

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14, 2023

SESSION OF 2023

207TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 27

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (ROBERT F. MATZIE) PRESIDING

PRAYER

HON. ALEC J. RYNCAVAGE, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Heavenly Father, we come to You today with gratitude, thankful for Your goodness to us. We know that every good gift comes from You, and You have truly blessed the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

As members of this Assembly, we recognize that we are simply stewards, entrusted by the people with the solemn responsibility of protecting and promoting the rights and freedoms and the very rights and freedoms You have given us.

Help us appreciate the needs and concerns of the people so we can do right by them and serve their interests well. Help us to be prudent with the resources placed in our care so that the needs of the people are met.

We ask these things, seeking Your will in all we do, so that Your hand of blessing may be upon us and our Commonwealth. We ask this in Your honor and glory. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Tuesday, June 13, 2023, will be postponed until printed.

HOUSE RESOLUTION INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 152 By Representatives BULLOCK, KINSEY, N. NELSON, PARKER, SMITH-WADE-EL, KHAN, KRAJEWSKI, MAYES, YOUNG, ABNEY, BELLMON, A. BROWN, BURGOS, CEPEDA-FREYTIZ, CEPHAS, CURRY, DAWKINS, FLEMING, GIRAL, GREEN, GUZMAN,

HARRIS, HILL-EVANS, KAZEEM, KENYATTA, KIM, MADSEN, McCLINTON, RABB, SCOTT, VENKAT, D. WILLIAMS, SANCHEZ, VITALI, MERSKI, HADDOCK, MADDEN, D. MILLER, HOHENSTEIN, BOROWSKI, SAMUELSON, DELLOSO, STEELE, CIRESI, BRENNAN, MALAGARI and SCHLOSSBERG

A Resolution recognizing June 19, 2023, as "Juneteenth Independence Day" in Pennsylvania in recognition of June 19, 1865, the date on which slavery was abolished finally in all regions of the United States.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, June 14, 2023.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 1388 By Representatives GROVE, KAUFFMAN, ZIMMERMAN, JAMES and ROWE

An Act amending Title 72 (Taxation and Fiscal Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for Commonwealth capital improvement plans, for duties of State agencies, for debt limit for capital projects, for prohibition on exceeding debt limit for capital projects and for legislative oversight; and making editorial changes.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, June 14, 2023.

No. 1403 By Representatives BERNSTINE and KEEFER

An Act amending the act of May 22, 1951 (P.L.317, No.69), known as The Professional Nursing Law, further providing for fees and qualifications for licensure, for education programs, approved lists, distribution and student credits where school removed from list and for certified registered nurse practitioners and qualifications.

Referred to Committee on PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE, June 14, 2023.

No. 1405 By Representatives GREEN, SANCHEZ, ISAACSON, KINSEY, DELLOSO, N. NELSON, FLEMING, KRAJEWSKI, OTTEN and CURRY

An Act amending the act of January 17, 1968 (P.L.11, No.5), known as The Minimum Wage Act of 1968, further providing for definitions and for minimum wages; providing for tipped employees; and further providing for civil actions and for preemption.

Referred to Committee on LABOR AND INDUSTRY, June 14, 2023.

No. 1406 By Representatives MUNROE, MADDEN, KINSEY, GIRAL, SCHLOSSBERG, R. MACKENZIE, McNEILL, SANCHEZ, HILL-EVANS, D. WILLIAMS, CIRESI, CONKLIN, WAXMAN, DONAHUE, T. DAVIS, DELLOSO, STEELE, CERRATO and GREEN

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, in realty transfer tax, further providing for excluded transactions.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, June 14, 2023.

No. 1409 By Representatives KULIK, MALONEY, HILL-EVANS, SANCHEZ, ADAMS, HADDOCK, HOHENSTEIN, STEELE, MULLINS, DELLOSO, GERGELY, McNEILL, JOZWIAK, NEILSON, KERWIN, T. JONES, KUTZ, MOUL, FEE and COOK

An Act amending Title 30 (Fish) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission, further providing for power to set fees; and, in fishing licenses, further providing for license, permit and issuing agent fees.

Referred to Committee on GAME AND FISHERIES, June 14, 2023.

No. 1410 By Representatives McCLINTON, KINSEY, WAXMAN, McNEILL, KHAN, MADDEN, KINKEAD, HILL-EVANS, HANBIDGE, SCHLOSSBERG, HOHENSTEIN, MALAGARI, PROBST, SMITH-WADE-EL, D. WILLIAMS, BURGOS, KENYATTA, SANCHEZ, HOWARD, SCOTT, STEELE, CEPEDA-FREYTIZ and PARKER

A Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, further providing for pardoning power and Board of Pardons.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, June 14, 2023.

No. 1411 By Representatives KEEFER, HAMM, JAMES, STAMBAUGH, D'ORSIE, ROWE, ZIMMERMAN and LEADBETER

An Act prohibiting Commonwealth entities from expending certain funds on association dues.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, June 14, 2023.

No. 1412 By Representatives KEEFER, CIRESI, PICKETT, ROWE, ZIMMERMAN, GLEIM, LEADBETER and LAWRENCE

An Act amending Title 62 (Procurement) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in source selection and contract formation, further providing for debarment or suspension.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, June 14, 2023.

No. 1413 By Representatives KEEFER, STAATS, GLEIM, HAMM, M. MACKENZIE, M. JONES, KAUFFMAN, JOZWIAK, ROWE, LEADBETER, ZIMMERMAN and SMITH

An Act prohibiting the requirement of vaccinations by certain public and private entities, protecting freedom of worship, maintaining the openness of the Pennsylvania State Capitol Building and legislative meetings and proceedings, protecting the operation of private businesses and prohibiting stay-at-home orders and curfews.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, June 14, 2023.

No. 1414 By Representatives RYNCAVAGE and PROBST

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in pupils and attendance, providing for use of geolocation system for attendance in cyber school program.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, June 14, 2023.

No. 1415 By Representatives DEASY, MALAGARI, PISCIOTTANO, KINSEY, HANBIDGE, HILL-EVANS, HARKINS, MADDEN, BENHAM, SANCHEZ, McNEILL, CIRESI, DELLOSO, CONKLIN, FREEMAN, KINKEAD, NEILSON, RADER, FLEMING, MARSHALL, STURLA, BOYLE, SHUSTERMAN, BOROWSKI, SAPPEY, KIM, N. NELSON, KHAN, INNAMORATO, OTTEN, D. WILLIAMS, GREEN, WARREN, VENKAT, BRIGGS, CERRATO and ISAACSON

An Act amending Titles 24 (Education) and 71 (State Government) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in membership, contributions and benefits, providing for supplemental annuity commencing 2023; and, in benefits, providing for supplemental annuity commencing 2023.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, June 14, 2023.

No. 1416 By Representatives MALAGARI, DEASY, MADDEN, HOHENSTEIN, VENKAT, McNEILL, SANCHEZ, SIEGEL, HILL-EVANS, FREEMAN, HOWARD, DELLOSO, HANBIDGE, WARREN, BENHAM, KINKEAD, OTTEN, CERRATO, SCHWEYER, ISAACSON, NEILSON, ZABEL, BRIGGS, CONKLIN, CIRESI, GREEN, R. MACKENZIE, FLEMING, TAKAC, D. WILLIAMS, INNAMORATO, BOROWSKI and STURLA

An Act amending Titles 24 (Education) and 71 (State Government) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in membership, contributions and benefits, providing for supplemental annuity commencing 2023; and, in benefits, providing for supplemental annuity commencing 2023.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, June 14, 2023.

No. 1417 By Representatives INNAMORATO, GAYDOS, KINKEAD, HILL-EVANS, McNEILL, SAMUELSON, RABB, HOWARD, MADDEN, SCHLOSSBERG, SANCHEZ, WARREN, KINSEY, DELLOSO, KHAN, SMITH-WADE-EL, STURLA, TAKAC, D. WILLIAMS, MULLINS, CERRATO, DONAHUE, ISAACSON, FRANKEL, KRAJEWSKI, BOROWSKI, O'MARA, T. DAVIS, SCHWEYER, KIM, FLEMING, YOUNG, KULIK, WAXMAN, GERGELY, MERSKI, STEELE, KAZEEM, GUENST and HANBIDGE

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Human Services Code, in public assistance, further providing for reimbursement for certain medical assistance items and services; and abrogating regulations.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, June 14, 2023.

No. 1418 By Representatives SHUSTERMAN, KAZEEM, MADDEN, HILL-EVANS, HOWARD, WARREN, SANCHEZ, SCOTT, SAPPEY, CEPEDA-FREYITZ, WAXMAN, STEELE, HOHENSTEIN, KINSEY and SMITH-WADE-EL

An Act amending the act of November 22, 1978 (P.L.1166, No.274), referred to as the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency Law, further providing for definitions and for powers and duties of the commission; providing for racial impact statement for juvenile matters laws; further providing for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Committee; and establishing the Youth Advisory Board and the Juvenile Nonresidential Evidence-based Practices Fund.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, June 14, 2023.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. We have some guest pages to recognize this morning.

Seated with the House pages on their bench, Representative Fleming has a guest, Violet Gill. Representative O'Neal has a guest, Allie West. Representative Kim has a guest, Nate Kubasko. Please rise and welcome them to the hall of the House.

To the left of the Speaker, Representative Sturla welcomes Nikki Rivera to the House. Ms. Rivera is a member of the Manheim Township School Board. Welcome. Please rise and be recognized.

Representative Struzzi welcomes Hadley Lawer and her parents, Sara and Andrew Lawer. Hadley suffers from and is here to raise awareness about juvenile arthritis, and July is Juvenile Arthritis Awareness Month. Welcome.

Representative Hill-Evans is hosting Cody Santiago. Since 2022 Mr. Santiago has served as the director of the York County Offices of Emergency Management and has served York County in public service roles since 2005. He has made it a priority to foster relationships with law enforcement, fire departments, EMS (emergency medical services), and county agencies to prepare a streamlined and seamless approach for future disasters. Welcome.

We have some extra special guests here. Representative Ecker's family is visiting the Capitol today. Please welcome his wife, Laura; daughter, Addy; and son, Oliver. Welcome.

In the gallery, Representative Ecker is also pleased to be hosting the Pennsylvania State Grange royalty. They are junior ambassadors, Danni Wilcox, Tyler Davis, and Logen Smith; and youth directors, Phil Vonada and Jen Danko. Welcome.

Also in the gallery, Representative Kauffman is hosting the Bowman family, who are his constituents. They are Terry and Diana Bowman, and their five children, Annika, Conner, Drew, Lance, and Janae. They are homeschooled, and Annika just graduated. Congratulations, Annika.

Representatives Kauffman and Gleim welcome the 2022 Cumberland Ag Expo Little Miss Queen, Tenley Timmons, and the 2022 Cumberland Ag Expo Junior Queen, Jordan Kann. They are here with their parents and pageant coordinators. Congratulations, and welcome.

Representative Shusterman has her interns from her district office here today. They are Suzie Ahn, an honors student at Georgetown University, where she is a double major in government and psychology. And Alexander Hallam, who is

attending George Washington University's Elliott School of International Affairs with a concentration in conflict resolution. Welcome.

Representative Ryncavage invited his district staffers here today to be here for his offering of the session opening prayer. They are Barbara Harvey, Maribeth Rosensteel, and Beth Clemow. Welcome.

Representative Cepeda-Freytiz is also hosting her district office staff and interns in the Capitol today. They are interns Aidan Schmidt from Hofstra University, Jack Kirchner from George Washington University, Jaylen Gwyn from Penn State University, and Lily Thomas from Albright university. Welcome.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Are there requests for leaves of absence?

The Chair recognizes the majority whip, who says there are no requested leaves of absence.

The Chair recognizes the minority whip, who also states there are no requests for leaves of absence.

MASTER ROLL CALL

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

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—203

Abney	Flick	Krupa	Rapp
Adams	Flood	Kulik	Rigby
Armanini	Frankel	Kutz	Roae
Banta	Freeman	Kuzma	Rossi
Barton	Friel	Labs	Rowe
Bellmon	Fritz	Lawrence	Rozzi
Benham	Gallagher	Leadbeter	Ryncavage
Benningshoff	Galloway	Mackenzie, M.	Salisbury
Bernstine	Gaydos	Mackenzie, R.	Samuelson
Bizzarro	Gergely	Madden	Sanchez
Bonner	Gillen	Madsen	Sappay
Borowicz	Giral	Major	Schemel
Borowski	Gleim	Mako	Scheuren
Boyd	Green	Malagari	Schlegel
Boyle	Gregory	Maloney	Schlossberg
Bradford	Greiner	Marcell	Schmitt
Brennan	Grove	Markosek	Schweyer
Briggs	Guenst	Marshall	Scialabba
Brown, A.	Guzman	Matzie	Scott
Brown, M.	Haddock	Mayes	Shusterman
Bullock	Hamm	McAndrew	Siegel
Burgos	Hanbidge	McNeill	Smith
Burns	Harkins	Mehaffie	Smith-Wade-El
C Freytiz	Harris	Mentzer	Solomon
Cabell	Heffley	Mercuri	Staats
Causar	Hogan	Merski	Stambaugh
Cephas	Hohenstein	Metzgar	Steele
Cerrato	Howard	Mihalek	Stehr
Ciresi	Innamorato	Miller, B.	Stender
Conklin	Irvin	Miller, D.	Struzzi
Cook	Isaacson	Moul	Sturla
Cooper	James	Mullins	Takac
Curry	Jones, M.	Munroe	Tomlinson
Cutler	Jones, T.	Mustello	Topper
D'Orsie	Jozwiak	Neilson	Twardzik
Daley	Kail	Nelson, E.	Venkat
Davanzo	Kaufner	Nelson, N.	Vitali
Davis	Kauffman	O'Mara	Warner

Dawkins	Kazeem	O'Neal	Warren
Deasy	Keefer	Oberlander	Watro
Delloso	Kenyatta	Ortitay	Waxman
Delozier	Kephart	Otten	Webster
Diamond	Kerwin	Owlett	Wentling
Donahue	Khan	Parker	White
Dunbar	Kim	Pashinski	Williams, C.
Ecker	Kinthead	Pickett	Williams, D.
Emrick	Kinsey	Pielli	Young
Evans	Klunk	Pisciottano	Zimmerman
Fee	Kosierowski	Probst	
Fiedler	Krajewski	Rabb	McClinton,
Fink	Krueger	Rader	Speaker
Fleming			

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

HB 544, PN 1588 (Amended) By Rep. BRIGGS

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in protection from abuse, providing for waiver of fee for corrected or duplicate State documents.

JUDICIARY.

HB 1108, PN 1164 By Rep. BRIGGS

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in preliminary provisions relating to divorce, further providing for legislative findings and intent, for definitions and for effect of agreement between parties; and, in property rights, further providing for equitable division of marital property.

JUDICIARY.

HB 1171, PN 1236 By Rep. SOLOMON

An Act amending the act of February 11, 1998 (P.L.58, No.15), known as the Combustible and Flammable Liquids Act, further providing for regulations.

VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS.

HB 1210, PN 1283 By Rep. BRIGGS

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in protection from abuse, further providing for relief, for emergency relief by minor judiciary and for arrest for violation of order.

JUDICIARY.

HB 1280, PN 1396

By Rep. BRIGGS

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.177, No.175), known as The Administrative Code of 1929, in administrative organization, further providing for Pennsylvania State Police.

JUDICIARY.

BILL REPORTED AND REREFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE

HB 1329, PN 1465

By Rep. SOLOMON

An Act authorizing the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to join the Interstate Compact; providing for the form of the compact; imposing additional powers and duties on the Governor, the Secretary of the Commonwealth and the Compact.

Reported from Committee on VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS with request that it be rereferred to Committee on PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be so rereferred.

RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority caucus chair, Representative Schlossberg, for a caucus announcement.

Mr. SCHLOSSBERG. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There will be a Rules Committee meeting in the majority caucus room immediately upon the break.

House Democrats will caucus 12 o'clock. We will be prepared to return to the floor at 1:30.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There will be a Rules Committee meeting in the majority caucus room immediately upon the break.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the minority caucus chair, Representative Dunbar, for a caucus announcement.

Mr. DUNBAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Republicans will caucus at 12 o'clock. Republicans will caucus at 12 o'clock.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HEALTH COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority Health Committee chairman, Representative Frankel, for an announcement.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am announcing an immediate meeting of the House Health Committee in room G-50 to consider HB 78, SB 262, HB 1351, HB 1209, HB 1407, HB 807, HB 817, and HB 818; G-50, immediately. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There will be an immediate meeting of the House Health Committee in room G-50.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Representative Mullins, for an announcement.

Mr. MULLINS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House stands in recess until 1:30, unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

RECESS EXTENDED

The time of recess was extended until 2 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

**THE SPEAKER (JOANNA E. McCLINTON)
PRESIDING****GUESTS INTRODUCED**

The SPEAKER. Colleagues, to the left of the Speaker's rostrum, we have some very important people here. We are very excited to welcome our colleague, Representative Kail's entire family. His wife, Abby, and all eight of their children are here today: Solomon, Emmanuel, Annika, Elias, Petra, Cleopatra, Evangelina, and baby Viona, whom we saw last week, is back. Welcome, Kails. Safe trip back to Beaver County. We are so glad to have you.

**HOUSE RESOLUTION
INTRODUCED AND REFERRED**

No. 153 By Representatives BRENNAN, GREEN, KHAN, PARKER, FLICK, PISCIOTTANO, SANCHEZ, HILL-EVANS, SCHLOSSBERG, PIELLI, RABB, HADDOCK, KINSEY, MENTZER, GIRAL, M. JONES, SMITH-WADE-EL, VITALI, KAZEEM and D. WILLIAMS

A Resolution recognizing November 19, 2023, as "Roy Campanella Day" in Pennsylvania.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, June 14, 2023.

**HOUSE BILLS
INTRODUCED AND REFERRED**

No. 1419 By Representatives PIELLI, GALLOWAY, MADDEN and SANCHEZ

An Act amending Title 15 (Corporations and Unincorporated Associations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in foreign associations, further providing for termination of registration.

Referred to Committee on COMMERCE, June 14, 2023.

No. 1420 By Representatives GROVE, R. MACKENZIE, SCHMITT, JAMES, M. MACKENZIE, STAATS, FEE, ORTITAY, JOZWIAK, MENTZER, MOUL, ROWE, GLEIM and STRUZZI

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, as follows: in preliminary provisions, further providing for definitions, repealing provisions relating to public funding of elections, providing for legislative authority over elections, establishing the Bureau of Election Audits and providing for special standing in challenges to the Election Code; in the Secretary of the Commonwealth, further providing for powers and duties of the Secretary of the Commonwealth and providing for reports on implementation of elections; in county boards of elections, further providing for powers and duties of county boards and providing for county boards of elections and satellite offices; in district election officers, further providing for district election boards and election, for qualifications of election officers, for tie votes for judge and inspector, for clerks of election and machine inspectors, for vacancies in election boards, appointment, judge and majority inspector to be members of majority party and minority inspector to be member of minority party, for election officers to be sworn, for oath of judge of election, for oaths of inspectors of election, for oaths of clerks of election, for oath of machine inspectors, for power of election officers to administer oaths, for compensation of district election officers and for appointment of watchers; in election districts and polling places, further providing for polling places to be selected by county board, for public buildings to be used where possible and portable polling places and for temporary polling places; providing for registration of electors; in ballots, further providing for form of official election ballot and for number of ballots to be printed and specimen ballots; in voting machines, further providing for examination and approval of voting machines by the Secretary of the Commonwealth, for requirements of voting machines, for preparation of voting machines by county election boards and for delivery of voting machines and supplies by county election boards to election officers; in electronic voting systems, further providing for experimental use of electronic voting systems and for statistical sample and providing for requirements of accessible voting machines and for voting system defects, disclosure, investigations and penalties; repealing provisions relating to voting apparatus bonds; providing for election equipment funding; in preparation for and conduct of primaries and elections, providing for voter's bill of rights, for senior voter's bill of rights and for disabled voter's bill of rights and further providing for delivery of ballots and supplies to judges of election, for time for opening and closing polls, for opening of polls, posting cards of instruction and notices of penalties and voters' rights and examination of voting machines, for manner of applying to vote, persons entitled to vote, voter's certificates, entries to be made in district register, numbered lists of voters and challenges, for assistance in voting and for deadline for receipt of valid voter registration application and providing for prohibitions; in voting by qualified absentee electors, further providing for applications for official absentee ballots, for date of application for absentee ballot, for delivering or mailing ballots and for voting by absentee electors, providing for supervised voting by qualified absentee electors in certain facilities and further providing for canvassing of official absentee ballots and mail-in ballots; in voting by qualified mail-in electors, further providing for

applications for official mail-in ballots, for date of application for mail-in ballot, for delivering or mailing ballots and for voting by mail-in electors; in Pennsylvania Election Law Advisory Board, further providing for Pennsylvania Election Law Advisory Board; providing for early voting by qualified electors; in returns of primaries and elections, further providing for returns to be open to public inspection and exceptions and for computation of returns by county board, certification and issuance of certificates of election; repealing provisions relating to Election Integrity Grant Program; in recounts and contests, providing for powers and duties of the Attorney General relating to elections and for powers and duties of district attorneys relating to elections; in penalties, further providing for disobeying lawful instructions, for perjury, for false affidavits of candidates, for refusal to permit inspection of papers, destruction or removal and Secretary of the Commonwealth, for refusal to permit inspection of papers, destruction or removal and county boards of elections, for insertion and alteration of entries in documents, removal and refusal to deliver, for refusal to permit overseers, watchers, attorneys or candidates to act, for driving away watchers, attorneys, candidates or overseers, for refusal to permit election officers, clerks and machine inspectors to act and driving away said persons, for refusal to administer oath and acting without being sworn, for violation of oath of office by election officers, for peace officers, failure to render assistance and hindering or delaying county board members and others, for nomination petitions and papers and offenses by signers, for false signatures and statements in nomination petitions and papers, for nomination petitions, certificates and papers, destruction, fraudulent filing and suppression, for offenses by printers of ballots, for unlawful possession of ballots and counterfeiting ballots, for forging and destroying ballots, for tampering with voting machines, for destroying, defacing or removing notices, et cetera, for police officers at polling places, for peace officer, failure to quell disturbances at polls and hindering or delaying election officers and others, for election officers permitting unregistered electors to vote, challenges and refusing to permit qualified electors to vote, for election officers refusing to permit elector to vote in proper party at primaries, for frauds by election officers, for prying into ballots, for interference with primaries and elections, frauds and conspiracy, for persons interfering in other districts, for assault and battery at polls, for unlawful assistance in voting, for election officers permitting unlawful assistance, for failure to keep and return record of assisted voters, for unlawful voting, for elector voting ballot of wrong party at primary, for repeat voting at elections, for removing ballots, for commissioners to take soldiers' votes, for fraudulent voting by soldiers, for bribery at elections, for receipts and disbursements of primary and election expenses by persons other than candidates and treasurers, for receipts of primary and election expenses by unauthorized persons, for contributions by corporations or unincorporated associations, for failure to file expense account, for prohibiting duress and intimidation of voters and interference with the free exercise of the elective franchise, for failure to perform duty, for hindering or delaying performance of duty, for violation of any provision of act and for violations of provisions relating to absentee and mail-in ballots and repealing provisions relating to violation of public funding of elections and providing for unlawful collection of ballots and for prohibiting duress and intimidation of elections officials; providing for reimbursements and withholding; making an appropriation; and making a repeal.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, June 14, 2023.

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

HB 78, PN 1591 (Amended) By Rep. FRANKEL

An Act establishing the Medical Debt Relief Program; establishing requirements for hospital-based financial assistance; and imposing duties on the Department of Health.

HEALTH.

HB 88, PN 77

By Rep. FREEMAN

An Act amending Titles 45 (Legal Notices) and 65 (Public Officers) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in legal advertising, providing for redundant advertising on Internet by political subdivisions or municipal authorities; and, in open meetings, further providing for public notice.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

HB 123, PN 1593 (Amended)

By Rep. FREEMAN

An Act amending the act of July 31, 1968 (P.L.805, No.247), known as the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, in subdivision and land development, providing for signage on subdivision or land development.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

HB 807, PN 765

By Rep. FRANKEL

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 Health and its departmental administrative and advisory boards, providing for perimenopause and menopause education.

HEALTH.

HB 817, PN 774

By Rep. FRANKEL

An Act amending the act of September 27, 1961 (P.L.1700, No.699), known as the Pharmacy Act, further providing for State Board of Pharmacy.

HEALTH.

HB 818, PN 1592 (Amended)

By Rep. FRANKEL

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.177, No.175), known as The Administrative Code of 1929, in powers and duties of the Department of State and its departmental administrative board, establishing the Pharmaceutical Collection Sites Educational Program; and making an appropriation.

HEALTH.

HB 1038, PN 1594 (Amended)

By Rep. FREEMAN

An Act providing for legal effect of surplus personal property disposed of by municipal officials and employees in support of the Ukrainian Government during 2022.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

HB 1209, PN 1279

By Rep. FRANKEL

An Act amending the act of December 30, 2003 (P.L.441, No.64), known as the Tobacco Product Manufacturer Directory Act, in preliminary provisions, further providing for definitions; in tobacco product manufacturers directory, further providing for directory, for certification, for required information, for agent for service of process and for records and reporting and providing for nonparticipating manufacturer and importer joint and several liability and for surety bond requirements; and imposing duties on the Office of Attorney General.

HEALTH.

HB 1216, PN 1595 (Amended) By Rep. FREEMAN

An Act establishing the Municipal Grant Assistance Program and the Municipal Grant Assistance Program Fund; and imposing duties on the Department of Community and Economic Development.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

HB 1230, PN 1321 By Rep. FREEMAN

An Act amending the act of May 1, 1933 (P.L.103, No.69), known as The Second Class Township Code, in auditors and accountants, further providing for surcharge by auditors; and, in township manager, further providing for township manager, appointment, removal, powers and duties, compensation and bond.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

HB 1231, PN 1322 By Rep. FREEMAN

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.177, No.175), known as The Administrative Code of 1929, in organization of departmental administrative boards and commissions and of advisory boards and commissions, further providing for State Planning Board.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

HB 1232, PN 1323 By Rep. FREEMAN

An Act amending Title 8 (Boroughs and Incorporated Towns) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in powers and duties of elected officials, further providing for surcharge by auditors; in powers, duties and rights of appointed officers and employees, further providing for borough manager created by ordinance and election, for powers and duties, for other offices not incompatible and for organization of commission; and, in taxation and finance, further providing for preparation of budget.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

HB 1234, PN 1325 By Rep. FREEMAN

An Act amending Title 11 (Cities) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in city administrator, further providing for appointment of city administrator, for employment agreement, for residency and elective city office and for powers and duties; and, in accounts and finances, further providing for powers and duties of chief fiscal officer.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

HB 1303, PN 1429 By Rep. FREEMAN

An Act amending Title 11 (Cities) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in mayor, further providing for execution of laws, powers of sheriff conferred and emergency powers.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

HB 1351, PN 1493 By Rep. FRANKEL

An Act amending the act of November 27, 2019 (P.L.742, No.108), known as the Pennsylvania Rural Health Redesign Center Authority Act, in Pennsylvania Rural Health Redesign Center Authority, further providing for Pennsylvania Rural Health Redesign Center Authority; and, in Pennsylvania Rural Health Redesign Center Fund, further providing for money in fund.

HEALTH.

HB 1407, PN 1572 By Rep. FRANKEL

An Act amending the act of June 22, 2000 (P.L.394, No.54), known as the Tobacco Settlement Agreement Act, further providing for definitions.

HEALTH.

**BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE,
CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED****SB 262, PN 833** By Rep. FRANKEL

An Act amending the act of May 9, 2018 (P.L.118, No.24), known as the Maternal Mortality Review Act, further providing for maternal mortality review committee and for purpose and duties of committee.

HEALTH.

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEES**HB 614, PN 1123** By Rep. BRADFORD

An Act making appropriations from the Professional Licensure Augmentation Account and from restricted revenue accounts within the General Fund to the Department of State for use by the Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs in support of the professional licensure boards assigned thereto.

RULES.

HB 615, PN 1124 By Rep. BRADFORD

An Act making appropriations from the Workmen's Compensation Administration Fund to the Department of Labor and Industry and the Department of Community and Economic Development to provide for the expenses of administering the Workers' Compensation Act, The Pennsylvania Occupational Disease Act and the Office of Small Business Advocate for the fiscal year July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2023.

RULES.

HB 616, PN 1125 By Rep. BRADFORD

An Act making an appropriation from a restricted revenue account within the General Fund to the Office of Small Business Advocate in the Department of Community and Economic Development.

RULES.

HB 617, PN 1126 By Rep. BRADFORD

An Act making an appropriation from a restricted revenue account within the General Fund to the Office of Consumer Advocate in the Office of Attorney General.

RULES.

HB 618, PN 1127 By Rep. BRADFORD

An Act making appropriations from the Public School Employees' Retirement Fund and from the PSERS Defined Contribution Fund to provide for expenses of the Public School Employees' Retirement Board for the fiscal year July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2023.

RULES.

HB 619, PN 1128 By Rep. BRADFORD

An Act making appropriations from the State Employees' Retirement Fund and from the SERS Defined Contribution Fund to provide for expenses of the State Employees' Retirement Board for the fiscal year July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2023.

RULES.

HB 620, PN 1129 By Rep. BRADFORD

An Act making appropriations from the Philadelphia Taxicab and Limousine Regulatory Fund and the Philadelphia Taxicab Medallion Fund to the Philadelphia Parking Authority for the fiscal year July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024.

RULES.

HB 621, PN 1130 By Rep. BRADFORD

An Act making appropriations from a restricted revenue account within the General Fund and from Federal augmentation funds to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission for the fiscal year July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024.

RULES.

HB 622, PN 1131 By Rep. BRADFORD

An Act making appropriations from the restricted revenue accounts within the State Gaming Fund and from the restricted revenue accounts within the Fantasy Contest Fund and Video Gaming Fund to the Attorney General, the Department of Revenue, the Pennsylvania State Police and the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2023.

RULES.

HB 623, PN 1132 By Rep. BRADFORD

An Act providing for the capital budget for fiscal year 2023-2024.

RULES.

HB 967, PN 1565 By Rep. HARRIS

An Act amending Title 48 (Lodging and Housing) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in hotels, providing for protection of hotel employees; and imposing penalties.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1160, PN 1295 By Rep. HARRIS

An Act amending the act of April 12, 1951 (P.L.90, No.21), known as the Liquor Code, in licenses and regulations and liquor, alcohol and malt and brewed beverages, further providing for sales by liquor licensees and restrictions, for retail dispensers' restrictions on purchases and sales, for breweries and for unlawful acts relative to liquor, malt and brewed beverages and licensees.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1170, PN 1235

By Rep. BRADFORD

An Act amending the act of April 28, 1937 (P.L.417, No.105), known as the Milk Marketing Law, further providing for title of act; in purpose, short title and definitions, further providing for definitions and construction; in organization of the board, further providing for appointment and terms of members and quorum; in licenses of milk dealers, further providing for grounds for refusal, suspension or revocation; in moneys and expenses of board, further providing for expenses and for payment; and, in saving provisions, repealing provisions relating to Joint Study Committee.

RULES.

HB 1207, PN 1277

By Rep. HARRIS

An Act amending Title 68 (Real and Personal Property) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in land banks, further providing for definitions.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1246, PN 1415

By Rep. BRADFORD

An Act providing for crematory regulation.

RULES.

HB 1249, PN 1348

By Rep. BRADFORD

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, providing for Pennsylvania Individual Recruitment and Retention Tax Credit.

RULES.

HB 1283, PN 1399

By Rep. HARRIS

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in rules of the road in general, further providing for additional parking regulations.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1295, PN 1469

By Rep. BRADFORD

An Act amending Title 63 (Professions and Occupations (State Licensed)) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in powers and duties, further providing for hearing examiners.

RULES.

HB 1304, PN 1426

By Rep. HARRIS

An Act amending Title 35 (Health and Safety) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in 911 emergency communication services, further providing for uniform 911 surcharge and for termination.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1305, PN 1427

By Rep. HARRIS

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Human Services Code, providing for behavioral health crisis intervention; and establishing the 988 Fund.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1500, PN 1534

By Rep. BRADFORD

An Act amending the act of January 17, 1968 (P.L.11, No.5), known as The Minimum Wage Act of 1968, further providing for definitions and for minimum wages.

RULES.

CALENDAR**RESOLUTION**

Mr. STRUZZI called up **HR 33, PN 273**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of July 2023 as "Juvenile Arthritis Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the resolution, Representative Struzzi.

Mr. STRUZZI. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you support HR 33, designating July as "Juvenile Arthritis Awareness Month" here in Pennsylvania.

Across this country, roughly about 300,000 children suffer from arthritis, and in most cases, it is juvenile idiopathic arthritis. But unfortunately, many times it goes undetected, and early detection and treatment are vitally important to help these children recover and heal.

And so again I ask you for your support for HB 33 because awareness is vital, and a lot of people do not even realize that juvenile arthritis is an issue. And earlier today I had some guests here from my district, Hadley Lawer and her parents, Sara and Andrew. Hadley was diagnosed at 2 years old in 2016. But her family has rallied around her. She has a lot of supporters. She is just a great kid with a great spirit, and the group that supports her, they are called Hadley's Heroes. Since Hadley has been diagnosed, they have raised more than \$76,000 for juvenile arthritis research and treatment. They also participate in the Walk for the Cure in Pittsburgh.

So I want to draw attention to that young lady, her efforts to promote awareness of juvenile arthritis, and I ask that you support me in this resolution so that we can make more families aware that this condition exists and that there is treatment available, and awareness is key.

So thank you for your support of HR 33, designating July as "Juvenile Arthritis Awareness Month."

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—202

Abney	Flick	Krupa	Rapp
Adams	Flood	Kulik	Rigby
Armanini	Frankel	Kutz	Roae
Banta	Freeman	Kuzma	Rossi
Barton	Friel	Labs	Rowe
Bellmon	Fritz	Lawrence	Rozzi
Benham	Gallagher	Leadbeter	Ryncavage
Benninghoff	Galloway	Mackenzie, M.	Salisbury
Bernstine	Gaydos	Mackenzie, R.	Samuelson
Bizzarro	Gergely	Madden	Sanchez
Bonner	Gillen	Madsen	Sappey
Borowicz	Giral	Major	Schemel
Borowski	Gleim	Mako	Scheuren
Boyd	Green	Malagari	Schlegel
Boyle	Gregory	Maloney	Schlossberg
Bradford	Greiner	Marcell	Schmitt
Brennan	Grove	Markosek	Schweyer
Briggs	Guenst	Marshall	Scialabba
Brown, A.	Guzman	Matzie	Scott
Brown, M.	Haddock	Mayes	Shusterman
Bullock	Hamm	McAndrew	Siegel
Burgos	Hanbidge	McNeill	Smith
Burns	Harkins	Mehaffie	Smith-Wade-El
C Freytiz	Harris	Mentzer	Solomon
Cabell	Heffley	Mercuri	Staats
Causar	Hogan	Merski	Stambaugh
Cephas	Hohenstein	Metzgar	Steele
Cerrato	Howard	Mihalek	Stehr
Ciresi	Innamorato	Miller, B.	Stender
Conklin	Irvin	Miller, D.	Struzzi
Cook	Isaacson	Moul	Sturla
Cooper	James	Mullins	Takac
Curry	Jones, M.	Munroe	Tomlinson
Cutler	Jones, T.	Mustello	Topper
D'Orsie	Jozwiak	Neilson	Twardzik
Daley	Kail	Nelson, E.	Venkat
Davanzo	Kaufner	Nelson, N.	Vitali
Davis	Kauffman	O'Mara	Warner
Dawkins	Kazeem	O'Neal	Warren
Deasy	Keefer	Oberlander	Watro
Delloso	Kenyatta	Ortitay	Waxman
Delozier	Kephart	Otten	Webster
Diamond	Kerwin	Owlett	Wentling
Donahue	Khan	Parker	White
Dunbar	Kim	Pashinski	Williams, C.
Ecker	Kinhead	Pickett	Williams, D.
Emrick	Kinsey	Pielli	Young
Evans	Klunk	Pisciottano	Zimmerman
Fee	Kosierowski	Probst	
Fiedler	Krajewski	Rabb	McClinton,
Fleming	Krueger	Rader	Speaker

NAYS—1

Fink

NOT VOTING—0**EXCUSED—0**

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 615, PN 1124**, entitled:

An Act making appropriations from the Workmen's Compensation Administration Fund to the Department of Labor and Industry and the Department of Community and Economic Development to provide for the expenses of administering the Workers' Compensation Act, The Pennsylvania Occupational Disease Act and the Office of Small Business Advocate for the fiscal year July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2023.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 616, PN 1125**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation from a restricted revenue account within the General Fund to the Office of Small Business Advocate in the Department of Community and Economic Development.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 617, PN 1126**, entitled:

An Act making an appropriation from a restricted revenue account within the General Fund to the Office of Consumer Advocate in the Office of Attorney General.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 618, PN 1127**, entitled:

An Act making appropriations from the Public School Employees' Retirement Fund and from the PSERS Defined Contribution Fund to provide for expenses of the Public School Employees' Retirement Board for the fiscal year July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2023.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 619, PN 1128**, entitled:

An Act making appropriations from the State Employees' Retirement Fund and from the SERS Defined Contribution Fund to provide for expenses of the State Employees' Retirement Board for the fiscal year July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2023.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 620, PN 1129**, entitled:

An Act making appropriations from the Philadelphia Taxicab and Limousine Regulatory Fund and the Philadelphia Taxicab Medallion Fund to the Philadelphia Parking Authority for the fiscal year July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 623, PN 1132**, entitled:

An Act providing for the capital budget for fiscal year 2023-2024.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1170, PN 1235**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 28, 1937 (P.L.417, No.105), known as the Milk Marketing Law, further providing for title of act; in purpose, short title and definitions, further providing for definitions and construction; in organization of the board, further providing for appointment and terms of members and quorum; in licenses of milk dealers, further providing for grounds for refusal, suspension or revocation; in moneys and expenses of board, further providing for expenses and for payment; and, in saving provisions, repealing provisions relating to Joint Study Committee.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1246, PN 1415**, entitled:

An Act providing for crematory regulation.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 614, PN 1123**, entitled:

An Act making appropriations from the Professional Licensure Augmentation Account and from restricted revenue accounts within the General Fund to the Department of State for use by the Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs in support of the professional licensure boards assigned thereto.

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

Mr. **LAWRENCE** offered the following amendment No. **A00973**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 17, by inserting after "verification"
, to fully implement licensure compacts enacted in statute

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

The **SPEAKER**. On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the amendment, Representative Lawrence.

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

The amendment before the House simply adds a little language into the Bureau of Professional and Occupational Licensure's appropriation, just to make sure they are taking a look at the issue of the licensure compact statutes that have been enacted, to make sure that they are implemented, and I would encourage an affirmative vote. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—203

Abney	Flick	Krupa	Rapp
Adams	Flood	Kulik	Rigby
Armanini	Frankel	Kutz	Roae
Banta	Freeman	Kuzma	Rossi
Barton	Friel	Labs	Rowe
Bellmon	Fritz	Lawrence	Rozzi
Benham	Gallagher	Leadbeter	Ryncavage
Benninghoff	Galloway	Mackenzie, M.	Salisbury
Bernstine	Gaydos	Mackenzie, R.	Samuelson
Bizzarro	Gergely	Madden	Sanchez
Bonner	Gillen	Madsen	Sappey
Borowicz	Giral	Major	Schemel
Borowski	Gleim	Mako	Scheuren
Boyd	Green	Malagari	Schlegel
Boyle	Gregory	Maloney	Schlossberg
Bradford	Greiner	Marcell	Schmitt
Brennan	Grove	Markosek	Schweyer
Briggs	Guenst	Marshall	Scialabba
Brown, A.	Guzman	Matzie	Scott
Brown, M.	Haddock	Mayes	Shusterman
Bullock	Hamm	McAndrew	Siegel
Burgos	Hanbidge	McNeill	Smith
Burns	Harkins	Mehaffie	Smith-Wade-El

C Freytiz	Harris	Mentzer	Solomon
Cabell	Heffley	Mercuri	Staats
Causer	Hogan	Merski	Stambaugh
Cephas	Hohenstein	Metzgar	Steele
Cerrato	Howard	Mihalek	Stehr
Ciresi	Innamorato	Miller, B.	Stender
Conklin	Irvin	Miller, D.	Struzzi
Cook	Isaacson	Moul	Sturla
Cooper	James	Mullins	Takac
Curry	Jones, M.	Munroe	Tomlinson
Cutler	Jones, T.	Mustello	Topper
D'Orsie	Jozwiak	Neilson	Twardzik
Daley	Kail	Nelson, E.	Venkat
Davanzo	Kaufner	Nelson, N.	Vitali
Davis	Kauffman	O'Mara	Warner
Dawkins	Kazeem	O'Neal	Warren
Deasy	Keefer	Oberlander	Watro
Delloso	Kenyatta	Ortitay	Waxman
Delozier	Kephart	Otten	Webster
Diamond	Kerwin	Owlett	Wentling
Donahue	Khan	Parker	White
Dunbar	Kim	Pashinski	Williams, C.
Ecker	Kinkead	Pickett	Williams, D.
Emrick	Kinsey	Pielli	Young
Evans	Klunk	Pisciottano	Zimmerman
Fee	Kosierowski	Probst	
Fiedler	Krajewski	Rabb	McClinton,
Fink	Krueger	Rader	Speaker
Fleming			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

The **SPEAKER**. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 622, PN 1131**, entitled:

An Act making appropriations from the restricted revenue accounts within the State Gaming Fund and from the restricted revenue accounts within the Fantasy Contest Fund and Video Gaming Fund to the Attorney General, the Department of Revenue, the Pennsylvania State Police and the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2023.

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

Mr. **ROAE** offered the following amendment No. **A00994**:

Amend Bill, page 3, line 3, by inserting after "Board."
No more than \$700,000 shall be used for salaries of the members of the Gaming Control Board.

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the amendment, Representative Roae.

Mr. ROAE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My amendment would limit in the bill total compensation of \$700,000 for the seven board members of the Gaming Control Board. The current salary is \$140,000 per member. That is really high. Our property taxes were supposed to go down with gambling. I think it is outrageous that board members get \$140,000 a year. With my amendment, it would cut that down to \$100,000 a year.

Keep in mind, Madam Speaker, we have hundreds of commissions, boards, and authorities; hardly any of them pay any compensation at all. A lot of us in this room serve on some of them. I am on the PASSHE (Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education) Board. We have people on the PHEAA (Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency) Board, the PSERS (Public School Employees' Retirement System) Board. All these different boards and commissions; \$140,000 a year, that is almost \$1 million to pay board members to have quarterly meetings of the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board. I think we should take it a lot lower than this, but I think at a minimum, \$100,000 a year to go to four quarterly meetings should be adequate to keep board members.

So I urge the members to vote "yes" on the amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the bill, Representative Harris.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

We urge the members to vote "no" on this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Mackenzie.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

At some point we may be having a debate on minimum wage, and the argument that I heard yesterday in the Labor and Industry Committee was about government bureaucrats and elected officials getting paid too much, but yet here we are, that people are advocating that cutting salaries for people that have quarterly meetings from \$140,000 a year to \$100,000 a year is problematic.

So I would encourage a "yes" vote on this amendment, and when we get ready for having a debate on minimum wage, let us remember how people vote on this. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Diamond.

Mr. DIAMOND. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise in opposition to this amendment. The gentleman, the maker of the amendment's points are well taken; however, the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board is basically a user fee-based agency, where it is not your income tax or your sales tax that goes to pay their salaries, it is the money that the people who are going to our casinos are putting in the slot machines or putting down on the sports book. That is where this money is derived from. So if you cut these people's salaries by 33 percent, it is not like your constituents back home are going to get any benefit out of that.

And quite frankly, Madam Speaker, the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board – I have been on the Gaming Oversight Committee ever since I first got here, Madam Chair – they are the most respected and robust regulatory agency for gaming in the entire world. We cannot afford to lose some members because somebody wants to cut their salaries by 33 percent.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, with all due respect to my colleague from Erie County.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—84

Adams	Flood	Kuzma	Rader
Armanini	Fritz	Lawrence	Rapp
Banta	Gaydos	Leadbeter	Rigby
Barton	Gillen	Mackenzie, M.	Roae
Benninghoff	Gleim	Mackenzie, R.	Rossi
Bernstine	Greiner	Major	Rowe
Bonner	Grove	Mako	Schemel
Borowicz	Hamm	Maloney	Scheuren
Brown, M.	Heffley	Marcell	Schmitt
Cabell	Hogan	Mentzer	Scialabba
Causar	Irvin	Mercuri	Smith
Cook	James	Metzgar	Stambaugh
Cooper	Jones, M.	Miller, B.	Stehr
Cutler	Jones, T.	Moul	Stender
D'Orsie	Kail	Mustello	Struzzi
DeLozier	Kauffman	Nelson, E.	Twardzik
Ecker	Keefer	O'Neal	Warner
Emrick	Kephart	Oberlander	Watro
Fee	Kerwin	Ortitay	Wentling
Fink	Klunk	Owlett	Williams, C.
Flick	Krupa	Pickett	Zimmerman

NAYS—119

Abney	Fleming	Krueger	Ryncavage
Bellmon	Frankel	Kulik	Salisbury
Benham	Freeman	Kutz	Samuelson
Bizzarro	Friel	Labs	Sanchez
Borowski	Gallagher	Madden	Sappery
Boyd	Galloway	Madsen	Schlegel
Boyle	Gergely	Malagari	Schlossberg
Bradford	Giral	Markosek	Schweyer
Brennan	Green	Marshall	Scott
Briggs	Gregory	Matzie	Shusterman
Brown, A.	Guenst	Mayes	Siegel
Bullock	Guzman	McAndrew	Smith-Wade-El
Burgos	Haddock	McNeill	Solomon
Burns	Hanbidge	Mehaffie	Staats
C Freytiz	Harkins	Merski	Steele
Cephas	Harris	Mihalek	Sturla
Cerrato	Hohenstein	Miller, D.	Takac
Ciresi	Howard	Mullins	Tomlinson
Conklin	Innamorato	Munroe	Topper
Curry	Isaacson	Neilson	Venkat
Daley	Jozwiak	Nelson, N.	Vitali
Davanzo	Kaufner	O'Mara	Warren
Davis	Kazeem	Otten	Waxman
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Parker	Webster
Deasy	Khan	Pashinski	White
Delloso	Kim	Pielli	Williams, D.
Diamond	Kinthead	Pisciottano	Young
Donahue	Kinsey	Probst	
Dunbar	Kosierowski	Rabb	McClinton,
Evans	Krajewski	Rozzi	Speaker
Fiedler			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1249, PN 1348**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, providing for Pennsylvania Individual Recruitment and Retention Tax Credit.

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

AMENDMENT RULED OUT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The Chair rules the following amendment out of order for violating House rule 20: amendment A00814.

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

Mr. **VENKAT** offered the following amendment No. **A00787**:

Amend Bill, page 2, lines 26 through 29, by striking out "Supervisory certificate; administrative" in line 26, all of lines 27 and 28 and "(vi)" in line 29

Amend Bill, page 3, lines 1 through 3, by striking out all of said lines

Amend Bill, page 3, lines 15 through 18, by striking out "Certified registered nurse practitioner." in line 15, all of lines 16 and 17 and "(vi)" in line 18

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

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the amendment, Representative Venkat.

Mr. VENKAT. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I agree that this legislation is very important work and that we need to move forward with trying to bring nurses and police officers and teachers into the workforce.

I will look forward to working with all stakeholders on this and withdraw my amendment.

The SPEAKER. It is the Chair's understanding that amendment A00787 is withdrawn.

The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. **LAWRENCE** offered the following amendment No. **A00847**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 7, by striking out "Either" and inserting One of the following

Amend Bill, page 2, line 12, by striking out "or"

Amend Bill, page 2, line 19, by striking out the period after "certified" and inserting

: or

(3) an individual:

(i) certified under 53 Pa.C.S. Ch. 21 Subch. D (relating to municipal police education and training); and

(ii) regularly serving as a police officer for the city of the first class in one of the four police districts in the city of the first class that, as determined by the Attorney General on January 1st of each calendar year until 2026, has the highest number of violations of 18 Pa.C.S. §§ 6105 (relating to persons not to possess, use, manufacture, control, sell or transfer firearms) and 6111 (relating to sale or transfer of firearms).

Amend Bill, page 3, lines 5 and 6, by striking out "(relating to Municipal Police Education and Training)"

Amend Bill, page 4, line 2, by striking out "as a recently certified professional"

Amend Bill, page 4, line 7, by striking out "qualified" and inserting

qualifying

Amend Bill, page 4, line 11, by striking out all of said line and inserting

(e) Duration of tax credit.—

(1) A taxpayer may claim the tax

Amend Bill, page 4, line 13, by striking out "qualified" and inserting

qualifying

Amend Bill, page 4, by inserting between lines 15 and 16

(2) A taxpayer eligible for a tax credit as a result of the provisions of paragraph (3) of the definition of "qualifying taxpayer" in section 1902-J may claim the tax credit for the year in which the taxpayer first becomes a qualifying taxpayer and the next two succeeding tax years, as long as the taxpayer:

(i) remains certified under 53 Pa.C.S. Ch. 21 Subch. D (relating to municipal police education and training); and

(ii) regularly serves in the city of the first class.

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

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

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the bill before the House is entitled the "Pennsylvania Individual Recruitment and Retention Tax Credit." This amendment, A4, A847 – Madam Speaker, I can see I am going to need to succumb to getting glasses here at this advanced age. My birthday is tomorrow. But amendment 847 deals with retention, specifically retention of police officers, which is one of the classes discussed in the underlying bill; specifically, officers in the city of the first class assigned to some challenging areas.

Madam Speaker, Philadelphia is slated for 4 new classes of recruits this year, which works out to approximately 150 new police officers, and this is welcome news. But this does not make

up for the fact that current police officers are leaving the force in higher numbers or for the fact that the Philadelphia Police Department is already at a deficit of approximately 1500 officers.

According to a WHY? radio profile earlier this year, a spokesperson for the mayor of Philadelphia said there are 761 Philadelphia police officers enrolled in DROP (deferred retirement option plan), which is the city's deferred retirement program. That gives them 4 years to plan their exit from city service; 761 over the next 4 years. These retirements will only exacerbate the challenges facing the department. At the same time, the mayor has launched an initiative to redeploy 100 additional police officers to areas of the city facing the greatest challenges.

According to a December 20 press release from the city, and I am quoting, "The new initiative is coupled with a recently-completed realignment of the Department's Operation Pinpoint, which is based on data identifying violence 'hotspots' across Philadelphia. Together, these measures will boost police presence and target high-risk offenders and potential victims in the four police districts...the 22nd District and 24th District in North Philadelphia, the 25th District in Kensington and North Philadelphia, and the 39th District in Germantown. Over the next several months, PPD will be realigning the Operation Pinpoint strategy in phases, and community members can expect to see an increased police presence in realigned Pinpoint areas."

The amendment before the House would extend the tax credits contemplated under the provisions of this bill to the police officers serving under this program in these areas. These officers deserve at least the same recognition as the other police officers recognized in the underlying proposal, and I encourage an affirmative vote.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the bill, Representative Munroe.

Mr. MUNROE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Before I get onto the amendment, I just want to give a little bit of a background on just policing 101. The first thing that you learn on what makes a good arrest is good probable cause. What does not promote good probable cause and what does not promote good arrests is a quota system.

Amendment 847 would be a quota system in our Commonwealth. I strongly recommend a "no" vote on this amendment, as what would follow is a bunch of potentially badly motivated arrests. Again, having been a police officer and a police corporal for 10 years, you know, that is always the main – they teach you two things. Number one, you never lie; and number two, you always have good probable cause.

So a quota system in Pennsylvania would make probably every police chief, living or dead, roll over, and I strongly suggest a "no" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the maker of the bill.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Samuelson.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise against the Lawrence amendment. When you read the language of this amendment, the bill in chief talks about newly certified police officers and deputy sheriffs across the State. The Lawrence amendment talks about certain police districts in Philadelphia – not all 21 police districts, but just 4. It sets up a

kind of unusual, inexplicable competition for who has the most gun violence violations, and only the four districts that make the list get the extra incentive payment for that quota. How would that be administered?

First of all, the way it is drafted, we are not talking about arrests. We are not talking about convictions. We are talking about "violations," which is not defined in the Crimes Code and it is not defined in the Judicial Code. So who determines whether the violation happens? Is it the perpetrator? Is it the Attorney General of Pennsylvania? Is she supposed to figure out how many violations happen in which neighborhoods? And why focus on just four neighborhoods? What if there is a tie for fourth? What if you are getting to the end of the year and there are two police districts that have the same number of violations? Is there an incentive to have more violations in your neighborhood so your police can get that financial? And why are we only talking about four? Why not five? Why not 10? Why not the State of Pennsylvania?

This has so many administrative problems. It is an unusual competition, and it is not drafted correctly. I urge a "no" vote on the Lawrence amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Kenyatta.

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I rose today because the number of the districts mentioned happens – that actually represent those areas. I would highlight, Madam Speaker, a recurring theme that happens too often on this floor where members in this body who do not represent the city of the first class continue to try to craft and insert themselves in the needs and concerns of residents of the city of the first class. This might shock some members, but the city of the first class actually has elected Representatives. We are in this body. We come to this building every day to represent our constituents and to try to drive forward policy that speaks to the concerns that our constituents lay out for us.

With all due respect for the gentleman from Chester County, this amendment, as has been previously said, is not drafted in an appropriate way to achieve the outcomes that we need. And a part of that might be driven that the gentleman from Chester County has not spent as much time as I and others have from the city of the first class actually talking about the concerns – not only of law enforcement, but the concerns of individuals who are living in these communities. We are not abstractions. We are not playthings for you to dictate to us.

I live in the 22d Police District. I talk to the officers in the 22d Police District about the things that they need. And what they do not need is this amendment, which is really a race to the bottom, where you only get the support if you happen to work in a district where there are high volumes of crime. We should not be pitting officers against each other. And also, this amendment does not recognize the fact that officers, captains, lieutenants, others, regularly move in and out of districts. And if the member from Chester, the gentleman from Chester County wanted to address this, I actually also happen to represent the police headquarters, spend a lot of time with our commissioners and with the leaders of our police force about the things that they need. Some of the things that they need and wanted, a lot of members voted against, like doing something about lost and stolen guns. The police wanted that bill. We had a lot of people vote against it.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order, Madam Speaker.

Mr. KENYATTA. The police wanted us to do something about safe storage. We had a lot of folks vote against it. Madam Speaker, I am wrapping up, just to say—

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

For what purpose does the gentleman, Representative Cutler, rise?

Mr. CUTLER. Madam Speaker, I believe the gentleman is discussing an issue that is actually not before the House. I would simply hope for encouragement to stay on the underlying amendment itself.

The SPEAKER. The Chair encourages the gentleman to stay on the amendment, A00847.

The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I will wrap up to make the point that if you care about what is happening in somebody's community, step one of that is to listen to them; step one is to listen. And as the member in this building who represents numerous of those police districts that you mentioned, I will say, for my community, we do not want the Lawrence amendment. Vote it down.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative White.

Ms. WHITE. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

I rise in support of the Lawrence amendment, and the reason is because this will help ensure that officers who are working in very challenging and dangerous communities in various parts of Philadelphia actually have resources available to them so that they maintain their jobs, so that they do not leave and go elsewhere.

We are already in a very, very large deficit of officers and law enforcement across the city of Philadelphia to the tune of over 1500 open positions. Our streets are dangerous, as we have all heard, even since last session and the session before that how much more dangerous our communities are becoming. I think it only makes sense to ensure that these incentives are put in place to have the proper resources made available to these law enforcement officers.

And as for the comments of some of my colleagues who were up here speaking earlier, to state that we are in a race to the bottom, that any law enforcement officer who has taken an oath, sworn to protect our communities, who risk their lives to do so, would actually intentionally try to make our communities more dangerous just for an incentive or some kind of ridiculous amount of money is an absurdity and an absolute insult to law enforcement officers all across this Commonwealth.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I urge a "yes" vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentlelady.

The Chair recognizes Representative Cutler, if no other members are seeking to be recognized.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, a couple points. I actually do agree with the gentleman from the 22d Police District. I agree that the first part is listening. And for anybody whom I have had the privilege of

working together with on issues, I think we can all agree that is the first part.

However, within this bill that we have right before us, we have an amendment offered by the good gentleman from Indiana County which was summarily dismissed as being out of order. The truth is, that is not listening. That is an important issue that needs addressed. So I do agree with the gentleman on that piece. And I understand that the good gentleman has requested that outside legislative districts or Representatives not insert themselves into this issue specifically, his home area. I understand that as well, Madam Speaker, but again I would offer that that is exactly what was happening when that other issue was dismissed.

Now, to the underlying bill itself. You know, who would determine these districts? How are they determined? I believe the good gentleman actually works through that in his wording. But I think that is also equally important to point out that these are the areas that the mayor, the elected official that was referenced previously – the city of the first class has a mayor. They have already identified this as being an area of concern. That is why there are going to be extra police officers deployed into these four areas. That I think is a vitally important piece of information.

So yes, there are higher crime rates. Yes, there are bigger issues that need to be addressed, and I think the good gentleman from Chester County who drafted the amendment is attempting to fix an issue. I have said it many times: I understand that we may agree on what the issue is – I think the issue is the high crime in these four areas – the difference is how we solve it.

I think the good gentleman's approach layers onto what the mayor is already proposing in terms of increasing a police presence there and providing the necessary support, as the good lady from Philadelphia also outlined. The goal is retention. I think that this amendment would buttress those efforts.

So I urge support of the gentleman's amendment because it supplements what the mayor is already doing. It supplements what is needed according to the own local officials that have identified that problem themselves. And yes, the Attorney General will make that delineation at some point in the future, but I am sure that will be in consultation with the mayor. So I urge an affirmative vote.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

And for the information of the members, and as the former Speaker knows, the Chair has an obligation to enforce the rules of this House, which this entire House voted on. And unfortunately, the gentleman from Indiana County, his amendment had nothing to do with police retention and recruitment. I just want to make sure that is clear for the members.

The Chair acknowledges the maker of the amendment for the second time, Representative Lawrence. The gentleman waives off.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—99

Adams	Fritz	Leadbeter	Roae
Armanini	Gaydos	Mackenzie, M.	Rossi
Banta	Gillen	Mackenzie, R.	Rowe
Barton	Gleim	Major	Ryncavage
Benninghoff	Gregory	Mako	Schemel
Bernstine	Greiner	Maloney	Scheuren
Bonner	Grove	Marcell	Schlegel
Borowicz	Heffley	Marshall	Schmitt
Brown, M.	Hogan	Mehaffie	Scialabba
Cabell	Irvin	Mentzer	Smith
Causar	James	Mercuri	Staats
Cook	Jones, M.	Metzgar	Stambaugh
Cooper	Jones, T.	Mihalek	Stehr
Cutler	Jozwiak	Miller, B.	Stender
D'Orsie	Kail	Moul	Struzzi
Davanzo	Kaufer	Mustello	Tomlinson
Delozier	Kauffman	Nelson, E.	Topper
Diamond	Keefer	O'Neal	Twardzik
Dunbar	Kerwin	Oberlander	Warner
Ecker	Klunk	Ortitay	Watro
Emrick	Krupa	Owlett	Wentling
Fee	Kutz	Pickett	White
Fink	Kuzma	Rader	Williams, C.
Flick	Labs	Rapp	Zimmerman
Flood	Lawrence	Rigby	

NAYS—104

Abney	Fiedler	Kinsey	Rabb
Bellmon	Fleming	Kosierowski	Rozzi
Benham	Frankel	Krajewski	Salisbury
Bizzarro	Freeman	Krueger	Samuelson
Borowski	Friel	Kulik	Sanchez
Boyd	Gallagher	Madden	Sappery
Boyle	Galloway	Madsen	Schlossberg
Bradford	Gergely	Malagari	Schweyer
Brennan	Giral	Markosek	Scott
Briggs	Green	Matzie	Shusterman
Brown, A.	Guenst	Mayes	Siegel
Bullock	Guzman	McAndrew	Smith-Wade-El
Burgos	Haddock	McNeill	Solomon
Burns	Hamm	Merski	Steele
C Freytiz	Hanbidge	Miller, D.	Sturla
Cephas	Harkins	Mullins	Takac
Cerrato	Harris	Munroe	Venkat
Ciresi	Hohenstein	Neilson	Vitali
Conklin	Howard	Nelson, N.	Warren
Curry	Innamorato	O'Mara	Waxman
Daley	Isaacson	Otten	Webster
Davis	Kazeem	Parker	Williams, D.
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Young
Deasy	Kephart	Pielli	
Delloso	Khan	Pisciottano	McClinton,
Donahue	Kim	Probst	Speaker
Evans	Kinthead		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order, Madam Speaker?

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

Mr. CUTLER. A point of order, Madam Speaker.

Given the commentary that was provided from the Chair without a parliamentary inquiry, I would like to now ask if we could appeal the ruling of the Chair on amendment 814.

RULING OF CHAIR APPEALED

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may do so.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, quite simply, this is a Tax Code bill. The issue that the good gentleman from Indiana County is attempting to address is in fact a tax issue in that how do you pay for it? Obviously, there could potentially be people that qualify for this tax credit and it would be an integral part of how they file; therefore, I think the TeleFile system is abundantly related to this issue and therefore would do the motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman appeals the ruling of the Chair that amendment A00814 violates rule 20. House rule 20 provides that no bill shall be passed containing more than one subject.

The subject of HB 1249 is the Pennsylvania Individual Recruitment and Retention Tax Credit. Amendment A00814 adds a second subject to the bill allowing the telephonic filing of any tax return or any document or any remittance of payment for a fee or tax liability under the Tax Reform Code.

Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of this House? Those in favor of sustaining the Chair's decision will vote "aye." Those opposed will vote "no."

On the question,

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—102

Abney	Evans	Kinsey	Rabb
Bellmon	Fiedler	Kosierowski	Rozzi
Benham	Fleming	Krajewski	Salisbury
Bizzarro	Frankel	Krueger	Samuelson
Borowski	Freeman	Kulik	Sanchez
Boyd	Friel	Madden	Sappery
Boyle	Gallagher	Madsen	Schlossberg
Bradford	Galloway	Malagari	Schweyer
Brennan	Gergely	Markosek	Scott
Briggs	Giral	Matzie	Shusterman
Brown, A.	Green	Mayes	Siegel
Bullock	Guenst	McAndrew	Smith-Wade-El
Burgos	Guzman	McNeill	Solomon
Burns	Haddock	Merski	Steele
C Freytiz	Hanbidge	Miller, D.	Sturla
Cephas	Harkins	Mullins	Takac
Cerrato	Harris	Munroe	Venkat
Ciresi	Hohenstein	Neilson	Vitali
Conklin	Howard	Nelson, N.	Warren
Curry	Innamorato	O'Mara	Waxman
Daley	Isaacson	Otten	Webster
Davis	Kazeem	Parker	Williams, D.

Dawkins	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Young
Deasy	Khan	Pielli	
Delloso	Kim	Pisciottano	McClinton,
Donahue	Kinhead	Probst	Speaker

NAYS—101

Adams	Gaydos	Lawrence	Rigby
Armanini	Gillen	Leadbeter	Roae
Banta	Gleim	Mackenzie, M.	Rossi
Barton	Gregory	Mackenzie, R.	Rowe
Benninghoff	Greiner	Major	Ryncavage
Bernstine	Grove	Mako	Schemel
Bonner	Hamm	Maloney	Scheuren
Borowicz	Heffley	Marcell	Schlegel
Brown, M.	Hogan	Marshall	Schmitt
Cabell	Irvin	Mehaffie	Scialabba
Causar	James	Mentzer	Smith
Cook	Jones, M.	Mercuri	Staats
Cooper	Jones, T.	Metzgar	Stambaugh
Cutler	Jozwiak	Mihalek	Stehr
D'Orsie	Kail	Miller, B.	Stender
Davanzo	Kaufer	Moul	Struzzi
Delozier	Kauffman	Mustello	Tomlinson
Diamond	Keefer	Nelson, E.	Topper
Dunbar	Kephart	O'Neal	Twardzik
Ecker	Kerwin	Oberlander	Warner
Emrick	Klunk	Ortitay	Watro
Fee	Krupa	Owlett	Wentling
Fink	Kutz	Pickett	White
Flick	Kuzma	Rader	Williams, C.
Flood	Labs	Rapp	Zimmerman
Fritz			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

Less than a majority of the members elected to the House having voted in the negative, the decision of the Chair stood as the judgment of the House.

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

Mr. **MERCURI** offered the following amendment
No. **A00976**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 10, by inserting after "penalties," in tax credit and tax benefit administration, further providing for definitions; and

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 14 through 16, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

Section 1. The definition of "tax credit" in section 1701-A.1 of the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, is amended by adding a paragraph to read:

Section 1701-A.1. Definitions.

The following words and phrases when used in this article shall have the meanings given to them in this section unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

"Tax credit." A tax credit authorized under any of the following:

(16.2) Article XIX-J.

Section 2. The act is amended by adding an article to read:
Amend Bill, page 4, line 29, by striking out all of said line and inserting

Section 3. The amendment of the definition of "tax credit" in section 1701-A.1 of the act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2022.

Section 4. This act shall take effect in 60 days.

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

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

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

I appreciate the opportunity to propose an amendment to clean up a bill that supports the retention and recruitment of our cops, our teachers, and our nurses. What this bill does – or this amendment does – is it will pull the tax credit language and the definitions under the same Department of Revenue code that the other tax credit programs in the State are already under. So I would ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes Representative **Samuelson**.

Mr. **SAMUELSON**. Thank you.

I appreciate the gentleman from Allegheny County offering the amendment. I do want to point out that the section of the law that he is talking about became part of our Tax Code 2 years ago, in 2021, in a section that provided Department of Revenue oversight for many business tax cuts. The bill in chief is about an individual tax cut that police officers, teachers, and also nurses would claim on their personal income tax return, not on the business tax return.

One interesting section of this section, that the gentleman is trying to add from what was added 2 years ago, talks about some oversight, that the Department of Revenue could demand an in-person meeting for some of the business tax credits that we talk about. I do not know if the intention is to have those in-person meetings for every personal income tax filer in Pennsylvania; additional documentation, filing an annual report for the Department of Revenue. Are you really talking about having each individual recipient of this tax credit filing annual reports?

And here is one that we just mentioned a few minutes ago, giving the Department of Revenue the power to require electronic filing. The previous amendment that was ruled out of order, and we had a motion to appeal the Chair, that talked about allowing telephone tax filing. Under the language of this amendment, the Department of the Revenue would have the ability to say no, no telephone tax filing, no paper filing; it has to be all electronic. That was the language that was put in in 2021 intended for the business tax credits.

So I believe the correct vote on this is "no." That was an important thing we did to provide some guidance on the business tax credits, but it is not appropriate for individual taxpayers. Furthermore, the Department of Revenue currently does have the ability to audit individual tax returns and have oversight over individual personal income tax returns.

I respectfully ask a "no" vote on the **Mercuri** amendment.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—101

Adams	Gaydos	Lawrence	Rigby
Armanini	Gillen	Leadbeter	Roae
Banta	Gleim	Mackenzie, M.	Rossi
Barton	Gregory	Mackenzie, R.	Rowe
Benninghoff	Greiner	Major	Ryncavage
Bernstine	Grove	Mako	Schemel
Bonner	Hamm	Maloney	Scheuren
Borowicz	Heffley	Marcell	Schlegel
Brown, M.	Hogan	Marshall	Schmitt
Cabell	Irvin	Mehaffie	Scialabba
Causar	James	Mentzer	Smith
Cook	Jones, M.	Mercuri	Staats
Cooper	Jones, T.	Metzgar	Stambaugh
Cutler	Jozwiak	Mihalek	Stehr
D'Orsie	Kail	Miller, B.	Stender
Davanzo	Kaufer	Moul	Struzzi
Delozier	Kauffman	Mustello	Tomlinson
Diamond	Keefer	Nelson, E.	Topper
Dunbar	Kephart	O'Neal	Twardzik
Ecker	Kerwin	Oberlander	Warner
Emrick	Klunk	Ortitay	Watro
Fee	Krupa	Owlett	Wentling
Fink	Kutz	Pickett	White
Flick	Kuzma	Rader	Williams, C.
Flood	Labs	Rapp	Zimmerman
Fritz			

NAYS—102

Abney	Evans	Kinsey	Rabb
Bellmon	Fiedler	Kosierowski	Rozzi
Benham	Fleming	Krajewski	Salisbury
Bizzarro	Frankel	Krueger	Samuelson
Borowski	Freeman	Kulik	Sanchez
Boyd	Friel	Madden	Sappey
Boyle	Gallagher	Madsen	Schlossberg
Bradford	Galloway	Malagari	Schweyer
Brennan	Gergely	Markosek	Scott
Briggs	Giral	Matzie	Shusterman
Brown, A.	Green	Mayes	Siegel
Bullock	Guenst	McAndrew	Smith-Wade-El
Burgos	Guzman	McNeill	Solomon
Burns	Haddock	Merski	Steele
C Freytiz	Hanbidge	Miller, D.	Sturla
Cephas	Harkins	Mullins	Takac
Cerrato	Harris	Munroe	Venkat
Ciresi	Hohenstein	Neilson	Vitali
Conklin	Howard	Nelson, N.	Warren
Curry	Innamorato	O'Mara	Waxman
Daley	Isaacson	Otten	Webster
Davis	Kazeem	Parker	Williams, D.
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Young
Deasy	Khan	Pielli	
Delloso	Kim	Pisciottano	McClinton,
Donahue	Kinthead	Probst	Speaker

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

Mr. **MERCURI** offered the following amendment
No. **A00981**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 10, by inserting after "penalties," in tax credit and tax benefit administration, further providing for definitions; and

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 14 through 16, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

Section 1. The definition of "tax credit" in section 1701-A.1 of the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, is amended by adding a paragraph to read:
Section 1701-A.1. Definitions.

The following words and phrases when used in this article shall have the meanings given to them in this section unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

"Tax credit." A tax credit authorized under any of the following:

(16.2) Article XIX-J.

Section 2. The act is amended by adding an article to read:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 9, by inserting after "2022,"

and before January 1, 2026,

Amend Bill, page 3, line 29, by inserting after "2022,"

and before January 1, 2026,

Amend Bill, page 4, line 25, by striking out "prior to" and inserting

before

Amend Bill, page 4, line 29, by striking out all of said line and inserting

Section 3. The amendment of the definition of "tax credit" in section 1701-A.1 of the act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2022.

Section 4. This act shall take effect immediately.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

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

Mr. MERCURI. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would ask to withdraw this amendment, please.

The SPEAKER. It is the Chair's understanding that the gentleman is withdrawing amendment A00981.

The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Mr. **MERCURI** offered the following amendment
No. **A00978**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 9, by inserting after "2022,"

and before January 1, 2026,

Amend Bill, page 3, line 29, by inserting after "2022,"

and before January 1, 2026,

Amend Bill, page 4, line 25, by striking out "prior to" and inserting

before

Amend Bill, page 4, line 29, by striking out "in 60 days" and inserting

immediately

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

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

Mr. MERCURI. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to speak in support of this broader bill, but also to take into consideration the fiscal responsibility of the Commonwealth. We have had discussions on the wisdom of a budget that expands spending without commensurate raises in revenue, and in this case, these tax credits will be a costly endeavor, and so it is important for us to limit and constrain the impact of these tax credits. We do not know in the out years whether we will still have the same recruiting and retention problem that we are solving for with these tax credits.

My amendment does time constrain and clarify how long these tax credits will be available, and it sunsets the provisions in 2026. I would ask for a "yes" vote on the fiscal responsibility for the State. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

MOTION TO TABLE AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the majority leader, Representative Bradford.

Mr. BRADFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise to make a motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his motion.

Mr. BRADFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise to make a motion to table this and all remaining amendments to HB 1249.

The SPEAKER. Representative Bradford moves that all remaining amendments be laid on the table.

On that question, members are reminded that the motion to lay on the table is debatable by only the leaders, the maker of the motion, the maker of the amendment under consideration, and the prime sponsor of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. On the motion, the Chair recognizes Representative Bradford.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

As we are getting late in the budgetary calendar, with 2 1/2 weeks until our constitutional deadline, we look forward to having most of these discussions as part of separate bills as well as part of a budget discussion in the weeks ahead.

For that reason I believe it is appropriate to move forward with the Governor's proposal as proposed and let us move forward and pass this budget. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

Mr. CUTLER. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CUTLER. Madam Speaker, is the motion divisible based upon each separate amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

As the gentleman, the former Speaker knows, pursuant to his ruling on November 15, 2021, such a motion is not divisible.

Mr. CUTLER. Madam Speaker, on the motion then, if I may?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed on the motion.

Mr. CUTLER. Excellent. And for the record, I actually do agree with that ruling and I am glad to hear that you also now agree with me. So thank you very much for supporting that.

Madam Speaker, on the motion—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair wants to make it very clear that this is not a moment to determine whether or not the Chair agrees with the prior Speaker's ruling, but the Chair wants to make sure all of the members know that whoever is in the Chair is bound to follow the precedent that has been set in this House. And the Chair following that precedent stated the obvious for the minority leader.

The gentleman may proceed on the motion.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I must confess I am somewhat confused by the fact that we both agree on the past precedent. But the underlying motion itself, let us discuss what we have here. We have a series of amendments that attempt to make this bill better and address many of the issues.

The good gentleman, the leader, has indicated in his motion that he wishes to move along in the budget process, and I welcome him to that discussion. I welcome the first call to schedule a budget meeting; that has yet to arrive. Madam Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to discuss these issues. When my friend, the good leader, previously discussed the budget, he said, where are your ideas? Our ideas, Madam Speaker, are on the system, and they are being summarily dismissed by a parliamentary maneuver to table all the amendments. Madam Speaker, we have repeatedly brought our ideas to the table. We have tried to discuss how to make some of these bills that have errors in them better. They have all been defeated – mostly on straight-party lines – Madam Speaker, so it is sad that that debate will once again not happen.

I assure the good gentleman I look forward to the invitation to discuss the budget, the code bills, and all of the things that should be done, because the one thing that we do agree on, Madam Speaker, is that it is late in June, and hitting the deadline at the end of the month is vitally important, and if those discussions do not begin in earnest soon, we risk missing that date.

So yes, this is a motion to table all of the amendments. Madam Speaker, it is also a motion to end all discussion on these issues. So we cannot have it both ways. We cannot say, let us hear your ideas, and then turn around and say, no, thank you, we are going to table those and keep moving.

Madam Speaker, I welcome the discussion. I welcome the invitation, and the House Republicans stand here ready, willing, and able to do a budget on time, a responsible budget. We are one reasonable Democrat away from being able to finish this process.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Bradford on the motion.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I have good news for the good minority leader. The House passed the budget on June 5 without a single reasonable Republican vote. And let me tell you something else, there is only one body and one party that has yet to engage in budget discussions.

I understand the gentleman is struggling with his new status, but here is the simple reality. This body has done its work day in and day out on many proposals that the minority party claimed to support. An earned income tax credit; claimed to support and voted against. Claimed to support dependent care tax credits, and then the leaders turned their back on working parents. This body has done its constitutional obligation. If you want to look for where there are problems in our current system, maybe the gentleman should look in the mirror.

The SPEAKER. On the motion, Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Madam Speaker, I will attempt to stay on the motion, because I think that is the proper form of debate. Once again what we have here is a personal attack because of a difference of ideas.

Madam Speaker, time and time again I have stood at this very podium and said, let us have a discussion. Now, I find it interesting that this bill – which contains, admittedly, I think a prime objective of the Governor – we are told to toe the party line; let us get the Governor what he wants, his Excellency. But interestingly enough, that is the same party that did not pass his budget. They had to add additional spending to it in order to get here.

So yes, it did pass and it was a straight party line because we were excluded from the conversation, Madam Speaker. Again, I await the first call and the opportunity to discuss the budget. These deadlines just do not happen. There are a variety of code bills that need to occur, and we have encouraged all the parties, with or without us, to get on the timeline that is necessary to hit the deadline by the end of the month. Now, maybe deadlines are not important. Maybe deadlines we say, well – maybe we will even hear the argument, and I am sure we probably will, that we would rather get it right than done on time.

It is important that we work towards a product that benefits everybody; I agree. But to benefit everybody we have to have a conversation about the product, the process, and the priorities of everybody, not just some, Madam Speaker. That is what the budget vote that happened earlier represented.

Working people sent us here in a divided government, yet the leader continues to dismiss, disregard, and ignore the half of Pennsylvania that we all represent. That, Madam Speaker, is very troubling. I would simply point out that I would be happy to look in the mirror, and here is why. My last budget that I worked on as majority leader had 180 votes here in this chamber. I hope that the good gentleman can rise to the same challenge.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Representative Bradford, on the motion.

Mr. BRADFORD. I would just point out that the current year budget passed on July 7 last year. That is called not on time.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—102

Abney	Evans	Kinsey	Rabb
Bellmon	Fiedler	Kosierowski	Rozzi
Benham	Fleming	Krajewski	Salisbury
Bizzarro	Frankel	Krueger	Samuelson
Borowski	Freeman	Kulik	Sanchez
Boyd	Friel	Madden	Sappye
Boyle	Gallagher	Madsen	Schlossberg
Bradford	Galloway	Malagari	Schweyer
Brennan	Gergely	Markosek	Scott
Briggs	Giral	Matzie	Shusterman
Brown, A.	Green	Mayes	Siegel
Bullock	Guenst	McAndrew	Smith-Wade-El
Burgos	Guzman	McNeill	Solomon
Burns	Haddock	Merski	Steele
C Freytiz	Hanbidge	Miller, D.	Sturla
Cephas	Harkins	Mullins	Takac
Cerrato	Harris	Munroe	Venkat
Ciresi	Hohenstein	Neilson	Vitali
Conklin	Howard	Nelson, N.	Warren
Curry	Innamorato	O'Mara	Waxman
Daley	Isaacson	Otten	Webster
Davis	Kazeem	Parker	Williams, D.
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Young
Deasy	Khan	Pielli	
Delloso	Kim	Pisciottano	McClinton,
Donahue	Kinhead	Probst	Speaker

NAYS—101

Adams	Gaydos	Lawrence	Rigby
Armanini	Gillen	Leadbeter	Roae
Banta	Gleim	Mackenzie, M.	Rossi
Barton	Gregory	Mackenzie, R.	Rowe
Benninghoff	Greiner	Major	Ryncavage
Bernstine	Grove	Mako	Schemel
Bonner	Hamm	Maloney	Scheuren
Borowicz	Heffley	Marcell	Schlegel
Brown, M.	Hogan	Marshall	Schmitt
Cabell	Irvin	Mehaffie	Scialabba
Causar	James	Mentzer	Smith
Cook	Jones, M.	Mercuri	Staats
Cooper	Jones, T.	Metzgar	Stambaugh
Cutler	Jozwiak	Mihalek	Stehr
D'Orsie	Kail	Miller, B.	Stender
Davanzo	Kaufer	Moul	Struzzi
Delozier	Kauffman	Mustello	Tomlinson
Diamond	Keefer	Nelson, E.	Topper
Dunbar	Kephart	O'Neal	Twardzik
Ecker	Kerwin	Oberlander	Warner
Emrick	Klunk	Ortitay	Watro
Fee	Krupa	Owlett	Wentling
Fink	Kutz	Pickett	White
Flick	Kuzma	Rader	Williams, C.
Flood	Labs	Rapp	Zimmerman
Fritz			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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 bill on second consideration?

The SPEAKER. The majority having voted in the affirmative, all remaining amendments are laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CUTLER. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CUTLER. I just wish some clarification from the Chair and the maker of the motion. Does that include all the late-filed amendments?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1295, PN 1469**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 63 (Professions and Occupations (State Licensed)) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in powers and duties, further providing for hearing examiners.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Mr. **MULLINS** offered the following amendment No. **A00892**:

Amend Bill, page 3, lines 5 through 7, by striking out "A REMOTELY LOCATED INDIVIDUAL MAY" in line 5 and all of lines 6 and 7 and inserting

(2) If agreed to by the parties to the hearing and, if as determined by the hearing examiner, good cause is shown that the individual cannot meet the terms of paragraph (1), allows a hearing examiner and a remotely located individual to communicate with each other simultaneously by sound only.

Amend Bill, page 3, line 8, 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 maker of the amendment, Representative Mullins.

Mr. MULLINS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

This is a largely technical amendment and a clarifying one, and I would appreciate everyone's affirmative vote. And the amendment is agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—203

Abney	Flick	Krupa	Rapp
Adams	Flood	Kulik	Rigby
Armanini	Frankel	Kutz	Roae
Banta	Freeman	Kuzma	Rossi
Barton	Friel	Labs	Rowe
Bellmon	Fritz	Lawrence	Rozzi
Benham	Gallagher	Leadbeter	Ryncavage
Benninghoff	Galloway	Mackenzie, M.	Salisbury
Bernstine	Gaydos	Mackenzie, R.	Samuelson
Bizzarro	Gergely	Madden	Sanchez
Bonner	Gillen	Madsen	Sappey
Borowicz	Giral	Major	Schemel
Borowski	Gleim	Mako	Scheuren
Boyd	Green	Malagari	Schlegel
Boyle	Gregory	Maloney	Schlossberg
Bradford	Greiner	Marcell	Schmitt
Brennan	Grove	Markosek	Schweyer
Briggs	Guenst	Marshall	Scialabba
Brown, A.	Guzman	Matzie	Scott
Brown, M.	Haddock	Mayes	Shusterman
Bullock	Hamm	McAndrew	Siegel
Burgos	Hanbidge	McNeill	Smith
Burns	Harkins	Mehaffie	Smith-Wade-El
C Freytiz	Harris	Mentzer	Solomon
Cabell	Heffley	Mercuri	Staats
Causar	Hogan	Merski	Stambaugh
Cephas	Hohenstein	Metzgar	Steele
Cerrato	Howard	Mihalek	Stehr
Ciresi	Innamorato	Miller, B.	Stender
Conklin	Irvin	Miller, D.	Struzzi
Cook	Isaacson	Moul	Sturla
Cooper	James	Mullins	Takac
Curry	Jones, M.	Munroe	Tomlinson
Cutler	Jones, T.	Mustello	Topper
D'Orsie	Jozwiak	Neilson	Twardzik
Daley	Kail	Nelson, E.	Venkat
Davanzo	Kaufner	Nelson, N.	Vitali
Davis	Kauffman	O'Mara	Warner
Dawkins	Kazeem	O'Neal	Warren
Deasy	Keefer	Oberlander	Watro
Delloso	Kenyatta	Ortity	Waxman
Delozier	Kephart	Otten	Webster
Diamond	Kerwin	Owlett	Wentling
Donahue	Khan	Parker	White
Dunbar	Kim	Pashinski	Williams, C.
Ecker	Kinthead	Pickett	Williams, D.
Emrick	Kinsey	Pielli	Young
Evans	Klunk	Pisciottano	Zimmerman
Fee	Kosierowski	Probst	
Fiedler	Krajewski	Rabb	McClinton,
Fink	Krueger	Rader	Speaker
Fleming			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

On the question,

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

The House will be at ease.

The House will come to order.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1304**, **PN 1426**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 35 (Health and Safety) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in 911 emergency communication services, further providing for uniform 911 surcharge and for termination.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of bill, Representative Solomon.

Mr. SOLOMON. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

How many people in this chamber use a landline, a home phone, as your primary means of communication? Okay. It is okay. Do not be shy. Do not be shy. No one. Come on. No one. Yet our 911 system, when it was created in 1968 for hardwired lines, uses analog technology. So right now our 911 system is operating off of 1970s and 1980s technology.

We all know that the number one priority of government is to provide for the safety and security of our friends, neighbors, and loved ones. So when that 911 call goes out and there is criminal activity taking place in your neighborhood, or you are looking to 911 to come and deal with a medical issue, we are stuck in the 1970s and 1980s.

The beauty of this bill is that we use the best technology. We allow for counties to coordinate in a seamless way. We provide for pinpoint accuracy in this new 911 technology. And by the way, we do it without increasing fees on taxpayers until at least – yeah – until at least 2028.

Let us vote for this bill. Let us say yes to safer, more secure neighborhoods.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Grove.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The last time this body took up the 911 fee, it was supposed to help fund the Next Gen 911 fee. Here we are today asking for increases to fund the Next Gen 911 fee off of analog. Obviously, the last increase did not work. Will this increase work? But dare I say, when someone does calls 911, they expect an answer. They expect that the 911 operator will ensure the services they need will be dispatched without delay.

My opposition to this bill comes not from a lack of appreciation of the necessity of funding a 911 system, but for the structure of this tax on our taxpayers. Taken with the elimination of the sales and use in the gross receipts tax that passed in this Assembly, which I supported, there is no savings of \$124 million to consumers, as claimed by the Governor and my colleagues across the aisle. The \$1.97 911 fee, taken with the 6 cent 988 fee, will be increased year after year by the CPI (Consumer Price Index) or the rate of inflation. At best, this plan saves \$53.6 million over 2 years, but – and, Madam Speaker, this is important – those savings are gone by fiscal year '25-'26 at best, assuming the Governor's budget book of 2.7-percent inflation holds. As we know now, 4 percent of inflation, that we are currently at, will even drive those savings to nonexistent even faster for taxpayers.

Before this bill sunsets in 2029, the total burden on consumers will have surpassed the savings. Let me read that again. Before this bill sunsets in 2029, the total tax burden on consumers will have surpassed the savings.

Let us be honest with the people of Pennsylvania. This body is asking for more of your money, but we cannot tell you how much more money. We can project the cost, as we have done, but I cannot tell my constituents with 100-percent certainty what that will be because this plan increases the fee by inflation. Benchmarking taxes to inflation is a dangerous precedent which should be outright rejected by this body. Cell phone bills are already high. This body wants to raise them by an unknown amount without any added transparency to the administration of the 911 fee.

The General Assembly's number one job is to appropriate and enact revenue streams. What this bill does is remove the General Assembly from the revenue process. If a tax needs to be raised, the General Assembly should not turn that power over to the CPI.

Madam Speaker, I will end my comments where I began. I believe in the importance of funding 911. I would gladly support this bill if it removed the automatic increases. But after taking into account the bait and switch of telling citizens we are cutting your taxes only to raise them a day later, and raise them higher than they were before, is no way to legislate, nor is losing our budgeting powers. I stand in opposition to infinity taxes built into HB 1304.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Scott.

Mr. SCOTT. Good afternoon, Madam Speaker.

This afternoon I rise in support of HB 1304. As a volunteer firefighter and an EMT (emergency medical technician) and first responder in Montgomery County, I know firsthand that when we train our 911 telecommunicators in Montgomery County, we emphasize location, location, location. Take a minute to think about the last time you ordered an Uber or a Lyft. When you did that, you used your location services and the driver pulled up exactly to where you were. Our current 911 infrastructure cannot support that precise location information that the Uber driver receives. Currently when someone calls 911 from a cell phone, which is 82 percent of the time in Montgomery County, we receive an estimated location within 300 meters.

Eight years ago in my district, our emergency operations center received a 911 call from a man who appeared incoherent. Dispatchers sent police to an area where he was pinging but ultimately was unable to locate him. The next morning he was

found dead in his car by his neighbors. Had this been in effect, it would have enabled our dispatchers to use GPS (global positioning system) to locate him. His life is worth 32 cents.

With Next Gen 911, our telecommunicators will also be able to receive Z-axis information, also known as height or elevation. Imagine receiving a call from someone in a high rise that is on fire when the caller loses consciousness and not knowing what floor they are on. The Z-axis information available to our dispatchers will be able to direct the EMS and fire responders directly to that person.

Another benefit of Next Gen 911 is that our telecommunicators will be able to receive multimedia to include photos and video. This would give dispatchers the advantage to watch the caller perform CPR (cardiopulmonary resuscitation) correctly instead of assuming they are doing it properly, or get a picture of the active shooter to responding units so that they could be on the lookout, or being a firefighter in a burning building and calling a mayday prior to losing consciousness. This information will be able to give telecommunicators and other first responders on the scene exactly where that firefighter is. Our lives are worth 32 cents.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman. Representative Munroe.

Mr. MUNROE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Again, I rise today in support of this bill, 1304, not just as a member of this body, but also as a former police officer and police corporal and someone who has worked very closely with 911 operators.

Through the hearings on this important issue and in front of the Veterans Affairs Committee, I spoke to highlight something that I believe has not really been a focus of a lot of the discussion. Supporting HB 1304 and appropriately funding our 911 centers is not just about supporting dispatchers. It is also about supporting police officers and officer safety. Remember, dispatchers do not just take the calls from the public; they do not just dispatch police. They stay with those responding officers all the way through the call – or I should say, through the call, the car stop, pedestrian stop, etc. – all the way to the end until the officer clears. They are the eye in the sky who constantly check on the status of the officer. They work closely with officers and develop, oftentimes, close working relationships with each other.

When officers do not have backup – which, by the way, is happening more and more frequently – it is the dispatcher who oversees the safety of that officer. When an officer is on a car stop dealing with a subject who may have a warrant, it is the dispatcher who has to figure out a way of how to tell that officer that that subject has a warrant without putting the officer in danger. The officer, for example, might be on the roadside talking with that subject.

With fewer and fewer officers, oftentimes there are more calls than they have police officers, and it is up to the dispatcher to keep track of the calls that are awaiting to be dispatched. This is called call stacking. We heard testimony in committee from the 911 director of Bucks County, and when I asked him if insufficient funding could result in officer safety being affected, the answer was yes.

So I am asking this body, as a former police corporal and currently a member of the Fraternal Order of Police, to not only support our 911 system and dispatch, but to also support police. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Takac. Mr. TAKAC. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise today in support of HB 1304 and in support of the taxpayers of Centre County and the residents of the other 66 counties across our Commonwealth. In order to do that, I would like to share some of what I saw and learned during a recent visit to the 911 call center that serves my home district in Centre County. And for anyone who has not done so recently, I would strongly encourage you to visit the 911 call center in your county.

When I visited on a Tuesday afternoon, I saw five of eight 911 operator bays occupied, including one staffed by a trainee and a supervisor. Each operator sat in front of an array of six to eight computer monitors. They each had primary responsibility for monitoring a major category of public safety services, including Pennsylvania State Police, local police services, multiple EMS and paramedic services, roughly a dozen volunteer fire companies, hazmat (hazardous material), traffic services, and more. This call center and these operators handle roughly 130,000 calls every year, or over 350 every single day. In other words, this is a complex, high-pressure, and demanding job. It requires a minimum of 6 months of intensive training in order to operate independently. These are indeed first responders dealing directly with people in distress and coordinating response by a complex array of providers and agencies. They provide a vital, essential, and professional service to every resident of our county – a high-quality service that our residents have come to expect and depend on.

And yet until recently, they were making less per hour than starting workers at the local convenience store. So despite their dedication and their best efforts, the call center was routinely operating with only half of all positions filled; a vacancy rate of 50 percent. They were forced to fill that breach by authorizing thousands of hours of overtime, requiring supervisors and trainers to work extra shifts, and other emergency measures. At that point, our county commissioners made the very difficult decision to commit hundreds of thousands of our local taxpayer dollars to very modestly increase pay, \$3 or \$4 an hour, and benefits to help recruit and retain these highly skilled, highly valued employees. The result is that while they still make less money than many entry-level managers at those same convenience stores, the 911 call center today has only a few remaining openings.

And the story is the same when it comes to the actual cost for the technology and infrastructure needed to operate a modern 911 call center. The bottom line is that the current revenues provided by the \$1.65 911 surcharge are woefully inadequate and do not even come close to covering the cost of operating a modern 911 call center. Therefore, they must be supplemented with the local tax dollar to keep going.

When the surcharge legislation was first passed, legislation was first passed, counties were expected to contribute between 10 to 15 percent of the total cost of operating their emergency call centers. Today that percentage has nearly tripled, with some local taxpayers contributing over one-third of the total operating and capital costs. That is unsustainable and it is a significant burden on local taxpayers.

So while I support the provisions of HB 1304, raising the surcharge to \$1.97 per month, the County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania estimates that in order to restore that

original 10- to 15-percent contribution range, the surcharge would have to be \$2.30 and increased by 15 cents each year thereafter in order to keep up with inflation and rising costs.

Yesterday I filed an amendment to reflect that funding level but withdrew it, and instead I urge all of us here and our colleagues in the Senate to continue working towards a sustainable solution that reduces the burden on local taxpayers, many of whom are on fixed incomes, and which reestablishes sufficient 911 funding so that our county call centers continue to provide the essential high-quality, lifesaving public safety services that the residents of our Commonwealth deserve and expect.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Gillen.

Mr. GILLEN. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I first want to commend the leaders on both sides of the aisle for populating the Veterans Affairs and Emergency Preparedness Committee with first responders – both sides. And my gentleman from Norristown, my friend, firefighter, EMT; if you look on our side of the aisle, emergency medical technicians and in terms of the Veterans Affairs side of the equation that responded to the call of the nation in fighter planes, infantry – we have an individual who was at Ground Zero on 9/11, so I do not think credentials need be an issue here. Everyone on either side of the aisle who is on this committee has a heart for people in distress. We are totally committed to a sustainable 911 system, and I appreciate the tenor and the tone of this discussion.

If I could add a few pieces in terms of Next Gen. There was a lot of discussion about that. PEMA (Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency) signed a contract in November of 2020. Next Gen is rolling out. Upgrades have been done in 28 counties. We are moving forward, and we will consummate those technical changes that everyone is looking for, and the concerns that I shared, were shared in the front, that will be consummated in July of 2024.

If I could roll back just for few minutes here. Back in 2013 there was a comprehensive rewrite of the 911 regs, HB 911. My good friend, firefighter, and former State Rep in this chamber, Frank Farry, and I were involved with that, in addition to then chair of the Veterans Affairs and Emergency Preparedness Committee, Steve Barrar, from Delaware County. We did seven hearings. We traveled all over the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Not a criticism of my colleagues, but last Sunday I received some information relative to a hearing that would be held on Monday morning. We are all busy, we are all under pressure, and we had one hearing in this building and it was continued right up until the time Wednesday that we voted on the bill. I do not think that the issue here really is one of product, but I think it is one of process. Seven hearings stretching from 2013 to 2015, a bill that was 92 pages long – longer is not necessarily better – but this bill should have included issues relative to auto dialers, alarms, to PSAPs (public safety answering points), VoIP (Voice over Internet Protocol), an antiquated funding formula that we are looking for changes in. It should have included helping out with the vacancies that exist at the PSAPs; some problems, like burnout, money does not solve.

We want this to be done right. We are not interested in it being rushed. Stakeholders, a large number of stakeholders contacted myself and the executive director – and this included while the hearing was going on – wondering why they were not called to testify. There were 13 drafts of that bill that came out of the work

of 2013 and 2015. This is an incomplete, and I am simply asking that we finish the job. I am confident that we will – so serious about the issue that I met with a director of PEMA in my office today, and there was no substantive disagreement.

Had we taken the course of action – and please listen to this – had we taken the same course of action 2013 to 2015 and we moved out of committee a one-page bill that included an increase, a surcharge increase, it would have been on top of landline costs, and they went extinct. But now we are moving into VoIP. In this very building we are receiving not \$1.65; we are receiving 17 cents based on contacts that could be made to 911. We are talking about contacts to our PSAPs. They are happening a variety of ways, and if we simply relied, moving forward, on a surcharge on cell phone bills, we are going to be exactly where we could have been in 2013 and 2015, but instead we decided there was going to be a comprehensive rewrite and that involves legislators, it involves providers, and it involves stakeholders, who felt very much disenfranchised by this process.

Madam Speaker, there is no one more committed to 911 than me. I drove ambulances. I worked on people in the back of ambulances. I was a first responder. I was trained in interior firefighting. I earned my way through college as an emergency medical technician. I am not patting myself on the back here, but at some point there is going to be a concern about the level of seriousness that we have regarding our 911 system. It should be put to rest right now. We are totally committed. We want a comprehensive rewrite. We are not interested in one hearing. We are not interested in one page – it does not have to be 92 pages, and it does not have to be what we did in 2013-2015 in seven hearings, but it has to be a little bit more than we have heard on the floor of the House of Representatives today.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, very briefly, I think the chairman has outlined a series of concerns regarding the process, and I agree with the good gentleman. The question that we have before us is only part of the discussion which, in and of itself, is the issue. While I trust the prime sponsor's intentions – I believe that they are good; I believe that he wishes to support the 911 system – the question that is in this bill is solely a tax increase. What we do not have a guarantee of yet is passage of the tax cut that unanimously passed this House that this is supposed to offset. Madam Speaker, I fully expect that to be contained in the Fiscal Code come budget time, because that is the only way that you can ensure that those two items are in fact paired up, and I will reserve my support until such time that we can guarantee that these two things occur at the same time.

The reason, Madam Speaker, is because government does not have a good history of actually following through with what it says it will do. You can look at a series of tax phaseouts, tax changes, tax things that were supposed to happen; promises that were made from the well of this House regarding property tax reform, and inevitably, the government ultimately decided at some point in each one of those processes that it needed the money for something else.

Madam Speaker, I will not support this bill as drafted because it is not paired with the corresponding tax cut. And I know that the good gentleman, the prime sponsor, was shocked to learn that we primarily have a landline at our home. That actually speaks to a different issue, and that is broadband access, which has had

good bipartisan support here in this chamber. But, Madam Speaker, I will tell you somebody else who solely relies on landlines: it is the 41,000 TeleFilers that we discussed earlier. There is a large section of the Commonwealth, that lives primarily in the midstate, that that is their only connection.

I want to thank the good gentleman from Montgomery and the good gentleman who served as a police officer previously for your service. I sincerely mean that. It is our honor to have individuals on both sides of the aisle serve in that capacity. They deserve to be taken care of, and, Madam Speaker, I simply cannot support a piecemeal approach at this time. We need to make sure that it is done in its entirety, as the good chairman has outlined. So at this time I will be a "no" but look forward to when I can be a "yes."

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Dan Miller.

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

Not to belabor the point or the vote here, but I also know that there are a lot of people who are waiting for those guarantees, and we are going to be delivering a lot during these next 2 weeks to be sure that a lot of promises are kept and services are there. But here is what I know. There is nothing more critical than making sure that our 911 system is there, functioning, supported in a way that protects not just one area or one town, or not just one community or another, but the entirety of the State. Everything is dependent. There is no police response unless that 911 call center works. There is no fire response unless that 911 call center works. There is no emergency medical service or EMT providers coming in unless that 911 center works. And not only that, we are talking about how to increase response time; how to be sure that we are cutting down on when those needed moments of critical lifesaving care, when it gets there. The quicker it is there, the more likely we are to save lives.

The modernization that has been talked about is critical. The funding is critical. The guarantee must be there so that when any Pennsylvanian calls that 911 call center that it is there, it is functioning, it is ready to answer and respond, and it gives that necessary critical information to those first responders to be sure that they are there safely and ready to perform their work, that critical work, to the best of their ability.

This is an easy vote. It is an easy vote to guarantee that these services will be there. Let us get it done. It should be a "yes" across the board. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—121

Abney	Fiedler	Krueger	Rozzi
Adams	Fleming	Kulik	Ryncavage
Bellmon	Frankel	Labs	Salisbury
Benham	Freeman	Lawrence	Samuelson
Bizzarro	Friel	Madden	Sanchez
Borowski	Fritz	Madsen	Sappey
Boyd	Gallagher	Malagari	Schlossberg
Boyle	Galloway	Marcell	Schweyer

Bradford	Gergely	Markosek	Scott
Brennan	Giral	Marshall	Shusterman
Briggs	Green	Matzie	Siegel
Brown, A.	Guenst	Mayes	Smith-Wade-El
Bullock	Guzman	McAndrew	Solomon
Burgos	Haddock	McNeill	Steele
Burns	Hanbidge	Mehaffie	Struzzi
C Freytiz	Harkins	Merski	Sturla
Cabell	Harris	Miller, D.	Takac
Causar	Hogan	Mullins	Tomlinson
Cephas	Hohenstein	Munroe	Venkat
Cerrato	Howard	Neilson	Vitali
Ciresi	Innamorato	Nelson, N.	Warren
Conklin	Isaacson	O'Mara	Waxman
Curry	Kaufert	Ortitay	Webster
Daley	Kazeem	Otten	White
Davis	Kenyatta	Parker	Williams, C.
Dawkins	Khan	Pashinski	Williams, D.
Deasy	Kim	Pielli	Young
Delloso	Kinthead	Pisciottano	
Delozier	Kinsey	Probst	McClinton,
Donahue	Kosierowski	Rabb	Speaker
Evans	Krajewski	Rader	

NAYS—82

Armanini	Gaydos	Kuzma	Rigby
Banta	Gillen	Leadbeter	Roae
Barton	Gleim	Mackenzie, M.	Rossi
Benninghoff	Gregory	Mackenzie, R.	Rowe
Bernstine	Greiner	Major	Schemel
Bonner	Grove	Mako	Scheuren
Borowicz	Hamm	Maloney	Schlegel
Brown, M.	Heffley	Mentzer	Schmitt
Cook	Irvin	Mercuri	Scialabba
Cooper	James	Metzgar	Smith
Cutler	Jones, M.	Mihalek	Staats
D'Orsie	Jones, T.	Miller, B.	Stambaugh
Davanzo	Jozwiak	Moul	Stehr
Diamond	Kail	Mustello	Stender
Dunbar	Kauffman	Nelson, E.	Topper
Ecker	Keefer	O'Neal	Twardzik
Emrick	Kephart	Oberlander	Warner
Fee	Kerwin	Owlett	Watro
Fink	Klunk	Pickett	Wentling
Flick	Krupa	Rapp	Zimmerman
Flood	Kutz		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1305, PN 1427**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Human Services Code, providing for behavioral health crisis intervention; and establishing the 988 Fund.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the bill, Representative Kinsey.

Mr. KINSEY. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, this legislation provides for essential funding to sustain Pennsylvania's 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline. Madam Speaker, just to be clear, the goal of the 988 Lifeline is to provide immediate assistance and support to any and all residents in this Commonwealth. Whether you live in a rural, suburban, or urban community, this line is established to help save lives here in Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Heffley.

Mr. HEFFLEY. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And I share the good gentleman from Philly's concerns about the 988 hotline and ensuring that we have an effective 988 hotline. It is a national hotline and it is a requirement of the Federal government. This hotline, the 988 system, I think in the fiscal note of this bill is about \$5.5 million that is needed to fund it.

So while I support the 988 system, I do have some concerns. In the one hearing that we did have, the testifiers testified that 20 percent of the calls, 20 percent of the calls, 20 out of every 100 calls that come in to the 988 system in our State right now, the system that is run by DHS (Department of Human Services), go unanswered. Imagine, you call 988 for assistance and DHS is unable to answer the phone. To me, that is very concerning. As a legislative body, we should have oversight over the 988 system. It should never be 20 percent, not 1 percent that goes unanswered. I think we can do better.

My concern with 1305 is that it increases the cell phone tax. That money is then indexed to the CPI for automatic increases and never sunsets, essentially taking away the legislative oversight over this system. So maybe we do fund it and maybe next year, 30 percent of the calls go unanswered. Where is the legislative oversight? There needs to be legislative oversight.

So I fully support the system. At \$5.5 million – we passed, this House, the majority party passed a general appropriation that increased spending by \$5.7 billion, a 14-percent increase, but yet they could not add a line item to fund the 988 at \$5.5 million. They cut it out. They never funded it because they wanted a tax increase.

Yesterday I saw members of the majority party – and I voted for it – cheering and slapping each other on the back because they cut the cell phone tax, and today we are raising the cell phone tax. If we have the money, why do we go back to the taxpayers for it? Let us give them \$10 million. Let us make sure they can do their job and answer the phone – unlike PennDOT, who does not answer the phone; unlike Unemployment, who does not answer the phone; unlike every other State agency that does not answer the phone and ignores the citizens of the Commonwealth. We can have oversight and make sure that this money is appropriated and make sure that these phones are answered.

Suicide – I do not think there is anybody in this room that has not been impacted by a suicide. It is an awful thing. It is tragic. It is why we work so hard on behavioral funding to get help to the citizens that need it. But one of the things that citizens do not need is another tax that does not sunset, that automatically increases, that this legislative body has no oversight over.

So while I share and I appreciate the good chairman's passion on funding the 988 system, I believe that we can do it in a different way. Madam Speaker, I would ask for a negative vote on this and that we could fund this with other means without going back to the taxpayer. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Grove.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Would the prime sponsor stand for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates that he will.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I appreciate that. I just want to make sure I clearly understand this legislation.

It is my understanding that your legislation, HB 1305, does not tax wire and landlines.

Mr. KINSEY. That is correct, Madam Speaker.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you.

Further, I just want to clarify, the Governor's spring update under his 988 plan called for the total appropriation of \$3 million. The fiscal note on this bill calls for \$5.5 million. Can you explain the discrepancy between the Governor's spring update of \$3 million and your proposal of \$5.5 million?

Mr. KINSEY. Madam Speaker, I am sorry; I am not privy to the Governor's \$3 million request.

Mr. GROVE. Under his budget, it was \$3 million that he has projected funding for the 988 funding under his structure, and I was just curious what the difference was between your proposal at \$5.5 million and his at \$3 million.

Mr. KINSEY. Madam Speaker, my proposal is requesting a 6-cent surcharge. I think when you add up the 6-cent surcharge, I think the Governor – and again, I cannot speak on behalf of the Governor – but I think that the Governor's projection, what I am asking somewhere falls around the \$3 million to \$5 million that you are referring to.

Mr. GROVE. Okay. So the difference is the Governor is projecting that his lower tax rate, but including wired line and landline services, is \$3 million, but your proposal at a higher rate, which does not include landlines, is at \$2 million more.

Mr. KINSEY. That is correct, Madam Speaker. And again, I am not privy to the Governor's proposal; however, I would have to review it and look at when the Governor's proposing to start that versus my legislation.

Mr. GROVE. Okay. The Governor's proposal also projects that there is one quarter of funding. Does your proposal in the fiscal note cover more than one quarter of revenues coming into the Commonwealth?

Mr. KINSEY. Madam Speaker, the fiscal note is very clear.

Are there any other questions?

Mr. GROVE. Okay. So the fiscal note does assume two quarters of revenue?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has answered that question.

Mr. GROVE. I did not hear it. I did not hear.

The SPEAKER. He said the fiscal note is clear.

Mr. GROVE. Okay. All right.

On the bill, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed on the bill.

Mr. GROVE. Today we have HB 1305, which, through interrogation, is not the Governor's plan to fund the 988 plan. There are significant differences between what we have here and what the Governor has proposed. This bill does purport to bring in two quarters of revenue, as the fiscal note claims. The effective date is January, so January, February, March, April is one quarter; June, July, August, September is another quarter. You literally cannot get two quarters of revenue within the effective date of this plan, thus the \$5.5 million of revenue will not actually come to fruition as the fiscal note claims.

This bill should cover and mirror the 911 fee, so you have two cell phone levies today. One will have a landline and wireless tax; the other will not. So you do not have the uniformity in taxation between these two. Why that is I do not know, but the revenue between the two is made up by a higher tax levy than even what the Governor proposed.

More importantly that this bill does, as the chairman has alluded to and brought up, this does have an infinity tax attached to it. This tax will continue to rise without the approval of this body because it has a CPI tax attached to it. You will not have another vote. Taxes will continue and increase on cell phone taxes, again, outweighing any savings from the previous bill to eliminate cell phone gross receipts taxes and cell phone taxes.

Again, adding CPI to taxes is an atrocious policy on taxpayers. It completely takes away this body's ability to monitor, to provide oversight, and provide justification for funding moving forward. This gives one agency a blank check, literally, to continue to bill taxpayers. Further, we have already seen CPI of 6 percent and 4 percent over the past few years. That is unsustainable for taxpayers, as they are paying higher inflationary costs at the grocery store, for child care, for everything else.

So I would urge a "no" vote on HB 1305 for these various reasons.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the bill for the second time, Representative Kinsey.

Mr. KINSEY. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And I want to be clear. We are talking about HB 1305. We are not talking about HB 1304. We are talking about HB 1305, which establishes a 6-cents-per-month surcharge on cell phones; 6 cents per month to support the suicide lifeline. So if folks here in this august body believe that 6 cents per month is too much to save a life, then I think that you need to go back to the folks who sent you here and let them know that their lives are not worth 6 cents per month.

Madam Speaker, you know, Madam Speaker, the previous speaker talked about the inflation. Well, let us talk about inflation for a second, because based on the annual rate of inflation of 4 percent, the fee would increase by 1 cent, 1 cent in year 4. So in year 1 you are only taxed 6 cents. In year 2 you are taxed 6 cents. In year 3 you are taxed 6 cents. In year 4 it is 7 cents. How dare we stand here and have this conversation and want to put a number on somebody's life when we are talking about saving lives all across Pennsylvania – not just in urban areas, not just in rural areas, but all across Pennsylvania.

I ask my colleagues, are your constituents lives worth 6 cents per month? If it is, support HB 1305. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes, for the second time, Representative Heffley.

Mr. HEFFLEY. Thank you, Madam Chair.

And look, I think lives are worth much more than 6 cents. I think lives are worth millions of dollars. I think every life is precious, and the underlying 988 system – which already exists, which is already functioning, which is a requirement of the Federal government – how we fund that is what we are debating here, not whether that service should be provided. And I would love to work together so we can provide that \$5.5 million through the general appropriation. If that increases through the GA, we can probably, in a line item, dedicate it to this through the general appropriation rather than being part of what is an overall 911/988 tax, right? This is a 23-percent, combined 23-percent tax on cell phones; 23-percent increase in taxes on cell phones. That is what this is.

So if you want to increase taxes by 23 percent, this bill and the previous bill will do that. If it is accurate that our revenues, as were quoted by the majority Appropriations chair, are growing by leaps and bounds and we can afford a 14-percent increase, then, my God, fund 911 and 988 through the general appropriations and stop going back to the taxpayers.

We could have voted this week for relief for every homeowner, but we only gave it to a select few. Now we are going to increase taxes. Yesterday we voted to decrease taxes; today want to increase taxes. The underlying services are not the issue here. There is nobody that is going to vote against 988. It is, how do we fund it? They always say how you budget is what your priorities are. The fact that this was not put into the general appropriation budget with a 14-percent increase, a \$5.7 billion increase that came out of this body, what are the priorities? Why did we not fund it then?

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would ask for a negative vote so we can continue to work on this process and make sure that the 988 system has proper legislative oversight and is properly funded. Thank you.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—113

Abney	Fleming	Krueger	Salisbury
Bellmon	Flick	Kulik	Samuelson
Benham	Frankel	Labs	Sanchez
Bizzarro	Freeman	Madden	Sappay
Borowski	Friel	Madsen	Schlossberg
Boyd	Gallagher	Malagari	Schweyer
Boyle	Galloway	Marcell	Scott
Bradford	Gergely	Markosek	Shusterman
Brennan	Giral	Marshall	Siegel
Briggs	Green	Matzie	Smith-Wade-El
Brown, A.	Guenst	Mayes	Solomon
Bullock	Guzman	McAndrew	Steele
Burgos	Haddock	McNeill	Struzzi
Burns	Hanbidge	Mehaffie	Sturla
C Freytiz	Harkins	Merski	Takac
Cephas	Harris	Miller, D.	Tomlinson
Cerrato	Hogan	Mullins	Venkat
Ciresi	Hohenstein	Munroe	Vitali

Conklin	Howard	Neilson	Warren
Curry	Innamorato	Nelson, N.	Waxman
Daley	Isaacson	O'Mara	Webster
Davis	Kazeem	Otten	White
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Parker	Williams, C.
Deasy	Khan	Pashinski	Williams, D.
Delloso	Kim	Pielli	Young
Delozier	Kinkead	Pisciottano	
Donahue	Kinsey	Probst	McClinton,
Evans	Kosierowski	Rabb	Speaker
Fiedler	Krajewski	Rozzi	

NAYS—90

Adams	Fritz	Kuzma	Rapp
Armanini	Gaydos	Lawrence	Rigby
Banta	Gillen	Leadbeter	Roae
Barton	Gleim	Mackenzie, M.	Rossi
Benninghoff	Gregory	Mackenzie, R.	Rowe
Bernstine	Greiner	Major	Ryncavage
Bonner	Grove	Mako	Schemel
Borowicz	Hamm	Maloney	Scheuren
Brown, M.	Heffley	Mentzer	Schlegel
Cabell	Irvin	Mercuri	Schmitt
Causar	James	Metzgar	Scialabba
Cook	Jones, M.	Mihalek	Smith
Cooper	Jones, T.	Miller, B.	Staats
Cutler	Jozwiak	Moul	Stambaugh
D'Orsie	Kail	Mustello	Stehr
Davanzo	Kaufner	Nelson, E.	Stender
Diamond	Kauffman	O'Neal	Topper
Dunbar	Keefer	Oberlander	Twardzik
Ecker	Kephart	Ortitay	Warner
Emrick	Kerwin	Owlett	Watro
Fee	Klunk	Pickett	Wentling
Fink	Krupa	Rader	Zimmerman
Flood	Kutz		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 226**, **PN 195**, entitled:

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

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Dawkins.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

As a part of a healthy working relationship with our Senate Republicans, I stand in support of SB 226 which corrects a drafting error that was made in Act 42 of 2022. Act 42 updated the Fire and Panic Act to require family child-care homes to install interconnected smoke alarms and portable fire extinguishers in kitchens and other cooking areas. This correction to the existing effective date makes Act 42 enforceable.

I urge a "yes" vote, and thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—203

Abney	Flick	Krupa	Rapp
Adams	Flood	Kulik	Rigby
Armanini	Frankel	Kutz	Roae
Banta	Freeman	Kuzma	Rossi
Barton	Friel	Labs	Rowe
Bellmon	Fritz	Lawrence	Rozzi
Benham	Gallagher	Leadbeter	Ryncavage
Benninghoff	Galloway	Mackenzie, M.	Salisbury
Bernstine	Gaydos	Mackenzie, R.	Samuelson
Bizzarro	Gergely	Madden	Sanchez
Bonner	Gillen	Madsen	Sappety
Borowicz	Giral	Major	Schemel
Borowski	Gleim	Mako	Scheuren
Boyd	Green	Malagari	Schlegel
Boyle	Gregory	Maloney	Schlossberg
Bradford	Greiner	Marcell	Schmitt
Brennan	Grove	Markosek	Schweyer
Briggs	Guenst	Marshall	Scialabba
Brown, A.	Guzman	Matzie	Scott
Brown, M.	Haddock	Mayes	Shusterman
Bullock	Hamm	McAndrew	Siegel
Burgos	Hanbidge	McNeill	Smith
Burns	Harkins	Mehaffie	Smith-Wade-El
C Freytiz	Harris	Mentzer	Solomon
Cabell	Heffley	Mercuri	Staats
Causar	Hogan	Merski	Stambaugh
Cephas	Hohenstein	Metzgar	Steele
Cerrato	Howard	Mihalek	Stehr
Ciresi	Innamorato	Miller, B.	Stender
Conklin	Irvin	Miller, D.	Struzzi
Cook	Isaacson	Moul	Sturla
Cooper	James	Mullins	Takac
Curry	Jones, M.	Munroe	Tomlinson
Cutler	Jones, T.	Mustello	Topper
D'Orsie	Jozwiak	Neilson	Twardzik
Daley	Kail	Nelson, E.	Venkat
Davanzo	Kaufner	Nelson, N.	Vitali
Davis	Kauffman	O'Mara	Warner
Dawkins	Kazeem	O'Neal	Warren
Deasy	Keefer	Oberlander	Watro
Delloso	Kenyatta	Ortitay	Waxman
Delozier	Kephart	Otten	Webster
Diamond	Kerwin	Owlett	Wentling
Donahue	Khan	Parker	White
Dunbar	Kim	Pashinski	Williams, C.
Ecker	Kinkead	Pickett	Williams, D.

Emrick	Kinsey	Pielli	Young
Evans	Klunk	Pisciottano	Zimmerman
Fee	Kosierowski	Probst	
Fiedler	Krajewski	Rabb	McClinton,
Fink	Krueger	Rader	Speaker
Fleming			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

Ordered, That the clerk return the same to the Senate with the information that the House has passed the same without amendment.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A CONTINUED

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1500, PN 1534**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of January 17, 1968 (P.L.11, No.5), known as The Minimum Wage Act of 1968, further providing for definitions and for minimum wages.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair rules the following amendment out of order for violating House rule 20, amendment A01001.

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

Mrs. **GLEIM** offered the following amendment No. **A00975**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 12, by inserting after "4(a)" and (e)

Amend Bill, page 4, by inserting between lines 28 and 29

(e) In lieu of the minimum wage prescribed in subsection (a) and section 5(c) and notwithstanding subsections (b) and (d), an employer may, during the first [sixty] ninety calendar days when an employe [under the age of twenty years] is initially employed, pay the employe training wages at a rate of not less than the minimum wage [set forth in section 6(a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act (29 U.S.C. § 206(a))] specified in 29 U.S.C. § 206(a) (relating to minimum wage). A person employed at the training wage under this subsection shall be informed of the amount of the training wage and the right to receive the full minimum wage, or a higher wage, upon completion of the training period. No employer may take any action to displace existing employes, including partial displacements such as reduction in the hours, wages or employment benefits of existing employes, for purposes of hiring individuals at the training wage authorized by this subsection.

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the amendment, Representative Gleim.

Mrs. GLEIM. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My amendment, A00975, expands the training wage provisions in section 4 (e) to workers of all ages for a period of 90 days. In the current law, it allows an employee under the age of 20 to be paid a training wage of not less than the Federal minimum wage for the first 60 days of employment. The employee must be notified of the right to receive a higher wage at the end of the training period. Employers cannot use this to displace existing employees. The minimum wage in this bill with annual COLAs (cost-of-living adjustments) is well beyond the inflation and will price the most vulnerable workers out of the job market. This amendment will make employers more likely to give people with barriers to employment or a lack of job skill the opportunity to get a job, and the rate of pay will increase to the full minimum wage after they transition.

In many vocations in our State, Madam Speaker, HR (Human Resources) departments already have a 90-day trial period, and in my district, we just started a reentry program. Employees are more likely to get a job under this new reentry program if people of all ages are given a trial period and time to learn. Also, Madam Speaker, I would like to point out that there are many retired people that would like to go back to work and need an opportunity for this training period as well, and they should also be allowed a training wage.

For this and many other reasons, Madam Speaker, I ask for an affirmative vote on my amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the maker of the amendment.

On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the bill, Representative Dawkins.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I just want to thank the gentlelady for bringing up A00975, but this is factually incorrect. This amendment could lower the pay for many workers by removing the age limit of the 20-year-old and increase that number and the length of time from 60 to 90 days, which would mean any worker could be paid less than the statewide minimum wage in their first 90 days of employment.

I think it is also important to note that we should be moving away from this idea of paying folks less money to come to work when we have a work shortage throughout this State and jobs we need to fill. I do not see a world in which someone is going to show up for 90 days and get paid less than the minimum wage.

So for those reasons I urge a "no."

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—101

Adams	Gaydos	Lawrence	Rigby
Armanini	Gillen	Leadbeter	Roae
Banta	Gleim	Mackenzie, M.	Rossi
Barton	Gregory	Mackenzie, R.	Rowe
Benninghoff	Greiner	Major	Ryncavage
Bernstine	Grove	Mako	Schemel
Bonner	Hamm	Maloney	Scheuren
Borowicz	Heffley	Marcell	Schlegel

Brown, M.	Hogan	Marshall	Schmitt
Cabell	Irvin	Mehaffie	Scialabba
Causser	James	Mentzer	Smith
Cook	Jones, M.	Mercuri	Staats
Cooper	Jones, T.	Metzgar	Stambaugh
Cutler	Jozwiak	Mihalek	Stehr
D'Orsie	Kail	Miller, B.	Stender
Davanzo	Kaufer	Moul	Struzzi
Delozier	Kauffman	Mustello	Tomlinson
Diamond	Keefer	Nelson, E.	Topper
Dunbar	Kephart	O'Neal	Twardzik
Ecker	Kerwin	Oberlander	Warner
Emrick	Klunk	Ortitay	Watro
Fee	Krupa	Owlett	Wentling
Fink	Kutz	Pickett	White
Flick	Kuzma	Rader	Williams, C.
Flood	Labs	Rapp	Zimmerman
Fritz			

NAYS—102

Abney	Evans	Kinsey	Rabb
Bellmon	Fiedler	Kosierowski	Rozzi
Benham	Fleming	Krajewski	Salisbury
Bizzarro	Frankel	Krueger	Samuelson
Borowski	Freeman	Kulik	Sanchez
Boyd	Friel	Madden	Sappey
Boyle	Gallagher	Madsen	Schlossberg
Bradford	Galloway	Malagari	Schweyer
Brennan	Gergely	Markosek	Scott
Briggs	Giral	Matzie	Shusterman
Brown, A.	Green	Mayes	Siegel
Bullock	Guenst	McAndrew	Smith-Wade-El
Burgos	Guzman	McNeill	Solomon
Burns	Haddock	Merski	Steele
C Freytiz	Hanbidge	Miller, D.	Sturla
Cephas	Harkins	Mullins	Takac
Cerrato	Harris	Munroe	Venkat
Ciresi	Hohenstein	Neilson	Vitali
Conklin	Howard	Nelson, N.	Warren
Curry	Innamorato	O'Mara	Waxman
Daley	Isaacson	Otten	Webster
Davis	Kazeem	Parker	Williams, D.
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Young
Deasy	Khan	Pielli	
Delloso	Kim	Pisciottano	McClinton,
Donahue	Kinkead	Probst	Speaker

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

Mr. E. NELSON offered the following amendment
No. **A00977**:

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 12 through 14, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

Section 1. Section 3(d) of the act of January 17, 1968 (P.L.11, No.5), known as The Minimum Wage Act of 1968, is amended to read:

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 16 and 17

Section 2. Section 4(a) of the act is amended and the section is amended by adding a subsection to read:

Amend Bill, page 4, by inserting between lines 28 and 29

(f) In lieu of the minimum wage prescribed in subsection (a) and

section 5(c) and notwithstanding subsections (b) and (d), an employer may pay an employe under the age of eighteen years a rate of not less than the minimum wage specified in 29 U.S.C. § 206(a) (relating to minimum wage). An employer may not take any action to displace existing employes, including partial displacements such as reduction in the hours, wages or employment benefits of existing employes, for purposes of hiring individuals at the wage authorized by this subsection.

Amend Bill, page 4, line 29, 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 maker of the amendment, Representative Eric Nelson.

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

I rise to offer this amendment to ensure we can incent our young people to work. There is no question – research, reality, historical preference – that raising the minimum wage costs young people jobs. Pennsylvania used to have a student wage, and what we want to do here is, should the minimum wage ultimately increase, we want to ensure that employers who are already subject to additional requirements of limited time, additional documentation, restricted hours to be able to work. It is harder for a small employer or a large employer to hire a younger person, and so this amendment would incent employers to be able to hire our young people because they truly need to both learn how to work and establish an opportunity to know that they can work.

So I ask for an affirmative vote on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the maker of the amendment.

On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the bill, Representative Dawkins.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Madam Chair.

And again, I would like to thank the gentleman for bringing up A00977, but again, we get back to this argument of this being factually untrue. There is no data that supports that this particular provision or raising the minimum wage is somehow going to eliminate folks' jobs. Many young workers help their families pay their bills and are saving for future educational opportunities. Inflation impacts these workers the same as anyone else.

So for those reasons I would ask for a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Eric Nelson.

Mr. E. NELSON. Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I appreciate the good gentleman's reference and recognition.

You know, the reality is, there have been a good number of studies, even the Congressional Budget Office, from a national level, said if a \$15-an-hour minimum wage would be implemented, it would cost 1.4 million jobs, specifically for teens and young people. Ohio University study, University of Georgia, Michigan State – each of those studies confirmed that raising the minimum wage decreases teen employment. The Michigan State study, 20-percent decrease in teens to be able to work. So if we are going to move forward, we should not pass a bill that restricts or limits opportunities for our 14-year-olds, our 15-year-olds, and our 16-year-olds to learn how to be able to work.

As a small employer, I know the challenges of hiring young people. You are teaching them to wash their hands, count money, show up. This is why we want to have a wage that is appropriate

for young people so that they do not lose the positions which the research has proven time, time, and time again is a fact.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the bill, Representative Dawkins.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The great thing about all the surrounding States raising their minimum wage is that we no longer need a study; we actually have the facts. Show me where we have lost young people in the workforce in any of the States who have raised their minimum wage.

Again I ask for a "no" vote.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—100

Adams	Fritz	Labs	Rapp
Armanini	Gaydos	Lawrence	Rigby
Banta	Gillen	Leadbeter	Roae
Barton	Gleim	Mackenzie, M.	Rossi
Benninghoff	Gregory	Mackenzie, R.	Rowe
Bernstine	Greiner	Major	Ryncavage
Bonner	Grove	Mako	Schemel
Borowicz	Hamm	Maloney	Scheuren
Brown, M.	Heffley	Marcell	Schlegel
Cabell	Hogan	Marshall	Schmitt
Causar	Irvin	Mehaffie	Scialabba
Cook	James	Mentzer	Smith
Cooper	Jones, M.	Mercuri	Staats
Cutler	Jones, T.	Metzgar	Stambaugh
D'Orsie	Jozwiak	Mihalek	Stehr
Davanzo	Kail	Miller, B.	Stender
Delozier	Kaufner	Moul	Struzzi
Diamond	Kauffman	Mustello	Tomlinson
Dunbar	Keefer	Nelson, E.	Topper
Ecker	Kephart	O'Neal	Twardzik
Emrick	Kerwin	Oberlander	Warner
Fee	Klunk	Ortitay	Watro
Fink	Krupa	Owlett	Wentling
Flick	Kutz	Pickett	White
Flood	Kuzma	Rader	Zimmerman

NAYS—103

Abney	Fiedler	Kosierowski	Rozzi
Bellmon	Fleming	Krajewski	Salisbury
Benham	Frankel	Krueger	Samuelson
Bizzarro	Freeman	Kulik	Sanchez
Borowski	Friel	Madden	Sappey
Boyd	Gallagher	Madsen	Schlossberg
Boyle	Galloway	Malagari	Schweyer
Bradford	Gergely	Markosek	Scott
Brennan	Giral	Matzie	Shusterman
Briggs	Green	Mayes	Siegel
Brown, A.	Guenst	McAndrew	Smith-Wade-El
Bullock	Guzman	McNeill	Solomon
Burgos	Haddock	Merski	Steele
Burns	Hanbidge	Miller, D.	Sturla
C Freytiz	Harkins	Mullins	Takac
Cephas	Harris	Munroe	Venkat
Cerrato	Hohenstein	Neilson	Vitali
Ciresi	Howard	Nelson, N.	Warren
Conklin	Innamorato	O'Mara	Waxman
Curry	Isaacson	Otten	Webster
Daley	Kazeem	Parker	Williams, C.
Davis	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Williams, D.
Dawkins	Khan	Pielli	Young
Deasy	Kim	Pisciottano	

Delloso	Kinhead	Probst	McClinton,
Donahue	Kinsey	Rabb	Speaker
Evans			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

Mr. STAMBAUGH offered the following amendment
No. A00980:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 8, by striking out "and" and inserting a comma

Amend Bill, page 1, line 9, by inserting after "wages" and for exemptions

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 12 through 14, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

Section 1. Sections 3(d), 4(a) and 5(a)(3) and (4) of the act of January 17, 1968 (P.L.11, No.5), known as The Minimum Wage Act of 1968, are amended to read:

Amend Bill, page 4, by inserting between lines 28 and 29

Section 5. Exemptions.—(a) Employment in the following classifications shall be exempt from both the minimum wage and overtime provisions of this act:

* * *

[(3) Delivery of newspapers to the consumer;

(4) In connection with the publication of any weekly, semiweekly, or daily newspaper with a circulation of less than four thousand, the major part of which circulation is within the county where published or counties contiguous thereto;]

* * *

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

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

Mr. STAMBAUGH. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, many newspapers in this State and across the State, through their editorial boards, have supported raising the minimum wage over the years. Ironically, there are exemptions in the current minimum wage law for newspapers.

You know, I do believe that what is good for the goose is good for the gander, and this amendment will remove the exemptions for the newspaper industry and allow them to pay all of their workers the full minimum wage. This is an antiquated exemption in the law and I believe it should be removed, and I ask for an affirmative vote on amendment A00980.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the bill, Representative Dawkins.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I want to thank the gentleman for offering A00980. This is a prime example of an amendment in which we are working on on the other side of the aisle, because we do believe that this bill is far from over. And there is a working group that we are going to be

working in to get some of these provisions that we know make sense into the bill.

So I want to thank the member – I want to let him know that – but at this time we are going to ask for a "no" vote because this is a working document that we are going to continue to work on until we get a final product that we know we all can be proud of. So thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—101

Adams	Gaydos	Lawrence	Rigby
Armanini	Gillen	Leadbeter	Roae
Banta	Gleim	Mackenzie, M.	Rossi
Barton	Gregory	Mackenzie, R.	Rowe
Benninghoff	Greiner	Major	Ryncavage
Bernstine	Grove	Mako	Schemel
Bonner	Hamm	Maloney	Scheuren
Borowicz	Heffley	Marcell	Schlegel
Brown, M.	Hogan	Marshall	Schmitt
Cabell	Irvin	Mehaffie	Scialabba
Causar	James	Mentzer	Smith
Cook	Jones, M.	Mercuri	Staats
Cooper	Jones, T.	Metzgar	Stambaugh
Cutler	Jozwiak	Mihalek	Stehr
D'Orsie	Kail	Miller, B.	Stender
Davanzo	Kaufer	Moul	Struzzi
Delozier	Kauffman	Mustello	Tomlinson
Diamond	Keefer	Nelson, E.	Topper
Dunbar	Kephart	O'Neal	Twardzik
Ecker	Kerwin	Oberlander	Warner
Emrick	Klunk	Ortitay	Watro
Fee	Krupa	Owlett	Wentling
Fink	Kutz	Pickett	White
Flick	Kuzma	Rader	Williams, C.
Flood	Labs	Rapp	Zimmerman
Fritz			

NAYS—102

Abney	Evans	Kinsey	Rabb
Bellmon	Fiedler	Kosierowski	Rozzi
Benham	Fleming	Krajewski	Salisbury
Bizzarro	Frankel	Krueger	Samuelson
Borowski	Freeman	Kulik	Sanchez
Boyd	Friel	Madden	Sappey
Boyle	Gallagher	Madsen	Schlossberg
Bradford	Galloway	Malagari	Schweyer
Brennan	Gergely	Markosek	Scott
Briggs	Giral	Matzie	Shusterman
Brown, A.	Green	Mayes	Siegel
Bullock	Guenst	McAndrew	Smith-Wade-El
Burgos	Guzman	McNeill	Solomon
Burns	Haddock	Merski	Steele
C Freytiz	Hanbidge	Miller, D.	Sturla
Cephas	Harkins	Mullins	Takac
Cerrato	Harris	Munroe	Venkat
Ciresi	Hohenstein	Neilson	Vitali
Conklin	Howard	Nelson, N.	Warren
Curry	Innamorato	O'Mara	Waxman
Daley	Isaacson	Otten	Webster
Davis	Kazeem	Parker	Williams, D.
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Young
Deasy	Khan	Pielli	
Delloso	Kim	Pisciottano	McClinton,
Donahue	Kinhead	Probst	Speaker

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

Mrs. **MARCELL** offered the following amendment
No. **A00987**:

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 12 through 14, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

Section 1. Section 3(d) of the act of January 17, 1968 (P.L. 11, No.5), known as The Minimum Wage Act of 1968, is amended to read:

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 16 and 17

Section 2. Section 4(a) of the act is amended and the section is amended by adding a subsection to read:

Amend Bill, page 4, by inserting between lines 28 and 29

(f) In lieu of the minimum wage prescribed in subsection (a) and section 5(c) and notwithstanding subsections (b) and (d), an employer that is a nonprofit entity exempt from taxation under 26 U.S.C. § 501(c)(3) (relating to exemption from tax on corporations, certain trusts, etc.) may pay an individual a rate of not less than the minimum wage set forth in 29 U.S.C. § 206(a) (relating to minimum wage).

Amend Bill, page 4, line 29, 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 maker of the amendment, Representative Marcell.

Mrs. **MARCELL**. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

This amendment simply is going to exempt nonprofit entities from this legislation. There are currently more than 78,000 nonprofit organizations in Pennsylvania, employing 1 out of every 6 workers. Many operate on shoestring budgets and strive to always do more with less. From food banks to nature centers and religious organizations, my district, just like yours, has many nonprofits that are helping to provide vital services to our community. And of the more than 78,000 nonprofit organizations across the Commonwealth, did you know that there are more than 24,000 in the Philadelphia metro area, 18,000 in Pittsburgh, 4300 in Harrisburg, 3500 in Allentown, 2900 in Scranton, 2800 in Lancaster, 2,000 in York, 1900 in Reading, 1600 in Erie, and 1,000 in State College?

Think about all of these nonprofits being affected, and almost one-quarter of Pennsylvania's nonprofits have revenue that is less than \$250,000 annually. This legislation would crush their ability to fulfill their mission and help those in need. That is why my amendment is so important; giving them freedom will alleviate their financial burdens and allow them to focus resources on their missions, not cripple them and force them to cut services. Exempting them will allow them to continue to provide valuable training, work experience, and opportunity in all of our communities. We must allow our nonprofits to set their wage rates based on the reality of tight budgets and donations. Requiring them to pay the minimum wage would force many to close their doors, and that would hurt the very people their missions serve.

I urge you to join me in supporting amendment 987 to help protect the nonprofits serving our districts across the Commonwealth. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the maker of the amendment.

On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the bill, Representative Dawkins.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I want to again thank the gentlelady for bringing up amendment A00987.

Let us be clear, all nonprofits are not created equal. There are some large and some small, and we should not create a two-class system of employees. People who work for nonprofit organizations deserve to be paid fairly as well. But what I will tell you is, there is a process in which we are looking at to figure out how do we ensure that we do not disrupt the very small – and I mean small – qualifying nonprofits to not be affected by this?

But again, this is a work in progress. We are going to be fixing a lot of these changes as it moves through this process, and at this time I am going to ask my members to vote "no" because there is a moving process as it relates to the minimum wage.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—100

Adams	Fritz	Labs	Rapp
Armanini	Gaydos	Lawrence	Rigby
Banta	Gillen	Leadbeter	Roae
Barton	Gleim	Mackenzie, M.	Rossi
Benninghoff	Gregory	Mackenzie, R.	Rowe
Bernstine	Greiner	Major	Ryncavage
Bonner	Grove	Mako	Schemel
Borowicz	Hamm	Maloney	Scheuren
Brown, M.	Heffley	Marcell	Schlegel
Cabell	Hogan	Marshall	Schmitt
Causar	Irvin	Mehaffie	Scialabba
Cook	James	Mentzer	Smith
Cooper	Jones, M.	Mercuri	Staats
Cutler	Jones, T.	Metzgar	Stambaugh
D'Orsie	Jozwiak	Mihalek	Stehr
Davanzo	Kail	Miller, B.	Stender
Delozier	Kaufer	Moul	Struzzi
Diamond	Kauffman	Mustello	Tomlinson
Dunbar	Keefer	Nelson, E.	Topper
Ecker	Kephart	O'Neal	Twardzik
Emrick	Kerwin	Oberlander	Warner
Fee	Klunk	Ortitay	Watro
Fink	Krupa	Owlett	Wentling
Flick	Kutz	Pickett	White
Flood	Kuzma	Rader	Zimmerman

NAYS—103

Abney	Fiedler	Kosierowski	Rozzi
Bellmon	Fleming	Krajewski	Salisbury
Benham	Frankel	Krueger	Samuelson
Bizzarro	Freeman	Kulik	Sanchez
Borowski	Friel	Madden	Sappey
Boyd	Gallagher	Madsen	Schlossberg
Boyle	Galloway	Malagari	Schweyer
Bradford	Gergely	Markosek	Scott
Brennan	Giral	Matzie	Shusterman
Briggs	Green	Mayes	Siegel
Brown, A.	Guenst	McAndrew	Smith-Wade-El
Bullock	Guzman	McNeill	Solomon
Burgos	Haddock	Merski	Steele
Burns	Hanbidge	Miller, D.	Sturla

C Freytiz	Harkins	Mullins	Takac
Cephas	Harris	Munroe	Venkat
Cerrato	Hohenstein	Neilson	Vitali
Ciresi	Howard	Nelson, N.	Warren
Conklin	Innamorato	O'Mara	Waxman
Curry	Isaacson	Otten	Webster
Daley	Kazeem	Parker	Williams, C.
Davis	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Williams, D.
Dawkins	Khan	Pielli	Young
Deasy	Kim	Pisciottano	
Delloso	Kinhead	Probst	McClinton,
Donahue	Kinsey	Rabb	Speaker
Evans			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

Mr. ROWE offered the following amendment No. A00989:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 8, by striking out "and" and inserting a comma

Amend Bill, page 1, line 9, by inserting after "wages" , for penalties and for civil actions

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 12 through 14, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

Section 1. Section 3(d) of the act of January 17, 1968 (P.L. 11, No.5), known as The Minimum Wage Act of 1968, is amended to read:

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 16 and 17

Section 2. Section 4(a) of the act is amended and the section is amended by adding a subsection to read:

Amend Bill, page 4, by inserting between lines 28 and 29

(f) In lieu of the minimum wage prescribed in subsection (a) and section 5(c) and notwithstanding subsections (b) and (d), an employer may pay an individual a rate of not less than the minimum wage set forth in 29 U.S.C. § 206(a) (relating to minimum wage) if the individual signs an agreement acknowledging all of the following:

(1) The individual is entitled to a higher rate of pay under this act.

(2) The individual, of the individual's own free will, has agreed to be paid a lower rate.

(3) The employer has not coerced the individual to sign the agreement.

Section 3. Sections 12(b) and 13 of the act are amended to read:

Section 12. Penalties.—* * *

(b) Any employer or the officer or agent of any corporation who pays or agrees to pay any employe less than the rates applicable to such employe under this act shall, upon conviction thereof in a summary proceeding, be sentenced to pay a fine of not less than seventy-five dollars (\$75) nor more than three hundred dollars (\$300) or to undergo imprisonment of not less than ten nor more than sixty days, or both. Each week in which such employe is paid less than the rate applicable to him or her under this act and for each employe who is paid less than the prescribed rate, a separate offense shall be deemed to occur. [Any] Except as provided under section 4(f), any agreement between the employer and the employe to work for less than the applicable wage rate shall be no defense to action by the Commonwealth under this section.

* * *

Section 13. Civil Actions.—If any employe is paid by his or her employer less than the minimum wages provided by section 4 of this act

or by any regulation issued thereunder, such worker may recover in a civil action the full amount of such minimum wage less any amount actually paid to the worker by the employer, together with costs and such reasonable attorney's fees as may be allowed by the court[,] and, except as provided under section 4(f), and any agreement between the employer and the worker to work for less than such minimum wage shall be no defense to such action. At the request of any employe paid less than the minimum wage to which such employe was entitled under this act and regulations issued thereunder, the secretary may take an assignment of such wage claim, in trust for the assigning worker and may bring any legal action necessary to collect such claim, and the employer shall be required to pay the cost and such reasonable attorney's fees as may be allowed by the court.

Amend Bill, page 4, line 29, by striking out "2" and inserting
4

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the amendment, Representative Rowe.

Mr. ROWE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, if I had a nickel for every time I heard "follow the science," I might actually be able to finally fix the East Wing escalators – and for our freshman members, you will understand that sooner rather than later.

But, Madam Speaker, the good gentleman, the prime sponsor of the bill, the chairman of the Labor and Industry Committee, asked for some data. He said if there was data, if there was science, let us have it; let us hear it. So, Madam Speaker, I have got the science. Madam Speaker, the Economic Policy Institute, the National Bureau of Economic Research, Miami Trinity University – all of these different entities have provided an abundance of information regarding the impact and the ramification of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, for example, this research shows that in Pennsylvania, a \$15 minimum wage alone – not including, not including changes to the State tipped minimum wage – is going to cost Pennsylvania over 143,000 jobs. Madam Speaker, this is data. This is facts. This is reality. This is the science. This is not the convenient political talking points that often consume the discussion in this room; this is reality – 143,402 jobs, to be precise. Those earners will lose their job.

Madam Speaker, to be more specific, let us break those numbers down. More than half of those losses, 52 percent to be precise, would be for teenagers aged 16 to 19. A majority, a clear majority, 59 percent of those losses, will be women, Madam Speaker. A majority of American economists – again, these scientists in this field in which we are discussing – a majority, 62 percent of American labor economists to be precise, oppose a \$15 minimum wage, citing effects of reducing jobs for teenagers and similar positions, and 81 percent of them citing concerns of negative impacts on small businesses. Fifty-eight percent of economists agree that a \$15 minimum wage will contribute to and exacerbate existing inflationary issues. Sixty percent of economists agree that a \$15 minimum wage will not be efficient to addressing poverty because of the cost increase and inflationary effects associated with it.

Madam Speaker, let us extend that now, that conversation, beyond just the minimum-wage earners to the tipped earners. Miami Trinity University found that the tip credit elimination alone will cost up to 17,000 tipped positions in Pennsylvania. Three out of four American labor economists believe that

eliminating the tip credits will reduce the overall number of jobs available. And the University of California-Irvine, hardly a bastion of conservative ideology, found that every dollar increase in the tipped minimum wage results in a 6.1-percent decrease in employment. A Cornell study found that tipped minimum wage increases, when that happens, the percentage of customers' tip decreases. You are taking money away from service industry workers by passing this bill.

Data on Toast also found, on restaurant transactions that scrapped the traditional tip credit system, such as in California and Washington – we were asked to compare to other States; here are some other States – they had the lowest tipping percentages in the nation.

So one more study from the California-Irvine study found that every dollar increase in the minimum wage resulted in a 5.6-percent decrease in tipped employee earnings – right out of people's pockets. A Miami Trinity University economist found that tip credit elimination could cost tipped employees \$109 million; \$109 million you are taking away from those individuals that are trying to make ends meet by working at these establishments. And finally, the Harvard Business School – again, hardly a bastion of conservatism – they estimate that for every \$1 increase in the minimum wage, tipped minimum wage, restaurants were 14 percent more likely to shut down.

Have they not been through enough? How many businesses did we lose during the prior Governor's shutdown? How many more employees do they have to lose? How many more businesses have to close?

The science is very clear. I am very glad we were able to clear that up. This bill will simply cost jobs. It will drive up unemployment in vulnerable demographics. Madam Speaker, the individuals that are enjoying six-figure incomes in the suburbs, they are not going to feel that. They will cheer for this bill because they will feel good about it, but it is not them that will be losing their jobs.

Now, let us address the darker reality of these statistics, Madam Speaker. I am glad that we just passed a bill to address the suicide hotline, because, Madam Speaker, the Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, doing the research study on 2.04 million respondents, found that being unemployed was associated with a two to threefold increase when it comes to the relative risk of death by suicide. Lancet Psychiatry found that unemployment causes 45,000 suicides a year worldwide. Madam Speaker, the National Institutes of Health concluded that the association between unemployment and suicide is more important than any other socioeconomic factor.

The Economic Policy Institute found that every 10-percent increase in the minimum wage – hear me out here – every 10-percent increase in minimum wage was associated with a 4.6- to 9-percent decline in teenage unemployment – in teenage employment, leading to increased unemployment. The list goes on and on.

Madam Speaker, the correlation between unemployment and suicide rates should give us pause, that we are going to lay off 145,000 Pennsylvanians, most of whom are teenagers; some of whom are single individuals or young mothers trying to make ends meet.

Madam Speaker, the good gentleman from Philadelphia earlier asked, what is the cost of a life? He asked if a life was worth more than 6 cents, and I would agree it absolutely is. But apparently supporters of this bill think it is worth less than \$15, and, Madam Speaker, I cannot agree with that and I cannot

support that, so, Madam Speaker, the substance of my amendment is this, the substance of my amendment is that it provides a path. If you are an individual who is going to lose your job because your employer cannot pay you and you would rather keep your job, all my amendment says is you can agree. It does not in any way impact the proposal of the minimum-wage increase. It leaves that proposal intact. It simply gives the relationship between an employee and an employer to continue by giving that employee the opportunity to say, hey, I would rather keep my job, and I know maybe you cannot afford to pay me, but I would rather keep my job. That is all my amendment does, Madam Speaker. It gives an employee and employer the freedom to decide; negotiate their own terms, payrolls, and hours. And, Madam Speaker, I think given that the clear data, the correlation between unemployment and suicide, it would be irresponsible and selfish to run this bill without this amendment included.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Madden.

Ms. MADDEN. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I read a study back in 2011 that was commissioned by President Obama, and he commissioned over 700 economists, many of them Nobel laureates, and they came to the conclusion that if we had raised the minimum wage to \$11 back in 2011, we would have lifted all the people living in poverty out of poverty. Imagine that. And here we are 10, 11 years later – I am not sure what is funny about lifting people out of poverty, but you joke – so here we are 10, 11 years later, we are fighting for \$4 more. If we had raised the minimum wage back then, we would be doing much better. And I have to stop and think, if we raise the minimum wage to more of a living wage, how many people no longer need services, how many people no longer need food stamps, how many people no longer need all the other assistance programs that we provide, because we are not giving people the dignity of a living wage for the work that they get up and do every day. And how we say to one sector of people, we can afford to pay you more, but because you are 16, the way you mop the floor, the way you flip a burger is not exactly the same as the 25-year-old guy flipping a burger. I do not understand that either. A day's work is worth a day's pay and it should not matter how old you are, and we should be not concentrating on the jobs we are going to lose, but the people we are going to lift out of poverty and the moneys that we are going to save on services we can put other places, I do not know, mental health, education, toxic schools.

Let us pay people what they are worth, let us save some money in the long run, and let us get it right.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentlelady.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Dawkins, the maker of the bill.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Madam Chair. And again, I would like to thank the maker of the amendment, A00989.

The one thing about data, if we truly believe it was fact, we would look no further than MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) Capital that shows you what an actual living wage would be in the State of Pennsylvania or across this country. But in 12 years we have not done any of those things, and here we are again having this debate around minimum wage only because House Democrats decided to bring this bill forward because

Senate Republicans decided that they wanted to do something on this issue.

And for that reason, you know, we are going to ask for a "no" vote, but when House Republicans are serious about having a debate, you know where to find me, and we can have a debate on all these important issues that you believe that we should be addressing. But until then, let us stop the antics and let us get serious about the work. So please vote "no" on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Napoleon Nelson.

Mr. N. NELSON. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I also rise in opposition to this amendment, and to be honest, all the rest that are coming. It is an interesting debate that we are having around what would happen to our State's economy if we increased the wage, and it dawns on me that there are probably 19 other States in the country that are having this same conversation. And it is only 19 because 30 other States have already increased the wage well beyond this and it does not seem that their economies have fallen off the face of this nation. It seems like we are actually fairly behind the ball here. The conversations that we are having are – I will call it theoretical in nature, but it is not theoretical in nature; it is simple politics. The problem is that we are just so far behind. We have so much work to do.

If you want to figure out how in the world to grow the population in our State, let us get closer to the cutting edge. If you want to figure out how in the world to make sure that we are protecting the members in our communities, if you want to make sure we are protecting jobs in large and small towns throughout Pennsylvania, let us at least get closer to where national conversation really is. We are just so far behind. And we now get the opportunity to get caught up a little bit. No, this amendment is not going to fix this bill. No, this bill is not going to tank Pennsylvania. We are just trying to get caught up to 30 other States that have already done this years ago – 30 other States – 30 other States that have already done this years ago.

To be honest, I do not even know why in the world we have spent this long on this conversation. It is so past time. I am an absolute "no" on this and all other amendments coming. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the maker of the amendment for the second time, Representative Rowe.

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

Madam Speaker, just to address some of the issues raised, one of the examples that was raised pointing out that President Obama did a study that found the benefits of raising the minimum wage. Madam Speaker, I would point out that President Obama controlled all three branches of government at the time and did nothing about it. So if raising the minimum wage was such a great thing and President Obama discovered it to be the case and he touted it, why did he not do it?

So again, let us compare the facts to the convenient talking points. Madam Speaker, one of the repeated points is a, quote, "living wage." A living wage is different depending on where you are in the State. A living wage for Philadelphia is going to be a different living wage for Erie County, it might be a different living wage for Snyder County, it might be a different living wage for Luzerne County. So by setting this flat rate across the State for what might be considered a living wage in one part of the State does a disservice to the rest of the State.

My good colleague from Philadelphia not long ago asked the members of my caucus to concern themselves with just the issues outside of it, saying that the Representatives of Philadelphia will address Philadelphia issues themselves, and I understand that point. It is an interesting point to be made. But the concern, Madam Speaker, is that now we are saying that we are going to mandate a wage for the entire State when the cost of living is going to be drastically different throughout.

Madam Speaker, again, my amendment does not eliminate the proposed minimum wage increase in this bill. It simply provides an opportunity for an employee to keep their job at their wage if they want to, because for all the reasons referenced earlier, Madam Speaker, unemployment is the largest socioeconomic corollary to suicide. It is the largest one. So why are we not providing people an opportunity to stay employed? They have that opportunity.

Madam Speaker, another point that was raised that if people make more, the cost of social services will be less because people will not need those social services, but, Madam Speaker, what about the 143,000 people put on unemployment? What happened to those people? They now need social services that they might not have needed beforehand. During the shutdowns that the previous Governor put this State through, almost 3 million Pennsylvanians were pushed onto an unemployment system that to this day is still not working, and now we are going to say, hey, we are going to rinse and repeat that one more time.

So, Madam Speaker, again, we need to be addressing the issues that allow people to make more money overall. Of course we all want to make money. I understand that the good gentleman, the maker of the bill, he wants people to make more money. That is a noble aspiration. We all want people to make more money. But creating mandates that are not feasible, not equal across the State, that disparately impact women and teenagers, that will drastically overwhelm our already dysfunctional unemployment compensation system, Madam Speaker, this amendment just provides a pathway for individuals to keep their job if they want it so we do not have to lay off those 143,000 Pennsylvanians that are already struggling to make ends meet.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Kenyatta.

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I will make this very brief because I know a lot of the conversation has been about the underlying bill, and I am sure we will talk about that next week, but we actually should talk about this amendment and what this amendment actually says. And so for folks – I do not know why you would be watching PCN (Pennsylvania Cable Network) – but if you are watching PCN, I want you to understand what this amendment actually says, and the real juice of the amendment is on page 1 between lines 20 and 25. What this amendment is suggesting is that people are going to sign a document that says pay me less. I mean, just think about that – and I know a lot of people, you know, in this room, maybe you did not have to have the minimum wage, maybe you did, but I cannot envision a worker coming to work and saying, yes, employer, please pay me less than you are statutorily required to pay me. And the problem with this amendment is this, is the amendment says that the worker should not be coerced, but how

do you actually enforce that? How do you enforce it? Who is going to ensure that workers did not sign this document under duress?

We have an issue in the Commonwealth right now where people are having their wages stolen. We have been talking about people being misclassified on the job. Workers are already having to deal with employers who are stealing their wages against their will. And if you have a low-wage worker who is already vulnerable and their employer walks in and says, "You better sign this document or I'm going to fire you," by the time their claim of coercion is actually adjudicated, their kids are going to go without a meal. They might have to go without that rent payment. They might be in a situation where that unexpected health issue or that unexpected auto issue is not going to be able to be paid in a timely fashion.

And so, you know, again, if you are watching this, paying attention, this amendment says: pay me less. I do not know who in their right mind, Madam Speaker, would sign a document to say pay me less, but I will tell you, nobody in the 181st District. We are a little smarter than that.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Schlossberg.

Mr. SCHLOSSBERG. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Let me – I promise I will be brief because the hour is late. I rise in opposition to amendment 989 and there is a very simple reason for that. First, let me state that I genuinely appreciate the maker of this amendment having a conversation that directly links the economic viability of someone's future to mental health and to mental illness. It is refreshing to hear because one of the things that I have tried to talk about as we have conversations around mental health is the overwhelming connection of mental health and mental illness to non-mental health-related factors, including economics, including wage. And that is actually why I rise, because while I appreciate him bringing up mental illness and I appreciate the connection that we have made, the conclusions, factually speaking, if we follow the science, were wrong.

According to a 2019 study that appeared in the Journal of Epidemiology, raising the minimum wage could reduce suicide rates by 3 1/2 to 6 percent, and there is a very simple reason for this. When people get paid more, they have more options in life. With all due respect, I cannot imagine a situation in which somebody who was suffering from depression or trying to get access to mental health care said to themselves, you know what would make my mental health better? If I did not make quite as much money. Frankly, that not only defies the science, but it also defies reality.

We have to have conversations about the connection between mental health and economics, but with all due respect, this amendment will harm the mental illness of others and passing this bill will help. I urge a "no" vote on the amendment and a "yes" vote on the bill.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Smith-Wade-El.

Mr. SMITH-WADE-EL. I am going to do my level best to keep this extremely brief, Madam Speaker, as I know it is late and we are all trying to do things.

Let me echo the chairman from Lehigh's compliments to the gentleman for raising the issue of suicide. I am actually a person who has considered suicide because of ongoing unemployment in my early twenties. I am very glad to be here with you right now, so thank you very much for your solidarity. No, that is – but thank you. Yeah, yeah, yeah.

But because we discussed that, indeed, it does cost a different amount to live in different communities, because we are concerned with a minimum wage that may be too high for Crawford or Elk or Clinton Counties, just sitting here with the publicly available information from the great folks at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, I want you to know that in Clinton County, the living wage for a single adult supporting no children is above \$14 an hour; in Crawford County, it is above \$14 an hour; in Elk County, it is above \$14 an hour; in Beaver, in Butler, in Philadelphia – there is nowhere in this Commonwealth that a single adult can live, can meet their expenses without social benefits, which are a burden on the taxpayer with which we are frequently concerned. There is nowhere, to say nothing of those parenting one, two, three, four children, to say nothing of them.

So let us get on board with the science. Let us not draw statistics from one group of people and then say that that applies to teen suicides, because the studies show that it simply does not. Let me put, let me put the Representative from Lehigh's study into context. That same study, that percentage shows that a \$1 increase in the minimum wage, a \$1 increase in the minimum wage after the Great Recession would have reduced the number of suicides by 27,550 lives, and those 27,000 lives, yes, in fact, Madam Speaker, they are worth \$15. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes Representative Cutler on the amendment.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Like the good gentleman from Philadelphia, I share the same question you do, and that is, who might be watching PCN right now?

So I do believe, while we are all here, that some of your questions actually need answered, and I think it is entirely appropriate to have the discussion. And I appreciate the discussion on mental health because that has been an issue that we have worked on for some time together in a bipartisan way. But to your question of who might actually work for less than minimum wage, I will raise my hand, because I did it when I worked on the farm. Some folks might be unfamiliar with the fact that family law and – family labor and farms actually both have an exemption. So we did work.

And for the record, 5 of 5 is not late, Madam Speaker. We worked until sunset. We often joked that we – which, by the way, we started milking cows at quarter of 3 in the morning and we would end at sunset – so we often joked that we would work a half day from 3a to 3p, and that is the truth.

So there are exceptions. And who would enforce such an agreement? The answer is also thankfully available. It is the Department of Labor. And I know that the Auditor General has from time to time audited various programs and their efficiencies, and that would be who in fact would do it.

But let us get down to the crux of the problem. I do not believe that there is one person here who only wants people to earn a minimum wage. I think that it is a shared goal of this body, and

quite frankly, I think everybody in the Commonwealth – and I think my good friend, the majority leader, would agree – our goal is to have people earn more than minimum wage, and the best way to earn more is to make sure that you learn, because you can learn skills, you can start at the bottom, you can work your way to the top. And as the good gentleman, the prior speaker from Lancaster, just outlined, he outlined his own career trajectory, and congratulations on being here with us. I think that is the American dream. I really do. The idea that any one of us could come from our home districts and have the privilege of representing our friends and neighbors here or working wherever we choose.

So where does that leave us? I think that we need to have schools and training programs that make sure people have opportunity. I think when you look at the most recent court decision, they also recognize that money alone will not fix this problem because we need to make sure that individuals that are enrolled in school actually learn while they are in school.

I want people to have good, family-sustaining jobs. And my good friend, the majority leader, has indicated that we will have the opportunity to discuss my next point at some point in the future. I have often argued, rather than just ask businesses to pay more, we should actually ask government to take a little less. We need to have a serious conversation about the poverty tax exemption, and I know he indicated earlier in the week that we will be doing that, and I actually look forward to that discussion because I think that is a way to help address this problem at the lower end of the wage scale.

So I think the good gentleman has asked some great questions. I appreciate his inquisitive nature. But I think at the end of the day, we should be focused on more than just minimum wage. We will have that discussion, I believe, as part of the budget. The leader has indicated that as such, and I look forward to that discussion; however, I think that there is a responsible way to do it to make sure that we do not impact some of the people that we outlined – you know, family labor, farms, sheltered workshops, some of the other areas that I think that we need to address.

So I urge support for the good gentleman's amendment because I do believe that we should all have the ability to choose where we want to work and ensure that there are protections in place. I think that is a balance that we can find. I do not believe it is yet in this bill.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes the majority leader, Representative Bradford.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And I do not wish to compare our respective upbringing. I worked at a parent small business as well, though. It was not a farm, but it was a flower shop. And I would point out that I also made less than minimum wage. I think Mom and Dad would agree that I actually made nothing.

But I would tell you that everyone who worked in that business also made more than minimum wage. And I say this not to make a laughing point but truly to make the real point, which is, what we provide to our children is the ability as a family to provide for them. What we provide as a business for our workers is their ability to provide for their family. And that is the fundamental difference that I think we miss when we talk about the farm exemption, and of course, there has been no change to that.

And what this amendment proposes to do is truly perverse. While I know there are safeguards on coercion, the idea that anyone is going to be told that, hey, I will give you the job, but I am not giving it to you at the minimum wage. We are going to negotiate something a little lower, is just a little, I got to tell you, perverse. It does not seem healthy in any context. It seems ripe for abuse.

Now, the gentleman expanded his remarks, the good minority leader, about the most recent Commonwealth Court ruling about the state of our schools and how we fund them in the Commonwealth, and we should provide a track for everyone whether they want to go to a 4-year college, no matter what they want to do with their future. But I should remind the good gentleman that our friends in the other chamber, actually their counsel during that litigation, actually said, listen, we do not have to fund all levels of education equally – and I do not want to paraphrase wrongly, but I do want to point out, he said, some of our kids are on, quote, unquote, "the McDonald's track."

Now, that was nauseating to many of us and deeply offensive, but I point it out to say, even those who may work at a fast-food restaurant should know the dignity of work, and the dignity of work includes a minimum wage that allows them to provide what my family provided for me in that small business, what that farm provided for your family, and what it provided for the workers who worked at that farm and that florist, which is the ability to provide for their family. And you cannot tell me \$7.25 an hour does that, and at \$15 an hour. But under the Rowe amendment, you could, you could negotiate that down. You can have a little conversation and say, hey, it was a rough week, I am just going to pay you \$12. Maybe you should take it up with your landlord. Maybe he is going to take a little less too. Everyone is going to take a haircut this month or this week. It is an absurdity. This amendment is, well, it is just absurd, and I think we need to move on and have a discussion about getting people a real \$15-an-hour minimum wage here in the Commonwealth.

So thank you, Madam Speaker, for the opportunity, and I appreciate everyone opposing this amendment for the absurdity it is.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—92

Adams	Flood	Kutz	Rapp
Armanini	Fritz	Kuzma	Rigby
Banta	Gaydos	Labs	Roae
Barton	Gillen	Lawrence	Rossi
Benninghoff	Gleim	Leadbeter	Rowe
Bernstine	Gregory	Mackenzie, M.	Ryncavage
Bonner	Greiner	Mackenzie, R.	Schemel
Borowicz	Grove	Major	Scheuren
Brown, M.	Hamm	Mako	Schlegel
Cabell	Heffley	Maloney	Schmitt
Causar	Irvin	Mentzer	Scialabba
Cook	James	Mercuri	Smith
Cooper	Jones, M.	Metzgar	Staats
Cutler	Jones, T.	Mihalek	Stambaugh
D'Orsie	Jozwiak	Miller, B.	Stehr
Delozier	Kail	Moul	Stender
Diamond	Kaufer	Mustello	Struzzi
Dunbar	Kauffman	Nelson, E.	Topper
Ecker	Keefer	O'Neal	Twardzik

Emrick	Kephart	Oberlander	Warner
Fee	Kerwin	Owlett	Watro
Fink	Klunk	Pickett	Wentling
Flick	Krupa	Rader	Zimmerman

NAYS—111

Abney	Fleming	Krueger	Rozzi
Bellmon	Frankel	Kulik	Salisbury
Benham	Freeman	Madden	Samuelson
Bizzarro	Friel	Madsen	Sanchez
Borowski	Gallagher	Malagari	Sappery
Boyd	Galloway	Marcell	Schlossberg
Boyle	Gergely	Markosek	Schweyer
Bradford	Giral	Marshall	Scott
Brennan	Green	Matzie	Shusterman
Briggs	Guenst	Mayes	Siegel
Brown, A.	Guzman	McAndrew	Smith-Wade-El
Bullock	Haddock	McNeill	Solomon
Burgos	Hanbidge	Mehaffie	Steele
Burns	Harkins	Merski	Sturla
C Freytiz	Harris	Miller, D.	Takac
Cephas	Hogan	Mullins	Tomlinson
Cerrato	Hohenstein	Munroe	Venkat
Ciresi	Howard	Neilson	Vitali
Conklin	Innamorato	Nelson, N.	Warren
Curry	Isaacson	O'Mara	Waxman
Daley	Kazeem	Ortitay	Webster
Davanzo	Kenyatta	Otten	White
Davis	Khan	Parker	Williams, C.
Dawkins	Kim	Pashinski	Williams, D.
Deasy	Kinhead	Pielli	Young
Delloso	Kinsey	Pisciottano	
Donahue	Kosierowski	Probst	McClinton,
Evans	Krajewski	Rabb	Speaker
Fiedler			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

Mr. D'ORSIE offered the following amendment No. A00991:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 8, by striking out "and" and inserting a comma

Amend Bill, page 1, line 9, by striking out the period after "wages" and inserting
and for Minimum Wage Advisory Board.

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 12 through 14, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

Section 1. Sections 3(d), 4(a) and 6(e)(4) of the act of January 17, 1968 (P.L. 11, No.5), known as The Minimum Wage Act of 1968, are amended to read:

Amend Bill, page 4, by inserting between lines 28 and 29

Section 6. Minimum Wage Advisory Board. * * *

(e) The board shall have the power and duty to:
* * *

(4) submit an annual report to the General Assembly by March 1 of each year detailing, to the maximum extent possible, data on the previous calendar year's demographics of those workers who are paid the minimum wage or below. The report shall include an analysis of the impact of the minimum wage on consumer prices and an analysis of the impact of the minimum wage on employment opportunities for

persons with barriers to employment, including persons with disabilities, persons reentering the workforce after a criminal conviction, minors initially entering the workforce and persons reentering the workforce after a recovery from drug or alcohol addiction. The board may include any other relevant facts that it believes necessary into the content of such report; and

* * *

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the amendment, Representative D'Orsie.

Mr. D'ORSIE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I am happy that we are talking about data and studies and science and that we value that because I think my amendment at least partially might be the solution to all of this. A00991 will direct the Minimum Wage Advisory Board to add to its annual report – a report that it is already obligated to conduct as a part of this bill – an analysis of the impact of the minimum-wage law on two categories: consumer prices, and employment opportunities for persons with barriers to employment. So we have heard here today in this hall that we value the data, the studies, the science, so let us collect it. I appreciate your "yes" vote on this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the maker of the amendment.

On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the bill, Representative Dawkins.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Madam Chair.

And I want to thank the gentleman for offering A00991. I agree, data is important, and there are a few other data points in which we want to add into this particular bill as we move through the process which we are currently discussing. So I want to thank the gentleman for raising that point. This is something that we are taking under advisement and adding a few other pieces. So as we move through this process, I think he will be pretty pleased to see the final product, but at this time I am going to ask for a "no" because there is a little bit more that is going to go into this data collection that we are looking to put into this advisory board. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—101

Adams	Gaydos	Lawrence	Rigby
Armanini	Gillen	Leadbeter	Roae
Banta	Gleim	Mackenzie, M.	Rossi
Barton	Gregory	Mackenzie, R.	Rowe
Benninghoff	Greiner	Major	Ryncavage
Bernstine	Grove	Mako	Schemel
Bonner	Hamm	Maloney	Scheuren
Borowicz	Heffley	Marcell	Schlegel
Brown, M.	Hogan	Marshall	Schmitt
Cabell	Irvin	Mehaffie	Scialabba
Causar	James	Mentzer	Smith
Cook	Jones, M.	Mercuri	Staats
Cooper	Jones, T.	Metzgar	Stambaugh
Cutler	Jozwiak	Mihalek	Stehr
D'Orsie	Kail	Miller, B.	Stender
Davanzo	Kaufer	Moul	Struzzi
Delozier	Kauffman	Mustello	Tomlinson

Diamond	Keefer	Nelson, E.	Topper
Dunbar	Kephard	O'Neal	Twardzik
Ecker	Kerwin	Oberlander	Warner
Emrick	Klunk	Ortitay	Watro
Fee	Krupa	Owlett	Wentling
Fink	Kutz	Pickett	White
Flick	Kuzma	Rader	Williams, C.
Flood	Labs	Rapp	Zimmerman
Fritz			

NAYS—102

Abney	Evans	Kinsey	Rabb
Bellmon	Fiedler	Kosierowski	Rozzi
Benham	Fleming	Krajewski	Salisbury
Bizzarro	Frankel	Krueger	Samuelson
Borowski	Freeman	Kulik	Sanchez
Boyd	Friel	Madden	Sappay
Boyle	Gallagher	Madsen	Schlossberg
Bradford	Galloway	Malagari	Schweyer
Brennan	Gergely	Markosek	Scott
Briggs	Giral	Matzke	Shusterman
Brown, A.	Green	Mayes	Siegel
Bullock	Guenst	McAndrew	Smith-Wade-El
Burgos	Guzman	McNeill	Solomon
Burns	Haddock	Merski	Steele
C Freytiz	Hanbidge	Miller, D.	Sturla
Cephas	Harkins	Mullins	Takac
Cerrato	Harris	Munroe	Venkat
Ciresi	Hohenstein	Neilson	Vitali
Conklin	Howard	Nelson, N.	Warren
Curry	Innamorato	O'Mara	Waxman
Daley	Isaacson	Otten	Webster
Davis	Kazeem	Parker	Williams, D.
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Young
Deasy	Khan	Pielli	
Delloso	Kim	Pisciottano	McClinton,
Donahue	Kinhead	Probst	Speaker

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

Mrs. **KEEFER** offered the following amendment
No. **A00992**:

Amend Bill, page 4, lines 12 through 27, by striking out all of said lines

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the amendment, Representative Keefer.

Mrs. KEEFER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My amendment removes the provision for the annual COLA in the minimum wage. The increase that we already have with these goes far above what the current COLA would be. So in 2009 when we adopted the minimum wage of \$7.25, if you would have taken that from 2010 to 2023, we would be at \$9.52. The proposal here bumps the minimum wage up to \$15 over the next 3 years, which far exceeds the COLA, but then it puts it in

perpetuity. So for every year, you would increase this. It would put it on autopilot.

Again, we are also usurping our duty as legislators as well. So it seems to be the trend in the budget that was proposed in February or March that, you know, we just put these COLAs in everything that we do and that way it goes on autopilot. We do not have to come back to the board. We do not have to do our duty as legislators and appropriate these dollars. They will get automatic increases. We need to stop doing this. We need to take responsibility for what we were elected to do.

So this would just take the COLA out of it. It leaves everything else in place and sets things back to where they should be. So I would request support for this amendment.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the maker of the amendment.

On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the bill, Representative Dawkins.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Madam Chair.

And again, I would like to thank the gentlelady for offering A00992, but this amendment would ensure that our minimum wage would begin losing its buy-in power almost immediately. And if the State can afford a COLA for all of its members, I do not see how we justify not having it for the lowest paid workers in this Commonwealth.

I have said this in committee, and I will say it again today. Not that long ago the cost of a carton of eggs was more than our current minimum wage, so when we talk about rising costs of goods and services, how can we justify not allowing our lowest paid workers to keep up with those rising costs of food and services?

So for those reasons I ask for a "no" vote.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—98

Adams	Fritz	Lawrence	Rapp
Armanini	Gaydos	Leadbeter	Rigby
Banta	Gillen	Mackenzie, M.	Roae
Barton	Gleim	Mackenzie, R.	Rossi
Benninghoff	Gregory	Major	Rowe
Bernstine	Greiner	Mako	Ryncavage
Bonner	Grove	Maloney	Schemel
Borowicz	Hamm	Marcell	Scheuren
Brown, M.	Heffley	Marshall	Schlegel
Cabell	Irvin	Mehaffie	Schmitt
Causar	James	Mentzer	Scialabba
Cook	Jones, M.	Mercuri	Smith
Cooper	Jones, T.	Metzgar	Staats
Cutler	Jozwiak	Mihalek	Stambaugh
D'Orsie	Kail	Miller, B.	Stehr
Davanzo	Kaufer	Moul	Stender
Delozian	Kauffman	Mustello	Struzzi
Diamond	Keefer	Nelson, E.	Topper
Dunbar	Kephart	O'Neal	Twardzik
Ecker	Kerwin	Oberlander	Warner
Emrick	Klunk	Ortitay	Watro
Fee	Krupa	Owlett	Wentling
Fink	Kutz	Pickett	Williams, C.
Flick	Kuzma	Rader	Zimmerman
Labs	Labs		

NAYS—105

Abney	Fiedler	Kosierowski	Salisbury
Bellmon	Fleming	Krajewski	Samuelson
Benham	Frankel	Krueger	Sanchez
Bizzarro	Freeman	Kulik	Sappery
Borowski	Friel	Madden	Schlossberg
Boyd	Gallagher	Madsen	Schweyer
Boyle	Galloway	Malagari	Scott
Bradford	Gergely	Markosek	Shusterman
Brennan	Giral	Matzie	Siegel
Briggs	Green	Mayes	Smith-Wade-El
Brown, A.	Guenst	McAndrew	Solomon
Bullock	Guzman	McNeill	Steele
Burgos	Haddock	Merski	Sturla
Burns	Hanbidge	Miller, D.	Takac
C Freytiz	Harkins	Mullins	Tomlinson
Cephas	Harris	Munroe	Venkat
Cerrato	Hogan	Neilson	Vitali
Ciresi	Hohenstein	Nelson, N.	Warren
Conklin	Howard	O'Mara	Waxman
Curry	Innamorato	Otten	Webster
Daley	Isaacson	Parker	White
Davis	Kazeem	Pashinski	Williams, D.
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Pielli	Young
Deasy	Khan	Pisciotano	
Delloso	Kim	Probst	McClinton,
Donahue	Kinlead	Rabb	Speaker
Evans	Kinsey	Rozzi	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

Mr. ROAE offered the following amendment No. **A00996**:

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 12 through 14, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

Section 1. Section 3(d) of the act of January 17, 1968 (P.L. 11, No. 5), known as The Minimum Wage Act of 1968, is amended to read:

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 16 and 17

Section 2. Section 4(a) of the act is amended and the section is amended by adding a subsection to read:

Amend Bill, page 4, by inserting between lines 28 and 29

(f) In lieu of the minimum wage prescribed in subsection (a) and section 5(c) and notwithstanding subsections (b) and (d), an employer may pay an individual who has not earned a high school diploma or high school equivalency certificate, a rate of not less than the minimum wage specified in 29 U.S.C. § 206(a) (relating to minimum wage).

Amend Bill, page 4, line 29, 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 maker of the amendment, Representative Roae.

Mr. ROAE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My amendment is about valuing education. My amendment recognizes that people who graduate from high school or people who earn a GED (general equivalency diploma) are going to earn

more money than people who do not. Under the current minimum wage, if somebody works full-time, they make about \$15,000 a year. Under the bill we are looking at, they would make about \$30,000 a year. My amendment says, if you want to make \$30,000 a year in minimum wage, you need to be a high school graduate or earn your GED.

I think everybody in this room agrees that we value education. If somebody graduates from high school or earns a GED, employers know that potential employee, they know how to read, they know how to write, they know how to do simple math, they have other, you know, general knowledge where they could probably, you know, do a good job. If somebody does not have a high school diploma, some employers that are willing to hire somebody for \$7.25 or \$10 an hour or some smaller amount, they may not be willing to take a chance on \$15 an hour.

I am concerned that people with limited education, limited job skills, limited experience, they are going to really struggle to find employment if minimum wage gets up to \$15 an hour. I just think it is important that we can tell kids if you have a child – a neighbor kid, a niece, a nephew, a family friend – if you tell that kid, if you drop out of school, you might only make 15,000 bucks a year; if you graduate, you are going to make \$30,000 a year. I think that is a powerful message to tell kids and we should be valuing education. Employers, employers, they are going to want to know somebody can read, they can write, they can do math, and I am just very concerned about some people are going to be shut out of the job market.

So I would urge all the members to vote for the amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the bill, Representative Dawkins.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The absurdity of this particular amendment, I do not even know where to begin. This idea that we can justify believing that in this day and age, in 2023, that we think it is good policy to pay someone less money because of what we deem their educational levels. I think Mark Twain once said, do not let school get in the way of your education. There is this assumption that because someone does not reach a certain attainment in education or academia that they are not deemed intelligent. These types of practices were outlawed and there were wars waged because of them. It was called slavery. It is about time we move past these policies and never utter those again.

So for those reasons I urge everyone for a strong "no."

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of the amendment will vote "aye"— The Chair recognizes, for the second time, the maker of the amendment, Representative Roae.

Mr. ROAE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ROAE. Did we already vote on amendment A00977?

The SPEAKER. Yes, we did. About an hour ago.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. ROAE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My amendment is essentially very similar to that. That one failed then, so this one— I am just going to withdraw the amendment. It is pretty similar to the other one. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. It is the Chair's understanding the gentleman withdraws his amendment.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Mr. ROWE offered the following amendment No. **A01004**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 8, by inserting after "providing" for short title,

Amend Bill, page 1, line 12, by inserting after "Sections" 2,

Amend Bill, page 1, by inserting between lines 14 and 15

Section 2. Short Title.—This act shall be known and may be cited as "The [Minimum Wage Act of 1968] Youth Unemployment Act."

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Rowe, the maker of the amendment.

Mr. ROWE. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be very brief.

As we all know, it is a common tradition to vote for resolutions, bills to name bridges, acknowledge days or counties, for recognizing somebody of significance, maybe somebody who suffered a tragedy, those sort of things. So, Madam Speaker, all my amendment does is it will just simply rename this to become the "Youth Unemployment Act," because, Madam Speaker, I think that we should really be paying homage to these 70,000 teenagers that are going to lose their job, and the least that we can do is recognize the sacrifice that they are being forced to make on the altar of political expediency.

So, Madam Speaker, I would ask for a "yes" vote, and let us pay, let us give a little honor to those teenagers who are going to lose their jobs.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—89

Adams	Flick	Kutz	Rigby
Armanini	Flood	Kuzma	Roae
Banta	Fritz	Leadbeter	Rossi
Barton	Gaydos	Mackenzie, M.	Rowe
Benninghoff	Gleim	Mackenzie, R.	Ryncavage
Bernstine	Gregory	Major	Schemel
Bonner	Greiner	Mako	Scheuren
Borowicz	Grove	Maloney	Schlegel
Brown, M.	Hamm	Mentzer	Schmitt

Cabell	Heffley	Mercuri	Scialabba
Causer	Irvin	Metzgar	Smith
Cook	James	Mihalek	Staats
Cooper	Jones, M.	Miller, B.	Stambaugh
Cutler	Jones, T.	Moul	Stehr
D'Orsie	Kail	Mustello	Stender
Davanzo	Kaufer	Nelson, E.	Struzzi
Delozier	Kauffman	O'Neal	Topper
Diamond	Keefer	Oberlander	Twardzik
Dunbar	Kephart	Owlett	Warner
Ecker	Kerwin	Pickett	Watro
Emrick	Klunk	Rader	Wentling
Fee	Krupa	Rapp	Zimmerman
Fink			

NAYS—114

Abney	Frankel	Krueger	Rabb
Bellmon	Freeman	Kulik	Rozzi
Benham	Friel	Labs	Salisbury
Bizzarro	Gallagher	Lawrence	Samuelson
Borowski	Galloway	Madden	Sanchez
Boyd	Gergely	Madsen	Sappey
Boyle	Gillen	Malagari	Schlossberg
Bradford	Giral	Marcell	Schweyer
Brennan	Green	Markosek	Scott
Briggs	Guenst	Marshall	Shusterman
Brown, A.	Guzman	Matzie	Siegel
Bullock	Haddock	Mayes	Smith-Wade-El
Burgos	Hanbidge	McAndrew	Solomon
Burns	Harkins	McNeill	Steele
C Freytiz	Harris	Mehaffie	Sturla
Cephas	Hogan	Merski	Takac
Cerrato	Hohenstein	Miller, D.	Tomlinson
Ciresi	Howard	Mullins	Venkat
Conklin	Innamorato	Munroe	Vitali
Curry	Isaacson	Neilson	Warren
Daley	Jozwiak	Nelson, N.	Waxman
Davis	Kazeem	O'Mara	Webster
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Ortitay	White
Deasy	Khan	Otten	Williams, C.
Delloso	Kim	Parker	Williams, D.
Donahue	Kinkead	Pashinski	Young
Evans	Kinsey	Pielli	
Fiedler	Kosierowski	Pisciottano	McClinton,
Fleming	Krajewski	Probst	Speaker

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

Ms. **FLOOD** offered the following amendment No. **A01022**:

Amend Bill, page 4, lines 7 through 27, by striking out all of said lines and inserting

(9) Ten dollars (\$10) an hour beginning January 1, 2024.

(10) Ten dollars fifty cents (\$10.50) an hour beginning January 1, 2025.

(11) Eleven dollars (\$11) an hour beginning January 1, 2026.

(12) Eleven dollars fifty cents (\$11.50) an hour beginning January 1, 2027.

(13) Twelve dollars (\$12) an hour beginning January 1, 2028.

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

The **SPEAKER**. On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the amendment, Representative Flood.

Ms. **FLOOD**. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My amendment removes the minimum-wage increase in the bill and the annual COLA and inserts alternative minimum wage provisions. It would start at \$10 an hour starting on June 1, 2024, and continue to increase 50 cents each year until it reaches \$12 an hour in 2028. The minimum-wage increase in the original bill goes well beyond inflation. If we applied the same COLA received by the General Assembly to the \$7.25 an hour minimum wage enacted in 2009, the minimum wage in 2023 would be \$9.52 an hour.

So with the minimum wage proposed in the original bill, the IFO (Independent Fiscal Office) projected 30,000 fewer jobs as a result of an increase in minimum wage to \$15 an hour. This amendment phases the minimum wage to \$12 an hour at a much more reasonable rate, and this will increase the minimum wage in real terms but to a level that will be expected to cause minimum impact, minimum negative impact. Thank you.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair thanks the maker of the amendment.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—42

Adams	Fee	Major	Pickett
Armanini	Flick	Mako	Rader
Benninghoff	Flood	Marshall	Roae
Burns	Fritz	Mentzer	Ryncavage
Cabell	Gillen	Mercuri	Scheuren
Causer	Grove	Metzgar	Schlegel
Cooper	James	O'Neal	Smith
Cutler	Kail	Oberlander	Staats
Delozier	Kaufer	Ortitay	Topper
Dunbar	Lawrence	Owlett	Watro
Emrick	Mackenzie, M.		

NAYS—161

Abney	Freeman	Krueger	Rowe
Banta	Friel	Krupa	Rozzi
Barton	Gallagher	Kulik	Salisbury
Bellmon	Galloway	Kutz	Samuelson
Benham	Gaydos	Kuzma	Sanchez
Bernstine	Gergely	Labs	Sappey
Bizzarro	Giral	Leadbeter	Schemel
Bonner	Gleim	Mackenzie, R.	Schlossberg
Borowicz	Green	Madden	Schmitt
Borowski	Gregory	Madsen	Schweyer
Boyd	Greiner	Malagari	Scialabba
Boyle	Guenst	Maloney	Scott
Bradford	Guzman	Marcell	Shusterman
Brennan	Haddock	Markosek	Siegel
Briggs	Hamm	Matzie	Smith-Wade-El
Brown, A.	Hanbidge	Mayes	Solomon
Brown, M.	Harkins	McAndrew	Stambaugh
Bullock	Harris	McNeill	Steele
Burgos	Heffley	Mehaffie	Stehr
C Freytiz	Hogan	Merski	Stender
Cephas	Hohenstein	Mihalek	Struzzi

Cerrato	Howard	Miller, B.	Sturla
Ciresi	Innamorato	Miller, D.	Takac
Conklin	Irvin	Moul	Tomlinson
Cook	Isaacson	Mullins	Twardzik
Curry	Jones, M.	Munroe	Venkat
D'Orsie	Jones, T.	Mustello	Vitali
Daley	Jozwiak	Neilson	Warner
Davanzo	Kauffman	Nelson, E.	Warren
Davis	Kazeem	Nelson, N.	Waxman
Dawkins	Keefer	O'Mara	Webster
Deasy	Kenyatta	Otten	Wentling
Delloso	Kephart	Parker	White
Diamond	Kerwin	Pashinski	Williams, C.
Donahue	Khan	Pielli	Williams, D.
Ecker	Kim	Pisciottano	Young
Evans	Kinthead	Probst	Zimmerman
Fiedler	Kinsey	Rabb	
Fink	Klunk	Rapp	McClinton,
Fleming	Kosierowski	Rigby	Speaker
Frankel	Krajewski	Rossi	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

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

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

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

Mr. LEADBETER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I would like to make a motion to suspend the rules for consideration of amendment A01029 to HB 1500.

The SPEAKER. Our colleague, Representative Leadbeter, moves to suspend the rules for the purpose of immediate consideration of amendment A01029. The question is, will the House suspend its rules? Members are reminded that pursuant to rule 77, the motion to suspend is only debatable by the leaders, the maker of the motion, the maker of the amendment under consideration, and the prime sponsor of the bill under consideration.

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

The SPEAKER. On the motion, the gentleman may proceed.
Mr. LEADBETER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

This bill was introduced on Monday and moved in committee Tuesday and is on second consideration Wednesday. Suspension of the rules is important. It is important, especially after His Excellency, the Governor, proposed a minimum wage hike in his budget address, but this bill was not even introduced until this week and now it is being accelerated through the process.

We need to suspend the rules because my amendment will remove an increase in the tipped minimum wage that, based on the language, hurt tipped workers within the Commonwealth. Changing the tipped wage is an unnecessary part of the wage debate. To be clear, any increase in the statewide minimum wage already would increase the minimum wage for tipped employees.

If a tipped employee does not earn at least the State minimum wage when working their shift, the employer will and must legally make up the difference. Having been a tipped wage employee, I am familiar with this, as I am sure are many of my colleagues on the floor.

Suspending the rules will allow for a much-needed amendment to HB 1500. Without suspension of the rules to allow for this important amendment to be built into the bill, a more than 200-percent payroll increase for the restaurants will be implemented to those restaurants least able to afford it. Restaurant operators will be forced to compensate for the drastic increase in payroll in a variety of ways. Madam Speaker, these ways are varying, such as cutting staff, cutting back hours, moving towards more automation, raising menu prices, and/or eliminating tipping altogether by moving to an hourly wage or service charge model. Ultimately, all of this translates to a pay decrease for servers, of which I was one, most of whom work in the industry because with their tips, they earn well above the minimum wage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

While the Chair has given the gentleman tremendous latitude, I am reminding the gentleman that this is on the motion to suspend the rules. Please limit your comments to the motion to suspend the rules. It is not time to debate the underlying amendment.

Mr. LEADBETER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

In conclusion, a massive increase in the tipped minimum wage will hurt the tipped workers that it is intended to help. Certainly, we should suspend the rules to at least have an up-or-down vote on this important issue. I ask my colleagues to join me in support of my motion to suspend the rules to consider this amendment.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the motion to suspend the rules, the Chair recognizes Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, we have heard several times from the prime sponsor that this is – to use his words – a "working document." Therefore, I do think it is important that we suspend the rules for the immediate consideration of this amendment. Given the rocket docket that this bill is currently heading on, where this bill moved out of committee by prenoticing, and more importantly, was never listed on the committee agenda and moved under any other business, it gave an inadequate amount of time to draft amendments such as this, which is exactly why we need a motion to suspend the rules for the immediate consideration of the underlying amendment so that we can talk about an issue that is vitally important to our tipped wage individuals.

I would urge support of the motion to suspend the rules.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—101

Adams	Gaydos	Lawrence	Rigby
Armanini	Gillen	Leadbeter	Roae
Banta	Gleim	Mackenzie, M.	Rossi
Barton	Gregory	Mackenzie, R.	Rowe
Benninghoff	Greiner	Major	Ryncavage

Bernstine	Grove	Mako	Schemel
Bonner	Hamm	Maloney	Scheuren
Borowicz	Heffley	Marcell	Schlegel
Brown, M.	Hogan	Marshall	Schmitt
Cabell	Irvin	Mehaffie	Scialabba
Causser	James	Mentzer	Smith
Cook	Jones, M.	Mercuri	Staats
Cooper	Jones, T.	Metzgar	Stambaugh
Cutler	Jozwiak	Mihalek	Stehr
D'Orsie	Kail	Miller, B.	Stender
Davanzo	Kaufer	Moul	Struzzi
Delozier	Kauffman	Mustello	Tomlinson
Diamond	Keefer	Nelson, E.	Topper
Dunbar	Kephart	O'Neal	Twardzik
Ecker	Kerwin	Oberlander	Warner
Emrick	Klunk	Ortitay	Watro
Fee	Krupa	Owlett	Wentling
Fink	Kutz	Pickett	White
Flick	Kuzma	Rader	Williams, C.
Flood	Labs	Rapp	Zimmerman
Fritz			

NAYS—102

Abney	Evans	Kinsey	Rabb
Bellmon	Fiedler	Kosierowski	Rozzi
Benham	Fleming	Krajewski	Salisbury
Bizzarro	Frankel	Krueger	Samuelson
Borowski	Freeman	Kulik	Sanchez
Boyd	Friel	Madden	Sappey
Boyle	Gallagher	Madsen	Schlossberg
Bradford	Galloway	Malagari	Schweyer
Brennan	Gergely	Markosek	Scott
Briggs	Giral	Matzie	Shusterman
Brown, A.	Green	Mayes	Siegel
Bullock	Guenst	McAndrew	Smith-Wade-El
Burgos	Guzman	McNeill	Solomon
Burns	Haddock	Merski	Steele
C Freytiz	Hanbidge	Miller, D.	Sturla
Cephas	Harkins	Mullins	Takac
Cerrato	Harris	Munroe	Venkat
Ciresi	Hohenstein	Neilson	Vitali
Conklin	Howard	Nelson, N.	Warren
Curry	Innamorato	O'Mara	Waxman
Daley	Isaacson	Otten	Webster
Davis	Kazeem	Parker	Williams, D.
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Young
Deasy	Khan	Pielli	
Delloso	Kim	Pisciottano	McClinton,
Donahue	Kinhead	Probst	Speaker

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

BILLS RECOMMENDED

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

HB 614;
HB 615;
HB 616;
HB 617;
HB 618;
HB 619;
HB 620;
HB 622;
HB 623;
HB 1170;
HB 1246;
HB 1249;
HB 1295; and
HB 1500.

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

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that the following bills be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar:

HB 1024;
HB 1025;
HB 1026;
HB 1027; and
HB 1300.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair is in receipt of information, today is Representative Armanini's birthday. Happy birthday to our colleague.

For the information of the members, there will be no further votes.

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 Chair is in receipt of a motion by the gentleman from Clearfield County, Representative Armanini, who moves that the House now adjourn until Tuesday, June 20, 2023, at 12 m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker. Have a wonderful Juneteenth.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to, and at 5:24 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.