

# COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

## LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

FRIDAY, JULY 8, 2022

SESSION OF 2022

206TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 38

### 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 gentlewoman, Representative Gaydos, that this House do now adjourn until Friday, July 8, 2022, at 9 a.m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to, and at 8:59 a.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.

The House convened at 9 a.m., e.d.t.

#### PRAYER

HON. BRETT R. MILLER, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As we begin today, I want to read a verse from the Book of Romans, chapter 14, verse 12.

"So then each of us will give an account of himself to God."

Please join me as I pray:

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. We give You the first place in our Assembly today. We acknowledge You as the creator and that we are the created. You are awesome in power, awesome in holiness, awesome in wisdom, and You are awesome in mercy, compassion, and love.

In this great hall, in this great Assembly, and before this great people, we acknowledge that You are greater than all – far greater than each of us – and we present ourselves to You as those who must give an account for our thoughts, words, and deeds.

Please grant us wisdom today, the wisdom that is from above, that is pure and peaceable. Please grant us greater understanding of Your heart and of Your Word, that we might make wise decisions that are pleasing to You and are for the betterment of

our Commonwealth and every person in it. Please keep us far from pride and self-promotion, and open our eyes so that we might walk in greater humility and reverence before You. The task before us is too big for us. We need Your help and ask for it.

Your Word tells us that You will remain faithful even if we are not. Knowing that we must give an account, we plead with You to hear us from heaven and answer us today. In the name of Jesus I pray. Amen.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

#### JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Thursday, July 7, 2022, will be postponed until printed.

#### JOURNALS APPROVED

The SPEAKER. However, the following 2022 Journals are in print, and without objection, will be approved: Wednesday, April 13, and Monday, April 25.

#### HOUSE RESOLUTION INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

**No. 220** By Representatives SAPPEY, HOHENSTEIN, MILLARD, SANCHEZ, KINSEY, DALEY and D. WILLIAMS

A Concurrent Resolution honoring the life and accomplishments of Humphry Marshall on October 10, 2022, on the 300th anniversary of his birth in this Commonwealth.

Referred to Committee on AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS, July 8, 2022.

#### HOUSE BILL INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

**No. 2739** By Representatives CEPHAS, FRANKEL, SANCHEZ, D. WILLIAMS, HANBIDGE, HILL-EVANS, MADDEN, A. BROWN, ISAACSON, HOHENSTEIN, A. DAVIS, GUZMAN, SCHLOSSBERG, HOWARD, CIRESI, O'MARA, LEE, KINSEY, McCLINTON, KIM, N. NELSON and DALEY

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Human Services Code, in public assistance, providing for effect of postsecondary education and work force training on subsidized child care.

Referred to Committee on LABOR AND INDUSTRY, July 8, 2022.

### SENATE BILLS FOR CONCURRENCE

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

#### SB 1201, PN 1769

Referred to Committee on INSURANCE, July 8, 2022.

#### SB 1299, PN 1818

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, July 8, 2022.

### SENATE MESSAGE

#### HOUSE AMENDMENTS TO SENATE 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 the Senate amendments to **HB 1642, PN 3374**.

### SENATE MESSAGE

#### AMENDED SENATE BILL RETURNED FOR CONCURRENCE AND REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, informed that the Senate has concurred in the amendments made by the House of Representatives by amending said amendments to **SB 982, PN 1856**.

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the House of Representatives for its concurrence.

### 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 1093, PN 1840**, and **SB 1284, PN 1847**.

### 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 1642, PN 3374

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in preliminary provisions, further providing for Keystone Exams and graduation requirements, for special provisions applicable to the Keystone Exams, graduation requirements and alternative competency assessment and for Special Education Funding Commission and providing for Commission on Education and Economic Competitiveness; in grounds and buildings, further providing for limitation on new applications for Department of Education approval of public school building projects; in professional employees, providing for locally titled positions; in certification of teachers, providing for out-of-State applicants for career and technical education certification, further providing for program of continuing professional education and for continuing professional education for school or system leaders, providing for teacher support in the Structured Literacy Program, repealing provisions relating to certificates issued by other states and providing for out-of-State applicants for certification and for prekindergarten through grade twelve dance certificate; in pupils and attendance, further providing for definitions, for Home Education Program, for assisting students experiencing education instability, for Nonprofit School Food Program, for exceptional children and education and training and for extended special education enrollment due to COVID-19; in school safety and security, further providing for School Safety and Security Committee, providing for survey of school mental health services, further providing for School Safety and Security Grant Program, for school safety and security coordinator and for school safety and security training and providing for school safety and security grants for 2022-2023 school year, for school mental health grants for 2022-2023 school year, for school safety and security coordinator training, for school safety and security training in educator, administrator and supervisory preparatory programs and for School-based Mental Health Internship Grant Program; in threat assessment, further providing for threat assessment teams; in school health services, further providing for health services; in Drug and Alcohol Recovery High School Pilot Program, further providing for definitions, for establishment of Drug and Alcohol Recovery High School Pilot Program and for scope of program and selection of students, repealing provisions relating to term of Drug and Alcohol Recovery High School Pilot Program and further providing for reporting; in terms and courses of study, further providing for agreements with institutions of higher education; providing for talent recruitment and establishing the Committee on Education Talent Recruitment, the Talent Recruitment Grant Program and the Talent Recruitment Account; providing for educational and professional development online course initiative, establishing the Online Course Clearinghouse Account and imposing penalties; in charter schools, providing for abolition of rulemaking and further providing for regulations; providing for disability inclusive curriculum and establishing the Disability Inclusive Curriculum Pilot Program; in career and technical education, providing for Cosmetology Training through Career and Technical Center Pilot Program and for Barber Training through Career and Technical Center Pilot Program; in community colleges, further providing for financial program and reimbursement of payments; in rural regional college for underserved counties, further providing for reports; in the State System of Higher Education, further providing for definitions, for establishment of the State System of Higher Education and its institutions, for board of governors and for council of trustees and providing for integrated councils; in educational tax credits, further providing for definitions, for qualification and application by organizations, for application by business firms, for tax credits, for limitations and for opportunity scholarships; in transfers of credits between institutions of higher education, further providing for definitions and for duties of public institutions of higher education; in sexual violence education at institutions of higher education, further providing for scope of article, for definitions and for education program, providing for consent to sexual activity, further providing for follow-up and for report and providing for memorandum of understanding; in miscellaneous provisions relating to institutions of higher education, further providing for Public Higher Education Funding Commission and providing for State-related university performance-based funding model and for prohibition on scholarship displacement at public institutions of higher education; in ready-to-succeed scholarship, further providing for agency; in funding for public libraries, providing for State aid for fiscal year 2022-2023; in reimbursements by Commonwealth and between school districts, further providing for payments on account of pupils enrolled in career and technical curriculums and for student-weighted basic education funding, providing for level-up supplement for 2021-

2022 school year and further providing for payments to intermediate units, for special education payments to school districts, for assistance to school districts declared to be in financial recovery status or identified for financial watch status, for approved reimbursable rental for leases hereafter approved and approved reimbursable sinking fund charges on indebtedness and for Ready-to-Learn Block Grant; in construction and renovation of buildings by school entities, further providing for applicability; and making editorial changes.

### **SB 382, PN 1850**

An Act amending Title 74 (Transportation) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in public-private transportation partnerships, further providing for definitions, for duties of board, for operation of board, for selection of development entities, for public-private transportation partnerships agreement and for taxation of development entity and providing for prohibition on mandatory user fees; and rescinding, in part, a resolution of the Public-Private Transportation Partnership Board.

### **SB 1093, PN 1840**

An Act amending the act of December 15, 1971 (P.L.596, No.160), known as the Outdoor Advertising Control Act of 1971, further providing for definitions, for control of outdoor advertising, for removal of prohibited advertising devices and for penalties for violation; and imposing a duty on the Secretary of Transportation to notify the Federal Highway Administration.

### **SB 1284, PN 1847**

An Act providing for funding for State-related universities for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2022, and ending June 30, 2023, for costs basis, for frequency of payments and for recordkeeping requirements; imposing a duty on the Auditor General; providing for financial statements, for the Agricultural College Land Scrip Fund and for restrictions; and making appropriations.

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

The SPEAKER. Turning to committee and caucus announcements.

## **REPUBLICAN CAUCUS**

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

Mr. DUNBAR. Good morning, Mr. Speaker, and thank you.

Republicans will caucus at 9:30 in the majority caucus room; that is 9:30 in the majority caucus room. We will attempt to be back on the floor at 10:30.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

## **DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS**

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

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

Democrats will caucus hybrid at 9:30.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

## **RECESS**

The SPEAKER. This House will stand in recess until 10:30 a.m., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

## **RECESS EXTENDED**

The time of recess was extended until 11 a.m.; further extended to 11:20 a.m.; further extended to 11:45 a.m.

## **AFTER RECESS**

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

## **SENATE BILLS FOR CONCURRENCE**

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

### **SB 676, PN 1851**

Referred to Committee on INSURANCE, July 8, 2022.

### **SB 1123, PN 1463**

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, July 8, 2022.

## **LEAVES OF ABSENCE**

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander, who indicates that the gentlemen, Representative Jim COX from Berks County and Representative Aaron KAUFER from Luzerne, both wish to be placed on leave for the day. Without objection, the leaves will so be granted.

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

## **MASTER ROLL CALL**

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

The following roll call was recorded:

### **PRESENT—199**

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

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Cox                      Kaufer                      Kerwin

LEAVES ADDED—1

Mihalek

LEAVES CANCELED—3

Cox

The SPEAKER. One hundred and ninety-nine members having voted on the master roll, a quorum is present.

**CALENDAR**

**BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 736, PN 840**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in registration of vehicles, further providing for use of farm vehicle plates.

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

Mr. **METZGAR** offered the following amendment  
No. **A05318**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 2, by inserting after "Statutes," in general provisions, further providing for definitions; and,  
Amend Bill, page 1, lines 6 and 7, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

Section 1. The definition of "farm vehicle" in section 102 of Title 75 of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes is amended to read:  
§ 102. Definitions.

Subject to additional definitions contained in subsequent provisions of this title which are applicable to specific provisions of this title, the following words and phrases when used in this title shall have, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, the meanings given to them in this section:

\* \* \*

"Farm vehicle." [A truck or truck tractor determined by the Department of Transportation to be used exclusively for agricultural purposes.] Any of the following that the Department of Transportation has determined to be used exclusively for agricultural purposes:

- (1) Passenger car.
- (2) Truck.
- (3) Truck tractor.

\* \* \*

Section 2. Section 1344(a) introductory paragraph and (3) of Title 75 are amended to read:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 9, by inserting after "rule.—A"

passenger car.

Amend Bill, page 2, line 2, by striking out "2" and inserting  
3

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Metzgar, for a brief description of the amendment. The gentleman waives off. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Representative Carroll, is seeking recognition. You are recognized and may speak on the amendment, sir.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, apparently the gentleman from Somerset is not willing to defend his amendment, so I will take a stab at trying to describe what this does.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment will open the door to virtually every sedan in the Commonwealth being titled and registered as a farm vehicle – good news for the gentleman from Mercer County with two tomato plants in his backyard. He can register his vehicle as a farm vehicle. By doing so, he will avoid registration fees. He will avoid a safety inspection on the vehicle. He will avoid the usual auto insurance and financial responsibility required in the State. He will not even have to have a driver's license, Mr. Speaker. And if he is 14 years old, he can still drive the vehicle.

So what we are going to do is we are going to set up a scenario for virtually anybody with a tomato plant in their backyard to be able to turn their sedan into a farm vehicle. He can carry as many passengers as he wants in this vehicle that is not safety inspected with no insurance, and he really does not have to worry about anybody checking on whether he has an actual farm; he could just self-certify that he has those two tomato plants and he is good to go.

Mr. Speaker, at a moment in time when our Motor License Fund needs money, this scheme suggests that we will have less money in our Motor License Fund, we will have less safe roadways, we will have people who work on farms be less safe, and we will turn the Commonwealth into a system of uninsured, unregistered drivers without a license operating on highways across the Commonwealth.

This is about as misplaced as it gets, Mr. Speaker. And I understand why the gentleman from Somerset did not want to outline this amendment, because there is no way to defend this one.

I ask for a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman, but I also believe the gentleman is going to get his wish. The gentleman, Representative Metzgar, is seeking recognition on the amendment.

Mr. METZGAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment came about because I was approached by a number of farmers in my district that are being absolutely overrun by costs. Fertilizer has tripled, I think almost quadrupled. Fuel prices have doubled, nearly tripled at this point. And one of the issues that they have is that they are trying to transport themselves, and sometimes some of their commodities, between different places. Sometimes at, you know, very short distances, but still the miles add up. And as we are all feeling the crunch from fuel, they asked for a green solution. They wanted a green solution as farmers that, you know, they sticker or plate farm vehicles, and then that gives them less rights as a normal plated or licensed vehicle. They are only allowed, in the stickered case, to drive between the hours of dawn and dusk.

They are able to save a little bit of money because they can sometimes use their farm blanket insurance policy, but contrary to what the gentleman from Lackawanna said, they have to have insurance. It is actually, it is listed in Title 75 that they are forced to have insurance of the same quality as what we have on our normal licensed vehicles. As a matter of fact, it is even on the application for PennDOT.

The gentleman from Lackawanna County is also confused about the ages of the people operating it because he is confusing a farm vehicle with an implement of husbandry. He is very much correct about the ages of an implement of husbandry, but this is a farm vehicle. A farm vehicle requires a driver's license.

And lastly, there are many other requirements, one of which is the filing of a Schedule F, so meaning that you have to be a legitimate farmer to be able to go and sticker or plate your vehicle in order to use this. But really at the base of this is we have our farmers often trying to just move their most important commodity, themselves, and their employees, their family, between one farm to the other or one implement of husbandry to the other. They are not allowed to drive some of those implements of husbandry after dark, so they leave them in the field. You have to get someone to come get them and then take them back to that implement of husbandry.

But we are just trying to save them money and save the carbon footprint for all of us so that we have a greener alternative for our farmers. I know some of the members might be interested in that we have actually included electric vehicles in this, so we are giving you an opportunity to help your farmers, but also an opportunity to help the environment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Seeing no one else seeking recognition, we will recognize the gentleman, Representative Carroll, for the second time on the amendment.

Mr. CARROLL. So, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is going to hide behind nuance here. He suggests that there is a requirement to have insurance. What he is really saying is that you do not need traditional auto insurance; you need farm insurance. We all have homeowners insurance, but that does not qualify as auto insurance. And so he will hide behind the fact that there is a farm policy, not a traditional auto policy. Good luck if there is an accident in that scenario.

And I am thrilled that he has such a passion for the environment and for the climate change that is underway as a result of global warming from the movement of passenger vehicles along our roadways, and maybe the solution here, if we are interested in trying to move farm workers from farm to farm, is to actually give them a driver's license and let us give driver's licenses to these folks. We could really save some money and we will not have to tie the farmer up with moving the undocumented folks that are going to be relied on to be able to harvest some of the crops from farm field to farm field.

Mr. Speaker, this is wildly misplaced. It is unsafe. It reduces the amount of money in our Motor License Fund. And I know there are bridges and roads in Somerset County. We have talked about, in the world of transportation, Route 219 to the Maryland border for 30 years. The gentleman's proposal will guarantee 219 to Maryland probably in the year 2085.

So, Mr. Speaker, if we are interested in not having money in the Motor License Fund to complete Route 219 – and I hope the farmer does not have a field that relies on that route. Mr. Speaker, it is time to be serious about how we deal with the Motor License Fund. It is time to make sure that we have safety at the forefront of what we do with our motor Vehicle Code. This amendment violates both the safety provisions and the financial provisions, and it demands a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Representative Metzgar, wishes to speak a second time.

Mr. METZGAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to – it appears that the gentleman from Lackawanna County is confused about the facts, and I just wanted to read him the statute regarding the insurance issue because he was far afield on some other things.

But Title 75, section 1302, subsection 10(iv) reads: "The owner of the farm vehicle shall maintain such minimum levels of liability insurance coverage on the vehicle as are required to be maintained under Chapter 17 (relating to financial responsibility) by owners of registered motor vehicles...."

I cannot say it anymore plainly than that. If he wishes to ignore the statute, I cannot help that and I feel for him.

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—108

Armanini	Greiner	Mentzer	Ryan
Benninghoff	Grove	Mercuri	Sankey
Bernstine	Hamm	Metcalfe	Saylor
Boback	Heffley	Metzgar	Schemel
Bonner	Helm	Mihalek	Schmitt
Borowicz	Hennessey	Millard	Schnee
Brown, R.	Hershey	Miller, B.	Schroeder
Causar	Hickernell	Mizgorski	Silvis
Cook	Irvin	Moul	Smith
Culver	James	Mustello	Sonney
Davanzo	Jones	Nelson, E.	Staats
Day	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Stambaugh
Delozier	Kail	Oberlander	Stephens
DelRosso	Kauffman	Ortitay	Struzzi
Diamond	Keefer	Owlett	Thomas
Dowling	Klunk	Peifer	Tomlinson
Dunbar	Knowles	Pennycuik	Topper
Ecker	Labs	Pickett	Twardzik
Emrick	Lawrence	Polinchock	Warner
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	Mehaffie		

NAYS—91

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Cox	Kaufer	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 agree to the bill on second consideration as amended?

The SPEAKER. For the information of the members, Representative Stephens's amendment, 5398, has been ruled out of order.

On the question recurring,

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

**RULES COMMITTEE MEETING**

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

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Multitasking.

There will be a Rules Committee meeting in the majority caucus room at 12:12.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

There will be a Rules Committee meeting in the majority caucus room at 12:12.

The House will be at ease while the Rules Committee meets.

The House will please return to order.

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE  
REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**

**HB 2702, PN 3372**

By Rep. BENNINGHOFF

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.

RULES.

**SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A**

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE  
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS**

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 2702, PN 3372**, 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 concur in Senate amendments?

The SPEAKER. Moved by the gentleman, Representative Hennessey, that the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate.

The Chair now recognizes him for a brief description of Senate amendments.

Mr. HENNESSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Senate amended HB 2702 by adding five highway projects at the request of the Montgomery County Planning Commission. This is a bill that authorizes highways to be considered for future funding but does not provide any funding. The amendment simply adds those five highway projects to the former list that we sent to them last week. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

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

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—198

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

Davis, T.	Jozwiak	Nelson, N.	Tomlinson
Dawkins	Kail	O'Mara	Topper
Day	Kauffman	O'Neal	Twardzik
Deasy	Keefe	Oberlander	Vitali
DeLissio	Kenyatta	Ortitay	Warner
Delloso	Kim	Otten	Warren
Delozier	Kinhead	Owlett	Webster
DelRosso	Kinsey	Parker	Welby
DeLuca	Kirkland	Pashinski	Wentling
Diamond	Klunk	Peifer	Wheeland
Dowling	Knowles	Pennycuick	White
Dunbar	Kosierowski	Pickett	Williams, C.
Ecker	Krajewski	Pisciottano	Williams, D.
Emrick	Krueger	Polinchock	Young
Evans	Kulik	Quinn	Zabel
Farry	Labs	Rabb	Zimmerman
Fee	Lawrence	Rader	
Fiedler	Lee	Rapp	Cutler,
Fitzgerald	Lewis	Rigby	Speaker

NAYS—1

Puskaric

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Cox                      Kaufer                      Kerwin

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments were concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

**BILL SIGNED BY SPEAKER**

Bill numbered and entitled as follows having been prepared for presentation to the Governor, and the same being correct, the title was publicly read as follows:

**HB 2702, PN 3372**

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.

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

The SPEAKER. The House will be at ease while we await some further action by the Senate.

The House will return to order.

**REPUBLICAN CAUCUS**

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman, the majority leader, for a caucus announcement.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There will be a caucus at 1 o'clock; caucus at 1 o'clock. We will return to the floor at 2. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

**DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Zabel, for a caucus announcement on behalf of Representative Dan Miller.

Mr. ZABEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Democrats will caucus at 1 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

**RECESS**

The SPEAKER. This House will stand in recess until 2 p.m., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

**RECESS EXTENDED**

The time of recess was extended until 2:15 p.m.; further extended until 2:30 p.m.

**AFTER RECESS**

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

**COMMUNICATION FROM  
RURAL HEALTH REDESIGN CENTER  
AUTHORITY**

The SPEAKER. The Speaker submits for the record a copy of the first annual report from the Rural Health Redesign Center Authority – 2020 Annual Report.

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

**SENATE MESSAGE**

**AMENDED SENATE BILL RETURNED  
FOR CONCURRENCE AND  
REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES**

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, informed that the Senate has concurred in the amendments made by the House of Representatives by amending said amendments to **SB 106, PN 1857**.

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the House of Representatives for its concurrence.

**SENATE MESSAGE**

**AMENDED HOUSE BILL RETURNED  
FOR CONCURRENCE AND  
REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES**

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 2709, PN 3378**, 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 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 1171, PN 1848, and SB 1222, PN 1853**.

**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:

**SB 1171, PN 1848**

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in size, weight and load, further providing for restrictions on use of highways and bridges, for securing loads in vehicles, for widths of vehicles and for permit for movement during course of manufacture; and, in powers of department and local authorities, further providing for promulgation of rules and regulations by department.

**SB 1222, PN 1853**

An Act amending the act of May 17, 1921 (P.L.682, No.284), known as The Insurance Company Law of 1921, in insurance holding companies, further providing for definitions, for acquisition of control of or merger or consolidation with domestic insurer and for registration of insurers, providing for group capital calculation exemptions, further providing for standards and management of an insurer within an insurance holding company system, for group-wide supervision for international insurance groups and for confidential treatment and providing for compliance with group capital calculation and liquidity stress test requirements; and providing for peer-to-peer carsharing.

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

**COMMUNICATION FROM GOVERNOR****VETO OF HOUSE BILL**

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

**HB 1420, PN 3371.**

Said bill having been returned with the following message:

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
Office of the Governor  
Harrisburg

July 8, 2022

TO THE HONORABLE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE  
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Pursuant to Article IV, Section 15 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, I am returning herewith, without my approval, House Bill 1420, Printer's Number 3371.



This legislation unnecessarily prohibits the Department of Human Services from contracting with a vendor to provide financial management services that assist with home and community-based services for older Pennsylvanians and individuals with physical disabilities. These self-directed services allow participants to make choices about their own care, with this model supporting both participants and direct care workers.

Furthermore, it is irresponsible to block a pathway to a living wage and health care benefits for direct care workers. Our health care workforce is in crisis. This model benefits direct care workers by allowing them to have the benefits of being co-employed by an agency, resulting in access to employer-sponsored health care as well as paid time off and other benefits.

I want to be clear, however, that I support the remaining provisions of this bill in their entirety, and I am asking the General Assembly to pass those provisions, cleanly, and in short order. Failure to do so creates a \$1.8 billion hole in the Commonwealth's financial statement for the current fiscal year, and the state budget cannot be considered complete without them.

For the reasons set forth above, I must withhold my signature from House Bill 1420, Printer's Number 3371.

Sincerely,  
Tom Wolf  
Governor

### **BILL AND VETO MESSAGE PLACED ON CALENDAR**

The SPEAKER. The bill and veto message will be placed upon the calendar.

### **RULES COMMITTEE MEETING**

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Leader Benninghoff, for a Rules Committee announcement.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There will be a Rules Committee meeting at 3 p.m. in the majority caucus room; Rules Committee meeting at 3 p.m. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

There will be a Rules Committee meeting at 3 p.m. in the majority caucus room.

The House will be at ease while the Rules Committee meets.

The House will return to order.

### **BILLS ON CONCURRENCE REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**

**HB 2709, PN 3378**

By Rep. BENNINGHOFF

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in particular rights and immunities, further providing for definitions, for lessee's right to acquire ownership and for advertising and display of property.

RULES.

**SB 982, PN 1856**

By Rep. BENNINGHOFF

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in preliminary provisions, providing for public funding of elections; in county boards of elections, further providing for powers and duties of county boards; establishing the Election Integrity Grant Program; and, in penalties, providing for violation of public funding of elections.

RULES.

### **SENATE MESSAGE**

### **RECESS RESOLUTION FOR CONCURRENCE**

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, presented the following extract from the Journal of the Senate, which was read as follows:

In the Senate,  
July 8, 2022

RESOLVED, (the House of Representatives concurring), Pursuant to Article II, Section 14 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, that when the Senate recesses this week, it reconvene the week of Monday, September 19, 2022, unless sooner recalled by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate; and be it further

RESOLVED, Pursuant to Article II, Section 14 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, that when the House of Representatives recesses this week, it reconvene the week of Monday, September 12, 2022, unless sooner recalled by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and be it further

RESOLVED, Pursuant to Article II, Section 14 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, that when the House of Representatives recesses the week of September 12, 2022, it reconvene the week of Monday, September 19, 2022, unless sooner recalled by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the House of Representatives for its concurrence.

On the question,

Will the House concur in the resolution of the Senate?

Resolution was concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

### **SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B**

### **BILL ON CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS**

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 2709, PN 3378**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in particular rights and immunities, further providing for definitions, for lessee's right to acquire ownership and for advertising and display of property.

On the question,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

The SPEAKER. Moved by the gentleman, Representative Marshall, that the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate.

The Chair now recognizes him for a brief description of Senate amendments.

Mr. MARSHALL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The amendment was technical in nature and I ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

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

Mr. MATZIE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As the majority chair said, this is a technical amendment. It is agreed to. I urge members to support on concurrence. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

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

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—199

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
Causar	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
Cruz	Innamorato	Mullery	Staats
Culver	Irvin	Mullins	Stambaugh
Curry	Isaacson	Mustello	Stephens
Daley	James	Neilson	Struzzi
Davanzo	Jones	Nelson, E.	Sturla
Davis, A.	Jozwiak	Nelson, N.	Thomas
Davis, T.	Kail	O'Mara	Tomlinson
Dawkins	Kauffman	O'Neal	Topper
Day	Keefer	Oberlander	Twardzik
Deasy	Kenyatta	Ortitay	Vitali

DeLissio	Kim	Otten	Warner
Delloso	Kinhead	Owlett	Warren
Delozier	Kinsey	Parker	Webster
DeLrosso	Kirkland	Pashinski	Welby
DeLuca	Klunk	Peifer	Wentling
Diamond	Knowles	Pennycuick	Wheeland
Dowling	Kosierowski	Pickett	White
Dunbar	Krajewski	Pisciottano	Williams, C.
Ecker	Krueger	Polinchock	Williams, D.
Emrick	Kulik	Puskaric	Young
Evans	Labs	Quinn	Zabel
Farry	Lawrence	Rabb	Zimmerman
Fee	Lee	Rader	
Fiedler	Lewis	Rapp	Cutler,
Fitzgerald	Longietti	Rigby	Speaker
Flood			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Cox	Kaufer	Kerwin
-----	--------	--------

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments were concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE  
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS  
TO HOUSE AMENDMENTS**

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to House amendments to **SB 982, PN 1856**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in preliminary provisions, providing for public funding of elections; in county boards of elections, further providing for powers and duties of county boards; establishing the Election Integrity Grant Program; and, in penalties, providing for violation of public funding of elections.

On the question,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments to House amendments?

The SPEAKER. Moved by the gentleman, the majority leader, that the House concur in these amendments.

The Chair recognizes him for a brief description of Senate amendments.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SB 982 is now before us on concurrence. It amends the Election Code to prohibit private funding of administrations of elections. The bill was also amended in the Senate to establish the Election Integrity Grant Program to require reports on county compliance with the provisions in the Election Code and Title 25.

I appreciate a unanimous "yes" vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments to House amendments?

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

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

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

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

The gentleman, Representative Harris, is recognized.

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—103

Armanini	Fritz	Mercuri	Schmitt
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Metcalfe	Schnee
Bernstine	Greiner	Metzgar	Schroeder
Boback	Heffley	Mihalek	Silvis
Bonner	Helm	Millard	Smith
Bradford	Hennessey	Miller, B.	Snyder
Briggs	Hershey	Mizgorski	Solomon
Brooks	Hickernell	Moul	Sonney
Brown, R.	Irvin	Mustello	Staats
Burns	James	Nelson, E.	Stephens
Causser	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Struzzi
Cook	Kail	Ortitay	Thomas
Culver	Kulik	Owlett	Tomlinson
Daley	Labs	Peifer	Topper
Davanzo	Lawrence	Pennycuik	Twardzik
Day	Lewis	Pickett	Vitali
DeLissio	Longietti	Polinchock	Warner
Delozier	Mackenzie, M.	Rader	Webster
DelRosso	Mackenzie, R.	Rapp	Wentling
Dowling	Major	Rigby	Wheeland
Dunbar	Mako	Roe	White
Ecker	Malagari	Sainato	Williams, C.
Emrick	Marshall	Samuelson	Zabel
Farry	Masser	Sanchez	
Fee	Mehaffie	Sankey	Cutler,
Flood	Mentzer	Saylor	Speaker
Freeman			

#### NAYS—96

Abney	Fitzgerald	Kinthead	Parker
Benham	Frankel	Kinsey	Pashinski
Bizzarro	Galloway	Kirkland	Pisciottano
Borowicz	Gaydos	Klunk	Puskaric
Boyle	Gillen	Knowles	Quinn
Brown, A.	Gleim	Kosierowski	Rabb
Bullock	Gregory	Krajewski	Rossi
Burgos	Grove	Krueger	Rothman
Carroll	Guenst	Lee	Rowe
Cephas	Guzman	Madden	Rozzi
Ciresi	Hamm	Maloney	Ryan
Conklin	Hanbidge	Markosek	Sappey
Covington	Harkins	Matzie	Schemel
Cruz	Harris	McClinton	Schlossberg
Curry	Herrin	McNeill	Schweyer
Davis, A.	Hohenstein	Merski	Shusterman
Davis, T.	Howard	Miller, D.	Sims
Dawkins	Innamorato	Mullery	Stambaugh
Deasy	Isaacson	Mullins	Sturla
Dellosso	Jones	Neilson	Warren

DeLuca	Kauffman	Nelson, N.	Welby
Diamond	Keefer	O'Mara	Williams, D.
Evans	Kenyatta	O'Neal	Young
Fiedler	Kim	Otten	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Cox	Kaufer	Kerwin
-----	--------	--------

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments to House amendments were concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

#### BILL SIGNED BY SPEAKER

Bill numbered and entitled as follows having been prepared for presentation to the Governor, and the same being correct, the title was publicly read as follows:

#### HB 2709, PN 3378

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in particular rights and immunities, further providing for definitions, for lessee's right to acquire ownership and for advertising and display of property.

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

The SPEAKER. For the information of the members, we are waiting on one additional bill from the Senate on concurrence regarding the Fiscal Code related to the GA (general appropriations) bill.

So the House will be temporarily at ease while we await its arrival.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will come to order.

#### SENATE MESSAGE

AMENDED SENATE BILL RETURNED  
FOR CONCURRENCE AND  
REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, informed that the Senate has concurred in the amendments made by the House of Representatives by amending said amendments to **HB 1421, PN 3379**.

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the House of Representatives for its concurrence.

#### RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader for a Rules Committee announcement.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Mr. Speaker, we will have a Rules Committee meeting immediately upon recess and we will just go over to the Appropriations Committee conference room. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There will be a Rules Committee meeting immediately upon recess in the Appropriations Committee conference room.

The House will be at ease.

**THE SPEAKER (BRYAN CUTLER)  
PRESIDING**

The SPEAKER. The House will please return to order.

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE  
REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**

**HB 1421, PN 3379**

By Rep. BENNINGHOFF

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in emergency COVID-19 response, further providing for definitions, repealing provisions relating to money in account, providing for Executive Offices, for Whole-Home Repairs Program and for arts and culture recovery grants, further providing for emergency education relief to nonpublic schools and for funding for library services and providing for biotechnology research, for use of money, for Child Care Stabilization Program, for Behavioral Health Commission or Adult Mental Health, for Department of Revenue, for State university assistance for fiscal year 2022-2023, for Development Cost Relief Program, for Housing Options Grant Program and for Department of Conservation and Natural Resources; in Rental and Utility Assistance Grant Program, further providing for reallocation of grants; in American Rescue Plan Rental and Utility Assistance Grant Program, further providing for department; in Treasury Department, providing for Commonwealth payment security; in oil and gas wells, further providing for Oil and Gas Lease Fund; in transportation network companies, motor carrier companies and parking authority of a city of the first class, further providing for transportation network company extension; providing for Agriculture Conservation Assistance Program, for Clean Water Procurement Program and for human services; in special funds, further providing for funding, for transfer, for H2O PA Account and for other grants; in additional special funds and restricted accounts, further providing for establishment of special fund and account, for use of fund, for distributions from Pennsylvania Race Horse Development Fund, for Workers' Compensation Security Fund transfer to COVID-19 Response Restricted Account and for Opioid Settlement Restricted Account; providing for additional special funds and restricted accounts; in 2021-2022 budget implementation, further providing for executive offices and for Department of Human Services; in general budget implementation, further providing for Executive Offices, for Department of Corrections, for Department of Education, for Department of Health, for Department of Labor and Industry, for Department of Military and Veterans Affairs, for Department of Human Services, for Department of Revenue, for Pennsylvania Infrastructure Investment Authority, for Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole, for Pennsylvania Public Television Network Commission, for Pennsylvania Securities Commission and for State Tax Equalization Board, providing for State-related universities and further providing for surcharges and for Multimodal Transportation Fund; providing for 2022-2023 budget implementation and for 2022-2023 restrictions on appropriations for funds and accounts; abrogating regulations; and making related repeals.

RULES.

**SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR C**

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE  
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS  
AS FURTHER AMENDED BY THE SENATE  
TO HOUSE AMENDMENTS**

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments as further amended by the Senate to House amendments to **HB 1421, PN 3379**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in emergency COVID-19 response, further providing for definitions, repealing provisions relating to money in account, providing for Executive Offices, for Whole-Home Repairs Program and for arts and culture recovery grants, further providing for emergency education relief to nonpublic schools and for funding for library services and providing for biotechnology research, for use of money, for Child Care Stabilization Program, for Behavioral Health Commission or Adult Mental Health, for Department of Revenue, for State university assistance for fiscal year 2022-2023, for Development Cost Relief Program, for Housing Options Grant Program and for Department of Conservation and Natural Resources; in Rental and Utility Assistance Grant Program, further providing for reallocation of grants; in American Rescue Plan Rental and Utility Assistance Grant Program, further providing for department; in Treasury Department, providing for Commonwealth payment security; in oil and gas wells, further providing for Oil and Gas Lease Fund; in transportation network companies, motor carrier companies and parking authority of a city of the first class, further providing for transportation network company extension; providing for Agriculture Conservation Assistance Program, for Clean Water Procurement Program and for human services; in special funds, further providing for funding, for transfer, for H2O PA Account and for other grants; in additional special funds and restricted accounts, further providing for establishment of special fund and account, for use of fund, for distributions from Pennsylvania Race Horse Development Fund, for Workers' Compensation Security Fund transfer to COVID-19 Response Restricted Account and for Opioid Settlement Restricted Account; providing for additional special funds and restricted accounts; in 2021-2022 budget implementation, further providing for executive offices and for Department of Human Services; in general budget implementation, further providing for Executive Offices, for Department of Corrections, for Department of Education, for Department of Health, for Department of Labor and Industry, for Department of Military and Veterans Affairs, for Department of Human Services, for Department of Revenue, for Pennsylvania Infrastructure Investment Authority, for Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole, for Pennsylvania Public Television Network Commission, for Pennsylvania Securities Commission and for State Tax Equalization Board, providing for State-related universities and further providing for surcharges and for Multimodal Transportation Fund; providing for 2022-2023 budget implementation and for 2022-2023 restrictions on appropriations for funds and accounts; abrogating regulations; and making related repeals.

On the question,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments as further amended by the Senate to House amendments?

**MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION  
UNDER RULE 21**

The SPEAKER. Before we can get to that question, Leader Benninghoff wishes to make a motion to proceed, I believe?

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

We need a motion to proceed with HB 1421. I appreciate the support of the members. Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Leader McClinton.

Ms. McCLINTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand to ask all the members of this chamber to support the majority leader's motion and vote affirmatively.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

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

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—192

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

Diamond	Knowles	Pisciottano	White
Dowling	Kosierowski	Polinchock	Williams, C.
Dunbar	Krajewski	Puskaric	Williams, D.
Ecker	Krueger	Quinn	Young
Emrick	Kulik	Rabb	Zabel
Evans	Labs	Rader	Zimmerman
Farry	Lawrence	Rapp	
Fee	Lee	Rigby	Cutler,
Fiedler	Lewis	Roae	Speaker
Fitzgerald	Longiatti		

NAYS—7

Burgos	Kinhead	Miller, B.	Samuelson
Keefer	Metzgar	Mullery	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Cox	Kaufer	Kerwin
-----	--------	--------

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

The SPEAKER. Now we will take up HB 1421, PN 3379, on page 1 of today's supplemental C House calendar for concurrence in Senate amendments to House amendments as further amended by the Senate.

On the question recurring,  
Will the House concur in Senate amendments as further amended by the Senate to House amendments?

The SPEAKER. Moved by the gentleman, the majority leader, that the House concur in the amendments.

The Chair now recognizes him for a brief description of Senate amendments.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HB 1421, there are provisions within this as amended by the Senate. It now includes material relating to the budget implementation for the Department of Human Services, and we would ask all the members for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,  
Will the House concur in Senate amendments as further amended by the Senate to House amendments?

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—185

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

## NAYS—14

Borowicz	Keefer	Metzgar	Rowe
Diamond	Lewis	Puskaric	Ryan
Hamm	Maloney	Rossi	Stambaugh
Jones	Metcalfe		

## NOT VOTING—0

## EXCUSED—3

Cox	Kaufer	Kerwin
-----	--------	--------

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments as further amended by the Senate to House amendments were concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

## VOTE CORRECTION

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

Mr. HARRIS. To correct the record.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On HB 1342 the gentleman, Representative Rabb, was recorded in the "yes" and would like to be recorded in the "no."

## 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 1100, PN 1852**.

## 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 1421, PN 3379**

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in emergency COVID-19 response, further providing for definitions, repealing provisions relating to money in account, providing for Executive Offices, for Whole-Home Repairs Program and for arts and culture recovery grants, further providing for emergency education relief to nonpublic schools and for funding for library services and providing for biotechnology research, for use of money, for Child Care Stabilization Program, for Behavioral Health Commission or Adult Mental Health, for Department of Revenue, for State university assistance for fiscal year 2022-2023, for Development Cost Relief Program, for Housing Options Grant Program and for Department of Conservation and Natural Resources; in Rental and Utility Assistance Grant Program, further providing for reallocation of grants; in American Rescue Plan Rental and Utility Assistance Grant Program, further providing for department; in Treasury Department, providing for Commonwealth payment security; in oil and gas wells, further providing for Oil and Gas Lease Fund; in transportation network companies, motor carrier companies and parking authority of a city of the first class, further providing for transportation network company extension; providing for Agriculture Conservation Assistance Program, for Clean Water Procurement Program and for human services; in special funds, further providing for funding, for transfer, for H2O PA Account and for other grants; in additional special funds and restricted accounts, further providing for establishment of special fund and account, for use of fund, for distributions from Pennsylvania Race Horse Development Fund, for Workers' Compensation Security Fund transfer to COVID-19 Response Restricted Account and for Opioid Settlement Restricted Account; providing for additional special funds and restricted accounts; in 2021-2022 budget implementation, further providing for executive offices and for Department of Human Services; in general budget implementation, further providing for Executive Offices, for Department of Corrections, for Department of Education, for Department of Health, for Department of Labor and Industry, for Department of Military and Veterans Affairs, for Department of Human Services, for Department of Revenue, for Pennsylvania Infrastructure Investment Authority, for Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole, for Pennsylvania Public Television Network Commission, for Pennsylvania Securities Commission and for State Tax Equalization Board, providing for State-related universities and further providing for surcharges and for Multimodal Transportation Fund; providing for 2022-2023 budget implementation and for 2022-2023 restrictions on appropriations for funds and accounts; abrogating regulations; and making related repeals.

**SB 982, PN 1856**

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in preliminary provisions, providing for public funding of elections; in county boards of elections, further providing for powers and duties of county boards; establishing the Election Integrity Grant Program; and, in penalties, providing for violation of public funding of elections.

**SB 1100, PN 1852**

An Act to provide appropriations from the General Fund for the expenses of the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Departments of the Commonwealth, the public debt and the public schools for the fiscal year July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2023, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2022; to provide appropriations from special funds and accounts to the Executive and Judicial Departments for the fiscal year July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2023, and for the payment of bills remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2022; to provide for the appropriation of Federal funds to the Executive and Judicial Departments for the fiscal year July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2023, and for the payment of bills remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2022; and to provide for the additional appropriation of Federal and State funds to the Executive and Legislative Departments for the fiscal year July 1, 2021, to June 30, 2022, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2021.

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

The SPEAKER. The House will be at ease.

The House will return to order.

**RULES COMMITTEE MEETING**

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

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. I call a Rules Committee meeting in about 4 minutes in the Appropriations conference room, please.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

There will be a Rules Committee meeting in about 4 minutes in the Appropriations conference room.

The House will be at ease while the Rules Committee meets.

The House will come to order.

**MOTION TO ADJOURN**

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does Leader McClinton rise?

Ms. McCLINTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a motion.

The SPEAKER. You may state your motion.

Ms. McCLINTON. I have a motion to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentl lady has made a motion to adjourn. We will put that on the board.

Leader McClinton, I believe you would need to amend that motion to a certain date and time.

Ms. McCLINTON. Absolutely, Mr. Speaker.

To September 12, 2022, at 12 noon that day.

The SPEAKER. Just for clarification purposes, that would be the next scheduled session day, correct?

Ms. McCLINTON. That is correct, Mr. Speaker. The next scheduled session day.

The SPEAKER. Leader McClinton has made the motion to adjourn.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. Would you like to speak on your motion?

Ms. McCLINTON. I have spoken. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, the majority leader, on the motion to adjourn.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of work in the last couple weeks preparing to get some of these different issues done. We have a constitutional amendment and those other issues to address.

I would ask the members to vote "no" on the motion to adjourn so we can finish the people's business.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

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

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

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

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—92**

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

NAYS—107

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Cox	Kaufer	Kerwin
-----	--------	--------

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

The SPEAKER. The House will be in recess until the Rules Committee meets.

The House will return to order.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED**

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Cox, wishes to be placed back on the master roll. The Chair thanks the clerk.

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE  
REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**

**SB 106, PN 1857** By Rep. BENNINGHOFF

A Joint Resolution proposing separate and distinct amendments to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, providing that there is no constitutional right to taxpayer-funded abortion or other right relating to abortion; further providing for action on concurrent orders and resolutions, for Lieutenant Governor and for qualifications of electors; and providing for election audits.

RULES.

**SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR D**

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE  
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS  
TO HOUSE AMENDMENTS**

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to House amendments to **SB 106, PN 1857**, entitled:

A Joint Resolution proposing separate and distinct amendments to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, providing that there is no constitutional right to taxpayer-funded abortion or other right relating to abortion; further providing for action on concurrent orders and resolutions, for Lieutenant Governor and for qualifications of electors; and providing for election audits.

On the question,  
Will the House concur in Senate amendments to House amendments?

The SPEAKER. Moved by the gentleman, Leader Benninghoff, that the House concur in the amendments.

The Chair now recognizes him for a brief description of the Senate amendments.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As we know, the Senate sent us SB 106, done by Senator Argall, which proposes five separate, distinctive amendments to the Pennsylvania Constitution, including to change the nomination, candidates for Lieutenant Governor; clarification that the "CONSTITUTION DOES NOT GRANT THE RIGHT TO TAXPAYER-FUNDED ABORTION OR...OTHER RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION"; requirements for auditing of elections and election results by the Auditor General; changes of "QUALIFICATIONS OF ELECTORS" to require voter identification; an additional exception to the present sentiment, pardon me, clause of Article III relating to disapproved regulations in our Commonwealth.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks gentleman.

On concurrence, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Frankel.

Mr. FRANKEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose SB 106. Just minutes ago, during our Rules Committee meeting, we saw an extraordinarily shameful display of antidemocratic behavior by the majority party, shutting down for the second time in 24 hours – in less than 24 hours – the ability of this caucus, the Democratic Caucus, to be able to offer amendments to one of the most consequential pieces of legislation that this body will be considering that will change the lives of Pennsylvania's women and families for the foreseeable future. On the heels of a devastating decision of the Supreme Court, we are supposed to follow suit here as a legislative body without any deliberation, without any opportunity to have a discussion, to have an opportunity to amend the piece of legislation. It was so shameful to be shut down.

The Senate Republicans did it last night and we are doing it here at the last minute on Friday evening. This is no way for us to be considering the future of our constituents, the women, and our families in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. There is no doubt about it, make no mistake: This legislation paves the way for extreme abortion bans.



The majority party knows that our constituents do not want to live in a place where half the population does not get to make decisions for their own bodies. That is why this was amended in the Senate in the dead of the night and shut us down here at 5 o'clock on Friday afternoon. That is why the wording of this amendment keeps changing. But Pennsylvanians are paying attention.

Republicans can use the constitutional amendment process, fill the bill with unrelated provisions and try to argue that it is just about taxes and voting, but none of that changes the fact that this bill is an inhumane, dangerous attack on the right to bodily autonomy. Pennsylvanians know that you cannot put lipstick on this legislative atrocity.

The ultimate goal of the majority party, of course, is to force anyone who becomes pregnant to give birth. They would pass a bill to do just that right now if they were not afraid of a public revolt. This bill is a giant, if covert, step towards that goal. The public is not falling for it, and neither are we. Vote "no."

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

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

That is the quietest I have heard this chamber in at least a week.

I do rise in support of SB 106 and for a couple of reasons. I want to mention that this particular constitutional omnibus does include a variety of issues, not just the life issue that has been referenced.

It also includes regulatory reform, which is very important to many in this chamber. It includes voter identification, which is also extremely important to election integrity. And it does include, it does include an amendment to stop taxpayer funding of abortion.

And I think it is important that we talk a little bit about how we got here and why this is important to so many. And it started, really, a very long time ago with the Hyde Amendment, that has been the law of the land for at least several decades, that said that we would not use taxpayer-funded abortions – excuse me – taxpayer funds for elective abortions. That does not say that taxpayer funding could not be included for life of the mother. Taxpayer funding is allowed for incest and rape, and this does not change that in any way.

In 2013 we had the opportunity, as a legislative body, to vote on HB 818, which later became Act 13 of 2013, where we had the option under the Obamacare to opt out of taxpayer funding of elective abortions. Again, I say this very clearly, elective abortions. Still permitted: life of the mother, rape, and incest.

We are now being taken to court to challenge that Act 13 of 2013, and that is why this legislative constitutional amendment is absolutely critical. It would prevent the court from forcing taxpayers to pay for elective abortions. The amendment simply protects the status quo in Pennsylvania; that it is up to the people – through their State legislators, not the courts – to decide how best to regulate abortion, and that is and will continue to be, in Pennsylvania, the Abortion Control Act.

The amendment will continue to allow the legislature to determine whether or not to use taxpayer dollars to fund elective abortions, and it will preserve the authority of elected officials, not unaccountable judges, to regulate abortion. And for these reasons, all of these reasons, I support SB 106 and ask for your support.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Fiedler, on concurrence.

Ms. FIEDLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Earlier today I asked some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle what seems like a simple question: Do you really think you should decide if I carry and birth a baby with my body? Do you really think you should decide that about my body? It is a simple question, and I think that your constituents, just like my constituents, deserve to know the answer. And I have to say that over and over, the response that I received from my colleagues was, "That's a ridiculous question. That makes me uncomfortable." It is ridiculous. It makes me uncomfortable. And it is outrageous that anyone, any lawmaker thinks that they deserve, that they have the right to insert themselves in a decision that should be made by a pregnant person and their doctor.

Imagine a pregnant person sitting in their doctor's office, maybe their partner is sitting in the chair next to them, and they are talking with the doctor. They are talking about a serious health condition the pregnant person has been struggling with. They are talking about the physical and economic implications of pregnancy, or maybe they are talking about test results that did not turn out the way they expected or hoped. That pregnant person is sitting in their doctor's office, and each of you, all 253 members of this legislative body, are inserted in between that pregnant person and their medical professional. It sounds ridiculous, right? It makes absolutely no sense that any lawmaker would think they had a place there, and yet that is exactly, exactly what is happening here tonight and what happened in the Senate last night.

If we actually wanted to help babies, pregnant people, families across the Commonwealth, we know there is a lot we could do, right? And we are here to work. We could increase services for postpartum depression. We could compensate people fairly for the immense amount of free care work that is done primarily by women across the Commonwealth. We could increase affordable housing, raise the minimum wage, fund child care and elder care. We could do so much good for this Commonwealth, and yet here we are tonight, as you heard, on Friday night, trying to tear away the rights from people across the Commonwealth.

It is outrageous and I hope that people vote "no." Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Gleim, on concurrence.

Mrs. GLEIM. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of all of the constitutional amendments under SB 106 today, because at the end of the day, this legislation sets in motion the process that gives Commonwealth voters a direct say on these issues. They get a direct say on election integrity and voter ID. They get to decide on some of the regulatory reforms that we have been working so hard on. They get a direct say on whether the Governor gets to pick his running mate and whether we audit elections by the Auditor General. They also get a say on whether or not we are going to have the taxpayers fund abortions in the State.

Mr. Speaker, I come from a district that is the majority a pro-life district. I am pro-life. The majority of my constituents do not want to pay for someone else's abortion. The majority of my constituents do want to have a say on all of the constitutional amendments under this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Shusterman, on concurrence.

Ms. SHUSTERMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This constitutional amendment is extreme and extremely cruel to women. I do want to read a sentence from the Senate bill No. 106, and it says: "THIS CONSTITUTION DOES NOT GRANT THE RIGHT TO TAXPAYER-FUNDED ABORTION OR ANY OTHER RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION," and that would include incest, that would include ectopic pregnancy, that would include rape. There are no exceptions in the law for those. So this takes away individual liberties – a woman's right to control her life, my right to control my life, my sister's right to control her life – and it allows for political and religious leaders to insert their radical, uninformed beliefs in the doctor's office.

Moving this amendment forward would be turning your back on your mother, turning your back on your sister, turning your back on children of incest and rape; basically turning your back on the mothers, sisters, and children and their experience of pregnancy, miscarriage, and ectopic pregnancy.

It is cruel and unusual punishment. How many women must die? Let me explain death. So anyone who has been to medical school, who has a sibling who is a doctor – I am from a family of doctors – we are talking death as everyone sitting there and talking about life. I am here to preserve the life of your sister, your mother, your 11-year-old child who becomes raped and her little body cannot handle it. How many women will be forced to carry pregnancies after being raped because of politicians decided that this is their fate? Not doctors, but politicians, which is all of us. It is a sick misjustice of power for which all of you will be judged. All of you will be judged by this sick misjustice of power.

And what I hear in committees is people do not even understand how women work biologically, and that is the most disturbing part of this. Women's bodies should not be used to score political points. It is low. It is low and it lacks leading. It lacks serving your community. And it also lacks questioning your community when you know they are not on the right track. Such an overreach will have tragic and unintended consequences. Instead of codifying your so-called religious – these are religions I have never heard of before – these religious beliefs into our Constitution, we should work to move Pennsylvania forward and to work for everyone in Pennsylvania. Can you imagine how many businesses are going to want to come to Pennsylvania now? Very little, very little business. And stop taking away the rights of women and girls.

And let us remember Thomas Jefferson, because you guys love to remember Thomas Jefferson when it is convenient to you. "Erecting the 'wall of separation between church and state'...is absolutely essential in a free society." So congratulations, this society, and myself included, are no longer free.

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

Mr. KAIL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of SB 106. There are a lot of components regarding this bill that ought to be commended and I think it is something that we ought to move forward.

There has been a lot of noise regarding this bill, particularly as it relates to taxpayer-funded abortions. I really want to set the record straight. This bill is about one thing: Are we going to let four people in the Supreme Court determine our job, or are we going to do the work of the people here in Pennsylvania? The question before us is this: Whether you are for abortion or for life, are you willing to do your job? Are we willing to have that debate here in this building?

Mr. Speaker, my opinion is that is what we are elected to do. Whether we win the argument or lose the argument, the argument must be had here.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Malagari, on concurrence.

Mr. MALAGARI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to discuss SB 106. I want to speak on the language of the bill and some of the implications that it would have on Pennsylvanians. In addition to restricting necessary medical treatments to ectopic pregnancies and miscarriages, the language of this bill could complicate, if not outlaw, in vitro fertilization. While it is designed as an anti-abortion bill, it implicates standard infertility treatments because fertilized eggs would be designated as "unborn children." In vitro fertilization and fertility treatments give people the ability to have a family. They allow those who are dedicated to bringing life into this world the ability to do so.

The language of this constitutional amendment is not thought out. It is far reaching and will create barriers in access to medical procedures like in vitro fertilization. That is many people's only option for starting a family.

Let me tell you a little bit about some personal history. I have been dealing with this my entire life. I knew it from the moment I was born and diagnosed at Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, I knew that this would be a struggle for me. This would be difficult in my life when I reached adulthood to try and have a family with my wife. I knew that. I knew it going into it and I knew it would be hard. Round one of fertility treatments yielded 13 eggs; 6 were fertilized. None survived past 5 days. Round two, 6 eggs were retrieved; 3 of them were fertilized. None of them survived past 5 days.

Half a million babies that are delivered annually in the U.S. are the result of in vitro fertilization. Stripping away the right to these treatments from countless Pennsylvanians is anything but pro-life, anything but pro-life. It is theft to the possibility of life and the possibility of having a family for oh so many people that require this treatment. Do not stand on this floor and say that you are pro-life and pro-family and then go and remove what so many people have as an only option to creating a family and creating life.

And as some of you may know – I speak from experience, as I just mentioned to you – my wife and I have been going through this for a very, very, very long time, and many of you have too, and I know it for a fact. To this point, we have been unsuccessful with our pregnancy. I hope to God and I pray to Him every single day that we will be successful and be parents, not because we do not want to be parents – we want to; we are trying – but because sometimes it is just not as easy for some to attain pregnancy as others.

I know firsthand the necessity for these medical treatments. I, like the majority of Pennsylvanians, believe reproductive health decisions at all stages of life should be between the patient and their doctor, and sometimes that patient might be a man. Those who have determined they are financially stable and mentally prepared to have a family should not be collateral damage in the push to ban abortion.

So I sincerely thank my colleagues for a vote against this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Gaydos, on concurrence.

Ms. GAYDOS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand here in support of SB 106, but first I have to say that I am personally offended at some of the comments that I just heard that are mischaracterizing the bill. This bill does nothing more than take the vote to the voters. It is the ultimate form of democracy. It gives the voters a direct voice, and I want to iterate, this bill lets the voters, not politicians, decide on several very important issues which I dare to say that this body has not enacted on. We are letting the people decide. This bill takes to the voters a decision if they want voter ID. No more waiting for politicians to decide; you decide. The bill also takes to the voters the decisions to allow or not to allow the Pennsylvania Governor candidate to pick their running mate, just like is done on the Presidential level when Presidential candidates get to select their Vice President. If voters approve, the Governor and Lieutenant Governor candidates come in as a team instead of two separate candidates. That is good for the Commonwealth. But this will be put directly to the voters to decide.

SB 106 also asks voters if they choose to use their taxpayer dollars to fund elective abortions. It does not prohibit abortions. It does not even change the Pennsylvania abortion law. It does not ban abortions.

Mr. Speaker, I am offended by the previous comments that try to mischaracterize this bill that it does this. It does not. It does not change the current Abortion Control Act, which still limits abortions to 26 weeks. It simply asks you, the voter – not politicians or either party – to decide what you think is best for your tax dollars.

Furthermore, it lets people, not politicians, decide if the elected State Auditor General should conduct election audits to ensure that elections are free and fair and are administered equally throughout the State. I applaud former Democrat Auditor General Gene DePasquale for his work on the 2019 audit of the Pennsylvania election process, which revealed that there were many flaws and inconsistencies that could threaten free and fair election – many of which this body did address. Overall, SB 106 lets the voters, not politicians, decide.

Last year the people made the decision to self-govern when they voted to decide that they wanted no more shutdowns and they had had enough of the Governor's decisions telling them what to do. They decided. They decided.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the voters, and I think we should have these discussions and we should listen to the voters. That is why I encourage people to vote for SB 106. Thank you.

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

Mrs. ROSSI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of SB 106. Whether pro-life or pro-choice, this would let the people get to decide. So many feel passionately one way or another. I know I do. This lets the voice of the people be heard. It already is not a constitutional right to have an abortion, so this is not a change to that, as many would make you believe. This would give us a clear answer as to how Pennsylvanians support or are against abortion being funded by their taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a "yes" vote on SB 106. Thank you.

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

Mrs. BULLOCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to SB 106. As chair of the Pennsylvania Legislative Black Caucus, as a member of this legislative body, as a mother, as a resident of Pennsylvania, as a Black woman,

I am offended. I am offended by the very notion of this bill. Everything in this bill, the majority of this bill attacks my very existence, attacks my rights and the rights of my community.

Yes, this is not just about abortion care, but when we look at the abortion care, I know that when we restrict access to that health care, we are putting the lives of Black women at risk, because many Black women who do look to see their pregnancy to term then have to face the likelihood of bias in the delivery room, the lack of prenatal care, the lack of postnatal care – all of which puts their health at risk. So as we force more women to carry to term, we are, by definition, putting their lives at risk.

So when we talk about funding with taxpayer dollars abortion care, I wonder why we do not ask our voters if they want to use their taxpayer dollars to fund your erectile dysfunction care? Why do we not ask taxpayers if they want to fund your Viagra? Let us ask taxpayers if they want to fund all of the other care that men seek and that others seek with taxpayer dollars. Let us put that to the voters as well.

I am offended because we seem to think that the only health care we want to put to the voters is the health care that impacts the lives of women and birthing folks. I am offended because not only are we stopping at health care and abortion care, but we also want to attack the rights, voting rights of millions of Pennsylvanians who do not have photo ID. We have been over this before. Voter ID disenfranchises Pennsylvania voters, and we know because we have heard on record the Republican Party state that voter ID helps them win elections. This again is another attempt to disenfranchise our voters, and we should be offended. We should all be offended by the elements of this particular bill.

And yes, some may say that we are putting the issues to the voters. The voters elected us to make those decisions. That is the decision of the voters. They put their trust and their confidence in the 203 folks in this room and the 50 folks across the hall to make those decisions. But many of us do not want to put in the work, like our colleague said on the other side, to actually debate the bills, debate the issues. We can debate them; let us do that. But instead, we cut each other off, we do not allow the minority party to offer amendments, we do not allow honest debate in this House to actually debate the issues. We should all be offended by our own offense to democracy in this building.

And let me tell you – and I will take a seat after this, no matter how long it takes – as a Black woman, I have seen this coming, because year after year, I have sat in this building as we chipped away and chipped away at the rights of Black and Brown folks and other disenfranchised people throughout this Commonwealth. We chip away and we chip away, and so that is why I share that the Black Caucus and many of the Black Caucus members, we have never stopped standing up for our communities, and I will stand before you every single time and stand up for those communities because we cannot afford to stand down. When we stand down, foolishness like this happens. When we stand down, you chip away at our rights. When we stand down, you fail to invest in our communities. When we stand down, we take away the rights of Pennsylvanians with foolishness and undercover in the middle of the night and at 6 o'clock on a Friday. We cannot afford to stand down. Pennsylvanians cannot afford to stand down. And this particular effort to undermine and disenfranchise the rights of Pennsylvanians will not be tolerated.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for a "no" vote on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Klunk, on concurrence.

Ms. KLUNK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today I rise in support of SB 106, putting many, many important questions of the day to the people.

I see these amendments as "we the people" amendments since we will pass them, and ultimately, let our people here in Pennsylvania decide. We will let the people decide on issues related to nominations and the selection of our Lieutenant Governor candidates. We will let the people decide on regulatory reform issues. We will let the people decide on voter ID and election audits – two issues that I have heard a lot about over the past few years. And finally, we will let the people decide whether or not our Pennsylvania State Constitution grants a right to a taxpayer-funded abortion.

Now, I have read our State Constitution, and there is no explicit right to an abortion in that State Constitution, and there is also no explicit right to a taxpayer-funded abortion in our State Constitution. And we have heard the debate here in this chamber and outside of the chamber, and what I would say is that this amendment ensures that the people and their elected representatives – their House member, their Senator; our General Assembly – will ultimately decide on the Commonwealth's laws governing abortion. We will let the people – the people – decide whether they want their elected Representatives or unaccountable judges on our State Supreme Court to regulate abortion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this amendment will not ban abortion here in Pennsylvania. I want to say that again: This amendment would not ban abortion here in Pennsylvania. This amendment also would not change our Abortion Control Act. If this amendment would pass, our Abortion Control Act will still stand. Again, our Abortion Control Act will still stand. And right now our Abortion Control Act still allows for abortions for any reason in Pennsylvania until 24 weeks of pregnancy, or 6 months. After 24 weeks, abortion is also allowed in Pennsylvania to prevent either the death of the mother or prevent a substantial and irreversible impairment of a major bodily function of the mother. Our Abortion Control Act also states that no abortions are allowed for the purpose of sex selection of a child. There are many other things that our Abortion Control Act says, but none of those things will change with the passage of this amendment.

Furthermore, nothing in this amendment impacts medical care for miscarriages, for ectopic pregnancies, or birth control. In fact, our State Abortion Control Act treats those things differently than abortion because they do not involve the purposeful ending of a human life, as is the case with an elective abortion.

IVF (in vitro fertilization) is also not prohibited under the Abortion Control Act and would not be impacted by this amendment. And finally, our Abortion Control Act specifically prohibits our State from prohibiting medically accepted contraception. So again, all of these things will not be impacted by the passage of this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, for me, voting "yes" to SB 106 is a vote to put these issues to the people, where they belong, and let them decide. I know I will be a "yes" here today and I will be a "yes" when they hopefully come before the people. I am a wife; I am a very, very proud mom; I am a proud daughter; and I am a proud granddaughter. And I am all these things because, yes, I am a woman, and it is okay to be pro-life and be a woman. And 5 years ago and 2 years ago, I was on this floor and I was not just a pregnant person, Mr. Speaker. I was a pregnant woman.

I am for protecting the unborn – our unborn daughters, our unborn sons – and I ask for your support today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Kinkead, on concurrence.

Ms. KINKEAD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of Pennsylvania women and birthing people. I am not a wife and I am not a mother, and that is my choice. And while my colleagues continue to highlight the prohibition on taxpayer funding of abortion, they are repeatedly and consistently leaving out the last seven words of this amendment: "OR ANY OTHER RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION." We have the right to an abortion in Pennsylvania, and the fact that what we are trying to do is circumvent the duly and democratically elected judges in this Commonwealth by introducing this legislation is shameful.

We are hearing all about unaccountable judges, and yet the same voters that you want to give this to elected those judges. Every judge in Pennsylvania was elected, and that is the right of Pennsylvania people; that is the right of our voters to decide who sits on the Supreme Court. It is not our role and it is not our role to go around them. They are our check. There are three branches of government for a reason, and every one of them is elected by Pennsylvania voters. These judges are not unaccountable. We have retention elections for a reason. We trust the courts to do their jobs, just like every Pennsylvanian has the right to trust us to do our jobs, and yet we are spending all of our time and energy in this session attacking our courts.

The first vote that I took in this body was attacking our courts, and we continue to talk about unaccountable judges. They are accountable to the law. They are accountable to the people of Pennsylvania. That is their role. Commonwealth voters should have a direct say if we just abandon our entire government process and do direct voting on everything, or do we trust that Commonwealth voters gave us the authority to use their voices to do their work so they do not have to? They sent us here to do the work of the people. This is undermining their votes for their judges and their Governor, and fundamentally, what we are doing is setting up a path.

Yes, this amendment does not explicitly and immediately ban abortion, but it is a pathway, and to say otherwise is a lie. We are setting up a pathway to see people like Savita Halappanavar, who died of blood poisoning because she could not access an abortion. Olga Reyes, who died of a ruptured ectopic pregnancy because she could not access an abortion. Izabela, who died of sepsis because she could not access an abortion. Manuela, who was charged with homicide because she had a miscarriage when she could not access an abortion, and on and on and on. The list of women who have died because they have not had access to an abortion will only grow if we pass this amendment, because the people of Pennsylvania, the voters of Pennsylvania, know exactly what we are doing here today, and it is not just codifying what is already reality. We are setting up a path for women in Pennsylvania to die.

And if we are so pro-life here in Pennsylvania, I find it very appalling that we would set up a pathway for more children to be born when we are not addressing the gun violence that makes them the targets in their schools. So we are mandating the birth of targets of gunmen.

So yes, we trust the voters of Pennsylvania to make these decisions about abortion, about voter ID, about all of these things, because their voices are paramount – until they elect a Democrat for President.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Owlett, on concurrence.

Mr. OWLETT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of SB 106. This is about more than one thing here today, but we are focusing on abortion, and really, when a life becomes a life. The question before us today as a chamber is, do we want the people of the Commonwealth to fund abortions? Why are we so afraid to put this question before the people? This debate has been going on for decades and is now officially back to the States, and I support putting this question and all of the other questions before the voters. We have all heard from constituents that have said at times, "Your vote did not represent me." This bill, SB 106, puts this important question ultimately before the voters – lots of questions. Issues that this body has fought about for decades.

And I ask for a "yes" vote on SB 106, and I want people in my district to know that I am putting this before them. I want them to answer these questions so that they know that their voice is heard in this debate about when a life is a life, when a human is a human, and when a beating heart is a beating heart.

I ask for a "yes" vote on SB 106.

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

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to SB 106 and I ask to interrogate the majority leader.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates that he is not available for interrogation. You may speak on concurrence, if you so desire.

Mr. BRADFORD. Sure. Is anybody in the majority party willing to stand for interrogation and defend this?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized to speak on concurrence.

Mr. BRADFORD. I am sorry. I was waiting for an answer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has indicated that he will not stand for interrogation and I would encourage the gentleman to speak on concurrence for which he is recognized on the debate. We will continue on. There are multiple speakers on both sides, which I think will answer many of the questions.

You are in order and may proceed on concurrence.

Mr. BRADFORD. Well, that is just breathtaking, is it not? A majority of 113 proud, pro-life Republicans; not a single one with the courage to defend this atrocity. Not a single one—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. BRADFORD. —not the leader—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. BRADFORD. —not any rank-and-file member.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend. He is not in order.

The purpose of debate is to discuss the underlying issues, not to subscribe motive, not to speak about anything other than the proper subject of debate, which is the concurrence—

Ms. McCLINTON. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. —on this issue.

The gentlelady will suspend. I will recognize you in just one moment, please.

The member is reminded that inciteful comments are not appropriate in the debate. We were doing quite a good job. We had many speakers who were able to comply with the rules. I will remind the members to, again, confine the remarks to the items under debate.

## POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. And now I will recognize Leader McClinton. For what purpose do you rise?

Ms. McCLINTON. Mr. Speaker, he was stating the facts. He was not talking about a motive. There was no one who stood up to defend this. Not one person will stand up to be interrogated on SB 106 this Friday night. That is the truth; that is the facts. No motive.

The SPEAKER. Madam Leader, I will refer to rule 10: "When a member desires to address the House, the member shall rise and respectfully address the Speaker. Upon being recognized, the member may speak, and shall be confined to the question under consideration...."

The Speaker was merely pointing out that the question under consideration is concurrence. The good gentleman's question was answered and he may proceed on concurrence, and he must avoid personal reflections.

Additionally, contained in Mason's Manual, under "Section 122. Breaches of the Order of the House...No person may indulge in personalities, impugn motives of members, use indecent or profane language, or participate in conduct that disrupts or disturbs the orderly proceedings of the body."

The Speaker previously mentioned the orderly procession in which we were engaging in debate. Members on both sides of the aisle were able to do so. Subsection 3 says, "A member who resorts to persistent irrelevance or to persistent repetition after the attention of the house has been called to the matter may be directed to discontinue the speech by the presiding officer."

Furthermore, Jefferson's Manual, section 370, pages 176 and 177, it says, "The freedom of speech in debate in the House" of Representatives "should never be denied or abridged, but freedom of speech in debate does not mean license to indulge in personal abuses or ridicule...."

"It is, however, the duty of the House to require its Members in speech or debate to preserve that proper restraint which will permit the House to conduct its business in an orderly manner and without unnecessarily and unduly exciting animosity among its Members or antagonism from those other branches of the Government with which the House is correlated."

I would simply remind the member I believe the last time that I quoted that section of Jefferson's Manual I did so in defense of the executive branch and many of the other comments.

I would encourage the gentleman to speak solely on what he was recognized on. Many members previously were able to do so and I would ask that we could continue to do so, as the length of speakers is quite lengthy.

Madam Leader, do you have any further points of order or clarification? The Chair thanks the lady.

Does the gentleman, Representative Bradford, understand the rules by which we abide here in the House?

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

If you can abide by the rules of the House, you are in order and may proceed; however, as outlined in the rules, consistent and repetitive breaches of the rules will result in a nonrecognition.

You are in order and may proceed, sir.

### POINT OF ORDER

Ms. McCLINTON. Point of order.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentlelady rise?

Ms. McCLINTON. You are impugning the motive of the gentleman from Montgomery County, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. I was simply reading the rules, as I have been asked to preside, and asking the gentleman not to provoke members and abide by the rules as they are written.

Ms. McCLINTON. Mr. Speaker, asking the gentleman if he understands the rules is not reading the rules.

The SPEAKER. I am asking him if he understood the points that I raised regarding this. The Chair will not engage in a debate and will simply ask all members to properly adhere to the rules as they exist.

The gentlelady has received her point of order? The Chair thanks the lady.

You are in order and may proceed, sir.

### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BRADFORD. Parliamentary inquiry. May I go down the roster—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may suspend. You may state your parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BRADFORD. Parliamentary inquiry. May I go through the membership of the majority caucus and ask if any one of them, respectfully, would stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Respectfully, the gentleman's question has already been answered regarding who would stand for interrogation. Going one by one I believe would be dilatory in nature, and the gentleman has expressed a desire to enter into debate and you are free to do so, on concurrence.

Mr. BRADFORD. So you are to say that none of them will, and if I were to ask, it would be dilatory. Is that correct?

It seems as though Representative Warner has assented.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's question has been asked and answered. You may proceed on concurrence.

Mr. BRADFORD. Will Representative Warner assent to interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates that he will not.

Mr. BRADFORD. Will Representative Stephens?

The SPEAKER. The House will be at ease. I would ask the gentleman and counsel to approach the rostrum.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

The SPEAKER. The House will return to order.

And the gentleman, Representative Bradford, is recognized on concurrence.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And thank you for the opportunity to ask these questions. And while I know they will not be answered by the majority this evening, rhetorically, they need to be addressed, because if we are to take rights from literally half of Pennsylvania, then maybe somebody at some point should answer.

The good lady from York reassures the women of Pennsylvania that the Abortion Control Act will remain law. She does not tell you whether she believes it is constitutional. She does not tell you what will happen if this amendment comes to pass. She will not tell you that the plan in the majority caucus has

been and always has been to end the right to safe, legal abortion in Pennsylvania.

Now, if this amendment would pass, could this body, could this majority leader pass legislation to ban abortion at 24 weeks? I would argue yes, he could. Could he pass legislation to ban abortion at 20 weeks? Yes, he could. Could he pass legislation to ban abortion at 16 weeks? Yes, he could. Could he, under the Abortion Control Act, which we have discussed at length this evening, could he ban abortion at 8 weeks? The answer is most definitely yes. Would, if this constitutional amendment came to pass, could this legislature ban emergency contraception? Answer that question.

The gentleman keeps yelling out. It asks the question: Would you like to stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please briefly suspend.

Members, this is not a responsive reading. The gentleman, Representative Bradford, has a right to debate the underlying issue regarding this, and that goes for speakers on both sides. Let the good gentleman speak, say his point. As I mentioned, there are close to 20 additional speakers yet to come. I know that there will be a continued and healthy debate, but engaging in a question-and-answer response with the audience is not consistent with the rules of the House.

Please move any other conversations to the rear of the House and off the rear of the House.

The gentleman, Representative Bradford, is in order, and you may proceed, sir.

Mr. BRADFORD. So I ask again, rhetorically: If this amendment passed, could this legislative body ban abortion for women who are the victims of rape or incest? The answer must certainly be yes. And I say rhetorically as if we do not know the answer, but one of the leading candidates for Governor of this Commonwealth has told us he had plans to do that. So this is not some theoretical, law school hypothetical. Come on. It is disingenuous to describe it as such. This is the pathway that this majority has been on for a decade to end the right to safe, legal abortion in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. When you cannot stand to defend yourselves, God, it is so obvious what you are doing.

Now, I would be remiss at this point if I did not bring up the exact language in the abortion provision in front of us. Several speakers, including the good lady from York, had said this is merely about ending the possibility of taxpayer-funded abortion, and I am here to concede something. The first provision clearly says, "THIS CONSTITUTION DOES NOT GRANT THE RIGHT TO TAXPAYER-FUNDED ABORTION...." Period. Full stop. But then there is this language that is pretty problematic, Mr. Speaker. It goes on to say "...OR ANY OTHER RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION." Now, if someone was willing to stand and defend this language, they would have to defend that second clause. They would have to explain why that is there, because it is not about taxpayer-funded abortion. You do not believe that there is a right to safe, legal abortion under the Constitution of the State of Pennsylvania, and that is a legitimate view held by a determined minority of Pennsylvanians. It is certainly not the majority.

It is not the opinion of the majority, though. You want to ban abortion and that is your right. What you need to do is have the intellectual honesty and integrity to stand up and answer the questions in front of you. This is the glide path you have been on. Why are you not celebrating what you are doing here this evening on this Friday night? Tell me what the purpose is of this second

phrase, the parenthetical of "OR ANY OTHER RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION."

Now, again, I would ask rhetorically into the ether, post-*Dobbs*, the Federal Supreme Court ruling, we all now know, according to the Alito majority, that there is not a constitutional right to privacy that includes abortion under the Federal Constitution. What we do not know and what is going to be tested in the courts and what this amendment attempts to cut off at the pass is to find out whether such a right to privacy exists in the Pennsylvania State Constitution. And if you do not believe that there are rights granted under the Constitution that are not explicit, then I ask you, do you believe that there is a right to gay marriage? Do you believe that there is a right to interracial marriage? Do you believe that there is a right to contraception? Because these are rights that are not explicit but we have always held them dear, because while some parties run around yelling about freedom, some have actually defended it.

Now, we have seen the boutique bans that this majority has passed in the last decade, talking about, oh, we are just limiting it to health-care exchanges. Now it is somehow just about taxpayer funding or based on an intellectual disability diagnosis or how the procedure itself is done. These boutique bans are now exposed for what they really are. The Alito majority at the Supreme Court has unleashed the possibility for you to work your will. You have the right now to ban abortion if, if that right is not secured under the Pennsylvania State Constitution.

Now, at this point, my intent was to ask some member of the majority that puts this forward, do you believe there is a right to privacy protected by the Pennsylvania State Constitution? It is such a simple question, you would think that of 113, the hands would go up. If you do not believe there is such a right to privacy, I wonder what you believe is the right to contraception? What is the right for gay brothers and sisters to marry? What do you hope to accomplish with this misleading reading of a constitutional amendment that is so disingenuous that no one stands to defend it, that this is somehow about taxpayer abortion alone? If you are against taxpayer abortion, then strike this language about "OR OTHER RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION." It is embarrassing. Come on. There are thoughtful people, many attorneys in this room who know exactly what is at stake and what this language would do.

Now, again, the hour is late and the chance of changing many minds is limited. People have strong opinions on abortion. They had them long before the *Dobbs* opinion. But for some of you who have a chance to do the right thing, who know that the idea of this is just wrong and to do it under the cloak of this intellectually dishonest, heartbreaking way – it is not appropriate, and there are many here who know as much. They go back to suburban Philadelphia and they tell their constituents that. They say, "Oh, we're never going to ban abortion."

Here it is, Mr. Speaker. This is the glide path. You have opened the door; you will inherit the wind. Good luck to this majority. Vote "no" on SB 106.

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

Ms. FLOOD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of SB 106. This bill does not change the Pennsylvania abortion law. It does not ban abortion. Mr. Speaker, let us make the facts clear one more time. The amendment on SB 106 simply says that you do not have the constitutional right to use taxpayer money to fund elected abortions. This amendment

will allow the good people of our Commonwealth the opportunity to weigh in on this topic and have their voices heard.

Considering this particular amendment directly impacts our taxpayers, I believe it is imperative to allow them their say. I believe Pennsylvanians have the right to speak for themselves. This bill also allows the people of Pennsylvania the opportunity to vote on this and all amendments of SB 106, including voter ID and election audits, which are extremely important for the election integrity here in our State.

I strongly support what SB 106 stands for and ask for an affirmative vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Madden, on concurrence.

Ms. MADDEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to SB 106, and I would like to say that I could not agree more with the previous speaker, because in my 6 years in office, I have been most impressed with the people of the Commonwealth and their engagement when called upon to act, and likewise, as how we as legislators have heeded the call to our constituents and acted – sometimes even in a bipartisan way – to respond to their calls for us to act.

Act 77 of 2019 comes to mind as an example. As a result of us coming together, we passed a bill that gave citizens greater and more convenient access to voting, which led to the highest voter turnout in six decades. In the summer of 2020, our constituents called on us once again to act, as citizens of color throughout the United States were being murdered by law enforcement at numbers that were devastating to anyone with a conscience. Here in this House, in a bipartisan way, we listened to their pleas and passed Act 57, requiring thorough background checks when hiring police officers, and Act 57, requiring mental health evaluations as a condition of continued employment for any officer suffering from PTSD (post-traumatic stress disorder). And we saw that legislation and that activist community speak out just this week when the Borough of Tioga hired, for one day, Timothy Loehmann, the Cleveland police officer who shot and killed Tamir Rice back in 2014. We saw the people demand action and we saw that action take place.

Now, sadly, this recent SCOTUS (Supreme Court of the United States) decision to overturn 50 years of precedent and this bill in front of us today challenge us once again – those of us who believe a woman has the right to bodily autonomy – to yet another call to action. We are now tasked with getting the word out to fellow voters that the decision to a safe and legal abortion will soon be in their hands.

In 2022 a Franklin & Marshall poll reported that 83 percent of Pennsylvanians support a safe and legal abortion. That is up from 51 percent in a 2014 Pew Research poll. Obviously, this is not the challenge we wanted, as so many of us thought this precedent was settled 50 years ago.

I am optimistic, however, that the people of the Commonwealth and this country will rise to the occasion. They will knock on doors and let folks know of the paramount importance of their vote on this urgent health-care decision. There will be many more protests like the ones we saw this afternoon on the Capitol steps. There will be demonstrations on courthouses, in all public areas until we get the message out that women have a right to choose whether or not to have a safe and legal abortion, and that safe and legal abortions are health care.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that whichever election this ballot referendum appears, we will experience voter turnout in numbers we have never seen before, because let us remember: 83 percent of Pennsylvanians support a safe and legal abortion. As legislators who believe that, we will join them at the doors, on the steps of the Capitols and the courthouses, as I mentioned before, and importantly, we will join them in the voting booth.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that the people of Pennsylvania will not stand to have their rights stripped away without a fight, whether it be their right to bodily autonomy or their access to voting or any of the awful decisions that a few Supreme Court justices are suggesting in the near future. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Commonwealth and this country are up to the fight. We will not waiver, we will win this fight, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, the revolution will be televised. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Keefer, on concurrence.

Mrs. KEEFER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So we are talking about a constitutional amendment that gives people, that gives the voters the right. The voters will get to choose. So do we trust our voters? Should they have the choice? And what choices will the voters have with this?

Voter ID, right? We will ensure that counties are protecting election integrity by verifying their voters. Taxpayer funding, saying that taxpayers do not have to fund elected abortions. There is no right to that. Regulations ensuring that legislators have the oversight on regulations and that their legislative intent is put into perpetuity. Choosing your running mate for Lieutenant Governor – right? – as we allow in other races. Auditing elections, and, simply put, that the counties would actually reconcile their election results.

But there is so much misinformation tonight about the implications of actually allowing the voters to choose. And the irony of this is, after 2021 I have no right to be left alone. I have no right to decline medical treatment if I want to participate in society. If I want to work, get a shot. If I want an organ transplant, get a shot. If I want to travel, get a shot. Right? You can force your will on me. No one here wants to act on that at all. But in contrast, you want to have it codified that the Commonwealth owes all women a taxpayer-funded abortion. Taxpayers must fund elected abortions – elected abortions.

This is not about the safety of women. What about the safety of the women in the womb? I am sure it is not safe for them. This is not about other things that are outside, ectopic pregnancies or miscarriages. And just to clarify, Mr. Speaker, the impact this will and will not have treating an ectopic pregnancy – and this is off of Planned Parenthood's Web site: "Treating an ectopic pregnancy isn't the same thing as getting an abortion. Abortion is a medical procedure that when done safely ends a pregnancy that's in your uterus. Ectopic pregnancies are unsafely outside of your uterus (usually in the fallopian tubes) and are removed with a medicine called methotrexate or through a laparoscopic surgical procedure. The medical procedures for abortions are not the same as the medical procedures for an ectopic pregnancy." Just to clear that up.

So we are not talking about all of these other procedures that are far outside the scope that are leading the voters astray. This is talking about voters – taxpayers – paying for elected abortions and saying that you do not have that fundamental right. This is not taking any rights away.

So I would ask everybody here to support this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Daley, on concurrence.

Ms. DALEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to SB 106. The history of Pennsylvania's Constitution has been to provide additional rights to people. It has not been to eliminate rights. The abortion amendment currently under consideration states that the right to an abortion does not exist in the Pennsylvania Constitution. This amendment also states that there is no right to a taxpayer-funded abortion, which is already the case in Pennsylvania.

We hear that the abortion amendment is not a ban on abortion. It is an interesting statement. But let us face it, the amendment to the Pennsylvania Constitution that is under consideration would, quote, remove "...ANY OTHER RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION." And also, it would ensure that there is no right to taxpayer-funded abortion. The abortion amendment outlined in SB 610 – I think I have the wrong numbers – SB 106 represents an enormous change to our Constitution and opens the gate to legislative action that could create a ban on abortion in Pennsylvania.

Right now abortion is safe and legal and our taxpayers are not funding abortions in Pennsylvania. But as my colleague from Monroe County suggested, it is time for Pennsylvanians who support abortion rights to organize, educate, and vote, but it is also really important for them to know the rules about how constitutional amendments work, because the process to approve a constitutional amendment can be complicated.

So let us take a little bit of time to just walk through that process to change the Pennsylvania Constitution. First, the exact language must be proposed as an amendment in two successive sessions of the General Assembly. If voted by a majority of both chambers, it is added to the Constitution. It does not need gubernatorial agreement and so it is never subject to a veto by the Governor. If a majority of both chambers approves a proposed amendment, it must then be advertised in every county of Pennsylvania 3 months before the next general election. This could mean that the abortion amendment would need to be advertised by August 10, 2022, if it passes this evening. The purpose of advertising before the general election is to provide voters information to help them decide which candidates to vote for, which candidates to vote for in the general election. So then we move into the next session of the General Assembly and a majority of both chambers must again approve the proposed amendment a second time. In that case, the amendment goes on a statewide ballot on any future election date. That decision, on which election, is determined by the State legislature.

At this point, all of us – and I emphasize all registered voters of Pennsylvania – would have the opportunity to vote even whether the question is on the primary or the general election ballot. We need people to understand this, because many people do not turn out for the primary elections because they are not registered either Democrat or Republican. But any voter, any voter in Pennsylvania would be able to turn out if this happened to be in a primary election.

So we have work to do to make sure the people understand the rules and can follow them to vote in their own best interest, because now that the Supreme Court has stripped us of our Federal protections and sent the abortion questions to the States, it is time for Pennsylvanians to fight even harder against every effort to deny women and birthing people the inherent right to have control over their own body. We cannot back down from this.



Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Pickett, on concurrence.

Ms. PICKETT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before us tonight are these questions. Number one, does a taxpayer who will have the opportunity to vote on this constitutional amendment want their tax dollars to pay for abortions? Number two, do our constituents believe election integrity can only be fully achieved by ID being presented when they vote? Number three, this constitutional amendment gives our constituents the opportunity to vote, to require audits of our elections and our election results.

The voters rose to vote on the constitutional amendment to hold a Governor's declaration of emergency to a restricted time period. I believe the questions before us tonight are important questions regarding the future direction of Pennsylvania, and I believe my constituents do not want to be denied the opportunity to vote on these questions. Therefore, I do ask for a "yes" vote on SB 106. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

### MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Cephas, on concurrence.

Miss CEPHAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to rise to make a motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman may state your motion.

Ms. CEPHAS. I would like to rise to make the motion to suspend the rules to offer amendment 05421.

The SPEAKER. For the information of the members, the gentlewoman, Representative Cephas, has made a motion to suspend a late-filed amendment that she had previously filed. This amendment is not in order, given the fact that the bill is on concurrence, which is why the gentlewoman is rising to now suspend the rules for the consideration of this amendment.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. The Chair now recognizes Representative Cephas for speaking on the suspension of the rules.

Miss CEPHAS. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. I would simply remind the gentlewoman before she starts that the speech should be contained to the subject matter of the need for suspension and not the underlying component parts of the amendment. We will get to that if and when the rules are suspended.

You are in order and may proceed.

Miss CEPHAS. I rise to make this suspension of the rules for this amendment because this amendment guarantees the personal reproductive liberty for Pennsylvanians to make decisions regarding the individual's own reproduction, including the ability to prevent, continue, or end the individual's pregnancy.

As a number of my colleagues have already stated, with the bill that is on the table, we recognize that voters are being asked specifically to limit the liberties and the freedoms of birthing people and women across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. But what this amendment will do is to ask the next question, and that is if individuals want to protect the bodily autonomy of those impacted by rape, impacted by incest, whose life is literally

threatened at the thought of something like this being put into our Constitution. That is the question that we want to ask our voters: Do our voters want to protect our personal reproductive liberty?

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman, Representative Cephas, has made a motion to suspend the rules for immediate consideration of the amendment that is posted. This motion is only debatable by the maker of the motion and both leaders.

The Speaker recognizes the gentlewoman, Leader McClinton, on the motion to suspend the rules.

Ms. McCLINTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking all of the members in this august body to support the gentlelady's motion to suspend the rules to take up amendment 05421.

Mr. Speaker, the rules need to be suspended because amendment 05421 will create a fundamental right to exercise personal reproductive freedom. Under this amendment, all women will have the right to effectuate decisions regarding our own reproductive health, including the ability to decide to prevent, continue, or end pregnancy.

Mr. Speaker, we should suspend the rules if we really care about liberty and freedom. We should suspend the rules if we really care about individual rights. We should suspend the rules if we in fact care about privacy. We should suspend the rules because so many of my colleagues across the aisle talk about liberty and freedom and individual rights and say, government, stay out of my life, and this amendment would give us all the chance to allow our constituents to make that decision at the voting box. We should suspend the rules because the government does not have a right to tell a woman that she cannot receive medically required health care that could be lifesaving.

We should suspend the rules because just a couple of hours ago in the Rules Committee, when amendments were offered, they were tabled. And the majority leader likes to tell this body all the time that amendments are for the committee process, but when we sat in the Rules Committee, we could not amend this bill. But it is not unusual in this building, because last night at 11 o'clock, the Senate majority Rules chairman did the same thing. So we should suspend the rules and allow the immediate consideration of amendment 05421 because we also do not know what is next, Mr. Speaker. Marriage? The right to vote? The right to bear arms? We got to suspend these rules.

So I am asking everyone to vote affirmatively so we can suspend the rules and consider this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, the majority leader, on the motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am asking not to support this suspension to support this untimely filed amendment so we can continue the debate. Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Does the gentlewoman, Representative Cephas, wish to speak a second time on the suspension? No. The Chair thanks the lady.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

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

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
 The electronic board is accurate.  
 The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Harris.  
 Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
 The electronic board is accurate.  
 The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—86

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

NAYS—114

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—2

Kaufer	Kerwin
--------	--------

Less than a majority of the members required by the rules having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the motion was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,  
 Will the House concur in Senate amendments to House amendments?

The SPEAKER. Does the Representative wish to speak on the underlying concurrence?

Miss CEPHAS. Absolutely.

The SPEAKER. You are in order and may proceed.

Miss CEPHAS. Thank you.

With the failure of that amendment, we have literally just failed the women and birthing people of Pennsylvania. We are constantly talking about freedoms, bodily autonomy for families to make their own decisions, but with the failure of that amendment, we are taking that away from them.

We are coming off the heels of celebrating freedom and liberty. When we talk about coming off of Fourth of July or when we talk about Juneteenth, we are only talking about tweets, going to parades, making posts specifically for that one day to acknowledge our freedom. But with this constitutional amendment, we are taking that freedom away from millions of families in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

So much so, I have a constituent in my district who passed away. Her name was La'Shana Gilmore. She passed away at 34 years old, a Black woman who lost her life on the hospital bed as she gave birth to her baby girl because she hemorrhaged. She leaves behind a grieving son and a husband who are now forced to bear the economic realities of caring for his family as a single father. We do not only just have this abortion conversation from a health perspective; it is an economic perspective, especially when we live in a country where you see an individual die every single day as a result of taking a pregnancy to term because this country, this State does not believe in maternal health infrastructure that actually keeps families alive, keeps women, keeps birthing people alive.

Until we figure out again how to ensure that women are not hemorrhaging, bleeding out on hospital beds; until we figure out how women are not getting preeclampsia during pregnancy, dying because of high blood pressure; until we ensure women have access to adequate prenatal care in an already eroding system where hospitals are closing, maternal wards are removing beds, we are constantly talking about a nurse shortage; until we have access to equal pay to pay for the expensive care of bringing a baby to term or until we have access to paid sick leave to ensure that they are able to care for them, their individual babies, because we know that 50 percent of these deaths that occur occur during the postpartum period; or until we have access to culturally competent doctors that understand how to care for Black and Brown people that are dying at a disproportional rate because of the decisions that we are making in this chamber, we could not vote on this Constitution.

But as our Appropriations chair literally just stated, the other side of the aisle would like to just state that it is banning just taxpayer funding for abortion care. It is almost as if you do not already know that it is already illegal for taxpayer dollars to be used. So the question is, if you want our taxpayers to be voting for something like this, it almost sounds like you do not know your job, because again, it is already not legal here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

But what they do not repeat is the remainder of the language of the bill, which is more than not using taxpayer funding, again, for abortion, which again, for the bill, for the Constitution to not grant "ANY...RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION." That is the part that you are refusing to talk about, not the part that is already law, but the part that will cause thousands and millions of individuals to lose their lives because we do not have a maternity health-care system that upholds an infrastructure that, again, saves the lives of women and birthing people here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

And because of those reasons, because you refuse to fund those things, because you refuse to make those issues a priority, I would ask for my colleagues to vote down SB 106.

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

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As this debate started out this evening, I was up in my office listening to the debate, and there were so many things being talked about that I actually, you know, I imagined we were opening up the Abortion Control Act and changing abortion law in Pennsylvania. And when I came down on the House floor, I realized that oh, no, that was not the case. We are actually arguing the bill that I supposed we were, SB 106.

And this bill is very clear. There are many provisions, I believe five different amendments to the Constitution in this. It provides for the Auditor General to audit elections in the Commonwealth. It provides for voter ID. It allows the General Assembly to disapprove State regulations that are written by bureaucrats who have never been elected to anything in Pennsylvania. It allows for gubernatorial candidates and their chosen candidate for Lieutenant Governor to run as a team. And then it also provides that the Constitution does not grant a right to taxpayer-funded abortion or any other right relating to abortion.

Now, that last amendment changes absolutely nothing in current State law – not one thing. It does not open up the Abortion Control Act. It reiterates what is currently understood in State law. Under this amendment, the Representatives of the people would continue to debate and determine abortion policy in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Most importantly, all of these amendments must be considered again next session by this General Assembly, then the people of this Commonwealth would subsequently determine which of these will be added to the Constitution when they go to the ballot box. I am not concerned as to what the voters of Pennsylvania will decide on these amendments, but as some attempt to change the subject tonight by talking about everything that is not in this bill, it would seem that many are terrified at the prospect that the people of this great Commonwealth will get to determine these key issues surrounding Pennsylvania governance. The decision of the voters of this Commonwealth should not concern those of us who are elected by those same voters.

Tonight I support the people of this Commonwealth determining the future of this Commonwealth. Vote "yes" on SB 106.

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 Dan Miller. The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am what I always am, which is the son of immigrants who was raised poor. And I always remember it because I also know this truth, that people do not come to a land of less opportunity, people do not come to a State with less freedom. Those are truth. They are American truth. They are reality to what has made our country great. They are at stake tonight here and in many State Houses across our nation. People do not come to a land of less opportunity.

You know, these amendments here that we have, they are kind of packaged together. It kind of makes it difficult in some ways, because although the voters may have a chance to vote on each one of these individually, we do not.

We have heard tonight a lot of talk about letting the voters decide. Let the voters decide. Well, they decide right now. They already can decide. You are asking them to decide what they already have the right to decide. The voters can decide to have an abortion, to not have an abortion. That is already law. That is exactly what it is.

We are told, do not worry about the last six words of that phrase, that "ANY OTHER RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION." Do not worry about it, we are told. There is nothing for you to be concerned about. I take you, though, at your word. I read your tweets. I watch your posts. I have fun in joint events whenever we can. But I truly take you at your word. There is no way to separate it or to assume that these six words were written there by accident or by chance. That they have no meaning; that they offer no hint to what is to come next. To think otherwise is ridiculous.

The litany that we have before us of these ideas do not reflect, obviously, anything of the Democratic Caucus. Our amendments, of course, were not worthy for consideration, I suppose. However, we have done some of this before.

The voter ID. We are acting as if we do not have voter ID. We have had several types of voter IDs. We have voter ID now; when you go to register, you show your ID. When you go to the poll for the first time, you will show your ID. And when this majority attempted to make a more restrictive voter ID, we also heard the words of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, who said that you did it in a way that violated the Constitution. But again, we listen to what you say, and what did your leaders say? That voter ID would win the election for the Republican Presidential nominee. All we do is listen to what you say – partially because we cannot get our amendments up – so we listen and we watch and we note and we think about those six words, that "ANY OTHER RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION" is right there for us to see.

The reality of it is that there actually, I think, is common ground, but not the common ground that seems that is ever discussed. Empowering women and strengthening families are shared goals, I have to believe it, for both caucuses.

But like I said, I grew up poor, and sometimes I struggle and wonder if anybody else in this building grew up poor, because if you did, then you would know what it is like for a mom to have to make tough decisions about paying the rent or trying to have enough money to get food or borrowing money for a Christmas present so that that child does not go empty.

You would know what it is like to sit there and wonder, when you get that diagnosis of Down syndrome and you are concerned to say, what supports are there for my family as we go forward? We all know the reality of it is that we have thousands of people with Down syndrome in this State on waiting lists, and then we wonder why parents and moms, why they say, you know what? I do not know if I can do this. Where is the State? Where is the State to help me with my child? Well, the State is not in maternal health. That is not what we do. The State is not in paid leave. You are in the wrong State for that. The State is not in affordable child care. That is not what we do here in Pennsylvania.

Seemingly, though, we are on the path of being the State of forced birth. That is troubling and scary, and I heard the word "terrifying" – yeah, it is terrifying. It is a terrifying concept to think that instead of empowering women and families, we are embarking on the path of forcing birth. People do not come to lands who do not offer more opportunity and freedom.

We have talked a little bit about the process here that we have for these amendments, and we have heard people talk about let the people, let the people decide. I am not quite sure, I kind of think we all kind of know that we are the people's voices here. That is our job. That is exactly what we are elected to do is to be the voice from our district. We must be confused as to what the job descriptions are.

But the process, the process of what we would do here with this is that we would send constitutional amendment after constitutional amendment, overwhelmingly with no hearings, overwhelmingly with no real chance of amendments, with no commitment to run them actually at a time when most Pennsylvanians vote. We cannot do that either, it seems. But we are going to let the voice of the people be heard. Just do not ask any questions about it or do not ask us to put it when more people vote, because that is not something we can do in Pennsylvania.

I get concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the process to which we take a look at our Constitution in a term to which we have had dozens and dozens of constitutional amendments authored and so little discussion as to their implication. One cannot help but feel that this process here tonight actually embodies the truth that we are a broken branch of government, that we do not work, and the only way to accomplish anything, I guess, of seeming value to one side is to go around the other. That is not what people send us here to do, but that is what it seems all we do.

I get lost with the idea, Mr. Speaker, of what brought so many people to our State and country as to how we will come together as a nation to discuss these issues. I get concerned, Mr. Speaker, when I think about why my family came here and what it meant to them to be the first in my family to come into New York City. That meant something to us, to be here in the land of the free. That meant something to us of immense pride. And now we are finding here that we are actually rolling back freedom after freedom, and I get concerned as to why this is.

We hear talk often about it is a republic if you can keep it. It is a democracy, not a theocracy. And I say that as a person raised in a church. And I always remember my faith, and I am lost at times when we seemingly get confused as to what this country is supposed to be. We have given the people of Pennsylvania the

chance to decide now what they want to do with their body and their family choices. They already have that choice. Let them keep that choice. Let them keep that choice.

And the six words here of "ANY OTHER RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION" is all that we need to know the intent. Those words there reflect what we know to be true. They mirror your Facebook and your tweets. They mirror your e-mails and your events. And they represent the reality that although the majority of Pennsylvanians support *Roe v. Wade*, this majority seems determined to impress upon this State its own interpretation and desire in eliminating choice of women and families across this State.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" on SB 106.

### THE SPEAKER (BRYAN CUTLER) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Grove, on concurrence.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Tonight is July 8. We had a primary election on May 17 and we still do not have a certified election. Crazy, right? Crazy. But that is the shape of our elections in Pennsylvania. Election after election, issue after issue. Undated ballots – they are in, they are out; they are in, they are out. Ballots being printed, misprints. Hispanic populations in Reading, wrong dates. A county in western Pennsylvania had to send out a correction and had to correct the correction. These are all issues we have faced in this Commonwealth. Mistrust from both parties about the outcome of elections. Today, Mr. Speaker, we take up SB 106, trying to correct some of these issues – not all, but some of them – in a rational and responsible way.

Voter ID has been mentioned several times. I know opposition to this claim is it disenfranchises voters. In a recent hearing of the House State Government Committee, held on April 6, I had the pleasure of asking the Department of State what complaints and lawsuits it received from the current voter ID provisions here in the Commonwealth. If you are not familiar, first-time voters actually have to show their ID in this State. Their response, and we have in writing, quote, "The department is unaware of lawsuits/complaints filed against the department that specifically related to guidance on Voter ID."

I also asked how many new voter registrations the department received from 2015 through 2021. In total, there are 2.4 million, 2.4 million new voters. Voter registration forms have an option for designating ethnicity, race as well. For these new voters who reported ethnicity and race, here is the data from the Department of State: Asian, 47,274; Black or African-American, 127,804; Hispanic or Latino, 90,390; Native American or Alaskan Native, 3,099; Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, 1,039; other, 14,706. From 2015 to 2021, 2.4 million new voters who, if they show up to vote, have been required to show ID; 308,567 of them designated themselves as a "minority." Not one complaint; not one lawsuit.

Recently we have seen major election changes in the States of Georgia and Texas. Major election changes, decried from up on high Washington, DC, as huge, huge disenfranchisement of voters. What is the outcome? Higher voter turnout than ever before in Georgia and in Texas. Higher minority turnout of elections in Georgia and in Texas. Voting results are clear:

Election integrity provisions do not disenfranchise voters, it increases turnout and gives individuals confidence in the outcome of elections. Mr. Speaker, it is a very simple provision. You show up to vote, you show an ID. Even more important, Mr. Speaker, if you do not have one, the government will provide a free one. Covers all the bases; covers all the bases.

Mr. Speaker, an important provision in this: currently no State in the country operates independent audits. Now, an audit is not an audit when it comes to elections. An audit is simply, we are going to check the ballots, resolve confirming ballots. It is actually not an actual audit.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that the State of Washington authorized a local university to actually investigate election audits prior to 2020. They came back and said, we actually need to start looking at comprehensive election audits throughout the entire ecosystem of the elections, confirm the results at the end. Look at the processes and procedures utilized throughout the election process. Why? Audits improve the overall system: what went wrong, what were the problems, what you can do better. It also identifies best practices to help other counties do it better.

Mr. Speaker, in no place, in no place in America except elections do we allow the people that operate audit themselves. In no place. We do not audit ourselves as the General Assembly. The Auditor General does not audit himself. They have outside counsel.

Single audits. Everybody that accepts Federal dollars has to have a single audit. It is a known entity to have independent audits, and that is the main part, the main part of an audit, Mr. Speaker. I know my colleague from Lebanon County is very excited about this discussion of audits and independent and conflict-free. He is very excited about this because that is a simple process of what an audit is – an independent, conflict-free analysis. That is not what we have in the election system anywhere in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first of the kind. This is exciting public policy to build confidence in our election system to ensure that we have an independent, conflict-free audit of our election system; make sure we know the results are accurate and the process is abided by by the law and we have the correct internal controls to make sure we have confidence in the outcome of elections, Mr. Speaker. This is important, important election policy that will ensure we have higher turnout, that to make sure that voters that are uneasy – from both parties – will come back and participate in the election process, Mr. Speaker.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on regulatory reform, a little-known piece of this bill. I have said it on this floor many times: regulation regime is actually a process of legislating that is endowed in the Constitution by this body. The administration has a role in it, but at the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, when we pass a bill, that bill better be present in those regulatory regimes that agencies put out. This bill puts that power back in the General Assembly to say, if the executive branch is placing regulations outside the scope of law of which this body passed, the people's voices passed, we can nullify that by a vote of both chambers. Mr. Speaker, that is an important tool to bring the power of regulation back into this body. I think both sides have seen the executive branch overwield their power of regulation over the years, and it is time we re-exercise our power to regulate in the Commonwealth, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does several important things. It protects life, it protects this body's constitutional obligation of regulatory of legislating, and it protects voters' rights to make sure they have fair elections in this Commonwealth, Mr. Speaker. I urge a "yes" vote.

And if nothing else, Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, the voters decide on this. If you do not like a provision and you think the voters are not going to approve it, let them have the vote. Maybe they shoot it down. But I think, I think some worry that these are actually popular with Pennsylvania citizens, and I think some of the animosity is around the fact that people know Pennsylvania residents will actually approve these at the ballot box, Mr. Speaker. But it is ultimately the people's decision, not ours, if these become part of our Constitution.

So I urge a "yes" vote. Let us send these to the people. Let us secure our elections, protect life, and restore our ability to regulate and legislate.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So right outside the majority caucus room, there are a bunch of pictures of former Speakers hanging up there, and one is of the great Benjamin Franklin, who said that "Half a truth is often a great lie." We have heard a lot of half-truths in this building today. And I do not want to impugn the motives of my colleagues, but I would surmise that those half-truths really hide a great lie, a lie about why we are here on a Friday night, almost 7:30, picking up where our colleagues in the other chamber left off last night, where they were in 11:30 – they changed the rules so that they could stay in as late as possible – and under the cover of darkness, do the opposite of what we are sent here to do to make Pennsylvanians less free and less safe.

It has been mentioned numerous times that this bill, SB 106, is about more than protecting the freedom to choose, and that is right. It is about more than just the freedom to choose. And so I think it is worth the time to actually dissect some of these half lies and to tell the whole truth about what is in this bill. And I would like to do it one by one.

And so we have had a number of my colleagues on the other side, they have suggested numerous times that if we pass SB 106, nothing will change. They have said it so many times that this bill would not actually ban abortion, that this bill would do nothing to make this Commonwealth more pro-life. This bill is just more of the same. Why are you here at 7:30 to do something that does nothing? That is a half-truth, and it is starting to feel like a lie.

I have heard my colleagues on the other side – these folks trust voters now. They trust the voters. Sixty-four members of the Republican Party signed a letter to throw out the votes of Pennsylvania voters, but now you trust the voters.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

Mr. KENYATTA. No, I will not suspend. I will—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman will suspend.

For what purpose does the gentleman, the majority leader, rise?

The gentleman will suspend.  
The House will be at ease.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

The SPEAKER. The House will return to order.

### POINT OF ORDER

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

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Mr. Speaker, it is pretty evident when you are talking about things— Point of order, pardon me.

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

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. I think the gentleman, respectfully, was well afar off the topic of tonight when he is talking about some actions subsequent of the 2020 election, and I would just ask the gentleman to stay on topic, please.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has raised— Members will suspend. I am going to address the point of order that the gentleman said. I will remind the members once again, it is not appropriate for members on either side to exchange in yelling to the members or the leaders or the Speaker who are engaged in the debate. I think we have done a very good job so far this evening. The gentleman has raised a point of order. The gentleman is correct. I would simply remind the members to stay on the topic of the underlying bill.

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

### POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman, Representative Harris, rise? Point of order. You are in order and may state your point of order. I think the microphone is working.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you. But, Mr. Speaker, if I am not mistaken, the underlying bill is a constitutional amendment, and it has in there, parts of there about election auditing. If the underlying bill has election auditing in the bill, then the gentleman talking about elections and throwing out votes is actually on the bill because this actually contains underlying issues on election audits. So I think the gentleman is on the bill and should be allowed to continue on the bill on that particular perspective.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is also correct, just as the majority leader was regarding the scope of the debate. It was actually the gentleman's continued actions after being asked to suspend that were at issue, which is why we are returning to the gentleman to continue speaking on concurrence.

Mr. HARRIS. So just so I am clear, we can talk about January 6 and folks wanting to throw out elections because the underlying bill is about election audits? So we can talk about the 64 folks who wanted to throw out Pennsylvanians' votes?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend. I do not believe the gentleman has stated a valid point of order.

Mr. HARRIS. It was a question; I am sorry. It was just a question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend. That is not a proper parliamentary inquiry or point of order.

I have recognized the gentleman and asked him to continue, and I believe he will do so.

You are in order, Representative Kenyatta, and you may proceed.

Mr. KENYATTA. So we are back from the commercial break, and what I was talking about when we left off was that now in this body, the majority trusts the voters. I am happy to hear that. I am happy to hear that. I am just curious and concerned that if the voters vote in the way that we know a majority of Pennsylvanians feel about protecting the freedom to choose, if those results will be respected? I am curious about whether or not the majority party, who wants to give this to the voters, will be okay with the result that they get?

I want to get back to some of those half-truths which sound a little bit like a whole lie. The gentlewoman from York and Cumberland Counties, she is talking about freedom over her own body. She suggested that it was beyond the scope of the government to demand that somebody get a shot to prevent them from spreading a deadly virus. She said that that was much too much, that that represented, in her view, an overreach from the government. And so I am just so curious how the woman from York and Cumberland Counties, how she squares the circle of feeling like it is not okay to get a shot but it is okay for her to be a part of forcing people to give birth? That is fine.

The same people who did not want to wear masks want to force a mammogram for pregnant people – same people. These are the same folks. And you would not be like, nobody could fault you for thinking that these are separate people. The anti-mandate people – I remember coming in this building at the height of a deadly pandemic, none of us knew what was going on, and they wanted to open up one thing after another. I remember that. Dog groomers. We had to open up the zoo. But these are the same people that want to close down abortion clinics – same people. You might be confused, but it is the same people.

And then these are the same people who got up here one after another, they hop up, and they are pro-life. They are pro-life. I think for anybody watching, we understand that you are pro-birth. You are pro-birth.

My colleagues spoke, many of my colleagues on my side of the aisle spoke very passionately about what pro-life actually looks like, what pro-life actually looks like. And if the gentlewoman wants to speak, there is a microphone, but please do not speak during my time. Do not speak during my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

Members, the Speaker has reminded you twice that the purposes of debate is for individuals to express their views on the bill. Members are not to engage in shouting across the floor. It is unbecoming of the House members and is in direct disobedience to the rules of the institution.

The gentleman, you are in order and may proceed.

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you. All right. I think we are good now.

The last piece that I think it is important to talk about, these half-truths which sound a lot like lies, is about the election issues that the good chair of the State Government Committee just got up here and talked about. He quoted that there were no issues, no lawsuits around voter ID, further underlining the point that in Pennsylvania, we actually already have voter ID. But he also did not talk about a hearing where the Auditor General, whom he is calling an impartial, impartial person. The Auditor General is a Republican elected official, for people who are watching at home.

He is not an impartial person. He came before the State Government Committee, the Auditor General, and was asked whether or not he believed the 2020 election was a free and fair election. He could not answer the question. And this is the guy, this is the great talent that we are going to be putting in charge of auditing the election. Give me a break. He cannot call a ball. He cannot call a strike. He is a coward. We want him auditing the election?

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Mr. Speaker?

Mr. KENYATTA. He also said— And I apologize, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend. The gentleman will please suspend.

Mr. KENYATTA. I did that one. That was my fault.

The SPEAKER. I believe the gentleman recognizes the error of his ways in regards to inflammatory comments regarding members of the executive branch, which was quoted earlier from Jefferson's Manual. I simply ask the gentleman to stay focused on the underlying issue, which is the election, I understand. You are in order and may proceed.

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some people might suggest that about the good Auditor General. I apologize for doing so from the floor.

But one of the things that he said during that hearing was that it would be a daunting task to audit all 67 counties, and I have not seen any interest or any line item in the budget that we just passed that would provide a substantial increase of funding to the Auditor General's Office that would even allow them to execute this task. So this, to me, does not make a lot of sense, that we are not going to give the resources to the office that we are charging to audit the elections. So this is one of those moments where you have to put your money where your mouth is, and I did not see any money in the budget that lines up with this new thing that you want to give to the Auditor General.

So here is what we know about SB 106, Mr. Speaker. This is a crap sandwich, and every single piece of the sandwich is worse and worse and worse. It starts off with a bill with language that would effectively ban abortion in Pennsylvania, and instead of the pro-life folks celebrating that, they want to convince us all that we are crazy and gaslight us and tell us that it does not ban abortion, but we know what it is and what it does.

This bill would also, in very real terms, make the climate crisis worse. We have literally members in this body – you do not have to trust me, go look on their pages – who do not believe that we are facing a climate crisis, and these are the people who we want to allow to overturn regulations that keep our water clean, that keep our public parks safe? These are folks that we just want to allow willy-nilly to overturn important environmental regulations?

And so, no; sadly, this bill is not just about taking away the freedom to choose. It is also about taking away the freedom to have clean air and clean water, taking away the freedom for us to sustain our beautiful public parks. It is also about that. And I think it is a reason that we have not heard a lot of defense of the proposal of that either.

We know that if this, the things that are in this bill could have been done through regular order. If folks could have introduced these bills in committee, had a hearing, brought those bills to the floor to actually allow for amendments, and then send those bills to the Governor's desk for a veto or a signature, if they felt like

they could achieve these goals through the regular process, that is what we would be doing. But instead, we are trying to ram through a laundry list of awful ideas through the constitutional amendment process. It is wrong, and I think that many people on this side of the aisle, I think you know that it is wrong. I know how you are going to vote, but I think some of you deep down know that you are wrong.

We have heard Dr. King say – and I will end here, Mr. Speaker – that when you look back, it is not just the deeds of the bad folks that you look back on, but it is the silence of your so-called friends. And there are a lot of folks who are going to go back to their districts and act like they are a friend to women, but they are silent in this building, and they are going to go along to get along and vote for this knowing good and well it is the wrong thing to do. There are a lot of people who are going to go home to their districts and act like they are a friend to the environment, but yet you are going to vote for a bill that you know is good and wrong. There are a lot of folks who are going to act like they are a friend to our democracy, but you are silent right now while you allow them to take an axe to the tenets of our democracy. For folks who are in the majority party, who know that this is the wrong way to go, get some steel in your spine. Say no.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Eric Nelson, on concurrence.

Mr. E. NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is funny. Oftentimes when my children scream and stomp their feet and spout about, it is because they are trying to distract from actual truths. The good gentleman, very passionate in his main arguments, forgot to mention that last year, the Governor vetoed the election audit—

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

### POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Philadelphia is recognized. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you. I think that the gentleman is impugning my motives. He is getting real close to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

Mr. KENYATTA. And, Mr. Speaker, are you going to instruct him—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. KENYATTA. —to not impugn my motives?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. KENYATTA. Is that an answer to my question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Speaker has consulted with the Parliamentarian. We did not hear a motive being questioned; however, we will listen very carefully and we appreciate the gentleman from Philadelphia bringing the point of order to the House.

The gentleman, Representative Eric Nelson, is recognized, and the Speaker would encourage the gentleman to stay on the topic of the bill.

Mr. E. NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And back on the topic of the bill and the facts at hand, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, despite the yelling, the Governor vetoed election audit language last year and there is money sitting waiting for the audit to occur. That is a fact, Mr. Speaker.

What is also a fact was mentioned this would be less free and less safe. This bill does not impact freedom or safety. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, this lets the citizens of Pennsylvania decide. This bill is not forced birth. This bill does not change any of the abortion laws we have in Pennsylvania. It is still legal to abort over 32,000 babies each year in this State. This amendment does not change that.

An earlier speaker spoke of gun violence and the over 200 deaths that have occurred in Philadelphia, over 41 deaths of children. This amendment does not change abortion rights in Pennsylvania. And the 14 – greater than 14,000 Black or African-American babies that are aborted each year, this does not change that, Mr. Speaker; 90 percent of which are in eight counties. This bill does not answer that question at all, though we look forward to future debate on the topics.

What this bill does do is let the people decide about election integrity. This bill lets the people choose if they want to show their ID to vote, if it is going to be a requirement. This bill allows citizens to decide if the government is going to pay for abortions or not. And if the citizens decide, yes, they can do it, then that is the choice and the will of the people.

Mr. Speaker, this bill allows citizens to determine should our elections be audited, because as multiple speakers said, both Democratic and Republican officials have attempted to audit counties. In 2019 audits were refused by counties. Factual.

Mr. Speaker, this bill confirms that if a regulatory body weaponizes legislation that this chamber and the Senate, working together, can offset those changes, and the people are going to decide if we and the Senate have the authority or we do not. That is all this bill does. It lets the people, the citizens of Pennsylvania determine some key issues moving forward.

I hope my colleagues can support it. I hope we continue to speak facts and let the vote occur.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate to House amendments?

On that question, the lady from Chester, Representative Sappey, is recognized.

Ms. SAPPEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise as a woman, as a mother, and a Pennsylvanian in opposition to SB 106. And I rise for the women and the families of Pennsylvania that do not want us in their reproductive lives.

We have heard a lot tonight about how SB 106 does not change anything, but the language is clear: "...ANY OTHER RIGHT... TO ABORTION." It does change. It changes a lot.

I have also heard the words "freedom" and "liberty" in this chamber a lot in the last several years. My concern and my disillusionment over SB 106 stems from how we seem to want to choose who is free and when and how they exercise their liberty. For example, sometimes it is okay, like last week, to disregard the will of the people of Philadelphia who duly elected their district attorney. That is not okay, but having this body regulate our bodies is okay. We must not choose indiscriminately when,

where, and how people exercise their rights. The women of Pennsylvania are capable of making their own health-care decisions, and they are exercising their free will.

SB 106, as we heard a lot about taxpayer-funded abortions, this will, you know, disproportionately impact poor women and women of color, and yes, White married women with families. You can ask the many who have walked that same tragic journey that should have been shared and remained with their doctors and their faith leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose SB 106, and in the protection of freedom and liberty and the rights of women throughout the Commonwealth, I urge my colleagues to do the same. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster, the Speaker, Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Earlier a person asked did we grow up poor? I will share my experiences as a young person. I will let you make that decision.

I grew up, as many people in the country do, and I famously alluded to it here on the House floor regarding garden centers being open and somebody replied, why do we need that? Why do we need manicured lawns during the shutdown? And I said, well, Mr. Speaker, where I come from, we grow our own food. Growing up, I thought it was because that is what everybody did. I was 18 years old before I realized that not everybody butchered their own animals and processed their own meat. And, Mr. Speaker, I remember as a child cutting up scrap lumber to put in my wood stove with my dad that came out of parts from Sperry New Holland that were the pieces of cottonwood because it was dried lumber that could burn and we could not afford the electric heat.

We heard a lot of talk about do we understand the situation? Have you ever been in a challenging circumstance? Many of you are familiar with my own story, where my parents were on Social Security disability because of their diagnoses related to Lou Gehrig's disease. I have shared it many times here. So yes, Mr. Speaker, I think I can relate to some of those experiences that were described.

We have heard it said this evening that we are only pro-birth. Mr. Speaker, I am pro-person. I am pro-life, and I am proud of it. Because the truth is, Mr. Speaker, it was not that long ago, just yesterday, that we voted a budget that addressed many of those issues. In fact, we had 180 votes here for that document, which I think is close to a record. What did we fund?

For the first time ever in the history of the Commonwealth, we had a child-care tax credit, actually inspired by the good gentleman from Montgomery County's amendment, that he had offered to some other bills, that was out of order, but we worked it into the budget because we understand that working people need help, Mr. Speaker. They need child care in order to go to work. We understood that. That good gentleman's amendment was capped at \$10 million; we uncapped it and it went north of \$40 million in the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I know because I was the one who personally did it. I lobbied for increased LIHEAP (Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program) funding out of the ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) funds as we go up. I will also share it is because we had the appropriate safeguards in that system that I worked with with the good gentleman, who is no longer with us, from Philadelphia, as the prime sponsor on the LIHEAP reform program because



former Auditor General, the Democrat from Allegheny County, had indicated that program had some serious fraud issues. Our side argued that fraud should not occur, the gentleman from Philadelphia argued fraud hurts my constituents, and we were both right. So I feel comfortable putting more money into that system, and that is why I advocated for it. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I was surprised by some of the people who opposed that request.

Unfortunately, I was unsuccessful in my advocacy for the poverty tax exemption or the earned income tax credit, which I know the good lady from Philadelphia has, but those are efforts that are worthy of continued effort as we go forward because they impact people, Mr. Speaker.

Intellectual disabilities. There was a reference to the Down syndrome diagnoses and the bills that were passed previously. We significantly increased funding in this budget for intellectual disabilities, long-term care, the waiting list.

I also worked with the good gentleman from the Lehigh Valley on a package of mental health bills, which I had the privilege of sitting with the Governor yesterday while he signed. So yes, Mr. Speaker, we also care about mental health, and we put hundreds of millions of dollars into that area as well.

We heard the issue of environmental regs and what we would be doing for clean air and clean water. Mr. Speaker, this budget actually protects those. They are included. Hundreds of millions of dollars yet again.

So we heard about the amendment process. Why are we here tonight at 8 o'clock in the evening? Well, first, Mr. Speaker, we are a deliberative body, and as was reminded me earlier, we are a full-time body. That means we are here. Now, I will point out that we sent this bill over on December 15 of last year to the Senate. They recently amended it and came back and that is why we are here tonight debating these issues. But what is the process? It was described earlier regarding the constitutional amendment process, and I think this is so vitally important. What makes this evening so important? Well, the latest that we have passed and appropriately advertised a constitutional amendment is actually July 15. We just did it last session regarding the emergency powers. We did that. We did that here. And we know that the administration can meet the deadline because the deadline for advertising is the first week of August. That is why we are here tonight, Mr. Speaker, and we are here tonight because these issues are important to people.

There was a lot of discussion about voter ID and the impacts.

Audits. I would simply point out, as the good gentleman from Westmoreland previous raised, that I was also the person who advocated for funding for audits and it was line-item vetoed by the Governor last session. And I understood where the Governor was. I will be very honest, I understand when the Governor says he is going to veto something, he means it. We saw it again this morning. I put the human services veto on the House voting schedule earlier today because it was vetoed. We will be putting another bill on the veto schedule as soon as we are done debating this one.

So, Mr. Speaker, one of things that I believe in is actually working towards those areas of commonality, and on audit funding, we clearly have not reached agreement with the Governor. That is part of the legislative process. Also the person who has advocated for the audit process, working with the good gentleman from York County on what I think is a very robust process; in fact, many of the other States in the country have actually since adopted it. I think that is important and I think we

should take a real look at that. That is what this constitutional amendment would do. It would authorize us to put that legislation in place.

And I understand that many of the people have focused on the issue of pro-life, pro-abortion because that was the most recent addition to the bill. But, Mr. Speaker, as has been repeatedly said here tonight, it does not change our current law, and any future changes will in fact come through the legislative process.

The Hyde Amendment was also referenced previously, which has been the long-standing bipartisan agreement in the Federal Congress in regards to the application of taxpayer dollars for abortions. The three exceptions were outlined previously, which are legal. But the Hyde Amendment is more than just about public funding of abortions. It has enjoyed strong bipartisan support until recently because of the right of conscience and whether or not you want your taxpayer money going there. I think Pennsylvanians deserve an opportunity to answer that question since the Federal government seems to be looking past that.

Mr. Speaker, it also includes regulatory reform. That is important because the current regulatory process is stacked in favor of the administration. We ran through that during the debate when we covered it. The idea that you need a supermajority to undo something a simple majority never voted for is ridiculous.

And finally, the original constitutional amendment was on the Governor, Lieutenant Governor and the dynamics in that race. We have seen it in terms of these prior and previous separate races. And it would mirror the Federal system where the ticket actually gets to pick itself.

Mr. Speaker, it was questioned earlier about trusting the voters, trusting people who wanted to open up businesses and express freedom during the government overreach and the shutdown. Mr. Speaker, I would simply point out, that just was not one side. Those votes were bipartisan, in many cases, and many of them flirted on the edge of veto override numbers. We did not do that alone; we did that together.

Mr. Speaker, let us review some of the other things that have been said tonight. We have heard that the Federal unelected judges have taken away a right and they cannot be trusted, while at the same time, the gentlewoman from Allegheny County argued that our judges can be trusted because they are elected by the people. We have also heard that we have to keep judges accountable, and we do that through the retention process; although given the fact that we have only not retained one judge in the last hundred years, some would probably just view that as a rubber stamp. I have made my position known on the judicial process. I think that there is a better way, and in fact, that is yet another topic where I have worked in a bipartisan way.

So sometimes we are told to trust the judges, sometimes we are told not to. Sometimes we trust the voters to make these decisions and then other times we do not. That is what we have heard tonight. The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, I trust the voters. I trust the voters on this issue. I trust that they have the right to have a voice in this process. I trust that they have a right to vote on these very important issues. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because our government is of the people, for the people, and by the people. I did not hear the branches of government in that statement. I heard "the people." That is who deserves a right to vote on this, because once we vote on this today, if it passes, it will be appropriately advertised, and then it has to pass a second vote in this chamber in a subsequent session. And that is after advertising, so the public will be made very aware of what went on here tonight, and then it goes out for a voter referendum. We

have demonstrated that time and time again, Mr. Speaker. That is the government of the people, for the people, by the people; to let them have a say on these issues, because that is what they deserve.

I urge a "yes" vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker recognizes the majority whip, who requests leave for the lady from Allegheny, Representative MIHALEK.

### CONSIDERATION OF SB 106 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, will the House concur in amendments inserted by the Senate to House amendments?

On that question, the gentleman from Lancaster, Representative Sturla, is recognized.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Lancaster that just preceded me pointed out an important reason why this is running tonight, and it is because the way we have set up how constitutional amendments get done requires that it be done in such a way that even though the voters will not actually vote on the amendment in this coming election, they have to be notified that the first part of that process started so that they get a shot to unelect anybody who started that process that they believe will not be good for them.

Now, there is a part of me that says, if I believe any polling that has been done in the last 50 years, that an overwhelming majority of Pennsylvanians do not want a woman's right to choose to be taken away from her, and so I have to believe that a majority of people that come out to vote will unelect members that vote for this today. I have also got to believe that the ones that do survive, even if they do survive, when they get to a second shot at this and it eventually goes on a ballot, that the majority of Pennsylvanians will reject the notion that a woman's right to an abortion should be taken away.

So there is a part of me that says, bring it on. Let us have at it. Except that I know the process by which these amendments have been brought in Pennsylvania. They have been run in primaries, and I believe the last amendment that passed the Constitution passed with 11 percent of the voters voting for it – 11 percent. Now, I am not sure what democracy you all live in, but the one I live in does not say 11 percent rules.

That being said, let us be clear about some of the things that are and are not in this piece of legislation tonight. I have heard repeatedly, and I will have to get the transcript to count just how many times people stood up and said this, is about whether or not elective abortions should be taxpayer-funded. Let me be very clear: The word "elective" does not appear in the entirety of this bill. It says, and I quote, "§ 30. ABORTION. THIS CONSTITUTION DOES NOT GRANT THE RIGHT TO TAXPAYER-FUNDED ABORTION OR ANY OTHER RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION."

Now, I know that there are people that applaud this. If that is the case, why do we only want to talk about this taking away of the right to this? Why do we not just do an amendment that says

we are banning abortion in the State of Pennsylvania? Why not? Come on. Let us have at it. This hides the "ANY OTHER RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION" by putting in front of it, oh, taxpayer-funded, taxpayer-funded. Nobody gets a taxpayer-funded abortion in the State of Pennsylvania right now. No one is going to get one after this amendment passes – has nothing to do with it. But let us do a little smoke and mirrors up front and say, huh, we know the people do not like taxpayer-funded abortions so then we can hide, oh, and other rights relating to abortion.

So the notion that nothing changes except rights – a tiny little thing called rights, that is what changes here. There is no legislation that changes. It is rights that change. It specifically says, there will be no rights. You are not taking away some tiny thing from somebody, you are taking away rights. And it says it right there in plain English, "...ANY OTHER RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION."

Mr. Speaker, we heard that the Pennsylvania Abortion Control Act offers protections, and that is true. It currently does. And assuming this amendment passes – although I do not think it will; I think it will pass tonight, but I do not think it will pass by the voters – but even if it did, you do not have to worry, the Abortion Control Act still does not allow for that. But we also know, because there were people applauding when I said you could just take away all rights to any abortion, that that is the intent. The intent here is to say, if there is no right to any related, anything related to abortions, that then the legislature can come back and change the Abortion Control Act, and that is the intent.

Now, I guess because people say, well, the people should speak on something as important as this. I am hoping that when you try and go from a 24-week ban to a 15-week ban, like Mississippi, or a 6-week ban like Texas, or an outright ban, that you put that up for a constitutional amendment also. Because after all, why would you want that in mere legislation? Why not give the people a chance to vote on that one? Are you going to do that? Answer me that question, because my guess is the answer is [word stricken] no. We are not going to let the people vote on that.

### THE SPEAKER (BRYAN CUTLER) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

Mr. STURLA. My apologies, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, just simply for the statement of the record, profanity is not allowed on the House floor. That profanity will be stricken from the record.

You are in order and may proceed on concurrence, sir.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My guess is your response would be, heck no. Gosh darn it. Dag gummit. Not us. We are not going to do that.

Mr. Speaker, this is about where we are headed. And if in fact we believe that, as we have heard so many times tonight, the people have a right to vote on these kinds of issues, but we are not giving them the right to vote on an amended version of this because we did not allow that tonight. We did not allow the words "OR ANY OTHER RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION" to be stricken from this. You know, my guess is, if it says this Constitution does not allow the right to a taxpayer-funded abortion, I doubt that we – we could have gone home at 4 o'clock this afternoon, because, heck, you cannot do that in Pennsylvania

right now anyway, so where is the fight? But it added those other words and we could not take them out, and the voters will not be able to take them out. They will not be able to split that question on the ballot. They will not be able to say, well, I do not really like taxpayer-funded abortions, but dang, do not take away every other right to an abortion. And that is why it was constructed that way. It is a little smoke and mirrors up front that blinds you with a little bit of taxpayer-funded abortion – you do not want that – oh, and any other abortion; oh, and any other – you know.

Mr. Speaker, if we really think that these kinds of issues that are this critical should be brought before the voters, let us start putting constitutional amendments up as to whether or not people think assault weapons should be banned in the State of Pennsylvania. I am pretty sure, if I look at the polling and I talk to my constituents, that thing would pass in a heartbeat.

Mr. Speaker, how about if we start putting up on the ballot whether or not we should increase fracking fees? I think that one might pass.

How about if we put on—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

The Speaker was trying to give the gentleman a little bit of latitude because I thought you would bring it back to the underlying issues contained in the five subsets of the constitutional amendments. I would simply remind the gentleman to focus on what is in the bill, not that which is not included in the bill.

You are in order and may proceed, sir.

### POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does Leader McClinton rise?

Ms. McCLINTON. Mr. Speaker, no one interrupted the previous speaker who talked about a number of topics that are not related to SB 106, so I just would ask that the same courtesy be extended to this gentleman from Lancaster County.

The SPEAKER. The gentledady's point of order is recognized; however, the prior speaker was simply responding to all of the prior points that were brought up by every speaker previously. The good gentleman—

Ms. McCLINTON. Now he is responding too.

The SPEAKER. The good gentleman is bringing up topics that are extraneous to the debate thus far, and I simply encourage him to stay – he acknowledged that when we requested he stop. I know he will be consistent with the rules going forward.

The Chair thanks the lady.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, how about if we put on the ballot no exception for the life of the mother or rape or incest? I mean, hey, it is an abortion, right? Now, there are people on the floor of the House, I believe, that would say, yes, absolutely. No exceptions. Let us put that one on the ballot. Do we know the answer to that one? Why not put that one on the ballot?

How about no abortions at all? Let us try putting that one on the ballot, because while this one just says no rights relating to abortion, it did not take away the right – it did not take away abortions yet; it just took away the right to an abortion. So let us put it on the ballot and see what the public thinks so that we can save ourselves a whole heck of a lot of time here in the ensuing months while we try and pass all those pieces of legislation without voter input.

How about if we put on the ballot no contraception that prevents a fertilized egg from implanting in the uterine wall? Because I know there are people on the floor of the House that would vote for that. Let us put that one on the ballot and see where we are at.

Now, if you wonder why people are concerned about the language in here that says "OR OTHER RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION," all those things are other rights relating to abortion. Every one of them. I do not understand why we are hiding behind, well, the taxpayer-funded abortions, that is what we are against. We really do not mean anything else. Everything I just described is other rights relating to abortion. Why cannot we ask those questions? Because you know what the answers are already also. The answer would be a flat-out no. But you want to open the door so that we can have those debates on this floor day after day after day after day.

And I guess my next question is, if the voters, after the second time this kind of amendment to the Constitution passes, if the voters actually say, no, I do not care whether it is taxpayer or not, I do not care, no, you are not restricting a woman's right, will you then stop? Or will you just say, well, now let us test how far we can go with those rights? Why are we dancing around this issue? Let us figure it out. Why not put all those questions on the ballot? We can let Pennsylvanians decide and save us a whole lot of heartache here in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I was approached recently by a constituent who is concerned that her young daughter, who has not yet had her menstrual cycle, whether she would need to put her daughter on birth control as soon as her daughter started having her menstrual cycle. And you go, well, why would she do that? If and when you all vote to make abortion illegal, her 11-year-old might need to have that ability to prevent an abortion.

Now, it seems a bit of a stretch to me to think that we would want to put every young 10-, 11-, 12-, 13-, 14-, 15-year-old on birth control. But the reality is, if the option of an abortion in the case of rape or incest, in the case of something happening that happens to 13-year-olds and 14-year-olds occasionally, that that pregnancy could not be terminated, if that is the only other option, guess what? You are now going to have every – or not every, because some of you will not allow your – well, you may not allow your kids to do it, but they will do it anyway – you are going to have a whole lot of 10-, 11-, 12-, 13-, 14-year-olds on contraception that otherwise would never even consider it.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things I go back to on this issue is the first time I ran, and it was a tumultuous time. My gubernatorial candidate at the top of my ticket was Bob Casey; gubernatorial candidate on the other side of the ticket was Barbara Hafer. My gubernatorial candidate was anti-choice; Republican gubernatorial candidate was pro-choice. I was pro-choice. My opponent was anti-choice. You know, talk about a mixed-up mess.

And I was out knocking on doors and I was looking at my voter list – and for those of you that have actually knocked on doors, you know that when you get to an 8Y voter, that means that they have voted in every primary and every general election as far back as we keep records to carry around on street lists. And it was a woman in her eighties. She was a Republican. And I thought, boy, I do not know. Why is a young Democrat going to go knock on this woman's door? But I did. And when she answered the door, I introduced myself and she said, "I have one question for you. Where are you on a woman's right to choose?"

Which I thought was a pretty strange question coming from an 80-year-old woman. I also thought I knew what the answer was that she wanted, and I said, "Well, ma'am, I will tell you. I am pro-choice." And before I could get out another word, she said, "You have my vote." And I was taken aback by that because that was not what I expected. And I said to her, "Could you explain to me, because that was not what I expected to hear from you?" And she said, "Young man," she said, "You might not be old enough to remember, but I had friends that died of back-alley abortions. We can never go back there."

This amendment takes us right back there. This amendment will not curb abortions. It will simply force them into back alleys. Women will die. If you do not believe it, talk to somebody who is 80 years old or 90 years old right now and ask them whether they knew anybody that died of a back-alley abortion. I guarantee you they do.

For the last 50 years, you have not to deal with that issue. *Roe v. Wade* took care of that issue for you. Think about women dying at a rate – it was mentioned there were 13,000 abortions, I believe it was – 32,000 abortions. Imagine if 1 out of every 10 of those goes wrong in a back alley. Think about thousands of women in Pennsylvania dying every year because they are forced into back-alley abortions.

Mr. Speaker, I have daughters that are of childbearing age, and they are proud mothers who cherish their children, my grandchildren. But they do not have to have somebody else tell them that they are forced to carry a pregnancy to term.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage a "no" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

### MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Daley, who has a late-filed amendment that is out of order.

I believe she is seeking recognition for a suspension of the rules?

Ms. DALEY. Correct, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You are in order and may proceed, ma'am.

Ms. DALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules for the purposes of offering amendment A05440. Mr. Speaker, A05440 would codify *Planned Parenthood v. Casey's* holding that a woman has a right to an abortion prior to fetal viability. We should suspend the rules because 60 percent of Americans oppose the Supreme Court's decision to strip women of their right to body autonomy. We should suspend the rules because if we do not and this constitutional amendment becomes law, the stage will be set for women to be sentenced to death in cases of medical necessity.

Mr. Speaker, I know that sounds extreme. I know that it sounds like it cannot be true. I know it sounds like we are talking about the bogeyman, but, Mr. Speaker, if we do not suspend the rules, SB 106 will begin the process of fulfilling the Republican nominee for Governor's stated goal: to ban abortions in cases of medical necessity to save the mother's life, in cases of rape, and in cases of incest. Mr. Speaker, if we do not suspend the rules, women will die, mothers will die, sisters will die, friends will die. Mr. Speaker, this is not hyperbole: women will die.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

The gentlewoman, Representative Daley, has made a motion to suspend the rules for immediate consideration of amendment 5440.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. Again, a reminder to the members, the motion is debatable by the maker of the motion, the underlying maker of an amendment – or in this case, the bills – and then both leaders.

The Speaker recognizes the gentlewoman, Leader McClinton. She waives off. The Chair thanks the lady.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Leader Benninghoff.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Respectfully, this is a late-filed amendment. I would ask the members to not support the suspension. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Leader McClinton, you are seeking recognition on the suspension of the rules?

You are in order and may proceed, ma'am.

Ms. McCLINTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was not going to say anything, but in Rules tonight, we had timely filed amendments and we could not run our timely filed amendments. All the members of the Rules Committee know how that went down. There were no cameras, so the people watching right now at home that are texting and tweeting and Facebooking about this nonsense, they did not see what occurred in the Rules meeting, but there were timely filed amendments that we offered in the Rules meeting, and guess what happened in the Rules meeting in this democratic chamber that loves votes and loves voters? Well, the members of the committee, in the Rules meeting, Mr. Speaker – and this is why we need to suspend the rules now – with our timely filed amendments, we were not allowed to vote on one of them. We offered three timely filed amendments, and, Mr. Speaker, you and the majority leader know the nature of the rules of this institution do not provide us the opportunity to provide a timely filed amendment tonight. You are aware of that because you made those rules.

So here we are on a Friday night, glad to be at work because we know our voters sent us here to fight this battle, and we cannot even suspend the rules for one consideration of something that is very important, as the maker of the motion stated. We are talking about women dying. We are talking about more than half the population not being able to make decisions when not even half of this body has a uterus. That is what we are talking about tonight, and that is why these rules need to be suspended, because we do not follow the rules in this body. Let the people back home know. That is why the rules need to be suspended, Mr. Speaker. That is why the rules need to be suspended, Mr. Speaker, because we had timely filed amendments that were tabled. And in case you are watching – because so many are, as we heard from constituents; voters are watching – we filed them in a timely way so they could be considered in committee, which is what the majority leader likes to lecture my caucus about each and every legislative day, but here we are being silenced yet again. And understand, when you are silencing us, we are actually elected officials like you all, so you are silencing millions of voters from

every corner of the Commonwealth when you silence us and do not allow us to amend bills that will not let people vote, that will not allow women to make their own decisions. You are silencing all of us.

So we need to suspend the rules and let this amendment come through before we rush this off to the voters – those same voters that you tried to silence in 2020 when you did not like the outcome of the election, those same voters that you said it did not matter what they chose—

### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Mr. Speaker?

Ms. McCLINTON. Those are the people you are trying to shut up.

The SPEAKER. The gentlelady will please suspend.

For what purpose does the gentleman, the majority leader, rise?

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Point of order.

The SPEAKER. You may state your point of order.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. It would seem that the previous speaker is trying to impugn the motive of some of our speakers. I just ask her to stay on topic.

The SPEAKER. The House will please come to order. The House will please come to order so that the leader can be recognized for his point of order, just as the prior leader was recognized to speak on the suspension of the rules.

I will once again remind the members that disrupting the orderly debate of session is contrary to the rules that we all voted on previously in the session. So, Majority Leader, you may state your point of order.

The Speaker asks the majority leader to please restate your point of order.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was encouraging the member to stay on the topic of the bill and not be impugning some of the motives of our members and actions of other elected officials prior, or we can start talking about the Secretary of State.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman – the Speaker thanks the gentleman for raising a point of order; however, I will remind the members that we are to engage in an orderly debate regarding this. Generally – and I will once again remind the members of this as well – both leaders are given a little bit more latitude to speak on items, both policy and procedure of the House. However, it is not productive to unnecessarily excite members from either side, and that applies to both sides.

The gentleman's point of order is noted, and, Leader McClinton, you may conclude your remarks.

Ms. McCLINTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I was saying, in this undemocratic chamber that cares so much tonight about voters and rushing off a constitutional amendment to voters, we need to suspend these rules because we wanted to make this better. If we are going to get a product to voters as early as the primary in 2023, then let us work on a product that explains to voters what these issues are. Let us not jam them all through on one very convoluted question that they may receive in the future. If we want to care about the voters, we need to suspend the rules, because the voters elected Tom Wolf. The voters elected us to legislate, not rush amendments down the turnpike to their voting booth at the next primary, off-year election.

So I ask everyone to support the gentlelady from Montgomery County's motion to suspend these rules.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the good lady.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the 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—86

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

### NAYS—113

Armanini	Gleim	Masser	Ryan
Benninghoff	Gregory	Mehaffie	Sainato
Bernstine	Greiner	Mentzer	Sankey
Boback	Grove	Mercuri	Saylor
Bonner	Hamm	Metcalfe	Schemel
Borowicz	Heffley	Metzgar	Schmitt
Brooks	Helm	Millard	Schnee
Brown, R.	Hennessey	Miller, B.	Schroeder
Burns	Hershey	Mizgorski	Silvis
Causar	Hickernell	Moul	Smith
Cook	Irvin	Mustello	Snyder
Cox	James	Nelson, E.	Sonney
Culver	Jones	O'Neal	Staats
Davanzo	Jozwiak	Oberlander	Stambaugh
Day	Kail	Ortitay	Struzzi
Delozier	Kauffman	Owlett	Thomas
DelRosso	Keefer	Peifer	Tomlinson
Diamond	Klunk	Pennycuik	Topper
Dowling	Knowles	Pickett	Twardzik
Dunbar	Labs	Polinchock	Warner
Ecker	Lawrence	Puskaric	Wentling
Emrick	Lewis	Quinn	Wheeland
Farry	Longietti	Rader	White

Fee	Mackenzie, M.	Rapp	Williams, C.
Flood	Mackenzie, R.	Rigby	Zimmerman
Fritz	Major	Roae	
Gaydos	Mako	Rossi	Cutler,
Gillen	Maloney	Rothman	Speaker
Gillespie	Marshall	Rowe	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Kaufer                      Kerwin                      Mihalek

Less than a majority of the members required by the rules having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the motion was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments to House amendments?

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Rapp, on concurrence.

Ms. RAPP. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It has been a long evening and I know there are a lot of members of the public watching, and, Mr. Speaker, a lot of the speakers already addressed some of the issues that I will be addressing, but I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak on SB 106.

I rise in support of the proposed constitutional amendment that will ensure that the taxpayers of this Commonwealth are not required to pay for elective abortions. Contrary to what is being said, this issue is not specific to the recently decided Dobbs case; rather, this issue focuses on a court case that is presently pending before our State's Supreme Court. In this case, the petitioners are asking the Pennsylvania Supreme Court to find a State constitutional right to an abortion and a State constitutional right to taxpayer funding of abortion – taxpayer funding of an abortion. If that occurs, and without this amendment, the State legislature will be stripped of its duty to determine much of the abortion policy in this State. Presently, 11 States have had their courts declare a State constitutional right to an abortion.

Supporters of the lawsuit before our State Supreme Court are looking for Pennsylvania to join that list, and some of these States, Mr. Speaker, allow for abortion up to the moment of birth. Let us look at the facts and not the rhetoric. This constitutional amendment will not change our State's Abortion Control Act, which has already withstood a Supreme Court challenge. It still stands today, as that law has banned taxpayer funding of elected abortions since its inception in 1982. That act will remain in place. This constitutional amendment will not ban current funding permissible under the law.

Currently Medicaid covers nonelective abortions involving the health and life of the mother, as well as elective abortions involving rape or incest. The amendment will not end abortions in this Commonwealth; that is simply not accurate. Currently a woman has access to abortion up to 24 weeks; that is 6 months, except for issues relating to the life of the mother. And, Mr. Speaker, you know, I have listened to all these stories from previous speakers. Yes, I am pro-life, and, Mr. Speaker, we have organizations in our State – pregnancy centers, as I have heard

people talk about women who are not going to have any support – we have pregnancy centers in this nation that in 2019, and more since 2019, that gave almost \$270 million in resources like diapers, classes, formula, and other needs to mothers. Pregnancy centers also already outnumber abortion clinics 3 to 1 in the U.S. We have been and will continue to work for a culture that values all life. Several centers follow the mothers for up to a year. We heard testimony in the Health Committee from a pregnancy center in Pittsburgh that follows a mother and the entire family for over a year to make sure that mother and child are prospering.

Mr. Speaker, I also heard about the concerns of our services for our children. We know, everyone in this body, that just in this last budget, we increased funding for early intervention, special education, children with intellectual disabilities, people on the waiting list. And you know, there are also many organizations in the private sector that also help many parents if they have a child with a disability. And I am very familiar, Mr. Speaker, with Shriners Hospital, because there are many of us that also grew up poor and also had family members that received those services, and I am very thankful for those services and for the institutions that help families who have children with disabilities.

What this constitutional amendment will do is ensure that the State legislature, and not the courts, will determine abortion policy in this Commonwealth. Giving one branch of government sole control over abortion laws does not represent a balanced approach to this issue. Ultimately, if this proposed amendment passes two consecutive legislative sessions, the voters, the people of this Commonwealth, will decide this issue along with the other issues proposed in SB 106. Polling has shown that across this Commonwealth, a majority of Pennsylvania citizens do not support taxpayer funding of elected abortions. This amendment will maintain the status quo. That does not mean that a woman in the State of Pennsylvania cannot have an abortion.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking my colleagues for an affirmative vote on this Senate bill, and I thank my colleagues for that vote, and I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

## MOTION FOR PREVIOUS QUESTION

The SPEAKER. And the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Topper, on concurrence.

Mr. TOPPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This has certainly been an emotionally charged debate, and I can appreciate that and I can understand that. There have been accusations that have flown across the room. There have been members who have been gavelled down, reminded of the rules. I understand that the decorum is at the core of this institution, and there has been a lot of talking about how we speak, people being silenced and how we speak as members, and the number one way that we speak, Mr. Speaker, is that we vote, and I believe it is time to do that on this issue.

So, Mr. Speaker, I move for the previous question, pursuant to rule 61, in order to proceed immediately to concurrence on SB 106.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Topper, has moved the previous question on SB 106. Those who second this motion will rise and remain standing until their names are recorded. For the information of the members, a total of 20 members are required.

The Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Representative Saylor, Representative Dunbar, Representative Oberlander, Representative Kail, Representative O'Neal, Representative Gregory, Representative Rigby, Representative Diamond, Representative Jozwiak, Representative Knowles, Representative Kauffman, Representative Klunk, Representative Maloney, Representative Owlett, Representative Causer, Representative Borowicz, Representative Roae, Representative Rapp, Representative Irvin, Representative Millard, Representative Davanzo, Representative Moul.

The Speaker has been notified that is the appropriate 20 seconds. The motion for the previous question having been made and seconded.

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

### MOTION TO ADJOURN

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

Mr. BRADFORD. To make a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may state your motion and we will determine the primacy of those motions.

Mr. BRADFORD. Motion to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Bradford, has made a motion to adjourn prior to getting the motion to move the previous question.

As the gentleman stated, this is a privileged motion, and we will now put the motion to adjourn made by the gentleman, Representative Bradford, on the floor. As expressed previously this evening, Representative Bradford, we need to adjourn to a date certain and time.

Mr. BRADFORD. September 12, 2022, please.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Bradford, has moved that we adjourn until September 12, which I believe is a regularly scheduled session day, and the time would be 12 noon.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Bradford, is recognized, and you may speak on your motion to adjourn.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to ask for at least approximately 7 weeks to have a thoughtful conversation. As you know, there are multiple constitutional amendments proposed in this bill in front of us. This is a dramatic restructuring of the role of government in the Commonwealth, not the least of which as affects women's health care, but in our elections. Many gentlemen and ladies have spoken with great passion. Clearly, there is a tremendous division of thought, one that potentially could, at least some meeting of the minds could come from appropriate hearings and the opportunity from people of goodwill to have an honest discussion about whether this is the appropriate time and hour to be amending our constitution without the opportunity of hearings or consideration or thought.

While I know it would be easy for those to fall into an easy, partisan, one-way-or-another vote, I think the conversation tonight reflects a recognition by many that this constitutional restructuring and the impacts it would have on so many

Pennsylvanians, men and women, on voters on so many issues that are such a hot button that created debate in this institution, but also protests across the Commonwealth and across the country that time and thoughtful consideration, as opposed to parliamentary jujitsu and a rush to judgement without the advantage of thoughtful inquiry from the majority party.

### MOTION FOR PREVIOUS QUESTION

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

For what purpose does the gentleman, the majority leader, rise?

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. To make my own motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may state your motion. The Chair will determine the primacy of the motion.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. I would like to make a motion to move the previous question on this motion to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. For the information of the members, moving the previous question on the motion to adjourn would be in order. Just like the prior previous question, it would require a total of 20 seconds, of which the Speaker will once again recognize the members.

The gentleman, Representative Saylor; the gentleman, Representative Dunbar; Representative Grove; Representative Kail; Representative Klunk; Representative White; Representative Oberlander; Representative Topper; Representative Warner; Representative O'Neal; Representative Gregory; Representative Knowles; Representative Kauffman; Representative Delozier; Representative Hamm; Representative Keefer; Representative Pennycuick; Representative Stambaugh; Representative Moul; Representative Gleim; Representative Hickernell; Representative Fee.

The Speaker has been informed that there are 20 seconds on the motion to adjourn.

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

The SPEAKER. The question to adjourn is now before the body. Those in favor of the motion to adjourn will vote "aye"; those opposed— Leader McClinton, are you seeking recognition to speak on the motion on the previous question to the motion to adjourn?

You are in order and may proceed for brief remarks as is consistent with our past precedent.

Ms. McCLINTON. How brief, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. We will determine that as we move along, Madam Leader.

Ms. McCLINTON. Okay. Because when we started this whole exercise, my concern was what is happening right now, and that is that the democratic process by which each of our constituents in our 203 legislative districts would not be allowed to occur in this august body.

Our constituents made some very serious decisions on that night in November in 2020, and so much of that has been the continual outcry of protest, sanction, challenges, even an insurrection. And here we are this evening, fast-forward a year and a half later, and we would simply like to do the job with which we lawmakers were elected to do, Mr. Speaker. And when this exercise began, once we completed the budget earlier this

evening, just about 4 hours ago, my concern was that we not go down the deep, dark pathway that the majority party loves called the silencing the minority. And in fact, chairmen, some very senior members, one gentleman from Luzerne, raised this exact moment about 5:10 in the majority Appropriations conference room stating, and actually asking your majority leader, would debate be permitted on SB 106 since our timely-filed amendments were tabled so quickly? And right before we voted on that, you will recall, Mr. Majority Leader, you were asked just flat-out, well, if our timely filed amendments are being tabled or were about to be tabled, we could not just get an up-or-down vote, can you please let us know that we will in fact be able to talk on the floor of the House the way our constituents decided we should be able to do on that fateful night in November in 2020? And, Mr. Speaker, that is all we are trying to do here tonight. We are not playing any games like the majority party. We are not doing any gimmicks for all those voters who are watching. We simply want to speak on behalf of our constituents, but here we go down that deep, dark path that the majority loves, and that is to simply tell our caucus that our constituents, that our voters, that their priorities cannot be uplifted in this chamber, that there will be one procedural maneuver after another to silence our caucus. But most importantly – and what is most sad – is that it does not silence just members of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, but it silences voters. It silences our next-door neighbors and those that live near and far among those 62,500 people each and every one of us represents.

So I am standing to make some brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, because several hours ago, where so many people could have made different commitments to their constituents thinking we would have had an on-time budget – you know, June 30 was the deadline – or done something about gun violence or fairly funded schools – I mean, we had so many opportunities ahead of us, and once again, we drop the ball. So in these brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, we are asking simply to be able to do our jobs.

The SPEAKER. Has Leader McClinton concluded her remarks?

Ms. McCLINTON. Mr. Speaker, I have concluded my remarks, but I hope we have not concluded our work.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, the majority leader, on the motion to move to the previous question to adjourn.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Well, that is a little confusing, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

You know, we are discussing whether to vote on the minority party's motion to adjourn, which therefore, would end the ability to do the people's work she just said she wanted to do. After hours of debate, we would like to continue the people's business that came here to vote. We have listened to lots of debate, Mr. Speaker. Let us finish the people's business.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the leader.

Is Leader McClinton seeking recognition for the second time?

Ms. McCLINTON. Absolutely. Just so we are clear—

The SPEAKER. The gentlelady will please suspend. I believe past precedent is each leader gets to speak once.

Ms. McCLINTON. But there were some things stated that are not rooted in reality or truth, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The leader will please suspend your comments. The Chair thanks the lady.

Past precedent of the House is that each leader gets to speak once and then we will move to the question that is before us. If the leaders would like to approach the rostrum and discuss any

other issues immediately after the vote, which this is several layers of moving the question, we can do so.

The question before us is the motion to adjourn – moving the question on the motion to adjourn.

Those in favor of moving the previous question and then immediately proceeding to the adjournment motion that was previously made by the gentleman from Montgomery County will vote "aye"; those opposed, "no." Members will proceed to vote.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

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

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The following roll call was recorded:

#### YEAS—110

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

#### 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	Sappery
Burgos	Guent	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			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Kaufer	Kerwin	Mihalek
--------	--------	---------

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

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

The SPEAKER. The question now before the body is the question that the gentleman from Montgomery County raised, which is the motion to adjourn.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

Ms. McCLINTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak on the motion.

The SPEAKER. Nothing is in order but the taking of the vote.  
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, on the question of adjournment.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—90

Abney	Delloso	Kosierowski	Pisciottano
Benham	DeLuca	Krajewski	Rabb
Bizzarro	Evans	Krueger	Rozzi
Boyle	Fiedler	Kulik	Sainato
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Lee	Samuelson
Briggs	Frankel	Longiotti	Sanchez
Brown, A.	Freeman	Madden	Sappey
Bullock	Galloway	Malagari	Schlossberg
Burgos	Guenst	Markosek	Schweyer
Burns	Guzman	Matzie	Shusterman

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

NAYS—109

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Kaufer	Kerwin	Mihalek
--------	--------	---------

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

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

The SPEAKER. The motion fails and we will move to the previous question as previously made by the gentleman, Representative Topper.

For what purpose does the gentlewoman rise?

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, personal privilege?

The SPEAKER. That is not currently in order. The question before the body is moving the previous question.

**POINT OF ORDER**

Ms. DeLISSIO. Point of order, Mr. Speaker?

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

Ms. DeLISSIO. Could the Speaker kindly explain why my personal privilege request is, because it is related to the vote that is about to be taken. Once that vote is taken, my personal privilege will be negated.

The SPEAKER. The rules are clear regarding the motion to move the previous question and that both leaders may give brief comments. I know there was some discussion previously that only one leader was given that opportunity; that is simply not true.

Leader McClinton spoke first, Leader Benninghoff spoke second, and then the question was called on the underlying motion. I will remind the members that the question was called, there was an intervening motion to adjourn, and the question was called on the motion to adjourn.

We are currently unwinding those series of motions. Both leaders had spoken on the adjournment motion which just failed, and now we are on the motion to move the previous question, which was also previously debated.

So the question before the body right now is the motion to move the previous question.

For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BRADFORD. I would like to debate the motion.

The SPEAKER. That is not in order. Past precedent—

**RULING OF CHAIR APPEALED**

Mr. BRADFORD. I would like to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. BRADFORD. Point of order to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Bradford, has appealed the ruling of the Chair regarding the debate ability of the motion to move the previous question and the past precedent.

On the question,

Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

The SPEAKER. Could the gentleman please clearly state the ruling that you wish to appeal.

Mr. BRADFORD. Yes. As you know, we are attempting, with almost no notice and no hearings, to amend the Constitution, most likely resulting in disenfranchising of voters and interfering with the right of women to bodily autonomy.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend.

The gentleman was recognized to state briefly his motion to appeal the Chair. I believe the gentleman is getting into the substance of the debate if and when the appeal is granted.

Mr. BRADFORD. There are nine speakers from the minority party that have yet been given the opportunity even to speak. I believe it is appropriate to appeal the ruling of the Chair to allow them the opportunity to be heard.

**MOTION FOR PREVIOUS QUESTION**

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentlemen will please suspend.

For what purpose does the gentleman, the majority leader, rise?

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. I would like to make a motion to proceed on the appeal of the Chair – pardon me, move the previous question on the appeal of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair has been made by the gentleman, Representative Bradford, and now the motion to move the question on the motion to appeal the Chair is now before the body. As in the prior moving of the previous question, 20 seconds will once again be needed.

The Chair will start with Representative Rapp, Representative Roae, Representative Borowicz, Representative Hickernell, Representative Fee, Representative Miller, Representative Zimmerman, Representative Greiner, Representative Causer, Representative Owlett, Representative Jozwiak, Representative Diamond, Representative Moul, Representative Maloney, Representative Gleim, Representative Sankey, Representative Keefer, Representative Kauffman, Representative Knowles, Representative Rigby, Representative Gregory, Representative O'Neal.

The Chair has been notified that that is the appropriate 20 seconds.

The gentleman, Leader Benninghoff, has moved the previous question on the motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair. The appropriate 20 seconds having been made.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Leader McClinton. Is she seeking recognition on the motion to move the previous question on the motion to appeal the Chair?

Ms. McCLINTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that before this evening winds down that the majority leader will rise for interrogation on SB 106, which is something that we did request about 3 1/2 hours ago. And the only reason why our caucus is moving to adjourn is because it is clear that if we cannot speak in this body that we were elected to come and speak on behalf of our constituents, if the minority is being silenced, if the party of transparency and accountability is shutting us down, then it is clear that we need to adjourn, have break so that we can have hearings, so that we can take testimony, and so that we can appropriately examine what should be happening with SB 106.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Mr. Speaker?

Ms. McCLINTON. And I am talking, Mr. Leader.

The SPEAKER. The gentlelady will please suspend.

Ms. McCLINTON. I am talking. Maybe you cannot hear me. I am talking.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Oh, I hear you.

The SPEAKER. Both leaders will immediately approach the rostrum, and the House will be at ease.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

The SPEAKER. The House will return to order.

The Speaker has consulted with both leaders regarding the current motion to move the previous question on the motion to appeal the Chair.

The leaders have indicated in conference that they would work through withdrawing the motions if a time clock was put on for the remaining speakers who are on the list to a time period of 3 minutes, if that is agreeable to both leaders.

#### MOTIONS WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Bradford, withdraws the motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

And I believe the gentleman, Representative Bradford, would also need to withdraw the motion to adjourn. We still have one of those left. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

And that brings us back to the gentleman, Representative Topper, on the motion to move the previous question. The gentleman indicates that he will. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments to House amendments?

The SPEAKER. In that case, we will post the 3-minute clock, and the gentlewoman, Representative Krueger, is recognized on concurrence. The goal is to get wrapped up as quickly as possible here while ensuring that everybody who remains on the list that was agreed to by the leaders has an opportunity to speak prior to final vote.

You are in order and may proceed, ma'am.

Ms. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, let us be clear. We are here in this chamber on a Friday night in July at 9:42 p.m., and the bill before us, SB 106, creates a vehicle to ban abortion here in Pennsylvania, plain and simple.

We have heard a lot of misinformation on this floor tonight, but you only need to read the language of the bill to understand where we are headed. "THIS CONSTITUTION DOES NOT GRANT THE RIGHT TO TAXPAYER-FUNDED ABORTION OR ANY OTHER RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION." Tonight this bill rolls back our rights, and the legislators behind this language are trying to pave the way for an end to abortion rights in Pennsylvania at a time when they think no one is watching. We only need to look at what has happened in other States that have passed similar language to know where this road heads.

In 2014 Tennessee approved similar language after politicians there promised that they would not use it to pass any abortion bans. In the year since that amendment passed, Tennessee legislators have passed nine bills restricting access to abortion.

Women's reproductive rights are under attack on this House floor tonight. Abortion is safe and legal today, but it will not be for long if this language becomes law. By this time next year, we could face the same abortion bans as Texas or Alabama or Oklahoma.

So if we want to protect our reproductive rights, we must all rise up and fight this bill with everything we have got. We will not go back.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Otten, on concurrence.

Ms. OTTEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to oppose SB 106. To ignore the last seven words of the language regarding abortion in this bill, "OR ANY OTHER RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION," would be intellectually dishonest and intellectually inconsistent with the bill, because the same people who have stood up here tonight and talked about trusting the voters in the very same bill address issues related to not trusting the 2020 election and still believe that that election was stolen.

It is all right here in this bill: voter ID, politically motivated audits, and assaults on the checks and balances—

The SPEAKER. The gentlelady will suspend.

Ms. OTTEN. —set forth in the Constitution.

The SPEAKER. The gentlelady specifically mentioned motivation, which is in violation of the rules. I would encourage you to please stay on topic of the underlying bill.

You are in order and may proceed.

Ms. OTTEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is the first time in history that an amendment to the Constitution seeks to deny rights to Pennsylvanians, and as we stand here today, Pennsylvania is in a health-care crisis. We have health-care deserts in every corner of Pennsylvania, in the poorest and the wealthiest counties in Pennsylvania.

Just this year, Chester County has lost two hospitals, and even before the total hospital closures, even in hospitals that remain open, the first services to close are maternity units.

Before I had my own children, back in the early 2000s, Pennsylvania experienced an exodus of ob-gyns (obstetrician-gynecologists) who would no longer deliver babies, because driving the cost of malpractice insurance for providers through the roof with restrictive livelihood-threatening policies threatens to drive ob-gyns from providing their services right here in Pennsylvania. Fear of restrictions and legal repercussions will make already limited access to sexual and reproduction health care and fertility care extremely inaccessible in Pennsylvania.

Imagine the day when Pennsylvanians have to drive to New York or New Jersey just to access essential personal health-care services, or the day when they need to be rushed there by ambulance because the lifesaving emergency health-care they need is either not legal or not accessible here in our State. Aggressively worsening the shortage of ob-gyn providers will make emergency obstetric care more and more scarce and unavailable to pregnant people who do not have the ability or time to travel or be transported in order to save their lives and the lives—

The SPEAKER. Suspend. Your time has expired.

The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Webster, on concurrence.

Mr. WEBSTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am also opposed to SB 106 for many of the reasons that have been cited previously, but I do want to add a few others from a good-government perspective very quickly.

We are governing — attempting to govern — today by constitutional amendment, and one of those amendments would abrogate, you know, regulations by fiat of the legislature. And it is important, I think, for us to recognize a foundational principle of United States democracy is the checks and balances of the three branches of government.

Second, our colleague from Warren County spoke to court laws and ongoing court cases, and I am very concerned that the language "OR ANY OTHER RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION" would abrogate the rights of Pennsylvanians to

petition the courts, and petitioning our government with grievances is a foundational right in the democracy of the United States of America. So there are a couple of reasons.

Here is a specific scenario about voter identification rights and our military members. I am referring to a letter from the Department of Defense to Virginia, who had a similar ID concern, and it says: "When registering to vote by mail, citizens covered by" the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act "are exempt under" Federal statute "...from State requirements to provide a copy of a valid photo identification..." etc., etc. And if we were legislating via bill, we might add that exemption, we might add definitions and requirements and get it right, but instead, we are going to present, you know, whatever it is, a 13-word constitutional amendment, and then go back to the courts – oh, but maybe we cannot petition the courts.

So this is disconcerting to me, especially since – we will make it personal right at the end, right? – in the middle of this discussion, my wife texted to me "debate tonight like your daughter's life depends on it," because our female family history suggests that she is highly likely to have a failed pregnancy at some time in her life, like her mother; like one, two, three, four of her aunts that I can name, and it is my job to protect my daughter and preserve her options.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

I have been notified that Representative Innamorato is the next and final speaker to be recognized.

Ms. INNAMORATO. I rise today to oppose SB 106 because today in this chamber, we have before us a document that threatens our freedom and our liberty. It aims to add a ban on Pennsylvanians' right to abortion into our State Constitution. Yes, regardless of what has been said up here, the text of this bill reads, quote, "THIS CONSTITUTION DOES NOT GRANT THE RIGHT TO TAXPAYER-FUNDED ABORTION OR ANY OTHER RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION." If added to our Constitution, this will not only take away our freedom and our liberty, but also our right to privacy that we are currently afforded as citizens of this Commonwealth under our Constitution.

This seems like a new low for this chamber, using the Pennsylvania State Constitution; instead of upholding and protecting rights and freedom of individuals, we are weaponizing this document to remove the rights of women, birthing people, and families to make their own private medical decisions. Think about the dangerous precedent this sets.

For the people watching at home, think about the road that this puts us on: a world where we use our Constitution to restrict rights instead of upholding them. And since the majority party has denied us interrogation and has denied us hearings, we can only imagine what is next. Like my colleague said, in 2014 Tennessee passed a similar– added similar language to their Constitution. And at the time, lawmakers said the same things that we are hearing this evening, that it is about the voters, that it is protecting taxpayers; that it will not change a thing. But they said, hey, trust us. And where are we today? Well, on June 28, abortion is illegal in Tennessee past 6 weeks – one of the most extreme bans in the United States. And these restrictions, they are dangerous. States with more abortion restrictions tend to have poorer health outcomes for women and children than any other States. This will harm children and it will harm women.

So what right are we going to use the Constitution to remove next? Are we going to ban the usage of IVF? Are we going reduce access to contraception? Are we going to criminalize doctors who provide care to patients? Are we going to ban abortions entirely like they did in Tennessee? Because what we are doing here is an abortion-access ban—

The SPEAKER. The gentlelady will please suspend. Your time has expired.

The Chair wanted to thank both leaders for coming to an agreement to rapidly wrap up debate; however, I do know that there are members on both sides of the aisle who were seeking recognition who wish to submit remarks for the record. The clerk has been notified that you will be preparing those remarks and may do so.

### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentlewoman rise?

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that courtesy.

What length of time will we have to submit those remarks for the record, please?

The SPEAKER. Any time in the next couple days will be just fine, Representative DeLissio. We have notified the clerk that members still needed to type up their remarks, that they were intending to give their speeches, and that they can expect remarks over the weekend and through Monday.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate that and my constituents appreciate that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

The Chair will look to both leaders.

Does either leader wish to speak on the underlying bill?

### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

Mr. STEPHENS. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. You may state your parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STEPHENS. This bill contemplates four separate and distinct constitutional amendments, and I was wondering whether this bill is divisible?

The SPEAKER. For the information of the members, the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry is, is the bill divisible? According to rule 63, "Division of a Question. Any member may call for a division of a question by the House, if it comprehends propositions so distinct and separate that one being taken away, the other will stand as a complete proposition for the decision of the House. Bills and resolutions" however "shall not be subject to division."

That would only apply to amendments, Representative Stephens.

Mr. STEPHENS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments to House amendments?

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 following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—107

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

NAYS—92

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—3

Kaufer                      Kerwin                      Mihalek

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments to House amendments were concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Before I lose the members' attention, I would like to remind the members to please clean out their desks prior to exiting the floor this evening, as there will be no further votes this evening.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander, rise?

Ms. OBERLANDER. Correct the record, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You are in order and may proceed, ma'am.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Representative from Bucks County, Representative Farry, would like to be recorded as a "no" on SB 1222, and I do believe that that was voted on yesterday. He was originally recorded as a "yes" and should be a "no." SB 1222. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and your comments will be spread upon the record.

For the information of the members, there will be some housekeeping here that we will do.

COMMUNICATION FROM GOVERNOR

VETO OF HOUSE BILL

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

**HB 972, PN 2886.**

Said bill having been returned with the following message:

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
Office of the Governor  
Harrisburg

July 8, 2022

TO THE HONORABLE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Pursuant to Article IV, Section 15 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, I am returning herewith, without my approval, House Bill 972, Printer's Number 2886.

This discriminatory legislation would prohibit transgender girls and women from participating on women's athletic teams or sports. The bill denies opportunities to transgender youth, which would have a devastating impact on a vulnerable population already at greater risk of bullying and depression. The harmful impact of politicizing transgender

and other LGBTQ+ issues is evident by increasing rates of suicidal thoughts among LGBTQ+ young people. Even if enacted, this bill would face legal challenges for violating federal law and constitutional guarantees of equal protection.

My Administration is committed to supporting transgender individuals and ensuring that Pennsylvania is an inclusive place, and we stand against efforts to divide us and distract us from critical work needed to enhance protections for LGBTQ+ Pennsylvanians. LGBTQ+ youth with supportive parents and caregivers, schools, and communities report lower rates of attempting suicide and better mental health. To the LGBTQ+ community in Pennsylvania and around the country, and especially to our transgender and nonbinary youth and young people: I see you, I support you, I respect you, and I stand with you.

For the reasons set forth above, I must withhold my signature from House Bill 972, Printer's Number 2886.

Sincerely,  
Tom Wolf  
Governor

### **BILL AND VETO MESSAGE PLACED ON CALENDAR**

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the clerk, and the bill and veto message will be placed on the voting calendar.

### **JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED BY SPEAKER**

The Speaker announced that the following bill has passed both houses of the General Assembly and the same being correct, the title was publicly read as follows:

#### **SB 106, PN 1857**

A Joint Resolution proposing separate and distinct amendments to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, providing that there is no constitutional right to taxpayer-funded abortion or other right relating to abortion; further providing for action on concurrent orders and resolutions, for Lieutenant Governor and for qualifications of electors; and providing for election audits.

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

### **BILL RECOMMITTED**

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that SB 736 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

### **BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE**

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that SB 347 and SB 562 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar:

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

### **BILLS TABLED**

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that SB 347 and SB 562 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.

### **CALENDAR CONTINUED**

### **BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1151, PN 1207**, 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 Revenue, repealing provisions relating to vehicle and tractor codes.

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

### **BILL TABLED**

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 1151 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 1151 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 2580, PN 3093**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in marriage license, repealing provisions relating to waiting period after application and further providing for issuance of license.

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

**BILL TABLED**

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HB 2580 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 2580 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.

**RESOLUTION**

Mr. BENNINGHOFF called up **HR 117, PN 1878**, entitled:

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

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolution?

**RESOLUTION TABLED**

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 117 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

**RESOLUTION REMOVED FROM TABLE**

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that HR 117 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.

**SELECT COMMITTEE APPOINTED**

The SPEAKER. Additionally, the Speaker wishes to notify the members of a select committee.

The following communication was read:

July 8, 2022  
In the House of Representatives

Pursuant to House Resolution 216 of 2022, the Speaker of the House appoints the following members to the Select Committee on Restoring Law and Order, including three members of the majority party and two members of the minority party of the House of Representatives:

Representative John Lawrence – Chair  
Representative Wendi Thomas  
Representative Torren Ecker  
Representative Amen Brown  
Representative Danilo Burgos

**REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD**

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of SB 106. What a great, momentous, historical occasion that we saw just a few weeks ago: our highest court, after 50 years and 63 million babies' lives lost – the greatest injustice of all time – chose life again. It has now been put into the hands of the States. I do believe my children and my children's children will not know of a time in America that we killed our most innocent among us. As Clarence Thomas said, "North is still north, and right is still right..."

No, this constitutional amendment will not change the current law, but I am here to state and let the nation know that the future of the Commonwealth, the seed of a nation, will choose life. We now have the upper hand. A new day is upon us in this country. A new day is upon us in Pennsylvania. A new birth of freedom.

I am asking my colleagues for a "yes" vote for this constitutional amendment. Stand up for those who cannot speak for themselves.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD**

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

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the debate here this evening runs a risk of misleading people. I keep hearing people comment that the aspects of SB 106 limiting rights to abortion relate to stopping the Commonwealth from paying for elective abortions. That is an unclear statement – no elective abortions are currently paid for by taxpayers – and asserting that they are is factually inaccurate. I will repeat: No elective abortions in this Commonwealth are paid for with Commonwealth funds. However, some here would have you believe that is all SB 106 is seeking to prohibit, glossing over the second half of this proposed amendment to our Constitution, which provides that there is no constitutional right to an abortion.

Those making such comments also state that the Abortion Control Act would continue to be the law of the Commonwealth and that abortion would remain legal. They are also many of the same people who sponsor legislation prohibiting abortion and have publicly and repeatedly stated that their goal is to end abortion access in this Commonwealth. Most importantly, they are the ones who have the power to enact prohibitions on abortion and overturn or significantly modify the Abortion Control Act.

Imagine if the language were altered – what if this amendment stated there was "no constitutional right to taxpayer-funded firearms or other right relating to firearms"? Like elective abortions, taxpayers already do not pay for private citizens to own guns, so nothing there would change,

and it would not change the laws in the Commonwealth regarding firearms. It would, however, open the door for those who want to change our firearm laws.

Such an alteration in our Constitution would send a clear message of changes to come and the intent to make such changes; so too should this proposed amendment to our Constitution. One could assert that it is disingenuous to hide behind implication that this only seeks to change payments for something taxpayers do not pay for. Let us be clear: This constitutional amendment is the first step in a path to strip women in the Commonwealth from obtaining abortions. It will ensure that a court cannot grant any right to or exception for abortion once the law is changed.

Should HB 904, which is a near total ban on abortion – limiting access 7-14 days after an expected missed period – pass, a court could infer no right to an abortion. There is no language in such a bill creating an exception for rape or incest. No language protecting the health of the mother. The child rape victims I represented, preteens, would have to carry to term. A woman diagnosed with a deadly form of cancer who needs to terminate 3 weeks after her missed period may not be entitled to lifesaving cancer care. A woman with an ectopic pregnancy would have to be in imminent risk of death to obtain an abortion to save her life. A court would not be able to intercede.

If we are going to take people's rights to control their own bodies away from them, let us at least have the decency to be clear with them what they are voting on.

Our Constitution is the very foundation of our Commonwealth and our rights. It is a sacred document. I have stated in the past my concerns about governing by constitutional fiat. We must always remember that we exist in a system of checks and balances with other duly elected officials. Using the constitutional amendment process in order to avoid court determinations or gubernatorial vetoes, as we have in recent years, is beneath us as a chamber and undermines the foundation and balance of our government.

Ideally, things should be taken to the voters and in fact already have been taken to the voters as they made their choices for their Governor, their judges, and their legislators. For partisan purposes, this body has been manipulating the constitutional amendment process, and therefore voters, for far too long. We need to stop.

We took an oath to this Constitution and must stop undermining it. Our continued refusal to bring up bills to fix the constitutional amendment process illustrates our unwillingness to undertake this process in a fair and consistent manner. Sometimes, to confuse this process, we ask unclear questions, such as when we asked whether judges should have to retire when they turn 75 instead of asking whether the judicial age of retirement should be raised from 70 to 75. Inferring taxpayers are paying for elective abortions, when they are not, muddies the water, hiding the actual intent of the amendment and is disingenuous. Only placing ballot measures on primary elections, which have significantly less turnout and where many voters who are not Republicans or Democrats think they are not able to vote, means that we are not really taking this to the voters. Refusing to hold policy hearings or other information sessions to hear from the public or educate them also shows our intent. Refusing to run any proposed constitutional amendment or amendments thereto sponsored by Democrats further illustrates the abuse of this process for partisan gains.

Our abuse of the constitutional amendment process is further illustrated by the fact that these methods work. In the 2021 primary election, only around 12 percent of voting-eligible Pennsylvanians voted to modify our constitution. Having our Constitution amended by 12 percent of Pennsylvania adults is not representative of our citizens. However, we as a body have embraced this system to avoid checks and balances from the judicial and executive branches – all of whom were elected by more voters than any one of us – and we do not seem to care that we are manipulating our Constitution for partisan gain.

I believe that abortion is essential health care and that I have no business interjecting myself into sometimes difficult decisions best made by a woman and her physician. I am and always have been very clear in

my belief in the fundamental right to reproductive autonomy. I think that the people of Pennsylvania deserve the same level of clarity from this General Assembly. Instead of obfuscating the intent of this amendment, let us be clear for the sake of the people we represent. This amendment states that there is no right to abortion in the Commonwealth. Instead of undermining our constitutional amendment process, let us protect the very foundation of our government by ensuring the questions we ask are clear, that policy hearings and listening tours are undertaken, and that we place all constitutional questions on general election ballots.

## REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Pennsylvania is the birthplace of the U.S. Constitution in more ways than one. Not only did we physically host the Constitutional Convention in 1787, but the Quaker-inspired Pennsylvania Charter of Privileges also formed the philosophical framework for our nation's supreme law of the land. In 1701, the charter read, in part, "...no People can be truly happy, though under the greatest Enjoyment of Civil Liberties, if abridged of the Freedom of their Consciences,..." Freedom of religion and many other civil liberties found their first foothold in the American spirit in this document. Our own State Constitution mirrors the Federal one and has a history of being amended only when the issue is serious, and the final change is well-considered.

In the more than 300 years since that first Charter of Privileges, Pennsylvania has only affirmed and recognized rights. It has never banned or taken a right away. If SB 106 and the five separate amendments it includes become law, two rights will be curtailed and a third will be placed in direct conflict with the new Constitution. This is not a well-considered legislative proposal. It is one that would slice a cut deep into the heart of our freedom.

First, SB 106 includes an anti-abortion provision that would take away the reproductive rights of any person who can become pregnant. In just six words, this amendment would stop protecting "...ANY OTHER RIGHT RELATING TO ABORTION." This amendment would continue the error of the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Dobbs*, where Justice Samuel Alito gave credibility to a 17th century judge who presided over witch trials. A sense of history is important, but to me, the stronger principle from the 17th century is the recognition of freedom as an expression of individual conscience. The SB 106 abortion provision would violate the rights to bodily autonomy and self-determination. It would directly abridge the "Freedom of their Consciences" that we have held dear for more than 300 years.

For my part, I trust people to make the right decisions for themselves and their families in consultation with their doctor. Any person who is pregnant or who can become pregnant should be free to have a safe, legal abortion, and to make other health-care decisions without our government telling them what they cannot do.

Another right that would be restricted under SB 106 is the right to vote. Two amendments would require a voter ID every time you vote and require a State-led audit. The voter ID provision might sound like a good idea, but it would disenfranchise groups like the elderly, the disabled, people living in poverty, and returning citizens who do not have the ability to get a correct, up-to-date, legal ID on a regular basis.

These provisions are also dangerous because they buy in to the Big Lie that the fairness of our elections is at risk. The only risk to our elections are provisions like these that would place obstacles to exercising the most fundamental right to citizenship. There is no problem of rampant fraud – or even significant fraud – in any recent election. However, if these ideas are enshrined in the Constitution, our Republic will suffer because thousands, perhaps millions, of people will have to jump through more bureaucratic hoops just to vote. Our system requires that when one party loses an election, it accepts that result. It should not be allowed to change the rules just because their candidate lost.



Finally, SB 106 contains a regulatory review provision that would allow a simple majority of legislators to overturn administrative regulations. The current constitutional provision requires a two-thirds majority to take this action. This is important because it takes away an important part of our checks and balances between the three branches of government. Just like the recognition of individual freedom of conscience, our system is based on the idea that the three separate but equal parts of the government – the Governor, the legislature, and the courts – can "check and balance" each other. A supermajority, like the two-thirds vote required to overturn administrative action, is part of that system because it avoids a yo-yo effect where policies change with every election. It also avoids going to extremes and keeps policies closer to the political center.

These amendments are rolling through the legislature because a single party has control there but does not control the Governor nor the courts. They are a desperate grab at absolute power. I am asking the final decisionmakers – our voters – to place themselves in the shoes of the disabled, the disenfranchised, the pregnant teenager. Recognize that in an instant, we could just as easily be on the outside looking in. We need to maintain a system that protects everyone, not just a select few. I will continue to oppose bills like SB 106, and I will vote against legislation that includes these dangerous constitutional amendments in the next session.

### REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Mr. Speaker, as we stand here and debate this issue, Pennsylvania is in a health-care crisis. We are in a hospital consolidation crisis. We have health-care deserts in PA, even in our very wealthiest counties. Just this year, Chester County has lost two hospitals. And even before the total hospital closures – even in hospitals that remain open – the first services to close are the maternity units. Driving the cost of malpractice insurance for providers through the roof with restrictive, livelihood-threatening policies will drive ob-gyns from providing their services in PA. Fear of restrictions and legal repercussions will make already limited access to fertility care extremely inaccessible to Pennsylvanians. Imagine the day when Pennsylvanians have to drive to New York or New Jersey just to access essential personal health-care services. Or the day when they need to be rushed there by ambulance because the lifesaving, emergency health care they need is either not legal or not accessible in our State. An aggressively worsening shortage of ob-gyn providers will make emergency obstetric care more and more scarce and unavailable to pregnant people who do not have the ability or time to travel or be transported in order to save their lives and/or the lives of their babies.

Currently 13 out of 1000 women in PA terminate a pregnancy for any reason. Pennsylvania's current abortion rate is 1.3 percent, and the rate of abortion nationwide has dropped in half as access to sexual and reproductive health care and education has become more readily available. Pennsylvania's new Maternal Mortality Review Committee report, the first statewide look at these data, found that pregnancy-associated death was on the rise in the State even before the pandemic, increasing by 21 percent from 2013 to 2018. Make no mistake, Pennsylvania's already growing maternal mortality rate will skyrocket. Patients will die. And not just the pregnant individuals who elect to have an abortion for any reason. All people in need of obstetric or gynecological care will be at greater risk.

As a legislature, as a State government body, we have absolutely no business enshrining the individual religious beliefs of only one of the many diverse religious groups in the United States in our Constitution. Instead, let us focus on an evidence-based solution to driving down the rate of abortions in Pennsylvania: Investing in comprehensive and universal local access to health care in our Commonwealth. Corporate for-profit hospitals in Pennsylvania are prioritizing their bottom lines over the health and safety of our communities in Pennsylvania. Let us

focus on where the real problem exists, and not exploit Pennsylvania's Constitution to advance a religious, nationalist agenda.

The Pennsylvania Constitution states:

"§1. Inherent rights of mankind.

"All men are born equally free and independent, and have certain inherent and indefeasible rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing and protecting property and reputation, and of pursuing their own happiness."

"§26. No discrimination by Commonwealth and its political subdivisions.

"Neither the Commonwealth nor any political subdivision thereof shall deny to any person the enjoyment of any civil right, nor discriminate against any person in the exercise of any civil right.

"(May 16, 1967, P.L.1035, J.R.1)"

"§28. Prohibition against denial or abridgment of equality of rights because of sex.

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania because of the sex of the individual.

"(May 18, 1971, P.L.767, J.R.2)"

"§3. Religious freedom.

"All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry against his consent; no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience, and no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishments or modes of worship."

Government mandated birth is Fascism. It is un-American. It is the very definition of "tyranny."

In 1776, with her husband, John Adams, attending the Continental Congress, future First Lady Abigail Adams wrote, "...in the new code of laws which I suppose it will be necessary for you to make, I desire you would remember the ladies and be more generous and favorable to them than your ancestors. Do not put such unlimited power into the hands of the husbands. Remember, all men would be tyrants if they could. If particular care and attention is not paid to the ladies, we are determined to foment a rebellion, and will not hold ourselves bound by any laws in which we have no voice or representation."

Do not be fooled, Mr. Speaker; this vote changes everything.

### REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to vehemently oppose SB 106. Let me begin by saying, we are here on a Friday evening discussing failed policy attempts. Instead of doing our jobs, which is to fully carry out the legislative process, we are here talking about how we could instead slip an overwhelmingly unpopular pro-life agenda and other dangerous items under voters' noses, potentially during a traditionally low turnout election like a municipal primary. This constitutional amendment, and the flawed process by which it can be secured, would not be "the people's choice." The constitutional amendment process is sacred, not a work-around.

Our PA Constitution is the foundation for our entire system of State government and enumerates our most fundamental rights as residents of the Commonwealth. Amending it is not a process that should be taken lightly. Understandably, it does need to be done on occasion. In that case, we need to ensure that every voice is heard – not just a select few. Posing a ballot question during an election with notoriously low turnout – for example, a municipal primary where as few as 10 percent of voters come out – is not "the people's choice." In case you forgot, democracy works best when everyone participates.

Earlier I called the pro-life agenda unpopular. This is because we know that the majority of Pennsylvanians support access to abortion, at the very least under certain circumstances. I have heard several times

now, "this bill will not ban abortion." This may be true, but it is the first step toward outlawing abortion in this Commonwealth, revoking its constitutional protections. And why would we not trust these statements, because all of this is based on the current activist U.S. Supreme Court – three of whom were appointed by a President who did not win the popular vote – and those justices undid 50 years of precedent that each of them assured us they would leave in place when they lied during their confirmation hearings. It is a house of cards, Mr. Speaker.

I urge you all to remember that banning abortions only bans safe abortions. Without constitutional safeguards to bodily autonomy, reproductive rights can quickly disintegrate – and people will die because of it.

If we want to truly leave this matter up to the people we represent, let us do it during a Presidential or gubernatorial election where voters come out in droves, where "the people" will truly speak. If the goal is to exclude the majority of voters from this decision and minimize Pennsylvanians' voices, for whom are we changing the State Constitution?

Not only is revoking individual rights to one's own body an incomprehensibly wrong and disturbing topic to debate within a legislature, but to leave it up to just a sliver of Pennsylvania's voters is a total betrayal of the democratic ideals on which the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania rests.

I urge you to vote "no" on SB 106.

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

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

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The SPEAKER. The Speaker is in receipt of a motion made by the gentleman, Representative Brett Miller, that this House do now adjourn until Monday, September 12, 2022, at 12 m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to, and at 10:02 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.