williams, C.
Ecker	Krajewski	Polinchock	Williams, D.
Emrick	Krueger	Puskaric	Young
Evans	Kulik	Quinn	Zabel
Farry	Labs	Rabb	Zimmerman
Fee	Lawrence	Rader	
Fiedler	Lee	Rapp	Cutler,
Fitzgerald	Lewis	Rigby	Speaker
Flood	Longietti		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Dowling                      Kerwin

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.

**REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD**

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When I was personally called by Governor Wolf in January 2021 to inform me that my proposed constitutional amendment HB 963 was not properly published by the Department of State – and was thus ineffective – I was crushed. But not on my own behalf, but for the victims of abuse. At that time I was confused about how this could happen. We reviewed the Legislative Data Processing Center's records, and the bill's vote had been recorded. The bill had been signed by the presiding officers of both chambers. The bill had been filed in the Office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth, where it was assigned a pamphlet law number.

Publishing constitutional amendments is a key task for the Secretary of the Commonwealth, a task assigned to that officer in the Constitution itself. Surely, I thought, there were systems in place to make sure that this would not happen. So I asked the Governor to make sure that the Office of Inspector General would do a full report on this failure and make it public. The investigation was completed and the report was made public, and that is why I am standing before you today.

In reading the report, it became clear that there was no system in place to track the process toward the publication of constitutional amendments. There was no training in place for staff whose job it was to complete the publication. And there was no one actually in charge of the process. In that report, there is a lot of finger-pointing about who was at fault. But a failure of this magnitude is not the fault of one person or

one office. It is a systematic failure, and seeing how poorly managed that system was, I am surprised that it had not occurred before.

I recently had a call with the current Acting Secretary of the Commonwealth, who explained to me how they have taken the lessons on this Inspector General report to heart. I appreciate that and I appreciate her work on that front. But there is always going to be staff turnover in agencies, and the lessons that we have learned can be forgotten.

So today we have an opportunity to take the Inspector General's report's recommendations and put them into law. We can make sure that a Deputy Secretary is in charge of publication of constitutional amendments. We can make sure that there are systems in place to manage the publication process. We can make sure that there is training for staff who are responsible for publishing constitutional amendments.

I hope that you will join me in voting for this legislation so that, hopefully, we will never have another failed attempt to publish a constitutional amendment.

## RESOLUTIONS

Mr. FARRY called up **HR 212, PN 3273**, entitled:

A Resolution establishing a legislative task force on intellectual disabilities, developmental disabilities and autism and directing the Joint State Government Commission to study the impact of this Commonwealth's current delivery of services to individuals with intellectual disabilities, developmental disabilities and autism and to report its findings and recommendations to the House of Representatives.

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. For the information of the members, 5255 is a corrective reprint of amendment 5138. I apologize for any confusion.

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

Mr. FARRY offered the following amendment No. **A05255**:

Amend Resolution, page 1, line 12, by striking out "17%" and inserting  
1.7%

Amend Resolution, page 2, line 3, by striking out "an integrated" and inserting  
a multifaceted

Amend Resolution, page 2, line 10, by inserting after "to" reasonably

Amend Resolution, page 3, line 6, by inserting after "community"  
or a self-advocate from the autism community

Amend Resolution, page 3, lines 7 and 8, by striking out "waiver" in line 7 and all of line 8 and inserting  
home and community-based waiver services or are themselves receiving waiver services, with at least one being the parent or guardian of an individual.

Amend Resolution, page 3, line 9, by inserting after "individuals" where it occurs the first time  
who are on the waiting list for services

Amend Resolution, page 3, line 9, by inserting after "who" themselves

Amend Resolution, page 3, line 10, by striking out the period after "services" and inserting  
, with at least one being the parent or guardian of an individual.

Amend Resolution, page 3, line 20, by inserting after "disabilities"

, developmental disabilities and autism

Amend Resolution, page 4, line 4, by inserting after "system," quality of life outcomes,

Amend Resolution, page 4, line 5, by striking out the semicolon after "protocols" and inserting

of moving into and out of one waiver or program to another or transitioning out of high school;

Amend Resolution, page 4, line 9, by striking out "with" and inserting

between

Amend Resolution, page 4, line 11, by inserting after "settings," direct support professionals, other

Amend Resolution, page 4, line 16, by striking out "integrated"

Amend Resolution, page 4, line 18, by striking out "into the community" and inserting

or choose not to go into the community because of underlying issues

Amend Resolution, page 4, line 19, by inserting after "Rehabilitation"

or the Employment First Commission

Amend Resolution, page 4, line 25, by inserting after "issues" , including, when appropriate, provider referral, admission and

discharge practices

Amend Resolution, page 4, line 29, by striking out "State centers, lifeshare," and inserting

services within family homes, State centers, lifesharing,

Amend Resolution, page 5, line 9, by inserting after

"professionals"

, supports coordinators

Amend Resolution, page 5, line 9, by inserting after "behavioral" health or mental health

Amend Resolution, page 5, lines 21 and 22, by striking out "June 1, 2023," and inserting

18 months after the adoption of this resolution

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

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

Mr. FARRY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The basis of this amendment, in addition to the technical change, is feedback we received from our committee meeting, as well as the stakeholders and the department, and I ask for an affirmative vote on the amendment.

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

Ms. BENHAM. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

While this amendment is not everything we would have liked to see, as it does not guarantee people with disabilities a place at the table, it does improve the bill slightly and I am asking for an affirmative vote on the 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 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—200

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Dowling	Kerwin
---------	--------

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

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolution as amended?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the prime sponsor, Representative Farry, on the resolution.

Mr. FARRY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This resolution and the underlying study that will be performed is derived from a year and a half as chair of the Human Services Committee. During that time we have heard from families across the Commonwealth about struggles they have with their loved ones that have disabilities in terms of where they can work in the community, where they can live in the community, and what opportunities are provided to them.

We have also heard many individuals with disabilities speak for themselves on these issues as well. In addition to that, we have heard from numerous providers with some of the problems they have had with the Office of Developmental Programs.

The goal of this study is to flush out what opportunities exist for those individuals with disabilities so we can ensure the best services possible are being provided for them. I ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Benham, on the resolution.

Ms. BENHAM. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As a person with a disability, I had encouraged the chairman and his office to ensure that this resolution guaranteed at least one spot for a disabled person on the advisory committee. Unfortunately, the bill – or the resolution, rather, as amended treats people with disabilities and their caregivers as interchangeable when they are not. Many of us voted "yes" in committee under the idea that this resolution would be amended to fix the problem. People with intellectual and developmental disabilities deserve a guaranteed seat at the table when the supports and services they utilize under the Office of Developmental Programs are discussed on a policy and implementation level. As amended, HR 212 does not guarantee the right of self-advocates to be a designated part of the advisory committee that will guide the Joint State Government Commission's study of the services ODP provides to the disability community.

People with intellectual and developmental disabilities are qualified, informed, and capable to advocate for themselves and the services that they use. The bill, as amended, does not clearly designate reserved spots for self-advocates; rather, it lists them as a potential option while clearly designating required spots to parents and guardians. This is unacceptable if this study is truly to be as comprehensive and all-encompassing as we want.

I cannot, in good conscience, support a resolution that does not guarantee the right of people with disabilities to be present on this advisory committee. As the saying goes, "Nothing about us without us." I urge a "no" vote. Thank you.

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

Mr. FARRY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do respectfully disagree with the previous speaker's comments. Based on feedback that she provided during the committee meeting, one, we actually withdrew an amendment to

ensure that her concerns were addressed. We just amended the bill on the floor to provide that opportunity for self-advocates to be part of the advisory task force. In addition to that, both the Speaker and the minority leader have the opportunities to make appointments to this commission – or, excuse me, task force, and the commission itself also has the opening to add people to this task force as they see fit.

So there are numerous opportunities for self-advocates to be represented on this commission. They are not being excluded. I do not want this body to think they are being excluded, because the feedback from the previous speaker was actually taken into account in the amendment that this body just passed. I ask for an affirmative vote.

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

(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—173

Armanini	Galloway	Malagari	Rowe
Benninghoff	Gaydos	Maloney	Rozzi
Bernstine	Gillen	Markosek	Ryan
Bizzarro	Gillespie	Marshall	Sainato
Boback	Gleim	Masser	Samuelson
Bonner	Gregory	Matzie	Sanchez
Borowicz	Greiner	McClinton	Sankey
Boyle	Grove	McNeill	Sappey
Bradford	Guenst	Mehaffie	Saylor
Briggs	Guzman	Mentzer	Schemel
Brooks	Hamm	Mercuri	Schlossberg
Brown, A.	Hanbidge	Merski	Schmitt
Brown, R.	Harkins	Metcalfe	Schnee
Bullock	Harris	Metzgar	Schroeder
Burns	Heffley	Mihalek	Schweyer
Carroll	Helm	Millard	Shusterman
Causar	Hennessey	Miller, B.	Silvis
Ciresi	Herrin	Mizgorski	Smith
Conklin	Hershey	Moul	Snyder
Cook	Hickernell	Mullery	Sonney
Cox	Howard	Mullins	Staats
Culver	Irvin	Mustello	Stambaugh
Curry	James	Neilson	Stephens
Daley	Jones	Nelson, E.	Struzzi
Davanzo	Jozwiak	Nelson, N.	Thomas
Davis, T.	Kail	O'Mara	Tomlinson
Dawkins	Kaufner	O'Neal	Topper
Day	Kauffman	Oberlander	Twardzik
DeLissio	Keefer	Ortitay	Vitali
Delloso	Kim	Otten	Warner
Delozier	Klunk	Owlett	Warren
DelRosso	Knowles	Pashinski	Webster
DeLuca	Kosierowski	Peifer	Welby
Diamond	Krueger	Pennyquick	Wentling

Dunbar	Kulik	Pickett	Wheeland
Ecker	Labs	Polinchock	White
Emrick	Lawrence	Puskaric	Williams, C.
Evans	Lewis	Quinn	Williams, D.
Farry	Longietti	Rader	Zabel
Fee	Mackenzie, M.	Rapp	Zimmerman
Fitzgerald	Mackenzie, R.	Rigby	
Flood	Madden	Roae	Cutler,
Freeman	Major	Rossi	Speaker
Fritz	Mako	Rothman	

#### NAYS—27

Abney	Deasy	Kinhead	Pisciottano
Benham	Fiedler	Kinsey	Rabb
Burgos	Frankel	Kirkland	Sims
Cephas	Hohenstein	Krajewski	Solomon
Covington	Innamorato	Lee	Sturla
Cruz	Isaacson	Miller, D.	Young
Davis, A.	Kenyatta	Parker	

#### NOT VOTING—0

#### EXCUSED—2

Dowling	Kerwin
---------	--------

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

\* \* \*

Mr. METCALFE called up **HR 213, PN 3297**, entitled:

A Resolution urging the Congress of the United States to fund measures to protect the power grid of the United States from electromagnetic pulse attacks and solar flare incidents.

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Stambaugh, are you seeking recognition to speak on the resolution?

Mr. STAMBAUGH. I do.

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

Mr. STAMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of HR 213. The threat to our nation, and human civilization in general, from an electromagnetic pulse, or EMP, event is probably one of the world-changing calamities that the public is least aware of. EMPs are geomagnetic disturbances, like a large solar flare or a high-altitude nuclear blast from a rogue power, that can cripple our electric grid and our communications networks, and the issue is very real. In 2017 the congressional Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from an EMP Attack estimated that a North Korean EMP assault would destroy several hundred hard-to-move high voltage transformers, with the loss of the power that resulted leading to the death of 90 percent – and I repeat that – the death of 90 percent of the U.S. population within a year. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has also found a large number of high-voltage transformers could be lost to a once-in-a-century solar storm.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge this body to move this resolution and encourage Congress to act on this issue. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

(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—165

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

NAYS—35

Abney	Evans	Krueger	Otten
Benham	Fiedler	Kulik	Pashinski
Burgos	Guenst	Lee	Pisciottano
Carroll	Howard	Madden	Rabb
Covington	Innamorato	Malagari	Sanchez
Curry	Kinhead	Markosek	Snyder

Davis, A.	Kinsey	Miller, D.	Webster
Dawkins	Kosierowski	Mullery	Welby
Deasy	Krajewski	Mullins	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Dowling                      Kerwin

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

\* \* \*

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

Mr. KAIL called up **HR 216, PN 3313**, entitled:

A Resolution establishing, authorizing and empowering the Select Committee on Restoring Law and Order to investigate, review and make findings and recommendations concerning rising rates of crime, law enforcement and the enforcement of crime victim rights.

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolution?

Mr. **HOHENSTEIN** offered the following amendment  
No. **A05217**:

Amend Resolution, page 1, line 13, by striking out "the City of Philadelphia" and inserting  
this Commonwealth

Amend Resolution, page 1, lines 15 and 16, by striking out "the City of Philadelphia" and inserting  
this Commonwealth

Amend Resolution, page 1, line 19, by striking out "the City of Philadelphia" and inserting  
this Commonwealth

Amend Resolution, page 2, lines 2 and 3, by striking out "the City of Philadelphia" and inserting  
this Commonwealth

Amend Resolution, page 2, lines 9 and 10, by striking out "the City of Philadelphia" and inserting  
this Commonwealth

Amend Resolution, page 2, line 25, by striking out "the City of Philadelphia" and inserting  
this Commonwealth

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the gentleman, Representative Hohenstein, is recognized.

Mr. HOHENSTEIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I want to start by thanking my colleague from Delaware County for allowing me to take on this resolution – recognizing this is an issue for Philadelphia, about Philadelphia. And frankly, those of us in Philly are more than a little insulted at the way that this mini-impeachment has been proposed. And I say it this way because I got a call from a constituent, and he said, "So, Joe, where do you stand on this impeachment resolution?" And I had to say, "Wait. Actually, Don, it is not an impeachment

resolution," because, like, I was not sure, because that is the way it was being said, and he said, "I trust you because you came out, you knocked on my door," and I said, "Yeah, I remember talking to you, Don." And what Don was saying was, we know we have a problem in Philadelphia. We get it. This is a problem that is happening all across the State as well, and I am affronted and offended – even though I am no big fan of the current district attorney and most of my constituents are not either – this is the kind of situation where if you are from a nice, big family – right? – and you get into a fight with your brother, you guys have to resolve it in-house. That is what should be done.

But this resolution will not let us do that. (Remarks stricken from the record.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman will not cast aspersions on another member of this House. The stenographer will strike those remarks from the record.

The gentleman is in order on the amendment and may proceed.

Mr. HOHENSTEIN. Respectfully, Mr. Speaker, I was not speaking on anyone's motivation, but rather, his knowledge of my district and my town. He does not know the streets. Many of the streets in my district are Lehigh, Westmoreland, Tioga; these are named after different counties all of you are from. I do not pretend to know that just because I have got Somerset Street in my district that I know what to do, to tell the people of Somerset County what to do with their disbarred D.A. I know enough to know what my lane is. My lane is my people, and this is a controversial thing for us and we have got to deal with it.

But if you are going to make all of us deal with it, let us make all of us deal with it. This amendment would make this process applicable to every county – all 67 of them – and I think that is only fair. So I am asking for a "yes" vote on the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

And on that question, the gentleman, Representative Kail, is recognized.

Mr. KAIL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the gentleman from Philadelphia's concern. I will say, he is free to offer his own resolution to have that in and introduce it and get it through committee, but this is not an agreed-to amendment and I would appreciate the members to vote "no" on this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

Are there any other members seeking recognition on the amendment? Seeing none.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

(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. The Speaker thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Representative Harris.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

The following roll call was recorded:

#### YEAS—89

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

#### NAYS—111

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

#### NOT VOTING—0

#### EXCUSED—2

Dowling	Kerwin
---------	--------

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 adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that question, the gentleman, Representative Kail, is recognized.

Mr. KAIL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, HR 216 establishes a select committee made up of five members appointed by the rules of this House, by the Speaker of the House. The purpose of this select committee is to investigate the alleged dereliction of duty that we have seen by Philadelphia District Attorney Larry Krasner. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, this select committee will give a platform to and allow witnesses, victims to be heard, allow evidence to be seen—

### POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

For what purpose does the gentleman, Representative Hohenstein, wish to be recognized?

Mr. HOHENSTEIN. My understanding is that in this House, we do not refer to other public officials, members of the House, by their names, but rather, by their titles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct, and the Speaker appreciates the member bringing forward, reminding everyone of the rules of the House.

The gentleman, Representative Kail, is in order and may proceed, and is reminded of the rules of the House. The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. KAIL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does gentleman, Representative Neilson, rise?

Mr. NEILSON. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. NEILSON. The gentleman from Philadelphia just brought a point up, and I do not recall the Speaker striking that name from the record. If you are allowing these comments to stay on the record, I think everything the gentleman from out west said should be stricken since he used people's names throughout his testimony.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker thanks the gentleman for those remarks.

The gentleman, Representative Kail, is recognized.

Mr. KAIL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this select committee will also give a platform to gather evidence, to allow victims to be heard, to hear witnesses, and it will conclude with a report, and the report will make recommendations for new laws, potentially, for new policies, and potentially recommendations for articles of impeachment.

We understand that this is an extraordinary step; however, the actions that this district attorney has taken have been extraordinary. And this House has tried to work with this district attorney; in fact, just this year this House passed HB 2275, which received bipartisan support. It would supercharge the Gun Violence Task Force, an interagency group headed by the Office of Attorney General, to increase prosecution of gun crimes in Philadelphia. We passed a package of smart justice bills that incentivized the enforcement of laws on the books. We have one

of the most comprehensive gun background check laws in the country. We are a tough-on-crime State. We have strong laws on the books that punish criminals for destroying our communities.

In response to these laws that are on the books, the district attorney from Philadelphia and his office have stated, "We do not believe that arresting people and convicting them for illegal gun possession is a viable strategy to reduce shootings." Additionally, they said, inequitable – stated the gun laws and the penalties allowed by the State are inequitable, and I am quoting here, "inequitable and obviously racist."

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is this: All the laws in the world do not mean a thing if we do not have district attorneys that are willing to enforce them. Vote "yes" on this resolution to start this investigation, vote "yes" for the victims, vote "yes" for law and order.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### THE SPEAKER (BRYAN CUTLER) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

And the gentleman, Representative Kenyatta, is recognized on the resolution.

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is actually yet another sad day in this chamber, it really is. And to think that in this moment, where we do actually have a gun violence crisis across the Commonwealth, that we would come here and play these types of political games is really frustrating, and it is an affront to folks in communities across Philadelphia who are desperate for solutions, solutions that we could be about providing in this building. I can think of multiple discharge resolutions which have gone nowhere in this chamber which would have an impact on the gun violence that we are seeing, but this idea that the gentleman from Beaver County is just so interested in the people of Philadelphia that he is just offering this up because he is so interested in giving the victims a platform – sir, this is about you having a platform.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

The chamber is reminded that we are not to call into question the motives of members on issues. I understand that this is, one, a very passionate issue of interest on both sides; but two, I also understand that we have differing viewpoints on how to best address the situation.

So I would simply ask the gentleman not to go after the motive of the prime sponsor or anybody who might support it – just as I would also encourage the members who will be supporting it not to go after the motive for anybody who opposes it – so that we can have respectful debate on the underlying resolution and how best to proceed in solving the issues before us.

The gentleman is in order, and you may proceed on the resolution, sir.

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you.

For the maker of this resolution, I am not sure I can count on my hands how many times they have been to Philadelphia County or what the maker really knows about what is happening in Philadelphia County.

But let me tell you what is happening in Philadelphia County. What is happening is that every day – just like the other 66 counties – you have families who are losing loved ones to the scourge of gun violence, families that will never be the same. And we can talk about this resolution, we can play all these political

games, but when this is over, a lot of members on this side are going to actually go home to Philadelphia. When this is over, I am going to go to a neighborhood where the threat of violence is not hypothetical. I will not be driving out west to Beaver County – and I like Beaver County – but I am not here introducing a resolution saying that we should get rid of the duly elected district attorney of Beaver County, and we certainly should not have members in this body try to supersede the will of the voters in Philadelphia.

This is not about whether or not you like the D.A. of Philadelphia. We just had an election. People who did not like the D.A. of Philadelphia voted against the D.A. of Philadelphia. That is their choice. And as folks in this body know, I love me some democracy. But what we just had was an election. The people of Philadelphia actually welcome people in this body caring about their lives. We would welcome that. If my colleagues are truly interested, if there has been, like, an awakening since we were last having this conversation and you are interested in moving any of these gun bills that we have put up, let us have that conversation. If folks in this building are interested for real in dealing with the root causes of gun violence, if you want to be a part of bringing back programs like general assistance, then let us have that conversation.

I am not far afield, because if you want to talk about gun violence, then you need to talk about root causes, and there are folks in Philadelphia who have spent time understanding this. These things are not disconnected. The quality of folks' neighborhoods, in terms of affordable housing, is connected to gun violence. That is not my opinion; that is fact. Whether or not folks have a good school in their community is connected to the levels of gun violence that we see. That is not Malcolm's opinion; that is a fact. Whether or not folks have a good quality job where they can take care of their family, that has an impact on gun violence. That is not my opinion; that is a fact. And so that is not far afield; that is on the field of play. And I want you to join me on this field of getting serious about gun violence.

This is a show. This is a game. And I hate that we are doing this again. We should be passing a budget, including the resources dealing with those root causes issues that I just laid out. That would help the city of Philadelphia. But I would welcome the maker of this bill to come to Philadelphia instead of constantly keeping Philadelphia in his mouth.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Representative Dawkins.

And while you are approaching the microphone, again, I understand that this is a very passionate issue for the membership. I would request that the members refrain from going after the motives of individuals and minimizing an interest in an issue. We can disagree on the policy without calling someone's motive into question.

The gentleman, Representative Dawkins, you are in order and may speak on the resolution.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So I will try to keep this based in facts. I agree with the maker that we need to hold bad district attorneys accountable. I agree that law and order should be the order of Pennsylvania. And if folks did not know, PA had a few D.A.s who were accused of committing crimes in recent years and have not been targeted for removal of powers or impeachment by this body. Maybe you did not know that these folks existed. But let me just share a story of a few who have been recently charged.

## POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

For what purpose does the gentlewoman, Representative White, rise?

Ms. WHITE. Point of order.

This is not on the bill at hand.

The SPEAKER. The gentledady will please suspend.

Representative White, are you raising the point of order on staying on the topic of the underlying resolution?

Ms. WHITE. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

The Representative is correct. The issue before us is HR 216, which has limiting language in it. I would simply encourage the gentleman to stay focused on the implementation of that resolution and the impact in your particular area, and any issues that might have occurred elsewhere that are resolved or in the process of being resolved should not be referenced.

Mr. DAWKINS. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You may state your point of order, Representative Dawkins.

Mr. DAWKINS. Is this bill not referencing the lack of prosecution of a district attorney, which is why we are looking to potentially remove or sanction this particular district attorney in not doing their duties and/or using their power in an efficient way that we do not agree as a body? Because simply, what I was going to state—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend, please. That really is not a parliamentary inquiry; that is more of a substantive bill inquiry, which would be the proper substance of debate.

I would simply point to the underlying language contained in the bill. While it does talk about prosecutions, whether numbers or lack thereof, it is limited to the city of the first class. So that is the play afield I believe is what the prior speaker referenced it as, and would simply ask the gentleman to contain his remarks there and that would be appropriate.

Mr. DAWKINS. Not a problem, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You are in order and may proceed, sir.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you.

So if an individual in the city of the first class was charged with rape or charged with prostitution or charged with breaking in a home of a constituent and forces themselves inside of that constituent, potentially, on September 18 in Philadelphia, would we then look to those folks who may have committed those crimes? I can see why we would hold that individual accountable. I can also see if our district attorney in the city of the first class showed up to a young woman's house with, let us say, a six-pack of beer and threatened prosecution if they did not engage in intercourse, I can see why we would have this resolution. If I was a D.A. who used my office to throw out certain cases of the female, women accusers who came in front of them and abused their power to force themselves onto these women, I can see why this resolution would be necessary. If I was a D.A. in the city of the first class, and during the time of my arraignment, I was set free on a bond, and while on bond, I still managed to rape a woman that caused my bail to be revoked, I can see why we would want this resolution. But it seems to me that has never occurred within the last year of folks who may have been close to the city of the first class, but I have never heard these folks' names or I have never seen a resolution, because if those horrible acts, that were not law and order, I cannot see this body being

silent while a district attorney was raping and doing horrible things to victims, revictimizing those victims with their power and their office. I am sure we would be doing something.

But let us get to the facts since we cannot talk about anything else but the city of the first class. Let us just talk about the facts of the city of the first class. Gun violence has increased in communities across PA, not just in Philadelphia. There are 31 counties in Pennsylvania that have more murders and manslaughters in 2000 than they did in 2019, and Philadelphia showed one of the lowest increases. This is the most recent year in which we have access to the crime data. And of those 31 counties, there was an increase; Philadelphia's increase was very, very low by comparison. We were 28th out of 31 of those 31 counties that had seen an increase. And counties – I will not name them all because we have to stay in the city of the first class – but there are 31 and we are 28th.

From 2019 to 2020, there was a statewide increase of 32 percent in murder and manslaughter throughout our State. Twenty of those thirty-one counties have a Republican D.A.; nineteen had larger increases than Philadelphia. Twenty-four of those thirty-one counties have a Republican Senator; twenty-two had larger increases than Philadelphia. Twenty-three out of those thirty-one counties have more R Reps than D Reps, and twenty of them had larger increases than Philadelphia. Seems to me that we are missing a few names on this resolution.

The Philadelphia District Attorney's Office has consistently charged nearly all Title 18 cases that have been brought to their office, at a rate of over 99 percent since the district attorney in the city of the first class took office. This is true even with the extraordinary increase of the number of arrests for these offenses. The Philadelphia District Attorney's Office has secured convictions in 85 percent of their homicide cases ready for trial between February 28, 2022, to present. And after 2 years of limited access to courtrooms for trial due to the pandemic, this is a period that covers when several courtrooms became available for jury trials that reflects the extremely high level of success in the district attorney's office in the city of the first class.

Philly has the most transparent criminal justice system in the Commonwealth, and all this data is public knowledge on the Web site, whereas I could not find one district attorney's office in this State that came anywhere close to showing the crime stats, so we do not know. But we do know if, hypothetically, one of those D.A.s in one of those counties we cannot talk about were using their office for illicit activities, I can see why they do not want to post those stats.

But let us also talk about the elephant in the room since we refuse to talk about it. Let us talk about arrests versus cases charged, and I am going to break it down into homicides, nonfatal shootings, commercial burglaries, and other property offenses. So up until the date of this data, which is roughly about June 1, the city of the first class had about 223 homicides as of that date. There were 74 arrests of those 223 homicides. You want to guess how many were charged? Seventy-four. One hundred percent of all the arrests that were made led to charges.

Let us talk about nonfatal shootings. There were 876 nonfatal shootings. Out of the 876 nonfatal shootings, there were 158 arrests. Out of the 158 arrests, we had 156 charged.

Let us talk about the commercial burglaries. I hear this a lot: folks' property is being stolen and no one is doing anything about it. There were 953 incidents of commercial burglaries, out of which 104 folks were arrested; 103 charged.

Let us talk about overall incidents. There were 33,000 incidents in the city of the first class up until that date. There were 1745 arrests out of 33,000 incidents; 1,671 led to charges. So for me, it is really hard to see where this particular district attorney is not doing their job, and if you have any data that supports your argument, I will be happy to vote on HR 216.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Krajewski, on the resolution.

Mr. KRAJEWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to HR 216, a dangerous resolution that would undermine the will of the actual residents of Philadelphia. This resolution does nothing to make Philadelphia or this Commonwealth safer, and instead irresponsibly politicizes the very real concern of rising gun violence that everyone in this chamber is committed to addressing. I could talk about how this resolution is unconcerned about the reality of gun violence in Philadelphia or that gun violence is rising not just in Philadelphia, but across this State and country, but I am not going to do that. I am going to focus on the facts.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is, regardless of the personal opinions of the maker of this resolution, the district attorney of Philadelphia was overwhelmingly elected with 67 percent and 69 percent of the vote respectively in last year's elections. In any other election, this would be considered a mandate victory, but here in this chamber we are considering disregarding the will of thousands of voters in a majority Black and Brown city to further a political agenda.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend. The members have been cautioned about referencing politics, games, jokes, and political agenda. I would simply remind the gentleman that does go towards motive. Please stay on the comments regarding the underlying pieces of the resolution, the findings of the resolution that they are proposing to look at, and the different pieces of that. Just please stay on that. Thank you.

You are in order and may proceed.

Mr. KRAJEWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, here are some more facts. The rising gun violence in Philadelphia is because we have not raised the minimum wage in 15 years. The rising gun violence is because our youth are being told to learn in schools with crumbling infrastructure, are lacking the appropriate mental health resources they deserve as children growing up during a traumatizing moment in history, and are facing dwindling opportunities to economic stability. The rising gun violence is because we have rec centers and libraries that cannot even have programming or stay open on weekends because they have been chronically underfunded.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to truly address gun violence in this Commonwealth, the way we must do it is by passing a budget that robustly funds our public institutions – our schools, our parks, our recreation centers, and our homes. Resolutions like HR 216 only serve to distract us from the real work needed to break this cycle.

I will be voting "no" on this resolution, and I ask my colleagues to join me and respect the will of the voters of Philadelphia. Thank you.

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

Mr. NEILSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today I rise in support of HR 216. This has been an issue that has been talked about for quite some time. And I understand the previous speakers where they said the voters voted and voters voted and the numbers were there, but the turnout was not as good as we thought. We tried. And since that time, many things have happened; many things have not.

Last week, right down the street from my house, we dedicated a playground to one of our neighborhood officers, James O'Connor, who lost his life because the district attorney's office decided to let that person go. He should not have been out of jail. So it is more than the stats; it is more than the numbers. It is the quality of life in my district, Mr. Speaker, the quality of life. The policemen and the firemen that go to work every day and are afraid to do their job because we have a district attorney that likes charging police with different things, sometimes when we feel that he should be holding the criminals more accountable.

So unlike many of my colleagues in Philadelphia, I rise in support of this resolution and I look forward to the fact-finding mission of this commission. We have to do it. For the last year we have been talking about, on this House floor and every headline grab what is talked about is, let us impeach this guy. Let us impeach this guy. Well, they have not introduced them. Personally, I think they should come up with these articles of impeachment and do it. I think this is a way to kick the can down the road and is not going to give the families of those fallen officers and the victims justice too. This will kick it down the road. Because by the time the commission is set up, by the time they meet, these articles should have been in the Senate a year ago, and the people that have been doing press conferences talking about it have not yet introduced them. So this is the secondary way of us getting to the point.

I have heard it, I have heard the gentleman earlier say, well, if you think another district attorney deserves this, introduce the same resolution. Unfortunately, we are in the minority. I mean, we cannot even get our names on these resolutions. We do not even know these things are coming until the day of, and here we are again. So we can talk about, well, my friend from Philadelphia was not able to mention all those criminal district attorneys throughout the Commonwealth because we are only allowed to talk about Philadelphia today. This is, after all, the House of Philadelphia today, not the House of Pennsylvania. We should talk about them and we should have passed the amendment on this resolution to hold everybody accountable that is doing the wrong thing. If you think they are doing the wrong thing, this is the right thing to do.

It is a sad day. It is a sad day that we have to do this. But it is a good day for my neighbors, my friends, and some of those who fell and no fault of their own. So I ask everybody's support of HR 216 today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Dan Miller, on the resolution.

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

And I want to thank all the speakers thus far who have spoken from Philadelphia. It is great to hear those voices raised on this issue, and no doubt that we have heard a lot of passion from all the Representatives from Philly who have spoken so far. So I appreciate their comments and their words.

That being said, as we pause and look towards the path that has been put out before us, it is difficult to us who think about

how to look into a district attorney who was just overwhelmingly elected from a city that clearly represents the largest voice of minority members of Pennsylvania's family. Clearly, they have made their voice heard, and clearly, they are aware of his politics, and clearly, they have analyzed the results and the direction to which he takes his office. This is not his first rodeo; it was not new. There is nothing there that is surprising except in reality that for many in this room, he articulates a vision that is different, and part of that also includes what is a long effort on his behalf to talk about ways that Harrisburg can help him – ways that Harrisburg can care about Philadelphia, ways that Harrisburg can make a difference on the streets and in the lives of those to which he works with, protects with, and cares about there.

And we have heard a lot of things over the years in relation to Philadelphia. It does shock me to the constant drumbeat of how, though, when bills or resolutions like this come to the floor, it is always, always with the idea that Harrisburg must make a decision for Philadelphia no matter what the members and families that live in Philadelphia have to say about that. There is no city that has ever, in my time, been called to the floor by this body over and over again because we must, it seemed, make decisions for Philadelphia. This resolution is just the latest line of that effort, and it is just so recently occurring after the will of the people have so steadfast and overwhelmingly been heard.

What is not heard or what does not come up in this body is what the district attorney and so many people from Philadelphia have asked us for help – whether it is mental health, whether it is school, whether it is economic supports – we do not answer that call. But here what we answer is that we, it seems, have to evaluate the decisions that the body of Philadelphia makes for itself.

I am tired of seeing these things that come up in relation to the will of the people of Philadelphia so constantly being ignored by this body. I wonder to what margin of victory must someone reach before Harrisburg respects the voices of Philadelphia as to who they wish to lead them.

I ask everyone to vote "no" on this resolution. Thank you.

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

Mr. RABB. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the comments of my colleague from Allegheny County and other colleagues. There is an irony in this moment and in this resolution. I draw your attention to the very inconvenient fact that under the current district attorney in the city of the first class, that his office has filed 2,447 illegal gun possession cases. What does that number mean in context? It is the largest number of cases filed in the city of the first class in 8 years; that means inclusive of his predecessor. Not a marked decrease, but a substantial increase of the very things that a lot of my Republican colleagues decry all the time.

But there is another context here that we do not talk about, which is, the district attorney does not arrest anyone. That is not his job. That is law enforcement. That is the cops, and they do not arrest 100 percent of the people who commit these crimes. So even if 100 percent of those arrested were charged and convicted and were put in cages for the rest of their lives, as so many of my colleagues like to do, it still would be a fraction of the people causing harm in the city of the first class, because we are always talking about downstream solutions to symptoms, and being indignant when many of my colleagues here – many from the city of the first class, but not exclusively – dare to talk about the

radical notion of addressing root causes. And I understand that is painful for a lot of people because it is hard and it is expensive and it is not politically popular in a lot of places, inclusive of the city of Philadelphia. I get that. But we are not supposed to do the easy work, we are supposed to do the people's work, and the people's work is – it is hard. But we are so fortunate to be able to represent 65,000 souls in our respective districts. This indeed is the work.

Now, I actually agree with the maker of this resolution that we need more accountability for district attorneys and we need bodies to ensure that we have greater transparency and accountability. My colleague from the city of the first class talked about having unparalleled transparency in this district attorney's office; that is a fact. I have used the DATA (District Attorney's Transparency Analytics) Lab many times. It is an extraordinary resource available to all humans on this planet. But accountability is indeed important, so this resolution, as I understand it, would establish a select committee of a majority of Republicans and a majority of folks not in Philadelphia to colonize the efforts of the city of the first class – which is a little ironic as we move towards celebrating the Fourth of July. I am anticolonization, but that is just me. I am also pro-local control. How about that? Do I get any praise from my conservative colleagues who support local control, because I do not hear that term or that buzzword or that value coming up? I embrace that conservative value. Guilty as charged. I admit it. I am on the record. I support local control.

And guess what? There is already a legislative body that holds the district attorney's office to account. It may not be well known to my colleagues who are closer to Cleveland than to Philadelphia, but it is called the city council. The City Council of Philadelphia, representing 1.6 million Pennsylvanians. That is an elected body. That is a legislative body that actually has a standing committee called the Committee on Public Safety. So we have what is already needed. Perhaps the problem is you do not like who the people of Philadelphia have elected to that body. Oh well. That is democracy, and sometimes it is messy. It does not guarantee the successes that many of us want. I know that because I was elected in 2016. I was very happy about what happened to me; not so happy about some other folks who got elected on that same night, but that is democracy in action. I do not have to say that election was rigged because I do not like the outcome.

I believe in democracy, and I believe there is already a legislative body that holds the current district attorney's office to account, and that legislative body is an elected body and it represents 1.6 million Philadelphians, and if you do not like it, perhaps you move to Philadelphia and change the next election outcome.

I strongly, strongly oppose HR 216. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Longietti. The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the problem with this resolution is this: In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, we provide almost unfettered discretion to all of our district attorneys on charging crimes. They get to decide – and sometimes we are frustrated with it – they get

to decide whether to bring charges and which charges to bring. And I say almost unfettered because there is a little bit of limit to that, right? Say, for example, a district attorney cannot intervene and protect somebody from being charged because it is a girlfriend who committed a crime. That actually happened in my county. We had a district attorney who did that and got charged criminally and eventually left office. But beyond that, we give them almost unfettered discretion. And so it is unfair for us to then say we are going to pass a resolution that creates a select committee that is going to investigate and potentially recommend impeachment because the district attorney exercised the unfettered discretion that we provided and we do not like how they exercised that discretion. And I am not saying that I like all the discretion that is being exercised out there. I do not. But therein lies where voters get to decide. Whether we like it or not, that is where the voters' role is, to determine we do not think that that district attorney has properly exercised discretion and so we are going to turn that person out of office. That is not for us to create a process to do when we have given them the discretion in the first place and now we do not like how they exercised it.

So, Mr. Speaker, for that reason I think this resolution is flawed and should be defeated. Thank you.

### **THE SPEAKER (BRYAN CUTLER) PRESIDING**

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative White, on the resolution.

Ms. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I heard a lot about a Web site that is provided by the district attorney's office, and I feel like people in this chamber should really take a close look at it because it tells us just how bad the city of Philadelphia is doing when it comes to crime and homicides happening on our streets. Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot of talk in defense of the district attorney's office. What I have not heard, though, is about victims of crime who are suffering across the city of Philadelphia and the surrounding counties due to the actions of the district attorney.

Last week a mother stood in this very Capitol and spoke to all of us with unbridled truth. She spoke of her son, who was applying for a new job and wanted to look just right for the interview, so he stopped by a local mall to find the right pair of pants, and minutes later he was gunned down by strangers – an act of violence so vicious, so random, but so common in Philadelphia and its suburbs. Worst of all, we learned that the young man's killers were repeat offenders who should have never been at that mall hunting for their next victim.

We also heard from a father who lost his son to carjackers that had just failed to steal three vehicles and instead wound up shooting and killing his 15-year-old who was taking groceries into the house. That father asked us, "Who in this building should I see about this? Who should I see that can bring my son back? Where can I go for justice?"

Where can anyone in Philadelphia find justice? Because here are the facts. Philadelphia is experiencing the highest rate of homicides in decades. There were 562 homicides in Philadelphia in 2021, which was an increase of 78 percent from the 315 homicides that occurred in the year before this district attorney took office. There have been 2,332 people shot in Philadelphia in 2020, which represents an increase of 85 percent

from the 1257 people that were shot in the year before this district attorney took office. All the while, our law enforcement is out there on our streets getting illegal firearms out of felons' hands. They have had a 46-percent increase in the arrests of violations of our Uniform Firearms Act, but unfortunately, the conviction rate – not just the charges that are brought – the conviction rate has decreased from 63 percent to 49 percent in 2020. It is not just about charges that are brought. It is about the cases that are being withdrawn, cases that are tossed aside, victims who have not seen justice for their family member.

We need to take a closer look at this issue because the leaders in Philadelphia, they are failing families like the ones I mentioned above. There are so many more families and stories that we need to hear from. It is up to us legislators exercising our responsibility to investigate how it could be that felons are continuously being allowed back onto our streets to terrorize the innocent. It is our job as legislators to be the check on city leaders when they fail to do so, to do their job, and do so in such an egregious way as murder rates are skyrocketing.

I really, genuinely appreciate my colleagues who have taken this issue up from all parts of this Commonwealth, because this is an important issue for all of Pennsylvania. Philadelphians are Pennsylvanians. This resolution is going to create a special bipartisan committee with subpoena power. It is going to allow us to question witnesses, take testimony under oath, and acquire any supporting documentation that we need to make better decisions here in Harrisburg and hold those who are responsible accountable. If there is no wrongdoing, then victims will be able to find some closure. If there is wrongdoing, then we can take the committee's recommendations under consideration and whether or not it rises to the level of impeachment. But the first step is to create this committee to learn exactly what is transpiring in our city of Philadelphia.

Many of you are asking yourselves why you should vote "yes" today on this resolution. I will give you 2,085 reasons – that is the number of homicides in the years since this district attorney has taken office. As you vote today, please remember these innocent men, women, and children whose lives are on the line and they are counting on us. I am asking you for an affirmative vote on HR 216.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Bullock, on the resolution.

Mrs. BULLOCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I would like to thank my colleague from Philadelphia who just spoke. She makes a valid argument. But let us talk about the victims. Time again and again I have stood before you and I have shared story after story. As a mother, I shared my concerns for my two children, my two Black sons, who are the demographic of the victims of this gun violence. Not once, not once have I asked for this. I have asked for many things. I have asked this body to stand up and to invest in schools. I have asked this body to stand up and invest in gun violence prevention programs. I have asked in tears, in tears, as I talked about my children listening to gunshots ring through the night in their bedroom, and I have never asked for this.

We have had a colleague who served with us who has shared that she has lost her son to gun violence, and since she left this body, she lost a second son to gun violence. She has served not only with this body, but as a staffer in the Victim Services Unit of this particular district attorney's office, and not once has she

asked for this. My office is directly next door to an organization called Mothers in Charge, a group of mothers who have lost their children to gun violence. I talk to them every single day that I am in my district office, and they have never asked for this. The voters of Philadelphia have reelected a district attorney that shares their values, a district attorney that they believe will look at the root causes of gun violence, that will work with them in partnership. They have not asked for this.

We may not all agree with this particular district attorney's strategies or policies, but I will not say that he is not doing his job. For some members – my dear friend from the northeast section of Philadelphia referenced earlier in his comments that this particular district attorney is focusing more on prosecuting law enforcement than addressing gun violence; for members of my community, we want him to do both. For so long, we did not see law enforcement, bad law enforcement be prosecuted, and for my community, that was a concern, that was a public safety concern. And for me, as a mother – again, of two Black boys who are on both sides of this issue – I pray every day that they do not become a victim of gun violence at the same time that I pray that they do not become a victim of police brutality. These are the issues that my community and that victims in my community are talking about.

In my community, and even in my family, many of these victims have a very nuanced relationship with crime. We often are what we call dual victims. At the same time of folks who are experiencing crime directly in their neighborhood, we are also victims of a broken criminal justice system, a broken criminal justice system that has removed fathers from our homes generations ago; a broken criminal justice system that has created this environment of crime and gun violence in our communities, one that this body has failed to recognize time and time again, as I stood before you with my passionate cries asking for you to invest in the prevention strategies that I knew would prevent gun crime and violence in my community. You ignored those cries, and now, now you want to attack the one sign, the one office that is looking to partner on those same strategies that we have been asking for help for years, for time and time again. Here we are ignoring the voices of victims, ignoring the voices of voters, ignoring the voices of mothers like me who have passionately asked you to invest in our communities in a different way.

I am tired of standing here and asking you to listen to me as a mother who goes home every Wednesday crying because I did nothing to make my sons safer. And I am telling you, this bill, this resolution is another case in which I will go home and say my sons are no safer than they were when I arrived here on Monday. It does nothing. It is not what has been asking this body to do. It is not what the voters of Philadelphia are asking you to do. We have asked for the investments in our schools and our communities and gun violence prevention and all of those things, and an investment in the broken criminal justice system that has honestly left our communities in this particular state that it is in.

So with that, I ask one more time – just one last time – to listen to the voters of Philadelphia. Listen to the voters of Philadelphia. They have elected this particular district attorney not once, but twice. That is their voice. Listen to the voters of Philadelphia. They have asked for investments in their schools, investments in gun violence prevention not once, not twice, multiple times. I ask you again, listen to the voices of mothers like me.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative O'Neal.

Mr. O'NEAL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of different perspectives on this particular resolution here this afternoon. We have heard the reason for this resolution and this investigation is because we simply do not like the elected district attorney in Philadelphia. We have heard that we just do not agree with his prosecutorial discretion. We have heard that City Council of Philadelphia already has this power. But the reality, Mr. Speaker, is that none of those things are what this resolution is about. This resolution is exactly what the gentlewoman from Philadelphia was just asking for. This resolution is about providing an investigation and a voice to the members of this General Assembly to ensure we correct the situation in Philadelphia as best we can.

As a matter of fact, I would like to read to you just a few points on what this select committee is actually tasked with doing. The committee is tasked with developing or recommending "...legislation or other legislative action relating to policing, prosecution, sentencing and...other aspect of law enforcement." To come up with "Legislation or other legislative action relating to ensuring the protection, enforcement and delivery of appropriate services and compensation to crime victims." To come up with "Legislation or other legislative action relating to auditing or "ensuring the appropriate expenditure of public funds intended for the purpose of law enforcement, prosecutions or to benefit crime victims. Other legislative action as the select committee finds necessary to ensure" adequate and "appropriate enforcement of law and order in the City of Philadelphia." And yes, yes, one final task is to determine that whether or not "...the performance of public officials empowered to enforce the law in the City of Philadelphia, including the district attorney, and" coming up with "recommendations for removal from office or other appropriate discipline, including" but not limited to "impeachment."

And just very quickly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight the fact that, again, going back to the comments that the gentleman made about the city of Philadelphia already having a city council that can do this, the reality is, there is only one elected body in the State of Pennsylvania that has the power to remove anybody from office, and that is this House of Representatives. The Constitution of Pennsylvania says that the reason for doing that is any "misbehavior in office."

Now, we should not take impeachment proceedings lightly and that is what this investigation is about; that is what this select committee is about. It is ensuring that we are taking the due diligence and the correct process to determine whether or not the dereliction of duty from the district attorney in Philadelphia rises to the level of misbehavior in office, or whether it might not and we just need to simply enact some sort of piece of legislation or some other legislative action.

I think every single person in this chamber should want to know what we can do to help the residents of Philadelphia correct this situation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

Mr. KENYATTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a motion to recommit this bill to the Judiciary Committee. The last speaker

just talked about due diligence. There was no due diligence before this came out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend. Let us get the motion that you made up on the board and then you will be permitted to speak on the underlying motion.

The gentleman, Representative Kenyatta, has made a motion to rerefer HR 216 to – I believe you said the Judiciary Committee? Is that correct, sir?

### MOTION WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the motion. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

For the information of the members, there is one additional member on each side to speak prior to recognizing the prime sponsor, if he wishes to be recognized, and then both leaders. Then we do have remaining bills on the calendar to get to after that.

So with that, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Conklin, on the resolution.

Mr. CONKLIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, I come from a county of 160,000 people – well, a little over 160,000 people. I do not have the right just because I come from a county of over 160,000 people to tell a county of 1.6 million people how to run their affairs. And I am going to tell you something right now, Philadelphia: Do not you dare come into my county just because you are bigger than we are and tell me how my elected officials should be run. And the reason I am saying that is, I elected my D.A. I worked for him. My people elected him overwhelmingly. The D.A. before that who lost election, they elected overwhelmingly, but that D.A. lost their election because the people of Centre County made a decision.

The reason I get up and say this is that when does democracy start and when does democracy stop? One hundred and sixty thousand people in my county – 162,000, not 164,000 – and I would be upset if Philadelphia's 1.6 million came in and told me that I did not elect my proper officials right and I want to change the rules because I do not like the way that person is doing business. Do you know what precedent that would start? Do you understand the precedent, the policy, the insaneness that would start if Philadelphia started telling smaller counties how to run just because there was more of them?

I want to tell you one thing and I am going to sit down very quickly, Mr. Speaker, and I want you all to listen. It is none of my business how the people of Philadelphia elect their officials. It is none of my darn business. I should be worried about back home before I worry about Philadelphia. They elected their people, let them worry about them. They elected him back in; that is their problem. Let them deal with it.

But let us go back to what the other speaker said. If I ask for help in my 162,000, I would hope you would listen to me. I would hope you would say, what do you need? Do you need more individuals on the street to help with violence? Are you having a gun problem? What can we do to help? That is what I would hope they would say, and I would listen and I would do what was needed. But when I start going out and telling other counties that we do not like your election process, that we do not like the people that you elected – why, because we can? You know, that is ridiculous. Stop it. Stop it. Just because you have the power does not mean you should abuse the power.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. ZABEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In 2012 and 2013 I represented crime victims in Philadelphia. I was a prosecutor in the Philadelphia District Attorney's Office. I have spoken to victims of crime. I have held some in my arms as they shook with nervousness or fear as they waited to take the stand while their accuser sat in the courtroom with them or his friends stood in the gallery, and they were nervous. I know what a serious issue violence and crime are. It is certainly an issue in Philadelphia and in many places in the Commonwealth.

But my objection, in particular, to this is that this is conflating a recall election with impeachment, and I cannot abide that. Impeachment is in our Constitution and it is not something to be taken lightly. It has a very high bar and it should; it should. Impeachment is not something to be taken lightly. It is not something to be done over policy differences, or as one of my colleagues referred to, differences in how you would exert prosecutorial discretion. And I think we heard that because the previous speaker referred to rising crimes not just in Philadelphia, but the suburbs. Well, let us assume that is true. This resolution does not cover the Bucks County District Attorney or the Montgomery County District Attorney, where we just were told the crime rates are increasing. I do not know why they are not specifically targeted in this resolution. I have a guess, but I will not venture it here.

In San Francisco, they recalled their district attorney. In my mind, that is a predicate for what is going on here, but California has that mechanism, and if we want to talk about instituting a recall process in the Pennsylvania Constitution, let us have that conversation. Do you know why I would tend to support it? Because recall elections come from the people who voted for or against that person. That is not what is going on here. The gentleman from Centre County, my colleague, referred to what we call terrible precedent, and this is – I talked about this in committee and I think we really have to think about this. Going after a prosecutor – or frankly, any elected official – because we do not like how they do their job is a terrible precedent. It is a terrible precedent. And I know right now everything seems safe and solid, that you are not in danger of this happening, but legislatures change, compositions change, and someday a different legislature could target a conservative prosecutor and say, you are overcharging, you are being overly carceral, you are depriving people of families, you are warehousing people. We think you are derelict in your duty to do justice, to do justice. Another legislature composed slightly differently could do that, and you know what? It would be as inappropriate as this, because prosecutorial discretion is a long-standing, well-established doctrine recognized from the United States Supreme Court all the way down to the most common trial court. We are going after prosecutorial discretion, make no mistake. We do not like – and I am hearing this from people – we do not like how the job is being done. That creates a terrible precedent.

If you ever watched an impeachment proceeding in the last couple years and thought it was political, if you ever watched that and thought there is nothing to this, this is weakening and a perversion of the impeachment process, you should not be voting for this. We should not be in the business of conducting impeachments to accomplish other goals other than impeachment itself.

I will say this. I also have a concern with whether or not this committee has – this standing committee would essentially stand in prejudice. Right now if crime victims want to share their stories, they go to a Web site that has been put up, stopkrasner.com. I did not set that Web site up, but that, to me, already creates a problem and a question of impartiality. Is this a committee that is actually going to investigate with an open mind, or is the conclusion preordained? I have a bit of a problem with that, with some of the remarks we have already heard which are distinctly anti the standing Philadelphia District Attorney. I do not know how Pennsylvanians are supposed to trust this process when the conclusion has already been preordained. We heard that in our Judiciary Committee meeting: "Enough with Krasner. Enough with Krasner." If the goal is to create a pretext to remove the district attorney from office – which it seems to me what this is – then I do not know how Pennsylvanians can trust this process, this kangaroo commission, which is what it is set up to be.

This will come back to haunt you if this passes, and I do not know how Pennsylvanians can trust a process where the investigation starts out and the conclusion is already there. This is not what impeachment is for. Impeachment should not be made simply because we disagree with somebody. I care passionately, passionately about safety and issues of violence, both in Philadelphia and I live about 5, 10 minutes away from it, from Philadelphia, and it is an issue everywhere. It is everywhere. And we can look at a million things and there are parts, and another Representative from across the aisle referred to a couple good things we can look into. We can look into what works what does not work, potential legislation. That is fine. But let us not ignore what this is really about. It is creating a pretext for a predetermined result, and I cannot support that.

Our institutions matter; our Constitution matters. I believe this is a wildly inappropriate use of the impeachment power, and I will oppose the resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

As I thought would happen, when I made the announcement that there was one speaker left on each side, we now have a couple more.

So with that, I will now go to the gentleman, Representative Jones, who had sought recognition previously on this. And you are now in order, sir, and may speak on final passage.

Mr. JONES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was not going to speak, but I wanted to address the issue of local control, which I also embrace. I am honored to say I have made a lot of friends amongst my Democratic colleagues from Philadelphia the 3 1/2 years that I have been in office. I believe I have traveled to Philadelphia more than 10 times to discuss the subjects of criminal justice and crime reduction and other similar initiatives. And so this is not a critique; it is a challenge to my friends across the aisle.

I actually think we should tread very lightly when it comes to impeachment, particularly elected officials who were recently elected by overwhelming majorities, as this district attorney was. However, this is not an impeachment resolution. This is a resolution that simply seeks to investigate a potentially bad actor, a gentleman who is not only responsible to those who voted for him, but those who did not or could not.

Two quick comments on local control. If you want local control and want this body to stay out of Philadelphia's business, then let us talk about local funding. Quit asking for

disproportionate funding for your [word stricken] schools, your [word stricken] social services—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend. Just as prior speakers have been encouraged to stay on the subject of the resolution, I would simply ask the gentleman to do that.

### POINT OF ORDER

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, we ask that the member's comments be stricken from the record.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman for raising that point of order. We will review the comments, and the gentleman has been properly encouraged to stay within the confines of the resolution and the issues contained therein.

You are in order and may proceed, Representative Jones.

Mr. JONES. Thank you. You could also fund your own public transportation and your own Temple University, which leads me to my second point—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker?

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

Mr. HARRIS. The speaker has clearly continued to go far astray. We are asking that those comments be stricken from the record.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman for raising that point of order.

Will the gentleman— The gentleman will suspend. You are not recognized.

Will the gentleman please approach the rostrum while the House is at ease.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

The SPEAKER. The House will return to order.

The gentleman, Representative Jones, had the floor previously. He has been instructed to follow the rules. The comments will be reviewed, as requested by the good gentleman, Representative Harris, and I will recognize Representative Jones on HR 216 to finish up his remarks. The Chair thanks the gentleman. You may proceed.

Mr. JONES. My apologies to my friend from Philadelphia and to the Speaker.

I mentioned Temple because this leads to my second point: This is not simply a local issue. We have constituents from Chester to Beaver Counties attending Temple University, and others attending sporting events, visiting the city. If your constituents attend York College, near my district, rest assured our district attorney is there to protect them. And if, unfortunately, they were to fall victim to crime, he would seek justice for your constituents. I think it is very reasonable for your district attorney to seek justice for our constituents when visiting or living in the city of Philadelphia. When he refuses to do so, we are justified in understanding why.

I am not prepared to support impeachment, but I do support this investigation and this resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Ecker, on the resolution.

Mr. ECKER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, we get asked a lot as to why we do things and why, why us? Why are we seeking this? Well, it is pretty simple. This body represents the State of Pennsylvania, the Commonwealth. We are about to pass a budget within the next couple of days that affects the whole Commonwealth.

Folks have reached out to us. Victims, business owners from the city of Philadelphia have reached out to us with concerns of crime and issues with the district attorney's office. We are not just doing this on a whim. Do those people not matter? Do their voices not matter?

Let us talk about what this resolution is. This is not articles of impeachment. In fact, you could argue that this resolution gives those that want to defend the district attorney the opportunity to come and defend what is happening in the city of Philadelphia. They can question the witnesses. They can ask the questions and cross-examine the victims and the business owners. Heck, they might even get to present some witnesses that defend the district attorney. And you know what? One of the rules of this committee is also to recommend policy initiatives, things that my friends to the left have been arguing about. It is to look at how we can help crime victims.

This resolution is not just about targeting one individual or entity. It is about conducting a thorough investigation to the crime crisis that is facing the city. And again, the outcome of this investigation could lead to many recommendations such as legislative solutions, policy changes, funding streams, and yes, possibly a recommendation for impeachment.

It is my sincere hope that my colleagues on both sides can come together and join in working to bring less crime and increased accountability. The outcry of our citizens has been, in the Commonwealth's largest city, has been deafening, and it is unquestionably our role as State legislators to deliver a swift and transparent resolution to that. The people of Philadelphia have contacted us, they have reached out to us, and that is why we are doing this, Mr. Speaker. That is why we need to pass HR 216.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Seeing no one else at this time, we will turn to the leaders.

Leader McClinton is recognized on final passage for the resolution.

Ms. McCLINTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And thank you to my colleagues for taking a moment to actually address the gun violence crisis. I know for the last several weeks, although strong and in the mighty minority, we have asked over and over and over again for this chamber to do something about firearms, about the proliferation of firearms, about the fact that there are assault weapons available for sale in every corner of this Commonwealth. And with each of our attempts to call up a vote, less than 24 hours after children were killed in Texas, there was no response by this body.

But here we are today making an effort to see once again that you do not like the outcome of an election so you just want to throw everybody's votes out. We have all been there where your party—

The SPEAKER. The gentelady will please suspend. Other members have been cautioned. And while the leaders do generally get a little more latitude to speak on the subjects before us, the motive issue is one that has repeatedly come up today, and to imply that the only reason to either not support or support this resolution is based on electoral results simply, I believe, is inappropriate, and I would simply ask the leader to please refrain from doing that and stay on the topic at hand.

The Chair thanks the lady for understanding, and you are in order and may proceed, Leader McClinton.

Ms. McCLINTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I was saying, we have all been there before where your party did not like the outcome of voters and you decided that you wanted to disenfranchise people and throw their votes away instead of respecting the outcome of an election.

The SPEAKER. The gentelady will please suspend. Given the close proximity to the last request to please stay on topic, I would ask both leaders – because I know that both will be speaking – to please stay on the topic at hand, just as the members have been requested to do so, because I think it is important the leaders demonstrate the qualities that we are asking them to engage in when we engage in the debate here on the floor.

Leader McClinton, you are recognized for the adoption of HR 216.

Ms. McCLINTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to work on a budget right now. I am not clear on why we are doing this when 70 percent of the people who came out in the May primary and in the November election decided on who they wanted to serve. If this General Assembly wants to do something about gun violence, here we are waiting. Let us do it. Let us work together. Let us not try to throw people's votes out again just because you do not like the outcome of an election. Let us respect those voters' decisions.

The SPEAKER. The leader will please suspend. I ask the lady to please approach the rostrum.

We will be at ease.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

The SPEAKER. The House will please return to order.

Leader McClinton had the floor. The Chair will recognize her to please conclude her remarks, and then we will go to adoption and the vote.

Ms. McCLINTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Those of us who actually live in Philadelphia – and it is a place I am proud to say I have lived my entire life, almost just a little shy of four decades here – we understand what the root of violence is, not just in Philadelphia, but all across America, and of course, in every corner of the Commonwealth. We know what the root causes are and we know how we can address them, and how in a timely manner, since it is June 29 on budget eve, we can actually address them right away. So I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to let us look not at root causes, not examine them, but let us make sure that when we align our budget priorities that they are dealing with the root causes of violence.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, the same way I have asked my colleagues and the maker of this resolution to not listen to the voters, I am not going to draft a resolution to make sure that there is no longer a sheriff in Washington County that was just elected last year. I am not going to have that resolution coming down the pike because I listen to people when they go into a booth and make their decisions.

So let us continue on in the discussions and journey forward, but most importantly, let us actually do something about the violence. If you are listening to victims, if you are meeting with victims, if you are bringing them to the Capitol, let us respond in a way that is wholehearted, that is genuine, and that will actually be effective, because I am concerned, should this committee be formed, should this resolution pass and the committee decides that Philadelphia needs to make its own gun laws, this body will not do anything about it because it never has.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Leader Benninghoff, on the resolution.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

I know the day is long, but, one, I just would like to refocus that this resolution is really not about elections. This is about gun violence in our beautiful city of Philadelphia. It was said that if it is about elections, that 70 percent of the voters put him back in, but we have to remind people that is only representing about 10 percent of the overall population.

Mr. Speaker, we do need to look at the facts here. There is no doubt – we hear this on the news, whether it is in the local news or across the State – about what is happening in a very wonderful city, a beautiful city, one of which I do visit and enjoy visiting, have taught my children to understand the cultural amenities there, whether it is the Museum of Art, and God bless the wonderful Children's Hospital that has been so good to our family. They have really, truly learned to like the city because they did not get there very much when they were younger.

But the numbers speak for themselves, Mr. Speaker, and that is why we are here on this resolution. When I talk to some of my friends there, some of your colleagues that live there, it very much is shocking, disturbing, but more importantly, very, very sad. I cannot imagine, considering we have just hit 180 days of the calendar year, that any community in our Commonwealth would suffer 256 murders. It is just not right. It is not what should be and something needs done. That is what we are here about today.

We are not here to bash a particular community, and frankly, we acknowledge that there are crime issues in other parts of the community, but the numbers speak for themselves, and that is what this committee is about. To say that this is just about a problem of increasing crime is a very small view of what this committee is about to do. It is designed to investigate throughout the Select Committee on Restoring Law and Order. It is about ensuring, very simply, laws are enforced. You know, we have rules in our household. We have rules in our own caucuses. And we have laws that govern us which are to ensure civility. And when you have differences of opinion, they are ironed out, adjudicated through a more peaceful manner. That is why laws were designed. And sadly, there are those who choose to break them, and subsequently, we have a court system that, after the police do their work, should adjudicate accordingly.

The difference, and why the City of Brotherly Love is mentioned so much in this situation, is that in other parts of Pennsylvania, the district attorney enforces the laws – public safety laws that were passed by the General Assembly, whether the current members or previous members, signed by duly elected Governors, and designed to keep the people of Pennsylvania safe. Whether you live there, drive through there, or are passing anywhere into Pennsylvania, our laws are designed to equally keep people safe.

I used to tell my children, you know, the laws that put people in jail are also the ones that allow you to walk free. There is a fine line there and that line gets broken when people make poor choices. But at the end of the day, laws help keep us civil as a community and as a State. As the crisis of crime and violence grows, it has been very apparent, we see it day in and day out, the openly flagrant, prideful way that the D.A. in Philadelphia refuses to enforce these laws.

Despite what some members have said, other current or former Philadelphia officials are also calling on the district attorney to do his job. Current Democrat mayor, I quote, "I'm calling on all law enforcement, all prosecution and the courts to keep us safe. Our police officers are doing their jobs" even while "They are in harm's way...they are out there doing their jobs every single day and they are taking guns out of..." the hands, illegal guns out of people who choose to have them. "Those criminals need to go to jail. They need to be detained...unless we do it, they are going to think there is no penalty for their actions and they are going to continue to carry guns."

In addition, we have a former Philadelphia mayor that says, the D.A. "...should also use his words to send a message to the shooters, murderers and criminals of this city by committing to actually prosecute them, rather than coddle them, make excuses, reduce or drop charges. He should commit to locking them up for carrying illegal weapons or shooting people. If..." the D.A. "does not have the fortitude or the guts to carry out those duties, he should resign and turn things over to someone who is not trying to sell Philadelphians on the false choice of having either public safety or police reform. Philadelphians can have – and deserve – both." Unquote.

And I would be remiss to not share the comments of another current appointee of the Democratic administration, and that is the very police commissioner, who has said that the "...justice system has become a 'revolving door' for repeat gun offenders – leaving more of them" out "on the street with their weapons, with little reason to fear the consequences of being caught."

This is something we do not want to have happen anywhere in our State. Again, it is why this resolution is so important. It is why we draft laws in order to keep civility in our communities.

Mr. Speaker, lots has been said today so I will round my numbers up in my comments. But again, it is just hard to understand when we talk about 256 deaths, every life is important there and all across our State, all 13.8 million. I cannot fathom this. We cannot turn a blind eye that over 64 percent of the murders committed in this Commonwealth are happening in two counties. This resolution is designed to do fact-finding, investigations, and get us information so we can make good policies.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has taken a keen interest in guaranteeing that the tough-on-crime laws that were enacted in Pennsylvania are there and will be enforced regardless of where in this State. It is my hope that this investigation, select committee, will leave no stone unturned in providing full airing of this issue and offering possible remedies, policy changes, and actions that will truly ensure that our State laws that were designed to protect the public safety are enforced. Pretty simple. You are the lawmakers, you make the law. The police are to enforce the laws, and the prosecutors are to adjudicate them when somebody has chosen to break them.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your time, the members' indulgence, and would ask all the members to please vote in favor of HR 216 to restore law and order in all of our beautiful State of this great Commonwealth. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

(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. You are in order and may proceed, sir.

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—114

Armanini	Gleim	Marshall	Rothman
Benninghoff	Gregory	Masser	Rowe
Bernstine	Greiner	Mehaffie	Ryan
Boback	Grove	Mentzer	Sankey
Bonner	Hamm	Mercuri	Saylor
Borowicz	Heffley	Metcalf	Schemel
Boyle	Helm	Metzgar	Schmitt
Brooks	Hennessey	Mihalek	Schnee
Brown, R.	Hershey	Millard	Schroeder
Burns	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Silvis
Causer	Hohenstein	Mizgorski	Smith
Cook	Irvin	Moul	Sonney
Cox	James	Mustello	Staats
Culver	Jones	Neilson	Stambaugh
Davanzo	Jozwiak	Nelson, E.	Stephens
Day	Kail	O'Neal	Struzzi
Delozier	Kaufer	Oberlander	Thomas
DelRosso	Kauffman	Ortitay	Tomlinson
Diamond	Keefer	Owlett	Topper
Dunbar	Klunk	Peifer	Twardzik
Ecker	Knowles	Pennycuick	Warner
Emrick	Labs	Pickett	Wentling
Farry	Lawrence	Polinchock	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

#### NAYS—86

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

Ciresi	Harkins	McNeill	Sims
Conklin	Harris	Merski	Snyder
Covington	Herrin	Miller, D.	Solomon
Cruz	Howard	Mullery	Sturla
Curry	Innamorato	Mullins	Vitali
Daley	Isaacson	Nelson, N.	Warren
Davis, A.	Kenyatta	O'Mara	Webster
Davis, T.	Kim	Otten	Welby
Dawkins	Kinkead	Parker	Williams, D.
Deasy	Kinsey	Pashinski	Young
DeLissio	Kirkland	Pisciottano	Zabel
Delloso	Kosierowski		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Dowling Kerwin

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

**SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B**

**BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2667, PN 3226**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 7 (Banks and Banking) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in preliminary provisions, further providing for definitions.

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—200

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Dowling Kerwin

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 635, PN 1125**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 12 (Commerce and Trade) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in property assessed clean energy program, further providing for purpose, for definitions, for establishment of a program, for notice to lien holder required for participation, for scope of work, for lien and for collection of assessments.

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 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 correct.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—148

Abney	Fiedler	Lee	Roae
Benham	Fitzgerald	Longietti	Rozzi
Benninghoff	Flood	Madden	Sainato
Bizzarro	Frankel	Major	Samuelson
Boback	Freeman	Malagari	Sanchez
Boyle	Galloway	Markosek	Sappey
Bradford	Gaydos	Marshall	Saylor
Briggs	Gillespie	Masser	Schlossberg
Brooks	Gregory	Matzie	Schmitt
Brown, A.	Greiner	McClinton	Schnee
Brown, R.	Guenst	McNeill	Schroeder
Bullock	Guzman	Mehaffie	Schweyer
Burgos	Hanbidge	Mentzer	Shusterman
Burns	Harkins	Mercuri	Sims
Carroll	Harris	Merski	Smith
Cephas	Heffley	Mihalek	Snyder
Ciresi	Helm	Millard	Solomon
Conklin	Hennessey	Miller, D.	Sonney
Covington	Herrin	Mizgorski	Stephens
Cruz	Hershey	Mullery	Struzzi
Culver	Hickernell	Mullins	Sturla
Curry	Hohenstein	Mustello	Thomas
Daley	Howard	Neilson	Tomlinson
Davis, A.	Innamorato	Nelson, N.	Topper
Davis, T.	Isaacson	O'Mara	Vitali
Dawkins	James	Oberlander	Warren
Day	Kail	Otten	Webster
Deasy	Kaufer	Parker	Welby
DeLissio	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Wheeland
Delloso	Kim	Peifer	White
Delozier	Kinthead	Pennycuik	Williams, C.
DelRosso	Kinsey	Pisciottano	Williams, D.
DeLuca	Kirkland	Polinchock	Young
Dunbar	Kosierowski	Quinn	Zabel
Emrick	Krajewski	Rabb	
Evans	Krueger	Rader	Cutler,
Farry	Kulik	Rigby	Speaker
Fee	Labs		

NAYS—52

Armanini	Grove	Mako	Rossi
Bernstine	Hamm	Maloney	Rothman
Bonner	Irvin	Metcalfe	Rowe
Borowicz	Jones	Metzgar	Ryan
Causar	Jozwiak	Miller, B.	Sankey
Cook	Kauffman	Moul	Schemel
Cox	Keefer	Nelson, E.	Silvis
Davanzo	Klunk	O'Neal	Staats
Diamond	Knowles	Ortitay	Stambaugh
Ecker	Lawrence	Owlett	Twardzik
Fritz	Lewis	Pickett	Warner
Gillen	Mackenzie, M.	Puskaric	Wentling
Gleim	Mackenzie, R.	Rapp	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Dowling	Kerwin
---------	--------

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.

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1813, PN 3321**, 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 military child advance enrollment.

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 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—200

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

## NAYS—0

## NOT VOTING—0

## EXCUSED—2

Dowling Kerwin

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 2619, PN 3270**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, providing for State-related university performance-based funding incentive.

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 Longietti.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this bill represents a significant change in higher education policy, yet it is being rushed and it lacks the type of input and consideration needed to make such a significant change. The bill was never put out for cosponsorship. We never had a hearing on this bill. I have been told by two of the State-related institutions that are involved that they need and they desire more input. There is no need to rush this. The bill would not affect appropriations to the State-relateds until the 2023-2024 fiscal year. If we can wait until then, we can certainly wait a little bit longer and make sure that we get the input and the consideration that we need.

Let me give you some examples of the problems with this bill. If you look at page 6 and 7 of the bill, it establishes minimum performance-based metrics which will be used to determine whether the university receives certain funding. But those metrics do not recognize the differences between these institutions. One of the metrics is the number of students enrolled and the number of degrees obtained in agriculture, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Using the number of students as opposed to the percentage of students does not recognize the fact that Penn State University enrolls three times more students than Pitt, and almost three times more students than Temple. The metric also does not recognize that Penn State is a land-grant university, and therefore, has a robust agricultural studies program, whereas Pitt and Temple are not in that category.

Another minimum metric is tied to postgraduation rates and salaries. So we could actually be penalizing universities because they have an emphasis on public interest careers, which tend to pay lower salaries. Yet we need people to work in health clinics. We need people to work for nonprofit disability providers. We need people to work for public safety forces. This has not been thought out.

There are other reasons to be concerned about this bill. This bill creates an unelected council, unelected council that is going to make decisions on other performance-based metrics. In essence, we are delegating higher education policy to an unelected council.

Now, I warned about this exact kind of model a few years ago when we debated the P3 bill, which created an unelected board to determine transportation policy, and I specifically warned, on this House floor, that it could lead to the tolling of transportation

infrastructure. And we realized those warnings this year. They were dismissed at the time by the majority party, and yet here we are today and they are a reality. So again, I warn against delegating higher education policy to an unelected council.

Some say that we need this bill because we need to hold these universities accountable for the dollars that we send them, but the universities are all accountable for the dollars we have provided. We held a hearing earlier this year and they provided us with detailed information on how the money is spent and who benefits. Specifically, the money goes to Pennsylvania students to provide for a lower in-State tuition. They opened their books, they answered questions, they offered up additional information. They have and are more than willing to provide the accountability. We do not need this bill for accountability.

Moreover, I find it hypocritical that this body has resisted basic accountability measures for charter schools and for the EITC (educational improvement tax credit) program that benefits private schools with hundreds of millions of dollars involved, yet we have to have this measure for State-related universities that have already provided the information that we need to see on how these funds are used and who benefits.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not ready for prime time, and I urge members to reject it. Thank you.

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

Mr. TOPPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And also, just to be clear, there was a cosponsor memo that was sent out even though the minority chairman chose not to sign on. Maybe I will get him next time.

This idea has been vetted. This is not something that has come about in a few weeks. This has come about over the course of almost a year, including working with the three R1 State-related universities. In fact, in an Appropriations hearing when this idea was brought up, President Barron of Penn State indicated that he helped to write the basis of this law, which is out of Florida, when he was at Florida State University. Each State-related saw this as an opportunity. This is not some kind of a punitive effort and this does not affect all of their funding. This is creating incentives to meet Pennsylvania's needs.

The gentleman brought up about one of the metrics that talks about the different fields. These are fields of study – agriculture, science, technology, engineering, mathematics – where Pennsylvania needs employees, where Pennsylvania needs the graduates from these universities. We have many institutions of higher education in Pennsylvania. They do not all need to do the same thing. What we need from our R1s is different than what we need from our PASSHE (Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education) system, and we acknowledge that.

This public policy creates a council, a council, as many, appointed by leaders in this institution and from the administration; representatives from the Department of Education, including the Secretary of Education – clearly an expert in the matter; and the Deputy Secretary of Higher Education – far more of an expert in this matter than any of us in this room.

We have one choice right now, red or green button; "yes" or "no." This provides a different path forward, and again, it is an incentive. This is not punitive. And I would ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on bringing this, what two-thirds of the other States in

this nation, adding some kind of performance-based metrics, to our State-related universities, and I ask for support of HB 2619.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Carroll, on final passage.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry, if you do not mind?

The SPEAKER. You may state your parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the sponsor of the bill is supposed to go first with the explanation. What just transpired preserved the ability for the sponsor of the bill to go twice, and I am wondering if we have had a change in policy with respect to having the sponsor of the bill go first with an explanation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct in that generally the prime sponsor does go first; however, in this case, the gentleman had waived off because he did not see anybody seeking recognition and was responding to a member who did seek recognition. So that is the normal order of business as we go in terms of recognizing members who speak. The prior bill, for example, went immediately from the reading by the clerk to a vote. I believe that was the good gentleman's intent at that time and that just was not the case. Certainly, the Speaker was hoping for that result, but we will continue to debate.

Mr. CARROLL. But by waiving off, did he burn his first opportunity to speak on the bill?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. CARROLL. Okay.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman did not.

Mr. CARROLL. Then, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, then, that the sponsor of the bill can simply refuse to engage in a debate and preserve two different opportunities to close instead of the usual one.

The SPEAKER. The rules are very clear that individuals are allowed to be recognized twice. In this particular case, and assuming that the debate has concluded, I believe the gentleman will in fact have waived off his second time at that point because we will go to the vote. I understand the gentleman's concern; however, the Speaker is the one who tries to maintain a list of individuals. We have done it historically for members on both sides in regards to the recognition. I am sure that every member believes that their own bill is the very best bill and that there will likely be no debate; however, sometimes that is not the case.

Has the gentleman concluded his parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CARROLL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do have some concerns, but enough said.

The SPEAKER. Fair enough. We can certainly discuss them after session. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Is the gentleman, Representative Samuelson, seeking recognition?

Mr. SAMUELSON. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Just to point out, in this legislation, I know there have been concerns raised over the fact that this commission would be allocating funding based on how many students are enrolled, and there are differences between the State-related universities. And there are concerns about how this commission would be

allocating funding based on student outcomes. Would they be looking at transcripts? Would they be trying to figure out to reward institutions that might have grade inflation but then penalizing other institutions? There are lots of questions about this.

But there is a fundamental question. I have served in this legislature and have seen a lot of bipartisan commissions. When I read the language of this bill, there are 10 members of the commission, 6 of the 10 are appointed by the legislature. So you might imagine, well, if it is a bipartisan commission, it is going to be three appointed by one party and three appointed by the other party. But read the, read the legislation. The way this legislation is crafted, the majority party would pick four members of the commission and the minority party would pick two members of the commission.

So not only are we taking the funding of State-related universities and introducing unknown factors about enrollment and some yet-to-be-defined measure of academic performance, but we are turning it into a partisan display. The Constitution of Pennsylvania says that when you allocate funding to a State-related university, you need a two-thirds vote. It is a nonpreferred appropriation. It guarantees that there be bipartisan cooperation. This legislation specifically says we are going to turn this funding commission into a partisan endeavor stacked with four members appointed by the majority party and two members appointed by the minority party.

I urge a "no" 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 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 good gentleman.

The following roll call was recorded:

#### YEAS—111

Armanini	Greiner	Mehaffie	Rowe
Benninghoff	Grove	Mentzer	Ryan
Bernstine	Hamm	Mercuri	Sankey
Boback	Heffley	Metcalfe	Saylor
Bonner	Helm	Metzgar	Schemel
Borowicz	Hennessey	Mihalek	Schmitt
Brooks	Hershey	Millard	Schnee
Brown, R.	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Schroeder
Causser	Irvin	Mizgorski	Silvis
Cook	James	Moul	Smith
Cox	Jones	Mustello	Sonney
Culver	Jozwiak	Nelson, E.	Staats
Davanzo	Kail	O'Neal	Stambaugh
Day	Kaufer	Oberlander	Stephens

Delozier	Kauffman	Ortitay	Struzzi
DelRosso	Keefer	Owlett	Thomas
Diamond	Klunk	Peifer	Tomlinson
Dunbar	Knowles	Pennycuick	Topper
Ecker	Labs	Pickett	Twardzik
Emrick	Lawrence	Polinchock	Warner
Farry	Lewis	Puskaric	Wentling
Fee	Mackenzie, M.	Quinn	Wheeland
Flood	Mackenzie, R.	Rader	White
Fritz	Major	Rapp	Williams, C.
Gaydos	Mako	Rigby	Zimmerman
Gillen	Maloney	Roae	
Gillespie	Marshall	Rossi	Cutler,
Gleim	Masser	Rothman	Speaker
Gregory			

#### NAYS—89

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

#### NOT VOTING—0

#### EXCUSED—2

Dowling Kerwin

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 818, PN 1833**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of July 19, 1979 (P.L.130, No.48), known as the Health Care Facilities Act, in licensing of health care facilities, providing for ambulatory surgical facility permitted surgical procedures; and abrogating regulations.

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 good gentleman, Representative Frankel.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Very briefly, I just wanted to say that getting to "yes" on this piece of legislation has been a very long process, and I wanted to thank the Department of Health for their efforts and their flexibility, the regulated entities under this bill, the orthopedists, ambulatory care facilities, and others committed to working together also on a bipartisan basis with my counterpart, the majority chair of the Health Committee.

This bill will go a long way to improving access and I think keeping health-care costs lower, so I want to thank all those involved in order to get this done. 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 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—200

Abney	Frankel	Mackenzie, M.	Roae
Armanini	Freeman	Mackenzie, R.	Rossi
Benham	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
Boyle	Greiner	Masser	Sankey
Bradford	Grove	Matzie	Sappey
Briggs	Guenst	McClinton	Saylor
Brooks	Guzman	McNeill	Schemel
Brown, A.	Hamm	Mehaffie	Schlossberg
Brown, R.	Hanbidge	Mentzer	Schmitt
Bullock	Harkins	Mercuri	Schnee
Burgos	Harris	Merski	Schroeder
Burns	Heffley	Metcalfe	Schweyer
Carroll	Helm	Metzgar	Shusterman
Causer	Hennessey	Mihalek	Silvis
Cephas	Herrin	Millard	Sims
Ciresi	Hershey	Miller, B.	Smith
Conklin	Hickernell	Miller, D.	Snyder
Cook	Hohenstein	Mizgorski	Solomon
Covington	Howard	Moul	Sonney
Cox	Innamorato	Mullery	Staats
Cruz	Irvin	Mullins	Stambaugh

Culver	Isaacson	Mustello	Stephens
Curry	James	Neilson	Struzzi
Daley	Jones	Nelson, E.	Sturla
Davanzo	Jozwiak	Nelson, N.	Thomas
Davis, A.	Kail	O'Mara	Tomlinson
Davis, T.	Kaufner	O'Neal	Topper
Dawkins	Kauffman	Oberlander	Twardzik
Day	Keefe	Ortitay	Vitali
Deasy	Kenyatta	Otten	Warner
DeLissio	Kim	Owlett	Warren
Delloso	Kinkead	Parker	Webster
Delozier	Kinsey	Pashinski	Welby
DelRosso	Kirkland	Peifer	Wentling
DeLuca	Klunk	Pennycuik	Wheeland
Diamond	Knowles	Pickett	White
Dunbar	Kosierowski	Pisciottano	Williams, C.
Ecker	Krajewski	Polinchock	Williams, D.
Emrick	Krueger	Puskaric	Young
Evans	Kulik	Quinn	Zabel
Farry	Labs	Rabb	Zimmerman
Fee	Lawrence	Rader	
Fiedler	Lee	Rapp	Cutler,
Fitzgerald	Lewis	Rigby	Speaker
Flood	Longiatti		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Dowling                      Kerwin

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

Ordered, That the clerk return the same to the Senate with the information that the House has passed the same with amendment in which the concurrence of the Senate is requested.

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2702, PN 3322**, entitled:

An Act providing for the highway capital budget project itemization for the fiscal year 2022-2023 to be financed from current revenue or by the incurring of debt.

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 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—200

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Dowling	Kerwin
---------	--------

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 1094, PN 1806**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in registration of vehicles, providing for apportioned registration renewal; in commercial drivers, further providing for commercial driver's license; in miscellaneous provisions, repealing provisions relating to snow and ice dislodged or falling from moving vehicle and providing for snow and ice; and, in motor carrier safety, repealing provisions relating to findings and declaration of policy and further providing for definitions and for Motor Carrier Safety Advisory Committee.

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 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—200

Abney	Frankel	Mackenzie, M.	Roae
Armanini	Freeman	Mackenzie, R.	Rossi
Benham	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
Boyle	Greiner	Masser	Sankey
Bradford	Grove	Matzie	Sappey
Briggs	Guenst	McClinton	Saylor
Brooks	Guzman	McNeill	Schemel
Brown, A.	Hamm	Mehaffie	Schlossberg
Brown, R.	Hanbidge	Mentzer	Schmitt

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Dowling Kerwin

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

Ordered, That the clerk return the same to the Senate with the information that the House has passed the same with amendment in which the concurrence of the Senate is requested.

The SPEAKER. For the information of the members, there will be no further floor votes this evening; however, we will be doing some housekeeping. And as has been the custom all week, we will only be going to recess in the event that we need to return to do any business.

### VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman, Representative Harris, rise? Correction of the record, I believe?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, Mr. Speaker. On HR 212 the gentleman from Philadelphia, Representative Cruz, was voted in the negative. He would like to be recognized in the positive.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman. His remarks will be spread upon the record.

### BILLS RECOMMITTED

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

HB 2331;  
SB 814;  
SB 904;  
SB 905; and  
SB 1179.

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

### BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that SB 1093 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

### CALENDAR CONTINUED

### BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 38, PN 105**, entitled:

A Joint Resolution proposing integrated amendments to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, organizing the Judiciary into representative districts and further providing for residency requirements.

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

### BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 38 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

### BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 38 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1641, PN 1825**, entitled:

An Act designating a bridge, identified as Bridge Key 8517, carrying Pennsylvania Route 403 over the Stonycreek River in Ferndale Borough, Cambria County, as the Private First Class Lee David Meadows Memorial Bridge.

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

### **BILL TABLED**

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 1641 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

### **BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE**

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 1641 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1830, PN 2074**, entitled:

An Act designating a bridge, identified as Bridge Key 25507, on that portion of State Route 3006 over the Kinzua Creek in the census-designated place of Westline, Lafayette Township, McKean County, as the Westline Veterans Memorial Bridge.

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

### **BILL TABLED**

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 1830 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

### **BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE**

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 1830 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

### **BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER**

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

### **RECESS**

The SPEAKER. Seeing no further committee or caucus announcements, this House will stand in recess.